DEC 6 1949

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 95—PART 4

APRIL 11, 1949, TO MAY 4, 1949
(PAGES 4225 TO 5626)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

DEC 9 1943

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of Life and Light, help us with contrite hearts to begin this week, of all the year the holiest. May its sorrows search our souls. May we rise to newness of life as our glad hearts thrill again at the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. Make us more worthy of the high trusteeship of power and of opportunity which Thou hast committed to our hands in these decisive days. In this quiet moment of devotion, with all other voices stilled, breathe on us, Breath of God. Amid the turbulent things that are seen may the peace of the unseen and the eternal keep steady and steadfast our hearts and minds.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 8, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1757) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to suggest that the Senate is in session following an adjournment, and there will be a morning hour very shortly, at which time Senators can present any matters they desire.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hunt	Mundt
Anderson	Ives	Murray
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Kem	Pepper
Capehart	Kerr	Robertson
Chapman	Knowland	Russell
Donnell	Langer	Schoeppel
Downey	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Ecton	Lucas	Stennis
Ellender	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McCarthy	Taylor
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Malone	Watkins
Gurney	Martin	Wherry
Hendrickson	Maybank	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Miller	Williams
Holland	Millikin	Withers
Humphrey	Morse	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND WEEK-END HOLIDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement for the benefit of Members of the Senate. After the morning hour has been completed we will then have the call of the calendar. After the calendar has been completed the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, House bill 2632, the first deficiency appropriations bill.

I desire to make a further announcement, Mr. President. Some Senators have been very much interested in what the Senate expected to do on Good Friday. It is the intention of the majority to take a recess or have an adjournment from Thursday night over until Monday. I thought Senators might want to know that at this time, in order that they might make their plans accordingly. In other words, there will be no session on Good Friday.

Those are the only announcements I have to make at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat will he yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any idea at what time the Senate may recess or adjourn on Thursday? Some Senators are interested in knowing, so they may make plans.

Mr. LUCAS. I assume the session on Thursday will be concluded around 5:30 or 6 o'clock, unless there is under consideration at that time some measure, action on which it is very important to have completed and to complete which will require but a short time.

I may say that after the Senate has completed action on the first deficiency appropriation bill it will take up the housing bill, which is now on the calendar. I am not sure what measure the Senate will take up after that.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 42)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a

supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $595,890,000, for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1949, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 16

"Petitioning the President of the United States to prohibit the importation of furs from Russia

"Whereas the fur farming industry in the State of Colorado as elsewhere is fighting for its existence due to unjust competitive conditions brought about largely by the importation of furs from Russia: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That it respectfully petitions the President of the United States in the exercise of his emergency or other powers to prohibit the importation of furs from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order to protect the fur farming industry in this State and elsewhere in the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this petition be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.
"FRED C. FERGUSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 14

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States various measures for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide for more comprehensive public welfare programs of assistance and welfare services to various categories of needy persons; and

"Whereas it is essential that provision be made through Federal legislation in cooperation with the States for the assistance of the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who by clinical and laboratory tests, or otherwise, have been determined to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve such proposed legislation providing for amendments to the Social Security Act in order to provide for assistance to the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who have been determined by clinical and laboratory tests, or otherwise, to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employment; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Security Administrator.

"PAT MAGILL, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"HENRY CHRISTENSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.
"FRED C. FERGUSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference petitions signed by 204 citizens of the city of Wilmington, and 30 citizens of Greenwood, both in the State of Delaware, praying for the the enactment of House bill 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverages over the radio, and I ask unanimous consent that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $9,640,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1947 as compared with $7,770,000,000 in 1945. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime, juvenile delinquency, broken homes, deaths, and injuries due to intoxicated drivers, in the number of alcoholics and also of habitual or heavy drinkers. There is every reason why this waste of money and of human values should not be increased but rather greatly decreased.

INTERFAITH DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a joint resolution which was recently adopted by the New York State Legislature which memorializes Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 29, which would designate the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day. This joint resolution is identical with House Joint Resolution 40 and Senate Joint Resolution 6. The last-named joint resolution was introduced by me. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 6 may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, Senate Joint Resolution 6 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day

Whereas the United States of America was founded on the firm basis of freedom of thought and conscience; and

Whereas the fomenting of antagonism between Americans on a basis of sectarian creed is contrary to American traditions and to the spirit of the guaranties of freedom of worship embodied in the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas it ought to be, and is hereby declared to be, the policy of Congress to encourage the mutual understanding of all people of good will; and

Whereas the program of the interfaith movement offers a practicable means for encouraging such mutual understanding: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the fourth Sunday in September of each year is hereby designated as Interfaith Day, and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day, and urging the participation of all Americans and all religious groups in the United States, regardless of sect or creed, to participate in the observance of such day by such means as they may deem appropriate.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, relating to the designation of the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate on April 7, 1949, p. 4014, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PROTEST AGAINST INCREASE IN PENNY POST CARD—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF SOUTH-CENTRAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, ST. JAMES, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the South-Central Electric Association, at St. James, Minn., protesting against increasing the cost of a penny post card to 2 cents.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors of the South-Central Electric Association at a special meeting held at St. James, Minn., at 2 p. m., on the 4th day of April 1949.

A motion was duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried adopting the following resolution and authorizing the manager to send a copy of said resolution to our Congressman and Senators:

"Whereas a proposed law (H. R. 2945) will increase the cost of a penny post card to 2 cents; and

"Whereas the post office favors it because they say big business buys post cards by the billions; and

"Whereas small businesses also use a considerable quantity of penny post cards; and

"Whereas increasing the rate from 1 cent to 2 cents would work a distinct hardship on many small businesses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That a bill be introduced into the Congress in which penny post cards be rationed to not more than 10,000 per month to any one buyer, so that the penny post card can continue to help the little-business man in his competition with the chain stores and big business, and thereby save penny-post-card advertising for the small stores, churches, lodges, clubs, etc."

RESOLUTIONS OF INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION RELATING TO BANKING LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted by the Independent Bankers Association, in convention assembled at the Buena Vista Hotel, at Biloxi, Miss., relating to banking legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. TO CONVERT EITHER WAY

Whereas this association believes that the preservation of our free economy rests in the continuance of the dual banking system; and

Whereas the National Bank Act contains provisions authorizing two national banking associations to merge, a State bank to convert into a national banking association, and a State bank to be consolidated into a national banking association; and

Whereas the present National Bank Act does not permit a national banking association to convert into a State banking institution or to be consolidated or merged into a State banking institution without first going through the process of liquidation; and

Whereas in the event of a merger of a national banking association into a State banking institution, the bank shareholders are in most cases penalized taxwise, which is not true in the case of a State banking institution into a national banking association; and

Whereas this restricts the freedom of any bank to choose either the national or the State banking system and discriminates against the State banking system; and

Whereas this association is convinced of the vital importance to the preservation of the dual banking system of establishing and maintaining reciprocal conversion and merger privileges as between State-chartered banks and national banks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association expresses its firm belief in the need for the enactment of a bill designed to accomplish this result, such as H. R. 58, H. R. 1161, H. R. 1269, and S. 101, which have been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, and urges the Congress to proceed promptly to pass such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the House and Senate Committees on Banking and Currency and to make known the views of this association to the chairmen of such committees; and be it further

Resolved, That each member of the association is requested to write his Congressmen and Senators, urging the prompt enactment of such legislation.

II. TO CONTINUE THE STATUS OF THE THREE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCIES

Whereas this association is firmly and unanimously of the opinion that the continuance of the dual banking system is essential to the maintenance of free enterprise in this Nation; and

Whereas the continuance of the dual banking system in large measure depends upon the division of Federal bank supervision and examination among the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress has passed H. R. 1569, which is a bill authorizing the President to reorganize and transfer functions among the Federal executive departments and agencies by reorganization plans, which plans will become law unless Congress disapproves by a majority of each House within 60 days after submission of the plan to Congress; and

Whereas in H. R. 1569, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System was placed in a special category of agencies which may be reorganized only by a separate reorganization plan that does not contain provisions for the reorganization of any other agencies, which amounts in effect to an exemption of the Federal Reserve System; and

Whereas the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency were not accorded such an exempt status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency should be maintained on a parity with the Federal Reserve Board and should be given like status under H. R. 1569 and S. 526; and be it further

Resolved, That secretary of this association is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the House and Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and to make known the views of this association to the chairmen of such committees; and be it further

Resolved, That each member of the association be urged to write to his Congressman and Senators requesting equal treatment for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve Board in H. R. 1569 and S. 526, as all are entirely maintained by the banks with no expense to the Federal Government.

III. OPPOSE BRANCHES FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Whereas this association is firmly and unanimously opposed to chain, group, or branch banking and the principle so involved; and

Whereas the Federal savings and loan associations are now establishing branches in several States: Be it hereby

Resolved, That this association go on record as opposing any branches whatsoever for Federal savings and loan associations excepting in States that permit State savings and loan associations to establish branches; and be it further

Resolved, That we recommend national legislation that will necessitate Federal savings and loan associations to comply with State law in regard to establishing branches.

IV. URGE LEGISLATION TO ADEQUATELY REGULATE THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY

Whereas holding-company operation of groups or chains of banks with its centralized control of credit and its lack of proper supervisory regulation constitutes a growing monopoly and is a dangerous move toward Government socialization of banking; and

Whereas holding-company operation of groups or chains of banks is inseparably linked to and identified with branch banking and is branch banking in fact if not in name; and

Whereas the expansion of bank holding companies across State lines is a device looking to and intended as a means of establishing branch banking privileges in many States in contravention of law; and

Whereas the Independent Bankers Association believes that a system of independent unit banking is best adapted to the highly diversified community life in the United States and it is therefore unalterably opposed to the growing menace of branch banking which growth has been and is aided, abetted, and made possible by its hidden identity with the uncontrolled and unregulated bank holding company: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Independent Bankers Association, That there be a prompt and speedy enactment by the Congress of the United States of such legislation as will—

1. Prohibit the further expansion of bank holding companies.

2. Place all bank holding companies under effective Government supervision and regulation similar to the supervision and regulation imposed on unit banks.

3. Require the separation of bank holding companies from all nonbanking activities.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY LABOR LAW—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF COLERAINE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Council of Coleraine, Minn., favoring repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act is in effect antilabor legislation which aims at the ultimate defeat of labor organizations in their pursuit of bargaining freedom; and

Whereas under the Wagner Act, millions of workers did organize into strong unions, thereby providing the instrument necessary to protect their interests; and

Whereas the workers in America, through their unions, were able to hold up their heads in the knowledge that for the first time in history they were free men, proving this by their great production record during the terrible years of the past global war; and

Whereas President Truman in his preelection tour of the United States brought the issue of the Taft-Hartley Act to the people, making it the major issue of the day, and the result was that the people voted supporting his stand in this matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Taft-Hartley Act be immediately repealed and the Thomas-Lesinski bill (S. 249–H. R. 2032) which have the approval of the Senate Labor Committee be enacted as law; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be forwarded to President Harry S. Truman, Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, and the Duluth and Iron Ranges Joint Council.

ARTHUR TOMS, *Village President.*

Attest:

RUTH F. HARRIS, *Village Clerk.*

LONG-RANGE FEDERAL FARM PROGRAM—STATEMENT OF POLICY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FARMERS UNION OF WALSH COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a statement of policy adopted by members of the Walsh County Farmers Union board of directors, in meeting at Park River, N. Dak., relating to a long-range Federal farm program, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement of policy was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY, WALSH COUNTY FARMERS UNION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

We, the undersigned, members of the Walsh County Farmers Union board of directors, meeting at Park River, N. Dak., on this 2d day April 1949, do unanimously agree on behalf of 1,100 farm families of this

county that the following Federal legislation should be immediately enacted:

1. A long-range Federal farm program that would: (1) guarantee 100 percent of parity on all farm commodities up to what is normally considered farm-family production; and that parity price supports should be sharply reduced on all farm production above these definitely set production limits; that these and other limitations be effected so as to encourage farm-family agriculture and discourage present-day trends in factory-type agriculture; and (2) greatly increase all farm commodity storage facilities through the use of Federal loans to local and regional REA-type cooperatives; and where such farm commodities must be processed before storage, additional Federal loans be made for the construction, establishment, and maintenance of processing plants. Such a basic farm program would not only strengthen the Nation's agricultural economy but would, additionally, stabilize the total economy.

2. We urge Federal legislation that would equalize all education and health opportunities for everyone. We recommend Federal aid to education and Federal health insurance.

3. We urge immediate and sufficient appropriations so that REA development can be stepped-up in all areas not now serviced by central power stations. Such appropriation measures should definitely specify that they can be used for the construction and establishment of central power stations as well as transmission lines; and that the necessary materials be made available. We further urge, that legislation be passed to establish a rural telephone administration in conjunction and along the lines of the REA.

We direct that a copy of this statement be sent by the county secretary to both Members of Congress and to the United States Senators from this State; and that they be urged to use their influence and throw their wholehearted support behind this legislation.

A. E. ERICKSON,
Chairman.
GORDON TWEDT,
W. R. LILLEHAUGEN.
GEORGE R. BERNTSON.
MRS. ELMER STAVEN.
W. N. ELZNIC.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 528. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 259);

S. 729. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941; with an amendment (Rept. No. 242);

H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Alex Bail; without amendment (Rept. No. 244);

H. R. 679. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 258);

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot; without amendment (Rept. No. 245);

H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok; without amendment (Rept. No. 246);

H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan; without amendment (Rept. No. 247);

H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of Jeanette and Jesus Esteva and their four children; without amendment (Rept. No. 248);

H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; without amendment (Rept. No. 249);

H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Maria Veltri Magnone; without amendment (Rept. No. 250);

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone and Rita Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 251);

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 252);

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd; without amendment (Rept. No. 253);

H. R. 1591. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; without amendment (Rept. No. 254);

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff; without amendment (Rept. No. 255);

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell; without amendment (Rept. No. 256); and

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Shao Hung Pond, and David Yat Wei Pond; without amendment (Rept. No. 257).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 243) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-4455093, Abbott, Arnold, or Felix Arnold Abbott.

A-4446440, Acuna-Salcido, Francisco.

A-6072837, Adamopoulos, Georgios Athanasius, or George Athos Adamson, George Athos Adamopoulos.

A-3305353, Andrianos, Panagiotis Stauros, or Peter Andrianos.

A-9186071, Apell, Karin Guborg Dagmar (nee Ericsson or Karin Apell or Appell).

A-6096785, Arriaza, Dafne Raquel Alvarez.

A-1416522, Atkinson, Marguerite Anne or Marguerite Anne Franklin Cavens or Marguerite Alice June Cavens (nee Marguerite Anne Franklin).

A-6248583, Balloff, Sophia (nee Papadoupoulou).

A-4391738, Bencivenga, Giuseppe, or Joseph Bencivenga or Raffaele Cirillo.

A-4897041, Bennett, Raya.

A-1385801, Blankenberg, Frederick Moritz Anst, or Frederick Moritz Ernest Blankenberg (alias Frederick Morris Ernest Blankenberg, alias Fred Blackwell, alias Fred Blackenberg).

A-6397588, Boellaard, Helena.

A-5713565, Bond, Austin.

A-6314545, Borg, Carmel Charlie.

A-7000606, Borza, Guiseppe.

A-7000607, Borza, Antonia.

A-1387774, Bushey, Elmer Joseph, or Boucher or Bushey or Dick or Richard Bushey.

A-7032447, Caballero-Bustamante, Alberto Antonio.

A-7032445, Caballero-Bustamante, Rafael.

A-7032446, Caballero-Bustamante, Maria Estela.

A-6261651, Caramsaledis, Fotini (nee Dileveu).

A-3725684, Castellano, Vincenzo, or Vincent James Castellano or James Castellano.

A-6720039, Cavallarin, Guerrino.

A-6448302, Chan, Kenneth Ivan, or Kenneth Ivan Hing.

A-6669678, Chavez-Reyna, Alfredo, or Alfredo Chavez.

A-6665545, Chew, Kwong Hai, or Harry Kwong (Hai Chew).

A-6261653, Christake, Merope (nee Kiloni).

A-3289766, Cipolat, Romano.

A-1235054, Cohen, Dora (nee Rom).

A-6798522, Courtsis, Elias Athanasius or Koutsis.

A-7005140, Cristiani, Henrietta Edith, or Henrietta Cristiani.

A-5343796, Cybulski, Benjamin, or Robert Gordon or Manuel Solis or Josef or Joseph Royer or Emilio Valdez or Emilio Honorato Valdez y Ramirez or Myer Bursyn or Burstein or Benumek Subelsky or Zubelsky.

A-3249572, DeGarciaduenas, Adela Arguilera.

A-6429946, DeLeon, Manuel Valencia.

A-6671577, Del Valle, Raul Rodriguez, or Raul Del Valle.

A-6323500, DePolendo, Genoveva Zavala.

A-6297365, Dittner, Pierre Raymond.

A-6194152, Eng, Winifred, or Winifred Ho Chong or Ho Gum Lan.

A-6440402, Fischer, Bela.

A-2856078, Fox, Irene (nee Fuschs or Ronia Malka Fuschs).

56051/858, Gali, Orzaio.

A-2358225, Gensen, Friedrich Paul, or Frederick Gensen.

A-5942350, Godinez, Juan.

A-6282215, Griffin, Robin Delmar.

A-9769331, Grizopoulos, George.

A-7629777, Grove, Marmaduke, or Marmaduke Grove-Valenzuela.

A-6226149, Guillemette, Dorothy Leslie.

A-4745611, Harb, Salem Arbaham Esah.

A-5382338, Hobbs, Ernest Frank.

A-4698673, Horvath, Zofia Mary Rawicz, or Zofia Mary Rawicz Oldakowska.

A-6707622, Koenig, Brigitta.

A-6489133, Kyriakakis, Constas.

A-1972384, Lawson, Margorie Ing-Kai (alias Marjorie Naitto).

A-7539114, Lee, Yung Tsin.

A-4593373, Lee, Joseph Tsu-An, or Jew On Lee or Joseph On Lee or Lee Jew On or Joe On Lee.

A-3454683, Leibovitch, Harold.

A-6405605, Lorenz, Kurt Paul.

A-6581437, Madrid, Manuel.

A-6581438, Madrid, Maria Elodia.

A-3405450, Matiatos, Spiros.

A-9533326, Matthios, Theodoros, or Terry Matthios.

A-6491875, Meireles, Domingos Amaral.

A-6261594, Mishas, Efthimia (nee Mandicas).

A-6533340, Nahra, Gabriel or Nahara.

A-1788665, Nemes, Bella, or Bill Names.

A-6450508, Niethe, Karl Wilhelm.

A-5295304, Onorati, Umberto, or Albert Onorati.

A-6022600, Orta, Maria De La Luz, or Maria De La Luz Horta.

A-6022602, Orta, Pilar, or Pilar Horta.

A-6022601, Orta, Ramona, or Ramona Horta.

A-5952938, Palmisano, Gaetano.

A-3491965, Panciera, Mario.

A-6268180, Pandelaras, Paraskevi Gregory (nee Paraskevi Apostolou Pavlou).

A-3435006, Papadatos, Evangelos Gregorious, or Angelos Papas.

A—6355563, Perez, Antonio, or Antonio Perez Matezanta.

A-6811080, Perez, Virginia Soto, or Virginia Soto Lagos Perez.

A-6704624, Pieber, Gerda, or Bessie Soukaras.

A-1324167, Pinto, Alessio.

A-6339441, Pollett, Robert Anderson.

A–5974374, Ramirez, Jesus, or Jesus Ramirez-Carrasco.
A–6711690, Randolph, Frank Charles.
A–1585863, Reichenbach, Mary Elaine (nee Pye, formerly Beebe).
A–3433637, Richter, John Frank.
A–6696460, Rodriguez, John Negrete.
A–6451215, Rouse, Peter John.
A–9620460, Samuel, George Ryan.
A–6774210, Schlupp, Anna (nee Heiman).
A–6296216, Sereni, Pier Dino.
A–4835531, Sobenko, Mary (see Maria Kuzmiak).
A–3158427, Sootzmann, Alex Fritz, or Alex Soodsmann.
A–1886212, Staub, Hyman, or Herman Staub.
A–6492676, Stewart, Charlotte Rattray.
A–6065478, Stipanovic, Branko, or Branko Stipanovich.
A–6816833, Tarin, Berta Alicia.
A–3363800, Tavares, Henry De Amorim Paula.
A–6225120, Theodorides, Georgios Basileios, or Georgios Theodorides or Michael Panagiotis Hadjistylianos.
A–5987833, Thomas, Eugene Watkin.
A–5916170, Thompson, Oscar Leonard, or Cyril Oscar Wilson.
A–3672478, Tomaselli, Charles Rudolph.
A–6245753, Trepcos, Helene (nee Helene Kovatsis).
A–6260601, Van Hanen, Toivo, Albert.
A–6738733, Vargas, Cesar Medrano, or Cesar Vargas Medrano or Jesus Maldonado Santiago.
A–6706772, Vassilaros, Sofia Ilias (formerly Apostolakis).
A–1467265, Vassos, Alfonso Apostolas, or John Paul Pappas or Paul P. A. Vassos.
A–4865007, Vene, Bruno.
A–1770952, Vitiello, Gennaro.
A–5336993, Volksdorf, Ernest William.
A–9726040, Vucetic, Henrik Emil.
A–6081841, Walters, Jr., Alfred Ernest.
A–1633174, Wineland, Marion Gladys (formerly Bundy, nee Walker).
A–7035406, Yee, Gloria.
A–2727259, Yue, Yeun Shai.
A–2751327, Ha, Chan (Chow) Min.
A–6724306, Zarate-Urzua, Dionisio; Dionisio Zarate-Covarrubias.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENDIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government during the month of February 1949, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH JANUARY–FEBRUARY 1949, AND PAY DECEMBER 1948–JANUARY 1949

(Note with reference to personal service expenditures figures: It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of January, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of December, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of February and are compared with the month of January. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.)

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

According to monthly personnel reports for February 1949 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In February numbered—	In January numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In January was—	In December was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,104,979	2,102,809	+2,170	$527,581	$613,877	−$86,296
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,210,242	1,210,625	−383	307,968	380,263	−72,295
2. National Military Establishment	894,737	892,184	+2,553	219,613	233,614	−14,001
Within National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,295	1,226	+69	434	450	−16
Department of the Army	370,024	367,884	+2,140	87,376	94,118	−6,742
Department of the Air Force	160,232	158,789	+1,443	38,297	38,292	+5
Department of the Navy	363,186	364,285	−1,099	93,506	100,754	−7,248

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number of employees inside continental United States, the number outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 170 from the January total of 1,911,297 to the February total of 1,911,127.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was a decrease of 851 from the January total of 1,155,645 to the February total of 1,154,794.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for February was 756,332, an increase of 680 over the January figure of 755,652.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 69 from the January figure of 1,226 to the February figure of 1,295.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 783 from the January figure of 299,841 to the February figure of 300,624.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within the United States increased 780 from the January figure of 132,205 to the February figure of 132,985.

The Department of the Navy civilian personnel within the United States decreased 952 from the January figure of 322,380 to the February figure of 321,428.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel increased 2,341 from the January total of 191,512 to the February total of 193,853.

An increase of 468 was reported by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the January total of 54,980 to the February total of 55,448.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment increased 1,873 from the January figure of 136,532 to the February figure of 138,405.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 1,357 in overseas civilian employment from the January figure of 68,043 to the February figure of 69,400.

The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 663 in overseas civilian employment from the January figure of 26,584 to the February figure of 27,247.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 147 in overseas civilian employment from the January figure of 41,905 to the February figure of 41,758.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of February increased 582 from the January figure of 574,164 to the February total of 574,746.

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment decreased 270 from the January total of 19,758 to the February total of 19,488.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 852 from the January total of 554,406 to the February total of 555,258.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 1,476 from the January figure of 206,389 to the February figure of 207,865. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 114, and outside continental United States there was an increase of 1,362.

The Department of the Air Force industrial employment increased 823 from the January figure of 95,050 to the February figure of 95,873. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 186, and outside continental United States there was an increase of 637.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 1,447 from the Janu-

ary figure of 252,967 to the February figure of 251,520.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

EMPLOYEES INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, BY STATE AND BY AGENCY, AS OF DECEMBER 1948

The information in table V, carried at the end of this report, was compiled by the United States Civil Service Commission, and is included in this additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in response to numerous requests for a break-down of paid civilian employees of the executive branch, by agency and by State.

It should be noted that differences between the figures released by the Civil Service Commission for the month of December and those compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures are not identical, but they are reconciled in footnote 1 which accompanies table V.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1949, and comparison with January 1949; and pay for January 1949 and comparison with December 1948*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	December	January	Increase	Decrease	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	$19,323	$17,805		$1,518	73,680	73,940	260	
Commerce	12,614	12,118		496	39,926	40,240	314	
Interior	13,999	12,826		1,173	49,588	49,901	313	
Justice	9,539	8,831		708	26,345	26,186		159
Labor	1,211	1,100		111	3,521	3,399		122
Post Office	178,809	122,108		56,701	507,507	507,430		77
State	5,941	5,369		572	20,115	20,210	95	
Treasury	28,075	26,074		2,001	89,015	91,302	2,287	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	84	119	$35		218	225	7	
Bureau of the Budget	261	244		17	530	531	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	15	15			69	60		9
National Security Council [1]	9	9			22	22		
National Security Resources Board	190	150		40	410	407		3
Council of Economic Advisers	23	22		1	39	39		
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation	17	12		5	39	39		
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	50	46		4	147	179	32	
Economic Cooperation Administration	876	926	50		3,078	3,078		
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,681	1,535		146	4,856	4,884	28	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	34	32		2	128	127		1
Philippine War Damage Commission	203	190		13	933	943	10	
War Assets Administration	5,007	2,777		2,230	6,708	4,899		1,809
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	14		1	138	143	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	1,768	1,652		116	4,803	4,811	8	
Civil Aeronautics Board	274	254		20	670	682	12	
Civil Service Commission	1,480	1,167		313	4,228	4,227		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	61	55		6	122	121		1
Federal Communications Commission	535	485		50	1,353	1,349		4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	289	355		34	1,052	1,062	10	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	221	185		36	374	368		6
Federal Power Commission	341	311		30	824	819		5
Federal Security Agency [2]	9,234	9,007		227	35,114	35,267	153	
Federal Trade Commission	296	259		37	650	662	12	
Federal Works Agency	5,978	5,776		202	23,081	23,124	43	
General Accounting Office	3,034	2,773		261	9,432	9,430		2
Government Printing Office	2,231	2,237	6		6,999	7,037	38	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3,806	3,741		65	11,862	11,873	11	
Indian Claims Commission	7	6		1	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	913	826		87	2,248	2,228		20
Maritime Commission	1,878	1,910	32		6,571	6,631	60	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,236	2,059		177	6,895	6,904	9	
National Archives	135	116		19	388	388		
National Capital Housing Authority	81	75		6	308	305		3
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	13	7		6	18	18		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1	1			3	3		
National Gallery of Art	82	79		3	320	325	5	
National Labor Relations Board	567	509		58	1,582	1,517		65
National Mediation Board	58	48		10	108	113	5	
Panama Canal	3,216	3,590	374		22,920	22,804		116
Railroad Retirement Board	706	654		52	2,421	2,451	30	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	[3] 1,989	1,771		218	[3] 4,578	4,589	11	
Securities and Exchange Commission	486	450		36	1,165	1,163		2
Selective Service System	1,212	1,126		86	5,903	5,834		69
Smithsonian Institution	175	160		15	549	547		2
Tariff Commission	108	99		9	240	240		
Tax Court of the United States	53	53			122	121		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,775	3,914	139		13,771	13,581		190
Veterans' Administration	54,948	49,936		5,012	212,928	211,453		1,475
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	380,263	307,968	636	72,931	1,210,625	1,210,242	3,759	4,142
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			72,295				383	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	450	434		16	1,226	1,295	69	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	78,463	73,617		4,846	299,841	300,624	783	
Outside continental United States	15,655	13,759		1,896	68,043	69,400	1,357	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	32,661	33,800	1,139		132,205	132,985	780	
Outside continental United States	5,631	4,497		1,134	26,584	27,247	663	
Department of the Navy	100,754	93,506		7,248	364,285	363,186		1,099
Total, National Military Establishment	233,614	219,613	1,139	15,140	892,184	894,737	3,652	1,099
Net change, National Military Establishment			14,001				2,553	
Grand total including National Military Establishment	613,877	527,581	1,775	88,071	2,102,809	2,104,979	7,411	5,241
Net change, including National Military Establishment			86,296				2,170	

[1] Exclusive of the personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[3] Revised.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1949 and comparison with January 1949*

Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	71,622	71,784	162	
Commerce	36,922	37,199	277	
Interior	44,260	44,222		38
Justice	25,868	25,710		158
Labor	3,485	3,363		122
Post Office	505,774	505,700		74
State	7,744	7,792	48	
Treasury	88,359	90,613	2,254	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	218	225	7	
Bureau of the Budget	530	531	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	60		9
National Security Council [1]	22	22		
National Security Resources Board	410	407		3
Council of Economic Advisers	39	39		
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation	39	39		
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	56	66	10	
Economic Cooperation Administration	901	931	30	
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,831	4,859	28	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	5	5		
War Assets Administration	6,693	4,896		1,797
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	10	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,800	4,808	8	
Civil Aeronautics Board	650	662	12	
Civil Service Commission	4,223	4,222		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	120	119		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,318	1,314		4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,052	1,060	8	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	374	368		6
Federal Power Commission	824	819		5
Federal Security Agency [2]	34,141	34,279	138	
Federal Trade Commission	650	662	12	
Federal Works Agency	22,448	22,500	52	
General Accounting Office	9,432	9,430		2
Government Printing Office	6,999	7,037	38	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,814	11,828	14	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Indian Claims Commission	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,248	2,228		20
Maritime Commission	6,532	6,592	60	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,895	6,904	9	
National Archives	388	388		
National Capital Housing Authority	308	305		3
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	18		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	3	3		
National Gallery of Art	320	325	5	
National Labor Relations Board	1,570	1,506		64
National Mediation Board	108	113	5	
Panama Canal	647	646		1
Railroad Retirement Board	2,421	2,451	30	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	[3] 4,565	4,577	12	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,165	1,163		2
Selective Service System	5,742	5,664		78
Smithsonian Institution	543	542		1
Tariff Commission	240	240		
Tax Court of the United States	122	121		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,771	13,581		190
Veterans' Administration	211,327	209,833		1,494
Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,155,645	1,154,794	3,223	4,074
Net decrease, exclusive of National Military Establishment			851	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,226	1,295	69	
Department of the Army	299,841	300,624	783	
Department of the Air Force	132,205	132,985	780	
Department of the Navy	322,380	321,428		952
Total, National Military Establishment	755,652	756,332	1,632	952
Net increase, National Military Establishment			680	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,911,297	1,911,127	4,855	5,025
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			170	

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[3] Revised.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during 1949 and comparison with January 1949*

Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	2,058	2,156	98	
Commerce	3,004	3,041	37	
Interior	5,328	5,679	351	
Justice	477	476		1
Labor	36	36		
Post Office	1,733	1,730		3
State	12,371	12,418	47	
Treasury	656	689	33	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	91	113	22	
Economic Cooperation Administration	2,177	2,147		30
Office of the Housing Expediter	25	25		
Philippine Alien Property Administration	126	125		1
Philippine War Damage Commission	928	938	10	
War Assets Administration	15	3		12
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	131	133	2	
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3		
Civil Aeronautics Board	20	20		
Civil Service Commission	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2		
Federal Communications Commission	35	35		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation		2	2	
Federal Security Agency	973	988	15	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Works Agency	633	624		9
Housing and Home Finance Agency	48	45		3
Maritime Commission	39	39		
National Labor Relations Board	12	11		1
Panama Canal	22,273	22,158		115
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13	12		1
Selective Service System	161	170	9	
Smithsonian Institution	6	5		1
Veterans' Administration	1,601	1,620	19	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	54,980	55,448	645	177
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			468	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army	68,043	69,400	1,357	
Department of the Air Force	26,584	27,247	663	
Department of the Navy	41,905	41,758		147
Total, National Military Establishment	136,532	138,405	2,020	147
Net increase, National Military Establishment			1,873	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	191,512	193,853	2,665	324
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			2,341	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1949 and comparison with January 1949*

Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,098	1,116	18	
Interior	4,509	4,372		137
State	353	352		1
Treasury	4,352	4,402	50	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	150	151	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	6	6		
Panama Canal	1,853	1,831		22
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,437	7,258		179
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	19,758	19,488	69	339
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			270	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	160,762	160,876	114	
National Military Establishment—Con.				
Department of the Army—Con.				
Outside continental United States	45,627	46,989	1,362	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	75,764	75,950	186	
Outside continental United States	19,286	19,923	637	
Department of the Navy	252,967	251,520		1,447
Total, National Military Establishment	554,406	555,258	2,299	1,447
Net increase, National Military Establishment			852	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	574,164	574,746	2,368	1,786
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			582	

TABLE V.—*Paid civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and State of official duty station, December 1948, continental United States (excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)*

[This chart was prepared and released by the U. S. Civil Service Commission as of Mar. 18, 1949 [1]]

Agency	Total	Washington, D. C., metropolitan area	Alabama	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky
Total	[1] 1,899,143	210,629	31,845	12,050	14,305	206,014	22,191	11,432	1,765	33,618	40,166	5,832	97,742	29,803	15,369	19,307	24,405
White House Office	209	204															
Bureau of the Budget	521	497				6	6						6				
Council of Economic Advisers	38	38															
Executive Mansion and Grounds	64	64															
National Security Council	20	20															
National Security Resources Board	353	353															
Office of Defense Transportation	26	24															
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2															
War Assets Administration	7,326	1,217	21	25	14	459	105	6		50	283		892	271	3	15	2
State	7,525	5,978				18	1			5	1		5				
Treasury	88,801	19,605	619	212	217	5,301	905	814	87	971	1,160	127	9,111	1,005	593	527	1,116
Secretary of Defense	1,159	1,136															
Department of the Army	297,019	26,567	6,053	736	3,343	26,474	4,714	11	81	649	11,707	13	14,634	4,750	531	2,282	7,778
Department of the Navy	321,510	35,778	10	384	715	82,721	68	1,381		15,248	892	935	5,165	4,262		126	886
Department of the Air Force	130,946	4,310	7,344	1,612	1	15,794	1,287	2	19	3,143	6,422	51	3,235	627	55	1,518	122
Justice	25,666	7,998	188	246	79	2,037	255	237	13	473	586	29	581	375	23	393	227
Post Office [2]	506,585	7,623	6,247	1,910	5,029	38,830	4,672	6,962	959	6,778	7,913	1,734	41,329	12,141	9,280	7,412	7,652
Interior	44,185	4,131	170	4,236	144	3,472	4,000	20	4	285	213	881	270	510	58	374	227
Agriculture	70,054	10,892	1,482	666	1,426	4,255	1,586	137	60	955	2,139	1,053	2,625	1,072	1,429	1,410	1,159
Commerce	37,072	13,408	365	207	260	2,101	439	103	55	912	914	191	1,138	500	257	465	277
Labor	3,422	1,629	63	7	10	133	20	24	2	17	54	5	170	34	20	45	19
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7															
Atomic Energy Commission	4,824	664				144	60						241		9		
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	529	513			1		2						3				
Civil Aeronautics Board	643	587				11	2			2	5		4				
Civil Service Commission	4,066	2,240			1	265	83	1		2	171		170				
Displaced Persons Commission	45	45															
Economic Cooperation Administration	854	852															
Export-Import Bank	121	121															
Federal Communications Commission	1,318	883	2			69	3			12	31	3	13				4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,029	319	4		4	22	2	7	2	4	42		52	19	17	4	9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	377	72	3	1	1	26	4	3		4	15		25	5	4	1	3
Federal Power Commission	831	662				50					29		31				
Federal Security Agency	33,994	10,879	500	53	262	1,350	201	92	16	243	1,021	23	1,124	149	74	92	565
Federal Trade Commission	634	563				11							23				
Federal Works Agency	22,321	12,527	160	60	76	1,186	670	40	17	99	266	66	613	96	82	17	84
General Accounting Office	9,413	6,468	1			110	16			11	43		131	5	7	7	8
Government Printing Office	6,953	6,788				28	22						32				
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,548	3,063	79	54	61	1,330	58	107		171	203	19	333	193	61	248	48
Indian Claims Commission	11	11															
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,286	1,577	5	5	8	48	19	2		10	19	2	60	9	9	8	7
Maritime Commission	9,072	1,331	434			1,089				456	5						
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,870	130				1,098											
National Archives	380	363															
National Capital Housing Authority	306	306															
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	7	7															
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	3	3															
National Labor Relations Board	1,648	561	2			122	12			2	60		80	9			
National Mediation Board	107	41											66				
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,813	301	52	28	25	498	44	50	12	116	197	7	310	92	37	44	29
Panama Canal	130	99											4				
Panama Railroad Company	505					3											

[1] GENERAL NOTE.—It is emphasized that the above break-down of Federal civilian employees of the executive agencies by States was prepared by the U. S. Civil Service Commission. It is noted that the total figures in this break-down are not identical with the number of Federal agency civilian employees of the Federal Government reported for December by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The difference of 11,546 between the figures in these 2 reports is accounted for by the fact that the joint committee report excludes the employees of the Federal Reserve System, Maritime Commission trainees, and employees of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which are included by the Civil Service Commission. The employees of the Federal Reserve System and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency are paid from funds collected through levies on banks. The Joint Committee report includes persons of the "expert consultant" type who serve without compensation, and persons receiving compensation while on terminal leave, which are excluded in the Civil Service report.

[2] Partially estimated.

TABLE V.—*Paid civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and State of official duty station, December 1948, continental United States (excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)*—Continued

Agency	Total	Washington, D. C., metropolitan area	Alabama	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky
Philippine War Damage Commission	7	7															
Railroad Retirement Board	2,388	7	9	5	7	86	51	2		9	81	2	1,419	11	7	9	8
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,610	1,588	82	3	68	215	54			100	110		196				64
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,159	829				35	18				13		49				
Selective Service System	5,819	228	113	33	105	315	92	54	16	96	209	58	224	131	149	128	140
Smithsonian Institution	867	855											12				
Tariff Commission	239	231															
Tax Court of the United States	124	124															
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,982	8	3,953							3	9						143
Veterans' Administration	201,800	13,295	3,884	1,547	2,448	16,302	2,718	1,377	422	2,792	5,353	633	13,366	3,537	2,664	4,182	3,828

Agency	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland [2]	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota
Total	22,679	12,991	40,464	55,992	36,745	19,320	15,419	48,905	7,602	16,060	3,545	2,959	42,031	10,910	181,110	24,119	5,956
White House Office				1											3		
Bureau of the Budget																	
Council of Economic Advisers																	
Executive Mansion and Grounds																	
National Security Council																	
National Security Resources Board																	
Office of Defense Transportation								2									
Philippine Alien Property Administration																	
War Assets Administration	88	40		71	81	3	45	271			24		142		967	5	
State	6		4	1	1			1		1					799	1	
Treasury	1,328	424	3,104	2,734	2,471	1,245	219	3,812	193	459	48	118	1,797	119	11,184	657	176
Secretary of Defense															23		
Department of the Army	5,190	153	13,201	6,197	5,751	1,239	3,426	13,123	441	3,115	1	28	14,410	1,470	25,605	2,122	658
Department of the Navy	1,747	6,076	7,025	11,714	92	121	63	132		1,502	1,200		4,129	108	19,577	6,020	
Department of the Air Force	1,198	371	1,121	2,141	518	103	1,449	789	346	1,149	87	202	1,697	1,529	5,375	147	1
Justice	211	152	211	393	679	234	36	440	126	104	19	9	285	51	3,090	121	75
Post Office [3]	5,480	3,614	5,857	21,412	19,102	8,180	4,341	17,875	1,852	5,488	410	1,985	14,331	1,584	79,369	7,343	2,520
Interior	145	226	97	217	72	414	229	879	2,108	964	1,053	19	50	2,248	334	272	847
Agriculture	2,289	218	415	411	934	1,582	1,704	1,649	1,290	1,534	185	156	476	945	1,694	1,488	655
Commerce	642	114	144	335	422	292	304	1,751	372	321	140	61	150	347	1,781	392	171
Labor	22	13	21	113	47	28	12	46	6	9	4	4	15	5	256	10	3
American Battle Monuments Commission																	
Atomic Energy Commission				2				19					37	1,175	547	4	
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System				1	1			1					1				
Civil Aeronautics Board					2	2		6							13		
Civil Service Commission	73			117	2	83	1	124		3					248		
Displaced Persons Commission																	
Economic Cooperation Administration															2		
Export-Import Bank																	
Federal Communications Commission	7	3	41	25	23	4	3	15		15					61		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	4	3	7	16	9	32	5	55		8			44		138	7	1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	2		1	19	19	3	1	21	1	1		2	3		27	3	
Federal Power Commission															27		
Federal Security Agency	984	110	5,739	734	495	112	121	801	141	70	19	27	175	176	3,003	152	22
Federal Trade Commission	7														26		
Federal Works Agency	96	35	179	386	40	125	61	525	44	75	6	18	109	45	1,650	112	20
General Accounting Office	32		28	39	61	24		774	4	5				9	109	951	
Government Printing Office			1												43		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	86	18	229	64	699	76	107	115	12	77	13	35	231	36	999	115	
Indian Claims Commission																	
Interstate Commerce Commission	12	2	5	32	9	29		52	5	14		2	12	4	69	20	3
Maritime Commission	170	196	156	196			290						224		2,603	488	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics																	
National Archives															17		
National Capital Housing Authority																	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission																	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission																	
National Labor Relations Board	36		46	64	70	37		66							169	9	
National Mediation Board																	
Office of the Housing Expediter	49	19	52	203	108	65	29	117	16	33	9	11	107	16	741	61	6
Panama Canal				3											9		
Panama Railroad Company															502		
Philippine War Damage Commission																	
Railroad Retirement Board	11	2	7	12	7	63	3	82	9	8	1		9	6	160	6	4
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	97		8	106	165	58		170	30	35	2		2	1	290	50	
Securities and Exchange Commission				11	3	2		2							139		
Selective Service System	128	32	75	130	206	126	107	261	67	141	26	28	85	48	276	172	70
Smithsonian Institution																	
Tariff Commission															8		
Tax Court of the United States																	
Tennessee Valley Authority							100									124	
Veterans' Administration	2,539	1,170	2,694	8,089	4,656	5,037	2,763	4,929	539	929	298	254	3,510	988	19,177	3,267	724

Agency	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia [3]	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming	Undetermined
Total	81,130	32,025	15,897	111,158	11,117	18,745	7,427	36,210	86,903	20,924	3,082	66,268	49,157	10,531	20,198	4,913	178
White House Office															1		
Bureau of the Budget									6								
Council of Economic Advisers																	
Executive Mansion and Grounds																	
National Security Council																	
National Security Resources Board																	
Office of Defense Transportation																	

[2] Excludes employment within the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area.
[3] Partially estimated.

TABLE V.—*Paid civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and State of official duty station, December 1948, continental United States (excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)*— Continued

Agency	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia [2]	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming	Undetermined
Philippine Alien Property Administration																	
War Assets Administration	698	15	25	703	26	14		3	526	9		7	184	15			
State	2			4					696				1				
Treasury	2,812	493	476	4,366	266	314	129	525	2,620	225	199	977	1,482	404	992	62	
Secretary of Defense																	
Department of the Army	10,921	2,633	2,990	19,012	164	1,732	616	6,398	17,754	7,324	51	8,660	10,201	1,342	760	8	
Department of the Navy	1,853	1,712	364	33,055	7,200	8,726		933	5,653	3,991		33,428	15,847	593	75	3	
Department of the Air Force	20,596	13,486	1	5,520	1	673	299	938	18,172	4,143	1	1,067	1,416	1	1	866	
Justice	650	368	97	917	31	38	12	181	1,567	72	168	449	791	244	96	9	
Post Office [3]	25,941	6,890	4,675	30,373	2,520	3,840	2,693	7,559	19,241	2,018	1,752	7,829	7,394	4,507	11,252	887	
Interior	251	1,867	2,204	1,067	4	54	1,368	264	673	902	6	635	3,605	269	206	1,463	178
Agriculture	1,088	1,397	1,850	1,441	70	1,221	778	1,068	5,143	861	210	1,095	1,203	550	1,712	396	
Commerce	716	610	332	555	51	212	150	423	2,116	291	61	443	1,248	140	190	203	
Labor	111	17	19	159	12	13	4	23	94	7	3	25	29	8	29	3	
American Battle Monuments Commission																	
Atomic Energy Commission	46							1,537					339				
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	2			1				1	2								
Civil Aeronautics Board									6				3				
Civil Service Commission	144	3	2	132		1			100	3		1	93		3		
Displaced Persons Commission																	
Economic Cooperation Administration																	
Export-Import Bank																	
Federal Communications Commission	2	4	24	8	5				33			9	16				
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	27	9	2	37		3	5	10	26		5	23	6	4	36		
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	37	3	5	23	1	2		4	11	1		5	10	2	3		
Federal Power Commission									32								
Federal Security Agency	676	77	86	792	45	152	21	262	1,120	32	22	437	516	92	119	20	
Federal Trade Commission													4				
Federal Works Agency	236	65	305	672	43	75	14	116	477	85	26	157	298	39	74	33	
General Accounting Office	392	1	16	37				13	53	1		15	34	1	7		
Government Printing Office	22												17				
Housing and Home Finance Agency	357	142	107	315	14	160	28	88	363	128	23	475	206	45	126	31	
Indian Claims Commission																	
Interstate Commerce Commission	40	7	20	44	2	3	2	23	39	13		17	9	5	4		
Maritime Commission			213	42					197			791	191				
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,341											3,301					
National Archives																	
National Capital Housing Authority																	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission																	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission																	
National Labor Relations Board	87		15	108		2		9	43				39				
National Mediation Board																	
Office of the Housing Expediter	284	56	40	223	21	21	10	76	285	18	9	69	79	48	80	10	
Panama Canal				15													
Panama Railroad Company																	
Philippine War Damage Commission																	
Railroad Retirement Board	103	5	6	39		2	2	17	68	8		11	8	7	7	2	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	179	80	81	147				74	312	41		93	108			1	
Securities and Exchange Commission	22	2							18				16				
Selective Service System	236	130	50	248	24	85	37	147	252	46	21	171	57	76	137	33	
Smithsonian Institution																	
Tariff Commission																	
Tax Court of the United States																	
Tennessee Valley Authority								9,636				6					
Veterans' Administration	10,258	1,953	1,892	11,103	617	1,401	1,259	5,882	9,205	705	525	6,072	3,707	2,139	4,288	883	

[2] Excludes employment within the Washington, D. C., Metropolitan area.
[3] Partially estimated.

Source: U. S. Civil Service Commission, March 1949.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian personnel in the executive branch of the Federal Government in February increased by 2,170. The total employment for the month was 2,104,979.

Civilian employment by the National Military Establishment for February totaled 894,737—a net increase of 58,000 since February 1948. The February 1949 increase was 2,553. This was partially offset by a decrease of 383 in the civilian agencies of the Government.

In addition to the Military Establishment there was an increase of 2,287 in the Treasury Department and lesser increases in 24 other agencies.

Principal decreases were reported by the War Assets Administration which is in liquidation and the Veterans' Administration. In addition to these decreases there were lesser decreases in a score of other agencies.

Civilian employment inside continental United States decreased by 170 during the month and outside continental United States it increased by 2,341.

These figures were revealed today in the monthly check of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL BY STATES

In addition to the usual break-down of civilian employment the committee this month includes also a break-down of civilian employment by the various agencies of the Government showing the number of employees in each State of the Union and the District of Columbia as of December 1948. This breakdown was compiled as of this month by the United States Civil Service Commission. It shows that the State of California is running a close race with the District of Columbia in the number of Federal employees. As of December the Federal executive agencies were employing 206,014 people in the State of California as compared with 210,629 in the District of Columbia.

The number of employees in New York State ranked next with 181,110. Outside of the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania was the third ranking State in terms of Federal employees with 111,158. Illinois was fourth with 97,742. Delaware was forty-eighth among the States with 1,765 Federal employees.

In the field the Post Office and the Veterans' Administration as a rule were the largest employers of Federal civilian personnel, with the Military Establishment employing large numbers in certain States.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1546. A bill disclaiming and reconveying any interest of the United States to the mineral rights in the lands comprising the Peason Artillery Range, La.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1547. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 1548. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make arrangements

for adequate educational facilities in connection with the opening of lands on the Hunt unit of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho; and

S. 1549. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make provision for public roads in connection with the construction of the Hunt unit of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1550. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1551. A bill for the relief of Jose Augusto Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1552. A bill for the relief of Ernest E. Heintz; and

S. 1553. A bill for the relief of Mary Ann Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1554. A bill to extend the time within which claim may be filed by O. M. Shaller of Lake Butler, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1555. A bill to amend section 144 (b) (4) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code to make applicable to pumice and scoria the percentage allowance for depletion applicable to certain other minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1556. A bill to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1557. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1558. A bill for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 1559. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER AND STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WIDOWS' ANNUITIES UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Public Law No. 426, enacted last year, provided that under the Retirement Act widows should get annuities or benefits. However, for some reason or other, widows under the Panama Canal Retirement Act were excluded. In order to take care of widows of retirees from service in the Panama Canal Zone, I now submit for appropriate reference and printing an amendment intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1081, to repeal the Canal Zone Retirement Act, and to extend the Civil Service Retirement Act, with amendments, to employees affected by such repeal, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, together with a statement by Mrs. Louise G. Franklet, of Bradenton, Fla., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, together with the statement, as follows:

AMENDMENT

On page 5, before the period in line 6, insert a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That any such officer or employee who shall have died during the period beginning on April 1, 1948, and ending on the last day of the month following the month in which this paragraph is enacted, leaving a surviving wife or husband, shall be deemed to have made such election and to have named such wife or husband to receive an annuity as provided in the proviso in such paragraph, but no such annuity shall become payable to such wife or husband prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph."

STATEMENT ON WIDOWS' ANNUITIES UNDER CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT

The Panama Canal Retirement Act at present provides no annuity benefit for the widows of Canal-Railroad retirees.

The Civil Service Retirement Act does provide for widows of retirees. The amendment authorizing this became effective April 1, 1948 (Public Law 426).

There has been introduced in the Senate of the present Eighty-first Congress, a bill, S. 1081, which proposes to merge the Panama Canal and Civil Service Retirement Systems.

If enacted into law, in its present form, S. 1081 would provide for the widows of previously retired Canal employees, as an optional alternative to be exercised by the retiree annuitant under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, as amended by Public Law 426.

This optional alternative involves a possible increase of 25 percent in the previously established annuity, not to exceed $300 a year, as in lieu thereof the establishing of a future annuity for the surviving widow in an amount equal to 50 percent of the previously established annuity but not to exceed $600 a year.

There has also been introduced, in the House of Representatives, a bill, H. R. 1722, which proposes to modify the above optional alternative for widows under the Civil Service Act. H. R. 1722 proposes to establish an annuity for the surviving widow if the retiree accepts a 10-percent reduction in his annuity after it has been increased by 25 percent not to exceed $300 a year, and thereby establish a future annuity for the surviving widow of 50 percent of the amount of above resultant annuity.

It remains to be developed whether the present Congress will enact S. 1081 without change and whether or not it will become effective as of April 1, 1948, to place the Panama Canal retiree in the same status as civil-service retirees.

It would be quite a discrimination against Panama Canal retirees if the increase in previously established annuities was not made applicable the same time as other Government retirees simply because the past Eightieth Congress did not get around to consider their case before it adjourned in June 1948.

It is not now apparent what consideration would be given to those who become widows before the above merger becomes law, as in case the option has not been exercised by a retiree before his death.

Mrs. LOUISE G. FRANKLET.

BRADENTON, FLA.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PHILIP J. FINNEGAN TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, April 18, 1948, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Philip J. Finnegan, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Hon. William M. Sparks, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is now holding hearings on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, be permitted to continue its hearings during the session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Finance Committee may be privileged to continue the hearing on the oleomargarine bill during the afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, consent is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for a period of 2 weeks, when I shall be absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS' PENSIONS—LETTER FROM S. FRED OLSEN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative

to pensions for veterans addressed to him by S. Fred Olsen, of Seattle, Wash., which appears in the Appendix.]

MORAL REARMAMENT—LETTER FROM H. KENASTON TWITCHELL

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of moral rearmament, addressed to him by H. Kenaston Twitchell, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF ACCOUNTS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Warren Backs Williams," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PENNSYLVANIA GRIDIRON DINNER—SONG BY MILTON V. BURGESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a song entitled "Roll Along, Pennsylvania," composed by Milton V. Burgess for the Pennsylvania gridiron show at Harrisburg, Pa., on April 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MILITARY PROBLEM IN THE PACIFIC—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MCCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Pacific Retreat—Military Planners Are About To Let Down the United States and Asia," from the current issue of Life magazine, and the second, entitled "United States Neglecting to Protest Pacific Interests," published in the Washington Sunday Star of April 3, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invitation to the Hangman," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RATIFICATION OF NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Petition Asks Senate To Ratify Atlantic Treaty," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOP-LEVEL SALARIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Top-Level Salaries," published in the Washington Post of April 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY DEMOCRACY WORKS—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY MISS ISABEL BERN

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay entitled "Why Democracy Works," by Miss Isabel Bern, as printed in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent on April 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERSTATE COMPACT RELATING TO BETTER UTILIZATION OF FISHERIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, which was, on page 6, line 16, after the word "limit", to insert "or add to."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. BREWSTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Before the call of the calendar is begun, the Chair would like to make a statement. His attention has been called to the confusion which frequently arises when a bill is called and a Senator, without rising from his seat, says "Over," or "I object." That is not in accordance with the rule. The rule requires that before a Senator may make any statement he shall rise from his seat and address the Chair. It is difficult for the reporters and the clerks at the desk to know which Senator objects to a bill unless that course is pursued. Their ears must be fairly well attuned to voices in order to enable them to know which Senator objects, if a Senator remains in his seat and objects.

The Chair will ask Senators who intend to object when a bill is called to rise and address the Chair, so that the RECORD may properly show who objects to the consideration of a bill.

The clerk will proceed to state the business on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 206) relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese-treaty merchants was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONNELL, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. THYE rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 196) for the relief of James G. Smyth was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 612) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 45) for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208 was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LIMITATIONS OF TIME ON ACTIONS FOR RECOVERY BROUGHT AGAINST CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 257) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by water, and freight forwarders, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment in section 5, on page 4, line 25, after "Sec. 5," to strike out "Title" and insert "Part", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 204 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 204a. (1) All actions at law by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges, action at law shall be begun against common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2)

a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the carrier, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for transportation services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of this section the term 'carrier' means a common carrier by water."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (f) (1) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) (A) All actions at law by carriers subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(B) All complaints against carriers for the recovery of damages not based on overcharges shall be filed with the Commission within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D).

"(C) For the recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun or complaint filed with the Commission against carriers subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D), except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(D) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (B) or the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (C) a carrier subject to this part begins action under subdivision (A) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Paragraph (5) of subsection (f) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 406 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 406a. (1) All actions at law by freight forwarders subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun against freight forwarders subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the freight forwarder within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the freight forwarder to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2) a freight forwarder subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the freight forwarder.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the freight forwarder, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for service in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 110) to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 213) to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the bill proposes exactly what the title says, to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training. It also includes the National Guard.

The thought behind the bill is that we must build up the Reserve if we ever intend to decrease the expense of our Regular Military Establishment. Up to date the young men who are serving in the Reserve, training for periods of less than 30 days, have not been permitted full coverage for disabilities incurred because of accidents or otherwise. It seems to me that they should be given the same consideration as those who are training for periods longer than 30 days.

In short, the bill proposes to give the same disability coverage to reservists and national guardists injured or killed while serving their country in peacetime as the Regulars now enjoy. Under present law they are not accorded the same protection that Regulars receive unless they are on active-duty orders for more than 30 days.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "perform", to insert "active duty for training or"; in line 13, after the word "compensation", to insert "death gratuity"; and after the word "pay", to strike out "and"; in line 14, after the word "benefits", to insert "and pay and allowances"; and in line 21, to strike out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission", and insert "Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency"; on page 3, in line 2, after the word "receive", to strike out the colon and the words *"Provided further,* That this section shall be effective from September 8, 1939"; in line 10, after "United States", to insert "or the Air Force of the United States"; in line 12, after "Army", to insert "or the Regular Air Force"; in line 16, after "days", to strike out "(other than for service with the Civilian Conservation Corps)"; and in line 21, after the word "perform", to insert "active duty for fraining or"; on page 4, in line 2, after the word "compensation", to insert "death gratuity"; in line 3, after the word "pay", to strike out "and"; and after the word "benefits", to insert "and pay and allowances"; in line 4, after the word "law", to insert "or regulation"; in line 6, after the word "Army", to insert

"or the Regular Air Force"; beginning in line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this act shall take effect as of August 14, 1945. No back pay, pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as a result of the enactment of this act prior to the date on which it is enacted.

And insert:

SEC. 3. All officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, the federally recognized National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—

(1) if engaged for periods in excess of 30 days in any type of training or active duty under section 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so engaged; or

(2) if engaged for any period of time in any type of training or active duty under such sections of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed, shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 14, 1945, but no back pay, pension, compensation, death gratuity, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this act for any period prior to such date: *Provided*, That in the case of persons electing to receive the benefits of this act, the amount of any monetary benefits received for any period subsequent to August 14, 1945, under any provisions of law providing benefits for disability or death incident to the service described in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, shall be deducted from the monetary benefits provided for herein.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any benefits to which he was entitled prior to its enactment.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 855c–1), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. All officers, nurses, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the United States Naval Reserve or United States Marine Corps Reserve, who—

"(1) if called or ordered into active naval or military service by the Federal Government for extended naval or military service in excess of 30 days, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so employed; or

"(2) if called or ordered by the Federal Government to active naval or military service or to perform active duty for training or inactive-duty training for any period of time, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed;

shall be deemed to have been in the active naval service during such period, and they or their beneficiaries shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps: *Provided*, That if a person who is eligible for the benefits prescribed by this act be also eligible for pension under the provisions of the act of June 23, 1937 (50 Stat. 305); compensation from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, under the provisions of section 304 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1181) or retired pay under the provision of section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1183), he shall elect which benefit he shall receive."

SEC. 2. The last proviso to section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress," approved April 3, 1939, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, or the Air Force of the United States, other than the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, or the Regular Air Force who—

"(1) if called or ordered into the active military service by the Federal Government for extended military service in excess of 30 days suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so employed; or

"(2) if called or ordered by the Federal Government to active military service or to perform active duty for training or inactive-duty training for any period of time, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed,

shall be deemed to have been in the active military service during such period and shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force."

SEC. 3. All officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, the federally recognized National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—

(1) if engaged for periods in excess of 30 days in any type of training or active duty under section 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so engaged; or

(2) if engaged for any period of time in any type of training or active duty under such sections of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line or duty from injury while so employed, shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 14, 1945, but no back pay, pension, compensation, death gratuity, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this act for any period prior to such date: *Provided*, That in the case of persons electing to receive the benefits of this act, the amount of any monetary benefits received for any period subsequent to August 14, 1945, under any provisions of law providing benefits for disability or death incident to the service described in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, shall be deducted from the monetary benefits provided for herein.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any benefits to which he was entitled prior to its enactment.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this joint resolution follows a series of recommendations by congressional committees and by others in regard to reforestation and replanting of sections of the public range.

Two years ago an investigation was conducted by the Barrett committee of the House of Representatives. It visited a number of the western areas that complained that the stockmen were having their grazing areas reduced, and suggested that that would not be necessary if the Department of Agriculture would undertake a replanting program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables, one showing the acreage of planting in each State, and the other showing the amount of revegetation which is proposed.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Initial planting program[1] *on national-forest lands by States (as of March 1949)*

State	Non-stocked land	Under-stocked land	Total
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*
Alabama	60,000	10,000	70,000
Arizona	13,000	----------	13,000
Arkansas	35,000	5,000	40,000
California	314,000	271,000	585,000
Colorado	70,000	8,000	78,000
Florida	90,000	6,000	96,000
Georgia	1,500	----------	1,500
Idaho	456,000	20,000	476,000
Illinois	12,000	2,000	14,000
Indiana	10,000	----------	10,000
Kentucky	10,000	----------	10,000
Louisiana	10,000	6,000	16,000
Michigan	510,000	180,000	690,000
Minnesota	175,000	190,000	365,000
Mississippi	155,000	17,000	172,000
Missouri	25,000	17,000	42,000
Montana	90,000	5,000	95,000
Nebraska	9,000	----------	9,000
Nevada	15,000	----------	15,000
New Hampshire	2,000	----------	2,000
New Mexico	115,000	5,000	120,000
North Carolina	10,000	5,000	15,000
Ohio	10,000	1,000	11,000
Oregon	310,000	220,000	530,000
Pennsylvania	45,000	6,000	51,000
South Carolina	15,000	6,000	21,000
South Dakota	30,000	3,000	33,000
Tennessee	5,000	----------	5,000
Texas	10,000	17,000	27,000
Utah	10,000	----------	10,000
Vermont	1,000	1,000	2,000
Washington	135,000	70,000	205,000
West Virginia	12,000	1,000	13,000
Wisconsin	165,000	95,000	260,000
Wyoming	1,500	----------	1,500
Virginia	1,000	6,000	7,000
Total	2,938,000	1,173,000	4,111,000

[1] Includes both areas to be planted and areas to be seeded to tree species.

State:	Acres
Arizona	100,000
California	250,000
Colorado	450,000
Idaho	526,000
Montana	100,000
Nevada	600,000
New Mexico	250,000
Oregon	280,000
South Dakota	10,000
Utah	1,169,000
Washington	65,000
Wyoming	200,000
Total	4,000,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my hope is that this authority may be granted, and then the whole matter may be considered by the Appropriations Committee, and funds may then be made available in such amounts as the Congress may determine.

But I believe it is important to start now in the replanting of our forests. During the wartime period we harvested timber 50 percent faster than it was grown; and if that process is not reversed, we shall soon have exhausted our supply of timber.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the purpose, but I am interested to know the amount of the authorization proposed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Three million dollars is proposed for the first year, and then there would be gradually increasing amounts, until finally a rather substantial sum would be reached. It would be $5,000,000 in the second year, $7,000,000 in the third year, $8,000,000 in the fourth year, and thereafter $10,000,000 a year for a long period; but all those are thus far merely proposed authorizations; and appropriations would be required, of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many trees does the Senator anticipate will be planted during the first year for which the $3,000,000 expenditure will be made, if such appropriation is actually made?

Mr. ANDERSON. I cannot answer the question, because the difference in costs of plantation as between various areas is substantial. But I have already had inserted in the RECORD a list of the various States and the amount of acreage in each State. The total is somewhat in excess of 4,000,000 acres, and nearly every State in the Union is affected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands under administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other lands under the administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, including the acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation; and $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; $1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for range revegetation.

The preamble was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN ROBINSON REMOUNT STATION, NEBR.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 314) authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a brief comment on the bill, which I hope will be discussed by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

This bill presents a difficulty in respect to an important matter of policy which I think should be considered by the Senate in connection with the question of disposing of property belonging to all the people of the United States for the benefit of a group in a particular locality.

As I read the report on the bill, what it amounts to, when we get down to its very essence, is that it is proposed that approximately 43 acres of land be given to the citizens of Crawford, Nebr., for public park purposes. I am at a loss to understand why all the people of the United States should donate a park to Crawford, Nebr. The record in this case shows that there is involved the question of an easement for a water main; and I certainly think the people of Crawford, Nebr., should have that easement. I think the record also shows that certain park improvements have been made by the people of Crawford, Nebr., because over the years they have been making use of these 43 acres for park purposes.

I should like to accommodate the Senators from Nebraska; but, so far as I am concerned, as in the last session of Congress, I think we must call a halt to giving away Federal property for the benefit of people in local communities, without their paying a reasonable or fair price for the benefit received.

I would much prefer this bill if it provided that the people of Crawford, Nebr., should pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the 43 acres of land.

Of course this bill involves a rather small item; but some time ago the Senators from Michigan encountered the same difficulty with respect to Fort Wayne; the Senators from Massachusetts ran into a similar difficulty in respect to a park in Massachusetts, and the Senators from Minnesota ran into the same difficulty in respect to certain property wanted by the University of Minnesota Medical School. Certainly we should follow a consistent principle in regard to all these matters; and I have not been shown to date that in such proposals as these an equitable solution would not be to have the citizens involved pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property.

So, Mr. President, subject to the right of the Senator from Nebraska to reply to this point, I wish to object.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, and I further wish to say that I am very sympathetic with him in regard to a general proviso that towns or municipalities or other groups which receive Federal property should pay something for it.

In this case, this particular piece of land was put under a revokable lease some 23 or 25 years ago. I suppose the land was then worth not more than $5 an acre. Since then it has been improved by the people of the city of Crawford, so that it has provided public park services, not only to the people of Crawford and their community, but also to the persons living in the remount station grounds. At times hundreds of such persons enjoyed the benefits.

The land was made into a park. It is not a residential part of the city at all; it is a playground or recreation area. At the present time there is a concrete stadium there, for which the people of Crawford have paid.

In view of the free services on the part of the people of Crawford to the people attached to the remount station, who are our servants, I think the people of Crawford have paid a considerable amount for this small tract of 43 acres, which is a part of some 15,000 or 20,000 acres of the remount station.

I have given the distinguished Senator from Oregon the other facts pertaining to the matter. The bill was passed in the Eightieth Congress, but it reached the House of Representatives too late for action there before the end of the session. That is why the bill has not been enacted before now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the bill is in need of amendment; therefore I object at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I have the understanding that we will try to bring up the bill at the close of the calendar call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot have any understanding about it.

Mr. BUTLER. I make a motion to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or

obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF POMONA STATION OF AGRICULTURE REMOUNT SERVICE

The bill (S. 969) to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is their objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I correct in my understanding that we are now on Calendar 84, Senate bill 969?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may inquire, can the Senator from Oregon tell us whether consideration of this bill also is objected to on the same basis as the objection to the bill relative to Crawford, Nebr.?

Mr. MORSE. No. Mr. President, I have gone into this bill, and it is a good example of the distinction in principle to which I have heretofore alluded. In this case all the bill proposes to do is to return to the Kellogg Foundation the property which they sought to turn over and did turn over to the Federal Government for a particular use. The Federal Government no longer desiring the property for that purpose, I think it is perfectly proper to return the property to the Kellogg Foundation. It is not a case of giving away property that belongs to all the people of the United States, but rather returning property turned over to the Government for a particular use which the Government no longer wants to make use of. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "California", to strike out ", which was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army) by W. K. Kellogg", and insert "which tract, originally in the ownership of W. K. Kellogg, was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Inc., without cost, the real property, comprising 812 acres, more or less, of the Agriculture Remount Station at Pomona, Calif., which was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army) by W. K. Kellogg and subsequently transferred to the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the act of April 21, 1948 (62 Stat. 197), and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Inc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2663) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill. This is a very important bill to those who are identified with the Central Intelligence Agency. In modern times it is necessary to assemble all the information that can be obtained concerning our own national security and its relationship to the national security of other countries. All governments—we might as well be frank about it—utilize every reasonable agency they can to assemble desirable information concerning the activities of other governments. Sometimes in some countries men who are engaged in trying to find out what is going on lose their lives. They are caught, held as spies, and liquidated. They are never heard of again. The bill does not provide for any new activity. What it does particularly is to seek to safeguard information procured by agents of the Government so that it will not fall into the hands of enemy countries or potential enemy countries who would use the information to discover who the agents were, and kill them.

To my certain knowledge, in a certain area, not many years ago three good Americans who were trying to serve their Government by finding out whether the intentions of another government were strictly honorable were liquidated. The men were detected and killed. What the bill does is to seek to keep their names and identities out of the normal accounting channels, so that they cannot be picked up through the promiscuous dissemination of information. That is the principal point in the bill.

I shall not ask for its immediate consideration. I know there are some Senators, one of whom is my good friend and colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, who wants more time to look into it. But I wanted to make this brief explanation, so that Senators would have in mind what is in the bill as they consider it and read it in the future. I shall be very glad to yield, within the time limit that is left to me, to answer, if I can, any question any Senator may desire to raise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over, then.

DISCLOSURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES CODES, ETC.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 277) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communications intelligence activities of the United States was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in order to get an answer on the record, I may say that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] explained to the Senator from Michigan that the words "lawful demands," do not mean that a subpena by Congress will be necessary in order to obtain information for congressional committees, either of the Senate or House, or joint committees. Will the Senator from Texas make a statement to that effect for the record?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Michigan has correctly stated the meaning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator object?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over. I should also like to have the same statement made following the objection raised by me to Calendar 71, Senate bill 1070.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. By request, I object.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Massachusetts will withhold the objection for a moment?

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma I am making objection at the request of a colleague who cannot be present today. I, myself, have no interest in the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, essentially the bill contains but two provisions. One is a reference to the board personnel. The second is a reference to broadening the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I understand there are objections to the personnel of the board as proposed in the bill. It is not necessary, in my opinion, to consider the second objective, which is to give the Commodity Credit Corporation power to acquire property by gift, lease, or otherwise for the construction of storage facilities. In order to secure action on the bill if the objection runs to the first feature, the personnel of the board, I should be willing, as author of the bill in part, to waive that feature in order to have the second part enacted into law.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator I, myself, have no knowledge of the bill. My colleague is necessarily absent today, and I suggest that it go over until his return, which will be very soon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection the bill will be passed over.

FEDERAL HOUSING IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not know which Senator raised objection, but I hope he will reserve the right to object, in order that I may offer an explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not heard any Senator object. The Chair recognized the Senator from Washington. But if a Senator wishes to be recognized in order to object, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask for information about the bill. I wanted to have an explanation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Utah that my colleague and myself are quite anxious that the bill be not passed over, for the reason that there is an explanation for it, and a further more compelling reason, that the season in Alaska for housing construction is very short, and unless the bill can be passed, the whole season will be lost, particularly in the northern area of Alaska.

Mr. WATKINS. What does the bill seek to do?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill proposes a certain housing code applicable to Alaskan construction, which is of a peculiar character. It creates a different set of rules and regulations, whereby the Federal Housing Authority may operate in Alaska. I am sure my colleague could furnish the Senator from Utah the details. I hope there will be no objection, because it is important that the bill be considered promptly, by reason of the shortness of the season in Alaska.

Mr. WATKINS. There may be no objection, when we know what it is all about.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say, very briefly, to my friend the Senator from Utah and all other Senators, that the bill which is before us presumes to accomplish four objectives First, the Federal Housing Authority may increase by one-third the dollar amount limitation for insuring mortgages in Alaska.

Second, the powers of Federal National Mortgage Association are broadened and liberalized in two ways:

A. Direct loans can be made if such loans are insured by FHA.

B. Loans may be purchased in excess of the statutory $10,000 ceiling, and more than 50 percent of the mortgages held by any mortgagee can be purchased.

Third, the Alaskan Housing Authority, with the consent of the Alaska Legislature, is permitted to make loans for either sale or rental housing. It is also permitted to make small or character loans.

Fourth, the FNMA would have the power to purchase from the Alaska Housing Authority, notes up to $15,000,000. These notes are interest-bearing and would have a 40-year maturity.

The reason the bill was favorably considered by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is that circumstances and conditions pertaining to Alaska will not be found anywhere else under the American flag.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Was the report of the committee unanimous?

Mr. CAIN. I think the report of the committee was unanimous. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a member of the committee, can speak with better authority than can I.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield, I will say that the report of the Banking and Currency Committee was unanimous. I may add that the House Committee on Banking and Currency has likewise reported a similar bill, and I believe it is scheduled on the calendar today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That report was also unanimous.

This bill involves a problem of health in Alaska. The Eskimos are being rapidly wiped out because of tuberculosis. The disease was introduced by the white man, and research has developed the fact the disease is increasing because of the camp and igloo conditions, and their summer housing. The bill would allow the Alaskan Housing Authority to make small character loans to the extent of from $100 to $200 to the Eskimos, who fish in the summer and have money at that time, so that they may build floors in their camps and tents. It is thought that in that way we can stop the spread of tuberculosis among the Eskimos and the Aleutian Indians, who are rapidly disappearing. The housing situation in Alaska is very acute, and we hope to get started this year. I hope the Senate will pass the bill. As has been pointed out, it has the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether the bill has the personal approval of the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. In response to the proper and direct question from my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey, "Does the junior Senator from Washington personally endorse this bill?" My answer is a most positive "Yes."

This bill, S. 851, permits of mortgage-loaning procedures by both the Federal Housing Authority and the Federal National Mortgage Association with which I thoroughly disapprove. Those procedures are excessive loan limitations and direct equity loans. I retreat from these objectionable practices only for the compelling reason that this legislation pertains to Alaska, not the continental United States.

Needs for housing, both for sale and rental are desperately needed there. Lending agencies up there are few. Private builders are unable to finance houses they desire to create, Building loans are unattractive to lenders, who can readily make other types of loans at interest rates up to 8 percent. Building costs are from 35 to 100 percent higher than in the Pacific Northwest. The building season is short. Transportation of needed materials from the States is and has been subjected to disastrous maritime interruptions which add to the costs. It is for these inescapable factors that I, in this legislation, approve those lending procedures that I shall sturdily oppose within continental United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in view of the explanation, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "That (a) title II of the National Housing Act, as amended," and to insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Alaska Housing Act' "; on page 1, line 5, to insert "SEC. 2. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended"; on page 2, lines 3 and 4, to strike out "title II and title VI of"; in line 7, to strike out "said titles" and insert "this"; in line 12, to strike out "(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or any other law, the Alaska", and to insert:

No mortgage with respect to a project or property in Alaska shall be accepted for insurance under this act unless the Commissioner finds that the project or property is an acceptable risk, giving consideration to the acute housing shortage in Alaska: *Provided*, That any such mortgage may be insured or accepted for insurance without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act that the Commissioner find the project or property to be economically sound or an acceptable risk. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act or any other law, the Alaska.

On page 2, line 25, and on page 3, beginning with line 1, to strike out "mortgage insurance under the provisions of titles II and VI of said act; and paragraph (A) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not apply to any mortgage offered, for purchase, to the Federal National Mortgage Association by, or if it covers property held by, the Alaska Housing Authority or any Federal, Territorial, or municipal instrumentality in Alaska," and insert "mortgage insurance under the provisions of this act. Upon application by the mortgagee, where the Alaska Housing Authority is the mortgagor or mortgagee, for the insurance of a mortgage under any provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to insure the mortgage (including advances thereon where otherwise authorized), and to make commitments for the insuring of any such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon, under

such provisions (and this section) without regard to any requirement that the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property or shall have paid a prescribed amount on account of such property."

On page 3, line 20, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; on page 4, line 2, to strike out "title III of"; beginning in line 4, to strike out "unless enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Federal National Mortgage Association shall be authorized to make real-estate loans, including advances thereon during construction, secured by property located in Alaska if such loans or advances are insured under any of the provisions of title II or title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended" and insert "unless enacted expressly in limitation hereof, any mortgage loans, or partial interests therein, may be offered to the Federal National Mortgage Association for purchase, and the association shall be authorized to make real-estate loans, including advances thereon during construction, if such loans or advances are secured by property located in Alaska and insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended."

On the same page, line 18, to strike out "2" and insert "3"; at the beginning of line 24, to insert "other", and in line 25, after the word "for", to strike out "other"; on page 5, beginning in line 8, after the word "investment", to insert: "and the legislature of that Territory may authorize said authority to make character loans to individuals or cooperatives for the improvement, conversion, or construction of dwellings in remote areas to be occupied by such individuals or members of such cooperatives where the loan does not exceed $500 per dwelling."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this public housing?

Mr. CAIN. The bill, in itself, has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of subsidized low-rent housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 4, after the word "interest", to insert:

And provided further, That such Authority shall exercise its powers under this section to encourage and assist the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and the development of well planned residential neighborhoods. Any law enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska which, except for its enactment prior to the enactment of this act, would be authorized under this section, is hereby authorized, approved, and validated.

In lines 15 and 16, to strike out "projects for the construction and sale or rental of dwelling accommodations, or of making loans for such projects, the", and insert "and administering projects or of making loans pursuant to any authority conferred by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska under subsection (a) of this section, the."

On page 7, beginning in line 2, to insert:

Provided, That such notes and other obligations issued and outstanding for the purpose of making character loans to individuals or cooperatives shall not exceed $1,000,000.

Beginning in line 16, to strike out:

(c) The Governor of Alaska shall make an annual report to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, with respect to activities pursuant to the authorization provided in this section.

And insert:

(c) The Alaska Housing Authority shall make an annual report to the Governor of Alaska on all of the activities of the Authority, for each fiscal year ending June 30, for transmission with his comments and recommendations to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

On page 8, beginning in line 11, to strike out "section, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator and the Alaska Housing Authority under this section (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress for the administrative expenses of the Administrator and the Alaska Housing Authority in connection with the performance of such functions" and insert: "section. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this section, the Administrator, notwithtanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided,* That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans or advances of funds and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and concusive upon all officers of the Government."

On pages 9 and 10, to strike out section 3 as follows:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Federal Housing Commissioner is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure or to make commitments to insure under section 207 of title II, or section 603 or section 608 of title VI, of said act, as amended, any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Alaska Housing Authority of any housing constructed or acquired by it under the authorization provided in this act (including any property acquired, held, or constructed in connection with such housing or to serve the inhabitants thereof, without regard to—

(1) any limit as to the time when any mortgage may be insured under said title VI;

(2) any limit as to the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under said title VI, but the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under title VI pursuant to this section 3 shall not exceed $30,000,000;

(3) any requirement that the obligation be approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or that the construction be new construction;

(4) any of the provisions of the first sentence of section 207 (c) or section 603 (b) (2) or section 603 (b) (5) or paragraphs (B) and (C) of the first sentence of section 608 (b) (3):

Provided, That such mortgage shall otherwise be eligible for insurance under section 207 or section 603 or section 608, as the case may be, and involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Commissioner shall approve) in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the appraised value of the mortgage property as determined by the Commissioner: *And provided further,* That any such mortgage insured under section 603 shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges) at not to exceed 5 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

On page 11, line 5, after the word "reserved", to insert "(in whole or in part),".

On the same page, after line 10, to insert new section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. Any executive department or agency of the Federal Government is hereby authorized to sell, transfer, and convey to the Alaska Housing Authority at fair value (as determined by such department or agency), for use under this act, all or any right, title, and interest in any real or personal property under the jurisdiction of such department or agency which it determines to be in excess of its own requirements, notwithstanding any limitations or requirements of law with respect to the use or disposition of such property: *Provided,* That the authority conferred by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any other powers and authorities of such department or agency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Washington. After all the striking out and the insertion of other language, do we now have a bill which helps public housing, and does it differ generally from what is being done in continental United States?

Mr. CAIN. The bill, as amended, has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of public housing. The bill, in its amended form, has to do with the liberalizing of procedures which are presently followed by "Fanny May" and the FHA, within the continental United States; it gives to the Alaska Housing Authority the right to extend loans for rental and sale housing construction, which right the Authority does not now have; and it permits the HHFA to purchase up to $15,000,000 of the notes of the Authority which are interest-bearing and repayable in 40 years The amended bill does these things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Alaska Housing Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 214. If the Federal Housing Commissioner finds that, because of higher costs prevailing in the Territory of Alaska, it is not

feasible to construct dwellings on property located in Alaska without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, or livability, within the limitations as to maximum mortgage amounts provided in this act, the Commissioner may, by regulations or otherwise, prescribe, with respect to dollar amount, a higher maximum for the principal obligation of mortgages insured under this act covering property located in Alaska, in such amounts as he shall find necessary to compensate for such higher costs but not to exceed, in any event, the maximum otherwise applicable by more than one-third thereof."

No mortgage with respect to a project or property in Alaska shall be accepted for insurance under this act unless the Commissioner finds that the project or property is an acceptable risk, giving consideration to the acute housing shortage in Alaska: *Provided,* That any such mortgage may be insured or accepted for insurance without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act that the Commissioner finds the project or property to be economically sound or an acceptable risk. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act or any other law, the Alaska Housing Authority shall be eligible as mortgagor or mortgagee, as the case may be, for any of the purposes of mortgage insurance under the provisions of this act. Upon application by the mortgagee, where the Alaska Housing Authority is the mortgagor or mortgagee, for the insurance of a mortgage under any provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to insure the mortgage (including advances thereon where otherwise authorized), and to make commitments for the insuring of any such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon, under such provisions (and this section) without regard to any requirement that the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property or shall have paid a prescribed amount on account of such property.

(b) The powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and of any other Federal corporation on other Federal agency heretofore or hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with properties or projects in Alaska designed principally for residential use; and, notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 301 of the National Housing Act, as heretofore or hereafter amended, or of any other law unless enacted expressly in limitation hereof, any mortgage loans, or partial interests therein, may be offered to the Federal National Mortgage Association for purchase, and the Association shall be authorized to make real-estate loans, including advances thereon during construction, if such loans or advances are secured by property located in Alaska and insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to relieve the particularly severe impact of the housing shortage in Alaska, the legislature of that Territory may authorize the Alaska Housing Authority, in addition to the housing projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 601; 48 U. S. C., secs. 481–483), as amended, also to undertake other projects for the construction and sale or rental of dwelling accommodations for inhabitants of the Territory, and to make loans for such projects to public agencies, or private nonprofit or limited dividend corporations, or private corporations which are regulated or restricted by the Authority (until the termination of all loan obligations to it) as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation to such an extent and in such manner as to provide reasonable rentals to tenants and a reasonable return on the investment, and the legislature of that Territory may authorize said authority to make character loans to individuals or cooperatives for the improvement, conversion or construction of dwellings in remote areas to be occupied by such individuals or members of such cooperatives where the loan does not exceed $500 per dwelling, and any powers of said Authority, including but not limited to powers of eminent domain and issuance of bonds and obligations, with respect to projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of said act of July 21, 1941, may be made available with respect to projects undertaken pursuant to the authorization provided in this section: *Provided,* That the authorization provided in this section shall be limited to projects where adequate financing on reasonable terms and conditions, or entrepreneurial sponsorship, or both, as the case may be, is not otherwise available: *And provided further,* That any projects constructed and owned by such Authority pursuant to the authorization provided in this section shall be sold for cash or on reasonable terms and giving consideration to full market value, as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest: *And provided further,* That such Authority shall exercise its powers under this section to encourage and assist the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and the development of well planned residential neighborhoods. Any law enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Alaska which, except for its enactment prior to the enactment of this act, would be authorized under this section, is hereby authorized, and approved, and validated.

(b) To obtain funds for the purpose of undertaking and administering projects or of making loans pursuant to any authority conferred by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska under subsection (a) of this section, the Alaska Housing Authority may, on and after the effective date of this act, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in an amount not to exceed $15,000,000 and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby authorized to purchase such notes or other obligations to the extent that funds are available therefor: *Provided,* That such notes and other obligations issued and outstanding for the purpose of making character loans to individuals or cooperatives shall not exceed $1,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities not exceeding 40 years, and shall be purchased under such general terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. Such notes and other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.

(c) The Alaska Housing Authority shall make an annual report to the Governor of Alaska on all of the activities of the Authority, for each fiscal year ending June 30, for transmission with his comments and recommendations to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $15,000,000 for the purposes of this section. Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this section shall be available for any of the purposes of this section. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this section, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided,* That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans or advances of funds and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

SEC. 4. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to provide technical advice and information and otherwise to cooperate to the full extent authorized by law to assist the Alaska Housing Authority in the program to relieve the severe shortage of housing in the Territory.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 4 and 301 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with respect to the disposition of housing of a permanent character, any such housing in Alaska under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator which has been reserved (in whole or in part), prior to the enactment of this act, for employees of an agency of the Federal Government may be retained by him for employees of that agency for such time as he determines such action necessary to provide adequate housing accommodations for them in the area.

SEC. 6. Any executive department or agency of the Federal Government is hereby authorized to sell, transfer, and convey to the Alaska Housing Authority at fair value (as determined by such department or agency), for use under this act, all or any right, title, and interest in any real or personal property under the jurisdiction of such department or agency which it determines to be in excess of its own requirements, notwithstanding any limitations or requirements of law with respect to the use or disposition of such property: *Provided,* That the authority conferred by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any other powers and authorities of such department or agency.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 498) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JUDICIAL SALARIES IN HAWAII

The bill (S. 566) to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following salaries shall be paid to the several justices and judges hereinafter mentioned, namely:

To the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, $15,500 per year, and to each of the associate justices thereof, $15,000 per year.

To each of the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, $12,500.

SEC. 2. All of said salaries shall be paid in equal monthly installments.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first month next following its approval.

DESTRUCTION OF LETTER BOXES OR MAIL

The bill (S. 1043) to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1705. Destruction of letter boxes or mail: Whoever willfully or maliciously injures, tears down, or destroys any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or breaks open the same, or willfully or maliciously injures, defaces, or destroys any mail deposited therein, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS

The bill (S. 1030) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, an identical bill, Calendar No. 193, House bill 779, is on the calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if the bills are identical?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are identical, except that the title of the House bill should be amended.

Mr. GEORGE. They are identical in substance?

Mr. McCARRAN. The substance is the same.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a detailed explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill increases the time within which claims under the Tort Claims Act may be presented to Federal agencies. That is all the bill provides; it merely extends for 1 year the time for the presentation of claims under the Tort Claims Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the bill with an amendment. I notice the House bill does not have an amendment. Does the amendment to the Senate bill run to the title merely?

Mr. McCARRAN. Only to the title. The Senate committee reported the bill with a change of title. When the Senate takes up the House bill, it is the same as the Senate bill, with the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 779) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1030 will be indefinitely postponed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have some Senator explain the resolution. I observe that there are some four or five measures on the Calendar postponing the deportation of aliens, ranging from 10 pages of names to 16 pages of names. I should like to have some Senator explain the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Congress passed a bill during the Eightieth Congress whereby the Attorney General was permitted to suspend the deportation of certain aliens if their deportation would jeopardize the financial interests of any American corporation or person. We also required in the bill that when he suspended the deportation of any aliens, he must take affirmative action and submit the names to the Congress for their approval.

In the Committee on the Judiciary we receive several names every week, and we report them to the Senate. In other words, we are merely taking action in conformity with the bill we passed and the mandate we gave the Attorney General to submit the names to us.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to say, further, by way of explanation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, that the Department of Justice has always had the right to suspend deportations. We put a limitation on that right of suspension, providing that the suspensions when made by the Department of Justice must be submitted to the Congress. These bills come to the Committee on the Judiciary under the Reorganization Act. The names of the suspended aliens are screened by the staff and by the Committee on the Judiciary, and in many instances we refuse to go along with the Department of Justice. For instance, in the group now pending before the Senate, I think we eliminated about 34 or 35 names. The others, after a complete investigation, we approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that answers the principal question I had in mind. I had some little familiarity with the basic legislation involved, but here are several hundred names of those who, under our laws, are subject to deportation, and I wanted to know whether the committee undertook to screen them, and to determine whether there was merit in the cases.

Mr. McCARRAN. We not only undertake to screen them, but we assign staff members to the work of screening, and they go into them in detail.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to hear that, because my experience in the past indicated that the Department of Justice was not too careful in dealing with these cases. I am glad to hear that the Committee on the Judiciary is screening and investigating the names.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator and to the Senate that this is one of the trying problems which was given over to the Committee on the Judiciary by the Reorganization Act. It is a perplexing problem, and one to which we give careful study at all times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was considered, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each person hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-9561344, Abrahamsen, Arne.

A-6233871, Acriche, Leo Abravanel or Leon Acriche.

A-5984018, Aguallo, Ofelia, or Ofelia Aguayo.

A-9748978, Ahmed, Mustafa Ali (alias Mustafa Ali Achmed).

A-5672802, Alter, Mollie (nee Malke Rubinstein).

A-2457068, Aman, Eigene Vites.

A-6195641, Amanatides, Erasmia, or Erasmia Sonikides.

A-6655514, Anderson, Albert Lorenzo.

A-6536080, Anjewierden, Dirk.

A-6724309, Aranda, Miguel Angel, or Miguel Aranda or Miguel Aranda-Tarango.

A-3882033, Arnoso, Louis Varela.

A-6526204, Asher, Vivian Catherine (nee Jones).

A-1862941, Atkinson, Stanley Reid.

A-9559565, Augustinius, Jose Herman.

A-5919879, Back, Erik Nestor Ernfried.

A-4024370, Bain, Zacharias, or Zechariah Bain (alias Zachirihi Bain alias Zacirihi Bain).

A-2495593, Bank, John.

A-7592940, Baptiste, Emma Josefina (nee Lujan Molina).

A-4354716, Baur, Ludwig, or Ludwig Bauer.

A-4188915, Bechara, Joseph Charles, or Joseph Bechara or Joseph Charles.

A-2069293, Beckford, Percival.

A-5342459, Bernier, Ann Claudine (nee De Freitas).

A-3121501, Betz, Fred August, or Friederich August Betz or Frederick August Betz or Fred Betz.

A-4826785, Bin, Anita (nee Toppazinni).

A-9666533, Blom, Jan Leendert.

A-3081497, Boffa, Luciano.

A-5309178, Bould, James.

A-5971012, Bousses, Nicolaos Stamatiou.

A-9769305, Bradley, John Hubert.

A-5991350, Brandon, Bertha Emily (nee Field).
A-1278361, Burrows, John James (alias Jack Burrows).
A-6489021, Campbell, Alexander.
A-2817248, Candelora, Francesca (nee Zaffino).
A-4743272, Castro, Mercedes, formerly Mercedes Alvarez (nee Mercedes Figueroa).
A-2022520, Chang, Mo Poon.
A-7552570, Chang, Teresa Alay.
A-5141080, Chaves, Faustino, or Faustino Chavis or Faustino Chavez or Faustino Chavis Murillo.
A-2229390, Chinn, Yue Gim, or Gee Yen Gim or Yem Gim Gee or Yue Gim Gee or Yu Gim Chin.
A-2592334, Cohen, Moe Martin.
A-1715256, Cohen, Sarah Iroff (alias Sarah Iroff alias Sally Epstein).
A-6246598, Coltras, Marica.
A-6303160, Contreras, Jose, or Jose Almanza Contreras.
A-5117652, Corrao, Carlo.
A-6069924, Cox, Silveria Pana.
A-6663382, Cragg, George Robert.
A-4377394, Cremades, Miguel (alias Miguel Cremades Villarroya alias Mike Valencia).
A-4335395, Cucksey, Anna Krebs, or Nita Krebs.
A-1164881, Daniels, Jean Rene (alias Jean Rene Francois Daniels or Gaston Carle).
A-5668032, Darkovich, Peter Stoiche.
A-5971753, Davis, Gladys Ovilda Gladys, or Gladys Ovilda Georges.
A-3860479, Dedis, Pantelis John.
A-5740896, De Flores, Reyes Valenzuela, or Reyes Valenzuela or Reyes Valenzuela Flores.
A-4150561, De Hernandez, Josefa Torres, or Josefa Torres.
A-2817560, Delgado, Jesus Maria.
A-4691015, De Llaverias, Maria Catalina (nee Evertsz).
A-2767060, De Lucero, Manuela Avina, or Manuela Avina.
A-6063059, De Luzuriaga, Enrique Ruiz.
A-6405944, Luzuriaga, Evelyne Patricia.
A-6405945, Luzuriaga, Eugenio.
A-1722409, Deneau, Harold Edward.
A-5863272, De Saine, Adeline (nee Simpson).
A-3802400, Di Gregorio, Paola or Pauline (nee Onorato).
A-4840700, Domenighini, Albert, or Aurelio Domenighini.
A-6261640, Domosiaris, Kalliopi.
A-6212801, Domosiaris, Konstantinos or Constantinos.
A-5909782, Dos Santos, Joaquim Antonio.
A-5982057, Doush, Joseph Harry.
A-5296040, Doyle, Paulette Marie (nee Briand).
A-6755401, Dumitrescu, Radu.
A-5455559, Duncan, Yeta Rosemburz or Jetta Rosemburz De Mojica or Yeta Rosemburz De Mojica or Yeta Rosemburz.
A-6037097, Duncanson, Wentworth Eustace.
A-4647266, Erdos, Vincent or Vince.
A-9651529, Eriksen, Magne, or Magne Taranger or Magne Taranger Eriksen.
A-5053925, Ertman, Einar Leopold Konstantin.
A-5053923, Ertman, Ellen Alice (nee Seppanen or Elli Alisa).
A-3974381, Escudero-Pascual, Nicholas, or Nicholas Escudero.
A-5209421, Fagervik, Carl Ingvald.
A-3720405, Fantasia, Salvatore.
A-2370108, Fantin, Teresa (nee Teresa Pagura).
A-3329048, Fazio, Pietro (alias Peter Fazio).
A-3788785, Fein, Anna (nee Anna Fishman).
A-5678327, Fisch, Meschulim, or Manny Fisher.
A-5415760, Flores, Angelina Nieto, or Angelina Nieto.
A-5415761, Flores, Eliseo, or Raphael Trejo.
A-1473200, Ford, Thomas Francis.
A-1615234, Fotenos, Stamatios (alias Steve Fotenos).
A-5180485, Fragakis, Stavros Georgiou.
A-5541925, Fuentes, Domingo.
A-6666532, Galindo, Maria Teresa.
A-5238894, Gansz, Elisabeth Anna Helene or Elisabeth or Elizabeth Gansz (nee Scholz).
A-1216334, Gargiulo, Philippo or Philip.
A-5220833, Geffke, Fritz Herbert.
A-9769263, Gialourakos, Nicholas John (alias Nicolaus Yialourakos or Nick Gialourakos).
A-6211352, Gittins, Alvin Loraine (alias Charles Gittens).
A-6211350, Gittins, Gwendolen Mary Ellis.
A-1500640, Gloor, Theresa, or Theresa Koller (nee Schneider).
A-9544853, Gomes, Raul Fonseca.
A-3767333, Gonzales, Pedro Arambula (alias Pedro Arambula alias Pedro Gonzales alias Pedro Arambula Gonsalez alias Pedro A. Gonzalez).
A-6199843, Goodstein, Stella, or Stella Zweig (nee Esther Akselrad).
A-6757483, Goudsmit, Jeannette, or Jeannette Smith.
A-3007301, Graeber, Adolf Paul, or Adolf Graeber.
A-1363182, Grant, Frank.
A-6458400, Greaves, Gayle Louise, or Gayle Louise Schluter.
A-4196849, Gripaios, Mabel (nee Birch).
A-6277066, Hanvey, Evelyn Maria.
A-2693302, Haroutunian, Constance, or Knarig Gazarosian or Knarig Keyaian or Connie Haroutunian.
A-2464397, Harrigan, Alice Mabel (nee Dickson).
A-6239763, Hermann, Liba Pourova.
A-4947943, Hernandez, Mario Perez (alias Mario Hernandez alias John Luis Perez Hernandez).
A-6267143, Holness, Gloriana.
A-4887327, Holscher, Anton Karl.
A-4963344, Hoogestraat, Herman Johann.
A-2766922, Hopfeld, Heyneman Herman.
A-2271554, Horn, Elmer Harry, or Elmar A. Horn.
A-7529293, Hsiang, Tso Ming, or Hisang Tso Ming.
A-2486359, Hsiang, Lan Ying Hsu (nee Lan Ying or Lan Ying Hsu).
A-4686786, Huang, I-Chen, or Huang I-Chen or Chen Huang or Huang Chen.
A-6210416, Iriarte, Blancamadruga.
A-6042302, Janiszewski, Zofia, or Zofia Mizera.
A-1636675, Jimenez (de), Esperanza Margarita Moreno, or Esperanza Margarita Jimenez Moreno.
A-3107724, John, Renee (nee Wan Lai Wong or Lai Wan Wong).
A-2559002, Johnsen, Arnst Henry, or Arnest Johnsen.
A-6167344, Jones, Sheldon William.
A-7674176, Kaniel, Alte Feiga Rivka (nee Kaplan).
A-1326265, Karaffa, Joseph.
A-3443887, Karsch, Gustav Adolf.
A-4602439, Karusis, Constantinos, or Gust A. Karousis or Constantinos Caroussis.
A-6248971, Katsohi, Vasilike (nee Hassope or Hassopis).
A-7606490, Ke, I-Djen Ho.
A-7606670, Ke, Ting Su.
A-6406522, Keating, John Stanley.
A-6193198, Kelly, Randi Erna Eleanor (nee Nagell).
A-9573408, Kingshott, John Horace Frederick Walter, or John Kingshott.
A-5560625, Kiss, Louis.
A-5686338, Kiss, Mary Josephine (nee Kun).
A-5952072, Kalmpfer, Alois, or Louis or Alois Ibitz.
A-6576269, Kornoff, Mary Dobrinin, or Mary Dobrinin.
A-5969606, Kraij, Gjuro Nikola (alias George Kralj).
A-3462421, Krivec, Mike or Michael.
A-4755227, Laakso, Jalmar Kustaa, or Gust or Gus Laakso.
A-3136596, Leandro, Constantino.
A-6186635, Lee Ellen Sun (nee Al-Ling Sun).
A-4097955, Lehman, Ludwig.
A-5341744, Lema, Mary Juliana, or Meeri Juliana Lema (nee Lundull).
A-7634421, Lu, Rosabel (nee Hsu).
A-3415507, Lynch, James Patrick.
A-2867817, Manguso, Guido (alias Guido Mancuso).
A-9540001, Manolakakis, Theodoros Emanuel, or Theodore Emanuel Manolakakis or Theodore Antone Emanuel.
A-5104652, Mantione, Rosario (alias Loverdi, Antonio, alias Colodio Senna alias Antonio Laverde).
A-9517528, Marmarinos, Grigorios John, or Grigorios (Gregory) John Marmarinos.
A-5955493, Marmoratos, Gregorio Domenico, or Gregorio Marmorato.
A-3100503, Martinez, Ceferino, or Ceferino Martinez Garcia.
A-3591468, Mayr, Henry, or Ferdinand Mayr.
A-3589127, Mazelow, Lillian (alias Lily Mazelow, nee Kaplan).
A-4076891, Mazelow, William.
A-6405631, McCallum, Elsa.
A-5882989, Melis, Isidoros (alias Sederis Melis or Mellis).
A-5990876, Meraz, Jose, or Jose Meraz Andrade or Manuel Garcia or Jose Mirass or Jose Miras.
A-6365722, Meza, Esiquio (alias Exequiel Meza).
A-4779627, Mihalka, Artur, or Arthur M. Maroth.
A-4561348, Milici, Joseph Catanese, or Charles Martin.
A-5690483, Moeller, Rudolph Christian.
A-5780774, Friederichs, Agnes, formerly Agnes Friederichs Kniffke.
A-6098940, Molina, Margarita.
A-6098941, Molina, Delia.
A-6098942, Molina, Graciela.
A-6098943, Molina, Heriberto.
A-4818636, Moller, Paul Theodor, or Paul Moller or Paul Miller.
A-5568513, Montion, Juanita (alias Juanita Lozano or Gomez).
A-4881272, Moore, Mary Margaret (nee Wilton, formerly Stevens).
A-7724011, Mora(y), Manuel Ramon Garcia.
A-3554834, Moser, Peter.
A-3489800, Naftis, Matheos George (alias Mathaios Georgios Naftis).
A-1686562, Nagel, Erwin.
A-9769308, Nicola, Primo.
A-6199844, Nieves, Delia (nee Delia Francisca Gonzalez Trigola or Delia Gonzalez y Pugula).
A-9524302, Nielsen, Svend Aage.
A-6444886, Niemeyer, Elzo, or Dick Niemeyer or Dick Van Hall.
A-2824650, Onga, John Rodica, or Severino Rodica.
A-4656663, Orshingher, Umberto Vittorio (alias Umberto Victorio Orsingher).
A-6171441, Pamphilis, Isabella (nee Mougannis).
A-5414747, Panariello, Pietro.
A-2036945, Pantring, Otto Wilhelm.
A-4908373, Pappou, Asthanasios (alias Athas Pappou or Athos Papou).
A-22330076, Pavlis, Apostolos Paraskevas, or Charles P. Pavlis.
A-6261580, Paykou, Alexandra nee Galiuri; Kallis.
A-6313070, Perez, Eduardo.
A-5294203, Petroutsa, Eleftherios Panayiotou, or Edward Panayioutou Petroutsa.
A-4866498, Philippen, Peter Joseph.
A-5132908, Pinto, Jacinto, or Jacinto Pinto Riquerme or Victorino or Francinto Pinto.
A-3584354, Polatos, Vasilios, or William Polatos or Polatos.
A-6610940, Press, Doris, or Dora nee Herscovitch or Doris or Dora Hearst.
A-6288530, Quintana-Lopez, Angel, or Antonio Lopez Chintana.
A-1993852, Rade, John Paul.
A-6314073, Raptou, Eleftheria Apostolou (nee Economidis).

A-5203221, Rasch, Heinz.
A-9651792, Redo, Waclaw.
A-2933966, Reichelt, Martha Luise.
A-5182094, Reiswig, Elsie Ruth, or Elsie Ruth Kukert.
A-3273271, Reiter, John, or Johann Reiter.
A-6199573, Resch, Walter.
A-6693292, Reiger, Ingrid.
A-6041092, Rios-Cardoza, Carmen (alias Carmen Cardoza Rios).
A-6051086, Rios-Cuellar, Herminio (alias Herminio or Herman Guellar Rios).
A-6041091, Rios-Cuellar Juana (alias Juana or Jenny Cuellar Rios).
A-6075212, Robb, Elvira (nee Camara).
A-6624990, Rodriguez, Jesus, or Jesus Rodriguez-Hernandez.
A-5445641, Roeben, Richard Arthur Frederick, or Richard Fred Roeben or Rosen.
A-3711643, Rolla, Felice Francesco.
A-4175237, Rollins, John.
A-1490125, Rotondo, Giovanni or John.
A-6088182, Rueda, William Henry or Guillermo Enrique Rueda.
A-6083480, Rueda, Ana Maria.
A-5399553, Rueger, Oscar, or Oskar Ruger.
A-6220625, Sacorafas, Athanasia Constantinau (nee Kapnia).
55860/943, Salmivaara, Laina Martha Maria, or Martha Lake.
A-5991510, Samuels, Armon, or Herman Murdock.
A-3167740, Schilling, Franz Xaver.
A-6234223, Schou, Svend Aage.
A-1768899, Scombulis Panagiotis Georgian, or Peter Scombul or Panagiotis G. Scombulis.
A-4405150, Sejfer, David, or David Seefer or David Seifer Y Kiply or Kipin (alias David Sobol).
A-6093512, Shaik, Mohammed Ismail, or Batir Uddin (Udding).
A-4255673, Shannon, William Antonio or Contcn.
A-6436388, Shemroy, Margaret.
A-7648407, Sjoberg, Arne Leonard Ivar, or Arne Sjoberg or Arne Leonard Sjoberg.
A-9769913, Small, Richard John.
A-6078132, Snodgrass, Aurelia (nee Aquino).
A-5947407, Sodergard, Lars Verner Aaron.
A-9552911, Sonneville, Wilhelmus Johannes.
A-6195011, Sotter, Despina, or Despina Soteriou.
A-5863250, Stathopoulos, George Constantine (alias George C. Stathis).
A-4567264, Stamatopoulos, Panagiots George, or Peter G. Stamos.
A-6171438, Stefanopoulos, Alexandra (nee Zervos).
A-9502898, Svenson, Sven Bertil, or Sven Zertil or Bertil Svenson.
A-4887710, Tachman, Louis, or Louis Leib.
A-1916810, Tarwater, Ruth Lucille (nee Ruth Lucille Burns).
A-4814027, Thompson, Jane Kennedy Orr or Jean.
A-9656937, Tonseth, Einar Gerhard.
A-3465184, Traikoff, George Atanas, or George A. Traikoff.
A-5997606, Tromblay, Brigida Colango.
A-1020274, Valensuela-Rivera, Nicolas.
A-5953947, Vanterpool, Othelia Zephera, or Othelia Zephera Maddox.
A-6682322, Vidana, Jose.
A-6268881, Villeneuve, Eleanor Rose (nee Perrin).
A-5367655, Vlattas, Philip Leonidas, or Philipas Vlattas.
A-3317688, Vrahatis, John Leonidas.
A-5124778, Vukmanovich, Dusan (alias Ban Bukas).
A-3782648, Warmbold, Helen Martha, or Helen Martha Winkler, Helen Altman, Helen Martha Heckendorf.
A-4491798, Wasmer, Joseph.
A-6669931, Watson, Raymond.
A-1386494, Wilkins, Ivan King.
A-9783055, Wojcicki, Stanislaw.
A-6178542, Yarbrough, Vera Petrovna (nee Vera Petrovna Shebleva).
A-4410248, Zaffino, Joseph or Giuseppe.
A-2817247, Zaffino, Raffaela Maria (nee Mannella).
A-5870857, Zane, Irene Hsu (nee Irene Kingman Hsu).
A-6397729, Zanotelli, Giuditta, Mengoni.
A-2554473, Zavala, Pedro Reyes, or Pedro Zavala-Reyes.
A-4494003, Ziccardi, Kay (nee Neamonitis or Katina Neamonitis or Papalambro or Pappalombris or Pappalombro).
A-4782964, Zuluaga, Angel (alias Angel Zuluaga Bidasolo).

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS UNDER THE WAR CLAIMS ACT

The bill (S. 326) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the need for this proposed legislation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill extends the time within which the persons who are named in the bill may file claims with the Commission. It further extends the time within which the Commission itself is required to submit a report to the President. This Commission was created by act of Congress, but no appropriation was made for the Commission, and the Commission was not appointed, and therefore did not function. This bill extends the time within which the Commission may function.

Let me say, further, that in the deficiency appropriation bill now pending there is an item for the implementation of the Commission. If I am wrong in that, I may be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his explanation. I withdraw any objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240) is amended in the following respects:

1. The last sentence of section 2 (c) is amended to read as follows: "The limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than March 1, 1951."

2. Section 8 (a) is amended by striking out the words "March 31, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 15, 1950."

PER CAPITA PAYMENTS TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 1755) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in conformity with the new ruling announced by the Vice President of the United States, I rise to my feet and object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder if it would not be well to have it understood by the Senate that where there is on the Consent Calendar a joint resolution providing for amendment of the Constitution of the United States, regardless of what the amendment may be, the joint resolution should not be passed on the Consent Calendar. It seems to me to be a mistake to have a joint resolution of this kind on the Consent Calendar so that it might slip through without proper consideration. I think such a joint resolution should in some way be segregated or designated on the Consent Calendar so that it would not go through by mere consent. It is an error to have measures of this type go through by mere consent, when a vote of two-thirds of this body and of the other body is required to pass such a joint resolution.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is the deficiency appropriation bill, the unfinished business, and will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want it understood that the bill will go to the foot of the calendar because it is the unfinished business.

COUNSEL FOR IMPOVERISHED DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

The bill (S. 1124) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel to impoverished defendants in criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have some explanation of the bill, and of its scope?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the bill merely provides that when there are impoverished defendants not able to employ counsel, the court may employ lawyers and order the lawyers paid at the rate of not to exceed $25 a day for preparation and $25 a day while in court. The bill also provides for reimbursement of expenditures. This proposed legislation is similar to that which is in effect in most States. Its purpose principally is to protect the rights of an impoverished defendant.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the provision for $25 per day for the preparation of and trial of a case apply to all criminal offenses or only to felonies?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is within the discretion of the court. It applies, I believe, to all criminal cases. The local bar drafted the bill. I have not gone into it in as much detail as I should have. But I am now informed it applies to any criminal offense.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can see a great deal of force to the proposal if it applies to felonies, but I question the wisdom of giving an attorney $25 to prepare a case and try a case for a defendant involving a misdemeanor, such as exceeding the speed limit, or for not having garbage removed from an alley, or some other minor offense. I shall object, and ask that the bill go over, and ask further if the Senator will not confine the scope of the bill by appropriate amendment before it comes up for consideration on the calendar again. I would have no objection to the bill if it applied only to felonies.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would it not be more desirable to have a regular public defender appointed than to have the court appoint different lawyers in individual cases who might present large bills for a considerable number of days spent in working on cases?

Mr. McCARTHY. Counsel for the District of Columbia Committee tells me that in the past a number of bills providing for a public defender have been before the Senate, but none of them have been passed. I may say that the bill is identical to legislation which is now in existence in many of the States. I think the objection the Senator from Maryland makes would be well taken if we were to assume that the court appointing a lawyer to defend an impoverished defendant would not use his discretion. I do not believe a local judge would allow an attorney $25 a day to defend the accused person in a speeding case.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported a bill, which I believe is on the calendar, similar to the bill under consideration, but which would apply to Federal courts throughout the United States. The bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary provides that the court may appoint counsel and pay the counsel a certain amount per diem while in court defending a felony case. The Federal courts never did provide compensation to attorneys in such cases. The result has been that if an attorney had previously been a United States district attorney, or had been an assistant in that office, and he went to court on arraignment day, he would return with about six impoverished clients. The bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary has the endorsement of all bar associations.

I may suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that, in order that the two bills may conform, the amount to be applied in the District of Columbia for preparation of a case be limited to a flat sum of $20, and the sum of $20 per diem for each day the attorney appears in court in the trial of a felony case. I think that will meet the approval of all bar associations and all persons who have studied the matter. The two bills would then provide that an attorney appointed by the court to defend an impoverished defendant in a criminal case would be allowed a flat sum of $20 for whatever time he spends in the preparation of the case, and $20 for each day he appears in court defending the case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might say that the Senator from Washington is in error when he says that all States have laws which provide that lawyers appointed by the courts to represent impoverished defendants in criminal cases shall be compensated by the State. There are a number of States which have no such law. I shall be obliged to examine the bill before I can permit it to be passed on the unanimous consent calendar. It seems to me we would be going rather a long way if we were to provide for appointment of attorneys by the courts to defend defendants in criminal cases, in any type of case that may come before the courts. Most of us are members of the bar and try to contribute to the ethics of the bar, but there are, unfortunately, some lawyers who might string out for a period of several days a case which should be tried in 35 or 40 minutes. That might result in the development in the courts of the land of what are called filibusters, which would place a very heavy and unjust charge upon the Government.

Some of the finest representations I have ever witnessed in a courtroom have been by attorneys who were appointed by the court to defend individuals charged with crime, for which the attorneys did not receive a dime, or for which they did not have the hope of ever receiving any compensation. One of the things that has made the legal profession preeminent is the fact that an attorney who is appointed by a judge puts into the trial of the case all the skill and energy within him, for which he does not receive any fee or any substantial fee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I probably should have said "most of the States." I think there are some 37 or 38 States which have such laws. I have forgotten the number. I suppose the courts of the District of Columbia would have to O. K. the vouchers presented by attorneys who have been appointed by the courts. I do not believe any judge would allow an attorney to string out a case merely for the purpose of obtaining $20 a day. Most of the lawyers who are appointed by the courts are young lawyers just starting to practice. If they secure a client in a Federal or a State court, and, under appointment, are paid $20, or $40, that might be barely sufficient to pay the rent for a month. I hope we can get together on these bills.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to point out in connection with this bill that very often a man charged with a misdemeanor deserves and should have a proper defense in his trial, fully as much as a man charged with a felony. What the Senator from Georgia has said is very true, that one of the great services the bar associations throughout the United States render is in coming to the defense of indigent persons charged with violating the law. I hardly know any way that this type of legislation can be handled except to leave it to the discretion of the trial judge. We cannot write a law applying to felonies, on the one hand, and another law applying to misdemeanors. It does not mean that the attorney who may be appointed will have to be paid a fee; it probably does not mean that at all, for when only a short time may be consumed in advising a defendant of his rights before the court, and seeing to it that he has his day in court, most Federal judges probably would secure the services of an attorney of the Federal bar to do that without charge.

But here in the District of Columbia, and the same statement applies throughout the United States, many trials are long-drawn-out and protracted. Many times when a lawyer is asked by the court to represent a defendant in a criminal trial he does not know how long it is going to take him. He may very well believe that the trial will only require his services in court for half a day, or for an hour; yet when he gets into the situation he finds that his client has some rights, and in order properly to protect them the case must be adequately prepared, and must be presented over a long period of time in court. I have known members of the bar to undertake the representation of indigent persons in court, when they thought the case would be finished in 1 or 2 days, but, as a matter of fact, the trial lasted as long as 30 days and even as long as 60 days. I know of one such trial which lasted 6 months. In that case the attorney representing the defendant did not get a penny for his work. After he had accepted the case he did not want to appear to be slacking up in his defense of the case. Yet he received no pay, because there was no provision for pay.

Mr. President, in the District of Columbia we have a splendid set of Federal judges. It seems to me we can well leave to their discretion the cases in which they should pay attorneys and the cases in which they should not pay attorneys. That is all the bill does. I am frank to say that I know of no way we can draft a measure of this kind and take into consideration all the various contingencies which might arise, whether the charges involve misdemeanors, serious misdemeanors, felonies, serious felonies, cases requiring the work of 1 day, or the work of 3 months or 6 months.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice the title of the bill applies only to criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Is it not true that minor cases in the District of Columbia are tried in the municipal court?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. The bill applies only to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOLLAND. But is it not true that in the District of Columbia minor cases, such as misdemeanor cases, are as a rule tried in the municipal court of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McGRATH. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] having objected, the bill goes over.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maryland to withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. The type of cases referred to by the Senator from Maryland, traffic violations, health violations, violations of various District ordinances, do not come before the United States district court. They are mainly tried in the municipal court. So we are not dealing with the minor cases. From my experience as a judge I am firmly convinced that proper and adequate defense cannot be provided for an indigent defendant unless provision is made for appointment and compensation of an attorney in the case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is an additional reason why the Senator from Maryland objects.

In the first place, I see no point in having one policy for the district courts of the rest of the Nation and another policy for the district courts of the District of Columbia, which come under the same Congress. The policy should be uniform. If we are making a policy for the United States district courts generally to apply only to felonies, then it ought to apply only to felonies in the District of Columbia. Whatever the law is for the rest of the Nation, it ought to be the same for the District, neither more nor less.

The Senator from Maryland will not object if the laws of the District of Columbia are brought into consonance with the laws for the rest of the Nation, if the policy applies only to felonies. The Senator from Maryland does not believe that it is good policy to pay out public money for the defense of mere misdemeanors.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, we shall be glad to discuss this question with the Committee on the Judiciary and try to bring our bill into line, if possible, with the legislation which is proposed for the rest of the country. I ask the Senator from Maryland to be present later this afternoon or tomorrow when we discuss another bill in which we shall try to bring legislation for the District into line with legislation for the Nation as a whole. If I may, I shall quote him at that time.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. The District of Columbia rent-control legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the cases are similar. The courts of the Nation operate under uniform rules, but the rents of the Nation are not uniform. Conditions are not uniform. Crime is the same all over the Nation; but the rent equation is different with each city, each locality, and each State. Their climates are different. In some places heat is required, and in other places it is not necessary. There is no similarity between the questions. The Senator's argument is drawing, not a red herring, but a yellow herring, across the trail.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think our 5 minutes have about expired.

In my judgment, the two situations are identical. Right and wrong are the same in all 48 States and in the District of Columbia. If a rule or regulation is right for the people in cities in the Senator's State, it is right for the people in cities in my State, and for the people in the District of Columbia.

I hope the Senator will be present when we discuss the question to which I referred a moment ago. We want to have the same rules and regulations for the area in which Senators live as we have for the area in which the constituents of Senators live.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland insists on his objection. The bill will be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN COURT ORDERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CONNECTION WITH PAYMENT OF TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT MAINTENANCE

This bill (S. 1125) to amend section 16–415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1346, ch. 854, sec. 980), otherwise known as section 16–415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever any husband shall fail or refuse to maintain his wife and minor children, if any, although able so to do, the court, on application of the wife, pendente lite and permanently, may decree that he shall pay her, periodically, such sums as would be allowed to her as pendente lite or permanent alimony in case of divorce for the maintenance of herself and the minor children, if any, committed to her care by the court, and the payment thereof may be enforced in the same manner as directed in regard to the payment of permanent alimony."

NOTICES IN CONNECTION WITH PROBATE OF WILLS IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (S. 1127) to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 130 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902 (title 19, sec. 301, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 130. Notice of petition for probate: Upon the filing of a petition for probate of a will, notice, as hereinafter provided, shall be issued to all persons who would be entitled to or interested in the estate of the testator in case such will had not been executed to appear in said court on a date named in the notice, and to show cause why the prayer of the petition should not be granted.

"(a) Such notice may be by a citation in which the return date named is not earlier than 10 days after the filing of said petition, and which citation shall be served in the District of Columbia, by the United States marshal, or deputy marshal, not less than 5 days before the return day named in said citation.

"(b) Such notice may be by a citation in which the return date named is not earlier than 20 days after the filing of said petition, and which citation shall be served not less than 10 days before the return date named in said citation: *Provided*, That such citation may be served only on nonresidents of the District of Columbia, and upon residents of said District who have been returned 'Not to be found' under paragraph (a) of this section, and such service may be made only by a person not less than 18 years of age who is not a party to or otherwise interested in the estate of the decedent, and the return in such case must be made under oath in the District of Columbia, unless the person making the service be a sheriff or deputy sheriff, a marshal or deputy marshal, authorized to serve process where service is made, and such return must show the time and place of service.

"(c) Such notice, whenever there is proof by the petition for probate or by other affidavit that any or all of such persons, interested as aforesaid, are nonresidents of the District of Columbia, or whenever they or any of them have been returned 'Not to be found' under paragraph (a) of this section, may be by a publication in which the return date named is not less than 30 days after the date of the first appearance of the publication, and which shall be published once in each of three successive weeks in some newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia, and a copy of this published notice shall be mailed to the last-known address of each of the persons, interested as aforesaid, who is not shown to have been returned served personally under either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of this section. The court may by general rule prescribe the form of such notice by publication, and may order such other publication as the case may require."

SEC. 2. Section 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (title 19, sec. 305, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 131. PROBATE.—When notice as prescribed in section 130 has been completed in any case the court shall proceed, if no caveat be filed, to take the proofs, or to consider the proofs theretofore taken, of the execution of the will. All the witnesses to such will who are within the District and competent to testify must be produced and examined, or the absence of any of them satisfactorily accounted for."

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAWS OF THE DISTRICT TO CONFORM TO FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

The bill (S. 1129) to amend section 16–416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure was con-

sidered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acts of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1345, ch. 854, sec. 963), and of June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 537, ch. 1329), otherwise known as section 16–416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, are amended to read as follows:

"All applications for divorce or for a decree annulling a marriage shall be made by complaint to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the proceedings thereupon shall be the same as in equity causes, except so far as otherwise herein provided."

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAW OF THE DISTRICT WITH RELATION TO CAVEATS TO WILLS

The bill (S. 1132) to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (title 19, sec. 309, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 137. Caveat: If, upon the hearing of the application to admit a will to probate, the court shall decree that the same be admitted to probate, any person in interest may file a caveat to said will and pray that the probate thereof may be revoked at any time within 1 year after such decree."

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAWS OF THE DISTRICT RELATING TO DEFENSE OF UNCONTESTED ANNULMENT CASES

The bill (S. 1133) to amend section 16–418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1347, ch. 854, sec. 982), otherwise known as section 16–418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, is amended to read as follows:

"In all uncontested divorce or annulment cases, and in any other divorce or annulment case where the court may deem it necessary or proper, a disinterested attorney shall be assigned by the court to enter his appearance for the defendant and actively defend the cause, and such attorney shall receive such compensation for his services as the court may determine to be proper, such compensation to be paid by the parities as the court may direct."

SERVICE OF PROCESS IN THE DISTRICT ON CERTAIN AGENTS, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1123) to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents or employees of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 2, line 21, after the word "court", to insert a colon and a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. of C. Code, 1940, title 13, sec. 103), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1537. Service on a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, and foreign corporation: In any action against a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation doing business in the District of Columbia, all process may be served on the agent of such nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation or the person doing or conducting the business of such nonresident individual partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation; or, in case such agent of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation is absent and canont be found by leaving a copy at the principal place of business in the District of Columbia of such nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation; or, if there be no such place of business, by leaving the same at the place of business or residence of such agent in said District of Columbia; and such service shall be effectual to bring the nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation before the court: *Provided*, That such service of process shall be effectual to bring the nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, or organization before the court only as to suits growing out of contracts entered into or to be performed in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia, or growing out of any tort committed in the said District of Columbia.

"When a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation shall do business in the District of Columbia, without having any place of business or resident agent therein, service in the District of Columbia upon any officer or agent of such nonresident individual, partnership, association, group organization, or foreign corporation shall be effectual as to suits growing out of contracts entered into or to be performed, in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia or growing out of any tort committed in the said District of Columbia.

"When a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, or organization is served in the manner provided in the aforegoing provisions of this section, then notice of such service and a copy of the summons and complaint shall be sent within 10 days by registered mail, return receipt requested, by the plaintiff or his attorney, to the defendant nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, or organization, at the defendant's last known address; and the plaintiff, or his attorney, shall file with the clerk of the court in which the action is pending an affidavit of compliance herewith and, either, a return receipt purporting to be signed by the defendant or defendants, or a person qualified to receive his or their registered mail, in accordance with the rules and customs of the Post Office Department; or, if acceptance was refused by the defendant or defendants, or his or their agent, the original envelope, bearing a notation by the postal authorities that receipt was refused, and an affidavit by or on behalf of the plaintiff that notice of such mailing and refusal was sent within 10 days to the defendant or defendants by ordinary mail. The aforegoing papers shall be filed within 30 days after the return receipt or other official proof of delivery or the original envelope bearing a notation of refusal, as the case may be, is received by the plaintiff. Service of process shall be complete 10 days after such papers are filed. The court in which the action is pending may order such continuances as may be necessary to afford the defendant a reasonable opportunity to defend the action, and no judgment by default in any such action shall be granted until at least 20 days shall have elapsed after completion of service of process as hereinabove provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia."

INCREASE OF FUNERAL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE FROM DECEDENT'S ESTATE IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1130) to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from $600 to $1,000 which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 356 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 520, D. C. Code, 1940), lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 are amended by striking out the words "after the payment of funeral expenses according to the condition and circumstances of the deceased, not exceeding $600" and inserting in lieu thereof "that in the payment of funeral expenses the court shall make a reasonable allowance for such funeral expenses according to the condition and circumstances of the deceased, not exceeding $1,000."

SEC. 2. Section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902 (title 20, sec. 605, D. C. Code, 1940), lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 are amended by striking out "$300: *Provided*, That for special cause shown the court may make such additional allowance not exceeding $300 as such special circumstances may warrant" and inserting in lieu the words "one thousand dollars."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on page 2, line 21, after the figure "$1,000", and within the quotation marks, the word "and" has been inadvertently omitted. I therefore move to amend the committee amendment by inserting the word "and" within the quotation marks after the figure "$1,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 21, in the committee amendment, after the figure "$1,000", it is proposed to insert the word "and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF ESTATES OF DECEDENTS IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1131) to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the words "striking out the" to strike out "word 'thirty'" and insert "words 'within thirty days after the first publication'"; in line 8, after the words "in lieu thereof the" to strike out "word 'ten'" and insert "words 'within ten days after publication'"; and in line 15, after the word "title" to strike out "14" and insert "18", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 260 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902 (title 18, sec. 501, D. C. Code, 1940, line 11), is amended by striking out therefrom the words "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "six months."

SEC. 2. Section 267 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 20, sec. 306, D. C. Code, 1940, lines 6 and 9), is amended by striking out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "five" and by striking out the words "within thirty days after the first publication" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "within ten days after publication."

SEC. 3. Section 309 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 401, D. C. Code, 1940, line 2), is amended by striking out the words "three months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two months."

SEC. 4. Section 315 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 407, D. C. Code, 1940, line 3), is amended by striking out the words "three months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two months."

SEC. 5. Section 348 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 518, D. C. Code, 1940, lines 9, 15, and 19), is amended by striking out the words "nine months" where they appear three times in said section and inserting each time in lieu thereof the words "three months."

SEC. 6. Section 350 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 526, D. C. Code, 1940, lines 2 and 6), is amended by striking out the words "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "six months" and by striking out the words "at least six months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at least three months."

SEC. 7. Section 361 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 20, sec. 601, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended by striking the period at the end of said section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following words: "*Provided*, That said account may be rendered 6 months from the date of his letters."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTIVE SERVICE BY PUBLICATION IN ANNULMENT ACTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1134) to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1206, ch. 854, sec. 105), otherwise known as the first paragraph of section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, is amended to read as follows:

And insert:

That the first paragraph of section 105 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1206, ch. 854), as amended (sec. 13-108, D. of C. Code, 1940 edition), is amended to read as follows:

And on page 2, line 1, after the word "service", to strike out "or" and insert "of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 105 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1206, ch. 854), as amended (sec. 13-108, D. of C. Code, 1940 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"Publication may be substituted for personal service of process upon any defendant who cannot be found and who is shown by affidavit to be a nonresident, or to have been absent from the District for at least 6 months, or against the unknown heirs or devisees of deceased persons, in suits for partition, divorce, annulment, by attachment, foreclosure of mortgages and deeds of trust, the establishment of title to real estate by possession, the enforcement of mechanics' liens, and all other liens against real or personal property within the District, and in all actions at law and in equity which have for their immediate object the enforcement or establishment of any lawful right, claim, or demand to or against any real or personal property within the jurisdiction of the court:

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF SMALL ESTATES IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1135) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "any" to strike out "married", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by adding to chapter 5 thereof a new subchapter 9 to read as follows:

"FAMILY ALLOWANCE AND ADMINISTRATION OF SMALL ESTATES

"SEC. 394. (a) Upon the death of any person leaving a surviving spouse the said surviving spouse shall be entitled to an allowance out of the personal estate of said decedent of the sum of $500 for his or her use, and that of any minor children, to be paid in money or in specific property at its fair value as may be elected, and which allowance shall be exempt from any and all debts and obligations of the decedent, and subject only to payment of funeral expenses not exceeding $200; and, if there be no surviving spouse, the surviving minor children if any there be shall be entitled to a like allowance, and which shall be payable, in the discretion of the probate court, to the person having their custody or to such other person as it shall designate, and shall be used by such person solely for said minor's care and maintenance. Said family allowance shall be in addition to the respective share or shares of the surviving spouse and children.

"(b) When any person dies, leaving a small estate consisting only of personal property of a value not in excess of $500, and there be a surviving spouse or minor children entitled to the family allowance authorized in the preceding section, if such surviving spouse or minor children (acting through the person having their custody or a next friend) file in the probate court a petition, under oath, declaring: The time and place of decedent's death; the known next of kin; the known assets and by whom held; that petitioner has made a diligent search to discover all assets of the deceased; the amount of funeral expenses and to whom due; and that said assets do not exceed $500 in value; the probate court, if satisfied that the allegations in the petition are true, shall pass a final order (1) declaring that no formal administration is necessary and no probate is required of any will; (2) fixing the amount of funeral expenses allowable, to whom due, and out of what property to be paid; (3) vesting title to the remainder of the property in the surviving spouse or minor children, as the case may be, in satisfaction of his, her, or their family allowance; and (4) directing the person or persons having possession of said property to pay over, transfer, and deliver the same as allotted. The probate court may also authorize in said order, or by further order, the sale of any of said property as the exigencies of the situation require.

"(c) (1) When anyone dies intestate, leaving a small estate consisting only of personal property of a value not in excess of $500, and there be no spouse or minor children surviving, if the person entitled to be preferred in the appointment of an administrator files in the probate court a petition, under oath, declaring: The time and place of decedent's death; the known next of kin; that diligent search has been made for a will; the known creditors, together with the amount of each claim, including contingent and disputed claims; and funeral expenses; the known assets and by whom held; that petitioner has made a diligent search to discover all assets and debts of the deceased; that said assets do not exceed $500 in value; and that there are no known legal proceedings pending in which the decedent is a party; the probate court, if satisfied that the allegations in said petition are true, shall pass a preliminary order declaring that no formal administration is necessary and instructing the petitioner to publish once in substantially the usual form notice to creditors to exhibit their claims duly authenticated, within 30 days after such notice, and which notice shall be inserted in one newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia as said court shall direct.

"(2) Whenever such a preliminary order has been passed and the notice has been published and the time provided in such notice has expired, the petitioner shall file, under oath, a statement, with the usual proof of publication attached, that the notice has been published, and that the said time has expired, and listing all then known

creditors, including contingent and disputed claims, and the amount of each claim. If satisfied that said statement is true, and after hearing and disposing of any objections filed in the probate court by anyone interested in the estate, the probate court shall pass a final order (1) directing the petitioner to pay from the estate all of said claims, in the order of priority provided by law, and (2) authorizing any person having possession of any property of the decedent's estate to transfer, pay over, and deliver the same in accordance with petitioner's directions, and (3) decreeing that, after the Register of Wills certifies upon said final order that he has seen the vouchers for the payment of said claims and is satisfied that said claims, as well as the fees hereinafter provided for, have been paid, then the remaining balance of the estate, if any, shall be vested as follows: First, in the adult surviving children equally, and, secondly, if there be no adult surviving children, then in those persons who would be entitled thereto under the statute of distributions (the share of any minor shall be payable, in the discretion of the probate court, to the person having custody or to such other person as it shall designate, to be used solely for the care and maintenance of such minor).

"(3) The probate court may also provide in its final order for sale of any property, upon such terms as it deems advisable, and for the distribution of the proceeds in accordance with its final order.

"(d) In the absence of fraud, no person who pays over, transfers, or delivers any property pursuant to the provisions of a final order entered under section 394 (b), or to the directions of a petitioner acting under authority of a final order under section 394 (c), shall be liable for the application thereof, nor shall any such person, nor any person who receives any property pursuant to the provisions of a final order entered under section 394 (b), or to the directions of a petitioner acting under authority of a final order under section 394 (c), be responsible for any claims on account of the payment, transfer, delivery, or receipt of such property; and the property distributed pursuant to a final order in either case shall be and become the absolute property of the respective distributees thereof.

"(e) No petitioner under this act shall be required to be represented by an attorney, or to give bond, nor receive any commission for performing any work or services hereunder.

"(f) The Register of Wills shall prepare, and make available, forms whereby the petition and final order under section 394 (b), and the petition, preliminary order, the statement, the final order, and the certificate of payment under section 394 (c), shall constitute in each case one connected instrument. In lieu of all other fees, costs, or charges, the Register of Wills shall receive a fee of $5 for all services and work administered under this act, including the taking of all affidavits, plus a fee of 25 cents for each certified copy of the aforesaid instruments.

"(g) The discovery of any additional property of the decedent, after the filing of a petition in either case provided for in this act, shall be reported by the petitioner to the probate court as soon as discovered by him. The existence of said additional property shall not invalidate any proceedings under this act except when the additional property is discovered before the passage of the final order provided for, and either (1) is real estate or (2) increases the total value of the estate to more than $500, in which case no final order shall be passed under this act and the court shall require regular administration. Where additional property is discovered after passage of the final order, if said property is entirely personal and does not increase the value of the total estate to more than $500, then such additional property may be distributed pursuant to a new petition under the appropriate section of this act; in all other cases such additional property may not be distributed under this act.

"(h) Any person who makes a false affidavit under this act, or who willfully violates any order of the probate court under this act or any other provision of this act, shall be liable to a fine of not exceeding $500 for each offense.

"(i) All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall be, and they are hereby, repealed to the extent of such inconsistency but only to such extent.

"(j) This act shall apply to the estates of all persons dying after the date of the approval of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF CROP PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 36), to investigate certain matters relating to crop production and utilization.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution. I should like to know why there was not included in the resotion provision for the investigation of the production and utilization of timber products, as well as grains, canes, fruits, vegetables, and livestock.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the distinguished Senator that this resolution is in the identical form of the resolution under which a former subcommittee operated, which had for its purpose the investigation of the distribution and the broadened utilization of farm crops such as vegetables and grains. I know of no objection to broadening the resolution to include timber; but that was not included in the former resolution.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 25, after the word "livestock" where it occurs the first time, it is proposed to strike out "and livestock products" and insert "livestock products, and timber products."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the production, means of production, and plans for production of all types of agricultural crops, with particular reference to the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's food, feed, and fiber production, including studies of the construction, location, management, and use of industrial plants for the processing of various farm products. Also including studies in the field of the distribution of farm crops and the methods and costs of transferring the crops from the producer to the consumer. Also including special attention to new uses and the study and development of new uses and markets, both foreign and domestic, for farm crops, including further studies in the production, means of production, and plans for production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber, and the utilization of all natural materials for such purposes. Also including investigation of the organization or organizations now controlling or seeking to control for the future such alcohol and rubber production together with the use of patents and processes used in such manufacture whether developed or owned in whole or in part by foreign companies, corporations, individuals, or agents, and particularly to inquire into the plans and purposes and policies of our governmental agencies with reference to such utilization in the processing and production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber. And the subcommittee is specifically directed to make careful study in all fields of possible expanded use of farm production, looking to the fullest possible utilization of farm crops to prevent as far as possible the adverse impact of recurrent surpluses of farm production on our agricultural economy and on the other segments of the Nation's economic structure. For the purpose of this investigation, farm crops include grains, canes, fruits, vegetables, livestock, livestock products, and timber products.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $12,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The resolution (S. Res. 78) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional temporary assistants and increasing the limit of its expenditures, submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina on February 28, 1949, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (e) (2) "the status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement" and subsection (e) (3) "the postal service generally, including the railway mail service and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service" of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized during the period beginning March 1, 1949, and ending December 31, 1949, to make such expenditures and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, clearical and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed

$5,000) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INVESTIGATION OF FINANCIAL CONDITION OF AIR-LINE INDUSTRY

The resolution (S. Res. 50) to investigate the financial condition of the air-line industry, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado with respect to this measure, although my remarks do not exactly address themselves to it. I understand that it is the policy of the Senator from Colorado to defer action on all aviation bills. I further understand that some eight bills which have been introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada do not come under that category.

I wonder whether the Senator from Colorado has in mind taking up those eight bills soon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I say to the Senator from Nevada that it is our purpose and our plan to take up in the very near future the bills to which the Senator refers.

Mr. McCARRAN. I refer particularly to the Federal airport bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; they will be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the preamble and insert:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-first Congress to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) the financial stability and operational efficiency of the air-line industry; (2) all matters pertaining to the United States merchant marine; (3) all domestic land and water transportation to determine (a) whether existing conditions conform to the national transportation policy as declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, and (b) the effect of large expenditures of public moneys and private capital upon transportation charges and to what extent such expenditures are reflected in costs of production and prices to consumers; and (4) all matters relating to radio, telegraph, and telephone communications, including (a) the problems relating to American common carriers operating in the domestic and international fields, including the relationship of these problems to the national security of the United States; (b) the problems presented by requirements of international treaties and conventions in relation to such revisions as may be necessary to the Communications Act of 1934; (c) the problems arising from unprecedented demands for frequencies for such communication services as television; safety and special services, including aviation, railroads, busses, trucks, taxicabs; common-carrier uses; and industrial uses; and the policies which the Congress should adopt for the granting of such allocations; (d) the manner in which the Federal Communications Commission exercises its licensing authority with respect to radio applications; (e) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the qualifications of applicants for licenses or renewals of licenses in order to determine that only qualified persons are licensed to operate radio stations or other licensed facilities; and (f) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the operation or proposed operation of radio stations in order to assure that such stations have been or will be operated in the public interest.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, and recommend such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, (1) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $165,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was rejected.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to investigate problems relating to the air-line industry, the United States merchant marine, domestic land and water transportation, and radio, telegraph, and telephone communications."

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE

The bill (S. 1185) to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a bill similar to this was reported during the Eightieth Congress by the Senate Finance Committee. I am not sure but what the bill then passed the Senate. However, it did not become law. The Veterans' Administration requested that the bill be reintroduced at this session of the Congress.

The bill simply would relieve the Veterans' Administration from the payment of the supervisory or administrative personnel of the Canteen Service. That is the chief purpose of the bill. Under the bill, the payment of the employees would be made out of the profits made by the Canteen Service.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs advised the committee last year that the bill was agreeable to all the veterans' organizations, and that there was no opposition to it at any point. Therefore, the bill was reported last year, and may have passed the Senate, but it did not pass the House.

So, for the second time, the bill has been considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and has been unanimously reported.

There are one or two other features of the bill, but I have referred to its principal provision. It will save to the Veterans' Administration, out of their appropriated funds, a little more than $1,000,000 a year. However, the Canteen Service makes a profit, and will continue to do so; and these payments will now be made out of the Canteen Service funds.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. On page 3, beginning in line 8, the wording is:

Such checks, money orders, and other similar instruments may be cashed outright or may be accepted in payment for merchandise or services, and the difference between the amount of the purchase and the amount of the tendered instrument refunded in cash.

There is some question as to whether a limitation should be placed on that authority.

Mr. GEORGE. That question did arise; but we were advised, as I now recall, by the Administrator and by the witnesses who appeared at the hearing during the last Congress, not the present Congress, that such checks were generally in small amounts, or the difference payable to the customer was a small amount, and that it had been found practicable and convenient to allow the Canteen Service to cash the checks. We were advised that there was no danger in that provision. Someone questioned it when the bill was originally introduced, I may say to the Senator. A limitation could well have been placed upon the amount; but inasmuch as these check transactions are not usually in large amounts, it was thought that there would be no danger in leaving the provision without limit.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, those amounts would be only nominal, I understand.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is true. That was understood at the time.

I may say to the Senator that the Veterans' Administration very much desires to have the bill enacted, because it will relieve it not only of the payment of a considerable amount of money, but also of quite a great deal of detail work, which the Veterans' Administration would like to get rid of.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia would object to one or two amendments to limit the amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before amendments are suggested, the question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to present some amendments, and I send them to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 4, after the word "instruments", it is proposed to insert "in nominal amounts;" and in line 10, after the word "accepted", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "subject to strict administrative controls."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that those amendments apply to checks which are cashed?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes; they do.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I have no objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1185) which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, at the end of the bill to insert:

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the 1st day of July 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (d) and (e) of section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 888, 38, U. S. C. 13a), are amended to read as follows:

"(d) To transfer to the Service without charge, rental, or reimbursement such necessary equipment as may not be needed for other purposes, and furnish the Service such services and utilities, including light, water, and heat, as may be available and necessary for its use: *Provided*, That reasonable charges, to be determined by the Administrator, shall be paid annually by the Service for the utilities so furnished.

"(e) To employ such persons as are necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Service, and to pay the salaries, wages, and expenses of all such employees from the funds of the Service. Such personnel shall be excluded from the determinations and reports required by section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. 947), with respect to personnel ceilings. Personnel necessary for the transaction of the business of the Service at canteens, warehouses, and storage depots shall be appointed, compensated from funds of the Service, and removed by the Administrator without regard to civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That such employees shall be subject to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, the Civil Service Retirement Acts, and laws administered by the Bureau of Employees Compensation applicable to civilian employees of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 888, 38 U. S. C. 13a), is amended by adding a new subsection (k) at the end thereof as follows:

"(k) To authorize the use of funds of the Service when available, subject to such regulations as he may deem appropriate, and without regard to the provisions of sections 3639 and 3651, Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (31 U. S. C. 521, 543), for the purpose of cashing checks, money orders, and similar instruments in nominal amounts for the payment of money presented by veterans hospitalized or domiciled at hospitals and homes of the Veterans' Administration, and by other persons authorized by section 3 of this act to make purchases at canteens. Such checks, money orders, and other similar instruments may be cashed outright or may be accepted, subject to strict administrative controls, in payment for merchandise or services, and the difference between the amount of the purchase and the amount of the tendered instrument refunded in cash."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 889, 38 U. S. C. 13c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. To finance the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Service there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such amounts as are necessary to provide for (a) the acquisition of necessary furniture, furnishings, fixtures, and equipment for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of canteens, warehouses, and storage depots; (b) stocks of merchandise and supplies for canteens and reserve stocks of same in warehouses and storage depots; (c) salaries, wages, and expenses of all employees; (d) administrative and operation expenses and premiums on fidelity bonds of employees; and (e) adequate working capital for each canteen and for the Service as a whole. Amounts heretofore or hereafter appropriated under the authority contained in this act, as amended, and all income from canteen operations become and will be administered as a revolving fund to effectuate the provisions of this act, as amended."

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the 1st day of July 1949.

CANCELLATION OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PORT OF SEATTLE AND UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the Port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Army, acting on behalf of the United States, is hereby authorized to negotiate for and enter into an agreement for such period and on such terms and conditions as he deems advisable for the continuing use by the United States of the property on which pier 39 and its appurtenant facilities are located and that the Attorney General, or his duly authorized representative, acting on behalf of the United States, upon notification that such an agreement has been entered into, is hereby authorized and directed to execute the necessary document or documents to release and cancel that certain agreement entered into on the 31st day of December 1923 by and between the Port of Seattle, a municipal corporation, and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board, acting by and through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States for the District of Columbia, which said agreement was recorded on the 17th day of March 1924 in the office of the King County auditor in the State of Washington under volume 54 of Chattel Mortgages, page 614, and volume 887 of Real Property Mortgages, page 448, bearing file No. 1844599.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, by request, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO MOUNT HOPE CEMETERY ASSOCIATION

The bill (H. R. 1401) relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Several years ago the Congress enacted a law transferring 4,000 acres of land to the Michigan State Department of Conservation for the purpose of permitting it to carry on certain demonstrations. The transfer was made with the provision that if the land were not used for the recreational and other purposes named in the act, title should revert to the United States.

It appears that the cemetery association has a cemetery immediately adjoining a portion of this 4,000-acre tract. There is a 10-acre lot which is desired by the cemetery association. The Michigan State Department of Conservation is willing to convey it. The only question is whether the use of this land for purposes of a cemetery might be regarded as within the original grant.

The purpose of the bill is merely to grant the consent of the United States

to the transfer of these 10 acres, subject to the same conditions of reversion if the use is not made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one question. I understood the last statement of the Senator to be that even though the 10 acres is conveyed by the State of Michigan, it will be subject to the same reversionary rights of the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I have no trouble with this case, because it is a case of a previous conveyance. I might have had trouble with it originally, as to the original conveyance, but certainly not now, with the reversionary right of the United States protected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming will look at the last paragraph of the bill again and see whether his last answer is correct, and whether it does not waive all reversionary interests.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. An amendment was adopted. The last sentence is:

Any conditions providing for a reversion of title to the United States that may be contained in the conveyance of such lands by the United States to the State of Michigan are hereby released as to the lands herein authorized to be transferred.

I am sorry; I was in error in my response to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask one or two questions of the Senator from Wyoming. In the first conveyance to the State of Michigan was there any consideration on which the transfer was based?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am unable to answer the inquiry of the Senator. The Senator from Michigan may possibly have the information.

Mr. FERGUSON. The best information I have is that there was not. I think there was a reason for deleting the reversionary clause, the reason being that the land was to be used for burial purposes. After interments have been made, it would not be desirable to take the land back for Federal purposes. The idea was that it should be used permanently for burial purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is why I raised my question. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he knows whether or not the State of Michigan will get any consideration for the conveyance of the 10 acres.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My understanding is it will not. But I point out that if the bill be not approved, it makes no difference to the Government of the United States, because the land is already conveyed to the State of Michigan. It will hold the land in any event, if the grant is not made. The bill provides merely that consent be given for the conveyance of the 10 acres, to be used for cemetery purposes. I think the Senator's objection, on principle, does not go to this type of transaction.

Mr. MORSE. I grant that it looks very much like a de minimis case. But I think the Senator from Wyoming knows that it is possible to lose a principle, too, by the accumulation of enough de minimis cases. The principle soon disappears. I may ask whether what we are doing here is not merely transferring to the State of Michigan whatever reversionary rights we may have, for the benefit of a private cemetery association.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reversion is being waived for the benefit of the cemetery association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not object, although I do wish to issue a caution that where I find there is anything but a de minimis case involved, I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1401) relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "released," to insert "as to the lands herein authorized to be transferred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO CHURNTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 164) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown elementary-school district, California, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I request an explanation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the land in the vicinity of the Shasta Dam reclamation structure in the State of California was acquired several years ago by the Bureau of Reclamation, I believe, from private sources. The Bureau of Reclamation has no use for the land. It is highly desired, however, for public-school purposes, and the effect of the bill is to transfer the title to the school district in return for a consideration to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, so we do not have to provide for a donation of public land, but an authorization to convey the title for a consideration to be fixed in accordance with the present valuation of the land by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I point out that the consideration could be 50 cents or a dollar or 1 cent. There is nothing in the proposed act anywhere, that places upon the Secretary of the Interior any obligation when fixing the fair value of the land. Again, we are dealing with a matter that is not of any great importance. But I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that he accept the following amendment:

Provided, That the school district concerned shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator, if consent is granted to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 8, after the word "conclusive" it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso:

Provided, That the Churntown elementary-school district of California shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO THOMAS A. PICKETT

The bill (S. 392) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Thomas A. Pickett, of Berkeley, Calif., a patent in fee to the following-described allotted lands situated in the State of Montana: (1) Lots 9 and 10 of section 3, the east half of section 10, the east half of the northeast quarter, and the east half of the west half of the northeast quarter of section 15, township 2 south, range 30 east, Montana principal meridian, and (2) the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 14, township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO GEORGE PETERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 716) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Peters, which had been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to George Peters, of Wyola, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The north half of the north half of section 29, the north half of the north half of the south half of the north half of section 29, and all of section 20, township 4 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

And insert:

That upon the filing of a written application by George Peters, Crow Indian allottee No. 1292, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell to a Crow Indian, under existing regulations, the homestead and other land of said George Peters, described as all of section 20; the north half of the north half; the north half of the north half of the south half of the north half of section 29, township 4 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing

eight hundred and forty acres, the status of such land with respect to taxability to remain unchanged.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the filing of a written application by George Peters, Crow Indian allottee No. 1292, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell to a Crow Indian, under existing regulations, the homestead and other land of said George Peters, described as all of section 20; the north half of the north half; the north half of the north half of the south half of the north half of section 29, township 4 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 840 acres, the status of such land with respect to taxability to remain unchanged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of George Peters under existing regulations."

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this resolution brings to the attention of the Senate another of the deportation suspension measures. They come about by reason of the specific law enacted by Congress which provides that when the Department of Justice suspends deportation of any alien in the United States, it must come to Congress for approval. Both Houses of Congress consider the suspension cases. They come, however, largely to the Senate because the Senate has a staff that can be assigned to a study of the subject, while the House of Representatives does not have a staff sufficient to give proper study to it.

I draw to the attention of the Senate the fact that we are doing everything within our power to study the deportation suspension cases. Up to date we have held up approximately 10 percent of the names sent to us by the Department of Justice. I am not saying that 10 percent is to be regarded as a criterion. We may some day disapprove the whole list which is sent to us, or we may cut it down to 1 percent. But we do assign members of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary to a careful study and screening of each case. When the report comes from the Department of Justice, we have demanded of the Department that they give us a detailed explanation of the reason for the suspension. If such detailed explanation meets with approval and seems to have nothing objectionable in it, we as a rule approve the suspension. If there is anything in it that seems questionable at all we hold it up.

I should like to have the Senate to understand how we deal with these cases, because they are numerous. Here are two resolutions, one following the other, and a few moments ago we approved another resolution which went through the committee, dealing with suspension of deportations. I draw the matter to the attention of the Senate because it is of grave concern to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I say grave concern, because we find on investigation that there are thousands of these cases, and in all probability we shall be compelled to deal with somewhere in the neighborhood of 15,000 such cases during this year, which is a matter of grave concern to the whole Nation. But I wanted to explain to the Senate how we deal with them, why the cases are here, in order that the Senate may know, in the approval of these measures as they come along, that the Committee on the Judiciary is doing its very best to see to it that no alien is detained in this country, or his deportation suspended, unless there is good reason for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 2, to strike out "pass" and insert "favor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favor the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-5348029, Adamiszyn, Mary (nee Grazio Maria Mitola alias Mitale).

A-4476899, Ali, Wahed Mohamed, or Mohamed Ali or Wahed or Wohaed Ali.

A-2771648, Amezcua, Guadalupe, or Guadalupe Chavez De Samaniego.

A-6581279, Andavazo, Felix.

A-9728106, Andresen, Hans Kristian.

A-6314071, Arabanos, Georgia.

A-5007171, Arena, Francesco.

A-6712870, Avalos, Tomasa, or Tomasa Avalos de Urquiza.

A-6199320, Balletti, Cecelia Margaret (nee de Cruz).

A-5431512, Bardi, Massimo, or Sam Bardi.

A-4699363, Bevilacqua, Anna (nee Maldera).

A-6142598, Breslin, Pacita Blanch (nee Pacita Mercedes Blanch).

A-6240752, Bryant, Lila Rachael (nee Weingarten or Hays).

A-3874697, Burghen, Anna Maria (nee Andrews).

A-6455114, Cabrales-Flores, Rafael.

A-4374492, Cocolis, Gerassimos Demetrios.

A-6539706, Cusenza, Violet Matilde (alias Violetta Matilde Bileci).

A-9500533, Da Silva, Vincente St. Aubyn (alias Vincent Da Silva).

A-6618909, De Chaides, Olga Encinas, or Olga Encinas or Olga Encinas De Chairez.

A-6088306, De Guzman, Manuel Fenix.

A-6088305, De Guzman, Nancy Schaefer.

A-6088309, De Guzman, Lillian Schaefer.

A-2085545, De Marquez, Josefa Aguilar (VDA) (alias Josefa Aguilar De Marquez alias Josefa Aguilar).

A-4323280, Demidovich, Mike or Michailo, or Michail Dimidovich.

A-6336480, Eney, Richard John, or Chiang Sheng Dai.

A-3644552, Ernest, Jean, or Jan Gluckman or Glicman.

A-4771499, Fantuz, Richard Joseph, or Richardo Joseph Fantuz.

A-5457910, Fung, Shiu Fine, or Shiu John Fung or Shiu John.

A-5804059, Giessler, Otto Alwin, or Otto Giessler.

A-7738794, Gonzalez, Maria Del Carmen Uribe Echevarria.

A-9539472, Gonzales, Heladio.

A-6251915, Gonzalez, Miguel.

A-6261916, Gonzalez, Ruben.

A-6666785, Gonzalez, Simon, or Simon Gonzalez-Villanueva.

A-6665517, Mendiola, Paula, or Pauld Mendiola de Gonzales or Pauline Mendiola.

A-5697168, Gronwoldt, Walter George.

A-6551423, Haberer, Florentina, or Florentina Nuguid.

A-9664258, Hadjipetros, Sotirios, or Sordi or Steve Hadjipetros.

A-5020056, Haller, Gottlieb Heinrich Gustav, or Gustav Haller.

A-3565724, Hamilton, Anna (nee Buczma).

A-6172375, Hamm, Juliana Rodil.

A-2663801, Haro, Jose Ysabel Flores (alias Jose Flores).

A-4715960, Hermandez, Francisco.

A-6679233, Hernandez, Benigno.

A-6679234, Hernandez, Francisco.

A-6639350, Hernandez, Norberto Roberto (alias Norberto Hernandez alias Roberto Hernandez alias Robert Hernandez).

A-6639351, Hernandez, Roberto.

A-6382878, Holsman, Marta Hugentobler (nee Marta Hugentobler).

A-5786464, Hoon, Chan Ngon (alias Mrs. Davis Owyang).

A-2038760, Hoyer, Kurt Emil.

A-3602671, Hunt, Henry.

A-6301859, Hyatt, Lewis.

A-6045907, Ichak, Ali, or Ichak Ali.

A-5599244, Illich, Yova, or John Illich.

A-5573460, Jacob, Sandor, or Alexander Jacob or Jacobs.

A-3148155, Joeng, Soe Siong, or Su Siong Jung.

56208/196, Joyner, William Harry.

A-2086707, Karavolos, Stephanos Theodore.

A-5448558, Kennett, Eunice Lorraine (nee Hultgreen).

A-5334990, Kent, Walter.

A-3192801, Khan, Aziz.

A-5019347, Klevers, Eric Joseph, or Erich Klevers.

A-5654893, Knowlton, Jessie Marie (alias Jessie Marie Aspden, nee Lawrence).

A-2855065, Koludrovich, Vladimir Ludovicco.

A-4776975, Laggan, Catherine Feeney.

A-1030731, Lazarich, Mirko.

A-5584293, Leon, Josephine (alias Josephine Leon Vicochea or Dicochea, alias Josephine Garcia).

A-6300095, Liddicoat, Harold Raymond.

A-2162658, Lombardo, Francesco.

A-5610107, Lopez, Luis, or Louis Lopez or Luis Lopez Garcia.

A-6400801, Lopez-Cabrera, Ezequiel.

A-9553892, Loucas, George Anthony (alias Georgios Antonios Loucas).

A-1598756, Madonna, Giuseppe (alias Giuseppe Clemente).

A-4555403, Magner, James Thomas.

A-4067230, Mancini, Adelio.

A-5825606, Mandel, Margaret Fanny (alias Margaret Sanders or Margaret Schoene or Margaret Barozzi).

A-5261900, Masu, John (alias Giovanni Masu).

A-5010273, De Mendoza, Marcelina Rivera.

A-6208054, Menzies, Colin John.

A-4136618, Miller, Fred, or Frederich Moller or Friedrich Karl Ernst Moller.

A-5107301, Mi-Loffe, Eric Goffe.

A-4066323, Mitola, Antonio, or Anthony Patrick Mitola.

A-3382835, Mitola, Maria Rosa, or Rose Mitola (nee Del Vecchio).

A-1274580, Monte, Caroline, or Caroline Demallos (nee Caroline Lannutti).

A-6251165, Monterrubio, Bienvenida (nee Bienvenida Vasquez Tirado).

A-4289029, Montes-Lopez, Andres, or Andres Montes.
A-1627591, Morales, Maria de Jesus, or Mary Morales.
A-6240784, Morden, Sarra, or Sarra Mesh.
A-4363956, Mueller, Hans Heinrich Alfred.
A-2862095, Mueller, John Hans, or Hans Otto Eugen Mueller or Hans Mueller.
A-7583119, Naef, Emil Joseph.
A-6815661, Ngai, Shun Him.
A-6815662, Ngai, Siu Kum.
A-2146542, O'Donnell, Francis Albert, or Frank Albert O'Donnell or "Inky".
A-3407260, Olivieri, Anthony (Antonio) (alias Francesco Porro).
A-6302145, Ossin, Sarah (alias Sarah Kovtun Ossin).
A-5942218, Osterlund, Holger Torvald.
A-4123010, Palomba, Giovanni, or Palombo (alias John Palombo).
A-6563748, Palomino, Julian, or Julian Palomino Quinones.
A-1868219, Parenteau, Narcisse (alias Joseph Exidas Narcisse Parenteau).
A-6153664, Pasatiempo, Remedios Navarra.
A-1011989, Pera, Anna.
A-6245339, Pericharos, Christos (alias Christ Pericharos).
A-6090963, Pick, Charles Robert.
A-2795198, Pitsiladis, Efstratios, or Charles Peterson or Charles Pitsiladis.
A-3176245, Porvari, Olavi Veli.
A-4384519, Ramos, Juan Jose, or John Joe Ramos (alias Jose Aguilar).
A-6357059, Rodriguez, Sabino, or Sabino Lozoya or Sabino Rodriguez Lozoya.
A-3146287, Rogga, John, or John Rouga.
A-5097023, Romej, Jan Ludwik, or John Ludwik Romej.
A-6047568, Rost, Harry (alias Harry Hyman Rashback).
A-2514884, Sabbe, Margaret Marie (alias Margaret Marie Rosselle or Margaret Marie Billiet).
A-2750510, Sainz-Gutierrez, Santiago.
A-6704617, Sallin, Catherine.
A-5936582, Samuels, Jensena Irene.
A-3477565, Santoro, Emilia (alias Emilia Zanone).
A-5249171, Sarkissian, George (alias George Sarkisian, alias Hachig or Hatchig Sarkissian or Sarkisian).
A-397443, Sharkey, Mary Jane (nee Mary Jane Ramsey).
A-5452595, Silbert, Mary (nee Finegood).
A-3444818, Silva, Manuel Y Cruces, or Manuel Silva.
A-6075260, Simmons, Pearl Salud (nee Tibig).
A-9769910, Singh, Mahadeo Javert Rampersaud.
A-3678239, Sokolow, Sol, or Zyskind Sokolow or Sokol or Zyskind Sokolow, or Janowicz or Janowitz or Yanowicz.
A-3930421, Speis, Stelios Napoleon, or Steve Napoleon Speis.
A-6517996, Sporup, John Soren Nielsen, or John Nielsen.
A-7703588, Soroosh, Gholam Hossein.
A-4761287, Soulvie, Gertrud Mae, or Seiweh (nee French alias Schultz).
A-3776190, Sousa, Mary Agnes.
A-6551396 Squires, Elizabeth Oonagh (alias Elizabeth Perdue).
A-6551397, Squires, Penelope Oonagh (alias Penelope Perdue).
A-6261575, Stamatiades, Nefelia (nee Valasi).
A3174351, St. Hilaire, Melvin, or Melville or Joe St. Hilaire.
A-6277447, Taylor, Beth (alias Beth Engeisen).
A-4491271, Thederahn, Walter Herman, or Walter Smith or Schmidt.
A-5378679, Uusmaa, Vladimer (alias Vladimer Vel Uusmaa).
A-7798513, Valencia, Baudelio (alias Baudelica Valencia Gonzaliz).
A-3716183, Wang, James Shu Woo, or Wang Shu Woo or James Wang.
A-6458405, Wands, Laraine Fay, or Loraine Fay Wands.
A-3497722, Whitaker, Laura Myrtle (nee Owen).
A-1275082, Williamson, Williamina, or Mina Williamson.
A-4495642, Wolinsky, Abraham.
A-6364147, Wright, Graham Patrick.
A-6292364, Zakrzewski, Genowefa, or Genowefa Szczepanska.
A-6292365, Zakrzewski, Jadwiga.
A-3154916, Zannis, Christos.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-6749936, Alcala-Martinez, Jesus, or Jesus Martinez or Jesus Alcala.
A-6313380, Ayala-Serrano, Irene.
A-6449001, Alexander, Chi Ngo, or Chen Chi Ngo.
A-6373549, Ayala, Juan Hernandez, or Juan Ayala Hernandez (alias Dan Hancock alias M. C. Stokes).
A-9579672, Bacich, Anton Sime.
A-2879588, Battaglini, Quirino Gene.
A-5652053, Beda, Sabetay.
A-6249257, Bellios, Paraskevi Costalia.
A-5166885, Bendfeldt, August Johannes.
A-6326675, Berliner, Kenneth Michael (alias Kenneth Michael Hovde).
A-3563940, Binicos, Ioannis Simeon, or John Sam Binicos.
A-3158850, Blake, Clara, formerly Sinclair formerly Bott (nee Brewster).
A-6745477, Bohn, Cecilia Sophia, or Cecilia Sophia Syre.
A-6428294, Boone, Patricia B., or Patricia Imelda Boone (nee Bibby).
A-9574254, Boonstoppel, Johannes, or John Jacob Boonstoppel.
A-6441010, Booth, Margaret Kato Walker.
A-5134452, Bosi, Enricko, or Henry Peter Bosi.
A-9810588, Bruggencate, Albertus Ten.
A-3726769, Callejas, Manuel Peidro.
A-6754664, Changeux, Daniel Robert.
A-5763706, Chau, Shing Leung, or Spaulding Chau.
A-6256341, Cirincione, Maria Teresa.
A-6256342, Cirincione, Carmela Marie.
A-6790777, Corazza, Gilberto Leo (alias Gilberto Corazza or Corrazza or Gilbert Lee Corazza).
A-6092372, Cortes, Caroline Napoleon, formerly Caroline Napoleon Denard.
A-1370087, Costas, Juan Antonio Lopez, or Juan Lopez Costas or Juan Lopez.
A-6172681, Cotsonis, Potoula George, or Potoula Laloussis.
A-4851448, D'Agostino, Arcangelo, or Angelo D'Agostino.
A-6218566, Dantes, John, or Ioannes Yusel Dantes.
A-7589086, Davis, John Champneys.
A-6371776, Derro, Giovanna (nee Totino).
A-6391245, D'Orsogna, Marcello.
A-6427491, Estridge, Edward Nathaniel.
A-3442924, Farese, Biagio.
A-4135957, Faustini, Sebastiani, or Benny or Beniamino Faustino.
A-4173534, Fook, Ling Bing, or Bing Fook Ling.
A-6075351, Francisco, Rogelio Chumbuque.
A-9770636, Furman, Franciszek Felix, or Franciszek Furman or Frank Furman.
A-9659926, Galanos, Nocolaos.
A-5929794, George, Eileen.
A-4669615, Gessner, Friedrich Albert Heinrich Robert, or Fred Horn.
A-5146721, Glick, Dorothy, or Dorothy Bloom or Debora Blimbaum.
A-3323609. Goffredo, Pantaleo, or Leo Goffredo.
A-7653000, Goldstein, Katherine Doris (nee Katherine Doris Victorsen).
A-6517959, Gunther, Esperanza Eroles (nee Esperanza Eroles).
A-7592298, Hansen, Marjorie McGuire.
A-1074698, Heiloo, Vartanoush (nee Markarian Rose or Vartanoush Krikorian).
A-6040369, Hodge, Lawrence.
A-6024985, Hodge, Maude Iola.
A-5878163, Hsueh, Wei Fan (alias Wilfred Hsueh).
A-6590350, Huggins, Frederick Oscar.
A-4833110, Hantwarg, Rubin or Huntverg or Reubin Hunter or Robert Miller.
A-2698572, Ionno, Pellegrino.
A-6428323, Jacobs, Margaret Genevieve (nee Bibby alias Genevieve Jacobs).
A-4301234, Jaeger, George Friedrich Willy (alias George Waldo).
A-6249467, Jarrin, Fanny Lucila or Mosquera.
A-6060836, Jarrin, Nelson Anibal, M. D.
A-6291689, Jarrold, James Michael.
A-5922766, Kellgren, Adam.
A-6755482, Kerketzes, Ioannis, or Joanis Stilianos or John S. Kerkentzes.
A-4699864, Klapprat, Robert, or Klaprat or Klappert or Kappert.
A-7558796, Klasson, Joanna Elizabeth.
A-9776542, Kritikos, Ioannis Stavros (alias John Steve Kritikos).
A-5946937, Kuzemka, Nikolaj or Nikolaj or Nick Kuzema or Joseph Meski.
A-6530589, Kuzninska, Jacek Richard.
A-6277981, Kyriazis, Christ Constantine.
A-6414794, Lamer, Mirko.
A-6251150, Lamer, Leonore.
A-6281356, Lara-Medrano, Jose.
A-7686310, Larson, Alice Mary Margaret (nee Seyer).
A-5234163, Laufer, Edith (nee Luberoff).
A-5886897, Leer, Cornelius.
A-2794013, Lemanis, Konstantine George, or Costas Lemanis.
A-6526015, Leni, Nunziata.
A-4882931, Leshley, William Alexander.
A-6633954, Leung, Vicente.
A-6300096, Liddicoat, Doreen Violet.
A-4441129, Lundsteen, Ernest Hubert.
A-3837986, Lyons, Thomas Joseph.
A-4535362, Madsen, Charles Marinus.
A-5668197, Majka, Jan or John Majka.
A-4940423, Majka, Katarzyna Rose (nee Banek).
A-6810821, Maldonado, Petra, or Petra Maldonado de Montes.
A-4947209, Mancusi, Mario, or Mike Mancusi.
A-6075160, Martin, Gladys Constance.
A-6108461, Medina, Jose Julio Juil Renteria, or Luis Medina Renteria or Jose Luis Renteria Medina.
A-5765526, Melanoff, Rose or Loza (nee Vassiloff or Vassideva).
A-6245144, Mobille, Catherine Z., or Catherine Vomvila or Aitkermis Mombilin.
A-3691575, Mohamed, Dost, or Johnnie Mohamed.
A-9552718, Monterroso, Herman, or Herman Monterrossa.
A-1858603, Morze, Charity Alma, or Charity Alma Fifield.
A-3640890, Mulkern, Joseph or Mulkerinus.
A-1231306, Napoli, Antonio.
A-9701787, Olsen, Ingolf.
A-9550196, Olsen, Rolf.
A-6624314, O'Neal, Etienne Emerson.
A-6239403, Paille, Jack Jean Paul, or Jack Paille.
A-1029502, Perel, Nechemia, or Norman Earnest Pearl.
A-5105586, Petibon, Yves, or Maurice Petibon.
A-6701961, Pfeifer, Karoline Maria (alias Karoline Mary Pfeifer).
A-6594725, Papandreopoulos, Elias Polyhios.

A-7041843, Pun, Chin Yuen, or Chin Yuen Pon, Pon Yuen Chinn.
A-6300094, Rankin, Jillian Kay.
A-6252336, Renteria, Manuel, or Manuel Renteria Portilla.
A-5712529, Reynolds, Henrietta Pauline (nee Adams).
A-7010074, Richter, Rolf Hans.
A-7010073, Richter, Lucie Gertrud, or Gertrud Lucie Richter.
A-6650790, Robertson, Clifford James Charles.
A-7528781, Roehmann, Dagobert (alias Dagobert Waldow).
56169/182, Ruello, Antonio.
A-4005355, Samad, Iris Daphne (nee Vanputten).
A-6125773, Sanchez-Barcenas, Jose Inez (alias Inez Sanchez-Barcenas).
A-6077519, Schaefer, Adelaida Santos.
A-6077574, Schaefer, Jr., John Santos.
A-4984498, Sartuche, Bertha Reyes (alias Bertha Sanchez Sartuche alias Bertha Reyes alias Bertha Sanchez).
A-1707593, Sauter, Anna, or Anna Manderscheidt or Anna Jetter.
56112/24, Scordilis, Panagiotis Stylianos.
A-2298613, Seiter, Christian Joseph, or Chris or Christ Seiter.
A-6633431, Serrano-Berrera, Jose Mauricio.
A-1384811, Simon, Malvina E. (nee Abraham, alias Malvina Ester Bsch, alias Malvina Schwartz and Malvina Eisenbach).
A-2700886, Skuza, Frank, or Franciszek Skuza.
A-1545593, Spencer, Charles Joseph.
A-7001121, Spencer, Mildred Vivian Margaret.
A-5139588, Stankiewicz, Josef, or Joseph Stank.
A-6233624, Stevenson, Walter George.
A-6239754, Stolz, Chen Li Ying (nee Chen Li Ying).
A-6345672, Stoyas, Athena, or Athena Moonos or Athena Papanghelidau.
A-7791546, Stroud (de), Maria Voltas.
A-6494368, Tedesco, Saviour.
A-6296116, Thomasson, Ivan Samuel.
A-5593901, Tietge, Paul (alias Paul Klein).
A-5629597, Trapani, Gaetano.
A-6357984, Tratarou, Pantelis, John.
A-6350818, Tratarou, Athenoula.
A-3073862, Traynor, Harry Joseph.
A-6692815, Trilling, Erin, or Erin Shikallof.
A-3428895, Tuerk, Arthur Erdmann.
A-6020295, Turnbull, Idalia Constancia "Dally."
A-1164142, Tye, Ong Hee.
A-4973977, Valliant, John Peden.
A-6709145, Vanskike, Verla Cora, formerly Strickland (nee Thomas).
A-6754859, Vanskike, Lois Isable Gladys, formerly Strickland.
A-6755531, Vanskike, Allan Robert, formerly Strickland.
A-5870852, Vanterpool, Viola Anastacia, or Viola Anastacia Fahir or Viola Anastacia Foy.
A-2830324, Vasilios, Christos.
A-4036671, Vassura, Anthony or Antonio.
A-3182536, Vassura, Josephine (nee Girolimini).
A-6007554, Vieira, Joao.
A-5546430, Villanova, Manuel (alis Manuel Villanova Dominquez or Manuel Ribas).
A-4328843, Vogt, Gustav (alias Augusta Conrad alias Paul G. Leonard).
A-2632561, Wang, Mabel Chih-Lan Chen, or Mabel Gee Lan Chan.
A-5748097, Werner, Margaret (nee Carmichael), or Mrs. Howard Charles Werner.
A-5100607, Wexelman, Sarah, or Sarah Dvora Wexelman.
A-7022757, Wexelman, Mortimer.
A-6433846, Wiesner, Lucille M. (nee Bibby).
A-2454595, Wing, Edward Yee; Yee On Woon.
A-6720886, Yankopoulos, Alexander Anastasiou.

CLAIMS OF J. N. JONES AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 146) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment on tort claims against the United States which accrue prior to January 1, 1945, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the following-named persons, all of Malheur County, Oreg., against the United States for damages incurred by them when their properties were flooded as the result of a break on May 7, 1942, in the reservoir gates which controlled the flow of water into canals of the Vale-Oregon irrigation district; the projects in such district being then under the exclusive control of the United States: (1) J. N. Jones; (2) May Delsole, successor in interest and heir at law of L. P. Delsole; (3) Anna Curry, administratrix of the estate of Fred Curry; (4) John U. Hoffman; (5) Orrin Curry; (6) Tom Joyce; (7) W. W. Seaward; (8) Gilbert Masterson; (9) Drexell Williams; (10) John Joyce and Kate Joyce; and (11) Mary Robertson, successor in interest and heir at law of W. A. Robertson.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person in accordance with the law of the place where the acts or omissions occurred.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted by or on behalf of the claimants listed in section 1 at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claims and review thereof, and payment of any judgments thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

H. LAWRENCE HULL

The bill (S. 147) for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. Lawrence Hull, of Newport, Oreg., the sum of $551.66, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of property damages sustained by him when a United States Army vehicle struck and destroyed two gasoline pumps owned by him on December 2, 1943, at Newport, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JAMES A. STAPLETON, RUTH BURK, AND MILDRED OVREN

The bill (S. 195) for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator kindly withhold his objection until we can have House bill 1113 substituted for Senate bill 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 1113?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1113) for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the time of renegotiation of contract between this company and the office of the division engineer, price adjustment division, a refund of $28,000 was proposed which was accepted by the contractor. Upon review, this settlement was criticized as unduly severe by the Chief of the Settlements Section, Army Price Adjustment Board. The settlement could not be set aside because of the statutory provision making such an agreement final and conclusive. The Department of Justice, in a letter dated August 23, 1948, states:

> In view of the fact that the renegotiation agreement referred to was entered into in the formative stages of enforcement of the Renegotiation Act, it would appear that the claimant company suffered an injustice in the consideration of its case and was not accorded the same treatment which other contractors similarly situated subsequently received. In the light of the unusual circumstances of the case, it does not appear that the proposed relief would establish a precedent which might adversely affect existing collection policy in renegotiation matters.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 195 is indefinitely postponed.

STONE & COOPER COAL CO., INC.

The bill (S. 227) for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,289.59, to Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc., of Augusta, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after May 18, 1942, to June 1, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, which period was not included in the regulations of the Office of Price Administration on bituminous coal

from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 683) to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the employees responsible for the excess or erroneous payments represented by the sums herein stated be, and they are hereby, relieved of financial liability therefor and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to take action to grant the said relief: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to bar recovery of the amounts herein specified from the persons to whom and through whom such amounts have been paid:

First. H. H. Milks, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in sum of $19.36, which amount was expended in August 1944, under symbol 11559.

Second. G. O. Haynes, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $7.58, which amount was expended in September 1943, under symbol 11559.

Third. M. Meyers, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $10.50, which amount was expended in January 1943, under symbol 11561.

Fourth. H. L. McCoy, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $5.27, which amount was expended in October 1944, under symbol 100–3225.

Fifth. D. M. Wolfe, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $20.47, which amount was expended in February 1946, under symbol 200–3225.

Sixth. C. J. Reichert, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, New York branch of central office, in the sum of $98.39, which amount was expended from January 1 through October 31, 1943, under symbol 11564.

Seventh. M. E. Head, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Lyons, N. J., in the sum of $32.25, which amount was expended in September 1942, under symbol 11564.

Eighth. John H. Ale, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Dayton, Ohio, in the sum of $26.56, which amount was expended in November 1943 and September 1944, under symbols 11568 and 104–3225.

Ninth. Eugene H. Dibble, Jr., certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Tuskegee, Ala., in the sum of $51.64, which amount was expended from June 1 through August 31, 1942, and in June 1943, under symbol 11569.

Tenth. R. D. Beer, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Hines, Ill., in the sum of $14.37, which amount was expended in December 1943, under symbol 11571.

Eleventh. Guy F. Palmer, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Dearborn, Mich., in the sum of $53.48, which amount was expended in May 1942, October 1942, and July 1943, under symbol 11571.

Twelfth. W. A. Birmingham, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Batavia, N. Y., in the sum of $56.50, which amount was expended from April 1 through July 31, 1942, under symbol 11561.

MICKEY BAINE

The bill (S. 948) for the relief of Mickey Baine was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mickey Baine, of Nashville, Tenn., the sum of $4,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States (1) for compensation for personal injuries, property damage, and loss of earnings suffered by him, and (2) for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred in 1943 in Nashville, Tenn., when his automobile was struck by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2680 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (S. 1168) to amend section 2680 of title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the definition of "Federal agency" in the Federal Tort Claims Act was so broad as to include the Panama Railroad Company, a company which was originally incorporated by an act of the Legislature of the State of New York in 1849, and reincorporated by Public Law 808 of the Eightieth Congress, as "an agency and instrumentality of the United States, and as an adjunct of the Panama Canal."

The varied activities of the company, which include the operation of a railroad across the Isthmus of Panama with terminals in the Republic of Panama, the operation of a steamship line between the Isthmus and American ports, the operation of hotels and commissary stores, and the operation of related commercial enterprises, are not those to which the principle of governmental immunity to suit should be applied. The company has long been registered as a foreign corporation in Panama and has designated agents in Panama to receive service of process in suits brought against it in the courts of the Republic of Panama.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1168) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2680 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(m) Any claim arising from the activities of the Panama Railroad Company."

REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOSSES SUSTAINED FROM FLOOD

The bill (H. R. 555) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SYLVIA M. MISETICH

The bill (H. R. 572) for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR G. ROBINSON

The bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF HILDA LINKS, E. J. OHMAN, AND FRED L. KROESING

The bill (H. R. 581) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LUCILLE DAVIDSON

The bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES W. KEITH

The bill (H. R. 592) for the relief of James W. Keith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUGENE J. BEARMAN

The bill (H. R. 618) for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH B. MURPHY

The bill (H. R. 659) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. O'NEIL

The bill (H. R. 729) for the relief of John J. O'Neil was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY JANE HARRIS

The bill (H. R. 739) for the relief of Mary Jane Harris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

B. JOHN HANSON

The bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of B. John Hanson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. C. OWEN, R. C. OWEN, JR., AND ROY OWEN

The bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen was announced as next in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the

bill, particularly in the light of the objection made by the Secretary of the Treasury, on page 4 of the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by way of explanation, the position taken by the Treasury Department is somewhat mystifying to the committee, in view of the fact that in the Eighty-first Congress the Department sought and obtained introduction of a bill, Senate bill 196, for the relief of one of its own employees who was responsible for the total loss of a far more substantial number of internal-revenue stamps under circumstances which at least raised the question of gross negligence, aside from the fact that none of the missing stamps were ever recovered, nor was there more than a reasonable hypothesis on which to base an explanation of their disappearance. The claimants in this case, through no fault or negligence on their part, have suffered an out-of-pocket loss which is definitely determinable, and the Government has correspondingly been unjustly enriched.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION, 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is terminated, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the first deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would there be any objection to continuing to completion the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada ask unanimous consent that that be done?

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not object, unless it will take too long. I am sure the Senator from Nevada wants the Senate to get to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, in which every Senator is interested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will agree to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, and the clerk will continue the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the agreement provide that we shall proceed to a conclusion of the call of the calendar, with no time limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was that the call be continued, and no objection was raised.

Mr. WHERRY. Just what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the call of the calendar shall be continued.

Mr. McCARRAN. That we may proceed to the conclusion of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

MRS. WESLEY BERK

The bill (H. R. 1043) for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNICE GREEN

The bill (H. R. 1061) for the relief of Bernice Green was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES LEON KEATON

The bill (H. R. 1066) for the relief of James Leon Keaton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF THE COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 1959) for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of $29,147.50 to Allegheny County, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by a fire which completely destroyed a building known as "Agricultural Hall," located in South Park, Allegheny County, Pa., on February 16, 1944, while being occupied and used by and exclusively under the control of the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOSEPH DE SOUZA, JR.

The bill (H. R. 2708) for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph De Souza, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEES, EXPENSES, AND COSTS OF JURORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 635) to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States Courts and before United States Commissioners, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "witness", to strike out "atending", and insert "attending", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1821. Per diem and mileage generally; subsistence. A witness attending in any court of the United States or before a United States commissioner or person taking his deposition pursuant to any order of a court of the United States, shall receive $4 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 7 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who are not salaried employees of the Government and who are not in custody and who attend at points so far removed from their respective residence as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $5 per day for expenses of subsistence including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance: *Provided*, That in lieu of the mileage allowance provided for herein, witnesses who are required to travel between the Territories, possessions, or to and from the continental United States, shall be entitled to the actual expenses of travel at the lowest first-class rate available at the time of reservation for passage, by means of transportation employed: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEES, EXPENSES AND COSTS OF JURORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1042) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "$4", and insert "$5", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 1871 of title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedures," are hereby amended to read as follows:

"For actual attendance at the place of trial or hearing and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and from such place at the beginning and end of such service or at any time during the same, $7 per day, except that any juror required to attend more than 30 days in hearing one case may be paid in the discretion and upon the certification of the trial judge a per diem fee not exceeding $10 for each day in excess of 30 days he is required to hear such case.

"For the distance necessarily traveled to and from a juror's residence by the shortest practicable route in going to and returning from the place of service at the beginning and at the end of the term of service and for all additional necessary daily transportation expense, 7 cents per mile, except that if daily travel appears impracticable, subsistence of $5 per day shall be allowed. Whenever in any case the jury is ordered to be kept together and not to separate, the cost of subsistence during such period shall be paid by the United States marshal upon the order of the court in lieu of the foregoing subsistence allowance.

"Jury fees and travel and subsistence allowances provided by this section shall be paid by the United States marshal on the certificate of the clerk of the court, and in the case of jury fees in excess of $7 per diem, when allowed as hereinabove provided, on the certificate of the trial judge."

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors," approved June 25, 1948 (ch. 652, 62 Stat. 1016), is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAURA SPINNICHIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of Laura Spinnichia, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, before the word "Hall", to strike out "McDonald" and insert "MacDonough."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ROSE MARY AMMIRATO, A MINOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, after line 9, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. Private Law 447, Eightieth Congress, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF MRS. FLORENCE BENOLKEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 139) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken, which had been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "compensation for" to insert "any and all;" and on line 8, before the word "advised", to strike out the word "erroneously", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken, of Omaha, Nebr., for compensation for any and all losses sustained by her as a result of having been advised by representatives of the War Department that she was not entitled to have her household goods shipped at Government expense from Seattle, Wash., to Omaha, Nebr., subsequent to the death in October 1942, of her husband, Lt. Francis John Benolken, while serving on active duty in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person in accordance with the law of the place where the acts or omissions occurred.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (S. 646) granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296, relating to the badge of the American Legion, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of December 9, 1919, being patent No. 54,296, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of approval of this act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of the American Legion."

BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY

The bill (S. 647) granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398, relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of June 1, 1920, being patent No. 55,398, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of approval of this act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary."

BADGE OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (S. 676) granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187, relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of May 8, 1934, being patent No. 92,187, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of approval of this act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of The Sons of The American Legion."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 734) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished dependents in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, at the request of my colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection of the Senator from Georgia, the bill will be passed over.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GRADE OF GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 796) to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "herewith" to strike out "designated" and insert "redesignated", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the grade of General of the Air Force.

SEC. 2. The grade of any individual transferred in the grade of general of the Army from the Regular Army to the United States Air Force, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947 (act of July 26, 1947; 61 Stat. 695), is herewith redesignated "General of the Air Force."

SEC. 3. Nothing herein shall be construed as appointing any individual to a new or different office or to alter or prejudice the status of any individual concerned so as to deprive him of any pay or allowances, rights, benefits, or privileges to which he may be entitled under existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS ON THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1181) to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regulary Army, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the date "1933" to insert "and who are or become citizens of the United States prior to appointment hereunder", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That until a date 1 year following the date of enactment of this act, and within the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts, who were appointed therein prior to June 30, 1933, and who are or become citizens of the United States prior to appointment hereunder, in the Regular Army in the same commissioned officer grades as are held by such officers in the Philippine Scouts at the time of appointment.

SEC. 2. The names of officers so appointed shall be entered on the Army promotion list in their permanent grades, precedence within grades being fixed in accordance with their relative permanent grade seniority among themselves and among Army promotion-list officers at the time of appointment.

SEC. 3. All active Federal service performed as commissioned officers of the Philippine Scouts by officers appointed under this act shall be creditable as active commissioned service as officers of the Regular Army for all purposes: *Provided*, That their positions on the promotion list shall be determined as provided in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 4. The acceptance of appointments in the Regular Army under this act shall operate to vacate the military status in the Philippine Scouts theretofore occupied by each of the appointees.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill puts back into the Regular Army of the United States those officers who had previously been on assigned duty to the Philippine Scouts, who are no longer an organization of the United States. It retains for them the benefits they would have had, and keeps them on active duty in our forces, because they can no longer be assigned to the Philippine Army.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION OF STRUCTURES, EQUIPMENT, AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CANAL ZONE

The bill (S. 1136) to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the report states the reason for the enactment of the bill. It provides for a recodification of the present laws. I do not believe there is anything of great importance in the bill. It was explained to our committee as a recodification of the laws. It grants no additional authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 1 thereof three new sections numbered 16 to 18, and reading as follows:

"16. Acquisition or construction of structures, equipment, and improvements: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized, within the limits of available funds, to purchase or otherwise acquire equipment, and within the Canal Zone to purchase or otherwise acquire, construct, repair, replace, alter, or enlarge any building, structure, or other improvement, when in his judgment such action is necessary for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, or civil government of the Panama Canal or Canal Zone.

"17. Claims for losses of or damages to property: Authority is hereby conferred upon the Governor of the Panama Canal, or his designee for the purpose, to consider, adjust, determine, and settle claims for losses of or damages to property arising from the conduct by the Panama Canal of authorized business operations, or arising from the maintenance, operation, improvement, or enlargement of capacity of the Panama Canal or from the sanitation or civil government of the Canal Zone: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to claims cognizable either under section 10 of this title, as amended, or under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

"Any award made to any claimant pursuant to this section shall be payable out of any moneys appropriated or made available for the maintenance and operation, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone; and the acceptance by the claimant of any such award shall be final and conclusive on the claimant, and shall constitute a complete release by the claimant of such claim against the United States.

"18. Disaster relief: In the event of emergency arising because of disaster or calamity by flood, hurricane, earthquake, fire, pestilence, or like cause, not foreseen or otherwise provided for, and occurring in the Canal Zone, or occurring in the Republic of Panama in such circumstances as to constitute an actual or potential hazard to health, safety, security, or property in the Canal Zone, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to expend available funds and to utilize or furnish materials, supplies, equipment, and services for relief, assistance, and protection."

SEC. 2. Chapter 4 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, which chapter is now entitled "Business Operations" and consists of sections 51 and 52 of said title 2, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 4—BUSINESS OPERATIONS; SALES AND SERVICES

"Sec.
"51. Authorization for establishment and operation of various facilities.
"52. Organization and conduct of any such facilities by Panama Canal as 'business operations.'
"53. Receipts from such operations, sales, and services; expenditure and reinvestment; reports.
"54. Exception of Canal Zone postal service.

"SEC. 51. Authorization for establishment and operation of various facilities: (a) In connection with the operation, maintenance, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, the President is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate, through the Panama Railroad Company, or otherwise, docks, wharves piers, drydocks, shops, yards, marine railways, salvage and towing facilities, dredging facilities, construction facilities, fuel-handling facilities, motor-transportation facilities, civil air terminals, power systems, water and sewer systems, warehouses, storehouses, hotels, a printing plant, living quarters and other buildings, and any other necessary facilities and appurtenances, for the purpose of providing, at reasonable prices, fuel, electric power, water, equipment, supplies and materials generally, repairs, labor, transportation, quarters, space in buildings, wharf and like services, hotel and restaurant services, and services generally, including recreational services, and for the purpose of assembling, assorting, storing, repairing, and selling scrap and other byproducts of manufacturing and shop operations, and materials, supplies, and equipment purchased or acquired for the construction, improvement, operation, maintenance, sanitation, or civil government of the Panama Canal or Canal Zone and which are obsolete, unserviceable, or no longer needed. The sales, services, equipment, supplies, and materials hereinbefore referred to may be made or furnished to vessels, to agencies of the Government of the United States, to the Panama Railroad Company, to employees of the Government of the United States or of the Panama Railroad Company, and to any other governments, agencies, persons, corporations, companies, or associations eligible to make or receive such purchases, services, supplies, or materials under the laws prevailing at the time and the policies heretofore or hereafter adopted consistently with such laws.

"(b) In the event the President has heretofore elected, or shall at any time hereafter elect, to maintain and operate through the Panama Railroad Company any of the facilities and appurtenances referred to in this section or section 52 of this title, theretofore maintained and operated by the Panama Canal, the President is authorized to transfer to the Panama Railroad Company all or as much as may be determined to be necessary of the personnel, property, records, related assets, contracts, obligations, and liabilities of or appertaining to the said facility and its appurtenances, and such transfer shall be deemed to have been accepted and assumed by the Panama Railroad Company without the necessity of any act or acts on the part of the said corporation except as otherwise stipulated in provisions of law applicable to the said corporation.

"52. Organization and conduct of any such facilities by Panama Canal as 'Business operations': The President may cause any or all of the facilities and appurtenances referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) of section 51 of this title to be organized and conducted by the Panama Canal as 'business operations', and in such case the aggregate net profit if any accruing from the conduct of such business operations shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

"53. Receipts from such operations, sales, and services; expenditure and reinvestment; reports: The moneys received by the Panama Canal from the operations authorized by sections 51 and 52 of this title, and from pilotage, quarantine, immigration, and like services, from rentals, from damage claims, and from any and all other sales made and services rendered, but not including tolls, taxes, court fees, or fines, may be expended or reinvested under the several heads of appropriation for the Panama Canal, without being covered into the Treasury of the United States except as provided in section 52 of this title; but, except as otherwise provided in this section, such funds shall be subject to the provisions of law relating to public funds of the United States. Monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President and annual reports shall be made to the Congress.

"54. Exception of Canal Zone Postal Service: The provisions of sections 51 to 53 of this title shall have no application to operations of the Canal Zone Postal Service."

SEC. 3. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 1 of chapter 6 thereof a new section numbered 85 and reading as follows:

"85. Special training of employees: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized, within the limits of appropriations made therefor, to provide for special training in the United States or elsewhere of any employee of the Panama Canal when in the judgment of the Governor such special training will be of material benefit to the work of the Panama Canal and the special training of such employee would be more advantageous than the hiring of other available personnel having the specialized skill or experience desired. During the period of such special training the employee may be paid his regular compensation and his travel expenses in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, subject to recovery by the United States of such costs or an equitable portion thereof, as determined by the Governor, in case the employee fails to complete such training or is separated from the service except for reasons beyond his control within one year following the completion of the period of training."

SEC. 4. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 3 of chapter 6 thereof a new section numbered 124 and reading as follows:

"124. Employees injured prior to September 7, 1916; appliances; lump-sum payments: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to purchase artificial limbs or other appliances for persons who were injured in the service of the Isthmian Canal Commission or of the Panama Canal prior to September 7, 1916, and to make payments in lump sums not exceeding the amounts authorized by the act of September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 15), to alien cripples who are now a charge upon the Panama Canal by reason of injuries sustained while employed in the construction of the Panama Canal."

SEC. 5. Title 6 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 27 thereof a new section numbered 906 and reading as follows:

"906. Clothing and money for discharged prisoners: On the discharge of a prisoner from any penal institution in the Canal Zone such prisoner may, in the discretion of the Governor of the Panama Canal, be furnished with such suitable clothing as may be authorized by the Governor, and an amount of money not exceeding $20."

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF LAWS OF THE CANAL ZONE REGARDING ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES

The bill (S. 1137) to revise and codify laws of the Canal Zone regarding the administration of estates, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding in article 1 of chapter 6 thereof a new section No. 84, reading as follows:

"84. Payment for accumulated or accrued leave upon death: Upon the death of any

officer or employee of the Panama Canal or the Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama, any compensation which may be payable on account of his accumulated and current accrued leave, under the conditions of employment prescribed by authority of section 81 of this title, as amended, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries, if any, lawfully designated by the employee under the retirement act applicable to his service; and

"Second, if there be no such designated beneficiary, to the estate of such deceased employee: *Provided,* That any such payment shall be subject to the deduction, as provided in section 83 of this title, of all amounts due from the employee for supplies and services to the extent only, however, that other compensation due to the employee is insufficient for such purpose."

SEC. 2. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 9 thereof two new sections numbered 181 and 182, respectively, and reading as follows:

"181. Reglulations relative to alcoholic beverages: The President is granted continuing authority to make regulations in respect to the sale and manufacture of alcoholic beverages within, and the importation thereof into and exportation thereof from, the Canal Zone, including the authority to prescribe licenses and fees for the sale and manufacture of such beverages.

"182. Violation of regulations; punishment: Any person who shall violate any provision of such regulations shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500, or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 6 months, or by both, and in addition the license of such person may be revoked or suspended as the President may by such regulations prescribe."

SEC. 3. Section 303 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"303. Revocable licenses covering lands outside of town sites: Whenever the Governor of the Panama Canal deems such action to be necessary to, or in the interests of, the Government of the United States and of the efficient operation, maintenance, sanitation, government, and protection of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, the Governor is authorized, either in person or through such officer as he may designate, to issue revocable licenses covering the use of tracts of land situated outside of town sites in the Canal Zone. The terms and conditions of licenses issued under authority of this section shall be as prescribed by the Governor, except that the said licenses shall be revocable at the pleasure of the Governor and that, upon revocation of a license hereunder, the licensee shall, immediately or upon such reasonable notice as the Governor may prescribe, vacate the licensed area, remove therefrom all improvements which he may have placed upon the licensed area, and restore the licensed area to a condition satisfactory to the Governor, and shall not be entitled to indemnification for the value of such improvements: *Provided, however,* That licenses heretofore issued by authority of the Governor, and still in force, covering the use of tracts of land for agricultural purposes are ratified and confirmed in accordance with the terms and conditions applicable to them, respectively, and that upon the revocation of any of such licenses the terms and conditions applicable to which are such as to provide for compensation to the licensee in the reasonable value of the improvements made by him on said tract, to be determined in such manner as the Governor may direct, the compensation is authorized so to be determined and to be paid out of any moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for such purpose, except that no compensation shall be paid in the case of any license which is revoked on account of a material breach by the licensee of the terms and conditions applicable to his license, or where the licensee shall have abandoned the license, or in case of the death of the licensee."

SEC. 4. Section 225 of title 3 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"225. Continuance after original license period: The right to continue to do business for the calendar year, and the successive calendar years, after the calendar year during which the original license was issued shall be contingent upon compliance with such provisions of this chapter as are applicable to corporations licensed under this chapter, upon the payment of a license fee of $10, payable in advance, on January 1 of each year, and upon the designation of a new process agent before March 1 if the process agent theretofore designated has ceased during a preceding calendar year to reside within the Canal Zone."

SEC. 5. Title 4 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by inserting therein a new chapter No. 27A, embracing sections 1470a to 1470f, and reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 27A—DISPOSITION OF ESTATES WITHOUT ADMINISTRATION

"Sec.
1470a. Setting aside estates not exceeding $1,000 in value; inclusion of application in petition for probate or letters.
1470b. Same; separate petition prior to hearing of petition for probate or letters.
1470c. Same; petition after filing of inventory.
1470d. Same; notice of hearing.
1470e. Same; decree setting aside.
1470f. Same; denying petition and instead acting on petition for probate or letters.

"SEC. 1470a. Setting aside estates not exceeding $1,000 in value; inclusion of application in petition for probate or letters: If the decedent leaves a surviving spouse or minor child or minor children, and the net value of the whole estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3, does not exceed the sum of $1,000, the person petitioning for the probate of the will or for letters of administration may add an allegation to that effect to the other allegations of the petition, with a specific description of all of the decedent's property, a list of all the liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death, and an estimate of the value of the property, and may include, in the prayer, an alternative prayer that if the court finds that the net value of the whole estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3 does not exceed $1,000, the same be set aside to the surviving spouse, if there be one, and if there be none, then to the minor child or minor children of the decedent. When such allegation is included in the petition, the petition shall be verified, and the notice of hearing shall include a statement that a prayer for setting aside the estate to the surviving spouse or minor child or minor children, as the case may be, is included in the petition.

"CROSS-REFERENCE

"Settlement by public administrator without regular administration of estates less than $250, see section 1703 of this title, as amended.

"1470b. Same; separate petition prior to hearing of petition for probate or letters: If the person petitioning for probate of the will or for letters of administration does not include such an allegation as is provided for by the next preceding section, the surviving spouse, if there be one, and if there be none, the guardian of the minor child or minor children, may, at any time prior to the hearing of such petition, file a verified petition setting forth the matters mentioned in the next preceding section, and pray that the estate be set aside for the use of the surviving spouse or minor child or minor children. If the hearing of the original petition is set for a day more than 10 days after the filing of the petition herein provided for, the latter shall be set for hearing at the same time as the former; if not, it shall be set for hearing at least 10 days after the date on which it is filed, and the former petition shall be continued until such date.

"1470c. Same; petition after filing of inventory: If the decedent leaves a surviving spouse or minor child or minor children, and upon the filing of the inventory of the estate it appears that the net value of the whole estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3, does not exceed the sum of $1,000, the personal representative of the decedent or the surviving spouse or the guardian of the minor child or children may file a verified petition showing the value of the estate to be no greater than as aforesaid, and the clerk shall fix a day for the hearing thereof.

"1470d. Same; notice of hearing: When a petition is filed under section 1470b or section 1470c of this title, the clerk shall give notice of the hearing for the period and in the manner required by section 1463 of this title.

"1470e. Same; decree setting aside: If, upon the hearing of any petition provided for by this chapter, the court finds that the net value of the estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of the death of the decedent and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3, does not exceed the sum of $1,000, and that the expenses of the last illness, funeral charges, and expenses of administration have been paid, it shall, by decree for that purpose, assign to the surviving spouse of the decedent, if there be a surviving spouse, or, if there be no surviving spouse, then to the minor child or children of the decedent, if any, the whole of the estate, subject to whatever mortgages, liens, or encumbrances there may be upon said estate at the time of the death of the decedent. The title thereto shall vest absolutely in the surviving spouse, if there be a surviving spouse, or if there be no surviving spouse, in the minor child or children subject to whatever mortgages, liens, or encumbrances there may be upon said estate at the time of the death of the decedent, and there must be no further proceedings in the administration, unless further estate be discovered.

"1470f. Same; denying petition and instead acting on petition for probate or letters: If the court finds that the net value of the estate exceeds $1,000, or that there is neither a surviving spouse nor minor child, it shall act upon the petition for probate or for letters of administration in the same manner as though no petition to set aside the estate had been included, and the estate shall then be administered in the usual manner."

SEC. 6. Section 1703 of title 4 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"1703. Estates less than $250: Whenever the public administrator shall file with the clerk of the district court a statement that the value of any estate, of which he has taken charge, is less than $250, there shall be no regular administration on such estate unless additional estate be found or discovered; and the public administrator may, after the payment of the expenses of the last illness of the deceased, and the funeral charges, pay out and deliver such estate to the surviving spouse of the decedent, if there be a surviv-

ing spouse, or, if there be no surviving spouse, then to the minor child or children of the decedent, if any, or, if there be neither a surviving spouse nor minor child, then to such creditors, heirs, or other persons as may appear in the judgment of the public administrator to be legally entitled thereto, and the title to such estate shall vest absolutely in the person or persons to whom the same is paid out and delivered as provided in this section."

SEC. 7. Title 5 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 8 of chapter 11 thereof a new section numbered 573 and reading as follows:

"573. Regulations for fire protection; violations: The Governor of the Panama Canal is granted continuing authority to make regulations for prevention of, and protection against, fires in the Canal Zone: *Provided, however,* That no regulation made under this section shall have force or effect within the boundaries of any military or naval reservation in the Canal Zone, unless prescribed with the concurrence of the officers commanding the military and naval forces in the Canal Zone, as to the reservations within their respective jurisdictions. Any person who shall violate any of the regulations prescribed under this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

SEC. 8. Title 5 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 10 of chapter 14 thereof a new section numbered 812 and reading as follows:

"812. Injuring or tampering with motor vehicle, launch, or aircraft: Every person who, without the consent of the owner of any motor vehicle—

"(a) willfully injures or tampers with such motor vehicle or the contents thereof;

"(b) breaks or removes any part or parts of or from such motor vehicle;

"(c) climbs into or upon such motor vehicle whether it is in motion or at rest, with intent to commit any malicious mischief, or injury or other crime; or

"(d) manipulates or attempts to manipulate any of the levers, starting mechanism, brakes, or other mechanism or device of such motor vehicle while the same is at rest and unattended,

is guilty of a misdemeanor. As used in this section the term 'motor vehicle' shall mean and include any automobile, motorcycle, other motor vehicle, motorboat or launch, or aircraft."

SEC. 9. The following statutes or parts of statutes are repealed:

(a) Canal Zone Code, title 2, chapter 17, article 2, which article includes sections 331 to 333 of said title 2;

(b) Canal Zone Code, title 4, sections 1467 and 1468;

(c) The act of May 3, 1932, entitled "An act to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes" (ch. 162, 47 Stat. 145; 48 U. S. C. 1304a to 1304c);

(d) The act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act authorizing the President to make rules and regulations in respect to alcoholic beverages in the Canal Zone, and for other purposes" (ch. 657, 48 Stat. 1116; 48 U. S. C. 1314b to 1314d).

ENLISTED PERSONNEL EMPLOYMENT IN AVIATION TACTICAL UNITS OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND AIR CORPS

The bill (S. 1270) to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 8 of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended by the act of June 30, 1932 (ch. 326, 47 Stat. 451), and so much of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended by the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 781), reading "On and after July 1, 1929, and in time of peace, not less than 20 percent of the total number of pilots employed in tactical units of the Air Corps shall be enlisted men, except when the Secretary of War shall determine that it is impractical to secure that number of enlisted pilots.", are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the status of enlisted personnel of the armed services, including the Reserve components thereof, designated as aviation or enlisted pilots or engaged in training relating to or leading to such designation.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2660) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader at whose request he objected to the consideration of Calendar 185, House bill 2660, so that before the next call of the calendar I may take the matter up with the Senator who asked the Senator to object.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will come to my desk I shall be glad to give him the information. It might be possible to get the matter ironed out before the call of the calendar is completed.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

The bill (S. 1432) to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this is the same as Calendar 192, House bill 3856, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bill may be substituted for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Which bill is this?

Mr. WHERRY. It is order No. 186.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the same as Calendar 192, which is House bill on the same subject.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senate bill is similar to House bill 3856, which has already passed the House. It provides for the appointment of a commission to take care of remodeling and rehabilitating the White House. The Committees on Public Works of both the Senate and the House looked into the matter, and the bill makes provisions similar to that made for other commissions having to do with buildings of the type of the White House. The Jefferson Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, and historical monuments of that kind are always operated by commissions.

The commission in question is assigned five specific functions, which are set forth in the committee report. The commission is to be composed of two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two members to be appointed by the President of the United States.

The five specific functions as set forth in the report are:

(1) To approve all construction plans for the renovation and modernization of the Executive Mansion;

(2) To determine the methods for selecting, and approve the selection of, the general contractor and the subcontractors who will perform the construction work, subject to such conditions and limitations as may be contained in appropriations made for such work;

No appropriations have been made up to this time.

(3) To supervise generally the progress of such construction work;

(4) To take measures to assure that all lumber, fixtures, and other materials removed from the Executive Mansion in the course of the work are carefully examined for the purpose of safeguarding and segregating any of such materials which are of such historical importance that they should be permanently preserved * * *;

(5) To submit to the Congress and the President from time to time, but at least once annually, a report on the progress of the work under its supervision.

Mr. President, the House has passed H. R. 3856 dealing with this subject. The Senate bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Public Works. It was approved by members of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3856?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in addition to what the able Senator from New Mexico has said, let me advise my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] that the President of the United States is extremely anxious that the bill be passed. The passage of the bill would relieve him of all responsibility, and place the responsibility for the renovation of the White House in the hands of the Commission, which shall have the power to employ contractors, subcontractors, and architects, and to do anything and everything necessary to rehabilitate the Executive Mansion. I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that from the reports we have had resulting from the present examination made of the White House, it needs rebuilding at the earliest possible time. It is a highly dangerous structure for anyone to attempt to live in.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request made by the Senator from New Mexico, but I should like to ask him a question, if he will yield for that purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I notice the bill provides for two members of the Commission to be appointed by the President from the executive branch or from private life. Under the bill he could appoint two members of the Commission from either the executive branch or

private life, or one from each. I wonder if a limitation should be placed in the bill to the effect that one appointment should be made from the executive branch and that the other appointment should be made from private life.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have no information respecting what the President would do about that. My opinion is that the work is of such great importance, and that the situation is so serious that the President would be desirous of obtaining the best available person to act on the Commission. My opinion is that he would endeavor to secure the services of the best engineers and architects to help the two Members appointed from the House and the two Members appointed from the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In view of the importance of the matter, Mr. President, I withhold any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3856?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3856) to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1432 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1432 is indefinitely postponed.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, SHAWNEETOWN, ILL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 755) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "June 26, 1946" and insert "the date of approval of this act."; and in line 12, to strike out "Sec. 3. This act shall be effective from June 26, 1947.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the proviso to the first section of the act entitled "An act to revive, reenact, and amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky,' approved July 18, 1939," approved June 26, 1946, the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near Shawneetown, Ill., authorized to be built by the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, by an act of Congress approved July 18, 1939, which act was extended by an act of Congress approved July 2, 1940, and was revived, reenacted, and amended by an act of Congress approved June 26, 1946, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE APPLICABLE TO ALASKA

The bill (S. 70) to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a new section be inserted in the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended, immediately following section 5 of title I thereof, to read as follows:

"5a. That the rules heretofore or hereafter promulgated and made effective by the Supreme Court of the United States under authority of title 28, United States Code, section 2072, or under authority of any other statute, regulating the forms of process, writs, and motions, and the pleadings, practice, and procedure, in actions of a civil nature in the district courts of the United States, and regulating appeals therefrom, shall apply to the District Court for the Territory of Alaska and to appeals therefrom."

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27), favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is this concurrent resolution similar to other concurrent resolutions concerning which inquiry has been previously made today?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; this is another of the same type of concurrent resolution. Mr. President, I ask the attention of every Member of the Senate to the statement I shall now make respecting these measures. Similar measures are coming to the Senate nearly every week, are being acted on, and are being placed on the calendar. They are measures which are of grave concern to the Committee on the Judiciary and especially of grave concern to the chairman of the committee, because I realize the seriousness of holding within this country persons who should not be here. With that in mind we are watching the situation as closely as our facilities will permit. We are demanding of the Department of Justice that it give us detailed statements in the case of each suspension. When we have such a detailed statement we then make a further study. But even with that precaution I am not at all certain that we are sufficiently cautious.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point concerning which I wish to ask the Senator. I am in full accord with the basic legislation involved. But the Senator from Nevada has over and over again stated that there was a lack of facilities or personnel or something with which to do what the basic legislation really provides should be done. Can the Senator suggest what more is needed in order to do what the Senator would like to have done?

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that, so far as the Senate Judiciary Committee is concerned, we are quite well staffed. Our staff goes into these questions in detail. But the House Committee on the Judiciary is not sufficiently staffed, and it brings matters of this kind quite frequetly to the attention of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. So we go into such matters with great caution and great care, but even then, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska, I am not always entirely content.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the procedure, the Attorney General states, in effect, that certain aliens in this country are not compelled to leave it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. He suspends deportation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I speak of. I have tried to put it into simple language. Then the matter comes before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the committee reviews what the Attorney General has done, and the committee either approves or disapproves the action of the Attorney General?

Mr. McCARRAN. We not only review what he has done, but we go as much further as we have facilities with which to go into the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose the committee should say it believes the deportation is advisable. What happens then?

Mr. McCARRAN. Then we hold it. It does not come before the Senate. We hold it, and the suspension does not go into effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, the only individuals who can remain in the country are those whose stay in the country is approved both by the Attorney General and the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. And the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the Congress. Therefore, unless the Congress approves what the Attorney General has done the persons in question are automatically deported.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator one more question. Does the committee or members of its staff see these individuals personally, or how does the committee secure evidence on which it decides whether the individuals should be deported or should not be deported?

Mr. McCARRAN. We do not see the individuals personally. It would be impossible for us to see them. That would require a staff much greater than we have, and I do not know then how far we would have to go. We take the report from the Department of Justice. We call on the FBI for all information they may have. We resort to every other means known to the Immigration Bureau, and then make our report to the full Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee reviews all the things it knows of that affect the case, and determines whether or not justice or injustice is being done?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I had in mind to ask some of the questions the distinguished Senator from Maryland has asked. I should like to ask one or two more questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. About how many such cases has the Committee on the Judiciary held up?

Mr. McCARRAN. Up to date we have held up approximately 10 percent of the cases submitted to us by the Department of Justice. When I say 10 percent, we may in some cases drop down to 5 percent, or we may go as high as 20 percent. Some day we may refuse to adopt the report from the Department of Justice with respect to all of them. I do not know. But we cannot be too cautious in this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. How many hundred cases would the Senator say have come before the Judiciary Committee for consideration?

Mr. McCARRAN. To date, about 800.

Mr. WHERRY. Of that number, approximately 80 have been held up.

Mr. McCARRAN. Between 80 and 100.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator satisfied with the facilities, personnel, appropriations, or whatever is necessary to do what the Senator himself feels should be done in the review of these cases? I do not mean to cast any reflection on the Department of Justice, the FBI, or any other agency. I have the greatest confidence in the Senator from Nevada. Apparently he is somewhat reluctant to feel that what has been done is all that should have been done.

Mr. McCARRAN. To be perfectly frank, if we had a staff of 100, I do not know that we could go as far as we should go in each one of these cases. But we go as far as we can, and before a case is submitted to the Judiciary Committee we are satisfied that the suspension should be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-9743510, Aasmo, Kristian Ingvard.

A-1537001, Anderson, Mary Elvera (nee Soderman, formerly Sjoblom).

A-3734119, Araya, Luis Alberto y Franc, or Luis Alberto Araya.

A-5987595, Arias-Perez, Jose Angel.

A-1901927, Augustatos, Panagis, or Peter Statos.

A-7028110, Ballester, Amparo Teresa Asela (alias Amparo Iturbi Ballester).

A-3172055, Bartkowiak, Peter (alias Hans Halbe).

A-5220001, Bausback, Robert; Robert Hill.

A-9575542, Berkhout, Willem.

A-2588586, Bogdanovic, Savo, or Nicholas Pechar.

A-3793346, Borgwardt, Hans Karl.

A-2890486, Borrell, Teresa Adell (nee Gelma).

A-6451024, Black, Cristeta Bracamonte.

A-4451159, Braxton, Bedena Mae (nee Jackson).

A-5277574, Breed, Lois Hannah (nee Lois Hannah Carson).

A-6010603, Browne, Wolsely, or Woseley Browne.

A-5911494, Bubaris, Gus, or Constantine Bubaris.

A-6635469, Castillo, Margarita de Nino, or Margarita Castillo-Guzman.

A-6645953, Castillo-Nino (Nino-Castillo), Maria Teresa.

A-6732046, Caudillo, Tula Bonnie or Buenaventura.

A-4196469, Chai, Yung Shu, or Ashun Yung.

A-5780020, Chairman, Imre Von Csernyak, or Irving Chairman.

A-5553362, Chiampi, Vincenzo, or James Chiampi.

A-4314275, Chaitowich, Louis, or Louis Kaplan.

A-6244381, Constantinidis, Aristides (alias Aris Contis).

A-6221542, Cooper, Prisca Edrozo.

A-1405762, Dadines, Gustus or Gus or Constantinos.

A-4859572, Dalsass, Vigilio.

A-5696856, De Garcia, Reina Flores, or Reina Flores or Reina V. Florez or Reina Flores Garcia.

A-1319885, Dove, Alec George.

A-4479978, Dumo, Caridad Inigo, or Caridad Inigo.

A-6458415, Fenner, Edward George.

A-6458414, Fenner, Ronald James.

A-2383471, Freitas (de), Robert Montello.

A-4641707, Gabriel, John Riaza, or John Riaza.

A-6289030, Galocky, Peter, or Peter Galocki or Szalaky.

A-6682329, Gallant, Marie Doris.

A-6682330, Gallant, Marie Aline.

A-5078290, Gaug, Elizabeth (nee Bergman).

A-4899082, Gobel, Andrew, or Andreas Hupka.

A-4266209, Goldschmidt, Paul Andrew.

A-2984527, Gonzales, Juan Cruz.

A-5965015, Goster, Anton, or Anton Goester.

A-6339993, Gutierrez-Telleria, Joaquin.

A-6057291, Henning, Charlotte (nee Meskewitz or Moskowitz).

A-3622165, Hing, Frank, or Fon Hing.

A-9527867, Hinojosa, Salvador De La Rosa.

A-4740106, Hodge, James Milton.

A-2744180, Horque, Abdul, or Abdull Ali or Michael Banali.

A-5789523, Ippolito, Lorenzo or Lawrence.

A-3009283, Karayiannis, Athanasios, Joamis, or Thomas Karras.

A-4790517, Karlsen, Gustav Adolf, or Gus Karlsen.

A-4385826, Khan, Mohammed Yousaf, or Mohammed Khan or Joseph Martin.

A-6163659, King Socorro Salvador.

A-6537545, Lambert, Peter William.

A-3244422, Larsen, Harry William.

A-5279913, Lazarowitz, Liza, or Liza Pollack or Liza Spector.

A-5341670, Liu, Pin Pin or Lau (nee T'an).

A-5946857, Macris, Demetrios (Demitrios) George, or James Demetrios (Dimitrios Macris or James Morris or James Makeras).

A-1293850, Mair, Esther Julia (nee Arlain formerly Beaubrun).

A-6756642, Martinez-Cuellar, Joel.

A-6342234, Mecham, Elisha James.

A-6199462, Mecham, Peggy Lynn.

A-6199463, Mecham, Eldon James.

A-6290925, Morris Edward Nemiah, or Edward Samuel Morris or Vincent Lawrence.

A-4648305, Moy, Mabel Mary, or Mabel Chung Moy or Mabel Mary Song or Geung Keu Sing.

A-5348214, Munoz-Melendez, Lorenzo.

A-6528174, Nino-Arroyo, Felipe.

A-5670657, Nolfi, Nicola Mario.

A-6069739, Nunez, Nicolas, or Nicolas Nunez Valencia.

A-6516676, O'Dwyer, Elizabeth (nee Semevsky or Elizabeth Semevsky Roberts).

A-6145883, Ortaliz, Jose Montilla.

A-6145884, Ortaliz, June Ann.

A-6145891, Ortaliz, Rosina Lou.

A-6047308, Pedroza, Gilberto.

A-6047309, Pedroza, Francisca.

A-5322856, Phillips, Clarence Daniel.

A-3138310, Pratelli, Gino.

A-6056513, Ramirez-Mendoza, David.

A-6243348, Rebollar, Jesus Garcia, or Jessie Rebollar or Jesus Rebollar Y Garcia.

A-5648666, Reno, Mildred Agnes (nee Deneau).

A-6087331, Rivera, Maria Lorenza Gonzalez (nee Mejia).

A-3610681, Rodriguez, Antonio Manuel Ruiz.

A-6581448, Rodriguez, Lucio Socorro, or Lucio Rodriguez-Velo.

A-6187293, Roesler, Norbert Leonhard Hugo.

A-5377064, Rohan, Shelia (nee McLaughlin).

A-5840169, Rose, Frederick Winston, or Winston Rose.

A-9530108, Rubin, Tore Gustaf Borje.

A-5290628, Saklias, Stavros, or Steve Saklias.

A-9706709, Schoneveld, Willem.

A-2851871, Shall, Mary Raffaela (nee Zaffino).

A-1748967, Shaher, Armed.

A-1253293, Shifriss, Oved.

A-1521407, Shifriss, Shoshana (nee Shoshana Zelmans).

A-6185203, Soriano, Vera Semenova (nee Doroshenko).

A-6346405, Stocks Alexander Albert.

A-2593026, Strupp, Adele (nee Eckstein alias Adele Elizabeth Strupp).

A-6378219, Tischner, Kenneth James, formerly Kenneth James Quigly.

A-9607272, Valantasis, Georgios and George Kosti Valantasis, or Valantassis.

A-6249025, Van Dillen, Mathilde Alexandrine (nee Schoorel).

A-6177707, Van Dillen, Paul.

A-6145980, Vasquez, Jose Garcia.

A-6145981, Vasquez, Elizabeth Beedle.

A-5553142, Von Rabenau, Alexander Constantine (alias Alexander Olvera alias Alexander A. Rabenau).

A-4205188, Wang, Hsi, or Harry Wang.

A-4205176, Wang, Djao Szi, or Lily Wang,

A-6099150, Widerynski, Maria Antonietta.

A-6551114, Zerda, Dolores Phyllis.

A-6551115, Zerda, Dale Melford Aldeous.

CARE AND CUSTODY OF INSANE PERSONS CHARGED WITH OFFENSES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 936) to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title 18, United States Code, chapter 313, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"§ 4244. Mental incompetency after arrest and before trial.

"Whenever after arrest and prior to the imposition of sentence or prior to the expiration of any period of probation the United

States Attorney has reasonable cause to believe that a person charged with an offense against the United States may be presently insane or otherwise so mentally incompetent as to be unable to understand the proceedings against him or properly to assist in his own defense, he shall file a motion for a judicial determination of such mental competency of the accused, setting forth the ground for such belief with the trial court in which proceedings are pending. Upon such a motion or upon a similar motion in behalf of the accused, or upon its own motion, the court shall cause the accused, whether or not previously admitted to bail, to be examined as to his mental condition by at least one qualified psychiatrist, who shall report to the court. For the purpose of the examination the court may order the accused committed for such reasonable period as the court may determine to a suitable hospital or other facility to be designated by the court. If the report of the psychiatrist indicates a state of present insanity or such mental incompetency in the accused, the court shall hold a hearing, upon due notice, at which evidence as to the mental condition of the accused may be submitted, including that of the reporting psychiatrist, and make a finding with respect thereto. No statement made by the accused in the course of any examination into his sanity or mental competency provided for by this section, whether the examination shall be with or without the consent of the accused, shall be admitted in evidence against the accused on the issue of guilt in any criminal proceeding. A finding by the judge that the accused is mentally competent to stand trial shall in no way prejudice the accused in a plea of insanity as a defense to the crime charged; such finding shall not be introduced in evidence on that issue nor otherwise be brought to the notice of the jury.

"§ 4245. Mental incompetency undisclosed at trial.

"Whenever the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall certify that a person convicted of an offense against the United States has been examined by the board of examiners referred to in title 18, United States Code, section 4241, and that there is probable cause to believe that such person was mentally incompetent at the time of his trial, provided the issue of mental competency was not raised and determined before or during said trial, the Attorney General shall transmit the report of the board of examiners and the certificate of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to the clerk of the district court wherein the conviction was had. Whereupon the court shall hold a hearing to determine the mental competency of the accused in accordance with the provisions of section 4244 above, and with all the powers therein granted. In such hearing the certificate of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall be prima facie evidence of the facts and conclusions certified therein. If the court shall find that the accused was mentally incompetent at the time of his trial, the court shall vacate the judgment of conviction and grant a new trial.

"§ 4246. Procedure upon finding of mental incompetency.

"Whenever the trial court shall determine in accordance with sections 4244 and 4245 of this title that an accused is or was mentally incompetent, the court may commit the accused to the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, until the accused shall be mentally competent to stand trial or until the pending charges against him are disposed of according to law. And if the court after hearing as provided in the preceding sections 4244 and 4245 shall determine that the conditions specified in the following section 4247 exist, the commitment shall be governed by section 4248 as herein provided.

"§ 4247. Alternate procedure on expiration of sentence.

"Whenever the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall certify that a prisoner whose sentence is about to expire has been examined by the board of examiners referred to in title 18, United States Code, section 4241, and that in the judgment of the Director and the board of examiners the prisoner is insane or mentally incompetent, and that if released he will probably endanger the safety of the officers, the property, or other interests of the United States, and that suitable arrangements for the custody and care of the prisoner are not otherwise available, the Attorney General shall transmit the certificate to the clerk of the court for the district in which the prisoner is confined. Whereupon the court may in its discretion cause the prisoner to be examined by a qualified psychiatrist designated by the court and one selected by the prisoner, and shall, after notice, hold a hearing to determine whether the conditions specified above exist. At such hearing the designated psychiatrist or psychiatrists may submit his or their reports, and the report of the board of examiners and other institutional records relating to the prisoner's mental condition shall be admissible in evidence. All of the psychiatrists and members of the board who have examined the prisoner may be called as witnesses, and be available for further questioning by the court and cross-examination by the prisoner or on behalf of the Government. If upon such hearing the court shall determine that the conditions specified above exist, the court may commit the prisoner to the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative.

"§ 4248. Termination of custody by release or transfer.

"Whenever a person shall be committed pursuant to section 4247 of this title, his commitment shall run until the sanity or mental competency of the person shall be restored, or until the mental condition of the person is so improved that if he be released he will not endanger the safety of the officers, the property, or other interests of the United States, or until suitable arrangements have been made for the custody and care of the prisoner by the State of his residence, whichever event shall first occur. Whereupon the Attorney General or his authorized representative shall file with the court which made said commitment a certificate stating the termination of the commitment and the ground therefore: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall preclude a prisoner committed under the authority of section 4247 hereof from establishing his eligibility for release under the provisions of this section by a writ of habeas corpus. The Attorney General or his authorized representative shall have authority at any time to transfer a prisoner committed to his custody under the authority of section 4246 or section 4247 hereof to the proper authorities of the State of his residence."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 313 of such title, immediately preceding section 4241, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4244. Mental incompetency after arrest and before trial.

"4245. Mental incompetency undisclosed at trial.

"4246. Procedure upon finding of mental incompetency.

"4247. Alternate procedure on expiration of sentence.

"4248. Termination of custody by release or transfer."

SEC. 3. The Attorney General may authorize the use of any unexpended balance of the appropriation for "Support of United States prisoners" for carrying out the purposes of title 18, United States Code, sections 4244 to 4248, inclusive, or in payment of any expenses incidental thereto and not provided for by other specific appropriations.

SEC. 4. If any provision of title 18, United States Code, sections 4244 to 4248, inclusive, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the said sections and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROCESSING OF VISA CASES INVOLVING ALIEN FIANCÉS AND FIANCÉES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés, and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would have any objection, in line 12 on page 2, to changing the date from January 1, 1949, to April 1, 1949. There are some very important cases in my State involving men who want to be married. They served in Germany or Austria.

Mr. MCCARRAN. As I understand, the proposed amendment would allow an extra 4 months.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MCCARRAN. The joint resolution has been passed by the House. It would probably have to go to conference. I have no objection to such an amendment.

Mr. LANGER. If it should go to conference, I do not think that would make any difference.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I have no objection, if the Senator wishes to offer that amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, after the word "before" it is proposed to strike out "January" and insert "April."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were, on page 2, line 12, after the numerals "1949" to strike out "and were unable to come to the United States for reasons beyond their control"; in line 14, after "United States" to strike out "before July 1, 1949" and insert

"within five months after the effective date of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT BENEFITS TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 493) to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill, particularly with reference to why the Virgin Islands are not required to match grants-in-aid, as the States are required to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the Vocational Education Act was passed containing a provision for vocational education for returning veterans, the Virgin Islands were unintentionally omitted. All the other island possessions and Territories of the United States are included. There are about a thousand veterans among the Virgin Islanders who, the committee believes, are entitled to the same consideration which is given to veterans in all the other possessions and States of the United States. The committee is merely correcting what it believes to be an unintentional omission. There is certainly no reason why there should be any discrimination against veterans in the Virgin Islands. The bill was unanimously recommended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Virgin Islands shall be entitled to share in the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, approved August 1, 1946, and any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as any of the several States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and annually thereafter, the sum of $40,000, to be available for allotment to the Virgin Islands under such act and the modifications hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. Sums appropriated under authority of section 1 of this act shall be allocated for vocational education in (1) agriculture, (2) home economics, (3) trades and industries, and (4) distributive occupations, in the proportions specified by the Vocational Education Act of 1946, except insofar as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, deems it necessary to modify said proportion to meet special conditions existing in the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 3. The provisions of sections 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to the use and payment of sums under said Act, shall apply to sums appropriated under this act with such modifications as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, shall deem necessary to meet the special conditions existing in the Virgin Islands.

CONVEYANCE TO PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA., OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

The bill (S. 166) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill is the same as House bill 1998, No. 217 on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1998?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1998) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 166 will be indefinitely postponed.

CHANGE OF NAME OF CULBERTSON DAM ON THE REPUBLICAN RIVER IN NEBRASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 270) to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to "Trenton Dam" which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment at the top of page 2, to insert:

The body of water arising behind such dam shall hereafter be designated and referred to as "Swanson Lake" in commemoration of Carl H. Swanson.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dam under construction on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska, heretofore known, designated, and referred to as "Culbertson Dam," shall hereafter be designated and referred to as "Trenton Dam." Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under and by the name "Culbertson Dam" shall be held and considered to refer to such dam under and by the name of "Trenton Dam." The body of water arising behind such dam shall hereafter be designated and referred to as "Swanson Lake" in commemoration of Carl H. Swanson.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to 'Trenton Dam' and to name the body of water arising behind such dam 'Swanson Lake.'"

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR USE OF CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 186) to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what is involved? The chairman of the committee, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, is present. I do not want to have the joint resolution go over unless there is reason for objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the joint resolution was introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It was reported favorably from that committee by unanimous vote, after public hearings, and passed the House without objection. The joint resolution has the approval of the United States Maritime Commission and the Treasury Department.

The purpose of this resolution is to amend section 5 of Public Law 384, Eightieth Congress, approved August 8, 1947, relating to the merchant marine construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, by striking out "March 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1951."

The reason for the joint resolution is to hold the funds together, so that investment may be made. Unless this measure is passed, the funds will be dissipated, which will necessitate the payment of taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LONG-RANGE PROVING GROUND FOR GUIDED MISSILES

The bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we all know that guided missiles were used in the last war. Mr. Hitler used them—the V–1, and V–2 buzz bombs shot from the Continent of Europe to London and other cities.

Since the termination of the war valuable data have fallen into the hands of various governments. Our Government considers it wise, in order to maintain its defenses, to continue testing the various guided-missile weapons to see whether or not they are adaptable to modern warfare. It is necessary to have a range on which the tests can be made.

We have held extensive hearings on the subject. We have even brought scientists all the way across the country from the Pacific coast. This is a national defense measure. It is asked for by the President and by the Department of National Defense. There is no objection to it. In drafting the legislation we have tried to frame it so as to locate and operate the proving ground at such a place and in such a manner that it will not interfere with the normal activities of the people of the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland whether the committee was unanimous?

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee was unanimous.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any available United States property where this proving ground could be located, or is it necessary to acquire new land?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator that it would be a little difficult for me to answer that question publicly. However, some United States property is available, and complete arrangements have been made to do the job in the most economical way it can be done. I think I speak for the entire committee in making that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 6, after the word "amended,", to strike out the comma and the words "in administering the provisions of the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C., Supp. 315q)." and insert "Prior to the acquisition under the authority of this section of any lands or rights or other interests pertaining thereto, the Secretary of the Air Force shall come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the acquisition of such lands, rights, or other interests."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 4. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are hereby authorized to contribute to the support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons to the extent they may deem necessary or advisable, including, but not limited to, the allocation for such support of funds available to them for such purposes.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Defense may, at his discretion, transfer and reallocate to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force all, or any part of the authority granted herein, and, in connection with such transfer or reallocation, may transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment or support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons.

And insert:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in his discretion, to transfer to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy, and to retransfer from either of such Secretaries to the other or to the Secretary of the Air Force, all, or any part of, the authority granted by sections 1 and 2 of this act; and, in connection with any such transfer or retransfer, to transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment and support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons. The Secretary of Defense is further authorized to permit, to the extent that he may deem appropriate, the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to contribute, with or without reimbursement, to the establishment and support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles by the loan, assignment, or transfer of personnel, supplies, equipment, and services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PERSECUTION OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES

The resolution (S. Res. 102) favoring the protest in the United Nations of the persecution of certain clergymen in Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that these actions should be strongly protested in the United Nations or by whatever other means may be appropriate.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass in Hungary, of Archbishop Stepinac in Yugoslavia, and of Protestant clergymen in Bulgaria, evidences the abridgment and violation of fundamental human freedoms guaranteed in the treaties of peace and reaffirmed in the United Nations Charter: Now, therefore, be it.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY NEEDS OF CRIPPLED CHILDREN

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 212) authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, by way of explanation, let me say that the additional amount which the joint resolution would authorize for the care and hospitalization of crippled children throughout the country is only $1,500,000. It has been found necessary to take care of a large number of children who suffered from infantile paralysis during the last year; and the proposed increase over the appropriation already authorized is only $1,500,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NELLIE M. CLARK

The bill (H. R. 1094) for the relief of Nellie M. Clark was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF H. M. McCORVEY

The bill (H. R. 1164) for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. LEROY HANN

The bill (H. R. 1176) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JUDGE E. ESTES

The bill (H. R. 1280) for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH ROWLAND

The bill (H. R. 1286) for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-7793367, Acevedo, Ramona nee Diaz Galetty.

A-6683184, Adam Emmanuel Konstantinos or Emanuel Constantinos Adam.

A-5880692, Altmann, Anton Frederick (Friedrich).

A-6758166, Alves, Domingos Esteves.

A-6115712, Anguiano-Alcazar, Felix alias Agustin Valencia alias Agustin Valencia Anguiano alias Felix Anguiano alias Felix Anguaino.

A-3224363, Andersen, Knud Kaspar.

A-2940833, Anderson, Axel Hjalmar alias Axel Hjalmar Carlsson.

A-9577267, Apessos, Ioannis Pndelis alias John P. Apessos.

A-6679669, Appelthaler, Katerina.

A-6679668, Appelthaler, Kurt Robert.

A-2211955, Arellano, Domingos Ramos.

A-1393347, Arellano, Soledad Valadez or Soledad Maria Valadez.

A-6071241, Arellano, Innocencio.

A-6071239, Arellano, Domingo, Jr., or Dominic Arellano.

A-6071240, Arellano, Juan or John Arellano.

A-3779214, Arlt, Hans Erich Lothar.

A-1153452, Arrighi, Alessandro or Alexander or Alessandro Arrigo.

A-6301280, Bagniewiski, Wanda Stanislawa or Wanda Stanislawa Kiernik.

A-6821666, Bastide, Genevive Marcelle.

A-2118744, Bau, Siu-Tsung or Marguerite Janet Bau Chang.

A-3419857, Baum, Betty.

A-3151534, Baumann, Henrik Chaskiel or Henry Baumann.

A-6026888, Beitelstein, Anton, Anton Stein, Tony Stein, or Anton Beidelstem, Anton Beitelsten.

A-7765476, Berard, Jorge Vandesmet.

A-5920168, Berkle, Ivera Romalia.

A-6434078, Bernheimer, Ludwig.

A-5153633, Bianchi, Luigi.

A-5932160, Blake, Eulalie Constancia or Eulalie Constancia Turnbull.

A-6760216, Blake, Helena Ketruda or Helena Ketruda Powell.

A-3113337, Bober, Maria Theresia Gerber.

A-6466991, Borraccia, Lorenzo.

A-6288235, Bronner, Eugenia Michael formerly Eugenia Gavriloff, nee Losseff.

A-6288068, Bronner, Helen Tamara Marianna formerly Helen Tamara Marianna Gavriloff.

A-6316110, Brouwer, Frans Hieronimus Borgman.

A–6625552, Brown, Doris nee Singh.
A–2673048, Brown, Morris Simon alias Movsa Braunreit.
A–6701608, Burgers, Willem Adolph Johan.
A–6645933, Butterick, Janet Barry or Janet Barry Mack.
A–7651629, Candia, Jose alias Jose Candia Urguidi or Jose Urguidi or Joe.
A–9769688, Carro, Alfredo or Alfred Carro.
A–3299176, Castillo, Geronimo or Giro Castillo.
A–6336616, Chalmers, Bromley Russell Scott.
A–6336617, Chalmers, Jill.
A–7041842, Chin, Yuen Chew or Chin Yuen Chew or Chew Yuen Chinn.
A–5138325, Chui, Wan; Chui Wan; Hang Kin Chui; Hankin Hunt.
A–1581731, Ciesla, Ludwik.
A–5179937, Valdes, Maria Hortensia Clemente y Sanches McDonald; or Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez McDonald Valdes nee Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez; Maria Hortensia Clemente Sanchez or Maria Hortensia Clementa McDonald.
A–5611302, Cohen, Joseph.
A–4860986, Cohen, Gertie Gertrude.
A–2554813, Conradt, Ernst Heinrich Wilhelm or Ernst Henry Conradt.
A–6262074, Cucullu, Francesca R.
A–2113086, DaGoutis, Louise Emilie nee Masse.
A–6404432, Davis, Diane May.
A–6404433, Davis, Eileen Marie.
A–6404431, Davis, Philip Bennet.
A–2945357, Dawson, Harriet Mae or Hattie Mae Lloyd or Harriet Mae Gibson.
A–4746398, De Escalante, Alicia Adriana Vara or Alicia Adriana Vara-Solis DeCordero.
A–3197506, De Gomez, Rita Avena alias Rita Avena.
A–6079055, Dimakos, Christos alias Christos Demakos.
A–4665465, DiPietro, Sebastiano or Pietro Petrillo or Grido Cardella.
A–9836789, Drioli, Salvatore.
A–9671716, Elvir, Cesar Augusto.
A–4785369, Engles, Elsie Violet nee Elsie Violet Huffman.
A–5906567, Fahie, Adeline nee Nibbs.
A–3481412, Fahie, Joseph Alfred.
A–5832029, Fahie, Rebecca.
A–3193626, Fekete, Agnes Elizabeth nee Pauza now Kourcosk or Korscak.
A–6774677, Frank, Annie or Ann Frank or Ann Burtnik Frank or Annie Burtnik Frank.
A–6716135, Frazer, Joseph Wellington.
A–6464484, Frenkel, Mayer.
A–6020425, Gabriel, Manuel Gimenez.
A–6405609, Gallegos, Manuel or Manuel Medina.
A–3750703, Garcia, Juan or John Garcia.
A–6063595, Garcia, William Joseph.
A–5140522, Garlipp, Franz Hermann or Frank Herman Garlipp.
A–5048436, Ghinelli, Germano or Jerry Ghinelli.
A–6051631, Gobb, Marguerite Elinor nee Aaron also known as Marguerite Elinor Aaron.
A–6500830, Gomez, Maria Pilar alias Olivia Gomez alias Maria Olivia Gomez Pedroza or Maria Pilas Gomez Quesada.
A–6288439, Greaves, Anne Marie nee Anne Marie Erneste Pierre Monlouis-Eugene.
A–6630058, Gson-Niebling, Goesta Bertil.
A–3053878, Hanko, Joseph Ewald or Joseph or Jozef Hanko.
A–6413603, Harvie, Meryl Lorraine or Meryl Lorraine Grayson.
A–6369265, Hernandez-Gutierrez, Jose Maria.
A–4463931, Haimburger, Rudolf Gustave or Rudolf Haimburger.
A–6590997, Huggins, William Archibald.
A–6425288, Jacobs, Olive Jane.
A–6446194, Joanta, Florence nee Florence Antonescu.
A–9505156, Johansen, Kristian Rudolf.
A–4624493, Kimbell, Ofelia Aycardi nee Aycardi.
A–9706894, Kokolis, Jonnes Peter; or Kokolis, John Peter alias John Nicholas Kokolis or Ioannis Kokolis or Ioanis Giannaris or Ioannis Panagiotis Kokolis or Ioanis Koukalis.
A–6489767, Kostrzak, Lita Foerster nee Lita Foerster.
A–6440727, Kovar, Anton or Anton Joseph Kovar.
A–6208118, Kromhout, Arie Jan.
A–4549342, Laeske, Hedwig Anna formerly Browne nee Bardeleben.
A–6484122, Lansford, Ethel Matilda formerly Ethel Matilda Molohon nee MacDonald.
A–2773539, Lee, Ruth Mo or Ruth Lo-Tak Mo.
56122/739, Lencovich, Joseph Peter.
A–1304739, Lepore, Salvatore alias Samuel or Sam Lepore alias Samuel Le Poce.
A–4769421, Lettsome, Edward or Edward Letsome.
A–1424552, Levitsky, Thomas.
A–6261599, Longos, Katina.
A–1322447, Lopez-Martinez, Juan.
A–2365797, de Lopez, Maria Valadez-Romero.
A–4388670, Lo Surdo, Sebastiano.
A–2145986, Lucas, Lieselotte or Lieselotte Muenzer or Lotte Muenzer or Munzer.
A–6706860, Luschnig, Klaus Oswald or Klaus Carnival.
A–4584463, Mac Clymont, David or Thomas Wood.
A–5777765, Mahlman, Bruno William or Bruno William Dietrich Mahlman.
A–4052648, Malerba, Domenico or Domenick Malerba.
A–6095324, Mantzuranis, Evagelia or Evagelia Mantzurani or Evagelia Stratigakis.
A–6645782, Mar, Judy alias Judy Muck.
A–6645783, Mar, James alias James Muck.
A–6566614, Mariades, Helene Agouras formerly Helene Andrea Agouras.
A–6612108, Marquez, Arturo.
A–6612107, Marquez, Maria Del Carmen.
A–6694634, Martinez, Cruz.
A–6689502, McDougall, Joseph Ignatius.
A–3024922, McGill, John Joseph.
A–6603045, Mendoza, Julio.
A–6608918, Mendoza, Jose Salome.
A–9578104, Montgomery, Clem.
A–5694677, Muller, Mathias or Mathew Muller.
A–5694675, Muller, Barbara nee Messner.
A–3869778, Munoz, Maria Amparo Gegunde Gomez nee Maria Gegunde.
A–2481845, Munroe, Harold Bruce.
A–9801088, Newton, Arthur.
A–4026037, Nimeneh, Thomas Kun or Thomas Nimeneh or Thomas Nimeneh-Bey or Thomas Kun Nemerea or Keen Nimeneh or Sam Nimeneh or Keen Nimeh.
A–4651936, O'Dwyer, Elizabeth nee Ahern alias Elizabeth Organ.
A–6611843, Ottley, Robyn Josephine.
A–9836874, Paiceira, Vicente or Vicente Paiceira Perez.
A–2201575, Palermo, Rosario or Richard Ross Palermo or Ross Palermo.
A–3140422, Palermo, Salvatore or Samuel Palermo.
A–3236433, Palermo, Vincenzo or James Palermo.
A–3140520, Palermo, Anna.
A–9769360, Pane, Antonino or Anthony Pane or Antonio Pane.
A–6256122, Papadakis, Georgia N.
A–4642742, Parasiliti, Nicola Sebastiano Collazzo or Nicola Sebastiano Parasiliti Colazzo or Nicholas Parasi or Benny Pernite or Nicholas Benny Pernite.
A–6374752, Paul, Alvin Colton Thomas Theophilus.
A–6331342, Piekarz, Hersz.
A–6633957, Pilostomos, Christos Antonios.
A–7598205, Questel, Francois Marie Edouard, or Edouard Questel.
A–5369159, Ramos, Anastacio.
A–3586557, Ramos, Anacleta.
A–5711339, Rando, Bartolo.
A–4798904, de Rangel, Rita Morales or Rita Arroyo.
A–7703612, Rehen, Estrid Viola Margareta or Estrid Viola Margareta Tengwall nee Sundberg.
A–9582529, Reinsma, Otte or Otto Reinsma.
A–6290531, Reiter, Fanny nee Diamond or Fany Reiter.
A–4030409, Resch, Frank or Frank Reck or Franz Resch.
A–6608814, Reynolds, Bernard Douglas.
A–5917858, Robles, Isidro.
A–6001963, Roberts, Norma Elizabeth or Norma E. Roberts or Norma Roberts.
A–7757524, Roders, Naomi Elizabeth.
A–6113669, Roman-Rodriguez, Antonio.
A–3680851, Rostar, Victor.
A–6373974, Rothstein, Izydor.
A–6373973, Rothstein, Helena.
A–6611826, Rudd, James Sidney.
A–3667351, Ruiz-Carillo De Quintero, Maria or Dolores Cardenas-Soto.
A–2548950, Rullo, Hazel Ann nee DeLisle.
A–9776541, Russo, Salvatore.
A–5155756, Sagert, Clarence James.
A–5573562, Schenk, Otto alias Otto Lehman.
A–5151143, Schneider, Richard Georg.
A–4728863, Schoenberg, Wilhelm Heinrich August or William Schoenberg.
A–6376906, Semega, Maria nee Maria Palovcik.
A–5314309, Shee, Ong Kwok or Ong Kwock Shee or Roy Ong.
A–6378087, Shumis, Artemis Troyannou or Artenoula Trogiannou or Artemis Troiannou or Artemis Troyannou.
A–1963646, Sirianos, George or Georgios Theodore Sirianos.
A–6446698, Smedley, Shane Karen Douglas.
A–4699538, Sommer, Oscar Felix or Oskar Felix Sommer or Felix Sommer.
A–5465763, Stevens, Annie Isabella.
A–6772017, Sturmer, Gerlinde Maria.
A–4433087, Tackolander, Leonard Helge alias Leonard Quire.
A–5880975, Tatem, Edmund Adolphus.
A–7539649, Tomas-Morelly, Jose or Jose Tomas, Junior.
A–5357499, Tornow, Marie nee Wejnis or Marie Fischer.
A–6345256, Trapatsa, Chryssoula.
A–9836782, Ullah, Anfar.
A–6346062, Vafides, Olga nee Rafaeledes.
A–9727432, Valjas, Artemi.
A–6459280, Vasquez, Jorge Carrion alias Robert Franco.
A–1114647, Vestes, Stratos or Ernest Vestes alias Efstiatios Vestis.
A–6690309, Villegas, Ramon alias Ramon Villegas-Ortiz.
A–6785838, Wallace, Ezra.
A–1052865, Wasserman, Benjamin or Bernard Wasserman or Benjamin Waserman.
A–5750607, Wayditch, Julia alias Julia Bornyaszi Oroszy.
A–4392874, Whearty, James Patrick or James Wheatley.
A–6431871, Willman, Philip John Archibald.
A–4777885, Wilson, Arthur Rutherford.
A–7799625, Wilson, Walter Allen.
A–6078139, Wright, Lourdes Dizon.
A–6757818, Yang, Chao-Chen.
A–6739338, Yang, Dzing-Tsch Shun.
A–2963630, Yuelling, Joseph or Yoesef.

MAMIE L. HURLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an

amendment, at the end of the bill, to change the period to a colon, and insert:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARION T. SCHWARTZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1169) for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$1,671."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FIRST-CITIZENS BANK & TRUST CO., ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) for the relief of the First-Citizens Bank and Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, in line 9, after the word "entitled", to strike out: ", together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from August 19, 1938; and (2) the sum of $1,555.55 representing actual court costs incurred by the said First-Citizens Bank and Trust Company in presenting such claim to the Court of Claims"; and in line 14, after the word "such", to strike out "sums," and insert "sum", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., of Raleigh, N. C., as administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr., deceased, (1) the sum of $9,860.35, the amount to which the Court of Claims found the said First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., entitled, the payment of such sum being in full satisfaction of the claim of the said First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., against the United States for compensation for work performed by the late C. A. Ragland, Sr., under contracts numbered 1-1P-5554 and 1-1P-5688, on projects 1T1 and 2E2, Shenandoah-Great Smoky Mountains Parkway.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose is to provide for the payment to the First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., of Raleigh, N. C., as administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr., the sum of $9,860, to which the Court of Claims found the trust company to be entitled, after consideration as authorized by Senate Resolution 256 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The matter was before the Seventy-eighth Congress, at which time the parties were authorized to sue in the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims has approved this judgment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

ELLEN HUDSON, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 42) for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, in line 5, after the name "Ellen Hudson," to insert "of 804 South Verdugo Road, Glendale, California"; and in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ellen Hudson, of 804 South Verdugo Road, Glendale, Calif., as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, deceased, the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Walter R. Hudson as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle, near Pittman, Nev., on April 4, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third, and passed.

BARBARA O'BRIEN FARQUER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 408) for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William E. O'Brien, deceased, late of Detroit, Mich., the sum of $10,232, in full settlement of all claims of the said estate against the United States on account of the death of the said William E. O'Brien, on November 20, 1943, as a result of injuries sustained when an airplane in which he was sitting was struck by an Army airplane at the Detroit City Airport, Detroit, Mich.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. O'Brien."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIM OF HARRY W. SHARPLEY, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 595) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the end of the bill to change the period to a colon, and insert:

And provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CARL E. LAWSON AND THE FIREMAN'S FUND INDEMNITY CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the word "California", to strike out "and to pay the sum of $1,038.79 to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., of San Francisco, Calif."; and in line 11, to strike out "and for reimbursement to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co. for expenditures."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO REVISE THE ALASKA GAME LAW

The bill (H. R. 220) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF SALE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS IN UTAH

The bill (S. 576) to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask for an explanation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the tribal council or tribal business committee of the Ute Indian Tribe, in Utah, located on the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to sell some lands, within the townsite limits of Duchesne, Randlett, and Myton, Utah, which were set aside some years ago for the Indians when those lands were opened for settlement. The lands were not sold, but later they were turned over to the Indians. The lands are needed now by Myton, Duchesne, and Randlett, Utah, for airport purposes.

This bill authorizes the tribal council or the tribal business committee of the Ute Indians, representing the Indians who are concerned in this matter, to sell the lands on such terms as the tribal committee deems satisfactory, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

The lands probably do not amount to more than 150 or 200 acres, and the value probably does not exceed $4,000 or $5,000. In other words, the bill simply authorizes the Indians to dispose of their own property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, in line 2, after the figure "29", to strike out "lots 1 and 2, the east half", and insert "lot 1 and the northeast quarter"; and in line 6, after the word "meridian" and the period, to insert:

Title shall be conveyed by issuance of patent in fee to the purchaser where approved surveys have been made and, in the absence of such surveys, by deed signed by the chairman and the secretary of said committee and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Uintah and Ouray tribal business committee of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah for and on behalf of said tribe is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, to sell and convey to any purchaser deemed satisfactory to said committee any of the lands of said tribe situated within the town-site limits of Duchesne, Randlett, and Myton, Utah, and any of the following-described lands situated adjacent to the town site of Myton, Utah, to wit, the north half of the northwest quarter of section 29; lot 1 and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of section 30; the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter or lot 4 of section 19, of township 3 south, range 1 west, of the Uintah special meridian. Title shall be conveyed by issuance of patent in fee to the purchaser where approved surveys have been made and, in the absence of such surveys, by deed signed by the chairman and the secretary of said committee and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

All such sales shall be made upon such terms as said committee shall deem satisfactory and may be made pursuant to bids or at private sale and all funds derived from such sales shall be subject to disposition of said tribe.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHILDREN BORN OUT OF WEDLOCK

The bill (S. 1122) relating to children born out of wedlock was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the enactment of this bill has been requested by the District of Columbia Bar Association, the officials of the District of Columbia Juvenile Court, and the District of Columbia Welfare Agency. They feel that enactment of the bill is necessary.

The bill has to do largely with the procedure in illegitimacy actions. It provides, for example, for an increase from 14 to 16 years, as respects the age at which the support of minor children shall cease—in other words, an increase of 2 years.

It also provides that the mother may bring action, even if not a resident of the District of Columbia, so long as the father is a resident of the District of Columbia.

The bill further provides for extradition, but only in case the parentage is either admitted or proved.

It also provides what some of us thought was a rather unusual and drastic step, something which is not provided in my State, certainly, namely, a provision to the effect that a mother may sue someone other than her husband for the support of an illegitimate child. Normally, as the Senators know, if a child is born in lawful wedlock it is presumed to be legitimate, and no action can be brought against some other man for support of the child. Because of that provision we held up consideration of the bill for some time.

I have been contacted by practically every welfare agency in Washington, by some of the officers of the juvenile court, and especially by Miss Rita Morris, who is chairman of the committee on relations with the juvenile court of the District of Columbia Bar Association. They have told me that in the District there exists an unusual situation which justifies the additional provision. I am told there is an almost unlimited number of cases where, the lawful husband having left, the wife, who may not believe in divorce, is apparently living with someone as her common-law husband. After three or four or five children have been born he may leave, and under the present law those children become a burden upon the District. I understand from talking to various people that the burden thus imposed upon the District is very heavy; that it is unnecessary, and can be remedied to a great extent by means of the pending bill.

The bill also provides a number of other things, such as proper legitimization of a child born of unlawful wedlock, and many other minor details. I might say we have amended the bill substantially since it was submitted to us by the bar committee.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask the Senator if there is any provision in the bill whereby an illegitimate child, recognized in writing by the father, can inherit equally with another child?

Mr. McCARTHY. The father may adopt the child, but if he does not do so, there is no such provision in the present law, as I understand, and there is none in the pending bill. I may be in error about that. The Senator will understand I am not an authority on District law. I must depend largely upon our staff and upon the local bar association. I do not believe there is anything in the present District law to provide that such a child shall inherit, unless he is adopted. However, the bill does provide for the adoption of such child and the issuance of a certificate of legitimacy.

Mr. LANGER. But there is no provision, even though the court finds that a certain man fathered the child, and even though the father recognizes him, whereby the child may inherit; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. This is a common-law jurisdiction, as the Senator knows, and the child normally inherits through the mother. I must admit I am no authority on the matter. The committee's counsel tells me the child would inherit through the mother, in such a case, but not otherwise. In other words, let us assume the father and mother have never married. If the father admits in writing, or if the court determines, that he is the father of the illegitimate child, under those circumstances I understand there is no provision for inheritance.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the Senator that in a great many States, where the father recognizes the child, the child inherits. I wondered why the committee did not include such a provision in the pending bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, the committee did not discuss that provision at all, and I doubt whether it would be proper. The committee could not very well do what the Senator suggests in drafting this proposed legislation, which is more or less a bill to provide quasi-criminal procedure for bringing a father back and making him support the child, and providing a method of starting a lawsuit. We did not try to do anything such as the Senator suggests. I am sure, if the Senator from North Dakota should care to introduce such a bill, it would be carefully scrutinized. In an offhand way, I may say I am inclined to think I should support such a measure. If a father admits the child is his, or if a court has found it is his, I can see no objection at all to providing that the child shall inherit.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I say, if the Senator should introduce such a bill, my present inclination would be to favor it.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be pleased to prepare such a bill, and I will show it to

the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1122) relating to children born out of wedlock, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 3, line 18, after the word "evidence", to insert "to impeach the complaining witness"; on page 4, line 22, to strike out "complainant" and insert "mother"; on page 7, line 11, after the word "discretion", to insert "after notice by registered mail to the defendant at his last-known address, and after hearing,"; and in line 15, after the word "empowered", to insert "after such notice and hearing"; and on page 10, after line 5, to strike out: "SEC. 15. (a) Marriage of natural parents; legitimacy. Any child heretofore or hereafter born out of wedlock shall be legitimated by the intermarriage of his natural parents. A child so legitimated shall be entitled to the same rights and privileges which he would have enjoyed if born after marriage, his status being the same as if he were born in wedlock."; in line 13, to strike out "(b) NEW BIRTH RECORD" and insert "SEC. 15. NEW BIRTH RECORD UPON MARRIAGE OF NATURAL PARENTS."; in line 17, after the word "parents", to insert "of an illegitimate child"; and in line 18, before the word "child", strike out "the" and insert "said", and after the word "child", insert "and paternity of the child has been judicially determined or acknowledged by the husband before the Health Officer of the District of Columbia", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the support and maintenance of bastards in the District of Columbia," approved June 18, 1912 (37 Stat. 134), as amended February 22, 1921 (41 Stat. 1144), and March 16, 1926 (44 Stat. 208), be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

SEC. 2. Title: This act may be cited as "An Act Relating to Children Born Out of Wedlock."

SEC. 3. Jurisdiction: The juvenile court of the District of Columbia is hereby given jurisdiction of all cases arising under this act. Proceedings shall be instituted in the name of the District of Columbia and prosecution upon information shall be by the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

SEC. 4. Time of bringing complaint: Proceedings to establish paternity and provide for the support of a child born out of wedlock may be instituted after 4 months of pregnancy or within 2 years after the birth of the child, or within 1 year after the putative father has ceased making contributions for the support of such child: *Provided, however,* That the time during which the defendant shall be absent from the jurisdiction shall be excluded from the computation of the time within which complaint may be filed.

SEC. 5. Complaint: Any unmarried woman who is at least 4 months pregnant or who has been delivered of a child born out of wedlock, or any married woman who is at least 4 months pregnant with a child, which if born alive, may be born out of wedlock, or who has been delivered of a child born out of wedlock and who was not living with nor cohabiting with her husband during the period of time in which such child could have been conceived, may go before an Assistant Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia at the juvenile court and accuse any man of being the father of her child and request his arrest. In case of death, disability, or incompetence of the mother, the complaint may be made by the custodian, guardian, or next friend of the child. The complainant shall be examined under oath by an Assistant Corporation Counsel concerning the married or single status of the mother when the child was begotten, when and where it was born, if born, and such other information as may be deemed necessary or pertinent for testing the truth of the accusation. If, upon examination, there appears reasonable cause to believe that the woman is at least 4 months pregnant or that the child, if born, is within the age limits provided in this act, or that the putative father has ceased making contribution for the support of such child within 1 year from the time of making complaint, and reasonable cause to believe that the accused person is the father thereof, the complaint shall be reduced to writing by such officer, verified by the complainant, and filed with the clerk of the court; and such verified complaint may be introduced in evidence to impeach the complaining witness in any subsequent proceedings therein.

SEC. 6. Apprehension of accused: Upon the filing of the complaint, the case shall be calendared forthwith for preliminary hearing. The clerk of the court shall issue a summons requiring the accused to appear in court on a day certain for such purpose, or, if deemed necessary, a warrant for the arrest of the defendant shall be issued, directed to the United States marshal or the Major and Superintendent or any member of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, requiring the accused to be arrested and brought before the court.

SEC. 7. Bond; commitment on failure to give bond; jury trial: The court may require the accused to enter into bond with surety in a sum not to exceed $2,500, guaranteeing his appearance on the date set for hearing or trial. If the defendant shall fail to appear, the security for his appearance shall be forfeited and shall be applied toward the support of the child if so ordered by the court. If the defendant shall fail to post bond fixed by the court he shall forthwith be committed to the Washington Asylum and Jail, there to remain until the date set for hearing, or until he enter into the required bond or otherwise be discharged by due process of law. In all prosecutions under this act the defendant shall be entitled to, but may waive, trial by jury. In no event, however, shall final hearing take place until after the birth of the child.

SEC. 8. Blood tests: Whenever it is relevant to the prosecution or defense of an illegitimacy action, the court may, in its discretion, direct that the complainant, mother, child, and the defendant submit to one or more blood tests to determine whether or not the defendant can be excluded as being the father of the child, but the results of the test shall be admissible only in cases where defendant does not object to its admissibility.

SEC. 9. Exclusion of public: Upon trial of proceedings under this act, the court shall exclude the general public at the request of either party.

SEC. 10. (a) Judgement; prenatal and confinement expenses; maintenance: If the defendant, in open court, shall acknowledge the paternity of a child born out of wedlock, or if at the trial the finding of the court or jury be against the defendant, the court in rendering judgment thereon may enter an order for the payment of the prenatal medical care and costs of the mother's confinement and expenses of childbirth in such amount or amounts as it may deem reasonable, commensurate with the defendant's ability to pay. The court shall also order the payment of annual amounts, equal or varying, for the maintenance and education of the child, commensurate with defendant's ability to pay, such payments to be made at such periods or intervals as the court directs. The court, in its discretion, may order payments to be made by the defendant at the precinct wherein he resides through the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia. Payments shall continue until the child reaches the age of 16 years unless the child prior thereto be legally adopted.

(b) Petition for modification of judgment; hearing: The court may from time to time, upon petition of any party in interest, change or modify its order directing the amount that defendant shall pay for the maintenance and support of the child. Hearing on such petition shall be held not less than 10 days following notice in writing by the clerk of the court to the parties in interest, mailed to or left at their last known place of residence.

(c) Death of child: In case of the death of the child before reaching the age of 16 years, the court, upon proof thereof, may order the payment of reasonable funeral expenses, and shall terminate the order for maintenance; and any arrears which may be owing at the time of death may, in the discretion of the court, be canceled.

SEC. 11. (a) Performance bond; commitment; probation: The court may require the defendant to give security not to exceed $2,500 guaranteeing payments ordered by the court. The court may, however, in its discretion, suspend the requirement of security and place the defendant on probation to the court on condition that payments be made as ordered. In default of payments as ordered, the court may commit the defendant to jail for a period of not more than 1 year. At the expiration of the term of commitment the defendant may be discharged, but his liability to make subsequent payments or any payments in arrears in accordance with the judgment shall not thereby be affected. In lieu of commitment or as a condition of his release from jail, the court may suspend sentence and place the defendant on probation upon such terms as the court may direct. The amount of security, if forfeited, shall be disbursed as the court, in its discretion, may direct.

(b) Judgment; execution: In event of default of payments as ordered, the court may, in its discretion, after notice by registered mail to the defendant at his last-known address, and after hearing, reduce the amount of arrears to judgment. The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia is hereby empowered after such notice and hearing to reduce to judgment the arrears under any order hereafter entered for the support and maintenance of a child born out of wedlock, or for any amounts provided to be paid by the defendant under any section or sections of this act, and when docketed in the clerk's office of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia such judgment shall have the same force and effect as judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and execution thereon may be effected in the same manner as upon judgments of the said district court.

SEC. 12. Voluntary acknowledgement of paternity by father: The putative father of a child born out of wedlock may enter into an agreement with the mother of the child, or with some other person on behalf of the child, for the support and maintenance of said child, and said agreement may be submitted at any time to the court for ratification and approval. When said agreement is ratified and approved, the court shall issue an order incorporating the terms thereof, the payments thereunder may be received and

disbursed by the court in the same manner as provided in section 13 of this act. The faithful performance under the terms of said agreement shall bar other remedies of the mother or any other person on behalf of the child for the support of the child, subject to the provisions of section 10 (b) of this act.

SEC. 13. (a) Concurrent jurisdiction in nonsupport cases: The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia is hereby given concurrent jurisdiction with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in all cases arising under the act of Congress of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 86), as amended June 18, 1912 (37 Stat. 136), and June 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 716) (title 22, sec. 903, of the D. C. Code, 1940 edition), and the court, in its discretion, may order payments to be made by the defendant at the precinct wherein he resides, through the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

(b) Failure to support illegitimate child; misdemeanor: The provisions of the said act of Congress of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 86), as amended, making it a misdemeanor to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance of minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances, shall also apply to any person who abandons or fails to support his illegitimate child when paternity has been established judicially or when paternity has been directly acknowledged by the putative father under oath, or indirectly acknowledged by voluntarily making contributions to the support of such child.

(c) Voluntary contributions for support: The juvenile court of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to approve voluntary agreements for the support and maintenance of wife or minor children and to accept payments made pursuant thereto and disburse the same to the person or persons for whom such contributions are paid, in the same manner as payments are accepted and disbursed under the provisions of the act of Congress of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 86), as amended.

SEC. 14. Liability of the father's estate: In the event of the death of the defendant after paternity has been established and prior to the time the child reaches the age of 16 years, any sum or sums due and unpaid under any order of the court at the time of defendant's death shall be a valid claim against the defendant's estate.

SEC. 15. New birth record upon marriage of natural parents: Whenever a certified copy of a marriage certificate is submitted to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia establishing that the previously unwed parrents of an illegitimate child have intermarried subsequent to the birth of said child and paternity of the child has been judicially determined or acknowledged by the husband before the Health Officer of the District of Columbia, a new certificate of birth, bearing the original date of birth and the names of both parents, shall be issued and substituted for the certificate of birth then on file. The original certificate of birth and all papers pertaining to the issuance of the new certificate shall be placed under seal, and opened for inspection only upon order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 16. (a) Reports to Bureau of Vital Statistics: Upon entry of a final judgment determining the paternity of a child born out of wedlock, the clerk of the court shall forward a certificate to the bureau of vital statistics of the jurisdiction in which the child was born, giving the name of the person adjudged to be the father of said child.

(b) Upon receipt of the certificate as provided in section 16 (a) hereof, the Health Officer of the District of Columbia shall file said certificate with the original birth record, and thereafter may issue a certificate of birth registration including thereon the name of the person adjudged to be the father of said child.

SEC. 17. Records: None of the records or proceedings in any case arising under this act shall be open to inspection by anyone other than defendant or counsel of record except upon order of the court. The court, upon proper showing may, in its discretion, authorize the clerk to furnish certified copies of any such records or portions thereof to the defendant, the mother, or custodian of the child, any party in interest, or their duly authorized attorneys, and the clerk is hereby authorized to furnish certified copies of such records or portions thereof upon request to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia for use as evidence in nonsupport proceedings as provided in section 13 of this act.

SEC. 18. Construction of statute; appropriations: This act shall be so interpreted as to effectuate the protection and welfare of the child involved in any proceedings hereunder, and appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized.

SEC. 19. Constitutionality: If any section, subdivision, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this act.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like merely to add a word or two for the benefit of the Senator from Maryland. I may say this was not my legislation. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. I merely reported it favorably, not because I was considered an authority on the factual situation, but only from a legal standpoint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISCLOSURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES CODES AND COMMUNICATIONS INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Calendar 91, Senate bill 277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 277) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 277), which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "shall", to insert "knowingly and willfully"; on page 2, at the end of line 8, strike out "the United States or"; and in line 9, after the word "government", to insert "knowing the same to have been obtained by such processes", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall knowingly and willfully communicate, furnish, transmit, or otherwise make available to an unauthorized person, or publish, or use in any manner prejudicial to the safety or interest of the United States or for the benefit of any foreign government to the detriment of the United States any classified information (1) concerning the nature, preparation, or use of any code, cipher, or cryptographic system of the United States or any foreign government; or (2) concerning the design, construction, use, maintenance, or repair of any device, apparatus, or appliance used or prepared or planned for use by the United States or any foreign government for crytographic or communication intelligence purposes; or (3) concerning the communication intelligence activities of the United States or any foreign government; or (4) obtained by the processes of communication intelligence from the communications of any foreign government knowing the same to have been obtained by such processes, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

SEC. 2. (a) The term "classified information" as used herein shall be construed to mean information which, at the time of a violation under this act, is, for reasons of national security, specifically designated by a United States Government agency for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution.

(b) The terms "code," "cipher," and "cryptographic system" as used herein shall be construed to include in their meanings, in addition to their usual meanings, any method of secret writing and any mechanical or electrical device or method used for the purpose of disguising or concealing the contents, significance, or meanings of communications.

(c) The term "foreign government" as used herein shall be construed to include in its meaning any person or persons acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of any faction, party, department, agency, bureau, or military force of or within a foreign country, or for or on behalf of any government or any person or persons purporting to act as a government within a foreign country, whether or not such government is recognized by the United States.

(d) The term "communication intelligence" as used herein shall be construed to mean all procedures and methods used in the interception of communications and the obtaining of information from such communications by other than the intended recipients.

(e) The term "unauthorized person" as used herein shall be construed to mean any person who, or agency which, is not authorized to receive information of the categories set forth in section 1 of this act, by the President, or by the head of a department or agency of the United States Government which is expressly designated by the President to engage in communication intelligence activities for the United States.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall prohibit the furnishing, upon lawful demand, of information to any regularly constituted committee of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States of America, or joint committee thereof.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1418) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]

asks that I make objection in his name; which I do.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill is passed over.

YUMA AUXILIARY PROJECT, ARIZONA

The bill (S. 690) to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I objected to the consideration of Calendar No. 221, Senate bill 690. Since that time an explanation has been given me by the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and I desire to withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 690) to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he will give us an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the bill merely transfers the irrigation of 3,000 acres of land from one project to another. The land is already being irrigated by the Yuma project. By transferring it to the Gila project it will save a pump lift of approximately 20 feet. The water has to be pumped 72 feet, and by transferring it to the other project, the land can be irrigated with water lifted only 52 feet.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not familiar with the hearings, and I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if there was any objection in the hearing at all.

Mr. McFARLAND. There was no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the bill unanimously approved?

Mr. McFARLAND. It was.

Mr. WHERRY. There are no amendments to the bill, are there?

Mr. McFARLAND. There is one amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Does it run to the substance of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, it is in the nature of a clarifying amendment which carries out the intent and purpose of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 690) to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 6, beginning in line 21, to insert: "and such costs, less applicable credits, shall not be repayable to the United States: *And provided further,*".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands heretofore withdrawn under the reclamation law in connection with the Yuma project and set apart or otherwise dealt with as an auxiliary project under the provisions of the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, are hereby severed from said auxiliary project, except those lands in the first Mesa unit of said auxiliary project which are north of the south line of the north half of the north half of the north half of sections 17 and 18, and north of the south line of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 9, township 10 south, range 23 west, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, which lands henceforth shall constitute the entire area of the Yuma auxiliary project. After application of the payments as provided in section 3 hereof, no costs heretofore allocated or charges heretofore assigned to the lands hereby severed from said auxiliary project shall be repayable to the United States.

SEC. 2. For a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this act the owners of land with appurtenant water rights severed from the Yuma auxiliary project pursuant to the first section, the titles to which are deemed satisfactory by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) may exchange the same, acre for acre, for public lands and water rights within the Yuma auxiliary project as herein limited: *Provided,* That if any tract contains any fractional acreage, the area shall be computed to the nearest acre: *Provided further,* That such privilege of exchange shall be subject to the sale or other disposition or use by the United States of any of such public lands prior to the time an application for the exchange thereof shall have been made.

SEC. 3. The proportionate part of all payments heretofore made under the contract dated October 23, 1918, between the United States and Imperial irrigation district, of California, which, under the act of June 28, 1926 (44 Stat. 776), as amended, would have been applicable as a credit to the public lands of the United States severed from the Yuma auxiliary project pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act, shall be applied as of the date of enactment of this act to offset that portion of the cost, originally allocated to such lands, of those facilities previously constructed to be used jointly for the furnishing of water to the lands of the Yuma project and the Yuma auxiliary project.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate and enter into a suitable contract with an organization, as defined in section 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, satisfactory in form and powers to him, representing the water users of the Yuma auxiliary project as herein limited (hereafter referred to as the organization), for the repayment of certain costs in connection with the construction of works to enable the said project to obtain delivery of water appurtenant to the lands of its water users through the works of the Gila project; to carry such water through the works of the Gila project instead of the Yuma project when additional works for the purpose shall have been completed; and to extend and improve the existing distribution system of the Yuma auxiliary project so as more adequately to supply the needs of the water users. The contract, among other things, shall provide for the assumption of liability by the organization for (1) the repayment of the cost of the additional works necessary to supply water to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project, together with an appropriate share of the cost of works common to the Gila project and the Yuma auxiliary project; (2) the repayment of the cost of extending and improving the Yuma auxiliary project distribution system; (3) the payment annually in advance of estimated charges for the operation and maintenance of the works of the Yuma auxiliary project and an appropriate share of the estimated charges for the operation and maintenance of the works common to the Yuma auxiliary project and the Gila project. The general repayment obligation of any organization entering into such contract covering the repayment of the construction, extension, and improvement costs herein enumerated may be spread in annual installments, without the payment of interest, over such reasonable period, not exceeding 60 years, as the Secretary may determine: *Provided, however,* That repayment of costs allocated on a per acre basis to lands not under water-right application under the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 962), on the date of the contract may be deferred until after water-right application has been made: *Provided further,* That the liability of the organization with respect to the costs allocated to such lands shall be suspended upon the cancellation of any water-right application as to any payments for the calendar year following such cancellation, and shall remain suspended until a new water-right application shall have been made. The contract may provide for the appointment of the organization as fiscal agent of the United States for the purpose of collecting any sums of money which may become due the United States with respect to land and water rights or water-right applications under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, and shall provide that payments made to the organization or any of its representatives for any purpose by any land and water right or water-right applicant shall not be applied to any tax or assessment of the organization if any obligations payable to the United States under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, or the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, remain due and unpaid. Such contract shall further provide that any lien held by the organization on lands covered by any land and water right or water-right application shall be inferior to the rights of the United States with respect to charges upon such lands under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, or the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, and to the lien thereon reserved by the United States pursuant to section 5 (b) of this act.

(b) Upon the execution of a satisfactory contract pursuant to subsection (a), subject to the availability of funds therefor, the Secretary is authorized to proceed with such construction, extensions, and improvements as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of such contract.

SEC. 5. (a) After a contract shall have been executed pursuant to section 4, land and water rights in the Yuma auxiliary project may be sold at private sale, pursuant to the provisions of the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 962), for a purchase price of not less than (1) $32 per acre for the land and (2) a sum for the water right consisting of not less than $160 per acre for the cost of the reclamation works previously constructed exclusively for the Yuma auxiliary project. Such purchase price shall be in addition to any charges or assessments which may be levied by the organization to pay for the per acre construction, extension, and improvement costs allocable to

such land under any contract executed pursuant to section 4 of this act: *Provided*, That said purchase price shall not include any part of the cost of works of the Yuma project and such costs, less applicable credits, shall not be repayable to the United States: *And provided further*, That after a contract shall have been executed pursuant to section 4 and water is ready for delivery to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project, the water users of the Yuma auxiliary project shall cease to be liable for any charges for the operation and maintenance of the Yuma project, except such charges as may then be due and unpaid.

(b) To insure payment of any sums due or which may become due to the United States under land and water right or water-right applications under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, the United States, as of the date of the application, shall have a lien for the entire amount of its charges which shall be prior to all other liens, mortgages, claims, or interests whatsoever. Upon default of payment of any amount so due, the United States is empowered to declare the whole of the unaccrued portion of the charges due and payable and may file suit to foreclose the lien for all accrued charges in any court of competent jurisdiction and sell said land to satisfy the obligation due the United States. This remedy, however, shall not be exclusive.

SEC. 6. All provisions of the act of January 15, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 962), not inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. After a contract shall have been executed pursuant to section 4 and water is ready for delivery to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project, the Secretary is hereby authorized to dismantle the existing B-lift pumping plant of the Yuma auxiliary project and to dispose of any salable parts thereof, either by public or private sale. All moneys realized from the sale of such parts shall be paid into the reclamation fund and credit therefor shall be given to the organization representing the water users of the Yuma auxiliary project toward the construction costs assumed by it pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the purposes of this act.

CLAIMS UNDER TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 729. If the bill requires more than 4 or 5 minutes, I shall withdraw my request.

The bill has been reported today from the Committee on the Judiciary, and for that reason is not on the calendar. The time within which it should operate will expire on the last day of this month. Therefore I deem it necessary that the Senate act promptly on the bill.

The purpose of the bill is further to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941. It involves persons who have claims for the return of property which is vested in the Alien Property Custodian. A similar extension was passed by the Eightieth Congress, and at that time it was thought to be sufficient to permit all those who might have claims to file them. If the time is not extended in this instance, there will be quite a number of persons who have legitimate claims to be filed before the Alien Property Custodian whose time will expire very soon, and the claimants will therefore be deprived of the right of filing perhaps legitimate claims.

If the bill takes up any considerable length of time I shall not insist on action, but I hope that the bill may be considered for the next 2 or 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 729) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "in the first sentence of" and to insert in lieu thereof "wherever it appears in".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "April 30, 1949" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "April 30, 1950".

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2632, the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if he does not feel we would save time if I should suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McKELLAR. There are quite a number of Senators present.

Mr. WHERRY. There are several Senators who wanted to be informed when the bill came up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Anderson	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	Long	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	McGrath	Tobey
Frear	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Malone	Watkins
Gurney	Martin	Wherry
Hayden	Maybank	Wiley
Hendrickson	Miller	Williams
Hill	Morse	Withers
Hoey	Mundt	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I announce that the following Senators are detained at a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considering the civil-functions bill, which committee has permission to sit during the session of the Senate: The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Finance, over which he is presiding. The Committee on Finance has permission to sit during the session this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before that is done I desire to make a short statement concerning the bill. It came from the House of Representatives containing a total appropriation of slightly less than $472,000,000. Budget estimates of about $90,000,000 more were sent to the Senate. The Senate did not allow all the $90,000,000, but, as the result of the budget estimate, allowed additional $53,000,000.

In addition to that, several other items were allowed. One was for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians. The committee felt a debt was owed to those Indians, and the amount of $8,359,000 was added for the Indians.

Furthermore there were restorations of reductions made by the House to the amount of $4,140,000.

For the legislative branch the committee added $43,725. This was for widows of deceased Members, furniture, postage, and other miscellaneous items.

For the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures we added $20,000.

For the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for Indians of Arizona and New Mexico, we added $550,000.

For the care of tubercular Indians in Minnesota we added $50,000.

For improvement of a small-boat harbor at Havre de Grace, Md., we allowed $9,000.

That makes a total of remaining increase by the Senate committee of $13,181,725.

Respecting the entire bill as it comes from the committee, there are two items of difference. The first is a difference in an item which the House put in the bill in reference to the employment in the Bureau of Reclamation of Messrs. Straus and Boke. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] presented an amendment dealing with that matter. The Senator has told me, however, that he will put that item in a legislative bill, so that question is not now before the Senate.

The other question, which is the principal one in dispute, has to do with an amendment which was presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to what is known as the New Johnsonville steam plant appropriation in the Tennessee Valley Authority. The New

Johnsonville steam plant will cost according to the budget estimate, $3,000,000. The House appropriated $2,500,000 for that plant. The Senate committee recommended $2,500,000 for the plant. The Senator from Michigan offered an amendment providing that any taxpayer or consumer of electric energy may go before a court of three judges in the District of Columbia and test the constitutionality of the TVA Act.

I desire to say a word about that before I take my seat. The question of the constitutionality of the TVA and its operations was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States in what is known as the case of Ashwander et al. against Tennessee Valley Authority et al., Two Hundred and Ninety-seventh United States Reports. I believe the case came before the Court in 1939, or perhaps it was 1940. It was brought out in that case, as will be recalled, that the TVA bought from the Alabama Power Co. its transmission wires and electric system, including a steam plant, by the way. Remember, that the purchase included a steam plant. All that matter was brought before the Court. I cannot say that the question of the steam plant was actually passed upon directly, but the Court found that the TVA had bought the transmission and distributing system from the Alabama Power Co., including the steam plant, and including various other things.

Chief Justice Hughes rendered the opinion of the Court. In that opinion the Court upheld the constitutionality of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and it upheld the purchase by the Authority of the area of distribution, the distribution lines, and all the other properties which were included in that purchase. The purchase was a considerable one. Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in that opinion said:

> The question here is simply as to the acquisition of the transmission lines as a facility for the disposal of that energy.

The Court held that the United States, having embarked in a constitutional venture, and the current having been generated by a Tennessee Valley Authority dam, the United States had the authority, through the Tennessee Valley Authority, to acquire such lines and such materials as wires and other distribution means as would enable it to sell the power to the best advantage.

That is all that is sought to be done by the provision in question. The Tennessee Valley Authority already has acquired a number of steam plants at other places. It owns a number of them, largely by purchase, however. But as between the purchase of such steam plants and the building of them there certainly cannot be raised a constitutional question, in my judgment. That, however, is neither here nor there.

Last year a similar measure came before the Senate, and then, as Senators will remember, a witness testified as to the unconstitutionality of the act. His name was Smith. It turned out that he was an agent of the power companies, drawing the nifty little salary of $65,000 a year. He testified, as appears on page 262 of the record of last year's hearings:

> My salary is $65,000 a year by contract.

He lost, so far as the Senate was concerned. This year the private companies have brought in another man. If my memory serves me right, his name is Jackson. Mr. Jackson is a very celebrated constitutional lawyer of Cleveland, Ohio. He made exactly the same arguments Mr. Smith made the year before. The Senate did not approve of the argument a year ago and I hope the Senate will not approve of similar arguments this year. As a matter of fact, to my mind, it is perfectly clear that the real purpose of these agents of the private power companies is to bring about a lawsuit respecting the matter, which would probably delay the building of the steam plant for some time.

The purpose of a steam plant is to accomplish what is known in power parlance as "firming up the power." We cannot always tell about the flow of water. We cannot always be assured that the flow of water will generate a certain standard amount of power which can be sold to the best advantage. But with the steam plant added to the water plant, we can always furnish a determined amount of power to those to whom the power is sold. In other words, the Government can then sell power to the best advantage.

I should like to read what Mr. Justice Hughes said on this question, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court:

> We come, then, to the question as to the validity of the method which has been adopted in disposing of the surplus energy generated at the Wilson Dam.

That is on the Tennessee River.

> The constitutional provision is silent as to the method of disposing of property belonging to the United States. That method, of course, must be an appropriate means of disposition, according to the nature of the property, it must be one adopted in the public interest, as distinguished from private or personal ends, and we may assume that it must be consistent with the foundation principles of our dual system of government, and must not be contrived to govern the concerns reserved to the States.

As applied to this particular question, that language means this: The Government owns the water power; it should sell it to the best advantage; it can get more money for it by having a steam plant to firm up the power, so as to produce a regular flow of power to the customers. For that reason I do not believe we should insert a provision inviting any taxpayer to bring a suit in the Federal court in Washington—not in Tennessee or Alabama, where this project is situated, but in Washington, D. C. First, of course, it is legislation. In the next place, it is for the purpose of litigating so as to prevent the installation of the power.

We already have the power there. Whether it was right or wrong, that is a question which is past and gone. The project has been established. It is a fine piece of property, bringing the Government a good income. It is being successfully managed at this time, and I hope will continue to be successfully managed. Surely we ought not to insert a provision which would tie up, perhaps for years, the building of the steam plant for the purpose of disposing of this power in the best possible way and in the interest of the Government.

That is the only question that is now before us.

Mr. WATKINS rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask the Senator a question on another matter, with reference to an amendment which I propose to offer. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I shall wait until he has concluded his statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am through now.

Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has informed me that he expects to offer a legislative amendment to the bill. I had to tell my friend from Michigan, who is a member of the committee, that, while I dislike to make a point of order in connection with the amendment, I shall be obliged to do so if it is offered. I hope he will not press it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to permit me to offer an amendment in connection with the Indian matter about which I spoke to him, prior to the consideration of the committee amendments? I think my amendment will probably be noncontroversial, and can be gotten out of the way.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only way that could be done would be by unanimous consent.

Let me say to the Senator from Utah that this is the fourth week I have sat here trying to get the first one of the appropriation bills for this year to the floor of the Senate. I have sat here every day watching for the past 4 weeks, and hoping that we could get started on the appropriation bills. The House has been unusually expeditious this year in passing appropriation bills, and the Senate has been unusually slow. I should like to have this bill passed today if it is humanly possible. I appeal to Senators for cooperation.

All Senators know that we must pass the appropriation bills. We must pass this bill and succeeding appropriation bills if the Government is to continue to operate. I believe that Senators will cooperate in passing the appropriation bills as rapidly as we can, in the interest of the Government. I hope the Senator from Utah will wait a little while before offering his amendment, and let us dispose of the committee amendments first. That is the usual procedure. Let the bill be read for committee amendments, and after they are disposed of the Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator says, I shall be happy to wait and offer my amendment after the committee amendments are disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative Branch—Senate," on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

For payment to Vera C. Bushfield, widow of Harlan J. Bushfield, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

For payment to Alice W. Broughton, widow of J. Melville Broughton, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to offer a clarifying amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order for the Senator to offer an amendment until the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

The appropriation for administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, is made available for the employment of an additional clerk at the basic rate of $1,500 per annum by each Senator from the States of California and Virginia, the population of said States having exceeded 10,000,000 and 3,000,000, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Hereafter the basic annual rates of compensation for two clerks at $3,480 each contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be one at $4,260 and one at $2,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

Commencing March 1, 1949, the appropriation for "Salaries of officers and employees of the Senate" contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be available for the compensation of laborer in charge of private passage at $2,280 basic per annum in lieu of laborer in charge of private passage at $2,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 3, after line 1, to strike out the subhead "Vice President's automobile"; in line 3, before the word "For" to insert "Vice President's automobile:", and in line 4, before the figures "$2,500", to insert "fiscal year 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

Postage stamps: For additional amounts for postage stamps, for the following offices: Office of the Secretary, $150; Office of the Sergeant at Arms, $75; in all, fiscal year 1949, $225.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 8, to insert:

Furniture: For an additional amount for furniture and repairs, fiscal year 1949, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

Commencing January 20, 1949, the provisions of existing law relating to long-distance telephone calls for Senators shall be equally applicable to the Vice President of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1949, the appropriation "Miscellaneous items, contingent expenses of the Senate," shall be available for purchase of new or used typewriters at prices which do not exceed prices established under the provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 4, after line 2, to insert:

For payment to Vera Bloom, daughter of Sol Bloom, late a Representative from the State of New York, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

For an amount which is hereby authorized to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration," on page 8, line 12, after the word "administration", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$14,000,000, of which $4,000,000 shall be available only upon determination by the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, that increased costs have resulted either from (1) increases in work load, or (2) increases in salaries of State employees, occurring after February 1, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 18, to insert:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion

For all expenses necessary for and incident to the renovation, repair, and modernization (without change of present architectural appearance of the exterior of the Mansion or the interior of its main floor) of the Executive Mansion, including the preparation of drawings and specifications, and the purchase of furniture, furnishings, and equipment, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil service and classification laws, $5,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any cost-plus-a-fixed-fee general construction contract entered into in pursuance of this authority shall be awarded on competitive bidding among responsible general contractors upon the amount of the fixed fee to accrue from the performance of such contract: *Provided further*, That with the exception of the subcontract to be made by the general contractor for the underpinning and foundation work and work incidental and appurtenant thereto, which may be a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, all other subcontracts made by the general contractor shall be fixed price contracts awarded on competitive bids received from responsible subcontractors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

General Accounting Office Building, District of Columbia

The contract authority provided under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, for the construction of a building for the use of the General Accounting Office, is increased in an amount not to exceed $2,550,000 under the revised limit of cost of $25,400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Maintenance and operation of schools

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and operation of schools," $3,000,000; and the limitation under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for administrative expenses, is increased from "$100,000" to "$175,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Federal Housing Administration", on page 10, line 13, after the word "to", to strike out "$23,000,000" and insert "$23,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 16, to insert:

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Federal Public Housing Authority" in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1947.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the amendment now before the Senate, which is the one relating to the Public Housing Administration. It reads as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Federal Public Housing Authority" in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1947.

Following that, the further amendment reads:

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Public Housing Administration" in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1948.

Mr. President, the history of the proviso in the Government corporations appropriation for 1948 and 1949 whose repeal is now sought is relatively simple. It reverts to the early history and practices of the Housing Authority created

under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

The Housing Act of 1937 was designed to provide low-rent housing for families of low income who could not otherwise afford decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings. It authorized loans by the Housing Authority to local public housing agencies to aid in financing slum clearance and the development of low-rent housing projects. In order to bring rents in the completed dwellings within financial reach of families in the lowest-income groups, the Authority was empowered to make limited annual contributions, provided the community would also make contributions toward the operation of the projects.

Besides the locally owned projects which constitute the greater part of the low-rent program, the Housing Authority has had under its management some federally owned projects. The main group of these consisted of Public Works Administration projects, and they also included war-housing projects directly constructed and owned by the Federal Government, although it was determined that after the war they should be sold to local housing authorities for low-rent use.

Under the United States Housing Act, low-rent housing activities are primarily a subject for local determination and control, the Federal Government being limited chiefly to providing technical and financial assistance. Federal assistance can be provided only under conditions prescribed by the United States Housing Act. Among these conditions is a provision that the local authority shall provide, by cash, tax remission, or tax exemption, a local subsidy equal to at least one-fifth of the annual contribution to be provided by the Housing Authority.

According to a statement submitted to the House Appropriations Committee at its hearing on March 26, 1948, as shown at page 791, it was "the original policy of the Public Housing Administration to encourage localities to grant complete tax exemption for their low-rent housing projects."

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement. It was "the original policy of the Public Housing Administration to encourage localities to grant complete tax exemption for their low-rent housing projects."

In other words, the municipality was to waive all taxes on the property which was to be used for low-rent housing projects.

I read further from the statement submitted to the House Appropriations Committee in 1948:

> It was only when a locality insisted upon receiving some payments in lieu of taxes that the PHA authorized the making of contracts providing for such payments. As a result of this original policy of case-by-case negotiations with the localities, the original contracts present a wide diversity of provisions as to payment in lieu of taxes. More than half of the original contracts contain no provision whatsoever for such payments, and only 7 percent of the contracts provided for payments equal to as much as 5 percent of shelter rent.

The statement in the House hearings continues:

> The various localities throughout the country speedily came to feel that there had been an unfair discrimination between them; those cities which had insisted upon payments in lieu of taxes had received them, whereas those which had not insisted had received none.

In other words, the first bloom of enthusiasm with which the local authorities had entered contracts with the Housing Authority wore off. Because other cities had been given better deals, certain cities began to complain. A typical example was the local authority which entered a contract providing for payments in lieu of taxes in an amount corresponding to the tax on the real estate if the Federal Government had not come in and assisted in construction of a housing project. This was $477. But later it sought a contract corresponding to a payment in lieu of taxes amounting to 10 percent of the shelter rent, or $50,000. Mr. President, that municipality at first was perfectly satisfied to get $477 in lieu of taxes; but when it learned that other cities were getting more, then it wanted the sum of $50,000.

Mr. A. R. Miller, Assistant General Counsel for the Public Housing Administration, described the process in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee last year. He said:

> We have contracts which were drawn at the time when the program was young and there was no experience, and the cities were enthusiastic. And they went further, it appears from their point of view, than they should have gone; and then, after that, when they found that the burden was excessive, they came to the Federal Government, to us, and said, "Here, we have made a contract which is too burdensome for us. Will you relieve us to some extent?"

As a result of such pleadings, the Housing Authority in 1942 began to revise its contracts, attempting a uniform policy of payments, in lieu of taxes, amounting to 5 percent of shelter rent. Since then, the Public Housing Administration has sought to have those payments increased to a uniform 10 percent, and that provision is the subject of authorizing legislation in Senate bill 138 of the Eighty-first Congress.

It will be observed that throughout the Housing Authority proceeded, in making payments in lieu of taxes, without an apparent doubt as to its legal authority to do so. The question of statutory authority to enter into any contract calling for payments in lieu of taxes on locally owned housing apparently was raised for the first time before the House Appropriations Committee in 1947.

At that time legal justification for such payments was requested from counsel for the Public Housing Administration In a brief submitted to the House committee, section 13 (c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 was cited.

Mr. President, I refer now to page 243 of the 1947–48 hearings. This section reads as follows:

> The Authority may enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or political subdivision thereof with respect to any real property owned by the Authority. The amount so paid for any year for any such property shall not exceed the taxes that would be paid to the State or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation thereby.

That quotation is taken from page 895 of the Public Laws, volume 50.

Mr. President, this only allowed the authorities to make an agreement in relation to taxes on property owned by the Authority. The properties and buildings from which we are attempting to remove the limit and to change the contract to allow 10 percent of the rent are not owned by the Authority, and therefore there is no authority to enter into the contracts.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina

Mr. MAYBANK. But is it not a fact that the same municipal services are rendered to the housing developments, whether owned by the Authority or not, the same street system, police, light, school, and so forth?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is true. There is no doubt that the municipalities render certain services for the properties whether owned by the Authority or not. I take it for granted that the services rendered by the municipality in each case are identical, but, under the law, only on properties owned by the Authority did the Authority have power to enter into an agreement to pay any sum annually in taxes.

Bear in mind that the United States Housing Act deals both with locally owned and federally owned housing projects, and note that section 13 (c) says, "with respect to any real property owned by the Authority."

Counsel's brief states:

> It is true that the United States Housing Act does not, in so many words, authorize Federal Public Housing Authority to approve payments in lieu of taxes when such payments are proposed in budgets submitted by local housing authorities to FPHA for approval.

The brief continues to support a position that despite the absence of such authorization, payments in lieu of taxes were legal because the act "makes no attempt to particularize the permissible expenditures of local authorities in their operating budgets."

What the FPHA attempted to do was not within the law itself, but outside the law, to allow the payments and to make the contracts. That is exactly what was prohibited by the legislation of 1947, and by the budget of 1948. The amendment now attempts retroactively to restore the provision and to compel the Federal Government to make payments which were illegally made in the first instance to municipalities.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator not admit that the payments have been made over a period of years in some instances?

Mr. FERGUSON. From 1942 to 1947.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator will further agree with me, will he not, that while the amounts are small, nevertheless the various cities counted upon those amounts in making up their budgets for the city governments?

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume the cities, after they obtained the contracts between 1942 and 1947, made up their budgets upon the assumption that they were going to receive certain taxes from the properties.

Mr. President, I have a city in my State, the city of Detroit, that will benefit by the adoption of the amendment. There is no doubt about it. I think it will benefit by about $31,000. But that does not mean that we should adopt it, merely because I am from a State that would receive a portion of the taxpayers' money. I think the time has come when, even though we come from States that would benefit by doing something illegal, merely because our States would get some money, we should not hesitate a moment to stand on the floor of the Senate and protest the taking of money from the Federal Government even by our own citizens. Unless we can do that, we are going to have no limit to the budgets of the Federal Government.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. There are cities in Michigan that receive benefits, though, are there not?

Mr. FERGUSON. They will if the provision is included in the bill as passed. That is what I say.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I say if the bill is not passed. They already have original contracts, do they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they have some original contracts.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to make it perfectly clear, with the permission of the Senator from Michigan, that there is no project whatever in South Carolina, such as the Senator suggested with respect to the State of Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

Mr. MAYBANK. The provision is supported purely on the basis of its merits as an adjustment. The benefit to any city in the State of South Carolina does not enter into the matter at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to say to the committee and to the Senator from South Carolina, there are no projects in his State that would benefit by so much as one dollar. It is not a question of what we get for our own States, at all. It is a question of principle.

The House committee does not appear to have been impressed by this argument, however. It inserted in its report on the Government Corporations Appropriation for 1948 the following language:

> Another policy of the FPHA permits local housing projects to make voluntary payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the rate specified in its contract up to 10 percent of what is designated as shelter rent. This practice the committee feels to be of doubtful propriety and legality, and it has been provided in the bill that the funds appropriated for contributions cannot be used for payments to local projects making payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the rate specified in the original contracts with FPHA.

In adopting the proviso referred to in the House report it was apparent that there was considerable doubt as to the legality of any contributions for payments in lieu of taxes not mentioned in section 13 (c) of the United States Housing Act. As a concession to a practice which had been built up, however, funds were appropriated and authorization provided for payments corresponding to those provided at the inception of the assistance contracts between the Federal Government and the local authorities. The General Accounting Office has subscribed to this by refusing to approve payments since the beginning of fiscal 1948 on any contracts other than the first assistance contract between a local housing authority and the FPHA.

Mr. President, this can be boiled down to very simple language, when we come to vote upon the proposition. The Senate and House of Representatives, in 1947, said these contracts could not be increased, and they compelled everybody to go back to the original contract. We now find the Congress saying, "Oh, that was all right in 1947, and in 1948; it would not be allowed. But now we are going to allow it retroactively." It will cost the Federal Government I think between $150,000 and $160,000 each year, or a total of about $300,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was $104,000 for 1948, $162,000 for 1949, making approximately the figure suggested by the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is about $270,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the proposed legislation is sought to be added to the appropriation bill, but I am not making the point of order. I am saying it is a matter that should be determined by a simple majority of the Senate, rather than by a two-thirds majority, because I feel that we should treat the matter as if it were a bill. I understand there is a bill pending before the proper legislative committee which would allow the contracts to be made.

I hope that the Senate will vote retroactively to put back into the appropriation bill these and all the payments for the increase of the amount as provided for in line 18 to and including line 21, on page 10 of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment referred to, on which the Senator from Michigan asks for a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate for any great length of time in discussing this amendment. I will say that last month a bill was introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I suggested to him at that time that since originally the amendment had been adopted as a rider to an appropriation bill, and since it was within the province of the Appropriations Committee, it be referred to that committee and not to the Banking and Currency Committee. I appreciate what the Senator from Michigan has said, that he would not make a point of order with reference to it, but it is a clear-cut instance of whether the Federal Government will keep its contracts with some 117 cities in the United States, contracts which have been made through the Public Housing Authority, and with the approval of the Congress, prior to the amendment to the Government Corporations Act for fiscal 1948 and 1949.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be attached to the few remarks I have made a memorandum from A. R. Miller, Assistant General Counsel, Public Housing Administration, together with a statement which sets forth the full facts. I wish to read briefly from the statement at this time:

> There are 17 low-rent housing projects which have been affected by this ruling. A list of such projects and the amounts involved is attached hereto. (On all other projects the "original" contract has either not been revised, or, where revised, no change was made in the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized thereunder; such projects are therefore not affected by the provisos in the appropriation acts.)

The question is merely whether or not they had a contract prior to 1948 when the amendment was placed in the appropriation bill, or whether they did not have one. That is the issue here. If the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan is defeated, all we do is to give to 17 cities approximately $300,000 over the past two fiscal years, which I think is due, and which my distinguished friend thinks is not due.

There being no objection, the memorandum and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FROM PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION FOR THE DEFICIENCY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS RELATING TO THE PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE PROVISOS IN THE GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION ACTS FOR 1948 AND 1949

In the Government Corporations Appropriation Acts of 1948 and 1949, a proviso was added to the Public Housing Administration's appropriation for annual contributions to low-rent housing projects which reads as follows: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Federal Public Housing Authority."

These acts also provided that expenditures thereunder should be subject to audit and final settlement by the Comptroller General.

The Comptroller General interpreted the term "original contract" as used in the aforesaid appropriation acts as meaning the first or earliest assistance contract between the

local housing authorities and the PHA, and that, therefore, in determining the amount of the annual contribution which the PHA might make out of the moneys appropriated under such acts, the PHA could give credit to the local authorities only for payments in lieu of taxes specified in the earliest contracts, even though such contracts had been validly revised to authorize larger payments in lieu of taxes.

There are 17 low-rent-housing projects which have been affected by this ruling. A list of such projects and the amounts involved is attached hereto. (On all other projects, the "original" contract has either not been revised, or where revised, no change was made in the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized thereunder; such projects are therefore not affected by the provisos in the appropriation acts.) The way in which the aforesaid 17 projects are affected is as follows:

Under the assistance contract between the PHA and the local authority, the amount of the annual contribution payable by the PHA is reduced by any rental income which the project may have over and above its expenses. One of the expenses payable out of the rents is the payment in lieu of taxes. Therefore, the greater the amount of payments in lieu of taxes the less there will be available from the rental income to reduce the annual contribution payable by the PHA and, consequently, the greater the contribution the PHA would make.

In the 17 projects involved, the "original" or earliest contract provided either for no payments in lieu of taxes or for a small amount. In each of these cases the contracts were subsequently revised or amended so as to authorize as an expense of the project larger payments in lieu of taxes than those specified in the "original" contract. These revised contracts were all validly entered into in pursuance of the authority vested in PHA by section 14 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, and were in effect prior to the passage of the appropriation act for 1948, and are legally binding obligations of the PHA.

The effect of the proviso in the Appropriation Act was to require the PHA to refuse to make annual contributions based upon the larger payments in lieu of taxes specified in the revised contracts and thus to breach the valid revised contracts in existence between the PHA and the local authorities.

In addition to the above 17 projects, there are 4 projects on which the local authorities, pursuant to authorization given by the PHA in accordance with its policy then in effect, made payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the contract amounts (known as voluntary payments) prior to the passage of the Appropriation Act of 1948. The annual contributions for these four projects, however, were payable on July 17, 1948, out of the moneys appropriated by the 1948 Appropriation Act and were, therefore, subject to the proviso in question. The PHA was required therefore to deduct those amounts from the contributions paid by it to these four projects.

The repeal of the provisos as of the dates of their respective enactments would, therefore, accomplish two things: (1) it would permit the local authorities to make payments in lieu of taxes equal to the full amount set forth in the revised contracts and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions paid to the projects to the same extent; and (2) it would validate the voluntary payments in lieu of taxes previously made and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions on those projects accordingly.

The Congress will not be required to appropriate any moneys for the above purposes since there is enough left out of the moneys already appropriated by the Appropriation Acts of 1948 and 1949 for the payment of these additional amounts of contributions. As shown by the attached statement, the total amount of additional contributions which the repeal of the provisos would permit the PHA to make, is approximately $300,000.

A. R. MILLER,
Assistant General Counsel.

Projects on which part of the annual contribution was withheld because of the difference between the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized by the "original" contract and the amount authorized by the revised contract

	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1949
Baltimore, Md.	$627.00	(1)
Detroit, Mich.	15,304.39	$16,451.26
Norwalk, Conn.	383.52	
Atlanta, Ga.	40,898.29	102,192.44
Annapolis, Md.	2,023.53	2,332.76
Beverly, N. J.	414.76	
Jackson, Tenn.	1,028.80	
Nashville, Tenn.	2,273.00	
Key West, Fla.	1,001.00	
Los Angeles, Calif.	4,655.00	4,877.49
New York, N. Y.	24,412.09	24,523.90 2,999.54
Omaha, Nebr.	6,451.49	6,119.00
Springfield, Ill.	725.50	
Trenton, N. J.	842.80	
Frederick, Md.	1,434.97	
McKeesport, Pa.	1,792.21	
Denver, Colo.		3,188.38
Total	104,868.35	162,684.77

[1] Where no amount is shown for fiscal 1949, it is due to the fact that the audit for that year has not yet been made. It is believed that when the audit is made the amount involved will be small, not more than $10,000 in addition to the total of $162,684.77.

Projects on which voluntary payments in lieu of taxes were made before the Appropriation Act of 1948 became effective

Augusta, Ga.	$6,771.03
Fall River, Mass.	12,633.20
Laurel, Miss.	6,086.62
McComb, Miss.	3,242.40
Total	28,733.25

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Cain	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Taft
Downey	Knowland	Taylor
Ferguson	Langer	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tydings
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McGrath	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	Magnuson	Withers
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 10, beginning in line 17, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to make a few remarks concerning the pending question.

The amendment is on page 10, beginning in line 17, and running through line 21. In 1947 fiscal and 1948 fiscal the Senate and House of Representatives inserted in an appropriation bill a provision that the FPHA amount in lieu of taxes had to be in accordance with original contracts. This is what happened: The local housing authorities wanted housing, they wanted low-rent housing. Many of them were willing to waive payments in lieu of taxes in order to get housing projects. They wanted to make contributions. Then, after they got a housing project, the FPHA would go to them and increase the amount of the payments in lieu of taxes.

When Congress really learned about that, in 1947 and 1948, we inserted in the appropriation bill a provision that they would get contributions only as provided for in their original contracts, not as provided in the changed contracts.

This year the Committee on Appropriations wants to insert in the bill the amendment from line 17 to line 21, which would retroactively provide for the payment of Federal money to municipalities which had already entered into contracts containing certain provisions and were able to persuade the FPHA to change the contracts.

If Senators are against changing what we did in 1947 and 1948 their votes should be "nay." If they favor the committee amendment, which would result in the payment to municipalities of about $275,000 of Federal money which was not legally due to them, then Senators should vote "yea."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope and trust that the committee will be sustained and that the amendment will be agreed to. The communities affected were not paid because the Comptroller questioned the right to pay them after the House and Senate language was inserted in the 1948–49 appropriation bill, before they had entered into contracts and had been paid. In a way they were left out because of language inserted in an appropriation bill. I trust that the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee. Those who favor the amendment will make it known by saying "yea," those opposed by saying "nay," as their names are called. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained from the Senate on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], both of whom are

absent on public business, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], both of whom are necessarily absent, would vote "yea" if present.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official committee business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—49

Anderson	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Pepper
Downey	Knowland	Robertson
Eastland	Long	Russell
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Frear	McCarran	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	Taylor
George	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McGrath	Tydings
Green	McKellar	Watkins
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Maybank	
Hoey	Miller	

NAYS—33

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Brewster	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kem	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thye
Donnell	Lodge	Tobey
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—14

Baldwin	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Graham	Myers	Wagner
Hunt	Saltonstall	Wiley
Kefauver	Smith, N. J.	

So the committee amendment on page 10, lines 17 to 21, inclusive, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment is the paragraph following line 21 on page 10.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, if I remember correctly, that paragraph is part of the same amendment as the preceding paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it is a separate amendment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Parliamentarian is very good. I would not dispute him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, after line 21, which will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 10, after line 21, to insert:

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Public Housing Administration" in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee about an amendment which we have not yet reached, for the purpose of clarifying his opening statement about that amendment. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say, with respect to the provision of law that certain positions in the Reclamation Service would have to be held by engineers, that that was not involved in this bill, but would be handled in another bill.

Mr. President, I think it is absolutely true that the final determination will be made in connection with another bill; but I believe that my distinguished colleague from Tennessee will recall the voluminous testimony which we took before our committee on that very issue, and especially the testimony of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. Before we reported the bill the committee struck out, on pages 25 and 26, the language which was inserted on the House side, which wiped out the engineering requirement and had the effect of restoring Commissioner Straus and Supervisor Boke to the pay roll. If the Senate adopts the committee amendment, we shall continue the prohibition against the payment of those two salaries, as provided in the appropriation act of last year. Is not that correct?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am afraid I made a mistake if I made the statement to which the Senator from Virginia refers—and, as I recall, I did make that statement. What I intended to say was that I understood the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was not going to press his point of view before the Senate, but would take it up in connection with a subsequent bill. This amendment, of course, strikes out the House language.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The statement which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has just made is absolutely correct. The bill is left in a form which is satisfactory to me. Under the Senate committee version, the prohibition against any man holding either of these two offices unless he is an engineer remains in the law. I informed the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that in view of the fact that the bill was favorable to my contention, I would not deluge the Senate of the United States with any statements on the Boke-Straus issue, and I do not intend to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This amendment has not yet been reached. The discussion is out of order.

Mr. MCKELLAR. In that connection, Mr. President, my original statement should be corrected to conform to my last statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before I resume my seat, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for the statement which he has just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing Expediter—Salaries and expenses", on page 11, line 4, after the figures "$4,800,000", to insert "of which $3,600,000 is contingent upon the enactment of legislation continuing rent control beyond March 31, 1949: *Provided*, That if rent control and veterans-preference requirements under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are not extended by legislation beyond March 31, 1949, the said sum of $3,600,000 is hereby made available on account and in part payment of liquidation expenses, including terminal leave, of the Office of the Housing Expediter."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be noted that the language beginning in line 4, is "of which $3,600,000 is contingent upon the enactment of legislation continuing rent control beyond March 31, 1949: *Provided*, That if rent control and veterans-preference requirements under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are not extended by legislation beyond March 31, 1949, the said sum of $3,600,000 is hereby made available on account and in part payment of liquidation expenses, including terminal leave, of the Office of the Housing Expediter." Since that time rent-control legislation has passed the Congress; and I ask that that much of the amendment, beginning with the word "of" in line line 4, to the end of line 12, be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with reference to the amendment which was last voted upon by a yea-and-nay vote, let me say that there are only 17 low-rent-housing projects which were affected by the ruling of the Comptroller General necessitated by the provisions which were inserted in the appropriation act in 1948.

Also, the effect of the amendment is to do only two things:

First, it would permit local authorities to receive payments in lieu of taxes equal to the full amount set forth in the revised contracts and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions paid to the projects to the same extent.

Second, it would validate the voluntary payments in lieu of taxes previously made, and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions on these projects accordingly.

I should like to have the RECORD show also that Congress will not be required to appropriate any money whatever for these purposes, since there is enough left of the moneys already appropriated under the appropriation acts of 1948 and 1949 for the payment of these additional amounts of contribution, as shown by a statement which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD. The total amounts are not very high.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement showing projects on which a part of the annual contribution was withheld because the difference between the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized by

the original contract and the amount authorized by the revised contract.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects on which part of the annual contribution was withheld because of the difference between the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized by the "original" contract and the amount authorized by the revised contract

	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1949
Baltimore, Md.	$627.00	(1)
Detroit, Mich.	15,304.39	$16,451.26
Norwalk, Conn.	383.52	
Atlanta, Ga.	40,898.29	102,192.44
Annapolis, Md.	2,023.53	2,332.76
Beverly, N. J.	414.76	
Jackson, Tenn.	1,028.80	
Nashville, Tenn.	2,273.00	
Key West, Fla.	1,601.00	
Los Angeles, Calif.	4,655.00	4,877.49
New York, N. Y.	24,412.09	24,523.90 2,999.54
Omaha, Nebr.	6,451.49	6,119.00
Springfield, Ill.	725.50	
Trenton, N. J.	842.80	
Frederick, Md.	1,434.97	
McKeesport, Pa.	1,792.21	
Denver, Colo.		3,188.38
Total	104,868.35	162,684.77

[1] Where no amount is shown for fiscal 1949, it is due to the fact that the audit for that year has not yet been made. It is believed that when the audit is made the amount involved will be small, not more than $10,000 in addition to the total of $162,684.77.

Projects on which voluntary payments in lieu of taxes were made before the Appropriation Act of 1948 became effective

Augusta, Ga.	$6,771.03
Fall River, Mass.	12,633.20
Laurel, Miss.	6,086.62
McComb, Miss.	3,242.40
Total	28,733.25

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this statement shows that the low-rent public-housing projects which were actually affected, and therefore will be benefited, now that this amendment has been approved, are to be found in the States of Maryland, Michigan, Connecticut, Georgia, New Jersey, Tennessee, Florida, California, New York, Nebraska, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Colorado.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] with respect to the repealer of the so-called Straus-Boke rider, I think I ought to make the statement that it should not be assumed from what was said that the issue has been decided. It was not decided in the committee, rather because of a matter of convenience. The decision was postponed. In the course of the consideration of this bill, when we come to that amendment, I wish to make my position clear.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, the first two lines under the heading "Housing Expediter—Salaries and expenses," on page 11, remain in the bill, with a period after "$4,800,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 12 to insert:

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission established by the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 880), including personal services in the District of Columbia, travel expenses, printing and binding, and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $50,000: *Provided*, That section 6 of the aforesaid act of July 2, 1948, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "nine months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "fifteen months," and section 13 of said act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "nine months' period" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "fifteen months' period."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

VESSEL OPERATING FUNCTIONS

Not to exceed $4,568,000 of the unobligated balance on March 1, 1949, of the funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, shall remain available until June 30, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Assets Administration—Salaries and expenses, special fund," on page 13, line 20, after the words "special fund," to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$13,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 19, to insert:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission; $100,000, to be derived from the war-claims fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948): *Provided*, That the date fixed by section 8 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 for submission of the report required by said section is changed from "March 31, 1949," to "December 31, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 9, to insert:

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

For payment of claims, as authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948, from funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the war-claims fund created by section 13 (a) of said act, such sums as may be necessary, to be available to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of claims under sections 4 (a), 4 (b) (2), 5 (e), 6 (b), and 7 of said act to the payees named and in the amounts stated in certifications by the War Claims Commission and the Federal Security Administrator or their duly authorized representatives, which certifications shall be in lieu of any vouchers which might otherwise be required: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for administrative expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Administration—Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases," on page 16, line 14, after the word "diseases", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,350,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senate and House Appropriation Committees covering expenditures from the fiscal year 1949 appropriations for this purpose."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 16, line 24, after the word "the" to strike out "Agriculutral" and insert "Agricultural."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 9, to insert:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

LOANS TO FARMERS, PROPERTY DAMAGE

The funds appropriated under the head "Loans to farmers, 1948 flood damage," in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, shall remain available until June 30, 1950, in accordance with the terms and conditions specified under said head, to provide assistance to farmers whose property is destroyed or damaged as a result of floods, storms, or other natural calamity during the calendar years 1948 and 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Coast and Geodetic Survey—Salaries and expenses, field," on page 19, line 9, after the word "field", to strike out "$290,000" and insert "$366,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bonneville Power Administration—Construction, operation, and maintenance," on page 20, line 5, after the figures "$3,521,600", to strike out "and the limitations under said head on force-account activities and on salaries and expenses in connection with informational work are hereby repealed" and insert "and the limitation under said head on force-account activities is hereby amended to read as follows: ': *Provided further*, That not exceeding 10 percent of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for wages for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator.' "

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to offer a clarifying amendment to that section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this same amendment applies on pages 23 and 24, I ask unanimous consent that we may consider all three of those committee amendments together, because they all deal with the question of force account.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then I ask that all three amendments be reported together. All of them use the same language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, in lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to strike out "for wages."

On page 23, in line 23, and continuing to line 1 on page 24, it is proposed to strike out "for wages."

On page 24, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out "for wages."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the effect of the amendments is as follows: We intended to raise the authorization for force account from 8 percent to 10 percent. But when the language "for wages for construction" was used, in effect we raised it to 20 percent, because wages would be only one-half of the construction cost.

So by striking out the words "for wages," and leaving it "10 per centum * * * for construction," it will be 10 percent for the over-all job. Undoubtedly that was the intention of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment, in line 12 on page 20; and to the committee amendment in line 23, on page 23; and in line 1, on page 24; and also in line 3 on page 24.

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, beginning in line 5, on page 20.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Navajo and Hopi Service—Agency services," on page 20, line 25, after the word "services" to strike out "$360,000" and insert "$1,310,000," and in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That after the approval of this act no payment shall be made from this appropriation to Indians who are eligible for benefit payments under the Social Security Act.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That a detailed report shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior to the Senate and House Appropriation Committees covering expenditures from the fiscal year 1949 appropriations for the education of the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in line 7 of the committee amendment, after the word "Indians" the following amendments:

EDUCATION OF INDIANS

For an additional amount for "Education of Indians," $50,000.

Also, in line 10, to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$75,000."

And also, in line 13, to strike out "$535,000" and insert "$560,000."

I offer those amendments to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 21, after line 7 it is proposed to insert:

EDUCATION OF INDIANS

For an additional amount for "Education of Indians," $50,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe such an amendment is not strictly in order at this time; but I ask unanimous consent that it be considered and adopted. We should permit it, and I am sure the committee would unanimously agree to permit the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment, following line 7, on page 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 7, to insert:

CONSERVATION OF HEALTH

For an additional amount for "Conservation of health," $50,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the committee amendment on page 21, in line 10, I offer an amendment to strike out $50,000" and insert "$75,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment on page 21, in line 10.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Welfare of Indians," on page 21, line 13, after the word "Indians", to strike out "$385,000" and insert "$535,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That after the approval of this act no payment shall be made from this appropriation to Indians who are eligible for benefit payments under the the Social Security Act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 21, in line 13, to strike out "$535,000" and insert "$560,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment in line 13.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say in explanation that those amendments are for the benefit of the North Dakota Indians at Turtle Lake and Fort Totten Reservations, who are very destitute, and have been supported by the neighboring towns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 16, to insert:

ALASKA NATIVE SERVICE

Vessel conversion

For expenses necessary in converting and outfitting a vessel for use as a service and supply ship by the Alaska Native Service, $700,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 22, to insert:

PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

For payment to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians in fulfilment of the terms of a contract between the United States of America and the said nations as authorized by the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483), and as ratified by the act of June 24, 1948 (Public Law 754), $8,359,000, of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be available until expended for defraying the expenses, including printing and binding, of making the per capita payment authorized by the above acts: *Provided*, That in addition to the per capita payment, the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to distribute per capita to the enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, entitled under existing law to share in the funds of such tribes, or to their lawful heirs or devisees determined in the manner prescribed in section 4 of the aforesaid act of June 24, 1948, any or all the funds held by the Government of the United States for the benefit of said tribes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 15, to insert:

INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Pursuant to Public Law 852, Eightieth Congress, second session, approved June 30, 1948, the sum of $25,000 is hereby made available out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, to remain available until expended, to be used to defray the expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in revising the roll as provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation—Force-account work," on page 23, after line 2, to strike out:

That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads "not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive" is hereby repealed.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 which reads: "Not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under

the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive." is hereby repealed and in lieu thereof the following provision is hereby inserted: "Not exceeding 10 percent of the construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation for any project contained in this act shall be available for wages for construction work by force account and on a hired-labor basis; except that not to exceed $500,000 may on approval of the Commissioner be expended for wages for construction work by force account on any one project when the work is unsuitable for contract or where excessive bids are received; and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General fund—Construction," on page 24, line 12, after "Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada," to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after "Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado", to strike out "$1,800,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 16, after "Columbia Basin project, Washington", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin", on page 24, line 21, after "(58 Stat. 887)", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reclamation fund—General offices, salaries and expenses (other than project offices)", on page 25, line 6, after the figures "$260,000", to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, there shall be available for expenditure under said head any sums transferred thereto for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings for which other funds or appropriations of the Bureau of Reclamation are available; and the first, fourth, and fifth provisos under said head are hereby repealed.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Provided, That the limitation of $7,800,000 contained in the first proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, is hereby increased to $8,410,000: *Provided further,* That the limitation of $48,000,000 contained in the fourth proviso under this head in said act is hereby increased to $53,376,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 20, to strike out:

Effective January 31, 1949, the proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads: *"Provided further,* That after January 31, 1949, no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation—" is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 26, line 13, after "Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 14, after "Provo River project, Utah", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment," on page 27, after line 9, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—MILITARY FUNCTIONS, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

The sum of $2,000,000 of the appropriation "Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense, fiscal years 1942–46," shall remain available until June 30, 1949, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed thereunder prior to July 1, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 25, in line 21, the committee amendment is the controversial Straus-Boke amendment to which I desire to address myself briefly in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear.

As I said a few moments ago, there was no decision of this issue in the full Appropriations Committee. The Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee which considered the matter, did act; it recommended that the repealer contained in the House bill be stricken from the bill.

Mr. President, in order to understand what this is all about, one should read the rider contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill of last year. The following language is to be found on page 25, beginning in line 23:

Provided further, That after January 31, 1949, no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation.

It will be observed that the effect of that language applies only to the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. It will further be observed from that language that it provides only that no appropriation contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949 shall be used to pay the salaries of certain officials who are not engineers. Obviously, the provision does not have any effect whatsoever after June 30, 1949. If it be argued that the purpose of the amendment was to change the qualifications of the position or office of Commissioner of Reclamation, it is plain that it is ineffective to do so. It merely provides that the person who was the incumbent Commissioner at the time when this rider was passed should not be permitted to draw a salary out of an appropriation contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act. It does no more; it does no less.

When that legislative rider undertaking to prohibit the use of these appropriations for the payment of salaries to the individuals in such positions who were not engineers was reported by the Appropriations Committee last year, minority views were filed by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wyoming, in which it was pointed out that the purpose of the rider was expressly to remove certain individuals from office. The minority views quoted the statement of former Representative Harness in which he said the object of the rider was to remove from office two officials, Commissioner Michael Straus and Regional Director Boke. The minority views did not prevail. The bill passed with this rider, except that instead of becoming effective immediately upon the enactment of the appropriation bill, as provided in the measure when it came from the House, the rider as finally adopted did not become effective until January 31, 1949.

Mr. President, when the President of the United States this year submitted his recommendation for the next fiscal year, he sent to the Congress a specific recommendation that the rider be repealed. The President, on January 6, 1949, addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in which he urged the repeal of this restrictive provision. I ask that the full text of the letter, with the accompanying enclosure, be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter, with the accompanying enclosure, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 6, 1949.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a repeal of a proviso contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 which is referred to in the attached letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I have previously indicated my opposition to this proviso which has the effect of legislating out of office the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and one of his principal assistants. This arbitrary action is diametrically opposed to the principles on which this Government is founded. Furthermore, these positions are primarily administrative in character and do not necessarily require a professional engineering background.

I strongly urge the repeal of this restrictive provision.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Estimate No. 3, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration a provision of language repealing a proviso in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 which would legislate out of office the Commissioner of Reclamation and one of the regional directors, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
General offices

Salaries and expenses (other than project offices)

The proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads: "*Provided further*, That after January 31, 1949, no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation"—is hereby repealed.

I recommend the transmission of this proposed provision to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. WEBB,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I placed the letter in the RECORD to make it clear that the President of the United States has asked for the repeal of this rider. The subcommittee on the deficiency bill held extensive hearings, went into the matter at great length, and reported to the full committee language striking out the repealer. Then, when that came for discussion before the full committee, I think several days at one time or another were devoted in part to the discussion. Finally, after much delay, members of the committee, feeling the necessity of having the bill acted upon on the floor, when one of the members of the committee raised an issue with respect to the loyalty investigation of these individuals under the Loyalty Act a subcommittee was appointed, and it was agreed that the matter should be postponed for decision. One member of the committee suggested that the second deficiency bill would be coming from the House presently, and that the matter could be decided at that time. So in order to save the time of the committee and of the Senate, because a subcommittee had been selected to confer with the Attorney General with respect to the loyalty investigations of the FBI, the bill was reported, but no action was taken upon the issue as an issue. The controversy was postponed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the status of Commissioner Straus at the present moment, relative to his service as Commissioner, and also with respect to the payment of his salary?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As the situation exists now, he is not receiving a salary.

Mr. WHERRY. Is he still serving as Commissioner of Reclamation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He is still there, so far as I know. I have not asked.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wondered, because I was very instrumental in helping to get the legislation passed last year, postponing the effective date to January 31.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Nebraska was very instrumental in so doing.

Mr. WHERRY. I wondered what the status was at the present time, and during the interval when apparently the issue has not been decided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Obviously no money is being used from the Interior Department appropriation bill to pay the salary of any person mentioned in the rider, and I am sure no money is being used from any other source for that purpose. My only purpose in rising, Mr. President, is to say that this is a very unusual situation. Because there were other bills coming over from the House and because of the desire of Members of the Senate to have the appropriation bill taken up, the controversy was, as I say, postponed. It is my own conviction that if we had had the time, the subcommittee's amendment would have been rejected by the full committee. Of course I have no way of proving that. That was my own judgment as to the way the votes stood in the committee. But I certainly want the RECORD to make it clear with respect to those of us who believe that this was an improper legislative rider upon an appropriation bill and that it should be repealed because it invades the executive functions of the President of the United States by seeking to remove individuals from office. From our point of view the issue is not yet settled.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to hear the Senator say the issue is not settled. What I say has nothing to do with personalities, but it does have something to do with the principle laid down by the President in his letter. It seems to me that if the Appropriations Committee assumes authority to do what it has done in this case, with respect to the qualifications of a man in an executive department, then they are certainly usurping the power that rightfully belongs to the executive department. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming will agree with me about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say that of course the Congress does have the right at any time to change the qualifications for any position in the executive department, the qualifications of which are not fixed by the Constitution. If they are fixed by statute, they can be changed, and, of course, they can be changed by a rider to an appropriation bill, when the rider is properly adopted. But in this case I point out that this is a perfectly futile attempt to change the qualifications, because it has no effect except between the period from January 31, 1949, to June 30, 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator will agree with me that the Congress has power to prescribe any qualifications, other than those prescribed by the Constitution, they desire for a person who is serving in the executive branch of the Government. But what the Senator from Illinois is objecting to is the Appropriations Committee using a rider of this kind to disqualify an individual without some committee of the Senate, other than the Appropriations Committee, peculiarly fitted or qualified to investigate and consider the question being permitted an opportunity to do so. That is the point I am making now, and I think what the President said in his message to the Congress is fundamental. I think the Congress itself ought to be jealous of the different prerogatives we have, and attempt the best we can to restrain the Appropriations Committee from doing what has been in this bill, or from doing again what they did last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In response to the Senator, I think it is appropriate for me to read a paragraph from the statement which was issued by former Representative Forest A. Harness, immediately before the Interior Department bill was handled in the House a year ago. In the statement he said:

> Legislation which would have the effect of removing Reclamation Commissioner Michael Strauss and Richard Boke, director of the Bureau's region 2, California, from their present positions, was recommended today by Chairman Forest A. Harness (Republican, Indiana), of the House subcommittee on publicity and propaganda.

He then sets forth this amendment or rider, which was designed to remove, as he said, certain officials. This is what prompted the President, no doubt, in signing the appropriation bill last year, to issue this statement:

> Yesterday—
>
> Said the President—
>
> I signed the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1949. I did so only because I had no choice. Since the bill came to me after the Congress had adjourned, a veto would close down the operations of the Department of the Interior on July 1.
>
> If it had been possible to veto this bill without bringing the vital work of the Department to a standstill, I would have done so because of a rider in the bill establishing arbitrary qualifications for the Commissioner, the assistant commissioners, and the regional directors of the Bureau of Reclamation. This rider is designed to effect the removal of two men now holding such positions who have supported the public-power policy of the Government and the 160-acre law which assures that western lands reclaimed at public expense shall be used for the development of family-sized farms. No matter what may be the asserted reasons for wanting to remove these men from office, the result would be to serve the purposes of special interests desirous of monopolizing the rich farm lands of the West and intent upon stopping the construction of transmission lines for the delivery of power from

Federal dams. These same interests tried first to get the law changed, but failed, and having failed, then sought to get the management changed.

So, Mr. President, the President made clear when he signed the bill last year and when he sent his message to the Speaker of the House, that the record of this legislation is an invasion of the Executive power of removal.

Let me add one word more. I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and recited to that committee that, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I stood ready at all times to go into the matter of qualifications thoroughly and completely. Since that time my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has submitted a resolution calling for an investigation of the Bureau of Reclamation. I have said to the Senator from California, privately, and I now say to him publicly, that it will be the purpose of the chairman of the committee to conduct that investigation. The committee has not only the power, but I think it has the duty to do so. I make this statement, Mr. President, only in order that it may be clear that because I did not ask for a vote on the question, I am not indicating that, in my opinion or in the opinion of many Members of the Appropriations Committee, the issue is settled.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield ?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, is the Senator willing to announce publicly in the Senate that the investigation which I have demanded of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be commenced within a period of 30 days, and thereafter vigorously prosecuted by his committee until its completion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my best answer to the Senator from California is this: There are before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs two matters of the utmost importance in which the people of California and the Senators from that State are deeply interested. One is the controversy over the waters of the Colorado River; the other is the legislation with respect to tidelands.

I shall not undertake at this time, and on the floor, to give a categorical reply with reference to a time within which this matter will be taken up, but I assure the Senator from California that if I can ever get my head above the waters of the Colorado River without having it submerged in the tidelands, we shall go ahead with the investigation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that whenever any committee, including that of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, is willing to listen to undeniable testimony supported conclusively by documentary proof, I am prepared to show that every day the inefficiency and dishonesty of the Bureau of Reclamation is continued in the West, tens of thousands of dollars are being lost. I am prepared to show by undeniable proof, on my word as a Senator, that there exists now a conspiracy in the Bureau of Reclamation to promote unneeded and extravagant projects, and that if they are successful—and they may be successful within the next 60 days—the Federal Government, the farmers of California, and others will pay an unnecessary bill of at least $100,000,000.

So, Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that his happy statement to me that whenever he can get free of the waters of the Colorado River and of the tidelands, he will undertake to consider this question, does not satisfy me. I have already presented to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee conclusive proof of the waste and maladministration under these nonengineering employees of the Government. I am prepared, whenever any committee is prepared to listen, to present an abundance of testimony of that kind—testimony so shocking and so incredible that it should result in the removal of these guilty men overnight.

Mr. President, the condition is so serious that it cannot be exaggerated. The loss runs into such huge sums that I say any appropriations committee charged with the duty of safeguarding the funds of the taxpayers, seeing maladministration by men lacking all essential qualifications of engineers, which did not say, "To the best of our power, we will prevent the waste of funds of the Government by changing this maladministration to one of high engineering ethics," would be derelict in its duty.

Certainly, Mr. President, the primary duty to appoint or to supersede these men rests with the Executive. But the primary duty of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and of the members of that committee, is to safeguard the funds of the public; and whenever convincing and conclusive evidence is presented to them of a wild and incredible mismanagement and waste, then I say, contrary to what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said, the members of that committee would be derelict if they had not done what they have done here, namely, to delete the House provision.

The distinguished Senator says this controversy has not been settled, but is merely postponed. Let me say to him that it has been postponed in a way that is entirely satisfactory to me, and whenever it is desired by any Senator to renew the controversy, we shall be present with an abundance of evidence to corroborate our position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate long on this point, and I had not intended to speak today, and would not do so except for the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. However, I do not believe that the RECORD should be allowed to stand as it is without having some clarification. I have the highest regard and respect for the Senator from Wyoming.

I had the privilege of serving during the Eightieth Congress as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that the issue now being discussed has nothing whatever to do with the question of the transmission of power. Both my colleagues, the senior Senator from California, who sits on the other side of the aisle, and the junior Senator from California, are in favor of and have been consistently in favor of the building of transmission lines from Shasta Dam to the load centers, which have been a part of the Central Valley project from its inception. So the question of the transmission of power has nothing at all to do with the issue under consideration.

I wish to say that one of the fundamental responsibilities of a Senate committee or a House committee, and particularly of the Appropriations Committee of this body is to get information from the executive branch of the Government so that it can properly study appropriation bills, and can report to the Members of the Senate what the facts happen to be. Unless the Committee on Appropriations is able to get such information, the members cannot discharge their responsibility to themselves or to the Senate.

It so happened that I was serving as acting chairman of the subcommittee at the time Mr. Straus testified 2 years ago, and I asked him some questions when the committee had under discussion the Central Valley project. In answer to an inquiry which I propounded, the Commissioner of Reclamation stated that the carry-over funds in the Central Valley project would amount to $10,000,000. I pressed him considerably on that point, because there was some doubt in the minds of the committee as to just what the carry-over fund would be. Time and time again Mr. Straus testified that the amount of the carry-over would be $10,000,000.

Mr. President, that session of the Congress went by. The Congress made appropriations based on the information it had before it. A year later we discovered that a month before the Commissioner of Reclamation had testified before our committee that the carry-over fund would amount to $10,000,000, he had received by teletype from his agents in the field in the State of California information that in fact the carry-over was some $25,000,000, or more than double the amount he had stated.

Mr. President, this is a very serious matter. It has nothing whatever to do with partisanship. It has nothing whatever to do with transmission lines.

The able Senator from Illinois has stated that there was a matter of principle involved. The matter of principle that is involved is whether or not representatives of the executive branch of the Government of the United States are to come before a Senate committee, the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of this body, and give testimony before the committee that is willfully and deliberately false. If the Senate or the Congress tolerates in one iota representatives of the executive branch coming before a committee and giving willfully false and untrue testimony, no matter what party is in control of the executive branch of the Government, no matter what party is in control of the Congress, I say that it tends to

undermine the legislative processes of the Government, and makes it completely impossible for the Congress to discharge its obligation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact, however, that so far as concerns the issue the Senator from California is discussing, and the issue the Senator from Wyoming and the senior Senator from California have discussed, that issue is not involved in the pending matter? Is it not a fact that the Committee on Appropriations left the matter in the same situation in which the Eightieth Congress left it a year ago?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct, but as I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks, which are now almost concluded, I had not intended to speak on this subject, and would not have done so save for the fact that the Senator from Wyoming made a statement which I did not think completely covered the reasons which required the Congress in the last session to make the change, and I felt that the RECORD should be corrected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Undoubtedly the Senator is making a record, but the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in order to save this body at this time going over the details it went over for 3 or 4 weeks, and in order to pass a deficiency bill which is absolutely necessary, avoided the controversy which the three Senators have been discussing. So why can we not pass the deficiency appropriation bill, and discuss at some other time the issue whether Boke and Straus should continue to serve the Government?

Mr. KNOWLAND. With all due respect for the Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have the highest regard, I have not taken more than 5 minutes of the time of the Senate, which I have used in order to make clear what I think needs to be clarified to the Senate. A number of letters have been written to various Members of the Senate. For the information of those who have not sat through the Appropriations Committee hearings, those who did not realize that here was involved an issue in which the very ability of a committee of the Congress properly to function was involved, I felt that it was worth a few minutes of the time of the Senate to clear the matter up.

I merely wish to say, in conclusion, Mr. President, that I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has taken the stand it has assumed. If and when the issues shall come before the Senate, I expect to have something further to say on the matter, and to cite the page, the verse, and the book to show that there was a deliberate and willful attempt to deprive a committee of the Senate of information to which it was lawfully and properly entitled.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished Senator from Wyoming as to what the status of Commissioner Straus was at this time, in view of the amendment that became effective on January 31, 1949, and which is now in effect, and the answer was, of course, that the Commissioner was not drawing any salary.

I should like to ask a further question, if I may, and I ask it because I have been asked the question myself. Does the senior Senator from Wyoming feel that the Commissioner should remain in full charge, and perform the functions of the office of Commissioner, even though he has not been paid?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my opinion upon that matter is of no effect at all.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not looked into the law. I have been given to understand that the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior takes the position that the provision which cuts off the salary of the Commissioner does not cut off his duties. That probably would have to be decided by higher authority than the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his observation. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate today, but I am in a state of total confusion as to what the result is to be on this amendment. I wish to state, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that when I joined in reaching what I thought at the time was a solution of the difficulty, and helped adopt the provision in the Eightieth Congress, I thought that by January 31, 1949, the issue would be determined. But the controversy has continued, and here is an official who is not drawing any salary, but apparently is assuming the full responsibility and authority of the office.

It seems to me the issue will not be settled if the provision contained in the pending bill is repealed. In order to accomplish the objective which some Senators apparently thought was accomplished, that is, to provide by law that only a qualified engineer shall occupy the place in question, there ought to be some limit to the time the Commissioner who is not qualified under the language of the rider placed on the appropriation bill could serve.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are a few committee amendments which have not been acted upon. I ask the Senate to act on them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rivers and harbors—Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works", on page 28, line 5, after the word "works", to strike out "$10,500,000" and insert "$10,509,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control—Flood control, general (emergency fund)", on page 28, before the words "to remain" to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$20,000,000", and in line 16, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be made available under the provisions of and for the purposes enumerated in section 205 of the above act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 11, to insert:

TITLE II—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Nos. 15 and 24, Eighty-first Congress, $22,700,571.07, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further,* That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 8, to insert a new heading, as follows: "Title III—General provisions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 10, to change the section number from "2" to "301."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The provision in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which places a limit on the price which may be paid for such typewriters as may be purchased under the act shall not apply to the purchase of office type machines which are designed and constructed primarily to compose and print master copies for quantity reproduction by another process.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 1, to change the section number from "4" to "302."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 302. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available from and including March 1, 1949, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between March 1, 1949, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain data giving justification for the amendment, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the data referred to will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1949.

(Memorandum for Mr. Everard H. Smith, Senate Committee on Appropriations)

We have reviewed the items in the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1949, with regard to those appropriations which are out of funds or will be out by April 15, 1949, for obligation purposes. As some of these appropriations were exhausted as far back as March 1, 1949, it is felt desirable to redraft your proposed section 3 to cover this by using March 1 instead of April 1.

Attached is the suggested redraft of section 3 and a list of the appropriations which will be out of funds by April 15, 1949.

F. J. LAWTON,
Assistant Director.

SEC. 302. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available from and including March 1, 1949, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between March 1, 1949, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

APPROPRIATIONS HAVING SUPPLEMENTAL AMOUNTS IN PENDING FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL WHICH WILL BE OUT OF FUNDS FOR OBLIGATION PURPOSES BEFORE APRIL 15, 1949

The Judiciary: Fees of jurors: April 14.
Office for Emergency Management: Office of Defense Transportation: Salaries and expenses: March 1.
Federal Security Agency:
- Employees' compensation fund: April 1.
- Grants to States for public assistance: April 1.

Housing Expediter: Salaries and expenses: March 15.
United States Maritime Commission: Vessel operating functions: March 1.
Veterans' Administration:
- National service life insurance: January 1.
- Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: January 1.
- Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: March 10.

War Assets Administration: Salaries and expenses: April.
Department of Agriculture: Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses: April 4.
Department of Commerce: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Export control: April 1.
Department of the Interior:
- Bureau of Indian Affairs: Welfare of Indians: February 24.
- Bureau of Reclamation: General fund, construction: Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada: March 1.

Post Office Department:
- Railroad transportation and mail messenger service: March 15.
- Railway mail service, travel allowance: March 8.
- Foreign air-mail service: February 28.
- Vehicle service: March 19.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1949.

(Memorandum for Mr. Everard Smith, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate)

Supplementing my memorandum of April 1 concerning the dates on which certain agencies in the first deficiency bill would run out of funds for obligating purposes, I would like to call your attention to the following cases in which the agencies will run out of cash to make payments:

Veterans' Administration—Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: Out of cash at the present time.

Judiciary—Fees of jurors: Will be out of cash April 14.

Housing Expediter—Salaries and expenses: Will meet April 13 pay roll by deferring payments of all other bills and will be out of cash thereafter. Next pay roll date April 27.

War Assets Administration—Salaries and expenses: Will meet April 13 pay roll by deferring payment of all other bills and will be out of cash thereafter. Next pay roll date April 27.

Federal Housing Administrator—Administrative expenses: Will meet April 13 pay roll by deferring payments of all other bills and will be out of cash thereafter. Next pay roll date April 27.

Commerce—Export control: Can meet April 18 pay roll by deferring payment of all other bills but will have no cash thereafter. Next pay roll date May 2.

Interior—Welfare of Indians: Out of cash now.

General Fund Construction—Davis Dam: Out of cash now.

I mention these because of the fact that the proposed recess of the House might prevent completion of consideration of this bill until after April 25. Several of the agencies are worried as to whether they should continue to obligate against the amounts in the bill by keeping people on the pay roll when they will have no cash to meet these pay rolls until the bill is passed.

F. J. LAWTON,
Assistant Director.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 33, line 1, to strike out the numeral "4" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "302" be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment to the committee amendment in line 1 on page 33, to strike out "302" and insert in lieu thereof "303."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerks will be authorized to make such corrections of section numbers throughout the bill as may be necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

The basic salary of the research assistant to the minority leader authorized by Senate Resolution No. 158, agreed to December 9, 1941, hereby is increased from $6,000 to $7,320 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

CONSTRUCTION, ETC., BUILDINGS AND UTILITIES

For an additional amount under this heading for the conversion of the Bushnell Army Hospital, Brigham City, Utah, for school purposes, $3,750,000, and the limitation, under "Construction, etc., buildings and utilities" in the Department of Interior Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount which may be used for surveys and plans and administrative expenses, etc., is increased from $190,000 to $227,500.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the committee has not passed on the amendment, but so far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, it seems to me the amendment might well be adopted in the interest of the Indians. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I appreciate the very fine statement made by the chairman, but for the purpose of the record I should like to make a brief explanation of why the amendment is offered, particularly at this time.

As many Senators know, and many probably do not know, some 61,000 Navajo Indians are living on the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah. We made a treaty with these Indians about 80 years ago in which we agreed to provide educational facilities for them. As I remember the words of the treaty we were to provide one school room and a teacher for each 30 pupils. There are now on that reservation some 16,000 children of school age who are not in school. Such a situation has existed for years, because the United States has not provided the facilities for these Indians.

They are quite a problem now in the matter of welfare. Many of them are not in condition to work at white occupations. We find, as a matter of fact, that the reservation resources will not sustain more than 30,000 of these Indians, although there are now about 61,000 Indians on the reservation. It is going to be necessary, and it is now gen-

erally recognized as being necessary, to move from thirty to thirty-one thousand of these Indians elsewhere in the United States so they can make a living and become self-sustaining citizens of the United States.

We are under the obligation of educating these Indians. Sixteen thousand of them, as I have just pointed out, are not in school. We had a program submitted to us by the Department of the Interior and by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, calling for educational facilities and for a welfare program for these Indians, amounting to $90,000,000. Personally I look with much favor upon that program. Certainly in order to keep our pledged word, if not for the sake of humanity, we should do something for the relief of these Indians.

In Utah the United States constructed during the war the Bushnell Military Hospital. It is of permanent construction, brick, steel, and concrete. It cost more than $10,000,000. The hospital buildings are readily convertible into dormitories for Indians. We have found that at least 80 percent of the Indians do not understand English, do not speak it, and for that reason cannot take occupations and work in white communities. There are in the Bushnell Military Hospital some 80 buildings of brick, steel, and concrete. It is almost a complete city in itself. It has been abandoned for several years by the Army and turned over to the War Assets Administration. The War Assets Administration has tried, without success, to sell the plant. It has not received any offers at all except from one man who is willing to take the plant, pay a dollar for it, and operate it as a private school for underprivileged children. He was going to have a military school there. His situation was investigated and it was found he did not have sufficient resources to carry on. Had his offer been accepted we would not only have been required to give him the buildings and the plant, and some 800 acres of very fine ground, but we would have been required also to equip the plant for him, and then it is doubtful if he could have succeeded. He was the only one who came forward with any kind of offer to use these buildings. It costs us $30,000 a year to maintain the buildings with guards and fire protection.

The War Assets Administrator, Colonel Larson, came before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and testified that the proposal to turn the Bushnell Military Hospital over to the Department of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in educating these children in a boarding school was a very fine proposal and he favored it. The Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Zimmerman, and Dr. Beatty, Director of the Division of Education of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, also testified that this plant could be converted so that 2,000 Indian youngsters could be housed there in a boarding school where they could be trained in vocational education and in English so they could work among white people and maintain themselves.

It is only about a day's trip by bus from the Indian reservation to Brigham City, which is in the heart of industrial and agricultural Utah. There will be ample opportunities for these Indians to work when they are once trained, when they are once taught the English language. We have the need. The buildings are ready to be used. By the way, Public Law 20 was passed by the present Congress authorizing the transfer from the War Assets Administration to the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior of these buildings, to take effect upon the appropriation being made, so the Bureau of Indian Affairs could go to work.

The Indian Bureau now plans to make full use of this plant. Two thousand Indians not in school can be taken there—probably those 12 years of age and older, those who are old enough to learn vocations and trades—just as soon as the plant is ready.

The reason why this program could not be fully considered by the committee either in the House or the Senate was that the law was not passed in sufficient time to get the information before the necessary committees. I have discussed the subject with the Bureau of the Budget and with the Indian Bureau, and they are in hearty accord with what I am now doing, that is, bringing the question to the attention of the Senate and having the project included in the pending bill as an amendment, so that beginning next fall this plant can be placed in operation, probably on a limited scale, for the education of Indian children. Probably by January 1, if we start immediately with the construction of the necessary classrooms to go along with the dormitories, the full 2,000 Indian students can be housed there and go to work. Delay until July 1 would probably bring construction into the winter. I think Members of the Senate know that in that climate construction is almost impossible in the winter. In any event, it would be very costly. So we shall save the $38,000 a year which we are spending for guards, and put Indian children in school where they belong, and where we have agreed to put them. The country will be better served by having this done now.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How many Indians will be taken care of at this particular place?

Mr. WATKINS. Two thousand from the Navajo Reservation, and some from other reservations can come in as the need develops.

Mr. LANGER. What is being done about the remainder of the Indians who are not going to school?

Mr. WATKINS. Fourteen thousand Navajo children not now in school, and whom we are obligated to place in school, will have to be provided for by some other means. I shall come back here and, in company with other Members of this body, present measures and ask for appropriations to carry out our pledge to those Navajo Indian children. After this project is taken care of, the remainder of the 16,000 children will be placed in school.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that now is as good a time as any to take care of the remainder of those children? Why wait until we come back again?

Mr. WATKINS. I think it would be impossible in a deficiency appropriation, and in cooperation with the Indian Bureau, to get the necessary plans ready so that the appropriation could be placed in this bill.

The principal reason for placing this particular amendment in the bill is to save a year in the lives of these students and put them in school now, rather than come along with an appropriation in July and have the construction drag through the winter. The President has approved the plan. The Indian Bureau recommended it, and the Budget Bureau cleared it. We intend to follow through with this plan, and now is the time to do it. If this bill is passed tonight and becomes a law within a few days, money will immediately become available.

Furthermore, it is necessary to get equipment for the school. The Indian Bureau has been notified that at Hanford, Wash., there are available many articles which will be needed in the Indian school, such as cooking utensils, stoves, bedding and beds, and other types of equipment now on sale at the atomic energy plant there. Some money is needed immediately in order to enable the Indian Bureau to buy these articles. Under the law, they must have cash. That is why the latter part of the amendment authorizes an increase in administration expenses at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Just when does the Senator intend to offer an amendment or introduce a bill to take care of the remainder of the Indian children who should be in school?

Mr. WATKINS. I intend to work with the Indian Bureau and the Department of the Interior. As the Senator knows, I was chairman of the Indian subcommittee for the past 2 years. We have been trying to devise a program to take care of the needs. I hope the department will have its plans ready. If we proceed as we intend to proceed, I think there will be a measure before the Congress in the near future to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest to the Senator that the second deficiency appropriation bill will be before us in 2 weeks. Does not the Senator believe that he could have an amendment ready by that time to take care of the remainder of those children who long ago should have been in school? Thousands of them cannot even speak English.

Mr. WATKINS. I so understand.

I am especially concerned when I consider the ease with which we approved an authorization bill for $16,000,000 for the Arabs over in Palestine, who are not particularly and directly our concern. That measure went through promptly.

I am sure that the Congress, realizing its responsibility, will take care of those Indians.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a report submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on Senate bill 170. It gives the details and the information which would have been given to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the report (No. 30) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, having considered the bill (S. 170) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, report favorably thereon, with an amendment, and recommended that it do pass.

This legislation authorizes the Administrator of the War Assets Administration to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians for off-reservation employment and placement, the property known as the Bushnell General Hospital near Brigham City, Box Elder County, Utah, comprising 298.5 acres, more or less, together with roads, buildings, and other betterments thereon.

The Bushnell General Hospital was constructed by the Army in 1942 and 1943 as a 3,700-bed general and psychiatric hospital consisting of 188 permanent buildings, of which 108 were of wood-frame construction and 95 buildings of brick. The acquisition and improvement cost was $9,822,915.99.

The hospital was declared surplus to the needs of the Army on August 21, 1946, after being rejected by the Veterans' Administration because of the lack of medical personnel in the immediate vicinity and the difficulty in staffing and maintaining the facility.

After advertising the property for sale or lease as a unit, during 1947, with no satisfactory bids, the War Assets Administration sold a total of 73 wood-frame buildings for off-site removal. On January 2, 1948, two areas were advertised for disposal as residential and farm land. Further advertisements of sale as separate units during 1948 resulted in the rejection of all bids.

The entire land area and the remaining 115 buildings were readvertised on November 15, 1948, with a fair valuation established at $4,788,560. One offer on the property, for transfer on a public-benefit-allowance basis, was received but disposal was withheld at the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, pending enactment of necessary legislation to authorize its acquisition and operation as a school for Navajo Indians.

Under the treaty between the United States of America and the Navajo Tribe of Indians, proclaimed August 12, 1868, article VI provides in part as follows: "and the United States agrees that, for every 30 children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school, a house shall be provided, and a teacher competent to teach the elementary branches of an English education shall be furnished who will reside among said Indians and faithfully discharge his or her duties as a teacher."

It is estimated that there are about 61,000 Navajo Indians now residing on the Navajo Indian Reservation in Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico, near the hospital site, with some 22,000 children of school age. The sponsors of this legislation maintain that the Government is still under obligation to educate these children, 16,000 of whom are at present not in school.

The hospital property involved in the proposed bill has no value to the Government in its present state, and its maintenance costs average approximately $3,200 per month. It has been estimated that the construction of facilities of comparable size would cost $14,000,000, whereas the present buildings can be converted to use as an Indian school at a cost of approximately $2,000,000 to accommodate 1,400 children, and $3,650,000 to its capacity of 2,000.

The transfer of this property to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for educational purposes and other utilization in behalf of the Indians would serve a useful and much-needed purpose. It would also remove the cost of maintenance and bring the property to an improved permanent status toward easy conversion as a Government hospital in any future emergency.

The Bureau of the Budget reported to the committee that there would be no objection to the passage of this bill. The following letters set forth the views of the Secretary of the Interior and the War Assets Administrator:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 25, 1949.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Reference is made to your request for a report on S. 170, a bill for the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

If amended as set out below, I recommend that S. 170 be enacted.

It is estimated that there are approximately 23,000 Navajo children of school age. At the present time there are educational facilities on the reservation, public, mission, and Federal schools for about 5,500. Provisions have been made during the last 2 years to transfer another 1,800 to off-reservation Federal schools. There remain, therefore, 15,700 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 18 years for whom no school facilities are available.

Bushnell General Hospital, Brigham City, Box Elder County, Utah, was originally built by the Army as a 3,700-bed general and neuropsychiatric hospital. The plant consists of 108 permanent buildings on a site of about 298 acres, immediately at the edge of the city. The original installation is reported to have cost $10,393,000. The buildings are in good condition, although all of the movable equipment has been removed.

The plant has been examined with a view to its conversion to an Indian vocational school. While not ideal, from school standards, it was found that a majority of the buildings may be converted to profitable use. Two great lacks will be classroom facilities and quarters for resident employees. It will also be necessary to reequip the plant completely.

In the proposed use of the plant two goals are possible. First, a school of about 1,400 pupils, which can be achieved with a minimum of additional construction. Second, a school of 2,000, which can be achieved by the construction of additional classroom facilities and employees' quarters. In either event the per-pupil cost will be well below that necessary to provide new facilities for an equal number of children.

After mature consideration it is my recommendation that plans be made for a school of 2,000 Navajo children at the Bushnell hospital plant, for this will provide for the education of the greatest number of Indians not now in any school for the least expenditure of funds. The necessary remodeling to provide dormitory facilities for 2,000 children is very slight. However, it will be necessary to provide by remodeling or by new construction quarters for approximately 100 married couples as well as more desirable quarters for approximately 90 single employees. It is assumed that about 25 will be housed off campus. The only employees housed on the Bushnell grounds were single nurses and WAC officers who were given one small room each, which is less than is being supplied to Indian Service employees anywhere in the United States. Officers were required to live off campus; many of the maintenance employees were employed from among the local residents who already had homes in Brigham City; and relatively few of the employed personnel were married. For an Indian Service boarding school, it will be necessary for the majority of teachers, dormitory workers, and supervisory personnel to be housed on the campus. It will be possible to make an arrangement very similar to that of the hospital in seeking maintenance employees from among the residents of the community who will have their own homes. Only 2 of the major buildings on the campus are suitable for remodeling into classroom structures and these will provide only 35 classrooms. It will, therefore, be necessary to build 3 additional structures of about 14 classrooms each to provide the necessary adequate space (total, 42 additional rooms). Scattered around the grounds are other structures which will lend themselves to use as home economics rooms and shops. The hospital had a gymnasium and a swimming pool but no large auditorium. With 2,000 students it will be necessary to have an additional gymnasium and an auditorium of between 800 and 1,200 seating capacity. It is estimated that:

The cost of repairs and alterations, will amount to approximately	$950,000
The cost of new construction will amount to approximately	1,867,000
Of new equipment to replace that which has been removed	700,000
Supervision and contingencies	128,000
Subtotal	3,645,000
It is proposed, also, to use the Bushnell grounds and some of the structures as a center for adult Navajos and other Indians for whom off-reservation employment and permanent relocation is being sought. These families will be allowed to live at the site between periods of seasonal employment, and during their residence a program of training in off-reservation manners and customs and in the use of English will be undertaken. The necessary alterations and equipment to provide 36 apartments for this purpose will be	133,000
Total	3,778,000

A careful study shows that the cost of operating the public utilities (heat, light, sewage, etc.) will amount to $280,200 annually for 2,000 children. If the total amount for repairs, alterations, and new construction is provided during the spring of the year and new construction begins as promptly as possible, it should prove possible to enroll an average of 1,200 children at Bushnell during the fiscal year 1950. It is estimated that the cost of operating plant and utilities for this limited number of children will be $252,000 for the full 12 months. At the present time, WAA is maintaining a stand-by staff, the cost of which will have to be assumed by the Indian Service from the time of transfer until children begin to occupy the school, at an approximate monthly cost of $2,750; and the cost of the teaching staff, materials of instruction, food, etc., will amount to $460,000 covering an average of 1,200 children for 7 months. It is believed that when the full enrollment of 2,000 pupils is achieved the operating cost will run around $751 per capita, or

$58 more than the average nonreservation school, due to the greater cost of operating within this Army structure and because about half the children will attend for 12 months.

Practically all of the youngsters who will be placed in this school will be from the Navajo Reservation—a majority will be non-English-speaking when they are received. Many will be more than 12 years old and entering school for the first time. For these older pupils, an intensive shorter educational period must be planned. As a result, the total operating cost will be somewhat greater than for the average boarding school which is not faced with these problems.

In spite of these greater costs, the operation of Bushnell for this purpose will represent a savings to the Government, for it will begin to receive some continuing benefit on the original investment for property which now stands idle.

To clarify the apparent intent of S. 170, which is to transfer this property between agencies of the Federal Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds, it is recommended that the bill be amended by inserting after the word "Interior" in line 5, the phrase "without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

Congressional time schedules will not permit ascertaining in advance the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President. This report, therefore, does not constitute a commitment respecting the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1949.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Reference is made to your letter of January 18, 1949, requesting the views of this Administration with respect to S. 170, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation would authorize and direct the War Assets Administrator to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, for use as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians, the Bushnell General Hospital, near Brigham City, Utah. The hospital covers an area of 298.5 acres, upon which are located 115 buildings, utility lines, and fire-fighting equipment. No personal property is located at the hospital at this time. The total acquisition cost of the property was $9,822,915.99.

The hospital was declared surplus by the War Department on August 21, 1946, after a determination by the Veterans' Administration that it had no interest in the property. Advertising of the property over a 2½-year period has resulted in the sale of some 70 buildings for use off site. No acceptable bids have been received for the remainder of the property.

It is the belief of this Administration that the question of enactment of legislation of this type is one for the determination of the Congress and, accordingly, it has no objection to the enactment of the bill.

Owing to the urgency of your request, this report has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

Cordially yours,

JESS LARSON, *Administrator.*

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this is the first appropriation bill to come before this session of the Senate. It is my personal opinion that the total revenues of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, will be much less than we anticipate at the moment. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, it is anticipated that there will be a deficit of between $600,000,000 and $800,000,000. After we appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, possibly we shall have a deficit, the way business looks at the moment, of anywhere from $5,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000.

I urge that we reduce our expenditures. I again recommend that we arrive at what seems to be a fair estimate of the amount we shall collect in revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and that we appropriate not a single penny above that amount. I can think of no greater catastrophe to the Nation than to continue to operate with a deficit during peacetime. That is particularly true when we face the fact that, during a period when the Nation has enjoyed its greatest prosperity, when the greatest number of people have been employed at the highest wages, when the farmers have enjoyed their greatest income, and business its greatest income, the Government has been unable to balance its budget.

Mr. President, I believe that the responsibility for balancing the budget belongs to the Congress. I do not believe that we are justified in appropriating more money than we can reasonably anticipate in revenues. I know that Senators are saying to themselves, "Where are you going to cut? Why do you not recommend some specific place to cut the budget?" I should be perfectly willing—and I think it would be the wisest course the Congress could pursue—to cut the budget not less than $8,000,000,000. We made an effort to cut the ECA authorization. I recommended a cut of $2,500,000,000. But the Senate in its wisdom has seen fit to pass the ECA bill authorizing a total of $5,580,000,000.

So, Mr. President, we must face this issue sooner or later. I am not advocating that we cut out any of these projects; I am not advocating that we refuse to take on some additional projects which are in the best interest of the Nation. I am simply advocating that we cut all appropriations, that we reduce our expenditures in line with the anticipated revenues. Again I ask this question: If we cannot balance the budget under the conditions which have existed during the past 2 years, how are we going to be able to do so when business, industry, farm incomes, and all other incomes level off? Is it not better to appropriate a lesser amount of money for each project, and still maintain all the projects we would like to maintain, rather than to appropriate such great sums of money, exceeding the revenues by substantial amounts, and thus run so far into the red and bring about such a great deficit that the Nation will get into a financial condition which none of us wish to see develop?

So I strongly urge—and I shall continue to do so during the entire session of the Eighty-first Congress—that all appropriations be reduced. I believe that as time goes on we shall find that Government revenues will drop. Let me suggest to the Members of the Senate that they go out into the country and talk to the people there and find out what is going on in the Nation at the moment, ascertain how business is dropping and how unemployment is increasing, how pay rolls are decreasing, and how the pay check of the worker is decreasing in size.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that under the Reorganization Act we were to do the very thing he is advocating this evening; and that was to be done for the benefit of the Senate, by the 15th day of February. But by a vote of the Senate a few days before the 15th of February, the time for making the economic report was extended to the 1st day of May. Does the Senator further realize that, so far as the Senator from Michigan, a member of the Appropriations Committee, is aware, no steps seem to have been taken to comply with that requirement even as of the 1st day of May? Does the Senator from Indiana appreciate that?

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate it, and I know what the able Senator from Michigan has stated to be a fact. I appreciate his calling it to my attention, as well as to the attention of the Senate generally.

So, Mr. President, again I urge that we give thought to balancing the budget, to reducing expenditures, and not lose sight of the fact that revenues simply will be less, because prices are falling—they were too high, and now they are falling—and as prices fall, fewer dollars will be handled in America; and as that happens, there will be less revenue for the Federal Government. However, while revenues are decreasing, if we appropriate more money this year—as we are doing—we shall run up a deficit that much greater.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The parliamentary situation is that all committee amendments have been disposed of, and the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I have offered my amendment, but I do not believe action has been taken on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; it has been agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Very well; I wish the RECORD to show that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$2,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$450,000."

In line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$24,639,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,139,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished senior Senator from

Illinois, the majority leader, and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], whether it is proposed to have the Senate finish action on the bill tonight, or whether it is desired to have a recess taken at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me inquire how long my friend the Senator from New Hampshire intends to speak.

Mr. BRIDGES. If we are to begin to consider the item for the New Johnsonville steam plant, I think we should finish it; does not the Senator from Illinois think so?

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. I assume it will take some time to finish that item; I doubt whether we could do so in less than 2 or 3 hours. So perhaps we should take a recess at this time until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Can the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, in cooperation with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], give us any idea how long it will take to dispose of this item?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the issues involved in connection with the item for the steam plant are fairly well known. I intend to present a brief statement, and perhaps other Senators will participate in the discussion. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] may present a statement on another phase of the steam plant item, but I should not think it would take very long for him to do so. I hope we can expedite action on this matter, because I think the issues are fairly well known, and certainly there is no sense in prolonging the discussion.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield further, Mr. President, let me say that, as he has stated, we had prolonged debate over this matter at the last session; in fact we had two votes on it, as I recall. Therefore, it has been fairly well discussed and debated.

I do not know how long the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire may desire to discuss this matter now.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not desire to talk for more than a few moments; but undoubtedly other Senators will wish to discuss this question, and perhaps the whole issue will take several hours' consideration.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have advised some Senators that probably the Senate would take a recess at about 6 o'clock today, and no doubt some of them have already gone to their offices or to their homes.

So, in view of that understanding, I shall move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Before doing so, I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader about the item on the Executive Calendar. The only item on the Executive Calendar is the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Am I correct in my understanding that there is some objection to the nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield to me, let me say that twice I have asked to have that nomination passed over, and on both occasions the acting majority leader consented. I made that request in behalf of a Senator who wished to look into the credentials of the nominee. That Senator is not on the floor of the Senate at this time.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I may state that if the Senator from Illinois will permit the nomination to go over once more, then so far as I am concerned I shall not ask, by request, to have it go over again.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is the only nomination on the Executive Calendar, so I shall not move to have the Senate proceed to consider executive business, in view of the explanation which has just been made by the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, April 12, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11, 1949:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph Earl Cooper, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska, vice Raymond E. Plummer, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Vernon P. Burns, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama, vice Roulhac Gewin, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of title I, section 107 (b), Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Charles E. Dunham, O16801.
Michael S. Grenata, O9304.
Franklin L. Litchenfels, O16355.
Alden H. Seabury, O7431.
James C. White, O11666.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Harry Mazur, O26137.

(NOTE.—Lieutenant Colonel Seabury was given recess appointment on November 24, 1948, and First Lieutenant Mazur was given recess appointment on December 7, 1948.)

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

TO BE COLONELS

Earl William Aldrup, O15972.
Miles Jason Baze, O41378.
Conrad Lewis Boyle, O15951.
William Joseph Bradley, O15967.
Harold Francis Chrisman, O15961.
Philip Feinberg, O38591.
Emroy Elmer Feind, O28787.
Conrad Gordon Follansbee, O15973.
Wayne Bailey Gardner, O41366.
Alexander Grendon, O39506.
Valerius Hakanson, O41371.
George Laurence Holsinger, O15989.
Carroll Delmar Hudson, O28785.
George Edward Isaacs, O15959.
John Gardner Ladd, O39509.
Frank Riley Loyd, O16004.
Harold Mills Manderbach, O15984.
Robert Reinhold Martin, O15953.
Murray Eberhart McGowan, O15943.
Edward Charles Miller, Jr., O38590.
Harry William Miller, O16005.
William Merritt Preston Northcross, O28793.
Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952.
Harry Edward Owens, O28786.
Raymond Dishman Palmer, O15942.
Lewis Ebenezer Perry, O28781.
George Cooper Reinhardt, O15963.
Coleman Romain, O28783.
Abraham Julius Rosenblum, O28788.
John Douglas Salmon, O15937.
John Henry Sampson, Jr., O15974.
August Edward Schanze, O15976.
William Frederick Schweikert, O28778.
Charles Stowe Stodter, O16013.
Esthel Oliver Stroube, O41368.
William Carl Thompson, O41374.
John Vogler Tower, O15956.
Herbert Ryan Tumin, O41367.
Harold Witte Uhrbrock, O15990.
Curtis Leigh Varner, O28779.
Thomas Clagett Wood, Jr., O15946.
Clyde George Young, O28790.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou conquering Galilean, as we walk with Thee through these days of Thy passion, unveil to us Thy redeeming grace, making it everlastingly new, yet as old as the heart of God. As we wait at Thy altar, we pray for the quiet balm of Thy holy presence. We invoke Thy guidance in all our labors, that we may give courageous thought to the decisions of this day. As sons of freedom, ever impress us with the urgency of our mission, to deal justly, to conquer wrong, and to guard our national honor.

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 9, 1949, was read and approved.

EXEMPTING ARTIFICIAL LIMBS FROM DUTY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3932) to exempt artificial limbs from duty if imported for personal use and not for sale.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Tariff Act of 1930 (relating to the free list) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"PAR. 1816. Artificial limbs and limb braces, if imported for personal use and not for sale."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert the following:

"PAR. 1816. Artificial limbs and braces imported solely for the personal use of a specified person and not for sale otherwise than for the use of such person."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3932 provides for the free entry under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, of artificial limbs and braces imported solely for personal use of a specified person. It will alleviate a most unfortunate situation in regard to amputee patients living in isolated communities along the Canadian border.

Prosthetic appliances, now composed chiefly of metal, are dutiable at 22½ percent ad valorem.

It is important that many of these patients be fitted in Canada because they are unable to travel 300 miles in order to be fitted in other localities.

For bilateral amputees a trip of 300 miles to be fitted to prosthetic appliances is impossible, but a trip to Montreal, Canada, by automobile in one afternoon is feasible.

The Tariff Commission approves the bill, and the Treasury Department has suggested the amendment which has been made.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the kindness of my friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and all the members of the Ways and Means Committee for unanimously reporting this bill out and bringing it up so quickly on the floor. The bill was introduced at the request of Dr. Marshall M. Kissane, of Malone, N. Y. Dr. Kissane was one of the top doctors of the Army in amputation cases and he found that along the Canadian border, where we live, it was difficult for disabled veterans and others to make the frequent long trips to New York and other big centers to buy artificial limbs and braces and the necessary subsequent fittings. This bill allows them to make the short trip in a car to Montreal and to frequently go back to have adjustments made. I appreciate the action of the Speaker and the House in allowing this bill to pass by unanimous consent.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. POULSON, and Mr. RODINO asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, each to include an editorial.

Mr. JAMES and Mr. BREEN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

DREW PEARSON'S VICIOUS ATTACK ON SECRETARY FORRESTAL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Forrestal needs no defense at my hands. He is one of our greatest living Americans. We all regret to learn of his illness, and pray for his early recovery.

Practically every Member of the House I have talked to this morning, as well as employees of the House, including the page boys, have expressed their indignation at the vicious attack made upon him by Drew Pearson last night.

I wonder how much longer that loathesome slime monger of the air will be permitted to carry on his filthy diatribes against decent individuals who are unable to defend themselves.

As I said, Secretary Forrestal is a very sick man, and probably delirious at times, as a result of the agony through which he is now passing; but for this smear monger to go on the air and broadcast his outrageous attack on him to all the American people is enough to arouse the resentment of every decent human being throughout the entire country.

I am calling for a copy of this vicious speech; and I am going to call upon the Federal Communications Commission to take steps to prevent such inhuman abuses as this being broadcast over the radio.

It is about time the Government stepped in and put a stop to such ghoulish practices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to rise at this time to tell the House of the death of a former Member of this body, Hon. James M. Fitzpatrick.

His was the life of a typical American. He was born in Massachusetts; worked as a young boy there in the iron mines; came on to New York City, at an early age; continued to work in what some people would call menial capacities; worked his way through school; then entered politics in the city of New York, where he served in various capacities in the city government; then was elected to this honorable body from the old Twenty-fourth District in the Bronx. He served here with distinction for nine terms. He retired in 1944. It is with extreme regret that we learn of his passing. We extend to his widow and the members of his family surviving him our heartfelt condolences and sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Jim Fitzpatrick is indeed a sad occasion for his many friends and a terrible blow to his loved ones. Those of us who served with Jim Fitzpatrick can well remember his fine disposition and smiling face as well as his sincerity and devotion to duty. I can see him now walking onto the floor of the House in that pleasant way that he always had, always smiling, always optimistic, always a gentleman, and radiating his spirit and personality among his colleagues, even in moments of great strain and stress upon the Members in connection with world matters, or in moments of stress and strain as to a personal matter of an individual Member.

There was no Member who more tirelessly devoted himself to his duties than Jim Fitzpatrick. He was a man of deep faith. I like to see people with deep faith, no matter what their religious convictions.

To me, it is a beautiful thing to see people whether they are Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, possessed of deep faith and willing to publicly profess their faith at the appropriate time—in fact, to profess their faith on all occasions, but particularly on appropriate occasions. Our late beloved friend was a man of deep faith. He was a fine husband and a fine father. He leaves behind him Mrs. Fitzpatrick and three sons and one daughter. One of his sons is an ambassador of God on earth, a Catholic priest, rendering service to God and country as a member of the Dominican Order of the Catholic Church, known as the Order of the Preachers, a great missionary and educational order. As a member of this order, his son is an outstanding citizen and servant of God. I can well remember the many times that Jim Fitzpatrick spoke to me about his son when he was a seminarian, and later after he was ordained. He spoke of his pride in his son and the joy that it brought to him and Mrs. Fitzpatrick in the knowledge that their son had received the call for service and to know that he had responded and that his whole life would be devoted to the service of God and his country.

James Fitzpatrick was a man of deep faith, a man who exemplified it with such sincerity and simplicity as to influence others to the maximum degree.

To his widow, to his sons, and to his daughter, I extend the deepest sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself. I know that I also extend the sympathy of all those who served with him, present and past, the sympathy of every one of them, to Mrs. Fitzpatrick and her children in their great bereavement.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, there are two philosophies of death—one that it is a black, terrifying, and awesome experience; the other is that while death itself is sad for those who are left, it is

the opening of a new vista, an eternal one, for the one who receives the beckoning call.

And so this morning, those of us who have learned of the passing of a former Member, the Honorable James M. Fitzpatrick, are saddened and we do experience a comingling of feeling, one of regret, but we are heartened at the recognition of the fact that he will now start his eternal life.

Over 80 years ago in the coal mines of Massachusetts a young boy earned his livelihood and as he worked underground, he saw that man's destiny was higher. He recognized his duty to do a day's work but he recognized still further the duty, the obligation of his employers to pay a living wage and to protect their men. Now possessed of this experience and this firm determination to better his fellow men, he came to the city of New York where, with its usual warmth, they welcomed him. He worked for the transit companies, first as a conductor and then in the claims department, and as he slowly but steadily climbed the ladder, his determination became greater and greater for public service. That public service was recognized when the people of his district elected him to the old board of aldermen. In those days the alderman was the connecting link between the people, the common people, and their government. They found his home always open, they found his ear ever attentive, they realized his heart, as well as his mind, understood their problems, and, again the party of his choice, the people whom he had served, gave to him one of the highest honors that can be afforded to any man in public life; they elected him to this, the Congress of the United States.

Without fanfare, without great, huge press releases, he continued as that connecting link and served the people now in a bigger area and in a bigger way. Never did he lose contact, never did he say "Yes" when by saying "Yes" he would compromise with principle or conscience and gain votes. James M. Fitzpatrick was a man of principle in not talk alone but in action. He served in this body for 18 years and was a member of the Appropriations Committee as well as many other committees during the tenure of his office.

Today, the House is saddened by the news of his death and it pauses during its busy day to pay tribute to one who served in this body and served so well. May the late Congressman enjoy now the fruits of his years of labor in the house of his Lord.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the death of Hon. James Fitzpatrick, a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. We were close friends. We were neighbors, living in the same hotel. Our lives were thrown together not only in social life but in official labors. I found Hon. James Fitzpatrick an able legislator both in committee and on the floor of the House. When serving as a member of the Committee on Education of which I was chairman, I found him to be a broad-minded man of vision, always fighting for the social and spiritual strength of his country and the welfare of his fellow men. In the field of rehabilitation of the crippled his enthusiasm knew no bounds, and his contribution to this worthy cause was, indeed, noteworthy. My friend, James, radiated good nature, affection and optimism. I know how devoted he was to his beautiful and accomplished wife, and also his pride in and love for his children. My sympathy and that of Mrs. Reed is extended to Mrs. Fitzpatrick and to her family in their great bereavement.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of former Representative James M. Fitzpatrick, of the Bronx, we have suffered the loss of an outstanding citizen and friend.

His record speaks for his keen interest in his community and Nation. In 1919 he was elected to the board of aldermen, on which he served for three terms, resigning from the board after his election to Congress in 1926. He was elected to Congress for nine successive terms, and retired at the time of the congressional redistricting in New York. He served on the important Appropriations Committee of the House, where his astuteness, good judgment, and business ability were important contributions to the work of that committee.

As a boy, he worked in the iron mines near his home town in Massachusetts. He came to New York in 1891 where he worked for the Metropolitan Street Railway Co., later becoming a claim adjuster. Because of his early experiences, he became a champion of labor—and remained faithful to the cause of labor throughout his legislative career. He fought for the laboring man at every opportunity, and voted accordingly.

From humble beginnings, he gained a high position of honor and respect, but he never lost touch with the "common man" and was in complete sympathy with his problems, aims, and efforts. He was friend and counselor to all who came to him for help, and gave generously of his time and efforts in their behalf.

We, in the Bronx, will greatly miss him, and his widow and children have our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late James M. Fitzpatrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the metropolitan area of New York City cannot and does not claim credit for all the great reform movements of this wonderful country of ours; that would be a historical untruth.

We can, however, claim that liberal and progressive Senators, Representatives, and even Presidents have come from the State of New York, and in particular, from the metropolitan area of New York City, with greater consistency than from any other section of the country.

To that noble tradition belonged the late great James M. Fitzpatrick, who brought to his official duties as a United States Representative from the Bronx not only a conviction of dedication to the welfare of the people but also a personal faith illumined with the light of truth and brotherhood. His was a full and wonderful life, which exemplified the American dream of material and spiritual success to the most humble if they but trod the good way of life.

It was my privilege to have served with Jim Fitzpatrick in this House; his name has been familiar to me from my earliest boyhood, and I hope that it can be said sometime that I served my people as he served his.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were interred in the consecrated ground of St. Raymond's Cemetery, Bronx, New York City, the mortal remains of our former colleague, Hon. James M. Fitzpatrick. For 18 continuous years he represented the old Twenty-fourth New York Congressional District which roughly comprised the northeast section of Bronx County and the southern part of Westchester County, including the city of Yonkers. He did not seek reelection after he completed his term in the Seventy-eighth Congress. He served for years as a valued member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Born in West Stockbridge, Mass., almost 80 years ago, he worked as a boy in the iron mines near his home. In 1891 he came to New York and for many years was employed by the old Metropolitan Street Railway, and later the Interborough Rapid Transit Co. Always active in the politics of Bronx County his first venture into public life was as Commissioner of Street Openings. He was subsequently elected to the board of aldermen in the city of New York where he served for three terms until his election to the Seventieth Congress.

Jim Fitzpatrick was my friend. I shall never forget his thoughtfulness and kindliness to me. He presented me to this House and stood with me when I first took my oath of office in the Seventy-sixth Congress. His clear political perception, his sound judgment and unfailing courtesy made him the ideal Representative.

In his death the country lost a distinguished citizen who gave many fruitful years of his life to public service.

I extend to his wife and children my deepest sympathy.

THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it will be 4 years tomorrow that America and the world lost one of the greatest American

citizens, a man recognized the world over as an outstanding humanitarian, one who had the interests of the masses in his heart and in his mind. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that he gave up his life for the cause of humanity. I know that when history is written, he will, even as he is today, be recognized as a distinguished American, and it will be recorded that he rendered to our country and to the world prodigious services. He will go down in history with Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Wilson, as the greatest interpreter of the cause of the common man, for he actually gave up his life for the cause of the people, for his country, and for the peace and democracy of the world. His indefatigable and successful efforts on behalf of the plain homespun American and the underprivileged, and for the preservation of our democracy, and the democracies of the world, shall endear him to all mankind. Beyond doubt he was the most beloved and most mourned man not only in our country but the world over. Here, indeed, is the man of the ages.

CIVILIAN ADMINISTRATION OF OCCUPIED GERMANY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the whole democratic world will approve the announcement made on Friday on the part of the United States and France and Great Britain that there should be civilian administration in western Germany. I wish to emphasize that those of us who have been deeply concerned about the manifestations of nazism in the western zones of Germany during the administration of the military governments there, want to be sure that there is not only a civilian government for western Germany which this announcement contemplates, but that there is also a civilian administration which will utilize to the full and cooperate with democratic and anti-Nazi elements in those zones on the part of the occupying powers. In the matter of the nomination of trustees for the Ruhr iron and steel industries; in the matter of the comings and goings and of striking out the names of those suspected of having Nazi affiliations who sought to participate in the German industrial fair in New York City; in remarks attributed to officials of military government like those attributed to the director of the administration of whole province of Wurtemberg Baden showing a lack of concern for the recurrence of Nazi influence in German public affairs (New York Herald Tribune, February 26, 1949); we have deep concern that our people who are handling the situation in Germany are too prone to themselves forget that the Germans have on three occasions been the greatest aggressive force the world has ever known, too prone to let circumstances develop under which they could start their aggressive belligerency and their outrages against human rights again.

It will be recalled the names of 12 Germans were recently submitted by the Bi-Zonal Economic Administration—which is an indigenous German agency—to the Western Allied Military Governors as managerial trustees of the Ruhr iron and steel works. The report of the New York Times, February 26, 1949 states the following with respect to this list:

> Most notable among German selections were Heinrich Dinkelbach, former financial director of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke and sponsor and financial contributor to the Nazi SS, and Herman J. Abs, former Deutsch Bank director who was denounced in a special military government report a year ago as a participant in the exploitation of Nazi-occupied countries.

It will be recalled also that the democratic world was shocked recently by evidences of the revival of the Nazi spirit shown in such movements as the League for German Revival of which it is stated that leading former Nazi leaders are the guiding spirits.

We welcome this change just announced by the three occupying powers and have a right to expect that by this change the civilian administrations on both sides both for the occupying powers and for the Germans of the western zones, will at long last deal only with the democratic elements who are there, and who have been shamefully neglected, and not the Nazi elements and Nazi affiliates in western Germany.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the ECA bill I may include certain extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Skipper of Guadalcanal."

UNITY IS NOT JUST A WORD

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a great tragedy has just been enacted in my home State of California. After many hours of heroic toil, workers yesterday reached the lifeless body of a little girl, 3-year-old Kathy Fiscus, of San Marino, who had climbed or fallen into an old and disused well pipe, and had slipped down the pipe for nearly 100 feet.

The tremendous effort to free the child was fruitless, and the youngster was yesterday found dead. The heartbreak of the parents of the youngster is shared by millions of Americans.

However, the tragedy proved that in an hour of human trouble we Americans become one, and that the great heart of America holds no place for hatred and rancor at such a time. We hear much of the "heartless corporation" which seeks only to grind labor beneath its heel, yet it was the expensive equipment of American industry that was rushed to the scene of the disaster in total disregard of the fact that the parents could never pay the $500 per hour or more required for the operation of the giant rigs.

We hear that free American labor seeks only to sweat industry and business for every possible dollar it can, yet it is well to remember that honest and fearless American workmen were the men who worked until complete exhaustion overcame them in what proved to be a futile race with death. In an hour of darkness, the tools and the hands of America met for a moment in common cause over ground of common tragedy. In those short few hours there was proof on both sides that, given cause for cooperation, it is forthcoming.

How tragic it is that only in common sorrow and common need we have been able to break down the barriers that hamper our economic, spiritual, and moral growth!

"A little child shall lead them."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he will make today excerpts from the United States News and other publications.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Allen, La.	Fellows	Morton
Barrett, Pa.	Fernandez	Murphy
Beall	Gamble	Nixon
Buckley, N. Y.	Gilmer	Norton
Bulwinkle	Granahan	Passman
Carlyle	Hall,	Powell
Carroll	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Hart	Regan
Chudoff	Hope	St. George
Corbett	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Davenport	Lane	Walsh
Dingell	Lodge	Whitaker
Dollinger	Lyle	White, Idaho
Douglas	Lynch	Withrow
Eberharter	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Elston	Morrison	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3748) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3748, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, general debate on this bill is nearing the end. Generally speaking, Members on both sides of the aisle are to be congratulated on the nonpartisan spirit shown here. That is as it should be, for the ranks against communism in this country are not made up of Democrats and Republicans, as such; we are all just simply Americans who want to remain free.

It is eloquent tribute to the merits of the bill and augurs well for its overwhelming passage that even the minority party in the presentation of the minority report or minority views claims authorship of the European recovery plan.

The minority report of six pages carries six times, once for each page, the words, "We Republicans." In the committee report of 59 pages "We Democrats" cannot be found.

There should not be pride of authorship in a thing of this kind, but the record should be kept straight if the issue is raised.

The minority views, signed by all Members of the minority party except the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and which throughout its pages shows the artistic hand of the very able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] says:

> This vast and far-reaching effort initiated in the Eightieth Congress.

As a matter of fact, this effort was initiated by a great American, General Marshall, Secretary of State in a Democratic administration. It was then recommended and proposed to the Eightieth Congress by President Truman, and be it said to the everlasting credit of that Republican Congress that it fell in line under the matchless leadership of two great Americans, Senator VANDENBERG and our own beloved and admired former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, and enacted the proposal into law by a majority vote of both sides of the aisle.

If credit there be for ECA, there is credit enough for all. If the plan fails, we must all equally share the blame.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], in his speech and in the minority views, lamented the fact that this is not a package bill to carry all forms of foreign assistance as was the case last year.

The bill last year carried four titles in a package—European recovery, International Children's Fund, Greek-Turkish assistance, and aid to China. This was done mainly on the insistence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS.]. It was a mistake and has been proven to be a mistake. This year in consideration of the European recovery plan we are sticking to our knitting. The other proposals must be considered separately on individual study and merit. The European recovery plan is unique in that it deals with, in the words of the gentleman from Ohio himself, those who have banded together "to help themselves, each other, and us."

Now, I must get along. I want to speak to the Members who, in good conscience and with the national interest uppermost in their minds, voted against the European recovery program when it came before the House a year ago.

I have no criticism of their motives. I believe that the opponents of this experiment were just as patriotic as those who defended this bill. At the same time, I believe that the things they feared then have failed to materialize.

The motives of the critics were sound. Their fears were baseless. If, with the same motives, they will reexamine their fears of a year ago, we can get an almost unanimous vote on this measure to extend the European recovery program. What possible action could better strengthen the position of this country and more profoundly hearten our friends and collaborators among the nations than a unanimous vote here in support of the extension of the recovery program.

The issue is different now from what it was in 1948. We debated then whether this Nation should launch this great experiment in international cooperation for economic recovery. Now the sole question is whether this Nation shall finish what it starts or shall be fickle in its undertakings. I believe no Member here wants us to appear in the latter guise. One proposition upon which we can all agree is that our country, once it has put its hand to the plow, should cut a straight furrow to the end.

Let us recall specifically the fears which dominated the thinking of many of the Members of this body a year ago, and let us see what has happened in the actual course of events.

First, there was the fear that this would be just another relief measure. "Operation rat hole" was the phrase we heard over and over again on this floor to describe this program. Lend-lease, UNRRA, residual aid, and interim aid were all reviewed. The assertion was that each of these measures had been sold to this House as a cure for the economic ailments of Europe, and that each had had a sequel in the form of a demand for more aid. The same was predicted for the Marshall plan.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield just for a question.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has made reference to the minority views. I wonder if the gentleman objects to these words on page 2:

> We deeply appreciate the fine spirit that prevailed in our committee throughout our hearings.

Does the gentleman agree to that part of our report?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not object to those words at all. They are kind words, but they are only salve for the statement in the first paragraph. Those words are an anticlimax. I am talking about the words "we Republicans" when it should have been "we Americans."

I have no apology to make for the predecessors of the Marshall program. We can never know their real value because we cannot know what would have happened to the world if those measures had not been passed. They did not bear out all our hopes, but they were not a total loss to us and to the world. They might have been better conceived and better carried out. But they helped to keep all of Europe from going irrevocably over the brink into another dark age. We do not have to be ashamed of all that we did in the period of 1945 to 1948 in helping other nations, even if we might have done them better.

The point I want to make here is that the European recovery program, launched as the Marshall plan and legislated into our laws by the Economic Cooperation Act, is a different sort of program from the ones that preceded it.

The Economic Cooperation Act was enacted in a Republican Congress, under the matchless leadership of two great Americans, Senator VANDENBERG, and our own beloved and admired former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, and is today going to be continued under the leadership of another great American, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The European recovery program is based on the idea that the recovery of Europe is a job for the European nations themselves. It recognizes that they will not be able to do that job unless they get together candidly and work together energetically in a unified program to balance their resources and their requirements. It recognizes also that for a short period the European cooperators by supplying things needed from the dollar area which are beyond the participants' capacity to pay in dollars. We will finance these things as gifts if necessary; we will lend them the money if their credit position justifies the loans.

All of that is spelled out in the act. The recovery effort is a European effort. Our aid is only subsidiary to that effort. Our aid is given on the understanding that the Europeans must justify it by their record of what they are doing for themselves, and so the program is subject to annual review.

That is the way the program is turning out. It is not another rat-hole operation—not just a relief effort for a bunch of mendicant nations. It is a recovery plan based on self-help supported with temporary American assistance to close the gap between the needs and the capabilities of the participants—and with that assistance gaged and calculated to stimulate the other nations on their upward climb along the slope of recovery.

Our participants have not let us down. The hearings tell the whole story. The report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this bill summarizes it. Let me quote just a few lines from that report:

After mature study, the committee is confident that the facts support the conclusions that production is rising significantly; that the participating nations have progressed substantially toward stabilization and have laid the groundwork for still further accomplishments in this regard during the coming year; and that the participants have made a start toward developing mutual trade as a principal avenue to the solution of their common economic problems.

What are the particulars? I quote again:

The total output of factories and mines in the participating countries during the calendar year 1948 was 14 percent above that of 1947, and about equal to prewar. Excluding western Germany, steel output is currently at a rate exceeding the prewar high of 1937 and 25 percent above that of 1947. The coal shortage has eased; although tonnage in the bizone and the United Kingdom remained below that of prewar, production in all other important fields in western Europe increased almost to prewar levels.

And here is another quotation:

The investment record justifies the conclusion that economic improvement in Europe is not transitory but permanent, the record demonstrates also that American assistance has renewed the confidence of western Europe in its own future. Gross investment in all countries for which estimates are available is expected to total roughly the equivalent of $30,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948–49—six to seven times the dollars provided by the Economic Cooperation Act. This means that gross investment would approximate 20 percent of the gross national product. This is about equivalent in proportion to the investment rate in the United States in the four highest years in the period from 1921 to 1939—namely, 1923, 1925, 1926, and 1929. It is approximately three times the rate of investment of 1932 in the United States, the lowest year of the period referred to.

That means that the European participants are forging ahead—and doing it not simply on the basis of the wealth they are getting from us but from the wealth they are reinvesting because of their own renewed confidence in themselves.

What of stabilization? Let us look at some of the highspots:

Great Britain's achievements are notable in checking inflationary pressures and providing a budgetary surplus—the keystone to recovery in that kingdom. France has made an encouraging start toward combating inflation, which has plagued the country's efforts toward recovery since the close of World War II. There was a serious set-back due to the Communist-inspired coal strike of last fall. The present Government has dealt courageously and effectively with this problem, however, in 1948 France levied the highest taxes in its history, and tax rates will be higher in 1949. The French Government has successfully floated an internal loan of 100,000,000,000 francs—roughly $310,000,000—the first loan, not a forced loan, successfully floated in France since 1944. Italy has had notable success during 1948 in maintaining the stability of its economy, first achieved in the fall of 1947, after a long inflationary trend, through the courageous adoption of a rigorous deflationary program by the Italian Government.

And so the record goes. The stabilization record is good, but it is not perfect. The nations of Europe know that they have to do even better, and I cite to you this quotation from their own study of the matter.

Throughout this report, the need to bring under control the inflation existing in many of the participating countries has been stressed. It threatens the production and investment program; it generates a demand for imports that wastes resources, including American aid; it hampers the export drive; it makes impossible that reasonable equilibrium in western Europe which must precede greater liberalization of inter-European trade and payments. The things that have to be done during the next 3½ years need time. Yet many can hardly be begun at all until inflationary pressures are under control.

And now, what of the development of trade among the Europeans?

As a result of increasing output and stronger fiscal and trade policies, the volume of exports from the participating countries rose and their ability to pay for essential imports improved considerably during 1948. Over-all exports for the countries taken as a group, excluding western Germany, were up 20 percent above the 1947 level. For the United Kingdom exports in 1948 were one-quarter again higher than in 1947. In Italy exports in 1948 were up almost 50 percent from 1947 levels; in the Benelux countries about 30 percent. In this current fiscal year the earnings of the ERP countries on exports and "invisibles such as income from the tourist trade" will probably pay for a little more than half of the imports they need from the outside world. In the calendar year 1947 these earnings paid for only 40 percent of imports from the outside.

As European production and exports have gone up the trade deficit of the participating countries with the United States had narrowed. During the first 11 months of 1948 imports from the United States declined by $1,000,000,000, as compared with 1947, while exports to the United States increased by $223,000,000.

Enough of the proof that this program is not just another relief project. It is a recovery program, and it is working.

In arriving at that I think I have disposed of another charge that we heard a year ago—the charge that the European nations would take our substance and then lay down on the job. They have set themselves in the direction we wanted them to take, and they have made progress. All the dissension and sabotage that the forces of Moscow have been able to produce have not diverted them from that course.

That leads to another fear that needs a new airing. We were told a year ago that this program would only serve to get these nations into shape to be picked off by the Communists. The fact that, even while we were considering the bill a year ago, the Czech democracy succumbed to the onslaught of communism may have had something to do with that fear.

Now look at the facts. Communism has lost ground in Italy and France. It has failed to gain elsewhere in Europe. Communism's best efforts to sabotage this program by traitorous strikes and other such interference has not halted progress. Freemen are breathing more confidently in western Europe today than at any time in a decade. We have not prepared Europe for the kill in the way you fatten a turkey for Thanksgiving. Not Communist conquest but the North Atlantic Pact is a sequel to the launching of the European recovery program. Our critics told us a year ago that bolshevism would take over. Instead we have a firm undertaking among free nations to stand together and remain free.

The development of the North Atlantic Pact leads to another recollection of the fears of a year ago—the fear that our policy would result only in hatred for us, and would lead to war. I shall admit that this program has not assuaged hatred for us among our implacable foes. But who can contend today that hatred for us has increased in Europe? That fearful prediction of a year ago has a hollow sound when repeated now in the same week that the foreign ministers of the majority of the same countries as participate in this recovery program have gathered in this Capital to join their governments with Canada and the United States in a covenant of mutual defense.

Rather than go over the whole list of dire predictions, let me take up just one other. A year ago we heard again and again that this program would bankrupt

us—that it would put such a stress upon our economy and create such a problem of shortages that the American people would find the situation intolerable and would demand the cessation of this effort. This time we heard quite a different story in the committee hearings. The worries arise now from those producers who are experiencing the problems of surpluses and want the recovery program for Europe converted into a vehicle for bearing away the surplus commodities being produced in the United States. If Congress were to grant all of the requests that have been put before it in behalf of people who are worrying about surpluses, "the annual cost of the ECA program would be increased by some hundreds of millions of dollars per year. More importantly, European self-sufficiency by midyear of 1952 will become an unrealized goal."

European recovery by midyear of 1952 is a feasible proposition and a sound prospect. It is a probable outcome of what we are attempting—and it will be realized if we and our friends in Europe just keep our minds on the goal and on our potential for reaching it.

I want to be just as realistic now as my committee was a year ago when it assured this House that all the fears expressed on this floor were fancies that would not come to pass.

In the first place, let us be realistic about the claims we make for the success of this program or the allegations of its failure. Both the critics and the friends of the program should approach cautiously the task of measuring results in the European recovery program. It is well to keep in mind that the data in hand show the performance only over a period of less than a year in a program envisaged to last 4 years. A lag between effort and result is inevitable. The processes of the program call for planning, authorization, procurement, and the introduction of the goods procured into the economy of Europe. In some instances it must be many months before the effect of money spent can be measured in terms of upswing in European production and productivity. Likewise, the effects of economic cooperation among the nations of Europe are matters to be evaluated properly only in a perspective of years. Friends of the program should keep in mind that some of the results achieved during the first year are actually residual effects of earlier aid programs or of earlier efforts by the Europeans themselves. They should remember that some of the most hopeful developments—for instance, the turning toward customs unions as exemplified in the Benelux arrangement—actually antedate the launching of this program. They should keep in mind, too, that nature itself has contributed a measure to European recovery in the past year; the bad weather of 1947 was succeeded by good weather in 1948.

Let us be realistic and conservative in estimating the needs and the degree of recovery achieved.

Defending the European recovery program requires a nice balance between pessimism and optimism, between warnings and encouragement. Many of the voices that a year ago were urging that we reject this program because it had no chance of success are now crying out that we should abandon the program because the measure of its success is already so great. These voices like to cite a speech made about 6 weeks ago by Mr. Christopher Mayhew, Parliamentary Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs for the United Kingdom. Let us take a moment to see what Mr. Mayhew actually meant when he said that "Britain has now virtually completed its economic recovery."

A careful reading of his speech in the light of the circumstances shows that Mr. Mayhew meant that during the last half of last year the United Kingdom's exports almost equaled its imports and that its foreign trade was in a sense balanced. Now, the plain fact of the matter is that Britain is exporting to the nondollar area about £300,000,000 worth of goods and services above what Britain imports from the nondollar area. If this surplus could be converted into dollars, Britain would actually be in a balanced trade position. The rub is that Britain cannot convert this surplus into dollars, and it is dollars, and dollars alone, that can be used to pay for the things that Britain must have in order to make the grade of recovery as conceived in the Marshall plan. Britain needs and gets from the dollar area more than it can pay for in dollars. At the same time, the nondollar area is getting more from Britain than it can pay for in sterling. A large part of the aid we are sending to Britain is actually being passed on by Britain to other countries that are fighting their way up the slope of recovery. Through the operation of the intra-European payments plan, the other participants in this program get $480,000,000 worth of what Britain passes along. In other words, Britain operates a little Marshall plan of her own and is doing a large share of the work not only for her own recovery but also for the recovery of her neighbors.

Britain has recovered moral independence. But Britain has not recovered its independence of the dollar. The need for extraordinary assistance granted by this Government goes on and will probably go on, but in diminishing volume, for the duration of this program.

Finally, let me bring out one more point on which there must be realism both among the critics and among the champions of this program. Too much should not be claimed for it; too much should not be expected of it. The European recovery program does not have the answer for every economic problem besetting Europe. There will be plenty of opportunity for statesmanship, hard thinking, and courageous effort after this program has expired.

Anyone who believes the European recovery program is supposed to have all the answers should read the iterim report of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. It is a completely honest document. It never attempts to delude us or the participating nations with beguiling prospects that are not supported by facts. It tells in full detail the economic straits of the Marshall-plan countries. It makes no attempt to soften the contours of the road ahead. No one's false optimism will survive a careful reading of this document. It leads to one conclusion: The road to recovery is hard and may take longer than the most hopeful prophets pretend it will take. It leaves no support for the assumption that Europe's plight is a short-term circumstance traceable only to World War II. It recognizes that this plight is the result of a deep-seated malady traceable to a long-term change in the world's trade pattern.

The report dispels the happy belief that Europe's problems can be solved in terms of production alone, for Europe's production will be contingent upon the supply of raw materials, and that in turn involves the larger and much more complex problem of the world's trade pattern.

Finally, the report leaves one without the hopeful illusion that Europe, some time in mid-1952, will pass in a moment from the status of a patient to the state of complete health. A long and difficult convalesence will still lie ahead.

Let us not fool ourselves about that. Rather, let us look at this word "recovery" in all its meanings and see just what one applies to this program.

First, there is recovery in the simple sense of restoring production capabilities depleted by war. Europe is already achieving success in that phase—and more success lies ahead in the development of this program.

Next, there is recovery in the sense of getting free from the requirement of extraordinary outside aid. That means the effort to close the dollar gap. It is achieved by austerity in the domestic economies, exploitation of every opportunity to develop trade outside the dollar area, and the most careful channeling of dollar expenditures.

Then, after the dollar gap is closed—in this program we hope that will be in mid-1952—there is recovery in the sense of having reattained a self-sustaining basis. Then the nations participating in this effort can turn to careful use of their credit abroad, and to development primarily through attracting private enterprise from abroad to participate in their economies on a wider scale.

Finally, if all goes well, will come the more abundant day when they can achieve recovery in the sense of a renewed abundance—the day when austerity will be behind them and the opportunity for enriched living will again be open to all who want to put out the effort to achieve it.

I recite all that simply to make it plain that the Marshall plan envisages recovery only in the narrow sense of enabling the nations participating and this Nation also to be free of the great problem of the dollar gap between their resources and their needs.

The European recovery program is one step in a long road. It is the approach to convalescence. It is not a formula for fully restored health.

It does not solve the problems. It transforms them into a manageable posture. But grave decisions and hard work lie even beyond mid-1952.

I do not want to oversell this program to you. I want to be perfectly honest about stating what it does not do.

But let me tell you one thing it will do. It will insure that the basic, hard decisions that lie ahead will be made in this Capital and in the capitals of our friends. They will not be made in Moscow, or Warsaw, Bucharest, Prague, and the like.

The European recovery program will leave the free nations of western Europe and of this continent masters of their own fate, capable of managing their own problems. As a formula for freedom it is worth going through with a hundred times over.

In closing may I add this word of warning. There are other programs for foreign assistance still to come before this Congress. Each should be weighed on its merits carefully and exhaustively as has been done in this one. American dollars simply cannot go around the world. The supply is not inexhaustible. A halt must be called sometime, somewhere. Sympathy and charity are laudable traits, for which the American people are renowned. But we cannot further strain the economy of the United States by granting dollars to any nation in this world unless that nation shows an effort to help itself, help other nations, cooperate with us, and, last but not least, the will to resist the encroachment of communism.

The call for American dollars comes from around the entire globe, but if we scatter what resources we have everywhere we may be successful nowhere. That is a maxim of war, whether hot or cold.

Mr. Churchill said that he did not become the King's Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I am sure you will agree, gentlemen, that we did not come to Congress to preside over the bankruptcy of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the enactment of the legislation now before us. During the Eightieth Congress I made my position clear on the European recovery program, and it has in no way changed. I believe that from the over-all standpoint the program has been eminently successful in working toward our ultimate goal. The economic recovery of Europe is necessary if we are to get our friends across the sea on their own feet and off the back of the American taxpayer. I further believe that during its first year the program has gone a long way toward containing communism and discouraging aggression on the part of the 13 men who now dictate the policies of all the millions behind the iron curtain.

I know that efforts will be made to reduce the authorization contained in this legislation. Further efforts will be made to protect certain special interests in our own country. I feel that the authorization requested by the administration should be granted. If any cuts are to be made, let them be made by the Appropriations Committee. This great committee is eminently qualified to effect any economies that might be justified and practical.

I further believe that we should proceed with great care in any attempt to favor a domestic group or industry in connection with the ECA program. This is not a program to directly aid American industry, commerce, or agriculture. It is a program to aid them all indirectly in building prosperity throughout the world, in resisting communistic advances, and in achieving the security of world peace.

Let us deal with this legislation in a clear and convincing manner so that there can be no doubt in anyone's mind across the seas as to the intent of the American Congress and the American people. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation will be adopted promptly and decisively.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MY COUNTRY'S FUTURE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us providing funds for the 15 months' continuation of the Marshall plan calls for an appropriation of $5,550,000,000.

The signing of the Atlantic Pact and its approval by the United States Senate will bring another bill calling for an appropriation of approximately $2,000,000,000.

Undoubtedly, the two measures are sponsored in the main by individuals who are of the opinion that the two measures, properly financed, tend toward the preservation of peace.

My vote will be cast against both appropriations because it is my sincere conviction that the Marshall plan has put us into a position which renders our involvement in war more probable.

The Atlantic Pact will almost certainly involve us in war. Not only are we to arm western Europe, but, even before the pact is approved by the Senate, we are being asked to send armed forces.

Shortly, there will come before the Congress from the armed services a request for an appropriation of $15,908,166,800. I do not know—and I doubt if any Member of Congress or, for that matter, anyone in the administration, in the armed services, actually knows—the amount of money which is needful to adequately prepare us for national defense or—if that be the alternative—for an aggressive war.

Believing that our national policy means war in the not-too-distant future, my vote shall be cast in support of every request made by the armed services. With the future national security of my country at stake, there is no alternative.

When the establishment of the United Nations was before the Congress, we were told by world-renowned statesmen that it was "a great adventure"; that it was a move looking toward the preservation of the peace of the world.

When lend-lease was before the Congress, the same statesmen advised us that it was "a great speculation"; that, by means of it and the expenditure of sums appropriated to make it effective, war-torn countries would be rehabilitated, a barrier against communism erected.

The Marshall plan, we were advised by international statesmen who assumed to have knowledge of international affairs, would enable Britain and western Europe to "contain" communism within the borders of Russia and its satellite countries.

None of these measures nor our contribution of more than $23,783,000,000 has stopped either Stalin or communism. The internationalists' answer to that fact is: "Who knows what would have happened, how much worse the situation would have been had we not made the effort, given away the money?" My reply is: "Yes, who knows?" Certainly not those who conceived and put into operation the various plans, for their predictions remain unfulfilled and there are no facts upon which they can base the conclusion that but for their efforts the situation would have been worse.

Since 1914, this Nation has disregarded Washington's advice to avoid entanglements with foreign nations, repudiated the policy of isolationism which it followed prior to that time.

And what has been the result of our policy of meddling in the affairs of other nations, of attempting to tell the people of other lands under what form of government they shall live?

The First World War was fought to end war. That purpose it did not accomplish.

The Second World War was fought not only to end war but to carry the four freedoms throughout the world.

Shortly after we, our allies, and our enemies ceased fighting, there were four active wars in progress.

Today, world war III is in the making.

Today we are told that Russia and her satellite nations contemplate the domination of the world, the destruction of our form of government—that the security of our Nation is in danger.

While World War I and World War II were in the making and while they were being fought, many were frightened into the belief that, unless we participated in both of those wars and they were won, we would be overcome; the slaves, in the first instance, of the Kaiser, in the second, of a Hitler.

Hence, our men and our resources were the deciding factors in both wars.

In the last war we created the situation which, while destroying Hitler and nazism, made Stalin and communism a world power.

The same old fear which drove us into two world wars, neither of which gave us anything, is now being used to ready us for a war with a nation and a philosophy, Russia and communism, which have attained their present position of power because, and only because, of the aid we gave.

We saved Stalin and Russia from Hitler and nazism.

TODAY STALIN AND COMMUNISM THREATEN US

The argument now is that, Russia and communism having overrun eastern Europe and the greater part of China, having agents in South America and in this country, we, if we are to continue as a nation, must form a partnership, a coalition, with all those nations outside the sphere of Red influence, and pledge our resources and the lives of our fighting men and women in any war in which any of those nations may become involved.

To put it briefly and bluntly, the argument is that, inasmuch as Russia and her satellites are apparently united under one governmental head, the rest of the world, if it would avoid being conquered, must join together in opposition to the Russian alliance.

We are going back, as it were, to the age-old balance-of-power arrangement, the theory being that if the world powers be somewhat nearly equally balanced, neither group will chance an aggressive war.

That theory is as old as history and never has it prevented war over an extended period of time.

There are at least two reasons which to me indicate that the Atlantic Pact is inadvisable; that it is more likely to encourage rather than discourage war; make war, rather than peace, probable.

History tells us that the man who lets ambition rule him; that the nation which seeks domination over the rest of the world, is sure to fail and, in the end, meet disaster.

No one has yet conquered the world. No nation has yet ruled the world. There is no reason to believe that the causes which brought about the distintegration of the empires of old seeking domination of the world no longer operate.

The history of Europe indicates that, if Stalin controlled Europe from the East to the sea on the West, ultimately the diverse nature of the people, their conflicting views and ways of life, would result in a distintegration of his empire or federation—whichever you prefer to call it—and that ultimately, whatever form of government he might temporarily throw together would disintegrate.

Just a few days ago, from the well of the House a statement was made, referring to these United States of America as an empire. When once we seek to dominate the world, we become an aggressor—a position we profess to abhor, and experience justifies the prediction that we will fail.

Empires come and empires go. The most recent example being the British Empire, the nucleus of which exists only because the fighting men and the resources of a Republic (not a democracy) have enabled it to live.

Churchill, the "Prince of Beggars," by his persuasiveness, elcquence, and because of our stupidity and generosity, caused us twice to save his England from destruction.

Will we permit her in this, the third world war, to drag us down with her?

Churchill's last visit was undoubtedly for the purpose of lending support to the proposed Atlantic Pact, under which we form a partnership with 11 or more nations, all of which are bankrupt, none of which is disposed to making a worthwhile effort to fight Stalin and communism—a partnership which, if we enter and do as we will be asked to do, will destroy our prosperity and freedom.

No man in his senses would join in a partnership or organization, agreeing to fight the battles of each and every member of that organization, when none of them nor all of them together could make a worthwhile contribution toward the joint enterprise.

Most people recognize the basic fact that the strongest possible barrier which could be erected against Russia and communism would be a rehabilitated, organized, industrious Germany. Yet the two nations most directly concerned—England and France—ever since the fighting ended, because of their jealousy and their greed, have blocked every effort we have made to recreate a nation of German people. Only within the last few weeks have they even conceded that they will discontinue some of their destructive efforts to build up their own industries, permit Germany to take measures necessary to become self-sustaining.

We are now being told, first, that we must rearm western Europe under the Atlantic Pact, then shortly will come the demand that our men and our munitions of war must establish a battle line in eastern Europe.

Few have forgotten that it was Churchill who told us, "Give us the tools and we will do the job." Then we were called to send a million men overseas.

The same old promise is here again. But mark this prediction—under the Atlantic Pact, wherever go our dollars or our arms, there will follow our men, and women, because they, too, have been inducted into the armed services.

By the Atlantic Pact, not only are we agreeing to enter a third world war, but, through it, the United Nations, and the Marshall plan, we are stripping ourselves of the resources which are necessary if we are to successfully defend ourselves, preserve ourselves a Nation.

Even some of the most outspoken and extreme internationalists have at times admitted that there was somewhere a limit to our ability to give and aid, though always they have failed to define that limit or to act as though it existed.

What, then, is the answer to the world situation?

The answer is that, inasmuch as Churchill—and he should know—when the fighting was over, proclaimed this the strongest, the most powerful Nation in all the world, we should conserve our resources; then, to the utmost of our ability, increase our capacity to produce; to go forward on every scientific front, looking toward the improvement of our fighting equipment; build here a Nation so strong, so powerful, that Stalin with all his allies would not dare to make an aggressive move against us because he would be forced to realize that such an effort could only end in failure.

Let us get away from the thought, ever that of the ambitious man, of an Alexander—a Napoleon—a Hitler, or a Stalin—that we are called to care for and determine the thought of the whole world—an impossible task, one sure to fail.

Any other course, the course now contemplated, the policy which we have been following, means, in my humble opinion, not peace for us or for our Nation in the future, but a world empire, first and for a time perhaps successfully extending itself throughout the world, but ultimately, because of that very expansion and the refusal of the peoples of the world to live under any one government, falling apart, disintegrating.

On every occasion my vote will be cast for national defense, for the strengthening of our country, for the armament of our Nation, even though it means an additional tax burden, even though it means a certain greater degree of domination by the Armed Services, because the opposite policy means not only all that, but, ultimately, destruction.

The policy we are following imposes upon the taxpayer a most grievous burden; condemns the future youth of our country to serve and fight on foreign soil, though our welfare is not at stake.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish to pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE. The courtesy, fairness, and consideration he has given to the minority I am sure is greatly appreciated by all those on our side.

In passing, I cannot refrain from saying the same fine spirit has prevailed in our committee toward the minority by all the majority members; and it is remarkable how the seven new members on the Democratic side have familiarized themselves with the complexities of this bill when they did not have the benefit of personal attendance at the extensive hearings held last year.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not it was a wise policy for our Government to engage in a $17,000,000,000 program to rehabilitate western Europe and stop communism is now a moot question. Our policy is established to carry on this program until 1952. The fact is we are morally bound to carry it out, of course, with the right of review periodically by the Congress. We cannot stop in the middle of a fight.

From the evidence produced before our committee I believe the program has a good chance of working economically. I am not nearly so sure it will work politically. And there is always present the great risk that all our efforts will

be lost if Russia decides to go to war. But it seems to me this is a calculated risk we must take. If we were to stop this aid now, we might well lose all we have put into the program without attaining our original objectives.

I disagree with several provisions of this measure. I strongly believe the amount authorized should be greatly reduced. For example, as a result of the recent international wheat agreement, in all probability the cost of wheat will be from $82,000,000 to $124,000,000 less than estimated by ECA. Why should we authorize more than is required for this item?

Contained in the total amount authorized by this bill there is an item of $169,000,000 for tobacco. When we at home are making great sacrifices to carry on this program, why is it necessary to spend such a huge sum for this purpose?

Also there should be a considerable saving on other commodities because of the deflationary price trend.

We have tried with indifferent success to determine just how much in commodities has actually been shipped under last year's program. As near as we could determine the figure is $3,800,000,000 up to April 1, 1949. This leaves a balance available from last year's appropriation of $1,100,000,000, sufficient to fill the pipe line for 2½ to 3 months. This would carry on the program without interruption until July 1. It therefore seems to me it is not necessary to authorize the full amount of $1,150,000,000 requested as interim aid for that period. We should strive in every possible way to cut this program wherever it is justified and as soon as possible remove this terrific burden from the backs of our taxpayers.

In the minority views accompanying this bill we stated:

> A careful and detailed review of the amount needed, in the light of conditions then existing, must be made by the Appropriations Committee.

I have no doubt the Appropriations Committee will screen the amounts requested very carefully. But I have not forgotten the hue and cry that went up when the Appropriations Committee last year brought in a bill containing deductions of the amount previously authorized. We were told we had made at least a moral commitment of the full amount previously authorized and could not properly make a reduction in the appropriation. Now is the time to make a reduction in the authorization bill and not wait until the appropriation bill is brought before us.

At the very time we are giving this aid we must remember there are in existence a large number of trade agreements between the recipient countries and Russia and her satellites. These are undoubtedly directly and indirectly building up the war potential of Russia and her satellites, just as are the huge reparations from Germany and other payments from Italy.

During the coming year it is my sincere hope all these matters will be given the most careful scrutiny and investigation. If it is determined these trade agreements and other policies are not to the best interest of the signers of the Atlantic Pact and for our own security, then they should be discontinued or revised so as to prevent practices which will be damaging to our mutual security.

In committee I offered an amendment requiring a certain percentage of our corn shipments under this program to be in the form of corn products. I supported a similar amendment that a certain percentage of our wheat shipments should be in the form of flour. The evidence before our committee disclosed this could be done without any increase in cost to the ECA and with possible savings in shipping and manpower. It certainly would have been a great help to the farmers of this country when we take into consideration the break in farm prices due, at least in part, to our large surpluses. But, nevertheless, the committee refused to adopt these amendments, although it is my understanding they were placed in the Senate bill. I hope this House will include them, as was done last year.

As I indicated the other day when the China-aid bill was on the floor, I stated I did not believe it was a wise policy to bring in piecemeal fashion bills affecting our foreign policy. On the contrary, we should have a global approach as far as possible and consider all related measures at the same time. We should not be asked to consider the ECA program without taking into consideration what is necessary to be done in other areas of the world, such as China. We ought to have an over-all picture before us of the total cost of our entire foreign-aid program.

There are few, if any, on the floor of this House who could even estimate the cost of the rearmament program to the western powers who signed the Atlantic Pact, to say nothing of the cost to maintain such military defenses over a period of 20 years, as agreed to in the pact. Unless we have such an over-all picture, we have no way of determining whether these programs will undermine and weaken our economy at home.

In spite of the lack of coordination of our foreign programs, and in spite of the lack of knowledge as to how they will affect us here at home, I believe it is the fervent hope of us all that our foreign policy will stop Stalin by peaceful means and not bring on the very attack it is designed to prevent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the closing paragraph in our minority views says:

> For politics to end at the water's edge, there must be a bipartisan participation in the formulation of policies, bipartisan agreement in the measures adopted, and bipartisan sharing of credit for the success of such policies.

I note that my good friend from South Carolina shows a grudging willingness to share with us Republicans a little of the credit for the forward march of this great program. I also note that, in addition to bipartisan support, we have tripartisan support for this program, from Republicans, Democrats, and Dixiecrats, and that only one party represented in this Congress is opposed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What party is it that is against this legislation?

Mr. VORYS. The American Labor Party is officially against it, and the other parties are in support of the general principles through the expressions of their national conventions. Of course, individual Members of all parties have the right and the duty to express their views and convictions by their voice and vote.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to one of the great elder statesmen of this age, a man of broad vision, deep spiritual insight, salty common sense and good humor, our beloved ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I take this position today with a sense of grave responsibility, and I want to say to the Members of this House that probably in the history of this great body there never has devolved upon its membership a graver responsibility, nor have its Members of all parties been clothed with such dignity as at this present moment.

I congratulate you young Members. You stand with foot uplifted at the threshold of your life; you are entering upon probably the most trying yet the most marvelous period of human history, and I pray God that every one of you and the people whom you represent may have the astuteness of mental vision, and the moral greatness to face the world that now challenges our resources of mind and character and our economies to the utmost.

This legislation now before the House, in my judgment, is probably as important and far-reaching as any that Congress has ever passed on. I want to say that in my own personal judgment the ECA has been a most remarkable success under the extraordinary leadership of Mr. Hoffman. It has kindled new hope in the hearts of the European peoples who are our ancestors; it has stirred to new life their economies; production has increased; the standard of living has risen, and they have rebuilt in some considerable portions, their shattered economy and their shattered ideas and ideals.

And now I want, if I may, to use my time in unfolding before you as I see it the real situation that confronts us here today. We will have amendments and we ought to have them. You and I here are charged with the responsibility of protecting our own national economy and seeing to it that this legislation is handled in a wise, a discreet, and a successful way. But after we have introduced all our amendments from the economic point of view, unless we know what we are doing and why we are doing it, at this moment we are very feeble indeed in our position.

Mr. Chairman, way back in prehistoric times, when I was young, I made the acquaintance of the greatest leader the world has ever known or ever will know,

the Man of Nazareth. I found that He had based His life and His service to mankind upon a strange and new philosophy, a universal philosophy. It was prophesied in the ancient Scriptures of the Jews that He would not fail nor be discouraged until He had set justice in the earth; and when He sent His disciples out carrying His message He told them to go into all the world and preach that Gospel to every creature. So, in Jesus of Nazareth I found my first teacher and my first leader to lay the foundations in my own mind and heart of a universal philosophy of human experience and human progress. I feel more profoundly today the truth of that great philosophy than I ever did in the days of my youth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that we have viewed the background, I want to unfold in a few words what I see at this moment as the real task that we are undertaking to meet in this legislation.

I am interested, of course, in all the little tweedledees and tweedledums, about Republicans and Democrats, and what not—which do not amount to anything. But, at a moment like this, when I hear folks in and out of Congress discussing from that limited point of view these great issues, I am reminded of the old friend down on the banks of the Bay of Fundy, where we have terrible fogs. He was shingling in the fog one day, and he shingled right out in the fog for half a day and never knew the difference until he fell down and broke his neck.

Mr. Chairman, in the long journey of man from the jungle to this age of cathedrals, homes, schools, congresses, freedoms, and struggles for freedom, he has created and destroyed a number of civilizations. Today we stand face to face with the birth of the greatest civilization the world has ever known. This is that "one divine, far-off event" toward which the whole creation has been moving. For the first time in human history we are to have a civilization that is universal, that is clothed with the dignity of the individual—black, white, or gray, whatever he may be—that is clothed with the destiny not of one nation or of one continent but of all nations and of all continents.

I want to call your attention to the greatness of this moment in your history and in mine. What is going on that you are taking a part in? First of all, this economic problem that we have undertaken to solve in Europe has created a new unity among the European peoples. It has developed the notion of federation and cooperation among them that hitherto they have not known. It has brought those nations across the sea to our shores and brought us with them into a new unity and a new understanding.

I said before our committee one day, when we were talking to our dear friend, Sol Bloom, that the world is convulsed today by three great revolutions going on at the same time. The first is the desperate conflict between communism and Christianity, between slavery and freedom, that is in every land and must be solved sooner or later by the triumph of one or the other. Another revolution is the new awakening of self-respect and passion for freedom among the nations of the world that hitherto have been under colonial control by western powers. And the third is the universal determination on the part of the masses of men in every country to better their economic condition, which so far has been responsible very largely for the glacial advance of the socialistic idea and ideals in all countries.

This is a time of tremendous confusion and tremendous difficulty, but, Mr. Chairman, the facts stand out so plainly that he who runs may read. We are at the threshold of a new world civilization, which by our ECA legislation and by our thought of world service and world leadership we have initiated. We are the leaders. We must accept that responsibility whether we will or not, and we will have to pay the price of that acceptance.

Today Washington is the political capital of the world. Today the United States is the recognized leader of the men and women everywhere on earth who desire to be free and who recognize the greatness and dignity of the individual. Today mankind is on the march. Sooner or later, with the leadership of this great Nation and with your leadership here, giving to you men and women the great responsibility and dignity of legislating in their behalf, men are on the march to a new age; an age in which individuals and races will be in contact with each other all the time; in which nations will have to unite upon common human problems, working in a world for common results everywhere.

This is a supreme hour in human history; great in every respect in its outlook, in its universality, in its heights and depths, and I congratulate especially you young Members that you stand at the beginning of this great age and, before the snows of winter settle upon you, as they have upon me, that you will have served the world and served your Nation as no other generation and no other Congress has ever had the privilege of doing.

Now, I close as I began, with one testimony. I believe the greatest event in our human history was the life of Jesus of Nazareth. I believe that there is no hope for mankind to solve its new world-wide problems, of life and death, unless we have a new spiritual awakening among all men; unless there is a new vision of the one God of all men, the Father of us all; unless there is a new sense of moral obligation that rests upon moral standards and can be accepted by all men. I say, even if this were the last word I ever spoke in this House, that the hope of the world today, as it was 2,000 years ago, centers about the Man who hung upon the Cross and rose from the grave triumphant. I beseech you men and women as you approach these great problems to approach them from the point of view of economic wisdom and judgment as you will; approach them from the standpoint of political statesmanship as you will; but remember this, a man is his soul and nothing else is the man; a race is its soul and nothing else; and in the future as in the past these great issues will be determined by the spiritual, the moral, and intellectual resources of men working together for a common world purpose, in a common world unity, and under the inspiration of a common thought that all men are brothers and that their destiny is one.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that our American shipping is entitled to at least 50 percent, or perhaps more, of all goods shipped under the Marshall plan or any other foreign-aid plan made available under programs financed by our Government. We should enact legislation now that clearly states that a minimum of 50 percent of all goods shipped be shipped in American vessels at market rates for American vessels, with no exceptions unless the Maritime Commission certifies absolutely that American ships were not available at American rates.

It has been brought to my attention that only 23 percent of ECA petroleum cargoes has been carried by United States flag tankers and that a great portion of the total tanker cargoes has been transported by foreign tankers. I protest very strongly against such discriminatory treatment of the United States ships. To me there is no logic for this manifest unfairness. It is inconceivable that our American companies, transporting our commerce, should be displaced in favor of the merchant marine of foreign nations, some of which are not even recipients of our foreign economic-recovery program and which have grown to major size because of their lax laws and below-standard requirements. This, indeed, affects the security and economy of our Nation. The cutting of rates by foreign ships can be accomplished due to the lower standard of living of the workers of foreign countries as compared to the higher standard of living in our country. We should take immediate steps to increase the number of United States flag tankers which are so necessary for our national defense on the high seas.

Another important matter to be considered, and I quote from the report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

> It appears that American-owned marine insurance companies are being deprived of a large amount of insurance business, which but for the policy of the Economic Cooperation Administration would be available for the strengthening of this very important element of the American merchant marine. The Congress has several times in the past forcefully stated its position with regard to fostering the growth of the American marine insurance market. It is the consensus of your committee that the Economic Cooperation Administration and all other administrative agencies of the Government should keep cognizant of the policy heretofore expressed by Congress on this subject.

Several weeks ago, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, pointed out the inconsistency of spending billions of dollars annually for national defense while at the same time, because

of an opinion from the General Counsel of the ECA, we are opposing and weakening one of the important elements of national defense, the American merchant marine.

The American merchant marine approaches a most critical period. At present there is a serious unemployment situation and unless we pass this amendment today, clarifying and strengthening the intent of Congress, as expressed in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, this downward trend will continue as a result of the progressive restoration and expansion of foreign merchant fleets—at the expense of our people—and there will be further untold hardships among workers in the maritime industry, as well as a loss of jobs of more than 10,000 skilled American seamen.

No thoughtful person can be blind to the gravities of the international situation today. This is not the time to gamble with the future or take any chances of crippling our merchant fleet. It is ever necessary to have this fleet quickly available—the importance of which has been sharply demonstrated in two world wars. World War II caught us with a woeful lack of ships and if we persist in giving our business to foreign companies, our own shipping must subsequently suffer. To continue this policy is not in the interest of the United States, nor of our shipping industry, nor of the thousands of seamen and workers who are engaged in the maritime industry.

Gentlemen, the strengthening and preservation of our merchant marine is of the utmost importance if the American people would continue to live and direct the peace of the world, as we are presently doing through the Marshall plan.

Our American merchant marine serves a twofold purpose; in peace, for shipping—in war, for fighting, if we must.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act in April 1948, the United States embarked on a joint enterprise for the economic recovery of Europe. This was highly essential to stop the rapid spread of communism in western Europe and bring new hope to over 270,000,000 people. The condition was made, however, that the 19 European countries participating in the program should work together to bring western Europe into economic balance by 1952. Whether this will come about, only time can tell; but now that the program is over 1 year old, we have definite assurances that the free nations of Europe are on the way to partial recovery.

The ink was barely dry on the European Recovery Act, as passed by this Congress in 1948, when there were some immediate results. The Communists lost the elections in Italy, and now 1 year later it is an established fact that the Communists have lost ground in every European nation where there is a free vote.

In the recent elections in France and Italy, the greatest Communist strongholds in western Europe, the Reds have just taken a terrific defeat at the polls. This is the direct result of the ECA program, and the improvement is to such an extent that Communist capture of power by ballot is practically impossible.

Despite these great gains, the European recovery job has just begun. This, Mr. Chairman, is the reason we are here today asking for the passage of H. R. 3748, which is a bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, to extend the European recovery program for an additional 15 months. This bill authorized an appropriation of $1,100,000,000 for the period from April 3 to June 30, 1949, and $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. The committee held extensive hearings and heard many witnesses, both for and against this measure. But after 26 days the bill was reported from the committee by a unanimous vote. H. R. 3748 was amended in several places on the recommendations of members of the committee, the Administrator of ECA, and the State Department. The outstanding changes recommended were the language to encourage the unification and federation of Europe, the rewriting of the guaranty provision, the small-business amendment, Italian emigrant amendment, and modifying the wording defining the transportation costs. These additions should alleviate some of the difficulties previously encountered in the administration of this program, and they have all been discussed in detail by previous speakers.

I think the bill should pass this Congress for the full amount. The European recovery job has paid handsome dividends so far. We must hold the gains already made. Europe is moving ahead. It is our duty to help them. We are striving for peace, and those who are now seeking to reduce the Marshall-plan funds should reread the hearings, reports, and debates of last year's ECA program and then compare them with the progress made to date, and it would convince anybody that we made a good, sound investment. Communist conspiracy has been aimed at the world. We have been successful in turning the tide. The effort is great and we must not slacken in this great task.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, it puts a new Member in a rather peculiar position to follow such a powerful speaker as the one who just left the well of the House. It was a very fine speech. I had what I considered to be a fine prepared statement for presentation Saturday and expected to be called, but after listening to the very forceful arguments expressed here Saturday I was just a bit happy that I was not called. My statement lacked the fire of the very splendid speeches that were delivered here then, so I forsook the pleasure of talking to you at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the importance of this measure, and I also believe it would be to our national interest to support an amendment which I will offer to this bill. I want to say that I am heartily in favor of the great program that we are debating today, and I concur heartily, in the main, with all of the speeches that have been delivered here in support of the general program. I did not appreciate one speech which was made in opposition to this bill. It is my purpose here to call your attention to an amendment which I propose to submit later. If you will refer to the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A2148 and A2152, you will find a statement that I had prepared in connection with this important matter. Elsewhere in the Appendix there appeared some other material in support of my position. I know that this amendment which I am going to offer, which reinstates the 25 percent milling program or feature of the original act will have a tremendous impact upon the economy of our own country. I am sure that I will receive the support from many agricultural and farming communities, and from many other communities where the milling of wheat and the manufacture of flour are done. I know that we have had some speeches in reference to this matter in the past. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] mentioned the fact that we have a great deal of unity here, and I noticed that fact myself Saturday. It was like eating ice cream after eating sour pickles for 3 months. We were very harmonious here Saturday, and we are starting out that way today. It is a relief to a new Member who is not used to the gaff, let me say, to use that slang expression.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. May I add my sentiments to those expressed by the gentleman from Missouri. Coming from a district which is composed largely of a milling industry, Buffalo, N. Y., I have a large number of letters from management as well as labor in support of the amendment that will be introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING]. I want to say here that we in the city of Buffalo feel that if the bill is passed as it is drafted at the present time, it will eliminate jobs and put probably several thousand people out of employment. For that reason I want to state here that I am in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IRVING. I fully appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I am quite certain I shall have support for the amendment from Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, and many of the other States that are interested in the manufacture of flour.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, when we enacted the Economic Cooperation Act a year ago many of us were interested particularly in the informational aspects of our assistance to Europe. America

was willing to help Europe. But it wished also that that help be recognized and acknowledged.

We wrote no special requirements into the act. One does not make acknowledgement and thanks a precondition for giving assistance to a friend. We trusted human nature in Europe to respond to the great effort which the United States was going to make in behalf of freedom and humanity. We rested on the assurance that if we ourselves made the information available in Europe, Europe would need no special obligation to get the word spread about that the United States was once again coming to the side of its sister nations across the Atlantic.

In the 3 weeks of hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we gave a good deal of attention to the results achieved along this line. All that we heard was encouraging.

We found that ECA has followed the practice of requiring the labeling with the ECA emblem of all goods and containers of goods procured with ECA funds—subject to exceptions, of course, for types of bulk commodities for which such a requirement is impractical.

We found that the office of the ECA Special Representative in Europe has established an alert, vigorous information program. This leads out to all the missions of the ECA participating countries—except for the minor countries or those participants receiving no direct aid. Each has an active, competent information staff which works closely with the information establishment of our embassy.

News about the Marshall plan is still the principal item on each day's presentation over our information network in Europe. It is still big news in the press of Europe. In the democratic press it is news—and in the Communist press as well. I suppose we should be just as glad for the denunciations of Marshall-plan aid in the Communist papers as we are for praise of Marshall-plan aid in the democratic press of Europe.

In summary, we can be sure that Europe is being adequately informed of Marshall-plan assistance.

What I want to ask is this question: Do we in America know well enough and appreciate fully what Europe is doing under the Marshall plan? There is a public relations duty for us as well as for the recipients of our assistance.

The most wonderful thing about the program to me is not simply that we have staked a few billion dollars on the production potential of Europe—and that our confidence has been justified. It is not the measurable, concrete story that is told in the indexes of the output of Europe's factories and mines, or the rate of investment, or the volume of traffic.

What impresses me most is that when we started this program we made a bet on human nature, and we are winning on that bet. Let us forget the notion that the Marshall plan is an undertaking in charity.

Its major premise is the self-respect of Europe. We are told that a continent, like a human being, can keep its self-respect only when it is living from the product of its own labor. Secretary of State Marshall realized that when he first proposed this magnificent plan in his speech at Harvard, now almost 2 years ago.

The Marshall concept was that Europe, if given a chance to develop its way back to a self-sustaining basis, would respond. He believed in that hope strongly enough—and we believed in it strongly enough—to pledge ourselves to underwrite the deficit for the time being if the Europeans would make the attempt.

Let us keep constantly in mind that this is a recovery program. It is a program to help Europe recover a self-sustaining basis through the recovery of production, the enlargement of its trade, and the stabilization of its economy. It is a program also to permit Europe to recover its sense of the tradition of freedom, to help Europe regain its moral independence. Let us remember, in the consideration of the bill and of the appropriations to follow, that the great value of this program is that it provides enough to give Europe more than relief. It gives Europe a margin for recovery. It is this element in the program that has brought a response in spirit and a diligence in effort among the Europeans far beyond the measure of any of the preceding programs to assist the war-depleted countries.

Wherever men were free in Europe, they responded to the Marshall proposal. Wherever their governments have passed under the cloud of dictatorship, they have stayed away in envious aloofness.

The free men of Europe went to work. The flow of assistance in the Marshall plan gave an extra stimulus—but it has by no means been the sole source of energy and substance in the rehabilitation of Europe. The main source has been the men and women of Europe, responding to a new hope, meeting the challenge of an opportunity for a renewed self-respect.

We should honor them for it. We should congratulate ourselves, not for our charity, but rather for our insight in seeing that, despite the terrible ordeal of war and despair, the human values were left in Europe as a foundation on which to build.

Let us say a word of praise now for the British, who have so nobly sacrificed in their austerity plan to restore a self-sustaining basis in their economy.

Let us say a word of praise also for the French, who appear so surely to be finding the upward way after the years of dismay, defeat, occupation—and then the ordeal of battle in the liberation.

Let us say a word of praise for the Italians, who did not lose the instinct of freedom even in two decades of dictatorship, and who now again are walking in the complete friendly fellowship of the Atlantic world.

We might go on like this, naming each of the peoples with whom we are honored to be associated in this great experiment in hope and freedom.

Let us remember that the revival of trade between east and west Europe is a fundamental concept in the success of the Marshall plan. Europe's best hope is in the restoration of her unity—and that restoration will come to pass when the grip of dictatorship over the eastern countries finally ceases.

In the Marshall plan we have made recovery and the revitalizing of democracy a factor of hope, not alone for western Europe but for eastern Europe as well. These peoples of eastern Europe, many of whom in the last 10 years have fought with such heroism for freedom and self-respect, have not forgotten all that they fought for then.

Let me quote a few words from British Foreign Secretary Bevin in his interview at the National Press Club here a week ago:

> Do please remember that there are millions of people * * * in all countries who are only looking for the day when the curtain will be rent and the light can go through again.

The Marshall plan gives hope to them as well as to the peoples of western Europe.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, today the Committee on Foreign Affairs presents to the House H. R. 3748. This bill amends and extends title I of Public Law 473, Eightieth Congress. After weeks of extensive study and careful work on this bill, it has been unanimously reported out of the committee.

I am sure that most of you will agree with me that a problem of such magnitude as European recovery cannot be translated into a law that will entirely satisfy any Member of the House. We rightfully approach this problem as we approach any problem, from 435 individual viewpoints, none of which are exactly alike. I sincerely hope that action on this very vital and dynamic issue will be approached with open minds, seasoned with cool and deliberate judgment, adjusted with fairness, and resolved with wisdom.

NEED FOR DEBATE

I am sure none of us want to deny or restrict fair and honest debate for, after all, public discussion is one of the major foundation stones of democracy. Our discussion here today should and will help in making the best possible decision. Congressional action is and should be merely an official expression of public desire. Congressional action is an expression of the recognized needs of our time. In our deliberation here today let us keep in mind that it is much better to debate an issue without settling it than it is to settle an issue without debating it. I would have no part in unduly restricting debate and constructive criticism. Yet I hope that opposition to our nonpartisan foreign policy will not sink to the levels of thoughtless sniping. There will be the argument that we just cannot afford to spend so much money. The answer to this argument is that we cannot afford the consequences of not spending it. There will be the argument that the plan would not work. The answer to this is that the plan is working. There will be the argument that we are rebuilding our competitors for world business. The answer is that we are rebuilding our customers for an expanded world trade.

There are those who will say that we are merely pouring American dollars down European rat holes. The answer to that argument is that you cannot pour American dollars down any kind of a hole in any foreign country and make them stay there. American dollars or American dollar credit must come home or they lose their value. American dollars represent American goods and American services. American dollars must ultimately be spent in America for either American goods or American services. Every dollar going to any foreign country, either through loans or grants, or any other method, remains a dollar and will eventually buy only American goods or American services.

GENUINE WORLD CONCERN

There is today a greater and more widespread genuine interest in our foreign policy than ever before in the history of the Nation. Many reasons for this interest are quite obvious:

First. Two world wars in one generation.

Second. National spending for national defense.

Third. The cost of repairing the destruction of war.

Fourth. The impossibility of isolation from world-wide movements.

Fifth. The sobering responsibility that democratic world leadership is ours.

These reasons could be extended by any of you to great lengths.

DEMOCRACY IS IN DANGER

We would be fools indeed if we overlooked the basic fact that democracy and all it means to the free peoples of the world is very definitely challenged today. There are those who believe and are determined that democracy with its doctrine of individual dignity and freedom must be banished from the earth. The plain facts of life are obvious. The world is divided into conflicting camps. We find ourselves engaged in an old technique with a new name—"a cold war." Neither the struggle nor the issues over which we divide are new. The conflict is world-wide. Two world wars were merely two rounds in the bout. The conflict is between two opposite concepts of government. A compromise just is not in the cards. In my humble opinion, the conflict is a mortal struggle. The final outcome awaits a knock-out blow.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ESSENTIAL

The world situation today demands adequate national defense. Congress has and will continue to recognize and meet this need. We must continue to consolidate and expand the military strength necessary to protect and preserve our pattern of life. We accept as inevitable enormous expenditures to remain free. While I am not at all critical of our essential national-defense program, I must point out that national defense from the military point of view alone is a negative approach to security. In our attempt to survive we cannot and should not continue to depend entirely upon military strength to crush those who would destroy us. Such a course will eventually exhaust our strength at the expense of enduring security. What I am trying to say is this: "Would it not be wise, while remaining strong, to share our pattern of abundance and devotion to freedom with all who will accept it?" It is my contention that it is cheaper, more pleasant and safer to make friends than to defeat enemies.

ECA IS THE FRIENDSHIP ROUTE TO STRENGTH

The European recovery program is just what its title suggests—a European recovery program. We should judge it and support it as a European recovery program. If we attempt to make ECA merely an American business venture or an outlet for surplus supplies, or a European relief program, we will most surely miss the bulls-eye. We must make ECA first, last, and in between, a recovery program. ECA must be made a recovery program dealing primarily with living, breathing, thinking, and appreciating average human beings. ECA is a recovery program designed to rebuild a war-wrecked economy. Out of the ruins a self-sustaining economy can be built—an economy in which the people may find some incentive to live. ECA, while insignificant in cost in comparison to the cost of war, may well mean the difference between the perpetuation or the end of democratic freedom. ECA is the friendly route to security and peace.

ECA, THE TECHNIQUE OF PEACE

Democracy and freedom must grow and expand by its efforts to maintain and promote peaceful relationships. War never solves any problem. By war, with its heavy toll, we force to submission those who would destroy us. It is marvelous how we will work with other nations to effectively prosecute the expensive, wasteful, and destructive tactics of war. We offer no objections to tangling alliances when an enemy is on our backs. Then we welcome and encourage the closest possible cooperation. We willingly submit, and rightfully so, to strenuous self-denial and exacting regulations to further a war effort. We gladly combine every possible interest and strain our economy almost to the breaking point to defeat an enemy on the field of battle. We and our democratic friends have thus won two world wars. We have learned the techniques of war. We win our shooting wars, but as yet, we have to master the techniques of peace. How long are we going to continue winning wars and throwing away peace? It is very disturbing that we bend every effort to defeat an enemy and refuse to give the necessary thought and attention to building the patterns of peace. Will we ever take the tumble that it would be much cheaper, far more pleasant, and certainly much safer to build for peace than to fight for existence through war. It should be a sobering thought that the entire expense of ECA, even if extended several years, might finance world war III for perhaps only a few hours. When are we going to realize the simple fact of life, that freedom cannot live on the battlefield? Freedom must live by practice of the techniques of peace. ECA is a major part of an inexpensive, happy, abundant, and powerful technique of peace.

ECA VERY TECHNICAL

A program so extensive and so dynamic as the European recovery program must necessarily be set up by legislation which is complex. It could not be written otherwise. It is a new technique in human relationships. The machinery to properly administer ECA is a worthy challenge. The thought, the concern, and the friendship written into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 is the marvel of a new age. The first year of its operation is an accomplishment of which we can be justly proud. This concerted effort to rebuild and expand confidence, hope, and friendship through operation peace has made a deep and permanent impression on a war-torn and weary world. Complicated though it is and although it would require hours, yes weeks, of study to really know the details, yet its results are quite obvious. Democratic nations are withstanding the onslaught of those determined on destruction, our own economy is reaching new heights, confidence and hope are again becoming realities in the hearts of men and Christian civilization is encouraged by the faint glow of a new dawn. Then let us not stumble or quarrel over the complexities of this new machine of friendship and peace; rather, let us marvel and rejoice at the smoothness, precision and sureness of its operation. We can very easily retard effective operation by unwarranted controversy. I sincerely hope that we will not obstruct the operation of this machine by magnifying unessential details. After all, it doesn't make too much difference whether the main wheel has 15 or 17 cogs so long as it turns in the direction of a free world.

OUR SOBERING OBLIGATION

Whether we like it or not, the obligation and responsibility of world leadership is ours. What we do, or perhaps what we fail to do, will tip the balance. The fact that we were the people who had the power, with the intelligence and will to use it, that won the last two wars is significant. We make no attempt and have no desire to scale down the contributions of our friends and allies to mutual victory. We know many of them suffered infinitely more than we did. Our irreparable loss of loved ones, together with the wrecked bodies of thousands of our veterans, is only a grim part of the widespread wreckage of civilization which only they who make up this hellish wreckage will ever know. As the leader in the shooting war we awake in victory to a greater leadership—not a leadership in destruction and hate, but a leadership in construction and love. We mastered the techniques of war and made the sacrifices and paid the bills necessary to implement those techniques. Shall we do less now? The task, the obligation, the challenge, is ours. The stakes are too high and the alternative is too grim to fail now. We have no choice but to master the techniques of peace and to make the sacrifices and to pay the bills necessary to implement those techniques. We, and our democratic allies, have won on the military battlefields of the world the privilege and opportunity of leading and directing

mankind in building a peaceful world based on friendship, abundance, and the dignity of a human being.

WE ARE THE ONLY HOPE

We are the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world today. Yes, we are the wealthiest and most powerful nation of all time. In sincere appreciation to Almighty God, we, in the depths of humility, should be the most friendly and most generous nation of all time. Surely the mind and will of divine providence is behind it all. Here we are on the winning side of the world's greatest tragedy with our Government intact, our country free from the physical wreckage of war, and our economy at an all-time high. We are the only nation that can befriend a wrecked humanity. We, as a nation, do have the bread of physical life to share. We, as a nation, have the means of production to share. We, as a nation, have wealth to share with those who need. We, as a nation, have the spirit of the Carpenter of Galilee to share with those who will accept it. Does this unique position carry no obligation? Have we no conscience? Yes, there is an obligation. Yes, we do have a conscience. Just about a year ago a grateful people, through action of their Congress in the enactment of a foreign-aid program, very quietly and without fanfare extended a hand of friendship to a starving world. By passage of this bill now before us we will further implement and further establish the role we are destined to play. Let us proclaim to the world in language that cannot be misunderstood our intention to extend the hand of friendship, encourage the arts of peace, and defend the concepts of freedom.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, (a) it is with a deep feeling of humility that I stand before you today to talk about one of the most important subjects of our time, the recovery program for Europe, which represents a positive, constructive part of our foreign policy and a heroic sacrifice on the part of the American people which has been an effective instrument in the interest of world peace.

(b) The older I get the more countries I see, and the more I learn the prouder I become of the fact that I am an American citizen. In these troubled times we have a great responsibility.

(c) I am proud to be a Member of the United States Congress, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

(d) It is an inspiration to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has demonstrated a fine, wholesome, bipartisan spirit in fighting together for a friendly, fair, and firm approach to the peaceful solution of world economic and political problems.

(e) Our chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, is truly one of God's noblemen, and the entire administrative and professional staff has given invaluable assistance in the preparation of this legislation.

II. WE MUST CONTINUOUSLY FIGHT FOR OUR FREEDOM

(a) Mr. Chairman, America has a great history, but since the beginning of the American Revolution, when we were first fighting to gain our freedom, we have always had to take calculated risks to protect it.

(b) In the American Revolution, George Washington took a calculated risk when he exposed Virginia to added dangers by moving her crack troops to defend other areas. Virginia needed those troops desperately, but George Washington was fighting for our entire country, and he won liberty for us all. It would have done no good for him to have saved Virginia and to have lost the country. Virginia could not have survived under such conditions.

(c) There is an obvious parallel today to the calculated risks taken by Washington, but on a much broader scale. In order to save American liberty again, it has become necessary to take the calculated risks of cracking our economy by helping the freedom-loving nations of Europe financially so they could become bulwarks of strength against dictatorship, atheism, and aggression.

(d) We could not stand by and see one country after another go the way of Czechoslovakia. Russia had already absorbed 15 sovereign nations.

(e) We could not take the even greater risk of waiting, because we could already see that the freedom-loving, God-fearing people of the world could easily become enslaved by the "dictated to" peoples of the world.

(f) To avoid this, then, the alternative to such a calculated economic risk was the great risk of a hot war and the sacrifice of American blood. By comparison, the cost of this program is small, indeed.

III. THE PROGRAM HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL

(a) We have been fortunate to have highly efficient and capable representatives serving us in the European recovery program. Mr. Paul Hoffman and all of his assistants are to be highly commended for the fine job they have done.

(b) We should continue this program because it is working. The great amount of political and economic unity in Europe at this time could not have been achieved if it had not been for our help and assistance. Europe's economy is more highly integrated today than it has ever been before. The political unity of countries which have never been together is on the verge of consummation.

(c) In the political field the two most important developments since the war have been the establishment of the Brussels treaty system or the western European union as it is sometimes called and the recently announced decision to establish a council of Europe.

(d) Last week we witnessed the signing of the Atlantic Pact. We have just recently read about the three powers agreement in Germany. Previous speakers have told you about the coordinated efforts to bring about reconstruction in Europe through the OEEC, the Benelux Treaty, the Scandinavian trade agreements and the intra-European payment plans. Considering the historic independence and even antagonistic attitude of the nations involved, this unity is truly a remarkable testimony of the success of the program.

(e) The Marshall plan has given Europe life and hope. In this part of the world it has stopped Russia, a former ally that never quit preparing for war, never demobilized, and never matched our efforts for peace. To the contrary, she has broken over 50 agreements to date which threatens the security of the entire world.

IV. WE MUST CONTINUE THE ERP

(a) The most important thing for us to realize is the fact that there is no such thing as isolationism any more. This fall I took a trip to Europe and visited 11 countries and returned to the United States all within 4½ weeks. We just recently read about the Air Force plane, *Lucky Lady II*, circling the globe in 94 hours. We are living in each others' back yards today whether we like it or not and we are truly our brother's keeper.

(b) We simply cannot survive on a little green spot in this world today surrounded by a sea of misery, despair, corruption, hunger, and aggression. Under these conditions even if communism were not running wild, it would be some other ism and we would be in danger just the same.

(c) We must continue this program. It is the greatest effort that any nation in the world has ever made to help the suffering people of other nations and it is the most enlightened risk that America has ever taken to protect our freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth and fifth sentences of section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 are hereby amended to read as follows: "Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification and federation of Europe, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: Page 2, line 3, before the word "unification", insert

the word "economic"; and in line 4, before the word "federation" insert the word "political."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may seem unnecessary. Some believe that the words of the bill as they were worked out in our committee already carry the same meaning that this amendment will give to them unmistakably; but I feel that further development of economic unification and political federation in Europe are so fundamental, such basic requirements for the success of this program that we are not being fair either with our own people and are being even less fair with the people in Europe whom we are trying to help to recovery unless we make perfectly clear what we believe the ultimate goal must be.

This program was started last year with the plain condition in the law that we would help only those countries that would cooperate economically with each other and with us. The bill last year stated this, and the language is strengthened in the present bill declaring that "it is the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity." Thus we have already declared that we encourage them to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which we say flatly is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. Now, if it is proper for us to say that it is essential that there be economic cooperation in Europe, why should we not go ahead to say, if that is our view, that we want to encourage the economic unification and political federation of Europe.

Almost every witness before our committee, of whom we inquired about this matter, testified that Europe would not attain permanent recovery by 1952, so that these nations would be able to stand on their own feet unless they move rapidly in the direction of greater economic unification and political federation. Why do I thus separate the two? Because they are not the same. Look at our own country. In my State, Minnesota, we have great deposits of iron ore and one of the greatest sources of our State's wealth and high standard of living is our iron ore; but the iron ore would be of no benefit unless we were able to get it together with coking coal. Now, where is the kind of coal that is necessary to turn this ore into steel? It is in West Virginia, 1,000 miles away. Fortunately, under our system, the ore from Minnesota and coal from West Virginia can get together in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, and Gary without going through customs barriers, changes in currency, and without waste, delay, and confusion at each.

The main reason our country is in a position to help the nations and people of Europe is not because we are smarter than they are; we are not, we are of the same stock. It is not because we have greater resources under our control than they have; we do not. It is not primarily because we have been spared the physical destruction of two great wars, although that is part of the picture. The main reason is because our forefathers developed a system whereby we have 48 federated political units and at the same time we are one unified economic unit. How many of the 48 States could be prosperous if they insisted on being completely separate economic units? Probably most could exist, but many could not be even self-sustaining, and none could be prosperous. The source of our great prosperity has been our success in welding the States into a single economic unit.

Likewise, in Europe, if those countries are to get on their feet and become self-sustaining and strong, they must move steadily in the direction of becoming an economic unit, that is, in the direction of breaking down trade barriers of all sorts. They have already made real progress, for example, the Benelux customs union, and probably still more important, the recent treaty between France and Italy, and also the case of the three Scandinavian countries.

No one expects either economic unification or political federation to be achieved overnight; we are perfectly aware of the problems involved and the difficulties. I do not suggest that we impose this as a condition but make it rather as a recommendation. We do not say, "You must do this or we will cut off our aid," for the far-seeing leaders of those countries have to work them out by degrees. But we can help those leaders, and we should, by expressing to them frankly our sincere conviction that they should work in this direction, and encourage them to move as rapidly as possible toward further economic unification and political federation. Some of the strongest and the ablest men in Europe have told us off the record that they would welcome this amendment because it would strengthen their hands when they go to their people or their domestic interests or to their Parliament and urge them to accept and work for closer association and integration with their neighbors. That is pretty hard for them to do because their political opponents promptly get up and charge, "You are more interested in other countries than you are in your own country." But if they can say that the people of the United States have declared it is their policy to encourage such economic unification and political federation, their hand is greatly strengthened. They need this official expression of the conviction of the American people that in order for this great mutually beneficial effort to succeed, they must move as rapidly as possible toward "the economic unification and the political federation of Europe," that language makes crystal clear what we think is necessary.

It is not imperialism, but kindness, when a doctor out of his experience tells his patient what he believes the patient must do in order to recover.

I hope this amendment will be accepted without serious opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] was offered in committee, and it was examined by the members of the committee from every angle. In order to understand the meaning of the amendment, in order to understand what it will do, not only to this program, but what it will do in respect to the policy enunciated by our country in the original act, it is necessary for us to explain the objectives of this bill, not the political objectives, for we have none. It is our policy to pledge to the participating nations that we have no desire whatever to enforce or to inflict our political advice or requirements upon European countries.

The people of the United States have no desire whatever, no wish or no intention to interfere with the politics or the political objectives of any of these European countries. In all of our legislation with respect to this matter we avoid the use of the term "political" because each one of the countries is a separate sovereign country and all of them are entitled to their sovereignty. We have no disposition by this act or by any other act upon the part of this country to interfere with that sovereignty or to disturb their political equilibrium.

What did we declare in the original act to be our policy? Let me read:

> It is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through a joint organization to exert sustained common efforts as set forth in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation signed at Paris on September 22, 1947, which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation.

If that does not set forth in clear, explicit language a sufficient policy upon the part of this country, I do not see how the language could be made stronger. Yet, the gentleman wants to insert the words "political federation" and "economic unification." We have already declared we are in favor of federation and unification, but he wants to insert the word "political." I say we have no desire or no intention whatever of interfering with the politics of those countries or in anything political about their organization or their set-up.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel rather reluctant to take the floor today and say anything about this legislation after the statement was made by the minority subchairman of the committee that all Democrats are for the bill, all the Republicans are for the bill and all the Dixiecrats are for the bill, leaving the inference at least that

any one who opposes this bill in any way whatever would be ostracized from his political party. Or in fact he might be considered as not being a good American—even an outlaw. If that be so I accept the challenge and assume the responsibility, but I am against this legislation and I want everybody to know it. I am a Republican and I expect to be a Republican until they kick me out, because I believe in America and Americanism and I am an American individual. But, when I read the first paragraph of the legislation, after it makes a statement about what the legislation is going to do, I note this:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

I say that this legislation does impair the economic stability of the United States. That is the reason I am against the bill, and I say it puts us in such a position that we, as a country, are going to fail, go into bankruptcy, if we keep on doing the things we are doing under legislation such as you are now bringing before the Congress.

What have we done toward aiding and assisting those foreign countries? Let us just review them a little bit. We have given over $64,000,000,000 to these countries under lend-lease; what did we get for that—you gave $24,000,000,000 to foreign countries after the war effort up until VJ-day and the advent of the Marshall plan; last year you gave them about $7,000,000,000 under this plan with an obligation implied of ten billion more. Now in this bill you are asking for $5,653,000,000. Well, let us just see how the economic stability of the United States is going to stand that. Here is the Treasury statement of April 4, and it shows that we are in the red $251,553,000,000. You have gone in the red this year—and June 30th will soon be here—$2,566,290,756.24. Too bad, then the President of the United States comes in here in January and he says he wants to do this: He wants bigger old-age pensions, more pay for the idle, higher minimum pay, to pay all medical bills of the people of this country, pay for the sick, new taxes, build homes at less than cost. Federal aid for schools, electric power at less than cost, lower rents for tenants, bigger Government aid in the West, bigger price supports for farmers, bigger Government subsidies, higher wages, lower prices, and what not.

Now if you are going to get all of that for the people of the United States and then assume the responsibility of all the people of all the nations of the world, God help America, because this Congress is only wrecking our American economy. This Congress is going to wreck America, and I just defy anybody to say that it is not, for in 5 years from now, if you keep on going the way you are, Joe Stalin will have easy pickings over here in America, because you will be wrecked and you will not even be able to take care of your own people. I stand here fighting the things that this committee is trying to do. I stand here fighting for America. I stand here fighting because I believe in America, but I know well and true enough that you cannot do what you gentlemen are trying to do. I think it is just simply outright silly, and that is my opinion of this legislation. You signed the Atlantic Pact last week. It will not be but a few weeks until this same committee will be in here and they will be wanting more than a billion dollars to arm all the countries that signed this pact, and you will be asked for a billion dollars for Greece and Turkey and all the other countries of the world to arm them. What are you doing? Destroying America?

The cold war now going on has cost us billions already, and for the following years the State Department wants for the cold war the following:

1948	$4,498,000,000
1949	7,700,000,000
1950	11,601,000,000
Total	23,799,000,000

You talk peace and prepare for war. Not only do you spend annually over $15,000,000,000 developing our own war machine, you build up a war machine in every country of Europe. Europe has had enough war, and they got us into two of them. This action will probably involve us in a third world war. It is terrible to contemplate. Talk peace, yet prepare for war—prepare all Europe for war. It will surely be a hot war when you get them all ready for war. It will cost us so much money that our taxpayers cannot stand the strain on our economy. To me this is just silly. Certainly it is not sound.

Every time you spend a billion dollars it costs every man, woman, and child in America $7. Multiply that by 7, and this legislation costs each individual $49 for this bill alone, or for a family of six almost $300 each. How many families can stand it? Certainly none of them, if called upon to put up the money, would want to do it. This bill is unsound in principle. It might have the right motive—but people have a good motive—but the results will be most disastrous. That is my judgment of the legislation, and I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, in my humble judgment the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives is one of the finest bodies in our great House. I am reluctant to deviate from the great work which they have done in any respect. I consider myself one of the strongest supporters of the Marshall plan. I very deeply feel, however, the fundamental issue involved in this amendment.

Some of you will undoubtedly recall that I offered the same amendment about this same time last year. That amendment was debated here during the closing hours on the bill, and upon the basis of a very impassioned address made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who at that time was in charge of the legislation on the floor, the amendment was defeated.

Some time ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] came to me—and I think I am at liberty to say this, because I read it in the New York Times—and told me that he had made a mistake in opposing the amendment which was offered at that time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am a Methodist, and we of my faith believe in the mourners' bench. The gentleman attempted to put in the words "and unity" last year. I opposed him. I was wrong. In the committee I offered an amendment to put in the words "and unity," but the committee changed the words to "unification" and added the word "federation." I feel that I have shown my repentance in joining the gentleman in getting into the bill substantially the same words he offered last year. He was right.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate his statement.

I think the committee has done a very constructive thing in endorsing in principle in the preamble to this bill the fundamental concept of federation in Europe. I have followed this debate as carefully as I can. I believe practically all of us are convinced that unless we have peoples who are free and allies who are willing to stand by us in this terrific struggle which is now in effect throughout the world our own Nation can have no hope of survival. I think, too, that it can be said without too much fear of contradiction that the Marshall plan in essence contemplates the combined resources of a free Europe working together toward the defeat of Communist aggression.

The language the committee has now incorporated in the proposed legislation, in which the idea of federation and unification is endorsed, is important and vital language because, in my humble opinion, without unification, without federation in Europe, without the free nations' working together economically and politically, this program cannot succeed.

The distinguished chairman of this committee has made the point that by the insertion of the word "political" we may somehow or another give the impression throughout free Europe that we are interfering with the sovereignty and the basic rights of the peoples of the 16 participating nations of Europe.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Is not that exactly what the Communists are accusing us of doing in their fight against this program?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am very glad the gentleman made that point because I intended to make the identical point. The Communists now all over Europe are saying that the Marshall plan is designed as a plan of American imperialism, whereby we will absorb the sovereignty of all those great independent nations of Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, all over Europe today the charge is being made by the Communists that the Marshall plan interferes with the sovereignty of the free nations of Europe, so that by the addition of the word "political" we add nothing new to the Soviet charge. The free people know that these charges are not true.

By inserting this language we do this—and in my judgment, it is vitally important—we give encouragement to those forces working in Europe now for unification and federation. Believe me, those forces are vital and important. You know what they have already done. They met last May at The Hague. They met again in September at Interlaken in Switzerland, and I had the privilege of attending that meeting. Again, at the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Rome last fall the first welcoming words by the Italian Foreign Minister were that Europe must unite or perish.

All the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota does is to say in the preamble that, as a matter of hope or as an expression of desire, without interfering with the workings locally of the governments of Europe, the United States of America hopes there can be economic and political cooperation throughout the 16 participating nations.

Certainly no Member of this body can deny that without political cooperation the Marshall plan cannot succeed. If the Marshall plan does not succeed, then we have wasted billions and billions of the American taxpayers' dollars, and we have run the risk of a third world war.

No matter that will come before this body could be of more importance. Without a federation in Europe, without that ancient dream of all political factions in Europe, which are devoted to free government, whether they be socialist or conservative, whether they be of the free left or free right, they have united on the fundamental concept that the combined economic resources of Europe must be worked out by political cooperation.

I understand this amendment simply puts the Congress on record as favoring, in principle, that vital concept. As a matter of fact, every important American leader, regardless of his political faith, and practically every segment of the American press, and all of our great organs of opinion, have endorsed this principle.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in a peculiar position with reference to this amendment. I think the words "economic and political" are inherent in the words "unification and federation" that we have already put in the bill. I would be most disappointed if, by a vote against these words, the House would appear to go on record as being against such unification and federation. The meaning of those words, it seems to me, cannot be denied. If "unification and federation of Europe" does not mean "economic and political unification and federation," then what does it mean? The gentleman from Minnesota, it seems to me, has neglected that old "adage," "If at first you do succeed, do not try again."

The gentleman from Minnesota got in the word "federation" in committee. I helped him and the gentlewoman from California helped him, and altogether we got this language in, which is a great step forward. Last Saturday, when few of you were here, I said this:

> As events unfold and develop, it is becoming increasingly clear that without increased unification in Europe, economically and politically, the Marshall plan is "operation rat hole."

Here is what Paul Hoffman said—and you will find it in the hearings, as well as on page 11 of our report:

> The material well-being of the people of Europe cannot be obtained if each country tries to work out its own salvation along separate nationalistic lines.

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the sentiments given here by the gentleman from Louisiana, and the gentleman from Minnesota. I am deeply concerned, however, that this attempt to gild the lily by adding words which imply that unification and federation mean something else from what we all think they mean, will be misconstrued.

If this amendment is voted down it will be construed to indicate an intention on the part of the House which I do not think the House wishes to express. I am, therefore, perfectly willing to support the amendment, but if it is voted down, it should be made clear that it is because that expression is already inherent in the bill and not because we are opposed to unification and federation of Europe.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Why does the gentleman think that it is against the will of the House and that it would not be an expression of our will?

Mr. VORYS. I am concerned that the words being offered here have the same meaning which is inherent and implicit in the words "unification and federation." If the amendment is voted down, it might be implied that the House does not mean what those words obviously mean.

Mr. GAVIN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] definitely expresses what he wants to bring about in effecting this economic cooperation and federation.

Mr. VORYS. That is right. My point is that whether this amendment is voted up or down, the meaning is implicit in the bill that we have reported from the committee. I do not know how I can make it any clearer.

Mr. BREHM. There is no harm in blessing the Ten Commandments, is there?

Mr. VORYS. I am perfectly willing to vote for the amendment, but my concern is, and I saying it for the record, and for the conference, that if the vote goes against it, the House action is not thereby interpreted as attempting to strike out the ordinary meaning of the words "unification and federation," which the gentleman from Minnesota has been so helpful in placing in this bill at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring out an angle that perhaps has not been brought out in connection with this amendment. If the amendment means what I think it means, I think it is a rather dangerous thing to encourage economic unification of Europe if that economic unification is in opposition to the economic development of the United States. I represent that section in California in which most of the motion pictures of the world are produced. If there is one industry in the United States that has been seriously affected by the curtailment of production of pictures in Great Britain, or the denial of the showing of American films in Great Britain, it is Hollywood. The Hollywood unemployment situation is back to what it was in 1937. This is no small industry; it runs into millions of dollars.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Not at this point. Negotiations have been attempted to adjust the situation. Great Britain still maintains that she wants 45 percent of the showings of British pictures in Great Britain to the denial of American films. The American motion-picture industry cannot break even without 30 percent of the foreign market, and the market has been dried up to the point where unemployment in the motion-picture industry, as I said, is back to what it was in 1937. This is not a policy that is agreeable to the people of Great Britain; it is a policy that is even opposed in the House of Parliament. I have statements here that I will include in my remarks from various members of Parliament that show that this is a denial of the freedom of exchange of motion pictures that heretofore has existed between Great Britain and the United States, and is hurting the British film industry.

If we are going to say beyond what the bill already says by amending it to read "to encourage the economic unification of European countries," are we going to say that they should unite for the purpose of affecting our wool industry, our fishing industry? Both have already been seriously affected by the last appropriations that we made for ECA, and who knows what will be the next industry of the United States to be seriously affected?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Not at this time. I will yield later if I get some extra time.

The Motion Picture Producers Association at the present time is trying to negotiate with the State Department for the purpose of adjusting this difficulty in the showing of films in Great Britain. I voted against the British loan in spite of appeals on the part of many, many heads of the motion-picture firms. They told me that some $87,000,000 was in the Bank of England that was due them and that loan would release the money. I told them at that time that the British loan would cost them more than $87,000,000 in the long run.

It did not produce the money; as a matter of fact, there are millions of dollars now frozen in Great Britain, dollars that belong to the American motion-picture industry. It is being held in Great Britain.

I do not like this language, if it is going to mean that we are to encourage economic unification of Europe to the detriment of the economic development of the United States.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. How will the people of Europe, Great Britain, or any other country, be able to buy the products of the Hollywood motion-picture industry unless they have dollars with which to pay for them? And how can they get the dollars without the economic recovery which can come only through greater unification?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman. I have noted that when Great Britain establishes a policy of trade restrictions it is the signal for every other country in Europe to follow a like policy. When Great Britain establishes a policy, immediately all the countries in the sterling bloc take similar action.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman willing to accept pounds sterling, or francs in payment for the products of the motion picture industry, or does he want to get dollars? And how without a coordinated development of their resources and an improvement of their economic situation are they going to be able to get the dollars the gentleman wants paid to his industries?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am greatly concerned lest the pound sterling supplant the American dollar as the standard of exchange and whether we are not some of these days going to be asking for pounds sterling instead of American dollars.

Mr. JUDD. May I remind the gentleman that one of the three purposes of the original act as passed last year was: (3) facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But not to the detriment of the economic development of the United States, and that is what is happening.

Mr. JUDD. This is precisely what is needed to help the economic development of the United States.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is the gentleman making a speech against the bill or against the amendment?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Against the amendment if it encourages their development to the point that it is against the economic interests of the United States.

The United States has always been a completely free market for motion pictures, wherever made. There have been no limitations on imports and no restrictions on the exhibition of foreign films in this country.

As a medium of expression like the press, the radio, periodicals and books, the motion picture should have the widest opportunties for exchange among the peoples of the world.

An entirely contrary point of view prevails in many other areas of the world, notably in Great Britain, which has adopted various restrictive devices discriminating against American films.

This British policy has been stepped up constantly in intensity since the war.

In August 1947 the British Government imposed a 75-percent tax on the estimated earnings of foreign motion pictures. This was obviously aimed at American films which traditionally supplied about 80 percent of the British market. This confiscatory tax forced American motion picture companies to halt shipments of films to Britain because the tax meant they could do business in Great Britain only at a great loss.

The tax was a device imposed on top of a quota system whereby 20 percent of playing time in British theaters was reserved for British-made films. Even this 20-percent quota could not be fulfilled by the British film industry, because there were numerous defaults by British theaters.

The official reason advanced by the British for the 75-percent tax was the necessity to conserve its supply of dollars.

The American industry was, of course, aware of Britain's dollar problem. On many occasions, the American industry expressed its willingness publicly to work out with the British Government an arrangement which would accomplish two results:

First. To conserve dollars for Britain through a voluntary limitation of remittances by American companies.

Second. To assure Britain an adequate supply of films to keep its theaters open and operating in order to meet the entertainment needs of the British public.

With the 75-percent tax throwing the entire British motion-picture industry into an economic tailspin, the British Government invited representatives of the American industry to come to London in the winter of 1948 to discuss a film agreement to accomplish these two purposes.

Such an agreement was made in March of 1948. Under its terms, the 75-percent tax was abandoned, and the American industry agreed to limit its remittances from Great Britain to $17,000,000 annually. This was a considerable sacrifice for the American industry, for it meant that approximately three-fourths of its earnings had to remain in Great Britain.

On both sides of the Atlantic the agreement was regarded as a mutually satisfactory accord.

Under its terms, the agreement was to become effective in June of 1948, and it was felt that a new era of mutual understanding and better relations was to begin.

This hope was short-lived. Hardly had the agreement gone into effect when the British Government adopted another drastic restriction on American films.

The 20-percent quota was raised to 45 percent. This was done at the insistence of British producers, even though they had not been able to meet a quota less than half that figure.

What was the effect? It undermined confidence in the whole British film industry, brought protests from the exhibitors who relied on American pictures for their theaters, caused studios to be shut down, and threw thousands of people out of work.

In spite of the chaos in the British industry resulting from the 45-percent quota, the British Government's answer is to propose now to reduce the quota by only 5 percent. This is obviously a meaningless gesture and removes neither the cause of the British industry's crisis nor the discrimination against American films.

Following are the views and opinions of several members of the British House of Commons who do not agree with the restrictive policy of the Attlee government against American-made motion pictures.

During debate in the House of Commons on March 30, Tom O'Brien, member for West Nottingham, spoke against the excessive quota out of his long and intimate knowledge of motion picture conditions as general secretary of the largest British film trade union—the National Association of Theatrical and Kine Employees. He said:

> In the field of entertainment there is one thing that even our friends, the Russians, have failed to do. They have succeeded in everything else, but they have failed to make their own people, and the people in countries they control, see films they do not like, even at the point of a gun. We cannot make people see films they do not want to see—no quota, whether high or low, will succeed in doing that. If we wish to have a successful British film industry, and to maintain and expand it, we must do it on quality. Quality does not mean extravagance, waste, and unnecessary costs. We must not aim at an arithmetical quota merely to satisfy ourselves that we have a 40 to 45 percent quota of films—which people do not want to see. We must satisfy ourselves: first, that the quota can be met and that what is made is good; second, that the pictures will commend themselves by their own merit; third, that finance is available to stand up to the quota.
>
> I am not convinced, and a considerable section of informed opinion in the industry and country is not convinced, having regard to what has happened during the past year, that finance is available, or will become available, to meet a 40 percent quota. * * *
>
> It is my own view as well as that of other people that this 40 percent quota will create further unemployment. * * *
>
> We cannot keep our cinemas open for many years to come with British films alone even if every studio in this country were fully occupied and were producing first-class films. This is an accepted fact which the board of

trade (government agency which recommended the quota) will not deny. Whether we like it or not, we have to have American films. * * * We should apply our minds, as a long-term solution, to making arrangements or to trying to re-open the matter in some way to avoid a quota.

Oliver Lyttelton, member for Aldershot, mentioned the feeling prevalent among British exhibitors that their interests had been neglected in respect to the quota, and spoke of their being "extremely perturbed about the quality of British films which are being produced under a quota which they think is unduly high." He said:

From what I gather myself about the industry, the effect of fixing the 45 percent quota has undoubtedly been to give some substance to the fears about the quality of British production which, I think, have been formed as a result of fixing too high a quota.

Mr. Lyttelton reviewed the agreement concluded in March 1948, between the American industry and the British Government by which the American industry voluntarily agreed for a temporary period, ending in June 1950, to limit drastically its dollar remittances as a means of assisting the British economy. He said:

A great mistake was made at that time, because immediately after the agreement had been concluded the quota was put at 45 percent without any previous consultation at all with the Americans. * * * Whether rightly or wrongly—that question really does not arise—it infuriated American opinion; they thought they had not been treated on the square. * * *

It is clear that the industry is in great jeopardy and the first step to take is to secure the cooperation of those (the Americans) who are as much hit as we are in trying to clear up the mess.

Sir Ian Fraser, member for Lonsdale, said:

Exhibitors in different parts of a considerable area of the northwest of England tell me they cannot fulfill a quota of 45 percent. They say they cannot fulfill a quota of 40 percent. Therefore, they visualize that they will have to commit, if not a felony, at any rate a misdemeanor or an offense, if the law says they are to do it. They tell me that they have tried to comply with the law. They have been willing to show good films, indifferent films, and bad films, and they have shown films over and over again, but they still cannot fulfill the law.

Neil Maclean, member for Govan Glasgow, said:

The particular quota which has been established and which now, according to the president of the board of trade, should be reduced in its percentage is, in my opinion, still too high.

As a matter of fact, the 40 percent which he is now suggesting is in defiance of the recommendations of the organization which he himself set up, the Cinematograph Films Council. That council recommended a 33⅓-percent quota. The president wishes to impose a 40-percent quota instead of the 45-percent quota that presently exists. In so doing, I consider that he is acting in defiance of the council that he set up and to which he looks for advice and guidance in what he is to do with regard to the cinema industry. They gave him advice which he now recognizes as partly correct by the reduction he is now proposing, but he will not go the full distance.

Edgar Granville, member for Eye, said:

I have said repeatedly when discussing this problem that any attempt to try and build up our film industry on parochial lines will fail, whether the quota be 40 percent or 45 percent. Films are international. I should have thought that the party opposite, with its international outlook on all matters of culture and recreation, would have been the first to admit that. At this late hour I appeal to the right honorable gentleman (president of board of trade) to get together with the United States and any other interests and let us have an international agreement which will give the production side of the industry in this country the first real opportunity it has had for 20 years.

William Shepherd, member for Bucklow, said:

We have to consider, in discussing this question of a 40-percent quota, whether it will make for a reconciliation between the American interests and the British interests, because that is paramount at the present time. If we pursue a course which is antagonistic to our American friends, the industry in this country will never really get on its feet.

I suggest that this quota, although it is reduced from 45 percent to 40 percent, is perhaps not best calculated to achieve that end. I hope that the president of the board of trade will do all that he can in the next 2 or 3 months to try to get some agreement with our American friends.

What is happening now is damaging to the interests of both the American and the British industries.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment if it means to encourage the economic development of Europe to the detriment of our own economic progress and prosperity, especially when they are using our American dollars to stop our own industry and increase our unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, harmless as the amendment may sound, it has within it dangerous implications. It was presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and considered very carefully, and it was voted down by the considered judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House on a nonpartisan basis. After all, it should be kept in mind that this so-called Marshall plan is the cornerstone of American foreign policy. Because our money is being spent in Europe does not mean that the European nations themselves have no pride.

I should like to read for the committee the statement of Mr. Harriman when the same subject was raised while he was before the committee. Mr. Harriman said with regard to inserting conditions similar to the one in the amendment:

I think you are treading in a very dangerous field. These are mature and sovereign nations with widely different types of organization, economic organizations and systems. I do not believe we could accomplish what ought to be accomplished if conditions are laid down in this field. Suggestions, advice? Yes. Discussions and argument? Yes; but not conditions.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is not the amendment. This would not impose a condition. It is simply a suggestion or advice.

Mr. RIBICOFF. No; it is a type of advice where you seem to be telling Europe what to do. I may say to the gentleman from Louisiana that one of the main propaganda points that the Communists make against the Marshall plan is upon the theory that Uncle Sam with his dollars is trying to tell all of Europe and all of the world what to do. If we tell Europe when or how or why they should unite, we are treading on European sovereignty and playing right into the hands of the Communists. I want to point out to the gentleman that the European recovery plan itself is leading to the unification of Europe.

Let me point out also that we have Benelux, where Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg have already united. You have also seen formed recently a customs union between France and Italy. If there will be patience with the OEEC you will eventually accomplish what you desire in this direction. I think the Members of the House must realize that in a program like this we must be patient and not try to force upon the European nations our own conception of how they ought to govern themselves.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I ask the gentleman, does he agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], that the words "unification" and "federation" imply political and economic?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. I believe that is the ultimate object we are seeking.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I ask the further question then, what possible objection could the gentleman have to it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Because by putting in "economic" and "political" we seem to be placing ourselves in the position of telling European nations what we expect them to do. May I say to the gentleman also that France, England and Belgium have as much pride in their nations as the gentleman from Florida and all of us in the United States have in our Nation. Unification, economic and political, will take time and should not be forced upon Europe because we of the United States are giving our dollars to help European recovery.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Unless we definitely specify certain conditions, how long does the gentleman think the economy of this country can stand the $5,000,000,000 appropriation every year?

Mr. RIBICOFF. All I can say to the gentleman is that this is a keystone in our American foreign policy and if we do not spend this money for European recovery it will cost us many more dollars in the future to stop communism by ourselves. We are asking these countries for assistance too and I think it

should be kept in mind that we have a great fight going on between Russia and America. This fight is based upon the sinews of production. If Russia should be able to take over the European recovery so that all productive capacity of Europe is incorporated under the Russian system, it would be equivalent to the industrial economy of America. That is one of the basic reasons we are stopping the Russian march to take over western Europe.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that we gave Russia $11,000,000,000 not long ago in lend-lease with the idea of trying to help Russia? Now what are we trying to do? You will find out we are doing the very same thing here that we did to Russia a year ago.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In reply to the gentleman may I say that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], handled that argument very well last Saturday when he said that if the $11,000,000,000 were not given to Russia it would have meant the lives of many hundreds of thousands of additional American boys on the beachheads of Europe. I would suggest reading the RECORD of Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply desire to call the attention of the Chairman to the fact I would like to be heard briefly on this matter.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to observe that the committee took all the time in general debate, and some of us would like at least 5 minutes to correct certain of the erroneous conclusions that were stated here on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the sky is going to fall whether or not this amendment is adopted. As a matter of fact, the committee very carefully considered this amendment. Members from both sides of the aisle were in favor of the purpose of the amendment, but the great majority of the committee came to the conclusion that it was not a wise thing to do. I think it was Apostle Paul who centuries ago said: "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient." Now, of course, we agree that it would be both lawful and wise that Europe politically unify itself, but whether it would be expedient for the Congress of the United States to say that Europe must or should do this thing is a different matter. It was not a question of whether the committee was in favor or against the political unification of Europe. It was a question of whether or not we could better accomplish the purpose of political unification of Europe by leaving the word "political" in the bill, or taking it out.

We came to the conclusion that the best thing to do was to leave it out. As a matter of fact, Mr. Harriman warned us about it; Mr. Hoffman warned us about it. So far as I am concerned, I do not care what Russia thinks about what we write into this bill. The question that concerns me is whether we defeat our purpose by putting the words in there.

The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Louisiana have indicated that the amendment broadens the provisions of the bill as regards European unification. But as a matter of fact may I call to your attention that those words are not broadening. They may be construed as a limitation.

What does it say in the bill before us? "To encourage unification and federation of Europe." The amendment proposes to say not all kinds of unification; it just says economic unification, and when it comes to federation of Europe, everybody knows when we talk about federation we mean economic federation, political federation, and spiritual federation. But the amendment proposes only political federation. It not only is unwise from the standpoint of the declared purposes of this bill, but the committee overwhelmingly thought it would be unwise from the standpoint of the effect it would have upon Europe.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman is making a very excellent statement. It is my understanding, however, that the legislation as presented to this body has the word "economic" in it, does it not?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; it does not.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Oh, yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. No; it does not.

Mr. VORYS. Not at this point.

Mr. RICHARDS. No; it does not.

Mr. JUDD. In line 1.

Mr. RICHARDS. Wait a minute. I am talking about the preamble of this bill. It says, "To encourage unification and federation of Europe." It does not say economic federation and it does not say political federation, but it means those things without saying them. The statement the gentleman is talking about, economic federation, is in another place in the bill.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. On page 2, at the top of the page, I read: "To achieve speedily that economic federation of Europe."

Mr. RICHARDS. Oh, that is correct. That is all through the bill, but I am talking about section 1 which the amendment seeks to modify.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman is making a very fine statement, and it was proposed last year that if we struck out the word "economic" it would not be necessary to insert the word "political," but it is my conviction that if you insert "economic" then you ought to insert "political."

Mr. RICHARDS. I just want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the words that the gentleman from Minnesota proposes to put in here will not accomplish the purpose he wants. He says that he wants to broaden and clarify the purposes of this act.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am amazed at the debate here. It seems to me that the words "unification" and "federation" are the greater.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly the greater always includes the lesser, and putting the words "economic" and "political" in there are the lesser.

Mr. RICHARDS. Exactly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore, I am very fearful that the words "economic" and "political" are going to be words of limitation. There are many factors that will bring about unification and federation other than economic and political; many factors outside of that enter into it. It seems to me that the intent of the Congress and the intent of the committee is being limited by the use of these words, because it says "economic and political" and eliminates all other factors that are essential outside of economic and political. The state of mind and many things enter into bringing about unification and federation. It seems to me that these are words of limitation, and for that reason it would be unwise for the Committee to adopt the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. The majority leader is undoubtedly correct. They are words of limitation. I think it would be unwise to put them in here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment. I wish someone would take some of my time, briefly, to tell me what can enter into these negotiations that is not either economic or political. I think the majority leader has referred to a state of mind that might exist. Show me a state of mind in Europe today that is not based on either economics or politics.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will yield if the gentleman wants to answer that question.

Mr. VORYS. I merely want the RECORD to show that no one attempted to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think there is any answer to the question except that these matters are all simply economic or political.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman recall that the only time Europe was ever united was under the church in the Middle Ages?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is correct. I do not know of any church that is not based on either economics or politics, along with the spiritual theories it advocates. If you know of any that is not based on that, tell me about it.

This proposition has been sold to the American people on the basis that the program would bring about the economic unification of Europe and straighten out some of the politics over there so that those governments could get along together.

I also think it is high time that those in charge of the policy of administering these appropriations should put some limitations on them. I have never been in favor of the burden being placed on our taxpayers and bond buyers. The bond buyers support the deficits and the taxpayers furnish the money to balance the budget.

I have never been in favor of those burdens being passed along to them because there has been such loose, extravagant use of the money and such unaccountability. I have never been satisfied with the results of the Marshall plan or the Truman Doctrine appropriations because I have never felt that the administration of those funds had very much respect for the burden imposed on the people who were paying the taxes and buying the bonds.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In the last sentence of the first paragraph it is stated that no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. Does the gentleman believe this legislation in any way, with the other legislation that has been granted to help these countries, will impair the economic stability of the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it has impaired the economic stability of the United States, but this yardstick comes up: Has it impaired it as much as it would if you did not have the plan? That is what we are up against and there is no satisfactory answer to that question. Suppose you do away with this plan, liquidate the Marshall plan, the Truman Doctrine, and all that goes with it, and kiss it good-by and quit, what would be the economic consequences of such a program to the United States? Nobody can satisfactorily answer that. I know that just as well as you do. Here is a question where you take a chance. You take a chance by going ahead with a program of this kind and let the consequences be what they may, and they may be very bad; or, you take the other road. I think the plans have impaired our economic stability, but the alternative might be worse. That is something you as a politician have to take a chance on, too, because if you vote against this the thing may catch up with you and the people may wash you out. I have had to take that chance. I have not supported it up to date. I am not saying yet what I will do with this bill. The chances are I shall vote against it, because I am not satisfied with the administration or with the results.

Mr. RICH. If we have a debt of $252,000,000,000 and those countries all-told have a debt of less than $150,000,000,000 are not they in just as good a position to help themselves as we are, financially, especially?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think they might help themselves a lot more if we would just step out of the picture, but we are not going to step out. This Congress is going to approve this bill, and no doubt many other proposals in the future.

It will approve future appropriations under this program. There is no doubt of that in my mind. I would like to make this bill as palatable to our people as possible. Therefore, I support this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. To come back to the amendment. In the beginning opponents said it should not be supported because to put in the word "political" would make it too broad, and now the majority leader objects to it because he says putting in the word limits the scope of the language. Why should we not say what we mean precisely?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Exactly. It is about time we say what we mean and back it up.

Mr. JUDD. We owe it to our own taxpayers, and we owe it to the people of Europe to say that it is the policy of the United States to encourage certain definite things, and thus avoid uncertainty resulting from vague and undefined words.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I believe in, and why I support the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, are we inviting disaster—committing national suicide? How long can we play Santa Claus to the rest of the world before depleting our natural resources? How long can we, with less than 6 5/16 percent of the world's population, and less than 7 percent of the world's area, continue to operate an international WPA? We have already depleted our natural resources from 11½ to less than 8½ percent of the world's raw material.

Because of our high standard of living, we, 145,000,000 people, are consuming our 8½ percent of the world's natural resources, about as rapidly as the other 2,250,000,000 people are consuming the other 91½ percent. Yet the traitorous internationalists—the greedy one-worlders for a profit—continue to dish out to foreign, inefficient, and in many cases corrupt nations, the wealth that belongs to future generations.

There is very little high-grade iron ore left in Minnesota—very little high-grade manganese and chromium left in the Nation. We need manganese to make steel and chromium to make stainless steel. Without steel there can be no national defense. We are rapidly depleting our petroleum and many other products necessary for our welfare.

Under the Marshall plan, at the taxpayers' expense, we sent so much aluminum to Great Britain, that she returned some and sold it to us at black-market prices. The manufacturers did not draw on Great Britain for this aluminum, but upon her Marshall-plan credit in the United States Treasury—a credit that Britain has no more intention of paying than the $34,000,000,000 she owed us after World War II that we canceled.

Under the Marshall plan the farmers were robbed of steel piping—well casing—for their homes and livestock. The veterans needed homes, and the builders were robbed of the piping needed to build such homes. Under this plan our manufacturers sold all available steel pipe to Holland and other foreign nations at $110 a ton.

Again the manufacturers drew on Holland's and other nations' Marshall-plan credit in the United States Treasury—on our taxpayers' money. Not a penny of this credit will ever be paid back. Then about a year ago Holland had so much United States steel piping that she offered to sell to an American distributor all the piping he needed at $290 a ton f. o. b. Holland. Thus the Marshall plan created an international black market with a vengeance.

Unless this international insanity of destroying ourselves is stopped, we will not long survive as a great Nation. What is true of manganese, chromium, and steel pipe is true of thousands of other needed articles—articles produced by Americans and ignorantly and lavishly given to foreign nations.

The Marshall plan has been handled inefficiently, wastefully, and in many spots corruptly. As a starter we appropriated $15,000,000 for certain newspapers and periodicals for their help in putting over the Marshall plan on a supine Congress and a misled people. If that bribery is not a betrayal of our Nation, then I do not know what a betrayal is. I say without hesitation that the internationalists—the one-worlders for a profit—are more dangerous than the Communists.

Men always deceive themselves by abandoning experience to follow blind leaders—blind bellwethers. How long will we follow and permit the do-gooders on the packed Foreign Relations Committee, in their blindness and zeal, to destroy our Nation? I have the highest respect for the members on that committee, but they are lost in the dismal swamp. They do not know where they are going

or where they came from. If they ever hit it right, it will not be by the law of averages, but by the law of accident.

Six years ago that committee told us that unless we surrendered our domestic market, reciprocal trade agreements, there would be a world war III. Later we were told to avoid war and rearmament, we would have to lavish billions upon other nations—among them Russia and her satellites. The waste and corruption connected with UNRRA has not yet been fully written. Then came Dumbarton Oaks, and they told us we had to have an international bank which in the end will fleece the American taxpayers out of another possible $16,000,000,000 or $17,000,000,000.

Then the committee told us that in order to avoid world war III, we would have to loan Britain $4,400,000,000 and cancel the $34,000,000,000 she owed us. Next we were told that unless we gave $350,000,000 to arm and feed the decayed Greek Government's Army, the Communists would get us. Later it was billions more for the Greeks and other inefficient, and in some cases, corrupt nations.

The some $60,000,000,000 that we have mostly squandered on foreign nations since World War II, and the billions more we are asked for have not and will not, in the end, produce peace, but war.

Now again we are lavishly entertaining the representatives of foreign nations—some "has beeners" and some "never wasers." These foreign representatives all flocked to Washington to sign the North Atlantic Pact, and before the ink was dry, they demanded that Uncle Sam give them billions in addition to the Marshall plan for armament. Each representative had one hand out in front of him and the other behind his back hoping to get one hand full of American goods and the other full of the taxpayers' dollars.

The forerunner, as usual, was Winston Churchill. He was wined and dined at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. He made a speech to gullible Bostonians. He calls annually just about the time that Uncle Sam finishes collecting taxes. He believes that the early bird gets the worm—gets the cash. On arrival he had his picture taken on the boat. Then he was wined and dined by the intellectual Tories who like to bask in the British atmosphere.

I do not blame these foreign lobbyists. I do blame our Government and the Committee on Foreign Relations for being gullible enough to be taken in by that kind of flattery—gush. In spite of the fact that we are some $260,000,000,000 in the red, and with future obligations owe $663,000,000,000, we are asked to operate an international WPA. In fact we are bankrupt twice over. The Federal Government, with future commitments, owes twice as much as the normal value of all our property. We owe about four times as much as all the rest of the world taken together.

We are now asked for billions more to continue the Marshall plan and billions more to arm half of the world against the other half. We are asked to commit national suicide by giving away our natural resources and depleting our Nation, and in the end when we are exhausted we may have world war III on our hands because of our stupidity.

The time has come for us to refuse to follow blind bellwethers. The time has come to put an end to the stupidity of the do-gooders both in and out of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I say that I am enthusiastically supporting this authorization. Regarding the pending amendment, reading this bill I note it refers to "sustained, common efforts to achieve economic cooperation, and to encourage the unification and federation of Europe," it appears to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is a meritorious one.

It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota should be adopted. I find myself in accord with the gentleman from Louisiana. This amendment, it seems to me, makes for clarification. The purpose of this entire measure is to preserve peace, and may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my neighbor to the east, that I am here as a representative at large of all the people of the State of Ohio in this Congress, and that I speak with the voice of 7,000,000 of my constituents, Republicans and Democrats alike, who are for America foremost and first; and I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana that there should never be another world war. Two world wars—and it happened that I had the honor to serve in both of them—two world wars in which we were forced to participate were two world wars too many.

This amendment does not express any limitation, but rather is a broadening statement of the great humanitarian purposes of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, this authorization should be passed overwhelmingly. We intervene in Europe not for the purpose of domination but to prevent domination by the Soviet Union. We intervene, not to impose our system of government but to allow other peoples to choose their own system. We intervene to protect freedom. We intervene to achieve world peace. We intervene to protect the integrity of nations like Italy, Greece, and Turkey—to safeguard our own national security and with it the peace of the world.

It is of the utmost importance that we continue economic aid and an information program—that we confine and contain the Red threat of Communist aggression.

It is an unfortunate choice confronting our people. It means we must pull in our belts. It means we must spend a huge amount of our resources but if we count our pennies now we shall have to count our war dead later.

Dictatorship once again threatens us. The ECA program, or Marshall plan, has succeeded, to this good hour, in rolling back the tide of Red fascism or communism—it matters not by which name you term it—and were we to stop now, before the nations of western Europe are able to proceed on their own, it is probable that the few remaining citadels of freedom in the Old World would be unable to prevent themselves from becoming black holes of oppression behind the Soviet's iron curtain.

World War II left us the most powerful nation on earth, politically and economically supreme. With that power goes a responsibility we must not ignore.

In Italy, to cite an example of which I have personal knowledge from 27 months' services overseas in the armed forces, the Axis armies in their retreat adopted a well-planned scheme of demolition, the like of which the world has never seen. As the Fifth Army went forward from Salerno to the Brenner Pass, the Germans and Fascists, in their retreat throughout the length and breadth of Italy, destroyed what the shells and the bombs of the armies did not demolish. Italy and other nations of western Europe were shattered and famine stricken. They would have been easy prey to communism, had it not been for the Marshall plan and the great and unselfish aid this Nation has given. As a result of the program, for which I today urge renewed support, Greece, Italy, and Turkey stand firm against Communist Russia. Who is there to say that any of these nations would have a government of their own choosing if we had not aided them 18 months or more ago?

Mr. Chairman, this program upon which we vote is a program for peace. We who support this will help write into history not of wars, but of peaceful people, their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Ours is the greatest and richest industrial nation on earth. We learned the hard way in bitterness and despair back in 1931 and 1932 that isolationism and depression go hand in hand—that building a wall around this Nation bankrupts agriculture and paralyzes transportation and trade. We have learned that international trade is not a one-way road.

By this great program we support today we voice again our realization that only a prosperous world can be a peaceful world and that by building up the industry and trade of foreign nations, we enlarge our own industry and trade.

The bipartisan foreign policy of the Truman administration has met with success even beyond our fondest hopes and dreams. It would be unthinkable that in this, the second year of the European recovery program, we should stop in our tracks or retreat. Our answer must be to vote up this authorization.

In Europe, through the application of the Truman Doctrine, or the Marshall plan, we have stopped the march of communism and we are seeking to bring permanent peace to a torn and war-weary world. Who is there who can say that but for our aid the Soviet Union would not have imposed an extension of the iron curtain across an area dominating a natural resource of tremendous importance in peace and in war—the Mediterranean Sea.

The American people may well have a feeling of confidence and satisfaction that they have, in Washington, a Presi-

dent and a Congress, preparedness-minded, courageous and firm in dealing with the Soviet Union.

The alliance of the free nations of Europe and this Nation, as is evidenced by the North Atlantic treaty and by the entire ECA program, attests that a strong unconquerable America is determined to achieve a just and lasting peace in a democratic world. If the Soviet Union should assail us this year or in the years to come as an aggressor nation in the Hitler pattern, an overwhelming force will be alert and prepared to hurl back the aggressor. We who support this authorization attest our belief that free peoples everywhere have a right to enjoy peace and security in a free world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 72, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 2, line 11, after the word "states" strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided further*, That assistance under this title shall not be made available to any participating country which fails to comply with the decisions or accept the recommendations of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations on measures to maintain or restore international peace or security or to bring about compliance with the provisions of the Charter until such time as the President finds that such compliance or acceptance has been effected."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment as is by now well known is intended to deal with the problem of the failure of the Government of the Netherlands to comply with the United Nations Security Council's resolution of December 1948, respecting Indonesia, ordering a cease fire and the release of the high officials of the Indonesian Republican Government held as prisoners. The issues are grave and could well affect the views of millions of people of Asia and the East Indies with respect to the devotion of the United States to freedom and self-determination for them.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that any effort to discredit this amendment by an argument as to the character of the people in the Government of the Republic of Indonesia I think is fruitless, and on two grounds: First, we already have a complete record since December 1948, that both the President of the United States, and no greater authority exists in our Government on foreign affairs, and the Secretary of State of the United States have protested to the Dutch Government against these very activities with respect to their failure to comply with the resolution of the United Nations Security Council; and, second, we are not being asked to make an independent finding of fact in connection with the administration of this amendment. We are asked only to take the solemn determination of the Security Council of the United Nations, of which the United States is a member, and in connection with which determination the United States has the absolute right to veto, so that if the United States does not agree with the resolution of the United Nations Security Council it could veto that resolution.

The argument will also be made with respect to this resolution that it is unnecessary because if the United Nations should impose sanctions, then the United States by virtue of its adherence to the United Nations Charter itself, must carry out those sanctions and no amendment to this law is necessary to bring that about. Certainly no amendment to this law is necessary to bring about the carrying out by the United States of sanctions imposed by the United Nations, but such sanctions cannot be imposed unless the Security Council votes, not a resolution like the one we are discussing here with respect to Indonesia, but specifically votes economic or other sanctions. Before it can vote those sanctions any great power, and that includes the Soviet Union, can veto, so that if the resolution for sanctions is vetoed in the United Nations Security Council there is nothing that the United States has to carry out under the terms of the Charter.

The Dutch, who are going to get under this particular legislation some $355,000,000, are not obeying the United Nations Security Council and we are told that the United States has not the power to do anything about it under circumstances where it is proposed to actually deliver this vast sum of aid to the Netherlands Government.

It is a fact that the United States as a measure of protest has already cut off aid to the Netherlands East Indies. But what has that done? What has been done is to deprive the East Indians themselves of the benefit of some assistance under the European recovery program; in addition some two-thirds of our aid had already proceeded to Indonesia before it was actually cut off by order of the Administrator following the resolution of the United Nations Security Council.

There is also a possibility that this kind of amendment and this particular situation will not apply alone to the Netherlands, but may apply to other nations. There are other great colonial powers in the European recovery program: Belgium, Great Britain, and France, to be specific. All the peoples of Asia are thinking now in terms of their own freedom, and their own independence. The ERP is a great program for economic recovery—to do what? To promote freedom, and all I am asking in this amendment is that as a declaration of policy we will say that we intend to see that freedom is promoted now, not by following our own views or the views of somebody else, but by following the organized opinion of the world, the organized conscience of the world in the United Nations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other body has already considered this question and came up with an amendment which was but a declaration of what is already an obligation of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. The other body has already passed an amendment to the European recovery program purporting to do something about the situation. What they have done is to say that where the United Nations Security Council has ordered sanctions to be imposed, the United States will withhold its aid unless the particular nation affected performs what the United Nations wants it to perform. Well, that is already a proper obligation of the United States under the United Nations Charter. We are creating no new obligation if we do nothing but pass the amendment of the other body.

In addition I would like to point out that I have not offered an amendment requiring that the Administrator or the President forthwith cease aid to the Netherlands if it continues its refusal to comply with the United Nations Security Council's resolution. On the contrary, I have written it into the statement of policy to give our top executive authority on foreign affairs—the President—with complete flexibility with respect to when and how that policy is to be carried out. But, I certainly think it is fundamental if the European recovery program is to succeed in this fight for freedom, that this provision be put in the law as part of the fundamental policy of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the continuation of ECA aid, for this investment in the rehabilitation and care of the people of war-torn countries is our most potent weapon in the present struggle between democracy and communism and in our efforts to preserve peace.

However, we know that the Congress, in voting for the Marshall plan, had no intention of allowing the funds granted or lent thereunder to be used in any program of aggression by any nation receiving such aid. In my opinion, the present Indonesian situation presents a flagrant defiance of the United Nations and its Security Council. Further, although there have been strong denunciations of the Dutch because of their offensive against the Indonesians—they continue in their aggression and their refusal to adhere to the order issued by the Security Council.

We must, therefore, protect ourselves against further misuse of grants under the Marshall plan. The people of the United States have indicated their willingness to make sacrifices for the nations which would benefit under the Marshall plan—but, primarily, those sacrifices are meant to preserve peace. We cannot afford to give aid to those who defy the orders and decisions of the United Nations or its Security Council, now or in the future. The prestige of these bodies must be maintained unless we are to have another futile and useless organization like the League of Nations.

Firmly convinced that we must take drastic action, I introduced H. R. 1643 on January 18, 1949, which provided:

That no money under this act shall be granted, lent, or used to or for any country which violates any provision of the Charter of the United Nations or directly or indirectly engages in acts of aggression, so long as such acts continue, as determined by proclamation of the President of the United States of America or by the United Nations.

This bill was introduced with the thought in mind of withholding aid from Great Britain and Holland, who were both aggressors at the time. Since then, Great Britain has been compelled to desist, but Holland persists in continuing with its program of aggression. In the light of these events, I am pleased to support this amendment which proposes to shut off American aid to any nation singled out for punishment by United Nations sanctions for violations of the UN Charter. This provision will protect us in the future, and will assure us that United States funds will not be used to further an aggressor's cause.

This country has no wish to assist any aggressor nation in a destructive undeclared war or any other activities which undermine the peace. It is only by signifying our firm intention in this regard now, and legislating accordingly, that we can hope to maintain the efficacy of the United Nations, upon which we must rely to keep order in our troubled world.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is evidently a great deal of misinformation on the Dutch-Indonesian troubles. I have studied this matter for some weeks, and I am convinced that it would be a mistake to enact an amendment to withdraw aid from the Netherlands because of the so-called police action of December 1948 and the continuing disorders in parts of Indonesia.

I have before me a report issued February 2, 1949, by Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, now president of Brooklyn College in New York. He is known as an expert on Netherland affairs and says at the beginning of his report:

Our American policy—and I am talking about American policy toward Indonesia, and only insofar as it is relevant about the policies of the Netherlands or other powers—is an incredible mixture of ignorance, of false starts, of noble intentions, and of ideological hypocrisy.

Dr. Gideonse then traces the Dutch colonial policy and concludes that these people of Holland have been easily the most progressive colonial power. It is well established, he says, that the Dutch have been progressive in the sense that the government of the dependent territory is conducted in a way to permit and promote a growing participation in that government by the folks who are themselves the natives of the dependent country. Unlike some other folks, he says, the Netherlands have not only preached this, they have practiced it. He cites the incident of the Rosenwald Foundation—that when the Rosenwald Foundation got interested in the problem of the educating of the American Negro of the United States, they chose to bring in as their leading expert a gentleman who had the standing of being the leading administrator of education in Dutch Indonesia. That choice was quite a compliment to the education achievement of the Dutch colonial administration.

Dr. Gideonse, is his report, states that the present Government of the Netherlands is a coalition between the large Catholic Party and the large Socialist Party. The more conservative groups are not represented on the right, and the Communists are not represented on the left. Policy in Indonesia at present is supported by Parliament and by the Dutch people. I have in my records here copies of correspondence between Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, and Mr. A. Vermuelan, secretary of the Netherland Federation of Trade-Unions. Mr. Vermuelan writes Mr. Murray, under date of January 24, 1949, that the federation of trade-unions rejoiced when the Linggadjatti and Renville agreements were signed because they looked upon these agreements as a realization of the ideals expressed in the charter of their federation. He says it became more and more a matter of great concern to the federation when developments during 1948 showed that chances of achieving a definite agreement with the Republican Government of Indonesia decreased steadily. He states that there can be no difference of opinion as to whether the fact that the Republic did not carry out the agreements into which it had entered and that no further arrangements could be made, must be attributed to unwillingness or to impotence, or to both, on the part of the Government of Indonesia. Mr. Vermuelan states that it is an established fact that communistic influence within the Republic was growing and that this influence made it increasingly difficult to reach an agreement with the Netherlands, and, finally, to the inability of the Republican Government to control its armed forces in irregular formations. Mr. Vermuelan further states it is the considered opinion of the federation of trade-unions that the military action of the Netherlands Government should be justified by the measures which will be taken in the next few weeks and that it is the intention of the Netherlands Government to direct its efforts toward a peaceable settlement, as evidenced by the speech of its representative in the Security Council.

Mr. Murray, in replying to Mr. Vermuelan under date of January 31, says the CIO accepts his assurances that the present action of the Government is motivated by the desire to maintain law and order in all Indonesia, and acknowledges that the Netherlands Government has never taken an exception to the final government arrangements of Indonesia in the United States compromise plan.

It is perfectly plain that Russia would like to draw Indonesia into her orbit, the sooner the better. The best method to effect this is to try to conquer Indonesia by her fifth columns. Should the U. S. S. R. succeed, they will then have deprived the Western democracies of one of the treasure houses of the world—a treasure house vital to us in peace or war. If Indonesia should be conquered by Communist fifth columns, the balance of power in the world-wide struggle might tip to the Russian side.

The Moscow Communists, under the leadership of Alimin, Musso, and Sjarifudin, have been one element in the Government of the so-called Republic. The latter was appointed Minister of War by President Soekarno and he signed the Renville agreement. He later admitted that he had always been a Communist and was executed by another element in the Republic. Now here is the record of two of the other leaders, President Soekarno and Premier Hatta:

WASHINGTON PICKS SOME QUEER PROTÉGÉS TO FIGHT IMPERIALISM IN INDONESIA

For weeks on end, our UN delegates have tried to outbid and outorate Russia in proclaiming the State Department's affection for Indonesia's nationalists. Pressure groups from all over have issued impassioned resolutions hailing Indonesian leaders as democratic underdogs personified and symbols of the world-wide struggle against tyranny.

Nobody, of course, can be that pure, and the Indonesian nationalist leaders certainly aren't. Just who are they, this former President Achmed Soekarno and Premier Mohammed Hatta, and what is it that makes them the idols of weepy sentimentalists from Palembang to Union Square?

Both have played along with Communists, on and off, ever since they appeared on the political scene. That, we realize, is still considered a highly respectable practice by some people who call themselves progressives. But Soekarno and Hatta also weren't reluctant when it came to collaborating with the Japanese effort to take over Asia. Here, briefly, is the story:

When the Japanese arrived in the Netherlands East Indies, they quickly recognized Soekarno and Hatta as their friends and brought them to the main island, Java. Soekarno, in his enthusiasm over Tokyo's first big victories, bet on the Japs to win. He told his followers on March 1, 1943: "Ever since the Japanese Army constituted a government in these lands, we Indonesians have done everything in our power to work with them, and we have exerted ourselves to attain that great goal placed before us by Dai Nippon: The greater East Asia coprosperity sphere."

Hatta celebrated the Japanese Emperor's birthday a few weeks later with these words: "We are integrated in the prosecution of the war of greater East Asia, and it is in complete

accord and cooperation that we work within this community of destiny." Making sure of pleasing his Tokyo bosses, he added: "We are ready to participate fully in the fight for the destruction of the United States and of England, and for this reason we stand in complete confidence and with all our strength behind the army of Dai Nippon, so that it may achieve victory."

Both Soekarno and Hatta were leaders in a number of Japanese-sponsored organizations set up to recruit Indonesians into Nippon's Army and to spur war production. Among these groups were the Poetera organization, the Hookoo-Kai and the Java Central Advisory Council. Soekarno and Hatta traveled up and down the country, making speeches, writing appeals, and generally trying to get popular support for Tokyo's "coprosperity" notions. In 1945 they organized, on their own initiative, a so-called New Life Movement, designed to rally the Indonesian people against the expected Allied invasion.

Just after the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Soekarno and Hatta were summoned by the Japanese to Saigon, Indochina. There they were told by the Japanese commander in chief for southeast Asia, Field Marshal Terauchi, that orders from Tokyo called for immediate proclamation of an Indonesian Republic. Soekarno was properly and extravagantly grateful. He acknowledged independence as "a favor of His Majesty, Tenno Heika, sprouting forth from his unlimited wisdom" and expressed his "eternal thanks." It should be noted, of course, that from the Indonesian point of view independence was welcome under any sponsorship, but that does not mean that we should regard former collaborators with Japan as models of political perfection.

The Indonesian Republic was born at the Batavia house of Rear Admiral Maeda, head of Japanese naval intelligence, on the morning of August 17, 1945. Soekarno signed the proclamation of independence that made him President and Hatta Vice President. Rear Admiral Maeda looked on; he had just planted a gigantic time bomb. Today Soekarno and Hatta are the subjects of Washington's concern. In its anxiety to get on the band wagon of "anti-imperialism," the State Department has taken on some curious protégés.

The American-sponsored resolution of the Security Council has demanded that the Netherlands Government set free the Republican leaders and negotiate with them. It might well be that the Dutch Government would be compelled to allow them to enter the Federal Government of the United States of Indonesia. These Communists, these Japanese quislings could then work legally toward the Soviet Government of Indonesia. Do you blame the Dutch for resisting them, for trying to clear them out of the so-called Republic? What would we do in similar circumstances? You know what we would do, I know what we would do—we would be harder than the Dutch have ever been.

Pressure groups from all over have hailed Indonesian leaders as democratic underdogs and symbols of republican principles. The leaders of the Republic that signed the Renville Agreement on January 17, 1948, were former Japanese collaborators and were among the people who hailed the Japanese as the founders of the great prosperity order of East Asia. The three main leaders who signed the Renville Agreement for the Republic, it is believed, have been executed during the last few months by more moderate elements of the Republic.

Returning to Dr. Gideonse's report, he states that before the Dutch military action of December 18 last, there were on average 50 Indonesian officials a week killed by guerrilla action. That was done deliberately to frighten the Indonesians from participating in the government administration of the Dutch area. The whole military action of the Dutch, Dr. Gideonse reports, the first one a year and a half ago, and this one now, has cost less than 100 casualties and this last one, counting the Indonesian casualties on both sides, less than 250. When you remember that the total population is 75,000,000 and that there were 50 killed a week among Indonesian officials up until the police action, these figures take on a new meaning.

The Marshall plan is not designed to help the Dutch alone. The Marshall plan is designed for the reconstruction and restoration of western Europe, and the Dutch have been in the forefront in cooperating with this plan. They suffered the loss of one-third of their national wealth through the occupation of the Germans; their living standards reached an unbelievably low point—at one time they were living on 400 calories a day, and when a communistic-inspired Japanese-quisling-trained group of people backed an uprising in Indonesia, it was immediately shouted that democratic principles are being violated. We do not always know what we are talking about. There is one last point. It is that if ECA aid is to be an instrument of political coercion, that would be against the basic concept of ECA. If this principle was established, the United States would be placed in the position of reviewing the activities of all the recipient nations with a view to determine whether such activities measured up to criteria satisfactory to United States foreign policy. Under this principle, the continuation of ECA aid to any nation could be construed as signifying endorsement by our Government of all the policies pursued by that nation and would place us in an impossible position.

I hope you will defeat the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman agree that the President, the Secretary of State, and the United Nations Security Council, all three, have vigorously condemned the Dutch for their failure to comply with the resolution of the United Nations Security Council passed in December 1948?

Mr. CHATHAM. I believe that is generally known.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact there are already in the law provisions which require the Administrator of the ECA to comport with the foreign policy as established by this Congress, by the Secretary of State, and by the President? In other words, does not the gentleman feel that the situation is already covered by existing law?

Mr. CHATHAM. The gentleman from Florida is exactly right. Section 118 of the act instructs the Administrator to terminate aid to a country whenever "because of changing conditions assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States."

THE CHICAGO COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS PRESENTS AMERICAN POLICY IN INDONESIA

(By Harry D. Gideonse)

Chairman CYRUS H. ADAMS III. Few people are better qualified to inform us than Dr. Harry D. Gideonse. To many in this room, he is well known from the years between 1930 and 1938 when he was in the Department of Economics at the University of Chicago and he has addressed this council on several occasions. To the radio audience, his voice will be remembered from his participation in the University of Chicago Round Table, the Invitation to Learning, and other similar programs.

Born in Rotterdam in the Netherlands, he came to this country at the age of 3. He received his bachelor and master degrees at Columbia. He has received other degrees from the University of Geneva in Switzerland, from Brooklyn Law School, St. Lawrence University, and Western Reserve University. He has had a distinguished teaching career at Barnard, Columbia, Rutgers, University of Chicago, and is now president of Brooklyn College in New York.

To list just a few of his activities, he is an author, an editor, a director of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, chairman of the board of Freedom House, and since 1946 has been a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Primarily an educator in the field of economics, he has always been keenly interested in foreign affairs. Although he has lived in the United States since the age of 3, he has never lost interest in Netherland affairs and has continually kept in close touch with that country.

He will speak to us today on American Policy in Indonesia.

Dr. HARRY D. GIDEONSE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members of the council and old friends, it is fun to be back here, fun to see old friends and to speak from this familiar pulpit. It is not fun to talk on a subject that is as full of confusion, and I think misunderstanding in the United States, not to speak of a few other places, as Indonesia. But the Chicago Council has a rather peculiar record as far as its choice of topics for me is concerned. I recall one time when you invited me back in 1939, when we had just seen the beginning of the Second World War, and the Chicago Council put on a program to which you had invited a gentleman who had often been Senator Borah's brain truster, who was to argue that it was not our war and could not by any stretch of the imagination be our war, and then his opponent was to argue that perhaps this was our war, and we should pay some attention to our interest in its outcome. That was my role, and it was not an easy one, although perhaps, as time went on, it became a somewhat understandable performance.

Then in 1943 you brought me on a comparable sort of an assignment. At that time, as some of you may still recall, American public opinion—and particularly the liberal and democratic wings—had become greatly concerned about the fact that Mr. Roosevelt was doing such strangely reactionary things when he wasn't giving full recognition to General De Gaulle. You may remember how all the liberals and all the democratic elements were critical of Mr. Roosevelt because he somehow could not see the four-freedoms light with regard to General De Gaulle. It was my function to come in and give you a speech in which, without any connection

at all with the State Department, I could speak somewhat more freely than the gentlemen in the Department who were under the sealed-lips tradition of responsibility. I explained how it could be argued that General De Gaulle was not so far away from Marshall Petain and Vichy in his attitudes on social, economic, and political questions, again a position which was then very difficult to take and for which perhaps some people have today a little more understanding.

Now, if you look at Indonesia, it is perhaps the toughest assignment of them all. I do not remember a question on which American public opinion has seemed, from the Chicago Tribune on the right straight through the fellow travelers on the left, as united in its determination to believe things that aren't so; and as united in its determination to refuse to listen to the other side, and I compliment the Chicago council for one of the rare opportunities to speak a piece in public on what are some of my reasons for making that very severe statement.

I am going to argue here, and I am putting you on warning, that our American policy—and I am talking about American policy toward Indonesia, and only insofar as it is relevant about the policy of the Netherlands or other powers—is an incredible mixture of ignorance, of false starts, of noble intentions, and of ideological hypocrisy. It is quite an order and now let's proceed.

To understand the position you must first of all remember that the Netherlands for now well on two generations have been regarded as, I think, easily the most progressive colonial power. They have quite a record that way. Any college library will show it. It is well established, I think, in the literature on colonial administration that the Dutch have been progressive, progressive in the sense that the government of the dependent territory is conducted in a way to permit and promote a growing participation in that government by the folks who are themselves the natives of the dependent country. Unlike some other folks, the Netherlands have not only preached this, they have practiced it. This is not recognized merely in the Netherlands. It is even recognized by groups like our own Chicago Rosenwald fund. I say that because I don't think that anyone would argue that the Rosenwald fund was a reactionary or an imperialistic group. When the Rosenwald Foundation got interested in the problems of the education of the American Negro in the United States, they chose to bring in as their leading expert a gentleman who had the standing of being the leading administrator of education in the Dutch East Indies. That choice was quite a compliment to the educational achievement of the Dutch in their colonial administration. The material written by the gentleman can be consulted in any American college library. And the choice was not made by anyone engaged in power politics at Lake Success or in the Netherlands. It was the choice of the Rosenwald fund, a free independent group of American citizens interested in the education of the American Negro. You couldn't have a more objective testimony to what that group thought of the educational policies practiced in the Netherlands East Indies.

Let us look at it historically, and let me cite a few facts. I do not wish to overburden you, but to remind you of some facts that show that education to native self-government was not some afterthought of the Dutch, not something that the Netherlands discovered during the Second World War when they temporarily lost control to the Japanese. The notion of participation of the natives in colonial government in the Dutch East Indies is very old. The notion of separating the budget of the Netherlands and the Netherlands East Indies is more than 70 years old. The notion of a colonial policy, the primary purpose of which would be the development within the Dutch East Indies of native Indonesian ability to share in and ultimately to take over the control themselves, goes back to the year 1901.

A Cabinet was put into office in the Dutch Parliament in 1901 to implement that policy. There is a very long record of policies designed to give the native civilization of the Dutch East Indies self-control culturally, something the West has not always understood, because it interfered with the imports into the Dutch East Indies of western culture, western religion and western technology. But the Dutch all along followed what you might call an anthropological policy in the Dutch East Indies. In other words, the great variety of racial, and religious groups in the islands were to be preserved in the integrity of their own culture. For example, they were legally to be judged in courts in which their own customary law was to be the standard—not Dutch law, not western law, but so-called Adat law. Adat is simply the word for native custom. We would say common law, and when the natives did not have the scholarly resources to codify such law properly, Leyden University devoted some of its most distinguished scholars to this task. Van Vollenhoven, who was one of the greatest experts in international law, was one of the great scholars in Adat law, codifying, in other words, the customary law of the natives, including among other things, the principle that no Dutchman, no westerner, was ever to be a judge in any of the Adat law courts. The Adat court law was always administered by natives who handed out native law. Land ownership was never to be vested in non-Indonesians, much to the displeasure of many foreign investors.

Of course, the implication was that you had other courts for other kinds of law, every group being judged on the basis of its traditional views. This is understandable if you recall that there are some 75,000,000 people in the Dutch East Indies; including some 15 to 20 clearly recognizable racial groups, and some 200 local dialects. They have no common language, although the Dutch have gradually put through the notion of Malay as the common language in recent times. It is now called the Indonesian language and is more or less a synthetic improvement of Malay above the bazaar Malay of the market. So Malay in that respect is a little like the Hebrew of modern Israel which has been given a contemporary vocabulary to describe recent economic, technical and scientific developments for which old Hebrew had no vocabulary. The Indonesian language of today, which you read about, is that standardized East Indies Malay, and its spread accompanied the accomplishment of over-all political unity by the Dutch. There was no such unity until it was accomplished in three centuries of Dutch administration.

Now, these 75,000,000 people living in an island empire that stretches over an area as large as the whole of the United States, have an enormous cultural and historical diversity. It is therefore natural that if you wanted self-government, you had to work with these groups in their own cultural tradition. If you tried to impose one standard on them all, you would be going flatly contrary to that object of self-government and self-participation, which we have always regarded as the yardstick of progressive colonial administration.

The developments toward self-government began to take a more concrete political form Indies—1916, mind you, when the Dutch established the so-called popular council (Volksraad) still by a slight majority Dutch; 1918 was another step; 1922 and 1928 were other steps in the expansion of its membership. By 1928 it had become in majority Indonesian and it was then an agency in which the final budgetary control over the Dutch East Indies had been transferred from the Hague to Batavia. That, you see, is 20 years ago. There still existed at that time a veto on the part of the Dutch Parliament over the budget as a whole, but no longer an item veto; and the budget as a whole was never vetoed. In other words, you had there a continuous development of participation of sharing in the government of the Dutch East Indies on the basis of favoring the development of local native cultures.

Don't get the impression that this was all done unanimously by the Dutch. Of course not. The Dutch aren't angels, no more than the Americans. There were commercial and bureaucratic interests that they did not wish to relinquish, something fron which they deprived profits of a commercial and financial sort. But you also had these other elements of which I have been speaking that dominated in the Netherlands Government policy, as I said, from 1901 on. There are such differences right now in the Netherlands where there are several rather important political groups, not however members of the present government of the Netherlands, who have all along felt that the policy of the Dutch Government has been altogether too idealistic and too unrealistic. These groups feel that power and force were not used early enough. These groups, many of them, are very close to big industry and financial investments in the islands. They have disapproved of this so-called ethical policy since 1901, and they are very vigorous in disapproval now. But they are not members of the present government of the Netherlands.

I think it is very important for you to keep in mind that the present government in the Netherlands is a government roughly comparable to a combination between the present government in England, a labor government, and the government in France. The two dominant parties in the government of the Netherlands today are groups that we could call Social Democrats and Christian (Catholic) Democrats. That is to say, the large Catholic and the large Socialist Party combined in one cabinet. The more conservative groups are not represented on the right, and the Communists are not represented on the left. Policy in Indonesia at present is supported by parliament as a whole, with the exception of eight Communists, and those of course you would not expect to be in support of any policy other than one that presented Communist infiltration in Indonesia.

If you look at the picture after 1945 you find, after the islands were liberated, a period of great confusion, because the Japanese, when they found they had to leave, left Japanese puppets in control. Soekarno, the president of the so-called Indonesia Republic, and Hatta, the vice president, were both men who during the Second World War were on the side of Japan. They were in Tokyo. They are both committed to extremely critical statements about American imperialism although they like to compare themselves today—even on postage stamps—to George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. The other day you saw in the papers pictures of Soekarno in Tokyo, which was one of the affiliations that were built up during the war and very genuine at that time.

When the Japs were forced to leave, they left Soekarno and Hatta in charge, and they left them armed with Japanese armament. The top leadership, in other words, of the so-called Indonesian Republic is definitely Japanese puppet leadership. It isn't as simple as that, however, for the Republic as a whole. There has always been a very large branch of so-called Republican leadership that is definitely Communist-infiltrated, if not Communist by identification, and the situation is further complicated by Nationalist and extreme Moslem elements. It is

not simply black and white. Some of these groups overlap. There are Communist affiliations that are built right into the Japanese Quisling groups. On the other hand, there are Communist groups that resent the Japanese element very much, because some of the Republican leaders during the period when they cooperated with Japan allowed tens of thousands of Java's best young men to be used by the Japanese to do construction jobs and build airfields, and so on, for Japan on the islands throughout the Pacific, and almost none of those boys came back. So that Java remembers that some of the Djogjakarta leaders did that Quisling job as far as Java's best young men are concerned. And, of course, the Communist element in this movement remembers that very much, and occasionally revives the memory of it.

Then you must keep in mind that in Java—and in Indonesia generally—the population is overwhelmingly Moslem. That is one of the big differences we must always keep in mind when we think of the Dutch East Indies and the Philippines. The Philippines were Christian, an inheritance from Spain. The Dutch East Indies are Moslem, overwhelmingly so, and there are socially conservative but religiously militant Moslem movements, and there is a good deal of that in Java, and in Sumatra. These Moslem militants are often extreme conservatives on the social question and therefore very much of an obstacle to the Communists who try to infiltrate the country. So you get, as you sometimes get with some of the Negro or Zionist groups in the United States, a very determined effort on the part of some of the Communist groups to confuse people's thinking about Negro or Jewish groups by trying to achieve some degree of infiltration in them, and thereby confuse the public as to the nature of those movements. You have that in Java where you can find certain groups of a militant Moslem character, that have practically no standing at all as far as the large majority of the Moslem elements are concerned, but these ideological motives confuse the observer—and sometimes the natives—with regard to where the real loyalties are.

One more word about the Republic. The Republic is called a "Republic," and I think that is one reason why American opinion is so much in its favor—anything described as a "republic" must be good. We think of it in terms of 1776—freedom, democracy, elections. Now, it is very important to keep in mind that there are elections in the Dutch East Indies, and there will be more, but the one part of Java where there never have been elections is the so-called Republican part. There never have been elections there. They have what they call a parliament, but it is entirely composed of people who have just been chosen by the leaders who were not elected either. There have been no elections in Republican Java. There have been many elections in several of the so-called federal states, the states that are favorable to the Dutch formula of Indonesian federation preserving local autonomy in the various areas. It varies from one part of the East Indies to another because of the cultural factors. In many regions there are age-old local governmental institutions of their own.

Some of the governments have been based on elections as far back as 30 years, so that when we talk about elections we should keep in mind that the only parts of Indonesia in which there have been elections are the Dutch or so-called federal parts. There have never been elections in the Republican part.

Another thing that one has to keep in mind is that the Republic is a very peculiar kind of republic. Djogjakarta and Soerakarta, which are the geographical centers of the Republic, have always been among the most backward or feudal parts of Java, so much so that the Dutch always hesitated to exercise their western influence there. On the maps before World War II you will find Djogjakarta and Soerakarta described as the so-called Prince's countries. That was done because the Dutch had never really imposed their rule completely on the entrenched Tory Moslem character of the rule by the Sultan of Djogjakarta or the Prince (Susuhunan) of Soerakarta. The Republic works in some way with the Sultan of Djogjakarta, and it is very interesting to note that the military governor of Djogjakarta is the old Sultan of Djogjakarta, a very strange kind of a thing when you think of the propaganda about the republican character of the so-called Indonesian Republic. I am not suggesting that there is deliberate deception here. I put it forward simply—and because I have to be brief about it in view of the time that is available—as another warning as to the complexity of these things. Djogjakarta doesn't represent elements that are more progressive than the Dutch; it represents very definitely, historically and socially, a group that was very much less advanced than a very large part of the rest of Indonesia. As to the western ideologies, that was added by these Communist elements of which I spoke a moment ago. You have there a mixture of a variety of forces which are very difficult to understand unless you have lived with it for a long time, and unless you know something about the genius of the party-liners' work when they have their minds made up to create disturbing pictures of confusion that will serve interests allied with Soviet influence throughout the world.

It is interesting to note just in passing that when negotiations took place under the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations—in which the United States was represented by President Graham, of the University of North Carolina—which ended in the negotiation of the agreement that was called the Renville agreement, Mr. Graham was there as the American official choice for membership in the Good Offices Committee, and he witnessed most of the negotiations between the representative of the Dutch, a Javanese, and the representative of the Republic, Sjarifoeddin, who was then Prime Minister.

Now, President Graham is a very honorable gentleman, but as some of you may have gathered from newspaper reports in the last few weeks, his name was in controversy before our own Atomic Energy Commission in connection with his loyalty record, because he was not thought to be as discriminating as he might be about Communists and fellow travelers. I base that statement on the newspaper reports that we have seen with regard to that loyalty report to the United States Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission chose to disregard it. Personally I have no doubt as to President Graham's loyalty, and I would trust his discretion concerning atomic-energy information. Nevertheless, there was a question raised as to whether he had been as discriminating in his observation of Stalinist fellow travelers as one would want an American representative to be under these circumstances. He sat on deck with those gentlemen for months during the negotiations on the Renville, and he came back with the conviction that all these arguments about Communist infiltration amounts to nothing. Just the other day when President Graham received the Hillman prize offered by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, he used the word "totalitarian" to describe the Dutch, and he referred to the Republic as the forces of freedom.

Now, it is interesting to observe that Sjarifoeddin was the representative of the Republic on that occasion during this long period when President Graham could observe him there on the deck all the time, and today, by his own admission, not by the assertion of some suspicious conservative agency, not by the statement of the Dutch, but by Sjarifoeddin's own admission, he is a self-confessed Communist since 1935—since 1935. Certainly, it is legitimate to feel that during all the months of negotiations our observer was perhaps a little wanting in discrimination with regard to those things to which he should have developed a wee bit stronger form of ideological allergy. [Laughter.]

Now, let's go beyond that. Sjarifoeddin resigned his office immediately after he signed the Renville agreement. Now, what do you think the impact on the Dutch would be after negotiations in which a man, after painful months of argument, agrees to something and then immediately resigns so that his successor can say, "I am not bound by that because somebody else signed it." Later on Sjarifoeddin joined in a form of Communist rebellion against the regime. It was said immediately by friends of the Republic that this rebellion proved that there had been Communists, and that they had infiltrated the important positions, but that they had now left the regime. In a sense it perhaps proves that point, and Sjarifoeddin seems to have been killed in that venture—although no one seems to have very good information on that—but the important factor to remember is that when the rebellion took place within the Republican forces, the Republican government released from prison a gentleman by the name of Tan Malakka. Tan Malakka was another kind of Communist. Perhaps you can make the comparison as between Tito's communism and let's say Stalin's communism. They agree on a lot of things, particularly on what they would do to us, but they disagree among themselves, perhaps as to the extent to which you use nationalism as a clock, and so on. When Tan Malakka was released from prison his followers cleaned up this Sjarifoeddin element and then, of course, came to increasing power as an influence within the Republic because it was their force that did the job. Incidentally, Tan Malakka has had influence in the Philippines, in Canton and all sorts of places in the far East over 25 yers. He has been one of the most dynamic Communists in that area. Tan Malakka is the man who kidnapped Sjalrir, the foreign minister of the so-called Indonesian Republic, after Sjalrir in negotiations with the Dutch, had agreed to a formula which he and the Dutch thought to be workable. That stopped that particular phase of the negotiations. Then later on Tan Malakka was captured by the Republican government and put in prison. Later on—as I have just said—the Republic released him to fight these other Communists.

Do you get a picture of a regime with which it is rather difficult to negotiate? A regime with which after 3 years of patience, of negotiation that never seemed to commit anyone, and increasing guerrilla warfare, it becomes a bit understandable that you should finally say that you will release your troops to march in and clear things up? Then we read in the American newspapers that after the troops have moved in, the guerrilla war started. That is another complete misconception. The guerrilla war has been going on since 1945 with the armaments left by the Japanese. The only reason we think it started after the Dutch police action or military action began, is that American newspapers and news services do not regularly keep reporters in Java. They send them in when big news breaks. If they had kept them there regularly they would have reported, as all Dutch news services reported, that guerrilla war continued straight through the period in which the republican

representatives were promising it would cease, and that the troops of the Republicans would no longer fight. A week after the Renville Agreement had been signed, the commander in chief of the republican army announced that the agreement committed the government in Djogjakarta but not the army. Now, under those circumstances you can perhaps understand that those who were responsible for law and order would ultimately come to a point where they felt that they were compelled to exercise some of that responsibility.

The record shows that during the 12 weeks before the Dutch military action began on December 18, there were on the average 50 Indonesian officials a week killed by guerrilla action. That was done deliberately to frighten the Indonesians from participating in the government administration in the Dutch areas, so that they would be intimidated and refuse to play that game any longer. The whole military action of the Dutch, the first one a year and a half ago and this one now, has cost less than 100 casualties, and this last one, counting the Indonesian casualties on both sides, less than 250. When you remember that the total population is 75,000,000, that there were 50 casualties a week among Indonesian officials right straight through the period before the police action took place, these figures are not as serious as they might sound at first, certainly not serious enough to speak of full-scale war in Java as some of our papers have done. One of the things we might remember is that 75,000,000 is a lot of people, and that 250 is less than the total death record in the United States, say on a New Year's weekend for automobile accidents. You have to see these figures in the perspective of the total scope of the problem and of the kind of things that went on before the military action was undertaken.

I will skip a number of factors that might be interesting and contribute to perspective if we had the time, and I will discuss one other angle that I think has been grievously misunderstood or twisted in our American public thinking, and that is the relationship to the Marshall plan. You find it said that we should "punish the Dutch" by withholding Marshall plan aid. Now, that suggests, first of all, a very strange perspective on what the Marshall plan is for. The Marshall plan is not designed to help the Dutch. The Marshall plan is designed to help the United States achieve a major foreign policy of the United States and that is the reconstruction and the restoration to self-support of western Europe. When we, therefore, talk about withholding Marshall plan aid to the Netherlands, we are talking about weakening our own determination to follow our foreign policy in western Europe. Part of that foreign policy is, as I said, to put western Europe back on its own feet. You get back to self-support and to independence from continued American aid by restoring markets and the supply of raw materials, and there, of course, Indonesia plays a large role. We must not forget that a very large part of the world's and western Europe's rubber, palm oil, tin, tea, tobacco, etc. come from Indonesia, and that the restoration of the flow of raw materials, not to speak of the markets that you can find there in return, depends on conditions of sufficient security on the islands to warrant new capital investments. Capital investments in the past have come heavily under Dutch auspices at low rates of interest because the Dutch took a confident view of the security of their investments. Today you can't get capital for Indonesia except at high rates of interest, and the rates will go down in proportion to the confidence that is restored, and it will go up to the extent to which people distrust the situation. That holds not only for profits as far as the Dutch or the bankers are concerned—that holds for the flow of raw materials which are essential for the continued hope of a self reliant, resilient, independent western Europe, and it holds for the population of Indonesia itself because it has grown tremendously and it is dependent on peace for its own productivity and self-support. Take Java alone, which has grown from 4,000,000 to 48,000,000, in 100 years. That does not exactly suggest that these people are being starved to death. There has been no physical starvation in Java—under the Dutch—as there has been, and is, in India and China continuously—because the Dutch have built a sturdy native agriculture for the food supply of Indonesia. But there is starvation today in Java, and especially in the republican areas.

Incidentally, to pin prick another one of the propaganda illusions, most of the rice Indonesians eat is grown in Java, and most of it in Java in the so-called Republican area. If, therefore, there is starvation, and there is in the Republican area, it is not due to any economic blockade which the Dutch are conducting against the Republic because the very food which would relieve starvation is grown in the republican area. That is where the rice comes from. If there is starvation there, it is the structure of government (and communication and transportation and all the other factors that go into the growing and distribution of new crops) that has broken down to such an extent that the rice box of Indonesia isn't any longer sufficiently filled to feed its people.

The Marshall plan requires for its success a continued supply of raw materials to western Europe, and it requires for its success a restoration of the dollar earning capacity of western Europe, and the Netherlands are a significant part of that balance because their standard of living and productivity has been higher than that of most of the Continent. When the flow of the Marshall plan dollars ceases Europe must be able to earn its dollar exchange by increased exports and imports, and since we in the United States are not likely to absorb all of Europe's additional exports, we must think of European recovery in the perspective of world markets. A very large part of the vitality of the Marshall plan concept requires that there be some kind of restored order, some kind of restored productivity in those areas of the world economy from which western Europe has drawn part of the dollar exchange with which it can continue to buy its goods in the United States.

In the United States we are not as yet sufficiently sold on Cordell Hullism and lower tariffs to restore markets in the United States to the extent required for a balance in European trade, so foreign exchange—in this case dollar exchange—has to be earned by Europe as a whole in the world economy as a whole. A large part of this dollar exchange has always been earned by imports into the United States of America from the Malay-Indonesian area. The standard of living of the people in Indonesia is interdependent with the standard of living in western Europe—and they are all a closely interwoven whole with the economy of the world, including this country.

There is one other large factor that I would like to touch on in these sketchy remarks, so that we might have a little bit of common perspective on it. I probably shall be saying something that some of you already very well know. I refer to the whole argument before the Security Council. In the Security Council Charter there are no provisions given to the Security Council in domestic issues. Several of the powers represented on the Council believe that the Security Council has no competence in the Indonesian issue. The Dutch have all along challenged the legal competence of the Security Council. They have said, "Let us go to the Court of the Hague and have the Court say whether the Security Council has authority in this issue." The UN delegates have frequently said they would like to leave that question open. They don't want to commit themselves on it, although Mr. Hodgson, from Australia, has been very vigorous in saying that what the Dutch have done in Java is worse than what Hitler did to the Netherlands. Did Hitler ever propose to go to the Hague to find out whether he had any legal rights in the Netherlands? Mr. Hodgson speaks for Australia, the domestic politics of which we do not understand too well in the United States. It has a Labor Government which is coming up for elections very shortly, and the margin is small. Several of the large trade-unions—particularly in the maritime and dock trades—are Communist-controlled to a great extent, and everybody knows that, and they are stipulating that the foreign policy must be what they want it to be. Does America know that Australia—the Australia of the "white Australia" which contrasts so curiously with the racial tolerance of the Dutch policies in Indonesia—in Paris a month or so ago was the only country, outside of the Soviet Union and its satellites, that voted against the Greek frontier report? It was the head of the same Australian delegation, Mr. Evatt, who created an opaque picture about the Berlin situation in the Council a month or so ago. Mr. Hodgson and Mr. Evatt rather consistently follow in the United Nations what I would call a "Trygve Lie line," leaning over rather significantly toward the side of an issue in which the Soviets are interested—not militantly, not by complete identification, since that, too, would lose votes in the Australian election, but by association, by "running interference," so to speak.

Then there is India which has been eloquent in its denunciation of the police action of the Dutch and seems to have forgotten its own police action against Hyderabad which led to casualties at least 10 times as high as the Java episode. Perhaps American opinion has forgotten that when India became independent, the grand parade that took place at Delhi gave the most featured place in the parade to the military contingent of Indian troops that had fought on the side of Japan in the last war. The pictures were in the New York Times. They have never been denied. That is very clearly and emphatically a picture of the type of power politics that gives it special flavor to the element with which the American representatives were cooperating against the Dutch in the Security Council.

The reason I used the words "ideological hypocrisy" in describing American policy is the contrast between the final conclusions which we support and the resounding rhetoric that precedes them. We seem to have our eyes primarily on the competitive ideological politics of the Voice of America rather than on the realities in Java. We make orations about good words like "freedom," "democracy," and "elections" without inquiring as to the meanings behind this vocabulary in Java. But the final action we support calls for a schedule of dates upon which interim governments and the ultimate Indonesian federation are to be established that do not differ in substance from the program announced by the Dutch themselves. The action we finally support is not mandatory but advisory. We recommend. We urge. And we do not dare to follow the rhetoric about the defiance of the Charter of the United Nations with specific mention of penalties or sanctions—we merely dress up the advisory machinery of the good offices, with a new verbal varnish to describe the same mechanism. In other words, we apparently preach for ideological effect on the gallery, but in the substance we are saying: "Go ahead and see whether you can get away with it." Meanwhile, we ignore the effect of this play to the gallery on the morale of the Dutch themselves, who are responsible for order in Java, and no one else is willing to undertake this responsi-

bility in their place. This seems to be a feeble way of translating the lessons of diplomacy which we should have learned from world affairs during the last 5 or 6 years. We can, perhaps, excuse our position at Yalta when we accepted the promises about freedom and democracy in central Europe, because it could then be argued that we had to give the Russians a chance to prove their good faith. Well, they went along and showed us what they meant by "freedom and democracy" in Poland. We got another lesson in the Jan Masaryk episode in Prague. But apparently we have to go through a mess of Yaltas to learn the same lesson all over again in the Far East.

If we had been clear in our policy, determined in our action, and had the courage of our convictions some years back, certain things could have been stopped in China which now, of course, are water over the dam. It may well be that we shall sacrifice another generation of young Americans; another wasted generation, as the fruit of that tragedy sometime in the future. Here we are allowing ideological rhetoric of the same sort to undermine the position of the Dutch who in their record of 50 years of progressive colonial administration, have proved that they mean what they say. Rhetoric on the one hand, realization and achievement on the other. Isn't it about time that America should see that its actions and its words are alined together? How many Yalta betrayals must there be to force us to a policy of action that is alined with realities, alined with the interests of America itself as well as of the Dutch and the peoples of Indonesia, rather than with Soviet propaganda mirages? Is there any evidence at all that fellow travelers and Japanese puppets are reliable allies in accomplishing the purposes for which America has always stood, the purposes of accomplishing real freedom, and democracy, real self-government?

It is a sad mistake to play competitive ideological politics when we undermine in the process the effectiveness of old friends tried in action, willing to back by action the things they say they believe in, and when the things these old friends are doing are, in fact, strictly in accord with American policy with regard to dependent countries as we have always defined it. Whether in the words of Cordell Hull, or Francis Sayre, our policy has not been a policy of giving independence immediately, which we didn't do ourselves in the Philippines, but of creating continuously circumstances through which the natives in the dependent country could work themselves into independence and self-control. Let's remember that in Indonesia 50,000,000 of the 75,000,000 are in the areas favorable to the Federal formula of local control; only 25,000,000 were in the area controlled by the Republic which favored centralized control from Djogjakarta. The Dutch advocate a decentralized administration, preserving the local privileges and self-government of these diversified cultural groups in the islands. Americans who remember the historic vitality of States' rights should have an understanding, if no one else has.

Holland had its declaration of independence in 1581, almost 200 years before we had ours. Her devotion to freedom and self-government is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Holland has a record in the support of international law, legal procedures, progressive humanitarian ideas that matches that of any other people, bar none. Holland has over the last 50 years made as distinguished a record in the management of Indonesia as can be found anywhere in the colonial experience of the west if you consider the nature of the challenge and what was in fact done.

I submit it is time for America to put its policies, its actions in line with realities rather than with rhetoric, to recognize where its real allies are, and to remember priorities. Priority No. 1 with us is a resilient self-controlled, independent, reconstructed western Europe. All the rest falls into perspective once you keep that in mind. If you get involved in side issues of an ideological sort in an effort to capture the votes of uncertain new friends while you sacrifice the old ones, you discredit the international machinery that is used to pursue such policies, and in the end you will sabotage and undermine the basic objectives of policy in the area of western Europe.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, thoroughly respecting the motives and views of my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in offering his amendment, I am constrained to take the position that its adoption would be harmful, and I hope the amendment will be defeated. There are compelling reasons which bring me to this conclusion.

In the first place, in the consideration of the passage of this legislation those of us who support it—and I respect the views of those who do not, and I am expressing only my own views—do so because we consider that it is directly connected with the national interest of our own country. The principal effect of this amendment would be to force the United States into the position of enforcing decisions of the Security Council by economic sanctions unilaterally applied.

Having in mind the national interest of our own country, there is a provision in the bill, section 118, which instructs the Administrator to terminate aid to a country whenever "because of changed conditions assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States."

We cannot ignore the fact that the people of the Netherlands are a constructive influence in the world. I do not know whether they have made a mistake in Indonesia or not. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances yet to determine in my own mind whether they have made a mistake. But I will assume that they have made a mistake for the purposes of my discussion now. If the Dutch have made a mistake in Indonesia, there is no reason why we should make a mistake in connection with this bill. The national interests of our country, in connection with the passage of this legislation, is consistent with joining the issue with international communism in its attempt to subjugate the peoples of different countries and to enslave them and ultimately extend their control of communism over those countries to the point where it is directly opposed to the national interests of the United States. That is the goal we always have to keep in mind.

Assuming that the Dutch have made a mistake, which I am only assuming for the purpose of argument, then I believe we would be making a mistake if we were to adopt this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think it would be extremely unwise for the United States unilaterally to impose sanctions on a country which is also a member of the United Nations before that body, itself, has voted to impose any sanction on that country?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman for his very gracious reference to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have profound respect for my friend, not only on this, but on all occasions.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman does recognize that I have tried in my amendment not to make it absolutely mandatory in the law that the President or Administrator immediately cut off aid, but I have made it a matter of policy.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I absolutely respect his views and his motives, but the gentleman's amendment rests on the premise that the Dutch have made a mistake, and if that is correct, I am not admitting it, but I am assuming it, for the purpose of the position I take, I think if we were to adopt his amendment, from the point of view of our own national interest, we would be making a mistake.

For the reasons that I have briefly expressed, Mr. Chairman, I think the adoption of this amendment would be unwise and I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, I, too, have great respect for my good friend from New York. I, too, am willing to make the same assumption in respect of the Indonesian situation. I make no defense of the action of the Netherlands in Indonesia. But I question very seriously whether this is a proper method for us to adopt in our desire to restore order and preserve freedom in that area. I call your attention to a part of section 121 (a) of the act which says:

> Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to delegate to, or otherwise confer upon, any international or foreign organization or agency, any of his authority to decide the method of furnishing assistance under this title to any participating country or the amount thereof.

I think that is very important. I think that section 118 is important, and it has already been referred to.

I also call your attention to the fact that section 104 (a) of the act subjects the Administrator for Economic Cooperation to the control of the President, and I believe it would be a mistake to subject him instead to the control of the President of the Security Council.

Furthermore, section 105 (b) enjoins the closest collaboration between the Administrator and the Secretary of State, and authorizes the Secretary's interposition and reference to the President in the event of any inconsistency between the operation of the program and the foreign-policy objectives of the country.

I believe that there are other ways of dealing with this situation. I believe that we should think first and foremost of the over-all purposes of this program and of our own national security, and then take whatever action is appropriate in the circumstances. We should keep our eyes on our main objective, recognizing our opposition to imperialism and predatory colonialism

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman agree that the Dutch, even considering the mistakes they may have made, have done a better job in Indonesia than any other colonial country anywhere in the world, except the United States in the Philippines?

Mr. LODGE. I am certainly interested to have the gentleman's statement on that.

Mr. JUDD. I believe the gentleman will agree that they have not killed nearly as many people in the areas they seized by force as we killed in the area that we seized by force—meaning these United States and the American Indians.

Mr. LODGE. I think this: We know very little about the so-called republican government there. But we do know one thing which is very shocking and that is a certain predatory contract with respect to the control of the exports and imports of that country. It is a contract of exploitation of the most reactionary kind. The republican government which represents at the most only one-third of the people of Indonesia, will by this monopoly contract be surrendering some of the most precious sovereign rights of the people of Indonesia.

Mr. JUDD. And that contract was not the work of the Dutch, it was cooked up by an American; is that not correct?

Mr. LODGE. By an American lawyer in New York City, and certain representatives of the so-called republican government of Indonesia.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if the Dutch had treated their minorities the way we treated the American Indian, there would not be enough natives left there even to revolt?

Mr. LODGE. I might also say that if the Marshall plan could have operated on the basis on which this New York lawyer has operated in Indonesia, it would simplify our problems but it would most certainly not be fulfilling the purposes of the European Recovery Act. But it is an established American axiom that a country cannot abdicate its power in such a vital sphere of government action.

Mr. JUDD. I am opposed to European or American imperialism. I have spent most of my lifetime trying to help those people to freedom and better living. Colonialism is dead. But this is not the place or the way to handle that problem. And I despise self-righteousness.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I think it is important to point out to the Committee that no money under this bill will go to Indonesia until the Netherlands have complied with the UN Security Council decision.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is very important.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. If an agreement is reached between the Indonesians and the Dutch then a limited sum will be made available.

Mr. LODGE. That is highly significant. If in adopting this amendment, aid were to be withheld from Holland, it might very well jeopardize the entire program; and that, personally, I am not willing to do.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me odd that there is now being used an argument to defeat this amendment on the ground that the money is going to be kept from Indonesia itself. Those are the very people we want to help; we should do everything possible, including the passage of this amendment, to see that they get money and fair dealing by seeing that the Netherlands comply with the resolution of the Security Council, because that is exactly the purpose we ought to serve.

Mr. LODGE. I, too, am interested in the effectiveness of United Nations decisions and resolutions. However, I may say to the gentleman that even if his amendment were acted on favorably, Indonesia would get no money under present circumstances.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very sorry, but the Dutch will.

Mr. LODGE. Depriving the Dutch of ECA aid may not solve the Indonesian conflict, but it will surely jeopardize the European recovery program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 5, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] saw fit last Saturday to brand the bill now before us as a war program. He intimated further that to pass the bill might be a matter of insanity. He then singled out the economic conditions of the Republic of Italy and other participating countries for his studied abuse and castigation. The gentleman finally satiated his spleen by urging upon his colleagues the astounding proposition that notwithstanding our generous help, the working masses of Italy and the rest of Europe are in the throes of hunger, unemployment, and fascism as the result of ERP aid. It is evident from the remarks of the gentleman that he is misinformed both as to results of ERP aid and to the over-all objective of ERP in all participating countries.

The gentleman did not brand as a war program the billions of dollars appropriated by this House in the pre-Pearl Harbor days for the deliverance of communistic Russia from the assaults of European fascism. I wonder whether the gentleman would brand as a war program the appropriation of a few billions of American dollars to assist communistic Russia to a more expeditious subjugation of the free Governments of China, Iran, Italy, France, England, and all ECA participating countries?

Mr. Chairman, if it is insanity for Members of this House to authorize funds to keep alive the spirit of freedom in the breast of man, if it is insanity to vote these funds to save the free governments of all Europe against subjugation by the hordes of communistic Russia, if it is insanity for this Christian Nation to provide funds to deliver the Christian civilization of Europe from the paganistic assaults of communistic Russia; then, I ask, was it insanity that motivated the intrepid Patrick Henry when he said "Give me liberty or give me death"? Was it insanity that induced men to risk the gallows when they wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence? Was it insanity for men to bare their breasts to sword and gun at Lexington, Bunker Hill, Germantown, and Valley Forge? Was it insanity that lead Charles Martel and his brave Christian Franks to rout the Moslem hordes at the Battle of Tours? Was it insanity for the brave Germans and Poles to bar the Mongol hordes of Genghis Khan at the Battle of Liegnitz, and turn back the Ottoman Turk from the gates of Vienna? And was it insanity for Christ to seek the cross and for His followers to embrace the Decalog as man's only hope for peace on earth and a fitting reward beyond?

On the contrary, it is insanity to believe that a widespread condition of hunger and unemployment could long exist in Italy and the participating countries without it becoming known to the many uncensored radio and newspaper correspondents that have freedom of passage in and out of these countries. On the other hand, I speak as one with personal knowledge of the matter. My uncle, 3 aunts, and 36 first and second cousins whose lot it is to live in Italy have advised us nearly a year ago that there was an abundance of food in Italy and for us not to send any more food packages. Members of my family have visited Italy in the past 6 months and on their return they report that there is plenty of food but there is a slight shortage in shoes and articles of clothing.

From the Alps to Mount Etna, the communistic vermin in Italy are frantically trying to create the belief that fascism is again nascent in that land. I can well understand this communistic fear. It was fascism that drove communism out of Italy. It was fascism that drove that same vermin out of Spain. It was fascism that drove it out of Germany. It was fascism that drove the Red hordes from the eastern borders of Europe to the Asiatic ramparts of Stalingrad where the bear that walks like a man staggered, whining and cornered, until American war-program money provided the vitamins that brought the bear back roaring and triumphant to the heart of Christian Europe where the treacherous beast now deigns to enthrone his pagan gods upon the altars of Christian shrines.

Mr. Chairman, if the money authorized by this bill is intended to encourage the

free and Christian people of Europe to drive the treacherous bear back to the mongol dens of Asia, whether the bill be called a "war program" or by any other name, its passage would be the act of courageous men and women whose love of God and freedom transcends the bounds of country and sectarianism. I personally hold no brief for fascism. I am against it. But in its ugliest form it may offer greater hope than communism.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last few words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to state for the RECORD that a number of Members from New York were not present in the Chamber last Saturday when there was a number of roll calls. They were unfortunately absent attending the funeral services of our late lamented colleague, Andrew L. Somers, so that they could not be present.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, after the First World War when Russia could not whip a cat, the people of the United States were worked into a frenzy so that for many years thereafter we had no trade and commerce with Russia and a good portion of that part of eastern Europe. However, some one profited from this trade and commerce. It was England and Germany that took advantage of the situation and they profited from trade and commerce with Russia during those years.

We find ourselves again whipped up into a great frenzy. I am not going to get all excited about this thing or get upset about it. This is a business proposition. Today we are restricted in our business and in our trade and commerce to less than one-half of the world. We are doing our business, trade, and commerce, with Treasury dollars, that is, taxpayers' dollars. It is not really business at all. If a private businessman was to operate his business on the basis we operate the Marshall-plan business today, he would go broke. It would be impossible for him to operate a business on that basis.

I see a lot of old Members of Congress present who were here when we had the old British loan up for discussion. Nearly all of us agreed that that was the last bit of money we were going to give away for nothing. I see a lot of Members here who were present when we voted on the second UNRRA appropriation bill. At that time you Members said: "Now, this is about as far as America can go. This is as much as we can stand. We have to protect our own people, our own Treasury, our own business, and the welfare of our own Nation." Also you said that you were not going to appropriate these moneys that way any more, that the thing would be done on a businesslike basis from then on.

I remember when the message came in from President Roosevelt stating to us that after that second UNRRA appropriation bill there would be no more free gift moneys going out from the United States Treasury; there would be no more lend-lease; that the economy of the United States of America could not stand so much; that from here on there would be no more of this gift money donated and shoveled out of the United States Treasury. That was the understanding here. So, right after that a plan was worked out to which I think we all agreed on that there would be an International World Bank established, through which bank money would be loaned to the various nations for their reconstruction and rehabilitation. It was supposed to be done on a business basis. The United States of America would have 75 percent of the stock in that bank, and the remaining 25 percent of the stock would be held by all the other nations of the world. All the nations agreed except Russia to participate in that bank. Now, that was a good set-up; that was a business set-up under which there would be no burden put upon our taxpayers and we would not have to dig into the Treasury of the United States for those dollars, or so that the nations of the world could not say, "Good old Uncle Sam, he has a lot of money; we will never pay him back," because they would have to return this money, the money which they borrowed from the International World Bank. They would have to return it or these nations would lose their credit and standing in the family of nations. They would have to return it even though we were the biggest stockholder in the bank.

There was another plan worked out, a plan for the International Trade Organization. This was a plan that was worked out in Habana wherein all the nations again agreed to participate except Russia. Under this plan we would have trade flow freely and on a business basis between all the nations of the world. It was a live and let live proposition, but no nation would be shown preference by us as against another. All nations were to be our friends, and it was a program for peace. The World Bank and the International Trade Organization are the two programs for world peace. They aim to bring the people and the nations together, not to disunite them, not to create blocs, not to create cold wars, not to create the kind of condition that exists today.

But, what has happened? Where have we gone? Yes, where have we gone? Is it too late to turn back? Can we not get back to a sensible basis again?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Can we not understand that the debt of the United States of America today is $252,000,000,000? Our debt is twice as big now as the entire debt of all the Marshall plan countries put together, including England. It must be paid.

You people were here when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], spoke the other day. Here is what he said:

> While on this subject, how many are in favor of repudiating the national debt? How many will vote to confiscate the Government bonds which constitute the national debt? We must either pay these bonds or repudiate them. We owe $252,000,000,000. If we start paying them and paid only $5,000,000,000 a year, it would take over 100 years to pay off the debt.

Now, I do not know how you people feel about it. I am not going to go back to my district and face the taxpayers and voters of my district in the next election and say, "Yes; I did vote for the expenditure of all these moneys under the Marshall plan." I am going to vote for old-age pensions for the people of America. I am going to vote for veterans' benefits, and I am going to vote for hospitals in the State of Michigan, schools, aid to education, public works, St. Lawrence waterway, housing, and all of those measures for the benefit of our citizens and our national welfare.

By the way, do you know that we were to get two hospitals in the State of Michigan, one for our tuberculosis patients and one for our mental patients? That program was cut out. They said, "We have not got the money to build these hospitals." We asked for two little harbors, one at Port Sanilac and one at Port Austin, amounting to some little amount of money to build these two little harbor projects in Michigan. Here they ask for $6,000,000,000, and you will just shovel it right out and give it to them.

Yes, the United States of America is strong, but you cannot be like the old father who was so generous with his children that he gave them everything he had, and then found himself living in a poorhouse in his old age.

Do not forget that our national income is down 8 percent for the first quarter of this year as compared to last year, and the arrow is pointing downward. The national income may go as low as 20 percent below that of last year. What does that mean? Where are you going to get these tax dollars? You are not going to get them out of a reduced national income, and you are going to find yourself taking probably 85 to 90 cents out of the businessman's profit dollar, and then expect that businessman to go ahead and do business and be in competition with the businessmen of Germany, the businessmen of England and France and other countries who will probably be paying only 10 to 15 cents out of their tax dollar.

In 1948 British exports climbed to $6,600,000,000. Four times as much as 1945 and the highest figure ever attained. In 1948 Britain sold nearly 300,000 motor vehicles abroad. Thirty-eight thousand of them coming to the United States of America.

During 1948 we sold only 430,000 vehicles overseas. So now with Marshall plan aid, the British automaker, sold 40 percent of the total export business. That is not all. Now the German Opel and the Volkswagen are being pushed by the Marshall planners and by General Clay to give us further competition in the automobile business.

In the field of textile manufactures Britain's sales eclipsed American sales almost 50 percent—$1,300,000,000 against $800,000,000. Americans have long prided themselves as manufacturers of machinery and machine tools, yet in 1948 Britain sold for export $1,016,000,000 while the American makers sold only $1,670,000,000.

In 1947 this country exported to Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay seven times as much as did Britain; but by the end of 1948 the South American nations were buying virtually the same amount of goods from both countries. In Argentine sales Britain led the United States by a substantial margin.

In the prewar years two of the toughest competitors for world trade were Germany and Japan. These defeated nations were almost entirely out of the market from 1945 to 1947, but in 1948 they started a come-back which is making itself felt all over the world.

"Made in Japan" and "Made in Germany" were very familiar marks throughout the world prior to 1939. Those same marks are showing up on store counters again. Japan gained almost a monopoly in the field of low-priced vases, Christmas-tree ornaments, cheap toys; and was a very important factor in such fields as electric-light bulbs, rayon, and cotton textile. Western Germany is again pushing the market in dyestuffs, chemicals, and cutlery, fields in which it has been dominant for nearly 50 years.

The military governments of Japan and Germany have been carrying out a policy of making both regions self-sufficient since the close of the war on both fronts. The American taxpayer has sent billions of dollars to those areas to accomplish this self-sufficiency; but the same taxpayer now finds he has erected competition to himself, which is being felt especially in South America and Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill calls, as I understand it, for $5,580,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. At present only $5,380,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that all? You cut it down and saved a lot of money on that?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEE. What is the parliamentary situation with reference to this section? As I understand, the section has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has completed the reading of section 1 of the bill through line 11 on page 2. There are 9 sections of the bill remaining to be read.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire whether the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to section 1.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. It is at page 2, between lines 11 and 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman proposes to insert a new section?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope it is not the intention of the Chairman of the Committee to shut off from debate those who may be opposed to the bill. I have been trying to get 10 minutes to speak since the bill was taken up, and I expect to request very shortly to be given 10 minutes to express my views.

Mr. KEE. May I say that there is no intention to cut off debate. We want to try to finish this bill this afternoon if we possibly can. It is our intention to finish it as rapidly as we can and at the same time to give everyone an opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that permit another amendment to be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot determine that. The Chair would have to recognize Members within the limitations of the time fixed by the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment to this section.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 2, line 10, after the word "shall", strike out the word "seriously."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, at page 2, line 10, beginning at line 9, the bill reads as follows:

That, no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

My amendment merely seeks to eliminate the word "seriously"; thus leaving the language to read:

That, no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall impair the economic stability of the United States.

The Committee should accept the amendment for the reason that I believe it was originally intended that this act should in no way impair the stability and economy of the United States.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Unquestionably this act last year impaired the economic stability of the United States by increasing inflationary pressures. It seems to me we must leave the word "seriously" in, because unquestionably a gigantic effort such as this affects the stability of our country. We must weigh that against the possible benefits.

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to that, I feel that those who believe in the objectives of this bill have let it be known publicly that this act in no way impairs the economic conditions and the stability of the United States. If that is so the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I said on the floor last year, if the gentleman will remember, that when we voted for this bill it meant voting among other things to reduce our standards of living in the United States. We knew what it meant. You cannot export steel and tools and farm machinery and scores of other things that are needed badly here at home, without impairing our stability. You cannot keep our taxes as high as they are without endangering our economy. But if we do not succeed in this program, the costs for our national defense will impair our security far more seriously. We said that frankly last year and we ought to face it frankly now, and support the bill knowing what it means.

Mr. STEFAN. Then you are serving notice on the people of the United States that if this bill passes, it is going to affect the stability and economy of our country and that the standard of living of our people is going to be lowered and impaired.

Mr. JUDD. The same words were in the bill last year.

Mr. STEFAN. And our standard of living is going to be lowered and impaired as a result of this legislation. I did not so understand it. I hope the members of the committee will accept my amendment and eliminate that one word "seriously" in order to notify the people of the United States that this act will not impair the stability and economy of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. That word "seriously" was in the bill last year.

Mr. STEFAN. That is still embodied within the act as it now stands.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Inasmuch as the members of the committee

admit that this will impair our stability, are they able to tell us how seriously and when? How far?

Mr. STEFAN. I should think they should give us some information. I understood that it was not going to impair the economy and stability of the United States. In any event the people of our country should be put on notice and prepared for coming events.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 32, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE: Page 2, between lines 11 and 12 insert:

"SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 103 (a) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the final period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: ': *And provided further*, That such country has filed with the Economic Cooperation Administration (as hereinafter established) an itemized account of its governmental income, expenditures, assets, and indebtedness, together with a statement of its national economic and security requirements.'"

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I yield.

Mr. KEE. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it is my understanding that the information the gentleman wishes to be filed under his amendment can be found in the records of ECA. If I am not correct in that I shall be very glad before the Committee rises to return to this section so that the gentleman can offer his amendment, but I feel sure the information is already with the ECA and is available.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I have implicit confidence in the chairman of the committee, and shall avail myself of the information the gentleman states is available to us.

In view of the statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM] is recognized.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I am for America first and it is because of that fact that I favor this legislation.

Every course which America has followed in the past has led us straight to war. It may be that this course will not prevent war; it may finally again lead us to war, but at least it affords an opportunity for us to detour around the old road and to take a determined step on a new road in the hope that it may lead us to a different goal than that toward which we have been marching and periodically arriving. That is my main reason for supporting this legislation. Call it a noble experiment, if you wish, call it a shot in the dark, call it by any name you choose; names are incidental, objectives all important; but even though it lead to war we shall not be any worse off than we have been in all the years past. We have always arrived at the same goal every time; namely, war.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Will not the gentleman agree that if an aggressor starts war anywhere in the world his target will be America first?

Mr. BREHM. I believe there is no question about that, for America would be more of a prize than any other country. I am hopeful that the passage of this legislation might make it impossible for any other nation to win this prize. Surely its passage will not facilitate the winning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired, all time has expired on section 1.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 104 (e) of such act is hereby amended by striking out "$10,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest rate authorized by such act."

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill now before us.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that circumstances sometimes alter cases. In the case of the European aid plan, a circumstance occurred recently which definitely should alter that case.

I refer to the signing of the Atlantic Pact.

The Atlantic Pact is designed to stop the spread of communism in Europe and I am for the Atlantic Pact but only as a temporary measure. Now that Europe is on its feet, so far as food and intense suffering are concerned, and now that the Atlantic Pact has been signed, and according to high Government officials will soon be ratified by the United States Senate, and Russian aggression will be stopped by force of arms if necessary; then, I ask you, why is it desirable for this Nation to keep giving these billions of dollars to Europe?

This proposal before us now, that this United States Congress continue to dish out people's money to Europe, would not be quite so hard for me to swallow if the excess-profits tax on corporations had not been completely taken off, as it has. That tax should have been left on to the extent of at least 50 percent, in order to lighten the load of those of our people who need their tax money to buy food.

I am against the continuance of this spending because I believe the plain people of this Nation are being made the goat, just as they were after the First World War. Then it was loans to Europe which were never repaid. The big-business men of the Nation who have made so much money out of selling goods to our Government under the European aid plan are behind this plan to continue this heavy spending longer than it is absolutely necessary. It is as plain as the nose on your face that the average people of this country are being victimized by the big-business interests again and I urge every Member of this House to join me in defeating the continuation of this unnecessary spending.

The Atlantic Pact is all right as a temporary measure but we must make the United Nations into an effective world organization for the maintenance of permanent world peace.

We must not let the United Nations suffer the fate of the League of Nations, for if we do, world war III is as sure as tomorrow's sunrise.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us stop this spending plan where it is, and get back on the road to true world peace through the United Nations, without Russia. The best way I can think of to insulate the freedom-loving nations of the world against communism is to force Russia out of the United Nations until she gives her people freedom of religion and all the other freedoms enjoyed by the people of truly democratic nations; then remove the single nation veto power from the United Nations set-up and provide the United Nations with an international armed force for the maintenance of permanent peace.

Russia as the lone nonmember of the United Nations would not dare attack the entire free world and we would have peace even without her in the United Nations. We should leave the door open for Russia to come in when and if she puts her house in order. Just as Woodrow Wilson predicted World War II when pleading for the League of Nations 30 years ago this humble individual now joins with millions of other people throughout our Nation and the world in predicting world war III if we do not make the United Nations into an effective organization for the maintenance of peace. Fellow Members, will you be able to look into the eyes of your children and your grandchildren with a clear conscience 20 years from now? I will, because I am going to vote against the continuance of this spending plan and try to get back on the road to true world peace through the United Nations.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this piece of legislation and tell you briefly why I am for it based on a personal observation that I made this last summer in Europe. I did not go as a Member of Congress because I was not a Member at that time. I was not entertained in any of the Embassies, because I did not want to be. I went as a plain citizen of the United States to try to find out whether or not the ECA was justified. I can say to you without fear of contradiction that no open-minded Member of Congress can make a personal investigation over there and come home with any other conviction except the fact that we are justified immeasurably by continuing this legislation. I could talk to you on charitable grounds; I could talk to you on the basis of the Golden Rule, but those who oppose it say, "Let us be practical; let us be sound." So, I base my support on an actuarial basis, if you please, and say that this is the cheapest

piece of insurance that the United States is able to buy in the world today.

If I were to oppose this legislation and to treat my own business in the same manner as I would be treating my country's business, suppose I owned a business block in some profitable section of my city, and the next block were on fire, and the wind were blowing in my direction, I should call my insurance agency and cancel my insurance.

I traveled through the Communist sections of Paris and the Communist sections of Rome. The reason the Communists are screaming today against the ERP is that we have stopped communism in its tracks in Europe.

Let us be realistic about it. Let us admit that we are interfering in the affairs of Europe. Let us admit that we are putting the might of America on the side of right and decency. I was in Italy a few days after the Italian elections, and every wall and every ruin, and there are a lot of them in Italy, was covered and plastered with posters saying in Italian, "Vote communistic." Where did that money come from? It came from Russia. The Communist leaders of Italy are frank to admit that is where it came from. Russia would like to get Italy and the rest of the western European countries as easily as possible.

You talk about spending $15,000,000,000 for the armed forces. Yes, I am for that. You talk about the lowering of our standard of living. If we permit the democratic nations of western Europe to become communized, and if we permit Russia to grab them off the same way they grabbed off Czechoslovakia and the rest of the free nations of Europe, we will have an enemy bent on our destruction standing only 5 hours by fast bombers from our shores. It will not be a question of a standard of living but whether we are living with this great Nation of ours standing with its back to the wall, as it will be if we take the easy way out. It is the easy way out if we do not adopt this legislation. It is the way we have taken in the past, when we played the ostrich and hid our heads in the sand and refused to adopt a positive foreign policy.

I listened with interest to some of the opponents of this legislation, and I have not heard any positive alternative broached. I have been a member of a minority party in the legislature of my home State. It is easy to be against something, it is easy to be negative, but it is difficult to present a positive policy. Perhaps those who are taking a positive approach will make mistakes, but I sincerely believe that if we do not take a positive approach we will not, to paraphrase the words of someone who preceded me, be able to look our children and grandchildren in the face, because we will have let them down, and we will have opened our gates to the kind of government that this Nation has abhorred since it has been a nation, a dictatorship of the worst order. I care not whether it be a dictatorship of the proletariat or a dictatorship of the Fascist-Nazi type, it is still a dictatorship, and it is against everything that democracy stands for and everything this Nation has been founded upon. Even if this legislation demanded that we lower our standard of living, and it does not, it promises to improve not only the standard of western Europe but our own, is it not better to take a positive approach, knowing what we are doing, deliberately, than standing defenseless against our enemy?

It seems to me the United States, in a realistic Christian approach, is answering affirmatively the age-old question, Am I my brother's keeper?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I find it most difficult to speak this afternoon in opposition to two distinguished colleagues from my own State. I have great respect for their integrity and their points of view but unfortunately I cannot agree with them on this issue.

I am in favor of the European recovery program in general and the highly desirable objectives it seeks to accomplish. I reserve, however, the right at a later date, possibly, to vote for a cut in the appropriations for ERP if the facts at that time show a needed reduction.

I have listened very carefully during all the general debate and all of the discussion here this afternoon. Fortunately, most of the discussion has been of a bipartisan nature, with both Republicans and Democrats supporting the plan inaugurated during the Eightieth Congress. However, little has been said about the specific problems facing the European nations who require assistance and the way in which our foreign aid has provided some solution to date.

For example, and I have become quite familiar with this situation, the United Kingdom has for a long time produced annually approximately 100,000 long tons, or 2,240,000 bags, of dry edible peas. Because of sorting and grading problems, close to 40 percent of the crop is not consumable by human beings in the United Kingdom. The antiquated sorting methods previously used in that country have been wasteful and inefficient and as a result the United Kingdom has been forced to import a considerable amount of dry edible peas. Better sorting methods in this one item in past years would have helped cut down Britain's unfavorable exchange balance.

Under the ECA, the answer has been partially found in 1 year. In this country American ingenuity has developed a machine which cuts down the sorting and grading costs and at the same time does a far better job. We in America have used this electric sorting machine for almost two decades and solely because of the European recovery program our friends across the seas will now derive similar benefit.

By the installation of less than 30 electric sorting machines the need for future pea importations to the United Kingdom will be cut down materially. In fact, the cost of the machines will be matched by less need for food imports. The cost of the machines equals only what England has been paying each year for the now-estimated savings in imports. This is progress, not only for the European beneficiaries of ECA, but for us in the United States. If this program continues on such a constructive basis, giving the same benefits to other European countries, I will continue to support the principles of ECA.

I would like to say one further word. The distinguished gentleman from California has said, "Will we who are going to support this program hereafter be able to look our sons and daughters and our grandsons and granddaughters in the eye and say, 'Did we do right by them by adopting ERP?'" It is my humble opinion that we who support the program can at least look them in the eye and say, "We tried and are trying to do something by adopting a policy that is new and which offers hope of success in our fight against communism." The European recovery program involves a calculated risk, but it is not a policy which in the past has been unquestionably a failure and which has led us to two disastrous wars, to the great detriment of the youth and future of this country.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio stated that the opponents of this bill have offered no alternative proposition. I think I did give you the alternative to the Marshall plan. I did give you the alternative to digging into the Treasury of the United States and stealing these taxpayers' dollars. The alternative is the International World Bank.

Every nation in the world would benefit from that except Russia, because Russia is the only one that has refused to go into it. As long as she does not want to go into it, that is all right with us. But other nations have all joined the International World Bank. That is the way this program should have been worked out. The reconstruction of the world should have been worked out through the International World Bank in conjunction with the International Trade Organization agreements that we reached at Habana.

In the New Deal days, when I was a Member of Congress here, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, we found many of these men who are coming up here now and who are going to vote for this exorbitant expenditure of money, as I said, we found them shouting their heads off against the CCC camps, against the HOLC, the PWA, the WPA, and all these New Deal programs. What was the total bill? What was the total tax bill at that time? What was our budget? It was $9,700,000,000. That is what it cost us in those New Deal days under Roosevelt. Congressman after Congressman got up in the well of the House and shouted his head off about those terrific expenditures. What is our budget now? It is $42,000,000,000, and it is going to reach $45,000,000,000. That is 4½ times as much. Do you have a national income to pay that kind of money? You cannot expect to keep on raising this money out of the taxpayers on the basis

of war-profit dollars. That is over with. You have to get back on an even keel, and on a solid business basis from now on. You are not going to have these free and easy dollars to pick up out of the taxpayers' pockets. They will not be able to afford it. You have got to get down to business. Let me see what Mr. Hoffman said here. Mr. Hoffman lists the first year's achievements as follows:

1. Industrial production for 1948, for all the participating countries, was virtually at the prewar figure and it was 14 percent above prewar in certain countries. For the last quarter of 1948 industrial output was at a rate 5 percent greater than prewar.

How far do you intend to rebuild these countries? To what extent? Where are we going to stop? When you talked about Marshall plan funds last year, you were talking about countries devastated by war and we were going to restore their economy. We have restored them; we have them right back where they were before the war. Where do we stop? Western European coal production reached 398,000,000 metric tons in 1948. Steel continued to set the production pace among heavy industry, the output for 1948 totaling approximately 40,000,000 metric tons in ERP countries, or 30 percent more than in 1947. In Bizonia a large balance of funds allocated for western Germany will remain after the first 15 months of Marshall plan aid ending June 30. The latest statistics on Bizonia show that of $519,600,000 allocated, only $248,000,000 had been contracted for by March 15, with very little likelihood that Bizonia will make use of or expend the other millions by June 30. The $270,000,000 allocated for Germany is still unspent. They cannot spend it, they cannot find a place to spend it; they cannot spend it before June 30, yet they are coming in here asking for more money. The Christian Science Monitor of last Tuesday contains an article stating that the Marshall planners for Austria have pledged themselves to build a big new opera house in Vienna. They have pledged it, they are going to do it; they are going to spend money to build an opera house in Vienna. We cannot get money to build schools and hospitals to take care of our own people in this country, yet we can afford to give money to build opera houses in Europe, probably to give the Europeans spiritual uplift, not only an economic and financial uplift but we must build them up spiritually.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

During the past few weeks we have been passing appropriation bills here in the halls of Congress. We are now faced with two measures that will cost the people of our country a large sum of money. I have reference to the military outlay and the economic aid program to the countries cooperating under the Marshall plan.

I am not and do not pretend to be an economist but I do try to analyze as best I can the trends of our business conditions here in America and base my judgment on the findings of improvements or slackening of general business conditions.

Recently farm prices have been steadier than industrial prices and a noticeable down-trend in the price of some of our metals has been noted.

According to the Census Bureau's estimate recent unemployment figures were around 3,200,000. This has been accentuated somewhat by the shut-down order on coal mining. But the unemployment compensation rolls seem to be levelling off according to the latest weekly figures by the United States Department of Labor and this Department seems confident that little or no further increase in unemployment will develop within the next few months and it is generally believed that we will again reach the 60,000,000 employed which existed during the summer months of 1948.

Inventory fluctuations are always a powerful factor in determining our business swings. The best estimate of our inventories shows a large reduction in practically all lines.

The latest figure on personal income is around $220,000,000,000 or more. This is very close to an all-time peak.

We have also noticed a reduction in prices of manufactured goods in the past few months, more than at any time since the inflation period started and I believe a new balance is being worked out on a firm basis on the over-all problem of inventories and commitments.

In cotton goods this adjustment has been running for more than a year. Metals and heavy industries only began to face it early this year. So it seems evident that this downturn in business will not be deepened and prolonged by drastic liquidations as it is evident that most business has been very cautious and properly so.

I feel that the strong point in the outlook is that familiar causes which in the past produce these recessions do not appear today to exert such a heavy weight. An enormous amount of work is in progress throughout the country at the present time and we have had very few cancellations. Public expenditures on construction are still large.

Interest on money is neither high nor is it very tight as it has been before in nearly all major business depressions. The reports show that banks are nearly all liquid and are in a position to take on new loans if the right borrowers request the loans. The Federal Reserve is in a position today to quickly relieve any strain in the supply of credit and it has already expressed this desire and willingness to cooperate in that direction. Also annual reports show evidence of satisfactory corporate earnings. Most of these corporations have recently made their annual reports.

It is these factors, coupled with the necessity of building up a sound European economy and those countries that desire to remain as members of a group that value freedom and desire to remain so, which make this measure necessary. World conditions being what they are at the present hour it still remains a fact that we must continue to remain in a strong position with an Air Force, Army, and Navy adequate to meet any emergency.

This measure which we are considering today and the armed services appropriation which will come before us in a few days will go a long way toward promoting and carrying out the American ideals of a peaceful world. This is my reason for supporting the measure.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, is the opposition going to get 5 or 10 minutes on some of these amendments?

Mr. KEE. There is no amendment before us.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I object to closing debate in 5 minutes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. I am glad to note a quorum is present and that the Members are showing their interest by keeping a quorum present because I know the committee will have a very interesting message from my colleague.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to delay the Committee, but there is nothing closer to my heart than the appropriation for this important work. I hope I may paraphrase a great Britisher, Winston Churchill, when he made the statement with regard to the Royal Air Force that, "Never in the history of mankind was so much owed by so many to so few."

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that never in my humble opinion in the history of mankind was so much given to so many by so few. When I think of 140,000,000 Americans trying to bring rehabilitation and help to practically the rest of the civilized world, in my opinion it is one of the finest concepts of true charity I know of in the history of the world. But we are not predicating this entirely on thoughts of charity. We are trying to build back into the economic structure of these countries a new life for them and we hope a new life for all the world.

I do not want to stand here as an American Pharisee and say that we are the privileged few; that we are better than other peoples; but I think Americans have shown to the world as fine a concept of the principles of Christ as has ever been shown by any of the peoples of the world. We were smitten on one

cheek by our enemy, Japan, and we immediately turned the other cheek and tried to help these people who had smitten us.

So that has been our program. When we start thinking about cost, we must also think about the result. One of our earlier Presidents, when we were discussing a pension program, said to the people of America that there are two views to the pension question: One from the Little Round Top at Gettysburg, and the other from the statistical tables of some of our accountants. So, today, I do not want to dramatize this very important measure, but I think there are two views to this great question: one from the standpoint of a devastated Europe and one from the point of view of what we can do to bring back to that devastated Europe some opportunity to regain their place in the world.

If I could in my humble way convert a man who I feel has the great ability and great linguistic power—and I refer to that distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]—if I could just have one person feel as I do about this great question I would be satisfied. I would like to feel that he is like Paul going down to Jericho and is being converted to this new concept of world leadership for America. I appeal to you with all sincerity I have to have sympathy for this great, great question. I do not want to be melodramatic about it, but to me this is the most important thing that we will be faced with in this session of Congress. If we can bring back to Europe an opportunity to take her place in the sun and if possible to lessen the chance of another war, I feel that it is worth the venture. So, my colleagues, let us with all sincerity realize that we are taking the money of our taxpayers. That we have a responsibility to spend that money as judiciously as our hearts and minds can direct, and I feel that if we go into our inward thoughts we will find that we will never spend that money more judiciously than in trying to bring back to the countries of Europe new hope and a chance to be rehabilitated and at the same time try to eliminate another horrible war.

One of the speakers referred to Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator. I have only met that gentleman twice, but I feel that in meeting him you realize his sincerity, and if you and I could find his inner thoughts, I think he would agree that he has given more time and energy and heartfelt enthusiasm to this task than he ever gave to the creation of his own fortune in private industry.

I think we should carry out Lowell's precept when he said:

It is not what we give but what we share
For the gift without the giver is bare;
Who bestows himself with his alms feeds three—
Himself, his hungering neighbor, and me.

We have really shared these gifts. We have sent our talent and our capable men to help in the administration of the program, and I do not think anyone can say that the past administration of this worth-while project is in any way to be criticized.

So, I say please let us support this great program.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 105 (c) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Export Control Act of 1949."

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 108 of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "There shall be a Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. The Deputy United States Special Representative shall perform such functions as the United States Special Representative shall designate, and shall be Acting United States Special Representative during the absence or disability of the United States Special Representative or in the event of a vacancy in the office of United States Special Representative."

SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 109 (a) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and the chief of the special mission shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or compensation and allowances in accordance with section 110 (a) of this title, as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or appropriate."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the bill was before the Congress last year which became the four packages of aid, as you will recall, I supported that legislation. I did it as a result of knowledge which I gained as a member of the deficiency subcommittee, which was conducting hearings in order to report the appropriation bill prior to the passage of the authorization act itself. When that act was on the floor for discussion last year, I recall so vividly, I could walk right from the committee room of the Committee on Appropriations onto the floor, after hearing the evidence that was submitted by the proponents of the appropriation, and then listen to the argument that took place here on the floor. I heard man after man stand in the well of this House last year and proclaim this as a program of charity, to relieve suffering, to relieve disease, to succor the wounded and provide them with food, and so on and so on. Some of you will recall I took the floor at that time to announce my position with respect to this bill. While I had great pride in all of the charitable impulses which prompted those who made that sort of argument, I knew at that time that I could not predicate my support of the legislation on such narrow ground. I told the Congress then that I was supporting it because I was convinced it was an implementation of the military strategy of the United States, and an implementation of our accepted and announced foreign policy and that not to support it, to my mind, would be to vote against the best interests of my own country. I challenged anybody to stand up on the floor at that time and tell the Congress what the alternative was to the program which was then before the Congress. I listened attentively to all the debates last year, and you can scan through that RECORD as you will and you will not find any alternative there. Neither will you find any alternative offered in the debates this year. They spent 14 days debating this thing in the other body at length, and all of the arguments that could possibly be thought of were raised. When the final vote came, there were seven Members of the other body who voted against the program.

I can stand here from now until the end of next week and point out what I conceive to be mistakes of administration, perhaps, but on the question as to the over-all policy, now that we are in this program, I do not intend, so far as my vote is concerned, to stop. I cannot see how we could possibly do that and act consisently in accordance with our own self-interests. The gentleman from Ohio who spoke a few moments ago explained the situation and made it just as clear as a bell. I say to you, my colleagues of the House, coming from the State of Wisconsin, where it has been alleged time and time again we were isolationists and all that sort of thing, we know that the die is cast. We fought certain things back in 1941 and 1942. But the policy of this country was announced. We went into that war and gave everything we had for it. So far as I am concerned, no one has brought forth any program to substitute for that which is suggested by both parties in this program. Until such an alternative is forthcoming, I can do nothing but support the program which has been given to us and which has the united support of both parties in both platforms.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (a) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the final period and inserting in lieu thereof "for United States flag vessels, not to exceed a reasonable differential above current world market rates."

(b) Paragraph (3) of section 111 (b) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

(1) By inserting after "projects" a comma and the following: "including expansion, modernization, or development of existing enterprises" and a comma;

(2) By inserting after "media" the following: "consistent with the national interests of the United States";

(3) By striking out "in the first year after the date of the enactment of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof "made in any fiscal year";

(4) By amending subparagraph (1) thereof to read as follows:

"(1) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the Administrator plus actual earnings or profits on said project to the extent provided by such guaranty;".

(5) By inserting after subparagraph (iii) thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(iv) as used in this paragraph, the term 'investment' includes the furnishing of capi-

tal goods items and related services, for use in connection with projects approved by the Administrator, pursuant to a contract providing for payment in whole or in part after June 30, 1950; and

"(v) the guaranty to any person shall be limited to assuring the following: (1) the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies received by such person as earnings or profits from the approved investment, as repayment or return thereof, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof; and (2) compensation in United States dollars for loss of all or any part of the approved investment, which shall be found by the Administrator to have been lost to such person by reason of one or more of the following causes: (a) seizure, confiscation, or expropriation, (b) destruction by riot, revolution, or war, (c) any law, ordinance, regulation, decree, or administrative action (other than measures affecting the conversion of currency), which in the opinion of the Administrator prevents the further transaction of the business for which the guaranty was issued. When any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency, credits, or assets on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title, claim, or cause of action existing in connection therewith."

(6) By amending the next to last sentence thereof to read as follows: "The total amount of the guaranties made under this paragraph (3) shall not exceed $300,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds allocated to a guaranty and remaining after all liability of the United States assumed in connection therewith has been released, discharged, or otherwise terminated, shall be available for allocation to other guaranties, the foregoing limitation notwithstanding."

(c) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (c) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

(1) By amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "In addition to the amount of notes above authorized, the Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section, to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $300,000,000 less any amount allocated prior to April 3, 1949, for such purpose, until all liabilities arising under guaranties made pursuant to this authorization have expired or been discharged."

(2) By striking out the first two words, "Such notes" in the second sentence thereof and inserting "The notes hereinabove authorized";

(3) By inserting after "Washington" in the sixth sentence thereof "for assistance on credit terms."

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATTERSON: On page 7, after line 4, insert the following:

"(d) Section 111 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof new subsections as follows:

"'(e) No assistance shall be furnished under this act to a participating country or protectorate during any period with respect to which the Secretary of State determines that such country or protectorate is violating any treaty with the Untied States.

"'(f) No assistance shall be furnished to a participating country, or a major political subdivision, or dependent area thereof, which is discriminating in the distribution of commodities or materials provided as assistance on grounds of race or religion.

"'(g) No assistance shall be furnished to a participating country or a major political subdivision, or dependent area thereof, which is discriminating against American enterprise located in such area.'"

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill at the place where offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this deals with the administration of ECA funds. I believe, therefore, it is germane to this particular section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has had an opportunity to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, and the Chair feels that the amendment is germane to section 111 of the act. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment very simply stated seeks to do three things—to assure that assistance under ECA will not be granted to participating countries who act in violation of treaties in effect between those countries and the United States; to assure that any assistance under the act will not be denied to persons because of their race or religion; and that there will be no discrimination against American enterprise doing business in any of the participating countries.

The necessity for this amendment is indicated by a condition that currently exists in French Morocco. It is hoped that by the adoption of this amendment conditions such as these which exist elsewhere will also be corrected. There are in Morocco 36 members of a trade association, all of them American citizens, 31 of them American veterans. They returned to French Morocco after the war feeling that there were many opportunities available for trade and hoping, by the use of American enterprise and initiative, to establish themselves in the economic pattern of Morocco. Events have proved since the enactment of ECA that discrimination of the most unfair kind is practiced.

All of these veterans are engaged in small business about which we in Congress proclaim our faith and good intentions. Here is the opportunity for us to help not only small business; but the veterans. Our trade treaty with Morocco specifies that an ad valorem tax of 12½ percent on imports shall be levied. Yet these American citizens are required to pay duties in excess of 150 percent of the value of the merchandise landed at Casablanca. If the duties are not paid promptly, the material is confiscated and, although payments have been made under protest for a year and a half, they have been to no avail. The sums which are unrecovered in these protest payments run well into seven figures. There is an accumulation of 3 months' supply of merchandise in Casablanca, much of which has used up the entire liquid capital of the American veterans and American businessmen doing business there.

On March 17 of this year the United States Minister called on the Governor General to protest the high-handed action of local officials and found him in agreement that such actions were illegal. He stated that he could not deviate from orders which had been handed to him directly from Paris.

American flags, which were to be used in celebration of the fifth anniversary of American landings at Morocco, Casablanca, and Fez were held up by local authorities until the time for such celebration had passed. Penicillin tablets, which were necessary for the treatment of illness and disease, were impounded and an American veteran was refused gasoline rations for his Greyhound bus business at a time when French competitors were given adequate allocations. The gasoline supplied was contributed by the ECA. An American representative for Remington Rand received an allocation of 7½ percent of the ECA funds while his French competitor, representing Underwood, was allocated 31 percent. This happened in spite of the fact that the American veteran's business had averaged well over two and one-half times that of his competitor. In Algeria, the exact opposite condition prevailed when a French representative of Remington Rand was allocated 55 percent of the ECA funds.

All of these actions are in direct contradiction to the spirit of ECA. Should the American people realize that their hard-earned money is being taxed to grant unfair advantage to foreign agencies where discrimination is made against American veterans, they would certainly rebel.

It is necessary that we legislate these provisions for the simple reason that both the ECA and the Department of State have been passing the buck to each other in this proposition. Both admit that there is discrimination against American agencies; but neither wishes to take the initiative.

In the bill now under discussion, the Foreign Affairs Committee has seen fit to write in guaranties of $300,000,000 to expand American enterprise in undeveloped areas of the world. At the same time, the committee refuses to recognize the injustice being committed against one American group now attempting to carry out that proposition.

Under my amendment, no additional sums are allotted. It is not a question of money but of principle.

The people in Morocco are being assailed on all sides by Communist propaganda which is nullifying all of our efforts under ECA. The French officials at Casablanca have refused to allow the distribution of matzoth for the Jewish passover. This is being held up, at the

present time, in an entirely discriminatory manner and allows the Communists to make capital of the fact. Jews and Moslems are not allowed to obtain foods and medicines which have been allocated and which are paid for by ECA funds.

Justice dictates that we provide in this act for safeguards against these discriminations. Our veterans, who have taken the initiative in spreading American enterprise throughout the world, are not seeking any unfair advantage, but they do want to be in as favorable a position as other foreign agents.

When this measure was first enacted, we did not specify that only Caucasians or Protestants or Catholics or any other group should receive its benefits. How can we allow the discrimination which is now practiced under the act? I say to the committee that it is necessary to spell out these provisions in the act because those charged with its administration have failed to take jurisdiction over these matters. There are over 400 Members of this honorable body who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee's united action in opposing amendments should not keep us from exercising our own good judgment in legislation where we are asked to appropriate billions of dollars annually. I hope that, in the name of justice and fair play for our veterans and for people of all races and creeds, the amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATTERSON) there were—ayes 61, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 7, before line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 112 (a) of such act is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph:

" 'The Administrator shall prescribe such regulations with respect to, and impose such conditions on, procurement in the United States under this title as will secure to "small business" in the United States, especially the producers, a fair and substantial share of the production and business resulting from any such procurement. For the purpose of this paragraph, "small business" shall include any small-business enterprise, and only such, if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of the employees does not exceed 500, except that the Administrator shall, where appropriate, specify a smaller number for any particular trade or industry, or subdivision thereof, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.' "

And in line 5 strike out "SEC. 7. (a)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)," and reletter the remaining subsections accordingly.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I know that three other Members on the Committee on Small Business have statements they would like to make on this amendment. They have not spoken on this bill, and I do not feel like it would be fair to cut them off. I hope the gentleman will not insist on less than 20 minutes for our side in presenting the amendment.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, with the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is it understood then that the proponents will have 20 minutes and the opponents the last 10 minutes?

Mr. KEE. I will make that as a part of my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], want to speak on the amendment, and we can divide the time accordingly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] claimed just now that it is understood that 20 minutes' time would be allotted to the proponents and 10 minutes be reserved for the opponents. I understood the unanimous consent request to be that the last 10 minutes should be reserved to the committee. There was no division as to time for the opponents or the proponents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas correctly understands the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems that we are trying to get this time allotted before we hear the debate. Something might develop that we may want to discuss at some length. Since the Senate took 3 weeks to debate this bill, and they are seeking to pass it here in 2 days, it does not seem justifiable. Therefore I object, Mr. Chairman.

SMALL-BUSINESS AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is very easy for a department or agency to deal only with large concerns. We found that to be true in the beginning of the emergency preceding the Second World War. It was necessary that we pass special acts of Congress in order to compel these agencies to give small business a fair share of the production of the business that they could procure and deliver. We had to compel them to do it. Even in wartime it was necessary. It was in the public interest, and there has never been a time that small business is pressed harder than it is pressed today. The huge concerns have every advantage. If you were in a position of authority and dealing with billions of dollars, and buying billions of dollars' worth of goods and commodities, the easy way for you would be to deal with the huge concerns that could make the deliveries and have the minimum number of contracts to deal with. It is perfectly natural. But this Congress has a good record of trying to protect the smaller concerns of the Nation.

I invite attention to the fact that we passed the Smaller War Plants Act, we passed the Small Business Mobilization Act, and the War Production Board was given specific small-business mandates by Congress under this act. That was during wartime, if you please. In addition, in the Surplus Property Act, after the war, we made sure small business was given an opportunity to purchase surplus property. The Reconversion Act and the Contract Settlement Act also had provisions favoring small business. The Armed Services Procurement Act had a similar provision. The Selective Service Act had a similar provision. This is the only major bill I know of to go through Congress without some good, strong, compulsory provision relating to small business concerns. I hope there is no objection to this amendment. I do not believe there should be.

After dealing with ECA, my findings are that if we do not have this provision in the bill small business will not have an equal or a fair chance. There is no provision in the present act that requires it, and this must be inserted in order to protect the small concerns of the Nation.

MR. HOFFMAN

I know Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of ECA, and I have confidence in him. I have known him for many years. I have been in many conferences with him. He demonstrated sincerity and honesty of purpose. I know if he were to have charge of this Act himself, directing every part of it, small business would be given the right chance. Obviously, however, he cannot personally look after all these things. He must delegate this power to others. The people we have been dealing with in ECA have not demonstrated too much sympathy for small business.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I am quite sympathetic to the gentleman's proposal. Certainly it is one worth while considering at this point. However, can the gentleman advise the Committee just how a determination might be made as to what would be a fair share for small business?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. Anticipating such a question as the gentleman has asked, if the gentleman will refer to the RECORD of last Saturday and turn to page 4192 he will find the amendment I have proposed, and on the next page he will find definitions of all the words and phrases used in this amendment, to indicate how they should be construed, about "procurement," and about "in the United States" and "producer" and especially "producers," and "a fair and substantial share" and what is a fair share. So refer to the RECORD at page 4193 and you will find a definition of all the words and phrases that are used in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that my request that debate close in 30 minutes was objected to, I now move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House who have served during the past three or four terms will recall, I am sure, the great personal interest I have had, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and many others, in behalf of small business in our economy. That evidence was seen first before our entry into World War II when we joined in the Committee on Small Business to do what we could, not only to protect the interests of small business, but to see to it that the great productive capacity of small business could be brought into the then developing war effort. We went through those years before the war, during the war, and since the war doing what we could to bring about administrative support and assistance for small business in connection with the various programs. We brought to final enactment legislation designed to protect the interests of small business and promote the interests of the country.

The gentleman from Texas has referred to certain precedents which I say clearly establish the reasonableness of the offering of this amendment. I recall it was said on some of those occasions that the proposals were not administratively such that they could be put into operation. Frequently it was said they would hamper this and that effort, which was of primary importance.

As I look back, I do not concede that any single one of those acts did anything except help promote the fundamental purpose which was before us and at the same time help preserve and protect that great stalwart segment of the American economy, the small-business man.

What is the situation which here confronts us in connection with the European aid program? The program involves principally the shipment of supplies from this country to foreign countries. When we undertook this program a year ago we wrote into the act certain requirements as to procurement which were designed to relieve, so far as possible, the impact of such procurement on our short supplies here at home. In the meantime, in the short space of a year, that economic situation has changed. Instead of having short supplies in many fields in the country, today we are now having surplus supplies. Whole segments of our economy find their products backing up on them. Now then, having a year ago written what I thought was a good provision of the bill to meet the situation then existing, why is it not good sense and sound judgment today to write into this legislation provisions which will, so far as possible, bring about the distribution of these procurement programs over the economy as a whole with particular reference to small business?

Bear in mind this amendment does not undertake to say to the ECA that they have to buy any particular commodity in this country. All it seeks to do is to provide that if ECA allocates money to be used for purchases in this country, then the ECA itself, so far as it can, should see to it that the great productive capacities of small business shall likewise be utilized in this program. I do not think there is anyone here who would contend other than that this foreign aid program is today, rightly or wrongly, supporting much of our economy insofar as employment is concerned. If that is true, then why is it not desirable that, so far as it can be worked out, the productive capacity of small business should be devoted to this effort which we are carrying on in foreign lands?

I am not against anyone in connection with that operation. Here again, as I have throughout the years, I want to do what I can to see to it that small business is protected in a fair way. I speak as one who voted for this program a year ago. I speak as one who expects to vote for it this time.

But I do not believe it can be said of these various amendments, as they come along, that they should not be given fair consideration. If they are found to be in the public interest and not destructive of the fundamental purposes of the act, I can see no reason why they should not be written into the law. I know, as many of you undoubtedly know, that small-business men have been coming to us complaining that they have not been able to get the door open to get into this business in the ECA program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly on the spot here. Like the rest of you I am strongly in favor of small business, and I am most reluctant to tangle with my distinguished and respected friend who invented the idea of having a Small Business Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. However, I greatly prefer the small-business amendment in the bill to the one proposed here. It may be that a little pride of authorship is involved; I had something to do with what our committee conceived as the proper way to handle the small-business situation, an amendment which appears on page 7, lines 14 to 18 of the bill as follows:

> And, insofar as practicable, make available or cause to be made available to suppliers in the United States reasonable information, as far in advance as possible, of purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this title.

I was the author of the provisions in the original act providing in sections 111 and 112 for the maximum use of private channels of trade, and it seems to me that the concept of private channels of trade is most important in this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. In just a minute.

I believe I am correct when I say that five-sixths of the program is conducted through private channels of trade. The problem involved is this: if you are going to permit a purchaser in Europe to come over here and buy something in private channels of trade from a seller here, how are you going to impose conditions or limitations upon his purchases such as you would provide for government purchases? I thoroughly approve of the magnificent work our committee on small business has done in writing provisions for participation by small business in government purchases. The problem we face, however, is how to write such provisions into a law which attempts to stimulate private channels of trade which, in my judgment, is the cornerstone of the future of international trade. The proposal before us is, I greatly fear, extremely unworkable. What is a "fair and reasonable proportion," for instance? At present small business, firms employing 500 persons or less, predominated in 44 percent of the trade financed by ECA, involving $1,672,500,000. In 5.9 percent of the ECA trade small business got the largest share; in 24 percent a moderate share went to small business and in 15 lines of endeavor, comprising 23 percent and valued at $955,000,000, small business got a small share.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VORYS. In just a moment. You and I know that small business cannot participate in the making of locomotives, turbines, or in the building of harbor installations, and a number of other items that are in this program. I am greatly concerned that in our interest for small business we put a lot of regimentation upon all private business abroad and at home that we do not want to impose.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I may state to the gentleman from Ohio that our committee has conferred on that, and we are convinced that the language inserted by the gentleman on page 7 will not get the job done. We are convinced that it is not sufficient; that unless there is a mandate so plain they cannot escape it, they will not follow it.

If the gentleman is interested further in the facts I refer him to the statistics appearing on page 4193 of the RECORD where he will find that the proposition we have is in conformity with the rules and regulations heretofore made by the Department.

Mr. VORYS. I have read with great interest the gentleman's speech and extension of last Saturday, but I still feel that the determination of a fair share to be imposed on private business here and abroad is a very difficult proposition administratively, and we have been told by the ECA that the amendment proposed is practically impossible of administration.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas and I have just pointed out—and the gentleman was here and heard the arguments—time and time again in connection with the program for World War II, when we had very critical problems before us, language similar to this was inserted,

and it did the work; it worked not only for the benefit of small business but for the benefit of the country and for the benefit of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, from what has been said here it is certainly apparent that this is not a partisan issue, for both sides are speaking in favor of small business in this case.

A gentleman said a while ago that a certain Member was the author of the Committee on Small Business of the House. I want to say that no one individual was responsible for it; this House of Representatives created this committee and charged the committee with the duty of inquiring into problems relating to small business and to report back to the House. It cannot enact legislation, but it can report to this House and make recommendations. We have found in our experience that small business is having the door closed in its face, so to speak, by ECA; they cannot get a fair or proportionate share of the business.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently favored the high objectives and purposes of the European recovery program. I have felt that the program was not only necessary but that it was of vital importance and in the best interest of the United States—that it is a humanitarian program, and not only this but such a program that was designed to aid and assist our friends abroad and stimulate economic recovery at home and to serve as a bulwark against the spreading and onrush of communism.

For these and other reasons I have supported the ECA program.

In the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 Congress in no uncertain terms stated its purposes, which were as follows:

> It is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries, through a joint organization, to exert sustained common efforts * * * which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity.

It is further declared in this act to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty—free institutions—and assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation, provided—and I call particular attention to the following statement of policy and intent:

> *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

The act further provided that—

> The Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes * * * utilize private channels of trade.

Private channels of trade have not been utilized to any appreciable extent as relating to small business in the United States.

I have carefully read the letter of March 29, 1949, to the House Small Business Committee from the ECA in this connection. The committee had asked what regulations or statutes would be necessary to insure small business a fair share of participation in procurement made in the United States. ECA replied, in substance, that any statutory mandate or regulation which would accomplish this purpose would be impracticable and would discourage the use of private channels of trade.

I am a great believer in the use of private channels of trade, as opposed to governmental usurpation of private trade channels. First let us see what countries are not using private channels of trade. This information is taken from a document supplied to the House Small Business Committee by ECA. The following countries used governmental or quasi-governmental agencies to handle procurement for the commodities indicated:

Austria: Feeds, grain, coal.

France: Substantially all procurement through these sources.

Greece: Food, medical supplies, technical items, and petroleum products.

Italy: Pharmaceuticals, spare parts, tin plate, coal, petroleum and petroleum products, wheat and flour.

The Netherlands: Wheat, flour, fats and oils, oil cake and meal, dried fruit, and meat.

Norway: Wheat, flour and rye.

Turkey: Coal-mining machinery and port construction machinery.

All of the purchases of Great Britain are handled through governmental agencies.

It will certainly be no imposition on these governments to require them to do what our Government does—and that is to give a fair share of procurement to small business.

As to those items which are procured through private channels of trade, I cannot see how it would interfere with those channels to require that they in turn give a fair share of their orders to small business in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this idea is not new. During the war and in the midst of hostilities when nothing was to be allowed to impede in any way the progress of our forces, this principle of attention to business channels was a customary practice.

We imposed a mandate to utilize small business wherever possible upon the Armed Services and certain other agencies. This was clearly set down in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947—to require a fair proportion of purchases to be placed with small business concerns.

Similar provisions have been inserted into the Reconversion Act, the Surplus Property Act, the Contract Settlement Act, and even the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act as amended.

Mr. Chairman, if this country—this Congress—could impose such provisions upon ourselves as a Nation during the war—and demand that our own governmental agencies observe the requirement to share business with small-business operators—then, certainly today we should require that the ECA insure that small business be given its fair and equitable share of contracts of procurements.

I believe that the importers in these participating countries, wherein small business is the backbone as it is in ours, would be willing to cooperate to this extent.

I do not believe that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas would in any manner destroy the intent and purpose of this act which, mind you, requires that we look to the economic stability of this country in our activities on behalf of the European recovery.

I am very much afraid that the authorities of ECA have improperly presumed that private channels of trade will be interfered with by trying to assist small business and have springboarded from that conclusion to their present position of resistance.

It is apparent that a congressional mandate is the only thing that will change that opinion, and I am, therefore, heartily in favor of the amendment proposed.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for the position he has taken on this amendment. As a member of the Small Business Committee on which he has served and served well, he knows the many problems that are facing the small-business men of this country. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that it is of far more importance that we preserve the economy of the small-business men of this country rather than looking first to the economy elsewhere.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], as a member of the Small Business Committee of the House, knows the deep interest I have in the welfare of the small business concerns of our country. I am in favor of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and intend to support it.

IN RE PATMAN AMENDMENT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the Ninth Report of the Economic Cooperation Administration, on page 68 I find that procurement authorizations issued by ECA for purchases in the United States, up to February 28, 1949, totaled $2,897,000,000. This was out of a total expenditure of $4,839,000,000 for procurement in all countries.

I am advised that ECA is unable to determine what portion of the expenditures in the United States went to small business. I am further advised that they cannot even say what proportion could have gone to small business. If the complaints which I and other Members have received are indicative, it is reasonable to assume that small business received very little. It is further reasonable to

assume that they will get no more in the future since most of the purchase orders and contracts for this procurement are made in foreign countries and with large businesses that are able to maintain agents and representatives abroad. The very nature of the operation limits the possibilities of small business. It is my sincere belief that, any time $2,800,000,000 changes hands in this country without small business getting a fair share of participation, our economic stability is shaken, and if things continue, that phase of our national economy will ultimately be seriously hurt. ECA has demonstrated that it will not on its own do any overt act to assist small business. I am tired of sympathy and lip service. I am tired of being told how things cannot be done and would welcome the refreshing change of ECA showing me how things can be done to assist the little fellow. It is my belief that the mandates of the amendment proposed by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], are the only means of producing effective results.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in considering a new appropriation for ECA, I want to remind my colleagues of a study conducted by the staff of the House Select Committee on Small Business last December. The results of the study indicated that through December 3 less than 500 firms had participated in the program as suppliers of goods to aid countries. That of the total 500 firms approximately 150 were foreign firms.

During the period of ECA existence, prior to December 3 roughly $4,000,000,000 was expended. In providing new money for foreign aid through ECA let us be certain that a privileged few do not receive a monopoly of this business. Let us guard against profiteering by political favorites in a charity program.

At one point in our investigation last year our staff discovered that the firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. had 71.2 percent of the total cotton procurement of the aid countries. One British tobacco firm had 80.98 percent of tobacco procurements, and four coal firms had 57 percent of all of the coal shipped.

Would it not be helpful for us to write specific provisions into the appropriation of new moneys to include small and independent businesses in this expensive aid plan in which small business is called upon to contribute many tax dollars?

Mr. Chairman, small business institutions have ever been the keystone of our business economy. From the beginning of our history, our country has thrived and grown only when our farmers, craftsmen, and tradesmen were producing and selling in abundance.

Today we are faced with a situation in our business world which demands recognition. Giant corporations, with far-flung organizations, can more than take care of themselves in both the domestic and foreign fields of trade and commerce. So we are not concerned, at the moment, with such organizations. We are, however, deeply concerned with the maintenance of a vigorous and prosperous business structure in its entirety. To maintain such a structure, small business must have a fair and proportionate amount of the total of our foreign as well as of our domestic trade.

In recognition of certain compelling facts, we have provided funds for a European recovery plan. We are now asked to renew and further implement this plan by supplying more dollar credits, many more dollars which are furnished largely by the rank and file of smaller American business institutions.

It is too much to ask that small business share proportionately in the dollar volume of goods and merchandise purchased in the United States by way of authorizations under the Marshall plan?

Is it too much to ask that the Economic Cooperation Administration be required—since it has taken no steps on its own motion—to use its organization and influence to properly propel and implement such purchases from small producers, processors, manufacturers, and fabricators

I think not, nor do I see any danger to the Marshall plan by merely providing a means through which the intent of Congress with respect to the preservation of small business is made manifest. To the contrary, I believe that the European recovery plan is strengthened by a congressional mandate which in effect impels a wide distribution of purchases in this country, a mandate by which Congress takes a further and positive step to insure that the economy of the United States is not impaired while, at the same time, the European recovery plan is in no way ruffled.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to rise in support of the amendment of the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business I endorse his amendment wholeheartedly and trust it will pass by a large majority.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a list of suppliers just came over from my office. There are 75 pages in one and 43 in another. I thought that possibly the members of the Committee would like to take a look at this and see just who all are furnishing this procurement.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I also would like to say to my colleague that I, too, have a list of where they bought their agricultural products, and the gentleman from Colorado is absolutely correct. So far as this procurement is concerned, it is pretty well confined to a few big companies.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman that the part of the bill that was read by the gentleman from Ohio which reads "as far as practical" means nothing at all. They are not going to buy it from small business firms anywhere, especially in the territory where I live. They say it is too far away; "we cannot police it; we cannot tell what they are going to do." So, they buy from the big firms, and the little firms just getting started never get a dollar's worth of business from the ECA, and that is why it is important to write this amendment in the bill.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. If we enacted such legislation in the procurement during the war, should we not do it now that the war is over?

Mr. HILL. It is more important now.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would this not require that the Government step in both on this side of the ocean and on the other side of the ocean and set up a governmental agency, which I know the gentleman does not want to have? Would it not require that a governmental agency be set up on both sides in order to see that whatever percentage you want from that source is bought?

Mr. HILL. It does not take any more business organization to buy from a little firm than from a big firm or to buy automobiles from a little firm than from General Motors. It just takes a little brains. If they do not have the ability they should not be placed in these important positions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement. They set the rules so that under the present purchasing program they cannot buy from the small firms.

Mr. HILL. In one instance they wrote into the contract a provision that prohibited a small firm that made fine trucks from bidding.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Commerce conducted a field survey to learn the experience of small business participating in the European recovery plan. The complaints of small business can roughly be divided into two categories: First, the lack of information emanating either from the Economic Cooperation Administration, or from other sources, as to foreign trading methods; second, the lack of information as to what was to be procured in the United States under an ECA-approved authoriziation in time to seek the

business. This second complaint emanated not only from those unfamiliar with the export trade but from firms, manufacturers, and other producers long engaged in shipping abroad.

The upshot of the whole business has been that the powerfully entrenched corporation or exporter has been able to obtain a lion's share of all European recovery business ending in this country.

I am not trying to say that such organizations are not entitled to receive business under the plan. I am saying, however, very positively, that no evidence has been adduced which would indicate that small business has received any share of business under its authorizations.

ECA authorizations have been made, in most cases, after sales have been consummated. How, I ask you, can small business ever hope to share in the dollars spent in the United States unless a mandate of Congress is written into this bill?

There is a very definite need for a widespread dissemination of information regarding ECA procurement authorizations. No agency of the Government is in a better position to accomplish this task than ECA. The weak and invalid excuse has been advanced by members of the ECA staff that it is impossible to break down a procurement authorization or to spell out the component parts so that a fair idea of the types, kinds, and qualities of goods to be purchased in the United States may be made available.

The matter of ECA regulations and their interpretation, while perhaps not too difficult for the initiated, are certainly not as thoroughly clear as they should be to the entire business structure. This is a task ECA should welcome: the job of making known to every businessman in the United States the story of how his dollars are being spent and how, as a businessman, he can have an equal opportunity to obtain his proportionate share of the dollars spent in the United States. It may well be that many small-business institutions are not interested in business under the European recovery plan or in export business, for that matter. But those who are should have an equal opportunity to compete for the business. Unless they know where, what, and how, there is certainly an impediment which cannot be overcome.

The ECA bill now under discussion has my unqualified endorsement as one of the best security investments we can make.

The amendment simply provides for a distribution of purchases on the portion of procurement made in the United States and gives opportunity for small business to compete.

For these and other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], known and avowed friend of small business, and am happy to join him in the advocacy of a fair and equal opportunity for small business at home and abroad.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this amendment. I believe it is fundamentally sound. I believe it is necessary. If it gives some inconvenience to the Administrator of the program, then, nevertheless, if considerable inconvenience and even some increased expense in matters of administration can well be had, and caused, as compared with the fact that the effect of this amendment will be to strengthen the sinews of small business in the United States, the strengthening of small business in America is more important than it is to have less inconvenience in the matter of administration of this important bill. With the evidence indisputably showing that small business, as defined by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has not to date had its reasonable share of the ECA resources in purchasing in America, I vigorously urge that this amendment carry and that, thereby, we vigorously declare that it is the continuing policy of this United States Congress that small business shall be strengthened and perpetuated in America at every reasonable turn of the road.

There is no other way provided whereby there is security for big business in America if, in fact, small business in America is either destroyed or deteriorates or disappears for any reason whatsoever. The sinews and the American way of life in competitive, free enterprise started in the places of small business in America and only by perpetuation of the intent and spirit of small business in America can our free, competitive enterprise be perpetuated in America. Neither disappearing small business nor increasing monopolistic capitalism will strengthen the sinews of free, competitive enterprise. It takes both sound small business and sound big business to perpetuate that.

I urge the overwhelming approval of this amendment which I believe to be imperative in the best interests of the business of America, and, therefore, of the people of America, and, therefore, in the best interests of the taxpayers of America.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas that is intended to permit the group of what is known as small-business men to participate in this program. I disagree with those who insist the program will cost more if small business is allowed a share. It will cost less for the reason there will be more competition on thousands of commodities included in this program. Of course, such things as locomotives, trucks, automobiles, will go to big business. But where small business can share, it should not be ignored.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had time to recite a number of experiences that have come to my attention. Let me tell you about at least one of them. Under the present program, Greece has been allocated several million dollars for the purchase of mules in this country. These mules are for farmers of Greece. Ordinarily you would think reputable dealers in this country would have a chance to submit offers, and there would be competition and a fair chance for all dealers of ordinary size, interested. One of my constituents, who is a pretty good-sized dealer, and who knows the business thought he might have a chance at bidding, especially since he is near the area where mules are raised and since he has been in the business for many years. Briefly, here is what I have found. The mules for Greece are being bought, not by a representative of Greece, but by a Turkish concern. I find also that the Turkish representative will deal only with less than a half dozen dealers who are exporters of mules, and that the ordinary dealer does not have a chance at the business. In other words, American taxpayers' money is being used to buy the livestock but American small-business men do not even have a fair opportunity to compete for the business. It has been reported within the last few days the price of the mules when they reach their destination is excessive. I suggest this committee look into this matter. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I would like to say that I, too, am interested in small business. That is the reason that in committee I proposed an amendment along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] on this subject.

However, we must be primarily interested in the workability of this program. We cannot endanger the entire ECA program by hamstringing the Administrator in this manner. It would be impossible for them to administer and to obtain the objectives of this amendment; it would take additional time and more money which would decrease the effectiveness of the operation. It would mean that the ECA would be taking the majority of its time in the field of procurement, and it is not the purpose nor the objective of this plan to get into the field of procurement to such an extent. In the long run it would hurt small business. Under this amendment it would be necessary to stop dealing through private channels necessitating additional concentration of business in the hands of the Government. The Department of Commerce has a full-time job of promoting the interest of business and it is doing a good job. The ECA also has a unit which is looking for the interest of small business.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It would be very difficult to administer the Patman amendment, but I think if after the word "producers" the words "so far as practicable" are inserted, it could be administered. I think that will carry out the idea in the Patman amendment.

Mr. BATTLE. The amendment we put in the bill in committee provided in effect that information on pending purchases by individual countries would be made available to the small-business men of America as far as possible in advance, so that all would have a fair chance in competing for the commodities to be supplied under this program. I believe it is the only way this can be handled. I am surprised to see the gentleman from Indiana is backing up the amendment which would allow for additional concentration of power in the Federal Government and which would allow an agency of the Federal Government to further regulate and control business.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not the purpose of the ECA program to revive the normal channels of trade not only in Europe but here in the United States?

Mr. BATTLE. That is certainly the purpose of ECA.

Mr. SMATHERS. If this amendment were adopted, would it not mean that, as in the war, when the Government bought a lot of equipment for the Army actually a governmental agency had to do it, this would require a governmental agency to be established to act here in the United States, and a governmental agency would have to act in the countries of Europe, so that we would defeat the whole program of trying to reestablish the private channels of trade?

Mr. BATTLE. That is absolutely correct. It would be impossible for ECA to use so much time and money in the field of procurement, which would mean that the effectiveness would be lessened to that degree. I believe the amendment we have in the bill, making available the information to all small business all over the country, would take care of that situation. If we use the words of the amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Texas we will hamper the program seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 120, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) Section 112 (c) of such act is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 112 (g) of such act is hereby amended by striking out "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto," and "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Export Control Act of 1949."

(c) Section 112 (h) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the period, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding "and, insofar as practicable, make available or cause to be made available to suppliers in the United States reasonable information, as far in advance as possible, of purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this title."

(d) Section 112 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to price-support programs required by law) at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment."

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IRVING: Strike out the following words after section 7 on lines 5 and 6 of page 7:

"(a) Section 112 (c) of such act is hereby repealed."

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer reinstates the provision which was in the original act of last year. It will continue the provision that 25 percent of the wheat and whole grains shipped abroad under ECA shall be milled in this country rather than in foreign countries. I believe that the Senate has recognized the necessity for this provision, although it has cut it to 15 percent. I am not in favor of cutting the percentage from what it was in the original act. There is nothing new in the proposal that I am making. It is bipartisan and nonpartisan, and everyone must have been in favor of it last year when they passed the act. Cutting this provision will cause unemployment in this country. It will also hurt the small-business people that we have heard so much about here this afternoon and over the last few years. Generally speaking, I think the provision as called for in section 7 should not be repealed. My amendment will reinstate that provision.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Has the other body put this provision in the bill?

Mr. IRVING. The other body has this provision in the bill.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. REES. The provision in the Senate bill provides for 15 percent, does it not?

Mr. IRVING. I mentioned that, and I said too that I was not in favor of the reduction, but was in favor of the 25-percent figure.

Mr. REES. Your amendment is for 25 percent?

Mr. IRVING. Yes; as it was in the original legislation.

Mr. REES. In other words, this brings it back to what it was last year?

Mr. IRVING. That is right.

Mr. REES. I think the gentleman's amendment ought to be supported.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I rise to speak in favor of the amendment the gentleman has offered. I offered a similar amendment in committee, but was not successful in having it adopted by our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. IRVING. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It was my intention to offer a 15 percent amendment, but of course I shall certainly support the gentleman's amendment providing 25 percent.

Mr. IRVING. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I have a full appreciation of what the chairman and members of the committee have done. There is no personal criticism of them or of their efforts intended in my statement wherein I say there is a weakness in their report. I meant nothing critical of them, except to say that they had not given full consideration to this matter, and for that reason did not have a full understanding of the proposition.

To show my interest in the matter, I wrote all my colleagues of the House on February 23 of this year calling their attention to the possibility that this provision might be dropped from the act. I am advancing this proposition, not alone from the point of view of the people who are employed in these mills, although there will be many hundreds and thousands of them unemployed, if this provision is deleted, but because I am also in favor of the employers and the business people who have their money invested in these mills. I have a telegram which states that since October 1948, 22 mills, representing a capital investment of $15,000,000, have shut down. Twelve hundred of our people have been permanently laid off. This affects not only my district in Kansas City, Mo., but it affects the North, the East, the South, and the West, wherever mills, either small or large, are located. I can picture the small mills on the Red River in North Dakota, the large mills on the Mississippi River in Minnesota, and the mills in Oklahoma and all over the country. I can picture those mills fighting to maintain their foreign trade. We have information from the testimony of Mr. E. W. Reed, president of Shellabarger's, Inc., millers in Salina, Kans.—testimony was given at the hearings before the committee and is found on pages 699 to 709—where he said that—

The mathematical average percentage of flour to the total for the 21-year period is 26.84 percent. It can be argued that a 21-year period is too long from which to draw an average applicable to the present case.

If so, a running 5-year average beginning with 1920 does not show a single 5-year

period as low as 20 percent, while the period since 1934 exceeds the 25-percent figure.

For the 10 years ending 1940 this arithmetical average is 37.7 percent.

Possibly it should be pointed out that in a comparison of this nature much can be said for each year standing on its own base, inasmuch as crops, general economic conditions, and other factors affect both wheat and flour from year to year.

Subsequent to World War II export began again with a 1945 percentage of 14.32; for 1946, 36.45 percent; and in 1947, 46.05 percent.

According to figures supplied by ECA for the 9 months of its operation in 1948, the relationship was maintained at 25.17 percent.

Based on historical records, certainly 25 percent flour should be considered a minimum of such participation in total export.

It is my information that during his testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Hoffman made the statement that ECA had sustained a loss as the result of the purchase of wheat flour.

A study of the calculations by which this loss is presumably arrived at discloses an approach that at least is subject to question.

These calculations show that ECA actually paid some $5,000,000 less for the combined wheat and wheat flour exported by ECA than would have been the case had all wheat been shipped. The loss conclusion is arrived at by establishing a theoretical figure of some $14,000,000 as the value of the millfeed byproduct retained in the United States from the wheat milled for export flour and concluding that the loss is the difference between the $6,000,000 reduction in amounts paid out by ECA for wheat and wheat equivalent in the form of flour, on the one hand, as against all wheat, on the other, and the $14,000,000 value of millfeed retained in the United States.

Disregarding the assumptions indulged in by ECA, which assumptions it would be difficult for anyone to prove, it is clear that the actual cost of wheat and wheat flour shipped was $6,000,000 less than if the entire quantity had been shipped as wheat grain.

It is erroneous to characterize in any respect the byproduct or millfeed resulting from the production of flour for the ECA countries as a loss. It is retained in the United States and is consumed by our own livestock.

Thus it contributes to our agricultural economy and our own domestic food supply.

It is significant to note in this connection that there is never a carry-over of millfeeds at any time. The entire quantity of millfeeds produced by the flour mills in the United States is consumed each year.

The ECA calculation made no allowance for the value of the bags, which are now recovered in the importing countries, or for dollars which would have to be used for fuel and other supplies if the milling of the grain is done in the importing country.

The victory the United States expects to gain through ECA is partly economic and partly moral. If the ECA fails to strengthen the will of the people to live free lives, it will not in fact succeed. It will fail miserably.

Flour goes to ECA countries with a label on every package clearly and unmistakably identifying it as a product "Made in the United States of America." That label carries a message of real meaning to every storekeeper and to every consumer who uses or sees a package, and to every baker who uses the flour in his bake shop.

Its advertising value, its value in strengthening friendship for the United States, defies calculation. It is food—and it is "Made in the United States of America."

Wheat goes to importing countries in bulk cargoes. It promptly loses its identity. It is mixed and diluted with other wheats from other countries. The resulting flour cannot be identified. There was no "Made in United States of America" label on wheat or on the flour milled from it in the importing country.

We have exported the wheat. We have helped increase the food supply. But we have lost the all-important opportunity for moral victory which is ours when we ship wheat in the form of flour.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry February 9, 1949, Dr. FitzGerald justified making ECA funds available for procurement of Canadian wheat and wheat flour by the statement that while supplies of United States wheat might be adequate it was not available because of inadequacy of shipping facilities.

In other words, United States grain export facilities were being operated at a maximum and it was not possible to ship additional quantities of wheat to meet current requirements.

It is quite significant that port facilities for the shipment of wheat flour over and above our shipments of wheat are adequate to ship large quantities of flour. Secondary ports are available for the export of flour which are not available for the export of wheat. Therefore, the shipments of wheat flour from the United States can be an effective supplement to the contribution and transportation of food supplies from this country.

In the second report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration for the quarter ended September 30, 1948, there appears in chapter IV, entitled "The ECA Financial Supply Program for Europe," the following:

"Furthermore, an analysis of the imports of the participating countries does not show the nature of the recovery that is expected to be achieved. For example, when the Administration finances imports of part of the food required for a manufacturing country, labor in that country which had been diverted from manufacturing into food production can be released for other and more efficient work. The importation of food under the ECA program thereby results in a net gain in productivity. This gain has a cumulative effect, if manpower so released is used for construction of capital plant and equipment. Under these conditions economic recovery is aided in much the same manner as in the provision of capital equipment. Actually, in such cases, food may at times be more helpful than capital-equipment imports in restoring the internal balance of production."

It requires labor and fuel to convert wheat into human food, namely, flour. Therefore, to the extent that food can be supplied to the ECA countries in the form of flour, thus releasing labor in the recipient country "for other and more efficient work," in ECA's own words and employing its own conclusion, there would result a net gain in productivity in the particular ECA country.

In conclusion, may I summarize:

1. An analysis of claimed increased cost to ECA reveals that participation, according to ECA figures, of 25.17 percent flour actually meant use of some 6,000,000 less of ECA dollars in the wheat program.

2. Byproducts of milling wheat into flour instead of a so-called loss provide a very valuable feed for livestock here, a feed that has never yet accumulated a surplus.

3. Flour has a morale-building factor—an identified processed food.

4. Increased port and shipping facilities where flour is in addition to wheat.

5. It is a fact that Canadian flour is being purchased with ECA dollars.

6. United States flour does have consumer preference in importing countries of this commodity if the consumer is enabled to exercise that preference; and

Finally, we are not asking for any export of flour above the historical participation in such business; we are not asking ECA be directed toward solving the problem of surplus agricultural production in this country; but we do feel most strongly that it is contrary to the basic principles of the American way of life should completely controlled marketing such as ECA be a means of destroying that which we have built up over the years.

It is unthinkable that this market for United States flour should be deliberately destroyed only because of the fact that our own Government has taken our wheat-supply problem and is having to operate it on a government-to-government basis.

That, gentlemen, is the case for the milling industry in connection with the proposed repeal of the 25-percent section in the ECA Act.

We are not asking for a thing that we have not gone out and worked for. We are only asking for protection during this temporary period so that when things again come back to a normal basis we will not have to go out and do it all over again.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. The overwhelming majority of the committee is opposed to it.

Here is what happened last year. Under pressure from the millers a 25-percent provision was put into the bill; in other words, 25 percent of the wheat and wheat products sent to Europe under the program must be milled and sent there as white flour. Last year there was a great shortage of cattle feed and stock feed in the United States; our farmers needed the byproducts of wheat. That was one of the main reasons that the Eightieth Congress stipulated that 25 percent be sent over there as flour. This year there is no shortage of stock feed in the United States, but there is a shortage in Europe. This thing simply means that the program will cost about $8,000,000 more because the millers want a subsidy. This is also going to cost the farmers of the United States who raise wheat millions of dollars because so much of the allocation for wheat is going to be consumed by the flour provision. Do not think for 1 minute that this is going to do anything for the American farmer; it is not going to do anything for the American farmer, it will hurt him if he wants to sell his surplus wheat in Europe. The man it will help is the big miller; there is no doubt about that. And do not think for a minute that this thing is going to help Europe because over there they do not want white flour; they need the whole wheat. They use

the byproducts for the feeding of their cattle.

I think this is an unwise proposal. Let me warn you that they will come in next with a similar proposal for corn, to send meal over there when the people of Europe are not accustomed to eat corn bread and grits. Eighty percent of our corn sent to Europe is used for cattle and horse feed; yet it will be proposed here that three-quarters of the amount sent for human consumption be sent in the form of meal or grits. It means that meal and grits will be fed to the cattle and that is pretty expensive cattle feed.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated that it would cost $8,000,000 more if we vote this amendment. Today we are being asked to pour out over $5,000,000,000 to stabilize the economies of these European countries. In my opinion $8,000,000 is a mere drop in the bucket when we are trying to protect the economy of this country. If we do not adopt this amendment, it means that these mills here in this country will have to close their doors.

Mr. RICHARDS. We are trying to rebuild Europe. It is in our interest to do so. We cannot do that unless we hew to the line. If we have surplus wheat we want to send it to Europe, but we want to send it in the form that will best promote the program.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. It should be pointed out that the American Farm Bureau Federation opposes the 25 percent milling for flour provision. In addition, it is going to cost $8,000,000 extra and there are $14,000,000 lost on stock feed that Europe otherwise would get if we send them the wheat. So we are protecting the farmer on this and we are protecting them against the large millers.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. The gentleman realizes that while we are trying to protect the farmer we are also trying to protect the small-business man, as was evidenced by the vote on the previous amendment. There are a great many millers affected.

Mr. RICHARDS. There are not many small millers affected.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. There are a lot of employees affected.

Mr. RICHARDS. There are a few.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Not a few; 10,000 employees in my district.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. When we passed the small-business amendment we did not increase the cost of this program to do it. That is what this amendment would do. It would cost the program $8,000,000 more.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is going to cost the program more and it is going to cost the American farmers more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to protect our smaller business groups and our farmers. We did buy $354,000,000 worth of wheat in Canada and at a time wheat was in great surplus in the United States. In the matter of cotton we learn from the hearings that Clayton, Anderson & Co. got $800,000,000 worth for cotton out of ECA funds. I guess maybe they are small business. You will remember Mr. Clayton was the gentleman who helped write some of this program. He seemed to have pulled the wool over the eyes of some of us.

Now, may I refer to the statement that in participating in this program there shall be no serious impairment to the economic stability of the United States.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if you really think this type of legislation does not impair our stability? I wonder if you think we are protecting the small mills and the wheat-growing sections of this country when we try to funnel all of the business through the large concerns? I ask you that question. Ask yourselves that question when you go home tonight. One member of the committee had the honesty and the courage to say, "Yes, we are lowering the standards of the people in this country by this type of legislation."

How much lower shall we go?

We must protect our economy or face destruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri that provides for the milling of 25 percent of ECA wheat in this country. The amendment should include corn as well as wheat. If this grain is going for food, why not process at least a part of it before it is sent abroad. This amendment was included in the act last year and worked pretty well. I say, if it is being sent for food, then they need our finished product from the standpoint of nutrition as well as palatability.

Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion about helping small business. I am informed there are several thousand small mills in this country that are either shut down or running at less than half capacity. It is rather odd you are unwilling to let the workmen in these mills grind even as much as 25 percent of grain that is being given to foreign people, and paid for by American taxpayers. It is contended by some Members the big mills might get the business. If they do, it is the fault of administrators of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I said this amendment should include corn. I am informed an amendment will be offered to include corn. I therefore, call attention to a statement in the Federal Register of March 20 and April 1, 1948. Here is what it says, and I quote:

(8) Federal Register.—The House unanimously passed an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Federal Register, March 20 and April 1, 1948). This amendment states:

"The most persuasive argument in behalf of the amendment springs from the fact that in the main, European countries do not have good milling facilities for corn. It must be milled in available mills which are adapted to the grinding of wheat and the net result is that a high-grade quality production of corn meal, corn grits, and corn flour cannot be produced in the mills abroad.

"This means an inferior product from the standpoint of nutritional and caloric value. That is highly important because the very purpose of the food commodities to be sent abroad is to build up the physical capacity of people to reconstruct their own industrial economy and this, of course, requires products where every element of nutrition is carefully preserved."

Mr. Chairman, this is a statement of the administration. What more evidence do you want? The amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that whether it is 15 percent or 25 percent the goal may not be reached for the reason that if you check over the figures for last year you will find that we purchased in Canada more wheat than we did in the United States under this program.

As to the total of wheat and flour converted from wheat we purchased more in Canada than we did in the United States. The only point that I wish to make is the fact that it makes all the difference in the world where you are going to buy this wheat If you buy the wheat in Canada, it does not make much difference as far as the mills in the United States are concerned. The difference between 15 percent and 25 percent could easily be taken care of if there was a will on the part of the ECA to have this in mind when they make their purchases.

Commitments[1] and reported shipments of specified commodities to OEEC countries, Apr. 3 to Dec. 31, 1948

Commodity and source	Commitments		Reported shipments	
	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons net weight	Million dollars	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons gross weight	Million dollars
Wheat:				
United States	3,583.0	342.6	2,453.6	232.5
Canada	2,920.0	201.4	2,762.5	190.8
Total	6,503.0	544.0	5,216.1	423.2
Flour—wheat equivalent:				
United States	1,378.0	127.2	958.6	83.0
Canada	681.0	49.3	678.0	47.4
Total	2,059.0	176.5	1,645.6	130.3

[1] Procurement authorizations initiated by Food and Agriculture, ECA, including purchase agreements initiated up to Dec. 31, 1948, for first quarter 1949 delivery.

Commitments[1] and reported shipments of specified commodities to OEEC countries, Apr. 3 to Dec. 31, 1948—Continued

Commodity and source	Commitments		Reported shipments	
	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons net weight	Million dollars	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons gross weight	Million dollars
Total wheat and flour—wheat equivalent:				
United States	4,961.0	469.8	[3] 3,412.2	315.5
Canada	3,601.0	250.8	[3] 3,449.5	238.2
Total	8,562.0	720.6	6,861.7	553.5
Tobacco:				
United States	107.2	98.8	59.0	63.5
Turkey and Greece	4.0	3.0	----------	-------
OWH	1.8	1.1	----------	-------
Total	113.0	102.9	59.0	63.5
Cotton:				
United States	391.2	302.5	117.0	112.8
Peru	.2	.3	----------	-------
Total	391.4	302.8	117.0	112.8
All dairy products, including cheese, product weight:				
United States	102.9	61.6	49.0	35.7
Canada	14.7	10.0	13.7	10.0
Turkey	.3	.3	----------	.1
Total	117.9	71.9	63.7	45.8
Cheese:				
United States	32.5	21.2	29.9	28.8
Canada	14.6	10.0	13.6	10.0
Turkey	.3	.3	----------	.1
Total	47.4	41.5	43.5	38.8
Soya Beans:				
United States	169.1	17.3	(2)	(2)
Brazil	4.9	.8	(2)	(2)
Total	174.0	18.1	(2)	(2)

[1] Procurement authorizations initiated by Food and Agriculture, ECA, including purchase agreements initiated up to Dec. 31, 1948, for first quarter 1949 delivery.
[2] Not available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to cut the amount, and I am opposed to increasing these figures even by the $8,000,000. There is one hard thought that we must understand, it seems to me, in this whole program, and it is that it is designed as a recovery program for Europe.

Now, what is the situation so far as the milling industry in Europe is concerned regarding the 25-percent provision.

The provision prejudices the milling industry in the participating countries which have milling capacity adequate or nearly adequate to their needs. These are Austria, Belgium, France, the French zone of occupation in Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, and Norway. The detriment to the local economy is bad, particularly in Austria, Italy, and Greece, where recovery is complicated by unemployment. Section 112 (c) drains away funds which would otherwise be available for assistance to the participating countries. The committee must stand on the premise that this is a European recovery program.

Now, if we adopt this amendment it means that we are going to throw out of employment men who are engaged today in the milling industry overseas. Again I repeat, I want to see American industry taken care of so far as it is possible, yet under the policy of the law as written we are interested in European recovery. Now that is a hard fact that we must all understand. I want to protect American agriculture and industry but we seem to be bound by our previous action.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Whenever we make this into a relief program for any part of our economy, we cut down on the amount of recovery over there or increase the expense of the whole business; is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, coming from the second largest milling city in the United States, Minneapolis, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not at this time, at least, speak up in defense of this amendment. It is true that I was interested during the course of the hearings in the committee in their deliberations on this activity.

But, I come here today speaking for several hundred unemployed milling employees of the city of Minneapolis. What I say about the city of Minneapolis, I presume, is also true of Buffalo, Kansas City, and other large milling centers.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It would also apply to many of our small mills.

Mr. WIER. That is true. There are many small mills throughout the State of Minnesota as well as our large concentrated milling industry, in Minneapolis. Bear in mind, I am not speaking here today for the milling industry; I am speaking for the men who are at present on the unemployment rolls because of the slackness of the milling industry in Minneapolis. I do not attempt here to interfere with the operations of ECA, but I do feel that we have some responsibility, not only in getting the grain to Europe, but there are some parts of that expenditure that we can well keep at home.

I heard the suggestion in committee that there was a surplus of feed in the United States. I also heard that disputed. However, I am not going to attempt to defend the pros or cons on the question of surplus feed, but I am deeply concerned, and I think all of us are deeply concerned, with unemployment in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Is it not a fact that today in Buffalo, one of the largest milling centers in the world, there is a 25 to 50 percent falling off in work in the mills? If this amendment is not adopted, it may mean the closing down of several of the mills in Buffalo.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, the present provision calling for 25 percent of the wheat which is ground into flour for shipment to foreign countries being milled in this country should definitely be retained.

Flour that goes to the importing countries with an American brand indicates it is made in the U. S. A. The baker, the housewife, the jobber, and everyone who handles the flour has visible evidence that it is a product of the U. S. A. that is given to their country. Wheat has no identity and a cargo of wheat might be from Russia, Argentina, or Canada, but no one handling the wheat would know it might be paid for with our American money.

The losses claimed by ECA in shipping flour instead of wheat cannot be proved. The mill feed is retained in this country and it is not a loss to our economy. One country in Europe is now considering the necessity of exporting mill feed because they are oversupplied. Labor is paid for in the manufacture and the handling of flour. This labor income is used to maintain our purchasing power and a share of it goes to pay taxes, including social-security and old-age benefits.

The miller is the largest purchaser of the farmers' wheat and any curtailment of the millers' wheat requirements means lower prices because one buyer—the Government—cannot support the market everywhere every hour of every day.

Flour exports have held up when there was no demand for our wheat. This was particularly in evidence in the 1930's when we had a difficult time exporting our supplies.

Now we are reaching the point where many countries do not want our wheat or flour even as a gift and they take the wheat because it can be fed to livestock and can be disposed of to other countries to better advantage than flour.

Flour can be shipped from any port and space is available and has been available for flour shipments. ECA claims they were justified in furnishing money for Canadian wheat and flour because of lack of ocean space and port facilities in this country. There was no shortage of space for flour and no shortage of port facilities for the shipment of flour. More wheat equivalent can be loaded in a boat in the form of flour than bulk wheat. In other words, the space used for flour is less than the space required for the amount of wheat it would take to make the flour.

Buffalo being the largest flour-milling center in the world, employing approximately 10,000 employees in the grain industry, namely workers in the flour mills, feed mills, and grain elevators, at present are experiencing short-running time. They are working 3 and 4 days a week. It seems strange to me that the Government, instead of being interested in preventing and averting any form of unemployment, if the ECA program goes through, it will be a promoter in putting more and more people out of work. Closing of mills and curtailment of running

time means fewer jobs. This will first affect the mills in the interior and in the small communities where there are no other jobs. The closing of these smaller mills will eliminate the best market the farmer has for his wheat.

Eliminating flour will give the ECA another opportunity to furnish money to buy wheat and flour in other countries because they probably can claim they cannot secure space for shipping bulk wheat from this country.

Where wheat or flour is paid for with our money, we believe we should furnish, first, the product that is best for our own economy and the economy of the American worker. Labor in importing countries can be utilized to better advantage than in the manufacture of flour. Our furnishing all wheat will encourage the building of mills that will be available for grinding local wheat on land that can be better utilized for other purposes or in grinding wheat from countries that can produce wheat at a cost lower than our cost of production. This will reduce our potential market for all time. ECA money should be used to support the economy of each country, but in order to make recovery faster in some other country, this should not be carried to the extreme of damaging our own economy more than the resultant high taxes. Supporting Canadian wheat prices with our money is one example of how far this idealism can be carried.

I heartily favor the stated objectives of ECA to help reconstruct a world which can again trade largely on an individual free-enterprise basis. We also recognize the necessity at this intermediate stage of tolerating some government-to-government trading. However, any arrangement whereby foreign governments can use this temporary period and our own taxpayers' money to destroy the regular channels of trade developed in free competitive markets obviously works against the best interests of the United States and against the objectives of ECA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IRVING. If Members will read the testimony in the hearings they will find it contradicts the statement made here that there is a $8,000,000 deficit or extra expense. The testimony by experts showed that if all this grain had been milled they would have saved $6,000,000, not $8,000,000, on the operation covered by the amendment I propose.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Everybody seems to be alarmed and worried about the cost of $8,000,000 and more. With $5,380,000,000 under consideration in this bill, I do not believe we ought to be too concerned with $8,000,000, when it throws American labor out of work, when it curtails the purchasing power of the men who are put out of work, when it shuts up shop for the small millers and curtails the activities of the large millers. If we are so concerned about saving a paltry $8,000,000 here now, I did not hear a single voice raised on the floor of the House when the previous section of the bill was adopted, which required us to use 50 percent American bottoms to ship these things to Europe, which would cost $8,000,000, too, according to Administrator Hoffman.

This is very serious, and it is very serious in my district. I hope the Committee will vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] will offer an amendment at the end of section 7 which in substance will provide that basic commodities purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation be first exhausted by the ECA before such commodities are purchased elsewhere.

I intend to offer an amendment to the Worley amendment which will incorporate the language of the so-called corn amendment. It was unanimously approved by the House last year when a similar bill was under consideration. The same language used in my amendment was adopted by the Senate on last Friday. My amendment does not require the shipment of corn or any particular amount of corn but it does require that when and if any corn is used by the ECA, not less than 15 percent shall be in the form of corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour. I take this time merely to notify the committee of the substance of my amendment, which will be offered at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, section 112 of the Economic Cooperative Act of 1948 was amended in the Senate by adding after the words "any agricultural commodity or product thereof" the following, "or class, type, or specification thereof."

This amendment was highly desirable to include various deciduous fruit crops in the agricultural commodities to be shipped to the countries receiving aid under the provisions of this act.

In the crops which we desire to ship are apples, prunes, pears, peaches, and so forth. Europe at one time imported about 20 percent of our apple crop. Germany and France consumed practically all of the small prunes produced in this country. During the war all imports were halted, and since the war no provision has been made under our assistance programs to include these crops. The American farmer will lose this market for all time unless we reestablish that export market.

Fruit trees, unlike cotton, wheat, potatoes, and so forth, cannot be restricted, as it takes from 10 to 15 years to grow a producing tree. These orchards must be pruned, sprayed, cultivated, and taken care of in the proper manner. To keep this fruit industry solvent, I trust the conference committee will agree to the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, ECA is not a pump primer for pressure groups and surpluses. ECA is not a carousel where every special interest tries to grab the ring for a free ride. If you want to subsidize, do so frankly. Do not hide behind ECA.

I call the attention of the Members of the House who talk about the cost of the program to the following items of special interest that raise the cost of this program $84,000,000:

Flour, $8,000,000; shipping, $25,000,000; surplus agricultural items, $35,000,000; marine insurance, $11,000,000; and corn, $5,000,000.

If you want to subsidize, let us do so frankly, but let us not kid ourselves. You are putting all this extra cost on the shoulders of the American taxpayer.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The statement was made that under the ECA we had made off-shore purchases of grain. I think that is a very important point, which ought to be answered now. We did make those purchases. We did so because when we passed this legislation last year we authorized ECA not to buy any commodity of which we were in short supply. I would like to read Mr. Hoffman's statement on grain, which is as follows:

> Speaking generally from July 1 of last year to January 1 of this year, we have shipped every bushel of wheat from America for which we could get an export license. The issuance of export licenses was dictated not only by the supply of wheat, but also by the availability of shipping.

If we have a surplus of bread grains, then naturally the ECA will buy bread grains from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to contribute to this debate a statement made by the American Farm Bureau Federation before our committee. That statement is as follows:

> We urge the elimination of the provision in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which requires that 25 percent of the wheat supplies under this program must be in the form of flour.
>
> This provision tends to penalize American wheat growers because participating countries, with only a limited supply of dollars available, are likely to buy less wheat if they must use more dollars to buy 25 percent of their requirements in the form of flour.
>
> Testimony before the committee showed that the provision cost the ECA program $8,000,000 in the first 9 months of the program. There was a saving of $6,000,000 based on the cost of the flour shipments as against the equivalent human food value in wheat, but this was offset by the extra cost of $14,000,000 in value of animal-feed byproducts which would have been realized by processing the grain in Europe.

We say that if this is a European recovery program, we ought not to make it a program for the benefit and the aggrandizement of everybody who happens to be in business here in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. IRVING) there were—ayes 66, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WORLEY: On page 8, line 3, at the end of section 7, add a new subsection as follows:

"(j) No funds authorized to carry out the purposes of this act shall be made available for the purchase of any basic agricultural commodity or livestock product other than from supplies now or hereafter owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such supplies have been exhausted."

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, just a few moments ago we adopted an amendment which will be helpful, I hope, to small business. Small business has a very definite interest in the progress of this bill, but the amendment which I am now offering will not only benefit small business; it will likewise benefit big business; it will benefit the farmer, the rancher, and people in every segment of our economy, because it will help to save the taxpayers' money.

This amendment provides that at any time we have a surplus of any basic agricultural commodity or of livestock or product thereof it shall be mandatory—now, please note the distinction—it shall be mandatory, not permissive, for the Economic Cooperation Administrator to purchase those surpluses before buying such commodities from any other country.

My reasons for offering such an amendment are that at the present time under the price-support program the Government has lent to cotton producers $670,000,000; that accounts for 4,275,000 bales of cotton. The Government has also lent $500,000,000 on 245,000,000 bushels of wheat. We have under loan on corn, 140,000,000 bushels to the value of $193,000,000; on tobacco, 400,000,000 pounds to the total of $153,000,000; and, in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, before the Committee on Agriculture this morning, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, said it would be but a short time until, under the hog-price-support program, his Department would be buying a great amount of pork. In addition to that, the Commodity Credit Corporation has, under the foot-and-mouth-disease program in Mexico, title to, and is in possession of, some 103,000,000 pounds of good canned beef.

I cannot fully concur in the statements that have been made this afternoon that the entire objective of this program is European recovery. While that is an integral part of the program, at the same time it seems to me consistent with sound judgment and sound business principles that at any time we have a surplus of any commodity which these participating countries need we should first dispose of our own surplus before buying from other countries.

Through December 31, 1948, the ECA had bought 241,000,000 pounds of meat of all kinds, not only from the participating countries but also from nonparticipating countries. Do you know how much of that 241,000,000 pounds was sold by the United States? Exactly 38,000,000 pounds; this leaves 213,000,000 pounds, including horse meat, that ECA has bought for distribution abroad, and they also brought meat from nonparticipating countries. Australia, for example, is not one of the participating countries. I do not know whether you will agree with me or not—I hope you do—it seems to me the best thing we can do is not to impair the operation of the recovery program but, so far as consistent with sound business practice, to dispose of the surplus commodities we have just as quickly as we can. To me that is just plain common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEVEN to the Worley amendment: Amend the Worley amendment by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The amounts of corn and corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour produced in the United States to be transferred by grant to the participating countries shall be so determined that the total quantity of the United States corn used to produce the corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title shall not be less than 15 percent of the aggregate of the unprocessed corn, and corn in the form of corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am proposing to the Worley amendment received unanimous approval of the House of Representatives last year when similar legislation was before us. The same amendment in identical language was adopted by the Senate on last Friday. We are all aware of the fact that the country is now entering an era of surpluses and this pertains particularly to corn. The 1948 corn crop consisted of 3,650,000,000 bushels. We had an old crop carry-over of 125,000,000 bushels. This made a total supply of 3,776,000,000 bushels available as of October 1, 1949. The prospects are that we will have about as large a corn crop in 1949 as we had in 1948; therefore the prospective carry-over of corn will exceed perhaps 700,000,000 bushels.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I offered a similar amendment in committee. I hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted by this Committee.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman. This amendment is simply a step in the direction of trying to meet an emergency, which may confront this country as far as the surplus of corn is concerned. We must take steps to handle these surpluses now and the ECA will afford an outlet.

My amendment does not require the shipment of corn or any particular amount of corn. We are assuming, of course, that the ECA will use some corn. My amendment simply requires that in the event any corn is shipped or used by the ECA not less than 15 percent shall be in the form of corn grits, corn meal, or corn flour. The purpose of the proposed amendment is also to contribute materially to continued high wages, full employment and to full production, and in establishing markets for the future.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Have they the facilities over there to prepare corn in the form of grits and other edible food for human consumption that we have in this country?

Mr. HOEVEN. No. These foreign countries have unsuccessfully attempted to mill our corn with wheat-milling equipment. That is the only thing they have. They have no corn-milling equipment, as far as I know. They have had very unsatisfactory results. They need our finished products, both from the standpoint of nutrition and palatability as well as the milling mark to shoot at.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman's amendment does not in any way alter, it really strengthens the Worley amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. It strengthens the Worley amendment because the Worley amendment pertains to all basic commodities, of which corn is one. My amendment simply says that whenever they use the basic commodities, of which corn is one, 15 percent shall be shipped in the form of grits, corn meal, and corn flour.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. May I say to the gentleman that I am very much in favor of his amendment and, if adopted, it will contribute to an alleviation of a possible shortage of storage space in the event another bumper crop is harvested this year.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. May I say that in view of the adoption of this amendment by the Senate I do not see why the House cannot take similar action at this time.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is quite correct. In view of the record on this amendment as it stands today, I am amazed that the committee opposes my amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there a demand in Europe for processed corn in the form of corn meal?

Mr. HOEVEN. There is. After World War I under the Hoover recovery program large quantities of corn meal and corn flour were shipped to Europe with detailed cooking instructions in the various languages inserted in each sack. The people used the processed corn, the statements of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] to the contrary notwithstanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, reserving 5 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 7 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I make the point of order that a motion to apply to all amendments to the section is not in order at this time, and further, that it reserves 7 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] makes a point of order against the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section of the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GRANGER moves that the Committee do now rise and the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important amendment. Certainly, limiting the time of debate is not in the interest of sane legislating nor doing the committee any good, in my judgment. I just wanted to take time enough to inform the House of a situation with which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] and I have been rather closely associated, that is, the matter of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

The Republic of Mexico is also a friend of ours, and perhaps is in need of some consideration in this program. As a result of the foot-and-mouth disease there, the President, by executive order, placed an embargo upon all Mexican cattle. There is not a hoof of Mexican cattle that can enter the United States except in a can. We have appropriated money and built packing plants in Mexico to process the cattle that cannot be moved out of that neighboring country. The taxpayers of this country have $25,000,000 now invested in canned meat. It is not an inferior product, it is a good one. It is not the inferior cattle but it is all the cattle the Republic of Mexico can sell. This amendment would provide a means of saving the taxpayers some money by making it possible for this meat to be sold and distributed in the countries where it is needed.

I think it is important to the people of Mexico and it is important to the taxpayers of this country because it is different from any other kind of amendment offered, for we already have this meat on hand. It does not belong to stockmen or farmers but is owned by taxpayers of the United States, and we cannot dispose of it locally because it is more than the normal channels of trade can consume. I hope the Worley amendment is agreed to, because it is important to our neighbors and to ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, this combination meat and corn amendment could well be called a pork amendment.

We must not make this European recovery plan a form of disguised subsidy for American agriculture in any form. It may be that we need a subsidy program, but let us not put it in this bill. The fact is as to meat that the only meat that goes from the United States is horse meat under this program. This meat that is referred to, that the Commodity Corporation has, is about 100,000,000 pounds of canned meat that costs about 50 percent more than the raw meat, which the Europeans like to eat. They do not like canned meat.

The same thing is true on the corn amendment. Eighty percent of the corn goes over there as feed, and if we are going to have corn flakes and corn products made out of corn, we simply add thereby to the cost of the program as a hidden subsidy for American agriculture and the milling industry.

Remember, in this program we are supporting the recovery of enterprises in agriculture and in industry in Europe that may be competitive with us. It is our past experience that in times of peace we have always had the most trade with the most prosperous foreign countries, that at the same time were our best competitors. If we start to gut this program for recovery in Europe by making it into a hidden subsidy program for business or agriculture in this country, we will do one of two things, we will make its cost completely prohibitive or we will cut down the amount of aid.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Does not the gentleman believe this amendment would mean that before ECA could purchase any meat for this program in Europe it must purchase the entire 100,000,000 pounds of this canned meat?

Mr. VORYS. That is right, and the gentleman from Texas explained it that way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the preamble to the bill contain this language:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

Without these amendments, how will you avoid impairing the economic stability of the United States?

Mr. VORYS. We have handled it without these amendments for the past year, and I do not know that the corn or the cattle industries of the country have been impaired by ECA.

The point is we must not make this program a form of subsidy for American industry or agriculture. There are a thousand different branches of industry and agriculture that can come here asking for special favors. They are not doing it, recognizing the possibility of competition in the future as a result of recovery over there. Let us not pick some favorites here and subsidize them in this indirect way. If there are surpluses that are available for use in the recovery plan under the existing law the Administrator must use those surpluses first. Let us not put through this type of pork-barrel amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to these amendments because you can upset the whole pattern of world trade. We are trying to increase and help world trade, and thereby help western European recovery and world recovery. If we do have a surplus of agricultural products, I would just like to point out in the few seconds that I have what the Secretary of Agriculture says about surplus products. In a letter of April 4 to the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, Mr. Brannan says:

The proposal would have the effect of redefining agricultural commodities to include not only those agricultural commodities and products which are determined by me to be in excess of domestic requirements, a definition now in effect, but also in addition to those agricultural commodities selling at less than parity, or comparable price. The proposal is not practicable from the administrative standpoint. I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, after you get your job done, come and see me; meaning I

am opposed to any and all amendments as to the amount to be granted by authority under a bill which only authorizes but does not grant the amount included in the bill as a ceiling.

The bill contemplates some relief or none. When the amount is determined it will primarily be by the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the surplus agricultural commodities in America, I am reminded of the old adage that charity begins at home. I see no reason why any surplus supplies or other commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation should not be purchased therefrom. This is a meritorious amendment and I regret that I do not have more time to discuss it fully from the standpoint of the American farmer.

However, I am familiar with the hearings held by the committee, and I am of the opinion that this amendment should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the statesmen on the Foreign Affairs Committee have found it necessary to railroad this bill through the committee, thereby precluding even a limited debate on its merits. It appears that the members of the committee are primarily interested in taxing the Americans to the tune of billions of dollars to be used as gifts to 19 foreign countries, and making certain that none of the money will be spent in the United States.

To illustrate the policy of the ECA, which has been concurred in by members of the legislative committee, I point out what has occurred since April 3 of last year. The ECA under direction of the Truman administration turned over $573,000,000 to the 19 Marshall countries to buy grain and food in Canada. This was at the time when we had large surpluses of wheat and other grains in this country, and the CCC was putting up several hundred millions of dollars to support the price of these grains in the United States. There will no doubt be another record wheat crop in this country this year, and with a carry-over of nearly 400,000,000 bushels, it seems to me that the membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee should be more interested in American producers than they are in financing the removal of surplus wheat in Canada. The spokesmen for the committee say, "No," to American producers. I say it is a disgrace.

The committee also takes the position that we must not ship any American-made flour to the Marshall countries under direction of the ECA. They say that the flour must be purchased in other foreign countries. And this comes at a time when the flour mills of the United States are operating on half time. The committee refuses to give American workingmen a break when it comes to work in our flour mills. What are we coming to in this Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio inveighs against subsidies for business and for agriculture. I rise in favor of this amendment, because I believe in subsidies for the American taxpayers. We American taxpayers have great investments in meat which we have had to buy because of the aftosa program in Mexico. We have tremendous investments in surpluses which have been incurred because of our agricultural program. I think it is unwise for us to contribute to the assistance of these people overseas when we have surpluses here in this country which they could utilize and utilize well. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and also in support of the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

In the outset let me say that in my judgment nations, like individuals, act in self-interest. The United States has purchased through the Commodity Credit Corporation, commodities costing several hundred million dollars. It seems but common sense that we should require that a few million dollars of the billions of dollars authorized under this bill be spent to purchase commodities owned by this country and suitable for use in the operations of this program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas has pointed out the Commodity Credit Corporation owns something over 100,000,000 pounds of beef that was purchased in that portion of Mexico not infected with the foot-and-mouth disease. This meat was processed and canned under the same standards as the military used in preparing meat for shipment to our armed forces abroad during and since the war. It is high grade in every respect. There is no good reason why this meat should not be used and the Treasury of the United States reimbursed for its investment therein. I may say, also, Mr. Chairman, that the Commodity Credit Corporation still holds a stock pile of some 80,000,000 pounds of wool all of which was purchased at different times over the past 6 years. A good many of the participating countries can use that wool to good advantage. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that any other nation on earth would take the money out of one of its pockets and put it into another if in so doing they could at the same time achieve the objective and purposes of the program. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI] is recognized.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORSKI of New York: On page 7, line 6, strike out "repealed" and insert "amended by striking out '25 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '15 per centum'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may speak now; his amendment will have to be offered later.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the amendment which would permit the 25-percent milling of flour in this country was defeated. My amendment substitutes 15 percent and is the compromise set by the Senate, the figure that is in the bill that was adopted by the Senate. So I am asking that it be approved because it is going to mean a good deal to the people of Buffalo.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI of New York. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's amendment should surely be approved. Today we are faced with surplus wheat in this country. This amendment is needed to give American workers jobs, men who are now working part time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, it does give me a lot of surprise as a Member from the city to hear certain Members from the farm States now complaining that they have a lot of surplus wheat. Because you will remember last year two Members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] said: "Do not put the limitation on the purchase of United States wheat by ECA. You farmers are going to have a surplus and you are going to be here asking for its removal."

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] insisted, however, on a United States minimum retention by law under ECA of 150,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat over United States needs. The ECA nations had to buy abroad. Now he should complain?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. No. The gentleman from Minnesota calls us "the elder statesmen of the Foreign Affairs Committee." I think we at least have the intelligence not within 1 year to change our positions completely, as has just been done, and say, "Now we are for selling as much wheat as we can force ECA to take by law." When last year we heard: "You people do not know what you are talking about when you try to prevent us from

restricting the purchase of United States wheat by ECA."

Ho hum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, once before when the ECA bill was under consideration I offered a similar amendment, and the amendment offered by me was accepted by the Committee and also by the House; however, when the bill was sent to conference the amendment was not approved by the conference committee.

Mr. Chairman, representing an agricultural district, and having had surpluses of various agricultural products in my district and State, I was one of those of the opinion that not only the agricultural surpluses in my district and State, but also all surplus agricultural products in the United States should be utilized in the program under the ECA. During the last 2 years of the operation of this program, together with others, I made every effort to have the ECA purchase some of these surpluses in the program, but without success.

Even today there exists in almost every State in the Union agricultural surpluses and in my district and State and the States of Texas and Georgia there are tremendous surpluses of canned sugarcane sirup which could easily be purchased and would be of great value to this program as well as assist our own people who pay the taxes for this program.

Mr. Chairman, as has been repeatedly pointed out on this floor, why should the administrators of this program continue to buy the products of other countries for this undertaking when there is available the same foods and products in this country that are just as economical and suitable as those purchased in other countries. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to take further time on this amendment for my position is too well known to every Member of this House on this legislation, and my record on this legislation speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I have not changed my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say two things: First of all, I am ready to vote on the bill now, and every other Member of this House is ready to vote on the bill now. Second, I am tired of having Members of this House say to the opposition to this bill, "You have no positive approach; you have a negative approach." A positive approach is one that looks after the interests of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have got so far afield from the amendment in the argument that I think it well to touch upon just what it means. First of all, it means the disposal of 100,000,000 pounds of canned meat in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That meat cannot be imported into the United States. In order to cover costs it is priced by CCC in the neighborhood of 30.4 cents per pound.

There are practically no dollar requirements for meat by the participating countries. Whether they should eat it or not is not what we are considering here; they do not like canned meat, and this is not only canned meat, but it is canned meat and gravy. Obviously, no participating country is interested in buying an unfamiliar product which would cost them 15 percent more than they can buy fresh meat for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, can we not give these Members more than 15 seconds apiece?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment because I believe in carrying out the theory that charity begins at home. I think this amendment will be very helpful to our constituents at home. Do not make any mistake about it, if the folks back home were voting on this amendment it would carry 10 to 1.

We have had certain experiences with the Administrator in the administration of this law. Recently a group of Senators and Congressmen from Louisiana, Texas, Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi, approached the Administrator with reference to the disposition of a commodity held by the Secretary to be in surplus, a wholesome product, sirup produced in those five States. We were told that the participating countries would first have to express a desire to use the sirup. My only objection to the pending amendment is that it does not go far enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the members of the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee, especially the members on my side of the aisle, that last year we adopted an amendment which provided $65,000,000 for one agricultural product. This happened to be dried skim milk. If we could do that last year I would like to know why any one can offer any objection as a principle or as a program to adopting the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Texas.

Maybe the rest of you gentlemen have millionaires in your districts, but may I say to my colleagues here that so far as my district is concerned the people have lost half of their purchasing power within the last year. I have always supported this legislation and I expect to support it this time, but I would like to have someone start using a little common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take one second of the time to say that I am ready to vote on the pending amendment. I would like to yield 49 seconds of my time back to speed up this resolution we are going to vote on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be so little understanding during these last few minutes of the thing we are really doing, including sending canned meat that cannot come into this country because of Mexican hoof-and-mouth disease to Europe, where canned meat is not eaten, apparently to pull the CCC out of a hole. It seems to me it would be much better if we were to get down to earth and do a responsible job on what we set out to do, which is the rehabilitation of Europe. The faster that can happen, the faster the people over there will be able to trade with us in increasing measure as the years come and go.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], and the members of the committee for their fine work in reporting out this legislation. It speaks well for the long hours of hearings held, and for the very few and relatively minor points of difference. It is only after the successful discussion and consideration of legislation of this character that a bill of such magnanimity of purpose and objectivity can be agreed on in such a relatively short time and after full and complete debate on the floor.

We have advanced a great step forward away from isolationism. Some people would try to make out that questioning of funds for foreign aid, both ECA and arms for Europe, means a new wave of isolationism. It is a healthy sign rather than a pessimistic one, because there is a real regard for caution and a raising of the question as to how much we really can afford to spend.

We as Members of Congress should awaken to the idea and to the hard economic facts that this Nation's resources are not without limit. It is about time that we give careful consideration to this point of view.

It is about time that we give serious thought to our present economic plight. We seem to be seeking a new level of normal activity. It is to the interest of all concerned that we remain a prosperous, continuing Nation of high-level production and consumption. We must not fail in this. Too much is at stake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, instead of this measure being designed for European recovery, it appears that we are going to use it for the purpose of subsidizing surpluses. If that be so, I would like to see it used as a subsidy to give employment to the many mills in this country that are running short.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is not a relief program for the nations of Europe. We decided that last year. It should not be made a relief program for the farmers of the United States who have enjoyed the greatest income that they have had in many years. I hazard the guess that the great bulk of the farmers of the United States know that their best interest lies in a prosperous America, a prosperous Europe, and not in these rather small maneuvers for a few million dollars of special returns to be inserted in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio said this meat that is owned in Mexico is contaminated with the foot-and-mouth disease. This is 350 miles from the infected zone in Mexico; is that correct?

Mr. GRANGER. That is correct. This is not any foot-and-mouth-diseased meat at all. It is good canned meat.

Mr. WORLEY. These beef cattle have been on grass up until this time. Ordinarily they would come into this country, until we slapped a quarantine on them, at the rate of 500,000 a year.

Mr. GRANGER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoeven amendment. The farmers in my district and in fact, the farmers all over the Corn Belt face a serious corn surplus. Here is a chance to help the farmers. Here is a chance to really do something about the farm-surplus problem. It is a big problem—a serious problem. I am surprised to hear opponents say the farmer is so well off. They claim he is making too much money. They should realize the farmer does not receive the money the consumers pay. There is a wide spread so far as what the farmer gets for what he produces and what the consumer pays.

So far as the Mexican canned meat is concerned I can say from official information that the meat in question does not come from animals affected by foot and mouth disease.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, it is well to remember that about 50 percent of the funds in the ECA program are spent for the purchase of food and agricultural products and 50 percent for industrial commodities. I think it is also wise to remember that Europe puts up dollar for dollar in their currencies the same amount of money that we do. They have mapped out a program which must be followed if rehabilitation is to be achieved by 1952. If we throw this program out of line by forcing the use of money to buy certain goods they do not want to buy and do not need to buy, it will seriously affect the whole program and will set back recovery. If we make it impossible for western Europe to buy the agricultural products they must have, their standard of living cannot be maintained at a safe level. That is what these agricultural amendments that are offered will do.

Western Europe buys a limited amount of canned meat and these products are now being purchased from the Commodity Credit Corporation's supply of canned goods from Mexico. The only other meat they buy from us is a limited supply of horse meat.

It is very short-sighted to ask now for special subsidies for, in the long run, they will benefit no one.

The program as it is now working is equitably distributed in the demands that it makes on our economy. Our entire economy benefits from our exports to the ECA countries. If we pull the whole program out of line by the adoption of the proposed amendments, the European countries will not be self-sustaining by 1952 and then, indeed, we will have wasted the taxpayers' money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. In the interest of getting through with the bill and coming to a vote, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that even those who favor this amendment should read it a little more carefully in order to see that they are properly protected. It reads, in substance, that no fund will be made available for any basic agricultural commodity or livestock product other than from supplies now or hereafter owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. There are literally hundreds of products that do not come under the Commodity Credit Corporation, which would mean just simply this, if this amendment were adopted, that the citrus people of Florida, the fruit people of California, and half of the other people in the agricultural business would not be able to participate under this Marshall-aid program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to inquire, if this amendment does not pass, in spite of the fact that I am in favor of it, will $100,000,000 worth of canned meat be served to the United States Army?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(The Hoeven amendment was again read.)

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOEVEN) there were—ayes 89, noes 129.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KEE and Mr. HOEVEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 131.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, under the Worley amendment, which now remains to be voted upon, would it not be possible for funds appropriated under the authority of this act to be expended for products after the surplus property of the Commodity Credit Corporation had been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. My good friend from South Dakota realizes that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Worley amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WORLEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 112.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WORLEY and Mr. KEE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 97, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI] has an amendment at the desk.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise; that is a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORSKI of New York: Page 7, line 6, strike out the word "repealed" and insert: "Amended by striking out '25 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '15 per centum'."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORSKI of New York) there were—ayes 25, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. To this section?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin: On page 8, line 3, after the word "payment", add "Subjection (j)" and insert subsection (j) reading as follows:

"(j) That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to permit the export of tobacco seeds to countries receiving aid under the European Recovery Act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, since the ending of the war in 1945, we have had presented to us for our consideration the same type of legislation that is now before us—namely, aid to Europe. Just how much we have actually given to the European nations seems to be very much of a question. However, we are certain it is in excess of $28,000,000,000 since the end of the war. We were told at the start the program would last 2 or 3 years at the outside. Today I listened to statements that it will take 2 or 3 years more. I am wondering now, Mr. Chairman, just when it is going to stop and how long can we afford to continue a policy of "give" which means to the taxpayers of America "spend and spend and tax and tax."

We are told that this money is being used to prevent the spread of communism. I would like to ask the question, Is that what it is being used for, to stop the spread of communism and promote individual initiative and freedom for all peoples? If such is the case, why do we find money and aid going to satellite nations of Russian and, yes, to Russia itself. May I call to your attention a United Press release of just last Saturday, April 9, 1949, and this release has not been disputed on the floor during this debate. It is datelined London, April 9, and I quote from the release, Mr. Chairman:

Britain and Russia will begin new discussions on a 1-year trade agreement within a few days, Board of Trade officials announced today. Negotiations for a long-term Anglo-Soviet treaty failed in Moscow last January, but Britain suggested renewed talks a month ago, after a series of Moscow propaganda broadcasts advised Britain to solve her export problems by trading with eastern Europe. British officials said today Russia had "agreed in principle" that the two nations should try to work out a short-term pact. The announcement coincided with reports that a 5-year trade pact between Britain and Yugoslavia will probably be concluded within 3 weeks.

If this statement is true and I repeat, it has not been denied, why are we giving Britain any money when it is charged and not refuted that she is negotiating with Soviet Russia as well as the satellite nations of Russia? It has been charged and not denied that countries to which we are giving aid under the European recovery program have been shipping copper to Poland, which is under Russian control, and, yes, Mr. Chairman, shipping steel rails and locomotives direct to Russia. The records will show that we are furnishing to European nations materials which are critical in this country and which are badly needed for the establishment of our own defense program. Communism, Mr. Chairman, starts when people are discouraged and under a burden of high taxes. Many of the nations that we are giving aid to under the recovery program have a tax per person of less than one-half of ours. Their indebtedness per person is less than one-half of ours.

I am raising the question, Are we not making these United States vulnerable to a spread of ideology different from our own by the extension of a program whereby we are asking our people to continue to pay high taxes and high living costs? Is it not time that the people of Europe do something to help themselves? I am certain that my people would be perfectly willing to pay this amount and even more if it would assure peace, and I would be willing to vote to continue this burden upon them if I felt certain the program would definitely stop the spread of communism. The records will show, and it has not been disputed, that some of the money we are sending to foreign countries is not getting to the people who actually need the aid. More depends upon the administration of a loan or the administration of a government, than the amount of dollars and cents. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are sending money to governments whose officials just a few weeks ago stated and I quote, "Britain's recovery is now virtually complete." This statement was made, Mr. Chairman, by a member of the British Cabinet, and it was concurred in by the Right Honorable Harry Wilson, a member of the Cabinet in Britain during a debate in the House of Commons.

Mr. Chairman, our economic condition can stand only a certain amount of indebtedness. Our military position needs a tremendous expenditure in order to protect ourselves. I am asking you, are we going to continue a policy of weakening our economic structure and weakening our military position? I am of the firm conviction that it is time for us to give recognition to our own needs. We have many, many people who are more poorly housed, have less clothes, and less food than many of the people of the countries to which we are giving aid. Nearly every day our mail shows us that many of our people need immediate assistance, yet we are told by some of the leaders, and some who are so insistent on the passage of this legislation, that we cannot afford to give such aid.

I have listened to many speeches in the last few days of individuals whose records show that they have refused to give assistance to the veterans, including the construction of veterans' hospitals, to the laboring man, to the farmers, and to practically all of the people of our country—yet they are calling upon us today to vote to give aid to peoples of other countries.

From personal experiences in the last few hours it has been proved that those who are in control of this legislation are accepting no amendments whatsoever. In other words, the distribution of this $5,000,000,000 is going to follow the same channel as it has in the past; even in the face of a record of wastefulness; yes, even part of it going to countries under communistic domination.

Let us be fair with the American people—recognizing their need, recognizing the weakness of our own country—put our own house in order. We have been lenient with other countries, certainly it is time for them to show some desire to help themselves. I am of the firm conviction that this raid on the American people will ultimately mean an increase in taxes and a continuation of the program of spend and spend and tax and tax, which certainly we must recognize is weakening our own national structure. It is time we recognize that in order to be strong, we must have a government that is stable and one which gives relief to its own people, so that when an emergency does arise, we will have the strength both economically and financially to assume our responsibility. Mr. Chairman, this cannot be done if we continue the policy of aiding the world without asking them to do something to help themselves.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) Section 114 (c) of such act is amended in the following particulars:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That, in addition to the amount above authorized to be appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title not to exceed $1,100,000,000 for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1949, and not to exceed $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the foregoing, any balance, unobligated as of June 30, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for any period ending on or prior to that date is hereby authorized to be made available for obligation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and to be transferred to and consolidated with any appropriations for carrying out and accomplishing

the purposes of this title for said fiscal year."

(2) By amending the last sentence of such section 114 (c) to read as follows: "The authorizations in this title are limited to the period ending June 30, 1950, in order that the Congress may pass on any subsequent authorizations."

(b) Section 114 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation additional to that made by title I of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.), shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this title."

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust this House will pass the appropriation measure it has before it to provide for the extension of the European recovery program during the second period of its existence. Nobody can guarantee that it will prevent another war. Nobody can guarantee that the North Atlantic Pact will be successful. We are unable to look into the future but we can judge the present and evaluate the future in the light of the past. It has been said on the floor of this House that the European recovery plan will bankrupt this Nation and it has been proposed that the funds be cut here and sliced there. Let us not go to this task with too little and get there with that too late. You, who are students of history, take a journey back along the steep and tortuous path that man has followed, go back until the trail is lost in the windblown dust of antiquity and you will find the path littered with the stark and naked skeletons of nations and empires that have been destroyed by selfishness, cupidity, avarice, and greed. However, I look in vain for any nation that has been destroyed by mercy, charity, or generosity. Our expenditures for war are staggering. Billions of dollars are spent every year to pay for wars of the past and prepare for wars yet to come. The European recovery plan is the first plan in the history of the human race on which any nation has ever proposed to spend a vast sum of money in the hope that it will bring peace. We are providing this money for the European recovery program in order that people living in other lands may have jobs and wages and homes and children and schools and a future. We are providing this money in order that people in other democracies may have churches, Sunday schools in order that they may have the privilege to worship God without being molested. The same God in whom we profess to have faith. Christ could have preached the fatherhood of God for 10,000 years and no one would have molested him but He chose to have compassion on the poor, the sick, the lame, and the blind. He scourged the money changers out of the temple, telling them, "My Father's house is a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." He told the scribes and pharisees they could not devour widow's houses and then atone for their misdeeds by making long prayers on street corners. He taught the people mercy, charity, and generosity, and the aristocracy of Judea nailed him to a cross. It was not popular to relieve hunger, want, and misery in those days, and it is not popular in certain places today, but my faith in the wisdom, courage, patriotism, and sincerity of the Members of this House is unshaken. I believe they will pass this measure without crippling amendments. How would we dare on our knees ask God to bless our home, our children and our country, if we failed to thus prove that we loved our neighbor as ourself.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3748) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter received from Prof. Charles C. Price.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters from employees who earn their livelihood in the west coast canneries and fields.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article which appeared in the China Monthly of March 1949. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $318, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I May be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain data.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] may have until 8 o'clock tonight to file a report from the Committee on Appropriations on the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on that bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE LATE JAMES WOLFENDEN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the death of the late James Wolfenden.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have read with deep regret of the death of my valued friend, and our former colleague, James Wolfenden, of Pennsylvania.

For many years Jim Wolfenden served his people and his country in this body with ability, fidelity, and with courage. His type of service was quiet, but was very efficient.

As a result of his great ability, his knowledge of legislative and public questions, his convincing personality, and the confidence and the respect his colleagues had for him, Jim Wolfenden exerted a most unusual influence on his colleagues. For years prior to his retirement from the House, he was recognized as one of the leaders of this body. In his own political party he was for years a recognized leader.

I regret very much his death. In his passing on, I have lost a personal friend.

The loved ones he left behind, Mrs. Wolfenden and her son and daughter, can derive great consolation in the knowledge that his life was a constructive and a fruitful one; that his friends were many in all parts of the country, and that he served his district, his State, and his country in an outstanding manner. To the loved ones he left behind, I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 12, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

518. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols, O-17498, professor of the United States Military Academy, in the permanent grade of colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

519. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 91. A bill to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3436. A bill to amend section 3 of the Lucas Act with respect to redefinition of request for relief; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3196. A bill to authorize appropriations for roads, trails, and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3111. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and section 118 thereof, and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; with amendments (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4177. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 4166. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Catlettsburg, Ky.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BREEN:

H. R. 4167. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4168. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4169. A bill to establish a standard schedule of rates of basic compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government; to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of basic compensation of individual employees; to repeal the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4170. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4171. A bill to provide authorization for additional funds for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committe on Public Works.

H. R. 4172. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4173. A bill to provide for the construction of a new post-office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4174. A bill to provide additional options with respect to Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4175. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy: to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4176. A bill to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By MR. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 4177. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4178. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 with reference to claims arising out of the death of members of the armed forces of the United States as the result of enemy action after cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 4179. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to permit individual sellers to absorb actual freight costs if such absorption is in good faith and does not result in injury to competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4180. A bill to repeal so much of the Hatch Act as prohibits certain officers and employees of the Federal and State Governments from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 4181. A bill to provide an allowance for uniforms for certain postal and other employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4182. A bill to promote the national defense and security by providing for a National Inventors Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4183. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to extend the time within which applications may be filed for lump-sum payments payable with respect to World War II veterans who died before August 10, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the anniversary of the birth of Rex McDonald; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to return to the State of New Jersey sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the State of New Jersey for the administration of unemployment compensation to provide adequately for administration of the law in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging support for an appropriation to carry out the sea-wall and harbor-improvement project at Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that the Government construction programs in Alaska allow the fullest participation of resident Alaskan firms and labor; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that the Secretary of the Interior to be authorized to investigate the advisability and feasibility of erecting a custom smelter in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available such facilities to the Territory of Hawaii needed for the construction of wharfage and harbor facilities in the vicinity of Kaneohe, Oahu; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that surveys necessary to establishment of a road between Nenana and Fairbanks be instituted next

summer with a view to construction as soon as possible; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging the construction of a road between Livengood and Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4184. A bill for the relief of Michael Zarechnak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4185. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Delimater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4186. A bill for the relief of Jan Liga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada Svejkovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 4189. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

547. By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

548. Also, resolution of the senate of the State of Colorado, petitioning the President of the United States to prohibit the importation of furs from Russia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

549. By Mr. BARING: Senate Joint Resolution 10, approved by Governor Pittman on March 29, 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

550. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, urging passage of the Local Public Health Services Act of 1949 and that the appropriation of $10,808,000, "Assistance to States, general public health," which was deleted from the appropriation bill H. R. 3333 for the Public Health Service, passed March 9, 1949, by the House of Representatives, be restored so that adequate financial assistance will be available; to the Committee on Appropriations.

551. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Colorado, urging the Congress to approve proposed legislation providing for amendments to the Social Security Act in order to provide for assistance to the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who have been determined by clinical and laboratory tests or otherwise to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

552. By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, asking that the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution give serious consideration to the calling of a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations, subject to later ratification, a constitution of a world federal government, open to all nations, with limited powers adequate to assure peace, or amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to ratify any world constitution which is presented to the United States by the United Nations, by a world constitutional convention, or otherwise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

553. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Holyoke, Mass., regarding the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

554. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Robert R Dalziel, druggist, and other citizens of What Cheer, Iowa, urging repeal of the 20 percent excise tax on all toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

555. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution of the Court of Common Council of the City of Meriden, Conn., memorializing the Congress to pass and the President to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

556. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Gulf Ports Association, Inc., Galveston, Tex., stating approval of the wording of the bill H. R. 1340; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

557. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

558. Also, petition of Mrs. Robert L. Rice and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

559. Also, petition of Mrs. Ruth Childers and others, Avon Park, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

560. Also, petition of Arthur C. Almy and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

561. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Pinckard and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

562. Also, petition of J. M. Villa and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

563. Also, petition of I. C. Ellis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, of New York City, offered the following prayer:

O God of our Fathers! In this solemn hour we call upon Thy name. We are Thy people. Thou art our God, our watching, mighty God. Thou hast carved us a nation out of the wilderness, sealing us with high destiny, to be light to peoples in darkness, to bring freedom to nations in chains. Thou didst breathe Thy breath into the face of our sires, Thy breath of freedom, of justice, of peace. Breathe we Thy breath, our Nation shall not die. O God, preserve us, Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

Grim are the signs we sight as rolling wrecks drift by, nations with decks awash, nations in frantic fear. Death riding at the masthead, with mutiny aboard, against Thy holy will, O God, our captain! Preserve us Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

When a nation drops God as a pilot, God abandons the ship of state to gales of pernicious doctrines, to cross-currents of greed, to the lash of pirates, to the lot of slaves, to the doom of drowning. O God, our captain! Preserve us Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

O Father of the nations! Great is Thy trust in us, sacred our hope in Thee. In Thee, we pledge our faith with the blood and tears of our bravest! Beside us lie the tasks of the hour. Before us shine the goals to be won. Bless us, O God, with unity; unity of heads, sharing common counsels; unity of hands, sharing common toil; unity of hearts, sharing common hopes. Our unity revealing Thy strength and our will.

O God, our Father! Preserve us Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 11, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3932) to exempt artificial limbs from duty if imported for personal use and not for sale, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] retained the floor under a unanimous-consent agreement last evening?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was no express agreement, but he had offered an amendment and was on his feet yesterday at the time the Senate took a recess.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present routine business and matters for the RECORD without jeopard-

izing the parliamentary situation and without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, my personal feelings on this anniversary compel me to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to recall to my colleagues——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is now operating precludes debate, the Chair will say to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a short address not exceeding 5 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, my personal feelings on this anniversary compel me to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to recall to my colleagues the shock we all received 4 years ago today when the news of the death of our President, Commander in Chief, world leader, and friend came to us over the wires from Warm Springs, Ga. It seemed to many of us as though the world stood still. The nervous strain we had been under during the trying days of the Great War had been eased by the confidence we had in his leadership, and this leadership was gone. For a little while we groped as though in darkness after the light had suddenly been extinguished.

There followed an upsurge of grief in all hearts, in the hearts not only of ourselves and of our fellow countrymen, but of the people throughout the world, especially the common people.

They felt that they had lost an understanding friend who had their welfare at heart. I give a couple of illustrations. Shortly after his death, I was in the city of Bogotá and was told how the telephone system broke down upon the spread of the tragic news. There was a strange human reason for this. Thousands were calling up to find out whether the rumor was true, but the telephone operators were so choked with tears they could not answer the calls. In the city of Caracas I visited a large new housing development erected by the Government for the occupation of white-collared workers. I wanted to see the interior of one of the apartments and selected one by lot. When I called, the family was having its midday meal, but the mother of the family took pride in showing me around. Finally she unlocked a glass cupboard and took out a cardboard on which was pasted a newspaper portrait of President Roosevelt in a little frame of paper flowers. She said, "He was a friend of ours, too." Surprised, I asked, "How did you know I was his friend?" and she said, "Because I saw your picture in the newspaper and am glad to welcome his friend here."

This affectionate regard for Roosevelt endures. Last fall when I was the guest of a group of farmers and farm laborers at an outdoor luncheon in the Mexican countryside, a laborer sitting far down the table finally arose to his feet and asked permission to speak. He said I was introduced as a friend of Roosevelt, and then he burst into praise of the great man and grief over his passing. The tears actually rolled down his cheeks. I have had similar experiences in other parts of the world.

So in these few words of eulogy, I want to emphasize not the leader who by natural temperament, expert training and long experience was best qualified for dealing with the great issues, first, of winning the war, and, second, of winning the subsequent peace, not the statesman who led us out of the depression and established the principles of the New Deal, but rather the big-hearted man who understood the masses of his fellow citizens. He had not only the heart to sympathize with them, but also the brain to devise means for helping them.

For a short while after his death the people wondered whether his policies would be followed. The new President was thinking profoundly and acting slowly. Personally I never doubted that he would continue along the path blazed by his predecessor. He has done so, and I am sure he will continue to do so.

It is this American way of life which now faces its greatest travail. It has won the greatest war in history. It must now win the peace. The time is approaching when it will be determined whether democracy can survive, whether we have reached and passed the highest point of a thousand years of recorded history. It is my belief that the clear, unified will of America will continue to be manifest in the administration which now represents it. So now, after looking backward for a short while, let us again look forward, and follow upward the leadership of President Roosevelt's loyal follower, President Truman.

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT—ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have an important announcement to make which I want every Senator to hear. The President of the United States has very graciously agreed to come to the Capitol today at 1 o'clock and take lunch with all Senators. Today marks his fourth anniversary as Chief Executive of the Nation. Under those circumstances, I think it is most appropriate that the Senate of the United States take a recess from 1 o'clock until 2 o'clock. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess beginning at 1 o'clock until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is requested that the Senate take a recess for 1 hour beginning at 1 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and a letter, which were referred, as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 46)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation, amounting to $152,000, and a proposed provision relating to an existing appropriation, fiscal year 1949, for the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 47)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates, in the amount of $5,777,250, Indian tribal fund authorizations in the amount of $103,000, and drafts of proposed provisions for the fiscal year 1950, for the Department of the Interior, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, HOUSING EXPEDITER (S. DOC. NO. 45)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $3,000,000, for the Housing Expediter, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NATIONAL ARCHIVES (S. DOC. NO. 43)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $200,000, for the National Archives, fiscal year 1950, in the form of an amendment to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 44)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $12,685,000, for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1950, in the form of an amendment to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DIVISION OF LANDS AND FUNDS OF OSAGE INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 14

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States various measures for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide for more comprehensive public-welfare programs of assistance and welfare services to various categories of needy persons; and

"Whereas it is essential that provision be made through Federal legislation in cooperation with the States for the assistance of the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who by clinical and laboratory tests, or otherwise, have been determined to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve such proposed legislation providing for amendments to the Social Security Act in order to provide for assistance to the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who have been determined by clinical and laboratory tests, or otherwise, to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employment; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Security Administrator."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation securing to all citizens, and particularly to its Negro citizens, the right to serve in the National Guard of the United States without segregation in separate units

"Whereas equality of opportunity, responsibility, and privilege of all its people is a matter of vital importance to the people of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the State of Minnesota that there shall be no discrimination between its people by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; and

"Whereas the regulations prescribed by the Department of the Army require that all Negro manpower subject to its authority, except Negro manpower with special skills or qualifications, be employed in Negro units which will conform in general to other units of the Army; and

"Whereas these regulations control the employment of Negro manpower in the National Guard of the United States; and

"Whereas these regulations of the Department of the Army, in denying to Negro citizens of this State equality of opportunity and service in the National Guard, are in derogation of the public policy of the State of Minnesota: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States at its present sitting be and is urgently petitioned and requested to enact such legislation as will secure to all citizens of the United States, and particularly to its Negro citizens, the right to serve in the National Guard of the United States in the same units with all other members without segregation of Negro manpower or any other manpower by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 15th day of March in the year of our Lord 1949.

"H. Y. TONEY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 29th day of March in the year of our Lord 1949.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved April 2, 1949.

"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed April 4, 1949.

"MIKE HOLM,
"Secretary of State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal all laws inhibiting free trade in gold in the open market

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted laws restricting free trade in gold produced in the United States, its territories and possessions, and compelling that all such gold be sold only to the Government of the United States at a price fixed by statute at $35 per fine ounce; and

"Whereas the aforesaid fixed price was established in 1934 at a time when both labor and materials were readily obtainable at a reasonable price; and

"Whereas wage costs and material costs have more than doubled since 1934 and no longer can be met by gold producers in the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas gold mining is a major industry in the State of Nevada and has, in the past, enabled the development of lead, copper, zinc, and silver properties which were of inestimable value to the Nation during World War II; and

"Whereas the restrictions and inhibitions on free trade in gold, coupled with the arbitrary and unreasonable fixed price on gold, have compelled the closing and abandonment of gold mines in the State of Nevada, resulting in unemployment and hardship for the people of Nevada and drastically affecting the economic and tax structure of the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to permit free trade in gold in the open market within the United States, its territories and possessions, and to permit gold to be exported without the imposition of duties, excise taxes, or licenses, permits, or any restrictions whatsoever; and

"Whereas the enactment of such legislation will be of inestimable benefit to the people of the State of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact Senate bill 13, Eighty-first Congress, first session, or similar legislation repealing all restrictions on trade in gold and permitting gold to be freely bought, held, sold, or traded in the open market, and permitting gold to be exported without duties, taxes, licenses, permits, or any restrictions whatsoever; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the erection and operation of a new precious- and rare-metals station of the United States Bureau of Mines in Reno, Nev.

"Whereas the precious- and rare-metals station of the United States Bureau of Mines located on the campus of the University of Nevada in Reno, Nev., has for many years rendered invaluable service to the mining industry and to the country at large in solving problems of metallurgy through extensive research in precious and rare minerals; and

"Whereas the existing United States Bureau of Mines precious- and rare-metals station has been housed on the campus of the University of Nevada for 30 years in a building supplied by the university; and

"Whereas the University of Nevada is in great and pressing need of the university building occupied by the precious- and rare-metals station that it may take care of the ever-increasing enrollment in the Mackay school of mines of the university; and

"Whereas the present headquarters of the precious- and rare-metals station on the campus are inadequate to meet current and growing requirements and for proper laboratory space, and are further inadequate for the engineers and staff of the Bureau, and which requires much of the equipment of the mining branch of the Bureau to be placed in storage; and

"Whereas the geophysical workers of the United States Bureau of Mines have for years been located in a university building also needed by the Mackay school of mines and which, moreover, is inadequate for the purposes of the Bureau; and

"Whereas the University of Nevada has deeded to the Government of the United States a tract of land of about 2 acres located on the campus of the University of Nevada, said tract to be used for the site of a building sufficient to house the precious- and rare-metals station and various other branches of the United States Bureau of Mines now located in Reno; and

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States, H. R. 2386, introduced by Representative BARING, which directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish, equip, and maintain a research laboratory in Reno for research and assistance in matters pertaining to precious- and rare-metal mining and metallurgy, and directs appropriation of $750,000 for construction of a building sufficient to house the facilities indicated, and also directs appropriation of $250,000 annually for maintenance and operation of said precious- and rare-metals station and other Bureau of Mines activities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to enact said bill, H. R. 2386, to the end that proper housing and facilities be furnished the United States Bureau of Mines precious- and rare-metals station, and that the University of Nevada may recover use of the building occupied by said station which it so sorely needs; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President and Vice President of the United

States, and to each Senator and the Representative of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 28

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that the Navy Department is contemplating the placing of the Naval Air Station, at Kaneohe, T. H., on an inactive status; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, a bill to appropriate the sum of $50,000 for the construction of much needed wharfage and harbor facilities in the vicinity of Kaneohe, Oahu, for use by Hawaiian tuna fishermen; and

"Whereas if the wharfage facilities at Kaneohe Naval Air Station can be made available to the Territory, it would obviate the necessity of the expenditure of the aforesaid sum of money by the Territory and would be of great value and assistance to the people of the Territory in further developing its fishing resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to make available such facilities to the Territory of Hawaii to be used for the public purposes contemplated in this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Commandant of the Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Secretary of Defense be and he is respectfully requested to defer any drastic reductions in the force of civilian personnel at Ford Island, Pearl Harbor, and other naval, military, and air installations and facilities in the Territory and to readjust the over-all defense program so that it may be carried out without undue hardship to the persons affected, many of whom have faithfully served for many years, and without serious adverse effects on the economy of the Territory.

"Be it further resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Army, Secretary for Air, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States of America, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by Summerall Chapter, No. 10, Disabled American Veterans, of Miami, Fla., protesting against any reduction in the Veterans' Administration hospital-program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

An excerpt from the minutes of the meeting of the directors of the Lehigh County Taxpayers' League, of Allentown, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Court of Common Council of Meriden, and the Board of Aldermen of the City of Derby, both in the State of Connecticut; the City Council of the City of Ecorse, Mich.; the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Palmer, and the Polish Women's Citizens Club, of Three Rivers, both in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Bermuda Benevolent Association, Inc., of New York, N. Y., signed by Winnie B. Pitt, secretary, remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 199, to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence and to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIAN PRIESTS, MINISTERS, AND LAYMEN IN SOVIET-OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by citizens of Angelina County, Tex., in mass meeting assembled, condemning the persecution of Christian priests, ministers, and laymen by the Soviet Union and their satellites in occupied territory, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the citizens of Angelina County, Tex., in mass meeting assembled, That we condemn and denounce, as un-Christian and barbaric, the wholesale persecution of Christian priests, ministers, and laymen by the Soviet Union and their satellites in occupied territory. Freedom of religious worship and conscience is the most fundamental and sacred right which God intended and ordained that every person should enjoy. No government or king or dictatorship has any right to take away or abridge this God-given right. The very foundation of Christian civilization is the religious and political freedom of every person, regardless of race, color, or creed. There can never be peace or justice on this earth, so long as any of the people are denied the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. It is, therefore, a matter of the deepest concern to us, that our brethren in the Balkan states, now controlled by the atheistic and pagan dictatorship of communism, are being subjected to indescribable torture because of their religious faith and practice. It is unbelievable that, in this age of enlightenment, a large part of the world should revert to the horrors and cruelties of religious persecution and suppression.

We call upon the President of the United States and the other officials of our Government to demand that Russia and her satellite countries be summoned by the United Nations to appear and be tried for the unspeakable crimes that are being committed upon the persons, rights, and consciences of Christian people and ministers who are now the victims of the same kind of persecution and outrages that were inflicted by Nero upon the early Christians. We call upon citizens of every community in the United States to assemble in mass meeting and pass similar resolutions, so that the world may know that all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed, condemn any form of religious persecution. We denounce, as unwise and un-Christian, any policy that seeks to appease these heinous crimes against God and man. We have not forgotten the tragic blunder of the appeasement of Adolf Hitler when he began his brutal policy of religious persecution of helpless minorities. We now know that, had we and other Christian countries taken a firm and uncompromising stand, Hitler could have been stopped before he became powerful, and the world could have been spared the horrors and sufferings of World War II. We call upon our fellow citizens, in America and in all of the Christian countries, to profit from this tragic example by taking a firm stand against Russian tyranny and persecution of defenseless minorities. We believe that the future of the United Nations depends upon its ability and willingness to deal firmly with any nation which violates the God-given rights of its citizens. We have learned by experience that we dare not sit idly and indifferently by, or remain silent when our fellow man—whoever he is or wherever he lives—is the victim of persecution and intolerance.

We reaffirm our faith in and devotion to the fundamental principles of Americanism that every person, whether in our own or foreign lands, is entitled to enjoy his God-given right to absolute and unfettered religious freedom. We condemn, as un-American and un-Christian and as unspeakably barbarous, every form, shape, or kind of bigotry and intolerance. We beseech our Government to go on record, formally and officially, against bigotry, persecution, intolerance, and the suppression of the rights of any minority.

Be it resolved that the chairman of this mass meeting be empowered and authorized to appoint a committee of five members to sign, in our behalf, and certify to this resolution, and to send copies of it to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Secretary of State and to our Texas Representatives and Senators in Congress, with the request that this resolution be read on the floor of the House of Representatives and on the floor of the Senate of the United States and incorporated in the records thereof, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the United Nations as a petition, urging the immediate trial of Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and other satellite countries, for the high crime of religious persecution and bigotry.

BENJAMIN J. WEBER.
ELBERT CLARK.
JOHN B. RILEY.
DR. E. G. TAYLOR.
FR. FRED JULIEN, M. S.

I, Martin Dies, certify that this is a true and exact copy of the resolution presented by me for adoption at a mass meeting of Angelina County citizens on March 8, 1949, and unanimously adopted.

MARTIN DIES,
Secretary of Mass Meeting.

PROTEST AGAINST CONTROL OF NATIONAL GUARD BY ARMY—RESOLUTION OF SCIMETER CLUB OF BOUMI TEMPLE, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the Scimeter Club of Boumi Temple, A. A. O. N. M. S., of Baltimore, Md., has adopted a resolution opposing proposals to have the Army take over control of the National Guard of the several States. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution of the Scimeter Club of Boumi Temple, Baltimore, Md.

Whereas there has appeared in the public press numerous references to a proposal by the Secretary of Defense to have the Army

take over the control of the National Guard of the several States; and

Whereas since the National Guard has proved beyond doubt that its existence is justified and through its efforts military training can be creditably accomplished at the civilian level; and

Whereas the integration of the National Guard into the Regular Army must ultimately lead to a military dictatorship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Scimeter Club, a body composed of 600 members, be recorded as opposing any change in the control of the National Guard; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS, the Honorable HERBERT R. O'CONOR, and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland.

RETURN OF CERTAIN UNEMPLOYMENT TAXES TO NEW JERSEY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference Concurrent Resolution No. 10 of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to return to the State of New Jersey sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the State of New Jersey for the administration of unemployment compensation to provide adequately for administration of the law in that State, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 10

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to the State of New Jersey sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the State of New Jersey for the administration of unemployment compensation to provide adequately for administration of the law in the State of New Jersey

Whereas the Federal Government has raised by taxation in the State of New Jersey for administration of the unemployment compensation law $34,000,000, about 38 percent in excess of the sums actually appropriated and expended for the administration of the law in this State; and

Whereas the funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States from taxes raised in New Jersey for administration have been and are insufficient for adequate administration of the law which has resulted in a drastic, emergent situation in New Jersey, in that thousands of involuntarily unemployed persons have been unable to secure the compensation to which they are entitled for many weeks after such payments are due, as long as 20 weeks in some cases; and

Whereas comparable industrial States have received for administration larger percentages of the sums raised therein; and

Whereas immediate action must be taken by the Congress of the United States to alleviate this distressing situation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the senate concurring)—

1. That the Congress of the United States be urgently requested to enact legislation by which sufficient moneys for the adequate administration of the unemployment compensation law will be returned to the State of New Jersey and to other States from the sums raised by the Federal Government by taxation in the States for the administration of the law to the end that the claims of unemployed persons entitled thereto may be promptly paid.

2. That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact basic amendments to the social-security law which will assure to all State unemployment compensation agencies adequate annual amounts for the proper administration of the law payable from the sums raised by the Federal Government by taxation therein for the administration thereof in order to prevent the annual recurrence of the present emergent condition.

3. *Be it further resolved*, That the secretary of state is directed forthwith to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Appropriations, and to the Members of the Congress from the State of New Jersey.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SELECTMEN OF PALMER, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Board of Selectmen of the town of Palmer, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relative to the General Pulaski's Memorial Day now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Selectmen, Town of Palmer, Mass.—

1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the two United States Senators from the State of Massachusetts, and to the Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of Massachusetts.

JAMES H. FITZGERALD,
HERBERT W. BISHOP,
PETER F. WARAKOMSKI,
Board of Selectmen.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY LABOR LAW

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Holyoke, Mass., favoring the immediate and unqualified repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution regarding immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law

Whereas there has been enacted by the Eightieth Congress of the United States, a labor bill known as the Taft-Hartley law; and

Whereas since the passage of this law, labor organizations have been oppressed and collective bargaining has been made more difficult to promote the advancement of the American labor movement; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law creates an inferior class of citizens, and inferior category and a debased position politically for the men and women who toil by hand or brain for their daily subsistence; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act, in its entirety, is an insult to the working people of the United States, a brand upon their integrity and decency, and a handicap to all fair-minded employers; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act invades the constitutional guaranties of free speech, free press, and freedom of contract; and

Whereas one of the main issues in the last Presidential campaign was the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and such issue was supported by an overwhelming majority vote for candidates to political office who were on record for the immediate repeal of this vicious and obnoxious law; and

Whereas the Eighty-first Congress has conducted hearings on a substitute labor bill known as the Thomas bill and such hearings have resulted in needless repetitious testimony, consequently delaying action on the repeal of this law; and

Whereas thousands of collective-bargaining contracts presently expiring and will expire in the very near future, and labor organizations and employers cannot negotiate with any degree of confidence as to the provisions that may be contained in a new labor bill, thus creating an air of uncertainty and endangering harmonious labor relations between labor and management which may result in unavoidable work stoppage; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States of America have, by their vote last November, delivered a mandate to the new Congress for immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen of the City of Holyoke assert its disapproval of the Taft-Hartley law; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen of the City of Holyoke go on record for the immediate and unqualified repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and that the President of the

United States, Harry S. Truman, the majority leaders of the House and the Senate, the Members of Congress from the western Massachusetts area, and the United States Senators from Massachusetts, be so notified as soon as possible after the passage of this resolution so that they may act accordingly.

WORLD GOVERNMENT—RESOLUTIONS OF CITIZENS OF SHERBORN AND BELMONT, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the citizens of Sherborn, and the town of Belmont, Mass., relating to making the United Nations into a world government.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted at the annual town meeting in Sherborn, Mass., March 7, 1949, by a unanimous vote of the citizens assembled

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the people of Sherborn, Mass., in town meeting assembled, That they call upon their Representatives in the Congress, in the Executive Department of the United States, and in the United Nations, forthwith to take such steps as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter for the purpose of making the United Nations into a world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to both Senators from Massachusetts, the Congressman from the Fourteenth Congressional District, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representative in the United Nations.

A true copy, attest:

[SEAL] ELIJAH C. BARBER,
Town Clerk.

I, Charles B. Wiggin, as I am town clerk of the town of Belmont, Mass., hereby certify that when article 43 in the warrant for the adjourned session of the annual town meeting was before the town meeting of the town of Belmont, Mass., for action on March 21, 1949, as follows:

"Article 43

"To see if the town will adopt a resolution affording the people of Belmont an opportunity to express to their Representatives in Congress, in the Executive Department of the United States, and in the United Nations, their deep feeling regarding war and peace and to request such representatives to take such steps as may be necessary to make the United Nations into a world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war, or in any way act thereon."

The following resolution was adopted:

"Voted, that the town adopt the following resolution:

" '*Resolved,* That—

" 'Whereas modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

" 'Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve peace and its charter is capable of amendment so as to make it effective for the maintenance of world order; and

" 'Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law, and some measure of world government; and

" 'Whereas the people of Belmont have since 1859 been happy to delegate certain functions of government to their town government, other functions to their State government, and still other functions to their National Government and are now willing to delegate further limited functions of government to a world government for the purpose of maintaining peace: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the people of Belmont, Mass., in town meeting assembled,* That they call upon their Representatives in the Congress, in the Executive Department of the United States and in the United Nations, to take note of these truths and forthwith to take such steps as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter for the purpose of making the United Nations into a world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; and be it further

" '*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to both Senators from Massachusetts, the Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representatives in the United Nations'."

A true copy.

Attest: CHARLES B. WIGGIN,
[SEAL] *Town Clerk.*

EXTENSION OF TIME ON READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF BUFFALO POST, NO. 87, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by Buffalo Post, No. 87, the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, favoring the extension for an additional 12 months of readjustment allowance benefits for veterans, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the deadline on readjustment allowance for most World War II veterans is July 25, 1949; and

"Whereas a large percentage of eligible veterans have never made application for this benefit; and

"Whereas many manufacturing establishments are curtailing production and dismissing employees and the need for this particular benefit is very apparent: Therefore be it

"Resolved by Buffalo Post, No. 87, American Legion, in regular meeting, That this post go on record as favoring legislation extending readjustment allowance benefits, under Public Law 346, for an additional 12-month period."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted by Buffalo Post, No. 87, American Legion, Department of South Carolina, in regular session on April 4, 1949.

Attest:

HAROLD A. LAWSON,
Commander.
LLOYD H. FLEMING,
Adjutant.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3704. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 260).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

John W. Askew, of Virginia, to be comptroller, Post Office Department, vice John J. Haggerty, resigned and retired; and

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1560. A bill to authorize the appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols, O17498, professor of the United States Military Academy, in the permanent grade of colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1561. A bill for the relief of Anton Bos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1562. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel, and George Henkel, and granting a preference in hearing on such claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1563. A bill to authorize emergency flood control works on White Bear Island, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. ECTON):

S. 1564. A bill to transfer control over Indian tribal funds to the Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1565. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ludovit Ruhmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1566. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of Presidio La Bahia and the Mission Espiritu Santo in Goliad County, Tex.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1567. A bill for the relief of Avner Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1568. A bill for the relief of Anna Rajmann; and

S. 1569. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the district courts to determine income tax deficiencies asserted against a taxpayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1570. A bill to preserve the export market for surplus agricultural export commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1571. A bill for the relief of Sergio Luis Rendon y Acosta, also known as Sergio Acosta; and

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Steven Etienne Laszlo; his wife, Mary Laszlo and his son, Ervin Laszlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. IVES introduced Senate Joint Resolution 76, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic Winter Games at Lake Placid, N. Y., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES, LAKE PLACID, N. Y.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic winter games at Lake Placid, N. Y.

I understand no other resolution of this kind has been introduced and that this is the only invitation thus far extended.

In view of the fact that provision must be made during the next 12 days regarding this question, I trust and I beg the Senate will take as early action as possible in connection with this matter.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic winter games at Lake Placid, N. Y., introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRICKER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3932) to exempt artificial limbs from duty if imported for personal use and not for sale was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY"

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed as a Senate document a pamphlet entitled "The North Atlantic Treaty," with the accompanying documents and illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (EXECUTIVE L, 81ST CONG., 1ST SESS.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a very important message has been sent to the Senate from the President of the United States. The message deals with the North Atlantic treaty. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the message be laid down by the Presiding Officer, and read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Senate a copy of the North Atlantic treaty signed at Washington on April 4, 1949, together with a report of the Secretary of State.

This treaty is an expression of the desire of the people of the United States for peace and security, for the continuing opportunity to live and work in freedom.

Events of this century have taught us that we cannot achieve peace independently. The world has grown too small. The oceans to our east and west no longer protect us from the reach of brutality and aggression.

We have also learned—learned in blood and conflict—that if we are to achieve peace we must work for peace.

This knowledge has made us determined to do everything we can to insure that peace is maintained. We have not arrived at this decision lightly, or without recognition of the effort it entails. But we cannot escape the great responsibility that goes with our great stature in the world. Every action of this Nation in recent years has demonstrated the overwhelming will of our people that the strength and influence of the United States shall be used in the cause of peace, justice, and freedom.

In this determination, our people wholeheartedly accepted the Charter of the United Nations in 1945. Since then, we have worked unceasingly to reach international agreement through the United Nations and to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for its mighty task.

In the last year we have embarked on a great cooperative enterprise with the free nations of Europe to restore the vitality of the European economy—so important to the prosperity and peace of our country and the world.

The North Atlantic treaty is further evidence of our determination to work for a peaceful world. It is in accord with the action of the Senate last June when it signified its approval of our country's associating itself in peacetime with countries outside the Western Hemisphere in collective arrangements, within the framework of the United Nations Charter, designed to safeguard peace and security.

The twelve nations which have signed this treaty undertake to exercise their right of collective or individual self-defense against armed attack, in accordance with article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and subject to such measures as the Security Council may take to maintain and restore international peace and security. The treaty makes clear the determination of the people of the United States and of our neighbors in the North Atlantic community to do their utmost to maintain peace with justice and to take such action as they may deem necessary if the peace is broken.

The people of the North Atlantic community have seen solemn agreements, designed to assure peace and the rights of small nations, broken one by one and the people of those nations deprived of freedom by terror and oppression. They are resolved that their nations shall not, one by one, suffer the same fate.

The nations signing this treaty share a common heritage of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law. The American members of the North Atlantic community stem directly from the European members in tradition and in love of freedom. We have joined together in the progressive development of free institutions, and we have shared our moral and material strength in the present task of rebuilding from the devastation of war.

The security and welfare of each member of this community depend upon the security and welfare of all. None of us alone can achieve economic prosperity or military security. None of us alone can assure the continuance of freedom.

Together, our joint strength is of tremendous significance to the future of free men in every part of the world. For this treaty is clear evidence that differences in language and in economic and political systems are no real bar to the effective association of nations devoted to the great principles of human freedom and justice.

This treaty is only one step—although a long one—on the road to peace. No single action, no matter how significant, will achieve peace. We must continue to work patiently and carefully, advancing with practical, realistic steps in the light of circumstances and events as they occur, building the structure of peace soundly and solidly.

I believe that the North Atlantic treaty is such a step, based on the realities of the situation we face today and framed within the terms of the United Nations Charter and the Constitution of the United States.

In the conviction that the North Atlantic treaty is a great advance toward fulfillment of the unconquerable will of the people of the United States to achieve a just and enduring peace, I request the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 12, 1949.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the message, together with the papers and the treaty, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed. The Chair hears no objection.

TAX ON COLORED OLEOMARGARINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of the tax on colored oleomargarine made by him before the Senate Finance Committee on April 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAJOR PROBLEMS IN UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS B. SAYRE

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Major Problems in United States Foreign Policy," delivered by Hon. Francis B. Sayre, Representative of the United States

in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, at the Third Annual Conference on Public Affairs, at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, on March 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD SUBSIDIES: FICTION VERSUS FACT—ARTICLE BY EDWARD H. COLLINS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Food Subsidies: Fiction Versus Fact," written by Edward H. Collins, and published in the New York Times of April 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY BRANNAN'S PROPOSED FARM PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Old Shell Game," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of April 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND—LETTER TO SENATOR JENNER

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated April 9, 1949, addressed to him, relating to the European recovery program and particularly to the Socialist Government of Great Britain, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN ENGLAND—LETTER FROM CHARLES MURPHY

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Charles Murphy, of London, England, under date of March 28, 1949, dealing with economic conditions in England under the present Socialist Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEAKING OF SPEED—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Speaking of Speed," published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTH OF THE NEW STATE OF ISRAEL—ADDRESS BY AUBREY S. EBAN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Aubrey S. Eban, Israeli delegate to the United Nations, before the Washington Chapter of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—LETTERS IN OPPOSITION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three letters in opposition to proposed Federal aid to education legislation, which appear in the Appendix.]

CARE PACKAGES OF FOOD AND CLOTHING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him showing what the CARE organization has done during the past 3 years in sending CARE packages of food and clothing to Europeans, which appears in the Appendix.]

WALTER APFELBAUM AND JORDAN BITTEL, WINNERS OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY INVITATIONAL DEBATING TOURNAMENT

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Florida Pair Wins Debate Tournament," published in the Washington Post of April 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance may hold hearings this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

A SCANDALOUS REPORT—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am sure every Member of this body is interested in any material that will shed light upon the report of the Hoover Commission. I doubt if many of us are as familiar as we should be with the work of the task forces in connection therewith. An editorial was published in yesterday's Omaha Evening World-Herald entitled "A Scandalous Report," which, of course, does not reflect upon the report of the Hoover Commission, but upon the report of one of its task forces. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SCANDALOUS REPORT

The Pick-Sloan plan recently has come under a barrage of criticism based on the report of a Hoover Commission task force.

This task force, headed by Edward A. Ackerman, a young professor of geography at the University of Chicago, turned in what it called a "case study" of Missouri Basin resources and the organization of Federal activities engaged in their development.

This "case study" finds much fault with the pattern of river basin development as exemplified by the Pick-Sloan plan. It dwells at some length and frequency on the lack of social and economic engineering. This, of course, is sweet music to the left-wing MVA crowd.

It also finds that the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee is inadequate as a centralized board to coordinate the work of Federal and State agencies, charges that the planning has been done backward and exhumes long-settled arguments about whether there is enough water in the Missouri River to do what Pick-Sloan planners have been authorized by Congress to do.

But the most striking feature of the task commission's report is not apparent in a mere reading of the report. The most striking feature is the fact that the task force apparently surveyed the Missouri Basin at long distance and with its field glasses reversed.

At a recent meeting of the Inter-Agency Committee in Jefferson City, Mo., Nebraska's Governor Peterson polled the membership, comprising Federal agency representatives and governors.

"Did any one from the Hoover task force ever talk to you about Missouri Basin development?" he asked each one.

The answers in each case except two were negative. W. G. Sloan, of the Department of the Interior, and Gladwin Young, of the Department of Agriculture, said they had been talked to by someone from the task force "for about a half hour."

Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Missouri River division engineer and chairman of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee at the time the so-called "case study" was being made, was not asked for information or opinion.

That in itself is scandalous. General Pick is the principal author of the Pick-Sloan plan. He has been and is the chief executive in building its projects. In any inquiry into valley affairs, the first step, the most important step, should have been to consult General Pick, to review his records and to hear his plans and hopes for the future. The fact that the task force ignored him is almost incredible, and it strongly suggests that the report as made was spun out of hearsay and theory.

Almost equally scandalous is the fact that neither Governor Peterson nor any other official of the State of Nebraska was consulted. This is one of the key States of the valley development program, and certainly its experience with the developing Pick-Sloan plan, over a period of years, should have been of interest to the task force which was making a "case study" of the valley affairs.

This newspaper has the greatest respect for the Hoover Commission, and believes that its reports, taken as a whole, constitute a massive contribution to the cause of good government.

But in any undertaking so vast it is inevitable that mistakes will be made.

In the case of the Missouri Valley, we believe the evidence is conclusive that the task force which made the investigation was incompetent or biased or both. The fact that it did not so much as rap at the door of General Pick or State officials who know what is going on strongly suggests that the investigators had made up their minds before they went to work—that they were a loaded jury.

Neither the people of the valley nor the Congress nor the President should heed such irresponsible findings of fact.

DR. PETER MARSHALL—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a most significant article, paying deserved and sensitive tribute to the work of our late Senate Chaplain, Dr. Peter Marshall, will appear in the April 14 issue of the Christian Advocate.

I have been privileged to obtain an advance copy, and I ask unanimous consent for its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it may be shared by the entire Senate and all others who read the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Clyde W. Park)

In the recent death of a Washington clergyman, Chaplain Peter Marshall, a voice was stilled that had carried far beyond the confines of the Senate Chamber. His prayers will be long remembered, not only because they are part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but also because they made a lasting impression on many of the Chaplain's contemporaries. These unusual prayers first came to my attention some time ago in connection with a bit of research work I happened to be doing. It was a typical case of serendipity, in which the thing accidentally discovered turns out to be more interesting than the object sought. Accordingly, the notes made on the prayers were fuller than those dealing with the more prosaic subject of inquiry. To one who was leafing through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to verify the date or wording of an enactment, the brief invocation at the head of the day's proceedings stood out like a jewel seen against a background of colorless fabric.

A passage of direct address would naturally attract the reader's notice when placed alongside the conventional language of parliamentary reporting—the sort of standardized English that is sometimes called Federal prose. But, although it was very different from the procedural text that surrounded it, the language of Peter Marshall's prayers was not an example of style for style's sake. He often used a balanced phrase or a punch line for the sake of emphasis, but his speech was never artificially ornate. There was no suggestion of premeditated eloquence, no straining for effect, as in the consciously alliterative language of one speaker who sought divine guidance in facing "the problems of duty and deity and destiny." It is true that oratory of this kind has a long tradition, and there have been old-time Republicans who looked back fondly to a period when the invocations of the Rev. John Wesley Hill received as much applause as the nominating speeches of Robert Ingersoll or Chauncey Depew. Marshall's language is simpler and more representative of the "straight talk" that is preferred today. This is to be expected from a former steelworker and engineer, whose pretheological experience included some work in a newspaper office. A certain crispness of utterance is probably traceable to his Scottish birth. Sometimes his speech is almost racy in its colloquial directness, but it conveys unmistakable overtones of sincerity and reverence.

Peter Marshall's prayers mean something; they appeal not only to the mind, but to the heart and spirit as well. He is mindful of the timely allusions that are expected of a clergyman-laureate; his prayers contain many references to national holidays and outstanding current happenings. Chiefly, however, he speaks as the collective conscience of the assembly, with earnest emphasis on the Senate's work and responsibility. The following extracts, including one or two complete prayers, will serve to illustrate his manner and his point of view.

"Eternal Father of our souls, grant to the Members and the officers of this body a sacred moment of quiet ere they take up the duties of the day. * * * From these moments of heart-searching may there come such a sweetness of disposition that all may know that Thou are in this place."

"Save this moment, O Lord, from being merely a gesture to custom or convention, and make it a real experience for each one of us."

"Slow us down, O Lord, that we may take time to think, time to pray, and time to find out Thy will. Then give us the sense and courage to do it, for the good of our country and the glory of Thy name."

"Let us not be frightened by the problems that confront us, but rather give Thee thanks that Thou hast matched us with this hour. May we resolve, God helping us, to be part of the answer, and not part of the problem."

"If there be any here sulking as children will, deal with and enlighten him."

"We pray for some evidence in what is done here that Thou hast been given a vote, and that men have yielded to Thee."

"O Lord, let us never be afraid of a new idea or unreceptive to a new thought, lest we pull down the shades of our minds and exclude Thy holy light."

"When we have the truth, let us not hit each other over the head with it, but rather use it as a lamp to lighten dark places, in order that we may see where we are going."

"Let us not mistake humility for an inferiority complex, but help us to understand that with the proud and the self-sufficient Thou canst do nothing until Thou hast brought them to their knees."

"Hear us as we pray for this blundering world, in which nations never seem to learn how to live as brothers."

"Spirit of God, come into our hearts and make us sensitive to the sufferings of other people. We think of the victims of flood and mishap and all those who have heavy hearts today. May we so grow in grace that the sympathy we feel for friends may also be felt for strangers."

"O Lord, our God, have pity on us, who have so little pity in our hearts.

"We give, but not in kindness.

"We give because the sound of crying disturbs us and we want to be free to look after the things that concern ourselves.

"We want peace without pain and security without sacrifice.

"We had to accept the responsibilities of war, but we do not want to accept the responsibilities of peace.

"O Lord, be patient with us.

"Give us yet more time to learn what love is, how love should act, and how love can change us as individuals and as a nation.

"We pray in the name of Him who loves us all. Amen."

"Our Father in heaven, today we pray for Thy gift of contentment, that we may not waste our time desiring more, but learn to use and enjoy what we have.

"We may not know everything, but we may know Thee and Thy will. We need not be rich to be generous, nor have all wisdom to be understanding. Our influence may not be great, but it can be good. Our speech may not be eloquent, but it can be truthful and sincere. We cannot all have good looks, but we can have good conscience, and having that, we shall have a good peace of mind and need fear no man.

"May we be kind to one another, tender hearted, forgiving one another even as Thou, for Christ's sake, hast forgiven us. Amen."

These examples are not cited in order to suggest comparisons between particular prayers and chaplains, much less between different branches of religious faith. The case of the late Reverend Marshall serves rather to highlight the general question of prayer as such, and its place in political or legislative assemblies. It has been argued that the custom of beginning such meetings with an invocation is a meaningless tradition, a hold-over from a time when public officials were more "religion-conscious." Along with the motto, "In God we trust" on the face of a coin, the official prayer is cited as something having chiefly historical interest. It has been made the subject of numerous jests, as in the well-known story of William Allen White, attending a political convention as a reporter, who was asked to give the invocation in the place of an absent clergyman and who declined, saying, "I don't want God to know that I'm here." And of course everyone is familiar with the ancient, oft-quoted saying that the Chaplain looks at Congress and then prays for the country.

This "gridiron" levity in the treatment of the subject is characteristic of American political humor. Equally characteristic, however, is a sober meaning beneath the surface. The great majority of elected officials take their responsibilities seriously, and evidently most of them consider it appropriate that their deliberations should begin in an atmosphere of reverence. At a time when these responsibilities are more fateful than ever before, it would seem logical to expect a deepening of the fundamental religious spirit that has always been closely identified with American patriotism. The prayers of the late Chaplain Peter Marshall have contributed much toward this end.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday in the concluding moments of the Senate session I offered an amendment, on page 12 of the bill, in lines 9 and 13, to strike out an item of $2,500,000 in the Tennessee Valley Authority for the New Johnsonville steam plant.

Mr. President, the United States Senate should not consider lightly or casually the item in this deficiency appropriation bill appropriating funds for the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

This item is one of the most important ever to come before this body. If anything, that is an understatement. The suggested appropriation covers an issue vital to our whole economic system. It involves the establishment of a policy which will be far reaching in its effects upon the private enterprise system.

Mr. President, this is not the first time those who favor a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., under Government cost and control have sought consideration here. The proposal was before us last year. It was turned down. It was turned down, not because of partisan considerations, but because there was a firm recognition of the proposal as an opening wedge in a further effort to nationalize or socialize the utility industry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remind the Senator that the proposal was approved by the Senate at least twice.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It was turned down in the House, which has since approved it, this year.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct; but it was turned down by the Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. I point out that it was twice approved by the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Vermont is correct; but it was turned down by the Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. That is a correct statement. It was turned down by the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was approved by the Senate twice, as the distinguished Senator from Vermont says, once by a vote of 45 to 37. I have the two votes before me.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Congress of the United States appropriates funds for the construction of this steam plant it will be financing directly a commercial operation in time of peace. Stripped of all the varied descriptions, the steam-plant project boils down to Federal Government operation and control in the field of private enterprise. No amount of talk can camouflage that fact; and, Mr. President, no amount of talk can dispel the certainty that if the Congress allows the Federal Government to operate in this particular phase of pri-

vate industry the way will be wide open for Government activity in every other phase of our private-industry system. I fail to understand how Senators, thinking clearly on this issue, can justify their support of the steam-plant appropriation.

I am aware that there are sectional interests involved in this issue. Yet I believe that this is a matter in the consideration of which sectional interests should be laid aside. If the Federal Government is allowed to enter in full force the private-industry system which is the strength of America's economy, the day will come when no section of our country will escape injury, and when all sections will regret that they did not place their particular interests aside.

Mr. President, we are not talking about the development of hydroelectric projects which are of such wide scope that there is a valid reason for the Federal Government stepping in. We are talking about taking the taxpayers' money and building a steam plant to generate power in order to supplement the hydro developments in that section. We are entering a new field. From the standpoint of benefits which it would bring to the particular section, almost as valid an argument could be made for building a steam plant at Government expense in practically any other section of the country.

When we talk about $2,500,000, it seems like a small amount; but, as in the case of most of such projects, the amount of the initial appropriation is small compared with the total cost. The total cost of the New Johnsonville steam plant will be approximately $54,000,000. So we are just whetting the appetite in this first appropriation. We are getting ready to expend on the plant probably more than $54,000,000. The cost is estimated at $54,000,000, but it will probably run higher than that.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator explain what appears to him to be the fundamental difference between the right of the Federal Government to engage in steam plant operations and the right of the Federal Government to undertake hydroelectric programs and developments?

Mr. BRIDGES. I told the distinguished Senator from Washington that I am not a great constitutional lawyer or anything of the kind; I am just a humble man from New Hampshire, who has none of the fame as a constitutional authority that some of the great legal lights of the Senate have. But to me there seems to be a difference between using Federal funds to develop a great natural resource of the country, such as hydro power, which is too vast an undertaking for private enterprise to develop, and which, if the Federal Government failed to act, would result in the water flowing to the sea and going to waste, and the building of a steam plant for the production of power. It seems to me there is a great difference between the two.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask a question. Does not the RECORD show that the Senator from New Hampshire is also opposed to the development of public power from hydro plants?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think there are areas in the United States where the development of hydro power involves such a tremendous cost that perhaps the public good could best be served by having the Federal Government step into the picture. Although I have fought many of the features of TVA, I have also supported it, insofar as the Appropriations Committee is concerned, with adequate appropriations to continue it.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator from New Hampshire say that the public good could best be served by public investment in the development of power anywhere in the Northeastern States, where the power rates are higher than anywhere else in the United States?

Mr. BRIDGES. Conceivably it could be, but I would like to see better evidence developed on the point than has been presented to date on the feasibility.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator give an example—and I should like particularly to have him give an example somewhere in the Northeastern States—where public funds could be spent so that all the people would get the full benefit from them?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that I could give any specific examples to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not ask for many; I ask for one.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say a word on the general proposition. If the Federal Government is going to step in and undertake the development, I would want the control to be established at least in a cooperative manner between the Federal Government and the States, and I would want the power developed to be distributed through existing agencies, and the public to benefit, in turn, as a result of such participation.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, the Senator would require, would he not, the power to be delivered to existing agencies at the bus bar?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. If there is existing a private utility system, then I think its facilities should not be duplicated by providing another selling and distributing system.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from New Hampshire aware that for the year 1947 the users of electricity in New York and New England paid $428,000,000 more for the power they used than they would have paid at TVA rates, although the distributing companies paid $151,000,000 in taxes, which left the people of New England and New York paying approximately $275,000,000 more for power than they would have paid at TVA rates? Under such circumstances, does the Senator from New Hampshire feel that if the expenditure of public funds could reduce that rate to a figure comparable to that paid by the rest of the United States, the use of such funds would be justified?

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that the Senator from Vermont has told only half the story.

Mr. AIKEN. I will tell the other half, of course, at any time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Last year TVA had a gross revenue of $48,000,000. In the same year, in lieu of taxes, TVA paid what it called tax equivalents of $2,000,000, or 4 percent. The average rate in taxes paid by a private utility will run somewhere between 20 percent and 23 percent, or 500 or 600 percent more in taxes than TVA pays.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator agree that the TVA paid, in lieu of taxes, a much larger sum than the private utilities in that area paid before the TVA existed?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I am not making any such statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, I suggest that the Senator from New Hampshire ascertain the facts, and he will find that the statement is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Vermont could be misinformed. I do not know that his figures on the northeast are completely accurate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator know whether the Federal Government has thus far restricted its generation of power to multiple-purpose operations? I am trying to get at the first proposal, namely, the proposal to have the Federal Government generate power through a steam plant.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is a little more familiar with that than am I.

In the original Muscle Shoals development there were one or more steam plants, were there not?

Mr. MCKELLAR. There were several. Besides that, later on, by an agreement made by the TVA with the Alabama Power Co., which was a very large private power corporation in the State of Alabama, the TVA purchased transmission lines and a number of steam plants, which are now the property of TVA. That is the situation, I may say to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BRIDGES. So the answer to the Senator from Washington is that in the original development at Muscle Shoals there were steam facilities; and also when the TVA purchased some of the utility properties in that section, included in them were some steam plants.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. In 1940 we built the great Watts Bar steam plant.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; that is true. Here is the testimony of Mr. Clapp, who is at present the head of TVA:

> We have five major steam plants and several smaller ones—the small plants have a total capacity of about 26,000 kilowatts. Altogether, our steam plants, the one we built, the Wilson Dam steam plant that the Government built during the First World War,

and the ones we bought, now total 450,000 kilowatts—considerably in excess of the capacity of the presently requested units for the New Johnsonville steam plant.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In my State we have 600,000,000,000 tons of coal, sufficient to light the whole world.

During all this time the private interests have not used the coal in the development of power, so that the farm families in the vicinity could get the benefit of REA. In a situation of that kind does not the Senator believe that a steam plant should be provided by the Government if it is interested in the welfare of its people?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, from the sectional point of view, that may be argued, but from the over-all point of view, I should hate to see such a general program inaugurated. I can see a justification for the development of great natural resources involving hydroelectric power from water which is now going to waste where the full evidence justifies such an undertaking. From the sectional point of view I can see how the Senator can argue his case. But I would not want to agree to it.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator agree that, with all the latent power that exists in certain places that power should be used, and that even the private interests should develop it for use in the enormous areas of the West where hundreds of thousands of farm families have neither light nor power in their homes?

Mr. BRIDGES. Very frankly, I should hate to see the Government of the United States enter such a broad field. In any event, in proposals of that kind a study of all the facts would have to precede the decision.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Under REA, the Government loans the money and it is required to be paid back. The record at the present time shows that there is only one cooperative in default. As a matter of fact, $17,000,000 was paid back before it was due. In view of that record, does not the Senator believe the Government ought to enter upon the development of such natural resources?

Mr. BRIDGES. Such a conclusion should not necessarily follow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall place in the RECORD a little later, figures showing the extent of TVA's net earnings. I shall not attempt to be accurate about it; I never was accurate about figures in my life. Figures I have, obtained by the department, show the TVA has actually earned about 8 percent per annum. Does the Senator not think that it is a fine record for an organization of this kind to show as good earnings as that, without having charged the users of electric current a large rate?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am interested, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee. He knows that while we think alike on many things, there is on this particular matter an honest difference of opinion between us regarding the basic premise.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand that. The Senator has always been perfectly frank and open.

Mr. BRIDGES. In that connection, I recall the statement made by the Senator from Vermont a few moments ago, in which he gave figures of the amount of taxes paid and the difference in the showing in the Northeast. Of course, in the Northeast I want to see power furnished as cheaply as possible. But I do not want to see a great Federal empire built up in that section. I want the people of our section to have something to say about anything that is to be done.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, am I correct in saying that the Senator from New Hampshire would not, as I think he has said, oppose development of power with public funds, if the power were to be made available exclusively to the existing distribution companies at the bus bar?

Mr. BRIDGES. What I am saying is that if we are to have public power development that power should be distributed by existing facilities.

Mr. AIKEN. But does not the Senator agree that where there is only one existing line to the site of a development, it would be impossible for the REA or municipal plants to secure the power from the Federal Government or from the State at reasonable rates?

Mr. BRIDGES. It does not follow that there would be such an impossibility. I do not think the Senator and I are far apart on this particular question, and I may say that if there is a development in a given section, the regulatory bodies should see that there is a lowering of rates whenever possible.

Mr. AIKEN. I am in hope, by means of this questioning, to get the Senator to say he will favor development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I should like to inform the Senator that I have received a communication from the president of one of the largest distributing companies in our area, advising me that if we would agree to deliver the power from that project exclusively to private distributing companies, they would not only withdraw their opposition to the development but would get behind it and help push it, even though it were to be constructed with public funds. I hope that may change, somewhat, the Senator's mind.

In assisting the Senator to arrive at a correct conclusion in this matter, I should like also to point out to him that if the power were turned over to a private company at the bus bar, there would probably be about a $20,000,000 saving made available to the people of New York and New England. But if it were sold at a rate which would yield a fair return on the public investment, then, undoubtedly, the saving would amount to possibly $100,000,000 or $200,000,000, for the simple reason that it would result in a general lowering of rates throughout the area.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want the Senator to understand one thing about the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a good thing.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator comes from a neighboring State in New England. If the St. Lawrence seaway were to be constructed in the manner proposed, there would be no guaranty that either the Senator's State or my State or any of the other New England States would be protected There are any number of sets of figures on what the St. Lawrence project would accomplish. The accuracy of all of them is challenged. If there could be written into the St. Lawrence seaway law a provision that the six New England States would get a substantial proportion of the power, I might feel very differently about it.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask the Senator, if the St. Lawrence seaway were so developed that the entire output of power were made available to the Niagara-Hudson Power Co., which has the only line in that area, I believe, and if New England were to be guaranteed a proportionate share of the power developed on the St. Lawrence, does the Senator think that would be an improvement?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is in the field of speculation. I do not think so.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that if the power were distributed solely by the Federal Government, New England would be assured of a greater share of the power?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. I think the only way to assure the six New England States along that line would be to write it into the law. I see the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] looking at me. He is out for the New York interests, naturally. I am endeavoring to look out for the interests of at least a part of the New England States.

Mr. AIKEN. In constructing the St. Lawrence seaway, I do not agree that anyone would be looking after the interests of any particular State. But I realize the Senator from New York is interested in the people of his State obtaining power. The Senator from New Hampshire understands, does he not, that the Federal Power Commission has no right to construct the plant with Federal funds and turn it over to the exclusive use of any one particular community?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. But the difference between the Senator from Vermont and myself probably is that he may have complete faith in what a Federal bureaucrat will do. I do not have such faith.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator understands, does he not, that I have fully as much faith in the Federal bureaucrats as I have in some of the Power Trust officials. We must trust one or the other.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not agree. We may safely trust State regulatory bodies and we may safely trust the Congress of the United States. The point is that if we have a firm provision of law any distrust can be removed.

Mr. AIKEN. I am unable to agree with the Senator on that, I am sorry to say.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have faith in them. But it is possible to write into the bill a provision relative to percentage of distribution of power. That is the only sure way I can see of completely protecting the rights of consumers.

Mr. HILL and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator was speaking of private power companies and rates. I merely want to call attention to the fact that, as we know, private power companies do not amortize capital investments in dams and steam plants. So far as I know, such capital investments continue forever. The bonds are not retired. They are not redeemed when the term is out. The bonds are refunded or new bonds issued. Under the law passed several years ago by Congress, TVA is required to amortize the entire cost of power projects.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for one more question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Apropos of what the Senator from Alabama has just said, will the Senator from New Hampshire point out a single private utility that today is amortizing its investments?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not familiar with what many of the private utility companies are doing. But I may say to the Senator from Alabama that we would not have to spend a great deal of money on TVA at this time if the money received by TVA had actually gone back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The reason there has not been much money going back into the Treasury from the TVA has been that TVA has been using its revenues to build other dams to generate power used for the winning of the war, when we produced so much of the aluminum that went into airplanes and many other war products. Instead of turning the money back into the Treasury, Congress permitted the TVA to use the money for expansion, for the construction of other dams and other works, which has made the property of the Government of more value. The money is there in capital investment, I will say to my friend the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall yield when I reply to the Senator from Alabama.

The Senator from Alabama makes a very eloquent plea for his cause, but I want to say to him that, as one Senator and one citizen, I shall be very interested when some of the cold cash from TVA actually goes into the Treasury of the United States and remains there. Very little of it has arrived there up to this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator does not deny the statement I made, that much of the cash which might have gone into the Treasury went into new construction, for the development of new power and for new generating facilities.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, not at all. But the more the Government goes into these fields the weaker our economic structure will become.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in response to a question from the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the Senator from New Hampshire stated that he did not want a large bureaucracy.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. He did not want the Government loaning money to a group of cooperatives to develop power. There would not be any bureaucracy involved; there would not be any State regulatory department; there would be only the persons who would borrow the money. What possible objection could the distinguished Senator have to that?

Mr. BRIDGES. I recognize the point the Senator is trying to make, and I admire him for his stand, from his point of view. But, no matter how he twists it, the Senator will not get me to stand on the floor of the Senate and say I favor the Federal Government's building commercial steam plants under complete Government control at taxpayers' expense and in competition with private enterprise.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. That is the very last thing I would try to get the Senator to say. I want to ask him if he does not believe the Government should loan to cooperatives under the REA law sufficient money so that not only can REA build lines, but also build steam plants to develop power, in view of the fact that the cooperatives have paid back $17,000,000 more than is due from them at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under the present law, REA can build plants, I will say in answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator does not believe the Government should loan the money. The law provides for it, but the money cannot be obtained on certain occasions.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have supported REA appropriations. I perhaps have not been so liberal as is the Senator from North Dakota, but I supported items that I could see of sound advantage to the country through REA. I think it has accomplished a great deal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to remind the Senator that the Eightieth Congress, when the Senator from New Hampshire was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was the most liberal with REA than was any former Congress. I do not want the Senator from New Hampshire saying that he has not been so liberal as some other Senator, because the Eightieth Congress made available almost as much money as was made available in all the years REA had been in existence up to that time. I rise to defend the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I recognize that his statement is true. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] suggested something which was more liberal than I could support.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator's committee gave $100,000,000 more for REA than was requested by the President of the United States. The committee not only gave $100,000,000 more, but authorized the construction of steam plants for REA purposes in the Northwest.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the Senator did a magnificent job, and I think he has simply forgotten the fine job he did in connection with the steam plants for REA.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I appreciate all the compliments which are being passed my way, but, nevertheless, coming back to the particular project involved, with its particular involvements, I have attempted to say that there is a difference between the Federal Government's developing hydroelectric plants on a large scale, when they are beyond the scope of a private utility, for the benefit of the people of the country, provided it is done on a sound basis, and the development of a steam plant such as is the New Johnsonville steam plant.

Let us get back to REA for a moment. I appreciate what the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Vermont have said about me. I have supported REA appropriations, and I think the last Congress did a good job.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. All I asked for was a billion dollars, and the committee granted $100,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to join the other Senators in what they have had to say regarding the action of the Senator from New Hampshire in reference to REA while he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I think the Senator was exceedingly considerate and that he did a good job.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. If we have all agreed on that, perhaps we can get together on the New Johnsonville steam plant.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope we can.

Mr. BRIDGES. The issue is very clear. It has been discussed pro and con in the Senate in previous years. I do not think there is any object in holding a lengthy debate on the subject. The item is a small one, $2,500,000, but it ultimately means $54,000,000, in all, for the development of the plant. I do not believe a case has been made for the New Johnsonville steam plant. I hope the Senate will amend the bill, and reject

that item. I can understand the concern of the Senators from the TVA section of the country and their desire to build up this additional supplementary power. But they are asking for a specific appropriation for a specific steam plant in competition in the commercial field, in peacetime, which is greatly different from that which we have done to date.

It has been done under the REA to a minor extent. There was a steam plant in the old Muscle Shoals development. It was bought at the time when Mr. Willkie headed the Commonwealth & Southern properties. At the approach of a great war we put money into a steam plant. But this is peacetime. Times are reasonably normal—at least, I thought so until I heard of increased unemployment all over the country, which has been growing by leaps and bounds, caused by the continuance in power of the present administration. So that times are perhaps not quite normal. But are considering, in reasonably normal times, the entry of the Federal Government into a new field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Senate, under the previous order, will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

Thereupon, at 1 o'clock p. m., under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

At 2 o'clock p. m., the recess having expired, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf Coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLAND, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WICKERSHAM, Mr. WEICHEL, and Mr. TOLLEFSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire if he will yield for a quorum call, with the understanding that he will not lose any rights he has to the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Humphrey	Myers
Anderson	Ives	Neely
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Bridges	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kem	Pepper
Cain	Kerr	Reed
Capehart	Kilgore	Robertson
Chapman	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Langer	Schoeppel
Connally	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Donnell	McCarthy	Sparkman
Downey	McClellan	Taft
Ecton	McFarland	Taylor
Ellender	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McKellar	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tydings
Frear	Malone	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Martin	Watkins
Green	Maybank	Wherry
Hendrickson	Miller	Williams
Hill	Millikin	Withers
Hoey	Mundt	Young
Holland	Murray	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be understood that if the Senator from New Hampshire yields, he will have the privilege of the floor after the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND ADDRESS BY HIM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, no greater honor can come to the United States Senate than to have an old friend and a former colleague here with us again. I refer, of course, to our great President of the United States, Hon. Harry S. Truman.

[Great applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is, of course, a distinct privilege to welcome the President of the United States, to indicate the very close relationship existing between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government, and to ask the President whether he will honor us by a few words on this occasion.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Majority Leader, Mr. Minority Leader, and Members of this distinguished legislative body, the legislative body to which I have been closest in my life: I appreciate most highly your kindness and cordiality to me today. I was asked to come to the Capitol for 'unch with the Senate. I had lunch with the whole Senate, and it was a good lunch. I had a chance to meet and talk to nearly every Member of the Senate, a privilege which I very highly appreciate.

The reason for this invitation was the fact that in 1945 I was presiding over the Senate as Vice President of the United States. On April 12, 1945, the Senate adjourned at 5 o'clock, and I had an engagement to see the Speaker of the House on a matter which was pending in both Houses, in which the administration was interested.

When I got to the Speaker's office I did not have a chance to talk to him, but was instructed to return a call from the White House, which I did. I was informed by Mr. Stephen Early, who at that time was the President's secretary, that he would like to see me at the White House, at the main entrance, as soon as I could get there. I had not much of an idea of what I would be faced with when I arrived. I was informed by Mrs. Roosevelt that the President had passed away. I immediately asked her if there was anything I could do for the family, and she very kindly and courteously told me that there was nothing at that time, that it was not herself and her family who needed help, but that it was the former Vice President who needed help.

The Chief Justice was summoned, and at 8½ to 9 minutes after 7 o'clock on the evening of April 12, 1945, I was sworn in as President of the United States.

I want it very clearly understood that on my part there is no celebration on this day. It is a day of sadness for me, because we lost on this day 4 years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt, in my opinion one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever had, and it became necessary for me to assume a tremendous burden on that evening. I have tried my level best to carry that burden, in the interests of all the people of the country, and I hope that when the history of the period is written it will be said that the effort was not in vain.

I thank the Senate most sincerely for their courtesies to me, for the pleasant luncheon which I have had, and I hope that this will not be the last time I may have the privilege of meeting with you. Thank you very much.

[Great applause, Senators rising.]

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am very happy the Senate has had a pleasant interlude during the consideration of the pending bill, and that the President of the United States has honored us by his presence. I had hoped that after the President had visited with some of his old colleagues on the other side of the aisle he might have come over to this side of the aisle, as is the custom of the President when attending the Army-Navy football game. If he sits on the Navy's side of the field during the first half of the game he always goes over to the Army side of the field in the second half of the game, and vice versa. Certainly no greater controversy exists between Senators on this side of the aisle and Senators on the other side of the aisle than exists between the Army and the Navy. So the President would have been welcomed and might have felt fully at home had he made a trip over to the Republican side of the aisle, but I assume he was here with us in spirit at least.

Mr. President, almost everywhere in the world American resources are being poured forth to stop the trend of strong paternal government. We have seen the injury inflicted upon governments and peoples who have been induced to accept a little government operation of private industry, only to awaken to the fact that private industry was gone. We know that the theory of Federal Government competition with private enterprise is not sound. We have seen it fail in other areas of the world, and we know the evils to which it leads. We are familiar with the truth that when such Federal Government competition with private industry comes, it does not end until Government monopoly is established.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will bear in mind that there is far more involved in the question now before us than an appropriation of $2,500,000, or even the $54,000,000 which this project will ultimately cost. Although the amount involved compared with other requests, is not high, we should always be thinking in terms of lower Government spending. The requests for appropriations which are being made today are simply staggering. The real question is whether in time of peace the United States and the United States Congress are going to strike a blow against the socialization of industry or go further in directing the socialization or nationalization of our American economic system. We must not try to dodge the issue. That is the real issue, no matter how much we may camouflage it or try to dress it up.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In connection with the opposition we now find to the construction of the steam plant I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he is aware of the fact that at one time some of those in opposition to the steam plant on the ground of socialism, or what not, because hydroelectric plants were being built, nevertheless urged that in order to carry on its program TVA should build steam plants. I have in mind that in the House of Representatives about 3 years ago former Representative Dirksen and quite a number of persons representing the private power lobby, as well as Members of the House who were opposed to the TVA, stated that it would be perfectly all right to have an expansion if it were done by building a steam plant, and that there would not be anything socialistic, or what not, if that were done.

Yet now when the TVA undertakes to build a steam plant to firm up and make sounder an investment the government already has, the private power lobby and some of those who are opposed to the TVA, have switched their positions and now say that it is all right to carry on with hydroelectric plants, but that the TVA should not build steam plants.

I simply wanted to ask the Senator if he was aware of that record before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, and of the amendment offered by former Representative Dirksen on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I am not familiar with that record, I may say.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will yield again, I will say for the RECORD that what I have just referred to will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 86, part 9 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, page 9726 and the following. There the argument was strongly made that to proceed on the basis of constructing steam plants and not hydroelectric plants would be in line with our American traditions and not socialistic.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Along the same line, I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire is familiar with what Dr. Harold J. Laski said at Howard University just a few days ago. Mr. Laski is a British Labor Party leader and professor of political science at the University of London. He has told us what the Tennessee Valley Authority already means to America. "This great experiment of the TVA," he told his audience at Howard University, is only one proof that public ownership and the regulation of private enterprise have advanced farther in this country "than most Americans are normally inclined to imagine." He added, "A new epoch in American history began in 1933. The old era of unfettered competition will not return unless the institutions of political democracy are overthrown by some catastrophic development."

Is the Senator familiar with that language? I ask that question in line with what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has just said.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not; and I am delighted to have the Senator call it to my attention.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the Senator is also familiar with the statement made a few days ago by a very conservative newspaper, the New York Times, which wholeheartedly approves the appropriation for this steam plant. The editorial concludes with this very significant statement:

> This expenditure would simply be good business. We hope the Senate will be wise enough to approve this item, as the House has done.

Certainly the New York Times would not be following any precept of Mr. Laski's.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire would be inclined to take the word of Dr. Laski on the question of socialization. He has probably had as much experience and direct contact with it as anyone else. He even guided it, to a greater extent than the New York Times would claim to have done.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is referring to probably one of the greatest authorities in the world on socialization. I certainly would have to take his word ahead of that of the New York Times. He has been mixed up in practically every crackpot scheme that has come along. That is not to say that the TVA is a crackpot scheme. I was referring to Dr. Laski, in the reference which the Senator from Michigan made.

Mr. President, let us consider the testimony before the Appropriations Committee. There was testimony in favor of this installation. There was very comprehensive and cogent testimony against it. Such testimony came from all sorts

of people—from private citizens, from civic organizations, from divisions of State governments, and from representatives of the power companies. The opposition represented a cross-section of various people and interests. Probably some of the opposition was very sound, and perhaps some of it not so sound. However, by and large, there was a feeling of opposition against the idea of the Federal Government using the funds of taxpayers from all the States of the Union to build steam plants in a particular area which would be in competition with industries in other sections.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Appropriations Committee. I understand from what he has just said that this item was thoroughly discussed in the Appropriations Committee during the hearings. What puzzles me—and I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire the reason for it—is that there is no reference to it in the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot answer that question because I did not write the report. I shall have to refer to the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee, in his very able manner, was attempting to put this project through without arousing too much antagonism.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield. I am sure the able Senator from Tennessee can explain it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there was no committee amendment on this subject. The item came from the House and was agreed to by the committee overwhelmingly, as the Senator from New Hampshire, no doubt, recalls. The same item was approved last year.

I think the two principal witnesses heard were Mr. Smith, of Washington, representing the power companies at a trifling salary of $65,000 a year, so he testified; and the other was a great constitutional lawyer from Cleveland, Ohio. When he was asked what salary he received, he stated that he did not receive a salary, but intended to charge a fee. He spoke largely about the constitutional question.

As I recall, the testimony was overwhelmingly that the Tennessee Valley Authority was seeking money to build a steam plant at New Johnsonville in order to enable it better to sell the power produced by the Government. As the operation is now carried on, it is selling the product of the Government, at a profit to the United States. The TVA is in fine condition. It already owns a number of steam plants. It bought a number of steam plants from the Alabama Power Co., and several have been built without objection heretofore on the part of either the Senate or the House.

I do not understand the remarakable objections which are now being raised to the New Johnsonville steam plant. I do not know whether there is something in the name "New Johnsonville" or not. As I understand, this is the ninth steam plant to be built. Several have been bought from the Alabama Power Co. The purchase of those plants was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is no doubt that the principal evidence offered at the hearing by the opponents was on the constitutional question, and not on the facts. Everyone seems to be agreed as to the facts.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. It seems to me that possibly the esteemed Senator from Tennessee has made a good technical case for not referring to this item in the report. Frankly, it is a matter which is known to be controversial. It is a matter with respect to which I do not see such overwhelmingly clear light on one side or the other that I could come to the floor of the Senate committed to one view or the other. It seems to me that in a case of this kind the report should have substantiated the request for the appropriation. I regret that it did not.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Is there an inadequate supply of electricity in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals for the present demands of industry?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is a debatable point. I think the proponents of the steam plant advance the argument that in order to get the full benefit of TVA's hydro development they must have the steam plant in order to create firm power.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I understand, during certain seasons of the year there is an ample flow of water to operate the power-generating facilities within that area. In fact, at certain seasons of the year water goes to waste. At such times there is not sufficient generating capacity to utilize all the supply of water power. At other seasons of the year the water supply is low. As I understand, it is desired to firm up the power by a stand-by steam plant when the water supply is low at certain seasons of the year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I can answer that question by referring to the report of the House hearings on page 27, where Mr. Clapp, the manager, uses this language:

> Now, I cannot say, as a matter of fact, that if this steam plant is not put into the TVA system these transmission lines and these distribution systems will not be any good; but they will not be able to perform the function for which they were built. That function is to keep carrying whatever increased electric current is required to provide the services which the municipalities and the cooperatives have agreed to give in their area, and which we, in turn, for the Government, have agreed to give, and arrange with them, the municipalities and cooperatives.

In other words, this steam plant is not to firm up the power, but is to be built in 2 or 3 years so as to provide for an increase in the electricity requirements on the part of the municipalities and cooperatives in that district. In short, it is for future business, rather than for firming up present business; is that not correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask the Senator whether the testimony does not show that in 1951–52 there will be an estimated shortage of 274,000 kilowatts? That is shown on page 14 of the House hearings and also at page 197 of the Senate hearings.

The testimony further is that the proposed plant, to be built and placed in operation over a period of 3 years, will deliver 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of prime electricity, available through the TVA system.

I ask the Senator further if the testimony at the hearings does not conclusively show that there is now a shortage of prime electricity in the Tennessee Valley, and a threatened greater shortage for years to come, and also that the proposed plant cannot be built overnight, but that we must look to the time in 1951 when it can be placed in operation? Does not the testimony further disclose that there will be a shortage of 274,000 kilowatts at that time?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question might be directed to the Senator from Tennessee if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit. The Senator from Tennessee says there will be a shortage of electricity in 1951–52. What type of industries are now waiting for the proposed development, or is it a question of what the junior chambers of commerce in those areas think they will be able to develop in the way of new industries, provided it can be shown that there will be sufficient electricity to warrant establishing new industries there?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator that the greatest percentage increase has been in rural electrification. Over the period of the last 5 years the amount of electricity used on the farms has been multiplied by five. The normal peacetime growth of the Tennessee Valley area is fully discussed in the hearings. As a matter of fact, there is a shortage of electricity now.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield in order that I may ask another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. THYE. My question is not only with reference to what the Senator says the present needs are of the REA, but also whether there now exist associations which are not able to obtain electrical current from the TVA because not sufficient electricity is being generated there.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am informed that the TVA is having to scan the new contracts for electricity very closely in order to be sure that it does not take on an immediate peak load which it will be unable to meet.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for one more question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. When we were at Muscle Shoals in the fall of 1947, an additional hydroelectric unit was being installed there. Can the Senator tell me how many additional units they intend to install in the future? Of course, each one of the dams has a series of hydroelectric generating units. I wonder how many more it is intended to install.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This appropriation carries $450,000 for two generators. I think one is to be installed at the Fort Loudon Dam, or perhaps both are to be installed at the Wautauga Dam in east Tennessee.

Mr. THYE. After all the hydroelectric generating units the dams can accommodate have been installed, how many months of the year does the Senator anticipate the water supply will be adequate to operate those generators?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The testimony shows that during an average year they need the proposed stand-by plant for 3 months of the year in order to bring the firm power up by 3,000,000,000 kilowatts, which would enable the TVA to take care of its contractual commitments.

Mr. THYE. In other words, there will be an ample supply of water 9 months of the year to operate all the installed hydroelectric units at full capacity; is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The answer is given, I think, more clearly than I could give it on page 197 of the hearings, in this paragraph:

> The New Johnsonville steam plant, by firming up additional portions of the power available from the hydro plants of the TVA system, will make possible an increase in firm power of about 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. To do this, it will be necessary to operate the New Johnsonville plant about one-third of the time, generally at full load, in addition to the present use of the existing TVA steam plants, to supplement the seasonal secondary hydro generation.

I may say further that the deficiency existing in 1951 is expected to be 274,000 kilowatts, unless the proposed plant is built.

The operation of this plant normally will be for the purpose of making available 350,000 kilowatts, but under the construction program one unit will not come into operation until about the latter part of 1952. So they will be just barely above their demands for firm power, but they will be able to take care of their estimated need if this plant is constructed.

Mr. THYE. In the event the funds are not made available, so that this steam plant is not provided, then hydroelectric generating equipment sufficient to utilize the maximum estimated generating capacity of the water supply could not profitably be installed, because there would be a season of the year when there would be an inadequate supply of water, although at that time of course the demand for electricity would be just as great as it would be at the time of the maximum of the water supply. So what the Senator is trying to do with the steam plant is to fit it into the hydroelectric units, so that when the water supply is ample the steam plant will stand idle; but when the water supply tapers off to a low level, the steam plant will be brought into operation, to supplement the electricity generated by means of the water supply. Is that the intention?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Exactly; the Senator has certainly expressed it very clearly.

As matters now stand, the Tennessee Valley Authority is losing 3,000,000,000 kilowatts for 3 months of the year.

Mr. THYE. The Senator says there is ample demand for the maximum load of both the water power and the steam power if and when the steam power is made available; is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is true.

Mr. THYE. In other words, there is ample demand now, without searching for and encouraging the development of new industries, to furnish a load sufficient to use the maximum of the electricity capable of development if and when the steam plant is constructed; is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The record shows that fully, I think.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator mean there is a need for the electrical current now?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; and with the normal development of the area, the need will be what I have stated, namely, in 1951 the need will exceed by 274,000 kilowatts the available supply, unless the proposed steam plant is constructed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think the question of the able Senator from Minnesota is answered from the record in language just the opposite to what the Senator from Tennessee has indicated. I again refer to page 27 of the House hearings:

> The function is to keep carrying whatever increased electric current is required to provide the service which the municipalities and the cooperatives have agreed to give in their areas, and which we, in turn, for the Government, have agreed to give, and arranged with them, the municipalities, and cooperatives.

In other words, there is in mind the idea that we do know the business is going to increase, that the municipalities and cooperatives are going to get more business in the future, but it is the purpose of the steam plant to generate enough electricity as to be able to supply this prospective increased demand in connection with business activities. There are undoubtedly other rivers and other places where dams could be built, according to the Constitution and according to statute. Instead of building dams and using water power from such dams, there are those who at this particular time want to install a power plant at a cost of $54,000,000, a plant which will be large enough to furnish firm power to a city of over a million people, and yet it is talked about as if it were only a firming-up project.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. My only reason for making inquiries about the matter is simply that in the event there is a water supply that will generate electricity for 9 months of the year, with a tremendous electrical output, because the dams must be emptied of the impounded water in order to prepare for the next flood period. While the water is being emptied, it must be run through the dam gates, in order to lower the level of impounded water, to prepare to receive the next flood water. If that water must be run off and not used in the generation of electricity, in order to decrease the amount of impounded water, water power will be wasted because of the inability, so to speak, to use all the electricity, since the load cannot be assumed. At the low-water season the water would be insufficient to generate the electricity contracted for at a time when the water was at the maximum level in the spring of the year.

That is the thought that comes to me in attempting to arrive at what is the wisest thing to do, whether to provide for a steam plant or to refuse to provide for it. If the steam plant could firm up and make the entire unit more efficient and more profitable as a Government enterprise, then we would be justified in entering into it, but in the event we are merely adding electrical output to encourage an expansion of industries because it is possible to give them an assurance of a low electrical rate, then I would say we are making possible the development of the enterprise only by an encouragement of low electrical costs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I may do so in the time of the Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that his first statement of the case is perfect; it could not be improved upon, in my judgment. As we all know, there is a period in the summer and fall of the year when the water power is very low; indeed, at times, almost nonexistent. That is the time we must have steam power, in order to provide a convenient flow of power to those who use it, including cooperatives, municipalities, people generally, and Government agencies. In that neighborhood, of course, the Atomic Energy Commission and the various other agencies are located.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do they use TVA power?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly, they use TVA power. Everyone in that whole area does. They have entered into an agreement. The agreement was attacked by the private power companies, just as the steam plant is now being attacked by the power companies. The case went to the Supreme Court, and is known as the Ashwander case. In that case the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of TVA. It upheld the purchase of the plants. The Supreme Court, speaking by Mr. Justice Hughes, one of the most distinguished Justices the Supreme

Court ever had, rendered an opinion upholding the constitutionality of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. It had a right, the Court said, to dispose of the power to the best interests of the Government, and for that reason it affirmed and confirmed the right of the TVA to sell power in that manner, which was the ordinary thing in business, and which would bring the greatest return to the United States Government. Under that ruling of the Court, the enterprise has been a great success.

I want to say again to the Senator from Minnesota that I do not believe his first statement about it could be improved upon by anyone. I know I could not state it as well as he has. It is a perfect statement of the case, that in order to utilize all the hydroelectric powers, we are obliged to have steam plants, in order to provide an even flow of electricity to those who buy power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator from Tennessee says is absolutely correct. The first statement by the Senator from Minnesota is 100 percent right. The purpose of building the steam plant is to avoid the waste of water, so that the Government properties may be operated with the least possible waste and on the soundest and most economical and businesslike basis.

The Government seeks to build the steam plant just as the private power companies in the Southeast have built and are today building steam plants. The precipitation of rain varies in such degree that there is an uneven flow of the rivers. Without an even flow of the rivers, the only way by which a great wastage of water and water power can be avoided is by the utilization of steam. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota, the Alabama Power Co. has just finished building a large steam plant in Mobile, Ala., in order to firm up the power on the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers. The company is now building at Gadsden, Ala., another steam plant for the same purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yesterday, the able Senator from Tennessee spoke about the Ashwander case, and again today he has referred to that case. It is not often that I disagree with the legal reasoning or opinion of the able Senator from Tennessee, but in this particular case I must disagree with him because the record in the case, the opinion of the court, and the record itself, are quite the opposite of what the able Senator from Tennessee has stated.

I am sure that is so because he has neglected to read the record of the particular case. I want to read from the record in the case what John Lord O'Brian said, what Justice Reed—who was then the Solicitor General—said, and what Justice Hughes said, as to what was involved in the case.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, John Lord O'Brian was not a member of the Court and did not render an opinion. Mr. Reed was a member of the Court, but, as I recall, he filed a dissenting opinion——

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Reed was at that time not a member of the Court; he was the Solicitor General. It was Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, one of the most distinguished jurists who ever sat on the bench of that Court, who represented the majority and delivered the opinion. If my memory is bad regarding the matter, I can read from the book.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not dispute the Senator's memory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; the Senator did dispute it. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. BRIDGES. I have yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I read as follows:

> The transmission lines which the Authority undertakes to purchase from the power company lead from the Wilson Dam to a large area within about 50 miles of the dam. These lines provide the means of distributing the electric energy, generated at the dam, to a large population. They furnish a method of reaching a market. The alternative method is to sell the surplus energy at the dam, and the market there appears to be limited to one purchaser, the Alabama Power Co. and its affiliated interests. We know of no constitutional ground upon which the Federal Government can be denied the right to seek a wider market.

Mr. President, I am reading from the opinion of the Court, and that is what counts when it comes to determining what the Court said. I am not reading what may have been said in the case by Mr. O'Brian, who was a lawyer for the Government in the case, or by the other lawyers. I am reading from the opinion of the Court itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I also want to read from the opinion of the Court. I have the same kind of a book here. We shall not disagree on what the Court said. But, Mr. President, the way to tell what is involved in a case is to read further to see what the attorneys are contending for in the case. John Lord O'Brian represented TVA. Mr. Reed, then Solicitor General and now a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was one of the counsel for the Government. Here is a colloquy between Justice McReynolds and John Lord O'Brian. The reason I refer to it is because Justice Hughes, in deciding the case——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did not Mr. Justice McReynolds dissent? Is it not true that he did not agree with the Court, but wrote a dissenting opinion in the case? What he and Mr. O'Brian may have expressed as being their views is of no consequence in connection with this question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to give to the Senate what the counsel for the TVA stated when he was appearing in the case. Anyone who is familiar with proceedings in a court knows that counsel lay down what they expect the Court to decide, and their admissions are considered against interest. It is true that Mr. Justice McReynolds was a dissenter in the case, but Justice Hughes in the majority opinion recognized what was said by John Lord O'Brian and what was said by Solicitor General Reed at that time.

Mr. Justice McReynolds asked this question:

> Is there a steam plant in connection with this project?
>
> Mr. O'BRIAN. Yes, your honor. That was mentioned earlier. There is a large steam plant which was built at Muscle Shoals before the dam was built.
>
> Mr. Justice McREYNOLDS. For what purpose?
>
> Mr. O'BRIAN. For the purpose of equipping the war munitions plant immediately, as quickly as possible, with power.

Digressing for a moment, there is no contention on the floor of the Senate that the United States Government cannot build a steam plant for the purpose of national defense, to manufacture munitions with which to win a war. That is not disputed. That is the reason why the steam plant was built at Muscle Shoals, as indicated in the record.

I now go back to the record:

> Mr. Justice McREYNOLDS. Is that used to generate electricity?
>
> Mr. O'BRIAN. No, sir; it has never been used. It stands idle. Much is made in my opponents' briefs of the danger of the Government's selling power from the steam plant. That steam plant is not in this case. It has never been used. It has been maintained. It has been leased to the Alabama Power Co., which has used it as a stand-by facility with which to meet break-downs in its service. There is nothing in this record to show that the Authority ever intends to use it for the purpose of generating power for sale, and I disavow any such intention at this time.

Those are the words of the counsel who is arguing the case before the Supreme Court.

I again go back to the record:

> Mr. Justice BUTLER. I know; but you assert the power, do you not?

He is questioning Mr. O'Brian.

> Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not.
>
> Mr. Justice BUTLER. Do you say that, to aid in disposing of the electricity incidentally produced from this navigation dam, the Congress has no power under the Constitution to build stand-by plants to supply their customers, to keep the current going?

Listen to what Mr. O'Brian said:

> Mr. O'BRIAN. If you mean breakdown facilities, yes, it could. It would have to. Any regulated system would have that.
>
> Mr. Justice BUTLER. And then to meet great demands upon the peak?

Listen to this answer on the part of Mr. O'Brian:

> Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not think that can be done in this case.

Mr. Reed, who was then Solicitor General, said this:

> From the bench and at the bar this controversy has come down to a question of this kind, if we assume that this act was primarily for navigation, then it would be valid. If we

determine that this act, while stating that it is for the navigation, national defense, and flood control, is actually for the purpose of developing power and selling it commercially, the act would be invalid.

Those are the words of the Solicitor General of the United States in that case.

I shall now read from the opinion of the Court. The first line I shall read is very significant:

We limit our decision to the case before us, as we have defined it. The argument is earnestly presented that the Government, by virtue of its ownership of the dam and power plant, could not establish a steel mill and make and sell steel products, or a factory to manufacture clothing or shoes for the public, and thus attempt to make its ownership of energy, generated at its dam, a means of carrying on competitive commercial enterprises, and thus drawing to the Federal Government the conduct and management of business having no relation to the purposes for which the Federal Government was established. The picture is eloquently drawn, but we deem it to be irrelevant to the issue here. The Government is not using the water power at the Wilson Dam to establish any industry or business.

It is not using the energy generated at the dam to manufacture commodities of any sort for the public. The Government is disposing of the energy itself which simply is the mechanical energy, incidental to falling water at the dam, converted into the electric energy which is susceptible of transmission. the question here is simply as to the acquisition of the transmission lines as a facility for the disposal of that energy. And the Government rightly conceded at the bar, in substance, that it was without constitutional authority to acquire or dispose of such energy except as it comes into being in the operation of works constructed in the exercise of some power delegated to the United States. As we have said, these transmission lines lead directly from the dam, which has been lawfully constructed, and the question of the constitutional right of the Government to acquire or operate local or urban distribution systems is not involved. We express no opinion as to the validity of such an effort, as to the status of any other dam or power development in the Tennessee Valley, whether connected with or apart from the Wilson Dam, or as to the validity of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act or of the claims made in the pronouncements and program of the Authority apart from the questions we have discussed in relation to the particular provisions of the contract of January 4, 1934, affecting the Alabama Power Company.

The decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals is affirmed.

In other words, the Court did not pass on the constitutionality of the act. That is clear from the language of Chief Justice Hughes, which I repeat:

And the Government rightly conceded at the bar, in substance, that it was without constitutional authority to acquire or dispose of such energy except as it comes into being in the operation of works constructed in the exercise of some power delegated to the United States.

That is, energy created by flood-control or navigation works comes clearly under the commerce clause, and the Government would have the power to use that energy or power.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have the floor, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota in order that he may ask a question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. THYE. I thank the senior Senator from New Hampshire. I should like to address a question to the junior Senator from Michigan. The whole purpose of the TVA project was, first, flood control, was it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Flood control and navigation.

Mr. THYE. Flood control.

Mr. FERGUSON. And navigation.

Mr. THYE. Navigation is secondary. Flood control was the primary purpose. The purpose was to check the devastating floods which affected other areas in the United States. If the river were left to go its own course it would devastate other areas. So flood control was the project first established. Once the water had been impounded, there immediately was potential power, which could become effective the minute the water dropped over the dam.

Then in order to harness the water power, hydroelectric units were established. The water power was harnessed. In the course of a season there are high-water levels and there are low-water levels in the ponds in which the water is impounded, so in order to have a reservoir in which to impound water in seasons of flood or high-water levels it is necessary to draw down the water. When all that has been accomplished there has been developed a potential generating unit which is capable of generating so many hundred thousand or so many million kilowatts in a given season of the year.

With all this potential impounding capacity and potential generating capacity, when in the low-water season of the year, the impounded water has shrunk and there is not sufficient water, yet the TVA does not dare to impound water any longer because the ponds would then be unable to receive the water in the flood season of the year. So for about 3 months of the year the generating capacity of all this installation is low. Industries cannot be hooked up to consume more electrical current than is generated at the minimum of its generating capacity. Industries cannot be hooked up to the maximum generating capacity because then there would not be ample electricity during the low-generating season or generating period.

The steam plant is being discussed, as I see it, to take care of that one period in the year when there is not sufficient electrical power being generated at the dams or by reason of the so-called impounding of water. If I am wrong in my understanding of the project, I want to have it cleared up, because I do not want to vote for something that is unnecessary; but I do want to vote favorably upon projects that are necessary. If the firming by steam makes the whole Federal project more profitable, more efficient, and will furnish for 12 months of the year a steady flow of current upon which industries can depend, and upon which war plants can depend, if we should ever again be compelled to reestablish war plants of great magnitude, I would not hesitate at all to vote for the measure. But that is what I must have made clear in my mind.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall try to clear up that point for the record. First, I will say that neither the able Senator from Minnesota nor anyone else is able to change the Constitution. This may become a question of the Government trying to make a profit. The Government might upon the same theory the Senator has referred to says, "Now that we have electric power there is no reason why we should not manufacture automobiles. There is no reason why we should not manufacture locomotives. If we use our own energy in the manufacture of automobiles, or in the manufacture of locomotives, we will be able to sell such automobiles or locomotives at a better price than if we could only sell the energy produced at a dam."

If that could be done, then America could be socialized. If that could be done, the Government of the United States could go into every business, from the operation of a grocery store to the manufacturing of locomotives, without changing the Constitution of the United States of America one iota. Then all that would be necessary would be somewhere in America to harness the power at a dam, and then it could be said, "Because we have that little bit of power we must firm it up, we must use it to the best advantage so we can make a profit." Under that theory it would not be necessary to alter or amend the Constitution of the United States in order to enable the Government to change the whole economic and the whole political system. I shall now try to answer the question about firming up.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota to ask a question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. THYE. We, that is the Government, must not lose sight of the fact, however, that the Government impounded the water for the purposes of stopping the ravages and devastations resulting from floods. That was the first purpose of TVA installation of dams. Then, of course, from there on the Government harnessed the potential power of the water in the Tennessee Valley. The Government did all that. The Government stepped into that particular activity for the purpose of conservation, by way of stopping floods. So the Government was not making an attempt to establish business, or to go into business. The Government went into the situation for the purpose of adopting a safety measure to prevent floods, and, of course, the impounding of water is necessary to stop floods. That makes possible the generation of power from the drop or fall of the water over the dam.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are talking about constitutional power, constitutional authority. There is no doubt that under the commerce clause the United States Government can erect dams for flood control and navigation, and when it erects a dam, the mechanical power from the falling of the water can be generated into electrical power, and the

United States Government can, under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution, sell the power so generated. There can be no doubt about that.

But that is not what is being done now. It is said, "Since we create this power from the dam, we can then go a step further." Remember, from 1933 down to date they have been generating power in the particular area by the falling of the water. There is no shortage at the present time. There is no evidence showing that they are unable to keep their plants going. No one seems to think that any of the industries in the Tennessee Valley should erect their own power plants and use coal. No one seems to think anything about that.

I say, Mr. President, that this is the first step, and that is what we are talking about. Why do I say this is the first step? Along the line, not here in the Senate, but in the administrative offices, there will be those who will say, "You in Congress took this step back in 1949, and now we can take the next step toward socialization."

Mr. President, in the interior Department budget for reclamation for this year, in the Central Valley project, those in charge are asking that they may take this same step under reclamation, to build a $36,000,000 steam plant at Antioch, Calif.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wished to ask the able Senator from Michigan if he thought the situation he just described might fall in the same category as a situation in Washington. As the Senator knows, we have the Grand Coulee project in the State of Washington.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In part that project is for the development of power, which is sold from the lines of the Bonneville project; but it is also to aid in reclamation. The Government is installing huge water pumps, which are operated by the excess electricity in a great project known as the Columbia Basin project. But Columbia Basin is operated by subdivisions of Government known as irrigation districts.

Suppose we should ask for a stand-by steam plant to operate those pumps, at a time when the water might not be available, or the electricity might not be available, not to sell the electricity, but to pump the water which would be controlled by the irrigation district for the benefit of the people of the area. Would the Senator consider that to be prohibited under his interpretation of the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. If it comprehended the use of the power by the Federal Government under one of its constitutional powers, as reclamation is, because most of that land was Government land, and they used the power to pump water on it so that the land could be settled, that would be constitutional, and I think proper.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the Senator thinks the situation is a little different from the one in California, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I am talking about the first step in socialization which I see today, and which later can be extended to cover an attempt to socialize the industries in America, because it will be contended that the Government can function more efficiently than can private industry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before we get too far away from the quotation the able Senator from Michigan gave from John Lord O'Brian, a member of the legal staff, and leading counsel in the case in the Supreme Court, I should like to quote something from the legal staff of the private-utilities side. Listen to this from Mr. Raymond P. Jackson—I think that is his name—of Cleveland, Ohio, whose name was signed to the petition, or complaint, of the private utilities.

Mr. McKELLAR. And he was a witness.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He was a witness in this case this year, as he was last year, and as he will be next year, and on and on. He is attorney for the private utilities, and comes to the committee each time in the company of Mr. Purcell L. Smith.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; let me continue. I wish to quote this witness.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the floor. I have yielded to the junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Will my colleague yield to me to identify Mr. Jackson a little further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is all right if I do not lose my place.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Jackson was the attorney in the case of Tennessee Electric Co. against TVA, in the Ashwander case, in the case of the Alabama Power Co. against Ickes, and on the question testing the constitutionality of the Norris Dam, which went to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. He has been the attorney for the power companies in all the cases, and he has lost them all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on this point will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like further to identify Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson was a partner of Newton D. Baker, Democratic Secretary of War under President Woodrow Wilson, and he is considered one of the outstanding legal and constitutional authorities in the United States of America. I assume that for the brief he has filed in the Senate he will receive a large fee. But I wish also to say that Mr. Clapp, appeared as an expert on Government time and testified. So we had special pleaders from both sides before the Committee on Appropriations. I assume that the Government witnesses were paid tax money, and I am assuming that the other men were paid larger fees from private interests who do want to see America take the first big step in socialization.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now that Mr. Jackson has been thoroughly identified, I should like to say that, according to his own statement, he was appearing in behalf of the electric power companies of the United States. Since the matter of pay has been brought into the debate, I believe Mr. Clapp receives $10,000 a year of taxpayers' money, and Mr. Purcell L. Smith receives $65,000, plus expenses, paid out of the pockets of the electric power consumers in the United States. Of course, Mr. Jackson would probably receive a similar fee. I do not know what his pay is. I wish to accept a part of what the Senator from Michigan has said, namely, that Mr. Jackson is an outstanding constitutional authority, and I wish to quote him for that reason. Listen to this:

> Under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, the number and capacity of steam—

Remember the word "steam"—

> Under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, the number and capacity of steam and hydroelectric plants for the generation of electricity which the defendants may construct and operate in the Tennesee Basin are wholly undefined. Said act, as amended, purposes to vest complete and uncontrolled discretion in the defendants in relation to such matters.

Mr. FERGUSON. On what page is that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is from last year's hearings, page 222.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to proceed with my remarks, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] raised some questions relative to the necessity of the steam plant, and whether it had to do with firming up power. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] looked into this matter, and on page 215 of the hearings, where the Senator from South Dakota was addressing Mr. Clapp, we find this:

> Senator GURNEY. Then, on your steam plants, there is a record of what portion of the percentage of the time they have operated, and we can have those listed also.
>
> Mr. CLAPP. We can best do that, if I may say so, on the basis of their past history.
>
> Senator GURNEY. That is right.

There follows a record of the existing steam plants and the percentage of time they have been used in the past 3 years. Hales Bar was used 42 percent of the time; Nashville, 7 percent of the time; Parksville, 4 percent of the time; Watts Bar 62 percent of the time; Wilson, 30 percent of the time; and the smaller plants, 20 percent of the time.

As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota can see, the existing steam plants in each and every case have been used only a small percentage of the time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the normal operation of a steam plant which is used for stand-by services, would it not be used for perhaps not more than 20 or 30 percent of the time? As I understand, in nontechnical language, the idea of the stand-by steam plant is to

firm up the power, so that there will be no hills and valleys caused by water shortages and other factors. So it would not be expected that a steam plant would be used to 100 percent of capacity, as I understand the situation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator from New Hampshire have information as to what amount of water must actually be let over the dams or through the gates in order to draw down the impounded water so as to form a reservoir to meet flood conditions? The amount of water deliberately let through the gates in order to get rid of it could well be harnessed and made to generate power if there were an outlet or consumer for the electric power which might be generated.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not that information at hand, but I refer to page 214 of the hearings, referring to the hydro plants. On that page there is a table showing the names of the hydro plants. The first column of figures shows the installed capacity December 1948; the second column of figures the expected average generation capacity; and the third column of figures the stream flow nonusable with present capacity. That is probably what the Senator is getting at.

Mr. THYE. I presume that would be the answer. I did not attend the hearings, and therefore I have not the information which is available to members of the committee who had the benefit of the testimony.

Mr. BRIDGES. The table shows that the figures vary from 5 percent, which I think is the lowest figure for stream flow nonusable with present capacity, up to 45 percent, with the average probably in the twenties.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Twenty-five percent.

Mr. BRIDGES. Twenty-five percent.

Mr. THYE. That is the reason why I asked the question, recognizing the fact that on the average, at all the installed dams, that amount of water is actually permitted to go by without serving any purpose. If the dams were operating at full capacity, naturally there would be periods in the year when there would not be an adequate flow of water to generate sufficient electricity to carry the safe maximum load which the installation could supply. That is the question which arises in my mind in connection with a steam plant. Is it wise to install it to firm up the entire unit of flood control, for which it was originally constructed?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to consider two or three other angles inasmuch as certain Senators have emphasized by the opposition from the private utilities. Opposition came also from many others. I should like to quote a few words from Hon. Charles R. Erdman, Commissioner, Department of Conservation and Economic Development of the State of New Jersey, one of whose representatives, Mr. HENDRICKSON, is now in the Chamber. Mr. Erdman said:

> New Jersey enterprise today is striving energetically to maintain conditions which in wartime gave the State fifth place in the Union as a producer of war matériel, and in peacetime has been responsible for the continued existence of approximately 36,000 companies employing more than 1,700,000 workers.
>
> With other segments of New Jersey life sharing the load this vast machinery of enterprise has made it possible for our State's taxpayers to contribute to the Federal Government more than $1,270,000,000 in Federal taxes annually. This represents at least $3 paid in Federal taxes for every $1 New Jersey affords for local and State tax purposes.
>
> Representing taxpayers, the objection is made to the use of tax funds to provide one particular section of the country with an unfair economic advantage which is entirely aside from navigation and flood control.
>
> Appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority for the purpose of increasing its power-generating capacity must be paid out of public revenue, contributed by the people of all 48 States, in return for which the money will be used to provide, through subsidized power rates, a new inducement to industries to move into the TVA area. This imposes a burden on New Jersey and other States in the free and orderly development of our respective areas.

That is typical of the views of representatives of the States. Let us take a statement from Kansas. The following is from the statement of Mr. C. C. Kilker, secretary-manager, Kansas State Chamber of Commerce:

> Mr. KILKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is C. C. Kilker, and I represent the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, of which I am secretary-manager. The Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, which has its headquarters in Topeka, Kans., is a voluntary organization composed of approximately 2,000 business and professional men of Kansas.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is the understanding of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce that this steam power plant would be another Federal enterprise which would be practically free of taxes but which would engage in direct competition with privately owned and privately operated business. These privately owned and operated companies pay out in taxes approximately 20 cents of every dollar they take in. On the other hand, a TVA steam power plant would pay no Federal taxes and practically no State or local taxes. This situation is made even more ironic by the fact that it would be built entirely from funds supplied by American taxpayers, including those privately owned companies with which it would compete.

Through the hearings we find opposition from the utilities, but also from many other people, representing their respective States; from industrial concerns, from chambers of commerce, and from members of State governments. In order that the RECORD may be entirely straight, let me quote a statement from another group. We hear a great deal said about labor. We find the CIO joining in opposition to the New Johnsonville steam plant. I read a letter from the CIO Utility Workers Union of America, Local No. 175, Dayton, Ohio:

> DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We have read with concern the contemplated action being taken by the Congress of the United States, concerning an appropriation to start a steam electric generating plant at New Johnsonville, and we, as a union, feel this is going a little too far toward socialism.
>
> We are very much against this type of action, and the enclosed copy of a news release given out by our international officer, William J. Pachler, gives our feelings in the matter and puts us on record as being against the project.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> LOCAL 175, U. W. U. OF A.,
> EDMOND WARD, *President.*

The article which he encloses reads, in part, as follows:

> CIO UNIT WANTS PROGRESSIVE CAPITALISM
>
> UTILITY UNION AGAINST FEDERAL OPERATION
>
> (By Alan Pritchard, Daily News staff writer)
>
> A CIO union that sees Government ownership as a dangerous threat to basic American principles is the Utility Workers Union of America.
>
> Their international secretary-treasurer, William J. Pachler, said here Saturday that the utility workers are strongly opposed to Government competition in business—especially in the light and power business.

I shall pick out a few other statements made by the writer of the article:

> "When we say we're against Government competition in the power business, we aren't beating the bushes for the power companies," Pachler emphasized. "There are many things wrong with the way some private power companies treat their employees. We're out to correct those things.
>
> "We are beating the bush for a type of living in which private ownership is fundamentally correct. We're not against progressive social measures under our present capitalistic set-up, but we are against socialism where the Government competes with private enterprise."
>
> "The building of power dams and reclamation of unusable land by Government authority projects is also not opposed by the union," Pachler said. It is only in the distribution of electrical power that an issue arises.
>
> Pachler believes that the Government should turn over power distribution to private companies. "Government regulation of the companies might be necessary," he said, "but not absolute Government control."
>
> The attitude of the union is not altogether unselfish, Pachler admits.
>
> "From a bargaining point we would be much better off dealing with private industry than with a Government agency," he said—

And so on. My reason for reading that, Mr. President, is to show that the opposition to the steam plant has come from various groups of our country's population and from various sections of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is opposed to financing socialism in the United States. I might ask whether it would be any worse to finance socialism in the United States, rather than in England?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, I am opposed to financing socialism anywhere; but if it must be financed, I would rather have it financed in England than here.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. First let me say that I have listened very carefully to the debate so far, and I wish to ask a couple of questions in regard to the use of steam power in firming up what I suppose is considered secondary power. I have had my assistants and the engineer of the Committee on Public Works

searching for several hours for information from which to determine what amount of firm power is furnished by each one of the dams mentioned, for instance, on page 842, in part 1 of the hearings before the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, 1948. The same list, or approximately the same list, appears in the hearings held by the Appropriations Committee on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949, at page 214. There is a difference of two dams, as between the two lists; one list sets forth 23 dams, and the other 25. Nevertheless, I see no place in any of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee where there is a determination of how much firm power each one of the dams furnishes, considering the available storage utilized in connection with such dam, and how much of the power is secondary power, and the percentage of the time that the secondary power is available in each case.

To make the point a little clearer, let me say that secondary power is, of course, power that is not available 100 percent of the time. Firm power is available 100 percent of the time. Storage back of the dams of course enters into the picture, for a large storage sometimes firms power which ordinarily would be secondary power. Of course, all those factors are taken into consideration in determining the amount of firm power and the amount of secondary power.

I find nothing that determines this matter for us, except we do find that there is available hydro power, from the 25 hydroelectric dams, as follows, as nearly as we can make the determination: 10,100,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power, and 2,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary power.

There is no information as to the percentage of the time the secondary power is available—that is to say, whether a part of it might be available perhaps 1 month or 9 months out of the year.

For instance, in a report entitled "Engineers Data, Tennessee Valley Project," turning at random to the figures for one of the dams, the Hales Bar Dam, which is one in the list of 23, and also included in the list of 25, I notice that in 1944, the last year for which we have complete water records, in January there was a discharge of 45,000 cubic feet per second—in other words, a flow of water in that amount in January. Apparently the maximum flow was reached in February and March; on March 4 it was 145,000 second-feet. It reached the lowest point in July, August, and September. The lowest I note offhand is 6,888 second-feet, which is only about one twenty-fourth of the maximum flow. So there is a great variation in flow.

No doubt the secondary power comes about during the summer and fall, in the low-water period. But I find nothing in the report, on the basis of a quick inspection of it, to tell us the percentage of time that such secondary power is available.

I am trying to determine the data upon which the Appropriations Committee determined the feasibility of the steam plant. Engineers know that if secondary power is of too little value—for instance, if it is available only 5 or 10 percent of the time—then rarely is it advisable to build steam plants to firm the power. On the other hand, if the secondary power is available 60 or 70 or 90 percent of the time, then there is a question of economics as to what amount of such power it is worth while to attempt to firm. Many factors are to be considered and in each case certain factors would be given different weights. These factors include fuel costs, availability of power elsewhere for the purpose, the sale price and usability of such firm power in comparison to the existing secondary or intermittent power.

All the information which we can get from a quick examination—and I have hoped that someone here would have the necessary information—shows that there are 2,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary power. The steam-plant power available from facilities already constructed amounts to 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours—on an annual basis; and the projected power plant would furnish 3,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours, making a total of 4,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam power to firm apparently 2,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary power. Those figures may not be correct, but that is the best information we can obtain from the reports.

That would show that, on an average, the secondary or hydropower is available approximately 30 percent of the time, and the proposed steam-power plant would be built to furnish power about 70 percent of the time, thereby making it firm power.

The question then that I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, leaving that phase of the matter for a moment, what is the amount of such firm and secondary power at each of the 23 or 25 dams and what percentage of the time is the secondary power available in each case? We made an investigation last year, I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Electric Power, Flood Control, and Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee, holding hearings on a bill that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had introduced to amend the TVA Act. Through those hearings we were determining how the TVA project compared with other projects authorized by the United States Government, as a general policy. We determined that the income from the power projects could be expended by the TVA Board in any way it saw fit without further authority, so long as it reported such expenditures to the Congress. We determined that there were no set payments except over a 10-year period. The House of Representatives had, very lately, established a certain payment which had to be made over a 10-year period. The method used in determining the amount was rather a shotgun method; there was no particular system to it, because until then no payments had been required.

The Power Commission made a report upon the invitation of our subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, examining the allocation of the entire cost of the TVA development of $750,000,000 to $800,000,000 relative to flood control, navigation, and power. Navigation was judged to be approximately 30 percent of the total expenditure; flood control, 30 percent; and power, 40 percent.

No data are available apparently, upon which we can base feasibility of the proposed power plant.

That would show the use of the 40 percent or $438,000,000 for power purposes. The other 30 percent, of course, for navigation and 30 percent for flood control were written off in accordance with the long-established congressional policy. There were no interest payments on the 40 percent allocated to power. For example, on the Hoover (Boulder) Dam project we pay 3 percent interest and amortize the cost over a period of 50 years. They meet those payments on the barrelhead, and pay the 3 percent interest. No steam power plant has been constructed or requested. I do not say it never will be requested. But thus far no steam power plant has been needed. There is a large amount of secondary power, but it is all sold to municipalities and private companies in the Southwest, and they have their stand-by steam-power facilities and are still constructing necessary steam power plants to make up and to firm up such power.

This suggests two questions: First, if the Senator from New Hampshire can furnish the information on the secondary power as to what percentage of the time it is available from each of these 25 dams, so we would have some idea of whether it was a proper balance and whether as such it is a feasible operation; second, is there any other source of such steam power which could be used for firming of the secondary power? Are there any cooperative organizations or companies within the area that would be willing to furnish or that could furnish such steam power?

I understand that all such companies are all connected now and all coordinated and working. I have not determined how I am going to vote on the Senator's amendment, because I am in favor of Government projects, as I was in favor of Hoover (Boulder) Dam, Shasta Dam, and San Joaquin Dam, Calif., Bonneville Dam, Oreg., and so forth, whenever through such construction which private companies cannot do a wide area and field of private investments is thereby made available. In such cases I have always favored Government assistance, and I intend to favor this project if it is justified by the facts. I am not opposed to the steam plant as such; it must, however be justified by the facts. Those are the two questions which I wanted to ask the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, but let me say——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder whether the Senator does not think that the statement in the table on page 214 of the hearings, taken in conjunction with the statement by Mr. Clapp, at page 197 of the hearings, would fairly well answer the question. As I get the picture on page 214, the "percentages of expected average generation capacity" mean substantially the firm power that is gen-

erated at those plants, and that the "percentages" given in the last column of "stream flow nonusable with present capacity" is the water that is going to waste, because they cannot firm it up. Then, on page 197, Mr. Clapp says that in order to make prime power to the extent of 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year this New Johnsonville steam plant would have to be operated one-third of the time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. We have carefully examined the table on page 214 which simply shows for each dam the amount of stream flow, nonusable with present capacity. It does not say what time, whether it is August, September, October, or November, or whether it is 2 months, 3 months, or 5 months, that the stream flow amounts to 10 percent. So it is impossible to determine how many kilowatt-hours of secondary power there would be. We may take, for example, the power at Chickamauga Dam, the fourth one on the list, was 81,000 installed kilowatt capacity. Expected average generation capacity is 95 percent, while the nonusable stream flow is 25 percent. It does not say what the unused capacity requires to go through the plant. It does not say how many kilowatt-hours of secondary power it will generate, or what period of time the kilowatt-hours are available. That is to say, whether it is 10 percent of the time, 30 percent of the time, or 50 percent of the time that it will be necessary to use the steam power in order to firm power. The table gives very little information. The information that I requested of Mr. Clapp is here and he did not give me the information needed for the purpose.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Nevada so far as I am concerned the Senator is a very distinguished engineer in his own right. He probes into these matters from a technical viewpoint, and I think they should be so treated. Generally, I have not the specific information at my command on the floor to give the answer. I can furnish it, but it will take me some time to go to the staff of the committee and turn to the TVA records in order to obtain it. I do not have it available.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. We have already gone to the record, everything we could find in the Public Works Committee hearings. I suppose we have gone back 3 or 4 years. We contacted several other sources, but it is impossible for me to get it at this time and I thought perhaps someone who had been dealing with the matter might have the information on the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sorry, but I do not have it. We can procure it latter, but I do not have it at the moment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the last question asked by the able Senator from Nevada I think can be answered by referring to certain statements in the record. I should like to give the information as to the first question, relative to the authority to firm up and whether it was the first intention of the Tennessee Valley Authority that they would take all the mechanical power and convert it into electrical power, and then firm it up, as the Senator has indicated. I think that question was answered by Mr. David E. Lilienthal in 1938, when he was testifying in a hearing before the Joint Committee To Investigate the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. Here is what he stated at that time:

> Yet it is a part of our job to dispose of all of this power not 20 or 30 years from now, but as soon as possible and, so far as possible, every year during the life of the plants. That means that some method must be found of disposing of power for relatively short periods pending the growth of load by our municipalities and cooperative customers.
>
> The only solution is the sale to industrial and utility customers that we have been able to find.

In other words, there was a mandate upon the part of Congress, saying they should furnish municipalities and cooperatives first. Mr. Lilienthal was trying to find out how they could take this power, not thinking about steam plants to firm it up, but how they could use firm power and the surplus power which would be sold. He said this:

> That means that some method must be found of disposing of the power for relatively short periods, pending the growth of loads by our municipal and cooperative customers.

What happened in 1948? The cooperative customers are demanding more power in the future, and instead of using the streams which they have a constitutional and legal right to use, they will not build dams at the present time, but will use steam, and then next year, and the year after that, they will be putting in more hydroelectric dams. They will then want to firm the power derived from them. In other words, there is no end. They have decided they will have a line reaching from the Tennessee Valley up through the Mississippi Valley, into Chicago, through Detroit, and into New England, so that the Power Authority can say it is interstate commerce, and they will have the right to firm up power in Chicago, Detroit, and all along this line.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not understand the authority for the Senator's statement. Was he quoting from someone?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I was not quoting.

Mr. HILL. Then, is it merely the Senator's theory of the matter?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. There is absolutely nothing in the record of any spokesman, proponent, or advocate of TVA which would justify the Senator's statement. Of course he has a right to his own opinion, but there is nothing in the record that would justify his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall read from Mr. Lilienthal's statement:

> We have been successful in so staggering our contracts that I believe we have in large part solved the problem of reserving power for the growth of our municipal and cooperative customers without presently wasting the power so reserved. I hope that is clear.

In other words, in 1938 they had solved the problem. Then he proceeds:

> The committee will see that our industrial contracts fit into a pattern. At the end of 5 years the Arkansas Power & Light Co. contract may be terminated. At the end of 10 years another very large block of power that is now sold the Aluminum Co. may be recaptured for sale to public agencies. In another 8 years another large industrial contract will expire. That is the Monsanto Chemical Co.
>
> * * * * *
>
> And I think, and I think most people feel it was remarkably good fortune that they succeeded so well in handling this very difficult situation of getting revenues as we go along and yet having blocks of power that we can cut off in the years to come to take care of the priority customers' increased needs in the future.

In the testimony given before the same committee, on behalf of the TVA, in December 1938, Mr. J. A. Krug, who is now the Secretary of the Interior, but who at that time was with the TVA, said:

> On the contrary, the power capacity to be provided by the Authority in connection with its navigation and flood-control program is proving to be an essential addition to existing generating facilities. It is now apparent that it will be necessary for the private companies or public agencies in the area to install over 885,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity during the next 8 years, as the 1,400,000 kilowatts of capacity which will become available under the Authority's present program will be far from sufficient to meet established additional power requirements.

He had in mind that all they were authorized to do and what they wanted to do was to furnish power coming from the dams, and the private industries would have to firm up their own power. That was then the plan but now they have conceived a different idea.

I read further from Mr. Krug's testimony:

> Since 1933 the situation has improved rapidly. We now expect by 1941 that practically all of the surplus capacity will disappear, and that in each year thereafter shortages will result if the only capacity installed is that already existing and that being added by the Authority.
>
> I don't mean to give any impression or arouse any fears that there will be a shortage, because the public agencies and the private power companies are in a position and have plenty of time to install the facilities that are necessary, but if none was installed by the private power companies or local public agencies, and we simply add the capacity now proposed in the TVA 10-dam system, by 1942 there will be a shortage of 182,000 kilowatts, and by 1946, which is the approximate date for the completion of the Gilbertsville Dam, the shortage will be 885,000 kilowatts.

In other words, the private-utility companies and municipalities did not build any of their own dams, and now TVA wants to furnish all the power.

Mr. President, there is another item which has been mentioned. It has been contended that the United States Government has waived the Constitution. In other words, Congress has been legislating on the assumption that these activities are always constitutional, and that the TVA had full authority. I am

glad the Senator mentioned the fact that the Public Lands Committee had been considering——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It was the Public Works Committee. We were trying to determine how the TVA differed in its operations from the regularly established policy of the United States Congress in connection with requiring no definite time for repayment, and no interest payment, together with the fact that the Authority could expand the income from power projects without authority from Congress, merely reporting to the Congress what had been done with the money.

We have not determined recommendations in connection with the subject. That was in November 1948. We secured necessary information, and the Senator from Nevada means to add it up on the floor sometime and make it a matter of record. But the question is asked now to determine the feasibility of a steam plant firming up power from all these 25 dams, and how much firm power is available in each one, how much is secondary power, and what percentage of the time could it be determined how much of the secondary power would be justified in firming up the power.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand what the Senator has asked, but I cannot give him the answers from the record.

Mr. MALONE. I do not see the information in any of the hearings. I am not opposed to steam plants as such. I have not determined how I shall vote on the pending amendment, because I am trying to determine whether the plant is justified or not. If it is justified, and there is no other way to secure the necessary power, the Senator from Nevada intends to vote for the provision of the bill. But I should like to have a little further explanation.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been stated that the Government has built other plants, and therefore they should build this one. But to prove—and I think this is good evidence—that the law at the present time does not authorize the building of this plant, I call attention to the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 1 was introduced in the Senate on January 5, 1949, by the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], on January 5, 1949, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 177 to grant direct authority for the construction of the proposed dam. So that I think it is fair to say that up until the present time there is no direct authority for the erection of the dam.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to section 9 (a) of the TVA Act:

> The Board is hereby directed in the operation of any dam or reservoir in its possession and control to regulate the stream flow primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods. So far as may be consistent with such purposes, the Board is authorized to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy at any such dam for the use of the corporation and for the use of the United States or any agency thereof.

This is the language to which I wish to call the Senator's attention:

> And the Board is further authorized, whenever an opportunity is afforded, to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy in order to avoid the waste of water power, to transmit and market such power as in this act provided, and thereby, so far as may be practicable, to assist in liquidating the cost or aid in the maintenance of the projects of the Authority.

Mr. FERGUSON. That does not change the opinion of the Senator from Michigan at all.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Of course, if the Senator is in that frame of mind, I cannot agree with him at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. Why did he introduce Senate Joint Resolution 1? If the Authority already had the power, why did the Senator ask the Congress to give them specific authority to build these dams?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not recall about the specific measure to which the Senator refers. That was a joint resolution which I think was never acted on.

I call the Senator's attention to further authority, in the last sentence but one of section 14 of the TVA Act, as follows, referring to the Board:

> Shall have power to construct such dams, and reservoirs, in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams * * * and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines. The directors of the Authority are hereby directed to report to Congress—

And so forth. I call the attention of the Senator to this further language in the TVA Act, in section 14:

> In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said Board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained and allocated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it would take a great deal of time to review the act itself to prove that authority is not given in the act to build a steam plant, but I shall refer to the record, where the subject may be found ably presented to the committee, on page 237 of the hearings, beginning at the bottom of the page:

> TVA Act as amended does not purport to authorize the TVA to construct steam generating plants.

That continues, citing sections of the act and the argument. I shall not attempt now to review all that has been said on this subject, but I will ask that this argument be placed in the RECORD. I repeat that if the act authorized the construction of the plant it seems strange that a new measure would be introduced to grant this specific authority.

It was argued on the floor of the Senate yesterday, and to some extent today, that the Watts Bar steam plant furnished authority for the right to build steam plants such as the Authority is here requesting. I wish to refer to the record. I have made up a collection of citations and authorities from the various reports. The record clearly shows that the Watts Bar steam plant was for national defense.

I wish to point out that in the Senate and House hearings the question was presented, "Has the Government the right to build a steam plant to generate electricity for commercial sale?" I desire to make it clear that the Senator from Michigan does not contend that the Government cannot constitutionally and legally construct a plant for national defense, but there is nothing in the record to show that the New Johnsonville steam plant is for national defense.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In the Senator's opinion what does the record show as to what the New Johnsonville plant is constructed for?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall read the language from page 27 of the House report:

> That function—

Of this New Johnsonville plant—

> That function is to keep carrying whatever increased electric current is required to provide the service which the municipalities and the cooperatives have agreed to give in their areas, and which we, in turn, for the Government, have agreed to give, and arranged with them, the municipalities and cooperatives.

In other words, the New Johnsonville plant is to take care of future needs of municipalities and cooperatives and industry that might from time to time in the future come into the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it the contention and view of the Senator from Michigan that the New Johnsonville hydroelectric plant was unconstitutionally erected?

Mr. FERGUSON. The New Johnsonville plant is not yet erected.

Mr. DONNELL. It has not yet been erected?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. This is the first appropriation for such purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. No money has been spent for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. No money has been spent on the plant as I understand. So I am arguing now that it will be unconstitutional to build this plant.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Even the hydroelectric plant, the Senator contends, is unconstitutional?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no; the hydroelectric is perfectly constitutional and legal because it is using the mechanical power of the drop of the water from a dam which is constructed under the spe-

cific authority of the commerce clause for navigation and flood control.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I want to be perfectly clear respecting these facts. I listened with considerable interest to a portion of the interrogation by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], but I am not sure that I have the facts as yet clearly in mind. Is there now existing a hydroelectric plant at New Johnsonville?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, there is not.

Mr. DONNELL. That has not been constructed as yet?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, and never will be. There is no water power at New Johnsonville, as I understand. Perhaps one of the Senators from Tennessee would corroborate that point.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. What is there to which the proposed steam plant is to be supplemental? Is it not a hydroelectric plant?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are hydroelectric plants in other places in Tennessee, throughout the Tennessee Valley Authority, but not in New Johnsonville.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it should be stated that the New Johnsonville steam plant is between the Pickwick Dam, which is near the Mississippi boundary, and Kentucky Dam, which is near Paducah, Ky. It is on Kentucky Lake, and it is to be supplementary to all the hydroelectric plants.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. The hydroelectric plants to which the Senator from Tennessee refers are now in existence? Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. So there are presently existing hydroelectric plants, as to the validity of which, from a constitutional standpoint, the Senator from Michigan is not making any complaint or contest? Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. But the Senator from Michigan is of the opinion that the proposed steam plant which is to be ancillary to and supplemental to existing hydroelectric plants at some other locations will be unconstitutionally erected if it shall be erected?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly the contention of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. A little later I want to ask, or to state, whichever it may seem best, the view I have arrived at as the result of hearing the debate this afternoon on the constitutional question. I do not want to ask it in the form of a fictitious question, so I presume the best way I can do it is to wait until I can secure the floor. But I wonder if the Senator will be kind enough, when the matter is presented by myself, to give it attention and give the Senate his views in regard to the points which have occurred to me during the debate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I expect to stay on the floor throughout this debate, and I shall welcome the argument or the comment on the part of the able Senator from Missouri, because I know he is familiar with the questions involving the constitutionality of the act or of any future appropriations in connection with it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished Senator from Michigan said that he felt that the Watts Bar steam plant could have been justified on the basis of national defense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that Public Law 17 of the Seventy-third Congress creating the Tennessee Valley Authority provides in its preamble that one of the purposes of the TVA is to provide for the national defense.

I also should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that in the consideration had before the House Committee on Appropriations before the steam plant at Watt's Bar was built, the private power lobby or interest, or a part of it at least, urged that it would be more in keeping with our principles of government to build steam plants than it would be to build hydroelectric plants, but no member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and no Representative on the floor of the House, even though several of them are distinguished lawyers, ever raised any question of constitutionality in arguing against the Dirksen amendment, which was offered for the purpose of building a steam plant instead of the Cherokee Dam in upper east Tennessee. No Member of the House contended that the building of a steam plant, such as the Watts Bar plant, or additional steam plants such as were urged by Representative Dirksen, would in any way be unconstitutional. Altogether some 35 or 40 distinguished Members, lawyers, of the House of Representatives, participated in that debate. That is very persuasive to me.

I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator if he is not aware that when the Watt's Bar steam plant was being considered by the House of Representatives, and also when the New Johnsonville appropriation was brought up in the last Congress, a point of order was made against those appropriations on both occasions because they were not authorized by legislation, and if the point of order was not overruled by the Speaker of the House of Representatives?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not familiar with what took place in the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the fact, I will say to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not familiar with what took place with respect to the point of order, I mean, but I am familiar with the arguments on the constitutional question.

Mr. President, the preamble to the act from which the Senator has just read, contains these words:

> To provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes.

Yes, the Muscle Shoals plant was built for the national defense, and in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan was constitutional for that purpose. Now it may be said that this may be done under a war power. I have found nothing in the record upon which to base such a claim. On that point I would cite two cases. One is *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries* (251 U. S. 146), and the other is *Wood* v. *Miller* (333 U. S. 138). I am satisfied that those two cases which recognize the war power—one on the question of the Prohibition Act and the other on the question of housing—do not apply in this particular case. I shall read a part of the opinion from Wood against Miller.

In Wood against Miller, the Court, in sustaining the rent-control law as an exercise of the implied war power of the Congress, said in part:

> We recognize the force of the argument that the effects of war under modern conditions may be felt in the economy for years and years, and that if the war power can be used in days of peace to treat all the wounds which war inflicts on our society, it may not only swallow up all other powers of Congress but largely obliterate the ninth and tenth amendments as well. There are no such implications in today's decision. We deal here with the consequences of a housing deficit greatly intensified during the period of hostilities by the war effort. Any power, of course, can be abused. But we cannot assume that Congress is not alert to its constitutional responsibilities. And the question whether the war power has been properly employed in cases such as this is open to judicial inquiry (*Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries Co.*, *Ruppert* v. *Caffey*).

So it may be said plainly that the Federal construction of proposed steam generating plants may not be sustained under these authorities as an exercise of the extraordinary implied war powers. The purpose of the plant is simply to meet the normal peacetime increase anticipated during the period 1949–52 in power requirements of "the 140 local public agencies which distribute TVA power." There is no purpose to meet even an alleged temporary shortage directly, immediately, and peculiarly caused by the war. Instead, the purpose is to meet precisely the same anticipated normal peacetime increase in power consumption which always has been, and is now being, met by privately and municipally owned public utilities in every locality in the United States. If, in the guise of exercising its extraordinary war powers, the Federal Government in time of peace may engage in the construction of steam plants merely to generate electricity for commercial distribution to the public, then it may engage in practically every business and manufacture in the United States in time of peace as an exercise of its implied war powers and thus

convert our Government into a totalitarian state.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able Senator a question or two with reference to one phase of national defense which has been discussed briefly in the colloquy between various Senators. I think the Senator will agree with me that the Tennessee Valley Authority was created as a means of national defense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Muscle Shoals was. I will answer in that way.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator say that the whole TVA power system in the Tennessee Valley could be used or has been used in the past for national defense purposes?

Mr. FERGUSON. A part of it is now being used for national defense, but a very small part. There is no contention in the record that the part which is being used cannot be fully and adequately supplied by the present hydroelectric power.

Mr. LUCAS. That raises a very serious question. I am not familiar with that testimony; but would the Senator agree with me that the construction of this steam plant would make available a larger volume of constant power for the valley?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I should say that the purpose of erecting the steam plant is to manufacture and sell constant power commercially in the valley.

Mr. LUCAS. If the power were constant, would not that make more effective the entire Tennessee Valley Authority, including Muscle Shoals and all the auxiliaries to Muscle Shoals?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will put it this way: It would provide industries, municipalities, farmers, and others with more electricity.

Mr. LUCAS. It would provide industry with more power. It is possible to assume, as the Senator stated a moment ago, that as a result of the erection of this plant some new industries might come into the Tennessee Valley, including some industry which might produce, in a great emergency, articles of war which would tend to strengthen and aid the national defense.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall have to answer that by saying that I do not believe the war powers or the national defense programs go to the extent indicated by the question. I believe that if a particular article were being manufactured for our national defense, the Federal Government could exercise its authority under the Constitution for national defense purposes, and manufacture the article, or erect a steam plant for the purpose of national defense. But there must be a relationship between the national defense and the particular thing which is being done, as was held in the case of Woods against Miller and the National Distillers case, which I have cited.

We cannot say that the erection of any steam plant in America is for the national defense. Otherwise, the Government could start in business tomorrow and take over all business, with the statement that, "We may have a war 10 years from now or 50 years from now, and now is the time to prepare for those wars."

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the last statement the Senator has made with respect to the Government building a new steam plant in a remote section of the country. But that is not quite the case here, as I understand. If we admit in the first instance that the TVA project has been constructed for purposes of national defense as well as for supplying electricity to the people in the locality, as well as industries which are operating there, it seems to me that we must admit that the construction of any other plant in that community to firm the power and make it more constant necessarily becomes an addition to and a strengthening of the national defense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me answer the Senator in this way: Muscle Shoals was built as a nitrate or explosive-manufacturing plant for the national defense in the First World War. I am sure the record will show the TVA was conceived in 1933, not for national defense, but solely under the commerce clause of the Constitution, which provides for the right to regulate streams with respect to flood control and navigation. It was not constructed as a part of the national defense.

If the United States Government wished to erect a steam plant as part and parcel of the atomic energy plant, I would not contend that it could not do so, because that would be directly for national defense, and it could be done. However, the Tennessee Valley project was started in 1933, not as a national defense project, but as a flood-control and navigation project. Muscle Shoals is different, and the Watts Bar steam plant is different.

I have taken the records from the various Senate and House documents, and later I shall place in the RECORD a statement showing conclusively that the Watts Bar steam plant was built solely for national defense. I shall quote the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the effect that it was so constructed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, all these steam plants and hydroelectric generating facilities are partly for national defense, because a great many defense plants are operating in that area. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that in June 1940, when the Watts Bar steam plant was authorized and appropriated for by Congress, no emergency had been declared by the Congress. As a matter of fact, even at the present time, when we are debating the New Johnsonville steam plant, we are technically still in a state of national emergency.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the record does not show that it is for national defense. It is to supply utilities.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is shown in the record that in order to enable the TVA to furnish power for the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, for the Aluminum Co. plant at Alcoa, and for the various defense or quasi-defense activities of the Government, it is necessary to firm up this power. It is shown in the record that the Alcoa plant cannot operate at full capacity at the present time because of shortage of power. I am sure that Colonel Huddleston, the manager of that plant, has conveyed that information to the distinguished Senator, or at least to a number of Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. The record is clear that there is sufficient firm power in the hydroelectric dams constructed under the Tennessee Valley Authority to furnish all the national defense plants in that neighborhood, and all Government agencies. I have read into the RECORD several times a statement to the effect that that is not the purpose. The purpose is to furnish municipalities and industries generally with power in the future.

We shall probably encounter the general welfare argument on the floor of the Senate—there was some indication of it earlier in the day in connection with the REA lending money. I want to comment on that argument. The general welfare argument takes us back to the debate between Hamilton and Madison at the time of the framing of the Constitution as to whether the so-called general welfare clause allows appropriations of money for the general welfare.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Michigan will agree with me, will he not, that in fact there is no such thing as a general welfare clause in the Constitution, but the clause referred to reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. It is a taxation clause for certain purposes; is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The general welfare clause so-called, is only in connection with the levying of taxes and the appropriating of the money for the general welfare. But the general welfare has nothing to do with the specific powers of the United States Government.

Mr. President, it has been held in a number of cases, and seems to be the law, that the United States Government can appropriate money solely under the general welfare clause, which the Senator from Missouri has just read, the one with regard to taxation. That is what is done in connection with the REA. Under the REA, the United States Government does not erect a plant; it does not undertake to do so. It merely gives the money to a cooperative organization, with which that organization is to erect the plant; and that cooperative organization is considered a private organization, not a Government agency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did not the Senator from Michigan make a mistake in using the word "give"? The Government does not give the money; it makes a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is correct. I did not mean that it donates, but that it provides, through loans.

Mr. President, I should be glad to review the authorities relative to that power, but I do not think it is necessary to do so here, because there is no contention here that to erect a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., would be for the general welfare. General welfare means just what it says—for the general welfare of the United States, not for the particular welfare of a specific locality.

The proposal now before us is not one for the loaning of money, but it is for the erection of a plant and the operation of a plant and the selling of the electricity from that plant to commercial users. Mr. President, we could not get nearer to the first step toward socialization than in connection with the proposal now made to us. I say this in all earnestness. Of course, I understand that today anyone who contends that we are taking the first steps toward socialization is considered out of line, and so forth; but I say in all sincerity that the same thing was true in the past. Well do I remember that a man by the name of Adolf Hitler started his program of nazism and a man by the name of Mussolini started his program of fascism under the first steps, as they called them, of socialism under the Democratic Socialist Party. They considered that they were taking the first socialist steps in Italy and in Germany. It is well known the world around that when we take such steps, we do not realize what the next steps will lead us into. No one could have argued successfully to Britain a few years ago that she would find herself socializing all her industries. No, Mr. President; Great Britain was then a free enterprise nation. So these things come upon us.

I should like to say just a few more words on this subject of the proposed TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. I personally feel that it is without constitutional authority; I am of the opinion that it is without statutory authority.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does not the Senator from Michigan make a point of order against this proposal, if he feels that it is without constitutional authority? That point interests me.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason I cannot do so is that the provision was placed in the bill in the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the point of order raised in the House of Representatives?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it was not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was not this question raised in the Senate a year or two ago, when the appropriation came before the Senate; and at that time did not the then President pro tempore rule that it was included under the authorization of the act, and that a point of order was not good against it?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Nebraska is absolutely correct. The then President pro tempore, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], was in the Chair at the time when the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] made a point of order against this very appropriation for the New Johnsonville steam plant, on the ground that the appropriation for the steam plant was not authorized in the act. Some of us then on the floor of the Senate presented the matter to the President pro tempore, and I am sure he examined the authorities and weighed the matter very carefully. In fact, I have before me a very extensive brief on the subject, but I shall not burden the Senate with it at this late hour.

But after considering the matter carefully, the Senator from Michigan, then the President pro tempore, made the following statement:

> It seems to the Chair that the entire purposes of the legislation which must be construed, and particularly the purpose as described and identified in the committee reports accompanying the original (TVA) legislation, contemplates an integrated system, and it seems to the Chair that an integrated system includes not only dams and hydroelectric works, but also steam plants, as identified in the specific language of the amended act.

That was the ruling of the Chair, and then the Chair overruled the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was an appeal taken from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; no appeal was taken.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that the then President pro tempore, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, laid his decision open to appeal; he wanted every Senator to know that he would take no offense if an appeal were taken. But none was taken.

Let me also say that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan who rendered that decision voted against the appropriation; he was not in favor of the appropriation for the steam plant. But he construed the law as the law was and is, namely, an authorization for this appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize what the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, the then President pro tempore, ruled last year. He stated at the time that it was a close point, and he suggested that his ruling be appealed without prejudice to either argument. But that, Mr. President, does not make it the law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska, I think, is in complete accord with the amendment or resolution the junior Senator from Michigan expects to offer relative to testing the constitutionality of the act. It has been my opinion, I may state to the junior Senator from Michigan, that the authorization is within the provisions of the act. For that reason it seems to me it is a question of appropriation, not of authorization. So I ask the Senator, why does he not attempt to amend the authorization so as to make it plain that it does not authorize the steam plant?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cited an authority this afternoon that proves the steam plant is not authorized by the act, namely, that both Senators from Tennessee in January of this year offered resolutions in the Senate to authorize the New Johnsonville plant.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. But that does not answer my question. Even though the senior and junior Senators from Tennessee submitted resolutions, that still does not answer the question I asked, which is, Does not the junior Senator from Michigan feel that the proper way to reach the point is not by way of restricting or eliminating the appropriation, but by an amendment of the act itself, making it plain once and for all that steam plants are or are not included? I ask that question in all seriousness, because the Senator knows as well as I do how I feel about socializing industry in this country.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall answer the question in this way: If we reject the appropriation, there is a resolution now before the proper legislative committee upon which the Congress can determine specifically whether a steam plant can be built, but that does not affect the argument of the Senator from Michigan that a measure providing for the erection of the steam plant is unconstitutional.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I can see that point, and I am inclined to go along with the junior Senator from Michigan on testing the constitutionality of the provision. I think that is proper. I believe possibly we should have an opportunity to do that at any time with respect to any act in which such provisions are included. But that is not the point I make.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not the point here, either.

Mr. WHERRY. No. The point is that this has been authorized. The basic act in 1933 authorized it. Whatever one's opinion may be with regard to socializing or not socializing American industry, I ask the Senator once again, is not the proper way to determine the question to write into the basic act itself a provision that the act shall not in any way be construed to authorize the purchase of land and materials for the construction and the construction itself of a steam plant, instead of attacking appropriations as they come to the Senate? That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. FERGUSON. I may answer by saying there are two methods of reaching

the result. One is the method suggested by the Senator of repealing the so-called authorization in the act. The other method is to withhold appropriation of the money. The provision of the pending bill is very cleverly worded. The able Senator from Vermont today wanted to know why this item was not mentioned in the report. Let me read the appropriation that covers this item. On page 12, line 7, "Tennessee Valley Authority"——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has served on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House committee in passing on this bill submitted a report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, authorizing a certain amount for the construction of the steam plant, with a full description of it. As the Senator knows, it has been the custom of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, when the House makes a report to which the Senate agrees, and the House report has already been printed, not to have it printed again. The Senate committee does not do that.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is not criticizing the report. I merely want to read from the bill to show how the matter appears there.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was saying the Senate committee had not submitted a report on it.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate committee had not reported on it because the House had reported, and the report was before the Senate committee, and it is now before the Senate. It is here now.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall answer the Senator a little later, but I want to read——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the junior Senator from Michigan feel, however, that the proper place to take care of such matters is in the basic legislative act itself, rather than to circumvent or destroy the purposes of the act through the secondary method of withholding appropriations? I ask the question for this reason: I believe the place to stop appropriations is in the authorization bills. That is the reason I did not support ECA. I said that I would, if it were cut 15 percent. I believe the authorization is the place to stop appropriations, otherwise appropriations may be sabotaged. I ask the junior Senator from Michigan whether the first place, namely, the authorization itself, is not the place to accomplish what he is desirious of accomplishing? Of course, if the Senator offers an amendment calling for a test of the constitutionality of the act, I may say now that I shall support the amendment, because I feel we have a right to test the constitutionality of any act. But I submit to the Senator, is not the place to remedy the difficulty in the authorization, rather than completely to withhold appropriations after the Congress has once determined upon a policy?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is of opinion that the Appropriations Committee has a function to perform, and that even though an appropriation is authorized for a given purpose, it constitutes no legal or moral obligation upon the Appropriations Committee to appropriate one dollar. If that is not the rule, we might as well abolish the Appropriations Committee. Let me explain for a moment what was brought out by the able Senator from Tennessee. Do we realize the position of the Appropriations Committee, when the House appropriates a certain amount in response to a budget request? For example, suppose the House authorizes the full amount of a budget request. I have never known the Senate Committee on Appropriations to go into such an item at all. It is only when the bureau wants more money than is allowed by the House that we go into it, and then we only go into the amount asked for, in addition to what was allowed by the House. In other words, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is merely an appellate court, in effect. That is what it amounts to. It considers only items on which the House has cut the budget request, or when an agency wants even more than the budget allowance, and it comes before the Senate committee to justify the demand. At times I feel that is why the people call the Senate the upper House, because we are always "upping" appropriations. Why do we do it? Because the agencies go before the House committee, have a complete hearing, and when the House cuts appropriations, they come to the Senate and put full pressure on the Appropriations Committee to get something more than has been allowed by the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the observation just made, and I suppose that, seated alongside the Senator, I have done my level best to curtail appropriations to as great an extent as any other Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has done that.

Mr. WHERRY. But I ask the Senator this question: Is it not true that in the event an authorization is not made in the first place, then the Appropriations Committee has no jurisdiction? If there is an authorization, is it not the real function of the Appropriations Committee to justify the amount proposed to be appropriated, rather than for the committee or an individual member of the committee to attack the authorization?

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me answer that by reading from the bill itself. I defy anyone to find in the bill itself what is embraced in this item. There is no reference to a steam plant. On page 12, line 8, we find:

> For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley Authority," $2,950,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for capital expenditures, is increased from "$21,689,000" to "$24,639,000."

A reading of the House bill discloses that $2,500,000 of the $2,950,000 is to be used to start to build the New Johnsonville steam plant. In other words, the general language "for capital expenditures" is used.

So I say the answer to the Senator's question is not that the item should be taken out of the original act; it should be defeated in the committee itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator agree that the duty of the Appropriations Committee is to determine the amount of the appropriation, and not to determine the constitutionality of the authorization? I think that should be tested in the basic legislation. It should be taken to the Supreme Court for decision. I agree with the Senator that whether it is $21,000,000 or $19,000,000, $2,450,000 or $1,450,000, it is the province of the Appropriations Committee to determine it. But after Congress has authorized it and made it a part of the basic law, then it is not proper to decide not to grant one dime of the appropriation. After the basic legislation is passed, its constitutionality can be tested by the Supreme Court.

I was everlastingly criticized a year ago for voting against ECA because I did not agree with the approach. This year I have been criticized because I voted against it. But, once it is the policy of Congress, once Congress has authorized it, then my job, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, is not to vote against any appropriation; my job is to see to it that every project is justified, and to vote the necessary appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator's job also is to screen the projects.

Mr. WHERRY. Should I vote for all appropriations for ECA after the committee has authorized them?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator should consider the question whether it is constitutional. The Senator from Michigan will put into the RECORD, at the end of his remarks, an argument on the basic law, showing that the authorization is not in the basic law and that, therefore, the Appropriations Committee must pass upon the question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator to answer this question: As a member of the Appropriations Committee, should I deny every penny of appropriation for the ECA after Congress has authorized the appropriation, or is it not the duty of the junior Senator from Nebraska to see to it that the projects are justified and to vote for whatever appropriations he feels are justified?

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator wants my opinion, I would say that, on the constitutional question, the Senator should decide whether, when appropriations are made, the project for which they are made is constitutional. If the Senator believes it to be constitutional,

then he should decide upon the amount he believes should be appropriated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The basic act establishing TVA was passed in 1933. The question confronting the junior Senator from Nebraska at this time is that until the basic legislation is changed, inasmuch as a point of order was not made in the House, and that a year ago, when the President pro tempore made his findings, and no appeal was taken, the Senate has to proceed on the theory that the authorization is in the basic act. If it is, then I say it is applicable to ECA. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that the question of constitutionality can be tested, and I think an opportunity to do so should be afforded. But it seems to me that the province of the Appropriations Committee is to determine what can be justified, and not sabotage appropriations to the extent that they are denied after the Congress has proceeded to authorize the project to continue for another year. It is the same way with regard to the steam plant which is involved in this bill. A point of order was not made in the House, and the basic authorization is provided for, and it is on that basis that we must face the issue.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason why it was raised in the Senate last year was that it involved new legislation in an appropriation bill. That point of order can be raised. But if the item is in the bill when it comes from the House, then no point of order can be raised. This matter was in the bill as it came to us from the House.

During the debate on the motion to amend the rules in the present session of Congress, we debated a ruling of the Chair. A few Senators on this side of the aisle voted not to sustain the ruling of the Chair. I know of no Senator who is forever bound because there is no appeal taken from the decision of the Chair, so that he can never raise the point that the decision of the Chair was incorrect. I disagree, and I now disagree, with the ruling of the Chair on the question of the right of the Senate under the rule, to take up a bill. It was debated for many days. I disagree with my able colleague from Nebraska who states that this item was authorized in the act itself. I have a right to raise the question on the floor now as well as at any other time. I am not raising it at this time. I intend to raise it later by motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator took exception a few moments ago to the method by which the $2,950,000 was placed in the bill, only $2,500,000 being used for the dam. The Senator has been a member of the Appropriations Committee for a long time. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that there is an item for the Davis Dam project of $4,500,000——

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator tell me from what he is reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reading from House bill 2632, page 24. It refers to the Davis Dam, the Colorado-Big Thompson project, and the Columbia Basin project. They are mentioned in identical language. It is not an unusual procedure. There is no intention to cover up or to prevent Senators from knowing what it is all about.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is entirely wrong regarding my statement. I read the language, and the language as it comes from the House is identical with the language in the bill now. There is no covering up in the Senate. The House put it into the bill in that language.

Mr. McKELLAR. And we are following it. It is the usual course of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. We are not doing anything which is unusual in this matter at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course not. The language is just as it came from the House. There is no complaint about that.

Mr. MILLER. Having come into the Senate a little late, I ask if it is the Senator's view that the bill should be defeated on the ground that it is unconstitutional.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; as to the particular appropriation we are discussing.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator aware of the provisions contained in the Constitution to the effect that the Government is divided into three cardinal branches, the legislative, executive, and judicial?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am familiar with that.

Mr. MILLER. Is not the Senator asking that we pass upon this question, being a legislative body, in a judicial capacity?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; this is the same question that has arisen before. As I remember, the President of the United States once sent word to a Member of Congress that Congress should pass legislation even though the Members believed it to be unconstitutional, and allow the courts to determine the question of constitutionality. That is not my idea of what a legislator should do. He is supposed not to vote for any measure which he believes to be unconstitutional. We cannot shift the burden of our responsibility to the courts.

Mr. MILLER. In asking that the appropriation be defeated on the ground that it is unconstitutional, is not the Senator asking this legislative body to resolve itself into a court, and pass on the question from that viewpoint?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am asking Senators to perform their functions as legislators, which is not to pass any measure which Senators have reason to believe unconstitutional.

Mr. MILLER. Suppose they do not believe that; if the Senator is asking them to pass on the question as a legal proposition—which the Senator is asking, as I understand his remarks—would that not be making of this body a judicial rather than a legislative body?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it is merely making it a careful legislative body. I may say to the Senator that, as the law is today, if the junior Senator from Michigan is not able to attach to the bill an amendment to provide for a suit to test the constitutionality of the appropriation, no one will ever be able to test the question of constitutionality. Does the Senator realize that under the case of Frothingham against Mellon and the case of Massachusetts against Mellon, it has been decided that when Congress merely makes an appropriation of money there is no way of testing the constitutionality of the appropriation? If the amendment of the senior Senator from New Hampshire is defeated, I shall later ask that there be attached to the bill a provision giving the right to bring a suit in court, to test the constitutionality of this appropriation. We are finding ourselves now in such a position that, though acts be unconstitutional, if they are appropriations, no one can ever raise the question of constitutionality against the appropriation. That is why we must exercise our constitutional right to see that we pass only constitutional laws and appropriate money only for constitutional purposes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Were the decisions of the Supreme Court in the cases to which the Senator alluded based on the idea that no person may show sufficient financial interest in the appropriation to constitute such an interest as the courts would recognize?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Is there any precedent of which the Senator knows for the enactment of such a statute as his amendment would make law, authorizing any taxpayer to institute a suit to test the constitutionality of an appropriation bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that there is no case absolutely on all fours, as we describe it, but I should like to refer the Senator from Missouri to the case of *Associated Industries* v. *Ickes* (134 F. (2d ed.) 694).

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is an authority for what the junior Senator from Michigan will attempt to do in his proposal for a constitutional test.

Mr. President, as I said before I think the present appropriation for the New Johnsonville plant is without constitutional authority. I think it is without statutory authority. The junior Senator from Michigan sees in it a dangerous intrusion upon the fields which through its history this Nation has reserved for individual enterprise.

I am not unaware that the character of our Government has changed and will continue to change in response to altered national and international circumstances.

I hope that I will not be thought of as one of those who believe all change is necessarily evil. I believe that change is inevitable, and that change is good where it represents progress within established and proven channels.

But I am deeply concerned by what I see in many directions—the gradual dilution of our economic system under the pressure of expediency and in the guise of dubious constitutional authority.

I do not presently foresee any prospect of death by violence for our free economic, social, and political institutions. Such events are rare in the history of men. But I do see the threat of a creeping paralysis which sets in upon those institutions to strangle them and eventually to bring certain death. That suffocation comes readily at the hands of an expanding state. I fear that process of slow but sure death, and I intend to fight it wherever it is cloaked in an authority which does not exist.

The TVA steam plant in my mind represents such a threat. If we do not stand up and draw a line on the extension of governmental activity such as this steam plant represents, we will some day awaken and find that the entire body of our free-enterprise system has disappeared.

It will not have been gobbled up overnight in one swoop. It will have been devoured by the locusts—one bite at a time.

The Senator from Michigan earlier quoted Harold J. Laski to the able Senator from New Hampshire, and asked him if he had heard of the quotation. I repeat what I said.

None other than Dr. Harold J. Laski, the British Labor Party leader and professor of political science at the University of London, has told us what the Tennessee Valley Authority already means to America. This great experiment of the TVA, he recently told an audience at Howard University, is only one proof that public ownership and the regulation of private enterprise has advanced further in this country than most Americans are normally inclined to imagine.

He added:

A new epoch in American history began in 1933. The old era of unfettered competition will not return unless the institutions of political democracy are overthrown by some catastrophic development.

Mr. President, that was the opinion of a man who has gone through socialism in England. He has been very near to socialism on the Continent. He knows whereof he speaks. We stand in the Senate and say we are doing things in behalf of free enterprise; we give lip service to free enterprise; but as we take one legislative step after another our action is used by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government to claim that we are taking them deliberately for the socialization of American industry. After we take such steps it is very difficult to retrace them.

Mr. President, in America we are accustomed to using precedent. Today on the floor of the Senate we heard the argument made that by reason of the fact that the United States built the Watts Bar plant we have forever waived our right to stop the United States Government from going into private industry. We have heard it said on the floor today that because the United States Government purchased some hydroelectric plants in the Tennessee Valley and there were connected with them certain steam plants, we have given to the United States Government full and complete authority to build steam plants anywhere in the United States.

Mr. President, I hope that when we take legislative steps we know clearly where such steps are leading us. We should determine whether we desire actually to destroy the free enterprise system in America, by taking steps toward socialization such as the provision for building the particular steam plant in question.

Mr. President, if we want to take such a step we should take it consciously. We should take it because as Americans we believe that the socialization of American industry is better for America than the free enterprise system. We should never take such steps in ignorance. It is for that reason I stand upon the floor of this great body today and urge the Senate of the United States to look, to watch, and to beware of the results that may arise if we take the step it is now proposed we should take. I do so in order that we may not go so far down the way of socialism that we will be unable to return. The proposed step is a very serious one. I hope the Senate will deliberate upon it and know where that step will take us.

Mr. President, Senators can say that those who are against taking such a step as is now proposed are representing the power interests. One would think from such statements that it is an evil thing to come before a committee of the United States Senate and represent the free enterprise system of America, and be paid for doing so. One would think it is allholy for a Government official to come before the United States Senate and advocate socialization. Some seem to feel that one who represents private industry is doing a reprehensible thing, and that the matter of fee determines whether or not the individual is honest in the statement he makes.

As a judge, I have been accustomed to special pleaders. As a Member of this body, I think we need special pleaders before the committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. But after we hear special pleaders we then should deliberate and determine what are the facts. We should determine whether the legislation we are about to pass is constitutional. If there is doubt in our minds respecting its constitutionality, we should not pass a measure.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, the question before us is a serious one. It represents but one step, but the matter which concerns the junior Senator from Michigan is where that step can lead us. That is something which should concern every Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point extracts from past House and Senate proceedings with regard to the Watts Bar steam plant.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been contended that the Government has built the Watts Bar steam plant—but this plant was for defense purposes. It is not contended that the Government cannot build a steam plant for defense purposes. The question here is, has the Government the right to build a steam plant to generate electricity for commercial sale. The record clearly shows the Watts Bar steam plant was for defense purposes.

The Bureau of the Budget asked for funds to begin building the Watts Bar steam plant to provide for national defense purposes so as to meet the rapidly increasing demands for power from plants engaged in the manufacture of materials and supplies needed for national defense purposes.

[S. Doc. No. 241, 76th Cong., 3d sess.]

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

To begin construction of steam electric-generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts in the area served by the Authority.

This amount is required to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to provide, for national defense purposes, additional electric-generating capacity in the area served by the Authority so as to meet the rapidly increasing demands for power from plants engaged in the manufacture of materials and supplies needed for national defense purposes.

House hearings on House Joint Resolution No. 583, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, indicates that the Watts Bar steam plant was requested completely on the basis of the national defense emergency.

Page 3: "There is complete agreement among those responsible for national defense industrial development that the Tennessee Valley area is one of the important centers for the production of such essential national-defense materials as aluminum and other metals, explosives, phosphorous, and other chemicals, and more recently aircraft. Expansion in these directions is under way. A deficiency of power supply is the bottleneck. All existing power installations, both those of the Tennessee Valley Authority and private companies in adjoining territory, are now being taxed to the limit to meet normal demands, and presently scheduled installations will only care for normal growth in demands without regard to the superimposition of the new demands of national defense. This emergency program is therefore necessary for national-defense purposes."

Page 8: "The increase, in our opinion, is justified on the aluminum alone, but almost every day now there is some new national-defense demand for power directed in the region of the Tennessee Valley."

Page 11: "Mr. DUNN. And here am I talking in favor of Government water power. The reason for this is, first, that it is a matter of national defense.

Page 13:

"RELATION OF INCREASED POWER PRODUCTION TO ADDITIONAL DEFENSE-FUND RECOMMENDATIONS

"Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Dunn, is there any relation between this necessity for increased power and the additional defense recommendations that are presently coming before the Congress? We are advised through the public press that we will probably get a very large additional request for defense items.

"Mr. DUNN. I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Stettinius can answer that.

"Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes; it all is a part of a coordinated whole, in that the plane production, and specifically aluminum, and the powder production that are contemplated to be financed through this approximately $5,000,000,000 request that you will shortly receive, are all part of the program, and are in proper relation to it. The chemical plants, the ammonium and other plants, and the aluminum plants must be served by this power increase."

Page 15: They present this and the President asks us, "Is this a thing that is needed for the national defense?" We go into it sufficiently to find that it is, and we say so most emphatically.

Page 18:

"Mr. LUDLOW. As a member of the committee, I am heartily in favor of this proposition,

but if it were not in a time of emergency you would not be in favor of the Government engaging in the power business?

"Mr. STETTINIUS. No, sir.

"Mr. DUNN. Neither would I.

"Mr. STETTINIUS. Mr. Dunn is an expert in the field of power. I am not an expert in the field of power, but I subscribe to everything that Mr. Dunn has said in his testimony."

Page 18:

"SCHEDULE FOR PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT

"Mr. DUNN. Before I conclude, I would like to mention that in this letter of July 1, from which I have taken the high spots, there is one point bearing on the time required to get this work started, on which I have not dwelt. With these huge expenditures that Congress has been providing for, the industries of the country will be filled with orders. Therefore, it is of the greatest importance, particularly with respect to steam machinery, that the orders for the increased TVA equipment be placed promptly while there is a place for them in the factories. In order to place those orders promptly, negotiated contracts are much more desirable than competitive bidding, because of the long time necessary in providing for competitive bidding."

Page 31:

"Colonel PARKER. Furthermore, I do not think it is going to be possible in this emergency to get the delivery of very much steam-generating equipment. I think that it is going to be a serious difficulty. Do not you agree with that, Mr. Dunn?

"Mr. DUNN. I am sure it will; unless the orders are placed promptly, they will lose their place in rank in the factories.

"Colonel PARKER. Last month we had a quotation from the Westinghouse Co. on a steam-turbo generator, and they gave delivery as 14 months. It has now gone up to 16 months, with the lapse of 2 or 3 weeks, and next month I hesitate to think what it will be. We are right at the point where, if we delay any longer, it is going to be almost impossible to get the steam equipment that we can do this thing with."

The House report states that this appropriation should be viewed and judged solely by its present bearing upon the national defense program.

[H. Rept. 2749, 76th Cong., 3d Sess.]

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1941, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE POWER FACILITIES TO EXPEDITE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report to accompany House Joint Resolution 583:

"The joint resolution carries an appropriation of $25,000,000 in accordance with the Executive recommendation in Senate Document No. 241 of the present session to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to provide additional electrical generating capacity to meet the present and projected requirements for power from plants engaged and to be engaged in the manufacture of materials and supplies for national defense purposes."

Page 2: "There should not be any confusion in the public mind with respect to this proposal for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Irrespective of the present or past views of anyone with respect to the governmental policy involved in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act or the operations thereunder, this appropriation should be viewed and adjudged solely by its present bearing upon the national-defense program."

The House debate on the measure states no other justification than the national defense emergency as a basis for building the Watts Bar steam plant.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, July 30, 1940, page 9698:

"Mr. Speaker, when members of the Appropriations Committee came before the Committee on Rules on their application for this rule, I raised the query as to whether the bill was business or politics, and I was assured by gentlemen appearing in behalf of securing a rule that it was business and not politics. The reason I made the inquiry was that I know, as every one of you knows, that different agencies of the Government may be expected to take advantage of this demand for national defense to secure legislation that will give them a stronger position in the Government and a larger share of the appropriations that are to be made in behalf of national defense. This very bill that is made in order by the rule happens to be an instance of that kind.

"Mr. COX. I hope that we may relegate to the rear our general objections to proposals of this kind and may unite in support of this measure, because in uniting we are expressing a concerted desire and determination of giving support to the administration in the effort to strengthen the national defense. There is no politics in this proposal and none should be put in it."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, July 30, 1940, page 9700:

"Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

"Mr. Chairman, the matter presented in this joint resolution is critically necessary for the national-defense program."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, July 30, 1940, page 9705:

"These projects were the logical, the imperative outgrowth of the Nation's dire need for war materials in the present emergency."

[Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U. S. Senate, 76th Cong., 3d sess., on S. J. Res. 285, a joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year 1941 to provide facilities to expedite the national defense]

Here in the Senate hearings you will note page 2 that funds for the Watts Bar steam plant had been denied at one time because Senate committee did not believe that it could be justified at that time—probably '39 or '40—on the basis of the national defense. Also note page 3, Senator MCKELLAR'S statement, that he contemplated no further additions to the TVA system with the exception of the building of the Watts Bar steam plant because of the national defense emergency. Herein the witnesses bring out at several different places the fact that this recommendation for building Watts Bar steam plant is made completely on the basis of the national defense.

They are waiting commencement now of another 60,000,000 pounds per annum capacity in Tennessee, which is clearly dependent upon this power expansion that you gentlemen are considering this afternoon.

"REASONS FOR COMMITTEE'S PREVIOUS ADVERSE ACTION

"Senator ADAMS. Mr. Stettinius, I think I can tell you briefly the reasons which led the committee before not to follow the recommendation which you made. We had your letter before us.

"The first reason has no relationship to the national defense, but we have a very distinguished member of this committee who had been the most ardent advocate of the TVA sometime back, when the last appropriation was asked for, who said that he would refuse any request for another dam on the Tennessee River. This distinguished gentleman was somewhat embarrassed, so I am speaking on his behalf.

"Senator MCKELLAR. I want to speak for myself on that. At that time, we were undertaking to get a program completed from Knoxville to the Ohio River so as to make that river navigable all the way. At that time, in order to get that dam through—we didn't expect at that time any war—very naturally, I made the statement that this completed our program, and said that I would never make another suggestion, because we have a lot of power down there that sometime has to be developed. There was nothing like this in contemplation. We did not have this emergency before us.

"But then this emergency came up, and you gentlemen made the recommendation; and I think that this committee ought to hear what you have to say and report this bill favorably in the interest of our national defense.

"And I hope you gentlemen will make such a strong case to this committee for defense that this committee will have to report it out.

"URGENT NEED FOR ADDITIONAL POWER

"Mr. DUNN. I would like to go back, if I may, to the thing that is most on my heart.

"We are in a dangerous situation in regard to the national defense. We need this power. The TVA is the best place in the country to get it now.

"NEED TO CATCH FLOODWATERS IN SPRING OF 1942

"If we don't get this appropriation promptly approved, if there should be a week's delay, we may lose a whole year in getting 180,000 kilowatts of the power.

* * * * *

"Mr. DUNN. No; we may have already delayed too long.

"I do say that if we in the Defense Commission who are charged with this responsibility don't do our duty now and start this thing as promptly as we could, and if you in Congress don't do your duty now and start this thing as soon as you can, and the odds should then go against us in the spring of 1942 before the dam is closed, and if as a result of this the aluminum for those airplanes is not ready the public will hold us responsible, as it will also hold you.

"A week now may mean a loss of a whole year in getting that power available. We may already be too late. But if we are, and you approve this matter, we have both done our best.

* * * * *

"Mr. DUNN. My answer to that is that unless we order the steam right away we may be too late for the steam also. The steam manufacturers of turbines, generators, and boilers are already nearly full of orders, and unless we place the orders for the steam equipment promptly we are not going to be able to get deliveries in time. It is even possible that the steam plant would take longer to build than the dam.

"Senator MCKELLAR. We just voted for two gentlemen as members of the Cabinet. It was done in the interest of national defense. You are making this recommendation in the interest of national defense?

"Mr. DUNN. Absolutely.

"Senator ADAMS. And you are not making the recommendation on any other basis?

"Mr. DUNN. None whatever.

"Senator MCKELLAR. To sum up, you think that it is absolutely necessary in the national defense to pass a resolution like that so that this work can be done as soon as possible?

"Mr. DUNN. Senator, I could not sleep nights unless I had discharged my responsibility and had told this committee that it is my thorough conviction that they should approve this measure. If this is delayed even by a week, or even if it is not delayed at all, I should hate 2 years from now to see that spring flood fail to fill the reservoir. The public would say, 'Those fellows were slow about this thing. It was presented on

June 14, and they didn't act on it until July 10.'

"Now we may not miss it, and I don't think we will if we start right away. But the time that the floods come is an act of God and cannot be determined exactly in advance. Therefore we should do everything in our power to discharge our responsibility; not to miss it."

In the Senate debate Senator MCKELLAR states categorically that the Watts Bar steam plant was needed for national defense.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, July 30, 1940, page 9687:

"Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, unless the action proposed in the joint resolution shall be taken, there will be no other place where they can get adequate power to operate this plant as it is desired that it be operated?

"Mr. MCKELLAR. For the best interest of national defense.

"Mr. TYDINGS. Is that correct?

"Mr. MCKELLAR. That is a correct statement.

"Mr. TYDINGS. There is no other way by which they can get the power except by building these two dams in order to furnish it?

"Mr. MCKELLAR. One dam and one steam plant. That is what the engineers testified."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD the argument that the TVA Act as amended does not purport to authorize TVA to construct steam-generating plants. The matter referred to appears in the Senate Committee on Appropriations hearings on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949, beginning on page 237 and ending on page 249.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L. THE TVA ACT, AS AMENDED, DOES NOT PURPORT TO AUTHORIZE THE TVA TO CONSTRUCT STEAM-GENERATING PLANTS

Whether the TVA Act purports to authorize TVA to construct steam plants is not important upon the question of constitutional authority; for if the Congress does not have constitutional authority to grant such power to TVA, an ostensible grant of that power in the present TVA Act could not supply a constitutional basis for the requested appropriation. However, this question of statutory construction has importance in another aspect. This is an appropriations committee. If the TVA Act does not authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct steam plants in the Tennessee watershed, it would seem that an appropriations committee would not have authority to deal with an appropriation of money for that purpose whatever may be the constitutional authority of the Congress under its legislative powers.

Some of the proponents of the TVA New Johnsonville steam plant seemingly recognize the absence of authority under the TVA Act to provide for its construction simply by an appropriation, inasmuch as two bills were introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress; namely, Senate Joint Resolution 1 by Mr. MCKELLAR on January 5 and S. 177 by Mr. KEFAUVER on January 5—to grant direct authority for the proposed construction. Be that as it may, the TVA Act, when fairly construed, does not support the TVA claim of ostensible statutory authority to construct steam plants in the Tennessee watershed.

The TVA claim of ostensible statutory authority for construction of steam plants, so far as material, must be examined in the light of certain well-settled rules of statutory construction. Words, phrases, clauses, or sections of a statute may not be construed in vacuo but only in relation to the context in which, and the subject matter with respect to which, they are used; the declared purposes of the enacting legislature; and the powers which the enacting legislature possesses or purports to exercise (*Brown* v. *Duchesne*, 19 How. 183, 194; *Pollard* v. *Bailey*, 20 Wall. 520, 525; *Costanzo* v. *Tillinghast*, 287 U. S. 341, 345; *Helvering* v. *Trust Co.*, 292 U. S. 455, 464; *Atlantic Cleaners & Dyers* v. *United States*, 286 U. S. 427, 433–4). In particular Federal agencies possess only such powers as are clearly delegated to them either expressly or by necessary implication; and a grant of authority to them, particularly of a sweeping character, "is not to be presumed or implied from any doubtful and uncertain language" (*I. C. C.* v. *Ry. Co.*, 167 U. S. 479, 505; *United States* v. *Chicago, etc., R. Co.*, 282 U. S. 311, 324). Another pertinent canon of construction is that a statute should be construed "so as to avoid not only the conclusion that it is unconstitutional but also grave doubts upon that score" (*I. C. C.* v. *Oregon-Washington R. & N. Co.*, 288 U. S. 14, 40).

The declared purposes of the TVA Act are found in section 1 (16 U. S. C. 831). Apart from the maintenance and operation of the national defense facilities at Muscle Shoals not here involved, the sole declared purpose is to provide navigation and flood-control improvements; and the sole constitutional power invoked is the commerce power. But navigation and flood-control improvements cannot incidentally or otherwise produce any type of energy or power except water power; and the exercise of the commerce power cannot involve or result in the creation of energy or power of any kind except insofar as water power may be incidentally created by navigation improvements. The entire act must be construed in the light of this declared purpose and of the nature of the constitutional power invoked; and both negative any intent to authorize construction of powerhouses other than for the conversion of water power into electric energy.[1]

All the provisions of the act dealing with the generation and sale of electricity are plainly incidental and subordinate to this purpose and related to the generation and disposal of electricity produced solely from surplus water power incidentally created by navigation improvements. By section 5 (1) the TVA is authorized "to produce, distribute, and sell electric power" only as "herein particularly specified." By section 9a the TVA is limited to providing and operating "facilities for the generation of electric energy at any such [navigation and flood control] dam * * * in order to avoid the waste of water power" and to transmit and market power so generated, to wit, surplus power generated to prevent waste of water power. By section 23, the utmost production of electrical energy under the act is limited to such production as would be "consistent with flood control and navigation."

All of the sections of the act dealing with the sale and distribution of electrical energy are limited to the disposal of "surplus power" and preference is provided for public customers because the energy to be disposed of by TVA is only "surplus power" and therefore limited in quantity. Sections 10, 11, 12, 12a, 14, 24. Manifestly, either Congress purported to authorize TVA to construct steam plants without limit anywhere in the Tennessee watershed or it did not authorize TVA to construct steam plants at all. But, if Congress had intended to authorize construction of steam plants anywhere in the Tennessee watershed, no question of surplus power or need for priorities would have existed; for obviously there is no limit upon the quantity of power which could be generated by steam in the Tennessee watershed.

Other clauses of the act demonstrate by necessary implication that the Congress contemplated and intended that TVA could construct only hydroelectric plants. Thus section 4 (k) (c), and authorizing the TVA Board to transfer real estate of the Authority to any other governmental department or agency, specifically provides that no land should be transferred upon which "there is located any permanent dam, hydroelectric power plant, or munitions plant heretofore or hereafter built by or for the United States or for the Authority," with the exception of Nitrate Plant No. 1 and Waco quarry. Had Congress contemplated or intended that TVA might construct steam plants as part of the TVA power system, it is incredible that a like restriction would not have been placed upon the transfer of such plants.

Under section 12 (a) TVA is authorized to extend credit to preferred customers "in order to facilitate the distribution of surplus power" only when such customers should be "situated within transmission distance from any dam where such power is generated." This language is consistent only with the obvious congressional purpose to provide only for the generation and sale of hydroelectric energy incidentally produced by navigation structures.

Although Congress was turning over to the TVA the steam plants which had been constructed at Muscle Shoals under the National Defense Act of 1916 (sec. 7), Congress deemed it necessary expressly to grant TVA authority to complete the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 (sec. 16). Manifestly, if Congress had intended, or understood, that it was granting to TVA authority to construct steam plants anywhere in the Tennessee Valley, it is inconceivable that Congress would have deemed it necessary or appropriate to include this express and special grant in the act.

Section 19 gives TVA access to the United States Patent Office files to enable it to employ the most efficacious and economical process for the production of fixed nitrogen, or fertilizer, "or any method of improving and cheapening the production of hydroelectric power." Significantly there is no reference to methods for improving and cheapening the production of steam power.

All of these foregoing provisions are wholly inconsistent with any other construction of the act than that the authority of TVA is

[1] TVA advances the curious argument that the foregoing construction of section 1 is fallacious because opponents concede that TVA may generate and sell hydroelectric power; and "section 1 does not refer specifically to the generation of hydroelectric power any more than to steam power." Senate subcommittee hearings, 296. The argument is more disingenuous than ingenious. The purpose of constructing the dams and reservoirs authorized by the act was not to create hydroelectric power. Nevertheless, the inescapable consequence of concentrating the fall of the streams and impounding their waters behind dams constructed for navigation improvement in the exercise of the commerce power would be to create raw water power; and since this raw water power would become the property of the United States, it was constitutional and appropriate for the Congress to provide in the act for its conversion into electrical energy and the sale of that energy in the disposition of the Federal property which would be thus incidentally but inescapably acquired. On the other hand, the construction of these navigation improvements in the exercise of the commerce power could not, incidentally or otherwise, result in the acquisition of any steam power by the United States. Indeed, if the Congress had declared that an independent purpose of the TVA Act was to create even hydroelectric power, the TVA Act would have been plainly unconstitutional upon that ground alone. (See secs. II–A, B, infra.)

limited to constructing and operating hydroelectric plants to convert into electric energy water power incidentally created by navigation structures in accordance with the declared purpose of the Congress in section 1 of the act.

Thus in *TEP Co.* v. *TVA* (21 F. S. 947, 959), the Court, after reviewing the foregoing sections of the act, including section 4 (j) upon which TVA presently relies, said:

"Under the statute, therefore, the generation of electric energy is specifically required to be incidental to the exercise of constitutional powers under the interstate-commerce clause, * * *."

It is significant to note the construction of TVA's statutory authority to generate and dispose of electricity, which was stated on behalf of TVA in the hearings before the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority (75th Cong., 3d sess., December 1938). In that hearing Mr. J. A. Krug testified (hearings, 5199):

"Turning to the first of these, I should like to remind the committee that the general limitations under which the TVA power program was inaugurated were outlined by Congress. The Authority has a definite congressional mandate to follow in developing the power program. The act itself outlined the policies to be followed in utilizing the electric power created by the Authority's flood-control and navigation structures.

"The Board was authorized to install hydrogenerating equipment at the dams and directed to sell the surplus power so produced for the benefit of the public, and to assist in liquidating the cost of the development.

"I might call attention to the following provisions of the TVA Act" (quoting in part from secs. 9a and 10).

Subsequently, in comparing the problems of TVA in production, marketing, and rates with those of private power companies, Mr. Krug testified (hearings 5243):

"Now, the position of the TVA, I think, is entirely different. Under the terms of our act our power supply is controlled by our navigation and flood-control program. We must, therefore, try to develop a market which will fit into that program of construction for flood control and navigation, in that our power-generating facilities are limited to what can be included in those structures."

Unable to cite any express statutory authority for the construction of steam plants, the TVA opinions referred to above seek to imply such authority from a few isolated words and phrases in certain sections of the act considered in vacuo without regard for the context in which, or the subject with respect to which, they are used. Even if it were permissible, as it is not, to construe these sections without regard to the controlling considerations hereinbefore cited, they fall far short of a grant of such authority.

Thus section 4 (f) merely authorizes TVA to purchase or lease and hold real estate and personal property. Section 4 (i) merely authorizes TVA to acquire real estate, by purchase or condemnation, for the construction of various structures. Plainly these sections do not authorize the construction of anything and the powers thereby granted can be exercised only for purposes expressly authorized in other sections of the act.

TVA relies principally upon section 4 (j), which reads:

"Shall have power to construct such dams, and reservoirs, in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, now under construction, will provide a 9-foot channel in the said river and maintain a water supply for the same from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins; and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines. The directors of the Authority are hereby directed to report to Congress their recommendations not later than April 1, 1936, for the unified development of the Tennessee River system."

Plainly section 4 (j) merely authorizes TVA to construct projects necessary to improve navigation and to control floods and to construct other incidental structures including powerhouses. Powerhouses were necessary to convert into electrical energy the raw water power incidentally created by the navigation improvements; and plainly the words are used in that sense in section 4 (j).

TVA in its supplemental statement seeks to avoid this result by arguing that section 4 (j) as originally enacted did not include the present first clause (said to be wholly the result of the 1935 amendments) but only the present second clause and that consequently, the second clause cannot be construed as incidental to the first clause. This argument is plainly unsound for several reasons:

First. We are here dealing with the statutory authority of TVA under the act as it now exists.

Second. The inescapable conclusion that this section refers only to hydro-generating plants is compelled by many other provisions of the act as hereinbefore shown.

Third. Original section 4 (j) did not include either the first or second so-called clause of present section 4 (j). Instead, present section 4 (j) is, with respect to both so-called clauses, an amplification of original section 4 (j) which, even considered alone, would require the same construction. Section 4 (j) as enacted in 1933 read:

"(j) Shall have power to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines" (48 Stat. 61).

Plainly, the dams, reservoirs and navigation projects were navigation and flood-control improvements which would necessarily create raw-water power. Powerhouses were equally necessary to convert this raw-water power into electrical energy and it is clear that this was the sense and meaning of the word "powerhouses" in section 4 (j) as originally enacted.

Section 14 merely provides for allocation of costs; and manifestly no power to construct projects not otherwise authorized under the act may be implied from that section. The reference to allocation of costs of steam plants is explained by those which had been constructed in part or in whole at Muscle Shoals during World War I and were being turned over to TVA (secs. 7, 16) and the possibility that the Congress might subsequently authorize other steam plants for some constructional purpose such as national defense, which, in the words of the last sentence of the first paragraph of section 14, might also be "turned over to said Board for the purposes of control and management." TVA futilely seeks to escape the foregoing conclusion by asserting that the foregoing language referred to the allocation of costs of Cove Creek (Norris) Dam. However, since the first sentence of section 14 expressly refers to allocating the costs of Cove Creek Dam, the last sentence of the first paragraph of this section manifestly could not have been intended to refer to that dam.

While section 15 originally authorized TVA to issue bonds in an amount not exceeding $50,000,000 for the construction of any future dam, steam plant, or other facilities it is quite clear that Congress intended this power to be exercised only for the construction of certain dams and completion and preservation of the Muscle Shoals defense plants, including their steam-generating facilities (H. Rept. No. 43, 73d Cong., 1st sess. pp. 8–9). See also TVA Act, sections 7, 16. In any event, any effort to imply authority for construction of steam plants from this section is foreclosed by the amendment of July 26, 1939, under which the Congress forbade TVA to issue any bonds under this section after that date. Section 15 (b).

Nor does section 31, to which a belated reference is first made in the TVA supplemental statement, lend any support to the TVA position. That section provides that the act shall be liberally construed "to carry out the purposes of Congress to provide for the disposition of and make needful rules and regulations respecting Government properties entrusted to the Authority, provide for the national defense, improve navigation, control destructive floods, and promote interstate commerce and the general welfare" (Senate subcommittee hearings, p. 296). Section 31 did not become part of the act until the 1935 amendments.

As used in section 31 "national defense" plainly relates to the national defense facilities at Muscle Shoals not here involved. And the words "improve navigation, control destructive floods, and promote interstate commerce" plainly and consistently relate to the second purpose declared in section 1 of the act to provide navigation and flood-control improvements under the interstate commerce power. The language with respect to disposal of Government property plainly and consistently refers to the water power which would be incidentally but inescapably created by the foregoing navigation improvements. It would be unthinkable that a mere statutory rule of construction, plainly applicable to the disposition of Government property thus incidentally and inevitably but constitutionally acquired, could be construed as an implied assertion of a much broader constitutional authority never before claimed by the Congress. While Congress presumably exercises all of the delegated powers for the "general welfare," it cannot be supposed that TVA intends to assert that Congress was claiming an independent power to legislate for the general welfare or that any such power exists in our Government of limited and delegated powers.

Thus, when considered alone, the sections cited by TVA, both individually and collectively, fall far short of granting authority to TVA to construct steam plants anywhere in the Tennessee watershed; but any such construction, were it otherwise permissible, is foreclosed by the congressional declaration of purpose, the constitutional power invoked by the Congress, and the other provisions of the act hereinbefore cited.

Indeed, although TVA is now claiming statutory authority to construct steam plants anywhere in the Tennessee watershed, TVA, in its verified answer in *TEP Co.* v. *TVA* (21 F. Supp. 947) expressly denied that it had authority even to construct hydro plants except where the dams would improve navigation or flood control, and alleged:

"* * * There are numerous sites upon the Tennessee River system which are valuable for the development of power, but dams constructed at such sites would not contribute substantially to the improvement of navigation or the control of destructive floods, although their construction would be more feasible for the development of power than any of the dams constructed, under construction, or recommended for construction by the Authority; but the Authority has not

constructed or recommended for construction and has no intention and no authority under the Tennessee Valley Act to construct such dams."

* * * * *

"The defendant, Tennessee Valley Authority, has disposed of and will dispose of only such electric energy as is generated from water power inevitably created by the operation of the said dams for navigation and flood control and which is not needed for governmental purposes and which would otherwise be wasted."

On the previous hearings much was sought to be made of a quotation from paragraph XIII of the complaint in *TEP Co. v. TVA* (21 F. Supp. 947) in which it was alleged, among other things, that TVA claimed authority to generate electricity by steam as well as by hydro. Apart from the obvious fact that lawyers employed to test the scope and constitutionality of a statute naturally raise every possible question for decision and that no issue of steam plants was thereafter raised, argued, or adjudicated in the litigation, it is interesting to note that TVA in paragraph 13 of its answer categorically denied the allegations quoted in the TVA supplemental statement. In its answer, TVA said:

"The defendants are informed that the allegations of section XIII of said bill of complaint are conclusions of law and argumentative statements which they are not required to answer, but if construed to be allegations of fact deny every allegation thereof."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have a vote on my amendment? When the time comes for a vote on the amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire a vote on his amendment this evening? I wish to say to him that I desire to be heard for possibly 30 minutes, and so stated to the Senator from Michigan a while ago. I know of one other Senator who desires to be heard more briefly than that. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, but if it is the intention of the majority leader to recess soon I shall not do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that the able Senator from Missouri desires to discuss the constitutionality of the question which is involved in the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The question before the Senate has nothing to do with that at all, as I understand.

Mr. DONNELL. No.

Mr. LUCAS. The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire deals with an entirely different matter. If the Senate could vote on that amendment we could probably take a recess.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. It was not my intention to confine my remarks or probably even to address them to the proposal of the Senator from Michigan with respect to authorizing a taxpayer to file suit. It was my intention to address myself to certain of the points which have been made, as to whether or not the appropriation would be constitutional. Therefore, I think it would have a direct bearing on the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wanted to say a few words. There are certain matters which I think should be placed in the RECORD. I believe I would not require more than 10 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in view of the remarks made by the Senator [Mr. DONNELL] and the majority leader, I do not know whether a vote can be had on my amendment tonight. There are several Senators who wish to speak on the amendment. I do not know how long the majority leader intends to hold the Senate in session tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the able Senator from New Hampshire that it is my hope that we can take a recess around 6 o'clock. That is what I announced earlier in the afternoon. I should like to have the Senate vote on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire before a recess is taken. Then we can perhaps take up tomorrow the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Of course, if a vote cannot be had on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire both amendments will have to go over for action tomorrow. It seems to me, however, the Senate can vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator from New Hampshire object to a quorum call? I may say that I know of one Senator who desires to have as many Senators as possible present when he speaks. I am not speaking for myself personally. I am speaking for another Senator. He spoke to me and said he wished to have a quorum call before he spoke. I make the suggestion in good faith, as I would not wish to relinquish the right to suggest the absence of a quorum if the Senator in question desires to proceed this afternoon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps the Senator would yield to me to speak for about 10 or 15 minutes now. I believe I know the Senator to whom the Senator from Missouri has reference. I believe he will be back on the floor in a few minutes. I certainly have no disposition to deny to the Senator to whom the Senator from Missouri refers the opportunity to speak this afternoon if he so desires. He advised me he wanted about 5 minutes, and that he would return to the Senate Chamber shortly.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Alabama is speaking about the other Senator to whom I referred?

Mr. HILL. Yes; the other Senator to whom the Senator from Missouri referred.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Would it meet with the convenience and approval of the Senator from New Hampshire if the matter were to be handled in this way, namely, that the Senator from Alabama may speak, while we are awaiting the return of the other Senator to whom reference has been made, and that the other Senator may then speak, and then if it be not too late, that I may speak, but if it be too late I will defer making my statement until tomorrow? I have not the slightest desire to delay a vote, but I do wish to be heard on the constitutionality of the proposed appropriation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire from the able Senator from Missouri how long he expects to speak?

Mr. DONNELL. Approximately 20 or 30 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. We might be able to reach a vote on the amendment at 6 o'clock.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in that case I yield the floor, if there are other speeches to be made on the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, with all due respect to my able friend the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and all that he said in his concluding remarks, I think the RECORD will show that time and time again reference has been made to TVA and its relation to our private enterprise system. Time and again it has been argued that TVA would be inimical to our private enterprise system. That was the burden of the argument when the bill was originally introduced to create it. There has been hardly a session of Congress when we have not had a fight over some phase of TVA or some appropriation for TVA, in which that argument has been made. We might not have had the answer to that argument when it was first made. I think we have the answer now, in the record of TVA.

I recall that when Mr. W. L. Batt, vice chairman of the War Production Board, came to Washington to take office he declared that he could not see TVA with a telescope. But after he had been in office for a short time he realized that but for the power and production which that power made possible in the Tennessee Valley, we could not have our great war program, which brought the war to a successful conclusion in a reasonable time.

Certainly nothing has ever come into the Tennessee Valley which has done so much for the promotion, development, and stimulation of private enterprise as has the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Tennessee Valley Authority has not brought industries or plants of private industry into the Tennessee Valley from other sections, but it has been a tremendous source of stimulation and development of industry indigenous to the Valley, through the development, processing, and manufacturing of raw products and resources in the Valley. So the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a mighty contributor, first to the saving of the American free-enterprise system in World War II, and second, to the en-

couragement, stimulation, and development of that system.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate more than a few minutes. There is nothing new about steam plants so far as the Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned. The Authority has bought steam plants; it has built steam plants; it has operated steam plants; it has maintained steam plants; in fact, the Tennessee Valley Authority now owns, maintains, and operates approximately 10 steam plants in the Tennessee Valley.

The Tennessee Valley Authority acquired some of those steam plants when it purchased the properties of the Tennessee Power Co. The Tennessee Power Co. had built some of the steam plants as integral parts of its power system.

We know that certainly as far as the southeastern section of the United States is concerned, we have a varying degree of rainfall. The precipitation varies in different seasons. Usually we have a great deal of rain in the spring and early summer, and very little in the late summer and fall. Consequently there is an uneven flow of water in our rivers. At some periods we have a great deal more water power at our dams than at other periods of the year. Therefore wise, businesslike, and economical operation dictated to the Tennessee Power Co. and to the other power companies in the southeastern section, and now dictates to the Tennessee Valley Authority, that steam plants be bought or built to firm up the power. As we know, most consumers of power can use power only if it be what we call firm power, that is, dependable power, power which is available the year round, every day of every week of every month of the year.

During times of high water in certain seasons of the year, the power which comes from such high water can be sold only as dump or secondary power unless there is a steam plant to compensate for the power which is not available in the dry seasons of the year. So what TVA is doing is simply asking that the investment which the Government has in the Tennessee Valley Authority, in the dams and hydroelectric properties, may be used in the most economical, wise, and businesslike manner by having the power firmed up so as to be salable the year round, bringing a much better return to the Treasury and to the taxpayers of the United States. That is all that is involved. The proposed steam plant is an integral and necessary part of the TVA power system if the TVA power system is to be operated on an economical and businesslike basis.

By building this steam plant we shall firm up and add to our system approximately 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power a year. As Mr. Clapp testified before the Senate committee, reading from the hearings at page 197:

> The New Johnsonville steam plant, by firming up additional portions of the power available from the hydro plants of the TVA system, will make possible an increase in firm power of about 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. To do this, it will be necessary to operate the New Johnsonville plant about one-third of the time, generally at full load, in addition to the present use of the existing TVA steam plants, to supplement the seasonal secondary hydro generation.

The Tennessee Power Co. owned most of these properties before the Government purchased them in 1939. Of course, the Tennessee Valley Authority could not purchase the Tennessee Power Co. properties without authority from Congress. Congress passed the necessary legislation for the purchase of the properties.

At that time approximately one-third of the generating capacity of the region was in steam plants. Due to the rapid construction of hydro plants, only partially offset by new steam capacity, the proportion has dropped until at the present time it is about one-sixth. At the end of 1951 the steam capacity in the Tennessee Valley will be only 13 percent of the total if we do not build the New Johnsonville plant. With the New Johnsonville plant constructed, it will be only 20 percent by 1952.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to ask several questions of the able Senator, who probably is as familiar with the Tennessee Valley Authority as is any other Member of the Senate.

First, I should like to ask this question: Is it not a fact that most of the arguments made against the power plant here proposed overlook the fact that the TVA is the sole supplier of electric power in a large area in the United States?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is entirely correct about that. Let me amplify on that point for a moment. It was recognized by the Tennessee Power Co., the Alabama Power Co., and the other private power companies operating in that section of the country that when the Tennessee Valley Authority bought the Tennessee Power Co.'s property—of course, the Government bought it by mutual arrangement and mutual agreement; there was no condemnation or anything of that kind, but the Government bought those properties by negotiation—the Government of the United States, through the TVA, would be the only and sole generator of electric power in that area. There is no other generator of electric power in that area. All the plants, the factories and corporations, the municipalities and the Government agencies in that area—and when I speak of Government agencies, I speak of national-defense plants, such as the Oak Ridge atomic-energy plant and the great chemical plant at Huntsville, Ala., and the ordnance plant in that valley—all those great plants are solely and entirely dependent upon TVA for their power. There is no other source of power there.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not a fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority became the sole supplier at the insistence of the private utilities, who wanted to get out of the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Illinois is entirely correct, Mr. President. The private power companies wanted to get out of that area. Let me say that, as the Senator knows, at the time when the Government bought the Tennessee Electric Power Co.'s properties, Mr. Wendell Willkie was the head of the Commonwealth and Southern Co., which owned the Tennessee Electric Power Co. Mr. Wendell Willkie represented the Tennessee Electric Power Co. in all the negotiations and in the sale of the Tennessee Electric Power Co.'s properties to the Government. Although we may not always have agreed with him on political matters, certainly no one ever questioned his great ability as a utility magnate; and this is what he said when testifying before the House committee in regard to the legislation to authorize the purchase of the Tennessee Electric Power Co.'s properties:

> I know not a man that is a man of any thought, whether he believed in the public operation of power or in the private operation of power, but who does not also believe that it should be noncompetitive. Something has been said here about monopolies. Now, I know not the distinction between public and private monopoly; but I do know, as any student of the utility business knows, that it is a natural monopoly, and should be such, whether in public or in private hands; and the man who represents the public agency and sits here and pleads for it to be a public monopoly, is absolutely right.

In other words, Mr. President, it was demonstrated there, that, as we know, it is not possible or feasible to have TVA transmission lines and then have parallel to them private power company transmission lines. Either the Government had to get entirely out of that area, so far as the development of power was concerned, or the private power companies had to get out of the area. They negotiated. The Government bought the private power companies. The Government not only has the monopoly, but it also has sole responsibility for the generation of power there. It is the only source of power to which the municipalities, the REA, the private factories, or the Government activities there can look.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at this point?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that the steam power plant now under discussion is essential to the efficient operation of the hydroelectric facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Illinois is 100 percent correct, Mr. President. Not to build the steam power plant would be simply to put our approval upon waste. Any businesslike operation there, any economical operation, any efficient operation, absolutely requires the construction of the steam plant. I said earlier today that the building of that plant is no exception to normal or customary operations. The Alabama Power Co., which is directly south of the TVA, in my State of Alabama—and incidentally, it supplies most of the power for my State, as we know—just finished the other day a steam power plant at Mobile, Ala., and it has under construction a steam power plant at Gadsden, Ala.

It is doing absolutely the same thing that is anticipated in connection with the proposal now before us.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has anticipated what I intended to ask as my next question, namely, whether any private power company would be building a steam plant of this kind to assure the constant flow of its power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, every private power company I know of is doing that very thing, of course. The Senator from Illinois knows that if power is available only half the time or even two-thirds of the time, it cannot be sold at the same price at which power which is available all year around can be sold. Power which is available only a part of the time must be sold as what is called "dump" power. But by building a steam plant, assurance is given that the power will be available all year around, because when the hydroelectric power is no longer available—for instance, let us say, at the end of the ninth month of the year—then the steam plant is fired up, and the necessary power is obtained in that way.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, by building the steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., we shall be doing the same thing that good business would do in a similar case. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes; not only shall we be doing what good business would do, but we shall be doing what good business is doing throughout the country.

In speaking of that point, I say to the Senator from Illinois that if there is one section of the United States where good business and also the national defense dictate that the production of power be stepped up, it is in the southeastern section of the United States. When we began our national-defense program in 1940, there was a 25-percent surplus of electric energy in the United States. The National Security Resources Board had made some 10 months ago, as the Senator from Tennessee no doubt recalls, a study which shows that now there is no surplus of electric energy in this country. It was that fact which compelled the National Security Resources Board, under the chairmanship of Mr. Arthur Hill, to recommend the construction of this very New Johnsonville steam plant.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. In connection with this debate, much has been said with respect to national defense; but apparently very little was said about it in the hearings, as we see upon examining the printed testimony. That is something I cannot understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I can clear up that point. I find nothing in the record of the hearings, this year, about national defense.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I was saying.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me, in that connection?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield to my friend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can say that in the Appropriations Committee hearings held during the war, many references to national defense can be found, because it was necessary to transfer electric power from the Duke Power Co., in South Carolina, across the mountains, in order to keep the TVA going. The records will show that fact.

Mr. LUCAS. That was during the war.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are speaking of the recent hearings held in connection with the present deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in speaking of the national defense—and I shall come to that point—let me say there was some discussion in the House committee about the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, and that discussion is referred to at page 21 of the House committee hearings, but unfortunately it was not included in the record; that discussion was off the record.

But if the Senator will bear with me, perhaps I may advert at this time, inasmuch as we are discussing the national defense, to even more recent testimony than that. I have before me a copy of the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950. That bill carries the regular appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority. These hearings were released only yesterday, when they came to us from the printer. This is the latest word, because that was the last appearance by anyone on any TVA item, before any committee of the Congress of the United States.

I turn to page 750, and there I find a discussion of the New Johnsonville steam plant. Mr. Clapp, who, as we know, is Chairman of the Board of TVA, made this statement:

> Mr. CLAPP. I should make one other comment. The justification for this steam plant, as we have explained in several hearings, rests upon conservatively estimated power requirements under normal peacetime conditions. We now know that in addition to the requirements of our normal customer load, as we have estimated it, more is going to be expected of us with respect to the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant. They are planning an expansion, and they are counting on us to be able to meet their additional power requirements.

Then Representative GORE of Tennessee, a member of the subcommittee, spoke as follows:

> For your information, the committee has had before it the Atomic Energy Commission, and the general manager of the AEC was questioned about this. We were told by him, on the record and off the record, about the magnitude—

"About the magnitude." I want the Senator from Illinois to hear this, and the Senator from New Hampshire, too—

> about the magnitude of the new program at Oak Ridge, plant K-29 and other conditions, and the need and demand for additional power which would result therefrom. We were told further by Mr. Wilson that the AEC—

That is the Atomic Energy Commission—

> had at first requested the Budget Bureau for approval of a request of this committee for an appropriation for a steam generating plant, but that it was now not making that request but depending upon the New Johnsonville steam plant as an addition to TVA which would enable TVA to serve the power needs. I give you that for your information in order that it might not be necessary to duplicate in your testimony.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. HILL. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. I have here a copy of a letter. It is authentic. It was sent to me by Mr. Clapp, of the TVA. It is a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is on the letterhead of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Oak Ridge, Tenn., and is dated January 7, 1949. It reads:

> UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
> *Oak Ridge, Tenn., January 7, 1949.*
> TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
> *Chattanooga, Tenn.*
> (Attention: Mr. G. O. Wessenauer, manager of power.)
>
> GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to the meetings and discussions between representatives of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission which were held on numerous occasions since July 1948, for the purpose of developing the most practicable and economical method of supplying the additional power required for the expansion of production operations at Oak Ridge.
>
> As a result of the discussions and related engineering studies, it has been concluded that it is in the best interests of the Government for the additional power to be supplied by TVA. It is requested, therefore, that the amount of power to be supplied by TVA to the AEC, at Oak Ridge, be increased by 70,000 kilowatts by not later than June 30, 1951.

I want to pause here to say that does not mean all the power they expect to get from this plant. They must have that much by June 30, 1951. The letter continues:

> An effort will be made to complete the construction of the additional production facilities at Oak Ridge, as soon as practicable, and it is probable that these facilities will be completed ready for use early in the spring of 1951. The additional power needed for these facilities will be desired as soon as they are ready for use. It is understood that because of the favorable water storage situation normally prevalent in the TVA reservoirs in the spring season, advancement of the date for initiating delivery of the increased power supply several months during that season probably would not greatly complicate the supply problems. As we proceed with the construction of the additional facilities, you will be kept informed of the schedule of our power requirements for operation of the plant addition.
>
> It is also understood the firm continuing supply of the additional power by TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission, at Oak Ridge, is contingent upon an addition to the steam generating capacity of the TVA system and that even with early action to increase the steam generating capacity, it will be necessary to make special arrangements for supplying the additional power required prior to March 1, 1952, on an emergency basis.
>
> We desire to meet with you at an early date to complete the special contractual arrangements for the supply of the additional power during the emergency period prior to March 1, 1952.
>
> This addition to our production operations is of great importance. We appreciate your assistance and desire to cooperate with you

in any way possible to complete arrangements for supplying the necessary additional power.

Very truly yours,

R. W. Cook, *Deputy.*
(For J. C. FRANKLIN,
Manager, Oak Ridge Operations).

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois. I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan in a moment.

Mr. LUCAS. These are not normal peacetimes in which we live, in the opinion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HILL. I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. LUCAS. I think we are probably traveling through the most precarious so-called peacetimes in the history of the Republic, and I do not want to be caught with my plants down in another grave emergency that might arise. We hope it will never arise, but with the North Atlantic Pact coming along, together with a few other things we are talking about constantly in the Senate, such a thing could happen.

I cannot for one moment believe that the erection of a steam plant is not incidental to power development by the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is being created for the sole purpose of firming the power to the point where we shall know exactly at all times the power that we are able to produce in any great emergency that might arise. If the building of the New Johnsonville plant is not a part of the national defense, I may say as a result of what I have heard here this afternoon and from what I know about the Tennessee Valley Authority, then I am constrained to believe that I do not know very much about what is necessary for the national defense. It may be we shall never have to use it in the national defense, but certainly now is the time to prepare for any emergency that may arise, by authorizing the construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant, so that it may be available in the event we have to use its power in the future for the production of articles which may be necessary in providing for the defense of the Nation.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right, and I may say to him that that was precisely the reason which impelled the National Security Resources Board to recommend construction of the plant some 10 months ago. So far as I know, there was not at that time any question about additional power for the atomic energy plant. There are other great plants there, upon which we are dependent in time of war, and which made tremendous contributions to the winning of the last war. There is a great deal of aluminum produced in the valley. It is the source of chemicals of all kinds, including phosphorus and nitrogen.

There are alloys produced in the valley which are used in the manufacture of steel for many purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to know whether the letter which the Senator just read into the RECORD was written prior to the Appropriations Committee's hearings?

Mr. HILL. It was not. I asked for the letter. I was not a member of the subcommittee which held the hearings. When I began to study the hearings I found that the House committee had asked questions about the matter, but the information was not in the record and was not available to me. I did not find anything in the Senate hearings on the matter, so I went to work on my own initiative to inquire about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator agrees that there is nothing in the hearings about it; is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The House committee referred to the fact that it had inquired into the matter, but the information was given off the record and was not disclosed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may clear it up?

Mr. HILL. Yes. If it can be cleared up, I shall be very glad.

Mr. McKELLAR. Every Senator knows that this exact question was fought out a year ago. The testimony adduced before the committee was to this effect:

First. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the one and only power and light plant in the State of Tennessee.

Second. There is no question of competing private plants in the State. Whether that is right or wrong, that is the situation which exists in the State. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the one and only source of power. There are no private power companies.

Third. The New Johnsonville power plant is absolutely necessary to firm up the water power so that no city, no town, no farm, and no factory in the State which needs power and light will be without them.

Fourth. It is absolutely necessary that this dam be built to give manufacturers and other users a steady and uninterrupted flow of power and light.

Fifth. There has been a tremendous growth of manufacturing business in our State since we have had this water power, and the needs are tremendously increasing in city, town, and State. It is absolutely necessary that we know in advance that there will be no shortage of power and light.

Sixth. This plant is absolutely necessary for defense purposes.

I call the Senator's particular attention to this.

This plant is absolutely necessary for defense purposes. The Oak Ridge Atomic Energy Plant, the plants of the Aluminum Co. of America, the plants of the Reynolds Metal Co., which will be called upon to produce aluminum for the 70-group air force which Congress has just voted, will need the additional steam power. Aluminum production requires enormous quantities of power.

The municipalities and the cooperatives which distribute TVA power in the Tennessee Valley have experienced a 60-percent increase in demand since the war, and expect another 65-percent increase on top of that. Not only the TVA, but the whole Nation, is short of power.

The growth, prosperity, and development of our State, the capacity of our many plants, and the development of our many farms, and especially the war plants now existing in the State, will all be put in jeopardy if we fail to have a proper supply and a continuous supply of power from TVA.

That evidence was presented before the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is involved in a technicality. The Constitution was not written this year. I believe it was written several years ago. I think the Declaration of Independence was written sometime ago, strange as that may appear to my good friend from Michigan. These things happened some years ago. But this particular question was not only before the committee, but the evidence was before the committee. The committee held hearings and passed upon the facts. The Senator was a member of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the committee not only passed upon them, but it threshed the whole matter out.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that there are 2,203,102 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power produced, and that would be sufficient to furnish firm power, as shown by this year's record, to all war plants and all Government agencies in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not know that the Senator's figures are correct. I do not mean to challenge them; I simply do not know. But, assuming the figures are correct, the Senator is saying that what we should do is to cut out every light from every farmhouse in the Tennessee Valley, cut out every light on every street in every city in the Tennessee Valley, close every plant——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Michigan said that the testimony was not in this year's hearings. Of course it was. If he will look on page 180 of the hearings he will find a letter from Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the last paragraph of which I shall ask the Senator from Alabama to read. It shows that the evidence was actually before the committee this year. It was before the committee last year and before the committee this year.

Mr. HILL. In the concluding paragraph of the letter to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred, which was written by Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to the Senator from Tennessee, I find this language:

The urgent need for the New Johnsonville steam plant, and for additional hydroelectric generating capacity in the TVA area was fully described last year in both House and Senate

hearings on the regular TVA appropriation for the current year. The facts presented a year ago were brought up to date in the recent hearings before the Deficiencies Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Because of the extremely tight schedules, we respectfully urge early consideration of the supplemental request by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and stand ready to supply any additional information which may be required.

In his letter Mr. Clapp referred to the presentation before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations. Before that subcommittee Mr. Clapp submitted this letter, under date of January 25, 1949, in which he had this to say:

This region is a major producer of chemicals, aluminum, and ferro-alloys which are required in large quantities for consistent maximum national productivity, and which require enormous amounts of power. A power shortage would force interruptions in the production of these vital materials and handicap the Nation's ability to prepare for national emergencies. A power shortage at any time is a serious condition for any region to face. It would be especially damaging in this area, in view of the kind of industry located here. Surveys by the National Security Resources Board show that, aside from the Northwest, this area is in more serious need of expansion of power supply than any other part of the country.

As I have said, the National Security Resources Board, under the chairmanship of Mr. Arthur Hill, 10 months ago recommended the construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant. I point out, first, that the only generators having power in the Tennessee Valley area, which takes in parts of seven States, are the generators of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the generators of the United States Government. There is no other source of power there. No matter how important it might be, no matter how necessitous might be the situation from the power standpoint, it is not possible to get any power except from one source, and that is the Tennessee Valley Authority. If the Tennessee Valley Authority does not provide the power, there will be no power there.

Surely no Senator will disagree with the proposition that in the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the operation of the Government's business, we should operate in a businesslike manner, should operate as a private utility would operate, in the most economical and in the wisest manner. That is exactly what we are asking to have done through the construction of the steam plant, to put an end to waste, to operate the Government's properties in a wise, economic, businesslike manner.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out that the shortage of power in the Tennessee Valley area is not peculiar to that area. I do not know of any area in the United States where additional power is not needed. The shortage is not among any particular class of people. Industry is using much more than ever before. Our homes are using much more than ever before. Our farms have increased their consumption by nearly 300 percent. Whereas in years gone by farmers used a thousand kilowatts a year, they now average 3,000 kilowatts a year. All over the United States the people are desperately trying, by various means, to increase their supply of electric energy. In some areas the private utilities are increasing the amount of available power as much as they possibly can.

Mr. HILL. They are doing so in the Southeast, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. In other areas the State authorities are attempting to increase the supply. In still other areas municipal or cooperative organizations are undertaking to increase the supply of power so as to meet the demand, which is increasing almost 10 percent every year.

In my section of the country, in New England, the private utilities are depended upon to furnish an assured supply of power. In the TVA area the TVA is depended upon to furnish a constant supply of power not only for the cooperative and municipal distribution systems, but for some of the private systems as well.

Would it not be just as reasonable to say that we will not permit the private utility interests of New England to increase the power which that area needs so desperately as it would be to say we will not permit the TVA to increase the power for which their area depends upon them?

I should like to make one other point.

Mr. HILL. Before the Senator gets to the other point, let me answer him.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's analogy of course is 100 percent correct. It is not any more reasonable to deny the TVA the authority to increase and step up its power than to deny a private power company the right to increase and step up its power. As I stated earlier, in 1940, when we were confronted with the emergency of that year, there was a surplus of 25 percent in electric power in this country. Today, as the Senator knows, there is no surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. No. The fact is that today the utility companies are using practically all their reserves in order to furnish their customers with enough day-to-day energy, leaving us in a rather dangerous situation. It would be just as fair to tell the Nebraska Power Authority that they cannot increase their energy and output to meet the demands of that State as it is to tell the TVA that they cannot increase their output to meet the demands of the TVA area.

The second point I wish to make is in answer to a question propounded on the floor early this afternoon as to why the TVA did not construct more of the small dams which might furnish more power. I understand that the New Johnsonville generating plant is expected to produce power at slightly over 3 mills a kilowatt hour, and I believe in that we find the answer. Steam, coal, gas generating plants are becoming more efficient, and now that the cost of producing the power is down to almost 3 mills, it is getting more and more difficult for water-power sites of the same volume to compete, which would have been able successfully to compete with the steam plants only a few short years ago.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In line with the observation made by the Senator from Vermont, but with a little different analogy, those living in the Tennessee Valley area, served by TVA, are now getting their power for about one-third of the average rate charged by private utilities, and the steam plant, I have been told, would furnish sufficient additional power to supply a city of a million people. I can understand why they would want it. I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he knows of any area in the United States where the inhabitants would not like to get their power for one-third of what they are now paying.

Mr. HILL. I do not agree with the Senator at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. About what?

Mr. HILL. That the people served by TVA are getting power at one-third of what those in other places are paying.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is in our hearing. The Senator should read the hearings.

Mr. HILL. I will say it is much higher in some places.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I said the average.

Mr. HILL. There is no "water" in the TVA dams. The people of that area are not paying on watered stock.

I will say also that under a law passed by Congress several years ago, TVA has to fix it rates so as to amortize the cost over a period of 40 years. In other words, at the end of 40 years every power project must be paid for with money turned back into the Treasury of the United States, something the private power companies never have done. No one ever heard of a private power company ever paying off any bonds.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me point out that a Federal development, such as TVA, is able to pay back the investment over a period of 40 years on a 4-percent-earning capacity, whereas the private companies estimate an 8- to 10-percent-earning capacity necessary in order to keep them on an above-water level.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to answer the questions which have just been raised. First, the Senator from Michi-

gan stated that TVA could divert all its power to war industries. If it did so it would be violating the plain mandate of sections 2 and 3 of the TVA Act which require that preference be given to rural and agricultural users. Certainly the Senator would not want TVA to violate the direct mandate of Congress.

Then, something has been said this afternoon about how much money TVA has paid back to the Federal Government, or how much has been reinvested in TVA power-producing property.. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the reference on page 894 of the hearings in the House Appropriations Committee on the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1950, to which he has referred. It is shown there that there has been repaid into the Treasury $34,131,519; retirement of bonds which were issued pursuant to the purchase of Tennessee Valley electric power property, $11,072,000; reinvested by authorization of Congress, $75,052,967; making a total of about $120,000,000 which has been repaid or reinvested in property as of this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Alabama has indicated that TVA has paid back certain sums of money into the Treasury.

Mr. HILL. I said some money, but not a great deal.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the fact that private companies are paying into the Treasury yearly large sums of money as income taxes.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator would say that the following figures are correct. As of June 30, 1948, total assets of the TVA, $819,942,171.

Mr. HILL. That is the total assets. But that figure does not represent only power. It represents flood control, navigation, production of fertilizer, and other items.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to put into the RECORD the sums of money paid into the Treasury.

First, from power proceeds, $23,059,000.

Second, from activities other than power, $7,911,000.

Or a total of $30,970,000.

The third item is bonds retired from power revenues, $11,000,000.

Fourth, for interest on the bonds, $5,789,000.

Which makes a total of $47,959,000.

The appropriations for TVA to June 30, 1949, were $736,223,000.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD a statement of the total sums made available to TVA and total investments of TVA, as of June 30, 1949.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is that the statement the Senator has just secured from me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be delighted to have the Senator place it in the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Total funds made available to TVA and total investment as of June 30, 1948

(1) Appropriations	$736,223,000
(2) Transfer of property from other agencies	41,107,000
(3) Proceeds from sale of bonds	65,072,000
(4) Net income from power operations	[1] 109,184,000
Total funds provided	951,586,000
(5) Less following amounts:	
(a) Bond redemption	11,072,000
(b) Payments into Treasury	30,970,000
(c) Net expenditures of non-income-producing programs	104,685,000
	146,727,000
Total investment, June 30, 1948	804,859,000

[1] The net income from power operations figure of $109,184,000 is arrived at in the following manner:

Gross income from power	$308,656,000
Less following amounts:	
Depreciation	72,021,000
Interest (net)	4,646,000
Other expenses	122,805,000
	199,472,000
Net income from power	109,184,000

TOTAL ASSETS OF TVA AS OF JUNE 30, 1948

As of June 30, 1948, the total assets of the TVA was in the amount of $819,942,171.

Funds paid into the Treasury

(1) From power proceeds	$23,059,000
(2) From activities other than power	7,911,000
	30,970,000
(3) Bonds retired from power revenues	11,000,000
(4) For interest	5,789,000
Total	47,759,000

INVESTMENT IN POWER PROGRAM OF TVA

The following table inserted in the hearings on the pending deficiency bill before the Senate subcommittee shows the break-down of the TVA power program assets as of June 30, 1948:

EXHIBIT I.—*TVA power program assets,*[1] *June 30, 1948*

The power investment includes the following assets:

Completed plant in service	$479,566,650
Less reserve for depreciation	72,136,307
Net plant in service	407,430,343
Funds held for future use under sec. 26, in the form of cash and current receivables	$7,551,476
Long-term receivables	84,832
Inventories	7,344,984
Total assets employed in power program	422,411,635
Construction in progress	27,093,750
	449,505,385

This investment was financed with capital from the following sources:

U. S. Treasury funds:	
Appropriations and transfers of property:	
Total	$309,379,918
Less payments under sec. 26	23,059,019
Net outstanding	286,320,899
Bonds:	
Issued	65,072,500
Retired	$11,072,500
Net outstanding	54,000,000
Total U. S. Treasury funds outstanding	340,320,899
Earnings of the power business:	
Gross earnings	$114,973,122
Less interest paid	5,788,636
The remainder represents the net earnings invested in power assets, including $34,131,519 paid to the Government for retirement of bonds and as an offset to appropriations and $75,052,967 used directly in the business	109,148,486
	449,505,385

[1] Exclusive of general assets not segregated by programs and exclusive of construction in progress relating to multiple-use facilities at projects for which an allocation of costs to programs has not yet been made.

EXHIBIT II.—*TVA power income and expense, by years, summarized from annual financial statements*

Fiscal year	Operating revenue	Operating expenses	Depreciation provisions and amortization	Net operating revenue	Interest income	Gross earnings
1933–38	$6,732,447	$3,870,994	$3,610,118	($748,665)	$164,946	($583,719)
1939	5,507,077	2,332,604	1,731,593	1,442,880	95,954	1,538,834
1940	15,285,074	7,081,735	3,615,623	4,587,716	143,595	4,731,311
1941	21,137,371	9,264,242	4,546,547	7,326,582	148,798	7,475,380
1942	25,329,954	15,819,351	5,230,350	4,280,253	136,078	4,416,331
1943	31,674,210	11,935,739	[1] 7,937,886	[1] 11,800,585	126,559	[1] 11,927,144
1944	35,429,546	13,815,808	[1] 9,876,468	[1] 11,737,270	115,045	[1] 11,852,315
1945	39,383,231	12,891,642	[1] 8,885,757	[1] 17,605,832	102,409	[1] 17,708,241
1946	35,264,545	9,875,814	8,605,731	16,783,000	78,591	16,861,591
1947	44,144,090	13,588,931	8,716,410	21,838,749	25,198	21,863,947
1948	48,769,524	22,328,321	9,264,755	17,176,448	5,299	17,181,747
Total	308,657,069	122,805,181	[1] 72,021,238	[1] 113,830,650	1,142,472	[1] 114,973,122

[1] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric-plant acquisition adjustment by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

EXHIBIT III.—*Return on the TVA power investment*

Fiscal year	Average investment [1]	Gross earnings	Annual return on investment
			Percent
1941	$190,000,000	$7,475,380	3.9
1942	220,000,000	4,416,331	2.0
1943	295,000,000	13,927,144	4.7
1944	360,000,000	14,852,315	4.1
1945	390,000,000	18,708,241	4.8
1946	400,000,000	16,861,591	4.2
1947	400,000,000	21,863,947	5.5
1948	405,000,000	17,181,747	4.2
SUMMARY			
			Percent
1934-40, 7 years (development period)	$60,000,000	$5,686,426	1.4
1941-48, 8 years	330,000,000	[2] 109,286,696	4.1
1934-48, 15 years	205,000,000	[2] 114,973,122	3.7

[1] Average net book cost during the year of plant in service plus long-term receivables and an allowance for inventories and general plant used for the power program.

[2] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric-plant acquisition adjustments by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

EXHIBIT IV.—*Disposition of gross TVA power earnings*

GROSS EARNINGS

Fiscal year	From exhibit II
1933-39	$955,115
1940	4,731,311
1941	7,475,380
1942	4,416,331
1943	[1] 11,927,144
1944	[1] 11,852,315
1945	[1] 17,708,241
1946	16,861,591
1947	21,863,947
1948	17,181,747
Total	114,973,122

DISPOSITION OF GROSS EARNINGS

Fiscal year	Interest	Bond retirement	Paid to U. S. Treasury (sec. 26)	Used directly in the power business
1933-39	$60,479			$894,636
1940	432,082			4,299,229
1941	484,602			6,990,778
1942	742,978			3,673,353
1943	778,291			[1] 11,148,853
1944	736,624	$2,000,000		[1] 9,115,691
1945	726,207	2,000,000		[1] 14,982,034
1946	647,867	2,300,000	$7,087,741	6,825,983
1947	615,570	2,272,500	7,971,278	11,004,599
1948	563,936	2,500,600	8,000,000	6,117,811
Total	5,788,636	11,072,500	23,059,019	[2] 75,052,967

[1] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric-plant acquisition adjustments by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

[2] $7,551,476 is in the form of cash and current receivables, a major share of which will be paid to the Government within the current fiscal year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan does not include the reserves that had been earned?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure they are contained in the statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The figures presented by the junior Senator from Michigan would include also the investment for flood control, navigation, and the fertilizer program. Whereas, on an average, only 40 percent of a multipurpose dam is charged to electric operation. So I think the figure of investment for the purpose of the electric business is about $450,000,000 instead of the $800,000,000 as stated by the Senator from Michigan.

The Senator did not mention the other calculation, which is that $75,052,000 of earnings of the TVA had been reinvested, with the approval of Congress, for electrical purposes, such as transmission lines.

Mr. HILL. Yes. In other words, TVA has been in a growing, expanding stage, and instead of putting the money into the Treasury, Congress has permitted the TVA to expend it on power facilities, transmission lines, and other investments in the project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the Senator will agree that multiple-purpose projects pay back the most money on the investment, and the returns are the quickest.

Mr. HILL. There is no question about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The power is readily available in these areas, and is in demand. Should the bonds of such projects be put on the private market they would sell far above par, because they are the finest kind of investment, whether it be private or public business. A similar situation exists in my section of the country. There we have the Grand Coulee and the Bonneville projects. They operate under the same schedules as TVA, though not at the same cost, and they make the same type of repayment. I should say that Grand Coulee and Bonneville are 9 years ahead of their 40-year schedule in repayment to the United States Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is evident we cannot have a vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the Senator to move that the Senate take a recess?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words before the Senator makes the motion. I desire to emphasize that the New Johnsonville plant is a very integral part of the national defense system of the United States. It has been said here that we built the Watts Bar steam plant as an emergency or war measure. We built that plant 17 months before we went into war. When we built that plant we had no selective-service law on the statute books. There was then no draft law on the statute books as there is today. We were not then expending nearly $16,000,000,000 a year on our Army, Navy, and Air Force. We had not then appropriated, less than 7 days before, five and a half billion dollars for the nations of Europe as a defense measure. Our Foreign Relations Committee was not considering the Atlantic Pact or any such pact, or anything of such significant or far-reaching importance or effect.

Mr. Churchill said in his speech in Boston a few night ago that we were not at war now because we held and possessed the atomic bomb. When he spoke of the atomic bomb he was speaking of the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., which must secure a large part of its power from the Tennessee Valley Authority. That plant is dependent upon the Tennessee Valley Authority for the additions and expansions which it now feels necessary to make. The Atomic Energy Commission advised in its letter to Mr. Clapp that it must have this New Johnsonville plant if it is to have the power for these additions and these expansions. We must build this plant, Mr. President. We must build it for the defense of our country.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from Alabama a question, but I can make this observation on my own account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad the Senator from Alabama discussed the important defense angles, because there is no doubt in the mind of anyone familiar with the projects at Oak Ridge and Hanford that had it not been for Tennessee Valley power and Bonneville Authority power the atomic bomb would not have been built in the time it was built. The great advances in the science of nuclear fission are going to require more power. There is no question about that.

These two great developments, one in the southeastern part of the United States and the other in my area, are just as important today, in the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or of any military man, as are tanks, battleships, or airplanes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator from Washington agree that they are far more important.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are far more important.

Mr. HILL. Because we are in the atomic age.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEE, Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, Mr. EATON, and Mr. VORYS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses there-

on, and that Mr. BROOKS, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. ANDERSON of California were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1113. An act for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners, doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein;

H. R. 2708. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph De Souza, Jr.;

H. R. 3856. An act to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion;

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 311 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House; agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 13, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 3d day of June 1949:

William Talmadge Adams II
Ernest Brenton Altekruse
Norman Brown Binns
Charles Lincoln Blaha
Gordon Warner Brockway
George Kenderdine Burkman
Charles Yardley Chittick, Jr.
John Marshall Clark
William Edward Clark
Henry Anthony Cretella
Richard Sargent Dolliver
Jules Berthold DuPeza
William Royde Fearn
John Aberle Flynn
Anthony Francis Fugaro
James Steele Gracey
Robert Walton Hampton
Herbert Maurice Hartlove
Thomas Edward Hawkins
Laurence John Hoch
Collins Stewart Hyers
Nicholas Ivanovsky
Herbert Adolph Johnson
Jack Mgum Jones
Harry Hexamer Keller, Jr.
Charles Earll Larkin, Jr.
David Francis Lauth
Royce Almon Lewis
Gordon Kendall Loftin
Richard John Mayer
Paul Wayne Meyer
Herbert Hyland Mulvany
Lee Charles Nehrt
Irwin Russell Pahl
Harold Arthur Paulsen, Jr.
Richard Thurman Penn, Jr.
Karl Fairbank Peterson
Reginald Winfield Raynor, Jr.
Donald Bruce Russell
George Melville Rynick III
Norman Marshall Sawyer
Robert Schuerch, Jr.
William Sheldon Schwob, Jr.
Robert Curtis Sedwick
Wilfred Hubert Shaw
William Hollis Shaw, Jr.
Frank Lawlor Shelley
Arne Johan Soreng
Kenneth Roger Spreen
William Hart Stewart
Clarence Henry Tannel
Ernest Ray Tindle
Sidney Arthur Wallace
Joseph William Eckley Ward
John Ellsworth Wesler
Neal Earl Williams, Jr.
Albert David Young, Jr.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Theodore C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia.
John W. Bailey, Jr., of Texas.
Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah.
Vinton Chapin, of Massachusetts.
Oliver Edmund Clubb, of Minnesota.
William P. Cochran, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Albert M. Doyle, of Michigan.
Gerald A. Drew, of California.
Homer S. Fox, of Michigan.
Julian C. Greenup, of California.
George J. Haering, of New York.
Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa.
Gerald Keith, of Illinois.
Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
Frederick B. Lyon, of Michigan.
Lester De Witt Mallory, of California.
Hugh Millard, of Nebraska.
Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon.
Harold B. Minor, of Kansas.
Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio.
Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
Robert Lacy Smyth, of California.
Edward J. Sparks, of New York.
Edward T. Wailes, of New York.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin.
E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey.
LaVerne Baldwin, of New York.
William H. Beach, of Virginia.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Michigan.
Daniel M. Braddock, of Michigan.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
A. Bland Calder, of New York.
John Willard Carrigan, of California.
Augustus S. Chase, of Connecticut.
Norris B. Chipman, of the District of Columbia.
Montgomery H. Colladay, of Connecticut.
Henry B. Day, of Connecticut.
Edmund J. Dorsz, of Michigan.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
Dorsey Gassaway Fisher, of Maryland.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Randolph Harrison, of Virginia.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
Knowlton V. Hicks, of New York.
Frederick W. Hinke, of New York.
John F. Huddleston, of Ohio.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
George Lewis Jones, Jr., of Maryland.
George D. LaMont, of New York.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of New Jersey.
Raymond P. Ludden, of Massachusetts.
John J. Macdonald, of Missouri.
Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
Edward S. Maney, of Texas.
Paul W. Meyer, of Colorado.
Arthur L. Richards, of California.
Donald W. Smith, of the District of Columbia.

Horace H. Smith, of Ohio.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Francis H. Styles, of Virginia.
Clare H. Timberlake, of Michigan.
Marshall M. Vance, of Ohio.
Joe D. Walstrom, of Missouri.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Barry T. Benson, of Texas.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
Reginald Bragonier, Jr., of Maryland.
Stephen C. Brown, of Virginia.
Thomas S. Campen, of North Carolina.
Carl E. Christopherson, of Iowa.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
Bernard C. Connelly, of Illinois.
Robert T. Cowan, of Texas.
Leon L. Cowan, of Texas.
Earl T. Crain, of Illinois.
Richard H. Davis, of New York.
Andrew E. Donovan, 2d, of California.
Edward A. Dow, Jr., of Nebraska.
James Espy, of Ohio.
William E. Flournoy, Jr., of Virginia.
Richard D. Gatewood, of New York.
Jule L. Goetzmann, of Illinois.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.
Landreth M. Harrison, of Minnesota.
Miss Constance R. Harvey, of New York.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Theodore J. Hohenthal, of California.
J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.
Perry Laukhuff, of Ohio.
Andrew G. Lynch, of New York.
Edward P. Maffitt, of Missouri.
Thomas C. Mann, of Texas.
Roy M. Melbourne, of Virginia.
John Frémont Melby, of Illinois.
Miss Kathleen Molesworth, of Texas.
John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.
Elim O'Shaughnessy, of New York.
Maurice Pasquet, of New York.
Paul H. Pearson, of Iowa.
Walter Smith, of Illinois.
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.
Ray L. Thurston, of Wisconsin.
John W. Tuthill, of Massachusetts.
Gerald Warner, of Massachusetts.
T. Eliot Weil, of New York.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.
Kenneth J. Yearns, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas.
William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Boies C. Hart, Jr., of Connecticut.
Roger L. Heacock, of California.
William J. Porter, of Massachusetts.
Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Stewart G. Anderson, of Illinois.
William Barnes, of Massachusetts.
W. Wendell Blancké, of Pennsylvania.
Byron E. Blankinship, of Oregon.
Findley Burns, Jr., of Maryland.
Don V. Catlett, of Missouri.
Ralph N. Clough, of Washington.
Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut.
Thomas J. Cory, of California.
William A. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Eugene Desvernine, of New York.
Thomas P. Dillon, of Missouri.
Clifton P. English, of Tennessee.
Thomas S. Estes, of Massachusetts.
G. McMurtrie Godley, of New York.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
James C. Lobenstine, of Connecticut.
Edwin W. Martin, of Ohio.
Charles Robert Moore, of Washington.
Carl F. Norden, of New York.
Julian L. Nugent, Jr., of New Mexico.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
Richard M. Service, of California.
Harold Shullaw, of Illinois.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Joseph S. Sparks, of California.
Norman C. Stines, Jr., of California.
Wallace W. Stuart, of Tennessee.
Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.
Andrew B. Wardlaw, of South Carolina.
Livingston D. Watrous, of New York.
William A. Wieland, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Frederic S. Armstrong, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Oscar V. Armstrong, of North Carolina.
Taylor G. Belcher, of New York.
Robert O. Blake, of California.
Thomas S. Bloodworth, Jr., of Louisiana.
John W. Bowling, of Oklahoma.
Robert A. Brand, of Connecticut.
Clarence T. Breaux, of Louisiana.
William T. Briggs, of Virginia.
Lewis D. Brown, of New York.
Stanley M. Cleveland, of New York.
Carroll E. Cobb, of Georgia.
William B. Connett, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Edwin D. Crowley, of Virginia.
Richard H. Donald, of Connecticut.
Thomas A. Donovan, of North Dakota.
L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.
Thomas J. Dunnigan, of Ohio.
John I. Fishburne, of South Carolina.
William Dale Fisher, of California.
T. Andrew Galambos, of New York.
Arthur L. Gamson, of Arizona.
Robert B. Hill, of Massachusetts.
Edward W. Holmes, of Massachusetts.
William P. Hudson, of North Carolina.
Elmer C. Hulen, of Kentucky.
Alfred le S. Jenkins, of Georgia.
Curtis F. Jones, of Maine.
Joseph J. Jova, of New York.
John M. Kavanaugh, of Louisiana.
William M. Kerrigan, of Ohio.
Thomas D. Kingsley, of Maryland.
William R. Laidlaw, of California.
William C. Lakeland, of New York.
Edward V. Lindberg, of New York.
David J. S. Manbey, of California.
David E. Mark, of New York.
David K. Marvin, of Nebraska.
Joseph A. Mendenhall, of Maryland.
Daniel W. Montenegro, of New York.
Edward N. McCully, of Texas.
Vincent T. McKenna, of New York.
John A. McKesson, 3d, of New York.
E. Jan Nadelman, of New York.
Joseph P. Nagoski, of Tennessee.
James F. O'Connor, Jr., of New York.
David L. Osborn, of Arkansas.
Robert Irving Owen, of New Jersey.
Claiborne Pell, of New York.
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr., of Connecticut.
Harry F. Pfeiffer, Jr., of Maryland.
William Walter Phelps, Jr., of New York.
James W. Pratt, of California.
Norman K. Pratt, of Pennsylvania.
C. Hoyt Price, of Arkansas.
Edward P. Prince, of Illinois.
Edwin C. Rendall, of Illinois.
John F. Root, of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin J. Ruyle, of Texas.
Stephen A. Rynas, of New York.
John Newton Smith, of Kentucky.
Rufus Z. Smith, of Illinois.
Clyde W. Snider, of California.
Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas B. Stauffer, of Illinois.
Charles G. Stefan, of California.
John L. Stegmaier, of Massachusetts.
Robin E. Steussy, of Wisconsin.
Albert W. Stoffel, of New York.
Robert W. Stookey, of Illinois.
DeWitt L. Stora, of California.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.
William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.
James S. Sutterlin, of Kentucky.
Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas T. Turner, of Oregon.
Norman E. Warner, of Iowa.
Herbert S. Weast, of California.
Jackson W. Wilson, of Texas.
Stanley B. Wolff, of New York.
Sam L. Yates, Jr., of Michigan.
Robert L. Yost, of California.
Harry R. Zerbel, of Colorado.

IN THE NAVY

The following named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert J. Artz	Richard H. Parsons
Albert T. Barr, Jr.	James McC. Patton, Jr.
William T. Barron	Lewis H. Petersen
Shelby D. Bass, Jr.	Robert G. Poage
Robert "D" Bell	James H. Pressley, Jr.
Otto C. Bender	David G. Prior
Robert E. Bennett	James C. Rahman
Paul J. Bergdahl	Jay V. Richmond
William H. Birk	Harold A. Riedl
Raymond A. Blank	William M. Rewey
Gaspare R. Bonsignore	Sam Rosenfeld
	Joseph V. Rossi
Warren R. Brown	Franklin R. Ruelke
David O. Brunius	David Rust
Gene W. Carnahan	Edward H. Schopp
William Clifford	Burton H. Shepherd
Donald C. Cole	Martin J. Signorelli, Jr.
William A. Daniel	
Chann Ellberg	Wayne O. Smith
Jack E. Everling	Harrison B. Southworth
Robert C. Gill	
Hollis O'N. Hall	Robert G. Stammerjohn
Bob N. Hancock	
John B. Hawkins, Jr.	David F. Tatum
Thomas L. Hogan	Benjamin W. Taylor
Robert C. Jacobson	Horace H. Taylor
Robert "J" W. Klimetz	Harold L. Terry
Philip E. Lucas	Harry E. Thomas
Robert C. McColloch	Edward J. Tomko
James A. McIntyre	Stanley VanLiere
Thalius J. Markham, Jr.	Curtis D. Vipond
	James M. Weaver
Frederick C. Marshall	Henry T. White, Jr.
Edwin L. Myers, Jr.	James D. Whyte
Delis Negron	Victor H. Wiegand
Lawrence D. Nicholls, Jr.	James E. Williams
	James H. Wilson
Robert D. Norman	William O. Wirt, Jr.
Lowery W. Norris	George A. Woodward
Charles C. O'Reilly, Jr.	William F. Wroth
Joseph B. Parse, Jr.	John Zvara

The following named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Winston T. Bachmann	James R. Roney
David A. Berry	Richard E. Sander
John C. Holz	Robert N. Summers
Francis J. Long	Peter Q. Waterloo
Donald W. McCracken	Ralph A. Webb, Jr.
Joseph R. Morgan	Donald A. Weiss
Harry J. Nelson, Jr.	Robert C. White
Robert D. Provost, Jr.	John R. Zech

The following named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Julius E. Morris
Howard W. Whitaker

The following named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Ralph R. Barnard	John G. Morgan
Reinhold M. Hendricks	Richard H. Schreiber

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Richard B. Doyle	John H. Lurz, Jr.
Michael S. Gaffney	Richard C. Messerschmitt
Marvin D. Hester	
Richard S. Hoover	Leonard J. Owen
John H. Keane	Gordon E Raymer
Louis E. Kollar	

Lucian L. Smith, Jr. (civilian colleged graduate), to be an ensign in the Navy from

the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct date of rank.

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Harry C. Alfred	Henry L. Hook
Paul G. Bamberg	Jerome Imburg
Robert K. Barton	James L. Keating
Charles H. F. Beach	Raymond J. Leffler
Jules H. Bogaev	Edward L. Mahon, Jr.
Wayne C. Brady	Joseph J. Maioriello
Frank M. Bryan	Robert R. Martelle
Richard S. Clover, Jr.	Francis P. Nash
Bernard H. Cobetto	Frank Ostapowicz
Ward Cooper, Jr.	Charles O. Parker, Jr.
Keith M. Coverdale	Leonard J. Raider
Benjamin L. Crue, Jr.	William R. Rundles
Robert P. Do' ie, Jr.	Edward J. Rupnik
Paul D. Doolan	Jack L. Smith
Duwayne D. Gadd	William L. Thomas
George E. Gardner	John W. Troy
Frederick W. George III	Robert G. Trout
John H. Heald	Donald O. Ward

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Joseph J. Carroll
Louis F. Parkers.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Ella M. Anderson	Jean E. Linsacum
Muriel A. Bennett	Roseann Lydon
Dorothy M. Culbertson	Sally Munyer
Lillian M. Deavers	Mildred L. Punch
Barbara A. Fredette	Ann M. Rigby
Helen E. Jarvi	Lucille M. Schill
Marie J. Keiss	Nadean M. Swoboda
Patricia A. Lee	Doris M. Wallace

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Bernard Frankel

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Joseph C. Pinto

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James M. Cole	Paul H. Pennypacker
Wallace C. Ellerbroek	Lyle H. Prenzler
Charles W. Lewis, Jr.	

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Robert E. Elliott

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Howard A. Barrett	William G. McGehee
Floyd H. Belknap	Paul M. McReynolds
Leslie E. Bond	Glenn E. Malby
William A. Breathwit	Howard H. Mayville
Herman H. Burton	Jack F. Moore
Armond P. Chartier	Frank P. Pfirrmann
Joseph P. Duane	George A. Rustad
Leo J. Elsasser	Ernest Sanders
Charles K. Garverick	Ancil B. Smith
Robert H. Getts	Whitner W. Smith
William B. Gilmore	John P. Soltysiak
Cecil R. Harvey	Fred E. Stewart
Joseph E. Herman	Clarence B. Stuart
Elma T. Jarrett	Andrew A. Taylor
Kenneth L. Johnson	Herman B. Tidwell
Allen W. Kenney	Russell G. Vliet
Henry Kibsgaard	Francis L. Westbrook
Ira V. King	Louie K. Witcofski
Leo M. Lay	Lee A. Young
Shelley "L" Lewis	

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Albert L. Andersen	Thomas A. Boyd, Jr.
William F. Anderson	Bernard N. Bricks
Paul B. Bennett	Frank A. Bruce
Ray Bohannan	Robert L. Cannon, Jr.
Jack A. Chapdelaine	Guy H. Morgan
Melvin A. Comstock	Russell S. Nance
Harold G. Donovan	James H. Parker
Clinton H. Dutcher	Walter K. Patton
Cary O. Edge	Fred E. Phillippi
Ernest N. Grover	Byron C. Raybourn
Arthur E. Johnson	Kenneth V. Rice
Leslie H. Joslin	Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
Wolfgang E. Klostermann	Arthur L. Rogers
James T. McDonald Jr.	Joe W. Russell
	Milfred E. Sims
Emanuel Mendrala	Robert L. Smith
Thomas J. Miles	Stewart P. Tipton
Lloyd W. Miller	Chester D. Worthen

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Sara J. Burris	Louise M. Novak
Gloria V. D'Auria	Ruth B. VanWinkle
Marjorie A. Kane	

Robert N. McKinney to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Hull, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Hull, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct rank.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou eternal Christ of God, in the hush before the cross we wait for Thee; O lay the compulsions of Thy love and forgiveness on our souls.

In this, the Passion Week of our Lord, we would walk with the Master, hear His teachings, heed His entreaties, confess Him and follow Him until daybreak in the garden.

O put into our breasts the meaning of Thy divine self-abnegation; let us constantly seek to be filled with Thy spirit, using our knowledge and influence to soften the sorrows of our fellow men. We would not falter, but go forward with brave and quiet hearts, with the cross of Jesus going on before. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1113. An act for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein;

H. R. 2708. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.;

H. R. 3856. An act to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion;

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 164. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown elementary-school district, California;

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 779. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to

Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts;

H. R. 1169. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz;

H. R. 1271. An act for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.;

H. R. 1401. An act relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 1741. An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson;

S. 70. An act to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States;

S. 146. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones and others;

S. 147. An act for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull;

S. 189. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken;

S. 213. An act to provide benefits for members of the reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training;

S. 227. An act for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.;

S. 257. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders;

S. 270. An act to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to "Trenton Dam" and to name the body of water arising behind such dam "Swanson Lake";

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 326. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948;

S. 392. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett;

S. 408. An act for the relief of the estate of William E. O'Brien;

S. 493. An act to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands;

S. 566. An act to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 576. An act to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah;

S. 635. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

S. 646. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

S. 647. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary;

S. 676. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion;

S. 683. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments;

S. 690. An act to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 716. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of George Peters under existing regulations;

S. 729. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941;

S. 755. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.;

S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 851. An act to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes;

S. 936. An act to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 948. An act for the relief of Mickey Baine;

S. 969. An act to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.;

S. 1042. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

S. 1043. An act to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 1122. An act relating to children born out of wedlock;

S. 1123. An act to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for services of process on agents of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia;

S. 1125. An act to amend section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony;

S. 1127. An act to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will;

S. 1129. An act to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

S. 1130. An act to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from $600 to $1,000;

S. 1131. An act to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative;

S. 1132. An act to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated;

S. 1133. An act to amend section 16-418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases;

S. 1134. An act to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates;

S. 1136. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. An act to revise and codify the laws of the Canal Zone regarding the administration of estates, and for other purposes;

S. 1168. An act to amend section 2680 of title 28, United States Code;

S. 1181. An act to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1185. An act to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes;

S. 1270. An act to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916, (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution for the relief of the First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr.;

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the Port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation;

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. J. Res. 42) entitled "Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf Coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. BREWSTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALASKA HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes, for its immediate consideration. This bill is similar to House bill H. R. 3615, which was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do it just for the purpose of having the gentleman from Kentucky explain the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. This is the Alaska housing bill. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It raises the dollar ceiling on mortgage loans in Alaska, because of the increased cost. It furnishes a secondary market for the securities and provides for direct loans where equity capital is not available. The building season in Alaska is very short, and it is very necessary that the bill be passed at this time in order that this season may produce housing. I think it is a very excellent thing to see that our last frontier, our furthermost outpost of democracy, should be an exhibit to which we may point with pride, and that its prosperity and the happiness of its people may be observed from Russia across the straits. This should furnish an added interest in the enactment of this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a unanimous report of the gentleman's committee, and it has also passed the Senate?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. A similar bill was passed by the Senate which we are now considering.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree that we ought to pass the bill. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, did the gentleman say there was a unanimous report by his committee?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; it was unanimously reported by the committee. There was not even a roll call; it was reported without a roll call and without objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Alaska Housing Act."

SEC. 2. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 214. If the Federal Housing Commissioner finds that, because of higher costs prevailing in the Territory of Alaska, it is not feasible to construct dwellings on property located in Alaska without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, or livability, within the limitations as to maximum mortgage amounts provided in this act, the Commissioner may, by regulations or otherwise, prescribe, with respect to dollar amount, a higher maximum for the principal obligation of mortgages insured under this act covering property located in Alaska, in such amounts as he shall find necessary to compensate for such higher costs but not to exceed, in any event, the maximum otherwise applicable by more than one-third thereof. No mortgage with respect to a project or property in Alaska shall be accepted for insurance under this act unless the Commissioner finds that the project or property is an acceptable risk, giving consideration to the acute housing shortage in Alaska: *Provided,* That any such mortgage may be insured or accepted for insurance without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act that the Commissioner find the project or property to be economically sound or an acceptable risk. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act or any other law, the Alaska Housing Authority shall be eligible as mortgagor or mortgagee, as the case may be, for any of the purposes of mortgage insurance under the provisions of this act. Upon application by the mortgagee, where the Alaska Housing Authority is the mortgagor or mortgagee, for the insurance of a mortgage under any provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to insure the mortgage (including advances thereon where otherwise authorized), and to make commitments for the insuring of any such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon, under such provisions (and this section) without regard to any requirement that the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property or shall have paid a prescribed amount on account of such property."

(b) The powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency heretofore or hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with properties or projects in Alaska designed principally for residential use; and, notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 301 of the National Housing Act, as heretofore or hereafter amended, or of any other law unless enacted expressly in limitation hereof, any mortgage loans, or partial interests therein, may be offered to the Federal National Mortgage Association for purchase, and the Association shall be authorized to make real-estate loans, including advances thereon during construction, if such loans or advances are secured by property located in Alaska and insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to relieve the particularly severe impact of the housing shortage in Alaska, the legislature of that Territory may authorize the Alaska Housing Authority, in addition to the housing projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 601; 48 U. S. C., secs. 481–483), as amended, also to undertake other projects for the construction and sale or rental of dwelling accommodations for inhabitants of the Territory, and to make loans for such projects to public agencies, or private nonprofit or limited dividend corporations, or private corporations which are regulated or restricted by the Authority (until the termination of all loan obligations to it) as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation to such an extent and in such manner as to provide reasonable rentals to tenants and a reasonable return on the investment, and the legislature of that Territory may authorize said Authority to make character loans to individuals or cooperatives for the improvement, conversion, or construction of dwellings in remote areas to be occupied by such individuals or members of such cooperatives where the loan does not exceed $500 per dwelling, and any powers of said Authority, including but not limited to powers of eminent domain and issuance of bonds and obligations, with respect to projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of said act of July 21, 1941, may be made available with respect to projects undertaken pursuant to the authorization provided in this section: *Provided,* That the authorization provided in this section shall be limited to projects where adequate financing on reasonable terms and conditions, or entrepreneurial sponsorship, or both, as the case may be, is not otherwise available: *And provided further,* That any projects constructed and owned by such Authority pursuant to the authorization provided in this section shall be sold for cash or on reasonable terms and giving consideration to full market value, as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest: *And provided further,* That such Authority shall exercise its powers under this section to encourage and assist the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and the development of well planned residential neighborhoods. Any law enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Alaska which, except for its enactment prior to the enactment of this act, would be authorized under this section, is hereby authorized, approved, and validated.

(b) To obtain funds for the purpose of undertaking and administering projects or of making loans pursuant to any authority conferred by the legislature of the Territory of Alaska under subsection (a) of this section, the Alaska Housing Authority may, on and after the effective date of this act, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in an amount not to exceed $15,000,000 and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby authorized to purchase such notes or other obligations to the extent that funds are available therefor: *Provided,* That such notes and other obligations issued and outstanding for the purpose of making character loans to individuals or cooperatives shall not exceed $1,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities not exceeding 40 years, and shall be purchased under such general terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. Such notes and other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States

as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.

(c) The Alaska Housing Authority shall make an annual report to the Governor of Alaska on all of the activities of the Authority, for each fiscal year ending June 30, for transmission with his comments and recommendations to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $15,000,000 for the purposes of this section. Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this section shall be available for any of the purposes of this section. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this section, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans or advances of funds and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

SEC. 4. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to provide technical advice and information and otherwise to cooperate to the full extent authorized by law to assist the Alaska Housing Authority in the program to relieve the severe shortage of housing in the Territory.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 4 and 301 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with respect to the disposition of housing of a permanent character, any such housing in Alaska under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator which has been reserved (in whole or in part), prior to the enactment of this act, for employees of an agency of the Federal Government may be retained by him for employees of that agency for such time as he determines such action necessary to provide adequate housing accommodations for them in the area.

SEC. 6. Any executive department or agency of the Federal Government is hereby authorized to sell, transfer, and convey to the Alaska Housing Authority at fair value (as determined by such department or agency), for use under this act, all or any right, title, and interest in any real or personal property under the jurisdiction of such department or agency which it determines to be in excess of its own requirements, notwithstanding any limitations or requirements of law with respect to the use or disposition of such property: *Provided*, That the authority conferred by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any other powers and authorities of such department or agency.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 3615 was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERSTATE COMPACT RELATING TO THE BETTER UTILIZATION OF THE FISHERIES OF THE GULF COAST

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries—marine, shell, and anadromous—of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BLAND, THOMPSON, WICKERSHAM, WEICHEL, and TOLLEFSON.

THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the death of our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, four years ago today this Nation was overcast with an awesome pall of gloom and grief.

A whole people—indeed, a whole world—then engaged in a titanic struggle for liberty, experienced a sense of shock and amazement at the stunning news of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

At the very moment of his death, there was prevalent a feeling of growing confidence that this Nation and its gallant allies were well on the way toward triumph over the forces of totalitarian evil.

That confidence was inspired by the knowledge and realization that our President was the principal architect of certain victory, and that the genius of his leadership would inevitably achieve it.

Nevertheless, with that certain victory within grasp, the messenger of death struck swiftly, and, in God's inscrutable wisdom, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was swept from this earth to the judgment Father.

It is futile, I suppose, to speculate upon how the course of world history would have developed if he had been spared to us.

Those who had the high privilege of working with him are consoled by the thought that his ideals and principles are still the guiding norms of our national and international objectives. It is but human to regret that he was denied the opportunity of devoting to the winning of the peace the same prodigious talents which insured the successful prosecution of the war.

As a peacetime President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt stood forth as a symbol of human freedom and individual dignity. Imbued with a philosophy of sound and logical humanitarianism, he was fortunately elevated, by the will of our people, to the highest office through which he could give practical application to that philosophy in the processes of government.

As a result, his administrations were both the occasion and the cause of a social progress founded on the theory that government is the servant, and not the master, of the people, and that the primary function of man on earth is to be brother to his fellow man, to render justice to all of our people.

While such ideas and theories were not in any sense novel, the manner of their utilization in the administration of Federal Government under Franklin Delano Roosevelt was distinctly unique. More than any other man in our history, he realized that the commerce and general welfare clauses of our Constitution were something more than dry, legal formulas and he had the courage to demand legislation which would effectuate their spirit for the social and economic betterment of our people.

He had but one overriding passion.

That was love of his fellow men—particularly the poor, the suffering, the aged, the underprivileged, and the exploited.

He had but one great ideal.

That was social justice. It was a virtue to which he gave outward expression through warm friendliness and sympathetic concern for all of the problems of those whom he was called upon to serve. A good neighbor himself, he sought to make the brotherly spirit of good neighborliness an implement of national policy.

He had but one buoyant hope.

That was the unity of our strong and friendly land with democratic nations throughout the world for the sole purpose of achieving international amity so that men everywhere might dwell secure in peace and brotherhood.

On this fourth anniversary of his death, the passions, the ideals, and the hopes of Franklin Delano Roosevelt remain with us as fervent aspirations.

With reliance on the faith with which he believed in them, we shall, with God's help, attain them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Panama Canal.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of Kentucky asking the Congress to pass legislation to supplement the tax loss because the Federal Government has taken so much land from my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

LET'S REPEAL THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in the House of Representatives we have gone a long way since January 3, 1949, under a great Democratic leadership. The noteworthy achievements of the House of Representatives of this Congress up to this good hour have been a matter of favorable comment by columnists and others.

We have worked hard in debating pending legislative proposals. We have sent to the other body numerous measures upon which we have acted favorably. Unfortunately, due to a coalition in that body between reactionary Republicans from the North and some southern Democrats, a temporary bottleneck developed there, and in legislative accomplishments and achievements we have, to date, far surpassed that body. Extraordinary efforts are now being undertaken in that body to pass on legislation we have been sending over to it. Therefore there is every reason for liberal, progressive, forward-looking people of this Nation to have hope and confidence that this Eighty-first Congress will make a noteworthy record for the progress and welfare of the American people and the peace of the world. Those voices of reaction that have been critical of this Congress soon will be squealing like stuck pigs that we have done too much.

Mr. Speaker, now that important appropriation measures, reciprocal trade agreement continuation, and rent control extension, ECA authorization, and other legislation of great importance for the welfare of our Nation will have been acted upon and favorably by the last of this week, I take the floor today to express hope that the Democratic leadership of this House later this month will bring before us legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. I propose to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and restore the Wagner Act plus pending amendments proposed by our Democratic leadership.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. What bill are we going to take up tomorrow morning?

Mr. McCORMACK. After the consideration of the ECA bill is completed, the armed services appropriation bill is in order, and after that the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. RANKIN. How much general debate will there be on the armed services appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state, but from information I have received I think they are trying to agree on 3 hours.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit tomorrow during the session of the House during the general debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. There may be some general debate today, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know, but if there is an hour or two of general debate in the morning we can sit then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit during the session of the House tomorrow morning during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 74]

Allen, La.	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Baring	Kean	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kearney	Regan
Bulwinkle	Kirwan	Sabath
Celler	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	Larcade	Smith, Ohio
Eberharter	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Lynch	Teague
Elston	McSweeney	Thomas, N. J.
Fernandez	Morrison	Walsh
Fulton	Morton	Werdel
Gamble	Murphy	Whitaker
Gilmer	Norrell	White, Idaho
Hall, Leonard W.	Passman	Withrow
	Poulson	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 54, Rept. No. 426), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation into the following problems of the economy:

(1) The problem of investment, including, but not limited to, (A) the role of investment institutions in the investment markets, in industry, and in the economy generally; (B) changes in sources of investment funds and the reason therefor; (C) availability and character of investment funds for national, local, and independent enterprise and the effect of such investment or lack of investment upon different classes or size groups in industry; (D) and needs, by industry, for various types of capital.

(2) The problem of the effectiveness and coordination of monetary, credit, and fiscal policies in dealing with general economic policy.

(3) The problem of low-income families in relation to economic instability.

(4) The problem of unemployment trends and their significance in current economic analysis.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 1949, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties; and (2) to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress prior to January 1, 1950; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per one hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued

under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3748) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3748, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, April 11, the Clerk had read through section 8 of the bill. Are there any amendments to section 8?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 8, lines 11 and 13; on line 11, strike out the figure "$1,100,000,000" and insert the figure "$1,000,000,000"; and on line 13, strike out the figure "$4,280,000,000", and insert the figure "$4,000,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to object.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that the chairman of my committee has objected to my having five additional minutes to speak on this important matter.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. As one who is supporting this program to the fullest, I, too, am very sorry that the chairman of the committee has taken that position today, and I wonder if he will not change his attitude thereon.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to change my attitude. We are endeavoring to get this bill through. There are two other bills following this before the Easter vacations. We want to finish this bill this afternoon, if possible, and as soon as possible.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I can hardly present my argument for this reduction in 5 minutes.

However, I want to bring you up to date on just what the situation is. This bill reached the committee under H. R. 2362, and called for an amount of $5,580,000,000. When the committee finished marking up the bill, we had reduced it $200,000,000. My amendment calls for a reduction of $380,000,000, which, when you take into consideration the $200,000,000 cut in committee, the gross cut would then amount to $580,000,000. At the outset I want to say that I am supporting this program and that this cut will in no way impair the efficiency of the program.

Now, I want to bring you right down to the point that I am trying to make, which is this: That we have heard a great deal about the efficiency of the program and of the remarkable recovery that has been achieved in Europe. With that I agree. Paul Hoffman says in his report, a report on the recovery progress and United States aid, on page 1:

Today there is a record to stand on, a record of achievement both for the Europeans and for the American people. It is by this record that the request for further funds should be adjudged.

I accept that as a premise for my argument to justify this cut.

Mr. Hoffman's own report indicates that, as far as actual shipments are concerned, as of January 31, 1949, $2,300,000,000 worth of goods had been shipped. To bring you right down to date, as of March 31, 1949, just 2 weeks ago, the amount of goods shipped aggregated only $3,800,000,000. We have had all this recovery, if you please, this fine showing with expenditures up until the 1st of March of $3,800,000,000. It seems to me that with $1,200,000,000 still in the till—and I say "in the till" because I am talking about the shipment of goods—that we could well afford to go along for the balance of this quarter even without appropriating one dollar; but this bill, even under my amendment, would still leave a billion dollars to be expended for the shipment of goods. How can we justify the appropriation of this large amount for the final quarter, justify it to the taxpayers of this country, when on the face of the record, their own record, if you please, they have made a remarkable showing by spending $3,800,000,000? Do you believe that this small cut I am asking, a cut of $380,000,000, is going to impair the program? It does not seem that way to me; and, certainly, we must face the facts. Today we are in a recession. Will you agree to that? We cannot go to our people any more in the face of Mr. Hoffman's own record and say that we need $5,580,000,000; so I ask you to consider this cut that I am proposing, a cut of $100,000,000 in the payments for the last quarter, and $280,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. This is an amount which we ought not to leave for the sole consideration of the Committee on Appropriations. Some have come to me and asked, "Why not leave this matter of the cut to the Committee on Appropriations?" My answer is, Let us face our own responsibility in this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the first consideration in this legislation is the financial position of the United States. That is the law. So let us take a brief look at our situation:

The President's budget calls for	$41,800,000,000
Estimated receipts (liberal)	41,000,000,000
This leaves a deficit of	800,000,000
Total foreign aid	6,700,000,000
Military expense	15,800,000,000
Arming of Europe	2,000,000,000
Total	25,300,000,000
Increased taxes	4,000,000,000
Total	21,300,000,000
Social-security program	(?)
Normal cost of Government	(?)
Veterans' Administration	(?)
Housing	(?)
Federal aid to education	(?)
Farm-subsidy program	(?)

How much can we spend, Mr. Chairman, without jeopardizing our own economy?

There are two ways to meet this gigantic spending program: First, by increasing taxes; or, second, by cutting the budget all along the line, and that means a cut in this program. I am not for increasing taxes. If we refuse to cut here, we should not cut on items affecting our own economy.

Is there anything sacred in the amount requested? I do not think so, and certainly a reasonable cut will not jeopardize the whole program. We are working on the balance-of-payments theory, nothing else. We pay, with dollars, the deficits that the ERP countries cannot meet.

There is a real danger to our economy when the money we give goes into the building up of industries which compete with industry in this country. Industry here is established with money invested by private individuals, with their own savings. Business people in Europe do not have to worry about saving money to establish their enterprises; we furnish it under the program without cost. Government-owned automobile plants in Italy and France, which do not worry about fixed charges, will soon compete with American firms, who must consider costs.

I am reliably informed that we are giving the British the money to build a complete airplane industry which is subsidized by the Government. It will, of course, compete with a like industry in this country. Under this Marshall-plan aid, England sets aside 20 percent of her national income to rehabilitate and extend factories of all kinds. This is a lot of money—more than industry sets aside in this country.

Today the British have from 15 to 20 percent greater production than they had before the war. In view of this situation there is a danger in overdoing the capital-investment program.

We must realize that the Marshall plan program is or should be a self-reducing one. If we are to believe the testimony at the hearings, that all of the participating countries have increased their production, then our giving should be reduced.

A dollar deficit means that people are not producing enough to maintain them-

selves at the standard of living which they would like to enjoy.

Sir Stafford Cripps, in England, operates a planned economy. It is all on paper and sets forth what everybody in Britain is obliged to do, what they are going to eat and wear, and what they are going to make. Do we have to accept this plan? That is what we do if we approve this legislation without reduction in the amount. The British reach their requirement figures because of the plan they have approved.

Is it fair to ask, what is their plan? Here it is. With a total national income of £13,000,000,000 they set aside 20 percent for capital investments, 15 percent on exports, and 65 percent on domestic consumption. This means food and clothing and rents for housing. It includes subsidies on food. A subsidized food program in the United States would cost $8,000,000,000. It also includes their health and welfare services, which would cost us $6,000,000,000.

This program can be reduced on the basis of the figures submitted by ECA.

Last Saturday, during general debate, and again today, there were statements about the fine record made by Mr. Hoffman and his associates. I agree that this is so. However, I call your attention to an irrefutable fact that the remarkable recovery made by these countries was actually accomplished by shipments of $3,800,000,000 as of March 31, 1949.

I am not speaking of allotments, contracts, or authorizations. Recovery must be based on the goods and services that the countries have received. And up until the 1st of April we had shipped $3,800,000,000 out of a total appropriation of five billion. I hope my amendment will be adopted by a substantial majority.

ECA OBLIGATIONS, SHIPMENTS AND EXPENDITURES

AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1949

Allotments to countries, $4,953,000,000—all of the funds available for commodity authorizations out of the $5,010,000,000 total.

Obligations (procurement authorizations), $4,567,000,000.

Estimated actual shipments, $3,300,000,000.

Expenditures (paid shipments), $2,634,000,000.

After procurement authorizations are issued, there is normally a lag of between 2½ and 3 months before shipments are made; after shipments are made, there is a normal lag of 1½ months until the necessary documents are submitted and payments are made.

In November 1949, procurement authorizations were issued in an amount three times as great as normal. Payments under these procurement authorizations will be made in March and April, which months will therefore show unusually heavy expenditures.

ESTIMATES AS OF MARCH 31, 1949

Obligations, $4,900,000,000, all of the funds available for commodity authorizations except a small amount which may be unobligated for technical administrative reasons.

Estimated actual shipments, $3,800,000,000, a lag of $1,100,000,000 in unshipped goods, approximately a 2½ to 3 months' pipe line.

Payments, $3,100,000,000.

ESTIMATES AS OF JUNE 30, 1949

Obligations, $6,000,000,000, the sum of $4,953,000,000 plus $1,100,000,000 appropriation for the period April 3 to June 30, 1949, minus a small amount unobligated for technical administrative reasons.

Actual shipments, $4,900,000,000, a lag of $1,100,000,000 in unshipped goods.

Payments, $4,300,000,000.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of April 9, 1949]

ECCLES SEES STABILITY AS UNITED STATES PROBLEM

SAN FRANCISCO, April 8.—Current challenges to democratic capitalism were discussed today by Marriner S. Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board. He addressed the Commonwealth Club of California.

Eccles said the challenges arise from Russia's Communist leaders and from the failure of democratic capitalism to achieve and maintain stable economic progress.

"Sustainable economic stability is the foremost long-run problem of democratic capitalism," Eccles said. "Democracies have not yet succeeded in solving it. On the contrary, recurrent depression has been a chronic tendency of western capitalism"

He reiterated previous statements that the Nation is in a "phase of deflationary readjustment" which is not only inevitable but desirable after such a prolonged period of inflation.

"Our economy is being stimulated by fortuitous developments and temporary stopgaps," he continued. "We are depending on a heavier investment in certain capital goods sectors than can be sustained in steady volume. We are increasing dependence on a public subsidy through high price supports and stock piling.

"Most important of all, we are bracing up our levels of activity by a huge military preparedness program and a world aid program, both without foreseeable terminal points as to time or amount."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman from Wisconsin very much, and I know that he has the best interests of his country at heart when he offers the amendment that is now before us. He has, however, told you that in our committee we did cut this amount in the sum of $200,000,000. He has made the further statement that not one dollar is needed to carry on during the 3 months' period before us; nevertheless, he has cut that amount by only $100,000,000. If that were the case, I would suggest that it would have been more logical had he moved to strike the full $1,100,000,000.

I wish also to bring to the attention of the Committee the statement which I made last Saturday to the effect that this is the time to hit hard for European recovery:

The full momentum of the recovery program, which has been so dearly bought, must be carried forward and the United States must back the efforts of the European countries to the full during this coming critical year.

It is for this reason that I urge the Congress to approve the full amount of the authorization provided in the present bill. If the Congress, because of the recovery progress achieved, attempts an unwise economy at this time, the momentum of recovery will be dissipated and recovery itself will be postponed. In the long run, such a course would cost the United States taxpayers more money rather than less.

The amounts authorized in the present bill for the recovery program, during the coming 3 months and the next fiscal year, are firm estimates screened many times, on the basis of almost a full year's experience with the aid program, and with the assistance of the several organizations which Congress in the original ECA act expressly created or contemplated.

As a result of this screening and rescreening, the European recovery program proposed to the Congress for the next 15 months is, as Mr. Hoffman has said, "a tight fit."

In addition to all these studies, the committee examined in considerable detail the program submitted to it. It questioned the Administrator and his principal subordinates, the special representative in Europe and the principal ECA mission chiefs. The committee report refers to the attention given by the committee to such particular questions as the effect of recent price changes, the problem of wheat prices under the prospective international wheat agreement, and the question of prices paid for Middle East oil under the ERP.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee a letter from the Honorable Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of the program, in which he states as follows:

In our discussions of the recovery program with the Congress we have made it clear that we are willing to go into the greatest detail in discussing the amounts required for the various country programs. At the same time, we have tried to make it clear that an arbitrary percentage cut might well result in shifting the program from recovery to relief. This would defeat the very objective for which Congress established the Economic Cooperation Administration and would be contrary to my understanding of the job I was asked to do. It is still true that if a man is drowning in a well and you need 20 feet of rope to save him, 18 feet won't do.

The authorization approved by your committee was based on minimum estimates of the amounts that would be needed for the last quarter of this fiscal year and for the next fiscal year. The proposal for an arbitrary cut suggests that the amount in the authorization bill is an arbitrary figure. This is by no means the case. Our estimates were the product of a careful and lengthy process of review and screening. In arriving at these estimates, we had nearly a year's experience to rely on. The amount we believe is needed is not a guess but a realistic appraisal of facts. The figures reflect tangible recovery objectives and are the amounts we honestly think are required to achieve those objectives. Any arbitrary reduction in such amounts can mean only one thing: It will mean that many of the specific steps toward European recovery simply will not be taken.

The Congress itself provided for the machinery by which our estimates were arrived at. ECA missions in each of the participating countries worked in the closest cooperation with those countries in developing estimates of the import requirements for the next year and a quarter. The individual country estimates were then transmitted to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation in Paris, where the Europeans themselves reviewed the figures in the light of the total economy of western Europe. In short, the OEEC helped to convert them into a single estimate for the total program. The resulting figures and recommendations were then reviewed with the greatest thoroughness in the office of the ECA special representative, Mr. Harriman, and when that review was completed the program was sent to Washington to be subjected to further detailed analysis and consideration. In Washington the ECA's own staff studied and altered the estimates of requirements to accord with our

views of what is necessary for European recovery and the ability of the United States economy to meet such requirements. Also in Washington the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems established by the Congress subjected the figures to the closest scrutiny and advised us with respect to the minimum actually required. Finally, with the benefit of all the recommendations secured through this process of review, it was my task to determine the amounts to be requested from the Congress. This I have done. The European recovery program finally proposed to the Congress and approved by your committee is a tight fit.

The effect of an arbitrary 10 percent cut will be far greater than a mere reduction of the program by 10 percent. Europe is living today in austerity. Even to continue on that basis, foodstuffs and other essentials of life must continue to be imported. There is little "give" in these items. It is therefore clear that any reduction in the authorization would have to be borne largely by the projects aimed at making Europe self-sustaining by 1952. And the serious effects of an arbitrary cut will not end there. Imports of industrial raw material and equipment are used in the factories of the participating countries to produce goods both for domestic consumption and for export. Through such exports those countries earn money with which to purchase additional imports. Therefore a 10 percent cut in imports under the European recovery program would result in a greater cut in the total imports of the participating countries and would impair recovery by that much.

In short, as I have said, an arbitrary cut would tend to make the European recovery program another relief program. In the long run such a course would cost the United States taxpayers more money rather than less.

I want to emphasize again that I believe the amount we have requested is essential if Europe is to achieve recovery by 1952. I assure you that I don't want to spend any more money for European recovery than is necessary. If the amount we have requested is more than we need I will not spend it, and if recovery is achieved more rapidly than we now estimate it will be the amounts requested in the future will be less. The way to reduce the cost of this program is not to hamper recovery by arbitrary cuts in this authorization, but instead to do the job as quickly as possible with the minimum amount needed to provide the essential supplies.

I believe that economic aid to western Europe is just as important as money for military expenditures. Until world peace and security are assured through the success of measures we decide to undertake, including the European recovery program, it is dangerous to resort to an unwise economy which might defeat our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

AMOUNT OF FUNDS

LAST 3 MONTHS FISCAL YEAR 1948–49

Program for fiscal year 1948–49 as screened by OEEC and further screened by ECA totals $4,823,500,000.

Funds allocated by ECA to 1948–49 program out of amounts made available last year total $3,673,500,000.

Deficiency is thus $1,150,000,000.

Committee cut this by $50,000,000 so that bill authorizes an amount of $1,100,000,000.

The amount of $1,100,000,000 is $460,000,000 less than the amount sought last year for the same period.

FISCAL YEAR 1949–50

Individual country programs totaled $4,690,100,000. OEEC recommended total of $4,347,000,000. ECA requested and the bill authorizes $4,280,000,000. The amount of $4,280,000,000 is $1,020,000,000 less than the amount requested for the first 12 months of the program a year ago and $730,000,000 less than the amount Congress made available for the first 12-month period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my colleague from Montana in saying that I respect very highly the dispositions of the gentleman from Wisconsin who has proposed this amendment and his complete good faith in proposing it. I think more than that, a very useful purpose is served in the House by requiring the committee to, in debate, justify the figures which it brings before the House. I thoroughly agree that there is nothing sacred about these figures just because the Administrator for European Economic Cooperation has asked for them. The House has an entire right to an accounting and I shall hope to contribute in some small measure to that accounting; but I would like to emphasize just one fact. We are asked by this amendment and the argument which supports it to substitute irresponsibility for responsibility.

If the Members will look at the morning papers—unfortunately there are none in Washington, but they can look at the New York and Philadelphia papers—they will see evidence of what is responsibility in seeking to cut funds. Yesterday before a committee of the other body testimony was given as to why funds sought for our defense appropriations were excessive, and those who spoke in support of that position, former President Hoover and Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, gave by book and page in exact deail to the dollar, and specified individual instances which made then believe that the request for funds was excessive and that, therefore, a cut was warranted.

We are asked to make a cut, and I say this with no invidious connotation whatever upon the basis of irresponsibility because we are not given any specification of where a cut may be made. We are given the actual shipments of goods as of the 31st of March 1949, as about $3,800,000,000. Every Member knows, whether in business or not, that the mere shipment of goods does not constitute a complete program—such a program starts far behind the water's edge.

I ask the committee to consider the fact that the allotments to the countries in the European recovery program, to wit, the authority that they have with which to buy and with which they actually do buy, including what is in the pipe line, either on contract or on order or being prepared for shipment, aggregates approximately $4,950,000,000 out of a total amount made available by the Congress in the first year of the program of $5,010,000,000, a difference there of about $50,000,000. Your committee was so careful that at the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that $50,000,000 was taken out of the request of $1,150,000,000 made on the committee by the Administrator for European Cooperation for the 3 months between March 31, 1949, and June 30, 1949, and that amount is eliminated from the bill which is before the House in the Committee of the Whole today which calls for $1,100,000,000 for that period.

I invite the Members to look at page 18 of the committee report as bearing the actions of ECA and of OEEC. It shows the screening process which the allocations for the initial period of the program had gone through. The national governments themselves which were affected requested $5,889,000,000. As screened by their own organization the OEEC it came down to $4,875,000,000, and as finally screened by the ECA itself it came down to $4,823,000,000 of proposed allotments, or a cut of $1,000,000,000 below what these governments themselves thought they needed.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please tell us to what extent unshipped goods have contributed to the present recovery that now exists in Europe, according to his own statement?

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman should know that when a country gives the figures as to the extent of its recovery, it includes everything it has contracted for in connection with its operations, as well as what has been shipped. The gentleman should know very well that the picture we are being given of the European recovery program includes not only shipments, but everything that these countries have contracted to get, and that that includes $4,900,000,000 and not $3,800,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has said that OEEC has screened these. I want to call his attention and the attention of the House to the basic document, page 72, which says that it has been necessary for the ECA to prepare this year's program "before the OEEC has screened the individual national programs and made its own recommendations." There is considerable confusion I find even in the committee. This year we do not have individual screening by the OEEC estimates of the countries' requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the present legislation. It is very unlikely that under any circumstances, unless considerable evidence is produced to the contrary, I would support a reduction in the amount asked for. However, I do feel that on this most important point, the real crux and the only serious point of contention in the entire program, that the membership of the House should have every opportunity to hear everything there is to be said with respect to the appropriations which are being asked for.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the committee's attention to the fact that I have before me a statement prepared quite recently by ECA which gives us the estimates up to and including June 30, 1949 of the amount of actual shipments and the lag in shipments. The actual shipments as of June 30, which are estimated, indicate $4,900,000,000, a lag, therefore, of $1,100,000,000 in unshipped goods.

Now, it is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that, in view of the statement by the ECA administration alone, there are sufficient funds to carry this program through, and that my amendment reducing the amount in the present bill by $380,000,000 is a drop in the bucket. It will have no effect of impairing the program and I do not want it impaired. As I said at the outset, I believe that Mr. Hoffman and his staff have done a remarkably fine administrative job. Thank goodness, this country is not plagued as it was in lend-lease and in the UNRRA program. Here we have a program of administration based upon realism rather than upon theory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before we leave this debate on this cut, we ought to call attention to the fact as to just what we are up against in this whole program so far as our own financial resources are concerned. I take it as a fundamental proposition that we are concerned with our own country first and the effect of this program on our economy. You recall that the President's budget called for $41,800,000,000. The estimated receipts, and I am liberal, are $41,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of $800,000,000. We have not considered it yet, but we will soon be called upon to appropriate for military aid to Europe. Tomorrow we are going to have before us a $16,000,000,000 defense bill. We are going to have total foreign-aid programs amounting to approximately $6,000,000,000, to say nothing about Social Security, the normal cost of operating the Government, the Veterans' Administration, housing, Federal aid to education, and the farm subsidy program which is before us. How can we spend this amount of money, Mr. Chairman, without jeopardizing our own economy? I think it is up to this committee to approach this matter of a $380,000,000 cut with a good deal of realism as to what is facing the country. $380,000,000 lopped off this bill will not impair its operation.

I thank the gentleman from California for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the Smith amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. PRESTON to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

On page 8, line 11, strike out "$1,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$990,000,000."

On line 13, strike out "$4,280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,852,000,000."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute amendment as one who is supporting this legislation. The gentleman from Wisconsin has offered some very good reasons why this authorization should be cut. I call your attention to what I think are some other very good reasons why the authorization should be cut.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have seen brought into the full committee, day after day, reports by the subcommittees cutting our domestic appropriations by 10 percent and cutting our construction program for all of our vast projects throughout these 48 States by 15 percent. The only bill brought in which has not done this is the armed services bill, which increases the President's budget considerably.

We have done this on the theory that the dollar will purchase more today than it would purchase at the time when the estimates were made. We believe that during the coming fiscal year the dollar will purchase even more. The Marshall plan is a purchasing program. The principal function of the program is to purchase. The majority of the purchases will be made in this country. If a dollar is going to purchase more during the coming fiscal year, surely we can make a cut in this authorization. I have no doubt but that the bill will be cut in the Committee on Appropriations, and I am confident it will be cut, but I think the House should give the Committee on Appropriations some sentiment upon which to go on here today.

I call your attention to the fact that we will soon have to implement the Atlantic Pact. It is generally thought by those who think conservatively that it will involve a billion and a half dollars. That money will further relieve the economies of the participating nations. We must find this money somewhere. We are faced with the proposition of deficit spending this year, while it is confessed before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the hearings that the budget of Great Britain will be balanced this year and they will actually have a surplus in the treasury of Great Britain. Not only that, Great Britain has found itself able to spend $1,900,000,000 for a consumer food subsidy, something we do not have in this country. It has found itself able to spend $2,000,000,000 a year for a socialized-medicine program, something we do not have in this country. It is spending 20 percent of its national income on capital improvements within its country; more than we spend. Their dollar trade balances have been improved by one-third, and as to their sterling balance, they have no deficit; they have a surplus in the sterling areas.

From the invisible standpoint they have to offset their dollar deficits with dollars raised through the tourist trade and through other means. This is a country whose economy is in good shape, or at least in much better shape. We completely overlook the fact that two men who are high-ranking statesmen of the party in power in Great Britain have said publicly that recovery has been effected in Great Britain; yet we turn blindly away from those statements. Yes, there is a lot of justification for cutting this appropriation. We will be faced in this very session with the problem of deciding whether we will increase taxes by $4,000,000,000. The Committee on Ways and Means is today standing by waiting to see what the total appropriations will be by the Committee on Appropriations before deciding whether or not there shall be an increase in income taxes in this country. Surely we do not want that to happen. When you consider the fact that we are increasing our national-defense expenditures, spending a billion dollars for atomic energy and a billion dollars for occupied countries this year, plus the Marshall plan, we are going to find ourselves at the end of the fiscal year 1950, with a deficit in our own Treasury.

I submit that we should take our eyes off of Europe occasionally and search the horizon in America and find out how we are at home. I am for this legislation. I supported it initially. I shall vote for it today regardless of whether my amendment or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is adopted. I say to you, however, that this program can be carried on at a reduced rate. If one-third recovery has been effected in one year, then certainly there is no need to extend this program over a period of 5 years at the same rate. We can reduce the authorization of the amount of money to be appropriated this year and carry it on through 5 years, but at a lesser rate.

Mr. Hoffman said before your committee:

It was initially understood and agreed that the program for the second year would cost less than the first year.

As I view the figures, having appropriated $4,300,000,000 in the Eightieth Congress, we are not reducing it this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Congress realizes that the adoption of these amendments reducing in a very slight degree this authorization does not mean a slackening of the program or a reduction of the program. The shipments to the 1st day of April, and the first 12 months, averaged $325,000,000 a month, and that is all there is to go by, except the allotment question. On that basis, with $5,000,000,000, practically, added to the $1,200,000,000 already available, the program can be carried until the middle of October or the 1st of November 1950.

Let us see what this allotment business means. In an article from Frankfort, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune, and which was received from their own correspondent, a week ago last Sunday, it appeared that $519,000,000 have been allocated to the Bizone section of Germany, and that only $248,000,000 would be used or obligated by the 1st of July. What does that mean? That means you cannot accept the figures of allotments in considering such an item as this. You must consider the needs. But this is what I am afraid of: If you turn this thing loose with too much money, you will have the same result that Winston Churchill has described as happening in Britain. He wrote a letter to a constituent of one

of the conservative candidates. It appears that the funds are being used for the building up of socialism in England. My own information is that a lot of these funds are being used to take care of the deficit of the socialistic operations in France. The result of creating socialism throughout western Europe will be to destroy the very thing that we are aiming for, because it will result in a dictatorship and there will be no free people left in western Europe and in England to help us if world war III should, perchance—and I pray to God it will not come onto us—ever come about. That is the kind of thing we must think about. On top of that, we must think about the tax situation in America. Today the taxes are taking, through State, Federal, and local taxation, 37 percent of every disposable dollar that comes to the American people. I pray that this House will show some signs of responsibility and will adopt these amendments reducing in a very small degree these proposals, because it is necessary that we show to the country a sense of responsibility. They are expecting us to meet our responsibility and not be guided by pressure and by propaganda. Let us stand up and let us be counted square.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, any argument that either one of these two amendments is hostile to the bill would not in my opinion be a sound one; on the other hand, I think it would be unwise for the Committee of the Whole to adopt either of the amendments. My very dear and valued friend from New York [Mr. TABER], and no one respects and admires him more than I, made a very eloquent appeal that we have "certain things" to think about. Yes; what he said is correct, but we have got to think about two world wars in which our country participated and which the world underwent. We have got to think about the possibility of another world war; we have got to look back and realize that it was failure on the part of men in public life here and elsewhere throughout the world, their failure to see; or seeing, their failure to do the things we now know could have been done that might have averted World War I and in all probability World War II. The question is, Are we going to take the road now that will be a contributing factor to world war III, or are we going to take the road that, based upon two terrible experiences, we know, or ought to know, we should take as the only road that might avert world war III? World war III is going to be averted, as I see it, only if the power of America is used affirmatively. Whether we like it or not, that is the situation in the world of today. I dislike it with all the feeling I am capable of entertaining, but I cannot ignore the reality as to what world conditions are; I cannot overlook the fact that the generation of young Americans who fought in World War I were overlooked and forgotten after World War II. They discussed money values then, they appealed to emotions, they made appeals that divided our people, and they failed to exercise our powers affirmatively and effectively to bring about a world peace. Are we going to do it now? That is the basic question. We know what the world situation is; our way of life is challenged; the world looks either to the Kremlin or to Washington. They look to Washington with hope; they look to Moscow with despair. If we do nothing, the countries now outside of the control of the Communists will be taken over one by one against their will. The only way they can live is if America helps, if America acts affirmatively. By acting affirmatively we are not doing something from a charitable angle; we are acting, as I see it, in the national interest of the United States.

Let us pause for a moment and think: If tomorrow, or a month from tomorrow, all of Europe were taken over by the Communists, or if 6 months ago it had been taken over by the Communists, the internal enemies within each country with the assistance of the Soviet Union taking over various countries, and then in control of governments with the force and fear they would impose upon people, compelling them to subject themselves to such regimentation, would you and I be as happy today, as contented even in our distrubed state of mind, as we are? Do you and I think if all of Europe went communistic or became subject to Communist control, that that would not be against the national interest of the United States?

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has considered this bill well. I have got to weigh the report of the majority of the Committee. Both members offered amendments, not hostile—I want that understood—but on the evidence as I see it I have got to accept the view of the majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is a presumption in favor of their report where there is a difference of opinion among the members. We must also consider that the Atlantic Ocean is no longer a barrier to attack. There was a time when the Atlantic Ocean was our first line of defense, but no longer. Those are the things we have got to think about and pass upon. If my judgment errs, let it be on the side of strength and security rather than on the side of weakness and insecurity.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I am rather disappointed at the attitude of my distinguished friend from West Virginia. This bill involves a large amount of money, $5,500,000,000, and I think the membership should be permitted an opportunity to be heard. The committee has monopolized most of the time and we who want to be heard cannot be heard and I think we should have some additional time.

Relative to these amendments, may I say that I think the amendment to cut this appropriation three hundred eighty million should be for about a billion and a half and then that billion and a half be placed in the 70 air group to build up our national defense to be in position to meet any emergency that might arise. That would be the answer to the problem confronting us today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the membership of the committee to a pamphlet issued by the British Information Service, an agency of the British Government, as follows:

U. K. STARTS $500,000,000 OIL PROJECT

LONDON, April.—In four commercially strategic corners of Britain work is going ahead on one of the United Kingdom's most ambitious and important recovery projects—an eightfold increase in her oil-refining capacity.

At Shellhaven on the north bank of the Thames near London, at Stanlow on the Manchester Ship Canal, at Llandarcy near Swansea in South Wales, and at Grangemouth on the Firth of Forth in Scotland, great new refineries and their complementary byproducts plants are either being newly built, or added to. In the coming months work will be started on a further three oil-refining projects.

The capital cost of those seven important plans will be some £125,000,000 ($500,000,000). This is part of the $7,600,000,000 which Britain will be spending this year on capital investment. When completed they should be treating nearly 20,000,000 tons of crude oil a year, compared with little more than two and a half million tons in 1947. And work is being pushed ahead so rapidly that by next year annual throughout should have reached 8,000,000 tons of crude oil.

While the growing demands for oil products partly account for this activity the most important objectives are the saving of dollars, and the practical contribution to European recovery. By expanding her refining capacity at home and overseas, Britain will eventually save on imports. It is cheaper to buy crude oil and refine it, than to buy finished petroleum products. Purchases from the United States of America will be cut down. At the same time British oil companies will be able to play an increasing part in supplying sterling area countries, western Europe, and other parts of the world with petroleum products which can be paid for in sterling, and not in dollars. As her refining capacity expands Britain will also be able to increase her production of petroleum byproducts, many of which are now imported from the dollar area.

Another important reason is that it is part of the development of Britain's and western Europe's basic industries on which successful production of so many finished goods depends, and in which oil is taking an increasingly vital place, with coal, steel, chemicals, and cement. Oil refining is in fact developing into one of western Europe's major industries.

Western Europe like the rest of the world is coming to rely more and more on oil for so many of its needs. A measure of this reliance is the fact that while oil has not replaced coal, it now supplies one-third of world energy.

War and postwar needs have accelerated demands for oil. Whereas between 1919 and 1945 world consumption multiplied more than five times to over 1,000,000 tons a day, demands in 1947 were nearly six times those of 1919. At present rate of progress it is estimated 1919 consumption will have been multiplied seven times by 1951. Compared with 1938 world demand is now more than 70 percent greater.

A significant development in this onward march is that recently the United States of America, which is the world's biggest consumer and producer of oil, has turned from being a net exporter to net importer. It is true the United States of America is still exporting large quantities of crude and refined

products to Europe and other parts of the world but on a decreasing scale. Growing home demands have on the other hand raised her imports. British oil concerns are taking a big share in filling the gap which this has created.

Britain's oil expansion program is not confined to multiplying her home refining capacity. British concerns are heavily interested in Middle East oil fields which are rapidly increasing production. British companies are also producing in Latin America, West Indies, India, and elsewhere. Including the Royal Dutch Shell group, a partnership of British and Dutch undertakings, the oil production of British concerns rose from 46,000,000 tons in 1946 to 54,000,000 tons in 1947 and was probably about 64,000,000 tons last year—by 1953 it will possibly be double the 1947 total.

The plans now in hand for increasing overseas resources include a new refinery in Venezuela, and the enlargement of existing refiners in the Middle East and East Indies. It is hoped to increase refining capacity overseas 40 percent by 1953. Increasing output from the Middle East will entail additions to existing pipe lines and the laying of new ones. Including current maintenance, all the various plans will call for 3,500,000 tons of steel between now and 1953.

The expanding world demand for oil has meant the call for more tanker ships. Britain is playing a leading role in meeting this need. From 242,000 at the end of 1946, the tonnage of tankers being built in British yards rose to 414,000 at the end of 1947 and to 608,000 at December 31, 1948.

The latter was nearly one-half of all tanker tonnage being built throughout the world.

The savings in dollars which these projects will bring eventually must not overshadow the immediate cost to Britain. Until adequate supplies come from nondollar areas she must continue to import a lot of dollar oil, while at the same time financing a large expenditure on steel and other materials for the expansion program, much of which has to be in dollar and other scarce currency. Also as she is now supplying western Europe with about 40 percent of its oil, she is in effect not only contributing to European recovery, but is doing so only at the cost of a substantial drain on her gold and dollar resources.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the final steps will be taken today to authorize the extension of the ECA program and to set a top limit on the appropriations for that purpose.

There are certain results of this program which are becoming visible. I want at this time to call attention to one very marked trend which we are going to have to have in the future, perhaps in the near future. That is the competition which is being created by the use of American taxpayers' money for the petroleum industry of the United States.

It is not a question of merely keeping our own oil at home, in our markets, and letting the supply for the Marshal-plan nations and others with whom we have friendly relations come from foreign sources of supply. There is every evidence of an ambition to invade the markets of the United States with still more foreign oil.

In other words, the American taxpayer is about to furnish the money to sharpen the razor which eventually will cut his economic throat. I am in sympathy with this program and expect I will vote for it; however I believe it should be cut down considerably, otherwise we may eventually find ourselves facing bankruptcy. I heard my distinguished friend refer to the two wars. I want to say that in both wars we in the United States floated to victory on a sea of oil. The petroleum industry was in a position to meet the terrific demand that was made upon it. Now, we intend to cramp the oil industry of the United States by bringing about a competitive situation so that these European countries and the Arabian and South American oil fields will be brought into the picture. In that event it might bring about a depressed situation in the petroleum industry in this country and reach a point where no further exploration would be undertaken to discover new fields to build up our reserves in this Nation.

We might become dependent upon South American and Arabian oil and European refineries with whom we may be unable to compete. The results would be that if we were catapulted into another emergency and our supplies from the South American and Arabian countries cut off, we would not be in a position to meet the demands that would be made upon the petroleum industry.

This is a very serious question and the curtailing of our development programs in the United States because of the inability of the industry to meet the competition that may be brought about, and is one that should be given very careful consideration.

The question of petroleum imports has for some months past been growing more acute and the independent producers have placed the problem before several committees of the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses. Imports have risen to more than 600,000 barrels per day in recent months, which is four times the prewar rate during the years 1935–39. In several States, the conservation agencies have ordered reductions of the production of oil, amounting, since the first of this year, to about three-quarters of a million barrels daily. Further cuts in the domestic production of oil are in prospect. The oil industry, the landowners, labor, the economy of the oil-producing States and the national security are involved in whatever is done to depress the domestic industry. The producer who has no market for his oil will not drill to discover and develop the reserves in this country.

Heretofore, the imports of petroleum came from the concessions held by large corporations in South America and in the Middle East. In themselves they possessed the ability to alter and affect the welfare of the domestic industry and all the economic and national defense considerations that are dependent on the course of the domestic industry. But we are entering a new phase. Competition by foreign governments with the private oil industry of the United States is in the making.

The British Information Services' statement made here in Washington a week ago and to which I referred and again repeat, is headed, "UK starts $500,000,000 oil project." It revealed the plans of the United Kingdom as an eightfold increase in her oil refining capacity. When completed, the plants, it was said, will be refining 20,000,000 tons of crude oil a year, compared with little more than two and one-half million tons in 1947. Mention was made also of the rapid expansion of production of crude oil by British concerns. By 1953, the statement said, it will possibly be double the production of 1947. Latin America, the Middle East, the East Indies, and India were named as areas of greater development. A new refinery will be built in Venezuela and refineries in the Middle East and the East Indies will be enlarged. This, I might say, is something for the petroleum industry to think about.

As a further aid to this program, it was published recently in a petroleum trade journal that through ECA we are now recruiting a party of 18 geologists for service in British east African possessions. ECA will pay the costs. The purpose is to help develop natural resources, including oil.

Apart from ECA, there is a program under way to finance governments in the Western Hemisphere in the development of oil. The Mexican Government wants millions of dollars—through the Import-Export Bank—to put its oil industry on its feet. An official of the Mexican petroleum monopoly—a government concern—was quoted to the effect that they hoped to have a surplus of oil for export, with the aid of United States funds. Into which market may we conclude the exports would come?

Everybody seems to want to get into the oil business. The tidal wave of oil imports has already driven the producers in the United States out of their own markets to the extent of about 10 percent of the production which was coming from our fields near the close of 1948.

The oil producers in my district, the region where the oil-producing industry of the United States started in 1859, have had one price cut after another in recent months. Their price has gone down 30 percent. A one-barrel well in Pennsylvania cannot compete with a 50,000-barrel well in the Middle East.

We have a Joint Committee on Foreign and Economic Cooperation in the Congress. I invite their attention to the fact that our Government is sharpening the knife to cut the throat of our own petroleum industry. It has been doing this for a long time. The Congress, sooner or later, will have to face the issue. The sooner it does, the greater the assurance that we will continue in existence an industry that has never failed, in peace or in war.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, several months ago down in Texas there was a terrible automobile accident. It involved the greatest golfer that the world has ever known. His name was Ben Hogan. He lingered in the hospital for many weeks and finally, after receiving the best medical attention that money could get, he was sent home. But before he went home the doctors looked at him and they had this to say about him: His blood pressure was better than it had ever been before the accident, his heart functioned better

than it had ever functioned before, his digestive system was better than it had ever been before. "But" said the doctor, "this man is not a well man. His system has suffered a severe and devastating shock, and therefore this man needs the attention, and all the care we can give him."

Now, I tell you that story because it seems to me the countries of western Europe are very much in the same position. They have suffered by reason of the war a tremendous ravaging and devastating shock. It is true that since we have been looking after them, in effect, been doctoring them with this Marshall aid plan, they have made great strides toward recovery, but they have not yet recovered. They are not yet durable or completely self-sustaining. The gentleman from Georgia says that Great Britain's production is up, there are other countries of Europe whose production is up, but the fact remains, and I want to emphasize that these countries of western Europe have not yet recovered from the shock of war. Therefore we must go forward in this period of convalescence, and give them every bit of assistance that they need in order to completely recover, so that they will be off our backs in 1952.

All agree, as the Members who have spoken down in this well have indicated, that no one desires to cut this figure of money allotted to Europe if they thought it was going to interfere with the recovery of these European democracies. We do not want to be penny-wise and pound-foolish, and yet those of us who come up here and offer amendments to cut this figure are in danger of being guilty of that charge. Those who offer amendments to cut are, in effect, saying that they know exactly what each one of the countries of western Europe actually needs, and they know it better than we, the members of the committee, and they know it better than do the officials of the ECA, who have been studying the minute as well as the big and long-range problems. I submit to you that the officials of ECA are just as good and patriotic and true Americans as any one Member sitting in this House today. They are just as anxious to save the taxpayers' money as is any one of us. I say that they have recommended these figures. There is not one of us here who can stand up in good conscience and say that those men are wrong and that they do not know what they are talking about, and that we will substitute our quick judgment and impressions for their accurate studies and specific recommendation.

The gentleman from Georgia has talked about Great Britain. I think, as most everybody does, that Great Britain is the key to this European recovery program. Great Britain has asked for $940,000,000. Last year Great Britain got $1,239,000,000, so we can see that already Britain is taking a cut of 25 percent this year. And why cut it 25 percent? someone may ask. Because this program is designed to apply for 4 years, and if Great Britain cuts 25 percent every year, at the end of 1952 she will be off our backs, and self-sufficient.

The question is, Can Britain get along with $940,000,000? Britain says that she can, and yet anyone, who has taken the trouble to look at the austerity program under which the people of Britain are living, it is wondered if she can do it. But the British people are people of determination, character, and of courage, and they say they can do it. Today they have 25 percent less clothing than they had in 1938; they are rationed to 20 cents a week of meat; they are allotted 2 ounces of bacon a week; they are authorized to have 10 ounces of sugar a week. Where and how can anyone cut that amount of food and clothing and still make it possible for the people of Great Britain to live? Already, as has been referred to, and I think properly so, this is known as the misery program in Great Britain.

How did Great Britain get into the shape that she is in today? In 1938 she had $17,000,000,000 of external assets. Today she has a deficit of $6,000,000,000 of external assets. In 1938 she had 470,000 more houses than she has today, and today she has 3,500,000 more people than she had in 1938. In 1938 she had $5,000,000,000 more of capital assets than she has today. It is well to remember that the way Great Britain lost these assets and suffered this loss was by going to war in 1939, in defense of the rights of little peoples to choose their own government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make my remarks as direct as possible to the specific issues that have been raised.

First, with respect to the matter the gentleman from Florida just mentioned with regard to Great Britain, it is true that Great Britain has asked for $940,000,000 and by the table on page 18 it is proposed to give her under the ECA allotment her full request. If the gentleman will go up and down the list of all the other countries, he will find there have been reductions from the requests of the other nations for the proposed ECA allotments. Last year Great Britain got almost what she asked. And before that, she got a $3,000,000,000 loan. Great Britain has done pretty well at the hands of the United States taxpayer and will even if the total is cut.

Now, for another point. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in his remarks on the figures that have been requested by the national governments, said they had been reviewed by OEEC and then had been reviewed by ECA, and that altogether there had been a reduction of a billion dollars from the original requests. That is not correct. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] did point out, OEEC has not reviewed the 1950 requests. The figures the gentleman from New York used were the 1948–49 figures, which were reviewed. And the $1,000,000,000 cut was for the current year—not 1950 with which the pending bill deals.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Sorry, but I cannot yield because of the limited time.

Every member of the committee can refer to page 18 of the committee report and see that the billion-dollar reduction was in the original requests for the current year. It is proposed by the pending bill to cut 1950 only by a very small amount, about $300,000,000 which is nowhere near a billion dollars. If we do as much reviewing as they did last year, we can go far deeper. Are you not going to do that?

The gentleman from Georgia has aptly pointed out that the domestic appropriation bills which are coming before the committee and the Congress are cut 10 percent, and 15 percent on construction. Of course, this is a dollar-exchange proposition, but the things these countries are going to buy here are cheaper for them, too.

Third, I want to bring to your attention something that has just happened. Yesterday the President of the United States sent a special communication to the Congress in the form of a new budget estimate, a supplemental budget estimate, that asks for $595,890,000. What for? For readjustment benefits for veterans. In that connection, what is said in the letter from the Budget Bureau which was placed before the House only last night?

> Costs of the readjustment (unemployment) allowance program have also exceeded previous estimates due to higher numbers of veterans receiving these benefits than had been expected. This higher degree of participation has become evident since January 1, 1949.

In other words, since January 1, 1949, veterans in the United States have been running out of jobs, so the President sends up a supplemental estimate and asks for $595,000,000, almost $600,000,000, more for unemployment allowances and readjustment benefits for veterans in this country.

In that connection, let me give you a sentence from the letter of Winston Churchill, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] alluded. Churchill said the Socialists "boast they have cured unemployment and at the same time admit that but for the immense American subsidy there would be between one and two million unemployed today."

If the President finds it necessary to ask us for $600,000,000 to take care of veterans out of jobs in this country, a situation that has become apparent since January 1, 1949, are you going to go back to those veterans and say, "We are going to tax you to cure an unemployment problem in England?"

Now, finally, the gentleman from Massachusetts made an eloquent plea on the basis of stopping communism, but it is not this program that has stopped the westward advance of the Kremlin. Rather, it is what Churchill said, fear of the atom bomb and our ability to deliver it, which stopped the westward advance. Building up western Europe is desirable and works toward desirable ends of unification, world stability, and all that—but merely to make western Europe more

prosperous and healthy would, in the words of my Ohio colleague, only make those countries fatter for the kill if the Kremlin moved west. The European aid program alone would only sweeten the invitation to the Russian bear to come and get it, were it not for the atomic bomb and the 70-group air force.

The hope of world peace is the hope that war can be made so evidently a losing proposition for any nation that no nation will try it while we develop the machinery and methods of peace. Let us adopt these amendments and apply to our foreign-aid program the same prudent pruning knife that we are applying to domestic expenditures more and more these days. That will protect our ability to maintain our own economy and to help others as well.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a time to end this debate. We have gone on now for 55 minutes. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and the substitute amendment thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RICH. I object.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 50 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are 13 Members standing. Fifty minutes would give them 4 minutes apiece. I presume members of the committee will wish to speak, including the chairman. There are some of us who have said nothing on this bill whatsoever. I am of the opinion that you want to finish this afternoon, and I suggest this is the most important amendment you will have to consider, and perhaps you would be wise to permit the membership to express themselves to some extent.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and the substitute amendment close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes being reserved for the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time will that give to individuals who desire to speak on the amendments?

I ask that question because the RECORD of yesterday will show that 75 percent of the time in debate was used by the proponents, and the opponents were only permitted about 25 percent of the time. I would like to see the Members have at least 5 minutes apiece.

The CHAIRMAN. On the basis of the Members who are now standing, and among whom the time will be divided, each Member will have about 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and the substitute amendment close in 1 hour.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if this motion should carry, is the Chairman going to recognize, as a matter of privilege, the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the exclusion of Members who are not on that committee?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be the purpose of the Chair to recognize within the time fixed those Members who are now standing, the time being equally divided between the Members standing.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, from the time that debate began on these amendments, I have been seeking recognition, and that is for 45 minutes. I have been unable to secure the recognition of the Chairman. Is the Chairman going to recognize the Members who are now standing, or will the Chairman recognize those who have been trying to get 5 minutes' times for the last 45 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has answered the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 88, noes 60.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. KEEFE and Mr. KEE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 130, noes 78.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COUDERT moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, apparently the only way that a junior Member of this House can be heard is by offering a preferential motion. Between the precedence of the committee members and those who are senior to him in service he is very lucky under the present control of this committee to be heard when we get down to the 50 seconds per Member period of debate; and I did not care to get down to that.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the most important bills which we are going to have. The issue involved here is of profound importance. If we are here today discussing relatively minor amendments to the bill, discussing minor reductions in amount, if we are here talking in terms of 12 months ago, it is because this committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has elected by its procedure to put blinders on the Members of this House, to merely repeat the debate of 12 months ago, to completely ignore the facts of life, the facts of life that each one of us is possessed of until he walks into the hall of this House; and then under the procedure of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the rules of the House he finds himself compelled to check his knowledge of the facts of current life outside with his hat and coat.

Mr. Chairman, this debate might just as well have been lifted bodily from the minutes of the debate 1 year ago when we enacted the 1948 law. The committee has completely ignored the new major revolutionary fact that has come into this European aid picture since we enacted the 1948 bill. That, of course, is the Atlantic Pact and the coming demands for military aid to Europe.

When this committee last year reported out a bill, it reported a bill which provided for both military and economic aid. This year, for some reason best known to its majority, because the minority did not agree, the majority reported out a bill that makes it impossible for this House to consider in one pattern on one occasion the competing demands for economic aid and military aid.

It is hardly necessary to say that the only possible way to exercise intelligent and reasonable judgment in such matters is to have before us a bill that is of such broad scope that the House can work its will on the entire European aid program, so that the House can determine whether or not, first, it wants to authorize foreign military aid to European countries and if it does want to authorize something for that purpose, it will be in a position to determine whether some of that cost should come out of the ECA proposed authorization. As it stands today, we are not free to act as our intelligence and our judgment might dictate.

Later I am going to offer an amendment to strike out the 1950 appropriation, leaving in the 3 months' provision, as a notice to the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the House wants a single-package bill, that the House wants that committee to come back here with a bill that will enable the Members to act freely in accordance with the facts of life. In the meantime, I am in favor of reducing the amount. It is the only alternative this committee leaves us. It does not solve the problem, it does not deal with the problem in a realistic, intelligent fashion. It puts blinders on our eyes and makes us check our knowledge of the facts of life outside. All we can do is to attempt to reduce this amount somewhat in preparation for what we know is coming in the way of demands for foreign military aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending motion.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet as a member of the Committee of the Whole requesting time to speak in opposition to this proposal. Now, the Chair is indulging in exactly the same practice under the limitation voted that

any time a member of this Committee on Foreign Affairs rises any other Member of the House who wants to speak is precluded under the rules from speaking.

I ask if the gentleman now in the chair is required under the rules to continue that same practice in view of the limitation of time that has been voted by the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has stated his parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair understands the parliamentary inquiry.

The Chair advises the gentleman, in answer to his parliamentary inquiry, that under the rules of the House recognition of Members by the Chair is within the discretion of the occupant of the chair. In this particular instance the gentleman from New York has offered a motion to strike the enacting clause. The Chair, acting within the discretion accorded by the Rules of the House, has recognized a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to speak in opposition to that motion.

The gentleman from Florida will proceed.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. SMATHERS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] I will be glad to yield him 2 minutes, provided that the colloquy which has just transpired is not deducted from my time.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that I think I have made my position very clear on this bill, and I want to enforce it as we go along. I have sat here by the hour without any opportunity to speak because the time is being monopolized by the members of this committee. I should think the Committee itself would like to hear from some of the other Members who are in support of this legislation and who might have an idea to offer. I cannot do it, in due deference to the gentleman, in 2 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RICH. Well, I just want to make the same request, in a measure, that the gentleman from Wisconsin made. When we first started debate on this amendment, there were only three of us standing. I asked the Chair to be recognized and I was not recognized, but every time some new Member would stand up he recognized him.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments.

As regards the Atlantic Pact, Mr. Chairman, which has been mentioned by the gentleman from New York, I think it well that we remember that the Atlantic Pact has not yet been passed by the other body. It would be impossible to appropriate any money or in any way implement an Atlantic Pact until such time as the other body has considered it. We do not even know whether it will be adopted by the other body, so how under this legislation, we are now considering, can we possibly implement or even discuss the Atlantic Pact?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. No; I cannot yield any further.

One other point I would like to make in reference to the Atlantic Pact is that it would not make a whole lot of sense for this country to adopt the Atlantic Pact, and to implement it with a billion dollars' worth of arms and munitions, if the countries of western Europe were not sustained as democracies and friends. If the countries of western Europe were controlled by the Communists, or had weak and vacillating political governments then there would be no occasion to have an Atlantic Pact, because the countries of western Europe could not do us any good and we, in turn, could not do them any good.

To return to Great Britain for a moment, I would like to point out, while Great Britain is being criticized severely here today it is well to remember what brought about the condition in Great Britain. She lost $23,000,000,000 in external accounts before lend-lease started. She spent $8,000,000,000——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand, the question was on the motion offered by the preceding gentleman to strike the enacting clause. The gentleman now addressing the House is not talking on that motion. He is just monopolizing the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is within his rights. He may discuss the provisions of the bill, because every section and line of the bill is involved in a motion to strike the enacting clause. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Chairman very much.

To continue with what I was going to say, Great Britain spent $8,000,000,000 of her own money in 1939 before lend-lease started for arms and munitions, and where did she spend it? She spent it over here in the United States, for the implements of war in order to fight dictatorship and tyranny; in order to fight our own common enemy Adolf Hitler and his Nazis. It was their valiant fight against our common enemy that bled them white and put them in such dire economic straits, that they need and require our temporary assistance.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was rejected.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, there are some disadvantages in being in Congress and in living in Washington, but one of the great advantages is meeting and knowing the people who make, not only this country tick, but also the world. It was my very good fortune to attend a small dinner party one evening shortly after I arrived in Washington. The speaker at this dinner party was a man of international reputation who had been loaned to ECA by his government. Because the group was small, this gentleman said he was going to let his hair down and give us the dope on the ECA as he saw it. He said, first of all, that the 16 countries receiving ECA aid worked smoothly together, and that the leaders of these nations were agreed that the money of taxpayers of America should be withdrawn from Europe at least by 1952. The most heartening statement on the European recovery program I have heard was made by this man when he said, "For God's sake, take the taxpayers' money out of Europe by 1952." I thought this point of view would be encouraging to those of you who are seeking to cut down the amount of money which is specified in this bill.

The gentleman also said that he believed both the leaders and the people of Europe were aware of the fact that, in order for them to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, they would have to accept a lower standard of living.

I had been afraid that maybe the people of Europe would get accustomed to the huge amount of money that was pouring into their countries and they would lose their initiative and wish to go on forever receiving assistance from the United States.

Let us not cut the appropriation in this bill. I am afraid it would do more harm than good. Let us instead adopt a firm policy and make sure that we have concluded this program by 1952. I believe that when Europe realizes that our yeas are yeas and our nays are nays, they will provide for their own recovery and rehabilitation after 1952—thereby relieving the tax load in this country and giving our own country a breathing spell in our tremendous tax load.

I hope there will be no change in the authorization of funds designated in the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Marshall plan last year. When I voted to place this burden upon the shoulders of the American peo-

ple, I did it with the full realization that the burden would be a heavy one. It was a step in the dark. There was no possible way to know whether the spending of this tremendous amount of money would insure peace and would stop the spread of communism, or not. The decision which I finally had to make, regardless of my doubts and misgivings, was whether or not the possibility that the Marshall plan would stop communism and preserve peace was great enough to justify our giving away these billions of dollars.

It was a question of balancing off on the one hand the billions of dollars required to finance the program against the chance on the other hand of avoiding a third world war and of preventing the further spread of communism throughout the world.

I feel, as the great majority of American people feel, that our money cannot be spent for a better purpose than that of preserving peace. If money can be properly spent to prevent the spread of communism, that also is one of the most worthy purposes for which we could use our substance.

While there is no point whatever to frittering away money, or spending it uselessly, nevertheless it is worth billions of dollars to avoid another war.

I have felt for a long time, and still feel, that war with Russia is inevitable, if communism continues to spread. Communism is so repulsive to our American sense of freedom and liberty, that we would never permit it to overthrow our Government, either by force and violence, or by infiltration.

Since 1917, communism has taken over 12 or more countries, and is constantly reaching for more. I believe that every country which goes behind the iron curtain lessens just to that extent our chances of stopping communism.

I realize, as we all do, that this program increases our tax burden; that it is going to have a definite effect on our economy in the future, because in this recovery program we are building up future European competition for American industry, American manufacturers, American workmen, and American agriculture.

Nevertheless, I believe that we can endure these things better than we can endure communism. We can endure these these things more easily than we can endure another war.

I am willing to endure them, if by so doing, there is a reasonable prospect that we may realize the objective of this European recovery program, namely, the stopping of communism and the maintenance of peace.

After weighing these things, one against the other, my conclusion was that it is worth while to give the Marshall plan a trial, and I so cast my vote at that time.

I hope I reached the right conclusion, and that my vote was proper.

We are now about to vote on the pending amendments to reduce the figures provided in this bill as the maximum amounts which can be appropriated during the next fiscal year to finance the European recovery program. It is true that this is not an appropriation bill. It is simply an authorization bill. However, there is no reason why the Members of this body in considering this bill cannot or should not determine at this time whether a reduction of 10 percent or a reduction of 15 percent, or a reduction of any other size is proper with reference to this program. It is proper to keep in mind now as well as later when the appropriation is being made, that, after all, this money comes from the pockets of the American taxpayers. It is proper to bear in mind, now and at all other times, that no tax money should be wasted. I have a feeling that the higher we make this authorization ceiling, it will to that extent encourage larger appropriations.

In helping Europe to get on its own feet, I do not intend to so impoverish America, that at the conclusion of this European recovery program America will stand in need of a recovery program of her own. If we should thus deplete our own resources, there would be none to extend a helping hand to us. It is just as important, and to my mind, far more important, to keep our own country and our own economy sound and stable as it is to restore the economy of western Europe.

In considering whether or not a reduction of 10 percent can be made in Marshall-plan funds for the next fiscal year, one of the first factors to be considered is the cost of materials to be purchased by the participating countries. It cannot be denied that prices are lower now than they were when the Marshall plant was voted. As has already been pointed out by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], appropriation bills are being reduced in some instances 10 percent, and in some instances 15 percent. This reduction is made possible because of lower prices and because of increased purchasing power of the dollar.

I do not believe it will impair this program in the slightest to reduce the amount of money 10 percent. Certainly I do not intend to vote for new taxes this year for any purpose short of preventing national disaster. If we do not save money wherever savings are possible, we are going to face the necessity either of deficit financing, or of increased taxes.

In my opinion a reduction of 10 percent in the amount of this authorization is proper. I do not believe such a reduction will impede European recovery in the slightest. It will help to lighten the load of our taxpayers, and I intend to support such a reduction in this bill, as well as in the appropriation bill which will follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California for yielding me her time.

Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that some of us who are tremendously interested in the welfare of our country should have an opportunity to express our views freely. When the chairman of this committee predicates his opposition to allowing a Member to speak for more than 5 minutes on the fact that we must finish this legislation in order that we can have a recess Thursday and go home, I think it is being placed upon grounds which the American people will not approve. I am serving notice now that if any unanimous-consent request is made it will be objected to. I think we can afford to take time, if necessary, to let the American people have all the facts and let those who are in opposition to this know all the facts.

I spoke yesterday on this bill and announced my support of it and gave my reasons. This does not mean, however, that I am going to oppose every amendment that may be offered and every suggestion that may be offered for the betterment of this situation for your country and mine.

See what we are now confronted with. Will you not listen? Do you know what is facing us, or are we, in our efforts to get away from here and get this thing through, not going to consider the vital facts?

Read the bill and ask yourself this question: Right in the first section it is provided "that no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States."

Can you answer that question honestly to yourself without knowing what the demands are going to be in total for the total foreign aid? You have nothing here to implement the Atlantic Pact. You do not know how much is going to be asked. You do not know what is going to be asked for the Greek-Turkish aid. You do not know what the emergency children's fund is going to ask. You do not know what may be asked for China aid or some other aid program.

I cannot answer my people honestly and say I voted for this thing with my eyes shut, just because Mr. Hoffman and his group have seen fit to send up here a request for the amount specified in this bill.

Let me ask the acting chairman of this committee whether or not you intend by the passage of this authorization legislation to take to the country the word that that maximum of authorization must be the amount to be appropriated later in the appropriation bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure I can speak for myself and every member of the committee in saying that it was never the intention of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to present this figure to the House as a fixed sum, as a maximum. It has always been the understanding, and it has been repeatedly set forth here, that the House Committee on Appropriations would revise those figures in the light of the international situation as it develops.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the committee examine meticulously the estimates as to the actual need, or did you take the figures that were submitted by ECA?

Mr. RICHARDS. Our committee examined those figures meticulously for a period of 6 weeks, sometimes at night and sometimes during the day.

Mr. KEEFE. What confuses me, then, is the statement in the minority report, signed by the Republican members of

the committee, which gives an entirely different impression and very definitely cautions the Congress and the country. They use the following language:

> There must be no repetition of last year's attempt to distort limitations into commitments, or the legislative maximums into appropriation maximums.

What I am worried about is that if you pass this bill with these so-called legislative maximum authorizations, the story is going to be just what it was last year, and when the Committee on Appropriations makes an honest attempt to examine the estimates, they will be charged with sabotaging the program.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the terrible thing that was done a year ago when the Congress and the force of American public opinion reversed the Appropriations Committee of the House in its decision to make the 12-month authorization do for 15 months—to cut the program thereby 25 percent—to make it a relief and not a recovery program. The terrible thing was not the reversal. It was the error in concept so narrowly averted. We of the committee claim no sanctity for our figures. Nor do we recognize the sanctity of any other committee's figures.

The record in the first year of this program shows that the authorization recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs was substantially correct. The figures submitted this year are tight figures. They are subject only to changes such as price changes—which may occur between the authorization and the appropriation.

I want to discuss now certain aspects of British trade relations with Russia. East-west trade is essential for recovery. Wheat, coal, lumber, and minerals must be imported by western European countries to sustain their economies. Dollars are not used to promote this trade—the local currencies of the countries are used. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the United State cannot begin to supply all the raw materials that are needed to carry forward the recovery of western Europe.

On March 31, 1949, the newspapers carried an account to the effect that the United Kingdom budget included an allowance of $36,000,000 to Russia.

Actually the mention of dollars was incorrect. The money involved was £9,000,000. This £9,000,000 allowance is not a new credit for future deliveries. It is an arrangement for regularizing transactions which originated during the war. It provides an advance against which payments by Russia for nonmilitary goods ordered by Russia from the United Kingdom and for the most part delivered during the war, may be concluded when the final contract details are settled.

The £9,000,000 item arises out of wartime relations between the two countries.

A trade and payments agreement signed by the two governments on August 16, 1941, provided that the Russians would pay 40 percent in hard currency for nonmilitary supplies and would obtain the balance through repayable sterling credits extended by the British.

Under the urgency of the war, many of the items were manufactured and delivered without final determination of contract terms. The manufacturers had to be paid, however, and the British Government advanced money to pay the manufacturers. At the end of the war, negotiations on the contracts lagged, delaying final settlements. A trade and payments agreement signed with the Russians on December 27, 1947, changed the method of settlement under which further trade would be handled.

Since the wartime authority under which the British made advances to the allies has expired, it is now necessary to secure additional parliamentary authority and appropriations to cover the remaining advances required to settle the wartime accounts. It was estimated in the budget presentation for 1949–50 that the amount required for this purpose in 1949–50 would be approximately £9,000,000 in sterling.

On settlements previously concluded, the Russians are making repayments in accordance with the agreements. This year Russian payments of this character will amount to about £5,000,000.

BASIC TERMS OF BRITISH-RUSSIAN TRADE

The basic terms of the United Kingdom's trade with the U. S. S. R. are set forth in the trade agreement of December 27, 1947, which adjusts and revises the earlier agreement of August 16, 1941. The trade agreement of 1947 has both long- and short-term aspects and has no stated terminal date. The countries have agreed to discuss developments under the terms of the agreement and recommendations for further developments of trade at least once a year.

It is anticipated that trade between the two countries will balance in the long run. In the short run, however, a lag of balance can be expected. The financial arrangements in the trade agreement provide that the Russian State Bank account with the Bank of England, established under the trade agreement of 1941, should be balanced off every 3 months, with any debit favoring the Russians for an excess of shipments over receipts by them to be settled by British repayable advances of sterling.

The agreement of 1941 also provided that the total advances outstanding under the payments arrangements then included should not exceed the sum of £10,000,000. When the outstanding advances should approach the £10,000,000, the two parties would negotiate for additional credit.

The short-run aspects of the trade are quite specific. For example, in 1948 Russia agreed to supply the United Kingdom with 750,000 metric tons of coarse grains and the British agreed to supply rails, largely from surpluses.

In the long run, Russia will supply basic foods, timber, and similar products, whereas the United Kingdom will supply industrial equipment. Deliveries on industrial equipment involve considerable lags, in some cases as much as 2 to 2¾ years following the placement of orders. It was estimated at the end of 1948 that, of the long-term goods desired, the Russians had so far placed only between 10 and 15 percent of the total orders necessary.

Trade between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union in 1948 resulted in the United Kingdom receiving more goods than it sent to Russia.

United Kingdom trade with Russia stated in dollar equivalent

Imports	$109,000,000
Exports and reexports	28,400,000

Grain, flour, and other food supplied more than 80 percent of British imports from Russia; machinery made up two-thirds of British exports of domestic produce.

PARTICULAR COMMODITIES IN BRITISH-RUSSIAN TRADE

Doubts about United Kingdom trade relations with Russia have been expressed in relation to a number of specific commodities and to strategic materials in general. The allegations and the answers in relation to specific commodities are stated below. The general question of British-Russian trade in strategic items is then discussed at greater length.

Aluminum: It is alleged that the United Kingdom has supplied aluminum to Russia.

The answer: Total shipments by the United Kingdom to Russia of nonferrous metals and manufactures, which include aluminum, amounted to less than the equivalent of $3,000 in 1948 according to the British Government's publication Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation. This figure indicates that aluminum shipments from the United Kingdom to Russia in 1948, if any, were insignificant.

Jet airplane engines: It is alleged that since early in the program the United Kingdom has sold jet airplane engines to the Russians.

The answer: The engines referred to were transferred by the United Kingdom to Russia prior to the time ECA came into existence, and under a contract entered into in 1946.

Steel rails: It is alleged that the United Kingdom sold 18,000 tons of steel rails to Russia, and these rails were included in the steel which the United States had supplied to Great Britain.

The answer: Only 1 percent of British steel is supplied by the United States. The steel shipped to Britain under ECA is of a special class, used mostly for steel pipe. No steel suitable for rails has been shipped from the United States. United States export-control policy does not bar the shipment of steel rails from the United States to eastern Europe. Since there is no security consideration and since the United Kingdom produces enough steel rails so that there are some for export, there is no objection to some of these rails being shipped to Russia—particularly since vitally needed wheat and other essential materials are received by the United Kingdom in return.

Tin: It is alleged that the United Kingdom has been shipping large quantities of tin to the Soviet Union.

The answer: International commerce in tin is controlled by an allocation system under an international combined committee, on which both the United States and the United Kingdom are represented. During the period in which the European recovery program has been in effect no allocation of tin for the Soviet Union has been made. The Soviet Union has applied for no allocation of tin.

STRATEGIC MATERIALS IN GENERAL

As to strategic materials in general, the United Kingdom exercises export controls limiting exports of goods of strategic value. It does not ship munitions, military equipment, or articles of strategic military value to Russia.

On March 31, the British Government announced that export licenses would be required in the future for a long list of additional products not previously limited. The countries of the British Commonwealth and the other participating countries, as well as the United States, are exempted from these licensing procedures so that it is clear that they are directed largely toward restriction of the movement of goods of strategic value to countries in eastern Europe.

The new list included certain metals, nonmetallic minerals, tools, chemicals, and certain kinds of machinery and equipment.

The implications of this new export license policy are indicated in an excerpt from an item from the Christian Science Monitor, April 2, 1949:

BRITAIN TO TIGHTEN CONTROL OVER EASTWARD EXPORTS

(By John Allan May)

LONDON, April 2, 1949.—Britain will greatly tighten its control over the exports of possible war potential to eastern Europe as of April 8.

Almost every type of machine tool, wide range of chemicals, and many items of scientific apparatus are included on the new schedule of goods needing export licenses thereafter if eastward bound.

The following colloquy between British Foreign Secretary Bevin and an American newspaperman at the National Press Club in Washington, April 1, 1949, is in point:

Question: Last night's press stated that Great Britain loaned Russia $36,000,000 to purchase British goods. Is this true, and, if so, why?

Mr. Bevin's reply:

We certainly haven't lent any dollars. They wouldn't even give me any to spend here. No, we haven't lent. What we have done is to have east-west trade, which is in keeping with the decision of the OEEC in Paris. We have restricted certain goods in the same manner as you have yourselves. I do feel that the absolute and exclusive cutting off, particularly of the people inside the curtain, in Poland and the rest of it, from all contacts is not a wise way to bring about recovery. Do please remember that there are millions of people in Czechoslovakia and in all these countries who are only looking for the day when the curtain will be rent and the light can go through again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I tried to get you to recognize me for an hour and a half, hoping to get 5 minutes. Now I am recognized, and because of the fact that the chairman of the committee wants to gag the House of Representatives, I get the great long time of 3 minutes to cut down this authorization. I want to say here I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs is showing little respect and consideration for the House of Representatives in the way they are conducting this legislation. I hold no ill feeling in my heart toward the committee or any of the individual members, but I think the proceedings here in the last day or so are just bad, terribly bad.

I am so provoked by the way things are going here in the House of Representatives, and the way you are handling this great Nation of ours, that sometimes I get worried to the extent that I just get sick at heart, knowing the way our country is being led to the slaughter, to bankruptcy and ruination. I do not know what is going to happen to us. While we think and talk about the greatest country on the face of the earth, if we follow this Congress any longer, you are going to see the greatest ruination that any nation on the face of the earth has ever seen, and that will be just because of the statement which was read to you here by my colleague from Wisconsin in the first paragraph of the bill.

You are not taking that statement the way it should be taken, and you are not fully recognizing what it means. It says:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

You are ruining us, the obligations you are and have assumed toward other nations are not aiding them or us. I say you are wrecking America.

I do not believe that the majority of the Members of Congress know actually what they are doing in the expenditures of the funds of the American taxpayers, when we are trying to obligate the people of this country with a debt of $252,000,000,000, and taking them down deeper and deeper, when this year you are going into the red for at least two and one-half or three billion dollars. Then what is going to happen? If you think about the Atlantic Pact and the other things that you are trying to give to these foreign countries, I predict disaster in America. You talk peace and prepare for war. The Foreign Affairs Committee seems to me is more foreign than domestic.

Talk about Great Britain; I heard on the radio this morning a commentator say that Great Britain was working now to get the ECA to give them money so that they would be in a good financial position to help Great Britain and all of their industries, and that with this aid and assistance that you are giving to those countries, to build plants, and guarantee them economic recovery, the first thing you know Great Britain and all these other countries will have the markets of America; American industry will be closed down and American labor will be on the relief rolls and you will be in bad shape, and it will be your fault. I am for the amendments to cut down the amount, and even if they do pass—and I do not anticipate anything even that good—I will vote against the bill. I want it to be known, after listening to the debate and taking all facts into consideration, this bill is so bad for our country that I do not want to support it. It is not a relief bill; it is economic death to America and the private-enterprise system.

Twenty years ago one who would have proposed such a plan would have been considered out of his mind, and I am sure he would have been right, and I have not changed my mind by time. To my colleagues, is it not time we get some sense and look after our own America, the land of freedom, the land we do and should love? God save America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I suspect that the membership of the House, depending upon their inclination at the moment, could take either side of the questions concerning the amendments that have been offered, and make sincere and fervent pleas for either position, because I know every Member of the House recognizes the difficult and opposing facts involved in this matter.

This is an authorization bill. It is not an appropriation bill. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] pointed out a moment ago, the proper figure can be set when the appropriation bill comes here, assuming that it is not claimed then that this is intended to set or fix the appropriation.

I would like to put in my view by pointing out that the ECA measure is a part and only a part of a strategic plan, or strategic concept, originated by the distinguished gentleman who became our Secretary of State, and who was formerly Chief of Staff of our armed forces. It involves, in this particular portion of that plan, the recovery of the nations of Europe, so that they may withstand the forces to the east of them, and be able to contribute substantially to their own defense in case they are attacked, and hence not require so much of our own forces. I think if we look at it from that standpoint, we may feel a little bit different about it. It is a part of a great strategic concept. In my view, it can save the people of the United States, perhaps, much blood and tears in the long run. I am willing to vote for the authorization that is brought here and reserve my judgment as to the appropriation until the Committee on Appropriations has heard all the evidence in a justification and brings in its recommendation. It hurts me in my conscience to do anything to support any Socialist government anywhere in the world. I do not like to do that. But so long as that socialistic government is going to oppose Fascist socialism, called

communism, which seems to be creeping upon the world, then I would rather support that socialism in its efforts to destroy communism, that force which would itself destroy freedom in the world. I cannot, therefore, go along with the amendments designed to decrease the authorization in this bill, although I will reserve the right to vote for a decrease in the appropriation if, when that bill is brought before us, the situation appears to warrant such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was particularly impressed a few moments ago by the statement of the gentleman from Florida to the effect that the British ration is 2 ounces of meat per person a week. I did my best yesterday to tell the committee where quite a large amount of good canned beef owned by this country is available which could be well used to supplement their diet.

It does seem strange to me, Mr. Chairman, that with the surpluses which we have here in the United States, not only of meat but of basic agricultural products as well, the ECA does not dispose of as much surplus as it can before buying from other countries, particularly from nonparticipating countries.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I have asked the gentleman from Texas to yield to me in order that I may address a couple of questions to the chairman, the acting chairman, and members of the committee.

I have here an article from one of the New York newspapers which concerns me. It is dated Paris, March 7. It reads as follows:

> Dr. Frederic Joliot-Curie, French high commissioner for atomic energy and a self-avowed Communist, today endorsed the newly announced Communist line of siding with Russia in event of war. He directs all atomic research in France and is in charge of building France's first atomic pile, the basis for atomic bombs.

I should like to know from the members of the committee if they can assure the House that none of the moneys or materials that are carried in this bill which, by the way, I am supporting, will find its way into the Communist-dominated portions of France which might eventually fall under the domination of Russia, and that we can be assured that these materials will not be directed toward the building of an atomic pile which may threaten this country in the future?

Mr. VORYS. I can give the gentleman that assurance.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I appreciate the gentleman's assurance. I should like to add this, I am sure the Members of the House will be interested. I wrote to Mr. Hoffman about this question and I have the following answer from him. He writes:

> In reply to your letter of March 15. I have investigated the question of whether ECA funds have contributed to the development of the French atomic pile. I find that the policy of our Government is opposed to shipping atomic-energy materials to France and that as a result no ECA-financed goods have been used directly or indirectly for this purpose.

He states that he understands that is the policy, but I believe that the Congress and the country should know definitely that it is not the policy of this country to ship any atomic-energy materials to the Communist-dominated portions of France.

Mr. VORYS. I can merely say that we investigated that in executive session, and I repeat the assurance that I made.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I appreciate having the assurance of the gentleman from Ohio on this important question. Certainly we do not want to repeat the mistake we made prior to Pearl Harbor when scrap iron and other materials were shipped to Japan and returned with interest in the form of planes, guns, and bullets.

Also I wish to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] for yielding me this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I will note take the full 3 minutes, because it is impossible to discuss this question in that short period of time. I do, however, desire to say that I will support the amendments to reduce this authorization, because I am not unmindful of the fact that while this Congress a year ago was told by the Committee on Foreign Affairs it was simply an authorization that we were voting for, when it came time to consider reduced appropriations the statement was made that we had committed our country to the other nations of the world to furnish these amounts, and that to refuse to appropriate them would be an act of bad faith on the part of the Congress and the American people. I am certain that the same thing will occur again if we authorize this full amount and the Committee on Appropriations, in its good judgment and wisdom, attempts to reduce the appropriations to a more realistic figure.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is it not always possible, should the amount turn out to be a little less than necessary, to increase it in January or in a deficiency bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly; and we have done just that time after time, both through authorization bills and through deficiency appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, let us reason carefully which way we are going. When the Marshall plan first came up for consideration the Committee on Foreign Affairs assured us that it would reduce our national-defense expenditures. Yet now we are asked for over $16,000,000,000.

We have just been told by a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that they got certain assurance and information in executive session. I might suggest that that committe has unwittingly been holding too many executive sessions with Mr. Hoffman and other ECA administrators, together with the heads of the State and Commerce Departments. These international industrialists are out to fleece the American people. I am quite positive that few, if any, of those representing the American ideologies of the founders of our Nation, outside of the group mentioned above, were heard in executive sessions. I feel that in the future this committee should hold its hearings in public.

I want to be frank and say to that committee that I wish to inform their friends, the foreign nations, that this insane program will end in 1952, and I also wish to inform the international gangsters, the one-worlders for profit and their unwitting innocent victims on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that it will end in 1952 when the American people realize that we have taxed and mortgaged the soul of every baby to the extent of $4,756. That is each individual's portion of the national indebtedness with future commitments. The time has arrived when we should think soberly and not smilingly and sneeringly because of the fact that some foreign nation or some foreign plutocrat has showered a smile upon you or because you may have seen the Queen of Greece.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think our Foreign Affairs Committee is more foreign than domestic?

Mr. LEMKE. I feel that some members are more interested in and represent other countries more than our own.

Mr. RICH. I have heard members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs say that this appropriation could be cut down without injury to the foreign program that the Foreign Affairs Committee is considering. When you hear members say that individually, then everybody stands up and says it cannot be done. I want to say that there is something wrong with the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LEMKE. I have seen some members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs vote against most everything for Americans and for most everything for foreigners.

This Marshall-plan authorization for some $5,300,000,000 will pass, but not with my vote. This bill provides for the exploitation of the European people by the international manufacturers and bankers of the United States. It guarantees these investors to the extent of $300,000,000 not only against loss but a profit.

This all at the American taxpayers' expense. According to the Bureau of the Budget we already owe $663,000,000,000 with future commitments. This is about four times what all the other nations in the world owe. Every baby from the moment it is born is mortgaged for $4,756. That is the share of the

Federal debt for every man, woman, and child.

It is true that you have not signed a note or a mortgage, but the Federal Government has a lien on all your property and all your earnings and the future earnings of the baby for $4,756. It will collect the lien via income taxes and a hundred other unseen and hidden taxes. You cannot, while you live, escape from helping to pay that lien. It is about time that we stop playing Santa Claus to other nations and forgetting our own people.

Here are a few of the big boys that profited out of the $5,500,000,000 previous Marshall plan. Five hundred and fifty million of the ECA dollars spent in the United States went to Anderson, Clayton & Co. The head of that company is William Clayton, former Under Secretary of State, who did more than any other person to get the approval of the plan in Congress.

Five hundred and sixty-five million dollars went to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The Rockefeller family played an important part in creating a favorable consideration by Congress for the plan. The Rockefellers interested worked through a committee called the Marshall plan to aid European recovery. The principal promoters of this plan were Winthrop W. Aldrich, brother-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. On that committee was Nelson A. Rockefeller, the son of John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Nearly two-thirds of all the ECA money spent in the United States went to the States of New York and Texas. We could fill several pages on those who advocated the Marshall plan and sold it to the administration, and profited financially. It may truly be said that America was sold down the river by the financial interests that expected to and did profit from the Marshall plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I understand these two amendments correctly, one would cut the appropriation to the extent of about $110,000,000 from April 3 to June 30, 1949, and the other would cut the over-all appropriation from $4,280,000,000 down to $3,852,000,000. If that is the purpose of the two amendments, I propose to support both of them if I am given a chance to vote.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to speak for the majority of the people in my district who are weary of carrying tax burdens that are unnecessary. This is my fifteenth year as a Member of this House and today more than ever before I am convinced that the Congress of the United States, including the other body and this body, is far too ruthless in its use of dollars provided by the taxpayers and the bond buyers.

In my opinion, two terrible forces are at work on this Hill. One is where men are compromising with themselves by taking the position that in view of these foreign-country appropriations which we make, and which they oppose, they are for any and everything that can be asked for by the people of the United States. I think that is getting on dangerous ground. Secondly, that if they are opposed to bills of this particular type, which involves armament, they are in favor of any kind of a bill that is brought in here for the armed services of this country. I think that is terribly dangerous ground on which to stand.

The people of this country expect us to have some personal convictions and some ordinary goose sense. We have thrown billions to the winds in the last 15 years until every branch of the Covernment has become immoral in its extravagance; therefore I use this opportunity to set the brakes just a little bit. There is no need of our sticking our own people in the back by appropriating funds or authorizing funds until they are absolutely justified beyond any question. I feel that when any Member disregards his own responsibility in that respect, he is committing economic treason against the people who sent him here and those people who are now too young to consider what these questions involve.

Mr. Chairman, these are my reasons for supporting the two pending amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote for this bill whether or not this amendment or any other amendment is adopted. However, I approach the problem with a great deal of doubt, and certainly agree that there is a great calculated risk. I fervently hope this will be the last authorization of such great sums we will be called upon to make. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking from the committee table, but I am not speaking for the minority of the committee. I am speaking for myself. I am in favor of the Smith amendment to cut this authorization $380,000,000 and am opposed to the Preston amendment. I am for ERP; I am for the Atlantic Pact and expect to support military aid in connection with that pact. I expect the Committee on Appropriations to do their duty when this authorization comes to them, regardless of what happens on this amendment. As has been pointed out repeatedly here, there is no specific commitment in this authorization.

But, when it comes to this proposed $380,000,000 cut I am mindful of certain things.

First, we have got to keep strong at home in order to keep helping abroad. We owe it not only to ourselves, but to the other free nations to keep strong.

Second, we just do not dare have a big tax hike or go into the red this year, if we want to keep strong.

Third, we have two unknown quantities facing us involving this very authorization; we do not know what the OEEC organization itself thinks about these individual country requests that are before us, and the cost of arming Europe is an unknown, unbudgeted amount.

Fourth, in view of the remarkable recovery so far, Europe certainly can get along with the mild cut of $100,000,000 from now to June, a period of about 2½ months, and $280,000,000 for the rest of the coming year. If we have cut too fine, Congress is going to be in session next year. So, after a great deal of consideration, I am opposing the majority of the committee in supporting this amendment. ECA can get along and go forward with less.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering H. R. 3748 to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. The measure the Members of this House are now debating authorizes the continuation by this Nation of the act of Congress passed in 1948 for the purpose of cooperating with the free nations of the world which have not yet fallen before the ruthless march of Russian military might, and which have not been brought under the sway and control of Russian communistic despotism. The measure now before us, if it is passed by the Congress, will authorize the appropriation by the Congress of $5,338,000,000 in further aid to the European nations we have heretofore been cooperating with up until June 30, 1950.

The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has offered an amendment to the pending measure reducing the appropriation authorized by the measure we are now considering to the extent of $338,000,000.

The able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to reduce the proposed appropriation to the extent of $990,000,000. The amendment of the gentleman from Georgia will be voted on first. I shall support it. If the proposal to reduce the appropriation authorized by this bill to the extent provided by the amendment by the gentleman from Georgia is defeated, I shall then vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

It has been urged by the Members of this House who favor this huge appropriation of $5,338,000,000 without reducing it one cent, that if we do not authorize the appropriation of these vast sums, without reduction, the European nations we have been assisting for the past year will be unable longer to stand on their feet; that they will become discouraged and will no longer stand up in opposition to Russian aggression and Russian communism. They are inconsistent in what

they have to say on this subject. Members of this House, Members of the Senate, and the representatives of this Government, along with men of character and intelligence in civilian life, have visited Great Britain. They have been in France, in Italy, in Belgium, in Holland, in Luxemburg, in Portugal, in Denmark, and in Norway. These Americans who have visited these countries who have been the recipients of our aid, are unanimous in their report that the countries we have been thus assisting are well on their way to recovery.

One of our colleagues has gone so far as to say that even in the case of those who apparently have made such a marvelous recovery, their condition is to be compared to that of a man who has sustained a physical injury and who has made a complete recovery. His wounds have healed. The fractures he sustained are reunited and are again strong. His heart is good and there are no after effects in the way of a psychosis or hangover which impairs his physical well-being. Yet, nevertheless, he feels he should have further treatment and if this is not accorded him he will collapse. A man who has recovered from an injury and who continues to simulate and pretends to be suffering from his hurts is ordinarily called a malingerer. Surely the friends of European relief and the supporters of this measure do not mean to say that the people of Europe who have been the beneficiaries of our generosity, and who are so far along on the road to recovery, will play the role of malingerers if we do not authorize the appropriation of the full amount named in this bill.

I do not believe for one minute that the free nations of Europe will throw in the sponge and quit if we do not authorize the appropriation of the $5,338,000,000 named in the measure we are now considering.

The free people of the nations of Europe who up to this time have stood up against the threat of Russian aggression have the will to be free and to remain free. They are not going to run up the white flag of surrender simply because the representatives of the people of this country seek to make a small saving in the funds we are proposing to give to our friends across the sea.

One of the finest and most inspiring examples the world has recently witnessed of the determination of a people to be free is the establishment of the State of Israel in Palestine by the Jewish people. Only a handful of them, surrounded on every hand by enemies in overwhelming numbers, established and are maintaining their independence among the nations of the world.

I am glad to hear my good friend the gentleman from Ohio, able member of the Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. VORYS], say on the floor of this House that he favors and will vote for the Smith amendment to reduce the authorization carried by this bill to the extent of $338,000,000.

In considering this measure I shall first consider my duty to my own country. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. This is true with individuals and it is true of nations. This truth was recognized by the apostle Paul when he said:

> But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

There is every likelihood that the full amount authorized by this measure will not be necessary for European relief over the period of the next 15 months. This is true for a number of reasons. First, the prices of the commodities which will be furnished under this measure are falling. Second, a good crop year in Europe will reduce the amount necessary under this measure. Third, accelerated European recovery will also justify a decrease in the appropriations needed to carry out the necessary relief to the countries affected.

The relief extended by this Nation to the peoples of Europe has been fully justified and it has inured to the welfare and safety of our people. It has prevented the further spread of communism in Europe. Communism thrives upon human misery and human weakness. Russia, by her use of the veto in the United Nations, by her refusal to cooperate and join in making peace between this Nation, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and the nations with whom we have been at war, and by her acts of aggression both in Europe and in Asia, has made it absolutely necessary for the free nations of the world to stand together, to join forces against the further spread of communism by Russian military might.

To protect ourselves and our friends, this Nation must remain strong.

If Russia marches and if the third world war comes—and I see ominous signs, and I hear reckless statements, coming from men who are charged with the safety of this Nation, indicating and virtually prophesying that it will come, this Nation, to protect its friends and our people must conserve and build up its own strength.

I wish the President had not said the other day that if it becomes necessary he will drop atomic bombs. This sounds too much like the talk of a dictator. I wish he would not get in the frame of mind where it appears that he is arrogating to himself the right to determine the issue of war or peace—the fearful power to declare war.

How becoming it would be to him in wisdom and in modesty to refrain from indulging in provocative and warlike talk. We know that a President can put us into war by bungling, stumbling and fumbling, or by design.

The men who wrote our Constitution, the founding fathers of this Nation, in an effort to safeguard peace, placed the power to declare war solely in the Congress.

It goes without saying that if Russia forces war on this country our military authorities will use every weapon available to us. They will use to the utmost in the defense of our country and in defense of our allies the atomic bomb, devastating, destructive, and fearful as it is. The people of this country, however, are not anxious that we get into another war unless it becomes absolutely necessary. It is infinitely better for our people and for the people of the world if we can avoid war and remain at peace. To accomplish this end, our President, the commanders of our armed forces, and the Members of Congress should avoid the use of language calculated to provoke, hasten, or make inevitable a war.

It is never wise in a personal difficulty and certainly not with respect to a war with a foreign nation that may destroy all the wealth of this country and cost the lives of millions of our boys for us to assume the attitude of an aggressor, either by word or by deed.

If war must come, let it come as the result of the aggression of some other power.

In this connection we should remember that there is such a thing as bleeding a country white. In the last world war this Nation spent more than $300,000,000,000. We have already spent and incurred obligations in our cold war with Russia $24,000,000,000. The debt of the Federal Government is $252,000,000,000.

We are mining our soil. We are exhausting its productive capacity. We are mining our mineral resources—our coal, iron, copper, lead, zinc, and bauxite from which aluminum is made. We are exhausting our supply of oil. We are dissipating the strategic materials without which this Nation cannot wage a victorious war.

And, above all, if war can be avoided with honor and safety, we do not wish to sacrifice the young manhood and young womanhood of this Nation on battlefields all around the world.

Nor do we wish to strap the taxpayers of this country upon an operating table, so to speak, and continue unnecessarily to give transfusions of treasure and blood to nations, even though they are our friends. This may be carried to such a degree that our country will be rendered so weak in material resources and in manpower that we may ultimately fall a victim to the power of Russia, after she has rendered us unable to put up an effective defense.

The late Will Rogers once said:

> This country never lost a war, and we never won a conference with foreign nations.

We have set our hand to the plow in our effort to maintain the peace of the world and, if the worst comes to the worst, to insure for ourselves friends and allies against the day when advancing hordes of despotism and communism may seek to overwhelm us.

Lest we forget, let it be remembered that the mistakes, the blunders, the incompetency of Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers at Teheran, at Yalta, at Potsdam, and those who betrayed our allies in China, are responsible for the unparallelled sacrifices and burdens this country has been forced to make and to assume in our defense against the perils which now confront us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from New York was speaking about the effects of propaganda, I could not help but recall in connection with

the propaganda upon this bill some of the activities of certain groups in this country, governmental and otherwise. I happened to go back in my file and found a letter from the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, dated February 27, 1948. It had a very distinguished executive committee, consisting of Mr. Robert P. Patterson as chairman, Dean Acheson, Winthrop Aldrich, Frank Altschul, Alger Hiss and others. How intriguing.

I have noted in the Congressional Quarterly, to which I subscribe, the fact that in 1948, according to the report on lobby spending, the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery spent $131,435. That is under date of February 4, 1948.

The next step we have is this, and I quote from the Congressional Quarterly of March 18, 1949. The title is "Foreign Policy: What Lobbies Want."

> Formation of an Atlantic Union Committee was announced by former Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, and former Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton. After Congress has acted on the Atlantic Pact, Roberts said, the committee will ask for passage of a resolution calling for an international convention to explore how far the United States and other democracies could wisely go at this time in forming a true federation of the Atlantic democracies * * * within the framework of the UN. A similar convention was urged by Federal Union, Inc., whose president, Clarence K. Streit, is a director of the committee.

I think as long as we are considering the Marshall plan, which became ERP and which is now ECA, we had better get ready for what will next come—Union Now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, one cannot say much on this very important subject in the short time available. I should like to say, however, I believe it to be an act of wisdom on the part of the Congress if we would support the substitute amendment and try to reduce this bill by about $500,000,000. Then, if we fail in that, I think, in the interests of our own country and our own people, it would be the better part of wisdom to support the Smith amendment, which would reduce the amount by $380,000,000.

I think we all have observed that the materials of every kind to be purchased in this country under the new authorization and under the new appropriations, after the amount is settled and brought before this Congress from the Committee on Appropriations, will require considerably less, due to lower prices. In other words, the money we are appropriating for the coming year will go further, and, inasmuch as we are trying to reduce our appropriations by about 15 percent for flood control and other various needs of our own people of America, why cannot we take the slim chance of reducing this authorization of aid under the Marshall plan by 10 percent, or $500,000,000? That is the percentage, as I understand it, which the first and major substitute amendment would provide. I think we all, as individual Representatives, representing our various districts, should give particular thought as to how we can best serve our own people. If we can save $500,000,000 here, or $380,000,000, it will probably help prevent the further threat of tax raises on the American people. I hope that the majority of the Congress will support one or both of these amendments. If we support the first amendment, it will not be necessary to take action on the second.

We should reduce the amount by $500,000,000 in the interest of our own taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] for 6 minutes, under the consent of the committee granted at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my good colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, LOU GRAHAM, for this added time. As the committee knows, I have spoken but briefly on this bill.

We should look closely to see whether this amount of this authorization should be reduced. If it should not be reduced, then we should vote for the full amount which the committee has brought to us as its recommendation.

Being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives is one of the hardest tasks in these days that any Member has to bear. Not only because he is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and must thus protect the over-all United States strategy and policy abroad, which many Members do not try to keep up with, but because the work takes many, many hours and there is very little thanks given publicly by some groups in the House for that work.

May I compliment the various Members on the Democratic side as well as the Republican side for the unlimited time that they have given to the exhaustive study, to look into these amounts, to check through the technical and complicated relations between the countries, and to come up with a bill as they did last year, which passed this House by a resounding majority.

Let someone who is opposed to this bill look back in the RECORD when they criticize the Committee on Foreign Affairs for doing its duty to the American people. They will find that on the Republican side of the House those Members who were Members of that Committee were least affected by the recent election. The Republicans who are on the Committee on Foreign Affairs suffered the fewest defeats in the last election. We lost less members than any other committee in the House. We, on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the Republican side, and who are standing up for this bipartisan foreign policy, are very proud of that fact.

Let some of the members of other committees, who are making such a great to-do today about the Foreign Affairs Committee's duty to the American people look back and see how many members they lost because of the lack of confidence of the American people in the policies that they were putting forward.

The first year of the European recovery program was a year when we were faced with emergency deficits of food and essentials, deficits of transportation which had to be met immediately or the people would starve; it was a starvation emergency program. The second year is to be the rehabilitation year and is to be the year of developing the industries and the farms of these countries so that they can look ahead in 1952 to supporting and feeding themselves and trading among themselves in this democratic society of nations.

You ask me: What is the amount by which the request has been cut to reach this figure of $4,280,000,000? The request of the governments participating in ECA for the year 1949–50, that is the coming fiscal year, was $4,690,000,000. The amount that has been set in the bill for the fiscal year by the committee's action is $4,280,000,000.

If we look at this bill now and say, "We will cut the authorization further," we will then possibly find that we do not have enough money to proceed with the program and that Mr. Hoffman will have to come in before the year elapses and go through the same motions again. We should not risk dampening the enthusiasm and fast tempo of recovery.

The crop estimates, as we all know, can be best made later in the year. Every farmer knows, everyone knows, that it is simply a gamble as to what the current crops will be in Europe or this country, for that matter, at this time. The proposed international wheat agreement, as you know, will be considered in August. Consequently the international price of wheat will be determined around August of this year. The Appropriations Committee must check these items closely in the succeeding weeks, as well as petroleum prices and many other factors.

How did Mr. Hoffman arrive at the figures which ECA approved and submitted to the Congress? He said to us on the committee:

> I want to begin by explaining how we divided the aid provided by Congress among the participating countries and how we arrived at the estimate of the money needed for the coming fiscal year. To make intelligent judgment on the different questions we have had to have (1) a thorough knowledge of the domestic economy and the resources within each ERP country; (2) of the economy of Europe as a whole; (3) of the economic relationships among the ERP countries; and (4) their economic relationships with the rest of the world.

Those are the basic factors that our own United States representative, Mr. Hoffman, says are technically inherent in this program. We cannot decide those major premises at this level upon these amendments. The committee is giving you the over-all limit this time and saying that the details of specific items of the appropriation can be worked out with further hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the provision in the act which states that the act should not seriously

impair the economic stability of the United States is extremely important. I believe, and I have frequently stated, that we must have a prudent regard for our own resources. I believe that the people of Europe have a great stake in keeping the American economy strong. I am against raising taxes, I am against deficit spending; but I do not believe that a cut here is the way to meet the problem of cutting our suit according to our cloth. I believe that the Hoover Commission report should be sincerely and energetically implemented. I understand that according to that report that we could save perhaps $3,000,000,000 a year, and in the process increase the efficiency of our Government. I do not believe that this amendment represents a realistic appraisal of the situation. The point about unspent balances is like trying to determine your financial status by referring to your bank balance only and forgetting about your outstanding checks, your outstanding bills, and your prospective expenses. I believe that it is not realistic to consider simply what has been delivered and not to consider also what has been allotted, not to consider the procurement authorizations, not to consider what is in the pipe line.

In a huge technical program there is always a lag between undertaking and delivery.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that whereas the participating countries requested $4,690,000,000 for 12 months, and whereas the amount requested of us by ECA was $4,347,000,000, the amount actually provided in the bill is $4,280,000,000, which is $410,000,000 less than the amount requested by the participating countries. Mr. Paul Hoffman has said that an arbitrary percentage cut might well result in shifting the program from recovery to relief. Let us bear in mind the objectives for which the Congress established the Economic Cooperation Administration. Let us take note of Mr. Hoffman's words:

> It is still true that if a man is drowning in a well and you need 20 feet of rope to save him, 18 feet will not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendments, even though in committee I voted for the first half of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and for the amendment which cut the authorization by $200,000,000.

The reason I oppose these amendments is because this is only an authorization and the stakes are so great in the fateful conflict in which we are engaged that I do not think we ought to take even the slim chance which a previous speaker advised. If I had pneumonia I would not want my doctor to say, "I will give you 10,000,000 units of penicillin, but if you are not well then, I will not give you any more." If we got into a war we would not say: "Well we will spend a hundred billion dollars, but if we have not won the war by that time we will give up and surrender."

Our whole future, perhaps our existence as a free and prosperous people is at stake in this program, and I would rather err on the side of providing a ceiling that may prove to be too high than to err on the side of providing a ceiling that is too low. The former can be easily corrected, the latter might have serious results indeed. I admit frankly that I do not know what the correct amount should be. The ECA officials told us they could not be sure either. We do not yet know what the crops are going to be this year; we do not know what is going to happen to commodity price levels here and around the world. Surely it is wisdom to provide a cushion to take care of any unforeseen emergency. The Appropriations Committee is commissioned and charged with the responsibility to review the situation and recommend the appropriate amounts in terms of the additional facts that will be available to that committee in June or July of this year.

I believe the amendments should be defeated. If they are, I want the record to show that authorization of the full amount in this bill is in no sense a commitment, an obligation, a promise. If later the Appropriations Committee, on the basis of its examination, thinks it advisable to change the figure, then I hope the newspapers and the commentators, as well as the administration and Members of the Congress, will not again mislead the public into thinking such action is reversal of any alleged commitment, or going back on a promise, or breaking faith with the ECA countries. There must be no repetition of the disgraceful performance we had here last year when that which we had set as a ceiling was interpreted almost universally as a floor, and great anxiety and apprehension were caused abroad and confusion here at home by irresponsible charges that the House was going back on the program, was reversing the policy it had established, and so forth. If the day comes, and I hope and believe it will come by June or July, when it is clear that we can with safety and even benefit cut down the appropriations below this authorization, it must be made perfectly clear even now that in any such action we are not changing a policy but are merely changing the amount of money that more recent facts indicate is necessary to carry out that policy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. What assurance, if any, can the gentleman give us that the performance of a year ago will not be repeated? That is, that it will not be said that the Congress has passed on the amount and any subsequent examination by the Appropriations Committee is in violation of the obligation and commitment of the Congress undertaken in the action on the authorization bill?

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry I cannot give any absolute assurance that mischievous persons may not try again to misinterpret such action. We can only do all we can to make sure that the truth is available on the record so that the whole situation will be accurately understood at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I know that my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, and my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, are 100 percent sincere in the amendments they have offered here.

This thing has troubled me too, as to how much money it will take to do this job in Europe, but frankly, I believe they are mistaken. I think it would be tragic if we accepted these amendments.

There is much talk about the Congress having pulled this figure out of the air; there is talk about what the House Foreign Affairs Committee did last year. As a matter of fact, these are tight figures with the lights before us. We have acknowledged in the report—you will find the acknowledgment there—that these figures may have to be revised even though we think they are the proper figures. We also acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, that it will be incumbent upon the Appropriations Committee to revise these figures.

We refer to wheat, we refer to oil, for instance, in the case of these two commodities we say that from the facts we have before us now we think so much money will be needed, but we do not know right now what the variations in price may be. Now, I mentioned the commodities, wheat and oil, because they are mentioned in the report specifically.

Now, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, either one of these amendments would be very easy to vote for from a political standpoint, because you could go back and tell your constituents that "I voted to save you money; I voted to quit sending money over there to feed a bunch of foreigners"; but do not forget that this authorization is just as essential to the welfare of the United States and just as essential to the defense of the United States as the Atlantic Pact or the bills for the armed services that will come in here shortly. My friends, we have put our hands to the plow and we cannot turn back. Yesterday the gentleman from Wisconsin said, "The die is cast." It is cast, and we have crossed the Rubicon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] to close debate.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I do not think I will use even the brief time allotted to me. I have listened to my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who said that he was in favor of the pending amendments. I wonder when the gentleman started to favor these amendments. We passed this bill out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with a unanimous vote. The gentleman from Ohio was present taking part in the meeting when the bill was voted out. We considered this amendment and similar amendments from every standpoint. We put in 5 or 6 weeks in the hearings, working day and night, considering every avenue of infor-

mation to see whether or not we could make any cuts in the amount of the authorization. We followed the advice of the gentleman from Ohio and cut $50,000,000 from the authorization for the first 3 months of the period. We had no advice from him with reference to cutting anything else from the bill, and we left the remainder, the $4,280,000,000, as it was, and voted it out without a dissenting voice.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I said, we explored every avenue; we went into the price structure. In examining the price structure with a view of cutting this authorization, we found we were in a field of speculation and probabilities, something that might or might not happen in the future, and we decided we could not possibly vote upon something that no man could anticipate or prophesy. We left the final review to the Committee on Appropriations.

At one time I heard an Irishman say that if his hoe handle was too short he could splice it, but if it was too long he did not know what the heck he could do with it. I believe that when we are sending a hoe handle down to the Committee on Appropriations for their consideration we should send down a handle that is of the right length, or if it happens to be a little too long it can be cut off. This bill establishes a limit to the appropriation, so let us not send down a limit, a ceiling that is too low, and that will ruin absolutely this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRESTON) there were—ayes 63, noes 140.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 86, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 8, line 13, after "1949", strike out "and not to exceed $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, it looks as if this bill is not going to be amended to reduce the amount of the authorization. The question still remains open, and this amendment presents it, as to whether or not this House wishes to be free to legislate independently and effectively. This amendment, if adopted, would free the House to work its will in the domain of European aid.

This amendment would strike out the provision for 1950 appropriations. It would strike out the $4,280,000,000, leaving in the bill the $1,100,000,000 for use through June 30, 1949, 4 months off.

The amendment, if adopted, would in no wise impair the operation of ECA, according to the program. It could go right on with that interim 4-month appropriation. During that period the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will have an opportunity, I have not the slightest doubt, to consider and act upon a Presidential request for a large additional authorization for a foreign military aid program. Now, I am not opposed to this program. I voted for it last year albeit with no little misgiving. I expect to vote for it again this year. But I should certainly like to vote for bills of this kind freely, in circumstances broad enough to permit exercise of an intelligent discretion. Everybody knows what is coming up. Every notice has been served upon us that we are going to get a demand for foreign military aid.

Mr. Chairman, there are strong arguments for taking some of this ECA appropriation and allocating it to military aid, if it be decided that such aid should be given. One has to keep an open mind on it until all the evidence is in, of course. But if we can postpone action on this long-term authorization until such time as we have an opportunity to consider all the factors involved, to determine first whether as a matter of wisdom and policy we want to authorize foreign military aid at all, and if it be decided in our wisdom that we want to authorize it, to determine whether our own economic conditions permit us to merely add it to existing requests—and that kind of mere addition, my friends, spells national bankruptcy—or whether in effect we want to transfer part of this proposed authorization to the military authorization because the two are inextricably entwined. That is the position this committee took last year when it gave us both economic and military aid in the same bill. There is no reason in the world why the committee should not do the same thing this year and give the Members of the House an opportunity to judge it intelligently and effectively. For that reason I have offered this amendment. I hope it will be supported. There is no reason in the world why anyone should not support it.

It will not impair the operation of ECA. It will not reduce amounts. It will not increase amounts. It will merely leave the Members of the House free to act as trustees of the American taxpayer—free to exercise their control of the purse intelligently. The minority members of this committee, in their report, filed a most effective brief in behalf of this amendment. They made a most persuasive statement of the wisdom and importance of a one-package approach. That is all I ask the committee to do—to give the House an opportunity to make a one-package approach to this bill.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Members of the House have just passed upon the question not only of retaining the amount of $4,280,000,000 in this bill, but they have passed upon the question of acting upon this bill now and not postponing it until a later day.

Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 43, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have read, very carefully, all of the 12-day debate in the other body, on the European relief problem. This debate should be read by every Member, because the short time given to this important legislation in the House, makes it impossible to have a complete discussion and airing of all of the complicated problems in our relief program.

After reading the debate and weighing the pros and cons, it is my considered judgment that the Marshall plan ought to be tapered off far more than is proposed in our present legislation. I say this because I am convinced that events taking place in our own country will make it impossible for this country to continue its generous dishing out of our resources all over the world, and at the same time, stay economically strong at home.

Evidence in the other body indicates that out of last year's appropriation, there is still about $2,500,000,000 in the pipe lines that have not yet reached the Marshall-plan countries. It is my opinion that the proposed appropriation of $5,500,000,000 for this year, ought to be drastically reduced.

I do feel that the aid so far under the European recovery program has been of much assistance to the Marshal-plan countries, in regaining some of their economic stability and has helped them to ward off communism. Our help has given these people new hope and confidence. I feel we underestimate how much they would have regained without our aid. They had hit bottom. There was no place to go but up. There is much evidence now in the testimony that these countries are reaching for our dollars—not asking for less, but demanding more and more. I just do not feel that we ought to be doing things for these countries that they can, but will not do for themselves. The Appropriations Committee so far has seen fit to reduce appropriations for our own domestic program of reclamation, flood control, and similar activities by 15 percent. No such reduction by the administration is proposed in our foreign-aid program.

Most of these European countries have already recovered 100 percent of their prewar production. Under the Marshall plan, we find England deliberately cutting her imports from the United States. The ECA spent $354,000,000 last year for Canadian wheat, when the United States had the largest surplus in her history. Today wheat is selling below parity, yet the taxpayers' money buys wheat from other countries.

The Marshall-plan countries have about $14,000,000,000 worth of securities in the United States. Why should not

they use some of this for their own recovery?

The evidence is unmistakable that our money has been used to finance experiments in socialism in Europe. England could never have adopted socialized medicine, nationalized her mines, her banks and transportation without the aid of our dollars. To me socialism, when carried to its final conclusion, is the first cousin to communism.

This country has been liberal in its help to Europe. The record shows that since 1945, we have made loans, grants, and mostly gifts, of over $24,000,000,000 to assist Europe in its recovery. This does not include the $6,000,000,000 of lend-lease to England or the $6,000,000,000 of loans made under the Bretton Woods agreement.

Our aid program this year, including the military aid to Germany and Japan, will be nearly $8,000,000,000 or about $55 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. If you live in a county of 10,000 people, it means that the Congress will bond you for more than a half million dollars just for this one program. It means an indebtedness of $71,500,000 for my State of Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, our country has about 7 percent of the working people in the world, and this 7 percent has developed about 36 percent of the world's income. This leaves 93 percent of the people in the world having 64 percent of the world's income. I am fearful that the road we are now traveling is designed to divide the wealth of 140,000,000 Americans on a share and share alike basis with the other peoples of the world. If we do this, certainly we are lowering our own standard of living to a point where we will no longer be able to help those in distress, or even help ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I did vote to send food, medicine, and clothing to European countries, to Greece and to China. I believe in that kind of relief. If they are still in need, I would want to carry it on. That is not the type of relief we are now giving under the Marshall plan.

Mr. Chairman, under the Marshall plan, the European countries were obligated to furnish us scarce materials for stock-piling. This provision has been a failure.

I am further concerned about certain trade agreements which the 16 Marshall-plan countries have with the iron-curtain countries. These countries have completed some 88 trade treaties with the countries behind the iron curtain. Most of them have been completed since World War II. Forty of these treaties are restricted and confidential. The evidence before the Senate is unrefuted that under these treaties, the Marshall-plan countries have sent nearly $5,000,000,000 worth of equipment to the iron-curtain countries. This equipment includes jet engines, locomotives, steel rails, and all types of items that are certainly war-potential materials.

I find, also, Mr. Chairman, that England just last week, has made arrangements to loan Russia $36,000,000. It seems to me that some of the equipment and materials we are supplying to the 16 Marshall-plan countries is merely in transit, and has found its final resting place in one of the iron-curtain countries, in the form of manufactured goods.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident that this European aid bill will pass the Congress. I am convinced that some of my colleagues will vote for the measure because they think it may help to stave off a depression in the United States. It may help to do that for a short time. I shudder when I think of what might happen to our economy, which is now geared to tremendous production for the military, lend-lease, and aid, all over the world, when all that aid is shut off at one time. Very soon we must pay the fiddler.

Mr. Chairman, last week, there was a meeting in Washington, attended by industrialists and manufacturers, considering ways and means of getting more gravy out of the Marshall plan. They are finding it rather difficult because of the red tape and restrictions to come under the provisions of this aid. If you followed the discussion of this group, you are convinced that they must either supply goods under the Marshall plan or curtail their production. One hundred and nine of these industrialists appeared before the committee insisting their products be included under the Marshall plan. In fact, the chairman of the committee declared, and I quote:

> There will be a fight if the demands of the folks at home are not recognized.

In other words, ladle out the gravy and make big appropriations to the special interests, or the bill is in danger. The get-it-now boys feel it may stave off a depression in the United States, and they may be right. But I am wondering if they are really interested in the recovery of Europe, or saving the economy in this country.

I am also amazed to find, that since the close of World War II, some 25 large industries in the United States have established themselves in Europe. They are making automobiles, washing machines, typewriters, vacuum cleaners, and hundreds of other products. They are taking the know-how of our country to Europe, and there produce goods in competition to our own. Our industries go there because they can take advantage of the lower labor costs, with labor that seems willing to work, and they can then ship these foreign-made goods back to the United States, over lower, or no tariff walls at all. Many of these products now flood our country. Take the case of automobiles. We find that in 1947, only 48 automobiles were imported into the United States. In 1948, more than 38,000 automobiles were imported, and we are just getting started. All of these industries establishing themselves in Europe will soon be flooding our country with their products. This is emphasized by the fact that just last year, our imports increased $1,700,000,000 over 1947, and our exports decreased $3,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, we have in the United States today about 4,000,000 people unemployed. There are another 9,000,000 people who are working part time. Unemployment is the first symptom of the job loss through imports of goods from Asia, Africa, and Europe. The workers of this country had better wake up to what these trade agreements will do to their jobs. They just have no protection and under the Marshall plan we are gradually lowering our standard of living to those of the rest of the world.

I feel we ought to look further at the economy of the Marshall-plan countries. The debt of this country is nearly twice that of all of the Marshal-plan countries, and yet we dig into our pockets to help them pay their debts. The per capita debt of those countries is $650, while ours is well over $1,800. Their total debt is about $150,000,000,000. Ours is more than $250,000,000,000. I am sure these European countries do not understand that we have this large debt, and that our own economic structure is wobbling on shifting uncertain economic sands. There is no question but what there is a jittery condition existing on our economic front. I read in this act these words:

> No assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

It is my considered judgment that this huge foreign-aid program, and our military spending is jeopardizing our economic stability. Prices in this country are down. Unemployment is rising. We may be facing more than just "disinflation." The handwriting is on the wall. It is time to stop, look, and listen, before we find ourselves bogged down in the morass and uncertain waters which will bring economic destruction.

To me it is a great hoax upon the American people, when we deal out our money to these Marshall-plan countries and let them make treaties as fast as they can to trade with Russia. Eighty-eight treaties since the close of World War II. We find our State Department has attempted to give the people the understanding that we have broken off negotiations with Russia and would send nothing which they could use in making war against us behind the iron curtain. That just is not true of the goods we send to Europe.

Mr. Chairman, it seems we ought to labor diligently to keep our democracy strong. It ought to be responsive to our needs, or we will find ourselves losing our freedoms. Certainly if we overextend ourselves and must levy higher taxes, which we must do if we continue with all of this spending orgy, it will mean certain depression in this country. It will bring unemployment and a disaster which none of us want. We cannot continue to dissipate our God-given resources in these unusual amounts. What if we do save Europe from communism and bankrupt our own Government and exhaust our natural resources? I am most apprehensive about the future economic stability of our own country. It is for that reason that I earnestly hope that the funds for the European recovery program can at least be cut in half. Should we find, within the next year, our assistance is bringing a deep and more serious impact on our economic stability, then our aid will cease. Our first duty is to ourselves and to future unborn generations who must pay for this program.

It is more important, Mr. Chairman, that the spending policy of our country be right rather than bipartisan. I know we want to have unity, but unity solely for the sake of unity can well be disastrous. The history of the world is strewn with the wreckage of countries that were supposed to be united, but in the wrong cause.

The propaganda which has been given to the country on this program makes my opposition more difficult. We who oppose this reckless spending of our resources will be branded as isolationists and smeared with all types of innuendoes and false accusations, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that whenever loyal opposition is silenced, either by force, threats, or sundry smear techniques, or if it fails to speak, then the freedom of this country is lost. I have spoken because I have a sincere and earnest desire to do the right thing and I have come to the conclusion, after reading the hundreds of pages of debate in the Senate, that to continue this program on such a full scale will certainly bring us to the brink of economic disaster. If economic, spiritual, social, and political disaster comes, we lose much of our cherished freedoms. The folks at home and future generations who must bear this extra burden will wisely question the steps we are about to take.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the money which the pending bill authorizes to be appropriated does not represent bounty that is to be heaped upon needy people; it is an investment in our own national security. We are simply undertaking to help needy people help themselves, to rebuild their economy, to make it possible for them to fulfill obligations that they have assumed under a solemn compact into which they have entered.

Mr. Chairman, on Monday of last week notice was given to all the world that liberty has made its last retreat before the assaults of Soviet Russia and to the peoples of participating countries I would pay a word of tribute.

What courage! What sublime courage do they display. Suffering adversities never before experienced, they do not despair. The gnawing pangs of misery have not broken their will to survive as free peoples. Living beneath the angry muzzles of Russian guns they are still brave. And here at a time when our own security is imperiled what a blessing it is—a blessing from heaven—that we are privileged to make common cause with them in the fight for the rights of the whole human family. To such an everlasting rock of character can we not afford to moor the destiny of our own Republic?

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in important business. Let those who would advocate surrender, who would purchase the bare right to live at the expense of liberty, call this a war budget if they may. That is a familiar cry that has been coming from the Kremlin and its minions in every part of the world for a long time and it frightens no one.

If this is war; it is war for peace; war for freedom and for humanity. It is war for God and country and against the monster that would devour the soul of man.

Mr. Chairman, let us go forward in this noble task to which we have set our hands and look forward to the coming morning with its brilliant rays of gladness and of peace.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support this legislation. I speak, as I am sure all of the Members on both sides realize, as a friend of the program. But I want to ask a few questions about certain features of the bill, and as an emphatic believer in the program I cannot refrain from voicing my objection to the manner in which this legislation is being handled, not by the Chairman presiding who has been eminently fair, but by those in control of this legislation on the majority side.

The amendment, for instance, submitted by my able colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], a few minutes ago, was deserving of far greater consideration by this Committee than was given to it. To shut off debate summarily in the manner adopted was in my judgment, an abuse of legislative power. I share entirely the views expressed yesterday by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I know he is situated as I am. He intends to vote for this program.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, the people of the country expect us to consider both sides of this question. Let us not forget that the Members who oppose this program are just as patriotic, just as loyal Americans as those of us who favor it. When we allow ourselves in the heat of debate to lose sight of that fact we are faithless to the trust reposed in us by a great people. They expect us to give both sides every opportunity to express their views and to accord to this problem the careful and sincere consideration which this great piece of legislation deserves. Therefore, while agreeing with the majority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in their objective, I condemn their tactics. After a little trip that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], and myself made to Europe last summer, I was more convinced than ever that this program is working, that it is helping Europe, that it has made a significant contribution to the achievement of economic recovery in many of the countries of Europe. In my judgment, it is a controlling factor, probably the controlling factor, in stemming the westward sweep of communism across the continent of Europe. In both these respects, it is serving the best interests of our own people. That is necessarily so in a world that has become a parish. I believe, therefore, that the program deserves continuance. In considering it, however, it is a distinct disservice to ourselves, to those whom we represent, and indeed, to the countries benefited by the aid, to gloss over those respects in which it does not live up to expectations. These deficiencies should be brought out in the open and discussed frankly and freely, in the interests of everyone.

No one can help Europe unless Europe helps itself. This self-help can come about only if the countries of Europe indicate an increasing readiness to subordinate age-old rivalries, and even national prestige, to a common effort based on economic and perhaps eventual political unification.

I have a strong impression that the nations involved must do a great deal more to assist in the achievement of their own recovery than they have done to date, if the results on the proposed target date in 1952 are to measure up to our expectations. It is somewhat disillusioning to note that in a recent survey of the situation made by the European Economic Cooperation Organization, it is estimated that there will still be a $3,000,000,000 deficit when the books are closed in 1952, with no money to meet it. As a result, the secretary of the organization has warned that unless the European nations take definite and drastic steps to meet this situation, they may face, at the end of the life of the program, political and economic consequences resulting in catastrophe.

The leaders of these nations have, in many instances, either been unwilling or unable to impress upon their people the significance of the great changes which have come over their countries in this postwar world. Greater European economic and political unity is the only answer to this problem.

This feature was recognized when we enacted the bill last year, particularly in section 115, containing the undertakings to be entered into by the participating countries. We sought, under paragraph (b) (3) to bring about greater cooperation between the participating countries in stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among each other and with other countries, and in reducing barriers to trade.

As to this matter, may I ask either the chairman of the committee or the ranking minority member to enlighten us on what has been done, other than in the Benelux agreement, by these countries to improve that situation economically and to bring about a greater economic unity.

May I have a reply to that? What was the evidence before the committee on that subject, or is the record devoid of any evidence?

Mr. VORYS. Of course, the OEEC itself has become a much more operating organization, and the inter-European payment arrangement which is described, the additional grants arrangement, has stimulated about $8,000,000 in trade, but the Benelux agreement has not yet been consummated. There is an Italian-French agreement which I believe has already been consummated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the section now under consideration do close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I believe no change has been made in the bill since that motion was made the last time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order against the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan that no change has been made in the bill since the last motion to strike the enacting clause was made. That is the case. Thus, the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 115 (b) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the period following the words "grant basis" and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the obligation to make such deposits may be waived, in the discretion of the Administrator, with respect to technical information or assistance furnished under section 111 (a) (3) of this title and with respect to ocean transportation furnished on United States-flag vessels under section 111 of this title in an amount not exceeding the amount, as determined by the Administrator, by which the charges for such transportation exceed the cost of such transportation at world market rates."

(b) Section 115 of such act is amended by adding two new subsections, as follows:

"(h) Not less than 5 percent of each special local currency account established pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of this section shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources or for other local currency requirements of the United States.

"(i) (1) The Administrator shall, to the greatest extent practicable, initiate projects for and assist the appropriate agencies of the United States Government in procuring and stimulating increased production in participating countries of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources; and in furtherance of those objectives the Administrator shall, in addition to the local currency allocated pursuant to subsection (h), use such other means available to him under this title as he may deem appropriate.

"(2) In furtherance of such objectives and within the limits of the appropriations and contract authorizations of the Bureau of Federal Supply to procure strategic and critical materials, the Administrator, with the approval of the Director of such Bureau, shall enter into contracts in the name of the United States for the account of such Bureau for the purchase of strategic and critical materials in any participating country. Such contracts may provide for deliveries over definite periods, but not to exceed 20 years in any contract, and may provide for payments in advance of deliveries.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to restrict or limit in any manner the authority now held by any agency of the United States Government in procuring or stimulating increased production of the materials referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) in countries other than participating countries."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], replying to a statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] and to one which I had made, among other things said:

The European recovery program involves a calculated risk, but it is not a policy which in the past has been unquestionably a failure and which has led us to two disastrous wars, to the great detriment of the youth and future of this country.

That part of the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] which charges that the European recovery program is not a policy "which has led us to two disastrous wars" is accurate. The European recovery program, as everyone knows, came after—not before—those two disastrous wars to which he makes reference.

His statement carries a further implication. Permit me to repeat that statement, deleting words which are unnecessary to the point I am endeavoring to make. He said, and again I quote—deleting certain words:

The European recovery program * * * is not a policy which * * * has led us to two disastrous wars.

The implication in that statement is that, prior to those two wars, we were following a policy which led us into those wars.

The conclusion the gentleman makes is not borne out by the facts. Prior to World War I, this country, in the main, had adhered to the advice of Washington, who told us to avoid entanglements with foreign nations.

Just prior to World War I, we abandoned that policy and entered upon a policy of international meddling—we began to concern ourselves with the affairs of other nations, and we were propagandized into World War I, a war which we were told would end all wars. It did nothing of the kind.

We became involved in World War II because we continued to ignore Washington's advice; because we followed down the international road. Internationalism and the policies of the internationalists—not isolationism—is the policy which led us into World War I and World War II—wars which the gentleman correctly stated were, and I quote, "to the great detriment of the youth and future of this country."

Whatever may be the faults of the isolationists, whatever may be the failure of isolationism, neither World War I nor World War II can be charged to isolationists nor to the policy they advocated.

We went into both of those wars with our eyes open. We went in voluntarily. We went in, in spite of Washington's advice. We went in because we had abandoned the policy of isolationism.

No one, neither the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] nor the world-renowned statesmen of the other body, can change the facts.

We are still continuing to follow the internationalists, to adhere, to a certain degree at least, to the so-called bipartisan foreign policy which to date has brought us nothing but war, debt, and a commitment to furnish the munitions and the men for a third world war in which any one of the 12 signatory nations to the Atlantic Pact may involve us.

Early in the day the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] stated in substance that we had become involved in two wars because of lack of foresight on the part of our leaders. It is not very often that I find myself in accord with the gentleman, but I think he is right about that one.

Either those statesmen who created the situation which caused us to become involved in World War I and World War II lacked foresight or they deliberately involved us in those two wars. I prefer to repudiate the second proposition; to think, rather, that they did not anticipate the results of their action. But the lack of foresight of which the gentleman complains was that of the Members of his own party and those who were willing to commit us to "a great adventure," "a great speculation," who now talk about "a calculated risk." Our involvement in those two wars was not due to the fact that we followed the policy of Washington and his advice to avoid foreign entanglements. We got into those two wars because we disregarded that advice. This recovery program to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] referred is part of the fruit of those two wars.

We are now reaping the harvest of those two wars, which were a prior harvest of internationalism. It would seem in all fairness as though those who advocate this policy of internationalism now, admitting that we have fought two disastrous wars and that we now have, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], a member of the committee, yesterday stated, a program which will impair the economic stability of these United States—and I quote him: "Unquestionably this act last year impaired the economic stability of the United States by increasing inflationary pressures"—would now acknowledge the futility of their efforts, the unsoundness and the disastrous results of their policy of internationalism, and permit us to once more follow the advice of Washington.

A little later today the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] spoke about this plan of Mr. Owen J. Roberts, Union Now. More than 7 years ago from the well of the House I exhibited a flag of Union Now. That was in January of 1942, when from Clarence Streit and others came the proposition that we appropriate a million dollars as a birthday gift to President Roosevelt, to be used to call a convention to draw up a constitution for a United States of the World—Union

Now—or a World Federation—whatever you want to call it.

The advocates of that movement at that time sent to every Member of Congress a request calling for an appropriation of a billion dollars to finance the international organization which it then advocated creating. At that time Mr. Roberts and his associates were advocating the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes and the raising of an international flag. They are still at it. They are persistent all right, they are still at it.

There is just one question I want to ask, What is the difference in the result to future generations—not the present, but to future generations—between the policy of the Communists who advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and the result of the policy advocated by Owen J. Roberts and his associates who favor Union Now and the formation of this world federation?

In the one case, the Communists, if successful, would have a revolution—that would be bad—we would not get that under the Roberts plan, but in the end the Communists, if successful, would by force wipe out our Government, make us a subject nation, establish communism and slavery, atheism, in the place of Christianity, freedom, and prosperity.

Under the Roberts plan, what would we get? Practically the same thing, insofar as our own form of government, our freedom, our prosperity, and our happiness were involved. The only difference would be that the Communists would force us to yield, while the outfit headed by Owen J. Roberts would seduce us into accepting a surrender of our sovereignty, into becoming part and parcel of a United States of the World—of Union Now—or of whatever high-sounding but deceptive title its advocates finally chose to call it.

In Union Now or whatever it is they advocate we would be but a part of the whole, subordinate to the will of our associates. We would furnish the money to them. We would supply them with not only the necessities of life, but with those things which would enable them to compete with us economically.

Yes, and worse than that, if we accept Union Now, or accept and implement the Atlantic Pact, we will pledge future generations of our young men to fight on foreign soil wherever, whenever, any one of the signatory nations becomes involved in a quarrel with its neighbor.

Make no mistake about the road on which we have set our feet. If we follow, if we do not repudiate the implementation of the Atlantic Pact, in the years to come we will find ourselves in war after war, and the only excuse offered is that we, the most powerful nation in all the world, are so fearful of our ability to defend ourselves that we must join in an alliance with quarrelsome, warlike, impoverished nations.

If world war III is late in coming, we may in the meantime find ourselves bled white, a victim of our own stupidity, our own generosity, our own unsound reasoning.

Later today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] stated that the votes against this bill, or perhaps it was against some then pending amendment, would indicate the lack of strength of the isolationists.

It may be that the vote will indicate a lack of courage on the part of some isolationists, for the isolationists have been falsely charged with all of the ills which have come to this country since 1914.

But I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] at least give some of us credit for adherence to our convictions, for having the courage to voice the views which we believe most likely to give us future national security.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 10, line 16, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and the total of such allocations, together with loans and guaranties made under section 111 of this act, shall not be less than 20 percent of the total amount of assistance furnished under this title."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I feel it my duty at least to give the House a chance to pass on this amendment which I offered in committee. I am a little surprised at my dear friend, our chairman, for scolding some of us for exercising our right as Members to vote on amendments to this bill. I was for ERP last year. I am for it this year, and I have certainly been supporting this legislation. I voted for this bill in committee with the distinct understanding that I would not forego my right to vote my convictions on any amendment on the floor. I offered amendments to cut the authorization in committee and naturally felt justified in voting for the Smith amendment when it came to the floor.

I offered this present amendment in committee and I feel I should call it to your attention now. Last year a $1,000,000,000, or about one-fifth of the total for ERP was earmarked for loans and guaranties.

We have plenty of exports this year and if we could get paid for them, our problem would be far simpler. I think this principle of earmarking about 20 percent of this fund for pay-back money, instead of grant money, should be continued as a token recognition by the ERP countries of the drain upon our natural resources by this program and as a token of continuity of cooperation by those countries in the future when the United States has deficiencies in its own resources as a result of this program. This amendment would earmark 20 percent or about one billion dollars, $300,000,000 is already earmarked for guaranties. We are told about $200,000,000 in loans are planned and 5 percent, or roughly $250,000,000 of the counterpart funds, the special local currency account, is earmarked by existing law and by the committee bill at the place where I have offered this amendment. Therefore, my amendment would require about $250,000,000 more to be on some sort of repayable basis.

We were told that Europe is "loaned up." These countries, if you look at page 836 of the hearings, owe $11,489,000,000 in the Western Hemisphere in dollar debts, including $8,222,000,000 to the United States Government. They owe $1,638,000,000 to other countries outside of the Western Hemisphere, except for the United Kingdom, which owes about $13,500,000 in sterling, and of course, their problem is the most acute. Dollar debt service in the European countries in 1955 is estimated at $456,000,000 a year. Our dollar debt service this year is about $5,000,000,000. We have made no post-Marshall plan trade arrangements with the ERP countries yet. Until we do, I feel they can at least arrange to pay us back 20 cents on the dollar after they have recovered. I present this amendment for your consideration and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is deceptively simple. If we had countries who were able to pay and customers who were able to pay then we would want to receive something on account; but the purpose of ERP is to make up the deficiencies in payments that these countries cannot possibly make. The whole reason for this program is based upon the premise that there is approximately for the four-year period from 1948 to 1952 a $17,000,000,000 to $22,000,000,000 deficiency of dollars or dollar area, necessary goods and services which cannot be met either by their material wealth or by hard currency.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. Not at the moment; I will yield later if I can.

Unless we look at the problem from the practical point of view, that this is actually a balance-of-payments deficiency matter we do not see what is wrong with the Vorys amendment.

Under the present bill the ECA Administrator, Mr. Hoffman, has the discretion to negotiate for these strategic materials so they can be obtained in countries where they can be found, and of necessity under this program where the level of living is high enough for the country to continue its recovery and pay for a portion of our dollars in kind by strategic materials.

There are, however, certain countries, such as Italy, that are short of strategic materials but which have a great deficiency in their balance of payments. You will be putting a burden upon this program in such countries by raising this requirement to 20 percent. The 5-percent requirement under the present act for strategic materials and also administering expenses has not even been reached thus far. The Administrator has not even approximated the 5 percent which is in the present act.

In addition to that, our strategic-materials program is necessary immediately and a 20-percent program would require long time development admittedly. We cannot wait for 2 or 3 years to get the strategic materials under this program. They can be, and are being currently bought under separate statutory authority, using dollar-purchase money outside of this particular program.

This program is for the purpose of making up deficiencies that the European countries participating cannot possibly make up themselves. If we take away from them at this time a great proportion of the products and strategic materials they produce we further keep their economies from rising to the level where they will be self-sufficient. This will delay the successful completion of the ECA program.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask how much has been borrowed from the World Bank by these countries.

Mr. FULTON. The over-all figure of the amount that has been borrowed from the World Bank is not part of this program. We are talking here about a deficiency that still remains after all the borrowings they can make from their citizens, the World Bank, and the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman and the House may be interested in the fact as to the terms of the loans already made, showing what the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems thinks about that. The terms are for 35 years at 2½ percent interest, but there is no amortization until June 1952, and in some cases no amortization until June 1956 and not even interest on these loans until June 1952. We questioned the representative of the bank closely and learned that whereas there was a billion dollars available for that purpose it had not been put into loans because of the severity of the requirements; and they could only legitimately use $200,000,000 this year. These facts have a very definite bearing on the necessity for this bill this year.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I close by saying that if the Vorys amendment is voted into this bill we are practically reducing this ECA program by 15 percent, because these countries do not have the wherewithal or the strategic materials to supply the United States. We have an outside program that is buying strategic materials at the present time.

The condition of these countries is such that there could be no requirement of repayment of principal or payment of interest until 1952 after a survey of the practical problem, as the gentleman from New York correctly states. This 20 percent requirement would be imposing the practical burden of paying in kind.

We should not put these ECA countries in an impossible position when we know they cannot start new factories or new mines to produce strategic materials within this fiscal year for which we are providing, which expires on June 30, 1950. So the adoption of the amendment will mean simply a reduction of 15 percent in the ECA program. I therefore ask you to vote against the Vorys amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is extremely difficult for me to state all my thoughts regarding this European aid program in the short time allotted me.

I shall vote against this legislation because I personally think this entire program is economic folly. While it creates a period of synthetic prosperity in America it is bleeding us white to finance the socialistic and communistic governments of Europe. And it is putting those governments in a position to enslave us.

What do you who support this vast spending program think the French, Italians, and even the English will eventually do with the aid we are now giving them?

Put this down in your book. They will run us out of every market they choose to enter—we are feeling the effects of that now—and when we quit dishing up money to them, when we are bankrupt—as we are certain to be in the end—we will be easy prey for a combination that will only then laugh at our predicament.

As surely as there is a God in heaven, before the passing of another two generations of our people, our Government debt will be repudiated and we will eventually walk in the steps of Germany where it became necessary for the housewife to carry a basketful of currency to buy a loaf of bread. There can be no other outcome.

Some future generation, possibly the infants of today, will look back on our present tin-horn political era of financing and justly decide to refuse to further enslave themselves by paying for such a smelly dead horse. When this sorry day arrives our Government will fall in a heap and will be reborn in a bath of blood if, which is not improbable, we are not already swallowed up by those whom we are at the moment making strong while we grow weaker and weaker.

The really sad part of it is, Mr. Chairman, that a considerable portion of the tremendous amount of European aid we have given under this program has found its way into Russia, our greatest potential enemy whose leader, Joe Stalin, is quoted as having once said that America would spend itself into bankruptcy and he, or his successors, would then take over.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of reminding the Members of the House once more that the matter we now have under consideration is not an appropriation bill, it is not for the purpose of making a law to appropriate money from the Treasury. The bill under consideration is an authorization bill for the purpose of making law to permit the continuation of our program to aid European recovery. As has been stated by numerous other Members today, I feel we are in the midst of a program, an effort to do a job in Europe. We have embarked on that program and we cannot very well walk away from it now. For that reason I feel I must vote for the bill before us this afternoon.

I point out very clearly for the record, however, that in voting for this bill neither I nor any other Member of the House votes to appropriate a specific sum of money. We have had considerable discussion on the subject of the amount of money, the dollars, written into this authorization bill. I have carefully read the committee report on the subject, particularly that section of the report which deals with the financing of the program, and I find the committee has not given any consideration at all to the question whether or not the United States can afford the dollars mentioned in the report and in the bill. I can in all charity understand why the committee did not take that particular matter into consideration, because after all they were dealing with a bill having to do with an economic recovery program for Europe, they were dealing with the problems of foreign nations, they were operating as a Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, there must be, there will have to be, hearings conducted by the Appropriations Committee based not only upon the justification for the figures given in this report and in this bill but based upon the ability of the United States Treasury to pay out this figure or any other figure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Insofar as our own resources are concerned, there were committees set up in the beginning to look into that. There is a National Advisory Council which at the present time advises the ECA as to how far we can go in the light of our own resources or the resources we possess. The committee has looked into that and has taken it into consideration in connection with its study on this bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman, but the report does not deal with that subject. However, by the time the appropriations bill is before us, I feel certain there will have elapsed sufficient time for a full and complete consideration of all of the financial matters involved in this program and that we can have placed before us when the appropriation bill comes in, a statement of dollars and cents and items that will clearly show when the appropriation is made where the money is going and why, and also the reason a specific sum is necessary. In addition to that I hope the report of the Committee on Appropriations will indicate the reason for the belief that we can support such a program. As to this figure in the bill—this is my personal view; I criticize no committee member or no Member of the House—but I feel that the figure has not been scientifically arrived at. I only accept it and will only vote for this bill on the basis that the sum named is the maximum, and an amount beyond which we could not possibly go in the matter of European aid. On that basis as a ceiling, as a maximum, as pointed out by the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee, I feel satisfied to vote for the bill, but the record, as he stated, and as I now state, must clearly show, and the people of the country must

clearly understand, that we are not today dealing with an appropriation item but only a maximum ceiling for the program.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to inform the gentleman that the chief counsel of the ECA before our committee officially advised us that they took the position that this would not be considered in any sense a commitment. They specifically asked us to go along with this higher authorization and then let the Committee on Appropriations scrutinize the whole program and come in with the proper figure. They expressed themselves frankly to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], who has just addressed the Committee has spectacularized the fact that this bill is an authorization only and that no money whatever is appropriated. The gentleman is technically correct. All that is intended in this proposal is to carry out the policy established a year ago. This is a policy bill.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has jurisdiction over foreign policy legislation, while the Appropriations Committee has jurisdiction over the appropriations part of the project. We all know that an appropriation to implement this law will be coming along very shortly. Generally speaking, when the Congress passes a law authorizing an activity on the part of the Government, it necessarily follows that adequate appropriations will be forthcoming. Too often a maximum amount named in an authorization bill proves to be the minimum amount of the appropriation. The maximum amount named in this bill is $5,580,000,000. There has been extensive debate here and in the Senate as to whether this amount is a ceiling, a limitation or the amount intended to be spent. The House has ample assurance not only in the printed Foreign Affairs Committee report, but also from the members of the committee in open debate, that this maximum amount in no sense binds the Congress morally or officially to appropriate this maximum. In other words, by voting for this bill we place a limit above which no appropriation can be made. We are not committed to appropriate this ceiling.

Now, I am not so naive as to believe that the maximum amount will not be asked for when the President asks that this law be implemented; nevertheless, by voting for this bill we are not committed as to amount. I expect to vote for this bill, and reserve the right to vote for only such appropriations under it as I feel are absolutely essential to carry out the purposes.

When the 1948 ECA Act, for which I voted, was before the Congress, I said in debate:

Mr. Speaker, to vote for or against this proposal is no easy decision, because no one has the absolute answer. The seriousness of our present international relations cannot be overestimated. A minor incident without significance ordinarily might, in these troublesome times, very easily plunge us into a great third world war. We all want to prevent this. We all want to do that which we conscientiously believe is most likely to prevent war. There is plausibility on either side of the argument and whatever position we take may be wrong. In short, it is a chance, and a terrible chance. If we pass this legislation it may not accomplish its purpose. On the other hand, the risk is so great that we cannot afford to take the chance, and not pass it. We may be damned if we do, but we are more likely to be damned if we do not.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the way I feel today. I am persuaded that in the over-all effort this law has been well administered. Of course, in an undertaking of this size mistakes will be made. Everybody seems to be agreed that there has been marvelous recovery in Europe where this aid has been given. There are those who feel that European recovery has already reached that stage where no further assistance on our part is required. Personally, I am not convinced that this is the case. If this project is not to be continued temporarily, then I believe the money we have already invested will be of no avail, and that the safety of our country will be even more imperiled than it was a year ago. Be it remembered that we are not here embarking upon a new and different policy. We are simply attempting to complete that which we started to accomplish a year ago in the original authorization. It has been asserted by numerous speakers that appropriating money for this purpose amounts to "pouring that money into a rat hole." Certainly if we stop now that will be true so far as money already spent is concerned.

In 1948, the House by an overwhelming vote passed the original ECA law and, in my opinion, the majority will be even greater when the roll is called on this bill. To me the die has been cast. Our Government is committed and our safety and protection demand affirmative action today.

Mr. Chairman, many figures and statistics have been placed in the RECORD throughout this debate. Too often these figures are assembled and quoted by those who do not properly evaluate their meaning and their relationships. The April 15 edition of the United States News and World Report, which came to my desk this morning, contains an article prepared by the research bureau of that publication, which boils down much of the argument made on both sides of the pending question so far as appropriations, costs, expenditures, risks, and objectives are concerned. This is an unbiased statement coming from a reliable, nonpartisan source and is thought-provoking and pictures the enormity of the problem now confronting our country and the world. This article makes one stop, look, and listen.

When one reads the article, he wonders how long our economy will permit our present rate of spending. At the same time, he wonders what the alternative is. It seems to me that our course has been charted and we cannot change in the middle of the stream. I therefore shall reluctantly vote for this extension.

Pursuant to permission given to me by the House, I am including this United States News article, which reads:

TWENTY-FOUR BILLIONS TO STOP RUSSIA—TAXPAYERS' BURDEN STILL RISING—OFFICIALS WONDER HOW MUCH UNITED STATES CAN AFFORD

Cost of the cold war is going higher. United States spending in the year ahead will top $11,000,000,000.

Marshall-plan aid, the Berlin air lift, help for Greece and Turkey, are part of current bill.

Lend-lease to arm Europe will be added. So will bigger defense program at home. Cutting price of the cold war is not in sight.

Cold war with Russia, in the year that will start July 1, is scheduled to cost United States taxpayers approximately $11,000,000,000. Actual cost before the year is over is more likely to be higher than this figure, rather than lower.

The cold war will be 3 years old by mid-1950. In those 3 years, on the basis of plans aproved and those projected, cost to this country will total about $24,000,000,000. That's a total expenditure of about $1 for each $14 spent in World War II during the 4 years the United States was active in the fighting.

Trend of cold-war costs in this period is sharply upward, rather than downward. That cost trend is expected to accelerate under a proposal now advanced with State Department backing. Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Army Chief of Staff, gave expression to the proposal that a line be established for defense of the borders of western Europe. This proposal is being interpreted as involving probable maintenance of United States armed forces on a considerable scale within Germany for an indefinite period. It would be in addition to lend-lease revival, soon to be proposed.

Costs of the cold war, even before counting any cost of a sizable United States Army in Europe, are measured in billions a year and are growing. The chart on this page shows the year-by-year rise in outgo for cold-war purposes as now spent or projected.

In 1948, the fiscal year that ended last June, outgo for cold-war purposes amounted to $4,498,000,000. Most of that expenditure was for the economic strengthening and relief of United States friends in western Europe, the rest for continued occupation costs that are high largely because of differences with Russia.

In 1949, the present fiscal year that ends June 30, cold-war costs are up to $7,700,000,000. Included are increases in spending by the United States armed forces, whose expansion is directly related to cold war. Military aid to Greece and Turkey also is included. So are the dollars being spent on Berlin's air lift. Occupation costs for United States are up because of tense relations with Russia, not down, as anticipated. Largest expenditure, however, is for Marshall plan aid to bolster nations that are on the United States side in the cold war.

In 1950, the year that starts July 1, costs as now being outlined will rise to an estimated $11,601,000,000. Big increase is in new outlays for this country's expanded armed forces. To that is added the start of lend-lease shipments of weapons to Atlantic Pact nations in the United States sphere of Europe.

Added up, these costs to date come to $23,799,000,000 before the latest plant for a firm military defense of western Europe's border is outlined in detail. Another increase could be added if Congress steps up lend-lease plans in line with new requests by this country's cold-war allies. How far these costs will rise in years that follow is uncertain at this stage. No predictions are being made beyond mid 1950.

Cold-war spending, in 3 years, has spread to cover a wide range of activities, but can be focused in these few fields.

Military outlays caused directly by differences with Russia show the biggest dollar increase. After World War II, the United States military budget dropped to $10,651,000,000 by fiscal 1948. Defense planners estimated that they could get this cost down to $7,000,000,000 as a postwar level. But then came the start of cold war and a new "get tough" policy aimed at containing Russia. This was the Truman doctrine. The trend toward demobilizing United States strength was reversed. Military spending increased $1,029,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. This increase was related directly to efforts to contain Russia. For the year starting next July, these efforts are to bring another increase, with the military budget set to rise $3,610,000,000 above the 1948 level.

Aid abroad is accounting for even more of the cold war's dollar cost. Outlays for building up western Europe against the spread of Russia's Communist fifth column amounted to $4,498,000,000 in fiscal year 1948. Marshall plan aid, superimposed when cold war was intensified in Europe, raises current outlays for aid abroad to $6,671,000,000. This outgo is to be only slightly less, at a planned $6,191,000,000, for the year starting next July.

Military aid now is being added to the United States bill for cold war. Arms shipments to Greece and Turkey are being made at the rate of about $350,000,000 this year. Lend-lease, as planned at this time, is to raise the cost of such aid to about $1,800,000,000 for the year starting in July. That's for a start. Then, if full-scale lend-lease gets underway, military aid may rise sharply in years ahead.

Within these totals are hidden dozens of cold-war programs that are scheduled to increase in cost under present plans. The Berlin air lift, for example, is financed out of Air Force, Navy, and Army funds running to hundreds of millions, and is slated to expand for a bigger and bigger load. Stock piling of war materials under pressure of the cold war, is increasing in cost from about $99,000,000 last year to $350,000,000 this year, and to a planned $525,000,000 for the year ahead. Aircraft commitments already made assure rising outlays for buying new military planes in years ahead.

What it all means is that the United States is undertaking to become the arsenal of the western world. More and more of the Government budget—and the productive capacity of the country—is being devoted to containing Russia through military and other aid programs.

Direct spending on the cold war now is scheduled to increase to a point where it will take $1 of every $4 in the national budget for the year starting next July 1. The trend is toward funneling an even larger portion of United States funds into this channel, as lend-lease and air-power plans are developed and presented as a relatively cheap way of avoiding a hot war later on.

But the ability of the country to continue and enlarge military programs and, at the same time, keep a healthy civilian economy in operation is beginning to be questioned. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, raised the question in a speech before a military-sponsored group. His doubts are being echoed rather loudly in the United States Senate.

The cost of past wars and safeguards against a new war, in fact, represent $3 out of every $4 that the Federal Government spends. The next budget year calls for a total outlay of $41,900,000,000. Of this total, $5,500,000,000 goes for interest on the war debt and another $5,500,000,000 to veterans. Then comes $10,600,000,000 for "normal" military outlays. On top of this are the cold-war costs of $11,600,000,000. The total comes to $33,200,000,000 or more than three-fourths of the budget.

Result is that spending for all normal peacetime functions of Government represents only about $9,000,000,000 of a planned $42,000,000,000 budget for the year ahead. This is only about 50 percent more than a prewar New Deal budget for civilian operations, while the total budget is six times as large.

Questions now being asked involve the ability of the country to afford these costs. Government officials frequently mention the civilian outlays that ought to be made to build up the country, but these projects have to be curtailed to make room for the cold war within a manageable budget.

Public-school systems, for example, are in disrepair and should expand to care for the increased number of children. One official estimate puts the need for new school buildings alone at $10,500,000,000.

The Nation's highways also need improvement and expansion. Planners would like to build a new 40,000-mile national interstate highway system that would by-pass large cities and relieve traffic congestion. But only 1,500 miles of this system have been built. Eventual cost of expanding national highways and improving existing roads is put at $50,000,000,000.

Then there are reclamation projects, river-basin developments, soil-conservation and forestry programs that the Administration would like to undertake. These are all costly, long-range programs that are being held back.

Cities and counties need new waterworks and sewerage systems to care for wartime and postwar growth, both inside city limits and in suburbs. States and cities also want more recreational areas, more health centers and hospitals. Many of these projects, too, have to be held back because of the effort required to build up the military strength of this country and its allies.

This civilian program, however, is being forced to take a back seat while the country builds its strength against a potential thrust from Russia. If an accord with Russia could be made, the Federal budget probably could be trimmed to around $30,000,000,000 a year and still leave room for many peacetime projects.

The trend, however, is in the other direction, toward more spending for cold-war programs in the period ahead. Even if lend-lease outlays are balanced by cutting Marshall plan and Army-Navy-Air Force funds, defense spending appears certain to increase in the coming year. And in years ahead, barring an unexpected agreement with Soviet Russia, these costs are likely to continue to climb.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I may say that I desire to offer an amendment, or, at least, to discuss a paragraph of the present act which has not been brought up, and that deals with reparations from the three western zones of Germany.

Mr. KEE. I have no disposition to foreclose the offering of amendments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would have to be offered to this section if I offer the amendment. I would like to interrogate the chairman a little bit about the progress that was made on that provision of the act which calls for agreements between the countries to whom reparations are due. I hesitate to agree to this if I am going to be shut off with 2 or 3 minutes on a possible amendment. I may not offer the amendment; that will depend on what the chairman tells me. If the chairman will confine his request to the pending amendment, I shall certainly have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to object.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 27 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the Vorys amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 10, after line 7, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(b) Paragraph (f) of section 115 of such act is amended by striking out the period and adding, '*Provided*, That in the absence of such agreement from any country so concerned, the Administrator shall withhold from it allotments from funds appropriated under the authority of this act.' "

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, paragraph (f), section 115, of the present act is found on page 73 of the committee report. It reads:

(f) The Administrator will request the Secretary of State to obtain the agreement of those countries concerned that such capital equipment as is scheduled for removal as reparations from the three western zones of Germany be retained in Germany if such retention will most effectively serve the purposes of the European recovery program.

My amendment seeks to implement that language.

Older Members of the House may recall that a year or so ago we had a select committee on foreign aid. It was my privilege to serve on that committee, as chairman of the subcommittee that was assigned to Germany and Austria. One of the recommendations which that committee made was that the dismantling program, the reparations program, should be reexamined in the light of the program to put western Europe on its feet and get it off the back of United States taxpayers. Growing out of that, I think, and as a result of the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], a very able member of that subcommittee, the Congress last year wrote into the ECA Act the paragraph I have just read.

The Congress also adopted a resolution of inquiry, which I introduced, directing the State Department to report as to what was happening under the dismantling program, to determine if modi-

fying reparations might contribute to European recovery by using German plants where they were.

Recall the situation set up at Potsdam. Russia got all the reparations in the Russian zone, 100 percent of them. She got all of East Prussia; she got control of all the industrial potential in Silesia assigned to Poland. On top of that Russia was to get 25 percent of the reparations out of the three western zones. The satellite countries got another 14 percent. Only the remainder of the dismantled plants was to be distributed among the other countries.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I have been opposed to amending the pending resolution, but I am convinced that this is one amendment the Committee ought to accept, and I hope will accept.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman, who was a member of the same committee and saw this situation in Germany, where it had been agreed to tear down and send to Russia 25 percent of the reparations equipment in the western zones.

So, the ECA Act last year said that the Secretary of State should attempt to get agreements to leave in Germany what would contribute to European recovery. And it is commonly known that Mr. Humphrey was appointed to go over there and make a survey to see what should and could be done.

Informally, some of us hear that Mr. Humphrey recommended that at least 150 of the 167 plants scheduled for dismantling be retained as a part of the European recovery program. But no definite results have come to public attention.

Thus far in the debate I have heard no allusions to this matter. I have not heard the chairman of the committee state what had been accomplished by the Humphrey survey. Can the chairman give us any information at this time?

Such information would let us know whether the paragraph mentioned needs implementation by language similar to that suggested by the amendment or whether progress is being made on the agreements requested last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 3 minutes. I have seen juries before, lots of them, and I do not like the looks of this one.

I used to play football on a small college team one time, and on defense I played right end. One of the things I was cautioned never to do was to be sucked in on the end, and let Wisconsin or Michigan run around us. I want to tell you this afternoon that you are going to get sucked in—the whole bunch of you. While we are here bleeding ourselves white to pick up money for England and the rest of Europe, England at this very moment at London is negotiating a trade treaty with Russia. Now, how do you like that? Do you think you are getting sucked in? I just want to tell you that, because I know how you are going to vote. Go ahead and vote that way. I am not excusing myself. I am not talking against this bill and then saying "Yes, but in the final analysis, I will vote for it." By the eternal, I will not! I will vote against the bill. I am against it from start to finish. When I got permission to strike out the last two words, the only thing I was sorry about was that I could not strike out the whole thing. You are afraid of communism. That is what you are building up this big defense fund for. You are afraid of communism, but you are building it instead of keeping it out of this country. Communism never grows unless the people are hungry and distressed and homeless and clothesless. You will bring this country to that condition someday if you keep on depleting our natural resources and our funds and the lives of our people. Then you will have communism here. You do not have it here now and you never will have it unless you bring distress to America. I just want to tell you that because I know how you are going to vote and I think you are wrong.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 9, line 21, after the words "SEC. 9 (a)" insert the following: "Section 115 (b) (1) of such act is hereby amended by inserting after the figure (1) the following: 'withholding any assistance under this act, where it appears that any participating country is impairing in whole or in part its economic recovery by reason of the expenditure of any portion of its funds, commodities, or services in the maintenance or subsidization of any dependent country, which naturally is, or should be, an integral part of some other participating country, until such time as such participating country shall sever its control of, and refrain further from maintaining or subsidizing such dependent country; (2), and by renumbering accordingly the subsequent paragraphs of section 115 (b)."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make sure that no country which is receiving aid under the Marshall plan will dissipate that aid by any uneconomic use thereof or by the uneconomic expenditure of its own funds. In endeavoring to restore the economic stability of the countries of Europe it is important that we make sure that our funds are being properly employed where they will do the most good and where they will promote the fundamental purposes of the European recovery program.

The particular situation, which I have in mind, is the situation in Northern Ireland, where the Government of Great Britain is annually expending huge sums of money in maintaining an uneconomic political unit, which is naturally a part of the rest of Ireland, and which by any and every viewpoint should be reunited with the rest of Ireland. This partition of Ireland was made some 27 years ago, for the first time, not because of any natural land barriers or normal division of this section of the island from the rest of the country, but solely to make it possible for the British to maintain a section of the country under its control. Ever since then, Great Britain has had to subsidize the government of Northern Ireland in order to continue this government in the six-county area.

Whenever the border is removed in Ireland, it will react for the benefit of both the north as well as the south and make it possible for the country as a whole to reconstruct the economy so as to create a self-sustaining nation. Moreover a new era of good will between Great Britain and Ireland would begin, once this last item of dispute between the countries shall have been eliminated.

In addition, by the adoption of this amendment we will be putting into effect in a practical way the stated purposes of the original act, which sets forth in its declaration of policy the following: "The restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence rests largely upon the establishment of sound economic conditions, stable international economic relationships," and so on. This amendment will clearly indicate that it is the desire of the American people that individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence of the peoples and countries of Europe shall be maintained and withal a sound economic condition prevail. In the case of Ireland it would mean the granting of freedom from foreign control or influence as well as the establishment of better economic conditions; the twofold purpose of this legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that I offered this amendment in committee where it received very sympathetic consideration but was, unfortunately, defeated. I am delighted that the gentleman has offered it on the floor today and I assure him I will be most happy to do what I can to help in its passage.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman on the stand that he takes in regard to this matter. I shall support his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to express the same point of view that the gentleman takes with respect to the unification of Ireland.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Wheresoever a similar condition may exist or may hereafter be created, this amendment would provide for the withholding of Marshall-plan funds until the freedom and independence of the people or nation were reestablished. Certainly it is not our intent that American funds being spent in Europe should be used to

continue the suppression of any people, nor to deny independence to any country, however small the area, which may be involved. Neither do we desire that any portion of our funds be used in maintaining a government contrary to the wishes of the people, which is an economic expense, and in the case of Northern Ireland, which will continue to be an uneconomic unit, so long as it is separated from the rest of the national unit, which should include the area of the entire island. No serious objection can be raised to this amendment and so I trust that it will meet with the approval of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 56, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, during the past year our country has been cooperating with 16 European nations in a peacetime program designed to free western Europe from political and economic bondage.

A year ago unrest in Europe threatened the survival of Democratic nations. The Congress authorized the Economic Cooperation Administration in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, in the fervent hope that the helping hand of dollars and material could contribute toward rapid European recovery.

The testimony given before the Foreign Affairs Committee by Mr. Hoffman and his aides is convincing evidence that the aid we have given has been justified by the accomplishments of the nations concerned.

A new unity of purpose among European nations as they create new life for their governments and peoples is evident.

Economic systems have been strengthened. Production of agricultural and industrial commodities has been built up to prewar levels in many countries. Within 1 year alone factory and mine output has been increased 14 percent.

As business conditions and agricultural conditions improve, the people of Europe are beginning to rebuild shattered cities and shattered careers.

Communists who sought to take advantage of Europe's misfortune have been turned away by the voters of France and Italy. A line against communism has been established and is being held.

To insure that this progress will have an opportunity to become permanent, our country must continue its participation in Europe's development. Within the next few years, the nations of Europe must successfully stabilize their domestic economies, extend their participation in world trade, and protect their peoples against totalitarian infiltration. Our aid in strengthening the United Nations and our participation in the Atlantic pact, along with continued material assistance, are essential.

A slow-down in material assistance through Economic Cooperation Administration would endanger our entire investment in peace. Machinery and raw materials, which can be supplied only by this country, are required. For the purchase of these goods a supply of dollars must be made available. European nations have not yet been able to develop an export trade sufficient to supply their import needs.

I gave my wholehearted support to creation of the Economic Cooperation Administration a year ago, and I shall vote for its continuation today. By assisting others, we are helping ourselves to continue the Democratic way of life and to ward off the perils of economic collapse and communism.

I want to congratulate the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the careful review they have made of the conduct of the Economic Cooperation Administration and for the fairness of the legislation they have brought before this body. Our vote today should be a token of our appreciation of the devoted service of the late Sol Bloom, for many years the respected chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose wisdom and foresight were instrumental in the creation of this program.

I hope the Members of the House and Senate will give an overwhelming vote of confidence to the continuation of this cooperative undertaking, without crippling it by restrictive amendments or reluctance to grant adequate appropriations for its administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that in an effort to bring about unity in Europe we bring about greater discord in the House of Representatives.

This legislative measure, House bill 3748, seeks to bring about an extension of the European recovery program. At first blush it appears to be a recovery and rehabilitation program for certain named nations, yet in truth and in fact it goes far beyond such humanitarian purposes, and very rightly so. It will aid the United States of America, not only to be helpful to right-thinking and right-acting war-torn and devastated countries, but it will, with the aid of an appropriation bill, put these countries in a position to, in turn, be helpful to the United States of America and the rest of the free world.

We are engaged today in a cold war with the most hideous, antisocial, and ungrateful nation in the world, the name of which, in my opinion, no healthy, decent tongue, should run the risk of uttering for fear of becoming diseased and prostituted. It is Satan's blood-child, if the Devil ever had a child. To it, appreciation and gratitude are unknown words.

When I think of how the United States of America came to its rescue during the last war when it had been, so to speak, baffled and beaten and backward reeled by the German armies from barren meads and stubble fields, and was all but prostrated and conquered—the United States of America came to its rescue with money, goods, and every other necessity, and saved the day for what now proves to be the greatest and most sinister ingrate known in history. This ingrate has in the past sought to extend its pernicious influences into other war-torn and devastated lands whose needs are so critical now, and have been for months past. The only way that this ungrateful nation would give to others aid and assistance in their days of sorrow and distress was if they, too, accepted the yoke of communism and passed under it, not in good old Roman style, with their shirttails pulled out, but naked of all love of God and man and each and every tent of religion and all that religion stands for.

The Marshall plan has done great good to date and should be continued even though it is a costly one. By appropriating this money under the present bill we may save many lives, not only in Europe, but in many other parts of the world, including these United States. We should always remember that we and every other nation in this program may accumulate more money, but we cannot, by any means now known, restore lost lives. The old axiomatic statement is still true: we may get more money but we cannot get another life for those who have given—or will be called upon to give—their lives, even though they died for the greatest and most worthy cause in the world.

Let us think sensibly and with a practical mind as we act upon this bill and proposed amendments, and evaluate it in an over-all forward-looking way. Let us think of it not with cold-war eyes but with hot-war vision. This is a time for preparation—preparation for free countries about to be trussed up in the iron ring of communism. Each of us must have a sense of responsibility and work to present the best front we can to the menace of communism in Europe, and right here at home also.

I refuse to be led by the specious arguments of a certain brother Congressman from New York and some of the smart congressional associates of mine who should have better sense than to follow, unwittingly, I hope, the way of the Communist serpent which goeth basely upon the belly and not upon the feet.

We should vote each and every future amendment down and pass this legislation intact. If I am in error in my votes and doings on this bill and the amendments thereto, I know that I have erred on the side of humanity and patriotism, and not on the side of communism and degradation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry which I made a few moments ago about expediting the movement of goods in Europe, I have been furnished with a great volume which will require a good bit of night reading to be able to digest it. I appreciate the assistance. Yet we are going to vote on this bill in a few moments and should have all the help we can get from the committee at this time.

I should like to inquire also about the movement of people between various countries in Europe. Certainly the greatest problem that Italy faces, for in-

stance, is the problem of overpopulation. I am delighted to find that a provision has been inserted in the bill which permits ships to be made available to Italy for the movement of Italian emigrants to various destinations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Only if the gentleman from Connecticut will please answer my question; and that question is: What provision is in the bill and what evidence has been presented to your committee relating to paragraph 115 (e) of the bill under which the Administrator is to encourage arrangements between the participating countries looking toward the largest practicable utilization of manpower available in any of these countries? That language was not written in there just because the House had nothing else to do a year ago. It had a definite purpose. What has been done? What does the Administrator tell you has been done in the implementation of that provision?

I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Connecticut or to the able gentleman from Ohio for the answer.

Mr. VORYS. Time is limited; if the gentleman desires a rather full statement he will find it in the so-called watchdog committee report, which I shall be glad to furnish.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, may I assume that the committee has addressed itself to that problem, and the Administrator has furnished the committee a satisfactory explanation of what has been done along those lines?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the gentleman offhand that arrangements have been made by the De Gasperi government for the emigration of more than 200,000 Italians during the year 1949. They have available shipping for 162,000, and the purpose of the shipping clause is to provide transportation facilities for the 40,000 remaining.

Mr. KEATING. As I say, I am very glad that the committee has incorporated this provision relating to Italy in the bill. That, however, is only part of the problem, even so far as Italy is concerned.

There are over 2,000,000 unemployed in Italy, whereas across the border in France, there is a shortage in agricultural manpower of roughly 1,000,000. Through the elimination of immigration barriers and assimilation of populations, it is essential to the over-all economic recovery of western Europe that in such cases plans be made to correct this disequilibrium of population. The necessity for such action must be impressed upon those responsible for determining policy in the countries we are trying to help.

There are a number of other questions which I desire to ask about this program, which time will not permit. Under the limitation of debate which has unfortunately been imposed, I shall be forced to seek light elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the amendments seeking to reduce the total of this bill were not passed.

It has been demonstrated in the debate that a reduction of at least a billion dollars could be made without in any way hampering the program.

This is a tremendously large sum that is being carried forward that can be used, and this also proves that the transportation of commodities has not been so rapid but that we can easily meet the full program of demands as they come forward.

I voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida and the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

I shall confidently expect the Appropriations Committee to safeguard the best interests of the American people by making no appropriations that have not been justified completely.

I expect to vote for this legislation. I voted for it last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, it has seemed to me many times in the course of this debate that we have lost sight of the fundamental things about which we are talking. The Marshall plan is an essential part of our bipartisan foreign policy. It is a part which has the support of almost every intelligent person in this country. It has that support because we almost all believe that the way to stop the spread of communism in Europe is to put the democratic nations back on their feet and give them strength to resist the Communist undermining of their institutions.

There are still a handful of die-hards who believe in the outworn theories of isolation. Giant planes and the atom bomb have made isolationism as outworn as the bow and arrow. We have to fight communism with different weapons today, and the results indicate that the Marshall plan is the way to do it.

We have ample testimony from our leaders both in the Democratic and Republican ranks, from our business leaders, from our labor leaders, that the Marshall plan has been the effective way of stopping the growth of communism in Europe. To pretend otherwise is to shut our eyes to the facts, as some prefer to do.

There are none so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. Chairman, I say that those who really want to do something about stopping communism and not just talk about it will vote to continue the Marshall plan when the vote comes in the House in a few minutes today.

However, we have had Members such as the gentleman from Michigan come on this floor quite recently and talk about the Marshall plan subsidizing Communist governments. Of all the tripe I have heard uttered today that is the prize remark. There is not a single Communist government receiving any Marshall plan funds. Any one who has taken the care to follow the working of the Marshall plan knows that full well.

To me that is the last cry of the isolationists. That is an attempt to hide the failure of the bankrupt policy of isolationism which some Americans still follow to this very day. It is the cry of those who like to raise red herrings but who want to do nothing about fighting communism.

We are working closely with the democratic nations of western Europe. We have recently joined them in a great defensive alliance against the aggression of Stalin—we have signed the Atlantic Pact.

Americans believe passionately in freedom. We respect the dignity of man. We are ready to defend those who believe in liberty and fight Communist totalitarianism.

The Russians have been picking off one country at a time in their drive against western democracy. Only the Marshall plan has stopped them in their tracks.

And yet Members of this House come down into the well and make speeches urging us to stop our aid to the European democracies. I say that wittingly or unwittingly they are giving hope to the grand design of Stalin—they propose to leave Europe shattered; weak and defenseless against the Communist hordes.

I am voting for this bill because I am convinced it is one of our best weapons against the schemes of Stalin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, as the debate closes, the time for rhetoric has probably gone, but a few figures may be important before we vote.

There has been a great deal of talk in the House today about how well the European countries are doing. If Members will turn to page 11 of this book entitled "A Report on Recovery Progress and United States Aid," a great many copies of which are still available, they will find the consumption of the following things by the people of Europe today as compared with prewar, indicating their present standard of living: Bread grains, 90 percent; meat, 65 percent; fats and oils, 74 percent; sugar, 81 percent; textiles, 80 percent.

That is a very considerable reduction from what was already a meager standard of living before the war.

Second, the annual income of the United States this year is likely to be somewhere in the neighborhood of $250,000,000,000. Yet we are told that an expenditure of $5,000,000,000 for the purpose of reforming the economy of the most vigorous industrial area of the world—an area critically important to international peace and economic prosperity—is going to bankrupt us or bleed us white. It just does not make sense.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this section. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) The first sentence of section 117 (c) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply

to shipments made by individuals to individuals through the mails."

(b) Section 117 (d) of such act is hereby amended by striking out "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Export Control Act of 1949."

(c) Section 117 of such Act is amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) Whenever the Administrator shall determine that shipping capacity available to Italy is inadequate for such emigration from Italy as may be desirable to further the purposes of this title, the Administrator shall request the United States Maritime Commission to make available to Italy vessels capable of engaging in such service for the purpose of transporting emigrants from Italy to destinations other than the United States, and shall specify the terms and conditions under which such vessels shall thus be made available, and the United States Maritime Commission thereupon shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, make such vessels available to Italy in accordance with such terms and conditions: *Provided*, That the total number of such vessels made available for such purpose shall not at any one time exceed ten: *Provided further*, That title to each such vessel owned by the United States Government shall remain in the United States: *And provided further*, That the terms and conditions under which such vessels are made available to Italy shall obligate Italy to return the vessels forthwith upon demand of the President, and in any event not later than June 30, 1952."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only because I would like to get some information about the construction which is to be accorded to this section. I think probably a member of the committee can answer my inquiry. I understand that it is necessary in Italy to have transportation available for the emigration, which is probably essential to the Italian economy. But is it contemplated that the vessels capable of engaging in this transportation service referred to in line 17 shall be vessels presently owned by the Maritime Commission? Can someone inform me on that point?

Mr. LODGE. I believe it is contemplated to use vessels presently owned by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. HALE. Are some particular vessels in contemplation?

Mr. LODGE. I am told that it is the C–4's that are in contemplation.

Mr. HALE. There would be no objection, as far as the bill is concerned, as I understand it, to an acquisition of vessels by the Maritime Commission for that purpose, is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. There is nothing to prevent the Maritime Commission from acquiring other vessels.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3748) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, pursuant to House Resolution 169, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 355, nays 49, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—355

Abbitt	Carlyle	Fellows
Abernethy	Carnahan	Fenton
Addonizio	Carroll	Fisher
Albert	Case, N. J.	Flood
Allen, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Fogarty
Andersen, H. Carl	Cavalcante	Forand
	Celler	Ford
Anderson, Calif.	Chatham	Frazier
Andresen, August H.	Chelf	Fugate
	Chesney	Fulton
Andrews	Chiperfield	Furcolo
Angell	Christopher	Garmatz
Arends	Chudoff	Gary
Aspinall	Clemente	Gathings
Auchincloss	Coffey	Gavin
Bailey	Cole, Kans.	Gillette
Barrett, Pa.	Cole, N. Y.	Golden
Barrett, Wyo.	Colmer	Goodwin
Bates, Ky.	Combs	Gordon
Bates, Mass.	Cooley	Gore
Battle	Cooper	Gorski, Ill.
Beall	Corbett	Gorski, N. Y.
Beckworth	Cotton	Gossett
Bennett, Fla.	Coudert	Graham
Bentsen	Cox	Granahan
Blemiller	Crook	Granger
Blackney	Crosser	Grant
Bland	Cunningham	Green
Blatnik	Dague	Gregory
Boggs, Del.	Davenport	Gwinn
Boggs, La.	Davies, N. Y.	Hale
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Hall,
Bolton, Md.	Davis, Tenn.	Edwin Arthur
Bolton, Ohio	Davis, Wis.	Hall,
Bonner	Dawson	Leonard W.
Bosone	Deane	Halleck
Boykin	DeGraffenried	Harden
Bramblett	Delaney	Hardy
Breen	Denton	Hare
Brehm	D'Ewart	Harris
Brooks	Dingell	Harrison
Brown, Ga.	Dollinger	Hart
Brown, Ohio	Dolliver	Harvey
Bryson	Donchue	Havenner
Buchanan	Doughton	Hays, Ark.
Buckley, Ill.	Douglas	Hays, Ohio
Buckley, N. Y.	Doyle	Hébert
Burke	Durham	Hedrick
Burleson	Eaton	Heffernan
Burnside	Eberharter	Heller
Burton	Ellsworth	Herlong
Byrne, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.	Herter
Byrnes, Wis.	Engle, Calif.	Heselton
Camp	Evins	Hill
Canfield	Fallon	Hinshaw
Cannon	Feighan	Hobbs
Hoeven	Marsalis	Rooney
Holifield	Marshall	Sabath
Holmes	Martin, Mass.	Sadlak
Hope	Merrow	St. George
Horan	Meyer	Sasscer
Howell	Michener	Scott, Hardie
Huber	Miles	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Irving	Miller, Calif.	
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.	Scrivner
Jackson, Wash.	Mills	Scudder
James	Mitchell	Sheppard
Javits	Monroney	Sikes
Jenkins	Morgan	Simpson, Ill.
Jennings	Moulder	Simpson, Pa.
Jensen	Multer	Sims
Johnson	Murdock	Smathers
Jones, Mo.	Murphy	Smith, Va.
Jones, N. C.	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Spence
Karst	Nelson	Staggers
Karsten	Nicholson	Stanley
Kean	Nixon	Steed
Keating	Noland	Stigler
Kee	Norblad	Stockman
Keefe	Norrell	Sullivan
Kelley	Norton	Sutton
Kennedy	O'Brien, Ill.	Tackett
Keogh	O'Brien, Mich.	Talle
Kerr	O'Hara, Ill.	Tauriello
Kilburn	O'Neill	Taylor
Kilday	O'Sullivan	Teague
King	O'Toole	Thomas, Tex.
Kirwan	Pace	Thornberry
Klein	Patten	Tollefson
Kruse	Patterson	Towe
Kunkel	Perkins	Trimble
Lanham	Peterson	Underwood
Latham	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Van Zandt
LeCompte		Velde
LeFevre	Pfeiffer, William L.	Vinson
Lesinski		Vorys
Lichtenwalter	Philbin	Wadsworth
Lind	Phillips, Calif.	Wagner
Linehan	Phillips, Tenn.	Walter
Lodge	Pickett	Weichel
Lovre	Plumley	Welch, Calif.
Lucas	Poage	Welch, Mo.
Lynch	Polk	Wheeler
McCarthy	Potter	Whitten
McConnell	Preston	Whittington
McCormack	Price	Wickersham
McCulloch	Priest	Wier
McDonough	Quinn	Wigglesworth
McGrath	Rabaut	Wilson, Okla.
McGuire	Ramsay	Wilson, Tex.
McKinnon	Redden	Winstead
McMillan, S. C.	Rees	Withrow
McMillen, Ill.	Rhodes	Wolcott
McSweeney	Ribicoff	Wolverton
Mack, Ill.	Richards	Woodhouse
Mack, Wash.	Riehlman	Worley
Madden	Rivers	Yates
Magee	Rodino	Young
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Zablocki
Mansfield	Rogers, Mass.	

NAYS—49

Allen, Ill.	Jonas	Sadowski
Barden	Larcade	Sanborn
Bennett, Mich.	Lemke	Secrest
Bishop	McGregor	Shafer
Burdick	Macy	Short
Church	Marcantonio	Smith, Kans.
Clevenger	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Crawford	Mason	Taber
Curtis	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Dondero	Morris	Werdel
Gross	O'Hara, Minn.	White, Calif.
Hagen	O'Konski	Williams
Hand	Powell	Willis
Hoffman, Ill.	Rankin	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, Ill.	Woodruff
Hull	Reed, N. Y.	
Jenison	Rich	

NOT VOTING—28

Allen, La.	Kearney	Regan
Baring	Kearns	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Lane	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Lyle	Thompson
Elston	Morrison	Walsh
Fernandez	Morton	Whitaker
Gamble	Passman	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Patman	Wood
Jacobs	Poulson	
Jones, Ala.	Rains	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Allen of Louisiana against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Thompson with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Morton.

Mr. WERDEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the bill H. R. 3748, as just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth sentence of section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is amended by inserting after "United States" where it appears therein the first time "to encourage the unification of Europe, and."

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 104 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out "$10,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest rate authorized by such act."

(b) Section 104 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) There shall be in the Administration a Special Assistant to the Administrator. It shall be the duty of such Special Assistant to formulate methods to assist American small business in securing equitable participation, insofar as practicable, in the furnishing of commodities and services for the procurement with funds appropriated pursuant to this act. Such Special Assistant shall receive his instructions from the Administrator and shall report to the Administrator quarterly on the performance of the duties assigned to him."

SEC. 3. Section 108 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"There shall be a Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. The Deputy United States Special Representative shall perform such functions as the United States Special Representative shall designate, and shall be Acting United States Special Representative during the absence or disability of the United States Special Representative or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the United States Special Representative."

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 109 (a) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and the chief of the special mission shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or compensation and allowances in accordance with section 110 (a) of this title, as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or appropriate."

SEC. 5. Section 111 (a) (2) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof "for United States flag vessels."

SEC. 6. (a) The first proviso of section 111 (b) (3) of such act is hereby amended by striking out "in the first year after the date of the enactment of this act does not exceed $15,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "made in any fiscal year does not exceed $10,000,000."

(b) The last two sentences of such section 111 (b) (3) are hereby amended to read as follows: "The total amount of the guaranties made under this paragraph (3) shall not exceed $300,000,000, and as such guaranties are made the authority to realize funds from the sale of notes for the purpose of extending assistance on credit terms through allocating funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington under paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section shall be accordingly reduced. After the amount of notes sold for the purpose of extending assistance on credit terms through allocation of funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington under paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section and the amount of guaranties made reach in the aggregate $1,000,000,000, any further guaranty made by the Administrator shall create an obligation against funds appropriated under authority of this title and the Administrator shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the issuance of such guaranty and of the maximum liability thereunder, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall then set aside on the books of the Treasury from the funds appropriated under this title an amount equal to the maximum liability under such guaranty as stated in such notification, which amount shall be available for expenditure to discharge liability under such guaranty, by the Administrator or by an agency designated by him, until such time as the liability under such guaranty shall have been discharged or shall expire. Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under paragraph (3) of this subsection shall be paid out of fees collected under subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (3) of this subsection as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid either out of funds realized from the sale of notes which shall be issued under authority of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section or out of funds appropriated under authority of this title and set aside on the books of the Treasury as hereinabove provided."

SEC. 7. (a) Section 112 (c) of such act is amended by striking out "25 percent"; and by adding at the end thereof "15 percent"; and by adding at the end there the following new sentence: "The amounts of corn and corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour produced in the United States to be transferred by grant to the participating countries shall be so determined that the total quantity of United States corn used to produce the corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title shall not be less than 15 percent of the aggregate of the unprocessed corn and corn in the form of corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title."

(b) Section 112 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to price support programs required by law) at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment."

(c) Section 112 (d) of such act is hereby amended by adding after the words "any agricultural commodity, or product thereof" the following: "or class, type, or specification thereof."

SEC. 8. (a) The first sentence of section 114 (c) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided, further,* That in addition to the amount heretofore authorized and appropriated there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title not to exceed $1,150,000,000 for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1949, and not to exceed $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950: *Provided further,* That in addition to the foregoing any balance, unobligated as of June 30, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for any period ending on or prior to that date is hereby authorized to be made available for obligation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and to be transferred to and consolidated with any appropriations for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for said fiscal year. To enable the Administrator to finance such transfers of capital goods items, or of commodities and services allocated to projects, as may not be made by June 30, 1950, the Administrator is authorized prior to such date to obligate the United States to make expenditures after such date in an aggregate amount not to exceed $150,000,000, which amount shall be in addition to the amounts above authorized."

(b) The last sentence of such section 114 (c) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The authorizations in this title are limited to the periods indicated in order that the Congress may pass on any subsequent authorizations."

SEC. 9. Section 114 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation additional to that made by title I of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 793, Eightieth Congress), shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1949, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $750,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this title."

SEC. 10. (a) Section 115 (b) (6) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period following the words "grant basis" and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the obligation to make such deposits may be waived, in the discretion of the Administrator, with respect to technical information or assistance furnished under section 111 (a) (3) of this title and with respect to ocean transportation furnished on United States flag vessels under section 111 of this title in an amount not exceeding the amount, as determined by the Administrator, by which the charges for such

transportation exceed the cost of such transportation at world market rates."

(b) Such section 115 (b) (6) is further amended by inserting after "or for such other expenditures as may be consistent with" the words "the declaration of policy contained in section 102 and".

(c) Section 115 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(h) Not less than 5 percent of each special local currency account established pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of this section shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources or for other local currency requirements of the United States.

"(i) (1) The Administrator shall, to the greatest extent practicable, without detriment to the European recovery program, initiate projects for and assist the appropriate agencies of the United States Government in procuring and stimulating increased production in participating countries of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources; and in furtherance of those objectives the Administrator shall, in addition to the local currency allocated pursuant to subsection (h), use such other means available to him under this title as he may deem appropriate.

"(2) In furtherance of such objectives and within the limits of the appropriations and contract authorizations of the Bureau of Federal Supply to procure strategic and critical materials, the Administrator, with the approval of the Director of such Bureau, shall enter into contracts in the name of the United States for the account of such Bureau for the purchase of strategic and critical materials in any participating country. Such contracts may provide for deliveries over definite periods, but not to exceed 20 years in any contract, and may provide for payments in advance of deliveries.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to restrict or limit in any manner the authority now held by any agency of the United States Government in procuring or stimulating increased production of the materials referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) in countries other than participating countries."

(d) Section 115 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Administrator shall encourage each participating country to insure, by an effective follow-up system, that efficient use is made of the commodities, facilities, and services furnished under this title. In order further to insure that each participating country makes efficient use of such commodities, facilities, and services, and of its own resources, the Administrator shall encourage the joint organization of the participating countries referred to in subsection (b) of this section to observe and review the operation of such follow-up systems."

SEC. 11. (a) The first sentence of section 117 (c) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals through the mails."

(b) Section 117 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Whenever the Administrator shall determine that the shipping capacity available to Italy is inadequate for such emigration from Italy as may be desirable to further the purposes of this title, the United States Maritime Commission shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, make available to Italy, under such terms and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator, not more than 10 vessels capable of engaging in such service, for the purpose of transporting emigrants from Italy to parts of the world other than the United States: *Provided,* That title to any such vessels which are owned by the United States Government shall remain in the United States, and any or all of such vessels shall be returned forthwith upon demand of the President, and in any event not later than June 30, 1952."

SEC. 12. (a) Sections 105 (c) and 117 (d) of such act are amended by striking out "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Export Control Act of 1949."

(b) Section 112 (g) of such act is amended by striking out "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Export Control Act of 1949."

(c) That section 112 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) The Administrator shall, in providing assistance in the procurement of commodities in the United States, make available United States dollars for marine insurance on such commodities where such insurance is placed on a competitive basis in accordance with normal trade practices prevailing prior to the outbreak of World War II. In the event any participating country directly or indirectly prevents United States companies from competing for marine insurance on commodities procured in the United States with funds from the Economic Cooperation Administration, the Administrator shall require that all marine insurance on such commodities procured with such funds, and shipped to such countries shall be insured with companies authorized to do a marine insurance business in the United States."

SEC. 13. An amount, equal to any balance, unobligated as of April 2, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated by Public Law 793, approved June 28, 1948, for the purposes of the China Aid Act of 1948 is hereby made available to the President for obligation through February 15, 1950, for assistance to areas in China which he may deem to be not under Communist domination, to be furnished in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he may determine without regard to the foregoing provisions of this act.

SEC. 14. The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, as far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities procured out of funds made available under this title and transported to or from the United States on ocean vessels, computed separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liner and tanker services, is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels; and, in the administration of this provision, the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the purposes of this title, endeavor to secure a fair and reasonable participation by United States flag ships in cargoes by geographic area.

SEC. 15. Section 112 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used for the payment of charges incurred after 60 days after the effective date of this amendment for charter hire, freight or passenger charges, or for any other purpose, to, on behalf of, or for the account of any vessel documented under the laws of any foreign country not a participating country unless, in the case of individuals the owner or owners of such vessel is a national of the country, and in the case of a corporation a majority of the voting power or controlling interest is vested in nationals of the country, under whose laws such vessel is documented. In administering this provision the Administrator may rely on the certificate of the owner of any vessel as to the nationality of such owner if an individual and as to the nationality of the controlling interest or majority stock ownership in the case of a corporation."

SEC. 16. The second sentence of section 118 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof "or (3) the provision of such assistance would be inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventative or enforcement action."

No funds authorized for the purposes of this act shall be allocated to or expended for any foreign government for the purpose of expenditures for the advertising of foreign products in this country nor for advertising foreign travel in this country.

With the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the fourth and fifth sentences of section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 are hereby amended to read as follows: 'Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification and federation of Europe, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided,* That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States'.

"SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 104 (e) of such act is hereby amended by striking out '$10,000 per annum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest rate authorized by such act.'

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 105 (c) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949'.

"SEC. 4. Section 108 of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'There shall be a Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. The Deputy United States Special Representative shall perform such functions as the United States Special Representative shall designate, and shall be Acting United States Special Representative during the absence or disability of the United

States Special Representative or in the event of a vacancy in the office of United States Special Representative.'

"SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 109 (a) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: 'and the chief of the special mission shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or compensation and allowances in accordance with section 110 (a) of this title, as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or appropriate.'

"SEC. 6. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (a) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the final period and inserting in lieu thereof 'for United States flag vessels, not to exceed a reasonable differential above current world market rates.'

"(b) Paragraph (3) of section 111 (b) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By inserting after 'projects' a comma and the following: 'including expansion, modernization, or development of existing enterprises' and a comma;

"(2) By inserting after 'media' the following: 'consistent with the national interests of the United States';

"(3) By striking out "in the first year after the date of the enactment of this act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'made in any fiscal year'";

"(4) By amending subparagraph (i) thereof to read as follows:

"'(i) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the Administrator plus actual earnings or profits on said project to the extent provided by such guaranty;'.

"(5) By inserting after subparagraph (iii) thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"'(iv) as used in this paragraph, the term "investment" includes the furnishing of capital goods items and related services, for use in connection with projects approved by the Administrator, pursuant to a contract providing for payment in whole or in part after June 30, 1950; and

"'(v) the guaranty to any person shall be be limited to assuring the following: (1) the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies received by such person as earnings or profits from the approved investment, as repayment or return thereof, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof; and (2) compensation in United States dollars for loss of all or any part of the approved investment, which shall be found by the Administrator to have been lost to such person by reason of one or more of the following causes: (a) seizure, confiscation, or expropriation, (b) destruction by riot, revolution, or war, (c) any law, ordinance, regulation, decree, or administrative action (other than measures affecting the conversion of currency), which in the opinion of the Administrator prevents the further transaction of the business for which the guaranty was issued. When any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency, credits, or assets on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title claim, or cause of action existing in connection therewith.'

"(6) By amending the next to last sentence thereof to read as follows: 'The total amount of the guaranties made under this paragraph (3) shall not exceed $300,000,000: *Provided,* That any funds allocated to a guaranty and remaining after all liability of the United States assumed in connection therewith has been released, discharged, or otherwise terminated, shall be available for allocation to other guaranties, the foregoing limitation notwithstanding.'

"(c) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (c) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: 'In addition to the amount of notes above authorized, the Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section, to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $300,000,000 less any amount allocated prior to April 3, 1949, for such purpose, until all liabilities arising under guaranties made pursuant to this authorization have expired or been discharged.'

"(2) By striking out the first two words, 'Such notes' in the second sentence thereof and inserting 'The notes hereinabove, authorized';

"(3) By inserting after 'Washington' in the sixth sentence thereof 'for assistance on credit terms'.

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 112 (a) of such act is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"'The Administrator shall prescribe such regulations with respect to, and impose such conditions on, procurement in the United States under this title as will secure to "small business" in the United States, especially the producers, a fair and substantial share of the production and business resulting from any such procurement. For the purpose of this paragraph, "small business" shall include any small-business enterprise, and only such, if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of the employees does not exceed 500, except that the Administrator shall, where appropriate, specify a smaller number for any particular trade or industry, or subdivision thereof, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.'

"(b) Section 112 (c) of such act is hereby repealed.

"(c) Section 112 (g) of such act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto,' and 'section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949.'

"(d) Section 112 (h) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the period, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding 'and, insofar as practicable, make available or cause to be made available to suppliers in the United States reasonable information, as far in advance as possible, of purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this title.'

"(e) Section 112 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(i) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to price-support programs required by law) at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment.'

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 114 (c) of such act is amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *'Provided further,* That, in addition to the amount above authorized to be appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title not to exceed $1,100,000,000 for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1949, and not to exceed $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending JUne 30, 1950: *Provided further,* That, in addition to the foregoing, any balance, unobligated as of June 30, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for any period ending on or prior to that date is hereby authorized to be made available for obligation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and to be transferred to and consolidated with any appropriations for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for said fiscal year.'

"(2) By amending the last sentence of such section 114 (c) to read as follows: 'The authorizations in this title are limited to the period ending June 30, 1950, in order that the Congress may pass on any subsequent authorizations.'

"(b) Section 114 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation additional to that made by title I of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.), shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this title.'

"SEC. 9. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 115 (b) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the period following the words 'grant basis' and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided,* That the obligation to make such deposits may be waived, in the discretion of the Administrator, with respect to technical information or assistance furnished under section 111 (a) (3) of this title and with respect to ocean transportation furnished on United States flag vessels under section 111 of this title in an amount not exceeding the amount, as determined by the Administrator, by which the charges for such transportation exceed the cost of such transportation at world market rates.'

"(b) Section 115 of such act is amended by adding two new subsections as follows:

"'(h) Not less than 5 percent of each special local currency account established pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of this section shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources or for other local currency requirements of the United States.

"'(i) (1) The Administrator shall, to the greatest extent practicable, initiate projects for and assist the appropriate agencies of the United States Government in procuring and stimulating increased production in participating countries of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources; and in furtherance of those objectives the Administrator shall, in addition to the local currency allocated pursuant to subsection (h), use such other means available to him under this title as he may deem appropriate.

"'(2) In furtherance of such objectives and within the limits of the appropriations and contract authorizations of the Bureau of

Federal Supply to procure strategic and critical materials, the Administrator, with the approval of the Director of such Bureau, shall enter into contracts in the name of the United States for the account of such Bureau for the purchases of strategic and critical materials in any participating country. Such contracts may provide for deliveries over definite periods, but not to exceed 20 years in any contract, and may provide for payments in advance of deliveries.

"'(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to restrict or limit in any manner the authority now held by any agency of the United States Government in procuring or stimulating increased production of the materials referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) in countries other than participating countries.'

"SEC. 10. (a) The first sentence of section 117 (c) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided,* That the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals through the mails.'

"(b) Section 117 (d) of such act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949.'

"(c) Section 117 of such act is amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(e) Whenever the Administrator shall determine that shipping capacity available to Italy is inadequate for such emigration from Italy as may be desirable to further the purposes of this title, the Administrator shall request the United States Maritime Commission to make available to Italy vessels capable of engaging in such service for the purpose of transporting emigrants from Italy to destinations other than the United States, and shall specify the terms and conditions under which such vessels shall thus be made available, and the United States Maritime Commission thereupon shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, make such vessels available to Italy in accordance with such terms and conditions: *Provided,* That the total number of such vessels made available for such purpose shall not at any one time exceed 10: *Provided further,* That title to each such vessel owned by the United States Government shall remain in the United States: *And provided further,* That the terms and conditions under which such vessels are made available to Italy shall obligate Italy to return the vessels forthwith upon demand of the President, and in any event not later than June 30, 1952.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings whereby the House bill was passed will be vacated.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1209), to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEE, RICHARDS, JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, EATON, and VORYS.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF LONG-RANGE PROVING GROUND FOR GUIDED MISSILES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-ranging proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BROOKS, RIVERS, PHILBIN, COLE of New York, and ANDERSON of California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and include an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter in each one.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and Mr. WALTER, asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper material.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, the following résumé while treating one of Connecticut's most famous native sons is to some extent prompted by a recent occurrence on February 20, 1949, in Boston. It is said that on that date at Symphony Hall 300 women mobbed Ferrucio Tagliavini.

In nearby Roxbury an overflow crowd of about 500 at a Communist-sponsored freedom rally cheered as Henry Winston, one of the Red leaders who is now on trial in New York spoke of his indictment as being contrary to all State and Federal laws.

Simultaneously at hallowed Faneuil Hall, where liberty saw birth, the statistics show that 43 people clapped rather politely at the annual Washington-Lincoln birthday celebration where a local senior class president spoke in tribute to the Nation's first President. Public officials gasped their shocked reaction and observed that people are becoming less and less interested in the great heroes who made this country possible. In sympathy with this justified remark, the following is submitted:

It seems only fitting and proper that on this 12th day of April 1949 we should commemorate the birthday of Lyman Hall, son of the Honorable John Hall and Mary Street. John Hall came from Coventry, England, and after a sojourn in Boston and New Haven settled down at Wallingford, Conn., which is also my home town. It was in this village that on the 12th day of April, 1724, Lyman Hall was born.

He was graduated from Yale College in 1747 and entered upon the study of theology under the guidance of his uncle, Rev. Samuel Hall. Shortly thereafter he abandoned the idea of becoming a minister of the Gospel and applied himself to the acquisition of a medical education. He was admitted to the degree of doctor of medicine, married Mary Osborne and commenced the practice of this noble profession in Wallingford.

A body of Puritans from Massachusetts who desired to encourage the foundation of churches and the promotion of religion in the southern plantations had removed to Dorchester which is not far above Charleston in South Carolina. It was shortly thereafter in his twenty-eighth year of age that Lyman Hall abandoned his home in Wallingford, and cast his lot among the Puritan dwellers in South Carolina.

About 1756, Dr. Hall moved to the Midway settlement in Georgia, which was located along the Savannah and Darien Highway. This road connected the northern and southern confines of the province. Here, Dr. Hall found ample employment for his best professional skill and endeared himself to the community by his unremitting exertions to counteract the pernicious influences of the diseases which were rampant in that locality. It was at Midway that the fires of resistance to the dominion of England were kindled. Lyman Hall was a protagonist of this movement and by his fiery exhortations and determined and

inexhaustible energy added stout fuel to the flames. On the 21st of March, 1775, Dr. Lyman Hall was appointed as a delegate to represent his community in the Continental Congress. This was in direct recognition of his prominent, persistent services on behalf of the revolutionary movement. It is interesting to note that when he departed for the Congress he carried with him as a present from his constituents, to those suffering patriots in Massachusetts, a hundred and sixty barrels of rice and 50 pounds sterling.

Dr. Hall was successively reappointed a Member of the Continental Congress from Georgia and upon the fall of Savannah which occurred in December 1778 and the capture of Sunbury, the entire coast region of Georgia was passed into the possession of the King's forces. They overran, plundered, and exacted the most onerous tribute of the conquered territory and its people. In the melee which followed, Dr. Hall's residence in Sunbury and his rice plantation were despoiled. It was at that time that he removed his family to the North where they resided until the evacuation of Savannah in 1782. His services as a Member of the Continental Congress were possibly not as conspicuous as those rendered by some of the other delegates, but it may nevertheless be fairly claimed that he was a regular, earnest, and intelligent delegate and admirably discharged the important duties which devolved upon him, including the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Upon his return to Georgia Dr. Hall made his home at Savannah. His fortune had been shattered so he resumed the practice of his profession. It was there while quietly employed that he was, in January 1783, elected to be the Governor of Georgia. His acknowledgment of the honor which had been conferred upon him was expressed in a brief address which is a matter of record and it may be observed that Governor Hall, by his early and wise suggestions contained therein, sounded the keynote and paved the way for the foundation and maintenance of the University of Georgia.

After finishing his term of service he resumed the practice of medicine in Savannah and apparently prospered. He accumulated a small fortune and purchased a fine plantation on the Savannah River, not far from Shell Bluff. It was at this place that he died on the 19th of October 1790, in the 67th year of his age, leaving his widow Mary, and a son John, both of whom died shortly thereafter. His remains have since been removed and placed at Augusta, Ga. They are beneath the monument erected by patriotic citizens in front of the courthouse in honor of the signers of the Declaration of Independence from Georgia. Subsequent to the removal of his remains to Augusta, authorities of Wallingford, Conn., were sent the marble slab which had been inserted in front of the brick wall, wherein his remains had so long rested. The slab is still very carefully preserved and bears the following as part of its inscription:

To those so mourned in death, so loved in life,
The childless parent and the widowed wife
With tears inscribes this monumental stone,
That holds his ashes and expects her own.

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout the day, or until such time as we may make other arrangements, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4146, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MAHON), the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am shocked and disturbed when I consider the vast sums we are spending and preparing to spend for national defense. Undoubtedly, most Americans must have a similar reaction. I wish we could find some way to avoid these huge outlays. It is imperative that we do everything in our power to prevent the desperation and horror which another war would bring to our homes and to the homes of our neighbors. There seems to be no road for us to follow except the road of anxiety and sacrifice. We have no other course open to us with so many ominous signs on the horizon of our world. We would be faithless to our trust if we failed to prepare for trouble and thereby seek to avoid it.

Today we have before us the appropriation bill for the National Military Establishment. This is the biggest appropriation bill of this session of Congress and, in all probability, the most important. Without it, the Army, Navy, and Air Force would not be in existence after July 1.

For the first time in history, insofar as I know, a subcommittee of five members of the House Committee on Appropriations was assigned the responsibility of handling the appropriation bill for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This is a long step forward in the unification of our armed services. We cannot have unification at the Pentagon Building if we do not have it on Capitol Hill.

The present change in procedure has brought great responsibility. We were given what might be called an almost impossible assignment. I hope the country and the Congress will be tolerant of any mistakes we have made and support us in our efforts to help make unification really work out in practice.

We have done our best. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have had the fullest cooperation from the other members of the subcommittee. We worked together as a team.

I should like to identify for the record the members of the subcommittee. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], vice chairman of the subcommittee, who sat on my right during all committee hearings, was formerly chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy. Next on my right was the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who served for years on the great Committee on Armed Services. On my left was the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who for many years was on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Army and Air Force, and who formerly was chairman of that subcommittee. Next on my left was the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who has long been a member of the Appropriations Committee and who was formerly chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. To these gentlemen, in my judgment, the Congress owes a debt of gratitude. They have character, ability, and experience. They gave their energies completely over a period of weeks to the drafting of the bill before us. I wish to pay public tribute to each of them.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the full committee, frequently attended our sessions and was invaluable to us in the final drafting of the bill. Mr. Robert Lambert, our executive clerk, did a masterful and prodigious job in making it possible to get the bill to the floor promptly and in proper order.

If war comes soon, we are appropriating too little. If we have miscalculated the dangers, if the threat of war is just a deceptive mirage on the horizon, we are appropriating too much.

The likelihood of the outbreak of war in the near future was a pertinent subject of inquiry by our committee. Among those with whom we discussed this subject were Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and former Secretary James Forrestal, Secretaries Royall, Sullivan, and Symington, Gen. Omar Bradley, Admiral Denfeld, General Vandenberg, General Wedemeyer, General of the Armies Dwight D. Eisenhower. These men did not predict an early outbreak of war, but they agreed that some unpredictable development might throw us suddenly into conflict. This, however, was not anticipated.

If potential enemies have any fear that this country is bent upon an aggressive attack upon any nation, their fears should be completely dispelled by the fact that no military leader in America with whom our committee has been in contact during the 11 weeks of preparation for this measure has made the remotest suggestion that we should launch an unprovoked attack upon any country on earth. The fine quality of patriotism which is characteristic of our military leaders—some of whom in peacetime are often maligned—should be an inspiration to the American people and the world.

I would have no part in deceiving the people of this country. The bill before us does not prepare this country for the immediate outbreak of war. A minimum of $50,000,000,000 would be required for that purpose. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have estimated that $30,000,000,000 would be required to place the country even in semireadiness for war. In other words, if every tax dollar that the Government collects this year were spent for military purposes the funds would not be adequate for full mobilization. No military man before us recommended complete preparation for war. Nothing would please a potential enemy better than to have us bankrupt our country and destroy our economy by maintaining over a period of years complete readiness for armed conflict. Such a course would not only destroy our economy, but it would also probably destroy our democracy, destroy the essential natural resources of the country, and perhaps lead to a military dictatorship.

Our country proceeds on the theory that our best interests are promoted by taking certain calculated risks.

That is what the military people say, and I think we are compelled to agree with them in that statement.

The bill before us provides that our entire military force in all its phases for the coming fiscal year will consist of 4,753,100 officers and enlisted men and women. Of this number, 1,644,300 will be in the regular service, 399,500 will be in the National Guard and the Air National Guard, and 2,709,300 will be in the Organized Reserves. Of those in the Organized Reserves, 579,388 will be in drill-pay status.

The bill provides the Army, Navy, and Air Force in cash appropriations for new obligations during the coming year and in funds to liquidate contracts authorized by previous Congresses the total sum of $13,080,115,800. The bill provides new contract authorizations by the armed services, principally for aircraft, in the total sum of $2,636,301,000, making a total in cash and contract authority in the sum of $15,716,416,800. These figures do not include $189,000,000 which is provided for the Office of the Secretary of Defense and which includes retirement pay for all the services and a total of $3,700,000 provided for the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

In cash appropriations the bill exceeds the President's budget by $53,497,100. In contract authorizations the bill exceeds the President's budget by $577,755,000. Many reductions were made in the budget, but there is an over-all increase of the budget in the bill which is brought about by the action of the committee in providing for additional aircraft and expansion of the Air Force.

However, of course, if one wants to consider other budget estimates which are pending before the Committee, such as the budget estimate for universal Military training and the budget estimate for additional housing and pay increases for the military services—if that $830,000,000 should be considered and the UMT should be considered, it could then be said that this bill before us is about $1,000,000,000 above the budget. But those requests were not actually before our subcommittee. However, I can say confidently that the sum total of military appropriations for this session will not be above the President's budget estimate. In the bill before us many reductions were made in the budget, but of course we have this over-all increase which has been brought about by the further implementation of the Air Force in our effort to make real that which we have voted for on paper—the so-called 70-group air program.

The sums referred to, huge as they are, do not account for all that Congress is being called upon this year to provide for national defense.

To those who expect to offer amendments, if any, to increase the appropriations in this bill, let me point out that in addition to $16,000,000,000 provided in this bill for national defense, which is a huge sum of money, vast additional sums are being provided for national defense, or will be provided. We are being called upon to appropriate about $4,900,000,000 for the European recovery and so-called foreign aid. Members who support that program will do so because they regard it simply as a national-defense program. Is not the $792,000,000 we are called upon to provide for atomic energy also national defense? Add to the amount in this bill the sums requested for European recovery, atomic energy, and the $525,000,000 requested for the stock piling of strategic materials and the $830,000,000 budget estimate for military housing and additional pay, and the $1,000,000,000 in the budget for Government and relief in Army occupied areas, and you have the colossal sum of about $23,000,000,000 for national defense for the fiscal year 1950. These who say that this Government is being niggardly in providing funds for national defense have not opened their eyes to the facts.

It has been said that Congress is making the same mistake in reducing national defense spending following World War II as was made after World War I. That is not correct. Let us take a look at the record. On the fourth year after the First World War Congress provided for expenditure for national defense in all phases the total sum of about $600,000,000. On the fourth year after the Second World War Congress is being called upon to provide about $23,000,000,000 for all phases of national defense. This year we will appropriate for national defense more than 3,000 percent above the sum that was expended for national defense 4 years after World War I.

I do not speak boastfully of these huge figures. I speak of them in humility and with grave concern for the economic and military security of our Nation. Let no one speak lightly of the tremendous sums which the Eighty-first Congress is providing for national defense. The taxpayer deserves to be remembered for the burdens which he bears, and he must take consolation in the thought that these expenditures are being proposed in the name of national security and the peace and happiness of the people of America and the world—in short, the object of this bill is to help prevent world war III.

UNIFICATION

I should now like to speak briefly about unification. Before speaking of particular details and further figures, these comments would be in order: Men who have been saturated with interdepartmental jealousies and rivalries for a lifetime cannot easily unify their efforts, particularly in peacetime. Here is one of the great difficulties: Unification often involves the giving up of offices and prerogatives which present incumbents have. If you consolidate three branches of a portion of the military establishment, at least two men who are heads of individual branches will lose prestige and position. Men do not often surrender power and position voluntarily.

Probably we shall never have unification until West Point and Annapolis have been converted into national defense academies. I believe Congress should give serious consideration to such action. Personally, I think it ought to be done; and I think all military personnel, as far as that is concerned, on shore duty, should be in the same uniform. No such attempt, of course, is being made in this bill.

The present set-up of our National Defense Establishment is very defective in the following general respect: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, made up of the Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and a representative of the President, function on a basis of unanimity; all decisions must be unanimous. This results in each service having, in effect, the veto power; each service can insist on getting what it wants or blocking action by failure to agree. This approaches the veto power which exists in the United Nations Security Council. In Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Army has a veto; the Navy, if it does not get what it wants, can veto action; and so can the Air Force by failure to agree. Hence, in peacetime one is compelled to take the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with a grain of salt, so to speak. Each service is angling for prestige, a place in the sun, a larger slice of the national defense dollar. During the war there was glory, and money, and manpower sufficient for all; but the peacetime situation is entirely different.

Military people are notoriously lacking in economy-mindedness. This is un-

derstandable in time of war when victory with the smallest loss in human life is the objective; there is no time to count dollars then. But in peacetime we cannot afford to bankrupt the country or squander our dwindling resources; that would be the road to national insecurity and the possible loss of the next war if one should come. General Eisenhower and many others in varying phraseology made clear this point.

It would be hard to prove that unification has thus far saved much money; some minor savings have been achieved. There is, however, much evidence that as we go along the savings can be tremendous. There is much evidence that efficiency is being promoted, a factor which should not be discounted.

We, as a committee, have insisted on the promotion of efficiency and economy; and in this bill we have tried to make progress in that direction. We realize that one of the most important things that needs to be done in this country is to hammer into the heads of the military people the necessity for economy. We have assurances of cooperation. We hope those assurances will materialize. Too many officers in varying echelons of the service seem to have no real comprehension of the necessity for the conservation of money and resources.

If some of our reductions seem rather severe I would point to the testimony of the new Secretary of Defense, Col. Louis Johnson, who definitely says that he feels economies can and will be achieved. Certainly there is room for economy in every branch of the National Military Establishment.

ARMY

Now, I should like to discuss briefly the Army situation.

When one thinks of that grand soldier, Gen. Omar Bradley, the Army Chief of Staff, and the traditions and accomplishments of the Army, he has no disposition to discount the importance of the United States Army.

The bill provides the Army with an appropriation of $4,481,834,200. We reduced the budget request by $123,000,000, which is less than one-half the reduction which was made by Congress in the bill last year.

But the entire appropriation for the Army as carried in the bill is less than the appropriation for the Army last year, but it is the judgment of the committee that if properly expended the huge sum provided will be reasonably adequate.

We provide the budget estimate in strength of the Army, 677,000 men. We do not reduce research and development.

As a matter of fact, we do not reduce research and development at any point in the bill. We provide $500,000,000, which is the most important money in this bill, for research and development in all its phases. Aside from any other factor, this action may contribute more toward our security in years to come perhaps than anything else we do.

We provide the budget estimate for the National Guard. The Guard is making excellent progress and is rapidly taking its rightful and important place in the national defense picture. We provided the budget estimate for the ROTC and the organized reserves. The Navy is doing an outstanding job with the Naval Reserve program, but this cannot be said of the Army and the Air Force. We hope that the hearings held and the funds provided will give real impetus and direction to the Army and Air Force Reserve programs. The fact is that prior to March 25, 1948, the Army and the Air Force did not have authority to provide drill pay for the organized Reserves. This made real progress very difficult.

The Committee on Armed Services, headed by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], performed a real service to the country in securing the passage of legislation to provide for drill pay.

In the fiscal year 1950, we expect to have in the Army organized Reserves 714,000 officers and enlisted men; 350,000 in the National Guard, and 677,000 in the Regular Army, making a total of 1,741,300 officers and enlisted men.

NAVY

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to discuss briefly the Navy part of this bill.

The bill provides the Navy with $4,375,327,600 in cash appropriations and $643,546,000 in contract authorizations, principally for aircraft, making a total of $5,018,873,600. This figure is a net of $32,698,400 below the budget estimate. Percentagewise the reduction below the budget figure is negligible. It would be a sad commentary upon the ingenuity of the Navy to say that economies could not be placed into operation sufficient to effect this reduction.

We made no reductions in the budget figures for Navy air power. The bill provides in excess of $1,000,000,000 in cash and $576,000,000 in contract authorizations for the Navy air arm. Roughly speaking, it can be said that 45 percent of the entire Navy budget will directly or indirectly be expended for air power.

The Navy always does a superb job in war. It is doing a good job during this postwar period. Admiral Conolly, commander of our naval forces in the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean waters, gave us a first-hand report of operations in that critical area of the world. There is no doubt about the fact that the Navy exerts a great influence for stability and peace throughout the world. It can almost be said that for practical purposes the American Navy is the only navy in the world.

The bill before us provides for the maintenance of a navy of 731 ships and 527,000 officers and enlisted men, marines included, for the approaching fiscal year. Whenever I speak of the Navy I speak of the marines who are an important part of the Naval Establishment.

When the war ended we were in the midst of a $22,000,000,000 ship-construction program which had been in operation throughout the war. In May 1946 Congress enacted legislation which provided for the revision and readjustment of the entire construction program. It was determined that a limited number of vessels then under construction should be completed. Of the wartime program, 13 ships are yet to be completed.

This bill provides $108,000,000 for the continuation of the wartime shipbuilding program. The entire wartime program will be approximately completed during the coming fiscal year.

Since May 1946 Congress has provided total or partial funds for the construction of 15 new ships and the conversion of 33 ships. This is in addition to the wartime program.

The big $189,000,000 supercarrier upon which about $9,000,000 has already been spent and $156,000,000 obligated is included in the new program. This carrier had already been authorized by Congress prior to the creation of the subcommittee having direct responsibility for this bill. It is scheduled for completion in 1952.

The bill before us today provides for one additional new ship, an auxiliary mine sweeper prototype. The bill also provides for the conversion of six destroyers to destroyer escorts.

In the field of research and development the bill provides the Navy with the budget estimate of $203,000,000. The committee regards preparation for antisubmarine warfare to be a matter of the greatest importance, and substantial sums are provided in order that the program may continue on a high priority basis. Of necessity much of our hearing on that subject had to be omitted from the printed record.

Among the 731 ships to be operated during fiscal 1950 are the following: 1 battleship, the *Missouri*, which is being operated principally as a training ship with frequent rotation of personnel; 8 heavy carriers; 11 escort and light carriers; 18 cruisers; 170 destroyers and destroyer escorts; 80 submarines; 99 mine craft and patrol craft; 84 amphibious craft; and 260 auxiliary vessels.

AIR FORCE

I come now to a discussion of the Air Force part of the bill. There would have been no Pearl Harbor in 1941 if we had been prepared to strike a quick and deadly blow at the vitals of Japan and Germany. We greatly diminish the likelihood of world war III when we prepare ourselves to strike a quick and deadly blow at the very heart of the potential enemy. The greatest deterrent to crime, we are told, is the certainty of immediate apprehension and quick punishment. Probable punishment in the dim and distant future is at best a mild deterrent.

Aggressor nations attack because they think they can somehow eventually get away with it. Under modern conditions they can be made to pause and reflect only with the assurance that at the very outbreak of war they will be confronted with quick and immediate devastation—devastation from the borders of their country to the population and industrial centers in the interior.

The only force under heaven that can now deliver the quick and devastating blow is the United States Air Force. So I say without hesitation that our first line of defense is the Air Force. The Air Force can carry the battle immediately into the far interior of the enemy homeland. It is also our best defensive weapon. It is our shield as well as our spear. It must be of modern design and in a state of readiness.

More cautious officials would probably not make the statements I am making. They might be restrained by the thought, "But what will the Navy and the Army say to that." My reply is that the object of our national defense program is not to make the generals and the admirals happy—and I have the sincerest admiration and respect for many of them—but to make the country secure. The people are not the servants of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Army, Navy, and Air Force are the servants of the people.

At times I have thought that some individuals are avoiding an expression of their true views as to the national defense problem because they fear they will offend Army, Navy, or Air Force officials, hoping always to have the plaudits of all three services, fearing to offend. But when we are spending billions of dollars, and when the future and the destiny of the Nation is at stake, we cannot temporize. We must meet issues head-on when the moment comes to meet them.

These individuals want to be all things to all people. When they give 50 cents to the Air Force they want to give a half dollar each to the Army and the Navy. They would buy an airplane for the Air Force, a ship for the Navy, and a tank for the Army—make everybody happy and call it a day. There is a danger in this philosophy. There is no place for log rolling and the throwing of dice for national defense. This idea of trying to split the national defense pie into three equal pieces is nonsense. Courage is demanded if we are to face our national defense requirements in a forthright and effective manner. Let us have an end to this pussyfooting on the subject and face the facts.

When Winston Churchill spoke in Boston a few days ago he was not speaking from a background of inexperience when he said:

> For good or ill, air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power, and fleets and armies, however necessary, must accept a subordinate rank. This is a memorable milestone in the march of man.

I hasten to say that in my judgment the Army and the Navy are vitally important in our national-defense structure. That viewpoint is confirmed by the fact that the bill before us carries about $9,000,000,000 for these agencies.

I part company completely with those who say that in the event of future war the Army and Navy will not have important roles. I also part company with those who say that world war III, if it comes, will be fought like World War II. Those who prepare for the possibility of world war III with the pattern of World War II in mind invite disaster as did the French who with their Maginot Line prepared for World War II on the basis of techniques used in World War I.

We must shake ourselves out of any complacency that would lead us into any such error.

Air power, and I am referring to Army and Navy air, was a negligible factor in the First World War; it was decisive in the Second World War; it will be incomparably more decisive if there is a third world war.

We put the emphasis of air power in this bill. Those who look backward are inviting disillusionment and disaster.

The people have already faced the facts as to the significance of air power. This committee has faced the facts in the preparation of this bill by giving the very highest priority to the Air Force. We made no exception of the Air Force in providing certain reductions and mandatory economies in the utilization of civilian personnel and in certain other fields as shown in the committee report. Yet, here was the situation. Last year in an appropriations bill we added funds looking toward a 70-group-air-force program. This year the House has approved the legislative basis for a 70-group air Force. The action in each instance was taken by roll call vote and was practically unanimous. In view of the convictions of the members of the committee as to the importance of air power to our security and in view of the legislation which all members of the subcommittee had supported last year and this year, and in view of the action of Congress, it was felt that steps should be taken immediately to make another definite approach toward the accomplishment of the so-called 70-group program. We took the necessary step.

Briefly, here is the broad outline of what the bill provides for. The total cash in the bill for new obligations and for the liquidation of contract authorizations provided for by previous Congresses is $4,222,954,000. In new contract authorizations the bill provides for $1,992,755,000, for which no appropriations will be required until next year. This will provide for an Air Force of 440,000 officers and enlisted men, and for the procurement of about 2,600 military aircraft.

We have provided for an expansion and acceleration of the Air Force program over the program submitted by the budget in the sum of approximately $851,000,000. In other words, we take into account reductions which we made in certain categories such as civilian personnel and we apply those savings to the accelerated program looking toward a 70-group air force. The total increase for the Air Force above the budget is approximately $800,000,000.

The total increase for additional air groups is $851,000,000, of which $209,000,000 is in cash and $642,000,000 is in contract authorization. Roughly speaking, the bill provides for 58 air groups, as compared with the budget request for 48 groups.

That generally covers the broad outline of what the committee did. Our hearings consist of 3,000 pages in 4 volumes. The report, prepared largely by our able clerk, Mr. Lambert, is exceptionally illuminating. I realize that it is impossible at this time to go into every detail of the military program, but I have tried to cover the high spots.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the able gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Texas on the splendid statement he has made. It is to be regretted that 435 Members did not have an opportunity to listen to him. I agree wholeheartedly with what he has had to say with reference to the importance of air. I agree that air, and in speaking of air I mean the air for both the Army and Navy, is necessary as our first line of defense. In view of the gentleman's position, and so important is air in future warfare, I am at a loss to understand how he can reconcile his views with the act of the committee in reducing naval aviation to the extent it has been reduced in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The Navy aviation was not reduced below the budget estimate. The committee gave Navy aviation something over a billion and a half dollars, which is the exact fund requested. Mr. Sullivan, the Secretary of the Navy, in his statement before the committee said that he stood foursquare behind the President's budget with respect to all the features in the bill. So we did not cut the air arm of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON. That is true. The gentleman's defense is that we have not done anything contrary to the budget recommendations and that he has carried out exactly what the budget recommended. But as a matter of fact, the budget—and you followed what the budget recommended—has reduced naval aviation under what the 1949 bill provided by some 3,000 planes.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, but every time that we give a dollar to one service, we cannot necessarily give a dollar to another service.

Mr. VINSON. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that it should not be parceled out like a piece of cake, but the gentleman has based his case on the importance of aviation.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman, but at the same time his acts do not follow his conclusions because he comes to the House with a bill reducing naval aviation below the 1949 budget by some 3,000 planes. On the other hand, he turns around and says that we can only have 7,700 planes and only permit 840 planes to be procured. Now, the life of a plane is only 6 years, and therefore the effect of your action is to cut naval aviation down to 4,000 planes in 6 years.

Mr. MAHON. The Navy at present has 14,000 planes. This bill provides in excess of 800 planes. The committee—or at least speaking for myself—felt that that was as far as we should go at this time. When we had men before us who were qualified to speak with respect to these matters, I was confirmed in the judgment I have expressed.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield further, so that the small number of the committee who are present can get this picture, may I say that the plan for 1949 for the Air Force and the Navy

is 30,886 planes. In the 1950 budget you have only planned for 25,600 planes. And this bill that you are now advocating proposes a reduction of 4,786 planes over-all. That is what the effect of this is.

Mr. MAHON. Some of our older planes, of course, are deteriorating. We still have a considerable backlog of planes. We are appropriating $500,000,000 for research and development. I think certainly it could be said that we have done a great deal in undertaking to provide for the Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact, the only complaint I have about your bill is in reference to naval aviation. I compliment the committee on the splendid work that it has done. Of course, it has cut the Army personnel some 37,000. But I am not going to argue about that. As a matter of fact you have reduced the total naval appropriations under the 1949 budget by $573,000,000. That is correct, is it not? The bill which was brought out by the distinguished gentlemen last year in that "No-good Congress," as it was classified by the President, carried $573,000,000 more for national defense for the Navy than this bill carries today.

Mr. MAHON. I believe that all the Members on the floor, as well as I realize the ardent support which the Navy has had from the gentleman from Georgia through the years. He was formerly a chairman of the great Committee on Naval Affairs. He made a great record and I pay him tribute. But I say that in this bill we give the Navy 527,000 men. We give them 360,000 civilian personnel. We give them $5,000,000,000. I say under the circumstances that is as much as can be justified at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman recognize that the conditions in the world today are more unsettled and that we have greater obligations upon the Government than we did last year when the committee and the Congress appropriated $573,000,000 more than the budget that you are recommending to appropriate this year?

Mr. MAHON. I would not necessarily say that conditions are more tense now than they were last year. I think perhaps at the time of the beginning of the Berlin airlift conditions were more tense, but I say to you that we are providing in this bill $16,000,000,000. We have just voted for $5,000,000,000 for national defense through the European recovery program. We have yet to come before us a billion dollar request for the cost of the occupation of Germany and Japan, a half billion dollars in budget estimates for stock-piling of strategic materials, and $830,000,000 for increases in pay in the Army and for housing, all of which will require additional appropriations. Twenty-three billion dollars are being provided this year for national defense. In my judgment, this probably is as far as we are able to go.

Mr. VINSON. It may be true that $23,000,000,000 may be as far as we should go, but it should be allocated where you will get the greatest results from the expenditure—that is the point. It is not the total amount that you spend, but how you spend it.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct and that is the reason we wrote this bill up as we did, so the money could be provided the Air Force, our highest priority in national defense.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to say to the gentleman that it would do us a great deal more good for the defense of this country to take a portion of the money that we have just authorized for foreign aid and instead of going to Europe with it, to fortify our own armed services.

Mr. MAHON. Both the gentleman and I, I believe, voted for the bill on the ground of national defense. Did the gentleman vote against the bill?

Mr. VINSON. No; I voted for the bill, but I certainly hope the Committee on Appropriations, in making this over-all survey, as to what is going to be done with the $23,000,000,000 will do two things—reduce the authorization and add something to the defense of this country and provide at least the same amount which was provided last year for the air force of the Navy. That is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, from looking at the actual figures, that the committee has increased the appropriation for the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy from $588,000,000 to $1,042,121,000, and they have also added a contract authorization for $643,000,000. Now, that is more than the contract authorization was last year. Thus, over-all, you have given the Navy an increase instead of a decrease.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I suggest this to the Chairman in closing his comment, $418,000,000 goes to discharge obligations incurred in the last fiscal year and is not in the category that you refer to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has given us new hope. I have resented very much the fact that production has been channeled more and more into lines of defense, but I must say that the straightforward presentation of the gentleman has given me solace in this matter and I am glad to go along with him.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish to thank the gentleman for his very able presentation of this complex bill, but I wish to ask the gentleman a couple of questions. In the deliberations which the gentleman's committee engaged in to arrive at these amendments, did you take into consideration the potential destructive power of atomic energy in arriving at these figures, particularly for the armed forces, the military, so-called, infantry, and so forth, and the naval forces?

Mr. MAHON. The committee—at least I speak for myself—we took into consideration all of these factors. We realize that we are going through a very dangerous and unpredictable period. We felt that in view of the fact that we possessed the atomic bomb, in view of the fact that we could level many of the population centers of this globe, almost overnight, we did not want to go beyond $16,000,000,000 in this bill for military purposes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is the point to which I am addressing my remarks. Notwithstanding the fact that within the last 3 years we have developed a force which is so destructive that it minimizes all previous destructive forces which we have been able to apply in a military way, yet we do not find ourselves in a position, apparently, to take advantage of those advancements by reducing the over-all military budget. Here we see, notwithstanding the advancement in science and technology and the increased ability to destroy, to defend, and to engage in offensive warfare, we do not seem to be taking that into consideration in the setting of the over-all budget.

Mr. MAHON. This, of course, is the first budget that we have handled for the National Military Establishment in one all-inclusive bill. Nobody can say with complete finality just what the next war is going to be like. We have tried to go along with the best plans for defense that could be offered. We may be wrong, but we would rather be wrong on the side of liberality than on the side of niggardliness.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not criticizing the gentleman or his committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am asking for information and with very sincere regard for the gentleman's efforts. We on the Atomic Energy Committee are interested in this question from that angle. I realize that the only purpose of our committee is to provide the means for our national forces to defend our country. I wonder just how much information has been given to the gentleman's committee as to how much destructive force is now in the hands of our people as a result of atomic energy? I realize, of course, that that is a secret, and I am not asking that it be made public at this time; certainly, I would be the last one to ask that. But I say that if we have 10 bombs a certain effect can be achieved in offensive warfare; if we have a hundred bombs a certain other effect can be achieved. It is absolutely necessary, it seems to me, in appropriating this money that the committee that has the responsibility of making the appropriations and sustaining our national defense know a little more than I think they do know about this matter.

Mr. MAHON. I think it would not be appropriate for me to comment on the

floor of the House in regard to what we know about atomic energy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not asking for details; I am just asking the gentleman if he has what he considers adequate knowledge to fit this into the over-all defense plans, and if his Committee has considered it in relationship to defense, or are they going ahead on the old basis of providing the old weapons of warfare without regard to these new weapons that technology has brought to us?

Mr. MAHON. We are not looking backward. We are trying to take advantage of new developments.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not a fact when spokesmen for the armed forces come before your committee they come fully prepared to give the committee the results of their years and years of experience involving the employment of the atom bomb in time of war?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Texas has given us a magnificent, comprehensive, clear exposition not only of this bill, but he has also made a speech which we would all do well, I think, to cut out and put in our memory books. I want to congratulate him on his seriousness, his diligence, his application to his work, and the thoroughness with which he has gone into this problem; it is simply astounding. For the benefit of the gentleman from California, who might not have heard all of the gentleman's remarks, do not forget that the gentleman from Texas at the beginning of his speech said that perhaps the $500,000,000 we are spending on scientific research and technological development is the best money that we could invest.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his very generous references.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the presence of the gentleman from Missouri and his remarks taken in connection with the tribute he paid to the gentleman from Texas reminds me of an occasion some years ago when the gentleman from Missouri and I were assigned to address a mass meeting of some 6,000 Republicans. The gentleman from Missouri preceded me and, with his usual evangelistic eloquence, for 30 minutes he talked to that group of Republicans mostly. At the end he said, "And shall we not follow Lincoln?"

The people all got up and they cheered. The presiding officer had difficulty in even getting a chance to introduce me. As I got up I said, and the gentleman from Missouri will bear me out, "Sure, we will follow Abraham Lincoln, but who in the world wants to follow DEWEY SHORT?"

That is a matter of record and I cannot deny it if I were to be interrogated for the truth. So today I am here before you feeling somewhat as I did that night and would ask, "Who would like to take my place to follow the eminent chairman of our subcommittee?"

Before I begin my remarks on this bill, Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman—and I use the term in full appreciation of its meaning—from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He has had an unprecedented burden involving the enactment of appropriations for all the branches of the armed services under the National Security Act in one bill and on consolidated basis for the first time. He has been fair. He has been calm. He has sought the light and he stands before you today with a clear conscience because he, as has every member of the subcommittee, made every endeavor to bring to this House a bill embracing the requirements for a balanced national defense. He is well informed. He has our complete confidence because of his outstanding ability and his demonstrated qualification for the leadership he has exemplified.

Mr. Chairman, last year the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy of the Eightieth Congress, of which I had the appreciated honor to be the chairman, recommended, the full Appropriations Committee adopted, and the House approved a bill appropriating $4,920,000,000 for the Navy.

The appropriation, Mr. Chairman, was for a Navy to be, as of June 30, 1949, of 50,100 officers, 409,900 enlisted men, which, in other words, comprised a total manpower strength for the Navy of 460,000 plus some 30,000 1-year enlistees, as I remember it.

This appropriation so made by our committee would also have assured a Marine Corps of not less than 92,000 officers and enlisted men, plus some 6,000 1-year enlistees and others. Right here I might say I am absolutely for and always will be for the maintenance and sustaining of the Marine Corps as such.

My subcommittee proposed, and the full committee approved, and the Congress endorsed the proposition that by the end of this fiscal year the Navy should have 777 active ships and around 8,000 regular operating craft. We also endeavored to assure the country that the Navy would for the fiscal year be able to procure in aircraft some six hundred and sixty-odd fighters, around 400 attack planes, and somewhere near 90 patrol planes, together with 8 troop carrier planes, and 1 lighter-than-air craft. And then there were some 57 others, totaling, as I recall it, around 1,200 aircraft.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the world situation then, as we saw it, demanded such action as we took for necessary preparation that not again should this country ever be found unprepared.

Now this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, and the full committee, and the House were in accord with the proposition, also, that the Navy should have for its use for research and development and to pay for the program the sum of $110,000,000 in order to permit a continuing program theretofore originated to make one prototype aircraft per year. I still say that was sensible.

And so I might go on, Mr. Chairman, but I summarize by saying that the actions taken by the committee of which I had the honor to be chairman were the result of very long and very careful consideration by men on that committee who had had long experience and who had very carefully thought out the possible and the reasonable and the necessary program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that the international situation today is decidedly worse and more chaotic and definitely more uncertain than as of a year ago today, or thereabout, when the report to which I refer was adopted. Despite all that is said by all parties connected with this so-called cold war, every man in this House knows down to his shoes that the situation is definitely worse and more critical than as of a year ago.

Why undertake to fool ourselves when we absolutely know the people cannot be fooled?

Within the last year we have lost the right of ingress and egress into and from Berlin. Just think of it, you red-blooded Americans. We have had to initiate "Operations Vittles" in Berlin with its daily hazard of a military incident, because Russia has said so. Moreover, since the program was started last year the United States has, may I say, established the North Atlantic Pact. This greatly increases our military liability throughout the world for our defense.

Our situation in the Far East in view of the events which have taken place and the Russian communistic potential control of Asia through China is a threat to our God-given destiny which we cannot dissolve, nor absolve, nor deny, nor repudiate.

Whether we like it or not we have to take on the white man's burden or be buried with the others who have never had the intestinal fortitude to fight for the right.

If the burden of our responsibility is so great as obviously it is, why do we not wake up and assume it?

Despite all these facts and my personal ratiocinations, it is nevertheless a fact that the President and the isolationists and pacifists, could they have their way, would reduce our opportunities for defense 2.4 percent in funds, which means that instead of 633,500 in the Navy we would have 543,544, which is 89,000 fewer. God knows we will need all we can have or get if I see what I think I see ahead.

The President's program cut that of my subcommittee by 45 active ships and by 2,433 regular operating aircraft. It would cut my committee's Navy procurement program by 30 percent so that in fiscal year 1950 the Navy would procure 380 less aircraft than my committee thought necessary last year. The construction program, did the President have his way, would be cut by 62.4 percent and he would reduce the other military requirements of the Navy, for development and research included, by 13.1 percent.

Now to reduce this all to dollars, the President undertakes to cut the program

which my committee outlined to the tune of $573,000,000, despite the fact that all costs will be considerably higher than at the time we arrived at the figures in the 1949 budget.

Necessarily I am not for the President's budget.

I shall support the bill as reported by the Armed Services Subcommittee, but I do wish it to be understood that I do not take back a single thing I said or did or that my subcommittee said or did with respect to the Navy and its needs for appropriations. To do so would be to stultify myself and to repudiate the action of my subcommitee.

The proposals we made last year should be forwarded. They should not be so drastically cut as the President's budget proposes. However, a part of a loaf is better than none, and I have gone along with the Armed Services Subcommittee, justifying my conscientious thinking in the matter by getting what I could toward the end which I seek to obtain.

There is one other thing, and I think it is fair and only right for me to say it, that while from certain standpoints the alleged unification of the services, Army, Navy, and Air, if accomplished as planned, is desirable, yet it will be the most expensive experiment on military lines, as a preliminary program, into which this Government ever entered.

We must still have an Army and Navy and an Air Force. In order to develop themselves they must be independent, one of the other. There must be no interference, one with the other, except when the time comes when there must be a unified direction of their activities. That is when unification means what it ought to mean.

Any attempt to coalesce and to coagulate the services and to destroy their individuality preliminary thereto is a mistake.

FIGURES

The figures before the House today indicate a total of $15,900,000,000 for the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1950. Whether it is enough or not, or too much, I do not presume to say.

This represents an increase over the President's request of approximately $650,000,000, which is roughly accounted for as providing an additional $800,000,000 for the Air Force and reducing both the Army and the Navy in a combined sum of approximately $150,000,000.

I am a great believer in air power. However, I likewise have strong convictions relative to the fact that a balanced force is necessary to wage successful warfare even in these advanced days of push-button tactics. My record is the proof of the foregoing.

I do not hold to the theory that in the event of armed conflict it will only be necessary to dispatch a large fleet of bombers to destroy in a matter of days the enemy that threatens us.

Based on my many years of experience with military matters, I feel strongly that the part of the Army and Navy in lending the necessary support, holding bases, and keeping the shipping lanes open will be as vital in any future war as history has indicated it has been in all past wars. That cannot be successfully disputed.

The House some weeks ago almost unanimously passed a bill providing for 70 groups of air power for the United States Air Force. This figure of 70 groups has been much publicized, and I feel that it has created an impression in the minds of the public that this relates to total air strength of the country.

I would like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that Naval Air has 22 powerful groups, and our Reserve and National Guard units have likewise substantial air power; in fact, under this bill, there will be a total of approximately 140 groups of air power in fiscal year 1950. Not too many, may I say.

However, I lament the fact that the publicity that has swept the country has prompted the Congress to increase Air Force strength and thus unbalance the careful deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the great military and civilian minds that comprise our National Military Establishment.

It is not my intention to offer amendments to this bill. I do feel it is my responsibility to invite the attention of the House to the fact that the bill is indeed providing for an unbalanced force. I likewise strongly urge that the new Secretary of Defense take strong steps to carry forward his responsibility for integration and combination of the three services to stop the internal bickering and foot racing that are so apparent at this time.

I am particularly interested in the matter of proper intelligence coverage. It is of serious concern to me. I am sure it is to every Member of this House as we are approving expenditures of such astronomical figures that it threatens our very economy. Certainly we should and must have adequate national defense, but the degree to which we can subordinate our civilian economy to it is one that should receive serious consideration by this great body.

Presumably, adequate national defense provides that we must keep ahead of any serious competitor in matters military. This brings us, then, to the basic fact that in order to keep ahead of a serious competitor we must of necessity have knowledge of their progress. It may well be that we are a generation ahead of any serious competitor, and in such event we are needlessly and extravagantly burdening our economy and our taxpayers with debt and taxation. On the other hand, we may conceivably be behind a prospective enemy in military matters, and in such event perhaps the sums we appropriate are niggardly or at least inadequate.

My point is that I have serious doubt that we have any real, accurate information, and a proper emphasis on real intelligence may save us millions of dollars and millions of lives. That we should lay more emphasis on adequate appropriations for research and for intelligence has been the burden of my conviction over the years in which I have served on the Military Affairs Committee and on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy.

As for me, I propose to err on the side of adequacy in order that never again may we be found so ill and inadequately prepared as we were prior to our entering both the First and Second World Wars.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I take it from the gentleman's remarks that he agrees with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that we perhaps could take a few hundred million or a billion and a half from the ECA program and give it to our Naval Air Service.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Maybe so.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, although there has been some criticism leveled at this Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, I think the entire House should appreciate the tedious task it has had to perform. To me, having been on the appropriations subcommittees for both the Army and the Air Force, and the Navy, for 2 years, it seems almost a miracle that these 5 men could consider so many intimate and crucial and important details in this period of just a few weeks.

I wish, however, it might have been possible for them to have time to wait until the Hoover report on the armed services had come in. It might have given them some information that would have enabled them to delve into some of the reported extravagance and waste. Had I been sitting on this committee I undoubtedly would not have agreed with all the items. I am not on that committee. It is not my responsibility, it is theirs, and taking everything into consideration they are to be commended rather than condemned.

As a matter of tribute to and confidence in this committee one thing should be done without very much delay, and certainly before the hearings begin next year. This committee should be given adequate experienced help. I say that for a good reason. Every time any admiral heading one of the Navy bureaus or any general heading one of the departments of the Army or Air Force comes before this committee he is always backed up by a big staff of experts, never less than 5 and sometimes as many as 15.

What did this committee have to work with to help them except their own experience, their common sense, and their knowledge of affairs relating to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? They had one committee clerk—and a good one—and one minority clerk—and he is a good clerk. There were these seven men pitting their judgment and their knowledge and their skill, their insight, and their vision, against this great array that comes up before them one after the other. These men have no opportunity to rest in between innings or rounds. They have to be in there every day all day from early morning until

late at night. It is a grueling job. It is a tedious job. In some people's minds it is a thankless job.

Tomorrow when we are reading the bill under the 5-minute rule I expect to offer an amendment, an amendment which, to me, is fundamental in principle.

My proposal is simply this: On page 70 an amendment will be offered that no part of the money appropriated for the Air Force shall be spent for blue uniforms. I expect now to get some help from the chairman of the subcommittee on this amendment in view of the fact that he just stated, a few minutes ago, he thought it was a good idea for all military personnel on duty on shore to wear the same uniforms. I am with him on that. We have been talking about unification. An additional type of uniform will be triplication or quadruplication, and it will divide the services more than ever before. Not only that, but it will complicate the matter of supplies. If we get into any serious difficulty and we have to move our troops in large numbers to various places, we are going to have enough trouble getting supplies to our men, without adding to the difficulties of the quartermaster. From all indications the Air Force is now going to have its own quartermaster corps, its own engineer corps, and its own medical corps, and several other items that will rather make for division rather than unification. But here is the picture. You have a difficult time now in getting supplies of uniforms to the Army and the Air Force.

Incidentally, I do not know why they should feel so bad about wearing that o. d. uniform. It has had an honorable history and a noble tradition. I wore that uniform for nearly 20 years and I was not the least bit ashamed of it. I stood out here during the Army Day parade and at the time of the inauguration and saw the Air Force wearing the o. d. uniform. I thought they looked mighty fine in it. Talking about this blue uniform, after all I have heard about it in the way of a build-up, to me it was a big disappointment. It lacked color and snap. I saw the young noncom walking down through the Capitol wearing that sample uniform, and it did not cause one single solitary eye, male or female, to turn. As I say, my proposal is not in derogation of this branch of the service. I am proud of them. I still remember the great exploits of the Air Force during the last World War. I recall the magnificent job they are doing in Berlin. I know many of these men, both enlisted men and officers—officers incidentally who will have to dig down in the pockets of their present o. d.'s to purchase the future blues. I have the greatest admiration for the job they have done, and the positions they hold, and I have the greatest respect for the future which they must face. Many of them are really personal friends, friendships I cherish. So, it is not a question of taking anything away from them. Rather it is an attempt on my part to do what we have been talking about doing, and that is to get unification. When summer comes you will see the men in the Navy wearing o. d.'s. The Army will be wearing o. d.'s, so why should not the Air Force wear them? Why should you not have more unification, instead of more diversification.

Take the position of the Quartermaster General, for example. He has enough trouble to furnish o. d. uniforms and o. d. shirts and o. d. socks, and in some cases, o. d. underwear, and tan shoes, and caps with the tan visors. Now you bring on this new uniform, and what do you have? The Quartermaster will have a pipe line for o. d. supplies. Over here you will have to duplicate that for blue uniforms, blue shirts, blue caps, black shoes, and caps with black visors. All of them have to be handled separately and labeled separately and stenciled separately and have separate supply lines. Nobody can tell us how much more it is going to cost for these duplicating services. It is bound to cost more money.

I remember the discussion last year. I have read as much of the hearings as I could in the short time that they have been available. Last year there was some discussion as to the additional cost. It was admitted then that these new uniforms would cost two and one-half million dollars extra. There seems to be some change in that position now in that with new plans, they claim they can produce this uniform for practically the same amount that they can produce the o. d. uniform. Nobody could tell, including the Quartermaster General, just how much more it would cost to keep the double supply line going. You have a matter of something like 9 months in which you must fill the pipe line up to the troops. In other words, you have got to build up your backlog of your incoming supplies, plus your depot supplies, plus your warehouse supplies, before the clothing can ever get to the troops. It takes something like 9 to 15 months to make these uniforms and move them to the point where these men will be wearing them. I understand, based upon that statement that the Air Force is going into blue uniforms in September of 1950.

Let us wait until we get some of these more urgent problems out of the way. Last year the Air Force said they had to have them because of morale. This year they do not even mention morale, they just say they want them. I will say this for Mr. Symington, the Secretary of the Air Force, while I do not agree with him on this thing I admire his stick-to-itiveness. He was determined to get blue uniforms. Last year he appeared before us and wanted blue uniforms. Congress voted 2 to 1 against them. He has kept right on working; he did not take "no" for an answer; you must admire somebody who keeps right on going for the goal like that and getting this close to achieving it.

The one big item that must be discussed in this connection, of course, is the matter of overcoats. Overcoats, of course, cost considerable money. The Army is going into a new type of overcoat, which has several features including a zipper lining, which means that eventually there are going to be a great number of the old-type wool overcoats on hand. I notice that it anticipates that the Air Force will give its overcoat orders in blue. This means that gradually the Army will have to absorb all the excess o. d. uniforms, overcoats, and shirts. Now, where is the Army going to be except holding the sack when in the winter of 1950 they want to go into the new overcoat with the zipper lining and they find the Air Forec in blue uniforms, blue overcoats; they will still have to wear out the supply of the old o. d. overcoats, which have very little to recommend them, including looks, warmth, or wearability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I understand the time was when they had trouble with recruitments. This would seem to be an accentuation in the wrong direction.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That was true last year when the Air Force talked about morale. They tried to tell us they had to have these blue uniforms to build up morale to get more recruits in the Air Force. I was not aware that they were having trouble getting recruits for the Air Force, but I was aware they were having trouble getting recruits in the Ground Forces where the man has nothing to look forward to except long hours, mud, and short meals. He did not have the inspiration of looking forward after his tour of duty to a rest spell in warm barracks, white sheets, and good meals. He had to stay on his belly in that mud and take it. There is where the lack of morale was.

A new impetus was given to recruitment last year—selective service—for men faced with the draft preferred to enlist. There is no present problem in morale; as a matter of fact, all of the services have had to put quotas on recruitments, whether it is the Air Force, the Ground Forces, or the Navy. If there is any place where lack of morale is to be expected, it is in the Ground Forces; if there is any place where they might need the stimulation of new uniforms, it is in the Ground Forces. Those are the men who do not have the glamor or thrill of being up where they can look down on th rest of their fellow men.

As I say, it is not that I have any lack of regard or lack of respect or lack of admiration for these men in the Air Force that I make this proposal, but it is a matter of principle, logic, and economy. If we are going to have unification, let us have it and let us cut out the duplication and increased expense of adding lines of supplies and the increased difficulties of getting these uniforms and these pieces of equipment. With the men of the Air Force in blue you will have to have two lines of supplies in shirts, socks, shoes, caps, overcoats, and everything else rather than one line of supplies which would call for simplification in the maintenance of the supply of uniforms.

I would like to know what the new Secretary of Defense thinks about this

proposal. A letter of inquiry to him about it has not yet been replied to.

With the demand for planes, let us forget new-fangled uniforms.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it has been a distinct privilege for me to serve on this subcommittee, a privilege which I shall long count one of the greatest I have received. I am deeply appreciative of the excellent work done by the chairman of the subcommittee and the masterful way in which he has carried through an extremely difficult task to the present moment. I am also deeply appreciative of the fine work and of the universal courtesy and helpfulness and kindness shown me by the other members on the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle.

Today we are talking about funds for the armed services. No one on this side of the Atlantic actually thinks we are going to be in war during the coming year. That is fine as long as we do not actually get into war. No one thought Pearl Harbor was coming. The next time—if we are asleep—there will be many Pearl Harbors and they will be right in our midst. They will not be on an outpost and, as you have been told countless times, there will not be time to get ready for war after the first blow falls.

Today we are neither at peace nor at war. Peace treaties have not been negotiated with Germany, with Japan, with Austria, but that is not the main threat that we are concerned about. It is not necessary that I name that threat.

The United Nations does not have the means to enforce peace. A new pact, the North Atlantic Pact, has been signed and there is talk of providing arms for the signatories of the North Atlantic Pact. But the arming of the signatory powers is not an overnight transition; it is not something that can be accomplished tomorrow so that we will feel the effect this year, and be able to relax where our own defense security is concerned. Today the nations of the North Atlantic Pact do not have the sinews of war. They do not have the means with which to protect themselves or us.

Today we must depend primarily on ourselves. That is going to be true through all the coming year. We are building toward the day when part of the load can be carried by someone else, but it is not here now.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the biggest cost item in our Government, the armed forces. This is a manifold operation and one that is so big it is difficult to conceive what it encompasses—1,644,000 men in uniform, nearly 1,000,000 civilian employees. Had you realized that? Nearly a million civilian employees in addition to one and two-thirds millions of men in uniform, plus the National Guard, plus the Reserves.

Yes, it is a big organization. Sometimes it is a wasteful organization, sometimes it is an inefficient organization, subject to human weaknesses just as any other agency of government or just as any other individual. It has weaknesses which should be corrected. This committee has made recommendation after recommendation in the report before you which, if followed out, will go far toward correcting many of those weaknesses. But, on the whole, Mr. Chairman, it is a great organization, which carries on the wartime traditions of the armed services, and we can be proud of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the armed services will cost us $13,000,000,000 in cash and nearly $3,000,000,000 in contract authorizations for the fiscal year 1950. Even at that great cost we cannot maintain the full mobilization that is necessary for certain protection of the peace, but the economy of the country could not stand much more than we are putting into arms at the present time. Hence, we must attempt to secure the strongest possible force offensively and defensively, that we can get for the money.

It will not be enough simply to have men in uniform; not enough to have even 1,640,000 of them in uniform. Those men must be trained, they must be equipped, they must be kept ready for the next war, not the last one.

It is not enough to have weapons that are as good as any in the world. Our weapons must be the best, because our forces are smaller and only by giving them the best of weapons can we even the great discrepancy in the size of world armed forces.

And we must have, Mr. Chairman, a balanced force. I have followed, as you have, the stories of push-button warfare, of 30-day wars, and I think back to the stories about the Jap fleet and how we were going to smash it in 3 months. I recall the long years and the lives and the cost that it took to smash that inferior Jap fleet. I do not want us to fall into that kind of thinking again.

No, Mr. Chairman, I see but one possibility of a war quickly ended, should war come to us. That would be if we were to strike the first blow, follow it through with other telling blows, and have the job done before the enemy could get his balance. But, we do not fight that way. We never have and we never shall. We will wait until war strikes, if strike it must, and then try to get our balance back and carry the fight to the enemy. And I subscribe to that policy, for we are seekers after peace.

Mr. Chairman, if we must have a balanced force, the first requirement is for a long-range striking force, a force that can retaliate an aggressor's blow with a counterstroke into the very heart of the enemy country; a force which an aggressor knows can destroy his plants and his cities and ruin his productiveness. Such a force can act as a greater deterrent to a willful aggressor than all the treaties ever written.

But, such a long-range striking force of air power is not enough, Mr. Chairman. Such a force can strike the blows to cripple, but it cannot seize and hold the enemy's land. Only the Army, which fights if it must in snow and mud, on short rations and with inadequate equipment—only the Army has the troops which must be called upon to move swiftly and surely into those vital bases which fringe our own country and without which we would not have the stepping stones essential to carrying on war. Only the Army has the men necessary to maintain a foothold on foreign bases, without which long months of costly preparation and bloody assault, as at Normandy and Iwo and Okinawa, would be necessary in the event of war. Only the Army can finally occupy the enemy homeland and stamp out continuing resistance.

There are other sides to welfare.

There is the unbelievable task of transportation; transportation of men and matériel to overseas bases; transportation of strategic materials from overseas to our own country; strategic materials which go into the manufacture of weapons, without which our plants could not operate a month. Such transportation is so enormous in scope that it must be carried on by land and sea. An incredible number of planes would be required for such an operation, and if we had the planes there would be no possible way of providing sufficient gasoline to fly them.

Then there is the additional place of the Navy as an agent of warfare, an agency which carried the fight in the Pacific, and which is prepared to carry the fight anywhere in the world today. The American Navy rides the far-flung waters of the world and it can be maintained definitely there. The Navy also refuels itself during operations. It does not have to come home for food and fuel. It is prepared to stay in enemy waters as long as necessary and to strike forces and bases anywhere anytime from close proximity. It gives protection from those dread raiders the submarines. It carries on mine and countermine warfare—all of greater importance than is commonly known.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this House will not forget that the Navy has carrier-based planes which can deliver the biggest bomb load, carry the greatest stock of munitions of any fighter planes in the world today. I hope, too, that this House will remember the Navy is prepared to deliver atomic bombs if it is called upon to do so.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we must have a balanced force, a balanced force with primary emphasis placed on a long-range striking force which can, if required, deliver through air power the immediate paralyzing blows so essential to modern warfare. That is what we seek to provide in the bill that the committee has reported to you today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain why the Navy was cut so much in its aviation and in other respects? I fail to understand. Does the gentleman think it is because they came last in the consideration?

Mr. SIKES. I do not think that is the reason for the heavy cut taken by the Navy. I think in large measure the people downtown attempted to achieve equal parts of the pie for all the services. If that were true, the Navy, because of its

great far-flung operations and the tremendous air and surface fleets over which it has supervision, was cut correspondingly more than the other services. Definitely, it was my feeling when we were scanning the budget recommendations that the Navy already had taken a greater proportionate cut than any other of the services.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then the Congress can restore to the Navy or give to the Navy some of the money it needs?

Mr. SIKES. The Congress certainly is within its rights in restoring funds it feels are essential for this very important arm of the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I speak with feeling, because I went to the Navy Department some time before Pearl Harbor and talked to the three high-ranking members of the Navy at that time. Then came Pearl Harbor. Two of those men spoke to me after Pearl Harbor about the conversation we had. I have the same very strong feeling today that if we do not give to the Navy what it needs for its Navy air and otherwise we will regret it the rest of our lives. If I live, I am going to continue that fight no matter what it costs me in any way.

Mr. SIKES. If the distinguished gentlewoman has studied what the future holds for naval air under the present budget she has double reason for apprehension. I know she speaks from fact. Naval air faces a very dangerous future unless we do implement the funds that are provided in this budget for aircraft procurement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are hundreds in the country that feel just as the gentleman does.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Was much attention paid to the development of a cargo fleet? We are wearing ours out in the air lift in Berlin. In case of war we would be drastically behind in building up a cargo fleet which could be of use to all three services.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is entirely correct in his apprehension about the future of our air cargo fleet. We are wearing out that fleet very rapidly in the Berlin airlift. I am glad to say to the gentleman that under the bill as it is now before us, cargo-plane procurement will be implemented. Additional cargo planes will be provided to replace those that are being worn out.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the gentleman knows, in the airlift with a few exceptions, we are using the C–46's and C–47's and DC–4's, which are not really adapted to carrying cargo in the most efficient manner.

Mr. SIKES. We are wearing them out so rapidly that it is going to be extremely difficult to produce others fast enough to meet our pressing requirements, but we shall attempt it.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LARCADE. I wonder if my colleague heard a radio broadcast last night by one of the commentators giving information released by Great Britain about the new fleet of jet planes and bombers.

Mr. SIKES. I did not hear the broadcast. It is known that Great Britain has long been a leader in the development of jet aircraft. I am afraid, however, that the number of such aircraft in Britain remains disturbingly small. The ones she has are very good.

Mr. LARCADE. Certainly we should let no nation get ahead of our country in that respect.

Mr. SIKES. I agree fully.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the able presentation of this appropriation bill by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], I, for one, wish to record my strong support of its provisions. It is tragic that so few of the Members of the House are on the floor at this time to have the privilege of this debate. I trust they will read the RECORD.

As I listened to the gentleman from Texas speak about other factors in our economy that enter into national defense, I am thinking of the great hospital program as conceived and carried out under the Hospital Construction Act. Under this program we propose to develop a healthy Nation. It is just as much a part of national defense to have a healthy Nation as it is to provide for ships, tanks, and airplanes.

And, Mr. Chairman, to implement this great hospital program, another phase of national defense, I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act—title VI of the Public Health Service Act—to extend its duration and increase its authorized appropriations for the construction, maintenance, and operation of hospitals, and for other purposes.

WHAT THE ACT PROVIDES

A great step was taken toward the goal of adequate hospital and health services for the people when the Hospital and Survey Construction Act was passed on October 13, 1946—Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress. It established a pattern of cooperation between Federal Government, the State, and local communities whereby democratic means could be used to advance one of the most important ends of a democracy—the promotion of the health of all the people. Local initiative and participation, State responsibility and, I am sure, Federal guidance and assistance were all insured by the provisions of this act.

An allocation of $3,000,000 was made to the States on a population basis in order that they might survey their existing hospital facilities and determine the areas of greatest need for the construction of new hospitals. A priority was given to rural areas where the need is greater than in the cities. The law authorized the appropriation by the Federal Government of $75,000,000 a year for 5 years, beginning with the fiscal year ending on July 1, 1947, the funds to be allotted to the States upon a population and per capita income basis. Federal funds constituted one-third of the cost of survey and construction, while non-Federal funds were to make up the other two-thirds. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, assisted by a Federal Hospital Council, was given the responsibility for administering the Federal aspects of this program, but each participating State set up a single agency and advisory council to carry out the decentralized tasks of its own program.

Before explaining the reasons for the amendments which I am offering to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, I should like to report on the accomplishments which have been made thus far throughout the Nation, and to tell, if I may, of our experience with the program in my own State of North Carolina.

In discussing the national accomplishments I cannot but pause to pay my high tribute to Dr. V. M. Hoge, Medical Director and Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities of the United States Public Health Service who has performed so masterfully in carrying out the intent of Congress under the hospital construction program. Dr. Hoge is highly respected by the various State agencies cooperating in the program. The Nation is most fortunate in having the services of this able Administrator to direct this far-reaching hospital program.

NATIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

One of the best features of the act was the requirement that each State should make a comprehensive survey of community needs on the basis of which to develop a long-range plan for hospital construction and service. This must be done before Federal funds can be allotted to any construction project. As a result, State plans have been submitted—except for Nevada—which enable us to plan wisely for future development on the basis of comprehensive and reliable facts.

Only 11 States had enforceable minimum standards for hospital maintenance and operation before August 1946, when the act was passed. But a year and a half later, only Nevada and the Virgin Islands did not have the enabling legislation. The act provides:

> If any State, prior to July 1, 1948, has not enacted legislation providing that compliance with minimum standards of maintenance and operation shall be required in the case of hospitals which shall have received Federal aid under this title, such State shall not be entitled to any further allotments.

In order to be eligible to participate in the program, 41 States or Territories—Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are included in the program—had to pass laws enforcing minimum standards of maintaining and operating hospitals. Through the cooperation of the Hospital Facilities Division of the Public Health Service, the American Hospital Association, and the Council of State Governments, a model statute was drafted which facilitated the passage of legislation providing for the establishment of standards for all hospitals.

Meanwhile, an amendment to Public Law 725, passed by the Eightieth Congress, provides that States may be eligible for the program if legislation on minimum standards and operation of hospitals is passed subsequent to July 1, 1948.

It is usually the case that the State agency in charge of enforcing minimum standards is also the one which administers the hospital survey and construction program. Thus, I think we may say that the action taken by Congress on this problem of providing hospitals for the people had the almost immediate effect of raising standards throughout the country, or at least making us realize what standards we have to meet in order to provide adequate hospital care for all the people.

The Division of Hospital Facilities in the Public Health Service has made a report as of December 31, 1948, on the construction projects which have been approved by the Surgeon General. The estimated total cost of the 643 initial project applications amounts to more than $366,000,000, of which the Federal share is nearly $107,000,000. This will provide a total of 31,633 beds. A breakdown of these approved projects indicates that 496 were for new general hospitals or additions, alterations, or replacements; while 29 were for mental hospitals, 18 for tuberculosis, 11 for chronic disease, 82 for health centers, 3 for nurses' homes, and 4 for health department laboratories. New facilities number 355, or four-fifths, of the general hospital applications.

The distribution of these projects seems to me to be of great significance. Towns of less than 5,000 population have been allocated 2 out of every 3 of the new general hospital projects. It is reported that 146 new general hospitals are in towns of less than 2,500 persons; 94 in communities of 2,500 to 4,999, 57 in communities of 5,000 to 9,999, 38 in communities of 10,000 to 24,999, 4 in cities of 25,000 to 49,000, and 16 in cities of 50,000 or more persons. Rural areas were granted 305 out of the 496 general hospital projects while 143 projects were granted in intermediate and 48 in base areas. For the record I should like to insert a table showing the status of construction projects as of December 31, 1948:

Table showing status of construction projects under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as of Dec. 31, 1948

State or Territory	Combined allotments, fiscal years 1948 and 1949	Project No.	Approved Federal share	Balance available	Proposed 1950 allotment
Alabama	$5,576,423	13	$3,912,412	$1,664,011	$2,690,543
Arizona	894,848	2	180,916	713,932	443,109
Arkansas	3,933,134	16	2,491,570	1,441,564	1,966,552
California	4,077,527	17	3,209,243	868,284	2,121,367
Colorado	1,292,530	6	983,981	308,549	635,878
Connecticut	843,745	6	789,993	53,752	422,222
Delaware	200,000	1	152,353	47,647	100,000
District of Columbia	573,378			573,378	275,268
Florida	2,941,706	14	2,839,221	102,485	1,481,446
Georgia	5,767,535	33	3,860,719	1,906,816	2,791,307
Idaho	593,509	5	514,897	78,612	300,347
Illinois	5,533,047	15	4,758,995	774,052	2,764,357
Indiana	3,480,448	18	3,840,476	(360,028)	1,754,093
Iowa	2,734,378	15	1,788,580	945,798	1,393,932
Kansas	1,905,477	14	1,579,895	325,582	972,758
Kentucky	5,148,052	21	4,102,390	1,045,662	2,560,957
Louisiana	4,254,357	12	2,320,555	1,933,802	2,099,507
Maine	921,577	4	591,493	330,084	467,139
Maryland	$1,696,964	3	$640,296	$1,056,668	$827,301
Massachusetts	3,216,356	8	1,878,068	1,338,288	1,622,561
Michigan	4,344,664	14	3,896,503	448,161	2,174,668
Minnesota	3,379,048	11	1,721,251	1,657,797	1,725,122
Mississippi	4,671,494	59	3,889,288	782,206	2,270,043
Missouri	4,574,137	7	2,841,058	1,733,079	2,293,924
Montana	455,667	6	420,712	34,955	224,137
Nebraska	1,366,837	12	890,375	476,462	682,443
Nevada	100,000			100,000	100,000
New Hampshire	709,770	1	299,450	410,320	367,648
New Jersey	2,640,607	7	1,945,294	695,313	1,328,053
New Mexico	914,694	8	864,795	49,899	457,632
New York	5,971,406	31	5,260,871	710,535	3,029,743
North Carolina	6,842,502	21	3,357,645	3,484,857	3,413,486
North Dakota	596,002	4	293,190	302,812	287,845
Ohio	5,406,035	18	4,479,231	926,804	2,715,846
Oklahoma	3,369,443	28	2,268,538	1,100,905	1,730,437
Oregon	995,176	5	592,834	402,342	534,815
Pennsylvania	9,239,734	20	6,382,315	2,857,419	4,692,355
Rhode Island	547,822	3	488,489	59,333	267,856
South Carolina	3,898,336	45	1,968,835	1,929,501	1,923,581
South Dakota	713,090	7	549,765	163,325	353,873
Tennessee	5,287,125	17	3,759,319	1,527,806	2,616,055
Texas	9,701,704	51	8,497,063	1,204,641	4,865,137
Utah	718,863	5	528,836	190,027	354,023
Vermont	441,641	4	422,804	18,837	227,131
Virginia	4,323,087	14	3,677,354	645,733	2,114,928
Washington	1,065,625	9	563,896	501,729	553,979
West Virginia	3,083,339	2	1,066,190	2,017,149	1,529,058
Wisconsin	3,231,294	8	2,321,144	910,150	1,610,133
Wyoming	291,735	2	200,000	91,735	146,879
Alaska	200,000	1	199,692	308	100,000
Hawaii	484,626	1	385,043	99,583	261,868
Puerto Rico	4,787,470	2	2,743,203	2,044,267	2,327,387
Virgin Islands	62,036			62,036	29,271
Total	150,000,000	646	107,211,036	42,788,964	75,000,000

Let me say here that we cannot commend too highly the work which has been done by Dr. V. M. Hoge, Medical Director, Chief of the Division of Hospital Facilities of the Public Health Service, for the efficient manner in which he and the members of his staff put this program into operation. Dr. Hoge has carried on the successful administration of the Federal aspects of this hospital program with a minimum of funds considering the great needs which are evident throughout the country.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN NORTH CAROLINA

The hospital resources and needs of North Carolina were studied by a State hospital and medical care commission which was composed of 60 members appointed by the late Governor and Senator J. Melville Broughton in 1944. This commission drafted the hospital legislation which created the North Carolina Medical Care Commission of 20 members, all of whom are apopinted by the governor for the purpose of administering the cooperative State and Federal hospital program. The commission was authorized to make contributions by the State amounting to $350,000 annually for aiding indigent patients, to conduct a survey and devise a plan for the State hospital program, to assist in financing hospital construction under this plan, and to expand the medical school at the the University of North Carolina, Durham, into a standard 4-year medical school. The commission is also responsible for licensing hospitals which receive assistance from State and Federal funds.

North Carolina has been very fortunate in the membership of the medical care commission, the State hospital advisory council, and the administrative staff of the commission. Their splendid teamwork has resulted in real achievements in health facilities for our State. The 20 members of the commission are James H. Clark, chairman; Clarence Poe, vice chairman; J. W. Bean; Paul B. Bissette; Franklin J. Blythe; J. Street Brewer; William M. Coppridge; Don S. Elias; Sample B. Forbus; G. Fred Hale; Fred C. Hubbard; B. Everett Jordan; J. W. R. Norton; W. S. Rankin; Mrs. Dillard Reynolds; Wiliam M. Rich; William B. Rodman, Jr.; C. E. Rozzelle; Miss Flora Wakefield; and Ellen D. Winston. The commission has the benefit of an advisory council composed of Claude F. Gaddy, chairman; R. E. Earp; James P. Richardson; George Watts Hill; and David A. Young. The administrative staff is headed by the executive secretary, Dr. John A. Ferrell. Other staff experts include Bruce K. Jones, architect-construction engineer; H. E. Hamilton, hospital administrator; J. Minetree Pyne and Thomas R. Howerton, assistant hospital administrators; and James A. Weathers, Jr., administrative assistant.

As a basis for participating in this program, the hospital resources of North Carolina were surveyed in 1946. It was found that 33 counties had no hospital facilities, that 5 other counties had only 5 to 20 beds available in private doctors' clinics, that the other 62 counties had hospitals but not enough beds. Some of the larger urbanized counties, however, had from 2 to 8 hospitals.

The North Carolina Medical Care Commission submitted its hospital plan which was approved by the Surgeon General on July 7, 1947. Each county was designated as a hospital service area with

some of the counties being divided into two areas. Altogether 102 hospital service areas and 8 regional centers were created for planning and administrative purposes. Federal funds for construction were allocated in the amount of $3,429,016 for July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, and for the succeeding year in the amount of $3,413,486. These amounts are keyed to population estimates made by the United States Census Bureau.

Since Federal funds represent approximately one-third of the cost of the program, the other two-thirds must be met with State and local money.

There are three ways in which the communities may raise the funds with which to finance their two-thirds share of the cost of hospital construction: they may organize a drive and raise the money by subscription; they may authorize a bond issue by means of a popular referendum; or they may receive State aid toward their share.

In North Carolina the local communities are responding in a way to prove that the program is receiving the active support of the people. In Scotland County—a small rural county of about 13,000 whites and 13,000 Negroes—they raised in 1946 through personal subscriptions $315,000 to build a community hospital. About $25,000 of this amount was donated by the Negroes in the county. In another county—Montgomery—the people voted a bond issue for hospital construction on a day when they had the worst weather that had been recorded for many years. With a total registration of 1,782, there were 1,269 people who voted for that bond issue which was a tax upon themselves. One precinct voted 91.3 percent in favor of the hospital. Altogether 13 North Carolina counties have voted for bonds, with supporting tax levies, of $3,365,000 since December 1, 1945. The State of North Carolina appropriated $6,250,000 for the biennium to end June 30, 1949, so that combined Federal, State, and local funds exceed $10,000,000 a year for the construction of hospitals. North Carolina is mentioned by national authorities as one of the States which has made greatest progress during the past 4 years in the development of hospital facilities. The record for 2 years of hospital construction in North Carolina is given below:

Record for 2 years of hospital construction in North Carolina, local general hospitals, July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1949

(The North Carolina Medical Care Commission, Raleigh, N. C.)

Town	County	Size		Ownership	Estimated total cost
		Acres	Beds		
Belhaven	Beaufort	1½	20	NPA	[1] $123,462
Scotland Neck	Halifax	4	20	County	160,000
Ahoskie	Hertford [2]	4	42	NPA	[1] 139,653
Do	do.[3]			do	[1] 106,546
Troy	Montgomery	6¾	40	County	480,000
Laurinburg	Scotland	6	100	NPA	1,200,000
Clinton	Sampson	10	100	County	1,200,000
Louisburg	Franklin	8	50	do	600,000
Siler City	Chatham	5	50	NPA	600,000
Roxboro	Person	10	60	do	720,000
Albemarle	Stanly	12	100	do	1,200,000
Lenoir	Caldwell	6	100	do	1,200,000
Sparta	Alleghany	3	20	do	160,000
Taylorsville	Alexander	5	23	do	184,000
Bryson City	Swain	1	20	do	160,000
Plymouth	Washington	3	23	County	184,000
Smithfield	Johnston	35	100	do	1,200,000
Warrenton	Warren	10	35	do	350,000
Greenville	Pitt	17½	120	do	1,440,000
North Wilkesboro	Wilkes	15	100	City	1,200,000
Burlington	Alamance	10	100	County	1,200,000
High Point	Guilford	3⅛	100	NPA	1,200,000
Total					15,007,661
In addition to aid for local hospital projects, the Commission has provided in Federal funds approximately one-third the cost of a spastic hospital, and for expansion of State-owned mental and tuberculosis hospitals. The aggregate total cost for the 2-year period approximates					[4] 5,519,845
Grand total					20,527,506

[1] Project on contract for amount shown; others are estimated.
[2] Roanoke-Chowan Hospital, Inc., Ahoskie, N. C.
[3] Roanoke-Chowan Hospital, Inc., nurses' home, Ahoskie, N. C.
[4] One-third of this $5,519,845, or about $1,839,948 was to have been United States funds. The appropriation bill now pending in the legislature contemplates financing State-owned hospitals entirely with State funds and allowing the Commission to apply all United States funds to local hospitals and health-center projects, except about $550,000 of United States funds already tied up in contracts.

These examples from my own State may be duplicated throughout the country. They indicate that the people are working hard to raise their share of the funds essential to construct adequate hospitals for America.

The required standards of construction of hospitals under this program are near the minimum which may be approved by the United States Public Health Service. Although these standards are the minimum approvable for Federal aid, nevertheless they are high in comparison to those which were previously acceptable in many States. Even so, North Carolina found that several desirable features had to be eliminated which would have been included if building costs had not risen. However, the new hospitals which have been authorized by the commission will be more modern, spacious, and fireproof than those now being used in the State. Hospital beds are usually called unacceptable if they are fire hazards, poorly planned, or poorly located.

Up to January 1, 1949, the commission was able to approve 21 local general hospital projects; 13 of these are in counties which do not have hospitals, 6 are in counties where less than a third of their needs are being met, and 2 are in counties where less than one-half of their needs are met. Even so, there are 31 areas which have no hospitals at all and 5 other areas which have no acceptable hospital beds. The need for beds is very great in the chronic, mental, and nervous, and tuberculosis hospitals.

This leads me to an account of the problems encountered in carrying out this program, and to an explanation of the amendments I am offering to the original act, which I think will help to meet these problems.

In the first place, the program has been seriously limited beyond our original expectations because of the increase in the cost of construction. Before 1946 we had 129 hospitals in 67 of our 100 North Carolina counties, and the beds in these hospitals cost about $3,000 to $4,000 per bed, sometimes less than that. When our commission drew up estimates for the 1947 legislature, they were based upon the figure of $6,000 to $7,000 per bed, but when construction started toward the end of that year, it was found that the cost would be from $11,000 to $12,000 per bed if we were to meet the standards set up by the United States Public Health Service. You can see from this that the actual number of new beds is only about half as many as we had expected to build.

The commission reports that during the first two years they allocated about one-third of Federal funds to State-owned hospital projects. Now the commission has asked the State to finance entirely all State-owned hospital projects in order that we may have more money for building local general hospitals. If the 1949 legislature approves of this request, it will be possible to build about 300 more local general hospital beds. However, the commission points out that—

> Even if this is done, the hospital program contemplated by the 5-year Hill-Burton law will not be completed during the 5-year period. In fact, several 5-year periods will be necessary. Some of the Federal authorities have estimated that only one-eighth of an adequate Nation-wide hospital system will be completed during the first 5-year period.

Another problem we have to face is that the counties which need hospital facilities the most are usually those which have few people and little money, and they can hardly meet two-thirds of the expense of building a hospital. Certainly it is true that there are many areas where hospitals are urgently needed, but where there is no real way that a hospital could be maintained on a financially sound basis even if it were built. This raises the whole problem of maintenance and operation of hospitals in areas which have the highest priority as far as need is concerned.

Federal Law 725 provides that hospitals which receive aid must guarantee against an operating deficit during the first two-year period, effective when patients are admitted. When the Commission grants aid it can do so only by taking account of first, construction cost; and, second, the dates when counties having a high pri-

ority are able to support their hospital applications by necessary local funds. You can readily realize the problem which arises when a new hospital is nearing completion. Personnel must be found in advance—a hospital administrator, nursing, medical, and technical staff—who are able to take care of the health needs of patients. All supplies must be bought and be on hand—drugs, chemicals, anesthetics, dressings, and foods. All these things require a large outlay of money considerably in advance of the time when the hospital begins to earn money. Timing has to be almost perfect to prevent a deficit.

Publicly owned hospitals can only be equipped by raising funds authorized by special elections on bonds and a tax levy. Fourteen North Carolina counties—up to January 1, 1949—have held successful elections for this purpose. In the case of a nonprofit hospital the county commissioners have sometimes given a guarantee against an operating deficit. But there are many places where it is difficult or impossible to make arrangements for the maintenance and operation of needed hospitals.

Another difficulty which is encountered, and not only in North Carolina, but throughout the country, is the shortage of personnel to staff hospitals. As new hospitals are built, the shortage will be increased unless steps are taken to train more doctors and nurses. The problem is more acute in the rural areas than in the cities, and this situation will have to be met by a definite program to recruit and train personnel. Of course, by providing the hospitals we are making it possible to distribute the available medical personnel. I understand that a condition of "no hospitals" and a condition of "no doctors" are parts of the same situation—that doctors do not want to practice in places where there are no hospitals. If we can get adequate and well-distributed hospitals we shall be taking one of the important steps toward meeting our national health problem.

But we shall also have to devise a program which will increase the number of doctors and nurses. I plan within the next few days to introduce a bill designed to deal with the urgent problem of training more people in the health field. I am not discouraged by the fact that it will take anywhere from 3 to 10 years to make a dent in the shortage of medical personnel—if it is going to take that long, there is all the more reason why we should get started with it right away.

NATIONAL PICTURE

In a report to the President on the Nation's health—September 1948—the Federal Security Administrator, Oscar R. Ewing, analyzes our need for hospital beds and points out that if the Federal contribution of $75,000,000 a year is fully matched with $150,000,000 of local funds, only one-eighth of the Nation's needs would be met by 1951. This means that we would be 40 years behind and would not meet the needs of 1946 until 1986.

According to this report—

The three basic problems of meeting our hospital needs must be discussed together, since the solutions of all three are interdependent. These are the three: Quantity—making sure there are enough beds; distribution—making sure hospitals are everywhere they are needed; and finance—making sure enough funds are provided so that hospital construction and hospital maintenance are guaranteed everywhere they are needed. * * *

Few of our States yet have enough general hospital beds to equal the standard set up for the Nation—4.5 per thousand; none has enough acceptable beds to meet the standard. More than 40 percent of all counties in the United States, with a total population of over 15,000,000, have no acceptable general hospitals at all. Not every county requires a hospital, but community hospitals of 50 beds and occasionally less should usually be placed in every community or area of 15,000 to 20,000 population. * * *

The Hospital Construction Act requires that communities, or States and communities together, must raise $2 for each Federal dollar contributed for hospital construction.

In most States, legislation to provide State financial assistance has not yet been passed; these States make no contribution at all, and local communities must raise two-thirds of construction costs. At the other extreme, at least one State is preparing to contribute up to half of all needed funds, so that its lower-income districts need raise only 20 percent locally.

Hospital building at present is completely dependent upon State and local initiative in matching Federal funds. It is imperative that all States act vigorously to assure that even their most impoverished areas will be able to have the health facilities that they need. The burden of operation and maintenance costs is severe on all hospitals.

And the report strongly recommends that the Federal Government participate in the maintenance and operation of hospitals. A report on hospital operating costs by the Public Health Service is given below:

HOSPITAL OPERATING COSTS

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

An examination of the statistical tables presented in our report and analysis of the information developed from AHA directories and find that for all general and special short-term hospitals—excluding Federal—in the year 1947 the average per patient day cost was $11.09. This group includes nonprofit short-term and special hospitals and proprietary short-term general and special hospitals. The per patient day cost for the nonprofit was $11.78 and for the proprietary group, the cost was $11.83. In the governmental group of general and special short-term hospitals the average per patient day cost was $8.91.

The analysis of the statistical data shows that in mental and allied hospitals, most of which are State-owned, the per patient day cost was $1.60.

The data for tuberculosis hospitals discloses that in 1947 the cost was $5.44 per patient day.

Additional data presented in the report may be summarized as follows:

Short-term general and special hospitals

	Number of hospitals	Number of beds	Operating cost per bed	Total assets per bed	Cost per patient-day
Type of control:					
Nonprofit	2,641	307,152	$3,413	$8,782	$11.78
Proprietary	1,070	37,751	2,898	3,420	11.83
Governmental	764	120,306	2,297	5,265	8.91
Type of hospital:					
Mental and allied	499	580,273	561	1,664	1.60
Tuberculosis	411	70,307	1,554	4,586	5.44

Schedule of hospital operating expenses for 1947 and related data

Type of hospital	Type of control	Number of hospitals	Number of beds	Operating cost per bed	Total operating expenses	Total assets per bed	Cost per patient-day
Short term	Nonprofit	2,641	307,152	$3,413.00	$1,048,316,000	$8,782.00	$11.78
General and special	Proprietary	1,070	37,751	2,898.00	109,408,000	3,420.00	11.83
	Governmental	764	120,306	2,297.00	276,396,000	5,265.00	8.91
Mental and allied	State and local	499	580,273	561.00	325,317,000	1,664.00	1.60
Tuberculosis		411	70,307	1,554.00	109,250,000	4,586.00	5.44

Thus we see that merely to provide that Federal funds may cover the need in rural areas where the need is greatest will not solve the problem, and we know from the surveys which have been made that not even all the urgent needs will be met by the present 5-year program of $75,000,000 a year of Federal funds.

WHAT AMENDMENTS PROVIDE

It is with such facts as these in mind that I introduce this bill to broaden the scope and lengthen the duration of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The amendments provide that the amount authorized for hospital construction in each fiscal year shall be raised from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000, and the program shall be extended beyond June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1955.

Increased Federal participation in the cost of hospital construction is provided and there is a corresponding increase in the amount recoverable by the Federal Government if any hospital so assisted ceases to be a public or other nonprofit hospital during the 10-year period following the completion of construction. Provision is made for Federal assistance in meeting the costs incurred by a State in administering its hospital construction plan, although the States must furnish adequate funds for such administration. The provisions of the existing law are added to in section 8 where conferences similar to those on hospital construction are also required of the various State agencies administering the plans for hospital maintenance and operation.

The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to States, political subdivisions, universities, hospitals, and nonprofit organizations for studies and demonstrations relating to the coordinated use of hospital facilities. This recommendation may bring us toward a solution of the problem of the integration of our hospital system so that the inconsistency in Government policy, which was pointed out by the Commission on Organization of the Executive

Branch of the Government in its report to the Congress—March 1949—between the Federal hospital construction program and Federal aid to non-Federal hospitals, under the Hill-Burton Act, may be ended.

Section 10 adds a new part E to title VI of the Public Health Service Act. Under the provisions of this new part there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, not to exceed $50,000,000 for the maintenance and operation of public and other nonprofit hospitals and for the administration of State plans relating thereto. Funds appropriated pursuant thereto are to be allotted among the several States in the same manner in which funds appropriated under title VI for hospital construction are to be allotted. The States are to give special consideration to needs of hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources.

The effective date of the act is July 1, 1949.

It was apparent during the hearings on the original bill that everyone agreed upon the objectives of this legislation. The bill was supported by the American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, and the Protestant Hospital Association. It was supported by organized medicine, dentistry, and nursing, as well as by all the major farm and labor organizations. Many other groups and persons testified in favor of the bill and our record of experience throughout the Nation as a whole indicates an enthusiastic response from the people in achieving the objectives of the act. In offering amendments to the existing legislation, I am merely advocating that the program be placed on a basis where the achievement of our goal will be made possible during our lifetime. The resources of our country are not so meager that we have to do this basic program on a time schedule which will not give us the hospitals we need until we have great-great-grandchildren.

And let us bear in mind that this program is related to our national defense. If the cities where our hospitals are now concentrated are ever bombed—and I pray that we may never see such a day—we shall be glad that we built these hospitals in our rural areas and maintained them on a sound operating basis.

In summary, let me say that the amendments provide for increased Federal assistance for hospital construction, for meeting the costs of administering the State plans for hospital construction, and for the establishment and support thereafter of State plans for aiding in hospital maintenance and operation, particularly in areas of limited population and limited resources.

The United States is a member of the World Health Organization which seeks "to lift the great and unnecessary burden of human suffering throughout the world and to protect us from invasion of our shores by disease from abroad and to lift the level of world economy through the strengthening of world resources in effective manpower." Can we do less for our own States, for our own counties, for the people of our own countryside? We all know, as Disraeli said, that "The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, during the last month I have had a rather interesting experience because on each and every Monday during this period I have been confronted by one or more of my colleagues who have invariably said they had just returned from a very interesting week end where they enjoyed the privilege of a cruise on board one of the Navy's largest aircraft carriers. They have been rather amazed at the techniques of the Naval Air Arm, and particularly by naval air operations from our aircraft carriers. On each occasion I have listened rather carefully to my colleague's discussion of his trip, but when he was through, I could not help but say that it was my privilege to have served on a combat aircraft carrier for some 2 years in the Pacific with the Third and Fifth Fleets. The comments my colleagues made about the speed with which the Navy launches planes and lands planes interested me particularly, because I know of the far greater problems that the Navy had to face during the war when we were not operating a single carrier. In the war we operated four or five aircraft carriers in a single task group. In the whole task force we had up to 22 aircraft carriers plus supporting ships. We were not operating in broad daylight, and under favorable conditions, but in many cases we operated for 24 hours a day. I am truly sorry that more of our colleagues have not taken advantage of the opportunity to see the Navy Air Force in operation at sea.

During the experiences I had in the Navy in the last war, I had ample opportunity to view at first-hand some of the vulnerability that the Navy air arm is bound to encounter. I say vulnerability, not only from the air, but from underwater craft. It was always a great concern that any one of the ships in our task group or task force would suffer torpedo attack either from aircraft or from submarine. Fortunately those occasions were few.

My comments today are predicated on some of those experiences which I went through for some 2 years at sea with the Navy. With this background I must agree with the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I think he is wholeheartedly in favor of a balanced armed service, and I gather the impression from what he has said that he is in favor of a military program that accentuates air power without discrimination against Navy air power. If that is what he meant, I am in full agreement with him.

Once again may I say for the record that we should and must have a balanced program. If I am wrong, I would like to be corrected, but it appears to me that the Air Force is benefiting to the extent of approximately $800,000,000 more than that which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

At the same time it appears, from the comments made here today, that the Navy Air Force has received less consideration to the extent of $573,000,000. If those facts are true, I am not in thorough agreement with the recommendations of the committee, because I believe in a truly balanced program, a balanced program that accentuates air power without undue or unfair discrimination against Navy air power. While favoring air power, I am not one of those who are swayed by statements made on many occasions during the last war, when the Air Force people, Navy and otherwise, said they won the war, for I can tell you from personal experience that some of the records claimed were not quite as good as they would like to have our people believe. I can tell you of several examples in the various battles of the Philippine Sea when the number of hits we actually got were very, very small, percentagewise, in relation to the number of planes that we sent out in those two particular instances. I have no sympathy for that kind of performance, none whatsoever; I condemned it then and I will continue to condemn it.

I wish to make a few comments on what I think is a very favorable program of this committee. I wholeheartedly favor the apparent consideration given to the Reserve components of the armed forces. I notice that in the Navy's budget there is a rather substantial sum allocated for the Reserve program. That brings to mind one further question. In my estimation all the services have been somewhat neglectful of the Reserve program in its actual operation. This Congress authorized a program a year ago which implemented the Reserve program, but the services, all three services, have not done a 100-percent job in putting that program into operation. Many of the members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserves have not been able, and will not be able, to take full advantage of the opportunities the Eightieth Congress desired. Some weeks ago I introduced a bill which would have set back the anniversary date until July 1, 1949, to give our Reserves an opportunity to take full advantage of the retirement provisions. If we do not change that date we will discriminate unfairly toward a great many of our Reserves who want to get in and make a substantial contribution to our national defense program.

In conclusion, I reemphasize my support of a well-balanced military program, but I wish to accentuate the need for air power. We should not, however, discriminate against the Navy Air Force. Let me remind you again we must give due consideration not only this year but in the future, to an adequate Reserve program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I propose to express some sentiments here which are not wholly consonant with those already expressed by various Members who appeared in this general debate.

At the outset, I disclaim any expertness as a military authority, a naval authority, or an air force authority; but I wish you to consider for a few moments what the people who live in Iowa, Texas, Connecticut, and the 45 other States are thinking about this military appropriation.

They are talking about it in the barber shops, in the stores, and on the farms; and they are saying to themselves that the Eighty-first Congress is about to appropriate $16,000,000,000 for war purposes—3 years after the war is over; yes, over and past for more than 3 years. Our friends, who by their votes sent us here, are saying that this Congress is spending more than one-third of the entire national budget for military purposes.

We are spending that amount of money despite the revelations made by the Hoover Reorganization Commission that tells, for example, how the Army lost 9,000 tanks. Read it for yourselves. Here it is on page 6 of the Task Force Report on the National Security Organization:

> War Production reports indicate that some 85,000 tanks were produced in this country during the recent war. Army statistics obtained by the committee with some difficulty indicated that about 25,000 of these were on hand at the end of the war. The Army was able to account to the committee for only 16,000 tanks. It was unable to state what had become of the others.

I heard one of the members of this task force say the other day, too, that these 9,000 missing tanks were all tanks that had remained in this country. Not one of them had gone overseas. It is easy to understand how small articles can be lost completely. But how could anyone lose a tank? And how could any organization lose 9,000 of them? Here is incredible and catastrophic negligence and incompetence.

I do not know how much a tank costs, but I can well imagine that some of them cost well toward $500,000. Let us say that those tanks were worth an average of $100,000, which I believe perhaps is a modest estimate. There you have $900,000,000 worth of military material disappearing. Gone forever. And the military authorities could not tell the Commission where they had gone.

I wonder what the people back in the barber shops, in the stores, and on the farms and on the street are going to say about that kind of performance here in the Capital of the United States. What is there in this appropriation bill or in any legislation that we have undertaken that takes any cognizance of this terrificly serious situation? Should not some effort be made in this Congress to rectify such terrible errors, before we hand over $16,000,000,000 to repeat such mistakes?

We have heard talk here today about the continued rivalry among the branches of the military service. Member after Member has come before the microphone and said: "Well, this or this or this should receive more appropriation money." This rivalry not only exists among the members of the armed forces, but it exists here on the floor of the House of Representatives among those Members who are proponents of the Navy or the Army or the Air Force.

I am not being critical of those who have ideas along these lines. I am merely trying to call your attention to what may be going on in the minds of the rank and file of the American people who are confronted with this kind of thing in the face of the report of the Hoover Commission.

There are two recommendations made in the task force report that might well have had the consideration of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and, parenthetically, I understand that there has been some criticism of the work of this committee from other lips than mine.

The first two things mentioned by the Hoover Commission as the pattern for improvement are (1) strengthening the central authority in the Military Establishment. There have been some attempts made in that direction. Indeed, the papers inform us that there is something like that going on down in Key West, Fla., under the guidance and leadership of General Eisenhower. More power to him. But why need we bring this military appropriation on the floor now, involving these huge sums of money, before we accomplish the other? The one effective check rein the Congress has over the Military Establishment, or indeed any governmental agency, is the power of the purse. Here we propose to appropriate $16,000,000,000 more than a third of the total national budget, without asking or insisting on administrative, budgetary, and internal reforms that are so sadly needed, and about which the people are demanding action. Legislative action about these matters is necessary and desirable. But the most effective compulsion from this or any other legislative body is the withholding of money appropriations. That is the way to accomplish this work and get the job done.

The second recommendation in the task-force report is the overhauling of the military budget. I suppose time alone can tell whether an overhauling has actually been had of the military budget in this bill. Certainly I am not qualified to judge adequately. I hope the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of this Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON], who is reported to have been dissatisfied with this bill, will give the Committee of the Whole House the benefit of his views as he expressed them to the whole Appropriations Committee when considering this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, without seeming to be unduly critical, may I suggest that there actually has been some little evidence of lack of overhauling the military budget here in the implied rivalry between the services.

Item 3 in the task-force report: Improving teamwork throughout the national security organization. In the time that I have I can only read these others, none of which, in my opinion, have been implemented or carried out by anything we are offered here in this bill;

Fourth, relating scientific research and development more closely to strategic planning;

Fifth, expediting plans for civilians, including economic, industrial, and manpower mobilization in case of war, and providing for continuous appraisal of the effect of all national security programs on our national resources, both human and material; and

Sixth, making adequate provision for and against new and unconventional means of warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in a very unconventional manner and perhaps in a manner unexpected on the part of some of my auditors, but I must repeat and remind you that the people whom we represent here are considering these matters very seriously. They are wondering, and they have said so to me and they have said so to you, Where are we heading in this country? Is this ever-increasing miiltary expenditure a preparation for war? Are the planners expecting to plunge our country into another war, in the meantime breaking the economic back of our people, with ever-increasing taxes piled on to pay for war goods, which in themselves do not serve any productive purpose—and whose sole ultimate use is destruction of life and property?

Last year we had a military budget of approximately $14,000,000,000. When we passed the European recovery program we were assured on the floor of this House that it was a defense measure and that this year we would be enabled to reduce our military expenditures. Now we come up with $2,000,000,000 additional over last year's military appropriations. What are the people of the country thinking about this?

Human history is marked with the ruin of civilizations whose governments relied, not wisely, but too well, upon military might. Is America heading in that direction, too? Surely we cannot pour out our resources in reckless disregard of history's lessons.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I had the privilege of seeing a portion of a statement that was made before another committee of the Congress by the Secretary of War in regard to the tanks, and I think that explanation is fully adequate, and if the task force had taken sufficient time to investigate they would have found the answer. As I understand, the 9,000 tanks to which the gentleman referred were tanks which were overseas, which were given to other governments. Some were never brought back to this country in our tremendous haste to get the men back to this country after the war was over. I believe if the gentleman had the

privilege of reading this statement he would be convinced that the Army did a thoroughly decent job with respect to that matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman realizes, of course, that I have not had the opportunity of seeing this information. My remarks were based upon the statements in the task-force report of the Hoover Commission and the oral statement of a responsible member of that task force that the 9,000 lost tanks were all in the continental United States. Not one of the lost tanks ever left these shores. May I further state to the gentleman that I trust he will not consider what I said to be critical of him personally or the work the committee has tried to do. I have made my statement on the basis of what the people in the country may well be thinking about in connection with this huge appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I hope the gentleman did not find any reference in the Hoover Committee report to the effect that this committee had been criticized.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No, I did not.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this is a most important piece of legislation. I realize it is one that authorizes the expenditure of money for the purposes outlined in the bill. It does not, of course, appropriate money. The appropriation of funds to carry out its purposes will come later.

In view of the fact that our country has already committed itself to help the countries included in this program, it becomes a question of carrying out such promises. We are told by proponents of this legislation and by the administration that the assistance provided under this program is for the purpose of helping these countries to help themselves. But most important of all, to prevent the overrun of communism in those countries.

Appropriations implementing this measure will be submitted at a later date. I think it is extremely important that when such appropriations are submitted that all of the items contained therein be carefully scrutinized and examined. We should make sure that the assistance granted under this legislation goes to the people to whom it is assigned. It is also important that the expenditure of such funds be handled just as economically as may be done.

Furthermore, if it develops that it is unnecessary to spend as much money as is allocated under this bill, then all savings possible should be made.

I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin who suggested we save only a small part of the funds allocated hereunder. I thought he made a good case, but the majority of the House deemed otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, we hope and pray that the legislation approved today will be for the good of not only the people who will receive these benefits but for the people of our own country as well. Personally, I am deeply concerned with regard to the tremendous expenditure of funds of the taxpayers of this country in an attempt to bring about a better understanding between the nations of the world. Mr. Chairman, you are taking a long chance. We hope it is in the right direction.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of Congress since September 1946. Since that time I have supported in full, sometimes wholeheartedly and sometimes reluctantly, but always with hope, every bill designed to bring about European recovery. I have spent many, many hours studying the testimony presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and also I have very carefully read and studied the debate in the Senate and whenever possible, I have gone to the Senate floor to listen to that debate. Certainly no one can say that the gentleman from Texas represents isolationism in any respect. I have gone to Europe to see what was going on. I have talked with our people over there and also with many Europeans and when I returned last year I came home with the definite belief that our aid to Europe could be reduced this year and our people at home provided some relief, because, Mr. Chairman, there are two beliefs which I have concerning our country which cause me to stop, look, and listen.

One of those beliefs is that our national debt is an obligation and an obligation which must be met or repudiated and, as far as I am concerned, it must be met. I regret that there is apparently little concern in Washington concerning our national debt. The other belief is that our taxes are now too high and that unless we soon reduce our taxes that we will destroy that unique American enthusiasm and incentive which has made this country, with one-sixth of the people and one-seventh of the land area, the greatest country the world has ever known. The greatest harm that we could do to the world today would be to destroy this country and it will be destroyed if we destroy that American incentive or if we do not remain economically strong.

The national income is going down. I do not know what our national income for the present fiscal year will be but I have reason to believe that it will be much lower than last year. If that be true we will either have to raise taxes or finance our country through deficit financing.

Mr. Chairman, I have lost none of my sympathy for the people of Europe but it is my belief that we must first know that we are secure in our position at home. I have read the hearings and all the debate and I do not believe our economy at home has been given sufficient consideration. It has been said to those of us who want this authorization reduced that when a man is ill you don't give him one pill when he needs two. I would also say to you that when a man rears a family he at first must furnish to his children every necessity of life, but as the children become older and are able to help themselves, the father reduces his help, and if those children are the kind they should be, they insist that the help from the father be reduced—so it should be with Europe.

It is my opinion that Mr. Hoffman and his staff have done one of the finest jobs possible and they are to be highly complimented for their work.

Mr. Hoffman in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs stated the following:

> The countries participating in the program of economic cooperation had made significant progress in industrial production, agricultural production, trade, and financial stabilization. The total output of factories and mines in the countries participating during the calendar year of 1948 was 14 percent above that of 1947 and about equal to prewar. Excluding western Germany, steel output is currently at a rate exceeding the prewar high of 1937 and 25 percent above that of 1947. Total output of electric power in the calendar year 1948 was 65 percent higher than it was before the war and 10 percent above 1947 levels. Railway freight traffic is one-third greater than it was before the war, despite a shortage of equipment and arrears of maintenance and repairs. Crops in general in the calendar year 1948 were one-fifth larger than they were in 1947, which was, however, a very bad year. The increase in bread grains is even more striking. The 1948 crop was 41 percent larger than that of the year before. Production of fertilizer in the participating countries was about 25 percent greater in the calendar year 1948 than it was 1947.

Mr. Chairman, as you may or may not know, there has been a dangerous shortage in the supply of fertilizer for our farmers the past year. If the production of fertilizer has increased 25 percent it seems to me that we can cut down on the shipment of fertilizer to Europe and supply our farmers, who have been feeding the world since the beginning of the war.

Mr. Chairman, it should be understood that the bill we are voting on today is an authorization and not an appropriation. I may vote for it but if, when this bill goes to the Appropriations Committee, the amount is not reduced by at least 10 percent, I intend to vote against the appropriation. Last year the Congress appropriated $5,000,000,000 and it was indicated that the Congress wanted, if possible, for this to last 15 months, but leaving a proviso in the appropriation that if the President deemed it absolutely necessary that it could be spent in 12 months. The $5,000,000,000 was spent in 12 months, although only about $3,000,000,000 worth of products has reached Europe and if as much recovery has been accomplished as the testimony of Mr. Hoffman indicates, with only a little over half of the money appropriated last year, then it is my honest and sincere belief that if Mr. Hoffman had given the taxpayers of America and the economy of America proper consideration that he would have made this $5,000,000,000 last for the 15 months. Instead, the $5,000,000,000 was spent, at least committed, and they are asking for another $1,150,000,000 to last from April through June; and, Mr. Chairman, this is not the whole story. The administration is in the process of asking for an estimated $600,000,000 for aid to China, Korea, and for military aid to Greece and Turkey. Another $1,000,000,000 will be

spent for relief in the areas occupied by the United States Army. Through the International Refugee Organization and the displaced-persons program, the United States will be giving additional assistance for relief and rehabilitation purposes.

Also, Mr. Chairman, our country in conjunction with other western countries has just signed the Atlantic Pact. We have heard many different figures concerning the cost of this country of assisting those countries to rearm. It seems that $1,000,000,000 a year is a conservative estimate.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state again that if we destroy the economic stability of the United States of America in trying to help Europe, we will have done the peoples of the world the greatest disservice that the world has ever known. As I have said before, I will probably vote for this authorization, but I wish to make it clear that it is not an appropriation and I wish it to be understood that because I voted for this authorization does not commit me to vote for an appropriation of this amount because after the most serious consideration that I know how to give a problem, I am firmly convinced that this amount could and should be reduced considerably.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time this afternoon.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Neither have I, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYS of Arkansas) having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours tomorrow, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, tomorrow, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. KEOGH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the military appropriations bill this afternoon be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a quotation from Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the American Legion dated April 9 with regard to the closing of Veterans' Administration branch office No. 2 in New York City.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 42. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 70. An act to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 146. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 147. An act for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 189. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 213. An act to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 227. An act for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 257. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 270. An act to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to Trenton Dam and to name the body of water arising behind such dam Swanson Lake; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the crypotographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 326. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 392. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 408. An act for the relief of the estate of William E. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 493. An act to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 566. An act to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 646. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 647. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 676. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 683. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 690. An act to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 716. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of George Peters under existing regulations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 729. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 755. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 936. An act to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 948. An act for the relief of Mickey Baine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 969. An act to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1042. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1043. An act to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1122. An act relating to children born out of wedlock; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1123. An act to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for services of process on agents of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1125. An act to amend section 16–415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia,

to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1127. An act to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1129. An act to amend section 16–416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1130. An act to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1131. An act to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1132. An act to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1133. An act to amend section 16–418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1134. An act to amend section 13–108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1136. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1137. An act to revise and codify the laws of the Canal Zone regarding the administration of estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1168. An act to amend section 2680 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1181. An act to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1185. An act to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1270. An act to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Service.

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution for the relief of the First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1113. An act for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners, doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. LeRoy Hann;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein;

H. R. 2708. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph De Souza, Jr.;

H. R. 3856. An act to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion;

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 311 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 13, 1949, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

520. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Army, recommending the enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska Communication System"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

521. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the claim of the Enjay Construction Co., Chicago, Ill., pursuant to Public Law 657, Seventy-ninth Congress, in the amount of $503,018.61; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

522. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $57,969 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 54. Concur-

rent resolution to investigate certain economic problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 162. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4029. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure for the Everglades National Park with available funds, including those made available by the State of Florida, the remaining lands and interest in lands within the boundary agreed upon between the State of Florida and the Secretary of the Interior, within and a part of that authorized by the act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816), and within which the State has already donated its lands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 781. A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCARTHY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3198. A bill to amend the act of June 18, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 222. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1837. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4190. A bill relating to the allocation of contracts for the construction of vessels in shipyards on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 4191. A bill to allow a special deduction, for income-tax purposes, of $600 in the case of an individual disabled by the loss of a limb or limbs, or the loss of the use thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4192. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 220, relating to receipt of commissions or gifts for procuring loans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4193. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit the rendering of free telephone service to certain hospitalized members, and former members, of the armed forces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 4194. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate and improvements thereon owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GORSKI of New York:

H. R. 4195. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Lackawanna, Erie County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4196. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations and on luggage, purses, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 4197. A bill to authorize assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain veterans with service-connected permanent disabilities necessitating the use of a wheel chair; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4198. A bill to provide for nautical education in the Territories, to facilitate nautical education in the States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4199. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 4200. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to require employers to pay attorneys' fees and witness fees in connection with certain proceedings under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4201. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4202. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the Federal courts of the United States and its Territories; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM (by request):

H. R. 4203. A bill to amend section 503 (b) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 4204. A bill to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4205. A bill to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the scientific investigation of tuna, signed at Mexico City January 25, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4206. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to assist individuals who are defamed over the radio or television in recovering damages therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (by request):

H. R. 4207. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4208. A bill to add certain surplus land to Petersburg National Military Park, Va., to define the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 4209. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4210. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundred twenty-fifth anniversary of Centenary College, Shreveport, La.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 4211. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4212. A bill to provide for the lease of the Belasco Theater to the American National Theater and Academy for the presentation of theatrical and musical productions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4213. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 4214. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 4215. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to provide additional Federal aid in the construction of hospitals, to provide Federal aid in the maintenance and operation of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4216. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, relating to the compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4217. A bill to eliminate or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 winter Olympic games at Lake Placid, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution making an appropriation to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 224. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 4218. A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4219. A bill for the relief of Gordon R. McKinney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Jacob L. Aaron and Mrs. Lena Aaron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4221. A bill to provide for the adjudication of a certain tort claim of Patricia Joyce Dunn, a minor, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Regina Tuerk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4223. A bill for the relief of Michelina Viavatene Alberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4224. A bill for the relief of John Irvin Clifford, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

564. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sussex County, Del., containing 45 signatures, in support of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

565. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Castle County, Del., containing 225 signatures, in support of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

566. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Delmar, Del., containing 56 signatures, in support of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Foreign Commerce.

567. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Milton, Del., containing 62 signatures, in support of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

568. By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the State of Colorado, petitioning the President of the United States to prohibit the importation of furs from Russia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

569. Also, memorial of the State of Colorado, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

570. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of 189 residents of Teaneck and West Englewood, N. J., urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. R. Orman Roberts, D. D., pastor, Temple Methodist Church, San Francisco, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we affirm our faith that Thou art the Good Shepherd and we are the sheep of Thy pasture. In the early morning let the still dews of quietness be upon us. In the heat of the day give us the shadow of the rock. In the evening time lead us beside still waters and cause us to lie down in green pastures. Let Thy mercy be upon us; Thy truth a light unto our feet; and so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, knowing full well then that we shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever. We pray in the spirit and in the name of Him whose life of love and sacrifice made this week holy. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 12, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1113. An act for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners, doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein;

H. R. 2708. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph De Souza, Jr.;

H. R. 3856. An act to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion;

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 311 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

MEETING OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON ECA BILL DURING SENATE SESSIONS—MEMBERS EXCUSED FROM ANSWERING QUORUM CALLS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate members of the conference committee considering the ECA bill be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate, and that they be excused from answering quorum calls, so that the conference may proceed. They are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that conference committees are not included in the order of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the conference referred to by the Senator from Texas be included.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered, and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Texas regarding the members of the conference committee is granted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that following each roll call an announcement be carried in the RECORD to the effect that the five Senators I have named, the members of the conference on the part of the Senate, are excused from attendance in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Humphrey	Myers
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
Gillette	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	Malone	Withers
Hickenlooper	Martin	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are excused by leave of the Senate in order to attend meetings of the conference committee on S. 1209, to amend the Economic Corporation Act of 1948.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are excused by leave of the Senate in order to attend meetings of the conference committee on the Economic Cooperation Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senate has reconvened following a recess, so I ask unanimous consent that Senators who desire to present routine business and incorporate matters into the RECORD may be permitted to do so, without prejudicing the parliamentary situation, and without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL BANK AND BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT ACTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

Mr. BREWSTER presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint resolution regarding a constitutional convention of the United States or amendments to the constitution of the United States relating to strengthening the United Nations and limited world federal government

Memorial

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-fourth legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas war is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization, because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no sure defense; and

Whereas the effective maintenance of world peace is the proper concern and responsibility of every American citizen; and

Whereas the people of the State of Maine, while now enjoying domestic peace and security under the laws of their local, State, and Federal Government, deeply desire the guaranty of world peace; and

Whereas all history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and that law and order are the product of government; and

Whereas the United Nations, as presently constituted, although accomplishing great good in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret or enforce world law, and under its present charter is incapable of restraining any major nations which may foster or foment war; and

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in articles 108 and 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the charter; and

Whereas many States have memorialized Congress, through resolutions by their State legislatures or in referenda by their voters, to initiate steps toward the creation of a world federal government; and

Whereas several nations have recently adopted constitutional provisions to facilitate their entry into a world federal government by authorizing a delegation to such a world federal government of a portion of their sovereignty sufficient to endow it with powers adequate to prevent war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of the State of Maine, That application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, to give serious consideration to the calling of a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations, subject to later ratification, a constitution of a world federal government, open to all nations, with limited powers adequate to assure peace, or amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to ratify any world constitution which is presented to the United States by the United Nations, by a world constitutional convention or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maine is hereby directed to transmit copies of the application to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures in the several States, requesting their cooperation.

House of representatives, read and adopted April 1, 1949.

Sent up for concurrence.

HARVEY R. PEASE,
Clerk.

In senate chamber, April 4, 1949, read and adopted, in concurrence.

CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Anastacia Roshani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr KILGORE:

S. 1574. A bill for the relief of Vanin Romildo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (by request):

S. 1575. A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr KERR (for himsel Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 1576. A bill to establish the United States Study Commission on the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1577. A bill to revive and reenact, as amended, the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1578. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska Communication System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to extend to July 25, 1950, the time within which readjustment allowances may be paid under section 700 of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL HOUSING LEGISLATION AND CITIES—ADDRESS BY MAYOR OF PROVIDENCE, R. I.

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Housing Legislation and Cities," delivered by Hon. Dennis J. Roberts, mayor of the city of Providence, R. I., at the United States Conference of Mayors in Washington, D. C., on March 22, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF BRITISH SOCIALISM—EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY GEOFFREY CROWTHER BEFORE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an address entitled "Economic Consequences of British Socialism," delivered by Geoffrey Crowther, editor of the Economist, of London, before the Economic Club of New York at New York City on January 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HUMAN BROTHERHOOD—ADDRESS BY MYER DORFMAN

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Human Brotherhood, delivered by Myer Dorfman, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, on March 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN E. PEURIFOY—ARTICLE FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "John E. Peurifoy Rises From State Department Ranks to New Top Post," written by Richard L. Stokes and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPLY BY NORMAN M. LITTELL TO WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL ENTITLED "ASSURANCE FOR INVESTORS"

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by Norman M. Littell, formerly Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, in reply to the editorial entitled "Assurance for Investors," published in the Washington Post of April 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC RECOVERY OF FINLAND—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Finns on Their Feet Despite Two Wars," published in the New York Times of April 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM IN THE FIELD OF STREAM POLLUTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him entitled "A Cooperative Research Program in the Field of Stream Pollution" and an exchange of correspondence between him and the Department of Agriculture, which appear in the Appendix.]

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF APPROVAL BY MARYLAND LEGISLATURE OF ESPERANTO LANGUAGE

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Maximiano Marmito Villareal on the thirty-ninth anniversary of the approval of the Esperanto language by the Maryland Legislature, together with a clipping from the Baltimore Sun on the same subject, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION REFORM—PAPER BY PROF. JOSEPH E. KALLENBACH

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, from the University of Michigan comes one of the most brilliant and irrefutable arguments in favor of the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 2 which has come to my attention. Senate Joint Resolution 2 is the proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the Electoral College and count the electoral votes in proportion to the popular vote, which is now pending in the Committee on the Judiciary.

The paper to which I refer is entitled "Presidential Election Reform," and its author is Joseph E. Kallenbach, associate professor at the University of Michigan. It was read at the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters at Detroit on April 2, 1949.

Professor Kallenbach's paper is not only complete and authoritative, but it is written with spirit and originality. For example, he says:

> The electoral college has been aptly compared to the vermiform appendix in the human body. While it does no good and ordinarily causes no trouble, it continually exposes the body politic to the danger of political peritonitis.

Professor Kallenbach also makes the interesting discovery that the electoral idea embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 2 was first proposed in Congress in 1848 and that it has been carefully studied by congressional committee and favorably reported on a number of times, namely, in the Fifty-second, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Eightieth Congresses. In other words, Mr. President, this proposal is now entering its second century. And yet, Mr. President, as nearly as I can discover, this delay is not due to any substantive arguments which have been made against the idea. The real enemies of this reform are apathy and indifference.

Professor Kallenbach concludes his distinguished paper with these words:

> Here is a matter in which by an act of prudent foresight, we can put our political house in order. By taking the appropriate steps now, in due season, we can avoid the political crisis which is certain to come, sooner or later, if we continue to rely on our present defective electoral system.

I hope that before very long Senate Joint Resolution 2 will be up before the Members of the Senate and that every single Senator will then have a chance to pass on the question. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Kallenbach's paper be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. I believe the busy Senator who has only time to read a few statements about this proposal cannot do better than to read the paper of Professor Kallenbach. I hope that over the coming week end there may be the chance for Senators to read this fine contribution.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION REFORM

(By Joseph E. Kallenbach, associate professor, University of Michigan)

The subject of presidential electoral reform is an exceedingly broad and complicated one. In view of the frequent attention it has received since the adoption of the Constitution it may be termed one of the hardy perennials of American political discussion. Since January 6, 1797, when Representative William L. Smith, of South Carolina, offered in Congress the first constitutional amendment proposal on this subject, hardly a session of Congress has passed without the introduction of one or more resolutions of this character.[1] In the 58-year period between 1889 and 1947, 123 amendment proposals relating to the method of choosing the President were introduced in Congress.[2] The electoral vote tie in 1800 between Jefferson and Burr brought a flurry of amendment proposals of this sort. One of them was eventually adopted as the twelfth amendment in 1804. The election of John Quincy Adams in 1824 by action of the House of Representatives provided the incentive for further efforts at presidential-election reform, as did also the disputed election of 1876 between Tilden and Hayes.

These periods of intensified activity, however, have only been high lights in what has been a more or less continuous struggle by reformists in and out of Congress to bring the system of choosing our chief executive into conformity with political reason and reality. Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, with the strong support of President Andrew Jackson, made this a prime object of his concern over a period of 20 years in the Senate in the 1820's and 1830's.[3] Senator Oliver H. P. T. Morton, of Indiana, led the fight in the 1870's, without success.[4] In more recent times Senator George W. Norris, of

[1] For a review and analysis of amendment proposals dealing with the presidential-election system introduced in Congress from 1789 to 1889 see Ames, H. V., The Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States during the first century of its history, House Doc. No. 353, pt. 2, 54th Cong., 2d sess., (1897) (series 3550), pp. 77–123; and Musmanno, M. A., Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, H. Doc. No. 551, 70th Cong., 2d sess. (1929) (series 9017), pp. 44–51, 60–64, which carries this analysis forward from 1889 to 1928.

[2] Proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States introduced in Congress from December 4, 1889, to July 2, 1926, S. Doc. No. 93, 69th Cong., 1st sess. (1926) (series 8546), pp. 148, prepared under the direction of Charles C. Tansill; and Proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States introduced in Congress from the 69th Cong., 2d sess., through the 79th Cong. (1947), pp. 114 (unlisted Senate document prepared under the direction of Carl A. Loeffler).

[3] Dougherty, J. H., The Electoral System of the United States (1906), pp. 326–342.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 89–106, 344–351.

Nebraska, and Representative Clarence Lea, of California, have labored to bring to the attention of Congress and the country a realization of the need for presidential electoral reform. On viewing the net results of their efforts and those of many others over the years, one is tempted to paraphrase a famous remark of Winston Churchill: "Never have so many labored so hard in such a worthy cause, to so little effect."

Despite the failure of these efforts of a century and a half to achieve substantial change in our presidential election system the struggle should continue. Anyone with a reasonable degree of familiarity with the functioning of this system must be aware of the needless complexities and the dangers to popular government inherent in it. It is a compound of outworn constitutional provisions upon which has been superimposed a system of party usages, rules, and practices, interlarded with the provisions of 48 different sets of State laws. By these means we regulate the choice of a body of 531 "ghost" electors who few people now realize still perform the solemn and momentous function of designating the persons who will occupy the offices of President and Vice President. In this state of happy national unconcern and popular ignorance about the actual workings of the system it was not surprising to read in the press last December that one of the Michigan presidential electors, who, of course, belonged to the Republican Party, had to be restrained by his colleagues from casting his electoral vote for Mr. Truman and Mr. Barkley when the electors met at Lansing in December.[5] While his desire to make Mr. Truman's election appear to be unanimous was commendable and was understandable in view of the great stress that was placed on the need for national unity in some quarters during the preceding campaign, it is an unfortunately significant commentary on the degree of popular misunderstanding which prevails in the Nation regarding the manner in which we actually determine who will be the next President.

The root of that misunderstanding lies in retention of the electoral college as the agency through which, normally, the choice of a President and a Vice President is officially made. The influence of the electoral-vote system on a presidential campaign is felt from the nominating stage to the ascertainment of the final result. As long as the Constitution remains unreformed on this point there will be confusion, misunderstanding, and possibility of miscarriage of the popular will. Consequently, there must continue to be waged a frontal attack upon this hoary and outworn relic of the stage-coach era. It must be eliminated from our electoral processes if we are ever to achieve complete assurance that our method of choosing the Nation's Chief Executive conforms to the principle of popular self-rule.

THE INDICTMENT OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

The indictment that can be drawn up against the electoral college system as it now operates is a lengthy one. In general, the various counts in the indictment fall under three main headings: (1) Those arising from retention of the office of presidential elector; (2) those which concern the method of determining the issue when no candidate has obtained a majority of the electoral votes; and (3) those which derive from use of the general-ticket system in choosing presidential electors. An outline of some of the counts in the indictment under these headings follows.

1. Retention of the office of elector

The electoral college has been aptly compared to the vermiform appendix in the human body. While it does no good and ordinarily causes no trouble it continually exposes the body politic to the danger of political peritonitis. A careful student of the subject has said:

"The elector in the constitutional sense is an abortive organism. He has no function to fulfill. But he is not merely functionless, he is dangerous. It is as true in the moral as it is in the material realm that any mechanism or organ that has ceased to perform its function is sure to work mischief, if not positive detriment."[6]

In the office of presidential elector we tolerate the continuance of an institution which not only has ceased to have significance but which also has dangerous potentialities for harm.

The first harmful effect that may be noted is the unnecessary confusion of the voter caused by printing on the ballot the names making up the various slates of candidates for presidential electors. The long, actually meaningless lists of rival slates of electoral candidates on the ballot sometimes lead to a voter's spoiling his ballot and thereby disfranchising himself in the most important electoral contest in the Nation. Twenty-two of our States have eliminated this particular evil by providing by law for the so-called presidential short ballot. In these States the names of the party candidates for elector are omitted from the ballot and only the names of the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the respective parties appear under the appropriate party labels. A vote for the presidential ticket of a particular party is counted as a vote for their slate of electors.[7] In 16 States the ballots carry the names of the presidential candidates and of the electoral slates as well; while in 10 States only the names of the electoral candidates appear.[8] With either of the latter two types of ballot, splitting of a voter's choice among various candidates for elector is possible. When this happens the result is either a spoiled ballot because too many electors are voted for, or the voter, in effect, divides his support between the rival aspirants for the presidency—a most foolish gesture, indeed.

There was much comment on the fact that at the recent election in Ohio approximately 160,000 more votes were cast in the gubernatorial contest than in the presidential contest. In that State, because of litigation that delayed final certification of the Progressive Party's slate of electors on the ballot, the electors of that party had to be listed in full on the ballot unaccompanied by the names of the Progressive Party's candidates for President and Vice President. The names comprising the Republican and Democratic electoral slates were omitted under the normal Presidential short-ballot plan. Only the names of their presidential and vice-presidential candidates appeared. Because of this peculiar arrangement a large number of voters cast invalid ballots in the presidential contest by voting for Truman or for Dewey (i. e., for their undisclosed electoral slates) and also for some of the Progressive electors as well. Such invalidated choices accounted in large measure for the discrepancy in the presidential and gubernatorial vote totals. These invalidated ballots may well have affected the disposition of the State's electoral votes, for there was a difference of only about 7,000 votes in the Dewey and Truman totals out of a total of almost 3,000,000 votes cast.

A second count in the indictment on this point is that an elector is only morally bound to cast his vote for the candidates of his party for President and Vice President. He cannot be compelled either by State law or by national law to register his choice for the candidates regularly nominated by his party at its national convention. A case arising out of the recent election has established this point. Electors who were presented on the Democratic ballot in four Southern States and were elected as Democrats repudiated the candidates named at their national convention and voted for candidates nominated subsequently at a rump States' rights Democratic convention. Attempts to enforce against the Alabama delegation so chosen a State law enacted in 1945 which required presidential electors to cast their votes for the candidates named at their national party convention were unsuccessful, both in the Alabama Supreme Court and in the Federal courts.[9] A Tennessee elector who ran as a candidate on both the regular Democratic slate and the Dixiecrat slate cast his vote for Governor Thurmond, despite the fact he was elected through receiving a popular plurality of 270,000 on the Democratic ticket and only 73,000 votes as a candidate on the Dixiecrat slate. It thus appears that constitutionally the way is clear for an elector to vote for whomever he prefers, regardless of the action of the national party organization.

---

[5] Ann Arbor News, December 14, 1948, p. 3. Only 13 of the 19 Republican electors appeared in Lansing to perform their duty of casting the State's electoral votes. The 6 vacant places were filled by appointment by the other electors, as permitted by State law. Six individuals who happened to be around the State house building were rounded up for this purpose. The elector who sought to cast his vote for the Democratic candidates, Mr. J. J. Levy, of Royal Oak, was one of the six substitutes. He was quoted as saying, "I thought we had to vote for the winning candidate. I certainly didn't want to. I'm a Republican and fighting proud of it."

[6] Dougherty, *op. cit.*, pp. 253–254.

[7] Cf. Aylesworth, L. E., The Presidential Ballot, American Political Science Review, vol. 17, pp. 89–96 (Feb. 1923), and The Presidential Short Ballot, *ibid.*, vol. 24, pp. 966–970 (Nov. 1930); Albright, S. D., The Presidential Short Ballot, *ibid.*, vol. 34 (Oct. 1940), pp. 955–959).

[8] For a digest of State and national laws as of 1944 regulating the manner in which presidential electors are voted for and their functioning see The Electoral College, S. Doc. No. 243, 78th Cong., 2d sess., p. 26, compiled under the direction of Edwin A. Halsey. See also Silva, Ruth C., State Law on the Nomination, Election, and Instruction of Presidential Electors, American Political Science Review, vol. 42 (June 1948), pp. 523–529.

[9] *Folsom et al.* v. *Albritton et al.* (335 U. S. 882 (Dec. 6, 1948)), (motion for leave to file petition for injunctive relief denied, thus sustaining a district court ruling to the same effect, — F. Supp. (2d) — (1948); *Adcock et al.* v. *Albritton et al.* (335 U. S. 887 (Dec. 6, 1948)), certiorari denied in case reported in — Ala ——, —— So. (2d) —— (1948), in which the Alabama Supreme Court had denied injunctive relief.) In an advisory opinion early in April 1948, the Alabama Supreme Court had held the 1945 State statute unconstitutional so far as it attempted to control the functioning of presidential electors. *In re Opinion of the Justices* (250 Ala. 399, 34 So. (2d) 598 (1948)).

The outcome of the litigation involving the Alabama statute would indicate that a California statute of similar nature and purpose, *Deering's California Code* (1939), sec. 10555, is likewise void, as is also an Oregon law of similar import, *Oregon Comp. Laws Anno.* (1940), sec. 81–503a. Certain other States, including Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Virginia, have provisions in their laws which by implication obligate an elector to vote for the regularly nominated candidates of his party. Cf. Silva, op. cit.

Still one more danger that lurks in retention of the office of Presidential elector is the possibility of confusion and uncertainty that can arise by reason of a question of ineligibility of an elector, his death, his failure to function as an elector, or the death of the presidential or vice-presidential candidate of his party before the elector has had an opportunity to discharge his pledge. All these are contingencies that have occurred and they will undoubtedly recur from time to time. Most States have enacted laws providing for filling vacancies in their Presidential elector delegation. The usual provision is an authorization for the other electors to fill the vacancy by appointment. But questions may still arise to throw the outcome of a presidential election into doubt. The Constitution sets up a rule making Members of Congress and holders of Federal office ineligible for the office of elector. Not infrequently, however, persons who are constitutionally ineligible run for and are elected to this office. After the recent November election several of the duly chosen electors in Virginia discovered they were ineligible to serve by reason of their holding Federal offices of one sort or another. They resigned their electoral college seats and others were appointed to their places by the remaining electors before the electoral vote was cast.[10] Had their ineligibility not been discovered in time and had they cast their votes as electors, the revelation later that they were ineligible would have caused these votes to be invalidated. In an extremely close division of the electoral vote the result of the election could thus be affected.[11]

Again, the electors may fail to function on the day or in the manner prescribed by law. In 1857 the electoral vote of Wisconsin was challenged at the time of the canvass by Congress because that State's electors had been held up by a blizzard and were not able to meet at the State capital to cast their votes on the day appointed by law. The two Houses of Congress were unable to agree on whether the Wisconsin electoral votes were valid or not. They were not decisive, having been cast for Fremont, the losing candidate. A double set of electoral vote results was announced by Congress, one with and one without the Wisconsin votes included.[12]

Still another danger lies in the possibility that a candidate for President or for Vice President may die or be found to be ineligible before the electors pledged to him have discharged their obligation to vote for him. In other words, there is a danger that the electors might some time have a chance to function as the Constitution framers intended that they should. In the 1872 election this contingency actually occurred, when the Liberal Republican candidate, Horace Greeley, died a few days after the November election. Fortunately, his electors were in the minority and the outcome of the election was not affected. His electors pursued their various inclinations when they met later to ballot. Most of them named on their ballots for President the vice presidential candidate of their ticket, and followed their own fancy in voting for someone else for Vice President. But a number were faithful unto death and carried out their implied pledge to vote for Greeley, even though he was in his grave. These votes were lost, the Senate and the House being unable to agree on whether Greeley in his current condition was a "person" within the meaning of the Constitution.[13] In these days when it is customary immediately after the November election for the victorious candidate to take a trip to some southern clime for the purpose of recuperating from the rigors of the campaign, there is always a possibility that he may fall victim to some unexpected disaster. If this should happen before he has become officially a President-elect, it would place in the hands of 531 obscure individuals the grave responsibility of actually choosing the next President. It should not be forgotten that Franklin D. Roosevelt, while sojourning in Florida before his inauguration in 1933, missed becoming a victim of an assassin's bullet only by a matter of inches.

2. *Method of settling the issue after an inconclusive electoral vote*

The second charge against the present electoral system concerns the method of settling the issue in case no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes. Under the provisions of the twelfth amendment, a candidate to win by virtue of the electors' votes must secure a majority of the whole number of electors, which now means 266 votes. In case no person receives an electoral majority for President, the House of Representatives, voting by State units, elects the President from those receiving the three highest totals of electoral votes. A majority of the State votes, that is, 25, is required to settle the issue. If no candidate for Vice President receives a majority of the electoral votes, the Senate proceeds to choose one of those who received the two highest totals of electoral votes. A majority of the Senators is required.

The major criticism of this arrangement is the inequity that results from giving to all States, without regard to differences in population, equal power in deciding the matter. It should be noted that the criticism applies not only to House election of a President but also to Senate election of a Vice President, since the States have equal representation in the latter body. The political injustice in this arrangement is so obvious that it "need only to be stated, not argued," as Senator Morton once observed.[14] It is significant that on the first occasion when an election of a President was thrown into the House, the political reaction produced the twelfth amendment, which made impossible the recurrence of the particular circumstance that necessitated recourse to House action in that instance. When reference to the House had to be made following the 1824 election because of the inconclusiveness of the electoral vote, the reaction was equally strong. While the effort to amend the Constitution to prevent recurrence of such an event in the future failed, the political bitterness that was engendered between the Adams and Jackson factions was deep. It was one of the underlying reasons for formation of a new political party alinement that endured for a generation.

It should also be noted that there is a possibility that the House decision may be delayed indefinitely beyond January 20, the inauguration day for a new President, when disposition of an election has been placed in its hands. In that event under the twentieth amendment the Vice-President-elect would act as President until the House resolved the issue, if ever. It is not difficult to imagine the confusion that would result in case of a long-drawn-out contest. If anyone is inclined to dismiss such a possibility as being too farfetched, let him contemplate what our situation would be now if Governor Dewey's electors in last November's election had succeeded in getting a very few thousand more votes in Ohio and California. Loss of the electoral votes of those States by President Truman would have reduced his electoral vote to 253, less than a majority; but their gain by Mr. Dewey would still not have given him an electoral majority. The election would have been referred to the House of Representatives, with Mr. Truman, Mr. Dewey and Mr. Thurmond as the three eligibles from whom selection was to be made. The Dixiecrats, it was openly announced, hoped that their candidate's entry into the contest would have just this effect.

The current make-up of the State delegations in the House indicates that Mr. Truman might have been expected to receive the votes of no more than 21 States; Mr. Dewey, of 20 States; Mr. Thurmond, of 4; and 3 State votes would have been ineffective because of their delegations' being evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.[15] In this contingency the House of Representatives might well be balloting yet, unable to give a majority of the State votes to any one candidate. Presumably Vice President BARKLEY (we can assume that he would have been chosen Vice President over Governor Warren by a Democratic Senate) would be serving as acting President, uncertain from one day to the next when his tenure as acting President would end. The possibility of our ship of state floundering in the present sea of national and international troubles with only a first mate's hand tentatively on the tiller is not pleasant to contemplate. Had we blundered into such a crisis of uncertainty, even for a short time, it is safe to say that the first problem the Eighty-first Congress would have felt impelled to attack, once it was able to turn to regular legislative work, would have been the submission of a constitutional amendment which would put an end forever to this aspect, at least, of our present system.

3. *The general ticket system of choosing electors*

Under the third heading in the indictment are found the charges against the electoral college system which probably seem most weighty to the ordinary citizen. The practice which now prevails in all the States by which the party slate of electors receiving a State-wide plurality are all deemed elected[16] with the consequence that votes cast for the losing slates of electors are completely unrepresented in the State's electoral vote, appears on its face to be indefensible from the standpoint of political justice. It should be observed first, however, that the general ticket system of choosing electors is not a necessary feature of the electoral college plan under the Constitution. The Constitution provides that each State shall appoint its electors "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct."[17] In the

[10] New York Times, December 14, 1948, p. 35.

[11] The election result in the famous disputed election of 1876 actually turned on a question of this sort. One of the three Republican electors who had been chosen in the State of Oregon was a Federal postmaster at the time of his election. On discovering that his Federal office made him ineligible to serve as an elector, he resigned both the electoral seat and the postmastership. He was then appointed to the vacancy by his two Republican colleagues. His somewhat tainted vote, which the Special Electoral Commission accepted, supplied the margin by which Hayes was declared elected. Dougherty, op. cit., pp. 184–202.

[12] Dougherty, op. cit., pp. 51–57. A similar mix-up in the final count occurred in the 1836 election, when Congress could not decide whether Michigan's electoral votes should be included or not. The question arose because Michigan had not achieved full statehood until several weeks after it had chosen presidential electors. Ibid, pp. 48–49.

[13] Dougherty, op. cit., pp. 87–88, 265.

[14] Dougherty, op. cit., p. 23n.

[15] See the article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times on January 14, 1949, p. 22, which is reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. A249.

[16] In Georgia, to be elected by popular action, electors must receive a majority of the popular vote. In case of failure of this requirement to be met, the electors are chosen by the legislature. (Georgia Code, Annotated, 1935, ch. 34, secs. 2502–2503.)

[17] Art. II, sec. 1, cl. 2.

early days of the Republic, appointment by the legislature itself was a common practice, vieing with election by congressional districts as a mode of selection. Election on a State-wide general ticket was first introduced in a few States in the campaign of 1800. Consideration of State pride and partisan advantage led to its eventual adoption in all of the States. From the point of view of constitutional authority the States are free now to establish a more equitable mode of selecting the presidential electors, such as choice by districts.[18] It is extremely unlikely, however, that the States can be induced severally to change from the prevailing mode of choosing electors. Consequently, the general ticket system must be considered a part of the present plan which a constitutional amendment will be required to uproot.

In the first place the general ticket system is criticized because it, in effect, disfranchises all those who voted for the losing slates of electors, so far as electoral college representation is concerned. Thus, in 1948, the 1,003,000 voters who voted for Truman electors in Michigan had no representation whatever in the electoral vote count of this State, even though they comprised 47.6 percent of the number participating in the State balloting; while the 1,038,000 who voted for Dewey electors were represented by all 19 of the presidential electors, even though these voters constituted only 49.2 percent of the participating electorate.

This failure of the popular vote to be accurately reflected in the electoral vote of a particular State is emphasized further in the compilation of national totals. Generally speaking, the percentage of the electoral vote won by the candidate with a national plurality of popular votes is considerably greater than his percentage of the national popular vote; while losing candidates have correspondingly smaller percentages of the electoral votes than their percentages of popular votes nationally. Third party and minor party candidates generally are completely shut out in the electoral vote. Frequently a result of this failure of the popular vote for particular candidates to be equated accurately in terms of electoral votes is the election of a so-called minority President, of which there have been 13 since the 1824 election.

A further charge against the general ticket plan is that it tends to overemphasize the political importance of the large politically doubtful States. Candidates from such States have a great advantage over rivals from other States in the nomination struggle. Sixteen of the 26 major party candidates since 1900 (17 if Theodore Roosevelt be considered a major party candidate in 1912) have come from New York or Ohio. The electoral vote power and the close division of party strength in these States give them a most solubrious climate for the growth of presidential timber. The so-called pivotal States also monopolize the attention of the candidates and the campaign fund spenders during the canvass for popular votes, while other areas not regarded as doubtful are ignored. Some of the blame for the relatively poor turn-out of voters in presidential elections is also laid at the door of the general ticket system. Voting statistics show a high correlation between the degree of closeness of the State-wide popular vote and the amount of popular participation. In the doubtful State there is a strong incentive for the voter to vote; in States where the outcome on a State-wide basis is a foregone conclusion, there is little incentive for the voter, regardless of his political inclinations, to take the trouble to register his preference.

Finally, the general ticket system is condemned in some quarters as causing both of the major parties to give undue attention to the demands and programs of relatively unimportant minority groups or factions. Such factions may constitute the balance of power between the major parties in a large State or in several such States, even though in the over-all national scene the particular group may not be numerically important. Because of the strategic position it occupies it may be the pivot upon which a large block of electoral votes turns; hence the major parties have to make large concessions and enter strong bids for its support. As a consequence major party programs may be influenced unduly by these strategically located groups, which often prove to be uncertain and even embarrassing party allies in the long run.

[18] *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1 (1892)).

CURRENT PROPOSALS FOR REFORM

In recent years three types of constitutional amendment proposals designed to correct some or all of these defects in our Presidential election system have had more or less serious consideration in Congress. The first type is represented in a resolution brought forward by Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, in 1934. It reached the floor of the Senate and was voted on in that year. It received strong support, but failed of the necessary constitutional two-thirds majority by a narrow margin.[19] The Norris proposal would have done nothing more than abolish the useless office of Presidential elector, while retaining all the remaining elements of the present system. While it would have corrected one major weakness, it would not have improved upon the present method of settling the issue when there is no electoral-vote majority; and it would have embedded in the written Constitution the general ticket system of awarding a State's electoral vote, with all of its objectionable features as outlined above.

The second type of proposal which has received congressional attention in recent years is one which would sweep away entirely the present system of nomination and election and substitute nomination by direct, Nation-wide primaries and election by a direct, Nation-wide popular vote. A plurality would suffice to determine the outcome in both cases. The proposal for direct popular election is not new, having been first advanced in Congress in 1826.[20] Currently its congressional champions are Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, who have introduced amendment proposals in the present Congress to effectuate it.[21]

In 1947 during the course of consideration of the proposed amendment to limit presidential tenure to two terms, which was eventually submitted to the States, Senator LANGER and Senator TAYLOR, of Idaho, offered this direct popular vote plan as an amendment to the presidential tenure resolution. Their amendment was rejected by a vote of 66 to 14.[22]

While this plan would, of course, eliminate all the objectionable features of the present system which have been noted above, it is open to at least three serious criticisms.

First, the substitution of a Nation-wide primary for the national convention as a nominating device is questionable from the standpoint of both practicability and desirability. Many authorities on nominating procedures endorse the convention system as preferable to the direct primary even at the State level. Objections to the direct primary at the national level are still more weighty. A more feasible approach to the problem of nominating procedures would seem to lie in improving the convention system, rather than abolishing it.[23]

Secondly, the Langer plan implies the establishment of a Nation-wide, uniform system of suffrage qualifications. It is doubtful if the Nation is ready for that step yet. Certainly objection on this ground would be sufficiently strong to defeat ratification of the proposal if it should be submitted.

Finally, abolition of the electoral-vote system as a measure of State strength in the choosing of the President, which this plan would bring about, would make it unacceptable to the States which presently enjoy a relative advantage through that system. All States, it should be observed, have two electors regardless of their population, because of their having two Senators. The variation in numbers of electors from State to State comes from variation in the numbers of House seats. Hence, the States of smaller population have in the electoral-vote system a relatively greater weight in choosing the President than their population, in proportion to that of the more populous States, warrants. These smaller States, favored now by the electoral-vote system, would undoubtedly prevent ratification of such an amendment, even if it could be passed over their protests by the requisite two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress.

The third plan now being urged upon Congress represents a compromise of a sort between the Norris and the Langer plans. It is like both of them in that it would abolish the office of presidential elector; but it would retain the electoral-vote idea in a modified form. States would retain their quotas of electoral votes as determined by the numbers of their Representatives and Senators. Presidential electors as officers, however, would no longer be elected to cast a State's electoral votes. On the basis of the popular votes cast for the various candidates in a State-wide election the election officers of a State would transmit to Washington the presidential-electoral vote of that State, each candidate being credited with the exact proportion of the State's electoral votes which his popular votes entitle him to. Thus in a State with 10 electoral votes a candidate who received 46.5 percent of the popular vote would be certified as having won 4.65 electoral votes; other candidates would be credited with electoral votes in a similar way. A plurality of the electoral votes in the Nation would be sufficient to elect. There would be no occasion to refer elections to the House or to the Senate.

The essential difference between this plan and the Langer direct-vote proposal lies in the fact that the popular vote is translated into the common denominator of electoral votes for ascertainment of the Nation-wide result. This would preserve the present relative strength of the several States in choosing the President and at the same time permit variation in State voting qualifications without penalty of loss of strength by those

[19] The vote was 42 to 24 in favor of passage. On a later motion to reconsider, the vote was 52 to 29. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 73d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 9127, 9245. Cf. Kallenbach, Joseph E., "Recent Proposals To Reform the Electoral College System," American Political Science Review, vol. XXX (October 1936), pp. 924–929.

[20] Ames, op. cit., pp. 87–88. During the first hundred years of our history under the Constitution 37 proposals of this nature were introduced in Congress.

[21] S. J. Res. 10 and H. J. Res. 118, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

[22] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1962. The votes in favor of the direct popular election proposal were cast by 9 Democrats and 5 Republicans.

[23] Some possible ways of improving the national convention as a nominating agency are discussed in Berdahl, Clarence A., "Presidential Selection and Democratic Government, Journal of Politics, vol. 11 (Feb. 1949), pp. 28 ff.

States which are more conservative in setting voting qualifications. This plan thus obviates some of the major objections to the direct-vote idea, while recognizing as a practical matter the principle of popular election of the President.

This proportional electoral vote idea is not a very recent one. It was first proposed in Congress just 100 years ago.[24] It has been carefully studied by congressional committees and favorably reported on a number of times.[25] It has a number of champions among both parties in Congress at present, prominent among whom are Senators LODGE, of Massachusetts, and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and Representative GOSSETT, of Texas. Amendment resolutions embracing it have been introduced in both Houses during the current session of Congress and are receiving committee consideration.[26] It is very likely to come to a vote during the life of the present Congress, since it will almost certainly receive favorable committee action again in both Houses as it did in the Eightieth Congress.

EVALUATION OF THE PROPORTIONAL ELECTORAL VOTE IDEA

Because the Lodge-Kefauver-Gossett plan gives promise of serious consideration by the Congress it merits careful analysis at this time. The points that can be advanced in its favor are numerous and weighty. It would abolish the obsolete office of presidential elector and thus eliminate the difficulties and dangers that lie in retention of this useless mechanism. It would also abandon the present majority electoral vote requirement for determining the result of an election, thereby eliminating the necessity for resort to the present unsatisfactory method of resolving the issue when a majority electoral vote fails to materialize. Most of the evils attributed to the general ticket system of choosing electors would either be avoided or mitigated in large degree. The influence of the pivotal States and of marginal minority groups within those States on nominations, platforms and campaign strategy would be diminished. There would no longer be reason for apathy and failure to participate in presidential elections in the so-called "sure" States. The electoral vote results of a particular State would accurately reflect political sentiment within that State; the national electoral vote totals would be a more accurate reflection of national political sentiment on the various candidates.[27] There would not be absolute assurance that the candidate with a plurality of the popular vote in the Nation at large would also have an electoral vote plurality; but the possibility that the winning candidate would not also be the leading candidate in terms of the total popular vote of the Nation would be almost nil. The principle that it is the people and not their representatives who elect the President would be recognized. All this would be accomplished while preserving for the States their present freedom to regulate suffrage qualifications in the way they deem proper; and without disturbing the existing distribution of electoral strength among the several States.

What are the arguments that will be advanced against it and what validity do they have? The first that will undoubtedly be heard is that our present system has worked very well, so there is no need for change.[28] For reasons that have already been stated above, it would appear that this is not an argument that will bear close examination. We have had at least three major presidential election crises in our history; and we have avoided others by the narrowest of margins. To those who say "Let well enough alone" the answer is "Why wait until it rains again before we mend the leaky roof?"

The second major objection which will undoubtedly be advanced against the Lodge-Gossett plan is that it will result in a multiplicity of minor parties and splinter parties, all of which will put forward presidential tickets; that it will weaken the two-party system; and, in view of the substitution of the plurality electoral-vote requirement for the present majority rule, that it will make election of minority Presidents the rule rather than the exception. Superficially this criticism seems to carry weight. It is based on the assumption that voters of minority parties, being assured that their vote for President will be surely reflected in the electoral-vote totals, even though their numbers are infinitesimally small, will be more inclined to stick with their favorites than they would under the present system. Minor parties and splinter groups, the argument continues, will find it less burdensome to place presidential tickets on the ballot, since there will be no need to line up an electoral slate beforehand. The presentation of many presidential tickets will cause a wider dispersion of the popular vote, it is claimed, thus producing a winner who has a plurality which may constitute only a relatively small proportion of the total vote.[29]

These conclusions will not stand up under close analysis, however. Under the proposed plan there will actually be no more incentive for a voter to waste his ballot on some candidate who has no chance of winning than there is at present. The contest will be between the two leading candidates, as now. Only one can win. A vote for anyone other than one of the very possible winners is still a wasted vote so far as affecting the result is concerned. There is merely a shifting of the base from which the plurality rule operates to determine who wins. Now it is the winner of a popular plurality in a State who wins the prize—all the State's electoral votes. Under the proposed system the base is merely changed to the national electoral vote total. He who gets a plurality there wins the prize—the Presidency. The same considerations which now induce voters not to waste their votes on also-rans would still be operative. Elections would continue to exhibit the characteristic phenomena of past elections, with the great mass of the voters alining themselves behind one or the other of two major party candidates.[30]

One further observation should be made on this point. It should not be forgotten that there are a large number of parties which put forward candidates for the Presidency even under the present system. No less than 11 different parties formally nominated presidential candidates in 1948.[31] Three other parties endorsed candidates nominated by some one of these 11 parties:[32] Because of State laws regulating access to the ballots, only eight of the groups which nominated candidates succeeded in getting their candidates' names on the ballot in any considerable number of States. Under the Lodge-Gossett plan access to the ballot would continue to be subject to State control. It may be presumed that requirements would continue to be applied which would present "lunatic fringe" groups which are numerically insignificant and late-comer "sore-head" politicians and their faithful followers from unduly burdening the ballot with the names of their candidates.

One final charge levied against the Lodge-Gossett plan is that, by embracing the idea of proportional representation, it will give impetus to the movement to adopt that system in the choosing of National, State, and local legislative bodies. It has even been suggested that a logical implication is that a national plural executive should be established.[33] This charge is wholly unfounded. It is based on a misconception of the "P. R." aspect of the proposed plan. Proportional representation in the usual sense of the term has reference to a system

---

[24] Representative Lawrence, of New York, introduced an amendment proposal for a proportional distribution of the electoral vote in 1848. Ames, op. cit., pp. 95 ff.

[25] See H. Rept. 2439, 52d Cong., 2d sess. (1893); H. Rept. 2194, 72d Cong., 2d sess. (1933); H. Rept. 262, 73d Cong., 1st sess. (1933); H. Rept. 1615, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (1948); S. Rept. 1230, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (1948).

[26] S. J. Res. 2, which is sponsored by Senators LODGE, of Massachusetts; SMITH of New Jersey; MORSE, of Oregon; and FLANDERS, of Vermont, all Republicans; and MCCARRAN, of Nevada; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; HOEY, of North Carolina; SPARKMAN, of Alabama; STENNIS, of Mississippi; NEELY, of West Virginia; and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, all Democrats, is the vehicle for this plan in the Senate. Hearings on it by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee were conducted on March 9, 1949. Identical resolutions introduced in the House are H. J. Res. 2, by Representative GOSSETT, of Texas; H. J. Res. 10, by CANNON, of Missouri; H. J. Res. 11, by CELLER, of New York; H. J. Res. 82, by PRIEST, of Tennessee; H. J. Res. 121, by BOGGS of Louisiana, all Democrats; and H. J. Res. 51, by DAVIS of Wisconsin, and H. J. Res. 81, by JOHNSON of California, both Republicans. The House Judiciary Committee favorably reported H. J. Res. 2 to the House on April 7, 1949.

[27] An indication of the working of the plan on the basis of the 1948 election results is shown in the following figures:

	Percent of popular vote	Actual number of electoral votes	Actual percent of electoral votes	Approximate number of electoral votes under new plan	Percent of electoral vote under new plan
Truman	49.5	303	57.1	258.1	48.6
Dewey	45.1	189	35.6	221.5	41.7
Thurmond	2.4	39	7.3	38.8	7.1
Wallace	2.4	0	0	10.0	1.9
Others	.6	0	0	2.6	.7

It should be noted that, had the new plan actually been in operation in 1948, the popular vote totals would probably have varied somewhat from that actually cast for the respective candidates.

[28] President Truman was reported recently to have expressed this view on the subject. New York Times, January 20, 1949, pp. 1, 4.

[29] Cf. Wilmerding, Lucius, Jr., Reform of the Electoral System, Political Science Quarterly, vol. 54 (March 1949), p. 21. This author questions the soundness of the Lodge-Gossett plan on a number of other counts also. He advocates reform along the line of requiring electors (who would still be retained) to be elected by single member districts, retaining the majority electoral vote rule as at present and submitting inconclusive elections to decision by a joint session of Congress in which Senators and Representatives would vote individually.

[30] Cf. the statement by Senator LODGE in answer to a number of questions regarding the effect of the proposed amendment propounded by Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 2891.

[31] These parties were the Democratic, Republican, Progressive, States Rights Democratic, Socialist, Socialist Labor, Socialist Workers, Prohibition, Vegetarian, Greenback, and National Christian Crusade Parties.

[32] The American Labor Party endorsed the Progressive candidates; the Liberal Party endorsed the Democratic candidates; and the Communist Party endorsed the Progressive candidates.

[33] Wilmerding, op. cit., p. 6.

of voting for members of a deliberative body or some other similar group of individuals. Its purpose is to secure a fairly representative group in terms of the constituency to be served. The "P. R." of the Lodge-Gossett plan has no relationship to this idea or purpose. The proportional division of the electoral votes of a State is only a device for transmuting the popular votes in that State into a common political coin for counting purposes. The end sought is determination of the will of the American people as to the one man they wish to occupy the office of President for the next 4 years. There is no more the aspect of a "P. R." voting system in this than there is in the awarding of the governorship of Michigan to the individual who gets the most popular votes in a State-wide election, with the popular votes first being officially canvassed by counties.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the movement for reform of the present system of choosing the President along the lines proposed in the Lodge-Gossett plan will bear fruit in the near future. There is little doubt that the Nation is ready for this reform. A popular opinion poll conducted in the fall of 1948 by the American Institute of Public Opinion showed that 58 percent of the American public favored changing the method of electing the President so that each candidate would receive the same proportion of the electoral vote of each State that he receives in the popular vote. Only 15 percent favored maintaining the present system, while 27 percent had no opinion.[34] Even after one makes the due allowance for error in such polls which recent experience dictates should be made, the conclusion seems warranted that all that is needed to accomplish the reform is action by those who have the power to act. Here is a matter in which by an act of prudent foresight, we can put our political house in order. By taking the appropriate steps now, in due season, we can avoid the political crisis which is certain to come, sooner or later, if we continue to rely on our present defective electoral system.

NECESSITY FOR TAKING POLITICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST THE KREMLIN

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the newspapers of Sunday, March 20, had a news notice to the effect that Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the junior Senator from Maine, and I had been listed as new additions to the group of warmongers. This was the news from Moscow. So far as concerns being completely hostile to the present Russian Government and having no faith whatever in its expectation of, or desire for peace, I accept the designation as the highest honor which it is within the power of that government to grant. However, I completely deny hostility to the Russian people, and I am sure that the junior Senator from Maine joins me in this statement.

It is indeed the government in Russia and not its people who have arrayed themselves against the rest of the world. The people of that unhappy country are the victims of the policies of their government. For years they have been compelled to undergo the sacrifice of living at a bare minimum of subsistence with the promise that by so doing an earlier and greater improvement in their physical conditions would be obtained. This would have been possible had not such a large proportion of the sacrifices they made been diverted into war preparations and armament instead of into capital investment. This diversion into armament was of course an inescapable necessity during the period of the German invasion. It is no longer a necessity, nor has it been since that invasion was stopped and the active fighting of World War II was ended.

It is my purpose to draw the distinction between a predatory totalitarian government and an exploited and deceived people. If we can make this distinction, and particularly, if we can use it as a basis of policy, I am thoroughly convinced that it will have a highly beneficial effect in ameliorating the world's woes and our Nation's heavy burden.

The Atlantic Pact is the latest and most serious evidence of the fix in which we find ourselves so far as our foreign relations are concerned. It is a part of a ponderous and burdensome defensive action into which we have been forced by the attitude which the Russian Government has taken. It is by no means the only defensive action. The unexpected expansion of our military program, the Marshall plan, and the coming rearmament program, which is the logical counterpart of the Atlantic Pact, are all projects into which we have been forced by the active political, and threatened military, offensive of the Russian Government.

Military expenditure above a small, basic organization and larger research undertakings is pure economic waste in time of peace, yet 4 years after the war's end we are faced with a $15,000,000,000 military budget. In addition we have a $6,000,000,000 proposed expenditure for the Marshall plan which is in large part required by our relationships with Russia. Then we have coming Atlantic Pact rearmament expenditures of an unknown amount, though a first appropriation of $1,200,000,000 has been suggested. These all add up to twenty-two-odd billion, from eighteen to twenty billion of which must be charged directly to the defensive action into which Russia's offensive has forced us. This is the price we are paying for a defensive part in a cold war.

The questions we must ask ourselves are these: Must we forever have our policy determined by a foreign power? Is there no way in which we can take the offensive, so that we become the determining force in our relations, instead of being anxiously dependent on the moves of an adversary? Mr. President, I firmly believe we can shift our attitude from minus to plus, from retreat to advance, from a slow drift toward defeat back to definite victory. This can be achieved by inaugurating a political offensive from our side of the cold war.

We must first ask ourselves against what portion of the adversary's program that offensive should be directed. The first thought that will come into the minds of everyone is that it should be directed against the doctrines and practices of communism.

Mr. President, we watch with loathing and fear the spread of communism over peoples and nations who once were free. The instruments of subversion and conquest are clear to all men. A specious philosophy lulls that large group possessed of certain elements of intelligence, but lacking in common sense and judgment. Behind this veil of shimmering pink, the disaffected and the lawless are organized and armed. Planned confusion is introduced into the national economy and the national councils. Confusion grows. Lies, cruelty, and violence are the means carefully rationalized into the official Soviet philosophy. When the time is ripe, the armed underworld breaks out; the intellectuals are liquidated; having served their purpose; and communism is established by the violent minority over the vanquished majority.

We have seen the beginning of this in our own land. We have watched the growing group of befuddled intellectuals finally organized into a national party, stepping bravely forth in a pink mist toward a destination which was mercifully hidden from most of them. We have seen more than one labor organization betrayed by its communistic leadership from its true function of serving the best interests of its membership to traitorous action as the instrument of a hostile power.

As we watch this destructive force rolling over the earth, erasing from its surface human values and human beings, we are filled with the deepest emotions of horror and fear. Like the ancient Hebrew prophet, we are minded to cry, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

Mr. President, feeling in myself, as I do, this deep emotional reaction to communism, I am yet so presumptious as to hope that there may be, and that I may help to find, some strategic point of attack in this confused and universal tragedy. In making this endeavor for myself, Mr. President, may I make the bold suggestion that communism may not be the immediate focal point of our problem. Is there not something else which has been happening to the nations of the world in which we ourselves have a strong national interest?

Is there not a new predatory power loose in the world? It has swallowed up country after country. It sets no limits to its ambitions. That power has been moving rapidly toward a world dominance so complete that, were we not conquered ourselves, we would yet find ourselves beleaguered within our boundaries and permitted to travel over and trade with the rest of the world only on conditions set by a power stronger than our own.

The ambitions and progress of Stalin and the Politburo curiously resemble those of Hitler. The fuehrer, first as a national hero, recovered the Rhineland. Then, as a conqueror, he annexed Austria. Next, as an insatiable imperialist, he invaded and conquered Czechoslovakia. Finally, as an international gangster, he seized and divided Poland with a rival gangster.

The rival gangsters, meanwhile, had pounced on tiny but brave Finland, and suffered many a black eye and broken

[34] National Municipal Review, vol. 37 (October 1948), pp. 511–512.

nose before they had robbed it of what they wanted. Besides its half of Poland, the eastern gang snuffed out the short-lived liberties of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

What is there to choose between Hitler and the Politburo in those events leading to the Second World War? When the two gangs, in true gangster fashion, fell out with each other, we supported the Russian people in their heroic defense of their soil. Against this defense, Hitler beat out his paranoiac brains. The Russian people had and have our admiration. We look forward to the time when their native virtues shall break the bonds of mental and moral regimentation and they shall stand erect among the free peoples of the earth.

The prewar parallel of Hitler and the Politburo is truly convincing. What about postwar history? Does the Russian story run true to the established predatory pattern? It does. Her record since the war is a continuation of her prewar course, but more deftly planned and executed as she has gained experience with her new subversive weapon, which is communism. The governments of the Balkan states, of Poland, of Hungary, and finally of Czechoslovakia, have fallen into her hands, more and more unwillingly as outrage succeeded outrage. The increasing skill with which the weapon of communism was used more than matched that increasing unwillingness.

This follows the Hitler program, but with a difference. Hitler's nazism was a nonexportable commodity. It was attractive only to the German mentality. Elsewhere it aroused fear and disgust. It is different with Stalin's communism. We know only too well that it is attractive to the soft-minded intellectual, hopefully regarded by the unfortunate, and avidly grasped by the underworld. Nazism was a poor weapon of world conquest. Communism is ideally adapted to this purpose. It operates secretly when such action is most effective. It weakens society at every level, from the gang "hide-out" to the university chair. When it breaks out in open violence, it springs from concealed sources upon the very vital nerve centers of the government and the people it has set itself to conquer. Nazism was insane. Communism is devilishly intelligent and effective.

If communism is, then, so dangerous and effective, why is not it the enemy? Why is not this an ideological war? Why not fight it as such? Mr. President, there is, I believe, more than one reason why we would make a mistake in so doing.

In the first place, we would fall flat into the trap set by Russian propaganda. From the days of Karl Marx on, it has been orthodox doctrine that the capitalist world will endeavor by force to destroy communism. The faithful are told that the two cannot live in the world together. We must make it plain, on the other hand, that we recognize the right of a free people to freely choose communism if they so desire. The fact that they have never so chosen—except as Russia itself is the dubious exception—is aside from the point. The right to so choose remains. It must be recognized and clearly stated.

It is as a tool of conquest that we should oppose communism outside of our own country; and we oppose it because we oppose the course of limitless predatory imperialism on which Russia is embarked.

That sheer conquest was the motivating purpose became clear in the sight of the world when Marshal Tito, a Communist, declared his intention of preserving the independence of Yugoslavia. Whether the revolt was real or, as some have believed, feigned, it nevertheless brought from the Politburo a clear, definite statement that such independence is not permitted. Communist countries have as truly lost national freedom as the individual Communist has lost personal freedom of thought and action.

Another result of our recognizing world conquest as the threat against which we must arm ourselves should be to give a new direction, a new frankness, a new force, and a new brevity to our debates with the Soviet spokesmen in the United Nations. They stand there self-convicted and they should be so treated.

The most important thing and the one to which I would particularly draw the attention of this body is that our relations with the Russian people will become more clear. To the extent that we can reach them we can assure them that we have no intention of fighting communism in Russia. The Western World is not encircling communism as such. It is determined to restrain a Communist Soviet government which, beginning with an unprovoked attack on little Finland, has followed a consistent course of outrageous conquest up to the present moment. Against such monumental brigandage the world perforce must arm itself. When Russia ceases her brigandage and frees the lands she has enslaved the world can disarm, for it has no other enemy. Then the Russian people can devote themselves, with our aid, to that better material and spiritual life which the resources of their country and the industry of its people can so easily supply.

As it is, we have left no possibility of opening up a door of understanding and hope in the wall which separates us from the Russian people. Every step we have taken and will take substantiates the fears with which they have been indoctrinated. Unless we can alter the course of our policy toward an effective and friendly political approach to these people, it will become clear that we and their government have constructed a slide which leads toward war. Without action to the contrary the North Atlantic Pact and the new lend-lease may only grease that slide.

Let us become more specific and see what is involved in opening a vigorous political offensive. The first thing we want to decide is this: What word do we want to get to the Russian people?

We can put plainly and simply in their own language the way Russia looks to the rest of the world. We can describe the way in which our fears have grown as we have seen the Russian Government conquer in turn Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Balkans, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. Such a list of conquests is unprecedented in all the years since the campaigns of Napoleon. And all of this has been happening at a time when the United States has released the Philippines and Greaf Britain has withdrawn its governmcnt from the control of India and Burma. The Western nations move toward liberty. Russia advances on the path of totalitarian conquest. She fills the world with fear.

Against such a ravening wolf among the nations of the world the world must arm itself. It arms itself in defense, not encirclement. The government against which we arm ourselves is not only our enemy, but it is also as much the enemy of the Russian people. To support its policy of unremitting conquest Russia must keep itself continuously in a state of military effectiveness. It must spend a large proportion of the nation's wealth on its military establishment instead of producing the food, the clothing, the shelter and the satisfactions of life which might otherwise come to as industrious and sturdy a people as the inhabitants of that unhappy country.

We are all on the side of the Russian people. We want to help them. But we cannot help them so long as the government of which they are subjects reveals itself as a conquering power with insatiable ambitions.

This is all very well, but it may properly be asked how we are to get in touch with the Russian people and by what means we can wage this political offensive. There are a number of ways in which we can do this, some of them presently available, others available in the near future, and still others which reach to the farthest bounds of our native resources of inventive imagination.

The Voice of America, with its messages revised to fit this political offensive, becomes the first means. To a small percentage of the Russian people the messages can carry this story of the way in which Russian policy affects the rest of the world and makes necessary a serious preparation for war which would otherwise be unnecessary. The Voice of America can carry the message that the world is afraid of Russia. It can show plainly why it is and must be afraid. It can show why it must arm against the threat which Russia presents. It can show that there is no other reason whatsoever for arming, and that if their country will pursue the policies which Great Britain and the United States have pursued since the war in releasing their control of subject nations, then the burden of war and preparation for war can be lifted from the backs of the inhabitants of the aggressor nation.

Among the other means now available, or soon to be available, is propaganda by way of guided missiles and remotely controlled planes, which are essentially the same thing. It is only a sluggish and uncreative imagination which supposes that these devices can be used for war only and not for peace. Their first use should be to rain down from the heavens pamphlets and handbills onto the Russian citizens so that those living

in Russia may be this means learn why it is that the rest of the world fears Russia and arms against it.

A little more thought, a little more of that same ingenuity which devised the automatic training mechanism for anti-aircraft guns and the propinquity fuze can devise means of spreading a heavenly broadcast over the great plains of eastern Europe. Captive balloons released from planes or by other means can support broadcasting mechanism on local wavelengths or even loudspeaker mechanisms connected with phonograph records.

We must turn the fertility of imagination and the scientific knowledge which envisions such projects to immediately useful ends. Is there any reason, Mr. President, why war alone should stimulate so effectively the scientific engineering and inventive mind? Should not the possibility of living at peace with a nation which constitutes the world's sole threat stimulate to an even more rapid pace the ingenuity, the inventiveness, the skill, and the experience which are so easily aroused and organized for purposes of destruction?

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, that the creative spirit of America can direct itself toward these peaceful ends as it has toward those of war and destruction. There is needed only a vision of the depth of necessity which envelops us.

Let us now move from imagination to practical problems. We have achieved the means. We get our message across to the Russian people. What do we hope to accomplish thereby? What can we accomplish? It must be admitted that we may have little expectation that the Russian people will rise against those who have mistaught and misguided them, yet that possibility must not be dismissed. It is not at all clear in our minds that the great majority of the people of all races are completely sold on the Communist idea and submit themselves willingly to Politburo tyranny. What is possible is this: That there can be a growing distrust. Their morale as slaves of the Politburo can be lowered. The difficulties of the Politburo can be multiplied. By the grim necessity for survival that group of gangsters may conceivably be led to divert their efforts away from conquest, to serving the interests of the Russian people whose fortunes lie in their hands.

In any event, we can shift from our present defensive in which we spend billions of dollars to counteract troubles which cost our adversaries mere millions of dollars. Instead of that, we can be the trouble makers in this contest. We can disturb the abject obedience of the victims of the Politburo. We can compel that body to change its purposes and reorient its policies.

We can do all this by means which lower the prestige of Russia in the world at large and heighten our own. Instead of being the victims of the cold war, we can become the victors, and the continuing cost of that war will in the process decrease, dwindle, and hopefully disappear.

Mr. President, this discourse would be our of order in a legislative body with less freedom of speech than we are accustomed to. It is not directed toward immediate pending legislation, for I am not clear at this moment as to just what form enabling legislation should take. It is, for the present, simply a collection of highly important ideas.

Early in my membership of this body I was told by one of the experienced reporters in the seats above the platform on which you, Mr. President, are seated that there were only two things that make news. They are, sometimes, a new and interesting bill and, always, a fight. Ideas do not make news.

Yet it seems to me imperative that in some way these ideas must make news. The question I am raising is as to whether I am justified in voting against the Atlantic Pact, in which I believe, to register my profound conviction that the Atlantic Pact does not, by itself or even when implemented with armed assistance, lead toward peace, and that it is foolish and dangerous for us to continue in this purely defensive and incidentally expensive posture of defense. What we are doing is so inadequate and so terrifically costly as compared with the result being achieved by our adversary that any contribution made toward reversing the situation should be brought forcefully to the attention of everyone.

It is due to the strength of the convictions which I have just expressed that I say at this time it is entirely conceivable that I shall find myself voting against the Atlantic Pact unless there is some strong evidence of a change in attitude and policy on the part of this Nation in the direction of a strong political offensive which is fundamentally friendly to the people of Russia.

Furthermore, I feel strongly enough about this matter to hope that there may be other Senators who will join me in this reluctant enterprise.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk numerous routine nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that these nominations be confirmed and the President be immediately notified. They are reported from the committee unanimously. There was no objection filed with the committee, or at any other place, so far as I know, as to any of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the nomination of Mr. Stephen T. Early, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense, with the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Armed Services that the nomination be confirmed and the President be notified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator believe that the absence of a quorum should be suggested, because of the importance of this nomination? I am a member of the committee, and I know that the committee reported the nomination unanimously. I merely ask the Senator for his opinion on the question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if I were to use my occult powers I am sure that if there were present the full membership of the Senate there would be no objection to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Early. Because the defense establishment has been completely metamorphosed in the past 2 weeks by the retirement of personnel, I think it is in the Nation's interest to restaff it at the earliest possible moment. I ask the consent of the temporary leader on the minority side that this nomination be confirmed, as in executive session, and the President notified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I know of no objection on this side of the aisle. If the Senator thinks it is not necessary to suggest the absence of a quorum, I shall not do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT LONG-RANGE PROVING GROUND FOR GUIDED MISSILES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I desire to preface the remarks I shall make concerning the pending measure by saying that, as a Member of the House of Representatives I supported the bill which created the Tennessee Valley Authority. I desired to preserve the investments we had made at Muscle Shoals during World War I to develop there a plant which could produce nitrogen and other war materials in the event of another war, and I desired to see created by the Government a yardstick by which we might more accurately and clearly evaluate a proper charge for electric energy to be purchased from private utilities. I rejoice in the benefits which have come to that area of the Nation from the activities of TVA, notwithstanding the fact that they have cost the Government, as I understand, in the neighborhood of $900,000,000. I hope my heart is free from sectionalism and envy. I hope I am sufficiently broadminded to realize that prosperity anywhere in the Nation is good for the whole Nation, and I want to see all sections of the Nation built up with good farming land, with prosperous farming, and properly balanced with industries, which, of course, need power produced by coal, by natural gas, or by electricity.

And, Mr. President, I would be false to every impulse of my heart if I did not also acknowledge my deep personal gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] for the many favors he has shown me, not only since I have been a Member of this body, but throughout the 14 years in which I was a Member of the House. There is no Member of this body for whom I have a higher regard or a warmer affection. There is no Member of this body whom I would more greatly rejoice to honor and to favor. I would go the length of my cable-tow to do anything I could for my distinguished friend from Tennessee in a matter in which he might be interested. I am sure he realizes, as I hope every other Member of this distinguished body will realize, that I would not stand on this floor and oppose a project in which the senior Senator from Tennessee was interested, except from a keen sense of public duty.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment to strike out the New Johnsonville steam plant, for three reasons:

First. I do not think Congress has the power to authorize such a steam plant.

Second. I think power to firm up the hydroelectric power of that area can be secured from a private utility without cost to the Federal Government.

Third. I think we are facing such a serious crisis in our fiscal affairs that prudence dictates that we shall not embark upon any project of a costly character to be fulfilled in the next 4, 5, or 6 years unless it be demonstrated that it is one of urgent and immediate necessity.

Mr. President, I desire briefly to elaborate on those three points. I shall not argue whether or not the TVA Act authorizes the construction of steam plants. I find no direct authority in the act to that effect, but there are two indirect references. In the general grant of authority we find enumerated powers, including the power to build power dams, transmission lines, and powerhouses, and then we find the words "other structures." It has been argued, and perhaps with some merit, that the words "other structures" include a steam plant, if the Authority wishes to build a steam plant. I had assumed, from the general tenor of court decisions in construing language of that character, that when we use the word "other" as an embracive term, what follows must be of the same character as the projects enumerated, and that "other" could not bring in new and entirely different types of projects from the general plan which was specifically authorized.

I find also in the statute creating TVA a reference, under the head of how the Authority shall keep the books, to the effect that so much shall be allocated to power, so much shall be allocated to fertilizer, so much shall be allocated to this or that, and so much shall be allocated to steam plants. It has been argued to me that that recognizes the power to build a steam plant. Perhaps it does. In any event, TVA has built a steam plant already, but I think under circumstances quite different from those attending the pending proposal.

Mr. President, I wish at this point to read the testimony before the House committee of the very able Mr. Gordon R. Clapp. I read from page 16 of the House hearings on the first deficiency bill for 1949. Mr. Clapp said:

> At the time that acquisition was made, TVA not only acquired, for example, the Hales Bar Dam which had been built on the Tennessee River and operated by the Tennessee Electric Power Co., but we also bought several large steam plants, including a steam plant at Hales Bar Dam, a steam plant near Nashville, Tenn., a steam plant at Parksville, Tenn., and so forth.
>
> Then, in 1940, through the regular appropriation procedure Congress authorized the TVA to build the Watts Bar steam plant near Watts Bar Dam which was under construction at that time. That steam plant at Watts Bar has a capacity of 240,000 kilowatts. Today out of a total system capacity of some 2,650,000 kilowatts capacity, 450,000 kilowatts is in steam plants.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that that steam plant was built along with a hydroelectric-power project, and clearly and definitely for the purpose of the effective operation of the water power.

I do not challenge the right of the Congress to authorize the construction of a steam plant to serve a governmental agency, and it would be useless to challenge it, because I think it has already been admitted, in one way or another, that when we build a hydroelectric plant under the power of Congress to regulate commerce, and for the other purposes, namely, flood control, and the like, on which those dams primarily rest, we contemplate the right to utilize the potential power that can be created at the dam concerned. So we put in a powerhouse and generator to utilize the power.

The next inference from the first inference—although we used to be taught in law school, in studying evidence, that we could not draw an inference from an inference—the second inference from the first inference is that if we build the power plant for hydroelectric power and find periods of low water, and the hydroelectric power is not being efficiently and properly utilized, we can then install a stand-by steam plant to firm up the power, as it is said, and supplement it, without violating any constitutional prohibition against the Government going into business in competition with private industry.

Mr. President, I feel that the present proposal, to build a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., which will furnish sufficient new power to supply a city of a million people, is the first real test of congressional action in connection with that policy. If there has ever been another steam plant built under congressional authority, except the one I have just mentioned as referred to in the testimony of Mr. Clapp, I do not know about it; and, as I pointed out, the construction of that steam plant was not challenged at the time, and it has not been challenged since, so far as I know, because it was built at the same time the dam was being constructed, and clearly for the purpose of making effective use of the hydroelectric power which would result from the construction of the dam.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. An examination of the record which the junior Senator from Michigan put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday indicates clearly that the power was also to be used for national defense, and there is no dispute on that question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In reply to my distinguished colleague from Michigan, I will say that of course the Federal Government has the right to build any kind of plant it desires, hydroelectric, steam, or any other kind of plant, which would contribute to the national defense. I admitted that at the outset. I also admit that if there is a steam plant at the location we are discussing, with hundreds or thousands of kilowatts of new power to be produced, it could be a contribution to national defense, provided a factory or series of factories were constructed to utilize the power.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it should be pointed out that the appropriation for the Watts Bar Dam and the appropriation for the Watts Bar steam plant came at different times. In other words, the Watts Bar steam plant was not built in conjunction with the Watts Bar Dam. Furthermore, the record shows, and the fact is, I may say to the Senator from Virginia, that the Watts Bar steam plant is used to firm up not merely the power coming from Watts Bar, because it produces a great deal more power than the Watts Bar Dam does, but it is used to firm up the power from the entire sys-

tem, just as the New Johnsonville steam plant would be used to do.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am not in a position to challenge the statement of the eminent Senator from Tennessee. I am simply relying on what Mr. Clapp testified a few weeks ago before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations when he said that, "Congress authorized the TVA to build the Watts Bar steam plant near Watts Bar Dam which was under construction at that time"—and I underscore the language "which was under construction at that time."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. For the information of the Senator from Virginia I will say it takes a great deal of time to build a dam. So the appropriation for the dam was made at least a year before the appropriation was made for the steam plant. I cannot see how it makes very much difference whether the steam plant is 1 mile or 30 miles from a dam, so long as it is used to firm up the power which is generated at the hydroelectric dam.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is probably correct, but before I conclude I shall speak of one 250 miles from the dam whose power it is supposed to firm up. I do not claim, however, that the $54,000,000, or whatever the exact sum may be, which is going to be added to the $900,000,000 it is proposed to spend in order to expand power potentialities of the Tennessee Valley, is going to break our backs. What I am leading up to is that I feel we are called upon now to take action on what will undoubtedly be characterized as a precedent for every proposal for a steam plant that may be presented in the future, whether it is to firm up power anywhere near a stream or anything else. In other words, since the matter cannot be tested in court under the general law, it is very important for Congress carefully to consider whether or not we shall establish a precedent which will rise up to plague us in every section of the country that cannot have a hydroelectric power plant, but which would like very much to have Government power even though it has to be produced by a steam plant.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Do I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Virginia to say that only one steam plant has been built by the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is my understanding. The Authority has bought all the rest of them. It is my understanding that only one steam plant has been authorized by the Congress in the whole history of the Nation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is present in the Senate Chamber. I want to ask the Senator from Virginia if he disagrees with this statement made by the Senator from Alabama yesterday, which appears on page 4381 of the RECORD. The Senator from Alabama then said:

> There is nothing new about steam plants so far as the Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned. The Authority has bought steam plants; it has built steam plants; it has operated steam plants; it has maintained steam plants; in fact, the Tennessee Valley Authority now owns, maintains, and operates approximately 10 steam plants in the Tennessee Valley.
>
> The Tennessee Valley Authority acquired some of these steam plants when it purchased the properties of the Tennessee Power Co. The Tennessee Power Co. had built some of the steam plants as integral parts of its power system.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will say that everything in the statement is correct except we should take the letter "s" from the word "plants" and leave it "has built a steam plant." It is my understanding that the Tennessee Valley Authority has bought all the other steam plants or inherited them from some previous operations, but that the one I have just referred to is the only one the Tennessee Valley Authority has built, and it is the only one the Government has built anywhere in the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct in saying that there has been one steam plant built by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is the steam plant known as the Watts Bar steam plant; but before the Tennessee Valley Authority took over the Government properties and operation on the Tennessee River, the Government of the United States had built three steam plants in connection with the Tennessee project. It had built the Gorgas steam plant which, incidentally, after the war was sold to the Alabama Power Co. under a contract which was made during the war. Some question arose as to whether or not the Government under this contract was under obligation to sell the Gorgas plant to the power company, and President Harding took the position, and I imagine we will agree with him, that whether there was any legal obligation or not, there could be no question about the word of the Government. So the Government built the Gorgas steam plant in connection with the Tennessee Valley properties. The Government built what we know as steam plant No. 1 in connection with its properties. The Government also built what we know as steam plant No. 2 in connection with its properties. Since that time, in June 1940, the Congress made appropriations and the TVA proceeded to build what we know as the Watts Bar steam plant. So the Government of the United States has built four steam plants in connection with the Tennessee River Government properties.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I tried to make it perfectly clear that I conceded the right of the Government to build a steam plant or any other kind of plant for Government use. The steam plants built in the Tennessee Valley area before the TVA was chartered were definitely Government projects for the production of munitions of war. That statement cannot be challenged. The whole thing was started as a war project, and these dams were built as such. The Muscle Shoals and the other dams and the steam plants represent definitely governmental action for governmental purposes. Nobody has ever challenged the right of the Government to do that. But I have tried to make it clear that since we started, during the depression years, mind you, to develop power with governmental aid, there has been but one plant built, and that is the one I have mentioned in connection with the testimony of Mr. Clapp, which he said was built during the construction of the dam. The two were so close together, I say, that nobody in Congress challenged the construction.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator from Virginia would perhaps be more accurate if instead of using the words "the Government built it for war," he should use the words "the Government built these properties for national defense." I emphasize "national defense."

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will accept that expression. I do not like to say we do anything for war. We do not like to go to war. Sometimes we are pushed into war and we simply defend ourselves.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. At the time these plants were authorized by the Congress and the legislation was passed we were not at war, but the plants were, as the Senator has said, in the first instance national defense plants.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I depart now from the theme I have had in mind to say that if I can make my position crystal clear by what I am saying about the steam plant project, this particular project, which I anticipate will be approved, and certainly I do not flatter myself that what I am going to say will change a single vote in this distinguished body, it will have served a useful purpose when proposals are made for other steam plants, that cannot qualify, as it is claimed this one can qualify, as a part of a definitely authorized power of the Federal Government.

Do I understand the senior Senator from Alabama to claim that he is relying upon the commerce power of the Federal Government to build a steam plant primarily for the purpose of firming up power from a hydroelectric plant which we concede the Government had the right to authorize?

Mr. HILL. I should say both commerce and national defense—either or both.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from Alabama believe that if some State which has no power plant at all decides that it wants to get into the national defense program and bring new industries into the State, which, of course, would be turned over for war operations in the event of war, but which would

otherwise build up prosperity in peacetime, it would have the right to come here and ask Congress to build a steam plant?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's question is rather involved. He talks about bringing in new industries. TVA has not brought in new industries. It has developed the indigenous resources of the Valley.

Whether or not in the case suggested by the Senator from Virginia Congress would have a right to build a steam plant would depend upon the circumstances. If the Government built a great dam for a governmental purpose, and it became necessary, in order to operate the dam on the most businesslike, economical basis, to build a steam plant so as to firm up certain power from the dam, I should say that the Government would have the right to build the steam plant to firm up the power from that dam.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is fully conceded; but with all due deference, the reply is not responsive to my question. Will the Senator please give me a clear-cut and distinct reply to this question: Does the Congress have the power to build a steam plant wherever it desires, and wherever a community would like to have it? I should like to have the Senator answer yes or no to that question.

Mr. HILL. I should say that the Congress has no power to build a steam plant except for governmental purposes, or purposes incident to governmental purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is begging the question.

Mr. HILL. My friend from Michigan says that is begging the question. It is not begging the question at all. Congress has certain powers. Among them is the power to deal with national defense and commerce. I should say that for the purpose of national defense or for commerce, the Government would have certain powers with reference to building a steam plant. A steam plant is necessary for the best and most economical, businesslike operation of a dam. If it is built for commerce or for navigation, in order that there may not be waste, and in order that the Government may realize upon its investment in the dam, then I should say that the Government could build a steam plant. In the Ashwander case the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Government, having built a dam for defense or commerce purposes, could also build transmission lines so that it might sell the power from the dam.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am very glad to have these suggestions, but I hope that my colleagues will help me to conform to the rules of the Senate. I can yield for a question only, unless I wish to be taken from the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall try to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that what the Senator has said might be taken as having some application to my answer to the Senator's question? Is it not true that the Senator asked me a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true. I think we face a very vital decision.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that when the Senator asked me a question and yielded to me to reply, he himself was in violation of the rule?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Possibly I was; but if I have offended, it was in the interest of making a record which would show whether or not we intend to put the Government into the steam-plant business, the steel business, the flour business, or any other kind of business a community may want, or whether we intend to maintain the constitutional limitations upon governmental action and protect our inherited system of private enterprise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator agree with me that it is not always in the interest of the public business to enforce the rules too strictly? Is it not a fact that sometimes the informal discussion which takes place on the floor of the Senate contributes more to the public business than too strict an enforcement of the rule with reference to a Senator yielding only for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with that statement so far as debate is concerned.

I regret that I cannot conceive that we can squint now and then at constitutional provisions, and inch farther and farther along in the direction of undermining that instrument, and hope in perpetuity to preserve that great charter of our personal freedom.

Consider what has happened in Great Britain. The British have no written constitution. They can nationalize the banks. Our Congress cannot take over all the private banks. The British can nationalize the coal mines. Our Congress cannot take over the coal mines. The British can nationalize anything, until they have 100-percent socialism in Great Britain; and no instrument can stay them, and no court decision can block their progress.

I give thanks that they have held up on the plan to nationalize the steel industry. I should like to flatter myself into believing that the conversation which I had with Sir Stafford Cripps at a dinner in Washington last October may have had something to do with that. I told him in all frankness that I was 100 percent for helping Great Britain and the democracies of Europe, but that it chilled us when we saw Great Britain going to a system of socialism, which we did not think would function as effectively as a system of private enterprise. I told him that in my opinion, as we came back here the first of this year to vote additional ECA and other funds, it would hamper us in getting adequate support if Members of the Senate felt that the British Government was going down the road to socialism, which we felt would eventually nullify all the aid we have given them in behalf of their rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I should like to return to the suggestion which I made, that I feel this is a decision which may influence other decisions, and the other decisions may lead to further decisions which eventually may lead us to the out-and-out proposition that the Congress has the right and power to authorize a steam plant, a steel mill, or any other kind of plant it pleases anywhere in the Nation. Eventually such plants may be used for national defense or something else, but actually such a program would be an experiment in socialism, and I believe that it would be in direct violation of our written Constitution.

As soon as we can get to it we shall have before us the supply bill for the Interior Department, which carries appropriations for the Reclamation Service. I shall not attempt to be accurate to the dollar, but I will say off-hand that the total appropriation for that service is about $400,000,000. I find in that appropriation an item in the budget of $63,000,000 for a beautiful area of California called the Central Valley, extending for approximately 500 miles. The land is very fertile, and the people are fine and wonderful. They lack water. To give them water Congress has spent in the Central Valley, up to June 30, 1948, $229,513,223.

The Reclamation Service has planned projects the total cost of which will be $440,069,000, nearly twice the amount which has already been spent. The budget included an item of $63,000,000. The House reduced it 15 percent, leaving it at about $53,500,000 for the Central Valley for the coming fiscal year.

In that appropriation there is an item of $2,000,000 to start a steam plant which will ultimately cost $32,700,000. It is called the Delta plant. It is to be located at what I assume is a relatively small place, called Antioch. I never have visited that section. I hope and pray to live long enough to do so. I know there are many wonders in that area for me to see. California is the second largest State in the Union. Some of my ancestors migrated to California when things were a little tough in Virginia, when it was said that there was gold to be found in California. I have many friends living there, and I have always enjoyed service in the House and Senate with the distinguished Representatives from California who come here as outstanding ambassadors of a great people. But, Mr. President, I tell you, following close on the decision that we make about the New Johnsonville steam plant will come a decision on the Antioch steam plant, which it is alleged will firm up the power from the Shasta Dam, 250 miles north of Antioch.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know the distance electric power can be economically transferred?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It used to be 200 miles. Now we are told it is 300 miles. I do not know. A better quality of copper wire is available now, and it seems there is some way of cutting down the resist-

ance of wire which is used for the transmission of electric energy. I would not know for sure, but I certainly should say that even under the most favorable circumstances 300 miles would be the limit.

Mr. FERGUSON. So when a steam plant is proposed to be located 250 miles from the hydroelectric plant——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then that is stretching it rather thin.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall come to that phase of the matter a little later.

Undoubtedly, Mr. President, if, as, and when the Antioch steam plant is constructed under the Reclamation Service, then we shall be told, "That is to firm up the power from the Shasta Dam." The power from it comes down the east side of the Central Valley to Antioch, and transmission lines are being constructed to Antioch or to that section of the State; and ultimately it will be desired, no doubt, to have the line go to the southern end of the Central Valley, an additional distance of approximately 250 miles, because I am told that the area is approximately 500 miles long. On several occasions the Reclamation Service has tried to obtain from Congress authority to build an extension line on the west side of the Central Valley, to start at the Shasta Dam and come down on the west side of the valley; but the Reclamation Service encountered opposition from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which said, "You have no right to parallel our lines and put us out of business." Since the Reclamation Service could not obtain from Congress authority to parallel the private-utility lines coming down from the Shasta district, now the Reclamation Service proposes to start at the other end and construct a $32,000,000 power plant; and if they get it, no doubt they will work up to the Shasta Dam, if they can obtain authority to do so.

But the point I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, is this: Unless we can clearly distinguish between the New Johnsonville project and the power of the Federal Government to build a steam plant anywhere it pleases, we shall be led from one thin argument to a still thinner argument, until finally we shall have no restraint left under the Constitution, unless we adopt the amendment which I understand is later to be proposed by the Senator from Michigan, namely, an amendment to give the taxpayers the right to go into a court in the District of Columbia and test the issue.

My second point in opening this discussion was that it is my information and belief that if it is necessary to firm up the power from one or more of the hydroelectric plants in the Tennessee Valley, the current necessary in that connection can be procured from private industry. My reason for saying that is that at our hearing a witness by the name of Philip Sporn appeared. He said he was president of the American Gas & Electric Co. His testimony will be found at page 352 of the committee hearings. I shall read only several paragraphs of it because his entire testimony was rather long, and I do not wish to encumber the RECORD or impinge upon the patience of other Senators. Mr. Sporn in his statement to the committee, among other things, said this:

> The American Gas & Electric Co. is a holding company, one of the first to secure approval under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. It owns all the stock of a series of operating utilities with an integrated electric system serving parts of Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. It supplies electricity to over a million customers.
>
> SUMMARY
>
> The situation of American Gas & Electric Co. in relation to TVA and our position in regard to the New Johnsonville steam plant can be summarized as follows:
>
> 1. Since 1941, American Gas & Electric has had contractual arrangements with TVA which have provided limited benefits to both systems. On our part, however, we have always urged the Authority to join with us in exploring the opportunities for a comprehensive coordination or power-pooling arrangement. We believe that a coordination arrangement could convert several hundred thousands of kilowatts of our off-peak steam and of TVA's secondary hydro into more valuable firm power. The result would be a saving to both systems of many millions of dollars in capital investment that would otherwise have to be put into new firm generating capacity. These savings would benefit the Federal Treasury and the owners of American Gas as well as the customers of both systems. The savings, moreover, would be further reflected in conservation of electrical equipment and other resources.

Mr. President, I now turn to page 358 of the same committee hearings, and in the testimony of the same witness I find his conclusion, as follows:

> CONCLUSION
>
> The American Gas & Electric Co. opposes the present proposal to appropriate funds to commence construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant.
>
> We believe that a genuine study of comprehensive coordination between TVA and systems like our own should precede any construction of new steam facilities in the TVA area.
>
> We believe that such a study would disclose that coordination is a feasible and, for the present and some years to come, a preferable alternative to steam installations in the TVA area.
>
> We believe further that steam expansion by TVA, which was initially conceived as a hydro system incidental to navigation and flood control, is a radical departure from the present law and requires a substantive amendment to the original TVA statute.
>
> Any authorization to install steam facilities would convert TVA from a naturally limited hydro system to a system with unlimited possibilities as to capacity. Therefore, we believe that if and when Congress undertakes to pass enabling legislation to permit the construction of steam facilities, such legislation should, at the same time, deal with the problem of territorial boundaries for the TVA and with the problem of rate subsidies.

Mr. President, I cannot put my finger on the testimony, but I understand that the record will show that Mr. Clapp, of TVA, informed that company that he did not care to discuss that proposal with it until he had first obtained his steam plant. No doubt after he obtained the steam plant he would come to the consideration of the last concluding line of the testimony of that private utility executive, who said that it should deal with the problem of territorial boundaries for the TVA.

Probably he would take the position which was so eloquently and frankly taken yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who said that the production and distribution of electric energy was inherently of a monopolistic character, and that the Government and private industry could not hope successfully to function in the same area.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I quoted to that effect Mr. Wendell Willkie, former president of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., which was the holding company of the Alabama Power Co., the Tennessee Electric Power Co., the Georgia Power Co., and several other power companies in the Midwest, one in Ohio, and some in other States. I quoted Mr. Willkie's statement to that effect.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am quoting the distinguished Senator's remarks from memory. I listened with great interest to him, and I realize that he quoted Mr. Wendell Willkie. But I understood, and naturally assumed, that he was quoting him with approval.

Mr. HILL. I did, and I do. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to make a brief observation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Senator will make an observation with a question at the end of it, I reckon I can yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in connection with this public utility, particularly the power business——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HILL. No. I appreciate that. I have put it in the form of a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator allow me to straighten this out?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let the Senator from Alabama ask the question.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Virginia, is it not true that in the power business it is neither businesslike nor to the interest either of the producers of electricity or the consumers of electricity, that there be parallel lines?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think competing parallel lines are very wasteful, and where they exist, I think I can make a hasty guess as to which competitor will eventually come out ahead. I do not believe where a private industry tries to buck and compete with the Government the Government is going to lose indefinitely. I think the Government will win.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. With reference to Mr. Sporn's statement, from which the Senator read, I note that he simply wrote a letter to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, enclosing therewith what he called a memorandum. It is from the memorandum, so designated by Mr. Sporn, that the Senator from Virginia has quoted. Does

the Senator know why Mr. Sporn, if he really was interested in the matter and really felt the compulsion of the seriousness of his case, did not appear personally, or ask to appear personally before the committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assume it was because we instructed our clerk to inform all witnesses we were pressed for time, we could not give them more than 10 minutes for oral statement, we would prefer that they cut it down to 5, but they could submit all the statements they wanted for the record. Some, rather than come from New York orally to say in 5 minutes what would take them an hour to cover in extenso, merely sent their statements down to the committee, and we placed them in the record.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, does he not think that if Mr Sporn had been very much interested in the matter, he would have appeared personally before the committee, even though he had but 5 minutes in which to state his case, knowing that if he appeared for 5 minutes in person, he would still have the right to put anything else he wished in the record?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Interest is one thing; hope and expectation is another. We heard it said in this Chamber not long ago that "Hope long deferred maketh the heart sick." Mr. Sporn had been negotiating for some time with Mr. Clapp to get this arrangement. Mr. Clapp had told him he did not care to discuss it until he got the steam plant.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the author of my quotation.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator will recall I made a correction of that, the next day, stating that the Senator from New Hampshire was correct in his quotation, namely, that "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

Mr. ROBERTSON. I had sufficient confidence in the Senator from Missouri and his unbounded knowledge of the Bible that, when he challenged "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick," and said "Hope long deferred maketh the heart sick" was correct, I merely jumped to the conclusion that I would back up my friend from Missouri on anything he said about the Bible. But, anyway, it is a question of hope that is involved, and the witness from New York, I am satisfied, did not have any hope, but he did want his views incorporated in the record.

I must hurry on, because, frankly, I have spoken much longer than I had intended, to my third point, which has some reference to our fiscal situation. I wish to emphasize the fact that the steam plant is not going to break us. I wish to emphasize the fact that I do not begrudge any benefit to the great area in which it is to be built, the prosperity which will contribute undoubtedly to the prosperity of the whole. I am sure that if we had all this power there, it would be possible, if we should become involved in another war, to convert some plants in that area or build new plants which could contribute to the national defense. But I think it will not be challenged that this steam plant will not be built and completed under 4 years, and it may take longer. I hope our statesmanship will have vision enough and ability enough to work out some solution for the cold war, which is costing us now $8,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 a year, and that the cold war will not eventually be succeeded by a shooting war. I think it is possible to work that out. Certainly I earnestly hope that it can be done.

In the meantime, though, Mr. President, we face what I regard as a very serious financial situation. The pending bill is the first appropriation bill upon which we have been called to act, and it is a deficiency bill. What is a deficiency bill? A deficiency bill is a bill to supplement authorized and pending appropriations. All the money authorized in a deficiency bill is expected to be spent before the end of the fiscal year in which the bill is passed. In other words, when we pass the first deficiency bill carrying approximately $500,000,000, we contemplate that an additional $500,000,000 over and above the appropriations for various purposes contained in the regular budget will be spent between now and June 30 of the present year.

Is that all? I regret it is not. Before we could act on the first deficiency bill, the House passed another deficiency bill. The second deficiency bill carries about $700,000,000. That is $1,200,000,000 more than is in the regular budget, to be spent before June 30, 1949, assuming the Senate Committee concurs in the House action, and I have no reason to assume that it will not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that yesterday the House passed the third deficiency bill that will call for $595,890,000, which came to the Senate today, and that there is an emergency committee meeting at 1:30 which we are unable to leave the floor to attend?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, I fully realize that, and I shall mention that as No. 3, after mentioning 1 and 2.

Mr. FERGUSON. The third deficiency bill is for more than one-half billion dollars.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the third deficiency bill that the House acted on today. We are told to act on it in a hurry, because the Veterans' Administration will be completely out of cash within 10 days, and they need $595,000,000 more to meet current obligations.

When the President sent Congress his budget in January of this year, he anticipated a deficit of $600,000,000. I have been told that he then contemplated some deficiency requests. I cannot believe that he contemplated sending up a deficiency request for $1,700,000,000. I cannot help but believe therefore that the anticipated deficit for the fiscal year will be more than $600,000,000. How much more, I have no way of knowing. But if I were to hazard a guess at the moment, I should guess that it would be in excess of $1,000,000,000—$1,000,000,000, when 1948 was the year in which the American people had the highest income in the history of the Nation.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that when the President estimated a deficit of $600,000,000 for fiscal 1949 he took into consideration that there would be signed and no doubt ratified a treaty of cooperation, which we call the North Atlantic Pact, or that within a few days after the foreign ministers of 11 cooperative countries met in Washington and signed that historic document, six or seven of these countries would notify us that they wanted and needed immediate military aid. I do not know how much that military aid will be, but I have heard estimates ranging all the way from a billion to $2,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I do not believe that when the President estimated a deficit of $600,000,000 for this fiscal year he knew the Appropriations Committee of the House would increase his recommended appropriation for the armed services from approximately $14,500,000,000 to nearly $16,000,000,000. Yet that is what has happened. There are included 58 air units or squadrons which may be very necessary.

We are considering in full committee the first regular supply bill. The House has acted on all except two supply bills. The Senate Appropriations Committee has not acted, in full committee, on anything except the pending deficiency bill.

I was a little shocked and greatly dismayed when, day before yesterday, I picked up the subcomittee report on one supply bill for the fiscal year 1950 and found that the subcommittee had recommended an increase in the amount of the appropriation recommended by the House of approximately $188,877,000, which makes the total of the bill some $542,000,000 more than the appropriation for the fiscal year 1949.

So, Mr. President, we do not know what we shall appropriate for ECA, but it is likely to be in the neighborhood of $5,000,000,000. We do not know what will be appropriated for lend-lease or some other type of aid under the North Atlantic Pact, but it will certainly be a substantial sum. Even if we take a part of it or much of it from the appropriations for our own defense establishment, we know that every bill which comes before the Senate Appropriations Committee results in the most urgent demands, on all sides, to increase the amount. I am sure every member of the committee knows that to be true. Increases are asked for reclamation projects, river and harbor improvements, flood control, and for all Federal offices. There has not been a single agency or group that has been satisfied with the appropriations recommended by the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. President, I am becoming very uneasy about the situation. I do not expect, of course, to stop anything in the pending first deficiency bill. I know the bill will be approved; I feel satisfied it will be, anyway. But I consider that I owe it to myself and to the great constitutency which I have the honor in part to represent to explain, first, why I shall vote against the establishment of the steam plant, and, second, why I think the adoption of that item, in the absence of a very clear and definite agreement

on the floor of the Senate that it is not to be a precedent for the establishment of steam plants generally over the Nation, may result in putting us in such a position that, wittingly or unwittingly, we may undermine the Constitution and the American system of private enterprise.

Mr. President, I do not want to make any invidious comparisons. I do not want to criticize what is happening in any part of the Nation, but I have told the Senate what is being spent in the Central Valley of California, which is a wonderful area, containing wonderful people. There are only a million and a half persons in that area, but there are pending projects which will cost in excess of $440,000,000. We have already spent in that area a per capita sum, based on the 1943 population, of $192.34. When the project is completed, it will be double that amount. If we multiply 384 by 440,000,000 we will reach an astronomical figure of expenditures for domestic improvements.

Mr. President, I feel that we are facing a solemn choice between conserving our assets, in order that we may remain financially solvent and strong, and directing what available money we have into the most essential undertaking that any nation could have, namely, to stay out of war, because, certainly, nothing could be more expensive or disastrous than another war. Sooner or later I think we must face that choice. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I shall do what I can to cut down foreign aid to the minimum I feel is necessary in order to do an effective and efficient job. I do not want to hamstring it; I do not want to be "too little and too late"; but I feel that if we can make some cuts, it will help us in what I deem to be the most essential undertaking we can have, namely, good, sound projects for ourselves. Some projects certainly cannot be said to be essential. They may be quite desirable and calculated to lift up our general prosperity and standard of living. I do not challenge those things. But, certainly, we cannot do for everyone in the United States what we are doing for a million and a half persons in the Central Valley of California.

Certainly we cannot establish steam plants and power plants all over the Nation. We do not have the funds with which to do it.

Mr. President, my interest in the fiscal affairs of the Federal Government did not commence in January, when I was assigned to the great Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which my distinguished predecessor, Carter Glass, was once the honored chairman. Neither did it begin when I was assigned to the Committee of the House of Representatives which has to raise revenue for the Government, where I participated in writing 12 tax bills, each one of which raised the taxes of the American people. I learned how much easier it is to spend than it is to lift an equivalent tax from the pockets of discouraged and disgruntled taxpayers. My interest in the fiscal affairs of the Government commenced with my nomination to the House of Representatives in the summer of 1932. No one campagined more vigorously than did I in behalf of that splendid platform which was written in Chicago and in which we committed the Democratic Party to economy, and promised, if elected to office, to reduce expenditures of the Government by 25 percent. We found we could not carry out that promise. We found that the depression was so severe and suffering was so great that we would have to do something in the way of a relief program. So I did something in the way of a relief program. I voted for a number of relief measures.

In January 1935 when we had outstanding appropriations and authorizations of $5,000,000,000, we were sent a new relief bill totaling $4,800,000,000. I was literally astounded when I faced up to that bill. To prove to my colleagues that my interest in the fiscal soundness of our Government is not a new and recent one, I shall take the privilege of quoting several paragraphs from a speech I made in the House of Representatives on January 24, 1935, against the appropriation of $4,800,000,000. Before I quote, I wish to admit that the speech, so far as I know, did not change any votes. On the final passage of that $4,800,000,000 bill there were 329 yeas, 78 nays, and 24 not voting. In other words, of 435 Members of the House, only 77 in addition to myself took the position that we were headed for a dangerous experiment in public spending.

When the bill got to the Senate it was passed, yeas 63, nays 16, not voting 11. Of a total Membership of 96 in the Senate, only 16 took the position that we should not appropriate at one time $4,800,000,000 on top of previous appropriations for relief which had not been expended of $5,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I wish to quote, and I hope briefly, from what I said in January 1935 because I frankly think that what I said then is just as true now as it was then, except that the trend has gone far beyond what I anticipated when I made those observations. I quote from the speech I made in the House of Representatives:

My observation of private financial transactions has been that when an individual, firm, or corporation continues to spend more than he or it earns, bankruptcy is the probable end. For 6 years I was legal adviser to the board of supervisors of my home county—the agency that prepares county budgets and levies county taxes. That experience convinced me that a big bonded debt was a great handicap to any county, and that after it reached a certain proportion of taxable assets repudiation would be the result. For 6 years I served in our State senate and for 7 years as the head of a State department. My experience with State financial affairs convinced me that a large bonded indebtedness was a dangerous thing. Following the World War motor transport developed by leaps and bounds in the United States, and with the widespread use of motorcars and trucks came a widespread demand for improved highways on which they might operate. In Virginia there was a bitter and long drawn-out fight over whether these improved highways should be built with the proceeds of a $50,000,000 bond issue or from current revenue. When that issue was ultimately submitted to the Virginia electorate it voted overwhelmingly for a pay-as-you-go policy in road construction. While sister States and political subdivisions thereof were freely spending the proceeds of tremendous bond issues, Virginia and the political subdivisions thereof kept relatively free from bonded debts.

I wish to digress there to say that during and immediately preceding the war years Virginia put into the retirement fund an amount sufficient to pay off completely her debt, a part of which she had inherited from the War Between the States. I continue reading:

As a result, when the depression came, Virginia was better able to weather the storm than many States, and ultimate recovery in Virginia, if the taxpayers of that State are not bowed down by an overwhelming national debt, will be more rapid than in some States. And the financial integrity of the Commonwealth of Virginia was preserved not only by refusing to expend the proceeds of bond issues but by making personal sacrifices during the depression. The appropriations for all State activities were drastically reduced, and the salaries of all State employees were cut, not 5, 10, or 15 percent, but 30 percent.

It is with this background, and representing in the House a section of Virginia that was settled and developed by industrious and thrifty Scotch-Irish and Dutch, that I approached the pending proposal to add to the present appropriated and unexpended sum of $5,000,000,000 an additional appropriation of $4,800,000,000. The pending resolution places the entire sum in the hands of the President to be expended as he thinks best. We have been given assurances that the President will personally supervise the expenditure of this huge sum. In my opinion, that will be physically impossible.

Mr. President, I shall skip a little, and come to this paragraph:

I would not undertake to speak dogmatically as to what is wise and what unwise, what is safe and what unsafe, with respect to a national spending program and a tremendous national debt, but will content myself with the mere expression of the personal opinion that the present spending tendency is neither wise nor safe. I roughly estimate that Virginia's share, as the seventh largest taxpayer in the Nation, of the proposed appropriation will be about $250,000,000, or equal to the entire cost of operating our State government for half a decade. I do not feel that any benefit that Virginia will receive, directly or indirectly, from the total expenditure will be commensurate with the burden of the repayment of Virginia's share of the debt.

When I was a boy an old farmer used to tell me, "The tendency of everything is to be more so." The tendency of a Federal spending program is undoubtedly to be more so. Close on the heels of this bill will come the demand for the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates. I for one do not feel that I could consistently vote for the current appropriation and then deny my comrades of the World War the payment of a debt already contracted on the ground that the national credit and the public welfare could not stand the payment. I will not undertake to enumerate the other demands of group benefit payments and social-reform measures nor the socialistic proposals that have been made that will involve a continuing operating expense as well as direct injury to private business through Government competition. But I do not feel that I am extravagant when I estimate that the demands for the coming fiscal year could easily run our national debt to $40,000,000,000, and since it is so easy to spend when we abandon a tax-levying pay-as-you-go program, our commitments for the 1937 budget could easily reach $50,000,000,000.

Mr. President, that was the prediction I made in January 1935, that commitments could easily run our debt up to $50,000,000,000, which at that time was far in excess of the authorized debt of the Nation.

I look backward from the present-debt situation, when the debt is five times $50,000,000,000. I was greatly alarmed and disturbed at the prospect of a debt of $50,000,000,000. I thought it would be very dangerous to our economy.

Oh, how we can be lulled into a feeling of false security when we embark upon a spending program, and pay for it by deficit financing, the issuance of bonds, which is only one step from printing press money, adding to the public debt, which is passed on for succeeding generations to pay.

I predict, Mr. President, that with the present debt standing at approximately $252,000,000,000 with billions of bonds representing that debt in the hands of banks and corporations, if in a period of great prosperity we deliberately adopt a program of deficit financing, and wind up this year with a deficit of a billion dollars or more, and go into the next year with a prospective deficit of $2,000,000,000 or more, the time will come when those who hold our evidences of debt and promises to pay will try to get rid of them. Once the banks and the corporations call on the Government to redeem, it will break down the open-market operations of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Congress will not find the money to give to the Federal Reserve Board to sustain its open-market operations. If the value of those bonds ever breaks as much as 10 points—and after World War I, 4-percent Liberty bonds went down as much as 20 percent, while our Government bonds now are on the average 2 percent bonds—I predict it will be the beginning of fiscal chaos in this Nation.

It is therefore, Mr. President, primarily not my object to challenge an improvement in Tennessee, not to take a position against the beloved chairman of my committee on the project in which he is interested, but fundamentally to call the attention of the Senate to two things: One, we are facing here a precedent on the subject of authorizing steam plants. Two, we face budget and fiscal problems which should certainly give us pause.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has spoken of the amount of money proposed to be appropriated under deficiency bills this year. The amount of money contained in the first deficiency appropriation bill is not large when compared with deficiency appropriations of last year.

Last year House Joint Resolution 470 contained a deficiency appropriation of $500,000,000. The first deficiency appropriation bill, 1948, contained $778,000,000. The supplemental national defense bill, which was a deficiency bill, contained $959,000,000. The second deficiency appropriation bill contained $549,000,000. The supplemental 1949 bill contained $15,000,000. The urgent deficiency bill contained $136,000,000. Making a sum total of $2,929,337,106 in deficiency spending last year, as compared with the bill now before us containing $538,000,000, which is about one-sixth the amount appropriated in deficiency bills last year. Last year we appropriated in deficiency appropriations $2,929,337,106. The amount contained in the pending deficiency bill is not a slight reduction over last year; it is a tremendous reduction over what was appropriated last year. Yet I find the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, taking the committee to task by reason of its excessive spending this year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I certainly have not criticized the committee. I certainly commend its distinguished chairman for bringing out deficiency bills of a smaller amount than were brought out last year. All I was trying to show was that last year when deficiency appropriations totaled nearly $3,000,000,000 we had an estimated surplus of more than $4,000,000,000, and now we have an estimated deficit of more than $1,000,000,000. That makes a difference of $5,000,000,000 in our latitude of operations.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate listened to a most interesting and instructive address by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] with respect to certain legal and constitutional phases of the New Johnsonville steam-plant proposal. I am in sympathy with the apprehension expressed by the junior Senator from Michigan with respect to the danger of governmental activities along socialistic lines being constantly and vastly extended. I take the view, in which I understand him to believe strongly, that constant watch should be interposed against gradual wearing away of congressional observance of the Constitution.

On February 1, 1886, Mr. Justice Joseph P. Bradley, then a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, referring to a compulsory production in a suit of private books and papers of the owner of goods sought to be forfeited in the suit, expressed the view that such production is the equivalent of an unreasonable search and seizure within the meaning of the fourth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Of the proceedings in question, he said:

> It may be that it is the obnoxious thing in its mildest and least repulsive form, but illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing in that way, namely, by silent approaches and slight deviations from legal modes of procedure.

Mr. Justice Bradley in the same decision further declared:

> It is the duty of courts to be watchful for the constitutional rights of the citizen and against any stealthy encroachments thereon. Their motto should be obsta principiis.

The distinguished jurist then made this observation:

> We have no doubt that the legislative body is actuated by the same motives, but the vast accumulation of public business brought before it sometimes prevents it on a first presentation from noticing objections which become developed by time and the practical application of the objectionable law.

Mr. President, the learned Justice employed a Latin expression, "obsta principiis." The present-day English equivalent of that expression is withstand beginnings.

I take the view, in which I understand the Senator from Michigan strongly to concur and actively to advocate, that not only should those words be a motto of the courts, but that they should also be constantly followed by the Congress.

So, Mr. President, as I stated, I am in sympathy with the apprehension of the junior Senator from Michigan, and I join with him in the view that the constant watch to which I have alluded should be interposed against gradual attrition of congressional observance of the Constitution.

Mr. President, although I share the apprehension of the junior Senator from Michigan, as applied to the instant case and to others, with respect to constant expansion of governmental activities along socialistic lines, and the danger of such expansion, I find myself unable to join with him in the view that the appropriation of funds for the beginning of construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant would constitute a violation of the Constitution.

It becomes of importance in this discussion to consider what are the facts as disclosed in this case. I appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the eminent Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and our able and revered Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, are, by reason of their membership upon that committee, far better informed upon the detailed facts of the situation than am I. Yet, Mr. President, I think the hearings and the report of the House committee, and the statements made upon the floor enable every Senator to understand at least the salient, important, predominant facts in this matter.

In undertaking to recapitulate the facts as I understand them, I invite attention to the letter addressed by Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board, under date of January 25, 1949, to Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. The letter appears in full in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, at pages 13 and 14 of those hearings. I shall not read all the contents of the letter unless it be desired that I do so. I quote what I consider to be salient features of the letter, indicative of the situation which is presented this afternoon to the Senate. Mr. Clapp says:

> The need for and urgency of additional generating capacity in the Tennessee Valley is more apparent now than it was last spring.

Then, after some intermediate discussion and statements of fact, he points out something as to the increase in residential and farm use of electricity. In order that that may be before the Senate, as well as the point to which I shall

pay special attention in a moment, I read the four sentences which next appear in Mr. Clapp's letter, previously mentioned:

Residential and farm use of electricity in the TVA power service area has more than doubled since the end of the war. More than a quarter of a million new consumers have been added to the distribution systems in the last 3 years. As a result, the percentage of farms electrified has increased from less than 30 percent at the time of the 1945 census of agriculture to nearly 60 percent today. The increase is continuing at the rate of 1 percent a month. The municipal and rural cooperative distributors of TVA power plan to build 40,000 miles of rural lines during the next few years to serve 200,000 additional consumers. These plans, which are heartening as signs of regional vitality and national strength, are wholly dependent upon continued growth in the farm power supply of the TVA system.

Next, Mr. President, I invite special attention to the following paragraph in the letter, which I think is of particular importance:

This region is a major producer of chemicals, aluminum, and ferro-alloys, which are required in large quantities for sustained maximum national productivity, and which require enormous amounts of power.

I emphasize the next significant sentence:

A power shortage would force interruptions in the production of these vital materials and handicap the Nation's ability to prepare for national emergencies.

I digress to suggest that no greater national emergency could be in the mind of any person, whether Mr. Clapp or anyone else, than the possible national emergency of war at some future time. He points out, as I have indicated, that a power shortage would force interruptions in the production of the vital materials which I have mentioned—chemicals, aluminum, and ferro-alloys—and would "handicap the Nation's ability to prepare for national emergencies."

Continuing, Mr. Clapp says:

A power shortage at any time is a serious condition for any region to face; it would be especially damaging in this area in view of the kind of industry located here. Surveys by the National Security Resources Board show that, aside from the Northwest, this area is in more serious need of expansion of power supply than any other part of the country.

Mr. President, I invite special attention at this time to that portion of the letter before reading somewhat further from it. I do so bearing in mind the fact that yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made on the floor of the Senate what I know he believed to be a correct statement of fact, which I quote as follows from page 4373 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday:

I am sure the record will show the TVA was conceived in 1933, not for national defense but solely under the commerce clause of the Constitution, which provides for the right to regulate streams with respect to flood control and navigation. It was not constructed as a part of the national defense.

If the United States Government wished to erect a steam plant as part and parcel of the atomic-energy plant, I would not contend that it could not do so because that would be directly for national defense, and it could be done. However, the Tennessee Valley project was started in 1933, not as a national defense project but as a flood-control and navigation project. Muscle Shoals is different and the Watts Bar steam plant is different.

Mr. President, with all respect to my esteemed friend from Michigan, I am unable, from an inspection of the act of Congress under which there was created a body corporate by the name of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to agree with him in the conclusion which I have just read, that the TVA was not conceived for national defense, and was not constructed, as he told us yesterday, as a part of the national defense. At this point I read from the first section of Public Law No. 17 of the Seventy-third Congress, approved on the 18th day of May 1933:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of maintaining and operating the properties now owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive flood waters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River Basins, there is hereby created a body corporate by the name of the "Tennessee Valley Authority" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation").

So, Mr. President, I submit that the act of Congress under which the Tennessee Valley Authority was created not only fails to substantiate the view, suggested yesterday, to the effect that the Tennessee Valley Authority project was not conceived in the interst of the national defense, but, on the contrary, lists as the first of the three purposes of that act "the interest of the national defense."

The letter from Mr. Clapp, from which I have already quoted the paragraph beginning with the words "This region is a major producer of chemicals, aluminum, and ferro-alloys," emphasizing as it does a power shortage which would "handicap the Nation's ability to prepare for national emergencies," indicates indisputably that one of the prime purposes in the mind of the proponent of this matter, Mr. Clapp, was to preserve and increase our power of national defense. I think that will have a very important bearing upon our consideration of this matter.

Mr. Clapp's letter continues, and there is some intervening matter which, in the interest of brevity, I shall not read. Then Mr. Clapp says:

There is no practical alternative to a steam plant at the New Johnsonville site in the solution of this area's power supply problem.

Madam President (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair), the letter continues as follows:

The proportion of steam to hydro capacity in this area, which has been falling rapidly, is now too low for maximum effectiveness of the hydro developments. Additional steam power will firm up more of the hydro generation, which is much smaller in dry years than in years of normal stream flow.

Madam President, in reading the foregoing, I emphasized, or attempted to do so, the words "firm up," because I think the matter of firming and the purpose of the requested appropriation to "firm up" the hydro generation is of great importance in connection with the determination as to whether the proposed appropriation is constitutional.

Further on in the letter, Mr. Clapp says:

Even a moderate drought could curtail the productivity of the entire area for several months.

Again I shall attempt to emphasize the words "firming up," as I read the following portion of Mr. Clapp's letter:

The great importance of the New Johnsonville steam plant in firming up the hydro energy under such conditions is indicated by the fact that each of the three generating units can be called upon, when needed, to add about a billion kilowatt-hours a year to the dry-year energy supply.

On page 17 of the testimony of Mr. Clapp before the House subcommittee, this language appears—and again I shall emphasize the words "firm up":

The fact that these are multiple-purpose dams places certain practical limitations upon their use in the production of electricity, and in order to get the best use of the controlled water in the Tennessee River system, we use steam plants to firm up the hydro power that is otherwise available in large quantities only during certain seasons of the year.

Then, at pages 25 and 26 of the hearings before the House subcommittee appears the following; the interrogation is by Mr. RABAUT:

Mr. RABAUT. Give us the story about the development of this power and tell us about it, in your own way, for the record.

Mr. CLAPP. This system that has grown over the years in the Tennessee Valley is, of course, primarily a hydro system built out of these dams that have been put on the river for flood control and navigation and for all the power that we can get out of them without conflicting with the primary purposes of flood control and navigation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Incidental power?

Mr. CLAPP. Power incidental to the flood-control and navigation purposes.

Continuing, Mr. Clapp says:

Now, as that power began to build up from these dams we began to work out agreements with the communities. There are now 144 municipalities and rural electric cooperatives that buy this power from the TVA and resell it to the areas which they serve.

Steam power was a part of that system to begin with. This was an extremely flashy river. There were great variations in the flow of the stream between the lowest water periods of the year and the highest water periods of the year when the destructive floods took place; consequently, you could not depend on that river for much hydroelectric power around the calendar.

Now, the addition of the dams on the main river and the tributaries which now provide a unified system of 27 major dams in the Tennessee Valley has, of course, reduced that wide range of fluctuation in water flow as between the lowest water period of the year and the highest water period of the year.

We take the top off the floods when they come and we are able to store water during the flood season and put something on to what would otherwise be almost a trickle in parts of the river.

Then, the concluding sentence of the observation by Mr. Clapp reads, very significantly, as follows:

Even so, with the addition of these dams and the reduction of this wide range in variation of the stream flow, it has always, from the beginning of this system, been an efficient

thing to have available steam plants that could be put on the lines and run during the time of low water.

So the testimony which I have read clearly indicates as I see it that among the outstanding ideas, if not the predominant idea in the mind of Mr. Clapp in his testimony, speaking as Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, was the idea of firming up the power so that even though the stream should subside, even though the strong, tremendous current at high peak should not prevail, the user of the current would by reason of the existence of the steam plant be able to have an uninterrupted source of current for his use, private or industrial, as the case may be.

Madam President, I pause to say that of course we are not bound by the statements of Mr. Clapp. I think they are of great importance, but to my mind the Senate is entitled, independently of the statements of Mr. Clapp, from the knowledge of its own Members, to realize the importance, first, of this steam-plant proposal from the standpoint of firming up power, and, second, the tremendous importance of adequate power production in the Tennessee Valley region from the standpoint of the chemical, aluminum, ferro-alloy situation and its bearing on the national defense.

Yesterday, Members of the Senate made certain statements of fact and statements of opinion with respect to the purpose of the steam plant, bearing on the question, I take it, as to whether this is a new line of business, a socialized effort on the part of the Government to engage in some independent business, as it might engage, for illustration, in the shoe business or the steel business, or whether the predominant purpose is to firm up the power which is an incidental outcome of the erection of the dams which are placed in their present position, as I see it, for three purposes: One, for defense, one for navigation, and one for flood control. I quote at this moment from certain of the statements which were made on the floor yesterday. I observe certain statements made by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is no novice in legislative matters, having served as he has, with distinction in the House of Representatives, and coming, as he has, to the Senate, with demonstrated ability and capacity. The junior Senator from Tennessee, at page 4363 of yesterday's RECORD, said:

> The testimony shows that during an average year they need the proposed stand-by plant for 3 months of the year in order to bring the firm power up by 3,000,000,000 kilowatts, which would enable the TVA to take care of its contractural commitments.

Then, Madam President, the following interrogation by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]:

> In other words, there will be an ample supply of water 9 months of the year to operate all the installed hydroelectric units at full capacity; is that correct?

The junior Senator from Tennessee responded:

> The answer is given, I think, more clearly than I could give it, on page 197 of the hearings, in this paragraph:
>
> "The New Johnsonville steam plant, by firming up additional portions of the power available from the hydro plants of the TVA system, will make possible an increase in firm power of about 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. To do this, it will be necessary to operate the New Johnsonville plant about one-third of the time, generally at full load, in addition to the present use of the existing TVA steam plants, to supplement the seasonal secondary hydro generation."

A little further occurs the following interchange:

> Mr. THYE. In the event the funds are not made available, so that this steam plant is not provided, then hydroelectric generating equipment sufficient to utilize the maximum estimated generating capacity of the water supply could not profitably be installed, because there would be a season of the year when there would be an inadequate supply of water, although at that time, of course, the demand for electricity would be just as great as it would be at the time of the maximum of the water supply. So what the Senator is trying to do with the steam plant is to fit it into the hydroelectric units, so that when the water supply is ample the steam plant will stand idle; but when the water supply tapers off to a low level, the steam plant will be brought into operation, to supplement the electricity generated by means of the water supply. Is that the intention?
>
> Mr. KEFAUVER. Exactly; the Senator has certainly expressed it very clearly.
>
> As matters now stand, the Tennessee Valley Authority is losing 3,000,000,000 kilowatts for 3 months of the year.
>
> Mr. THYE. The Senator says there is ample demand for the maximum load of both the water power and the steam power if and when the steam power is made available; is that correct?
>
> Mr. KEFAUVER. That is true.
>
> Mr. THYE. In other words, there is ample demand now, without searching for and encouraging development of new industries, to furnish a load sufficient to use a maximum of the electricity capable of development if a new steam plant is constructed; is that correct?
>
> Mr. KEFAUVER. The record shows that fully, I think.

Then, Madam President, at page 4381 of the RECORD, there appears a statement by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], only a portion of which I shall read at the moment because of its applicability to the question of firming up power.

Said the Senator from Alabama:

> We know that certainly as far as the southeastern section of the United States is concerned, we have a varying degree of rainfall. The precipitation varies in different seasons. Usually we have a great deal of rain in the spring and early summer, and very little in the late summer and fall. Consequently there is an uneven flow of water in our rivers. At some periods we have a great deal more water power at our dams than at other periods of the year. Therefore wise, businesslike, and economical operation dictated to the Tennessee Power Co. and to the other power companies in the southeastern section, and now dictates to the Tennessee Valley Authority, that steam plants be bought or built—

I emphasize the next words—

> to firm up the power. As we know, most consumers of power can use power only if it be what we call firm power, that is, dependable power, which is available the year round, every day of every week of every month of the year.

Madam President, I shall not trespass further upon the time of the Senate to read from the RECORD of yesterday, but I should like, at this moment, to present for the RECORD a statement made by the House Committee on Appropriations. I find no dissenting report. If there is one, I have no doubt that some Senator will put it into the RECORD; but I do not have it.

At page 6 of this report, which was filed on February 14, 1949—or, at any rate, it was on that day committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed—there appears this language:

> The committee is convinced, on the basis of testimony presented, that if the Government is to make full utilization of the natural resources and of its investment in that area, an additional steam plant of the capacity indicated is fully justified.

A little further in the report there appears this sentence:

> The great variation in the flow of rivers of the system makes it necessary for the Government—

Again I emphasize, by my own voice, what probably will not be emphasized in type—

> to firm up the hydro-generated power in order to provide for as uniform deliveries as possible.

That was the finding of the House Committee on Appropriations with respect to this subject matter.

From what I have read and from what the Senate may well conclude from its own knowledge, I think it is obvious that it is of importance, where there is a seasonal situation, with a river declared by one statement which I have read to be flashy—I take that to mean that at one time it is high, and quickly thereafter, at another time, it is low—it is of importance that there be at hand a plant which will firm up the electric power.

At this point I desire to make it perfectly clear that I am not unmindful of the fact that, although this appropriation is for $2,500,000, there is far more involved in the matter than $2,500,000. I realize it is planned that $54,000,000 shall be used in the construction of this plant. The evidence before the committee is to that effect.

I observe at page 15 of the House hearings a statement by Mr. Clapp, as follows:

> The estimated total cost of this plant is $54,000,000, including the expenditure for switchyards required at the plant.

So, Madam President, I do not want the Senate to be under the impression that I am being lulled into security by the alleged smallness of the appropriation. I have heard no Senator claim that the appropriation is all the cost. I desire to show, affirmatively, as I have indicated, that I am cognizant of the fact that $54,000,000 may be, and doubtless is, involved in this subject matter.

The general function of a steam plant has been, I think, sufficiently indicated by what I have read. In addition, I submit at this moment only one or two sentences for the RECORD, one of which is

the statement by Mr. Clapp, at page 16 of the House hearings:

I think the committee understands the general function of steam plants in the TVA system. This is predominantly a hydro-electric-power system, producing power from dams that are designed, built, and operated primarily for flood control and to maintain navigable channels.

I pause to comment at that point, along the line mentioned a few moments ago, and to say the Senate is not bound in any sense by an inadvertent or a studied sentence of Mr. Clapp. Although he mentions as the primary purposes flood control and the maintenance of navigable channels, to my mind, from the evidence I have read, this sentence would be mistaken in its conclusion if it should underrate the vast importance of this property of TVA from the standpoint of national defense. I shall have a little more to say on that subject in a moment.

Continuing, Mr. Clapp uses the sentence which I read a few moments ago, and which I shall repeat at this moment because of its applicability:

The fact that these are multiple-purpose dams places certain practical limitations upon their use in the production of electricity, and in order to get the best use of the controlled water in the Tennessee River system we use steam plants to firm up the hydro power that is otherwise available in large quantities only during certain seasons of the year.

Madam President, I think I have sufficiently indicated the need of this steam plant, and I should like to read a very significant observation appearing last year in the debate upon this question on the floor of the Senate. I refer to the observation found at page 8258 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 7, made by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

He said:

If anything should cut off the fuel supply of the steam plant there—

That is to say, at Oak Ridge—

the availability of a source of adequate power would be of tremendous interest, and, I think, would be an absolute necessity to the plant at Oak Ridge.

To which the then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Cooper, responded:

A few moments ago I think the Senator from Michigan said he did not recall any testimony about deliveries of power to Oak Ridge. I should like to call his attention to page 59 of the hearings. Mr. Wessenaeur, power manager of TVA, stated, speaking in regard to certain charts which had been introduced:

"The sales shown on that chart, however, are actual sales to the municipalities and cooperatives. The total shown by the utilities did not include sales to the Government for its own use, the largest use being at the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge."

Farther down on that page former Senator Cooper said:

We see that Mr. Wessenaeur said:

"Because it may disclose energy deliveries to the Atomic Energy Commission, we cannot put this chart in, but I do have some others which can go in."

So, Madam President, I submit that the matter of power is of importance, as is demonstrated by the fact that power from the Tennessee Valley Authority which is used in connection with Oak Ridge is certainly highly important to the national defense of the Nation. It needs no emphasis on my part to bring home a realization to the Members of the Senate of the fact that it is at Oak Ridge that the atomic-energy project has its great development, and it has a vital bearing, perhaps one which would determine the very existence of our Nation, on the welfare of the United States of America.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator would not mind, I should like to continue my remarks to a conclusion.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the Oak Ridge matter, I should like to ask the Senator if he knows how far the New Johnsonville steam plant will be from Oak Ridge, and whether it will be possible to transmit the electricity from this plant to Oak Ridge.

Mr. DONNELL. I am unable to answer that question from an engineering standpoint, but I undertake to say that with the TVA furnishing power, as it does, to Oak Ridge, obviously it is of tremendous importance that all the power be conserved, and all that is necesary be produced, because whether this particular power can be brought from the New Johnsonville steam plant or other agencies near at hand, it seems to me entirely possible, though I am not an engineer, that it might be of importance to conserve as fully as possible the production derived from the New Johnsonville steam plant in order that other power elsewhere might be used for Oak Ridge.

I am making no concessions as to whether it is possible or not possible to transmit the power from New Johnsonville or from any of the other 27 hydroelectric plants which are to be supplemented, as I understand, by steam plants. I am making no statement of fact as to whether the transmittal is possible, but I recall that a suggestion was made on the floor of the Senate that in the mind of some Senator—I have forgotten now which one it was—there was an apprehension that power should be transmitted from away down in the Tennessee Valley Authority area to the city of Chicago, Ill., though I think the fact as to whether it was to be so transmitted was disputed by another Senator on the floor.

So, I submit, first, that certainly one of the predominant purposes of the proposed construction of this steam plant is the firming up of the power, and not the entry into a new separate line of business. It is not the entry into the power business ab inito, it is the firming up of the supply of power which flows incidentally, as it does, from the construction of the dams which have been built for the three multiple purposes to which I have adverted, namely, flood control, navigaton, and defense.

Second, and among the very vital, important questions which the United States Government is entitled to take into consideraton, and which the Senate must take into consideration, is the question whether or not national defense is involved, as I believe it is involved, in the matter of the construction of this proposed steam plant.

I pass now to the question to which all of what I have said is preliminary—though I do not wish to discourage any Senator by leading him to think that the length of the prelude necessarily justifies the inference of a corresponding length of the body and of the peroration. I pass now to the subject matter to which I primarily direct my attention, namely, the question presented so interestingly yesterday by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as to the constitutional phase of the erection of the plant at New Johnsonville.

Madam President, is there any violation of the Constitution in expending money for this steam plant? The question is pertinent and proper, and it should be answered, and the Senate cannot, in line with the obligation of its Members under their oaths, vote, as I see it, upon this matter without adequate consideration of this question presented as to the constitutionality, or the contrary, of the proposed appropriation.

Fortunately we are not compelled to rely entirely upon our own reasoning, although in part I think we may supplement the information at hand by our own opinions. Fortunately, some light has been thrown upon the subject by the Supreme Court of the United States. I refer, of course, to the ligitation which arose with respect to the proposed transaction some years ago relative to the Wilson Dam, in which a certain preferred stockholder of the Alabama Power Co. sought to set aside a contract which had been entered into by that company and the Tennessee Valley Authority involving the sale and exchange of electric power generated at Wilson Dam, and the acquisition by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain transmission lines from the power company. The case is one which was mentioned both by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] yesterday, the case of Ashwander et al. against the Tennessee Valley Authority, et al.

I shall not undertake to detail all the facts of this particular piece of litigation. I do refer to the fact that at the hearings before the House subcommittee Mr. Clapp referred to the Wilson Dam in the following language, and I quote from page 16 of the hearings:

I believe this committee is well aware of the fact that the power system of the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a hydro and steam combination from the beginning. The committee will recall, I am sure, that at the time the Government built Wilson Dam which was started during the First World War and finished in the 1920's, Congress also authorized, and there was built by the Government, a steam plant known as the Wilson Dam steam plant, of 64,000 kilowatts capacity.

Continuing, he said:

Then, at the time of the major acquisitions of private utilities properties, during the period closing generally in 1939, TVA in collaboration with the municipalities and

rural electric cooperatives of the power service area, bought a combination hydro and steam system from the private utilities.

Thereafter there was some further discussion of the matter by Mr. Clapp.

In the course of the Ashwander litigation the court determined the question of the validity of the construction of that particular dam, the Wilson Dam, which was built by virtue of the Defense Act of June 3, 1916, 39 Stat. 166, 215. I quote somewhat from the decision of the Court, handed down as it was by Chief Justice Hughes. At page 327 the Court said:

We may take judicial notice of the international situation at the time the act of 1916 was passed, and it cannot be successfully disputed that the Wilson Dam and its auxiliary plants, including the hydroelectric power plant, are, and were intended to be, adapted to the purposes of national defense.

Then the Court makes reference to a certain particular type of plant which I think is of importance at this point. The Court said:

While the district court found that there is no intention to use the nitrate plants or the hydroelectric units installed at Wilson Dam for the production of war materials in time of peace, "the maintenance of said properties in operating condition and the assurance of an abundant supply of electric energy in the event of war, constitute national defense assets."

The Court continues:

This finding has ample support.

Madam President, I am neither an engineer nor a chemist, but it is my understanding that nitrates are of very great importance in connection with the manufacture of ammunition. The fact that in connection with the Wilson Dam there was nitrate plant No. 1 mentioned by the Court in a footnote, and that the reference of the Court itself shows that there was more than one nitrate plant, indicates that in that particular section of our country, certainly the nitrates, which I submit are of importance from a standpoint of national defense, exist, and that the development of power, with the resultant production of nitrates, is of tremendous importance from the standpoint of national defense.

Now, Madam President, the Court undertakes to state—and I shall make this as brief as possible—the basis on which it holds that the Wilson Dam construction, under the act of 1916, was justified by the Constitution. It is interesting to observe that the Court refers not solely to the matter of national defense, but refers also to the fact that the act of 1916 had in view, as does also the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority which I have read, "improvements in navigation." The Court says:

Commerce includes navigation.

The Court quotes Chief Justice Marshall as indicating that the word "commerce" does "comprehend navigation." So, in the Ashwander case, as I read it, the Court bases its decision sustaining the validity of the acquisition of the dam, and therefore the validity of the proposed transaction with the power company, in part upon the fact that the commerce clause was involved.

I need not read in detail the reasoning of the Court, but I quote one sentence from page 330 of the Court's decision, as follows:

The Wilson Dam and its power plant must be taken to have been constructed in the exercise of the constitutional functions of the Federal Government.

I may say, Madam President, that I do not think the power plant referred to there is the steam plant, though I am not, without further search of the decision, quite clear as to whether it is. But in the interest of absolute accuracy I do not make the claim that the term "power plant" does so comprehend. Nevertheless, the Court in passing upon the situation bases its decision upon points of constitutional law under which, as I see it, the New Johnsonville construction can be fully justified and is fully justified by the Constitution of the United States.

Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan said that up to this point he has no objection, at least insofar as I have referred to plants other than the steam plant. I should perhaps not have used the term "at least," because I know that he does not agree with my conclusion as to the steam plant. But he stated in the RECORD of yesterday at several different times that the construction of the hydroelectric plant was constitutional. I quote from the Senator from Michigan at page 4365 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

We are talking about constitutional power, constitutional authority. There is no doubt that under the commerce clause the United States Government can erect dams for flood control and navigation, and when it erects a dam, the mechanical power from the falling of the water can be generated into electrical power, and the United States Government can, under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution, sell the power so generated. There can be no doubt about that.

Again, at page 4370 the following appears:

Mr. DONNELL. Even the hydroelectric plant, the Senator contends, is unconstitutional?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no; the hydroelectric is perfectly constitutional and legal because it is using the mechanical power of the drop of the water from a dam which is constructed under the specific authority of the commerce clause for navigation and flood control.

Thus I say the Senator from Michigan concedes the constitutionality of the erection of the hydroelectric plants.

I desire to submit and do submit at this time that the constitutional power exists, to my mind, from the consideration which I have mentioned, namely, the fact that a predominant purpose, or certainly one of the major purposes of the New Johnsonville plant, is to be the firming up of this same power resulting from the dropping of the same water to which the Senator from Michigan refers, and also I say resulting from the fact that under the power of the Congress with respect to national defense we have a right to conserve that defense.

I say, first, that there is a constitutional power to erect the New Johnsonville steam plant. Then I go further and say that the constitutional power to operate the New Johnsonville plant follows from the constitutional power to construct it. Why do I say so? To my mind the constitutional power to construct the dam or the plant, or both, implies and comprehends the power to carry out the entire plant, the entire navigation, flood control, national defense plan, economically and with sound business judgment.

In that connection I may read some language from the Supreme Court of the United States. Chief Justice Hughes, at page 335 of the decision in the Ashwander case, said:

The argument is stressed that, assuming that electric energy generated at the dam belongs to the United States, the Congress has authority to dispose of this energy only to the extent that it is a surplus necessarily created in the course of making munitions of war or operating the works for navigation purposes; that is, that the remainder of the available energy must be lost or go to waste. We find nothing in the Constitution which imposes such a limitation. It is not to be deduced from the mere fact that the electric energy is only potentially available until the generators are operated. The Government has no less right to the energy thus available by letting the water course over its turbines than it has to use the appropriate processes to reduce to possession other property within its control, as, for example, oil which it may recover from a pool beneath its lands and which is reduced to possession by boring oil wells and otherwise might escape its grasp. * * * And it would hardly be contended that, when the Government reserves coal on its lands, it can mine the coal and dispose of it only for the purpose of heating Government buildings or for other governmental operations. Of, if the Government owns a silver mine, that it can obtain the silver only for the purpose of storage or coinage. Or that when the Government extracts the oil it has reserved, it has no constitutional power to sell it. Our decisions recognize no such restriction (citing cases). The United States owns the coal, or the silver, or the lead, or the oil, it obtains from its lands, and it lies in the discretion of the Congress, acting in the public interest, to determine of how much of the property it shall dispose.

We think that the same principle is applicable to electric energy. The argument pressed upon us leads to absurd consequences in the denial, despite the broad terms of the constitutional provision, of a power of disposal which the public interest may imperatively require. Suppose, for example, that in the erection of a dam for the improvement of navigation, it became necessary to destroy a dam and power plant which had previously been erected by a private corporation engaged in the generation and distribution of energy which supplied the needs of neighboring communities and business enterprises. Would anoyne say that, because the United States had built its own dam and plant in the exercise of its constitutional functions, and had complete ownership and dominion over both, no power could be supplied to the communities and enterprises dependent on it, not because of any unwillingness of the Congress to supply it, or of any overriding governmental need, but because there was no constitutional authority to furnish the supply? Or that, with abundant power available, which must otherwise be wasted, the supply to the communities and enterprises whose very life might be at stake must be limited to the slender

amount of surplus unavoidably involved in the operation of the navigation works, because the Constitution does not permit any more energy to be generated and distributed?

After some further statement, the Court says:

The decisions which petitioners cite give no support to their contention.

Madam President, I submit that the Government is entitled so to utilize the dams and the plants—steam plants, hydroelectric plants, or whatever they may be—as not to permit the investment in them to be a waste, which in part it would be if the project could be used only a portion of the year. Therefore it is within the power of the Government, just as in the cases indicated by the Supreme Court, to prevent such waste, the prevention to be brought about by the erection of a steam plant which can function in that part of the year in which the hydroelectric plant cannot produce adequate power.

It is not necessary, as I see it, to leave the hydroelectric plants unsupplemented. No businessman, whether Mr. Wendell Willkie, who has been referred to here today, or anyone else, would consider it sound judgment to permit an investment of millions of dollars in a hydroelectric plant to lie idle and wasteful and useless during a portion of the year, when an additional amount could be judiciously invested by the Government, which would make the entire enterprise productive of power throughout the year.

In my judgment, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Ashwander case, clearly illustrates the thought which I have in mind. This case involved the sale of certain transmission lines by the power company to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Court stated, at page 339:

The transmission lines which the Authority undertakes to purchase from the power company lead from the Wilson Dam to a large area within about 50 miles of the dam. These lines provide the means of distributing the electric energy, generated at the dam, to a large population. They furnish a method of reaching a market. The alternative method is to sell the surplus energy at the dam, and the market there appears to be limited to one purchaser, the Alabama Power Co., and its affiliated interests. We know of no constitutional ground upon which the Federal Government can be denied the right to seek a wider market. We suppose that in the early days of mining in the West, if the Government had undertaken to operate a silver mine on its domain, it could have acquired the mules or horses and equipment to carry its silver to market. And the transmission lines for electric energy are but a facility for conveying to market that particular sort of property, and the acquisition of these lines raises no different constitutional question, unless in some way there is an invasion of the rights reserved to the state or to the people. We find no basis for concluding that the limited undertaking with the Alabama Power Co. amounts to such an invasion. Certainly, the Alabama Power Co. has no constitutional right to insist that it shall be the sole purchaser of the energy generated at the Wilson Dam; that the energy shall be sold to it or go to waste.

The Congress of the United States, once it has the power, once there is a basis on which it may exert legislative action, as, for illustration, under the commerce clause, or, as a further illustration, under the preservation of national defense, preparation for war, or preparation for the Army or Navy—once it has the general field within its power, the courts have held uniformly, I think, that the reasonable discretion of Congress will not be interfered with by any court. Indeed, it is difficult to think of a case in which the Court, under the circumstances which I have just described, would hold the exercise of discretion by the Congress to have been an abuse of discretion.

Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, decided in 1819 (4 Wheat. 316), said this:

But we think the sound construction of the Constitution must allow to the National Legislature that discretion, with respect to the means by which the powers it confers are to be carried into execution, which will enable that body to perform the high duties assigned to it, in the manner most beneficial to the people. Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

In the same case Chief Justice Marshall said:

But where the law is not prohibited, but is really calculated to effect any of the objects entrusted to the Government, to undertake here to inquire into the degree of its necessity, would be to pass the line which circumscribes the judicial department, and to tread on legislative ground. This Court disclaims all pretentions to such a power.

In *Juilliard* v. *Greenman* (110 U. S., 421), Mr. Justice Gray, speaking for the Court, referring to that portion of the Constitution, which as the Chair will recall, gives the Congress the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers previously mentioned, said:

By the settled construction and the only reasonable interpretation of this clause, the words "necessary and proper" are not limited to such measures as are absolutely and indispensably necessary, without which the powers granted must fail of execution; but they include all appropriate means which are conducive or adapted to the end to be accomplished, and which in the judgment of Congress will most advantageously effect it.

In the case of *United States* v. *Fisher*, at 2 Cranch 358, Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, in speaking for the Court, says this:

In construing this clause, it would be incorrect, and would produce endless difficulties, if the opinion should be maintained, that no law was authorized which was not indispensably necessary to give effect to a specified power. Where various systems might be adopted for that purpose, it might be said, with respect to each, that it was not necessary, because the end might be obtained by other means.

Continuing, the Chief Justice said:

Congress must possess the choice of means, and must be empowered to use any means which are in fact conducive to the exercise of a power granted by the Constitution.

Then, Mr. President (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair), in the legal tender case, 12 Wallace 457, in 1870, the Court said this:

Indeed the whole history of the Government and of congressional legislation has exhibited the use of a very wide discretion, even in times of peace and in the absence of any trying emergency, in the selection of the necessary and proper means to carry into effect the great objects for which the Government was framed, and this discretion has generally been unquestioned, or, if questioned, sanctioned by this Court.

The Court then proceeded to illustrate the meaning.

Mr. President, I submit that the Congress has a very broad discretion in determining the appropriate means to be used in respect to matters coming within its jurisdiction.

A little while ago I referred to a former distinguished colleague of ours, the former distinguished Senator Cooper, of Kentucky. I observe at page 8253 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 7, the following observation by Senator Cooper. He was referring to a previous question which he had presented to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and at that point Senator Cooper said:

I again submit that the distinguished Senator has not answered my question. The point I am making is this: The courts and the Congress have said that money can be appropriated to build dams and that there is authority to dispose of the power developed at the dams. If there is the right to dispose of the power, there is authority to do so efficiently, and of electric energy developed there, it follows that we should appropriate sufficient money to build such steam plants as will enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to efficiently dispose of the power. There is a distinction between my point and the statement of the Senator from Connecticut a few minutes ago.

Mr. President, I take it that it is uncontrovertible that Congress does have the power to handle efficiently and economically property which comes into its ownership by virtue of an express power or as an incident to the exercise of any of its powers.

I assure the Chair that I am coming reasonably near to the conclusion of my remarks, and I am about to come to the point as to whether there is property which comes into the possession of the Government from the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There is a constitutional right to dispose of this electric power. But before mentioning that, I think I should say in justice to our former colleague, Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, that it was due. I should say primarily, if not exclusively, to the very informative and, to my mind, sound discussion which he was kind enough to give to me last year, as a friend and colleague, in regard to the Tennessee Valley and the New Johnsonville plant, that I came to the conclusion that the appropriation for the plant should be supported. I wish the Senate to know that whatever of merit there may be in the position I have taken, to my mind comes primarily, if not entirely, as an initial matter from

the wise words of counsel and information given to me by former Senator Cooper, of Kentucky.

Mr. President, what is the power that is developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority? The Supreme Court of the United States in the Ashwander case, to which I have referred, takes up the question as to whether Congress has any power to dispose of electric energy—in that case, the electric energy generator at Wilson Dam. It points out a very interesting fact which I think is of tremendous importance; it says:

The Government acquired full title to the dam site, with all riparian rights. The power of falling water—

To which the Senator from Michigan referred yesterday—

was an inevitable incident of the construction of the dam. That water power came into the exclusive control of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I emphasize the sentence:

The mechanical energy—

So says Mr. Chief Justice Hughes—

was convertible into electric energy, and the water power, the right to convert it into electric energy, and the electric energy thus produced, constitute power belonging to the United States.

It is only a short step from that conclusion by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes to the sentence in the Constitution which he cites. Perhaps I should read his observation:

Authority to dispose of property constitutionally acquired by the United States—

He has just held that the electric energy does constitute property belonging to the United States—

is expressly granted to the Congress by section 3 of article IV of the Constitution. This section provides:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of—

I emphasize that—

and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

So, Mr. President, I take it there can be no question as to the constitutional power of the United States Government to dispose of the electric energy which is or shall be created in the Tennessee Valley Authority's jurisdiction.

Mr. President, with your permission I shall divert for only a moment to one matter which I think is of sufficient consequence, although not directly involved, to justify a brief comment. I called to the attention of the Senate earlier in my remarks this afternoon the observation by Mr. Justice Joseph P. Bradley, on February 1, 1886, with respect to the importance of courts following a rule which being interpreted into English means "withstand beginnings." I emphasize what to my mind follows logically, namely, that not only is it the duty of the courts to follow that wholesome admonition, but it is the duty of Congress to follow it. May I most respectfully say, concerning the executive branch of the Government, that there, likewise, the same rule should be followed.

I have referred this afternoon to atomic energy and to the Oak Ridge plant, and I should like to mention just this incident in connection with the matter of atomic energy: In a public statement made on November 15, 1945, by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Prime Minister of Canada, occurs a declaration in substance that the signers think—

The spreading of the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy, before it is possible to devise effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards acceptable to all nations—

Might have the effect opposite to a contribution—

to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb.

And then occurs this significant remark in the public statement made by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Prime Minister of Canada:

We are, however, prepared to share, on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy just as soon as effective enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised.

Mr. President, it will be observed that the announcement signed by these three men—the President of our Nation and the two Prime Ministers mentioned—that they are prepared to share, at the time mentioned in the announcement, "detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy" is made without any statement being contained therein to the effect that the insurance of being so prepared is contingent, so far as the United States is concerned, on approval by the Congress. I have not observed any statement which declares or demonstrates in whom is vested the legal title to information "concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy." It seems likely to me, however, that with an investment of probably $2,000,000,000, as we have been told—billions of dollars, not millions of dollars—having been made by the Government of the United States in the development and use of atomic energy, important property rights in such information are vested in our Government.

Mr. President, I may say most respectfully, first, that, inasmuch as section 3 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States reads, in part, as follows:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States—

And, second, inasmuch as the Supreme Court of the United States, through Chief Justice Hughes, in the Ashwander case, from which I have quoted, in referring to the grant made to the Congress by section 3 of article IV, of authority to dispose of property constitutionally acquired by the United States, said:

The grant was made in broad terms, and the power of regulation and disposition was not confined to territory, but extended to "other property belonging to the United States," so that the power may be applied, as Story says, "to the due regulation of all other personal and real property rightfully belonging to the United States." And so, he adds, "it has been constantly understood and acted upon"—

And, third, inasmuch as the Supreme Court stated in that case:

That the water power and the electric energy generated at the dam—

Meaning the Wilson Dam at the Muscle Shoals plant—

are susceptible of disposition as property belonging to the United States is well established.

I state, in view of these facts, that I assume most respectfully that, notwithstanding the unqualified announcement of November 15, 1945, by the President of the United States of his being prepared to share the detailed information therein mentioned at the time stated in the announcement, it is not his intention to proceed to share such information without prior approval by Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he proceeds to the next point?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the able Senator advise me as to how much longer he expects to speak?

Mr. DONNELL. I should say about 10 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. I think I have demonstrated, or rather, the observations which I have quoted have demonstrated that as Mr. Clapp says, at page 13 of the hearings before the House of Representatives, a power shortage would force interruptions in the production of these vital materials and handicap the Nation's ability to prepare for national emergencies.

I think it has been demonstrated that the action proposed in respect to the construction of the Johnsonville plant is amply justified by the considerations of national defense. I submit that the Government of the United States in view of such defense necessities should not be dependent upon private power companies for any part of the year, but that the Government itself or its agencies should own such facilities as will enable the Government to have power production 100 percent throughout the entire year.

I submit further the absence of ability to provide year-round service may interfere with the ability of the Government to dispose of its peak load power, and indeed it has already interfered with its disposition, because today, as I understand, large quantities of the power generated in the Tennessee River are disposed of as so-called "dump" power at a price averaging approximately half of what the Government could derive from the disposal of it as primary power or firm power; that is to say, power that can be availed of at any moment during the entire calendar year.

In addition to that, I think the Government is entitled, and the Congress is entitled, to consider the matter from the standpoint of fairness to the citizens. The Government in selling to its citizens

power from the Tennessee River should not make them dependent on private power producers in case of emergency.

Furthermore, from the standpoint of the Government itself, the Government should not be able merely to contract with customers to supply them with power while the water is high and the power abundant, for it is obvious that the customers may conclude it is not desirable that they be compelled to contract with the Government for only a part of the year, or be compelled to rely on some private producer of power who may or may not continue in business or be a satisfactory supplier of power during the drought.

I think the Government is entitled to operate the Tennesee Valley Authority in an efficient manner as suggested by Senator COOPER last year. I think the Government is entitled to operate it in an economical manner. I think the Government is entitled to operate it in a way which will conduce to the firming up of power, thus making its investment reasonably productive, rather than to operate it in such a way that the power can be furnished to consumers only a part of the year.

So, Mr. President, for these and the other reasons I have indicated this afternoon, I very respectfully submit that there is a constitutional power to make the appropriation sought for the entry upon the construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—COLUMBIA RIVER VALLEY (H. DOC. NO. 153)

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that legislation be enacted reorganizing certain Federal activities in the Columbia River Valley to the end that the Federal Government may play a more effective part in the development and conservation of the resources of the Pacific Northwest.

The resource activities of the Federal Government in this region are of great importance, not only because of the Government's responsibility with respect to the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, but also because of the extensive federally owned lands within the region.

Many Federal agencies have long participated in these activities to some degree, and the coordination of their separate activities presents a difficult organizational problem.

In general, two main objectives should guide the organization of the Government's resource activities. There should be unified treatment of the related resources within each natural area of the country—generally the watershed of a great river—and within the framework of sound Nation-wide policies. Furthermore, there should be the greatest possible decentralization of Federal powers, and the greatest possible local participation in their exercise, without lessening the necessary accountability of Federal officials to the President and to the Congress.

The traditional method of organizing the Government's resource activities, through departments and bureaus which carry on separate Nation-wide activities, does not itself provide for the unified consideration of each area's resources which is so necessary, nor does it easily lend itself to decentralization. It has long been apparent that some organizational adjustments are necessary.

We have not found—nor do I expect that we shall find—a single organizational pattern that will fit perfectly the resource problems in the many diverse areas of the country.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, with headquarters in that valley, has been spectacularly successful in achieving many of the goals of a wise and balanced use of resources, through its own activities and through close cooperation with other Federal agencies and with State and local organizations. The integration of Federal activities, through the TVA, has contributed greatly to the growing prosperity of that region, and has met the acid test of satisfying the people who live there.

More recently, Federal interagency committees have been established in several of our western river basins, under the leadership of an interagency committee in Washington, D. C. These committees have proved useful in improving the coordination of Federal activities in those basins.

This committee system, however, has obvious limits, since none of the field representatives of the several departments and agencies concerned is responsible for an over-all view of all the resources of an area. Furthermore, the field committees have no power, other than the separate delegation of authority made to their members, and important problems must be referred through separate channels to headquarters in Washington, D. C., for decision there.

In improving the organization of Federal activities in the Pacific Northwest, we must recognize the unique features of that region. The Pacific Northwest—comprising principally Oregon, Washington, Idaho and western Montana—is a relatively undeveloped area of our Nation, rich in resources and opportunities. The grand dimensions of the Columbia River give consistency to the problems, needs and opportunities of the region.

The waters of the Columbia River system (among our rivers second only to the Mississippi in flow) are capable eventually of producing more than 30,000,000 kilowatts of electric power, of which only a little more than 3,000,000 kilowatts are now installed. There are possibilities of reclaiming many more acres of land by irrigation, as they may be needed, in addition to the 4,000,000 acres now irrigated. More than 40 percent of the Nation's saw timber and many important minerals, including 60 percent of our known phosphate reserves, are in the region. Properly developed and conserved, the resources of the Columbia Valley region can furnish enormous benefits to the people living there and to the Nation as a whole.

The Pacific Northwest has been developing very rapidly in recent years. The population has jumped 37 percent since 1940. The tonnage of agricultural production—not including livestock and livestock products—has risen about 25 percent in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho between 1940 and 1947. Total income payments have increased 200 percent since before the war in those three States, as compared to 150 percent for the country as a whole. The per capita income is among the highest in the Nation. These are signs of the progressive energy of the people of the region, and of the growth that can occur there.

However, this growth will not take place to the extent necessary to provide adequate employment for the growing population unless there is a steady program of investment in the development of basic resources in accordance with broadly conceived conservation and development plans.

The activities of the Federal Government have already been of great help. Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Bonneville power system, begun before the war, made possible the tremendous war and postwar expansion in population and in industry. Industrial development in aluminum, electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries, atomic energy, phosphates, and other lines is going forward rapidly. Each of these requires large amounts of low-cost power, in the production of which the Columbia River and its tributaries offer greater possibilities than any other river system in the country. Continued industrial progress depends upon turning these hydroelectric-power potentialities into realities, since the present power supply is far short of the demand, and the region has no significant resources of coal or petroleum.

But far more than power is involved in the further development of the Columbia River for useful purposes. The disastrous flood of 1948 showed how much needs to be done, both in the river and on the land in the watershed, to reduce potential flood damage. The first irrigation water will soon be brought to the thirsty land in the Columbia basin project below Grand Coulee Dam, and other irrigation projects are possible. The important lower Columbia fisheries program, to adjust the salmon-fishing industry to the dam-construction program, needs to be pushed forward. The use of the river for low-cost transportation of bulk goods can be greatly expanded.

Various Federal agencies are now at work on these phases of river development, and a considerable amount of competent planning has already been done. In particular, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have jointly worked out the framework for a comprehensive program of dam building. McNary and Hungry Horse Dams are now under construction, and others are about to be started to meet urgent needs.

So far as river development is concerned, the task ahead is twofold. Present plans and schedules should be incorporated in a more inclusive, better-balanced river-development program.

And a unified operating system must be established for the many facilities already built or to be constructed. These objectives require better organizational arrangements than we now have.

Furthermore, a great deal needs to be done to bring the land, forest, and mineral activities of the Federal Government into step with the water development program. It is questionable economy to spend millions of dollars for dams as part of a flood-control scheme, unless at the same time we are doing all we can in the way of forest and soil conservation and rehabilitation, so that floods will be minimized rather than aggravated. Similarly, it is not sensible to spend millions of dollars to reclaim land, in order to create new farms, if at the same time we fail to take appropriate steps to save existing farm lands from being washed into the rivers.

It is obvious that Federal activities and expenditures concerning land resources need to be planned in relation to those concerning water resources. Here again better organizational arrangements are needed than we now have.

I do not wish to minimize the substantial progress that has been made under the programs as they have been conducted in the past. However, we have now reached a point where the growing scope and complexity of the Federal activities in the region require much greater integration and the full-time attention of top-level administrators if the tremendous potentialities of the region are to be wisely and rapidly developed.

I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation to provide a means for welding together the many Federal activities concerned with the region's resources into a balanced, continuously developing program.

In so doing I recommend that certain Federal activities in the region be consolidated into a single agency, called the Columbia Valley Administration. To that agency should be transferred the Federal programs of constructing and operating physical facilities on the Columbia River and its tributaries for the multiple-purpose conservation and use of the water, including the generation and transmission of power. These programs are now carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and by the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army. This consolidation will provide not only for a balanced program of constructing dams, irrigation works, power transmission lines, and other facilities, but also for a workable operating plan for using these facilities simultaneously for flood control, navigation, power generation and transmission, fish protection, and other purposes. It is plain common sense that the planning and operation of the system of river structures is a job for a single agency.

The Columbia Valley Administration would have the advantages of a sound foundation of basic planning already done, and a large construction program already under way. The bulk of its staff would be secured from existing agencies. It would follow the practice of existing agencies in carrying on its construction work by contract so far as practicable. Under these circumstances, the establishment of the Columbia Valley Administration would result in no hesitation or delay in the development program. Instead, the Administration would carry forward the work already started in a more effective manner.

I do not recommend the consolidation of any other Federal activities in the Columbia Valley Administration. I do recommend, however, that the Administration be given direct responsibility for preparing definite plans and programs for soil and forest conservation, mineral exploration and development, fish and wildlife conservation, and the other aspects of Federal resource activities in the region, and the means to see that those plans and programs move ahead in step. Such plans and programs would be worked out in cooperation with all interested groups—local, State, and Federal, private and public.

In this way the activities of the Columbia Valley Administration and other Federal agencies would be properly adjusted to each other and to the activities of State and local agencies, and the maximum degree of joint and cooperative action would result. In this way the activities of all agencies concerned with water, land, forest, mineral, and fish and wildlife resources can be brought into a consistent pattern of conservation and development.

The Columbia River rises in Canada, and part of its watershed is in that country. Under long-standing treaties, the Governments of Canada and the United States consult with each other on any development projects which affect international waters, including the Columbia River. The Columbia Valley Administration can work out, in cooperation with appropriate Canadian agencies and in accordance with our treaty obligations, practical means of developing the resources of the Columbia River region, on both sides of the international boundary, on an integrated basis. It is my hope that we will be able in this respect to demonstrate to the world new ways of achieving mutual benefit through international programs of resource development.

A further vital element in developing a better organization of Federal resource activities in the Columbia Valley region is to bring about a larger degree of local participation. To this end I recommend that the Columbia Valley Administration be required to have its headquarters in the region, easily accessible to the people who live there. I recommend further that the Administration be required, with respect to all phases of its activities, to seek the advice, assistance, and participation of State and local governments, agriculture, labor, and business groups, educational institutions and other representative groups concerned. This can best be done, as the Tennessee Valley Authority experience has shown, not through formalistic statutory machinery, but through the establishment by the Administration of a large number of advisory groups for its different activities and in different parts of the region, and through the use, wherever possible, of established local agencies to carry out the development program.

In these various ways the Columbia Valley Administration, while retaining its basic accountability to the President and the Congress, will be far more responsive to the needs and interests and desires of the people of the region than the present subordinate field establishments of the Government can be.

The Columbia Valley Administration should, of course, administer its activities in accordance with Federal policies which apply to the whole country. In seeking decentralization of Federal authority and appropriate flexibility to meet the unique characteristics of the Pacific Northwest, we should not establish different national policies for that region than for the rest of the country.

For example, the Administration should be required, in accordance with long-established Federal policy, to respect existing water rights and the water rights laws of the several States. The Administration should be required to follow the reclamation laws in contracting for the disposition of land or water in reclamation projects. It should be required to give the customary preferences and priorities to public agencies and cooperatives in disposing of electric energy. It should be required to demonstrate the economic soundness of the various projects it undertakes, and to repay reimbursable costs, in accordance with national policies. In short, its activities should harmonize, and not conflict, with Federal policies concerning agriculture, commerce, labor, and the other broad areas of national interest.

Finally, the Columbia Valley Administration should be given, with respect to its revenue-producing activities, appropriate financial and operating flexibility under the business-type budgeting, accounting and auditing methods established by the Government Corporations Control Act. Without detracting from the necessary control of the Administration by the President and the Congress, this will permit more businesslike procedures and more steady and economical scheduling of construction and operations than are now possible.

These recommendations I regard as the fundamental elements of a better organization of Federal resource activities in the Pacific Northwest. They involve no expansion of Federal powers, no encroachment on the rights of States, communities, or individuals. Instead they are designed to achieve a more sensible and unified organization of Federal activities, which will result in a more effective program for resource development and more effective participation by the people of the region in shaping that program.

The enactment of legislation embodying these recommendations will bring Government closer to the people—closer to the grass roots. This means Government action that will be more responsive to the needs of the people.

In recent years the people of our country have come to understand that the progressive growth of our economy and the maintenance of national security depend largely upon the wise use of our

natural resources. We have reached overwhelming agreement that our natural resources must not be wastefully exploited, but instead must be developed and used for the benefit of all our people, and at the same time must be conserved so far as possible to preserve their usefulness permanently.

We have been making great strides toward accomplishing these objectives. Private citizens and groups, local and State governments, and the Federal Government have all been doing more and more as we have found new technical methods and new ways of working together.

Much remains to be done. We will need sustained private and public effort over many years, based on a realization of the importance of long-range investment in developing and conserving natural resources. This is an effort in which each citizen should feel a direct responsibility—not only the private owner of resources, whose management of his property has an immediate bearing on the public good, but every other citizen as well, since the welfare of all depends upon the preservation and wise expansion of our resources.

I believe that the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration along the lines I have recommended will enable the Federal Government to carry out, far more vigorously and effectively than is now the case, its part in the tremendous long-range task of developing and conserving the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest for the increasing welfare of the people.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 13, 1949.*

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understand that this is a very important message, and there may be some question as to what committee should have jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein. In view of the importance of the message and in view of the fact that the Vice President of the United States is unavoidably absent at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the message may remain upon the desk until the Vice President returns, in order to permit him to make the decision as to the appropriate reference; and I further ask that the message may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation in support of the suggestion which has been made by the majority leader. This message will be accompanied by a bill which will be introduced later; but because of the fact that the House of Representatives will take an Easter adjournment, the bill accompanying the message will not be introduced in either the House or the Senate until a week from Monday. Therefore I think the matter should be held up until that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection in accordance with the request of the Senator from Illinois, the message of the President will lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2440) to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2440. An act to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the junior Senator from Connecticut to address himself briefly to the amendment to the pending bill offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], an amendment which in effect would remove from the bill the appropriation for the steam plant in the Tennessee Valley.

We have always been ready to believe, and I think the debates in the Congress will demonstrate the fact, that the purpose of the development of the Tennessee River and the Tennessee Valley was to improve navigation, to help with reforestation and to provide for that section of the country such cheap power as could be developed by the water resources there.

Naturally, Mr. President, when there is a development of cheap power in a certain locality, industry is attracted to it. With that, the junior Senator from Connecticut finds no fault. He feels very strongly that it is the function and, indeed, should be the purpose of the Federal Government, at all times to develop with Federal funds, when necessary, the natural resources of the country so that they may be put to the best use of its citizens. But what would be the effect of developing a natural resource to the limit of its potentialities, attracting industry there because of the cheap power thus made available, and then, finding that the available power was not adequate to take care of the situation, proceeding to supplement it by mechanical means? That, Mr. President, is exactly the policy proposed here through this appropriation for the New Johnsonville plant. If we were to follow that policy to its logical conclusion, we should find ourselves picking out here and there some water resource from which power could be developed to its utmost use as a natural resource, supplementing it with mechanical power, then attracting to that area new industries as a result of the cheap power, until we would be in grave danger, as I submit we are now in grave danger, if the process should continue, of draining off from other parts of the country the industries which employ workers there.

Mr. President, today in the State of Connecticut there are upward of 67,000 persons unemployed, which is the largest number of persons in Connecticut who have been on the unemployment compensation rolls in 11 years. Connecticut is and long has been an industrial State. She became an industrial State through no appropriations from the Federal Treasury, but because of the energy, the industry, the wisdom, the judgment, and the skill of her own people. Years ago Connecticut was an agricultural State. Then the great Middle West and, later on, the far West were developed as the portion of the country best adapted to supply the American people with good food at cheaper prices. So the Connecticut farm boy hitched up his ox team or his horses and took either a two-wheeled cart or a four-wheeled wagon, and put his family into it, together with his family goods, and started for the land where one could plow a furrow a long distance without turning around a rock or running into a swamp or a bog or a sidehill. Consequently, Connecticut found she had turned her energies for the employment of her citizens to other fields than agriculture. She began to develop her industries. Those were the days when there were no appropriations from the Federal Treasury. Up and down the rivers and streams of Connecticut one can find today the remains of dams, earthworks, masonry, and dry stone walls marking the sites of small local industries which employed Connecticut's people.

When it was discovered in Connecticut that the water resources she had developed through the energy of her citizens were not sufficient to take care of the needs of her expanding industry, she did not come to the Federal Treasury and ask for money to meet that emergency situation. She turned to private industry, private initiative, and private enterprise, and developed her own power resources. Hundreds of thousands, nay, millions, of dollars of the money of Connecticut's citizens, and, indeed, citizens from outside the State of Connecticut, have gone into investments to develop her power resources.

Mr. President, whenever one makes a speech of this kind, he is always charged

by the opposition with being a representative of the power interests. The junior Senator from Connecticut stands here today, not in defense of the power interests—they are well able to take care of themselves. He stands here in defense of the hundreds of thousands of persons employed in Connecticut's industries, the hundreds of thousands of persons in Connecticut who have their money invested in Connecticut enterprises, industries, and power installations, and the many insurance companies and banks which hold the securities of such enterprises as a backlog against the unfortunate day of the expiration of an insurance policy which, through the wisdom and farsightedness of some policyholder, has been taken in order that he might provide against the contingency of his own death or his own ill-health.

Mr. President, there are hundreds of thousands of such persons whose future, in great part, depends upon the success of Connecticut industry and the employment of Connecticut citizens. Not that we ask any appropriation from the Federal Treasury or any subsidy from the Government; we merely ask an even chance and a fair opportunity, which we cannot have, Mr. President, if the Congress takes money from the Federal Treasury and dumps it into a project of this particular kind.

I may say, Mr. President, that I do not stand here as one who says, selfishly, that we must protect Connecticut and we must not do anything for the rest of the Nation. That never has been the position of Connecticut. Down through the years the amount of money which has been paid in taxes by Connecticut citizens has never been returned in benefits to Connecticut citizens. They have been content, Mr. President, to see such Federal funds used elsewhere, knowing that in the long run they will derive some indirect benefit, because it means an indirect benefit to the citizens of Connecticut to have other parts of the Nation developed. But, Mr. President, is it fair to ask that the taxpayers of Connecticut and the taxpayers of other parts of the country should be assessed in order to establish in some other area a supplementary mechanical means to develop a natural resource to the extent that it can continue to furnish increasing amounts of cheaper power, and thus attract industries to that area, away from Connecticut, and away from New England, where we must carry on and where we shall need to have increasing employment for our people?

Mr. President, the argument has been advanced here that the power which has been referred to will be used to supplement the power now available for one of our atomic energy installations. It is not argued that unless the steam plant is built with Federal funds, power cannot be provided. We all know it can be provided in many other ways. But, Mr. President, may the junior Senator from Connecticut remind the Senate that there are other instrumentalities, quite as important to the American economy in peace as well as in war, which do not depend upon an atomic energy plant? The American economy also depends upon all other kinds of industry.

Let us turn for a moment to the war years and to industry in Connecticut and in New England. During those years the per capita value of war production was higher in the State of Connecticut than in any other State of the Union, and the skilled workmen and intelligent managers in Connecticut were proud to make that contribution. Those industries are vital to our peacetime economy, and they are likewise vital to our wartime economy. If they are torn down or remain idle there will be a serious loss to the productive effectiveness of the whole country.

Mr. President, it is not good judgment to take a natural resource, develop it to its limit, then find it is overloaded by the attraction of users because of cheaper power, and then continue to develop it indefinitely through gratuities from the Federal Treasury. If there are natural resources in this Nation which we can develop, let us develop them, but when we have reached the ultimate limit of their development as natural resources, then is it not fair to expect that a natural resource in some other part of the country will receive the benefit of Federal attention and Federal funds in order that that natural resource may be brought to its full development and into its full utilization as a natural resource?

So, Mr. President, if we do not have a question of constitutional law involved, that is more or less beside the point. There is here involved a broad question of policy, namely, shall we appropriate Federal funds to develop a natural resource as a source of power, to its full extent, as a hydroelectric development and then, finding it developed to its fullest extent, shall we move elsewhere to some other natural resource, and use Federal funds to develop that resource to its fullest extent? Let us not say, "We have attracted an overload to this area by virtue of this cheap source of power we have developed for the American people. Now we must step in and supplement it with steam generation. Rather, let us go somewhere else and pick out some other natural resource, perhaps some other of a different kind from this, and develop it to its full extent as a natural source of power, as a natural field for reclamation, or irrigation, or what have you, for the benefit of all the people." It seems to me that if we are to pursue the policy proposed in the pending bill, if it is to pass without the Bridges amendment, we will in the long run be unbalancing our whole economy.

Mr. President, again the junior Senator from Connecticut says he stands here not as a representative of the power companies, who are well able to take care of themselves, but he stands here as a representative of hundreds of thousands of people in Connecticut who are now deeply concerned about their prospects for future employment. They remember the grand job they did during the war, and they are proud of it. On a per capita basis, their production, in dollar volume, surpassed that of any other part of the country. Their record for labor management relations, for the continuance of production, and a high man-hour record, is unparalleled in the whole land. They now face the prospect of wondering where their employment is to be, in the general recession in which the country now appears to be, and they are further faced with the prospect of being required to continue their contributions to the Federal Treasury, and seeing those contributions used in some other part of the country to develop there an industrial area which will be in direct competition with their own.

Mr. President, eastern Tennessee and northern Alabama are beautiful parts of the country. I have been there, and they are lovely indeed. I know that the people who live there now are attached to the soil and attached to the locality; it is their home. The same can be said of the people of Connecticut. Connecticut is a beautiful part of the country, too. The people want to live there and stay there, and in order to stay there and live there they must have employment, and in this time of threatened disruption of our national economy, when such tremendous financial demands are being made on us, not only here at home but throughout the whole world, it seems to me we should not embark upon a policy different from any I recall, such as that proposed by the particular bill now pending, of continuing to develop to an indefinite limit a natural resource which now has to be supplemented by mechanical means because it has reached the limit of its productive capacity as a hydroelectric generating facility.

Mr. President, reaching the highest total in 11 years, the number of claims for unemployment benefits in Connecticut rose to 67,974 during the week ended April 2, from 66,680 for the previous week. A year ago there were 24,383 applying for unemployment benefits. The amount paid out during the week in veterans' readjustment allowances, under the Connecticut law, totaled $1,122,967.

Initial claims, which represent new unemployment, rose to 7,888 from 6,919 for the previous week. During the same week a year ago there were 2,582 initial claims. Since the beginning of 1949 initial claims have averaged approximately 7,000 weekly.

Mr. President, that is not the whole story; that is only a part of the story. Many of those who are still continuing to work, and who are not entitled to unemployment compensation benefits because they are working, are employed a greatly diminished number of hours compared to their employment a year ago. So that the employment picture in Connecticut is not a happy one to contemplate.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, and under the circumstance that in other parts of the country there is the same situation, it would seem to me the better part of wisdom to postpone this particular appropriation, to attempt to preserve the situation as it is now, without adding to it some new features which will require a drastic readjustment, and in the ultimate logical process, may bring about a disruption of the entire industrial economy of the whole country. It would seem to me the better part of

wisdom to postpone this action to a more propitious time.

For these reasons, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut intends to vote in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] striking from the bill the appropriation for the New Johnsonville steam plant.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I know the Members of the Senate are anxious to vote on the pending bill this afternoon, so I shall not ask the indulgence of Senators very long.

I do wish to say that I am disappointed that any Member of the Senate would discuss the provision of the bill with reference to the steam plant appropriation from a sectional viewpoint, and I do not think the Senator from Connecticut intended to do that. If we are to oppose improvements in a particular section of the country from that angle, then we are never going to make very much progress in the development of the resources of this great Nation. I am certain that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut must appreciate that a development which is worthwhile in any section of the United States helps the economy of the whole United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I feel flattered that the Senator should refer to the remarks I have just made, and show an interest in the point of view we take at home.

Suppose there were a choice in the Senate today between making an appropriation for a steam plant in Tennessee or making an appropriation to further develop the water resources of Connecticut with Federal funds; which would the Senator support?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a Member of the House of Representatives I always voted for appropriations for the development of the water resources of Connecticut, as I have for the development of the water resources all over the United States. The RECORD will show that the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the Tennessee Valley area have voted for appropriations for harbor improvements, water development, and the development of other resources, all over the United States, without regard to the particular benefit the improvements would bring to a particular section.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me preface my question with the statement that I appreciate what the Senator says about his support of harbor developments in Connecticut, and in New England generally, and his statement is indeed accurate. As a New Englander, and as an American from New England, I express my gratitude for the Senator's interest and support. I think, however, that the Senator did not quite understand my question, due, to the fact that I did not put it in the proper form.

The question I was trying to ask is this: As between an appropriation to any part of the country to develop a natural resource which is still in its natural state, and to bring it up to the full development of its uses as a natural resource, such as hydroelectric generation of power, and the choice of taking an area where the natural resource had been developed to the full extent that it could be developed as a hydroelectric system, and making an extensive appropriation further to add to the power generated by the hydroelectric system, by means of establishment of a mechanical or steam plant, which proposal would the Senator favor under those circumstances, irrespective of where it was in the country?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut I would say that if in the northeastern part of the United States, in Connecticut, let us say, if a situation existed which was analogous to the one in the Tennessee Valley Authority, I would be here doing my best to try to secure approval and an appropriation for such a development. I certainly would not say that because it was not in the Tennesee Valley region or in the South I was opposed to it. I am sure I would be just as vigorous in joining the Senator from Connecticut in support of a project on behalf of New England, as I am in support of the pending measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may point out to the Senator that on the St. Lawrence River there is an opportunity to build one dam which would generate more power than all the power generated in the TVA area last year. The construction of this dam has been prevented by certain business interests of New England and New York, who at the same time complain about the success of the TVA operation. All New England, outside the State of Maine, is within economic transmission of the St. Lawrence project. Nearly all of New York is within a 200-mile radius of it. Does the Senator agree that the development of this great river, the firmest flowing river in the world, 70 percent of it firm power, would be a good thing for the country?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator from Vermont, in view of the fact that it is desired to bring the matter now before us to a conclusion as soon as possible, I do not wish to become involved in a discussion of other projects of this kind, for the Senator from Vermont very readily realizes the length to which such a discussion might go. I may say, however, that, from my own point of view, I think the St. Lawrence development is greatly worth while. I have always been for it, and I expect to support it, because I think it is the development of a great natural asset for the benefit of the country. It is certainly going to have my hearty support.

Mr. President, we should not overlook the very important fact that, though the purchasing power and the annual average income of the people of the Tennessee Valley area are still greatly below the national average, yet in the Tennessee Valley region great strides forward have been made agriculturally and in many other ways, so that the farmers in the Tennessee Valley area, by virtue of being able now to have electricity, and to buy more farm equipment, are in a better position to buy manufactured products which are made all over the United States, including those made in the State of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. It should also be considered that very little of the equipment which goes into the dams built in the Tennessee Valley area, and very little of the equipment which will go into this steam plant is manufactured in the South. Most of it is made in the northern and eastern States. So construction of the steam plant would give employment to the workers and help the economy of those sections. I think practically all the generators which have gone into the hydroelectric plants were made at Schenectady, N. Y., or at Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. President, it should also be considered that every dollar of investment that goes into this steam plant will be charged to the electrical operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which under a law passed by the Congress at the last session must be amortized and paid back to the Government within 40 years. So this investment in the steam plant is going to be paid for by the purchasers of electricity in the Tennessee Valley area.

Those of us who live in the Tennessee Valley area have no source of power except that provided by the TVA. We are simply asking that the Congress give us a spare tire. There is nothing of less value than a spare tire until it is needed, but when it is needed there is nothing that can take its place.

Mr. President, the record shows that the proposal is good from a business standpoint. Every private power utility likes to have a combination of hydroelectric plants and steam plants. There certainly cannot be wise economy in not making it possible for the Tennessee Valley Authority to use all its prime power to the greatest possible extent. As matters now stand for about 9 months of the year water which would generate 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity is going to waste. If the steam plant is built, that much power would be firmed up by its operation over a 3-month period.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask for information. The Senator just made the statement that for 9 months of the year there was so much water available that a great deal of power which was generated went to waste.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator explain that statement in a little more detail? I do not quite follow it. Does the water go to waste because it cannot be utilized, or does it make power than cannot be sold, or both?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and I should have amplified my statement. Some water goes to waste, but the chief loss occurs in that during the period of 9 months or 8½ months, a great deal of power has to be sold as dump or secondary power, which

brings a very low rate of return, whereas if the TVA could make firm commitments, as it would like to, for prime power, then the power which is sold as secondary or dump power would bring a greater price and result in a considerably larger revenue.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator further if it would be possible to hold the water in check so as to have it available for the 3 or 3½ months when the water supply is less than normal?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I am sure the water which is held by the TVA dams is used to the very greatest facility in the generation of power and for the other uses of navigation and flood control. A visit in the TVA region during the end of the dry season will reveal that the lakes are down very, very low, so that the water supply is practically exhausted, just before the rain starts to fill them up again.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator how much the steam plant will cost when it is completed and in operation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The cost, I believe, will be about $54,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. What prompts my inquiry is this: If we were to take the $54,000,000 and build another dam farther up the river to make two reservoirs or two pools of water, would it then be necessary to build the steam plant in order to have power during the dry period? Could we not impound water by building one or more dams and not utilizing the water, but turning it loose into the pools which are being depleted, so that the present plant would run continuously with water power, without the use of steam power being required at all?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator's question is a pertinent one. It is gone into in a colloquy between the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and Mr. Clapp, the general manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I find the following on page 198 of the hearings:

> Mr. CLAPP. That is correct.
>
> Senator THOMAS. You said you were not a lawyer, but I know you are a good electrical engineer.
>
> Mr. CLAPP. I cannot qualify as an electrical engineer either.
>
> Senator THOMAS. You are good practically, both as a lawyer and an engineer. You have an alternative to building this steam plant, but it will be very expensive. You could dam those streams and the tributaries of those streams and watch the rainfall when it falls and hold the rainfall in the dam and then let the water down into hydroelectric dams as you needed it, but that would be a very, very expensive process, and it would cost you many times more to do that than it would cost you to build the steam plant you are asking for here.
>
> Mr. CLAPP. It could be extremely expensive. As you move farther up into the tributaries, the drainage area you are damming up becomes smaller, of course, in proportion to the amount of concrete you are putting into the dam.

In the colloquy the Senator from Oklahoma stated that he agreed that it would be very expensive and not feasible. He also stated that wherever private utilities had hydroelectric plants they also had steam plants to firm up their power; and that in the Northwest, while the Bonneville and other operations do not have steam plants, they sell the power to private utilities operating in that region which, in turn, use it during the time when they have plenty, and then firm it up with their own steam plants. So I am certain that to follow the procedure suggested by the distinguished Senator would be a very expensive operation. Moreover, most of the tributaries are fairly well filled with dams, so that they would not be able to catch and hold back enough water to make any substantial difference. The reservoirs are pretty well used at the present time. It would be physically impossible and financially exorbitant for this procedure to be followed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator if in the testimony there is any statement showing what the increase in revenues will be to the TVA, assuming that the steam plant is built and can be operated during the 3½ months when the firming-up process is necessary from steam-plant operation, as against the existing situation, in which the excess of power must be sold in 8½ months, and because of that fact the contract price is less than it would be if there were stable power the year round. Do I make my interrogation clear to the Senator?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; the Senator's query is clear. I am certain that I have seen a statement, either in the Senate or House hearings, as to what the anticipated increase in revenue would be. I do not find that statement at the moment, but I remember reading that Mr. Clapp testified that the New Johnsonville steam plant would be one of their most profitable electrical investments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator from Tennessee recall whether or not the returns of the TVA by virtue of building this plant would be sufficient not only to amortize the steam plant proper, but to provide additional revenue to apply against the whole project?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certain that it would. In the first place, the TVA would not recommend an electrical installation that it could not amortize and pay off within a period of 40 years. Mr. Clapp's statement that this would be one of the most profitable electrical investments from the viewpoint of return would indicate that it would help pay off the rest of the cost. I believe it has been estimated that the steam plant would bring in additional revenue of $12,000,000 annually and that expense of operation and depreciation would amount to $5,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I am not delaying the Senator too long, would that income find its way year by year back into the Federal Treasury, so that the $54,000,000 would eventually be returned to the Treasury by way of revenue?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It must find its way back within a period of 40 years, so the entire investment in electrical properties will be returned to the Federal Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. For some time during my service here the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has made considerable effort to have the revenues derived from TVA accounted for, and to some extent returned to the Treasury, particularly while Mr. Lilienthal was director of the TVA. My recollection is that the money stayed in the hands of the TVA to use pretty much as it desired for the further development of electrical properties.

What I am concerned about is this: If we appropriate the $54,000,000, will the revenues to be derived from the operation of the plant be kept by the TVA? If that situation continues indefinitely, the Government never will get back its original investment. Can the Senator clear up that phase of the matter?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yesterday I stated the amount which had been returned so far, either returned directly to the Federal Government or reinvested in electrical properties with the approval of Congress. Of course, up to the present time we have had a period of expansion on the part of the Tennessee Valley Authority, when it has been building new facilities and additional transmission lines. In round figures, the amounts are approximately as follows at the present time: $34,000,000 has been returned to the Treasury——

Mr. TYDINGS. Out of how much?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me get the total returns.

On page 893 of the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1950 there is a statement showing the return to the United States Treasury proper as $36,970,334; bond redemption—these bonds were issued to pay the Commonwealth & Southern for property which was purchased—$16,072,500; interest paid on bonds, $7,358,636. Added to that should be the amount which has been reinvested from the earnings of the Tennessee Valley Authority in electrical properties, with the approval of Congress. I believe the figure was stated in the RECORD yesterday to be approximately $75,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, more than $700,000,000 has been expended for the development of TVA. Is that correct as a round figure?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. Almost $800,000,000 has been invested in TVA. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to this fact: Those investments include the investment for navigation and flood control, in addition to the electrical business. The part of the investment charged to electrical operation stands at about $440,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have often heard that figure, but I take exception to it for this reason: First of all, there is very little commercial navigation in that area, as the Senator well knows. I do not mean that there is none, but it is infinitesimal. Furthermore, there were floods long before this project was built; and I do not believe that we have had $400,000,000 worth of floods. I take it that the value of this project lies primarily in the great amount of electric power which it brings to the community. In my bookkeeping I would charge at least three-quarters of the investment to electrical development.

I would say, without in the slightest way wishing to reflect on the other advantages, that I think the great advantage is the bringing of cheap electricity to that community.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the observation the Senator from Maryland has made, and at some time I should like to discuss the value of flood control and navigation furnished by TVA. We have had very greatly increased navigation in the Tennessee River, and I think I should call this point to the attention of the Senator from Maryland: At Chattanooga, where I make my home, it has been estimated that on the average the TVA dams above Chattancoga have saved the city from an average of approximately $2,000,000 of damage a year. We, in years past before TVA, have had very severe floods which have completely covered the downtown section of Chattanooga; and those dams have been able to bring the crest of the river down very considerably at Chattanooga. Moreover, recently I saw a statistic by the TVA, which I think was joined in by the Corps of Engineers, that the control of the water in the Tennessee River by means of dams had lowered the flood crest of the Mississippi River by several feet—perhaps by 3 feet, I think—and thus greatly lessened the burden and the menace of flood on the Mississippi River. So it has been of great and substantial value.

But I also should point out to the Senator from Maryland that not all the dams are charged partly to flood control. The dams which were built during the war, specifically as war measures—such as Douglas Dam and Cherokee Dam—although serving for flood control and navigation to a considerable extent, are charged entirely to electrical operations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, my general inquiry into this subject has been made because with $800,000,000 of Federal money invested in this whole project, it seems to me, without belittling it—because I do not mean to do that—that the time has come for a reorientation of the whole project. It seems to me that inasmuch as we have almost a billion dollars invested in it, the use of a revolving fund to expand it still further should not be left up to the directors, but should be left up to the Congress.

Now that the pioneering work has largely been done, I believe it is wise to have the revenues derived from the TVA turned into the Treasury of the United States, and Congress from now on should determine, it seems to me, what new projects in the way of extensions of transmission lines or what-not within reasonable limitations should be undertaken.

I can understand how in the early days there was a tremendous amount of latitude because the whole proposition was in a formative state. But in my opinion when we bring our investment in this entire project up to $800,000,000, it is a major enterprise; and it seems to me that from then on the revenues should be turned into the Federal Treasury, just as any other revenues coming from comparable operations are turned into the Federal Treasury, and an accounting made, and then the Congress should decide where it wishes to continue the expansion of the project.

I have generally supported a great deal of this program; but it seems to me that by having it revolve in one particular community, we might in the end penalize other communities of the country which perhaps may be in greater need at the moment than are some of the communities affected by enterprises undertaken in this locality.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations the Senator from Maryland has made, but I am sure he will agree with me that they are not matters which pertain to this particular legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course they are not involved in this particular legislation at all.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, all the major projects of the TVA—the dams and steam plants—in the past have been appropriated for by the Congress, by specific acts of the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Moreover, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate go over all the TVA expenditures for electrical purposes, and have done so over the years.

Mr. TYDINGS. However, I think the time has come when we should reorient the approach of Congress to this matter, and not leave four or five men in charge of such a vast enterprise, able to do almost whatever they wish to do, except in the case of major improvements. That is the point I wished to bring to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee. There are other questions, but I shall not take time to ask them now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, to show the fact that it is a good business operation to firm up the power that is generated by the hydroelectric dams of the TVA, I have an advertisement of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri. I wish to read several paragraphs of the advertisement. It points out witht a great deal of pride what a good power system it has, that it can have prime or firm power all the year round, and that it is well balanced by having a certain number of steam plants to augment or supplement the hydroelectric plants during the dry seasons.

I read from the advertisement:

> One of the characteristics of hydroelectric plants, such as Bagnell, is that the amount of electric power available from the plant varies with the flow of the river. When water is plentiful and hydro is flush, as it usually is in the spring and fall, power is abundant and the plant may carry full load around the clock, day after day. At other times during the year when the flow of the river is low and in consequence the amount of power available is limited—

Then it goes on to tell how the steam plants supplement or firm up the power.

I read now from another paragraph in the advertisement:

> In contrast with the variability of water power, steam-power plants can carry their full capacity for long periods of time and by using Bagnell—

The lake where the hydroelectric system is—

> in combination with our five steam-generating plants located in St. Louis, we are able to use to the fullest extent the varying output of power at Bagnell.

Mr. President, inasmuch as we have asked the TVA to condu this operation in a strictly businesslike manner, in order to make the most out of the investment the Federal Government has in the Tennessee Valley Authority, we should not stand in their way in their effort to make this operation a successful business enterprise. The only way it is practical and feasible for the TVA to firm up the power which is available most of the year, but is not available when the water is low, is by building the new Johnsonville steam plant. If the TVA can do that, it will be able to secure contracts for firm power all the year round, for the power which will be available.

Mr. President, the TVA is a great national defense asset. The great plants in the TVA area which are necessary for the defense of our Nation have been discussed. In the interest of defense, as well as in the interest of a successful, sensible business operation, I believe the Tennessee Valley Authority should be authorized to build this steam plant and should receive an appropriation for building it.

Mr. President, I shall not go into detail about the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], but I point out that the charter of the TVA fully authorizes the construction and operation of steam plants. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has discussed that matter fully and most ably. There can be no question as to the logic of his conclusion.

The Supreme Court has held that an act which authorizes a contest, where there is not a real controversy between people, is itself unconstitutional. So I think the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan would really be asking the Senate to do something which is unconstitutional; and there are a number of cases to sustain that viewpoint which I can give if necessary. This steam plant is fully authorized by the charter of the Tennessee Valley Authority. One steam plant has previously been built. Certainly under the property clause of the Constitution, if the Government has a property, as it has in this case, which it can make more valuable and the product of which it can sell to better advantage, then there can be no constitutional obstacle to the granting of this appropriation.

So I urge Members of the Senate not to put an economic lid on the development of our section, not to penalize the TVA in its effort to operate the property of the United States Government on an efficient basis, but to grant this appropriation, which will be fully repaid to the Federal Government within the time required by the amortization law enacted by the last Congress.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am not prepared at the moment to vote either for or against the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, but I think that with some assistance from

the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], if he will be so thoughtful as to answer some of the questions that really concern me, I might in a very few moments be prepared to vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to answer any questions I can. I am not sure I can, but I shall be very glad to do so if possible.

Mr. CAIN. I deeply appreciate the Senator's attitude. I should like to say, because it may interest the Senator from Tennessee, that I am asking these questions because of my own uncertainty. It has been a surprising fact to me that with reference to the desire to erect a steam plant in Tennessee under the Tennessee Valley Authority I have not received from the Pacific Northwest a single communication either in support of that desire or in opposition to it.

I seek information in order that I may not only satisfy my own concern as to where we are heading but in order that I may be able adequately to explain to those who, as the Senator from Tennessee knows, are very greately interested in the development of power in the Pacific Northwest, what the past record is and what the future intentions are of citizens living within the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

My first question is, Does the Senator from Tennessee know what the water power potential of the rivers under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority is? What is the total volume in number of kilowatts to be produced when those rivers have been fully developed in terms of power generation?

Mr. McKELLAR. The dams on those rivers have not all been developed. There are other dam sites which may be developed and which no doubt will be developed. But, so far as this particular steam plant is concerned, it is necessary because of the hydroelectric power which has already been generated. It is designed to make possible a constant flow of power to those with whom the Tennessee Valley Authority has already made contracts.

The Senator understands, no doubt, that all the power business in Tennessee is now owned by the Tennessee Valley Authority. A number of years ago, the Authority agreed to sell power to various municipalities and to others under the terms of a contract which has been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Mr. CAIN. I understand that. I further understand what the construction of a steam plant within the jurisdiction of the TVA will mean. I am sympathetic and appreciative of what a steam plant would do, because it is perfectly natural that those living within the Tennessee Valley should desire to firm up the secondary power, obviously in order that more power will be available for greater expansion and development purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is also desired in order that it can be sold as firm power, as the Senator understands, which brings a higher price than secondary power.

Mr. CAIN. I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. The estimated peak demand for 1951–52 is 3,230,000 kilowatts. The corresponding assured capacity on the basis of facilities existing or under construction is 2,956,000 kilowatts.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to restate my original question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. What will be the number of kilowatts when all the water resources under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been fully developed?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am getting for the Senator the figures. However, the examination into that question has not been completed. There are a great many dam sites on the tributaries especially of the Tennessee River. It depends on another thing, also. On the Cumberland River, which is north of the Tennessee River and flows in the same general direction, there are a great many dam sites which are still undeveloped. No one has the figures up to date, so far as I know, as to the total potential power inasmuch as all the investigations are not completed.

Mr. CAIN. I assume, I may suggest to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, that someone must know, in fact, many people must know, what the total number of kilowatts will be when the waters within the Tennessee Valley are fully developed. The Senator might ask me similarly about the Columbia River, and I could say in reply it is a fact that we have a total power potential in terms of kilowatts of more than 30,000,000, and as of today we have installed generators to produce 10 percent, or 3,000,000 kilowatts. I should like to have the Senator satisfy my curiosity, if he can, and I know he will, as to the power potential, for example, as between the Columbia River and the rivers within the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Is it a matter of 10,000,000 kilowatts in prospect, or 5,000,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have in a moment the latest figures available. Does the Senator from Washington have other questions?

Mr. CAIN. I have several that I should like to ask with the Senator's indulgence.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall indeed be glad to have the Senator ask the questions.

Mr. CAIN. How many kilowatts is it estimated will be produced by the steam plant if it is authorized and constructed?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if I may suggest, I think the figure is 375,000 kilowatts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Three hundred and seventy-five thousand kilowatts is the correct answer.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield. I may say to the junior Senator from Tennessee I shall very much appreciate any information which may be provided by any Senator familiar with the situation in the Tennessee Valley, because I am seeking information which I have not thus far been able to obtain.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator that on page 214 of the Senate hearings there is a list of all the dams which have been built, except Watauga and South Holston.

The installed capacity, as of December 1948, is 2,203,000 kilowatts. Mr. Clapp was asked a question as to what the present total installed capacity was, and on page 195 of the hearings it will be found that he afterwards furnished the information that the total capacity presently installed and under construction is 3,449,000 kilowatts, of which 445,000 kilowatts is steam. The information shows that by adding the capacity requested in the deficiency bill will bring the total capacity by June, 1952, to 3,838,000 kilowatts, of which 785,000 kilowatts will be steam, or approximately 20 percent of the total.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator speaking of capacity which will be in force as of a given date?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire if the Senator knows what the total power potential output in terms of kilowatts may be? Going back to the Columbia River as a comparison, if and when that river is fully developed, it will produce 30,000,000 kilowatts of power against the 3,000,000 which is being produced today.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, I am sure the senior Senator from Tennessee is better prepared to furnish the details.

Mr. CAIN. The senior Senator from Tennessee is hopeful of getting the information, but he did not have it at the time I asked the question a few moments ago.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Before the river reaches Knoxville it divides into quite a number of tributaries. Of course, the tributaries have a certain power potential, but the question of economic feasibility arises in the case of the smaller tributaries.

Mr. CAIN. I dare say the engineers have pretty conclusively arrived at a total power potential, which is available to the Tennessee Valley when properly developed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am advised that it is not planned to build many more dams. It is considered that there are many more sites. As to what the total potentiality will be, I am unable to say.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we are getting the latest available information for the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I was asking several questions concerning the steam plant itself. I understood it would produce approximately 375,000 kilowatts.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. It would take approximately 4 years to construct it and place it in operation, and its total cost would approximate $54,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask this question of the senior Senator from Tennessee? Has the Tennessee Valley Authority, since it found it needed additional power to firm up its power, made any attempt to buy firming power from private industry? There is a reason for that question. We are concerned in trying to develop a Federal power policy, and there is reason to think there is a difference between a hydroelectric development on the one hand and a steam-plant operation on the other hand. I wonder if any negotiations have been had with private power companies to determine whether

they could provide for the Tennessee Valley the firmed-up steam-plant power which they so obviously need.

Mr. McKELLAR. The answer to that question is that there is such a scarcity of power in that area that, as a matter of fact, there is none to buy. It is necessary to build a steam plant in order to get the firm power.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has said rather firmly, in answer to my question, that there are no private power companies available in that region from which to buy surplus power; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if any private company has ever been encouraged or asked to construct a steam plant for the purpose of selling power to the TVA for resale to its present consumers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know of no such application.

Mr. CAIN. I think my question is based on a very sound premise. As we are faced with the need of continuing the development of our river systems, how much happier it might be for all of us if private dollars were to be invested in steam plants for the purpose of producing power for sale, not necessarily to the TVA, but to other public agencies in other sections of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that electricity is, in its nature, monopolistic. Before the Tennessee Valley Authority was developed, one company had the ownership and control of practically all the electricity produced in Tennessee. That company was the Tennessee Power Co. When the TVA took, over, it entered into a contract to purchase a number of steam plants.

For instance, the TVA acquired the Hales Bar steam plant, a steam plant near Nashville, and a steam plant at Parksville, Tenn. The Government had built the Wilson Dam steam plant, and the Watts Bar steam plant was authorized in 1940, which has a capacity of 240,000 kilowatts. The TVA has five major steam plants and several smaller ones. As I recall, the total kilowatt capacity of these steam plants is 450,000 kilowatts.

It was known from the very beginning that it was absolutely necessary to have steam plants in order to make firm power which could be sold at all seasons of the year. There are two seasons of the year, in Tennessee, when it is necessary to use steam plants. One is a rather long season in the fall of the year, when the weather is dry and there is very little water. The other season is in the wintertime, from the latter part of December into January and February, when there is an oversupply of water. Under those circumstances it is necessary to drain the water off to take care of floodwaters which come in the spring of the year, and it is necessary to use steam power. Not so much steam power is required in that season as is required in the dry period, but some steam power has to be used. It is absolutely necessary, and it has been from the beginning, even when the Tennessee Power Co. controlled all the power. No objection had been made to steam plants until last year. I think that was the first time any objection was ever raised to steam plants. This is not a new matter at all.

Mr. CAIN. At the moment I am not talking about objections to a steam plant. I am raising the question as to whether we should not carry out the development of hydroelectric possibilities, of which there are scores in almost every region of the Nation, before we embark seriously on creating stream plants to firm up secondary power. If we had a national power policy, I would not find it necessary, as the Senator knows, to raise that question, but I find it advisable to do so in this connection.

Mr. McKELLAR. The main sites have been developed. There are other smaller sites on the tributaries which have not been developed. They have been regarded as not feasible in the system at this time, but the Authority must have the steam plant whether they develop the smaller sites or not. They have to have the steam plant in order to firm up the power.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if I understand the Senator from Tennessee correctly, because my assumption is that he has just said that the water potential presently under the jurisdiction of the TVA has been fully developed, namely, that the rivers have been used about as effectively and economically as they can be used, and that from now on if the Tennessee Valley is to benefit from additional kilowatts, provision must be made for power to be generated in steam plants, and not from river developments. Is the Senator from Washington to understand the position of the Senator from Tennessee in this instance to be that the TVA must obtain power generated from steam plants in the future in addition to the total number of kilowatts presently being developed by the rivers there and the number anticipated with reference to the future?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the figures now about the present kilowatt capacity, and that which may be developed, which I shall give the Senator.

The present and authorized projects, including the New Johnsonville steam plant, will by 1953 have a capacity of 3,900,000 kilowatts. The present kilowatt capacity is 2,800,000. There is a difference of 1,100,000.

Mr. CAIN. I understand there is a difference in that connection, but it still does not explain the difference between what is already authorized by the Congress and what the actual potential of the region happens to be. They may be one and the same thing; I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am giving the potential figure.

Mr. CAIN. The ultimate capacity of the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. McKELLAR. That will be the ultimate capacity, according to the engineers of the TVA.

Mr. CAIN. Something in excess of 3,000,000 kilowatts?

Mr. McKELLAR. Three million nine hundred thousand kilowatts?

Mr. CAIN. I understand, and I am very grateful for that information.

Mr. McKELLAR. However, that includes the steam plant, with a capacity of about 375,000 kilowatts.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly. Any question I can answer I shall be delighted to answer, because there is no secrecy of any kind about this matter.

Mr. CAIN. The President of the United States today has sent to the Congress a message in sturdy support of his proposal that a Columbia Valley Authority be created in the Pacific Northwest. In the middle of the first page of the statement he refers to the Tennessee Valley Authority in these words:

> The Tennessee Valley Authority * * * has been spectacularly successful in achieving many of the goals of a wise and balanced use of resources.

During much of the debate I have been impressed with the statements of the senior Senator from Tennessee and other Senators who supported the steam plant when they have said, "We need the steam plant to make our operation more economical and more efficient."

Mr. McKELLAR. And to sell the product at a greater price in the interest of the Government.

Mr. CAIN. Exactly. But I wonder what the Senator is actually talking about. Is the Authority presently and has it been operating an uneconomical system?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they have been operating an economical plant for a number of years, and it is paying well. It pays between 3 and 4 percent on the amount of money the Government has invested for all purposes. This is a multiple purpose system of dams.

Mr. CAIN. I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator indulge me a moment?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator referred to the Columbia Basin project, but he has not referred to the Missouri River project. In January 1933, President Roosevelt, who was President-elect at the time, sent me a telegram, and a similar telegram to Senator Norris, of Nebraska, and Senator Clarence Dill, of the State of Washington, one of the predecessors of the Senator who now has the floor. He asked us to visit with him in his private car at Muscle Shoals. We went there, and I should like to show the Senator some time a picture of the party as they were at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to see it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I was probably a little more active than Senator Dill and Senator Norris were at the time. We had already had a start at Muscle Shoals. I had introduced a bill for the construction of the Muscle Shoals Dam, and, therefore, the Tennessee Valley got a slight lead on the Missouri River and the Columbia River projects. I believe that all three projects should have been adopted. I still think the others should be developed. I think it would be to the best interests of our common country that all three should be developed. They should be developed with the greatest care. We should look after the interests

of the private operators, but inasmuch as the deveopment of electricity is by nature a monopolistic enterprise, private interests should have charge of the development in certain areas and the public in other areas. The three projects mentioned were three President Roosevelt felt at the time might be developed by the Government, leaving the rest of the country to private industry.

Mr. CAIN. Let me make an observation to the Senator from Tennessee. From what he has taught me so well up to date, first, the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority with reference to its output and utilization of power has been both effective and efficient.

Mr. McKELLAR. And economical, as well.

Mr. CAIN. But the Senator and his associates wish to construct the proposed steam plant to make their over-all operation even more effective and efficient than it has been to date.

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly.

Mr. CAIN. Against that observation, may I ask if the Tennessee Valley Authority is today able to satisfy all its contractual obligations?

Mr. McKELLAR. Substantially all. Any lack of power to do so has been because of unusual circumstances. The demand for power is constantly increasing, as the Senator knows, and in order to take care of the contracts it now has, and the applications for new business which are already coming in—and that includes a number of war operations in Tennessee, such as the Oak Ridge project and others, the chemical plant there, and the like—it is absolutely necessary to have a steady flow of firm power, and that is all we are seeking to provide through the pending bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make a statement for the benefit of the Senator from Washington. Between 1945 and 1947 residential and rural consumers in the Tennessee Valley increased their consumption of power by 60 percent.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In the same period commercial and industrial consumers increased their requirements by 25 percent. It is estimated that by 1952 rural and residential requirements will be 90 percent over the 1947 requirements. Likewise, commercial and industrial consumption is expected to increase 65 percent by 1952. There is no dispute that new sources of power must be developed in order to meet the growing demand for power.

Mr. CAIN. Let me say to the senior Senator from Illinois and to the senior Senator from Tennessee that they have both established a point that satisfies my curiosity, namely, that with reference to debts, the TVA finds it possible to meet every penny of its obligations, 100 cents on the dollar; but what TVA not only needs and wishes but must have, is additional power with which to meet obligations which are not under contract today, but which everybody knows are anticipated or are pending.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been advised that approximately 100,000 farmers who belong to rural organizations, such as the REA and others, have made application to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power, and are unable to get it because the Authority is unable to furnish a steady flow of power. It is absolutely necessary to have the steam plant to aid in this undertaking.

Mr. CAIN. I have tried to make very clear to the senior Senator from Tennessee that I note that the requirements are such that more power must be generated. Some of the questions I have raised have been hard-headed and searching from my point of view, because I am hopeful that, with reference to steam-plant operations, the power from such plants could be provided by sources other than Federal dollars. I know the Senator has not begrudged any of these questions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. I have welcomed them.

Mr. CAIN. I notice my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, sitting in the Chamber. We are tremendously concerned not only over what the Senator is attempting to have accomplished and wants to do in the future in the Tennessee Valley, but we wonder where we are going in the Pacific Northwest. As I mentioned a few minutes ago to the Senator from Tennessee, the Columbia River, the second largest river, I suppose, next to the Missouri, in all America, alone has a power potential of 30,000,000 kilowatts. We have accomplished approximately only 10 percent of the job. No dollar of Federal expenditure which is used elsewhere in this country for the development of hydroelectric power would find me or my colleague in opposition. But now we are presuming to start to establish steam plants. We are only starting one now in the Tennessee Valley, but I think that will be a reasonable precedent, sir.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken about that. As I have stated, the TVA now has five major steam plants and several smaller ones, having a total capacity of 450,000 kilowatts.

Mr. CAIN. Under the jurisdiction of TVA.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they are owned by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Some of them were built by the Tennessee Valley Authority. The strange thing to me and to others who are interested in this matter is why this particular steam plant has been selected to bring on a fight of this kind.

Mr. CAIN. Let me ask a question. I do not know its answer. What is the logical difference between the steam plant we have under consideration today and the other steam plants which I understood the Senator to say have previously been constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator mean how much capacity each one has?

Mr. CAIN. No; wherein lies the fundamental difference? If questions are being raised about this one, were similar questions raised about the other plants?

Mr. McKELLAR. No questions at all were raised about the other plants. The appropriation for the Watts Bar steam plant, if I remember correctly, was passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. CAIN. I am not qualified to say, because I was not in the Senate then.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know there was no opposition on the floor to the Watts Bar steam plant, or to the one at Muscle Shoals, when it was proposed to build a steam plant there. Muscle Shoals is the largest dam. There was no opposition when the plant at Chickamauga, just below Chattanooga on the Tennessee River, was under consideration. There was no objection raised to the other plants which have been built. The belated opposition to the steam plant under consideration is something which surprises me very much. I really thought there would be no trouble about it. The Senate passed the appropriation for it by a considerable majority a year ago. The item went to the House for its consideration. I had no idea it would be attacked in the House, but it was, and the item was defeated in the House. We now have before us a provision for appropriation for the steam plant similar to the provision which was before Congress last year.

Mr. President, I wish to read from page 16 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949 as follows, being a part of Mr. Clapp's testimony:

GENERAL FUNCTION OF STEAM PLANTS IN TVA SYSTEM

I think the committee understands the general function of steam plants in the TVA system. This is predominantly a hydroelectric power system, producing power from dams that are designed, built, and operated primarily for flood control and to maintain navigable channels.

Mr. CAIN. A multiple-purpose dam?

Mr. McKELLAR. A multiple-purpose system of dams.

And operated primarily for flood control and to maintain navigable channels. The fact that these are multiple-purpose dams places certain practical limitations upon their use in the production of electricity, and in order to get the best use of the controlled water in the Tennessee River system, we use steam plants to firm up the hydro power that is otherwise available in large quantities only during certain seasons of the year.

Mr. CAIN. What is the date of the hearing?

Mr. McKELLAR. January 28 of this year before the House Subcommittee on Deficiencies.

Mr. CAIN. It is my understanding that in 1936 the Congress authorized or directed the Tennessee Valley Authority to report fully to the Congress on its experience up to that time. May I inquire of the Senator from Tennessee whether included within that report any portion of the discussion was devoted to the need of steam plants in the future to firm up secondary power? For how many years, in other words, have we been talking about the need for secondary power being firmed up through steam plants as auxiliaries to hydroelectric-river systems?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I remember, there was very little said about it for the reason that we had built the steam plants to which I have referred, one at Muscle Shoals, and the other places I have mentioned. The Wilson Dam steam plant, which had already been built, and no particular point was raised with respect to any of them. The biggest fight came up last year when Mr. Smith, a representative of the power companies in Washington, made a spectacular fight to stop steam plants on the theory that we were starting a general steam plant proposal. That was an entirely new point. That is not the purpose at all. It is not the purpose to go into the steam-plant business. The plant is to be erected merely for the purpose of aiding the Government in disposing of its power to the best advantage to the Government itself and to the best advantage of those who buy the power from the Government.

Mr. CAIN. Would the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee construe the establishment of this steam plant in itself as creating a precedent which is likely to result in other steam plants being authorized for other sections of the country before we have had a chance in every section of the country fully to develop our water resources?

Mr. McKELLAR. I see no reason at all why this particular plant would have the slightest effect on that situation, any more than the building of the one at Wilson Dam had, or any more than the building of the one at Muscle Shoals Dam had, or the one at Watts Bar Dam. They have never had the effect of interfering in any way with the private power business at all. The Government is not setting up an independent steam-power business, and does not propose to do so.

I want to say to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], whom I do not see on the floor at the moment, that we are not undertaking to take business away from Connecticut or from any other State. We wish to take care of the business we have in the Tennessee Valley, which is asking for more power and is unable to get it.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator certainly is being very helpful to my thinking.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am trying to be.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has provided information with which those of us who have not been long in the Senate are totally unfamiliar.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to contribute anything I can; and I wish to be entirely accurate. If I make any mistake in figures, I should like to have my attention called to it, because I do not want to make any mistake.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. A few minutes ago the Senator from Washington inquired if there had been any discussion in connection with previous appropriation bills relative to the question of building steam plants to firm up power.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I invite the Senator's attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 30, 1940, at page 9738, and many pages prior thereto, on which will be found the debate in the House of Representatives on the Watts Bar steam plant.

Mr. CAIN. I am grateful to the Senator, and I shall read those pages with real interest.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This question was fully discussed. The appropriation for the Watts Bar steam plant was the main question involved. On a motion to recommit, the vote was 125 to 299, and on the passage of the bill it was 265 to 93. In the discussion at that time there was no doubt that the Congress was fully authorized, constitutionally and within the TVA Act, to appropriate for the steam plant. There is a very full discussion of the Watts Bar steam plant in those pages.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in further answer to the Senator's question, I have the testimony of Mr. Clapp, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on the 26th of January 1949. This testimony gives the names of the steam plants and their location. It appears on page 16 of the House committee hearings on the first deficiency bill. I shall not read it because it is along the line of the statement which I have already made. I ask unanimous consent this excerpt from the testimony may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The additions we are requesting in this supplemental are a natural development of the TVA power system. I believe this committee is well aware of the fact that the power system of the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a hydro and steam combination from the beginning. The committee will recall, I am sure, that at the time the Government built Wilson Dam which was started during the First World War and finished in the 1920's, Congress also authorized, and there was built by the Government, a steam plant known as the Wilson Dam steam plant, of 64,000 kilowatts capacity. Then, at the time of the major acquisitions of private utilities properties, during the period closing generally in 1939, TVA in collaboration with the municipalities and rural electric cooperatives of the power service area, bought a combination hydro and steam system from the private utilities. The TVA purchased the generating and transmission facilities of the existing companies, the municipalities bought their distribution systems, and the rural electric cooperatives bought those parts of the distribution systems which were in the areas in which they were going to retail TVA power.

At the time that acquisition was made, TVA not only acquired, for example, the Hales Bar Dam which had been built on the Tennessee River and operated by the Tennessee Electric Power Co., but we also bought several large steam plants, including a steam plant at Hales Bar Dam, a steam plant near Nashville, Tenn., a steam plant at Parksville, Tenn., etc.

Then, in 1940, through the regular appropriation procedure Congress authorized the TVA to build the Watts Bar steam plant near Watts Bar Dam which was under construction at that time. That steam plant at Watts Bar has a capacity of 240,000 kilowatts. Today, out of a total system capacity of some 2,650,000 kilowatts capacity, 450,000 kilowatts is in steam plants.

Mr. KERR. How many steam plants do you have?

Mr. CLAPP. We have five major steam plants and several smaller ones—the small plants have a total capacity of about 20,000 kilowatts. Altogether, our steam plants, the one we built, the Wilson Dam steam plant that the Government built during the First World War, and the ones we bought, now total 450,000 kilowatts—considerably in excess of the capacity of the presently requested units for the New Johnsonville steam plant.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I appreciate having the opportunity to read the testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator any further questions?

Mr. CAIN. I have two more questions. First, if this appropriation is granted, what sum of money will be requested for the steam plant in the fiscal year 1950?

Mr. McKELLAR. The estimate is $16,500,000.

Mr. CAIN. I know the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee will not think that this observation has any prejudice within it. I wish I knew whether or not we have a Federal power policy. So far as I know, we have none with reference to the relationship of the respective rights as between steam plants on the one hand and hydroelectric plants on the other.

Mr. McKELLAR. The answer is a perfectly natural one. The two must be used together. One is the complement of the other. The production and sale of electricity is almost a natural monopoly, so the two must be used together, and can only be used together where water power is available.

Mr. CAIN. I agree that they must be used together, in due course. Whether or not a steam plant should actually be owned and operated by the Federal Government is, I take it, a question upon which one could argue for a long time. But the question I raise is whether or not we should encourage the erection of steam plants before we have more adequately developed the water resources of the country and provided for multiple-purpose dams by means of which much more can be done with reference to navigation, flood control, and the generation of electricity than has been done thus far.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand the Senator's question perfectly. I see his point. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the best-developed water-power project in America.

Mr. CAIN. And it is being efficiently operated today?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. For quite a while, as some of my colleagues will remember—I know that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] will remember, because he referred to it this afternoon—I had very serious doubt as to whether it was being economically managed. But under the present management of the Authority I have been convinced that Mr. Clapp is a very efficient man. He has very efficient employees. The project is making money. It is bringing in a return. As the Senator from Maryland pointed out a while ago, there may be some corrections which we ought to make in the payment of the money actually into the Treasury of the United States. That is a question which we should determine, and

it will be determined. I am quite sure that with the development of power in this valley by the Tennessee Valley Authority as it is now developed, and to the extent it is now developed, steam plants are absolutely necessary.

Mr. CAIN. However, let me say most sincerely to the Senator from Tennessee that while we use Federal tax dollars to construct a steam plant, millions upon millions of acre-feet of water in the western regions of the country are being wasted. I can give one concrete example. I do not know what the answer is or ought to be.

Before the Appropriations Committee in recent weeks there were apparently two requests. One was for the New Johnsonville steam plant. I can understand the need for it. The other was a recommendation coming from the President to the House of Representatives that $1,500,000, as I remember, be appropriated to begin a particular project in the Pacific Northwest, known as the Ice Harbor project, a project which could have been constructed in 3½ years and would have produced more than 350,000 kilowatts.

It has been determined, wisely or otherwise, by the Appropriations Committee that as a policy we think it better for the economy and development of the country to encourage the establishment and construction of a steam plant before we continue and pursue to its logical conclusion the development of river-power potential in America.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad to answer the Senator's question. I remember very distinctly the Ice Harbor proposal. It has been before our committee during the past week. The difficulty with that particular project is that it was represented to the committee that there is a controversy over the construction of fish ladders. That has caused a delay. So far as the proof on the project itself, which was presented to the committee, was concerned, it was exceedingly strong. It was well presented, and it made quite an impression.

There is one thing about the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. It is like a special university course. It teaches even elderly men a great many things. I do not think I have ever seen or heard a better demonstration of that fact than in the hearings we held in our committee during the past 3 or 4 weeks.

As I have said, a good case has been made on that project, with one exception; and if there is any delay, in my judgment the delay will be over the matter of getting the right kind of fish ladders so as to protect the fish in the waters of that river.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator from Tennessee aware of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has removed the restriction it had placed on the Ice Harbor proposal?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; we have not been advised of that. When was it done? Was it done today or yesterday?

Mr. CAIN. Within the last week, as I understand, the Director——

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator from Washington that the committee will be delighted to hear him and to hear the representative of the Bureau of the Budget at any time the Senator wishes to present that matter to the committee. Indeed, I am advised by the clerk of the committee that the Ice Harbor project is on our committee's schedule for tomorrow morning, and I invite the Senator from Washington to come to the committee at that time.

Mr. CAIN. That concerns itself, obviously, with the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. CAIN. In thanking the Senator from Tennessee most sincerely for the time he has placed at my disposal, I should like to ask whether he believes that as a matter of principle in connection with the development of our country, regardless of the region in which the potential development may be, the Government of the United States will be well advised to complete its river hydroelectric developments for power before embarking upon the construction of a series of steam plants to be auxiliary to the hydroelectric developments or establishments?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; as a matter of policy, I disagree with the Senator about that, for the reason that it would cost the United States Government an enormous amount of money in the sale of the property it now owns, unless firm power were produced by means of auxiliary steam plants in all these developments.

Mr. President, let me say a word about another matter at this time. I understand that the House of Representatives will adjourn for several days, probably tomorrow or the next day. As I think every Member of the Senate knows, I have been here in the Chamber for 4 weeks waiting for an opportunity to have this bill passed. I have done so, not on account of the New Johnsonville Dam, but on account of the bills the Government owes and is behind in paying. The New Johnsonville Dam is a mere incident. We can act as to it at any time, perhaps; but it has served to delay the passage of the bill itself.

So, Mr. President, most respectfully and most earnestly, and in the friendliest possible way, I ask for prompt action on this bill. All Senators know that I have taken practically no time in the argument which has been presented here. Of course, I have answered questions, but I have done so in an attempt to expedite the handling of the bill. I appeal to all Members of the Senate, as one Senator to another, to let us vote on this bill and pass it or defeat it, as the Senate may determine.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wonder whether we can arrange to obtain a vote on my amendment at a certain time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be delighted to vote on it immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize the Senator from Tennessee would like to have the Senate vote now on the pending amendment, but I think I should say something about some of the facts which have been discussed during the debate this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to make an announcement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say that I hope we can dispose of these two amendments tonight. I am sure that after the distinguished Senator from Michigan discusses his amendment, we shall be in a position to vote.

I think all phases of this bill have been very well developed and ably debated for the past 2 days. No Senator likes to remain in the Chamber in the evening any longer than is necessary, and certainly the Senator from Illinois does not like to remain here after 6 o'clock in the evening.

But in view of what the able Senator from Tennessee said a moment ago with respect to what the House of Representatives may do, it is barely possible that if we do not vote on these two amendments some time today or this evening the bill may be delayed for another 10 days, if the House of Representatives carries through the suggestion it has made that it will take a recess for that length of time. I believe it would be a very serious matter for the country as a whole if the pending deficiency appropriation bill failed of passage tomorrow. It should be passed promptly, so that employees may be paid and so that certain contractors thoughout the Nation, who depend upon the money we appropriate, may continue to carry on the projects they now are undertaking to execute for the Government.

So I hope we can move along toward the disposition of this bill with the least possible delay, and I hope we may obtain a vote on both amendments in the next several hours.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has asked some very pertinent questions. One was in relation to the development of water power in the valley, rather than the building of steam plants. It appears that there is at present in the hydro plants of the TVA a generating capacity of 2,203,102 kilowatts. That figure is very significant, because the proposal now before the Senate is made on the basis of firming up that power by the development of 375,000 kilowatts from a new steam plant. That indicates the firm power which already exists in the valley. I think the figure for it is 1,758,202 kilowatts.

Mr. President, the 1,758,202 kilowatts will take care of all the Government's needs and all the needs of Government agencies in that area, for instance, at Muscle Shoals, at the atomic energy plant, and at other plants. So this is not a question of firming up.

The able Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] today raised the point that no doubt the United Statets Government could build a dam for flood control in an area where floods were a great problem. But the able Senator from Missouri and I part company when he suggests that if there is a certain location where flash floods, lasting for perhaps only 2 weeks in the year, occur, if a dam were built to utilize the water power available at the time of those flash floods, subsequently the Government could build a steam

plant to firm up such water power for the entire year. So far as the situation we now are considering is concerned, I think such a suggestion is absurd.

The Ashwander case clearly holds that if the Government has property, it can sell it to the best advantage. But the property involved in the case the Senator from Missouri has mentioned is property arising from flash floods, and the Government should sell it as such. It is in that connection that the proponents of the pending proposal wish to firm up 2,203,102 kilowatts of hydroelectric power by the use of 375,000 kilowatts developed from a steam plant. If we adopt their suggestion and authorize the construction of the steam plant, what will happen in the future?

The question has been asked during the debate today, Will the step here proposed, if taken, subsequently result in the building of steam plants elsewhere in the United States? Mr. President, have not we heard that the other steam plants which have been built in the Tennessee Valley are being used today as stepping stones for the building of the proposed New Johnsonville steam plant? If the New Johnsonville steam plant is built, will not it be insisted that that plant has for its purpose the firming up, with 375,000 kilowatts, of approximately 2,000,000 kilowatts, and therefore there was justification and authority for building it?

Mr. President, it has also been argued that in the debate yesterday no mention was made of the fact that the Tennessee Valley project was developed for national defense. However, the title of the TVA Act was read yesterday, and the title includes the words "in the interest of the national defense," but I say to the Senate that in all fairness everyone must concede the fact to be that the Tennessee Valley projects were built for two purposes: One was flood control, the other navigation, under the commerce clause.

Oh, yes, we had the Muscle Shoals Dam, and that was for national defense. If I understand the argument made by the able Senator from Missouri on the question of national defense, there are aluminum companies in the Tennessee Valley, and therefore the Government having begun to serve power at a cheap rate, made possible by the fact that no income tax is paid, owes the duty and obligation to all the private industries which some day might be used for national defense, to build steam plants and furnish them with all the power they will ever need in the future because it began at one dam to give them some power, which did not turn out to be firm.

That is not the purpose of the New Johnsonville project. The first press release showed the purpose, and I shall read what Mr. Clapp said, as appears on page 37 of the House hearings. But first I shall show what happened.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was authorized to furnish electricity to municipalities and cooperatives on a priority basis. Electricity was also to be furnished for purposes of national defense. But it has been discovered, as the able Senator from Connecticut said, that by means of advertisements of chambers of commerce, firms moved from Connecticut to the Tennessee Valley, where they can buy cheaper power. There was written into the statute a priority for municipalities and cooperatives, but it is found that numerous industries are moving to the Tennessee Valley, the number of municipalities is increasing, the number of cooperatives is increasing, therefore it is desired that the supply of power be increased.

Mr. Clapp, at page 27 of the hearings, said:

> That function is to keep carrying whatever increased electric current—

I emphasize the word "increased"—

> is required to provide the service which the municipalities and the cooperatives have agreed to give in their areas, and which we, in turn, for the Government, have agreed to give, and arrange with them, the municipalities and cooperatives.

In other words, it is not desired for the purpose of firming up. It is desired as a source of supply for future demands. Was that the original contemplation? I think so. The facts show it. I read into the RECORD yesterday statements by Mr. Krug and Mr. Lilienthal, which I shall not repeat.

With respect to national defense, if the senior Senator from Missouri is correct in his interpretation of the Constitution, then I assert there is nothing so far as business in America is concerned that cannot be begun today in the name of the United States Government, to be carried on completely under the idea of national defense. A steam plant can be built in Detroit to furnish all the power needed by the city of Detroit, because Detroit is a great industrial city, and if war should start some day, the industries of Detroit would naturally be needed in the national defense. There is not a firm in America that could not be caused to manufacture plows, binders, combines, and everything else, on the theory that in the event of war America must be strong upon the farm and in the factory.

Mr. President, it is plain to see where pursuing the idea of national defense leads. No; preparation for the national defense is not the intention at all. The people may be taxed for the national defense and for the general welfare. The Government I think owns about one-eleventh of all the land in the country. Is it contended that factories could be built on all that land, by reason of the fact that it could thereafter be sold to better advantage? Would it be contended that because the United States Government owns 50 acres of land in the city of Detroit, an old fortification, it can today build an automobile plant on it and sell automobiles to private customers? That would be using the land to its best advantage, for in Detroit we have skill to manufacture automobiles. No; that was never intended. The Ashwander case does not support that view. The Ashwander case does nothing more than this: Assuming there is a dam, and there is no way by which power can be sold locally; therefore a power line can be built to transmit the electricity to places where it can be sold. Similarly, the idea is that if there is ore in the ground and the Government owns it, and also owns the ground, it can extract the ore. That is true. It could be marketed. But it does not necessarily follow that the raw material should be manufactured and sales made. I say if that is the rule, if it is to be insisted upon the floor of the Senate that the Government can become socialistic, with all industry and all property owned by the Government or the State, on the argument that it can all be used in the national defense, then we need no amendments to the Constitution; all we need do is to say we are going to make all kinds of machinery and equipment in the name of national defense and are going to sell it.

Mr. President, this project involves a commercial enterprise. Electricity is to be manufactured by steam power, and it is to be sold. A letter from the Atomic Energy Commission was read, stating that a portion of TVA power is to be used. If the Atomic Energy Commission came to the Senate today and said, "We need a steam plant at Oak Ridge," I doubt if one Senator would vote against giving it to them. Do Senators know how far Oak Ridge is from the site of the proposed New Johnsonville Dam? I think the figure is anywhere from 200 to 350 miles. Anyone familiar with the subject knows electricity is not transmitted 250 miles in order to furnish power to the Atomic Energy Commission. Think of it. Think of the United States Government, or the Atomic Energy Commission, wanting to build a plant by which to furnish power to Oak Ridge to manufacture atomic bombs, and transmitting that power approximately 200 miles.

Mr. President, if the power is needed for Oak Ridge, it would be constitutional to provide it to Oak Ridge, because that is a United States national defense plant, which was established for that specific purpose. But we cannot stretch the idea of national defense to include everything, because, as I said before, everything we use could be produced under the guise of national defense, and, therefore, everything could be in the hands of the Federal Government, and it would be the only commercial firm in the United States. We cannot stretch it that far. We must do the things which are reasonable.

I come back to the question of the 2,000,000 kilowatts. The new Johnsonville steam plant would furnish only 375,000 kilowatts. It is not a firming-up proposition. There are rivers which have not been harnessed. The evidence, I think, would show clearly that if we should harness those rivers, more than 375,000 kilowatts could be furnished, in the out season, because of the length of the streams and the running of water from one dam into another dam. But that is not what is wanted. Industries are developing. Advertisements appear seeking industries from other places in America, as was argued by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. They want the power so they can sell it for dollars, as a commercial enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Murray
Baldwin	Hoey	Myers
Brewster	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Conor
Bridges	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Butler	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Sparkman
Cordon	Kerr	Stennis
Donnell	Kilgore	Taft
Douglas	Knowland	Taylor
Downey	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Long	Thye
Ellender	Lucas	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tydings
Flanders	McClellan	Vandenberg
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McGrath	Wherry
George	McKellar	Wiley
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Martin	Withers
Gurney	Maybank	Young
Hayden	Miller	
Hendrickson	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will not the Chair state the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], which in effect would strike from the bill the funds recommended to be appropriated for the commencement of the New Johnsonville steam plant. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment was, in the item "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 12, line 9, to strike out "$2,950,000" and to insert "$450,000," and on page 12, line 13, to strike out "$24,639,000" and to insert "$22,139,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALDWIN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who is necessarily absent. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. FREAR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], who is absent because of illness. If present the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. TAFT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business and his pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has been previously announced.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—30

Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Kem	Robertson
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Ecton	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
Flanders	Martin	Tydings
Gurney	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hendrickson	Mundt	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Myers	Williams

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Miller
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Butler	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Cain	Hunt	Pepper
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cordon	Kefauver	Stennis
Donnell	Kerr	Taylor
Douglas	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ellender	Lucas	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Wherry
George	McFarland	Withers
Gillette	McGrath	Young
Green	McKellar	
Hayden	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—11

Baldwin	McMahon	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Malone	Taft
Graham	Morse	Wagner
McCarran	Reed	

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall not speak at length on my amendment. My reason for not doing so is that I have sent to each Member of the Senate a copy of the remarks I intended to make on this occasion. I submitted my amendment on March 18, 1949, and it was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the statement I have sent to all Senators, and which I had intended to make orally at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, to a considerable extent the debate on the appropriation of $2,500,000 to undertake construction of a TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, which is contained in H. R. 2632, has revolved about a constitutional question.

That question is whether or not the United States has constitutional authority to construct a steam generating plant to produce electrical energy for commercial sale to the public.

Anticipating that question, and being of the opinion that the Congress should not take it upon itself to make a final determination of this issue I filed notice with the Senate on March 19, under rule 40 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that I intended to move a suspension of paragraph 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of proposing an amendment to H. R. 2632. The purpose of the amendment is to vest a substantive right in a Federal taxpayer in order that he might bring an action to test the constitutionality of this appropriation to authorize the vindication of the public interest by a designated group. Suspension of the rules is necessary because the proposal is admittedly legislation attached to an appropriation measure.

The proposed amendment to H. R. 2632 reads:

"Any Federal taxpayer or any consumer of electric energy, neither of whom is supplied with electric energy produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority, may, and is hereby authorized to, institute and maintain an action against the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to enjoin the expenditure of any funds herein appropriated for the construction of any steam electric generating plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority and to enjoin the construction of said plant or plants as being contrary to law: *Provided*, That such an action shall not be maintained unless the complaint is filed within 3 months from the date when the act making the appropriation becomes effective. Service may be made under the Tennessee Valley Authority by delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to any officer or agent of the Tennessee Valley Authority at the office of said Authority in the District of Columbia or by sending a copy of the summons and of the complaint by registered mail to the Tennessee Valley Authority at Knoxville, Tenn. The provisions of sections 1253, 2101, 2282, and 2284 of new title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, shall be applicable to such an action.

"2. It is the intention of this provision to vest in such Federal taxpayers and consumers of electric energy the private substantive right to be protected against unlawful expenditures of Federal funds and the unlawful construction of steam plants by the TVA, and to permit the action herein authorized by the protection of the public and the protection of such private substantive right."

It is my position in proposing this amendment that a vital constitutional question is involved in the appropriation for the New Johnsonville steam plant and one which should have a proper determination by the Supreme Court of the United States, which is the only constituted authority that can rightly make a final determination on the constitutionality of any legislative action taken by the Congress.

The amendment authorizes an expeditious means of allowing the court, through intervention of a Federal taxpayer or consumer of

electric energy—by means of a test case, to prevent a possibly unlawful action of a Federal agency and the possibly unlawful expenditure of Federal funds.

Unless it is adopted, if the appropriation is approved, those who believe there is a grave question of constitutionality in the construction of a steam-generating plant by the TVA will never have their day in court—a right that has been inherent in Anglo-Saxon common law since the days of the Magna Carta.

This is true because it is a fact, little understood I am sure, that suits of taxpayers in instances of this nature are impossible without specific authorization by the Congress.

Before a taxpayer may question the power of Congress to make an expenditure for any purpose, he is met with the difficulty of finding a means to test its legality. In the leading cases on this subject, *Commonwealth of Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* and *Frothingham* v. *Mellon*, the Supreme Court has held that neither a State nor a Federal taxpayer may invoke judicial determination as to whether or not Federal funds are being expended for an unconstitutional purpose.

In *Frothingham* v. *Mellon* the plaintiff challenged the constitutionality of the Federal Maternity Act of 1921. This act provided for appropriations to be apportioned among the sections of several States, which accepted and complied with its provisions, for the purpose of cooperating with them to reduce maternal and infant mortality and protect the health of mothers and infants. The Court denied the right of the plaintiff to maintain the suit, holding that the interest of the Federal taxpayer in the money in the Treasury was too minute and indeterminable, and the effect of the particular expenditure on future taxation was too remote and uncertain to afford a basis for an attack upon the statute.

In the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, the Court also denied the right of a State as parens patiae to maintain a suit to attack a statute as unconstitutional.

In *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *TVA* (306 U. S. 118), the Court expressly declined to pass upon the constitutional or statutory validity of any structure or activity of TVA upon the ground that the complainant utilities, even though faced with the destruction of their businesses or sale to TVA at its own price, had no standing in our courts to invoke a judicial determination of whether their destruction was being encompassed by methods permitted by the Constitution or even by the TVA Act.

As Justice Sutherland said in the Frothingham case:

"The functions of Government under our system are apportioned. To the legislative department has been committed the duty of making law; to the executive the duty of executing them; and to the judiciary the duty of interpreting them and applying them in cases properly brought before the courts. The general rule is that neither department may invade the province of the other and neither may control, direct, or restrain the action of the other. We are not now speaking of the merely ministerial duties of officials. *Gaines* v. *Thompson* (7 Wall 347.) We have no power per se to review and annul acts of Congress on the ground that they are unconstitutional. That question may be considered only when the justification for some direct injury suffered or threatened, presenting a justiciable issue, is made to rest upon such act. Then the power exercised is that of ascertaining and declaring the law applicable to the controversy. It amounts to little more than the negative power to disregard an unconstitutional enactment, which otherwise would stand in the way of an enforcement of a legal right. The party who invokes the power must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as the result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally. If a case for preventive relief be presented the court enjoins in effect, not the execution of the statute, but the acts of the officials, the statute notwithstanding. Here the parties plaintiff have no such case. Looking through forms of words to the substance of their complaint, it is merely that officials of the executive department of the Government are executing and will execute an act of Congress, asserted to be unconstitutional, and this we are asked to prevent. To do so would be not to decide a judicial controversy, but to assume a position of authority over the governmental acts of another and co-equal department, an authority which plainly we do not possess."

In short, there is today a vast and ever-increasing field of Federal activities, with respect to which no State and no citizen can invoke a judicial determination of whether the Federal Government has exceeded constitutional limitations or whether its officers or agencies have exceeded constitutional limitations or the scope of their authority. In final analysis this means that Congress has become the sole defense of our constitutional system in this shaded but highly critical area.

To be sure, a citizen may maintain an action to enjoin the invasion, either by unconstitutional action of a Federal officer or by unconstitutional Federal statute, of a private substantive right which is recognized in common law or which has been created by statute.

Moreover, in order to protect the public interest, Congress may also constitutionally authorize private citizens to maintain actions to determine whether any actual or threatened Federal action is within the authority of some constitutional statute, even though the citizen is asserting only the public interest and otherwise possesses no private substantive right which is being invaded or threatened through the allegedly unconstitutional action or statute.

For an exhaustive discussion of the theory of cases on this subject, see *Associated Industries* v. *Ickes* (134 Fed. 2d 694). In that case the Court said:

"Instead of designating the Attorney General, or some other public officer, to bring such proceedings, Congress can constitutionally enact a statute conferring on any nonofficial person, or on a designated group of nonofficial persons, authority to bring a suit to prevent action by an officer in violation of his statutory powers; for then, in like manner, there is an actual controversy, and there is nothing constitutionally prohibiting Congress from empowering any person, official or not, to institute proceedings involving such a controversy, even if the sole purpose is to vindicate the public interest. Such persons, so authorized, are, so to speak, private attorney generals."

It is contended that the appropriation for the New Johnsonville steam plant falls in the area where no private citizen can test the constitutionality of any action taken by the Congress, in the absence of expressed congressional authorization. The proposed amendment is brought before the Senate in order that Congress may make such an express authorization, and the language is explicit for that purpose: "It is the intention of this provision to vest in such Federal taxpayers and consumers of electric energy the private substantive right to be protected against the unlawful expenditure of Federal funds in the unlawful construction of steam plants by the TVA and to permit the action herein authorized for the protection of the public and for the protection of such private substantive right."

I submit that for the Congress to close the door to the ordinary channels of the judicial process, which would be the certain consequence if this amendment is not adopted, would mean that the Congress has arrogated to itself the prerogatives and functions of the judicial branch of the Government—and on a question of fundamental implications for the future of our economy.

Such a course, I firmly believe, is unwarranted and should not be tolerated.

The constitutional question about which I am concerned has, as I have said, been the subject of considerable exploration in the course of debate on the steam plant appropriation. It has previously been aired before the Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

The House committee last year, after hearing the constitutional arguments, refused the appropriation and supported its objections "on the serious question of whether the TVA has a constitutional right to engage commercially in the development and sale of power." The quotation is from the House Appropriations Committee report on the Government corporations appropriation bill for 1949.

Before the Appropriations Committees and on the floor of the Senate in the course of this debate it has been contended that the authority of the TVA in this kind of case was determined and the appropriation would be constitutional. The authority relied upon is the case of *Ashwander et al.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288).

I submitted to the Senate yesterday that the question was not involved in the Ashwander case, and I read not only from the decision of the court but from the record of the case and statements of counsel. With the indulgence of the Senate I should like to read those statements into the RECORD again.

In the argument of the Ashwander case, the following colloquy occurred between the justices and Mr. John Lord O'Brian, who was chief counsel for TVA in the Ashwander case and later in the TEP Co. against TVA:

"Mr. Justice MCREYNOLDS. Is there a steam plant in connection with this project?

"Mr. O'BRIAN. Yes, Your Honor. That was mentioned earlier. There is a large steam plant which was built at Muscle Shoals before the dam was built.

"Mr. Justice MCREYNOLDS. For what purpose?

"Mr. O'BRIAN. For the purpose of equipping the war-munitions plant immediately, as quickly as possible, with power.

"Mr. Justice MCREYNOLDS. Is that used to generate electricity?

"Mr. O'BRIAN. No, sir; it has never been used. It stands idle. Much is made in my opponents' briefs of the danger of the Government's selling power from the steam plant. That steam plant is not in this case. It has never been used. It has been maintained. It has been leased to the Alabama Power Co., which has used it as a stand-by facility with which to meet break-downs in its service. There is nothing in this record to show that the Authority ever intends to use it for the purpose of generating power for sale, and I disavow any such intention at this time.

"Mr. Justice BUTLER. I know; but you assert the power, do you not?

"Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not.

"Mr. Justice BUTLER. Do you say that, to aid in disposing of the electricity incidentally produced from this navigation dam, the Congress has no power under the Constitution to build stand-by plants to supply their customers, to keep the current going?"

"Mr. O'BRIAN. If you mean break-down facilities, yes; it could. It would have to. Any regulated system would have that.

"Mr. Justice BUTLER. And then to meet great demands upon the peak?

"Mr. O'BRIAN. No; I do not think that can be done in this case."

Likewise, in the argument in the Ashwander case, Mr. Justice Reed, then Solicitor General, also said:

"From the bench and at the bar this controversy has come down to a question of this kind, if we assume that this act was primarily for navigation, then it would be valid. If we determine that this act, while stating that it is for the navigation, national defense, and flood control, is actually for the purpose of developing power and selling it commercially, the act would be invalid."

The statement of Chief Justice Hughes in the opinion on the Ashwander case was, at least in part, undoubtedly in response to the foregoing statements of TVA counsel, one of which expressly disclaimed any constitutional authority to construct steam plants (other than to supply energy for Federal use) either under the commerce power or any other delegated power.

That the Court was conscious of the question presented to it and the denial of the constitutionality of the act, I quote from the opinion of Chief Jusice Hughes (297 U. S. 339):

"We limit our decision to the case before us, as we have defined it. The argument is earnestly presented that the Government by virtue of its ownership of the dam and power plant could not establish a steel mill and make and sell steel products, or a factory to manufacture clothing or shoes for the public, and thus attempt to make its ownership of energy, generated at its dam, a means of carrying on competitive commercial enterprises and thus drawing to the Federal Government the conduct and management of business having no relation to the purposes for which the Federal Government was established. The picture is eloquently drawn but we deem it to be irrelevant to the issue here. The Government is not using the water power at the Wilson Dam to establish any industry or business. It is not using the energy generated at the dam to manufacture commodities of any sort for the public. The Government is disposing of the energy itself which simply is the mechanical energy, incidental to falling water at the dam, converted into the electric energy which is susceptible of transmission. The question here is simply as to the acquisition of the transmission lines as a facility for the disposal of that energy. And the Government rightly conceded at the bar, in substance, that it was without constitutional authority to acquire or dispose of such energy except as it comes into being in the operation of works constructed in the exercise of some power delegated to the United States. As we have said, these transmission lines lead directly from the dam, which has been lawfully constructed, and the question of the constitutional right of the Government to acquire or operate local or urban distribution systems is not involved. We express no opinion as to the validity of such an effort, as to the status of any other dam or power development in the Tennessee Valley, whether connected with or apart from the Wilson Dam, or as to the validity of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act or of the claims made in the pronouncements and program of the Authority apart from the questions we have discussed in relation to the particular provisions of the contract of January 4, 1934, affecting the Alabama Power Co."

It should be clear that in my personal opinion the appropriation is purely unconstitutional and that Congress should not purport to authorize it. I recognize that in that opinion I differ with some constitutional authorities, among them members of the Senate whose opinion on such matters I respect highly.

Any such personal differences of opinion are wholly incidental, however. The point is that at best the issue is moot at the present time and that fact only serves to stress the vital importance of a proper and conclusive test on the issue.

I am pleased to say that some of the constitutional authorities with whom I happen to differ on the question have joined in this amendment to permit a judicial determination that the issue might have its "day in court." The amendment which I am offering was defeated by a single vote in the Senate Appropriations Committee and was supported there by some who not only believe in and support the appropriation for the steam plant but in their own minds are satisfied as to its constitutionality.

They nevertheless feel that the American people will want and properly deserve the right to a final decision on this matter by the only authority in the land capable of making the decision—the Supreme Court of the United States.

I want to stress that a vote for the amendment which I am offering is not a vote against the steam-plant appropriation nor is it a vote which expresses any opinion as to the constitutionality of the appropriation.

An affirmative vote will merely express a belief in the ancient "day in court" right of the citizen and taxpayer. In no other manner than by the affirmative vote of Congress can that right be exercised or this issue of constitutionality be laid to rest.

I am aware of the argument that adoption of this amendment might occasion delay in the construction of this steam plant. This I regard as an argument of expediency, an argument that assumes it is more important to build a plant in peacetime, regardless of its legality, than it is to open the doors of the Federal courts to citizens who may with cause consider themselves to be aggrieved.

Anticipating this objection, however, and fearful myself of delay in reaching a final decision, two provisions have been included in the amendment which will assure an early and conclusive determination of this constitutional question. It is provided first that any contest, as permitted, must be brought within 3 months of the date upon which the appropriation becomes effective. It is provided further, in the reference to section 2282 of new title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, that the test action may be brought before a three-judge district court in the District of Columbia, whose decision may be appealed directly to the Supreme Court of the United States without reference to the circuit court of appeals.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senate has just acted, by a vote of 55 to 30, to allow the appropriation for the New Johnsonville steam plant to remain in the appropriation bill. There is in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan very serious doubt as to the constitutionality of that provision. But under the law as it now is, it is impossible ever to test its constitutionality. My amendment would allow the courts of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of this important question.

Mr. President, there are two cases, that of Commonwealth of Massachusetts against Mellon and that of Frothingham against Mellon, which are referred to in the memorandum sent by me to Senators. Those cases clearly indicate that the amount of money a taxpayer may pay into a project of this sort is so small that the court would not recognize it as cause for controversy, and therefore would not allow a suit, nor would the court allow a suit to be brought by a taxpayer or even by a State on the ground that they were representing the public.

Mr. President, there is authority for the fact that if the Congress creates a substantive right in the party who wishes to bring suit, action may be brought in order that the constitutionality of a measure of this kind may be tested. The authority, and the one which contains an exhaustive discussion of the subject, is the case of *Associated Industries* v. *Ickes* (134 Fed. (2d) 694).

An attempt is made by my amendment to have an early hearing to test the constitutionality of the proposed legislation. There is no intent on my part to delay the matter. The amendment would allow a trial by three district judges and would provide for an appeal directly from the district court to the United States Supreme Court so an early hearing could be had. In fact, the amendment provides for a statute of limitations under which the cause of action must be brought within 3 months. Every possible provision has been placed in the amendment so as to guarantee a speedy trial of the issue involved.

Mr. President, I say to all the Members of the Senate, and I say it with all the earnestness at my command, that I believe the amendment should be adopted. There could be nothing fairer to the people of the United States of America than to have a test of the validity of this proposed undertaking.

Mr. President, on the basis of the step we are taking today more steps of the same kind will be taken in America, and if we cannot test the constitutionality of this project then we will never be able to test any similar project which may be undertaken in the future. I think it is well for the Senate and for the Members of the House to know and to let the people back home know whether the proposed action can be taken under the Constitution of the United States. I plead with those who believe the provision for this steam plant is constitutional at least to give credit to those who believe it is not constitutional, and that we may have a vote upon this important matter. For if we take the step, and the people of the United States can never know by a court opinion whether or not it is constitutional, then greater steps of a similar nature toward socialization of industry and the destruction of free enterprise in America can be taken, and there will be no remedy for the people back home.

So I plead with Senators at least to adopt my amendment so that it may be determined whether under the Constitution we can or cannot do what is now proposed to be done.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator agree that it is in some cases impossible for Congress to create jurisdiction in the courts?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I think we cannot confer upon the courts anything that is not justiciable, and we cannot confer upon the courts anything that is not a controversy nor a case.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it, that the basis of the Senator's opinion is Section 2 of article 3, which reads in part:

> The judicial power shall extend to all cases—

And so forth. And then the language—

> to controversies to which the United States shall be a party.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator agree therefore that unless there should be created a controversy by the proposed act of Congress contemplated by the adoption of the Senator's amendment, no jurisdiction would be conferred on the courts?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator agree with the observation in the case of Associated Industries against Ickes, to which the Senator referred, which I believe is the leading authority:

> There is the related rule that Congress cannot constitutionally enact a statute authorizing a suit to be brought to test out the abstract question of the constitutionality of the suit where there is no actual justiciable controversy.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that that is the law as it now stands. But I say that the purpose of the amendment is to create, as was done under that case, a right in a particular group of people to represent the public interest, and as was said in that case, it means that the party who brought the suit would in effect be a private attorney general of the United States in the bringing of such an action. If the amendment shall be adopted all will have been done that can be done by Congress to create a controversy and a substantive right in the individual who may bring the case.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator agree with this further observation of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit that—

> While Congress can constitutionally authorize no one, in the absence of an actual justiciable controversy, to bring a suit for the judicial determination either of the constitutionality of a statute or the scope of powers conferred by a statute upon Government officers, it can constitutionally authorize one of its own officials, such as the Attorney General, to bring a proceeding to prevent another official from acting in violation of his statutory powers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and the purpose of the amendment is to create in the party mentioned in the opening paragraph the right to take the action which the Attorney General could take. It makes a controversy, and creates a substantive right in the individual who would bring the case.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator take the view that the amendment which he proposes, which authorizes any Federal taxpayer or any consumer of electrical energy to institute the suit, would in effect constitute a Federal taxpayer or any consumer of electrical energy a special Attorney General of the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. It is in that group that the right is given.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it on the theory that the amendment would create the right, without the obligation on the part of the taxpayer or the consumer of electrical energy to take any official oath as Attorney General or as Assistant Attorney General, in any Federal taxpayer or any consumer of electrical energy to act as a deputy Attorney General?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. No oath would be necessary. He would be representing the public in this matter, and there would be a controversy within the meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator agree with this observation of the court in Associated Industries against Ickes:

> In a suit in a Federal court by a citizen against a Government officer, complaining of alleged past or threatened future unlawful conduct by the defendant, there is no justiciable controversy, without which, under article III, section 2 of the Constitution, the court has no jurisdiction, unless the citizen shows that such conduct or threatened conduct invades or will invade a private substantive legally protected interest of the plaintiff citizen; such invaded interest must be either of a recognized character at common law or a substantive private legally protected interest created by statute.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with that, because this amendment would create such a right under this statute.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether there is any doubt in his mind as to the validity of the amendment he proposes?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt, under the decisions of the courts, that this would be a constitutional act. I must say, as we all say, that when we argue the constitutionality of a law we must remember what Thomas Jefferson once said, that the Constitution is a thing of wax in the hands of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. We must also remember the admonition of Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, that the Constitution is what the Court says it is.

Mr. FERGUSON. That amounts to the same thing.

Mr. TOBEY. In modern language.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate long. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared, and take one minute to make the point I am about to make.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan—and, by the way, before I make my statement I make a point of order against the amendment as legislation on an appropriation bill, if that be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not yet been offered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and not in order except, of course, through a suspension of the rules.

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the rule be suspended——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair rule first on the point of order. The point of order is well taken. It is in violation of clause 4 of rule XVI, which prohibits general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, notice was filed in conformity with the rule, and in anticipation of what the Chair might rule in this case. Therefore I move the suspension of the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was a motion filed in compliance with rule XL?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the motion was duly filed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan is itself unconstitutional, as an attempt to confer on the Federal courts jurisdiction to render an advisory opinion in the absence of a genuine case or controversy within the meaning of article III, section 2, clause 1, of the Constitution, which prescribes the powers and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the lower courts.

It has long been settled that the Constitution gives the Federal courts jurisdiction only over cases and controversies between genuinely adverse litigants, and that any attempt by Congress to enlarge the limits of Federal jurisdiction by authorizing the Federal courts to render mere advisory opinions as to the constitutionality of certain legislation will itself be declared unconstitutional. The leading case on this subject is the case of *Muskrat* v. *United States* (to be found in 219 U. S., at p. 346).

An act was passed by the Congress and held by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional because the act purported to authorize certain individuals to test in the courts the constitutionality of an act enlarging the classes of Indians who might benefit from certain lands and funds held by the United States.

It is also settled that a Federal taxpayer does not have sufficient interest in public funds to enable him to challenge the constitutionality of an appropriation act on the ground that the money is to be devoted to non-Federal uses. That was decided in *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447). This is precisely what the Ferguson amendment attempts to do.

Even substantial private interest will not per se give rise to a case or controversy. It must also appear that the interest invaded is some recognized legal right. Economic injury may, for example, be damnum absque injuria, affording no basis for a case or controversy. To this effect are *Alabama Power Company* v. *Ickes* (302 U. S. 464) and a number of other cases.

The case cited by the Senator from Michigan, *Associated Industries* v. *Ickes*, and other cases cited in that case, are different from the case presented by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, in this respect: Those cases deal with the right of an individual to appeal from a decision of an administrative agency in the Government, an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission, an agency which exercises quasi-judicial power, so to speak, holds hearings, examines witnesses, takes testimony, and then renders a decision. The Supreme Court has held that in such a case the individual has a right to appeal from the decision of the agency, but not a right to appeal from a decision of the Congress of the United States. We are acting here not as some agency down at the other end of the Avenue, not as the Federal Communications Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission. We are acting tonight as the Senate of the United States.

When we act, there is no case, there is no controversy under the Constitution of the United States; and under such a situation, the Supreme Court of the United States will not attempt to review our action.

As I have said, the cases cited constitute no authority for the Ferguson amendment. All of them involve the question of an appeal from an order of an adminstrative agency on the ground that the order exceeds the powers granted by statute of such agency. There is an obvious public concern in seeing to it that more administrative boards and commissions, to whom Congress has delegated extensive authority to regulate and control, keep strictly within the confines of legislation empowering them to act. To insure that this is done, the courts have jurisdiction to review such orders for the sole purpose of determining whether errors of law have been committed in the promulgation or enforcement of the challenged order.

Mr. President, I could well take the time of the Senate to read all of the Muskrat case, but I shall not do so. That case is entirely in point on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan; and it shows clearly, in the last few words, that—

> It never was the thought that, by means of a friendly suit, a party beaten in the Legislature could transfer to the courts an inquiry as to the constitutionality of the legislative act.

In the case the Court further said:

> It is therefore evident—

Remember, Mr. President, that the decision in that case relates to an act by which the Congress said to the persons attempting to institute litigation that they should go into court and should question the constitutionality of the act—

> that there is neither more nor less in this procedure than an attempt to provide for a judicial determination, final in this court, of the constitutional validity of an act of Congress. Is such a determination within the judicial power conferred by the Constitution, as the same has been interpreted and defined in the authoritative decisions to which we have referred?

In the case the Court refers to many decisions, from the time of John Marshall down.

The Court answers that question by saying:

> We think it is not. That judicial power, as we have seen, is the right to determine actual controversies arising between adverse litigants, duly instituted in courts of proper jurisdiction. The right to declare a law unconstitutional arises because an act of Congress relied upon by one or the other of such parties in determining their rights is in conflict with the fundamental law. The exercise of this, the most important and delicate duty of this Court, is not given to it as a body with revisory power over the action of Congress, but because the rights of the litigants in justiciable controversies require the Court to choose between the fundamental law and a law purporting to be enacted within constitutional authority, but in fact beyond the power delegated to the legislative branch of the Government. This attempt to obtain a judicial declaration of the validity of the act of Congress is not presented in a case or controversy, to which, under the Constitution of the United States, the judicial power alone extends.

Therefore, Mr. President, the Court went on to say that it declined even to consider that case, saying that under the Constitution it had no power to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in this connection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Ferguson amendment would be unconstitutional as an attempt to confer on the Federal courts jurisdiction to render an advisory opinion in the absence of a genuine case or controversy within the meaning of article III, section 2, clause 1 of the Constitution.

It has long been settled that the Constitution gives the Federal courts jurisdiction only over cases and controversies between genuinely adverse litigants and that any attempt by Congress to enlarge the limits of Federal jurisdiction by authorizing the Federal courts to render mere advisory opinions as to the constitutionality of certain legislation will itself be declared unconstitutional. Thus, in *Muskrat* v. *United States* (219 U. S. 346 (1911)), an act was held unconstitutional which purported to authorize named individuals to test in the courts the constitutionality of an act enlarging the classes of Indians who might beenfit from certain lands and funds held by the United States. It is also settled that a Federal taxpayer does not have sufficient interest in public funds to enable him to challenge the constitutionality of an appropriation act on the ground that the money is to be devoted to non-Federal uses. *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447 (1923)). This is precisely what the Fergusan amendment contemplates. Even substantial private interest will not per se give rise to a case or controversy; it must also appear that the interest invaded is some recognized legal right. Economic injury, may, for example, be damnum absque injuria, affording no basis for a case or controversy. *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes* (302 U. S. 464 (1937)); *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (306 U. S. 118 (1939)); *City of Atlanta* v. *Ickes* (308 U. S. 517 (1939)); *Singer & Sons* v. *Union Pacific R. R. Co.* (311 U. S. 295 (1940)).

The foregoing cases appear to be conclusive authority on the present question. Nevertheless, the Senator from Michigan seems to think his proposal would be within the power of Congress on the authority of the following cases: *FCC* v. *Sanders* (309 U. S. C. 470 (1940)); *Scripps-Howard Radio Inc.* v. *FCC* (316 U. S. 4 (1942)); *FCC* v. *NBC* (319 U. S. 239 (1943)); *American Power Company* v. *SEC* (325 U. S. 385 (1945)); *U. S.* v. *Public Utilities Commission* (151 F. (2d) 609 (C. A. D. C., 1945) certiorari denied, 331 U. S. 816 (1947)); *Associated Industries* v. *Ickes* (134 F. (2d) 694 (C. C. A. 2d, 143) reversed on ground that question had become moot (302 U. S. 707 (1943)).

The first three of the above cases construed section 402 (b) (2) of the Communications Act of 1934, which provides that any person aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected by an order of the FCC may appeal to the courts. The last three cases cited involved appeals from administrative orders under similar provisions of other statutes.

The cases cited constitute no authority for the Ferguson amendment. They all involve the question of standing to appeal from an order of an administrative agency on the ground that the order exceeds the powers granted to such agency by statute. There is an obvious public concern in seeing to it that mere administrative boards and commissions, to whom Congress has delegated extensive authority to regulate and control, keep strictly within the confines of legislation empowering them to act. To insure that this is done, the courts have jurisdiction to review such orders for the sole purpose of determining whether errors of law have been committed in the promulgation or enforcement of the challenged order.

In this limited field of judicial review of the actions of administrative agencies, the Supreme Court considered that the constitutional requirement of the existence of a case or controversy is met because the plaintiffs were suing to vindicate the public interest by appeal to the courts, and even though the alleged private injury could not supply a foundation for a case or controversy, the public injury provided such a foundation.

The reason for relaxing the rule in this particular situation is obvious. To apply the strict rule in such cases would often result in denying to persons whose private interests are adversely affected, or perhaps destroyed, by the decision of an administrative agency, the right to seek judicial scrutiny of the legality of such action. Power granted to administrative officials has traditionally been too jealously guarded to permit such a result. In the Ferguson amendment, however, we have a different situation. Here it is proposed to authorize the challenging, not of an administrative order, but of an act of Congress itself, although under the decision of the Supreme Court in *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, supra, no case or controversy would exist. This is precisely what the Muskrat and Mellon cases prevent. The cases referred to by the Senator from Michigan did not overrule the Muskrat and Mellon cases, and the numerous other cases to the same effect. They did not eliminate the requirement that a case or controversy must exist in order to provide standing to sue in the Federal courts. They are merely an adaptation of the case or controversy rule to a special situation.

Quite apart from the fact that the reason for the rule adopted in the cases cited by the Senator from Michigan is totally lacking in the present situation, it is evident that no authority for such a proposal exists. On the contrary, the precise issue was decided adversely in *Tennessee Electric Power Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, supra, where it was held that in order to challenge the validity of the TVA Act, the plaintiffs must show the invasion of some legally protected right. Supreme Court cases decided subsequently to the cases cited in support of the Ferguson amendment indicate that the rule of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. case has lost none of its force. *Perkins* v. *Lukens Steel Co.* (310 U. S. 113 (1940)); *Stark* v. *Wickard* (321 U. S. 288 (1944)).

There is a second and independent ground on which the Ferguson amendment runs afoul the cases on the constitutional requirements for standing to sue in the Federal courts. In each of the cases cited by the Senator from Michigan, the Supreme Court insisted upon a showing of substantial injury to private interest in order to entitle the appellant to raise the question of public interest. The Supreme Court has already decided, however, that as a matter of law a Federal taxpayer has no substantial interest in public funds. *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, supra, and the interest of electric consumers outside the valley in the constitutionality of the Johnsonville steam plant is certainly no greater. The interest of the unsuccessful plaintiffs in the Tennessee Electric Power Co. case was clearly greater than that of a mere taxpayer or electric consumer. It is therefore doubly clear that the Ferguson amendment attempts to invest the courts with jurisdiction to render purely advisory opinions in proceedings having none of the attributes of case or controversy. Such an attempt the Constitution clearly prohibits (*Muskrat* v. *United States*, supra).

Mr. FERGUSON. First of all, Mr. President, I ask consent to have my amendment printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After the paragraph under the caption "Tennessee Valley Authority" insert the following:

"Any Federal taxpayer or any consumer of electric energy, neither of whom is supplied with electric energy produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority, may, and is hereby authorized to, institute and maintain an action against the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to enjoin the expenditure of any funds herein appropriated for the construction of any steam electric generating plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority and to enjoin the construction of said plant or plants as being contrary to law: *Provided*, That such an action shall not be maintained unless the complaint is filed within 3 months from the date when the act making the appropriation becomes effective. Service may be made upon the Tennessee Valley Authority by delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to any officer or agent of the Tennessee Valley Authority at the office of said Authority in the District of Columbia or by sending a copy of the summons and of the complaint by registered mail to the Tennessee Valley Authority at Knoxville, Tenn. The provisions of sections 1253, 2101, 2282, and 2284 of new title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, shall be applicable to such an action.

"It is the intention of this provision to vest in such Federal taxpayers and consumers of electric energy the private substantive right to be protected against unlawful expenditures of Federal funds and the unlawful construction of steam plants by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to permit the action herein authorized for the protection of the public and for the protection of such private substantive right."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the Muskrat case. In the case of *Muskrat* v. *United States* (219 U. S. 346), the question involved in this amendment was not decided at all. The congressional authorization which was invalidated by the court in the Muskrat case decision empowered four named persons "to institute their suits in the Court of Claims to determine the validity of any acts of Congress passed since the said act of July 1, 1902."

At the outset it is clear that the language referred to simply authorized a suit to be brought for the purpose of obtaining an advisory opinion of the Court. There is no question that such an act cannot validly confer jurisdiction on a Federal court. Moreover, the act involved in the Muskrat case charged the Attorney General of the United States with the duty of defending suits brought thereunder. Those suits were not authorized to protect the public interest, since the Attorney General himself was charged with that duty. Furthermore, the Court pointed out in the Muskrat case that any judgment which the Court could render could not be executed, and, therefore, the judgment would amount to no more than an expression of an opinion upon the validity of the acts in question.

Mr. President, no such criticism could properly be directed against my amendment, inasmuch as the court would have the undoubted right to give final judgment in such a suit and to enforce judgment, just as it could in any other validly instituted action.

I read now from the Ickes case, which I have previously cited:

Instead of designating the Attorney General, or some other public officer, to bring such proceedings, Congress can constitutionally enact a statute conferring on any nonofficial person, or on a designated group of nonofficial persons, authority to bring a suit to prevent action by an officer in violation of his statutory powers; for them, in like manner, there is an actual controversy, and there is nothing constitutionally prohibiting Congress from empowering any person, official or not, to institute a proceeding involving such a controversy, even if the sole purpose is to vindicate the public interest. Such persons, so authorized, are, so to speak, private attorneys general.

In the Scripps-Howard case—*Scripps-Howard Radio Inc.* v. *Federal Communications Commission* (316 U. S. 4)—the Court said:

The Communications Act of 1934 did not create new private rights. The purpose of the act was to protect the public interest in communications. By section 402 (b) (2), Congress gave the right of appeal to persons "aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected" by Commission action. * * * But these private litigants have standing only as representatives of the public interest. * * * That a court is called upon to enforce public rights and not the interests of private property do not diminish its power to protect such rights.

Mr. President, my amendment in effect and in fact would confer on a designated group authority to bring suit in behalf of the public to prevent unlawful action by a group of officials or by a Government agency, namely, the Tennessee Valley Authority; and the amendment also would vest that group with a substantive right to be protected against such unlawful action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan to suspend the rule, under notice given on March 18.

Mr. FERGUSON. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALDWIN (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who is necessarily absent, and likewise with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If the senior Senator from Connecticut were present, he would vote "nay." If the senior Senator from Kansas and I were permitted to vote, we would vote "yea."

Under the circumstances, we withhold our votes.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that on this vote the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the senior Senator from Nevada and the junior Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained, and if present each of these Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness, and if present would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent, and if present would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business.

The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] who is detained on official business and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

The result was—yeas 38, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—38

Brewster	Gurney	Robertson
Bricker	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Cain	Kem	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Tydings
Cordon	Lodge	Vandenberg
Donnell	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Flanders	Mundt	Williams
Gillette	O'Conor	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Holland	McKellar
Anderson	Humphrey	Magnuson
Chapman	Hunt	Maybank
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Miller
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Eastland	Kefauver	Neely
Ellender	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kilgore	Pepper
Fulbright	Langer	Russell
George	Long	Sparkman
Green	Lucas	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Taylor
Hill	McFarland	Withers
Hoey	McGrath	Young

NOT VOTING—13

Baldwin	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Morse	Tobey
Graham	Reed	Wagner
McCarran	Smith, N. J.	
McMahon	Thomas, Okla.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the rule is not suspended.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2632 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT CONTROL ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I present the conference report on House bill 1757, to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, before Senators leave the floor, I announce that I shall ask for the yeas and nays in connection with this conference report.

The report was read as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1757) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3 and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"On page 1, line 7, of the House bill, strike out 'March 31, 1949' and insert in lieu thereof 'April 30, 1949' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Strike out 'April 1, 1949' in the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof 'May 1, 1949' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In the fifth line of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment strike out the word 'were' and insert in lieu thereof the word 'are' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. HOWARD McGRATH,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OREN HARRIS,
O. E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, at this late hour I may say that there is only one point of controversy in the conference report. The Senator from Wisconsin has stated that he will ask for the yeas and nays, but I believe the debate on the report should not consume more than 10 minutes. I should appreciate it if Senators would remain on the floor and be present to vote, if the yeas and nays are requested.

This is the conference report on the District of Columbia rent-control bill. We have reached agreement on all points but there is some controversy with respect to the provision in the bill as passed in the Senate which applied the fair net return principle to the District of Columbia, similar to the principle which has been written into the national act. This has been rejected by the conference because of the great difference which exists between the national act and the District of Columbia act, and in the method by which both have operated through the years of rent control. In the District of Columbia due consideration has been given to all applications for increases in rents based upon the very principles contained in the proposal for a fair net return, to the extent that more than 90 percent of the rentable property in the District of Columbia has received relief through the administrative processes of those charged with the administration of the law within the District of Columbia.

I sincerely believe, Mr. President, that if we were now to try to write this particular provision into the District law, it could bring only one result, namely, a great inequality with respect to tenants within the District of Columbia, and an undue and unfair advantage to landlords within the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McGRATH. Please let me finish, and then I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. President, if I felt that rent control would be with us for years to come, probably there would be reason for a different approach to the problem; but the matter of controlling rents within the District of Columbia under a separate and distinct law has worked very well over the years in which we have had rent control. Administrative procedures and processes have been established, and it seems to me wholly unwise, at this late stage of the proceedings, to write into the law something which would require an entirely new organization to administer rent control within the District of Columbia.

That was the opinion of the conferees as we weighed the question very seriously, over several days in conference.

Therefore, Mr. President, I express the hope that because we are in the position of having a rent-control law in the District of Columbia which, in many details, from the very beginning, has been different from the rent-control law governing the rest of the Nation, we should not at this time upset the procedure, the organization, the methods, or the precedents which have been established in the administration of the law.

I know there has been a strong appeal to Senators to have uniformity with respect to legislation, but I would remind them that we act here in rather a dual capacity. We act as the legislature for the District of Columbia; we act as the city council for the District of Columbia. There are many things we agree to do and which we do in our capacity as legislators for the District of Columbia, which we would not do for the country as a whole. In other words, Mr. President, it seems to me there is a great distinction as we legislate for a particular situation within this city. The principles which we might well apply here we would not be willing to apply in our own States. As arguments are made for unification of principles with respect to laws, I think we should always keep in mind that we are acting in a dual capacity. For some reason or other, in the early days of rent control, the Congress determined that there should be a different rent-control law for the District of Columbia from that for the rest of the Nation. I think it was a wise decision, because it has worked well. It has operated without serious complaint. It has been well administered. I am sure the people of the District of Columbia are satisfied with it.

So, Mr. President, my appeal to the Senate is that we give our support and our approval to the conference report, knowing that it is the wish of the vast majority of those who live in the District of Columbia that the law should be continued on the basis upon which we have now presented it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall not take much of the Senate's time on

this question. It is a perfectly simple proposition. We have before us the question whether we should provide a different set of rules for the city in which Congress sits from the rules which we provide for the rest of the Nation.

The only difference between the national law and the District of Columbia law is the part of the legislation which provides for a fair net operating income for the landlord. My friends on the other side of the aisle have had much to say regarding the great advantage of this particular provision in the national law. When the President signed the bill he had much to say about it. I should like to quote what the President himself said regarding the provision which the very able Senator from Rhode Island now says should not be applied to the District of Columbia.

This is what the President said:

> While affording more effective protection to tenants against illegal and unjustified rent increases, the act also facilitates the making of adjustments necessary to correct injustices against landlords.

I call particular attention to the next sentence:

> In particular, the act will be helpful in the case of any small landlord who may not be obtaining an adequate net operating income.

I wish the Senator from Rhode Island would listen to me. May I impose upon the Senator from Rhode Island? If I may impose up the chairman of the Democratic National Committee to call his attention to what the President said about what the Senator is now opposing, the President said this:

> In particular, the act will be helpful in the case of any small landlord who may not be obtaining an adequate net operating income.

The words "net operating income" are the words which the Senator wants stricken from the District of Columbia bill.

Further down in the President's statement he says this:

> The act provides that in making adjustments the Housing Expediter shall assure landlords "a fair net operating income." This provision does not create an administratively unworkable standard of fair return, nor does it mean a general rent increase for all tenants. Rather, it provides an equitable standard for adjustments where they are needed.

I repeat. The President says, in regard to the provision which the Senator from Rhode Island opposes in the District of Columbia bill:

> Rather it provides an equitable standard for adjustments where they are needed.

Throughout the President's statement he goes out of his way wholeheartedly to approve this provision in the national law, which the Senator now says should not be in the District law.

Going further, the President says this:

> This act was passed by the Congress despite the propaganda barrage which was designed to destroy rent control altogether. In its final form it represents a crushing defeat for the real-estate lobby.

It seems unusual, if we are to pass a bill which represents a crushing defeat for the real-estate lobby as to all the cities in which our constituents live, to say that that bill is not good enough for the city in which we ourselves live.

I realize full well that no Senator is going to vote against this provision because he himself thinks his own rent is going to be increased, but it will not be possible to convince the 143,000,000 people living throughout the country that that was not the intent of the Senate.

I sat through the conference, and heard the conferees argue that if we included in the District law the identical provision we have in the law covering the rest of the Nation, we would be subject to rent increases in this city. That may be true; I do not know. I did not think too much of the rent-control bill which was passed for the rest of the Nation, but if it is good enough for the people whom we represent, then it should be good enough for us.

Mr. President, I should like to quote the very able junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], now presiding over the Senate, when he was discussing this particular provision insofar as the national law was concerned. I wish to quote what the able Senator from Alabama said, and I may say that I think he spent more time on this subject, as head of the subcommittee considering rent control, than perhaps any other Senator. This is what he said:

> First, let me say, yes, I believe in a fair return. I think I can say that every member of the committee believes in a fair return. It was one of the points which engaged our attention most earnestly from the very first. We tried to write the legislation in such a way as to insure, so far as we could, a fair return, reasonable treatment to both the tenant and the landlord.

That is what the very able Senator from Alabama had to say about this particular provision in the national law. If that provision is so good that the chairman of the subcommittee says we must have it in the national law, if it is so good that the President says its inclusion in the national law represents a defeat for the real-estate lobby, then I cannot see why it is not good enough for those of us who live in Washington.

The Senator from Rhode Island raised another point. He said it would be difficult administratively to carry out the law. Mr. Cogswell, the head of the local rent-control board, offered that argument to the conferees. He said, "We do not have the staff to administer this locally."

Mr. President, I took the trouble to compare the staff in Washington as against the staff in my State, in an area larger than the city of Washington. In Washington, D. C., there are 34 men administering rent control. In Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha, Wis., a combination of all those cities, there is a total of 44, for an area about three times as large as Washington, D. C.

I might say, in closing, that I have been very much disturbed by the attitude displayed by people throughout the country to the effect that Congress goes out of its way to protect itself in Washington. I do not believe that to be true; however, we do make it appear to be true.

Senators will recall that when the Senate some time ago was considering some action relative to the pay of Members of Congress there was a campaign called "Bundles for Congress." I say in all seriousness, if we provide more protection for Members of Congress in Washington than for citizens of the country generally, then instead of a "Bundles for Congress" program, we should have a "Leases for Congress" program, and I might say "very short-term leases."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have heard it said that the District of Columbia rent office does not have sufficient personnel to administer the phase of the law which is in dispute. Has the Senator spoken about that?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator was absent from the floor for a brief period. I pointed out that there are more men in the Rent Control Office in Washington, in proportion to the number of tenants and landlords, than in any other city of which I know. There are about three times as many as there are in the State of Wisconsin. So if Wisconsin can administer the rent-control law with one-third as many men as there are in Washington, they must have sufficient personnel here.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the result of sustaining the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin would probably be to leave the District of Columbia without a rent-control law, because the rejection of the conference report would mean that we would have to start in all over again with a rent-control bill. I do not think Congress has either the time or the disposition to do that.

Therefore, I hope Senators will agree to go along and support the conference report, with the knowledge in the District of Columbia that there have been very fair and equitable adjustments of all applications for rent increases.

I repeat, the measure we are dealing with here is entirely different from the national act. The references the President made to the national act, while they may have great application throughout the Nation, taking into consideration all the various conditions which exist, do not have the same application in the District of Columbia, and I do not believe the President's references to the national act should be held to apply to the bill we are now considering.

Mr. President, much as I welcome the support of the Senator from Wisconsin of the President of the United States, and agree with the righteousness of his statements, I do not believe that in this particular instance they should be of much concern to the Senate. I therefore hope that the vote will be to adopt the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McGRATH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Am I correct in my understanding that if a majority vote "yea" it means that the conference report is approved, and if a majority vote "nay" it means that the bill will go back to conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a vote "nay" does not mean the bill will go back to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not catch that part of the inquiry of the Senator from Wisconsin. A vote "yea" means approval of the conference report. A vote "nay" means disapproval.

Mr. McGRATH. Disapproval, and therefore we would be left in the position of having to start all over again to write a District of Columbia rent-control law.

Mr. TAFT. Is is not true we could ask for another conference, and send the bill back for a new conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALDWIN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who is necessarily absent. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. THYE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] who is unavoidably detained. Were he present he would vote "yea." Were I permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Connally	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Frear	Langer	Smith, Maine
George	Long	Sparkman
Green	Lucas	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Taylor
Hill	McGrath	Tydings
Hoey	McKellar	Withers
Holland	Magnuson	
Humphrey	Maybank	

NAYS—23

Bricker	Gurney	Martin
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Butler	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Cain	Ives	Taft
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Cordon	Lodge	Wherry
Donnell	McCarthy	Williams
Ferguson	Malone	

NOT VOTING—33

Baldwin	Hunt	Robertson
Brewster	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McMahon	Thye
Ecton	Miller	Tobey
Flanders	Millikin	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Morse	Wagner
Gillette	O'Conor	Wiley
Graham	Reed	Young

So the report was agreed to.

HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1070, to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the majority leader able to tell us when he plans to bring up for action Senate bill 900, the Commodity Credit Charter amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to my distinguished friend from Delaware that I am not sure how long the Senate will debate the housing bill. Tomorrow we shall also have before us the conference report on the ECA. It is barely possible that we may take up the bill to which the Senator refers following the disposition of Senate bill 1070, but not before that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not until after the housing bill has been taken up?

Mr. LUCAS. Not until after the housing bill has been disposed of by the Senate one way or another. It may take 2 or 3 days to dispose of the housing bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I just wanted the RECORD to show that I was ready any time the Senator from Illinois was ready to take up Senate bill 900.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the statement the Senator has made that he is ready.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois mentioned the conference report on the ECA bill. The conferees have worked all day today on the matter and have come to an agreement. The conference will have to be acted on in the House first. I hope Senators will give attention to the report tomorrow, so we can have it adopted and get it out of the way, because the House is going on a vacation. I hope Senators will acquaint themselves with the terms of the conference report, and give us a chance to get it out of the way tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator from Texas how long he believes consideration of the conference report will require?

Mr. CONNALLY. I believe it will require not over 30 or 40 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the conference report is a privileged matter and would have right-of-way tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from South Carolina is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1070.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. So the housing bill is now the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until next Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. McKELLAR), from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) making an additional appropriation for the Veterans'

Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 261) thereon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John W. Askew, of Virginia, to be Comptroller, Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

IN THE COAST GUARD RESERVE

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the United States Coast Guard, dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the regulations governing determination of precedence as commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve officers. Former Reserve officers, and former temporarily commissioned officers:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Edwin W. Coleman
John W. Cherry

The following former member of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard:

To be lieutenant commander, with date of rank June 3, 1943

John H. Speckin

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, April 13 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Stephen T. Early, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John W. Askew to be Comptroller, Post Office Department.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Don Walter Adair, O28491, et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 1, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Don Walter Adair, appearing on page 3700, and ending with the name of Dugald Walker Hudson, which is shown on page 3702.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Ura M. Ankrom, L500060, et al., for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 1, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Ura M. Ankrom, appearing on page 3702.

IN THE AIR FORCE

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Bertrand Ellwood Johnson, AO28920.
Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, AO38663.
William Taylor Thurman, AO26374.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 308, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be majors

Millicent Anderson	Edith E. Gintzer
Grace M. Barth	Helen Kulikowska
Marjorie E. Bowman	Kathleen McClure
Edythe S. Cobbe	Margaret L. Miller
Martha L. Cross	Catherine M. Moran
Ruth M. Downey	Margaret J. Steele
Edith G. Eide	Vera E. Von Stein

To be captains

Rachel W. Brinton	Adeline Franzel
Jane A. Buck	Elizabeth T. Hickson
Bernice D. Coulter	Rosalia A. Hoffmann
Lillian W. Duncan	Anita E. Johnson
Leonora E. Embich	Anne S. Krizanauskas
Gladys Foley	Lorna V. Kubli
Claire J. McDonald	Elizabeth Ray
Mary E. McPherson	Edythe L. Robertson
Olive L. Moeckel	Marguerite L. Roux
Theresa C. Mravintz	Elizabeth O. Ryland
Genevieve K. O'Brien	Marion L. Watt
Rose E. Panowski	Olive E. Young

To be first lieutenants

Margaret V. Berry	Helen R. Huyett
Margaret R. Brinson	Marcia A. Levy
Rose J. Coppa	Agnes W. McAmis
Lucille B. Dion	Gloria K. Miller-Potter
Florence R. Ferris	Dorothy A. Porter
Orla L. Geick	Mary L. Porter
Ellen T. Gilbert	Jane Sewell
Sarah Goldin	Barbara S. Smith
Carolyn F. Greenway	Virginia J. Starbuck
Jessie V. Hogan	Gwendolyn J. Watson

To be second lieutenants

Betty B. Coleman
Delores M. Knapik

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Robert S. Barmettler	Terrence V. McGuire
Axel Bolvig, Jr.	Joseph F. Olshefski
Leon E. Boswell	Herbert W. Remington
Charles C. Briggs, Jr.	Harold K. Snook
John A. Burdick	Edward G. Sperry
John F. Christopher	Robert C. Storrie
James L. Dennis	Lammie L. Thurmond, Jr.
Michael Fatula	Francis M. Wildman
Jack A. Fowler	Clifford M. Winter, Jr.
John R. Habicht	Burton Zeiger
Ned D. McDonald, Jr.	

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Charles A. Nicholson II et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 2, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles A. Nicholson II, appearing on page 3772 and ending with the name of Brendan J. Moynahan which appears on page 3773.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Walter J. Degregori, Los Banos.

FLORIDA

Billie S. Campbell, Lake Harbor.

IOWA

John R. Bahne, Eldora.

KANSAS

Ralph W. Smullins, Burr Oak.
E. Lucille Logsdon, Grenola.
Beatrice H. Howell, Langdon.
Gordon N. Carlisle, Leoti.
Faye G. Mullikin, Montezuma.
Ola J. Canny, Mound Valley.

MICHIGAN

Harry T. Dransfield, Channing.
Clarence F. Bushman, Rochester.

MINNESOTA

Vida B. Adams, Truman.

MISSOURI

Clyde A. Revelle, Advance.
Maude E. Coburn, Arbyrd.
Ida M. Brunnert, Argyle.
Cleatus F. Henson, Bell City.
Edna M. Keesling, Belleview.
Mary W. Chaffin, Breckenridge.
Waldo E. Malone, Clifton Hill.
Dudley W. Peters, Crane.
Eugene H. Davison, Elkland.
Fred V. Hogan, Flemington.
Alfred D. Boon, Franklin.
Arthur G. Emmons, Grandin.
Willie L. Anderson, Green City.

Floyd R. Robertson, Harviell.
Leanora R. Condit, Hayti.
Walter H. Bruens, Hermann.
Lola E. Frohse, High Ridge.
Charles H. Boemler, House Springs.
Tom J. Molloy, Joplin.
Carl E. Schreiner, Lamar.
Aubrey M. Gooch, Meadville.
Doris N. Cornine, Nelson.
Sylvester Welch, Parnell.
Desmond Earl Todd, Pevely.
T. Ray Gourley, Phillipsburg.
Paul R. Viles, Pineville.
Jacob E. Fry, Stover.
Mildred F. Parsons, Syracuse.
Billie B. Cooper, Windsor.
Donald H. Lockman, Winona.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rodney B. Wright, Brookline.
Walter E. Hill, Fitzwilliam Depot.
James H. O'Connell, Fremont.
Joseph E. Hurley, Wilton.

NEW YORK

John L. Barrett, Minetto.

OKLAHOMA

Phil Lee Brown, Cherokee.
Alfred V. Koehler, Manchester.
Glenn H. Newell, Nash.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry E. Grim, Boyertown.
Clarence R. Tobin, Cresson.
Wilma S. Walker, Emeigh.
Woodrow W. S. Lehr, Fogelsville.
Michael J. Pagani, New Galilee.
George H. Davis, Saxonburg.
Robert A. Lanzendorfer, Twin Rocks.

TENNESSEE

Russell E. Rankin, Union City.

WASHINGTON

Esther L. Coleman, Harper.
Virgel M. Newman, Kingston.
Gladys M. Pearson, Olalla.
Lawrence C. Tompkins, Suquamish.

WISCONSIN

Oswald L. Weber, Cedarburg.
James W. Johnson, Chaseburg.
Robert W. Howard, Cornell.
Clarence Keith Hammond, De Soto.
Ruby C. Bahr, Fairchild.
Claude A. Thomas, Forest Junction.
Hugo J. Quast, Granton.
Hazel M. Pfeil, Granville.
Rudolph C. Trauba, Greenville.
Leone C. Mader, Gresham.
Donald L. Schulz, Irma.
Robert S. Grogan, Kaukauna.
Edwin L. Saykally, Lake Tomahawk.
Joan T. Sullivan, Ojibwa.
August E. Mecikalski, Pelican Lake.
John H. Hennessey, Roberts.
Otis M. Rude, Viroqua.
Otis L. Holman, Westby.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1949

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour divine, who wilt bow the head upon the cross and pass beneath the shadow of pain and dying, we lift our souls to Thee who in all meekness and lowliness hath given us a pledge of life eternal.

We would not mourn as those who have no hope of the morning, but as watchers on the mountain we would wait for the dawn and rejoice in the coming glory of the future. We rejoice to see the beauty of God in the patience, the purity and tenderness of Jesus the Christ. In Him is the seal of victory over the powers of darkness and human oppression. O fill our hearts with such peace that we shall be ashamed to murmur and complain, and unto the Lord of glory be eternal praises. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1209) entitled "An act to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948"; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SALE OF PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2440) to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the sale of what are ordinarily known as the green towns, Greenbelt, Md., near Washington, Greenhills near Cincinnati, and Greendale, a suburb of Milwaukee, Wis.

The bill provides that veterans' cooperatives shall have priority in the purchase of these properties. It also provides that tenants in possession may join the cooperatives on the same terms and conditions as required of other purchasers. The sale may be either a negotiated sale or a sale as a result of competitive bidding.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It could be either?

Mr. SPENCE. There are several veterans' cooperatives that have been organized and, I understand, are able to purchase these properties. They are very anxious to have the opportunity to make the bid immediately.

The terms provide that at least 10 percent of the purchase price must be paid at the time of the sale; deferred payments bear 4 percent interest, and the amortization period is 25 years.

The bill was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency without a dissenting vote, and I am sure that there will be no opposition to it here.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us what the total loss to the Government has been in these properties?

Mr. SPENCE. What the total loss will be?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much did we lose on them?

Mr. SPENCE. I believe the whole project cost about $40,000,000. What they are going to obtain, I do not know.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us if it is mandatory that these properties be sold by competitive bids.

Mr. SPENCE. No; the matter is left to the discretion of the Public Housing Commissioner.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is possible to transfer the properties under negotiated contracts without competitive bids; is that right?

Mr. SPENCE. That is a request that some of the veterans' cooperatives have made. They wanted an opportunity to buy on negotiated sales. Should it develop that two or more organizations negotiate for the sale they must submit sealed bids. I think it is a good thing for the Government to get rid of these properties.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think it is the perfect end of a noble experiment.

Mr. SPENCE. I believe this is the best way in which we can dispose of them; it gives the veterans preference; it will mean more housing. I hope that the bill will pass and the properties will be disposed of at an early date and Government obligations with respect thereto will cease.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I understand the Federal Government has spent $40,000,000 on these three projects.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. RICH. That was a pretty big deal for someone to make handling Government funds. Suppose a cooperative is formed and they say, "Now, we can get that proposition for a fraction of what it cost the Federal Government"; suppose further that someone else is willing to pay 20 or 30 percent more for the property; how will the Government be protected to get the better price? How will that be determined by those handing it out?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not know how we are going to dispose of them unless we entrust the disposition to somebody. This is the only way I know of in which it can be done.

Mr. RICH. Does the bill provide that they may be sold without advertising?

Mr. SPENCE. No; they must be sold after appraisal by disinterested appraisers employed by the Public Housing Commissioner or at cost, whichever is least. Mr. Charles P. Taft is very much interested in one of these projects. He represents a cooperative and is very anxious that it be sold immediately. A veterans' cooperative in Milwaukee, Wis., is very anxious to purchase the project there.

Mr. RICH. Will the authorities do their best to get every dollar they can to

help relieve this great deficit that these projects helped to get us into?

Mr. SPENCE. If they did not they would be recreant to their trust, and I assume they will not be.

Mr. RICH. What I want to know is, are they going to try to do it?

Mr. SPENCE. They tell me that they are.

Mr. RICH. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say for the consolation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that these properties cannot be exported.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky and his committee in making this report. The veterans of Wisconsin are especially interested in this project in Mr. DAVIS' district. It seems to me it is a blessing to the veterans.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wish to correct the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]; it is not in my district, although it is in Milwaukee County. I do, however, wish to express my appreciation to the chairman and other members of this committee for their practical action in this matter, and to express my belief that it represents a fine way for the Government to get out of the real-estate business. It will do a lot of good to the veterans of Wisconsin.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman; I hope that will be the result.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3709, as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, or any other provision of law, the Public Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized, by means of negotiated sale or sales and without competitive bidding or public advertising, to sell and convey, at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert selected by the Commissioner and subject to such terms and conditions as he may determine to be in the best public interest, to such purchaser or purchasers as he deems to be responsible, all right, title, and interest of the United States in or to all or any part of the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio (including improved and unimproved lands, war housing constructed on lands of or adjacent to said suburban resettlement projects, and personal property used in connection with said projects or housing): *Provided*, That the Public Housing Commissioner shall, during such period as he deems to be reasonable, give a first preference in such negotiated sale or sales to cooperative, or mutual corporations or other nonprofit organizations, including veteran and nonveteran members or where shares of stock are held by veterans and/or veteran organizations, and may sell to such corporations or organizations at fair market value (as determined by him on the basis stated above) or at cost (as determined by him, including the apportioned cost of structures, lands, appurtenances, and personal property transferred, together with the apportioned share of the cost of all utilities and other facilities provided for and common to the project of which any property being sold is a part), whichever is lower: *And provided further*, That in the event the Commissioner shall not have been able to dispose of any one or all of said properties, or any part or parts thereof, by negotiated sale as authorized herein within a period of 6 months after the effective day of this act, he may sell and convey any such unsold project or part thereof to the highest responsible bidder at a public competitive sale upon such terms and after such advertisement as said Commissioner may deem in the public interest, or otherwise dispose of such projects or any part thereof in accordance with other applicable legislation.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3709, as amended, the revised Statutes of the United States, or any other provision of law, the Public Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized, by means of negotiated sale or sales and without competitive bidding or public advertising, to sell and convey, at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert selected by the Commissioner and subject to such terms and conditions as he may determine to be in the best public interest, to such purchaser or purchasers as he deems to be responsible, all right, title, and interest of the United States in or to all or any part of the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio (including improved and unimproved lands, war housing constructed on lands of or adjacent to said surburban resettlement projects, and personal property used in connection with said projects or housing): *Provided*, That the Public Housing Commissioner shall, during such period as he deems to be reasonable, give a first preference in such negotiated sale or sales to veteran groups organized on a nonprofit basis (provided that any such group shall accept as a member of its organization, on the same terms, subject to the same conditions, and with the same privileges and responsibilities, required of and extended to other members of the group, any tenant occupying a project on the date of its acquisition hereunder by such group, and provided further that any such group shall extend an opportunity to such tenants to so become members for such period as the Commissioner shall deem appropriate), and may sell to such groups at fair market value (as determined by him on the basis stated above) or at cost (as determined by him, including the apportioned cost of structures, lands, appurtenances, and personal property transferred, together with the apportioned share of the cost of all utilities and other facilities provided for and common to the project of which any property being sold is a part), whichever is lower except, however, that in the event two or more such groups desire to purchase any such project they shall be required to submit sealed bids therefor and the award shall be made on the basis of the highest acceptable monetary return to the Government: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall preclude the Public Housing Commissioner from selling and conveying any such project or part thereof to the highest responsible bidder at a public competitive sale upon such terms and after such advertisement as said Commissioner may deem in the public interest, or from otherwise disposing of such projects or any part thereof in accordance with other applicable legislation: *And provided further*, That in the event of a sale other than for cash, the Commissioner shall require a down payment of at least 10 percent of the total purchase price, the balance to be amortized over a period of not more than 25 years, the unpaid balance to bear interest at the rate of 4 percent and the payment of any unpaid balance to be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust against the properties sold."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy that H. R. 2440 has passed the House. This bill directly affects a large number of the residents of my district, and under the provisions of this measure it is now possible for the veterans' group and the tenants of Greenhills, Ohio, to purchase this project and be relieved of the uncertainty which has been hanging over their heads for quite a long time. It is also very appropriate that just about a half an hour before the passage of this bill I had the pleasure of being in the company of Mr. R. D. Matthews and Miss McAfee, teachers at the Greenhills High School, and a group of 32 of their students who are visiting the Nation's Capital.

I am glad that my colleagues have seen fit to pass this bill and I know that the minds of a lot of my constituents will be set at ease when the same bill passes the Senate and is signed by the President.

Only today I received a letter from one of my constituents who was actively working to bring about complete cooperation between the residents of Greenhills and the veterans' group, which were anxiously awaiting the action of the House. In this letter my friend, Mr. Marty Eagan, informed me that as a result of my several letters to the two groups interested in Greenhills they had held meetings on last Saturday and Sunday and arrived at an amicable settlement of all the differences—hence, I am proud to say that the people of my district now present a united front in their efforts to provide proper housing for themselves and our veterans. With this united front these groups can go forward and purchase this project and immediately start new construction which is very necessary at this time in order to alleviate the housing shortage.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to the House the great appreciation of my constituents in approving this measure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky and his committee have done a very conscientious job in amending H. R. 2440, the measure to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Greendale,

and Greenhills, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising.

One of the projects, Greendale, is located in my congressional district and I have repeatedly urged that careful deliberation be given this measure. I have asked that the bill include the following provisions:

(a) A true market value.

(b) Due consideration for tenants, veteran and nonveteran, particularly in exorbitant rent increases and unfair evictions.

(c) A provision for negotiating a term sale if and when a cash disposition should not be feasible.

While I have at no time opposed the sale of these housing projects, it is my firm conviction that everyone who is interested, especially the present tenants, should be given all possible consideration. In a letter received just this morning from one of the Greendale residents, I was urged to support legislation which would give a tenant's cooperative corporation priority in the purchase of Greendale from the Government through negotiated sale, wherein such cooperative corporation shall be controlled by the tenants and in which all the residents of Greendale would be eligible. Further, first priority for the purchase of the individual units should be afforded to the present occupants of these developments.

It is my understanding that it was the intention of the original planners of these developments, that when the Government would feel free to dispose of them, they would be turned over to a nonprofit corporation formed from the tenants of that project. I believe the present measure, as amended, gives the Public Housing Commissioner such authority and therefore feel that the legislation is not controversial.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor may have permission to sit in public hearings today and tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1949

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 222, with Mr. BRYSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Allen, La.	Garmatz	Nixon
Andrews	Gilmer	Passman
Bailey	Hall,	Patman
Barden	Leonard W.	Poulson
Baring	Harden	Powell
Bland	Hedrick	Rains
Buckley, N. Y.	Heller	Regan
Bulwinkle	Herter	Sasscer
Burke	Hill	Scott, Hardie
Burnside	Hobbs	Scott,
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Hugh D., Jr.
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	Javits	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Jennings	Smith, Va.
Cox	Jones, Ala.	Staggers
Davenport	Kearney	Stigler
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Stockman
Dawson	Kee	Thomas, N. J.
DeGraffenried	Kennedy	Thompson
Dingell	Kirwan	Vursell
Dollinger	Kunkel	Walsh
Douglas	Lane	Whitaker
Elliott	LeCompte	White, Idaho
Ellsworth	Lucas	Wickersham
Elston	McConnell	Willis
Fernandez	McDonough	Withrow
Frazier	Morrison	Wolcott
Fugate	Morton	Wood
Gamble	Multer	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BRYSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 222, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 347 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I need.

Mr. Chairman, the item which is now before the committee involves a considerable amount of money. The resolution is of an urgent nature and the amount recommended for appropriation is $595,890,000 for the Veterans' Administration.

The matter came to the attention of the committee only yesterday afternoon, following which hearings were held, resulting in this resolution. The appropriation is needed to supplement the amount currently available for the fiscal year 1949 for readjustment benefits.

It was testified that the present fund for this purpose would be completely exhausted at the end of the first 3 weeks of this month or around the 20th of April. Public Laws 411 and 512 of the Eightieth Congress increased the unit cost of subsistence allowance payable to veterans for educational and training purposes. The original Budget estimate for the fiscal year 1949 was amended by House Document No. 673 of the Eightieth Congress, second session, and reflected a preliminary estimate of these increased costs; however, it is now apparent that the amended estimate did not fully recognize the increasing cost which will result from these laws. In addition to the increased unit cost the enrollment increased above the enrollment previously estimated very much.

The three major categories in which the Veterans' Administration needs additional money follow:

First. Education and training: (a) Tuition fees; (b) supplies and equipment; (c) subsistence allowance.

Second. On-the-job training.

Third. Unemployment allowances.

The joint resolution provides an appropriation of $595,890,000 for readjustment benefits for veterans to be paid by the Veterans' Administration. The benefits consist of tuition fees and supplies and equipment for institutional trainees, payments for on-the-job training, and unemployment allowances. The major portion of the added requirements for the current year is attributable to the enactment of Public Laws 411 and 512, Eightieth Congress, since the consideration of the regular fiscal year 1949 appropriations. The total amount available for this purpose for the fiscal year 1949 was $2,629,977,894. Through the month of February total obligations were $2,062,425,606. Actual expenditures in the month of February were $273,599,720, and total expenditures in the month of March approximate $344,000,000. The balance available in the fund as of April 1 was $219,250,000, and the best estimate available is that an average of $271,000,000 per month will be required to the end of the fiscal year.

In connection with the budget for 1950, the amount recommended to be appropriated for readjustment benefits included an amount of $323,193,891 estimated to be utilized in fiscal year 1949. The changed situation with regard to the education and training program now appears to require that the full amount included in the budget be available for use in fiscal year 1950.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the increased enrollment is due somewhat to unemployment conditions?

Mr. KERR. I think that is certainly correct. The increased enrollment is due very much, if not largely, to the unemployment conditions in the country.

The estimate was submitted by the budget to the Congress on April 11, and the committee was informed in hearings on April 12 that present funds will be exhausted within 10 days. The committee has had an opportunity to make only the most cursory review of the matter but is

convinced that at least the amount proposed will be required. The amount of the appropriation is no control over expenditures inasmuch as expenditures are entirely dependent upon the number of applicants for training and for other benefits to which veterans are entitled under the law.

Therefore, the committee recommends the enactment of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon about 12:30 we were summoned to a meeting of the Deficiency Committee for 1:30. The day before an estimate had come up here from the Bureau of the Budget for $595,000,000 to pay for readjustment allowances for veterans. The Veterans' Administration, according to our hearings, had submitted this matter to the Bureau of the Budget with its estimate on the 9th of March, indicating a very decided deficiency. Yet, the budget message did not arrive here until day before yesterday afternoon. It, and the hearings, indicated that at least this amount would be necessary to meet the obligations of the Veterans' Administration to the 30th of June. Perhaps it will take more.

I presume that if the recess were scheduled for 2 weeks ahead of next Thursday instead of next Thursday, the budget message would not have arrived until 2 days before the recess. The reason for this resolution is that there are more veterans taking on-the-job training, and the allowances for that and for institutional training, such as colleges, has increased very markedly during the year. Unemployment allowances have increased very markedly. The number for unemployment allowances in October was 240,000; in March it was 670,000 indicating almost 3 times as many on the 52–20 allowance. We hope that the estimated drop off in April, May, and June will take place. That is all set forth in the hearings.

Frankly, in view of the fact that Congress has passed the law authorizing and directing the Veterans' Administration to make these payments, there is nothing we can do except pass this resolution. I regret that it comes up and has to come up, but there is no such thing in my book as failing to meet a definite obligation the Congress has created. We must pass the resolution right away so that the Veterans' Administration will be able to send out the checks which have been promised.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in the assumption that the budget submitted by the President for the fiscal year 1950 contained an amount to take care of a possible deficit in this item available for expenditure in 1949?

Mr. TABER. That is true. It contained an item amounting to $323,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. In other words, the President's 1950 budget anticipated the possible deficiency in this item in the 1949 budget of $323,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, as the result of this request for $595,000,000, we find that the amount for expenditure in 1949 will be increased over the President's budget estimate by the difference between $323,000,000 and $595,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. $272,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. So that $272,000,000 is in effect an unbudgeted item and represents an amount beyond any budget estimate that has been submitted by the President?

Mr. TABER. It represents an item of $272,000,000 above his January submission. There was a budget estimate submitted on Monday afternoon for the $595,000,000. It does represent an increase above the January submission by that amount.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested, because it was thought last year when those bills passed the Congress that the educational and on-the-job training work would taper off, that it was more or less the end of the program. I think it shows there is a great deal of unemployment, and that is one reason for the increase.

Mr. TABER. That probably is the reason for the increase.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. My question is directed to the unemployment benefits, or the 52–20 club. Is it a fact that the same office in the State administers the 52–20 payments as is in charge of making payments for unemployment benefits?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SADLAK. Therefore, where you have unemployment, the work load automatically is increased on the personnel of these offices by the daily increase in unemployment of veterans?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we pass today a notable milestone in the history of congressional appropriations. We have now reported to the House all the annual supply bills for the support of the executive and judicial branches of the Government, and by tonight or tomorrow night we will have established the unprecedented record of sending to the Senate all the annual appropriation bills before mid-April. It is a record without precedent since the constitutional amendment abolishing the short session.

Furthermore, these bills have been so exhaustively studied and so thoroughly processed that they have been presented to the House by the practically unanimous vote of the membership of the subcommittees on both sides of the aisle and have reached the floor in such carefully considered form that none of them have been materially modified. And they have been accepted by the House practically in the form in which reported by the committee.

The exceptional efficiency with which the appropriation bills have been handled this session has been made possible by a number of contributing factors.

Foremost, it may be said, was the inauguration of the practice of assigning members of the Committee on Appropriations to a single subcommittee, instead of to two or more subcommittees as in former sessions, making possible the concerted functioning of all subcommittees simultaneously.

Next, I should say, was the indefatigable industry and zeal of the chairmen and the members of the several subcommittees, on both sides of the aisle, in the handling of the hearings and investigations, and in their determination to meet the dates scheduled for the respective reports.

Third, particular credit must be given to the capable and efficient members of the committee staff, who have worked all day and far into the night through months of crowded hearings and rendered an outstanding service unexcelled in the annals of the committee.

And last, much of the credit is to be attributed to the splendid cooperation and support of the House leadership which has smoothed the way and kept open the avenues of prompt consideration when we brought our bills to the floor.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, we are not only sending the supply bills to the Senate in record-breaking time and form but we have been successful in making large reductions in the budget estimates and in holding planned outlays to what impressed us as the essentials. Every bill except one presented by the committee and passed by the House has been appreciably below the estimate of appropriations, including both the First and Second Deficiency Appropriation bills, which we have also passed and sent to the Senate before the Easter recess.

The budget estimates applying to all the regular annual bills referred to aggregate $29,357,897,996. The bills as they have passed the House and the one expected to pass the House this afternoon or tomorrow, carry a grand total of $28,269,635,101. The difference in favor of the taxpayer is $1,088,262,895. I am appending a table giving the components of these amounts by bills.

From this table it will be noted that while the bills reported by the committee are more than a billion dollars below the budget estimates, they are $2,538,183,220 in excess of comparable appropriations for the fiscal year 1949. However, the budget estimates for 1950 include $2,260,540,958 directly attributable to legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress. Increased veterans' benefits account for almost $1,000,000,000 of this amount, and pay increases to Government employees account for $550,000,000. When these mandatory items are taken into account and provision is made for increases in work loads and volume of business, the bills as passed for 1950 are not materially in excess of comparable amounts for 1949. The total of appropriations recommended by the committee is $1,088,262,895 below the estimates recommended in the budget. Every bill

reported has been substantially below the budget except the bill providing funds for the Military Establishment.

The budget, as submitted, did not include estimates for universal military training, but the President informed the Congress that it was his purpose to propose legislation authorizing universal military training and that it would require appropriations of $800,000,000 the first year. While this amount was not actually submitted as a budget estimate, it was referred to by the President in the budget and was taken into account by the Budget Bureau in computing probable expenditures for national defense in the ensuing fiscal year. It now becomes evident that no appropriation for this purpose will be required, so it is fair to say that the appropriation for the Military Establishment, as recommneded by the committee, though apparently in excess of budget estimates, is in reality substantially below the total appropriations contemplated by the Budget Bureau and the President at the time the budget was prepared.

All circumstances considered, the House may well view the work of the subcommittees in the processing of these bills as a commendable accomplishment and a tribute to the application and the judgment of the membership of the subcommittees, irrespective of political consideration.

Their problems were in no sense easy. It requires no effort and little thought to make arbitrary slashes, letting the consequences be such as they may. That is not intelligent economy. The Appropriations Committee is confronted with demands in consequence of law and in response to situations which it is powerless to alter or ignore. Its task is to determine the least amount of money required to meet the situation in the most efficient and economical way. Our reports to the House follow out that conception of the committee's responsibility.

The place to avoid additional spending and to keep budgets in line with foreseeable revenue is right here in the Congress in the consideration of legislative measures that embody additional Treasury demands. For example, at the last session of Congress additional compensation was authorized for Federal personnel. That meant an added expense for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 of approximately millions of dollars, and swelled the total of every bill the committee has reported. It is doubtful whether when these authorizations are before the House, due consideration was given to the expansion they involve in the ultimate aggregate of the budget, and to the added demands they mean upon revenue. When we later meet with these increases in the supply bills, we become very much disturbed. But it is a bit late by that time.

Let me also remind you that 76 percent of the expenditures contemplated by the 1950 budget are earmarked for national defense, international affairs, and finance, veterans, and interest on the public debt; 76 percent just for those four categories. The remaining 24 percent or $10,000,000,000, applies to all of the other multitudinous activities of the Federal Government. For the present, therefore, we are more or less restricted in our economy efforts to the $10,000,000,000 latitude. That is not an unconscionable amount for so wide a spread. Of course, it is well above the prewar level for comparable objects, but that is due to newly authorized undertakings and to a very large extent to the pay-roll expansion in consequence of liberalization of the Classification Act and successive pay increases.

This general summary should convey some idea of the difficulty confronting the members of the Appropriations Committee in subtracting, upon justifiable grounds, substantial amounts from the regular annual appropriation bills.

The expeditious and effective management of the appropriation bills this session, and the reduction of the budget estimates, as transmitted to the Senate constitute a noble accomplishment.

But even at that, there is reason to believe that the committee and the Congress could have been even a little more economical. Certainly there is need for the most rigid economy. The resources of the country are not unlimited. There is a bottom not only to the revenues available but to the natural resources of the country, as well.

There is need for retrenchment of expenditure, not only for the sake of the national economy but as a part of national defense. The General of the Army appearing before one of the subcommittees emphasized the fact that we could imperil national defense by the expenditure of excessive funds for the armed services in time of peace. And it cannot be too strongly emphasized that we cannot continue to vote for increased appropriations unless we expect in the near future to vote for additional taxes.

Mr. Chairman, there follows a recapitulation of the regular annual appropriation bills as reported to the House with a comparison of amounts carried for the current fiscal year and the amounts recommended by the Budget:

Bill	Appropriations, 1949	Budget estimates, 1950	Committee bill, 1950	Committee bill for 1950 compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1949	Budget estimates, 1950
District of Columbia	$99,879,483	$103,321,427	$98,923,621	−$955,862	−$4,397,806
Treasury-Post Office	2,545,392,680	3,172,666,750	3,072,817,903	+527,425,223	−99,848,847
Labor-Federal Security	1,857,955,310	2,235,065,685	2,211,794,085	+353,838,775	−23,271,600
Civil Functions	648,575,666	767,733,220	586,762,000	−61,813,666	−180,971,220
Interior	409,389,974	616,805,020	536,211,908	+126,821,934	−80,593,112
Agriculture	573,888,953	726,879,908	701,122,079	+127,233,126	−25,757,829
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	599,704,390	740,023,456	684,616,102	+84,911,712	−55,407,354
Military Establishment	10,454,477,413	13,219,835,700	13,272,815,800	+2,818,338,387	+52,980,100
Independent Offices	6,808,368,663	7,775,566,830	7,104,571,603	+296,202,940	−670,995,227
Total	23,997,632,532	29,357,897,996	28,269,635,101	+4,272,002,569	−1,088,262,895
First deficiency, 1949	466,882,177				
Second deficiency, 1949	671,047,172				
Veterans benefits, estimate	595,890,000				
Grand total	25,731,451,881			+2,538,183,220	

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks just made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, were to me both interesting and amusing especially when he rejoiced over the fact that his committee has established an all-time record for appropriations during this session of Congress.

I desire to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that such a record could have been established by the Eightieth Congress if his many motions to increase appropriations during that Congress had prevailed.

Just to keep the record straight, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, who now asserts such a burning zeal for economy, during the Eightieth Congress offered 10 amendments relating to just one department which, if they had been accepted, would have increased appropriations for that one department by $306,077,666. I think I am correct in saying that on every appropriation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] offered motions to recommit to be reported back forthwith to include increased appropriations. Members of his own committee have told me that the increased appropriations proposed by Chairman CANNON, both during debate on various supply bills and in his motions to recommit, would have amounted to $289,385,710. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], had had his way, the Eightieth Congress would not have been as successful in saving the taxpayers' money and to have balanced the budget for the first time since 1932.

So that one can make a fair comparison between the performance and the pleas for economy by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I recall to Members of the House his strenuous opposition to efforts by the Republican minority to eliminate the TVA steam plant from a recent appropriation bill. The cost of this project and those which necessarily follow it will ultimately cost $150,000,000.

The gentleman from Missouri also speaks in glowing terms of the excellent job that has been done by the Appropriations Committee staff and the careful consideration that has been given the supply bills so far during the present session of Congress. The staff referred to, of course, can only mean clerks and employees of the committee. No doubt

these employees are competent and have done a good job. However, in his statement he fails to tell the Congress that he discharged the investigating staff that was set up during the Eightieth Congress under the Reorganization Act, and that no investigating staff has replaced those who were fired. Without such a staff how can anyone believe that requests for appropriations by various departments can be properly studied and judged.

Only last week the gentleman from Missouri placed a number of letters in the Appendix of the RECORD. These letters were from businessmen throughout the country complimenting him on statements demanding economy. Most of the businessmen who wrote these letters sent copies to their Members of Congress. I rarely reply to letters which are merely a copy of a letter to someone else that is sent to me. I did, however, reply to these letters with the following:

DEAR MR. BLANK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to Congressman CLARENCE CANNON.

I think it is a fine thing for you and others to write Mr. CANNON such letters. You may be able to persuade him to act and vote as he talks.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

PAUL SHAFER.

It is quite apparent that these letters written to the gentleman from Missouri have not had much effect because the record shows that the supply bills that have been considered by Congress during the present session have been increased a total of almost $2,000,000,000 over similar bills passed last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits," 1949, $595,890,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome to the ranks of those who seek economy in expenditures of the Federal Government the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. It is simply amazing to me to see how he has been converted to the necessity of retrenchment in the expenditure of public funds. I compliment him upon the remarks which he made this morning, and similar speeches which he has made from time to time to the Committee on Appropriations, but let me warn you and warn the country that while we may take just pride in the speed with which we have passed these monumental appropriation bills, we are not through. Nothing has been said about the demands that will be made upon the Treasury when the whole program, to which I understand the gentleman subscribes, is passed and brought before the House. This program is involved in deficiency appropriations that will come before the Congress prior to its adjournment. If the program as announced is legislated into law, and must be implemented by appropriations, it will make these estimates look puny and small. So I want to warn the country and the Congress right now, in view of what the gentleman has said, that we expect in the future to examine these estimates of deficiencies that come before the Congress to take care of, for instance, the Atlantic Pact, China, Greek-Turkish aid, aid to dependent and neglected children in foreign countries, social-security-tax legislation, housing, and everything else, none of which have been submitted to this Congress up to the present time. God alone knows what the cost will be if that program is carried out and must be implemented by appropriations.

It is a little too early to pat ourselves on the back and let the country know that we have done such a magnificent job when on the major parts of your program legislative authorizations have not yet been made and when and if they are made, oh, what a different story will be before the public at that time.

It is a grand thing to talk about reducing appropriations, Mr. Chairman, and about a record for reducing appropriations; it is another thing to vote when the time comes to vote to actually carry out that purpose by casting a vote that you preach.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BRYSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. J. Res. 222) making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include resolutions.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain articles and excerpts.

ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN FIANCÉS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. J. Res. 160) to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés, and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancés Act, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "January" and insert "April."

Page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike out "and were unable to come to the United States for reasons beyond their control."

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "before July 1, 1949" and insert "within five months after the effective date of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain these amendments?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the amendments the Senate placed in the bill passed by the House have in anywise changed the bill, because the relief provided therein relates only to those cases of GI fiancés that were being processed at the time the act expired. The Senate changed the date from January 1 to April 1, 1949. However, that does not affect the objective of the act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It gives them three more months to process them.

Mr. WALTER. It gives five more months to complete the processing that was going on at the time the act expired and does not make eligible any more GI fiancés.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, suppose that in 3 months' time they are not able to process them; they were in the hopper at the time, but there was some technical delay. Do I understand that is as of April 30, this year?

Mr. WALTER. January 1, 1949.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Suppose they have not started to work on the processing.

Mr. WALTER. If no application was made to the consul prior to midnight December 31, 1948, no case could now be considered. I understand most of the

eligible cases have been completed. There are some remaining, and the State Department has informed the Committee on the Judiciary that the 5 months provided for in the bill is the time that would be required.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There is no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject American Taxpayers Have Sent $92,169,000,000 to Foreign Countries.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Humboldt Times, Eureka, Calif.

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4146, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday, by unanimous consent, further general debate on the bill was limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, at the outset of my remarks I want to pay high compliment to this distinguished Committee on Appropriations that has brought in probably the largest bill that will be before this House during this session, in dollars and cents. This committee is composed of some of the most distinguished and best posted men in the Congress. It is headed by one of the Congress' most learned and gifted young statesmen, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He has done a magnificent job. It is a hard job. I have read the hearings, and the questions he asked indicate considerable knowledge of this complicated problem of our national defense and the money necessary for its support. Assisting him was the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], who, for a great many years and during the war, was chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations.

Also on the majority side is the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who for a great many years was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and in recent years was a member of the Committee on Armed Services. On the minority side are two distinguished Members, both chairmen in the Eightieth Congress, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who headed the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who headed the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department. This is a great committee, composed of outstanding, able men.

I have read a third of the hearings. I read the hearings in relation to the Air Force and the Navy. The only fault I find with the handiwork of this subcommittee is that they have followed, as far as the Navy and naval aviation is concerned, the conclusions and recommendations of the budget. They have given to the Committee on Appropriations and to this committee the figures the budget has recommended.

I say the facts justify a departure from the conclusions of the budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff in making their recommendation are entirely at variance with the recommendations of the budget. But this distinguished committee has adopted the budget figures, so this bill now becomes the committee's bill even though it writes in exactly what the budget has proposed for the Navy.

I call your attention to how this affects one branch of the service, naval aviation. Listen to this, and every line I am going to utter is taken from the hearings on this bill.

This bill cuts 2,930 planes from the number of operating naval aircraft that were planned for June 30, 1949.

It cuts the Navy attack carriers by 3, from 11 to 8. These ships, the airplane carriers, are the backbone of the modern Navy. There was a day and time when the battleship was the backbone. That day is past. Today the backbone of the modern Navy is the airplane carrier.

The budget recommended to take out of commission three of these carriers, and this distinguished Committee on Appropriations goes along with and approves the recommendation of the budget.

What else does this bill do? It deactivates nine naval air stations. Every one of them, except two, is outside the continental United States. It cuts out one attack-carrier group—a major unit of the Navy striking force.

It cuts out four Navy patrol-plane squadrons, these being antisubmarine planes for the defense of waters immediately adjacent to the United States.

It permits the Navy to procure almost 500 fewer planes in 1950 than were authorized in 1949. It permits the Navy to procure one-half the number of planes needed even to maintain the reduced strength of the Navy's air arm. It cuts the strength of the Navy's operating Air Force from 10,713 to 7,783.

Then the committee turned around and said, "The Navy can have only 843 planes built a year." If you can build only 843 planes a year, it means that you cannot maintain 7,783 operating and modern planes because the life of a plane is only 6 years. Therefore, they are stagnating the Navy air arm and they are letting the naval operating air force die on the vine.

In addition, this bill cuts the naval air personnel 550 officers and 12,000 enlisted men below the budget of last year.

Now, listen to this. It forces the discontinuance of training of Naval Reserve air groups on fleet carriers.

It reduces the number of aircraft overhauls by 16 percent from the authorized 1949 level. To sum up—it cuts the Navy's operating aircraft; it cuts its attack carriers; it cuts its naval personnel; it reduces to an astonishing extent its procurement authority; it forces the deactivation of nine air stations; it prevents the production of new-type aircraft. By the reduction of $30,000,000 in research, you cannot get any new types of Navy aircraft engines or aircraft in 1950 under the bill before the Committee today.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Does it not also prevent any experimental work from being done so that naval aviation would be obliged to use whatever the Army has developed, even though it might not be adequate for the tasks of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. It has the effect of forcing the Navy to continue to use and to maintain obsolescent airplanes in the future. That is the effect of this reduction of this $30,000,000.

I say this bill should be amended. I would like to see it amended to carry out at least what was done for the Navy and what was done for our defense establishment in 1949. Listen to this. In 1949 the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] brought in a bill which was rounded out in all respects and which gave the country adequate protection in peacetime. This bill provides $573,000,000 less for the Navy than was appropriated under the act of 1949.

The other day you heard the distinguished Britisher, Mr. Churchill, say that nothing has contributed more to keeping peace in the world than the atomic bomb. That is absolutely true. The atomic bomb, and with America keeping a worth-while national-defense establishment, has enabled us to maintain peace.

What is before us today? On the one hand, we are assuming greater responsibilities than ever before under the Atlantic Pact, and on the other hand by this bill which we now have before us, we are not only reducing by $573,000,000 the appropriation for the Navy, but we are also reducing the Army some 34,000 men in its personnel. I say to you, if you want to keep peace in Europe—if you want to keep peace in the world, then let the world know we are going to be prepared. We have just signed, as I said,

the Atlantic Pact, and the very next day, after assuming that additional responsibility, this Committee on Appropriations, following the conclusions of the budget, cut the very vitals out of naval aviation. I say there is nothing more important than aviation. The distinguished gentleman from Texas yesterday pointed that out. I agree with him. But he does not take his own medicine. He points out how valuable and effective aviation is; yet on the other hand, he comes here and reduces by some 3,000 planes the operating force which Congress appropriated in 1949. When he does that, he then says, "The Navy can only buy 843 planes in 1950," and you cannot maintain 7,783 planes by a yearly production of only 843 planes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. MAHON. Would not the gentleman also point out that the Navy has 12,000 planes; that the appropriation in this bill for the entire Navy is greater this year than it was last year; and that the appropriation for naval aviation is greater than it was last year; and that this is the greatest so-called peacetime military budget in the history of this Nation?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes; it may be the greatest that has ever been written, but your money is not being properly allocated. In regard to your first question, I pointed out in the debate of yesterday, and I challenge the gentleman to dispute the correctness of these figures, and I measure my words when I say this, that by this bill the total strength of operating aircraft is less by some 4,000 planes than was provided for in the bill for 1949.

Now, here are the figures. I knew this question was coming up. Air Force planes for 1949, 15,886; for the Navy, 14,500. That is a total of 30,386.

In this bill the Air Force gets 15,100, and the Navy, 10,500; a total of 25,600. Subtract the 25,600 from 30,386 and it is 4,786 less in the 1950 budget than was provided for in the 1949 budget.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. Just a minute. And that is what we did in 1949, the Eightieth Congress, which was heralded over the country by the President as a no-good Congress.

Now, what more does this bill do to the air power of the Navy? It knocks out an approved program by which two Essex-type carriers were to be modernized yearly so that modern naval aircraft can operate therefrom. Within 2 years most of the Navy attack carrier aircraft will not be able to operate from the decks of the unmodernized carriers. This bill ignores that fact completely.

The procurement rate under this bill is so low that the Navy will be down to 4,000 aircraft 5 or 6 years from now, barely one-third of its present aircraft strength. And the yearly input of 843 aircraft authorized in this budget has this effect.

It means a monthly average delivery rate of 70 airplanes. It would take 12 months to get that up to 200 per month, 24 months to get to 700 per month, and almost 3 years to reach the minimum rate to wage all-out war.

And all of these reductions, these failures to plan for the future, ignore completely the fact that more than 80 percent of the Navy's aircraft today were delivered during or before 1945—4 years ago. Their expected life is only 6 years. But this bill proposes just to let the naval air arm wither on the vine.

It was only last spring, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress and the President signed an appropriation act which provided for an end strength of 10,713 operating aircraft in the Navy.

Now we are to cut that back to 7,783—a reduction of 2,930 aircraft in active operation in the Navy. As I said before—and I find this most difficult to understand—this bill does not even provide enough naval aircraft procurement to maintain that lowered figure, which is 27.5 percent lower than the level proposed for this fiscal year.

This is a cut of $343,000,000 from the lowest budget proposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for naval air power of $1,030,000,000. To maintain the strength proposed in this budget, the Navy needs 1,700 new aircraft in fiscal year 1950. The bill proposes only 843, thereby forcing the Navy to make up the difference with obsolescent aircraft that will be comparatively worthless 2 years from now.

There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman.

This budget is the beginning point in the effort to destroy naval air strength.

It inserts a knife into the very vitals of naval power. It puts out the eyes of the fleet, sharply reduces its striking power, reduces its protection against submarine attack, and jeopardizes the ability of the American Navy to control the high seas.

What is the meaning of this? Who prompts this, and why? It defies logic.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is not the meaning of the Berlin airlift, with its risk of daily military incident with the Russians, that this is the time to reduce American air power by this slash in the Navy Air Force.

Certainly it is not even reasonable common sense to reduce American air power at the same time we assume the vastly increased responsibilities of the United States throughout the world under the new Atlantic Pact.

And obviously it cannot sensibly follow from our recently deteriorated position in the Far East, that this is the proper time to start to destroy the air power of our Navy.

Mr. Chairman, the lesson of the terrible destructions wrought at Pearl Harbor by carrier-based aircraft should make it perfectly obvious that we must maintain our own Naval Air Force striking strength up to date.

The destruction of the non-carrier-escorted British battleships *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* in the South Pacific early in the war by Japanese aircraft means that we must, of course, provide adequately for the aerial protection of the American Fleet.

And need I remind you of the Doolittle raid on Japan—where land-based aircraft were compelled to use Navy aircraft carriers in order to get near enough to Japan to perform their hit-and-run bombing mission.

Let us not close our eyes to the fact that no aircraft carrier of any nation was sunk during World War II by shore-based aircraft. Let us not be blind to the fact that not one of our standard attack carriers of the *Essex* class was sunk by any form of attack in the last war.

Let us not fool ourselves! Maybe we can fool someone else, but let us not go so far as to fool ourselves at the same time.

No, Mr. Chairman, this budget for naval air power should and must be increased.

To do otherwise means that we are plucking the heart from the American Navy. To do otherwise is, in my opinion, inexcusably dangerous to the national security of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee is doing such a splendid job that I am going to yield him my 10 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. No; do not do it; I could not take it.

Mr. SHORT. I shall be glad to.

Mr. VINSON. I appreciate the gentleman's desire very much, but I wish the gentleman to use his own time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, those of you who were fortunate enough to hear the distinguished gentlemen from Texas yesterday [Mr. MAHON], and then the very able Member from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] this morning realize, I am sure, that there is little that I or anyone else could contribute to this debate. Yesterday this House voted $5,580,000,000 in extension of European aid under the Marshall plan. That was a half billion dollars more than we voted a year ago. You have been told what marvelous recovery has taken place during the past year in Europe—and Europe has largely recovered; I visited it two or three times last year. It seems to me that instead of increasing appropriations for aid under the Marshall plan we should increase appropriations for certain other phases of our defense. As Europe rises we go down; we siphon off the wealth of this country; we deplete out natural resources; we transfuse the blood of America to countries in Europe that are rendering us weak at home. It is high time, I believe, that we need to take stock and inventory of our national situation.

I voted against that $5,580,000,000 yesterday because I believe that $5,000,000,000 in atom bombs and in B–36's will do more to stop communism than anything else this Nation could do. I am constrained to agree with my chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that we should increase the appropriation for naval aviation.

I deeply appreciate the subcommittee that brought out this bill, because you

were kind and you were even generous; you gave us $2,818,000,000 more than was assigned by the Bureau of the Budget. $13,272,000,000. And in addition to that almost $3,000,000,000 increase you gave us for the three different branches of the service. There is over $2,000,000,000 additional in contract authorizations. In other words, there is in this bill, including contract authorizations, a total of $15,905,000,000. Mr. Chairman, that is nearly $16,000,000,000 for national defense alone. That is twice as much as it cost to run this Government before this last global conflict. When you consider the five and one-half billions we are paying in interest on the $252,000,000,000 national debt, plus the almost $7,000,000,000 that is being spent by the Veterans' Administration in addition to the $5,500,000,000 that was voted yesterday for European aid, you can see the staggering cost to the American taxpayer merely for national defense, interest on the debt, and European recovery. These astronomical sums will destroy us.

I, myself, feel as does the gentleman from Texas, this is a most painful pill to take. I do not love castor oil but sometimes must take it. This budget is shocking; it is staggering; but it is necessary. What else can we do? It is my fond hope and fervent prayer that if we can get over the next 2 or 3 years, if the United Nations will be able to walk, and perhaps run a little, with an international police force to carry out its decisions, then we can reduce armaments all over the world and we can cut the tremendous cost that weighs so heavily upon the taxpayers in every nation. But we have not reached that Utopian ideal up to the present time. We must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. The only language that some people understand is force.

The recent war taught us one lesson, the value of an integrated, coordinated, synchronized striking force in all three branches. The Army, Navy, and Air Force are essential in modern warfare. We could not win without all three. While we are living in an air and atomic age, with the air arm supreme, and while the Navy and the Army must take, perhaps, a subordinate place, they must not be overlooked or neglected.

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley from my State, perhaps the greatest general of this last global conflict, a master strategist, has told our committee and has stated in public, that it is supreme folly to think that one branch of our Armed Services could win a modern war. The Air Force could not bomb without the Navy supplying the weapons overseas, a most important logistic prbolem, and after the cities are bombed, we need a land force to march in and take over.

Let us stop this silly bickering among the different branches of our services because all three are very essential and most necessary in order to win any war.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing sacrosanct about the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. I am not criticizing the present Director of the Budget. I heard Frank Pace last week down in our National Rivers and Harbors Congress and he impresses me as being a very fine, able young man. But who is any Director of the Budget, regardless of whom he might be, to determine what is necessary for the adequate protection and defense of this Nation? I would rather risk the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, and Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg.

It is the Congress of the United States, and particularly the two Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House that are to determine what is necessary for our national defense. The subcommittee, composed of these fine, able men, in spite of the splendid job they have done in bringing out this bill, in my opinion, made a mistake by following the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget so far as naval aviation is concerned. Unless we adopt the amendment that will be offered by the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], I fear that we will not have much of a Navy by 1952. We all know that these planes rapidly become obsolete; we know that we must keep a private industry going. You cannot manufacture a plane overnight. I repeat what I said to this body a short time ago, that not one plane we had on the drawing board before Pearl Harbor was ever used in this last global conflict. We do not want to adopt the Maginot Line philosophy if there should be another world war, which will be as different from the last one as the last one was from the First World War. The reason France fell so quickly was because her leaders were thinking in terms of the war of 1914–18.

We must carry on our scientific research and technological development, and I congratulate the committee for appropriating more than $500,000,000 for this very worth-while purpose. Nothing could be more important.

May I express again to you five gentlemen on this subcommittee my personal appreciation for your kindness, your courtesy, in hearing us before you brought this bill out. I am afraid that if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had not gathered a few of his little chickens around him to go in to see you, we would not have as good a bill as we have today. We appreciate what you have given us, but we do not want merely the crumbs. We are not like Lazarus. We want a strong air army and the grandest and best Navy in all the world, stronger than all others combined. We now have it. Let us not lose it. As long as we keep that way, with the possession of the atomic bomb, we are safe.

Mr. Chairman, there are three things that have kept Russia from taking all of Europe in the past year or two. The first is our possession of the atomic bomb. Secondly, is the recent demonstration of our might in air power in the form of the air lift from Frankfurt into the Tempelhof Airport in Berlin. Some of us took a look at that last November—every four minutes these four-motor planes landing with their cargos. They carry coal, potatoes, canned goods and everything necessary for their needs. That has taught Russia a lesson, and the world knows it well. The third thing in addition to this mighty demonstration of our power through the air lift and through possession of the atomic bomb is Russia's knowledge of our industrial might and productive capacity, because, after all, it was American aid that saved the day at Stalingrad, that saved Britain, that saved the United States, and I hope will help save the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the establishment of every great military power in the history of the world has been founded upon the development of a new weapon.

Alexander supplied the Macedonian phalanx with a new lance, a spear 18 feet long, and with that equipment an infinitesimal Greek Army decimated a Persian Army of a million soldiers armed with every antiquated weapon Xerxes could supply.

Caesar armed his centurions with a new weapon, the short sword. And his legions behind interlocking shields, closing in at close quarters where the long blades of the enemy could not be swung, lunged up beneath the guard of their opponents with the deadly short sword before they were aware of their danger. With that weapon Rome conquered the known world.

At the Battle of Hastings, the Saxons with their heavy maces and two-handed swords outslugged and outslashed the Normans, but the Conqueror's archers, armed with the long bow, filled the air with flights of arrows which fell slanting into the faces of the Saxons; annihilated Saxon power and laid the foundations of modern England.

Napoleon perfected a new gun, and personally supervised and inspected the output of his foundries. And from the day when, as a young lieutenant, he swept the streets of Paris with canister, until his supreme victory at Austerlitz, where he depressed his guns to crush the ice beneath the charging squadrons of allied cavalry, he won a continental empire with artillery.

Again, in the last World War, allied success was based largely on the aerial bomb. We could not have reduced Berlin and crushed German power without the aerial bomb.

Success in the next war—if there should ever be another war—likewise rests upon the utilization of a new weapon, the atomic bomb. Churchill—who according to his own appraisal "has not always been wrong"—says that but for the atomic bomb we would now be at war. And all military authorities agree that this new and terrible weapon can be decisive if there should be another world conflict.

But in order to be effective the atomic bomb, powerful and deadly as it is, is useless unless delivered to its target. If there should be another war, which God forbid, the outcome could be decisively determined by atomic warfare in 3 weeks or less. But such a war could not be won by keeping atomic bombs in storage here in the United States. It could not be won by starting transportation of the atomic

bomb in army supply trains. It could not be won by shipping atomic bombs in naval vessels. The Army cannot reach Moscow. Both Napoleon and Hitler tried that and failed. No battleship or submarine can reach Moscow.

All military experts agree that Russia would occupy the entire European continent within 90 days after the opening of hostilities. And neither the Army nor the Navy could reach Moscow with the first atomic bomb in 3 weeks—or 3 years.

Naval aircraft cannot deliver the bomb. Naval airplanes are limited to a range of approximately 500 miles—700 miles at most. Navy flat tops in the Mediterranean or the Baltic Sea or the North Atlantic could not possibly survive. It is generally conceded that Russia has a minimum of 15,000 effective planes of modern design.

As a matter of fact Russia preceded us in the development of jet propelled planes. She had jet planes in the air while we were still experimenting and when we could get them up in the air but could not get them down. She would welcome one of our carriers in European waters and one of our expensive flat tops would be little more than a sitting duck under such a barrage.

Only land based bombers could reach Moscow with a lethel charge. With the signing of the North Atlantic Pact we would have ample land bases and within a week we could blast every nerve center, every center of communication and production, every military concentration, and every naval submarine and air base. Why should we waste vast sums of money on naval planes tied down to a radius of five or seven hundred miles, to be launched from floating docks which cannot even approach the shores of continental Europe—when a smaller amount of money can supply land-based planes about the effectiveness of which there can be no possible question?

We have the greatest navy in the world. And we will keep it the greatest navy in the world. But the function of the Navy in modern warfare is the maintenance of lines of communication and transportation. Let it exercise those functions. The launching of atomic bombs at strategic targets is the function of another branch of the service, and let that branch of the service perform the duties for which it is adapted.

There was a day when wars were won by control of the sea. And England gave the world a hundred years of peace through mastery of the seas. But today wars are decided by control of the air. And we must meet changed conditions or perish.

Of course a war could not be won by air power alone. There must be troops for occupation and navy ships for transportation. But under the Marshall plan and North Atlantic Pact we will have allies with troops and ships who should also be given an opportunity to discharge their obligations as contracting powers. Why not let them contribute some of the boys needed to occupy enemy territory after we have demoralized and annihilated enemy territory from the air? We followed that plan in the last war and American boys are living today whose bones would be mouldering in alien soil had we insisted on rushing them in when our allies had an obligation to participate and were willing to send in their boys as a fair share of their contribution to the war and to the defense of their people and their civilization.

The safety of our Nation and the maintenance of peace are not so much dependent on the amount of money we spend for armament as it is dependent on the kind of armament we buy. We can spend a hundred billion dollars on the wrong kind of weapons and lose a war. Or we can spend ten billion dollars on modern weapons and preserve the safety of the Nation and avoid a war.

How can we forget the fatal decision of the French Chamber of Deputies on precisely the same question which is facing us here today? They were urged to build airplanes. But they declined on the ground that the airplane was useful only for reconnaissance, and their matchless army protected by the impregnable Maginot Line was invincible. As a result, the number of army planes manufactured in France declined every month for the entire year preceding the attack upon Poland, and when French battalions gallantly holding their own against the German advance were decimated from the air and telegraphed frantically back to Paris for planes—there were no planes to send them. Let us not make the same mistake. If we must spend money for armament, let us invest it in modern weapons to meet the changing conditions of the times. Let us spend it for long-range land-based bombers which will do more than anything else to preserve the peace of the world. Churchill says only the atomic bomb is preserving peace. Let us insure peace by providing along with the atomic bomb the means of making the bomb effective.

The only way to avoid a war is to have available at any instant the means of striking swiftly and surely and effectively at any distance. And the atomic bomb serviced by land-based bombers is the only weapon which can insure that protection. As long as we have both we can and will maintain the peace of the world.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I agree wholeheartedly with the emphasis and the supreme importance that the gentleman from Missouri is placing on long-range land-based bombers. But those land-based bombers and the atomic bomb alone will never win any war. Our fellow Missourian, Omar Bradley, I think, perhaps knows a little more about military strategy than the gentleman and myself combined.

Mr. CANNON. I am in complete accord with the gentleman. And this bill takes care of precisely that situation. We are appropriating in this bill the greatest amount of money ever appropriated for naval aviation, and the full budget estimate for practically every peacetime need of both the Army and the Navy. With the Army and the Navy and the air power provided by this bill, we will be invincible and peace is assured.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am personally reluctant to enter this debate. I would not have spoken had not members of the present Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with the Armed Services asked me to do so. It was my privilege to serve on the subcommittee for the War Department for a number of years, and I heard the testimony for a number of years and all during the war on the development of the Army and Air Force. And during the 2 years prior to this, in the Deficiency Committee, I also heard a great deal about the Navy as well as the Army and the Air Force.

During the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress it was also my privilege to be a member of the Congressional Joint Policy Committee on Aviation, which had representatives from the Army, Navy, and Air Force as advisory members to give us the benefit of their knowledge and to make known the wishes of those services.

During the past few years it has been my privilege to work in support of greater appropriations for the Air Force.

I recall very well the battle for the 70-group air force last year and the important part played by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I was then a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and had a part in working out the language to increase funds for aircraft procurement and to insure that we should get the maximum of modern types and gadgets consistent with the security outlook at any given time. It was a pair of committee amendments to a deficiency bill which started the 70-group air force in the Eightieth Congress.

And those of you who were Members of the Eightieth Congress will remember that in the deficiency bill which was handled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], we provided some $800,000,000 above the budget and the administration program for the procurement of airplanes. That initiated the 70-group air force. So I feel that I can honestly say I am somewhat air-minded, and I do not want the Navy to be overlooked in whatever development of air power it is proper for the Navy to have.

At the same time, in looking at the over-all picture it must be recognized by everybody that when you appropriate fifteen and sixteen billions, a third or more of the national budget, for the armed services, that we must spend our money where we can get the most for it.

When the Joint Policy Committee asked the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for their estimates of what they would need for a period of years, their figures were printed in a document known as Report No. 949 of the Senate on National Aviation Policy; it was the report of the National Aviation Policy Board to the Congress of the United States.

By reference to the figures which appear on page 9 of that report, you will find that under plan B the appropriations carried in the present bill give the Navy approximately 80 percent of what the Navy itself said it wanted for 1950 under plan B, while even with the increase proposed by the Committee for the Air Force, the Air Force will not get quite 80 percent of its plan.

In other words, under the bill as now presented to the committee, the Navy will have 80 percent of what it said it would need under plan B, but the Air Force is not even brought up to that 80-percent point.

Something has been said about research. I understand that the present bill carries $530,000,000 for research, of which $203,000,000 is to the Navy; $215,000,000 to the Air Force; and $112,000,000 to the Army. So there is a fairly large provision for research for each of the services. Now as to increasing funds for Naval Air. A fundamental problem is involved. I confess very readily if anyone wants to ask me: "Do you know as much about it as these admirals? Do you know as much about it as General Vandenberg or General Bradley?" I will say, "Of course I do not." I will say, however, that no Member of Congress can escape his portion of responsibility for making decisions of national policy when it comes to the defense of the country. The Constitution did reserve to the Congress and particularly to the House control over the purse and the sword; and you cannot as an individual Member of the Congress escape your share of the responsibility. Members who are assigned to the Committee on Appropriations cannot escape the responsibility for making decisions objectively by hearing what one service says, what another service says, and then trying to give the best balanced judgment he can.

A fundamental decision of this Congress is in the process of making, whether we recognize it or not: Whether or not we are going to develop two air forces. I can recall when the Air Corps was a very small part of the Army; but, in response to the development of aircraft research and new weapons the Air Corps grew until finally in the so-called Unification Act we set up the old Air Corps as a separate department of the Air Force.

If we now build up the Bureau of Aeronautics or its successor in the Navy until we have something comparable to what the Air Corps used to be in the Army, we are going to find ourselves with two air forces, the independent air force which grew off from the Army and the new Air Force of the Navy.

In my own thinking on this matter I have never been able to get away from a very potent illustration that was given one day by General Curtis LeMay. Curtis LeMay was the man who was in charge of the B–29's when the B–29's carried the war to Japan, and is now in charge of strategic air planning. I recall the time when he said somewhat pointedly, and perhaps more than pointedly, that the Air Corps could not understand during the war why it was called upon to use B–29's to provide an umbrella for the Navy in an attack upon a certain objective in Japan when the B–29's had to drop 2,000 tons of bombs to protect a carrier so that smaller Navy bombers could deposit 600 tons on the primary target. He pointed out it would have been much easier and would not have risked the big carrier to let the B–29's put those 2,000 tons of bombs on the primary target rather than spending them to shield a carrier so that its lighter bombers could take 600 tons of bombs to the primary target.

I think there is a proper place for air attached to the Army in connection with certain tactical operations and there is a proper place for air attached to the Navy in connection with its normal operations; but if we are going to get the most for our money, our principal money for air ought to go to the Air Force. Bear in mind here that even with the increase provided by the committee bill you have not got them quite up to 80 percent of plan (B) whereas the Navy is up to a little better than 80 percent of plan (B) with the bill as here presented.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The distinguished gentleman from South Dakota has served with great credit to the country for years on the Appropriations Committee. Here is what disturbs a great many of us. The bill says we can have only 7,783 operating aircraft for the Navy. All right. I am finding no fault with cutting down from 10,000 to 7,000, but, on the other hand, it says you can only have annually 843 planes. The life of a plane is approximately 6 years. It is purely a question of mathematics. Just multiply 843 by 6 and that will show you what the strength will be.

How can you maintain 7,783 operating aircraft if you only build 843 a year? All we are asking is that you try to bring it up to what the committee says. The committee says we shall have 7,783, but they only permit us to buy 843 a year; therefore you cannot get 7,783 out of purchasing only 843 a year.

What I think we ought to do, and I would like the judgment of the gentleman, is this: The Joint Chiefs of Staff say we ought to have 1,300. The distinguished gentleman from California is going to offer an amendment which would provide 1,200 a year instead of 840.

That is really the only difference. We all agree on the importance of aviation. The committee has said you must keep 7,000 in active operation, but it does not give us enough money to keep but 5,000 going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I say that there would be enough money in this bill for the Navy to get those planes if it were properly allocated. The suggestion I would make is that the Navy recanvas its application of funds to antiquated, obsolete types of vessels and use that for aircraft. That is suggestion No. 1.

Mr. VINSON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I think by a reallocation and putting out of commission various ships we could concentrate on Navy aviation and might accomplish it in the same way. But the bill is not written that way. The only way we can deal with it is as the bill is written right now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is one suggestion, and I am glad the gentleman agrees with me that is the logical approach to it.

Second, if we are going to escape this continual rivalry between the services, I hope the distinguished gentleman's committee will bring out a bill and give this Congress an opportunity to provide for interchangeability of ratings and commissions between the various services, so that a man in the Navy may transfer to the Air Force and vice versa, or a man who grows up in the Army may transfer to the Navy and vice versa without losing his rank. When that happens we will get rid of these rivalries and jealousies that bid for these various appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, there are two ways in which this great Nation of ours can be defeated. One of them is by economic bankruptcy and the other is by military might.

We in this Congress today are on the horns of a fearsome dilemma. We must provide the Nation with defense forces adequate to meet every possible contingency and the need is perhaps greater than at any time in history. Yet to do this in the fullest sense and to keep on doing it for a number of years would bankrupt this Nation.

We must compromise. We cannot have all of everything that we might conceivably be able to use. The money we can spend must be spent on weapons that will serve our vital, immediate needs if war would come.

We have heard a great deal of talk today on who would win the next war. I think there is something else we must consider and that is how to prevent that next war. The next war will not be prevented because this country has aircraft carriers but it will be prevented because we have weapons today that will reach to the heart of the enemy country, striking at its capital and at its productive centers, including bombers like the B–36's that will reach into any aggressor nation. I have heard the B–36 condemned; I have heard it criticized; I have heard men tell me that we have no long-range fighter planes to escort these bombers on their long missions, and that therefore the losses would be prohibitive.

During the last war I flew B–24's on targets like Ploesti, Vienna, and Munich, and we had no long-range escorts when we started those missions. Our losses were heavy, but they were not

prohibitive. We think we did a job, and I think those Members on the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have gone to those places have seen the rubble that was left and have seen the enemy countries' productive sources destroyed. They saw that we did a job, the airpower in the next war will do that job, and that will be the greatest deterrent against any aggressor nation in launching an attack against these United States. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Congress do everything possible through legislation and appropriation to strengthen our long-range strategic bombing force. That is our primary weapon. It is the only weapon that will strike anywhere effectively and on short notice. We have been told that the air-group carriers could go into the Mediterranean and the Baltic. If you remember those losses that we had when we were trying to supply Malta and in trying to get through to Murmansk, you will realize, I think, that it would be most impracticable. That they would be sitting ducks. An aggressor nation usually has the largest force and usually strikes first. They aim to strike and effect their conquest and consolidate their position before effective opposition can be assembled.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, the initial phase of the next war must be won in the first two or three weeks. We must have sufficient air power to maintain air supremacy, and we must have that long-range bombing force to go to the vitals of the enemy country. This would give us time to consolidate our positions and prepare for the long drawn out conflict ahead.

It is strategic bombardment that the totalitarian leaders fear. This is what Mr. Churchill meant when he spoke of air supremacy, and that is what we mean when we say American air power is peace power.

I am not attempting to say, Mr. Chairman, that air power can win a war all by itself. I understand the need for balanced forces. But I do contend that balanced forces should mean the proportion of each that our situation and means dictate. I contend that it cannot sensibly mean the same amount of each—or sea, air, and ground forces of equal cost. At any time, for the most suitable Army, Navy and Air Force of any nation to require equal amounts of money would be an astounding coincidence. To eat a balanced diet is not to spend the same amount on meat, vegetables, and potatoes.

I am convinced that our situation requires, more than anything else, a long-range strategic bombing force. A force large enough and properly trained to deliver an overwhelming atomic attack at any time it should become necessary. We should have the most powerful Army and Navy that we can afford, but we must maintain this bombing arm at maximum efficiency at all times.

It has been argued, however, that our long-range bombers could not accomplish their mission. The B–36, in particular, has been frequently disparaged. It has been called slow, too large, uneconomical, and a "sitting duck" for fighters. These charges I have heard before. They were leveled at the B–17. Yet the B–17 carried the war to Germany with deadly effectiveness. It made a contribution to the defeat of that country that no statistician could compute. These charges were leveled at the B–29. The B–29 smashed Japan.

Now the B–36 receives the same criticism. I don't want to repeat figures you have all heard, but certainly the B–36 has shown on many occasions this past year that the charges of inadequate speed, range, and load-carrying capacity are dubious at best. The statement that it is uneconomical I cannot comprehend. In terms of destructive power, what weapon can compare in economy with a heavy bomber carrying an atomic bomb?

We were attentive, before the last war, to the criticisms of the B–17. We paid a terrible price in blood and treasure for our error. Let us not repeat so costly a mistake and give ground to some of the Maginot line type of thinking we had before the last war. Let us not have any more repetitions of the condemnation of Billy Mitchell. We have heard the argument advanced for this super aircraft carrier that is going to cost $189,000,000. It will cost over a quarter of a billion dollars once it is filled with its complement of planes; a carrier that will take us some time to build; a carrier that I believe will not be able to go through the Panama Canal.

I have heard the effectiveness of strategic bombing itself minimized. No person could examine the terrible destruction in Germany without realizing what that destruction meant in terms of war potentiality that was never brought to bear against us. But most of that destruction was actually accomplished during 1944 and early 1945. Our attack, and that of the RAF, could have hit full stride in 1943. But here and in Britain the opponents of air power were strong. In consequence, the attack was pitifully slow in reaching full strength. For that a price was paid in blood. In future war the price of folly will be ruin.

It is fashionable today even to minimize the atomic bomb. I can well understand the fears that prompt such whistling in the dark. I wish it were just another bomb. But I know it is not, and we all know that it is not.

Mr. Chairman, the resources and needs of this country, our strategic position, and above all the realities of modern warfare all dictate that our primary need is for unquestioned supremacy in long-range bombardment.

We should create this force, and we should support any project that will contribute to its effectiveness. War, aircraft, and weapons are changing constantly. Our forces must be kept abreast of these developments. Research and development facilities and projects should receive all possible support. Warfare today is technical and demanding. Highly trained, capable men of the best character are vitally needed in all our services. Means must be found to attract these men into their country's service.

If we do these things, Mr. Chairman, we will have the power most suited to deter aggression. We will be able to afford it. If war does come, we will be in a position to begin the immediate and systematic reduction of the enemy. We learned the hard way once. It should never happen again.

Let us today back our able committee's report and maintain an adequate defense force, whose decision has been pointed toward the type of fighting we can expect in the next war, not the last. A committee who has kept in mind the economic drain of a defense program on the taxpayers and attempted to lighten the load as much as is feasible with a cold war on, a cold war that can quickly become a holocaust. Let us back the able committee which has given serious consideration to the appropriation today and have a balanced budget. We have not cut the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget for the Navy aircraft by 1 cent. I think that the committee has done an admirable job, and we should back it up to the fullest extent.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that we should cease operations on this supercarrier the Navy wants to start. I do feel we should have a clear and a better picture of just what the situation is with reference to what will be available to the Navy in the line of airplanes before we vote to increase the number of those planes.

Last year we authorized the Navy to contract for $588,000,000 worth of planes. Those planes were expected to be 1,537 in number, but the Navy can buy only 1,223 because the costs are higher. These 1,223 planes that they expect to buy are very much larger and more expensive planes than the ones they have already bought.

Let us see what that picture is. They estimate that on June 30 they will have in storage 3,479 planes, of which 2,400 they say are obsolete. That "obsolete" does not mean not useful or operable, it simply means they are out of date. They claim they will draw out of storage 785, leaving 2,385 in storage at the end of the fiscal year 1950, of which 1,600 will be obsolete. They claim, and the table on page 618 of the hearings shows it, that they will have 1,075 new planes, and the 785 added from storage makes a total of 1,860 new planes.

Their present operating schedule, as appears on pages 594 and 595 of the hearings, is 15 large groups and 4 small groups. Next year they intend to juggle those figures around so that there will be 14 large groups and 8 small groups. This does not mean a reduction in the number of planes in operation.

On top of that, what we have needed the most was trained pilots, and this bill provides for an increase in the number of trained pilots from about 750 to 1,500 in the year. That is the most important thing they need to do.

Let us take stock of this whole airplane picture. We are equipped with the B–36's and the B–29's in sufficient number so that we are probably able to protect ourselves in pretty good shape, but we have to be careful as we approach any

critical situation that we throw into storage enough of the critical materials, the materials that are necessary to make the jet engines, and the materials that are necessary to make airplanes, that is, the bauxite that goes into the aluminum. We need to stock-pile those things and be ready so that when we approach trouble, when we think we are going to have trouble, we will be in position to go ahead and make modern and up-to-date planes in sufficient quantity to do us some good.

We should go ahead now and use up those planes which are becoming obsolete and keep ourselves in such a position that we will be able to step in when the time comes and when it is necessary to get the very best planes and the best engines that are available. It seems to me, that according to their own statements by the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations, that they have 11 large carriers in operation this year and are only cut down to 8. The smaller carriers, which are of the most use in hunting for the Snorkel submarine, have been increased from 10 to 11 as to the number in operation. Further, as I understand it, the Marine Corps is operating 3 of these smaller carriers. I do not think this leaves the Bureau of Aeronautics in a hole. They really have more money available for obligation, with $643,000,000 to build planes and to let contracts with, than they had before. There was an appropriation of $588,000,000 which was intended for the 1949 budget, but we made it immediately available by the 18th of May, when that bill was passed, so that really we are giving them more money, and although they cannot buy as many planes as they would like, because of the larger-sized planes that they want, we still are giving them more money. It seems to me that that factor ought to be taken into consideration by the House and that we should not increase this bill as it comes from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to defer any discussion on any proposed amendments to the bill until such amendments are offered under the 5-minute rule. I want to go back to the over-all picture and the bill itself.

This is my thirteenth annual military appropriation bill. I have been on the Military Functions Subcommittee since January 3, 1937. I have never known a harder working group of men than the men on that committee. When I came on this committee, Lucius Clay was a captain in the outside office of the Chief of Engineers. I have been privileged to serve in a most interesting period of American history in a most interesting capacity, for which I am truly grateful. As the years go by, and as I continue to serve on this committee, I become more and more convinced, Mr. Chairman, that a sound, strong economy, with a strong stable government is the first prerequisite of our national defense. You cannot have a strong national defense built upon a weak economy. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether we unknowingly, through our own selfish desires, are destroying from within the very thing that we are trying to defend ourselves against from without—and that is our own free Government.

The first question that our President should have and undoubtedly has in mind with regard to the national defense program is: How far can we go in our spending program, of which this $16,000,000,000 national defense bill is a part, without jeopardizing our economic position in the world? How much can we spend, Mr. Chairman, for all Government purposes that go to make up our tremendous national budget? How much can we spend, yes, on airships and on ships that sail the seas before our Ship of State strikes and perhaps founders on the rocks of economic disaster?

Our national defense, Mr. Chairman, is as strong and as weak as the economic structure of our Nation is strong or weak, for that structure supports national defense. I shall return to this in a moment.

This 1950 budget contains $15,900,000,000 for national defense, including contract authorizations. Of this amount $13,219,000,000-plus is cash. Let us compare that with the 1949 appropriations. The bill for 1949 as it passed the House during my chairmanship of the Military Functions Subcommittee contained $10,454,000,000. This 1950 bill contains in cash alone $2,818,338,000 more than the 1949 bill contained. There is a reason for some of these increases. For instance, we have been living, as it were, on what might be called fat. The Navy inventory during that period has dropped from $14,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. A great many surplus items that we had at the end of the war are exhausted, and we must replace them. Then, too, we have a larger Army, Navy, and Air Force. Last year, Mr. Chairman, this House by an overwhelming vote increased the Air Force far above the budget figures. That action of the House was a mandate to me which I felt compelled to obey. But to return now to the Military Functions Subcommittee items, let us see how much we reduced these bills that made up this budget in the past 2 years; I am referring to 1948 and 1949 during which time I was privileged to act as chairman of the subcommittee. The 1948 military functions bill passed in 1947 included the Army and Air Force only. The bill as it passed the House was $475,809,000 below the 1947 appropriation, a reduction of almost half a billion dollars over 1947. The 1949 bill was reduced $647,900,000 below the 1948 appropriation. While we were not able to sustain all of those cuts in the conference with the other body we did sustain approximately a billion dollars for the 2 years. When the 1948 bill went through the House we had cut more than 74,000 civilian employees off the Army and Air Force budget, and when it came out of conference we were still 58,000 civilian employees below the budget. In the 1949 bill we cut 80,000 more employees off the budget; or, in the 2 years, 138,000 employees were taken off the pay rolls by this committee by my subcommittee under my chairmanship. I was very proud of that committee.

The Navy subcommittee did a splendid job during the same 2 years. It was a grand and wonderful subcommittee. The 1948 Navy bill was $377,500,000 below the 1947 appropriation as it went through; and the 1949 Navy bill was $241,000,000 below the 1948 appropriation. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate that the Military Functions Subcommittee and Navy Subcommittee which handled the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy bills for 2 years and prior to this year did an outstanding job. We have some of the same men on this subcommittee handling the bill this year. We had put the National Defense Establishment into the financial frying pan and fried out much of the surplus fat. It is perfectly obvious that there is not going to be as much fat to fry out the third year as there was the first and second years when we started the job.

There never has been a time during the 13 years I have been on this subcommittee when there was any politics in the subcommittee. Time and time again we divided, yes; we disagreed, but never along political lines. The same was true in this committee. Mr. Chairman, the encouraging thing about this bill to me is that when we bring the bill in here we are divided in our ideas as to what should be done with certain phases of it upon nonpolitical lines. A Democrat gets up on this side of the aisle supported by a Republican on the other side of the aisle, and a Republican gets up on the other side and is supported by a Democrat on the right-hand side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a moment about the so-called functional budget. Two years ago I had Secretary Symington, General Spaatz, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Lieutenant General Eaker, and General Rawlings, the budget officer, over to the office of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, where we discussed there at my request a functional budget. If you and I were in business and we had five branches, we would want to know what it cost to operate each branch, what the sales in these individual branches were, and the profits, if any. That is the kind of an accounting system we would insist upon having. We could then say to the branch manager of branch 5: "You did not do a good job. We are going to fire you." And say to the manager of branch No. 1: "You did a splendid job. We are going to raise your pay and that of your assistants; we are going to move your assistant over as manager of branch 5."

For instance, I want to know just what it cost to operate Bolling Field, or any other installation, and I do not want to go to 17 or 18 agencies to get that information. We discussed this fully at that meeting more than 2 years ago. We have this year a functional budget in the Air Corps giving that kind of information. It is not complete, it is not all I want, but it is a good start.

Two years ago the Navy budget was drawn along the same lines and this Navy budget in the present bill, Mr. Chairman, was rewritten in part along functional lines in our subcommittee. If I am wrong, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] can correct me. He has an outstanding knowledge of the Navy. We placed it upon a functional basis. Is that right?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We are now working on the Army functional budget along the same lines. These things take time. I am glad to have the support of the Hoover Commission. That Commission is doing an outstanding job, but in justice to these subcommittees I also must say that we have been 2 years ahead of the Hoover Commission on this budgeting problem. Of course there is still waste and a great deal of it. I wish I could talk to you about that today, but time will not permit. We are reducing waste in the armed services.

The first thing we should do before making up a national defense budget is to determine just what nation is most likely to attack us and what nation is strong enough to attack us. Once that is determined, the next question is, what are the missions of the three services going to be in carrying out an offensive and defensive war against that particular attacking nation, whatever nation it may be.

The next step will be to determine the manpower, equipment, matériel, and other costs to carry out each mission by the service to whom that mission has been assigned. The first mission will be that of destruction of enemy plants, productive capacity, and transportation facilities behind the lines through strategic bombing. That mission has been assigned to the Department of the Air Force. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should and undoubtedly have determined just how large an air force, number of groups, the type of equipment, and so forth, will be required to carry out that mission. The first offensive against us by the enemy will be that of trying to destroy our commerce and lines of communication, depriving us of strategic materials required for our defense. To the Navy will be assigned the task and mission of protecting our commerce and preventing the enemy from destroying that commerce. This will require ships, carrier planes, submarines, and so forth. Immediately upon the opening of hostilities the mission of the Army will be, among other things, the protection of our overseas bases by regimental combat teams and other troops, to take possession of bases with paratroopers, to defend our installations overseas and at home wherever they may be and repair and stand ready to take possession of any territory that may have been evacuated by the enemy either forcibly or otherwise. These are just a few of the missions of the three services. Once these missions have been determined, together with the length of time it will take to carry them out as nearly as possible, then it becomes a matter of men, equipment, matériel, and supplies necessary to carry out such missions. The Joint Chiefs of Staff send the amount required for these purposes to the President, the budget figures are then revised and reduced, such revision and reduction being dependent upon, first, our ability to carry on a peacetime national budget without endangering or wrecking our financial and economic structure, and, second, the length of time we have to build up our force in the light of the facts and circumstances as they exist at the time. That is in effect the way this budget should be and undoubtedly was made up. The $30,000,000,000 requested originally by the services was by no means a scientific budget. On the contrary, each service was guessing what the other service would ask for and determined that they were going to ask for more than the other two services. Like a poker player they knew what they had in their own hand but had to guess what the other fellow had in his. The budget that actually came down to us was a budget which met all the requirements of our immediate needs in view of all the conditions as they existed at the time.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has an outstanding chairman in GEORGE MAHON. He made a splendid presentation yesterday. None better was ever made on the floor of the House in support of a bill. He did an outstanding job. It was a pleasure to work with him.

I have worked with HARRY SHEPPARD and CHARLIE PLUMLEY for the past 2 years. It was mainly through their efforts that the cuts were made in the Navy appropriations in the 1948 and 1949 bills. Whatever was done to this Navy bill here so far as savings were concerned was primarily due to their efforts.

BOB SIKES comes to our sub-committee as a new member, but with a world of experience with a legislative committee, experience that is sorely needed in our committee, experience which gave us the view of a legislative committee on many of these issues.

I do not want to fail to say a word about two men who worked with us on this bill. One is Bob Lambert, the executive secretary of the committee for many years. He was my executive secretary when I was chairman of the committee. He did an outstanding job on a most difficult bill. I want to commend Bob Lee, who is a minority employee of Mr. TABER on the Committee on Appropriations. He was loaned to me by Mr. TABER, and he did a splendid job for me. I do not know what I would have done without him and the work he did.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague, the vice-chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, you have heard an extensive discussion pertaining to the financial composition of the bill which is presently under consideration by the membership. Our committee spent a long time in research into necessities for the finances requested by the respective departments, which appeared before us. I pay my compliments to the gentleman from Texas, GEORGE MAHON, for the manner in which he functioned in his official capacity as chairman of the committee, handling a very troublesome bill. I also want to pay tribute to every member of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for the fine cooperative spirit which they showed in trying to attain an end and accomplish a purpose necessary to do the job and yet give to the taxpayers of this Nation proper protection, which factor is always a pertinent part of the committee's consideration when a bill of this character is before them.

I also want to pay my respects and my compliments to a gentleman who has been acting as our statistician, Mr. Robert Lambert, who has been with us for a long time. While I have but recently come to the committee, you older members on the military aspects of the work in its prior operations, have enjoyed his cooperation. I also want to pay my compliments for the fine contribution of Frank Saunders, the younger member of the clerical staff. He came to our committee and did a very splendid job and contributed his part to the over-all picture with which we had to deal.

Another group of gentlemen that I feel it is incumbent upon me to refer to, is the budget officers of the respective branches of the military—Admiral Hopwood, budget officer for the Navy; Major General Arnold, for the Army; Lieutenant General Rollins for the Air Corps. These men, in my opinion, have been called upon in the prior accumulation of material within the departments for which they function to exercise great care and caution and in working with the committee their cooperation was unquestionable at all times.

Furthermore, I would like to say to this assembled membership that I have never had occasion to question the integrity, mathematically or morally, of those gentlemen or any of the other witnesses who appeared before our committee.

There has been, of course, difference of opinion in the final analysis because that is what makes this body what it is. Each Member has an individual right in this House to form his opinions and cast his votes as his conscience and inner promptings guide him.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise very briefly to commend the gentleman and the other members of the subcommittee and especially the chairman, on the work of the committee, on doing a very difficult job. And particularly to point out that I think this year for the first time, in what has been a long-standing controversy, the chairman and the gentleman from California and others have brought out as effective a solution as has ever been brought out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his courteous comments.

In what I am going to say to the assembled membership of the House this afternoon I wish it distinctly understood that while in one instance I differ with

my chairman and some other members of my subcommittee, it is not a difference in which personalities are at all involved; it is a difference of analyzing a problem and reaching a conclusion. Consequently, insofar as the membership of the committee is concerned I may say to you, frankly, that our working arrangements have been most happy, and I sincerely trust that I may live a long time and have an opportunity to continue functioning with these splendid gentlemen from both sides of the aisle, although I do reserve to myself the right to exercise the prerogative of doing my own thinking.

I want you to bear in mind during the consideration of this bill that very competent people have explained the financial aspect of the bill pretty literally in detail. Much more will be brought out later, of course, when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule. I wish to approach this issue from a different slant, with your permission; let us approach it from the aspect of policy on a national basis and not upon one of defense of the military against some other branch of the service. My reason for approaching it with that philosophy is predicated upon the fact that all the witnesses who appeared before us in the top echelon who make our military policy, every one of them without reservation has definitely stated, voluntarily and also in response to interrogation, that there was a place for all three services and that he or they felt that particular service division of operation was now clarified so that the Air Force knew its responsibilities, the Army knew its responsibilities, and the Navy knew its responsibilities.

I will admit that heretofore we have had considerable newspaper publicity emanating in my opinion from a lot of swivel chair generals not in unform who invariably get their money by writing headlines but who are not always too well posted on what is necessary in military procedure. We all realize, however, that if they were not given the opportunity to write their headlines and make their comments that possibly their salaries would evaporate or lessen and they might have to step down to a lower level of income. I am in no manner interested or particularly concerned with headline writers, irrespective of what branch they represent, or with radio commentators; I would far rather sit down and listen to the men who through their actual military experience and the services they have rendered to our Nation—in the past tense—really know what the job is all about. When I say that, my mind goes back to Admirals Ernest King, Bill Halsey, Chet Nimitz, and all the rest of the splendid men who made up our wonderful defense establishment, from Eisenhower and Arnold down, wonderful men for whom I have the greatest respect and whose opinions I value most highly. In fact, we spent money to send these gentlemen through an academic processing in the military concept in order that they might have the ability to analyze our military problems and then advise us on the strategy necessary to apply the military functions should that become essential.

Listening to some of the discussions that have taken place here—and I am just reminiscing; there is no continuity to what I am saying; I realize that, but it all adds up to a whole—one of the gentlemen in his analysis stated that the Navy was limited to its flight aspect to 500 miles. I may say to the gentleman that he has just transposed some of his mathematics, because the actuality is that Navy heavy bombers have a range of 5,000 miles. So, those are just little things, and sometimes in the contribution to the general whole too much significance must not be attributed to such unwittingly erroneous statements.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I have been reading the report of the committee on this bill under the item of Air Force. I am wondering if during the hearings any reference was made to the establishment of an Air Force Academy for the training of future officers? The gentleman being from California and I personally having introduced a bill to establish one in the State of California, I should be interested in hearing what comments he has to make concerning it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; there was considerable discussion in the committee relative to that particular proposition.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. To reply further to the inquiry of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH], it may interest him to know that the particular matter not only was discussed in the hearings but there is a legislative bill before the Congress pertaining to the subject matter.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman referred to the range of the heavy bombers in flight and said it was 5,000 miles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That had specific reference to the Navy's heavy bombers.

Mr. HORAN. That is carrier-based bombers?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Carrier-based heavy bombers designed for attack bombing.

Mr. HORAN. Is that a detail that has come about during the past year, since we considered this bill a year ago?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would say definitely yes; in other words, this particular type of plane was in or past the blueprint stage as of a year ago. However, it is already in operation and has proven extremely successful from flight deck into the air and return.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that is our whole concept appropriationwise in the treatment of the services, does he not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am going to offer an amendment, I may say to the gentleman, that will clarify his question and I think answer it rather definitely.

Mr. HORAN. I was informed of a rumor that a jet-propelled heavy bomber took off from a carrier on the east coast, flew to the west coast, up and down the west coast, then flew back to the carrier in the East; is that true?

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that is not a rumor; it is a fact.

Mr. RIVERS. That is a fact; yes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from California as always is making a very fine statement. I wonder if he would object if I pointed out, in addition to the things that have been brought out, the fact that Jimmy Doolittle's bombers took off from a carrier to make the first strike on Japan in World War II and even though his bombers did not come back to those carriers, the Navy now has bigger, heavier planes that are daily taking off and landing on carriers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution because it is predicated upon fact and something that I suggest the House take into consideration at a later time.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I ask the gentleman to yield and request an answer to my question previously asked. The gentleman from Washington asked the gentleman a question before I think he had sufficient time to answer the question as to his attitude toward an Air Force Academy in California and the necessity for an Air Force Academy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what the gentleman wants me to do is commit myself to the establishment of an academy there. My answer is yes, because it is necessary.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Before they get the air academy out there, they are going to have a mighty stiff fight from Illinois.

Mr. SHORT. And do not forget Missouri.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to be courteous and gracious, but may I say if you are going to have any private fights, take them out in the alley.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As the question was raised by a gentleman on my right in reference to bombers flying off of airplane carriers, may I ask, is it not a fact that the modernization program of the carrier type *Essex* is going forward now to such an extent that large bombers of at least 100,000 pounds can fly on and fly off?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman is correct, and there is one thing I would like to call attention to. While we are in the status of remodifying the *Essex* type and we can deck those planes, you must not overlook the fact when you are going into that type of heavy plane that you have got to have something downstairs to take care of them. It is a question of whether modification will fulfill the completed mission as compared with a bigger carrier.

Mr. VINSON. In the curtailment of appropriations in this bill, it denies any further modernization of any more than those two already being modernized now?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to answer that question directly. I am inclined at the moment to say yes, as I recall it. Let me say this: I am sure the older Members of the House will concede the fact that I have never had any desire not to answer any question that I could answer. However, may I say that when you are handling an appropriation of the size of the armed forces budget that this committee has had to deal with, you have to be very careful in answering your mathematical questions that you do not confuse one aspect of a paragraph versus that of another aspect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am a little worried over some of the remarks of our colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and I am sorry he is not here at the present time. I wanted him to yield at the time, which he did briefly. I think we all agree on the supreme importance of long-range land-based bombers, but, certainly, in emphasizing their priority we should not underestimate the need for both the Army and Navy, and should always remember what Omar Bradley recently said in a speech in Boston, and he has told us repeatedly in our committee the same thing. General Bradley was perhaps the greatest strategist of the last war. In my humble opinion, he was the greatest general of World War II. I think General Eisenhower would agree to that. General Bradley said that it is utter folly to think that we can ever win a modern war with only one branch of the armed services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that is a statement of fact, as is known by any one who is familiar with military concepts.

Mr. SHORT. Perhaps the thing that contributed most to the winning of the war in the Pacific was really our aircraft carriers. They won the Battle of Midway. The airplanes took off and they came back. Every service man in this House who served in the last war knows the importance of the air carrier.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. They are movable bases.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. There is a phase of the Air Force procurement which is somewhat disturbing to me from the reports and rumors I hear, and that is whether the Air Force in this concentration of the purchase of long-range bombers to the extent of cutting back its fighter-plane program is going to jeopardize a well-rounded Air Force defensive outlook.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no question about that.

Mr. COLE of New York. My question is whether the committee reporting this bill is concerned in that respect, or whether the funds approved for the Air Force are sufficient to give them this three to five hundred million dollars for long-range bombers and fighter planes also.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would rather put it this way, Mr. Chairman. I am concerned about it, and fully intend to offer an amendment which will express my sentiments, because in your production requirements—and I am sure the gentleman recognizes this and knows it even better than I—the time involved in the production of planes of that character runs from 15 to 24 months, and those are the things that are so important to a balanced, rounded-out picture that must be anticipated in any appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to ask the gentleman about a matter that I cannot find in the bill. I think it is important, and I think it is in the gentleman's own district. Is there anything in here about acquiring the extra land required for the Muroc Lake Experimental Station?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; not that I recall. That is under the status of investigation, engineeringly speaking, at this time, and I presume it will be recommended for consideration at a later date. At least, that is my information at the moment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I see there is an amount of $75,000 for field officers' quarters in Alaska. I was wondering if the Army was planning to bring that cost down. That is an awful lot of money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that the committee membership was just as concerned with that as is the gentleman. I spent considerable time in Alaska in my early stage of life, and I want to say this, that there is an extremely high cost of construction in Alaska. I even went so far, knowing that country as I do, or as I did, as to suggest that it might be feasible for them to construct their own sawmill in order to avoid that terrific transportation charge that pertains between the States and Alaska. I will say this for the armed forces, they are working now on an experiment with a type of Quonset hut that I think perhaps may be the ultimate solution. I do not know that it may be, but they are trying it out in countries of that general weather character, and I hope it will have something to do with that. But under the present circumstances, we are just stymied with the problem.

In closing, I would like to draw a rather homely parallel if I may be permitted. We are all sincerely and honestly concerned with the economy of our country and its welfare. But, you know, as this picture occurs to me, I go back in my mind to 1945 when my committee was privileged to go over to Europe. They went through the Pacific and covered practically every military installation throughout Europe. At that time we came back and made a report to the White House and then to the Congress, and, as the chairman of Naval Appropriations, you may recall that I exceeded the budget for the purpose of inaugurating a naval reserve program. I received a lot of liberal criticism; in other words, in many instances I was spanked rather thoroughly, and only recently those who did the most vituperous spanking said that they considered the naval program today and its category was outstanding, comparatively speaking. So I am going to again, when this bill comes under the 5-minute rule, offer an amendment, because I think it is essential to the welfare of the Nation if we can take for granted what those in the Executive staff and who write the formula of strategic procedure have told us is the function that the Navy must perform. I say that, of course, with respect to everybody, and everybody in this House has a right to his own opinion. But, I firmly believe that if we are going to protect the continuity of our form of government and our way of life, that the best way to do it is to be able to protect ourselves against any eventuality and not hypothetically.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think the gentleman is to be commended for his work in perpetuating and protecting the Naval Reserves. In my State of Washington during the last summer the Naval Reserves were the only ones that were effective and happy. The Army and Air Force Reserves were in bad shape.

I commend the gentleman on his foresight, and also commend the subcommittee on having taken care of that very important element, the Reserve force, in the bill before us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Speaking of the Navy, is it not true that England found, to her bitter sorrow, that cutting up the Navy, dividing it too much, as it were, caused a great deal of hardship and a great deal of loss of life, and now England's navy and England's naval air force are back where they were before?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think undoubtedly the gentlewoman is correct in her position there. History will record the mistake that was made in that particular respect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am wondering whether the cut in naval aviation is not the beginning of a program to dry up naval aviation and eventually remove the Navy from the seas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman's observation is one that might be worthy of consideration, but I leave that to his own judgment, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof: "That there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $13,215,618,000, for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment, and for other purposes, in not to exceed the following respective amounts, namely."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to approach this bill as an expert or an amateur on military science. I am speaking merely as a humble citizen interested in the welfare of his country and who happens at the moment to be sitting in the Hall of this House.

The economic life of the United States is at stake. Its security is at stake. The decisions this Congress makes before it comes to an end may determine the future course of the history of our own great and beloved country.

The President of the United States together with the Chiefs of Staff and the military experts of all the arms and the civilan heads of the various departments through long, dreary months struggled to bring out an armed forces budget. They brought out that budget. The total amount of that budget was $15,300,000,000, nearly $3,000,000,000 in excess of the sums appropriated in the current fiscal year.

At the same time the President of the United States recommended an enormous sum for foreign aid. We passed that bill yesterday.

Those needs are the reverse sides of the same coin, the coin of national security.

In view of the background out of which the Presidential estimates arose, estimates that took into full consideration from the high level of the Presidency and all the top officers, military and civilian, all the elements in the problem, economic, international, and military, in view of the work they have done and the conclusions they have reached, I think it would be wholly irresponsible for this House, with what little additional evidence is before it, to fly in the face of those recommendations, to repudiate the President's recommendations and those of the armed services, and follow this committee, in effect its subcommittee, in increasing the Presidential estimates by $631,000,000. After all, every one of those dollars, while perhaps meaningless to us, when lost in this enormous figure on a piece of paper, means a living, buying dollar in the hands of the hard-working American who earned it and from whom we take it. This amendment, if adopted, will limit the over-all total of appropriated cash to the figure in the Presidential budget and knock out some $54,000,000 that the committee has added to it. The other big items of increase over the Presidential requests are in contract authorizations. They will come later in the bill. I shall deal with them appropriately when the time comes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman voted yesterday for $5,500,000,000 for European aid, did he not?

Mr. COUDERT. That is exactly why I want to have the opportunity this time to vote for exactly the recommended figure. I voted for the Presidential figure yesterday. I think the House should vote for the Presidential figure today. I do not want to throw completely out of balance the national security picture or the cold-war picture.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes, reserving the last 4 minutes to the committee.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think there may be one other Member who would like to be heard for 5 minutes on the amendment. I wonder if the gentleman would make it 15 minutes. May I say that this is a pretty important amendment, and I think the people of the United States should have the opportunity, at least, to have this question presented.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, and that the committee may have the last 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the first impression might be that there is an inconsistency if we vote one day for a high appropriation and on another day vote for an addition to an appropriation bill, and then vote on the same day, or in the same series of bills, for a limitation upon an appropriation bill. I think there is no inconsistency whatever. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is very much in order, and will bring to the Congress and to the people of the United States what should be the most important issue today before the Congress and the people. The United States is just a multiple of the families of the United States. Few families can say "We have an emergency in this family, and we will spend all the money that we want to spend." The average family has to say, "We have an emergency in this family. We will spend money to meet that emergency from the family budget. We will be forced to reduce expenditures on some less essential item."

We have reached the point in the United States where, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] pointed out, some 37 percent of the income is going for taxes. That has long been recognized as being beyond the danger point. Therefore, we in the Congress should recognize what should be called a matter of relative urgency, and we should spend the money of the taxpayers of the United States for those things which are most necessary in any fiscal year. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] raises a good issue when he says that in this bill we should stay within the limit established by the President of the United States and should keep our expenditures, as necessary as they may be, within those limits. While I might even vote for an amendment to increase the bill in some particular item, which I think is more necessary than some other, I would still vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], which says that we should spend only within the limit proposed by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of the bills that have presently been reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the funds available to the executive department for expenditure in the next fiscal year will be over $4,000,000,000 above the amount available for expenditure this year. This amendment seeks to decrease the total carried in this bill by $53,484,000, as I remember the figure. That is not a very substantial amount as compared with the $13,215,000,000, the total. But, nevertheless, it would reestablish a principle which has only been violated once this year, and that was in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, where we went above the budget by $216,000,000. It would reestablish the principle that the Congress keeps within the budget estimates that are submitted to us by the President. I, therefore, hope that this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be adopted. It is perfectly clear that we owe a responsibility to the people of the United States to keep from spending more money than should be spent. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHESNEY] is recognized.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I wish to say that I am not opposed to any strong national-defense program. However, today we are debating an appropriation bill for the armed forces almost as large as we would appropriate if this country were actually at war.

I was not a Member of the Eightieth Congress, but I followed the course of the unification bill very closely. At that time I was hopeful that the great duplication of material, personnel, and effort would be reduced to a minimum. When the bill was passed, I felt that at last the armed forces were on the right path toward a sound national-defense program.

The example of unification of our armed forces was ably illustrated in many of the invasions of the South Pacific when all the components of the armed forces worked in close harmony toward attaining their objective. This was the first display of cooperation among the forces and I know that if this type of teamwork was not carried out, many of the battles would have ended in defeat.

I am a firm believer in the unification of our armed forces. During my 5 years in the armed services as an enlisted man and an officer, the majority of which time was devoted to the training of personnel and to carrying out the administrative functions of the Army Air Forces, I had the opportunity to witness waste of material, waste of personnel, duplication of functions, and general poor administration in the armed forces. I fully realize that in wartime there are millions of men from every walk of life banded together in the service of their country and leeway must be given to waste. However, I always felt that the uniting of logistics in the armed service could be easily coordinated without too much effort if the leaders would step down and break their iron-bound customs and traditions. I am not a person to completely disregard custom and tradition; however, during my service in World War II I observed many types of inefficiency. As an example, in cases where the Army Air Force and the Navy Air Force each had its own supply depots and landing fields in the same city, due to the individualistic attitude of each force, Army planes were not permitted to land on Navy air fields and Navy planes were not permitted to land on Army air fields. Further, the distribution of equipment from Navy supply depots to Army Air Force personnel was prohibited. This same situation existed in the attempt of Navy personnel to procure supplies from Army Air Force depots.

This very example of duplication and waste was typical throughout World War II until, in certain quarters, the components began to act in close cooperation. When the unification bill was passed in the Eightieth Congress, I felt that we had taken a very progressive step in establishing greater cooperation among the armed forces.

I make these statements because I feel that the billions of dollars which have been spent in the past could have been saved by efficient methods and good common business sense.

Today we are debating a bill for the appropriation of more billions of dollars—an amount so great that it makes the average taxpayer shudder when he visualizes the additional taxes he must pay to meet this obligation.

I personally believe that if the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are better informed as to the operation and maintenance of the armed forces than I am, would cease thinking of padding many of their operations, they could give more serious consideration to implementing and furthering our civilian reserve program, which, I feel, has been handled in a very haphazard manner. It is certainly bad planning when full consideration is not given to the maintenance of the high efficiency and skills of our former enlisted and officer personnel. Many of the former service personnel who have seriously considered staying in the Reserve are now dropping out at a very rapid rate, and this is due to the lackadaisical attitude of the armed forces toward Reserve programs. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that if there is another war a great majority of the military personnel will be comprised not only of men from civilian life, but also the thousands of men who were trained during the last war. The latter should be given the opportunity to maintain their skills at a level of maximum efficiency in order to be ready in case of an emergency. I intend to vote for this bill, but I certainly feel that the armed forces should start thinking of real economy and should work toward that end. They should start eliminating duplication and nonessential activities. Furthermore, I believe that the armed forces can save money by minimizing travel of personnel throughout the world by efficient methods of allocation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will look at the first paragraph of the bill and see what the gentleman's amendment undertakes to do. Here we have a bill of 91 pages which we had planned to read this afternoon, study carefully, listen to debate, listen to amendments, and after we had heard all the facts and the evidence, like a jury in a case, we would say that under the circumstances we thought our decision should be to appropriate a certain amount of money for the National Military Establishment. But the gentleman from New York, [Mr. COUDERT] wishes us to say before we read the bill, before we hear the evidence, before we hear the debate, wishes us to say in advance of that what we should do. I shall not be a party to an amendment which would deny to Members on both sides of the aisle the decision, as we approach the various items, of saying just how much Congress should appropriate. I therefore urge the Committee to vote down this suggested amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Why should Members of Congress blindly follow the recommendations of either the President or the Director of the Budget? Certainly the Director of the Budget is not an authority on military affairs.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is going to vote what the President says we need for European aid; he is going to vote what the President says we need for national defense, and the members of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services, the Members of Congress, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are to be ignored completely.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I cannot yield for the moment.

I repeat, in my opinion it is up to us to state in such detail as we wish, what we should appropriate for the various branches of the military service; it is not up to the Budget or to anyone else; it is our responsibility, and we cannot dodge it by casting a lump sum into the hands of the President and saying, "You can spend it. We absolve ourselves of all responsibility, we wash our hands of the matter."

I am not unsympathetic toward the desire to accomplish economy, and if there is some place in the bill where the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment making cuts whereby he can save $53,000,000, I hope he will do so.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. In answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri, does the gentleman really believe that the five members of the subcommittee who acted on this bill in a brief period are better informed than the President and the Secretary of Defense in determining what should be the over-all figure for national defense?

Mr. MAHON. I say that Congress should not abdicate its functions. I say that after eleven weeks of hearings and hundreds of hours of study the members of the Committee are vastly better informed about some provisions of this bill than some of the people in the executive branch. Congress must not abdicate; we must stand firm in our constitutional function to legislate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. What would happen should the gentleman's amendment be adopted and then the total of the items individually as we go through the bill exceed in the aggregate the sum stated in the first paragraph?

Mr. MAHON. The question is a good one. I presume we should have to ask consent to undo the action previously taken. This is another reason why the amendment of the gentleman from New York should not be agreed to. Yet, I commend the gentleman from New York for the objective which he is seeking to achieve. He is an able member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me answer the inquiry of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. There is ample precedent for this procedure. It was started back in 1924 and it has been done a number of times since, the last time

being in the Coast Guard bill of last year. There is an over-all limitation on the total of the individual items that may be in excess when added up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 21, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the Government has lost one of its most faithful and efficient employees. Mr. Joseph Gartland, Director of the Budget and Administrative Planning, in the United States Post Office Department, died on Monday and was buried today.

Mr. Gartland had served the Department in many capacities over a period of 50 years. He was appointed on May 11, 1898, as a clerk in the Wellsboro, Pa., post office.

As inspector in charge of the Army Mail Service, American Expeditionary Forces, he served in Britain, Germany, France, and Luxemburg, during World War I. Following the war he was appointed Assistant Director of the Postal Savings System.

In 1924, he was detailed as Chief Inspector of the Interior Department. Commenting on the efficient manner in which he served in this position, the Secretary of the Interior, Hubert Work, informed the Postmaster General that his services in this Department cannot be too highly commended. Largely through his efforts, the work of our bureaus has been coordinated as never before, with direct financial savings to the Government beyond computation.

Mr. Gartland was elevated to the position of Assistant Chief Post Office Inspector in 1933, and served in that position until October 1, 1942, when he was appointed Director of the Budget and Administrative Planning, the position from which he retired in March of this year.

During his half century in the postal service, Mr. Gartland served as Assistant Superintendent of Post Office Service, secretary of the United States Censorship Policy Board, traveling representative of the First Assistant Postmaster General, and chairman of the United States Budget Officers Conference. He was Chairman of the Operations Board of the Post Office Department from 1942 to 1946, and conducted the first schools of instruction for postoffice inspectors in 1930.

Mr. Gartland was connected with the United States Post Office Department nearly one-third of its 159 years of existence. He served under 15 of the 53 Postmasters General, and during the span of his service, revenues grew from $89,000,000 to over $1,411,000,000 annually.

This faithful public servant frequently appeared as a representative of the Post Office Department before congressional committees in recent years, and he is well known to many members of the House. As a member of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, it was my privilege to know him intimately. His gentle spirit and gracious manner endeared him to all who knew him. His patriotic devotion to duty characterized his long life of public service. Our Government can ill afford to lose men of his caliber.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall always remember Mr. Gartland's appearances before our subcommittee. He was character-plus and his testimony was always to the point. He liked to remember that he was not only a public servant but also a taxpayer of the United States.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am saddened by the news of the death of one of the outstanding career employees in the postal service. Joe Gartland, former director of budget and administrative planning of the Post Office Department, passed away yesterday, less than a month after he retired from the postal service to which he had given more than a half-century of service.

As former chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the last Congress, I had come to know and admire Joe Gartland and, like other Members of Congress and his colleagues, I cherished his friendship and relied upon his excellent advice with respect to postal matters.

The postal service, and indeed the country, has lost one of its truly fine public servants. I join with my colleagues here in the House in expressing my sympathy and condolences to his widow, and two children.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following the debate on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coudert amendment. On yesterday I offered an amendment to the European recovery legislation which woul d reduce the amount only $380,000,000. You know what happened to that amendment. It was decisively defeated. Now I understand this committee will offer an amount substantially above that recommended by the President in his budget. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the statement by the President in refutation of the statements made by the committee members. He said, and I quote:

> I have had the benefit of the considered advice of civilian and military leaders best qualified to evaluate the international, strategic, and economic aspects of our national defense requirements. I believe that these recommendations reflect a proper relationship between our security requirements and our economic and financial resources, and envision an Army, Navy, and Air Force in a condition of relative readiness, all functioning as an integrated team.

So it is apparent that the President did consult with civilian and military leaders whom he thought were best qualified to evaluate our national defense requirements in view of the world situation of today. I am thoroughly convinced that the bill before us (H. R. 4146), is sufficient without increasing the amounts as is now proposed. I take this position, Mr. Chairman, not in opposition to the policy underlying this bill, as I am for an adequate national defense, and I have spent years of my life as a member of the American Legion advocating a full security program for this great Nation. I believe, however, that at this time when there are such terrific demands for money from the Treasury, and in view of the further fact that we are entering a period of recession with the possibility of a reduced national income, we should begin to pare all appropriation bills. That is my position and I stand on that ground on this bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say in view of the importance and the nature of the bill that I shall find it necessary to object to any further extraneous debates. I am sure the Members will understand the situation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think if the debate that we have had proves anything, it proves the necessity for more unification. I think there is still overlapping and duplication and waste in the armed forces. I think that a great deal of money could be saved by more efficient handling of the affairs of all three branches of the service.

I applaud the Secretary of National Defense in proceeding with the unfication plan. I think if we are going to have a bang-up job of defense, he has to proceed and he has to cut out this jealousy and bickering and rivalry between the services. He has a huge problem there and we have a big problem in this Congress, too, to help in this respect and to back up the Secretary of Defense in his efforts to apply unification as recommended by the Hoover Commission report in respect to the elimination of waste in the armed forces. There is, no doubt, some waste in the armed forces, and as long as there is a dollar wasted in the armed forces, we ought to cooperate in eliminating that waste.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am for aviation; I am for more aviation. I think aviation is so vital to the defense of this country that you can hardly appreciate its urgent importance. I think it is fair, however, to comment on this. I am not critical of the committee. I think the committee has done a good job. I think they are sincere and honest and hardworking, patriotic gentlemen, who are doing the best they can for the defense of this country. I want to call the attention of

the House to the fact that we have not completed the development of the Air Force. It has been only a few weeks ago we passed a bill setting up a 70-group air force, and every expert on air security has told us that we need a 70-group air force. As I say, I am not critical of the committee since the committee did provide $800,000,000 in this bill additional for the Air Force. But, that does not give us the ultimate of what our experts say we need in the way of air power. It gives us only 58 groups whereas now we have 55 air groups; only three additional air groups. I think that in the long range program we cannot overlook this fact: that we must continue to fight for the further development of the Air Force, if we are going to properly protect this country. In our struggle to get additional appropriations for this or that branch of the service, I feel that we cannot overlook the vital branch of air service, the Air Force. I do not want the Congress to overlook the further development of the long-range program of a 70-group air force.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

Mr. Chairman, the debate so far reflects here on the floor of the House a conflict which has existed for some time and exists now between the two arms of the air, Naval Air and the Air Force. It is reflected here at this time because the battle for appropriations still exists.

I have had the honor of being chairman of the combat aviation subcommittee of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board in the Eightieth Congress and have been through this fight, a fight waged on both sides for a long time. I should like to point out to the Members of the House that this is the season of the year for the Air Force and the Navy, yes, and other agencies of Government, to do their propagandizing of the Congress of the United States. Not very long ago we had a very splendid air show based over here at Andrews Field by the Air Force, in which they displayed the splendid might of the Air Force. That no sooner had cooled off than the Members of this Congress began to get invitations to go down to Norfolk and go out on a naval aircraft carrier. Of course, that is a little easier way to propagandize, because, after all, they keep you aboard overnight and feed you and that is just lovely. Everybody who goes aboard can learn all about the value of naval aviation. It is a great thing.

This appropriation bill brought out by this committee provides for about 80 percent of what the Air Force asks for in cash and contract authorizations and provides about 80 percent of what the Naval Air Force asks for in the way of cash and contract authorizations for the procurement of aircraft. There is very little difference in the treatment of the two, but if either side has got the worst of it, it is the Air Force, which has a little less than 80 percent of what it needs to build to its authorized strength of 70 groups.

I am a little bit surprised that my friend from Georgia does not stand up here and advocate the necessary increase of the Air Force budget to build a full 70-group-air-force program instead of stopping at the 58-group force.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say to the gentleman from California at the outset that my recommendations are not based on any conflict or rivalry between Naval Air and the Air Force. Nothing I have said would indicate that. I am merely pointing out the appropriation required to provide sufficient planes to support the number of first-line Navy planes the Appropriations Committee has approved. As to the 70-group air force, the committee generously gave about what was given last year, $851,000,000. So, now, there will be a postponement of only 2 years in building up to the 70-group air force. This is the second year on the 70-group-air-force program, and we have 3 more years to go and $800,000,000. By 1954 we will have a fully balanced 70-group air force.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will permit me, I have the table before me showing the figures submitted by both the Air Force and the Navy to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board just about a year ago, a year ago the 1st of March. In that request the Navy asked for cash appropriations of $670,000,000 and contract authority of $770,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. The Air Force asked for $1,700,000,000 in cash and $2,600,000,000 in contract authority.

Under the bill we are now considering the Navy has received approximately 80 percent of what it asks for, namely, $523,000,000 in cash and $576,000,000 in contract authorizations, whereas the Air Force is receiving somewhat less than 80 percent. It gets $1,100,000,000 instead of $1,700,000,000 in cash, and it gets $1,992,000,000 instead of $2,600,000,000 in contract authority.

If what you want to do is build both of these arms to merely the level of what we called plan B in the Congressional Aviation Policy Board report, then both arms must be built up to something like the figures shown in this report, and not merely one arm. I suggest the committee has treated both sides equally. If 80 percent of requirements is the figure we are to support, then let us support the figure the committee has brought here. It is fair and equitable to both arms of the service, both Naval Air and Air Force. I submit that for your consideration without any propaganda, trying to be as conscientious and even-minded as I can on this subject, as I love them both.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; printing and binding; payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; $200,000.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 2, line 11, strike out "$50" and insert "$35."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because the National Security Act of 1947 provides that $35 is the maximum per diem to be paid to people brought in temporarily for the advisory committees. I recognize that the National Security Act did not say what should be the rate of pay for advisory personnel employed by the National Security Act, but in view of the fact that a bill is now pending in the other body and a bill is now pending in the Committee on Armed Services dealing with amendments to the National Security Act, I hope that this per diem payment can be kept as it now is until these bills have been considered. Of course, there is not much involved in this, but it is a matter of principle. The Appropriations Committee has a perfect right to fix this as a limitation in this bill. You are clearly within your rights. But, in my opinion, other sections in the bill dealing with this same point are subject to point of order. It says in the National Security Act that the maximum pay shall be $35 per day. Just give us a little chance to work on this and we will probably agree with you on $50, but we may try to keep it at $35. That is the whole purpose of my amendment. Let us keep all of these per diem payments uniform.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Of course, this is a $16,000,000,000 bill and here we are talking about $35 a day for experts and technicians who work for the National Security Council. The committee is trying in every possible way to reduce civilian personnel. That is our object. We are told that it is necessary to occasionally bring in experts for a few days—just a few days. The Council brings in people like the president of General Motors, and the head of General Electric, the very top men of the Nation. Of course, their time in many instances, I would say, might be worth $1,000 a day or more.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's position, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my amendment. Of course, the committee has the right.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not insist upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; printing and binding; travel expenses; the services of domestic and foreign organizations by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes,

as amended; purchase (not to exceed two for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and not to exceed $5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $3,500,000: *Provided,* That notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 303 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, approved July 26, 1947), members of advisory committees and part-time advisory personnel may be appointed by the Chairman of the Board at rates for individuals not exceeding $50 per diem.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the proviso on page 3 is legislation on an appropriation bill, because the National Security Act in section 303 states that it shall be $35 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be heard, except to say that I do feel this should be clarified by legislation. I have no argument to present as to whether or not it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the War Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed four) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $20,000 for payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); and not to exceed $50,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $9,000,000: *Provided,* That notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 303 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, approved July 26, 1947), members of advisory committees and part-time advisory personnel may be appointed by the Secretary of Defense at rates for individuals not exceeding $50 per diem.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the proviso on page 4 is legislation on an appropriation bill, because the act fixes it at $35 a day.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Retired pay, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force: For pay, as authorized by law and not otherwise provided for, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, $180,000,000, to be allocated to such agency or agencies of the National Military Establishment as the Secretary of Defense determines will assure the most economical administration of the funds herein provided.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that portion of the section on retired pay after the figure $180,000,000 is legislation on an appropriation bill. Mr. Chairman, the National Security Act of 1947 specifically defines the authority of the Secretary of National Defense. It enumerates in section 202 the authority, and nowhere gives the Secretary of National Defense any administrative responsibilities or administrative authority. What this does is to take the retired pay of the four services from where it is today being administered in their own offices and puts them in the Office of the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretary of National Defense is so circumscribed by his duties that he does not have any administrative function.

The reason I make this point of order is because this whole subject matter is being considered in the Senate today, and is before the House Committee on the Armed Services. We are going into this question as to the broadening of the authority of the Secretary of National Defense. I believe, therefore, that it should not be prejudged in an appropriation bill or that the Committee on Appropriations should legislate until there has been a thorough hearing on the question.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MAHON. The committee had in mind that we had passed a unification bill and undertook to save funds by throwing together in the office of the Secretary of Defense all retired pay for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. By reason of the consolidation we estimated that $10,000,000 could be saved, and we made that reduction in the bill. We conferred with the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force with regard to the matter. It was in accordance with their suggestion and we had their complete cooperation. In view of the fact, however, that there may be some question about the technical legal aspects, I do not press the point.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I have no objection, probably to its being administered in the Secretary's office after the powers that he is asking for are considered by the legislative committee. The Senate committee is having a hearing on it today and we are going to have a hearing on it to see whether or not we will confer administrative authority on the Secretary of National Defense.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I think a point that should be kept in mind by the committee is that we are trying to save $10,000,000 this year which we cannot save if the point of order is insisted upon.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is clearly in error; I am not dealing with the $180,000,000, but merely the administration of the $180,000,000. This proposal comes after the $180,000,000. The law does not give the Secretary of National Defense the power to administer anything. His duties are spelled out, and that is not one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order against the language on page 4 in line 22, after the figure "$180,000,000" on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair is of opinion that if the Secretary of Defense has the authority to do what the bill seeks to permit him to do the language is merely redundant; but if the Secretary of Defense does not have the authority, this language is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military activities of the Department of the Army, including mileage, transportation, reimbursement of actual expenses, or per diem allowances, to officers, contract surgeons, and others whose rank, pay and allowances are assimilated to officers; transportation of troops; transportation, or reimbursement therefor, of cadets, enlisted men, recruits, recruiting parties, applicants for enlistment between places of acceptance for enlistment and recruiting stations, rejected applicants for enlistment, general prisoners, cadets and accepted cadets from their homes to the Military Academy, discharged cadets, civilian employees, civilian witnesses before courts martial, and dependents of civilian and military personnel; travel pay to discharged military personnel; transportation of discharged or paroled prisoners and persons discharged from Saint Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service; transportation of persons discharged other than honorably; monetary allowances for liquid coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; commutation of quarters and rations to enlisted men traveling on detached duty when it is impracticable to carry rations, and to applicants for enlistment and general prisoners traveling under orders; per diem allowances or actual cost of subsistence while in a travel status, to civilian employees and civilian witnesses before courts martial; for rental of camp sites and the local procurement of communication service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary supplies and services incident to individual or troop movements, including transportation of organizational equipment and impedimenta; and for transportation of authorized baggage of military and civilian personnel, including packing and unpacking; $77,000,000: *Provided,* That other appropriations for the Department of the Army shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for travel in connection with development, procurement, production, maintenance, or construction activities; and, with such exception, no other Army appropriation in this act shall be available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Department of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" and the appropriations for Engineer Service, Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and except as may be provided for in the appropriations "Special Field Exercises," and "Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army;"

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take this time which might have been better used in general debate, but there are just one or two thoughts that I feel obliged to express. I do not want anything I may say to be considered as in the least a reflection on the Committee on Appropriations, for I think the gentleman from

Texas yesterday when he opened the debate on this bill approached this giant problem in a very humble and a very fair way; he admitted that this was a task which was almost impossible for the Appropriations Committee to perform. He admitted that if we were going to face peace during the ensuing year that this appropriation was too high, but that if we were facing war it was obviously too low. So the Appropriations Committee itself is necessarily wrestling with a number of imponderables here which it is very difficult for the House to resolve. Of course, as far as I am concerned, there is nothing in the world I can do except to follow the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee and vote for this bill. I cannot take a chance otherwise, but I think it ought to be called to the attention of the Committee of the Whole that there probably is an enormous amount of waste in this bill which the Appropriations Committee cannot very well under present circumstances do too much about.

In this morning's New York Times, and I take it that the quotations were reasonably accurate, it was reported that a task force of our Commission to Reorganize the Executive Departments said that if the armed forces would reform its accounting practices alone, just the accounting practices, we might be able to save $1,500,000,000 a year. The same article indicated that in the original approach to the Appropriations Committee for funds the armed forces asked for funds to build family houses in Alaska at a cost of $58,500 per dwelling unit, a fantastic and entirely unjustified figure. That same report stated that the armed forces requested funds to modernize more tanks than the armed forces actually possessed. The same report indicated that the armed forces had requested an appropriation of funds which would have been sufficient to purchase 880,000 tropical uniforms, more, of course, than we can foresee a possible need for, at a cost of $129 per uniform.

May I say that as far as I can see there is nothing much that the Committee on Appropriations can do about these extravagant estimates, these grossly negligent figures; there is nothing we Members of the House who do not have expert or detailed knowledge of the situation can presently do about it, but I would like to make this one suggestion for our future consideration, and that is that we probably would not waste money in appropriating two, three, or four times as much money for the use of the Committee on Appropriations as it now has. If we gave that committee the extra money for larger expert staffs, so that it can go into detail on every one of these money requests, we would, in my opinion, save in the long run hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars in considering appropriation bills of this character.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has asked what we could do other than to follow blindly the recommendations made in this bill.

Mr. HAND. Except to give the Appropriations Committee more money so that it can do a more detailed job.

Mr. COUDERT. Is there not another alternative? Is there any reason why the gentleman and the Members of the House should not follow the recommendations of the President and the National Defense Establishment in the matter of this budget?

Mr. HAND. The gentlemen and I are for the same objectives but I do not want blindly to follow the President, either.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. In connection with the report to which the gentleman has called attention, it is also a fact that the report indicates a request for $39,000,000 in this bill for the purchase of 6,955 howitzers and the report states that the actual cost is only $9,000,000. The gentleman has brought out many things that should be called to the attention of the Committee and upon which we should have some explanation.

Mr. HAND. I may say to the gentleman that I was immensely disturbed when I read that report.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Regarding the Alaska housing situation, last year the committee sent investigators to Alaska. The fact of the matter is that those houses at Fairbanks cost $74,000 apiece. The $59,000 was for company, civilian, and noncommissioned officers quarters at Fairbanks and at Anchorage. The committee went up there and went into that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the committee went into the matter of Alaska housing very carefully. I had the Chief Engineer of the United States Army in my office last year. He promised to discontinue cost-plus contracts. I said, "When you build a house, the first material you have to have is concrete. Concrete is made out of water, gravel, sand, and cement. You have the water, gravel, and sand. Where do you buy your cement? What does it cost you a ton at the source of supply and on building site in Alaska?" Who got the difference? I took every item like that and I put those items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We sent an investigator up in there. They changed the chief engineers and now we are going to build the $74,000 houses under competitive bidding for $34,000. So we are doing something about it. That investigatory staff was very effective.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that members of the subcommittee have given consideration to these matters which have been raised and have undertaken to make every provision possible under the circumstances and under the law with regard to accounting and with regard to the cost of houses and with regard to many of these other important matters which very appropriately have been discussed before the committee here today?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Last year we sent investigators to check into the Quartermaster Corps. Seventy percent of the Army procurement is quartermaster, and 35 percent is clothing and food and subsistence. I have a 100-page report on those two items. We submitted that report to the Quartermaster General, and he answered it paragraph by paragraph. That report was condensed and put in the record, and you will find it in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman, I am sure, understands that I know, as all of the Members of the House know, that the Committee on Appropriations devote themselves unceasingly and unselfishly to their task. I am only suggesting that in the future you should have more with which to work.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There is no question about that. I was just pointing out some of the things that are being done.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing, crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of transportation facilities and installations, including the purchase, construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development, and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment, including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; personal services in the District of Columbia; procurement of supplies and equipment; printing and binding; communication service; maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage; conducting instruction in Army transportation activities; $340,000,000: *Provided,* That during the current fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of origin to the first point of storage or consumption of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: *Provided further,* That vessels under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission, the Department of the Army, or the Department of the Navy, may be transferred or otherwise made available without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the request of the head of one agency and the approval of the agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. I make the point of order that the proviso on page 18, lines 16 through 22, is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Texas is not able to say whether or not the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the language to which the

point of order is addressed is legislation on an appropriation bill, and sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating, and training the Army National Guard, including expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities and alterations and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than 10 years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal services at the seat of government or elsewhere (including services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians, without regard to their military rank) necessary for the care, maintenance, modification and repair of materials and equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting work, and for administrative and such other duties as may be required; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected therewith as authorized by the act of June 15, 1936 (10 U. S. C. 455 a–d); pay at a rate not less than $2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing officers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mileage), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army National Guard division and regimental commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard personel at military service schools and expenses of enlisted men of the Regular Army on duty with the Army National Guard, including allowances for quarters and subsistence; drill pay of the Army National Guard; travel of personnel of the Regular Army detailed to or on duty with the Army National Guard, including mileage, transportation of dependents, and transportation, packing, crating and unpacking of household goods and effects; procurement and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equipment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-propelled vehicles and airplanes, and repair and modification of such equipment and supplies; $216,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to issue to the Army National Guard without charge against this appropriation except for actual expenses incident to such issue, supplies and equipment from surplus or excess supplies or equipment purchased for the Army: *Provided further*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the settlement of claims (not exceeding $500 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property incident to the operation of camps of instruction, either during the stay of Army National Guard units in such camps or while en route thereto or therefrom.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do this for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Texas with reference to the armory program which is dealt with in this bill in connection with the National Guard and the other civilian components.

This is the situation, Mr. Chairman. There is pending now before the Committee on Armed Services, and a hearing has been had on it, a bill seeking to bring about the complete unification and the joint use of the armories throughout the country. For a long time the Navy has been building armories, and the National Guard has been building armories. What we are trying to do now is to have armories suitable for all branches of the service.

It may so happen that in one town you might have to have more than one armory, but there cannot be any justification for the Navy having an armory, the National Guard having an armory, the Army Reserve having an armory, and the Marine Corps Reserve having an armory.

We have had a hearing, which has been completed, on this matter. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] conducted the hearing. The only reason why the bill is not reported out is that we are trying to check up to find out how many armories each one of these organizations has so that we can work out a program for their joint use.

This bill makes money available for temporary construction for the various civilian components. I think this temporary construction should be abandoned until we can work out a complete unification. This is where we can get some bona fide unification. This is where we can build in one community armory facilities sufficient to serve all the branches of the service. It is absurd for the National Guard to have an armory to use on Monday nights and the Marine Corps Reserve to have an armory that they will use on Tuesday nights. What we are trying to do is have an armory that all of them can use jointly. This temporary construction that is allowed in these various sections means a promulgation of the present policy, which we hope to abolish just as soon as the Committee on Armed Services can get the necessary information.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to enlighten the Committee on this because I know all members of the Committee wants to do the same thing.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to know from the chairman of the committee just what this language means on pages 31 and 32, starting with line 23:

Alterations and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than 10 years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities.

Does that mean the Army will be in a position to build armories throughout the country?

Mr. MAHON. The committee had before it representatives of the National Guard. There is no money in the bill for the National Guard armories. We also had before us representatives of the Organized Reserves. They have worked out a program which will give them some temporary relief. As you know, it is most important in a democracy such as ours that our Reserve program function well. So they have presented to us a program under which it is permissible under the existing law to expend $10,000,000 in making temporary provisions for armories for the Organized Reserves. It may, of course, extend over the years to the Organized Reserves, in order that they may get going with their program. When you come along with a permanent unified program in this or in succeeding Congresses that demand can be more fully met.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what we are trying to do. We have spent weeks on this matter of the reserve forces facilities trying to decide on needed facilities for them to use in the States and in the communities. The only report that has been made available to the committee so far is a complete report by the National Guard which I have in my hand. What we are trying to work out, as the chairman has said, is a plan to unify the forces. We find in a city they may have an armory used by the Navy with fine electronic equipment and radar in it, and the National Guard armory over here trying to carry out their function where the men have to drive 100 miles in order to do the same thing. So the committee asked them to come up here with a bona fide plan to put those services together so that there can be a joint use of these facilities. At the present time there is $800,000,000 worth of equipment in the National Guard armories throughout the United States. There are 1,900 National Guard armories, and the report shows that there are only 82 being used jointly. That simply does not mean very good business. I hope that there will be nothing in this bill to jeopardize this program, because in my opinion this will be the greatest asset to the national defense picture of anything that we can develop.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the committee is completely in accord with what he is seeking to achieve in the way of a joint-armory program for all of the Reserve components. The committee however, takes the position that the situation of the Organized Reserves of the country has now reached a point that if we do not do something, to boost their morale and give them a place to train and help their program along, that this Organized Reserves program may be killed. This provides $10,000,000 which can be used for temporary armories for the Organized Reserves. They are the Quonset-type of armories, which have been used so effectively by the Navy in many places. While they are called temporary, they will last for years. I feel we must bear in mind the fact that the gentleman has

not yet completed action on his bill. The Senate has not acted on his bill. If it should be approved by both bodies, and I hope it will, it must then go to the Committee on Appropriations and then we would have to wait for a year or 2 years before any of these armories are going to be completed.

Mr. DURHAM. I might say to the distinguished gentleman, who served on the Committee on Armed Services, that it is not my bill. I think the gentleman himself introduced a bill which is before the committee at the present time. The whole object, as I said a few moments ago, is to try to bring about this joint use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, what I am afraid of getting into is this temporary construction program. That is what worries me, because I feel, unless we can get State cooperation and Army and Navy cooperation, together with the National Guard, which you know is a difficult problem to work out, we will not be able to get the best results. But we have achieved closer cooperation in the hearings on this and we have gotten closer together on this than we ever have in the history of any legislation that I have seen handled in the Committee on Armed Services. What I want to be assured of is that this program will not in any way give them a wedge to drive in down there. At the present time the Army and Navy Munitions Board has appointed a committee in every State in the Union. And every State in the Union has reported on the National Guard. If we can have time before the end of this session of Congress—we can work this thing out and it is a must program. But if we get this thing jumbled up here as it has been for many years, I know what will happen. I am afraid of what will happen, because it has been happening. I certainly hope, and I want to be assured by this committee that we are not going to jeopardize this program that we are trying to work out.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. What the gentleman and the gentleman's committee is trying to do is to bring about complete unification of the armories.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. Under the language of this bill it means that you are going to have a 10-year period building separate units for each one of the organizations.

Mr. DURHAM. And you can give the Secretary of National Defense all the authority that you can confer on him here in the Congress and he can never do this job unless we do it by legislation.

Mr. VINSON. If you want bona fide unification, this is the way to get it.

Mr. DURHAM. That is exactly what we have been trying to do.

Mr. MAHON. That is why the committee has insisted, if I may say so, with the gentleman's permission, that these armories be fully utilized and that these different components work together. We anticipate real cooperation and we are just trying to help the cause along. We are very much interested in the National Guard and the Organized Reserves. I know of the keen interest of the gentleman from North Carolina in the program.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. We have worked out certain amendments dealing with this thing, and I do hope the Committee will accept them because the objective is the same; we want to have one armory system and not five or six different armory systems.

Mr. MAHON. That is exactly the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true your subcommittee understands the problem of the Reserves in general and not just Officers' Reserve Corps?

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And we are working with the target in view of providing a permanent armory system at the earliest possible date.

Mr. DURHAM. It is to be a permanent unified armory program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It will not only improve the service but will also save a lot of money by combining their use.

Mr. DURHAM. It is a complete program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I do not believe the committee should have serious objection.

Mr. DURHAM. It will carry out a training program which has been advocated for many years if properly conducted.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It will also give an opportunity to the armed services to evaluate all the armories for unified purposes. We have in mind, of course, the fact that Naval Reserve armories will not lend themselves to practical use by National Guard officers.

Mr. DURHAM. That is true, and they are planning where to place the armories. One armory, for instance, might cost $200,000 and another $50,000.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They could be utilized and coordinated.

Mr. DURHAM. The definite plans are before the committee at the present time, for the type of armories, and everything is before the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Also our committee is working out this program of defense.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. It is a logical program that considers the problems of the different Reserve components of the Guard, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Reserves.

Mr. DURHAM. Three years ago at the end of the war the gentleman and myself, as you recall, visited the Bureau of the Budget, and asked them to O. K. this. At the present time they have O. K.'d a 10-year building program of $500,000,000.

Mr. RIVERS. While the bill carries $10,000,000, I should like to see this program proceeded with with the utmost dispatch.

Mr. DURHAM. If we can authorize this and take a part of it each year, it will prove to be a successful program.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. For the information of the House I might say that the chairman had designated a special subcommittee to handle this whole Reserve question.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. And we expect to begin hearings immediately after the Easter recess.

Mr. VINSON. A subcommittee has been appointed to deal with this matter, and I have designated the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] to be chairman of it. I trust the gentleman from North Carolina will call to the chairman's attention the amendments that we want to put in, because we have the same purpose; we want to bring about unification and not merely talk about unification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that here is a very definite place in legislative processes that shows lack of coordination between a very important legislative committee the Armed Services Committee, and a very important subcommittee of the Committee of Appropriations which has done such fine work. In other words, here is the hard-working Appropriations Committee coming in and asking for $10,000,000 which manifestly should not be voted for, if you are going to have earliest possible effective unification in connection with an important segment of the armed forces.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to say to the Members and to my colleague that our committee has been thoroughly conversant with the program that the gentleman has indicated here. May I say this to you, however, that there has been no absolute program for the Organized Reserves thus far of the Air Force and the Army that has been worth a shotgun and will not be until we have a well-considered program.

Mr. RIVERS. We are working on that.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not going to tolerate losing the Reserve components. We believe in them and will strengthen them.

Let me remind you that we must act intelligently in this matter and that

there is no reason for haste. You might spend $10,000,000 in 10 months, which would otherwise be saved. This bill provides that nothing shall be spent on property unless it is leased for at least 10 years. That is not a temporary program. It is clearly a program which can become one of several times 10 years. We are looking to a permanent program of sound, sensible unification of and joint use of armories, and I suggest to the Members, even of the Committee on Appropriations, that here is a chance to save $10,000,000 and compel unification. We should make it compulsory. There is no need of duplication of millions of dollars of taxpayers' dollars. They must be efficiently expended and public property used fully.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is always so courteous to me.

Mr. SHORT. I think the statement made by the gentleman from California is absolutely correct; we have shamefully treated the Reserves of all departments, particularly of the Army and of the Air. The Navy is much better, but they have been given, I think, $75,000,000. Congress voted monye to the Air Force for the Reserves; they have not spent any of that money or done anything about it, and it is most regrettable that we are losing many of our very best men, men of war experience. That is the reason the chairman has set up this special subcommittee of which I shall be chairman, and we are going to begin hearings immediately after the Easter recess and put the heat on the boys over in the Pentagon.

Mr. DOYLE. I am a member of that important subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of which the distinguished gentleman speaks and I may say one of the bills before us is a bill offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, who renders such invaluable service on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that some of us have been watching the Reserve program for many years and we have endeavored to get a place in which to house these Reserves. Until we have a building we are not going to have much of a Reserve program. In my opinion, we ought to have unification. That is what the Armed Services Committee is going to come forward with. Until we have a Reserve program that is properly integrated between the services, we do not have the answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman. The justification of the collection of taxes for the purpose of building armories for the National Guard or Reserve components is need for these buildings, and publicly owned armories must be used to the maximum, consistent of proper use and needs of the community. Communities do not need armories which are closed to use by all Reserve components in the communities excepting only one such unit. These buildings can only justify themselves by the use which they have need of, by Reserves who have need of such use. The declared policy of this Congress must be consistently for economical use of all publicly paid for buildings and this includes armories. The leaders and members of these Reserve components should get their feet together under the table and coordinate their joint use of armories. In war they fight together and in peace they should pull together in use of buildings provided for them by the taxpayers. At the local level wherever these armories are now located or new ones are constructed, the declared policy carried out must be that there shall be a maximum use to the end that the National Guard and all Reserve components shall be allowed to use these armories jointly and fully and cooperatively. There are 6 days and nights, excluding the Sabbath, in each week when these armories should be used if there are National Guard or other Reserve components who want to use them. I repeat that real need and much use—not limited use—are the justifications of tax collections to build and maintain these armories.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself somewhat confused because of the apparent interjection and the taking over of command of this bill by the legislative committee on the armed services and taking it away from the Appropriations Committee. There has been a tremendous amount of talk here about amendments which are not presently pending before the committee. I have tried to see if I cannot get heads or tails out of exactly what is being proposed and what the amendments are that are being suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the members of his committee.

I want to tell you of a situation in my own city. If you are seeking to cure that sort of situation, and if there is anything in this bill that will try to do it, or if you have any legislation that will do it, I hope you will bring it before the Congress.

In my city the Navy built a Naval Reserve armory on land given to it by the city in one of the most beautiful locations in the entire city. I am told that the expense of building this Naval Reserve armory with all of its equipment will exceed $1,000,000. I know that the Naval Reserve components were recruited to full strength because the Navy gave to those reserve components of the Navy every single thing they asked for in the way of equipment, in the way of uniforms and everything else.

Located in the same city is the National Guard armory owned by the State, a very antiquated, inefficient and obsolete building. The National Guard tried to recruit men following the war, with the result that they found great difficulty because they were not furnished equipment to make it attractive to the recruits to go into the army. When they came out on Armistice Day the Naval Reserve recruited to its full strength turned out on parade. A group of patriotic young men just out of the war, wearing their own Eisenhower coats and whatever equipment they could find around, were marching in there representing the Army and right down on the corner at the same time was an army store selling the very equipment to the public that the National Guard boys were clamoring for. All right.

I protested most vigorously to Mr. Forrestal over that situation and it was not 10 days before supplies began to flow into this National Guard unit. As a result it is now a splendid National Guard unit and these people are working. But we have the National Guard armory with all of its expense and its equipment, we have the naval armory with all of its expense and all of its equipment, then on top of that we have the Reserves of the Army. The Army Reserve Corps leased from the city another building at a tremendous monthly rental to house the Army Reserves.

Thus, we have three buildings; one, the Navy and the Naval Reserves; one, the National Guard; and, another one, the Army Reserves, all occupying separate structures and all costing us a tremendous sum of money.

I have tried to call that to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and said, "My God, if that is what unification means, it is the most ridiculous thing that I have heard of in all my life." Why have we not had brains applied to this so that, in my community as well as in any number of others I could cite, where the same condition prevails, we could have one splendid, fine building that would house all of these activities and save the overhead that is incident to the operation, and provide the facilities that we ought to provide in these towns where they expect to build and maintain national defense activities of this Nation?

The question I ask is this: I have heard a lot about the $10,000,000 cut; I do not know what it means. There is an over-all appropriation estimate here on page 33 of $216,000,000. Other Members of the House are confused because of the mix-up of time between the committee headed by my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the Committee on Appropriations, to know exactly what we are talking about.

Will the gentleman explain to me and tell me whether or not his committee proposes to bring legislation to this House that will not permit a disgraceful situation to continue as the one which I have pointed out?

Mr. VINSON. Take the illustration that the gentleman has just used of the three different arms. This bill will permit temporary repairs to be carried on on those three different set-ups. We now propose to consolidate them and have one to meet all three services. That is what we are trying to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman this: In my city, like in many other cities where they have spent, as I say, in building and equipping a naval armory, over $1,000,000 for a magnificent structure, if they could integrate the facilities of the Army Reserves and the National Guard and the Naval Reserves into that structure, is it the gentleman's proposal that that be done?

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly what the bill calls for, to utilize one establishment, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. KEEFE. Who is going to determine whether it is possible to do it in this set-up?

Mr. VINSON. We are going to write into the bill that the Secretary of National Defense shall have complete control and must have the authority to allocate it for joint use of all the services. This provision in the bill continues to carry on exactly what the gentleman is talking about, because it permits temporary repairs. Now I say that we should not engage in temporary repair; that we should get away from any repairs at all, and to tell these different component parts of the armed services to try to get together and use one and the same armory instead of each one building separate armories.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman a question. He has answered that part of it. Am I correct in the assumption that in the language appearing under the head of "Army National Guard," beginning on page 31, what you are seeking to do is to eliminate the language in that part of the bill which would permit the expenditure of money for the building on leased land, under leases for 10 years, or the repairs and equipment of perhaps obsolete existing structures, and to take the money out of the bill that is allocable for that purpose and withhold it until your authorization bill comes before the Congress; is that correct?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. May I say to my friend that the $10,000,000 which has been referred to is carried under "Organized Reserves Appropriation" on the bottom of page 35 in an item of $115,000,000. And, if I may take just a few seconds longer, may I say that this committee is thoroughly in accord with the idea that we should have a joint-armory program at the earliest possible moment, but until the committee of the gentleman from Georgia brings in such a bill and until the other body has approved such a bill and until the Committee on Appropriations has had an opportunity to supply funds for such a program, we must either provide temporary facilities in those areas when there are no facilities or run the risk of seriously damaging the program.

Mr. KEEFE. That is the next question I was going to ask, and that is this: If you do not appropriate these funds to provide at least temporary facilities for the organized Reserves and the National Guard, then you are going to destroy those Reserves in my community and every other community throughout this country; is that not true?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. We cannot afford to wait on the suspicion that perhaps this committee will bring in such a bill, and we cannot afford to wait until we know that both the House and the Senate will accept such a proposal. With that understanding of the situation, so far as I am concerned, I intend to support the action of the Committee on Appropriations, and it would seem to me to be entirely unwise to throw aside the work that the subcommittee has put upon this proposition with the mere hope and expectation that at some undetermined time in the future there may be legislation offered from the committee headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to deal with this problem, with no assurance that it will be passed in the present session of Congress. I do not want to see either the Organized Reserves or the present National Guard set-up, housed as inadequately as it may be, destroyed until the over-all program is written into law that will provide for adequate integration of these services.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORGANIZED RESERVES

For pay and allowances, not otherwise provided for, of members of the Organized Reserve Corps on duty in accordance with law; mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, at rates authorized by law, and transportation of temporary change of station baggage incurred by officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army and Organized Reserve Corps personnel traveling on duty in connection with the Organized Reserve Corps and for travel of dependents, and transportation of other effects as authorized by law of such personnel ordered to make a permanent change of station for duty in connection with the Organized Reserve Corps; personal services; pay, transportation, subsistence, clothing, and medical and hospital treatment of enlisted members of the Organized Reserve Corps; conducting correspondence or extension courses for instruction of members of the Organized Reserve Corps, including necessary supplies, procurement of maps and textbooks; transportation and traveling expenses of employees; purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms; establishment, maintenance, and operation of Organized Reserve Corps headquarters, installations, aviation facilities and camps for training of the Organized Reserve Corps; alterations and additions to present structures; transportation and erection of temporary structures; construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges and facilities, including acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein and temporary use thereof; arms, equipment, supplies, and matériel (not otherwise provided for) required to arm and equip Organized Reserve Corps organizations; purchase (not to exceed 200) and hire of passenger motor vehicles and hire and purchase of aircraft; miscellaneous expenses incident to the administration of the Organized Reserve Corps; expenses incident to the use, including upkeep costs, of supplies, equipment, and matériel furnished from stocks under the control of the Department of the Army; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Organized Reserve Corps who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty, as provided by the act of June 15, 1936 (10 U. S. C. 455 a–d), and such other purposes in connection therewith as are authorized by the said act, including pay and allowances, subsistence, transportation, and burial expenses; in all, $115,000,000.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On pages 31 and 32, starting with line 23 on page 31, strike out the following: "and alterations and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than 10 years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that we have already passed this portion of the bill and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that the Clerk had read only down to line 7 on page 34.

The CHAIRMAN. That paragraph has been read. The Clerk has now read down to line 25 on page 35.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 31 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. MAHON. and Mr. SHEPPARD objected.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On page 35, lines 2 to 10, strike out the following: "establishment, maintenance, and operation of Organized Reserve Corps headquarters, installations, aviation facilities and camps for training of the Organized Reserve Corps; alterations and additions to present structures; transportation and erection of temporary structures; construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges and facilities, including acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein and temporary use thereof" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "maintenance and operation of Organized Reserve Corps headquarters, installations, aviation facilities and camps for training of the Organized Reserve Corps; maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has already been fully discussed here, and the effect it will have. If you take part of this program, which can be done under the appropriation bill, and get it all jumbled up, we will finally wind up with no reserve program.

One who has studied this reserve program over the past few years knows we have made great progress. The gentleman from Florida, who today is serving on the Committee on Appropriations, was one of the members who started out to study this reserve program right after the war. We did an excellent job of trying to put them together. I would certainly hate to see a program start out here at the present time. Why in the world the War Department should ask for such a program, after they have already at the suggestion of the Chief of Staff appointed a committee, the Munitions Board, to make a complete and very

expensive survey at the expense of the War Department, I cannot understand. There is $216,000,000 in this bill for construction that can be used. I know how they are going to use it. It is not just the $10,000,000, it is $216,000,000 that can be shifted around. Is that true or is it not true?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is in error. Ten million dollars is in the bill for armories for the organized reserves and for the others who can use them.

Mr. DURHAM. The total amount is $216,000,000 that can be used for training facilities?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, that is on page 33, and your amendment does not apply to page 33 at all.

Mr. DURHAM. I understand that very well. In fact, this amendment affects part of the Reserve officers' training program. You have three types of Reserve programs here. You have the Air Corps training Reserve program, Reserve program and National Guard.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will just read the provision, he will find that the $216,000,000 is for all activities of the National Guard, for the drill training, for uniforms and summer training, and so on.

Mr. DURHAM. This is for the whole program and not just for the building facilities?

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. In that case, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For the procurement, maintenance, and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, of such public animals, means of transportation, supplies, tentage, equipment, and uniforms as he may deem necessary, including cleaning and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; and to forage, at the expense of the United States, public animals so issued, and to pay commutation in lieu of uniforms at a rate to be fixed annually by the Secretary of the Army; transporting said animals and other authorized supplies and equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and training camps and return of same to place of issue when necessary; purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms; for the establishment and maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps or other places designated by the Secretary of the Army, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit, or, in lieu of transporting them to and from such camps and subsisting them while en route, to pay them travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp and for the return travel thereto, and to pay the return travel pay in advance of the actual performance of the travel, or to pay commutation in lieu of subsistence at camps at rates fixed by the Secretary of the Army; expenses incident to the use, including upkeep costs, of supplies, equipment, and matériel furnished in accordance with law from stocks under the control of the Department of the Army; pay for students attending advanced camps at the rate authorized by law; payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at a rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920 (10 U. S. C. 387); medical and hospital treatment of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, who suffer personal injury or contract disease in line of duty, and for other expenses in connection therewith, including pay and allowances, subsistence, transportation, and burial expenses, as authorized by the act of June 15, 1936 (10 U. S. C. 455a–d); mileage, traveling expenses, or transportation, for transportation of dependents (including dependents of retired officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the first three grades, and enlisted men of the first three grades of the Regular Army Reserve, ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom), and for packing, crating and unpacking, and transportation of baggage (including baggage of retired officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the first three grades, and enlisted men of the first three grades of the Regular Army Reserve ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom) for officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men traveling on duty pertaining to or on detail to or relief from duty with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; purchase (not to exceed 30) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement and issue as provided in section 55c of the act approved June 4, 1920 (10 U. S. C. 1180), and in section 1225, Revised Statutes, as amended, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, to schools and colleges, other than those provided for in section 40 of the act above referred to, of such arms, tentage, and equipment, and of ammunition, targets, and target materials, including the transporting of the same, and the overhauling and repair of articles issued as the Secretary of the Army shall deem necessary for proper military training in said schools and colleges; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law shall be furnished from surplus or excess stocks of the Department of the Army without payment from this appropriation, except for actual expense incurred in the manufacture or issue: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount paid from this appropriation for uniforms, equipment, or material furnished to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps from stocks under the control of the Department of the Army be in excess of the price current at the time the issue is made: *Provided further*, That hereafter no appropriation shall be used for the organization or maintenance of a greater number of mounted units in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps than were in existence on January 1, 1928: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated elsewhere in this act, except for printing and binding and pay and allowance of officers and enlisted men, shall be used for expenses in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it would be advisable to take the floor at this time to clear up any misunderstandings as a result of some of the statements which were made on the floor of the House relative to the cost of the building of these reserve armories. I can well understand the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in respect to watching the expenditures in the military organizations. I think he is to be highly complimented for so doing. What he said this afternoon, however, interested me tremendously because he knows that during the past 2 years I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee dealing with building facilities for the Army and Navy, and watched very closely the construction program of the Naval Reserve armories throughout the country.

I appreciate to the fullest degree the underlying purpose behind the program. But I was quite familiar with the cost of these armories; and when the statement was made here this afternoon that in the home city of the gentleman from Wisconsin they constructed a Naval Reserve armory which cost over a million dollars, it interested me tremendously because I knew that the Navy Department, through the Bureau of Yards and Docks, had established a standard type of armory known as the Quonset-hut type, with the proper head house to carry on the administrative work. Now, I know that none of those armories cost over $300,000. I knew it only because I had inquired many, many times over a period of time when the so-called Naval Reserve armories were under construction in the various parts of the country. I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin, himself, elicited a great deal of interest in what the Navy was attempting to do by developing the so-called Naval Reserve program in his home district. He spoke to me about it on a number of occasions. Now, I just want to give the facts that I received from the Bureau of Yards and Docks in order that we might be able to clarify this situation. We all know that in our districts we hear many things being said which are not altogether true or may be partially true, and some of them not a bit true. But in the home town of the gentleman from Wisconsin—Oshkosh—the Navy Department entered into a contract with the so-called Ben B. Ganther Co., located at 78 State Street, Oshkosh, for the construction of a Naval Reserve armory of the Quonset-hut type at a cost of $245,745. The total amount of money available for the project, which included the fitting out and tooling and the equipment of many different kinds, was only $273,718. That included everything. I thought that information would be available for the gentleman so that he might be able to give us, perhaps, the source of his information as to who gave him the million-dollar figure.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. To begin with, the figure that the gentleman has quoted was the correct contract price without any extras that were added which did not include the cost of the Quonsets themselves and the expense of hauling them there to the site. That is number one,

and it was a very substantial amount. Secondly, the expense that you have listed of two-hundred-odd-thousand dollars that went in there for equipment, I was advised by the people and the admiral who came there to dedicate it when I was there, and by the commanding officer himself, that the electronic equipment and all of the machine tools and everything else that was in there would cost over $700,000.

The gentleman asked the source of my information; I got it from the people on the ground, the very best people whom I could approach who seemed to know something about it. The information shows that the total cost of this outfit without any expense for the land, which was given by the city, would run in excess of a million dollars. I do not care what the Bureau of Yards and Docks says.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think we all appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin, but the facts are that the total cost of the construction job was $245,745; and that is all that the contractor got for the construction of the building and the grading of the grounds.

When we speak about equipment, whether it be electronic equipment or any other kind, we know that all that material is surplus material; we know that the Quonset huts were surplus material; we know that the material and the equipment would deteriorate wherever it may be if we do not make some use of it. Because of its availability it can be incorporated in the over-all naval reserve program and we have brought it together in buildings that were constructed for those purposes. I think the Navy has done a magnificent job in that respect, and for that purpose alone I came here to the floor this afternoon to defend what they have done on an economical basis as well as from the standpoint of the security of this country.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to know what difference it makes whether the Naval Reserve armory built in some city of Wisconsin a few years ago cost either the sum of approximately one-half million dollars or a sum in excess of a million dollars. This argument is beside the point in face of our knowledge as to the manner in which the armed forces have splashed funds around, with no remote idea of ever attempting to save one penny for the taxpayers. We all know that our armed forces would fortify the moon if they could get to it and Congress would allow them to do so.

Now, we talk about duplicating armory facilities in various localities of this country—the Naval Reserve groups, the National Guard, and any one of the other Reserve components of our armed forces having duplicating armory facilities that are only used by either of the components 4 or 5 days a month. Of course, unification would make available the same facilities for the various components at a tremendous saving to this Government.

Please do not believe that I am merely a disgruntled enlisted man of the last World War just because I served as an enlisted man, when I say that systematic duplication in all the armed forces is costing us more than double the amount necessary for the defense of this country. There is less democracy in our armed forces than in any other department of our Government, and I venture to say there is less democracy in our armed forces than in the armed forces of our enemies. Why the necessity of duplicating facilities for officers and enlisted men is a question that no man in this House can answer. The officer and enlisted man have separate eating quarters, separate drinking fountains, separate latrines, separate barracks, and separate everything else as though the officers and the enlisted men constituted separate armies. Perhaps the officers might become contaminated if they ate with the enlisted men, and the same might be true with reference to the drinking fountains even though the water spouts straight up out of the fountain, and to use the same latrine might cause the enlisted man not to have the proper respect for the superior rank. Why they should not eat together or at least in the same building is another unanswered question.

These duplicated facilities in every branch of the armed forces cost this Government millions of dollars each year, and this Congress hesitates to advise the big brass to cut out the Boy Scout tactics. Rather than attempt to save money the high-ranking brass of our armed forces had rather knock off little regulations as to where you should park your car and which direction the vehicle should face, and whether the enlisted man can do this, that, or the other. Elimination of these pinhead ideas would afford enough money in this appropriation bill to buy all the airplanes that the Air Force and Navy are now crying for. For some reason the membership of the Congress does not care to talk about the totalitarian tactics existing in our armed forces, which are costing us so much money.

Gentlemen, imagine the cost of separate eating quarters, sleeping quarters, latrines, drinking facilities, recreational halls, and so forth, housed in separate buildings for but the simple purpose of separating officers and enlisted men that can produce no ultimate results other than uncalled for hatred—with the majority of the armed force officers not believing in the simplicity of this archaic system. Then, too, imagine the number of bombers that could be built with the savings of unification.

This Congress does not lack for brains, because there are plenty of smart men here, but it could certainly stand individual courage.

The Clerk read as follows:

Promotion of rifle practice: For construction, equipment and maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in marksmanship; and promotion of practice in the use of rifled arms, for arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice, for issue and sale in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of the Army; clerical services, including not exceeding $91,427 in the District of Columbia; procurement of materials, supplies, trophies, prizes, badges, services, and such other items as are authorized in section 113, act of June 3, 1916, and under this head in War Department Appropriation Act of June 7, 1924; conduct of the national matches, including incidental travel of rifle teams and of individuals and of Marine Corps and other detachments required in the operation of the matches and including incidental travel of rifle teams and individuals attending regional, national, and international competitions, and for the purchase of medals and badges for use in National Rifle Association competitions, including those fired as a part of the national matches; mileage at 8 cents per mile for members of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice when authorized by the Secretary of the Army, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding; and maintenance of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, including not to exceed $10,500 for incidental expenses in addition to the amount authorized by act of May 28, 1928; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army; $272,500: *Provided*, That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard and Organized Reserves, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, volunteer to participate without pay as competitors or range officers in the national matches to be held during the current fiscal year, may attend such matches without pay, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, but shall be entitled to travel and subsistence allowances at the same rates as are provided for civilians who attend and participate in said matches, but this proviso shall not operate to prohibit the pay of such competitors or range officers, provided funds for such payment are available from this appropriation, nor shall any provision in this act operate to deprive a Reserve officer ordered to active duty incident to the national matches of pay for the full period of such active duty, provided funds for such payment are available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard and Organized Reserves may be ordered to duty, with their consent, for the care, maintenance, and operation of the ranges used in the conduct of the national matches, and such officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men while so engaged shall be entitled to the same pay, subsistence, and transportation as officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of corresponding grades of the Regular Army are entitled by law, which expense shall be provided by the appropriation "Promotion of rifle practice"; and after being duly mustered may be paid for the period from the date of leaving home rendezvous to date of return thereto as determined in advance, both dates inclusive.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 41, line 15, strike out the sum "$272,500" and insert "522,500."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns the National Rifle Board. I feel that the majority of the membership here today have in their communities what is commonly known as the National Rifle Association which is an offspring of the National Rifle Board.

The National Rifle Board was created back in 1903 for the purpose of promoting and aiding our national defense.

In 1916 the National Defense Act when adopted instructed the Secretary of War to encourage rifle practice among our able-bodied citizens, and the program was to be carried on through the National Rifle Board.

The National Rifle Board is composed of 21 members appointed by the Secretary of War from among the Army, Navy, Air Forces, Marine Corps, and the Reserve components of our national defense.

The program for 1950 as set up by the Secretary of National Defense called for the expenditure of a little better than a million dollars. It provided for a program under the jurisdiction or supervision of the National Rifle Board to be carried on among the schools and colleges, senior and junior rifle clubs, and also the promotion of national and international rifle matches.

The cost of maintaining the National Rifle Board is more than taken care of by the tax that our Federal Government receives from the sale of ammunition. It approximates about $12,000,000 annually. Then, also, the Board disposes of obsolete or surplus rifles and the Federal Government receives approximately a million-dollar income annually from the sale of them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I am delighted the gentleman has offered this amendment. I shall support it and I hope it will carry in the Committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman. The $250,000 we ask for is the minimum the National Rifle Board must have to conduct its program for the fiscal year 1950. In 1937 they were given $645,000; in 1938, $645,000; and again in 1941, $732,000. With the advent of World War II the program was discontinued. Now the National Rifle Board desires to reinstate this program so that encouragement can be given to developing marksmanship and the use of rifles among the younger men and women of the country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the National Rifle Board been continued since its first inception?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct, since 1904.

Mr. DONDERO. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to pay the gentleman this compliment and let the House know that in view of the presentation which he made in respect to the necessity for these funds, I am very sure this committee raised the present budget $112,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Bureau of the Budget requested $160,000 and the committee was kind enough to increase it to $272,500, but we are asking for another $250,000 so that the program can produce real results.

The Department of National Defense actually requested $1,075,000 for the National Rifle Board program for the fiscal year 1950. Then the Bureau of the Budget, speaking for the President, reduced this amount to $160,000, a paltry sum, in view of the needs of this program.

The committee was kind enough to increase the Budget Bureau's figure of $160,000 to $272,500.

If my amendment is adopted the amount of $272,500 will be increased by $250,000 or a total of $522,500.

This program is a part of our national defense effort and I trust that the members of the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the budget estimate for 1950 called for $160,000 for this program. The committee recommended $272,500, which is an increase of $112,500.

The committee recommended this increase so that that part of the program which deals with rifle practice in schools, the providing of ammunition for rifle practice in secondary schools, can be carried on and so that an additional five civilian employees by the National Rifle Board can be obtained in order to aid in the distribution of the obsolete arms and equipment which the gentleman has discussed. It was the understanding of the subcommittee that this was all the money that is presently needed, unless we are to again inaugurate the Camp Perry type of national rifle ranges. There was some question in the minds of the subcommittee members whether we are ready to go into that type of program; or whether a regional type of match could not more economically be undertaken to take the place of the national matches. The committee is very much in sympathy with this valuable and important work. It definitely wants the work carried on. But the committee does feel from the evidence submitted that the money it has appropriated is adequate for the coming year.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that we are providing hundreds of millions of dollars for ammunition and all sorts of training in our armed forces, and that we are confronted with the possibility of a new tax bill, and that we do not want to provide additional money for those shooting matches and have tax dollars shot away, when they can be used for better purposes?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would like to point out that the executive vice president of the National Rifle Association of America in writing insists the money provided by the committee is not adequate to carry out the program for fiscal 1950.

Mr. SIKES. I realize that the gentleman may have such a letter, submitted in good faith, but may I point out that the subcommittee heard testimony from many people, and that it was the considered judgment of the subcommittee after hearing all of the testimony that these essential functions, the distribution of the obsolete arms and equipment and the carrying on of rifle practice in the schools, could be continued with the money carried in this bill. In later appropriations we probably shall want to provide for the rifle matches in addition.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Will the gentleman advise the committee how much of the $112,500 added by the committee is to go to the schools and colleges in terms of the rifle groups?

Mr. SIKES. One hundred thousand dollars. The other $12,500 is to provide for five additional employees to aid in the distribution of obsolete arms and equipment, on which the Government realizes a substantial return.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. I desire to ascertain from the Chair if it would be in order to dispense with the further reading of the bill and have it open for amendment, if someone from the committe made that request?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the pending amendment should be disposed of first.

Mr. VINSON. Would it be proper to make such a request after the amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would entertain such a request at that time.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is the first time as a freshman Congressman that I rise to join in debate of any kind. Yesterday we adopted a bill for the European recovery program calling for the expenditure of over $5,000,000,000. During the debate I seriously considered voting for the reduction of some amount of money. But, as I sat here and listened to the different distinguished Members of this House debate the question, I resolved in my own mind that if I voted for the amount of money that was asked for in the bill I was voting for the best interests of this great country of ours. So, I voted in the affirmative. Today we are being asked to vote for over $15,000,000,000 for the armed forces of the United States. And, what for? Because we are in a program of preparedness. I say that we are not only preparing ourselves, but we are faced with the threat of a war. Why do we not tell the American public, the American people of this great country, that we are preparing for war and that the clouds of war are now threatening us? That is why we are being called

upon to vote for these great amounts of money.

I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We are asked to spend billions of dollars and then we quibble about a mere $250,000 that will prepare our civilians in this preparedness program. That is the reason I stand here today supporting the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in his amendment for a mere $250,000 so that the civilian program can be carried out and so that the civilians of this great country can be prepared. I sincerely hope that the members of this Committe will support this amendment because I feel that we are being faced with another threat of war, and if we are being faced with another threat of war, let us be prepared right down the line. Let us tell the American people we are threatened by another war. The Atlantic Pact is only a choosing of sides by the nations who are friendly to the United States, and those nations friendly to Russia are choosing their side today. So I plead with you that you support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. TAURIELLO) there were—ayes 43, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining portion of the bill be considered as read, that points of order be waived, and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should do that. I must ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk read as follows:

For new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories therefor, including expansion of public plants or private plants (not to exceed $500,000), and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants, and for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Aeronautics necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, $523,070,000, of which $418,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $576,546,000.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order with respect to the last three lines of that paragraph—lines 8, 9, and 10, on page 65, as legislation on an appropriation bill. If the total amount specified in the bill is not increased, I shall not insist upon the point of order. If it is increased by amendment, I shall be compelled to insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order should be disposed of before any amendment is considered.

Mr. COUDERT. In that event, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that language.

Mr. Chairman, may I state a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, is it the final decision of the Chairman that I may not reserve the point of order until the amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that it has not been the practice to reserve points of order and then consider amendments. The Chair will entertain the gentleman's point of order if the gentleman presses it.

Mr. COUDERT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to insist upon the point of order. The reason of course is that the amendment will increase the amount specified in the Presidential budget, the committee not having increased this item. I am sorry I have to insist upon it. My purpose really was to reserve the point of order so that I might make it if the amendment should carry to increase the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York indicate to the Chair whether his point of order is addressed only to the language appearing on page 65, lines 8 to 10, after the word "purposes" on line 8, and not including the amount?

Mr. COUDERT. It is directed to the language authorizing contracts by the Navy—the contract authorization provision. I believe that is legislation and not properly in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has made that point clear to the Chair.

Mr. COUDERT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands, however, that the amount of the appropriation in line 10 on page 65 is not included in the gentleman's point of order.

Mr. COUDERT. Yes, it is; Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it or is it not?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am making the point of order against the contract authorization. I do not want to insist upon it if the amount is not increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that part of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. COUDERT. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon the point of order to the entire paragraph, including the amount. In other words, Mr. Chairman, my point of order is to the following language: "and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $576,546,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, of course there is authorization by law for the procurement and contracts of procurement of munitions, armaments and airplanes. It seems to me that there is ample justification for the provision contained in this bill. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order to the language appearing on page 65, line 8, after the word "purposes" down to and including the figure on line 10 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair is of the opinion that if in existing law the Secretary of the Navy were authorized to enter into such contracts, this language in the bill would not be necessary; if the Secretary of the Navy is without that power, this language is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 65, line 5, strike out "$523,770,000" and insert "$1,399,616,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of bringing to your attention a very pertinent factor in our national defense program.

The Navy part of the appropriation bill now being considered by this Congress is woefully inadequate in one of its most important features. I refer to the funds for procurement of new aircraft.

At no time since the end of the war have we appropriated for sufficient new aircraft to support our current operating levels. We have been lulled into a false sense of security by maintaining our forces mainly with surplus aircraft left over from the war. Let me impress upon you, gentlemen, that more than 80 percent of the present aircraft of the Navy were procured during or prior to 1945 and are fast approaching the point at which they will no longer be of any military usefulness.

The current appropriation bill for the Navy carries but $687,000,000 with which the Navy can buy only 843 new aircraft. This is about half the aircraft needed to equip our peacetime organization to a reasonable degree of readiness. Deficiencies can be made up in quantity, but not in quality, and then only for the coming year, by using World War II models. It is 2 years from now and later that become most critical since funds appropriated now will provide the aircraft that will be in the fleet 2 years hence.

Deficiencies in numbers of aircraft to be procured are glaringly evident in the fields of those for antisubmarine warfare

and carrier task forces conducting offensive operations in the most forward combat areas. There is an urgent need to correct this situation and the bill now before us must be the start.

The Navy has an urgent requirement, beyond those planes provided for in the bill now before us, to procure 230 additional aircraft of the attack fighter-bomber type and 25 additional aircraft of the patrol 2- and 4-engine type in order to partially improve a most difficult anti-submarine situation. Also, equally urgent is the necessity to procure 152 additional jet fighters in order to permit the carrier-task forces to vigorously and immediately carry an air war to an enemy. Such an early offensive is essential if we are to be strong enough to prevent such catastrophies as the Philippine campaign in 1941 and the seizure of Norway in 1940 by the Germans. Strong carrier-task forces could have prevented both of these fiascos and could have turned utter rout into victory and measurably shortened the global struggle. We now possess the necessary carriers for this assignment in a war of the future, but unless we provide the necessary aircraft, it will be impossible for them to do the job.

The Navy must have a minimum of $300,000,000 additional contract authority now for the procurement of new aircraft. Without this additional authority, we must accept the fact that one of the most important parts of the national air potential, will begin a steady and inescapable decline. No additional cash is required in this bill for this purpose.

What will this $300,000,000 do? It will permit procurement of 1,265 new aircraft instead of 843, an increase of 50 percent. This increase also provides for the armament necessary for the additional planes authorized. All of this increase will be in combat models except for 10 jet trainers. It is important to note that of the 1,265 aircraft that can be purchased, 1,205 will be combat models, fighters, attack, and patrol types. The remaining 60 will be: 5 of the transport type, especially important in view of the Navy participation in Operation Vittles; 20 jet trainers; and 35 helicopters for rescue, observation, and utility services.

As I have indicated before and I want you to note, the planes we provide for in this bill will be the aircraft which will be in the fleet 2 years from now. The United States is fortunate in its unique possession of the aircraft carrier as a weapon of modern warfare. It is only logical that we should exploit to the utmost the great advantage of this potent weapon, combining its effectiveness with the strength of our Air Force in full recognition that the two are mutually complementary.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no reason at this time why the amendment should not be favorably considered by Members of the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to assure the gentleman his amendment has my wholehearted support, but I should like to ask him the effect of his amendment. Is not the effect of the amendment to restore to the appropriation available to the Navy Department for the procurement of aircraft approximately the amount which the Joint Chiefs of Staff requested and the amount which the Budget Bureau reduced?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The answer to the gentleman is "Yes."

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHESNEY. In what way does this program apply in reference to the unification program which the Eightieth Congress passed last year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In my opinion, the Eightieth Congress in passing the legislation it did set forth a given air policy. In other words, in the wisdom of the Congress it thought that it was authorizing a military procedure that was essential in the coming conflict if such were possible or if such happened. However, in the legislative attitude as expressed by the Congress, I do not recall any specific portion of the language of the bill that said the so-called coordinated program should be exclusive of one particular type of operation. It is a unified situation.

Mr. CHESNEY. Is it not true that in the last war the Army air force accomplished the same job that the Navy is attempting to do now?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It did not and it never has and anybody who knows the story realizes that is the fact.

Mr. CHESNEY. Did not the Army air force patrol the Caribbean in connection with submarine warfare?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I grant the gentleman that, but it was the Navy who took MacArthur back home.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It may be well to enlighten the membership of the committee as to just what it would mean to replace our present conventional type of aircraft with jets as far as carrier operations are concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is the difference between the ability to do a job expeditiously and proper under modern scientific conditions with which we will have to contend, or remain an obsolete characteristic. In other words, let us protect the boys who have to fly over the water as well as the boys who fly over land.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It may be well also to explain the advantages of the helicopter from the rescue or life-saving standpoint.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps I could refer to that with some degree of experience because I was the only Member of Congress who went up in the helicopter when they brought it to Washington a few years ago. I know its adaptability to rescue work. Our Forestry Department is using this type of aircraft for fire patrol. We have also used it up in Alaska for various purposes and when we had the deep snow in the West last winter it was used to drop feed and to take care of the families out there in other ways. It has accomplished a great deal scientifically speaking.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that seven-tenths of the surface of the earth is water? Today the Navy has control of that water, and it can go everywhere in the world unhampered. But this is an air age, and it is just so important for the Navy to have control of the air over the sea as it is to have air control over any other part of the surface of the earth. It is the greatest protection to our freedom that we have. Do not weaken but strengthen our naval aviation. Then this country can maintain our true way of life.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the Navy is charged with the direct responsibility of keeping the sea lanes open in order that our commerce may continue to flow and be kept operative, and if we are going to charge them with that responsibility, it is no more than fair and just that we should give them that protection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman state whether or not this amount which has now been advanced by the Joint Chiefs of Staff is not the rock-bottom minimum considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and is a cut-down from the original amount that they considered?

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no question in the world about that. In other words, let us get this record straight. Once the Presidential budget is established, then it becomes imperative upon the part of those who have to deal with that budget to fit themselves within the budget and not ask for any more.

Mr. HÉBERT. They are estopped by the Bureau of the Budget from advancing the cost further.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Absolutely so.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: Page 65, line 5, strike out "$523,070,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$1,099,616,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to restore to the bill the amount eliminated by the point of order. It reinstates the amount stricken out by the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and the substitute close at 5 o'clock, with the last 15 minutes to be reserved for the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. It seems to me we must maintain a balanced program, and when I favor that point of view I am for a truly balanced program for all elements of air power.

Air power as we know it has two component parts in our Military Establishment. We have the Air Force, which has done in the past and, I am sure, will continue in the future to do an outstanding job. However, we must remember the Navy air arm has a different function than that performed by the Air Force.

It so happens that I had some experience during the last war on active duty with the third and fifth fleets in the Pacific. I can assure each and every one of you in this body that most of the job that was done by the Navy Air Corps then, and I think in the future, cannot be done by the Air Force. The Air Force with its land-based planes can and will perform important functions, but the ship-based planes must be available for the special jobs they will be called upon to perform.

I was interested in the statement made earlier in the afternoon by my colleague from South Dakota in which he quoted General LeMay as saying that the B–29 gave protection to our Pacific carrier task groups. With all due deference to the statement made by General LeMay, I cannot under any circumstances see how a group of B–29's could protect a task group of carriers or any group of Navy ships. It is just not practicable. The only way you can protect carriers is by fighter escort and torpedo bombers, the F–6's and the TBM's, or other comparable planes. For B–29's to protect carriers is absolutely absurd.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is possible the B–29 could have been given a target to keep enemy planes grounded while the operation from the carrier was being conducted.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. They may have had a mission to cover the airfields and keep the planes from taking off, but for B–29's to stay at 30,000 feet and in that way give protection to a group of carriers is, I repeat, absolutely absurd.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not intend to say that it was a practical thing. I was only pointing out that it was a rather impractical thing to tie up some B–29's to drop 2,000 tons of bombs on a secondary target so that our Navy planes could drop 600 on a primary target. It would have been much more practical, it seems to me, to let the B–29's go on to the primary target.

Mr. FORD. I agree with that statement.

In the operation of carriers off the coast of Japan, off the coast of the Philippines, and off the coast of Okinawa our bombing planes got ample protection from the carrier fighter planes. Carrier bombing planes got very little protection from the Air Force escorting planes while operating in the Pacific.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. It was impossible for the Air Force to afford coverage either at Okinawa or at Leyte. The Navy had to furnish their own coverage, the gentleman knows that.

Mr. FORD. I certainly do.

Mr. RIVERS. It was not possible for the Air Force to do that.

Mr. FORD. The Air Force did not have the bases or the planes and the Air Force in the future in such operations would be similarly handicapped.

Mr. RIVERS. There was no way for them to do it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I should like to endorse the statement the gentleman has just made, for I, too, had the privilege of serving in the Naval Air Corps; and I might observe that the Navy air arm did 75 percent of the work in the Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, may I make this plain at the beginning. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] restores the $576,000,000 that was stricken out by the point of order made by the gentleman from New York and adds thereto $300,000,000 to keep the Navy in the air business and not abolish naval aviation. The sum and substance of this amendment is to retain to the Navy the naval aviation.

We have signed the Atlantic Pact. If we do not give the Navy $300,000,000 for naval aviation and research, we will have signed the death warrant of naval aviation, make no mistake about that.

I think there is enough glory in the United States and in the world for all of our services to get along in absolute harmony. There is plenty of glory for the Air Force, for the Army, and for the Navy in their primary and allocated missions. I was terribly disturbed a little while ago when the chairman of this great Committee on Appropriations made some statements on the floor which I trust and fervently pray he will correct, because they are without foundation in fact. He made the statement, and I hope he will correct it, that the Navy did not have planes which could fly over 500 miles. I tell you—and I know whereof I speak—that we have planes that can fly 2,500 miles and return; and we have planes that can do even better than that.

In addition I state as a fact that they can carry atomic bombs. I state as another fact that they can return to carriers. To get up on the floor and make a statement of that kind is doing a disservice to the great record of the Navy and belying the things that the Navy can do, things that no other branch of the service dare attempt to do. Say, for instance, that we did not have carrier-based planes. What I am about to say is in all deference to the Air Force. I want you to remember that the Navy and the Air Force are getting along all right. We are going to give $800,000,000 to the Air Force because they are entitled to it, but it does not follow that the Navy is not entitled to their glory, which they have earned. Say, for instance, that we do not have carriers to patrol the coast of Europe when that war with Russia comes—which I hope is long delayed. Our carrier-based planes will keep the forces of the enemy strewn all over Europe, because they will not know where the carrier-based planes are going to strike. But land-based planes will be attacked, because they will know where they are coming from. The chairman of the committee said another thing. He said that we have to win the war in 3 weeks. If we do not win the war in 3 weeks, take it from me that there will be no bases in continental Europe, because the Russian Army can kick any army off of continental Europe in 6 weeks. I know. London and Great Britain will be a shambles. If you do not have carried-based planes, you will not carry on, and your Navy will have been wiped out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is really a pity that we hear on the floor of the House today talk apparently from those who are experts in the field of aviation—both Army and Naval Air. But I want to speak a word for that branch of the service, namely, Naval Air only because for a period of 10 years I served on the Committee on Naval Affairs up to the time of the consolidation of the Military Affairs Committee with the Committee on Naval Affairs 2 years ago. Down through the period of years we followed with a great deal of interest the magnificent job, not only that the Navy as a whole has done, but the naval air arm in those most dangerous days in the Pacific area when they had so little and so few things to fight with; in those days when they were using torpedo boats as destroyers. They were making the best of the situation that they were dealing with. Only a brief word can be said about this amendment to put it clearly before the Members of the House, and that is whether or not we want to maintain the efficiency of the authorized strength of the air arm of the Navy or whether, because we refuse by the adoption of this amendment offered by the gentleman from California, to provide enough planes to maintain the naval air arm on an efficient basis. If this amendment is defeated, I say to you men and women, Members of the House, that in relatively few years, because of the lack of replacements in the Navy program, the efficiency of the naval air arm will be cut just in half. That is the thought we want to keep in mind as we vote today on this amendment, which I am wholeheartedly in favor of. We must also keep in mind that 80 percent of the planes the Navy now has were purchased in 1945 or in the years before. It is important, it seems to me, in this unsettled world we are now living in, that we maintain the efficiency of the armed

forces in a balanced status. This amendment was recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Many other things have been cut out by the Bureau of the Budget down through the years, but in this case I am referring to the needs of the air arm for the Navy and trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I just stated to my very dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services that we have the best illustration of the integration of the armed services when the chairman of that committee moved his forces in here on the floor this afternoon to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, I find I am somewhat confused, as are some of the other Members of Congress, in knowing just what is the right thing to do. There is not a man or woman in this House who does not want to do the thing to provide for the security of the Nation and to give the funds that are necessary to implement it. The Appropriations Subcommittee lists some very distinguished men among its membership. They have heard this testimony over a period of weeks and they have given careful thought to the problems involved. If the amendment of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], be adopted, if you grant the entire budget estimate for this item, you will still fall far short of what was requested. We are told that the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended $343,000,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget has recommended. The fact of the matter is, as I read the hearings, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff came up with a program which asked for $30,000,000,000 to put this country on a war footing right now. That was then scaled down to $23,000,000,000; and after meeting, after meeting, after meeting, they finally scaled their requests down and came to agreement under the President's prodding and pressure, and the over-all ceiling established at the amounts that are submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. If you give this $343,000,000 you are not coming anywhere near the amount of money that the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended to the Bureau of the Budget.

Whom are we going to believe in this matter; that is the thing that bothers me. Pick up the hearings and look at the first page. There is the testimony of Secretary Sullivan. He represents the Navy; he is supposed to speak for the Navy, and this is what he says:

> Though the total proposed appropriations for the Navy are $600,000,000 less than the naval appropriations for the current fiscal year, the Navy accepts and completely supports President Truman's budget.

I understand thoroughly that he is an appointee of the President, he is the Cabinet officer; and I understand that he is not permitted to come out and support anything other than the Bureau of the Budget estimate. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I thoroughly understand that, but if the situation were in reality $343,000,000 as the absolute minimum, why are you asking for $300,000,000? Why not $343,000,000? Why have you again scaled it down by $43,000,000? I think you ought to support the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations that has given this thing very great study.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as I tried to explain a few moments ago, the appropriations for cash and contract authorizations for the procurement of aircraft for both the Air Force and the Navy have been reduced approximately to 80 percent of what these services originally thought was necessary to build themselves to the proper strength necessary, not to win a war, but to prevent the losing of a war at the very outset of hostilities. I have no disagreement with the desire of the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from California, my beloved colleagues, to put the Navy on a par with what it ought to be in accordance with plan B that was submitted to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board; but at the same time I think that if they take that position they must logically also take the position of increasing the Air Force appropriations for the procurement of aircraft by the 20 percent which they have been cut; otherwise, their position is not logical.

I should like also to call to the attention of my colleagues one very important fact: As we know from reading the press, General Eisenhower is down in Key West right now, delegated to go there by the Secretary of Defense to attempt to obtain some kind of agreement between the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to exactly what will be the roles and missions of the various components of the armed forces. We called attention to that conflict among the Joint Chiefs last year in the Eightieth Congress in the Congressional Aviation Policy Board's report. Full agreement has not yet been accomplished. As matters stand today, evidently they have been given a specific sum from the Bureau of the Budget which said: "Whack it up, boys; divide it three ways, and each one of you do what you think you can with it." The Committee on Appropriations has done differently; they have attempted to obtain full justification for these programs and to bring here a bill which is fair to all concerned; and I think it does a better job of defending the United States from the appropriation standpoint than has been done by the Bureau of the Budget. I compliment the committee for the bill they have brought in. At the same time I call the attention of my friend from Georgia to the fact that if he is going to be consistent he must also support a further increase in the budget for the Air Force, because he himself says that, under the present bill, to arrive at the 70-group air force will take 2 years longer under the appropriations included in the present budget than he and I both think should be the outside limit in time. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if that is not true?

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact, with the $800,000,000 made available now, it will be 1954 before we will have a 70-air group.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct, and the target date which has been given to all of us for the setting up of our Air Force and our Naval Air arm, our entire Military Establishment, is 1952.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. And not 1954.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COFFEY].

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that has been going on here for 2 days, mainly concerned with an increase in Air Force appropriations over those of the Navy and Army. I am in wholehearted agreement with the committee; therefore, I find that the reoccurrence of the Maginot Line type of thinking in this House is somewhat alarming.

Now, it is to be expected that the Navy and Army "brass" would feel that way. The Navy, in particular, having been the first line of defense for 150 years, refuses to admit that they no longer have the answer to the defense problem. The admirals are putting up a gallant fight; they spare no effort each week end. They sacrifice themselves and their crew members in order to take a luxury cruise on the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* to prove its value to the visiting Congressmen. They are die-hards, but they are surely dying, and they will possibly go down with the supercarrier.

Of course, there is a lot of basis to many of their arguments. The Navy having its own army—the Marine Corps—and its own air force does a very efficient job; however, by the same token, the Army would perhaps be better pleased and perhaps a little more efficient if they had their own air force and their own navy. I am sure that the Air Force would be positively delighted to have its own air-borne army, and the marines are peculiarly adapted to this role, and also its own navy. Everyone would be much happier, but, unfortunately, we just cannot afford it.

We will, very shortly, pass a record peacetime budget. This is necessary, but we cannot continue along this road much further. We have just about reached our saturation point.

The United States is the greatest stabilizing force in the world only as long as it remains economically healthy. We cannot, therefore, under present conditions, with our present commitments abroad spend more than sixteen billions on the national defense. This is insufficient to prepare for war. Indeed, yesterday, the gentleman from Texas stated it would require almost four times this amount to put us into readiness for war, and most all of the Members know the terrible cost of war, if it should come.

Therefore, I submit to you that we are approaching this matter from the wrong direction. Since we are unable to afford

war preparation, we must utilize this sum to the greatest possible advantage. Now, it is not our wish to prepare for war. It is our wish to prevent war. How can we do that? Their answer is simple. We are manifestly unable to match Russia on the ground, for every division we can arm in Europe, they can place in opposition one army. They are not afraid of our Navy. They have no Navy except for the Snorkel submarine. They do not require one. They are content to wait until our great fleets approach and then wipe them from the oceans by air power. There is only one way we can touch Russia and that is by air power. Therefore, if our wish is to prevent and not to fight war let us invest the major part of our limited funds in the only weapon for which Russia has fear.

I do not believe this is a new strategic concept. It is known that air power has been cried from the roof tops for years, but I do think the Members of this great body should accept the facts of life and face reality.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, let the Committee clearly understand the issue. Under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California, it means that we would have 1,265 modern, up-to-date planes. Under the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], it means that you will only have 843 planes. Now, that is the issue.

The committee said that the Navy should have 7,783 active planes in commission; but, on the other hand, it said the Navy can only build annually 843. You cannot have 7,783 active planes if you are only permitted to build or purchase annually 843 planes. So, to carry out the mandate of the committee to have 7,783 planes, it is necessary to increase the yearly contract authorization or the yearly purchases of new aircraft. So the gentleman from California is trying to be consistent, as are other members of the subcommittee when he says, "We accept the figure of 7,783." But, you must build more than 843. You must build at least 422 more, which would be 1,265. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said that when the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended 1,361 planes it was based upon a budget of $23,000,000,000. He is absolutely in error. It was based upon a budget of $17,500,000,000, which the Secretary of National Defense sent to the Bureau of the Budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff said that you must have 1,361 planes annually to maintain 7,783 planes. Now, that is the whole issue. You cannot figure is out any other way. Because a plane is only good for 6 years, the present total of 843 planes is wholly inadequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support this amendment because I think the obligations of this country have been spread so far that the best thing we can do is to protect our own interest. I think this is a very effective way to do it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman have reference to the Sheppard amendment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman make that plain, again.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think you all understand my position on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with this bill, and the one that has been reported and will come up tomorrow, the Congress will have increased the amount of funds available to departments between four and five billion dollars above what they had for the current fiscal year. On the 18th of May last the Congress passed a bill appropriating $588,000,000 for the construction of airplanes for the Navy. With that they were able to let contracts for 1,223. Now with $643,000,000 they are talking about only 843. It just does not make sense.

What the Navy needs is carriers of the smaller variety that are equipped with moderate-sized planes that can cruise around within a radius of 500 miles, or so, and look out for these Snorkel submarines. That is their job in the airplane field. With the money that is here provided they are set up to have 15 groups of planes of 100 each and 4 smaller ones this year. Next year they are expected to reduce from 15 to 14 the number of the large groups and to increase the number of the smaller groups from 4 to 8. They will have 1,071 coming in on the contracts that have already been let, and if they are given this money they will have that many the following year. There is no point in our going ahead beyond these figures. We will have provided what the Navy needs. The Navy already has over 10,000 planes; really, it has 14,000, and the Army probably 20,000, but the Navy has enough good planes so that it can continue to operate for quite some time. If we go ahead now and build a lot of new planes, they will be half obsolete, and instead of taking care of the situation and having the most modern planes if anything should happen, and when the planes that we have in storage are worn out, we will just not be as well off as we would be if we postponed some of this construction until a little later.

We have plenty now to take care of whatever situation might arise. We have planes in the Air Force, where they are building and developing the large planes. There is no sense in our going ahead and building more of the Navy planes at this time, these small planes that they need. We should try to conserve some of our money.

If we adopt the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] it will add $300,000,000 to the appropriation, and instead of being $4,000,000,000 above last year it will be nearly $5,000,000,000. We ought not to get into that kind of a proposition. If we get into any more increases, we are going to be in a situation where we cannot avoid a tax bill. It seems to me that our people do not want to be voting here in this Congress for more appropriations and then get in the position where we vote against a tax bill. We are going to have to have a tax bill that will take 40 to 45 percent of the disposable income of the people if we go on with the spending programs that have been proposed. We must begin to think about that and conserve our energy and conserve our materials so that we will have something to fight with if we have trouble. It seems to me we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and not go above the committee report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is most unusual for me ever to take the floor in support of a proposal providing for the expenditure of larger amounts of money, and I would not do so at this time if it were not that I felt so sincerely that this amendment should be adopted that I cannot remain silent. As I see it, the committe action indicates a trend which, if carried out, in the near future will spell the end of Navy aviation. I doubt very seriously that any Member of this Congress would deliberately and consciously vote to dismantle and scrap our naval forces, but most certainly if we adopt a policy, even though for the moment it may be indicating a trend, which will deny to the Navy the use of the air in the performance of its naval mission, then we might just as well take from the seas every single combat vessel we own, because without the full and unrestricted use of the air by the Navy in the performance of its missions it might better never undertake the missions at all.

It is difficult for me to understand upon what basis of justification this committee can increase the amounts allocated to the Air Force by $800,000,000 beyond the amount the budget allowed the Air Force for the procurement of aviation and yet, at the same time, say to the Navy that they should have no increase.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while he and I have listened here this afternoon to budget, budget, budget, that particular part of the budget was never considered downtown. It came in up here.

Mr. COLE of New York. It should be borne in mind that this committee has

recommended for procurement by the Air Force $800,000,000 worth of airplanes beyond what the budget recommended. It is my own personal notion that while the committee did quite right in reducing the $800,000,000 which had been set up for universal military training and setting it up for procurement of aircraft, the $800,000,000 should have been distributed in some appropriate fashion between the Air Force and naval aviation, so that both services could take advantage of that amount of money in procurement of aircraft.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am happy that the gentleman from New York, one of the ablest and hardest working members of our Committee on Armed Services, has issued this solemn warning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania served with great distinction both in World War I and in World War II. He served in the Navy in the last conflict, in the Pacific. Is it not a fact that not one single aircraft carrier of any country in World War II was sunk by land-based planes?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not also a fact that no carrier of the Essex type was sunk by any form of attack?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Yet some people think that naval aviation is outmoded. It contributed more to our victory in the Pacific than any other one thing.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Without it we probably would have lost the war in the Pacific.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the gentlemen have not forgotten the Battle of Midway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the Committee that the majority of the members of the House Committee on Armed Services are supporting the Sheppard amendment. Let me remind you the Committee on Armed Services is composed of men who have served on the old Committee on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of the House for many years. In addition there are several freshmen, like myself, who have had military service, who serve on the committee. Over a period of years the committee has been constantly briefed on world conditions. We have been told by spokesmen for our military services what we need to give to the American people the security to which they are entitled. With this knowledge the majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services today support the Sheppard amendment.

We all know that each branch of our Armed Services has been given a mission. We know that the Chief of Staff of each branch of our Armed Services is charged with the responsibility of keeping his force in a state of readiness to carry out that mission. Therefore the Navy is simply asking the Congress of the United States for planes—replacements is what it amounts to—so that the Navy, including its naval air arm will be in a state of readiness to fulfill its assigned mission.

A moment ago I mentioned replacements. I would like to address myself at this time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and ask him this question: Is it not true that the planes to be provided by the additional $300,000,000, which your amendment provides for, will simply provide modern planes to replace those that will become obsolete in a matter of several years?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will provide modern combat types of planes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I qualify my answer by saying, of course, with the exception of helicopters. My answer to the gentleman's question is that my amendment will provide planes to replace all combat type planes with the exception of helicopters.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Navy carrier groups are being modernized and that the conventional type of airplane is being laid aside, and the jet type is taking its place.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Unless we have a flow of modern aircraft into the Navy, we will not be able to keep the naval air groups modernized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no question about it. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In regard to the helicopter, is it not a necessary part of carrier operations, and used effectively for lifesaving purposes?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The testimony was to the effect that it is absolutely necessary for lifesaving purposes, not only in carrier work, but in other ramifications of the same type of work.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I do hope that the committee will accept the Sheppard amendment so that our armed forces will be kept at the degree of readiness necessary to carry out the mission assigned them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to delay the committee longer, but I do want it understood that so far as I am concerned, this is not a question of measuring dollars with one breach of our military service as against another branch. I have no such intention. I do not want anyone to misconstrue my approach to the problem in such a fashion. I say to you that the Navy's air arm is rapidly becoming obsolescent. If you charge them with the duties of protecting our operations on the high seas, then you should obviously give them air protection upon the same basis as you would any other branch of our military service. I can see no other approach to this problem except on that basis. I am sure of that, because I have made it my business on many vacations, instead of going home, to visit the military installations throughout the United States and elsewhere. I think I am reasonably conversant with what is going on, so far as obsolescence in the naval air branch is concerned. I say to you that if we are going to respond to our obligation, if we charge the Navy with keeping the sea lanes open, and if we charge the Navy with fighting the pigboats and the submarines, which have already reached a greater degree of numbers than in this country, then in the name of decency let us give the air protection to which the Navy is entitled.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that the aircraft carrier, as far as the Navy task forces have been concerned in the last war, and in the present disposition, is the center of the task force? It is the heart, and unless you have it adequately protected you will have the same thing we had in the last war when carriers without adequate radar and zonar went out but never returned; instances when men went out in planes and never returned, but had they had adequate equipment we would have had a much better striking force; but they did a lot with what they had.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the gentleman's experience merits careful attention; he speaks with far greater experience than I, for he was in combat and I was not.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. CHESNEY. Does the gentleman believe that the carrier will win the next war in time of battle?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly I do not; I would be stupid if I believed that, just as anybody else would be stupid to believe that air alone could win the next war; it takes a combination of the three services to make a success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the 500 airplanes before the Second World War; I have never regretted it. I have been very much shocked and rather terrified at the effort that it seems to me is being made to scrap and weaken naval air. I certainly will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I merely wish to make the observation as one who participated in the island-hopping operations in the Pacific in common with a great many other Members of the House that we could not possibly have done the job, we could not have obtained the bases that were so vital to us if we had not had the close air support that was given at that time by tactical aircraft from the aircraft carriers.

I gather that this amendment does not deal with strategic air, but that it deals with the air power which is actually necessary in close support of combat

troops going ashore. I feel very deeply about the matter from personal experience. It was not because the Army did not want to support us, it was only because they did not have the available bases from which to launch the close-up support needed by the ground troops.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Seven-tenths of the surface of the earth is covered by the sea. At the present time our Navy has control of these vast ocean areas. Since this is the age of air power, our Navy must possess completely adequate air equipment to insure the continuance of its controls over these sea areas of the world. Naval air power is every bit as important as land air power. Remember this: Throughout history, both ancient and modern, that nation which controlled the sea was the leading nation in the world, and no nation who has failed to control the sea ever became great.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LATHAM. I hope that this amendment is adopted. I think it is tremendously important to the security of this country that it be adopted. I would remind you that in one specific island campaign, just one, 7,000 Japanese planes were shot down, and of those 7,000 planes, 4,155 were shot down by the naval air arm. I believe that were we to permit either the decline or the demise of the naval air arm, we would be removing and destroying the single most important force that we have in this country today for the protection of your family and mine, and of your country and mine.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that unless we approve this amendment that the air strength of the United States Navy in relatively few years will be cut in half?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That would seem to be in the cards.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is why the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended the additional appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is so.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. As a matter of fact, naval aviation will not be cut in half; it will be cut one-third of what the Congress a year ago directed and authorized; naval aviation will be cut one-third instead of one-half.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and with this momentous bill before us it is incredible that that be done.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] are certainly in position to know that naval air strength is vitally needed, from their combat experience in the past war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized.

Mr. SIKES. The Committee has been told repeatedly, and I say it again, today we seek only to keep from crippling naval aviation in the coming years; we are not asking for more personnel; we are not asking for more ships; we are asking only for the planes that we know are going to be needed. We are asking for 1,265 additional planes, almost altogether of combat type, the newest improved combat planes, instead of the 843 which are now provided under the bill.

Why do we need more planes? Because aircraft burn out fast. Let us take a look at the figures of planes on hand. The current inventory is 14,000 naval planes, currently operating 7,765, but in 1955, if we do not vote for the Sheppard amendment, there will be in the Navy inventory only 4,121 planes and operating only 2,984 planes. Whereas if you vote for the Sheppard amendment, there will be in 1955, 5,660 planes in the inventory and 4,141 planes operating.

There are 22 groups of naval air in addition to trainers and other type planes. The Navy's part of the defense requires more planes in the coming years than will be available under the bill. In other words, the Navy cannot properly carry on its part of the job if it is not allowed to build up its incoming stock of new planes faster than the current bill will permit. Why? Because of the fact that planes do burn out fast. Obsolescence is a very important factor. Attrition constantly eats away planes. There is only an average life of 6 years for a plane from the time it is made until it is outdated or worn out or wrecked. Even planes in mothballs will not last indefinitely.

We have talked here about the functions of the Navy. Let me reiterate very briefly some of the things that naval air is called on to do in its job of helping to defend the peace and to protect this Nation against emergencies.

We pointed out what naval air can do. A carrier-based plane has recently flown from one coast to the other coast and all the way back to th carrier from whence it started. We pointed out that carrier-based Navy planes today carry the heaviest bomb load of any fighter planes in the world. We pointed out that Jimmy Doolittle struck the first blow on the Japanese homeland when he took off from carriers with bombers and though he did not go back to those carriers the Navy now has heavier planes, larger planes, which every day take off from carriers and return to those carriers.

Yes, the Navy is doing a job. It has a historic function to perform in carrying on antisubmarine and mine warfare. We have not touched very much today on this. Yet may I remind you that in the beginning of World War II Hitler had only about 50 submarines. He implemented that number very rapidly, but at the beginning he only had about 50 submarines and with them he very nearly drove shipping from the seas. Naval air has an equally important part in mine warfare and countermine measures. Each of these functions appears slated to occupy a much more important place in our own defense in future warfare than heretofore.

The Navy will need all the planes which the Sheppard amendment would permit. This is a proposal of much importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised to hear so many friends of the Navy accuse our subcommittee of scuttling and sinking the Navy. If the Navy is being scuttled and sunk with its air force, it will take down to Davy Jones' locker $5,018,873,600 of appropriations provided for in this bill. If the Navy is not getting an adequate number of planes with that money, it is because they are spending the money for super carriers and other weapons than airplanes. When they presented their estimates these planes did not become important, but the super carriers were. It is only when they saw a chance of getting $300,000,000 more that these planes became so important.

Let us see what the story is here. We started out with a $30,000,000,000 request from the various bureaus and divisions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The amount of $23,000,000,000 was submitted to the Chiefs of Staff. The Chiefs of Staff sent to the President $16,900,000,000, and finally, when it got down to the budget, they asked for $14,400,000,000.

The President sent this budget back to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for further reduction. He sent it back because it still was too high "in view of the military needs and the economic aspects of our national defense and our economic and financial resources."

Then they came back up with another budget for $14,497,000,000. That was sent back down again by the President with a ceiling which was apportioned by the Army, the Navy and the Air Corps. The Navy share in cash and contract authorizations was $5,000,000,000 and the Navy determined how much of that $5,000,000,000 was to go to air, how much for ships and how this sum was to be spent. If they are short of airplanes in this bill it is because they themselves, Mr. Chairman, did not put them in.

In the budget of $14,997,000,000 the Army finally received $4,434,000,000. They were cut $476,000,000. Nobody talks about raising that. Then the Navy was given $4,624,000,000 cash plus contract authorizations, and they were reduced to $4,347,000,000 cash, plus the contract authorization, a reduction of $271,000,000. That is the budget Secretary Sullivan said he supported. The Air Force was reduced accordingly. The reason this committee put in that $800,000,000 for the Air Force was because the House itself had taken it out of the committee's hands last year and increased the

Air Force. That was a mandate of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Navy will have 1,071 planes delivered in 1951 out of the 1948 appropriation. They will have an additional 993 more which will be delivered in 1951 and 1952 out of 1949 and 1950 funds. That is over 2,000 planes for the 2-year period.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to stand by the amount fixed by the President as allocated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that the substitute motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was offered by the gentleman at my request in order that I might, under the parliamentary procedure, have the privilege of closing the debate on the question before the House. I had prepared the motion and would have offered it myself except for that situation.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the shortness of the time which I have I should like not to yield for any questions, and in view of that fact I shall be very careful to quote the record straight.

This committee has worked hard on this bill, about 7 hours per day for 11 weeks, and I want you to know I appreciate the fine support which you have given us in declining even to accept one amendment. But this is the major contest of the day, and it is tremendously important.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been a little bit disappointed that some people have been looking backward to the bases in the Pacific. Does anybody in the House think we are about to give up those bases where American boys fought, bled, and died? No. We have funds in the bill to make our continued possession of those bases a reality, and I want the American people to know that their sons will not have to die again for the conquest of Guam and Saipan and those other bases that Members have made reference to. We already have those bases, and we do not propose to give them up.

Now, as to the bases in the Atlantic, we have two B–29 groups stationed in England that roam the skies in that part of the world, and the evidence is pretty good that the British do not intend to give up those bases in time of emergency or war. They are a tenacious people. Let us look forward in our consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made that we are running counter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been made so often that I am afraid some of you will take it seriously. We are not running counter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In the Cannon amendment we are doing exactly what the Joint Chiefs of Staff say. In other words, the President said, "Gentlemen of the Military Establishment, you can have about $15,000,000,000; that is all we can spend, because there is about $8,000,000,000 more that we are going to spend on national defense in other undertakings, such as atomic energy, and so forth."

So, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sat down and they agreed on the budget, and this budget is the budget of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under the ceiling established by the President, so please do not be misled by suggestions to the contrary.

Moreover, one of my distinguished friends said, "It looks as if we are going to dismantle and scrap the Navy." If the Navy is so poorly operated that it cannot on $5,000,000,000 run a pretty decent establishment, there is something radically wrong with the Navy. Five billion dollars is more than we gave the Navy last year, with more for aviation than we provided last year, and people shout, "They are going to scrap the Navy." Oh, but they say, "Yes, but you are going to scrap the air force of the Navy." The Navy was told by the President and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Mr. Navy, you have about $5,000,000,000. Now, you spend it as you think you would like to spend it, Mr. Navy." And Mr. Navy said, "I am going to spend it this way." So it was the Navy that decided on the 800 planes to add to the 14,000 planes they already have. Scrap the Navy? What strange words, in view of the cold facts in this situation.

If the Navy had wanted to say as to this supercarrier, which was never actually approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and is going to cost about $200,000,000, "We will not lay the keel next week on that, we want to buy some more planes with that money," they could have done it.

I do not know of a Navy man in or out of Washington who will say that in the event of another war the battleship will be used to fire a single shot—a single shot—yet the Navy is spending huge sums to operate the battleship *Missouri*. Who made that decision? The Navy. Yet the battleship serves as a training ship and is of service in this respect. If the Navy desired to utilize the $5,000,000,000 in a different type program it could have planned to do so. Everybody agrees that $5,000,000,000 is enough for the Navy. Why did not the Navy change its plans and present a program that is adequate and that we can support? I say, for my money, $5,000,000,000 is enough for the Navy, as $6,000,000,000 is for the Air Force and $4,400,000,000 for the Army, under all the circumstances. Frankly, I think the Navy has a fairly good program. Under the plans the Navy will remain strong in the air and otherwise.

Let me get this point over to you. This amendment is for the buying of planes. Here I have a statement from the Navy as to what will be needed to put into operation this amendment. It shows that additional military and civilian personnel will be required. It seems to me the present 360,000 civilian employees which the Navy has is adequate.

I do not see why we should fail to remember that this is the biggest peacetime military bill in history, $2,000,000,000 above what it was last year. Have we not gone far enough? The taxpayers who are going to have to pay additional taxes if the sums in this bill are increased above the committee recommendations will be disposed to agree that $5,000,000,000 is enough for the Navy. If that means scrapping the Navy, heaven help the Navy.

The Navy has an important part to play. It is to command the seas, the surface of the seas and beneath the surface of the seas. The Navy has the problem of ships. The Air Force has the primary problem of the air, according to the decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at Key West. Wherever possible the Air Force will help the Navy on the water and the Navy will help the Air Force in the air, but primarily the air is for the United States Air Force.

Let us not look back. If war breaks out tomorrow, we have a pretty good guess with whom it will be. We know that the reason it has not already broken out is perhaps the fact that we have the atomic bomb and we have the planes to carry the bomb to the interior of those faraway places, to the population and industrial centers of the potential enemy. The greatest deterrent to a potential enemy today is the United States Air Force.

Our Navy is incomparable. We are not threatened as far as the Navy is concerned. What navy can meet us on the seas? None whatever. That is not where our weakness lies. The possibility of weakness is in the air. That is where the threat of 15,000 planes belonging to the possible potential enemy might give us trouble. Let us fight for those things that help us where we most need help. If war comes the decisive operations will be in the air.

That is the reason why we kicked the budget overboard and used our own judgment in providing additional funds for the United States Air Force. But please let us not try to divide the defense dollar into three equal parts. You should have seen General Eisenhower smile when he made reference to the strange coincidence of each service requesting approximately the same number of dollars. You know it is not right. We cannot be all things to all people. We have to do our duty and stand forthright. We are not the servants of the Army and Navy and the Air Force. We are the servants of the American people. Likewise, the services, too, are the servants of the American people. I plead with you to defeat the amendment and stand fast for the bill as written.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendments read again for the information of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be read.

There was no objection.

The amendments were again read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHEPPARD) there were—ayes 125, noes 63.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, would a unanimous consent request be in order at this time to restore the language stricken out on the point of order at page 65?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the pending amendment should be disposed of first.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, as amended by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services at the seat of Government for the Marine Corps, $3,505,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, permit a question?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. FLOOD. Can the chairman assure us that there is nothing in the appropriation bill with reference to the Marine Corps that will in any way endanger the existence of the Corps in its traditional entity in the armed forces?

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing whatever in the bill which would in any way endanger the Marine Corps; the Marine Corps has received the kindest treatment of all of the armed services by the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I was sure that the members of this distinguished committee, from their long experience and knowledge of the armed forces would be the first to rally to the defense of the greatest combat unit in any nation in the world, the United States Marine Corps.

Paraphrasing a few words of the great historian, Macaulay, and adding a couple of lines of the great hymn of the Marine Corps, let me say that when the Washington Monument shall have sunk into the Potomac, when the dome of this great Capitol shall have fallen into dust, the Marine Corps will be on duty and true to its motto "Semper Fidelis." Mr. Chairman, if the Army and the Navy and the Air Force "ever look at heaven's scenes, they will find the streets are guarded by United States Marines."

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, procurement, and contract modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and accessories therefor; electronic and communication equipment, detection and warning systems, and specialized equipment; expansion of public plants, and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants for the foregoing purposes; industrial mobilization, including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and procurement planning; transportation of things and personal services in the field; to remain available until expended, $1,100,000,000, of which $875,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes including not to exceed $75,000,000 for payment, during the current fiscal year, of obligations incurred prior to June 30, 1946, against the appropriation "Air Corps, Army," 1942–46; and, in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes in an amount not to exceed $1,992,755,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation "Air Corps, Army," 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1950, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder prior to July 1, 1947.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 67, line 14, strike out "$1,992,755,000" and insert "$1,415,000,000."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, when this committee started reading this bill I offered an amendment and stated that I meant to give the committee an opportunity to restore the total authorizations and appropriations for the armed services to the figure proposed by the President. The amendment offered at the outset of the bill would have restored $54,000,000 of the increase made by this committee. The amendment I am offering will restore $577,000,000 more. The two added together reach the total of $631,000,000, which is the amount by which the President's budget estimates for the armed forces were increased by the action of the Committee on Appropriations in this bill.

The Presidential recommendations are for the large sum of $1,415,000,000 for Air Force procurement. I propose to restore that figure in this bill; that is what the amendment is. I believe it should be voted and I hope it will be.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment is to cut the Air Force to a 48-group force instead of the 58-group force recommended by the committee.

Mr. COUDERT. My intention, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, is to rely upon the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President and his advisers as to the total amount that should be appropriated for such purpose, and that amount is $1,415,000,000, which is the amount in my amendment. I believe the amendment should be adopted; and, frankly, I think nothing else is justified.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Should the committee adopt the gentleman's amendment, the effect is to maintain only a 48-group air force; in other words, we strike down the five-hundred-and-some-odd millions that the committee put in to provide for the maintenance of the 58-group air force.

Mr. COUDERT. That may well be the effect of it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the hearings. The proposal has been made to increase the amount of the appropriation for the Air Force and naval air. The new Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, stated on page 245 of the supplemental hearings:

The President's program is the one I expect to support.

Further than that, on page 18 of the original hearings, Air Force Secretary Symington said:

The Air Force is supporting the 48-group program.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Members of the House that if they want to completely repudiate the President, the Secretary of National Defense, the entire national-defense establishments, and the chiefs of staff, then vote down my amendment. If they want to support those individuals above mentioned, vote for it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Some things have been said here today which I might have resented had I been in a state of mind to resent them.

Mr. COUDERT. I am sure the gentleman is never in such a state of mind.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I have served upon the Committee on Military Affairs for some years with other gentlemen of that committee. When they say I do not know anything about what is going on in this country or abroad or anywhere else, having served on the Committee on Appropriations having to do with the Navy, and having been chairman of it, and when they try to tell me that some new man as budget officer knows more about the Navy and more about the necessities of the Navy and more about what the War Department should have than I do, I must take issue with them.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I do this more or less to express my own views in general over what has occurred today. It is extremely refreshing and most interesting to see so many gentlemen on the other side of the aisle presently supporting the Presidential budget. May I say it is one of the most gratifying things I have witnessed in a long, long time.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman object to support of the President when he is right on those rare occasions?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I reserve the right to take my own attitude on that. I also refuse to adopt the general policy that the gentleman is momentarily laying down, politically speaking, because I think that is what my people elected me to do.

I do think it is a mighty splendid thing and I sincerely trust you gentlemen will concur in the future program of the President as you have in this one.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would undo the work of the committee, a work which is undoubtedly concurred in almost unanimously by all Members of the House. We are taking a step toward the so-called 70-group program. Our present bill provides for about 58 groups, and insofar as I know, there is no serious objection in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further remarks to make except that I hope the committee will vote today as it has on previous occasions on this important issue.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the adoption of this amendment would undo some of the work we started out to do last year when we provided funds for a 70 air group?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We do not want to blow hot today and cold tomorrow. We do not want a start-today-and-stop-tomorrow-program. We want to follow through with a consistent program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of the bill? If not, the Chair will consider the offering of amendments.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to page 65 of the bill where a point or order was raised by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I ask unanimous consent that the language stricken out on a point of order be restored in order that there will be a contract authorization rather than cash. I understand that is the suggestion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. That was my suggestion and I am delighted to acquiesce in it.

Mr. MAHON. And we thereby reduce the cash sums as they were agreed to in the amendment and substitute the printed text of the original bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman should specify the exact portion of the bill, including page and line, in order that there will be no question as to what is stricken out or is not stricken out.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's point is well taken. I refer to line 5, page 65, reinsert this language:

until expended, $523,070,000, of which $418,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $576,546,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the Chairman of the subcommittee explain this point? I think there is some confusion on it. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] offered an amendment which I think picked up the $576,546,000 which appears on page 65, line 10 of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Because of the fact that the language referred to by the gentleman from Texas had been stricken out.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, if the language is put back into the bill, what effect does that have upon the Cannon amendment?

Mr. MAHON. That language will be as read, and on line 5, the sum which in the amendment was $1,099,616,000 will be stricken out and we will have the substitution for the other sum as printed in the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, we revert to the original language in the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Precisely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the Scrivner amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 70, line 13, after the words "as authorized by law", insert a comma and the following: "*Provided, however,* That no part of these funds shall be spent for blue uniforms or parts thereof."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this amendment cannot possibly generate as much controversy or heat as the two previous amendments have. However, this amendment is important in two ways; important in principle and important in economy. The Air Force intended about a year ago to put its airmen, not soldiers, in blue uniforms. The House a year ago, when the amendment was up in the deficiency bill, voted that down and said they should wear the o.d. as soldiers in the Army. Now the proposal is up again. It is now proposed that the o.d. uniforms that the Army has, when the pipe line for blue uniforms is filled, shall be transferred from the Air Force and put into the supply stocks of the Army, and that the Air Force will be furnished blue uniforms, blue caps, black shoes, and caps with blue visors.

The Quartermaster General is the officer who must procure and distribute all of these items. You can see in time of emergency that this program, if adopted, will duplicate and double the work that the quartermaster has to do. He must procure blue uniforms, blue shirts, black shoes in all of the sizes—100 sizes of shoes—at the same time he is procuring o.d. uniforms and o.d. shirts and tan shoes for the Army. I feel that inasmuch as the House expressed its views last year, that as a matter of principle it should express its views this year. Personally I would like to go further in the other direction as suggested by the chairman of the subcommittee yesterday that all of the members of all the armed services, when they are on shore duty, should be wearing the same uniform, and then you would be getting some place toward unification rather than quadruplification as you are now in these varied uniforms.

It has been said, and in the hearings it was partially shown, that after the pipe line and everything was filled with blue uniforms, that the cost of the blue uniforms would be substantially the same as the o.d. Nobody could tell how much extra handling, extra stenciling, extra ordering, extra invoicing, and extra warehousing and all of that would add to the cost of the quartermaster in the distribution of two types of uniforms. Now, if emergency comes, you will have the quartermaster faced with the matter of sending to some point, whether it is Alaska or some island, two different types of uniforms to serve men on the airfields and military men that are serving in the Ground Forces on the islands. I wore the o.d. uniform for some time, and I was very proud of it. It has an honorable history. I saw a sample uniform as a young noncom walked down the corridor of the Capitol, and not a single eye turned toward him, male or female, so it does not have the glamor it was supposed to have. As far as morale is concerned, that argument is gone. Every branch of the service has more recruits than it needs. I would like to wait and see what the new Secretary of Defense has to say about this particular type of uniform and the triplification of the services. I have written him a letter asking him about this and other things, to which no reply has been had.

I hope the House feels as it did a year ago and that the amendment will be carried, so that there will be one uniform for the Army and the Air Force.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does not the gentleman feel that where large bodies of troops from both the Air Force and the Army are together in a group, it would be far better to have distinctive uniforms so their officers could tell them apart?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If their officers cannot tell them apart without distinctive uniforms something is wrong.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Suppose they were in a group of two or three thousand, mixed up.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So what? I have been in the service, and I expect the gentleman has, too. I have seen groups of as high as three or four thousand men, and from different units, and I could identify those under my command. I do not know why an Air Force officer could not recognize his own men.

Mr. O'TOOLE. They might not be in military formation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 8 minutes, the last minute to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. I would not do so if I thought there would be any additional cost involved in the adoption of the blue uniform by the Air Force. In fact, I believe, after investigating, that the Air Force in going to blue would possibly save money for the taxpayers.

I do not see anything unnatural about the Air Force desire for a distinctive uniform. Certainly there is no sinister motive in their request.

Anticipating the opposition to the blue uniform for the Air Force, I made some investigations into this matter. After carefully weighing and evaluating all the factors, I find that the Secretaries of Defense, of the Army, of the Navy, and of the Air Force recommended to the President that distinctive uniforms for the respective services should continue to be authorized in the interest of morale and esprit de corps. This recommendation was approved by the President, who authorized the Secretary of the Air Force to prescribe in his name the uniform of the United States Air Force.

Acting under the authority conferred by the President, the Air Force has prescribed a uniform which shall be a distinctive shade of blue. Prior to taking this action, exhaustive studies were made by the Air Staff in cooperation with the Army Staff, particularly personnel of the office of the Quartermaster General, who have been continuously engaged in the ramified problems incident to clothing and equipment of military personnel.

As a result of a careful analysis of the entire problem, including the function of determining the specifications, requirements, budget estimates, purchase, inspection, transportation, storage, packing, distribution, and stock control, it was found that the distinctive blue uniform could be adopted by the Air Force without any change in budget requirements and without any additional cost accruing to the National Military Establishment.

There will be a gradual change to the new uniform. Stocks of the old uniform now on hand will be used. There will be no waste, because the olive-drab uniform will continue to be authorized for wear by Air Force personnel until present Air Force stocks are exhausted. New issues, however, will be in the blue.

Due to a difference in items issued, the new uniform will be slightly less expensive than the comparable Army uniform. I shall cover the cost later.

What I want to make clear to my friends in the House is that absolutely the only thing involved here is whether the Air Force, like the Army and the Navy, is entitled to a distinctive uniform. I feel that it is. And I hope the majority of the House will agree with me this afternoon.

There are many very good reasons, firmly rooted in solid realities, why the Air Force needs this uniform.

To look at the thing one way—why should they not want to wear blue? Most men do. I am sure that most civilian suits sold are some shade or other of blue. Most uniforms in the world are of blue. And that is for the exceedingly simple reason that more men look well in blue than in any other color. In fact, our own Army wore blue for many years. They were forced to change to olive drab solely by tactical necessity—and then retained blue for dress occasions. The Air Force is not faced with the tactical necessity of camouflage. Why on earth, then should they not be permitted to return to the color—a color long traditional in the United States service—which the Army preferred before practical combat necessity forced a change?

The point I make is this: adopt blue for the Air Force uniform and you increase the odds of the average airman looking his best in uniform. It is that simple. Equally obvious is the resultant gain in personal pride and self-respect.

Pride and self-respect are intangibles, but they are potent. So are morale and esprit de corps. Morale and esprit de corps are things of the emotions. Perhaps man should be less emotional. Maybe a creature of cold intellect alone would be more reasonable and efficient. But men are not creatures of intellect alone. There are social and psychological forces that have to be considered when you are dealing with people. You have got to consider these factors even when you deplore them. For my part, however, I see nothing to deplore in a man's desire to be able to take pride in being a part of a military organization devoted to the service of his country. This desire represents the ultimate expression of a deeply felt need that is part of every socially conscious human being. A uniform is a symbol. As a symbol, it plays a vital part, along with the customs and traditions of a service, in developing the spirit so vital to a fighting man. It is incalculable how large a role the distinctive marine uniform has played in creating the pride, esprit, and fighting spirit for which that valiant corps is world-famous.

It has been argued that the glamor of flying gives the Air Force more esprit de corps than it needs anyway. That seems silly to me. I can easily imagine a man who disliked the service but stayed in because he did like to fly. I do not suggest that the Air Force has any problem in that respect, but I do say that enthusiasm for airplanes is not necessarily the same thing as esprit de corps.

We could deny that anything that will enhance the morale, discipline, and appeal of our Air Force should be done, and done quickly? In these times it would seem beyond question.

With those who argue that the uniform change would retard unification and promote friction between the services, I cannot agree. Is there friction between fire and police departments stemming from their different uniforms? Unity and friction both stem from other factors besides clothing. Any tendency to dissension today is caused primarily by the changing and uncertain factors in warfare itself. Besides, the Congress in 1947 endorsed the essential principle of this thing when it determined that total merger with one uniform was undesirable. The logic and importance of the Army and Navy having their own distinctive uniform were recognized at that time. Why should this not apply to the Air Force? Expediency alone kept the Air Force in Army uniform at that time. There were enough problems to be solved.

Things are vastly different today. The Air Force has a uniform designed and ready to be put into use. They also have a simple, workable plan for changing into it at no added expense to the Government.

Again I want to make it clear that if this thing involved any great diversion of efforts or funds from the vital tasks of the Air Force I would oppose it in practice even while approving in principle. But it involves neither of these.

I want to stress the matter of cost, because I have heard it asked, "Isn't this a bad time to be appropriating a lot of money to buy the Air Force fancy new uniforms?" Well, why a lot of money? One color dye is no more costly than another. As a matter of fact, I have learned that the new uniform will actually cost $3.86 less than the old one. Moreover, the change itself can be effected without extra cost. The Air Force buys uniforms all along. As planned, they will just switch from old to new, buying at the same rate. By using the blue first just for off-duty wear, and then for parades and ceremonies, they can continue wearing their olive drab until it is worn out. What is not used will be returned to the Army.

I might say in passing, in connection with the remark I just quoted, that neither is the new uniform fancy. I find it, if anything, to show more restraint, especially in the case of officers, than the old one. It seems to me to combine the dignity and attractiveness to a degree that is bound to reflect credit on both the Air Force and the Nation.

That is all I have to say about that matter, Mr. Chairman. It seems beyond dispute to me. It is simple and inexpensive to do. It is logical and based on sound principles of human nature. It is in accord with traditional practice among major nations the world over. It will enhance the morale and efficiency of a vital arm of our fighting forces.

I respectfully urge that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COFFEY].

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Chairman, the study of military history is highly fascinating. It is also valuable—especially

for men in public life in these difficult times. It is impossible to study the subject without being forcibly impressed by the vital role that tradition has always played in the lives of military men.

That is not surprising. Tradition is important to all men. It is especially so to those who devote themselves to the public welfare—or to any cause outside their own private interests. Here in this House we have many cherished traditions which serve as both guidance and inspiration. There are many school teachers and other public servants, underpaid and overworked, who I am sure are held to their vital tasks by tradition alone. I mention this to show that tradition is a positive force. It is also indispensable.

In the military life this is doubly true. Military men live under conditions that are not always personally desirable. They must frequently live in distant, unpleasant, places. They accept a discipline that would be unnecessary and galling in the normal pursuits of life. In time of war they endure great hardships and extreme danger. Yet they must have high morale; ready and cheerful acceptance of discipline, hardship and danger; and genuine enthusiasm for their way of life. That, I submit, is a difficult requirement. Yet we take for granted that this requirement will be met. For the most part, it always has been, and tradition more than anything else is responsible.

Now uniforms and tradition are inseparable. Every famous fighting unit in history has had its distinctive uniform that symbolized that unit's history and tradition, what it had done and what it stood for. Our own Marine Corps is an excellent example of what I am talking about. Someone proposed not long ago that the distinctive uniform of the Marines be abolished. There was a public outcry all over the land. People knew instinctively what that would mean. Abolish the uniform and you abolish the Marine Corps. That uniform represents what the Marines stand for all over the world. As soon as a raw recruit puts it on, he feels new pride and new responsibility.

Now I know of no unit in the world that has greater cause for pride, or bears greater responsibility than our Air Force. They too are known the world over for their deeds. But they often are not recognized even at home by their uniform. They alone are in this predicament. Naval aviators wear a distinctive uniform. Marines have their uniform. Within our own Army there are what amounts to a number of distinctive uniforms. That is interesting. Types of footwear, various devices, different colored scarves and helmet liners—these things sprang up as new modes of fighting created new attitudes, prides, and traditions. It is a natural process. It fills a real need.

Do these loyalities, prides, and traditions, centering around units and arms, hinder over-all unity? Do they obscure loyalty to the armed forces as such, and to the Nation? They do not. They play rather the role of family ties in a community. Moreover, they arise inevitably out of the ways men live and fight.

Uniforms symbolize, not create, pride and tradition. These cannot be abolished, nor could they be dispensed with.

Our Air Force should be able to derive the maximum benefit from these vital constructive forces. Many men have entered the Air Force since the war. Consider what the morale and discipline of these new men, as well as the morale state of the Air Force itself, will mean to us in any future conflict. When I think of these things, I realize how important a thing a suitable, distinctive, Air Force uniform really is. It should be adopted with no more delay than is absolutely unavoidable.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman believe that all Congressmen should wear blue suits?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, in the name of common sense and fairness, why should not the men in each branch of the services be allowed to wear a uniform of their own choice? Believe it or not, men take a fierce pride in their uniforms. It is a very personal thing. Since the Secretary of Defense this year directed that the Secretaries of the different branches of the armed services should decide the uniform that each branch should wear, the Secretary of the Air Force, after conferring with both officers and enlisted men, decided on a uniform which would distinguish them just as soldiers are distinguished by khaki, and the Navy and Marine Corps distinguished by their respective uniforms. It will not cost any more money to purchase blue uniforms. Aviators fly the blue skies. Why should they not wear blue uniforms? Khaki is fitting for the ground forces—not for airmen. The Quartermaster General and the Secretary of the Air Force have agreed not to purchase these blue uniforms until the khaki or other uniforms now on hand are used. These uniforms of course will not go into use until the first day of September 1950, and as a matter of building morale and creating a fine esprit de corps among the Air Force, I hope the amendment is voted down.

Early this year the Air Force requested from higher authority a policy on uniforms, whether or not there would be one uniform for the entire National Military Establishment or whether each service would prescribe its own uniform. The latter was approved and the Secretary of Defense authorized the Secretary of the Air Force to prescribe the uniform for that service. Let there be no doubt, gentlemen, that unless proper authority had approved the blue uniform for the Air Force it would not have been prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The President has delegated to the Secretary of each Department the authority to prescribe the uniforms for his respective service. Why then are we trying to duplicate authority? Why do you then not attempt to prescribe the identical uniform for the Navy and the Marines? Uniforms have long been the semblance of a unit; without a uniform where is the pride of the soldier, sailor, or a marine? There is no basis in fact for the thought that because the Army has a few extra odd-sized o.d. overcoats in stock and the Air Force has a new uniform that the Army will have to wear these overcoats until all stocks are exhausted. The Air Force has under previous agreements agreed to take proportionate shares of stocks when these are split. Since it has been argued and proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the new blue uniform can be furnished at approximately the same cost as the o.d. uniforms without any additional cost to the taxpayer, why then is there opposition? It is true that the Air Force can carry out its mission in dungarees or any other type garment, but since they are a department and quite possibly the dominant one of the period it is our duty as representatives of the people to adequately provide that which is essential to the morale and general welfare of the air personnel.

Since under Public Law 158 it is the responsibility of the USAF to provide service for itself, and, further, since the stocks of common items will be divided, it costs no more to account and handle blue uniforms than o.d. clothing. The 12 items of clothing are a minor effort on the part of the supply system of the USAF. When you consider that within this system the USAF handles thousands of items per year the effect and impact of 12 items is practically nil.

The Air Force and the Quartermaster General have worked diligently in the preparation of a plan whereby o.d. uniforms will be used by the Air Force until worn out through fair wear and tear in the service. Here is every evidence that there is no nullification of the express purpose of the Air Force to assist the Quartermaster General with his o.d. clothing program. For the fiscal year 1950, utilization of funds for purchase of blue rather than o.d. cloth is a logical situation. As it is not planned to issue the blue uniform before September 1, 1950, stocks of blue uniforms will begin to fill the pipe line as the last stocks of o.d. uniforms come from the pipe line to Air Force personnel.

This House has recognized the dynamic character of our Air Force when by overwhelming vote a 70-group air force was authorized, but if we are to prevail in the proposition, it takes more than airplanes and air bases to make the Air Force the dynamic instrument that Congress wants. We must think of the men of the Air Force about which all else revolves. These men have a fierce pride in their organization which is distinguished from the other military services but for the uniform of its personnel.

As the uniform is a most personal item, the fortitude of the Air Force personnel is a major issue.

Since consideration of the blue uniform has circulated among Air Force personnel, a material improvement in esprit de corps has occurred.

The Congress wants, yes, demands, that the Air Force be progressive in all avenues of its endeavors. I believe the Congress is satisfied with the strides the Air Force has made in advancing aircraft and engine design and performance together with ground equipment utilization. Therefore, it behooves us to support this onward march and approve to the airmen the blue uniform to com-

plete the whole picture of advancement and acclaim the morale so prevalent in the Air Force today as a result of the fact that a blue uniform may be worn by all Air Force personnel.

In summing up the facts it is clear that we must now decide: To abide by the Commander in Chief who has approved this blue uniform for the USAF; provide for the service that is protecting your home and mine; stop bickering over minor policy matters that really are the responsibility of the National Military Establishment.

Let not your aging years deter your mind from the youthful pride in being given a new uniform, whether a new pair of coveralls or while in the service a new uniform.

I assure you it does make a difference in the manner in which a man will fight for his country as well as yours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The argument has been advanced that for unification purposes they all should wear the same uniform. As a former member of the service, I believe that we have no trouble as far as cooperation is concerned between the enlisted men in the different branches of the services, or the officers of lower grade. All your conflict is in the higher brass. And that will not be obscured by the fact that all of the men wear the same uniform. The statement has been made that the blues would cost more money, but from the investigation I made I found that there will actually be a saving of money with the blue uniforms, after the supply lines are emptied on the khaki uniforms. You will save $3.86 on each uniform and over a period of 3 years, you will save $1,930,000 by putting the Air Force in blue uniforms. The reason for this saving is that the soldier has to have a heavy overcoat in which he can sleep in the rain and the cold. That is not true of the Air Force. They can wear lighter clothing. And as a result there is substantial saving to the Government, if you vote for the blue uniform and defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. SIKES, a member of the committee, will close in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the chips are down. If the services want a distinctive uniform, and that uniform is in keeping with the traditions and dignity of the service, there is no reason why they should not have it, if the cost is not prohibitive. Many of us have been concerned, of course, about that. After checking into that angle, we find that the new uniform is going to cost about $3 less than the old uniforms. Of course, if we put all the men in the Air Force in a new blue uniform at once, it would cost a great deal of extra money. That would involve a lot of waste. But we have it positively stated to us that this will be a gradual policy of integration. The new uniforms will be issued to the men as the old uniforms are worn out. Consequently the same personnel who are in charge of the stocks of uniforms will continue and the same warehouse staffs will be involved and there will be little, if any, additional cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 76, insert after line 12, the following new section:

"SEC. 601. The appropriations in this act shall not be available for the pay, allowances, or travel of any person inducted without his consent into the armed forces under the Selective Service Act of 1948, who is, on July 1, 1949, over 22 years of age. The appropriations in this act shall not be available, after September 24, 1949, for the pay, allowances, or travel of any other person inducted without his consent into the armed forces under the Selective Service Act of 1948. This section shall not apply with respect to any person who, after June 24, 1948, or after the date of enactment of this act, shall voluntarily have extended the term of his service."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the point of order is not well taken.

This amendment is strictly a limitation of the present appropriation under this act; it does not add any other money; it does not say that any action shall be taken by any administrative officer; it does not instruct the services to do anything; it simply puts a limit similar to that in title 6, section 603, on page 77, which reads:

During the current fiscal year provisions of law prohibiting payment of compensation to or employment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the National Military Establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

An examination of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania indicates that it is in the nature of a limitation on the appropriation.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I have offered to release draftees in a reasonable time, brings up a real question. The Eightieth Congress passed the draft bill which looked necessary then, when it clearly is not now. The effect of the bill was to put young citizens in the armed services without their consent between the ages of 19 and 26, whether we like to face the fact or not. That was Public Law No. 759 of the Eightieth Congress.

These young men inducted under this act are still in the armed services without their consent. Many of us veterans of World War II who have been in the service by our own consent, like and admire the services. But I am not in favor of keeping young men in the services against their consent when there is no national emergency of a level to create a dire need, and the services are turning away volunteers who want to make it a career.

Public Law 759 states, in section 20:

The Secretary of the Army for the Army and Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy for the Navy and the Marine Corps, are hereby directed and authorized to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strength.

That is a specific direction under section 20 of the act to carry out an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. And the voluntary enlistment program has had to be shut off, these programs are now so successful.

You heard the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] when he said without objection or contradiction from anyone on the floor of this House, either by any member of the Armed Services Committee or otherwise—and I believe the gentleman from Kansas is an experienced member of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Every branch of the service has more recruits than it can now take.

If this be the case, why not permit these fellows who are over 22 on July 1, 1949, and who need to go back to work and start on the interrupted career of their choice, to get out of the services by the first of the next fiscal year, July 1, 1949? And then for the young fellows who ought to be going back to school and who do not wish to remain in the services, let them out by September 24, 1949, and they can all go back to school next year.

You have men who are over 22 and up to 27 years of age in the armed services at this time who want to be getting back establishing their families, who should be getting back to their life work. This is not war service; this is involuntary peacetime military service.

Although there are too many people coming in under the recruiting programs now, why not have the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force go ahead with a further intensified recruiting campaign and then give them the time under this amendment, almost 5 months—to replace these men? If you vote for this amendment you will permit orderly withdrawal from the armed services of these people in present involuntary peacetime servitude. That does not mean that the services would be releasing any one man on any certain date; it simply gives two terminal dates, by one of which, July 1, 1949, you will release the draftees over 22, and the date of September 24, 1949, by which terminal date it would be expected to release the ones between 19 and 22 years of age.

In addition to that, there is no more emergency in this country now than there will be 5 or 10 years from now, and we on the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees know it. What you are doing is keeping these fellows in the service now who do not want to be there.

and neither the services nor the emergency require it.

A further provision in this amendment states that if the man voluntarily extends the term of his service after June 24, 1948, or after the passage of this bill, he can stay on in the service.

This amendment puts the burden on the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and Marine Corps to step up the enlistment program. It does something else. It makes these services sell the services to the men who are in them. The services can keep every man who is in there under the draft who does not have some urgent home reason to get out, if they do a selling job. If you want to be fair to these young draftees from 19 to 26 who are in there and who are forced in, vote for this amendment.

Everyone of us admits that no new draftees need be put into the service at this time. The Selective Service is not inducting registrants into the service any more. We are not drafting men, we are not taking any more on a voluntary basis than we have to, and are depriving many men of their chosen career in the armed services. Think of the veterans of the merchant marine who served with us under like combat conditions in the last war, now continued against their will in the armed services of this democracy in peacetime.

Let us open up the voluntary enlistments, let us increase the voluntary-enlistment program for the good of the services, and give these young fellows and their families a break.

I ask the Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble with the amendment is it would allow these young men who have been drafted to stay in the armed services but would give them nothing to eat and no pay. It does not take them out. It just says that none of the money shall be spent for their pay or their food.

I do not believe we want to do that.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Anyone who voluntarily wants to stay in the service can stay in by enlisting and anyone who does not want to stay in you can just bet if you do not have the money they will not be kept in.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], would be the last man to have it said of him that he is on a subcommittee of which he is not a member.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I was for 2 years a member of the Subcommittee on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Appropriations, but with the change last November I am not at this time. But I would point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that one of the reasons why the enlistments are coming in is because of the very existence of the Selective Service Act.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been unalterably opposed to conscription, probably for the very simple reason that I was brought up in conscript countries. Although we have given this measure a different title in this country, we call it draft, it is by and large conscription.

It is also a fact, and I think it has been brought to the attention of this House repeatedly in recent weeks and months, that the voluntary enlistments have been so great that we keep putting off the drafting of these young men. In other words, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are getting all the volunteers and more than they can possibly take care of. That is a very good thing.

There is nothing finer in the world than a voluntary force. That has been proved in the past history of our country. Volunteers who voluntarily go to fight and to serve their country will do so with far more enthusiasm and far better than men who are dragged in.

Another thing about taking these young men in the age brackets of 19 to 22 is that it interferes very seriously with their education. That again is a thing that does not help us later on. It does not help our armed forces.

I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well worth the consideration of this House. I think that it will have the support of many of the women and also of the young men back home and I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will indulge me. I wavered whether I should take any time or not. However, I have come to the conclusion that the Armed Services Committee should be heard on this proposition. Of course, it is a matter that came from our committee. I think that those of you who were here at the time remember that I had the most distasteful task of handling this bill on the floor just before my primary campaign last summer. So, I can say to you that in many respects it was a most distasteful task.

But we have here an exact example of why you should not write legislation on the floor and why you should not attempt to repeal a law by resorting to an appropriation bill and attempting to twist the Holman rule into the repeal of an existing law. Fortunate for me, last summer when I was arguing for the passage of this bill I stated that if we had it we would not need it, and it has worked out exactly that way. The fact that we have it, we have reached the point that we have not had to induct anyone for a number of months now. But it is absolutely correct, as the gentleman from Kansas has said, that these enlistments are coming in because the law has been in existence. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is also correct, that it would have the effect of preventing the payment and the feeding and the clothing of the men now in the service and all those who might hereafter be taken in. I recall our battle last summer also. I appreciate the argument that they would not take them in if they could not pay them, but is that the way the great Congress of the United States is going to legislate?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman has mentioned the fact that they are not drafting any more, but my information is that there is at least one draft office in every one of the 3,500 counties in the United States; that there are presently being employed at full pay over 37,000 now under the draft order; that there are 3,500 offices in operation but they are not drafting anybody. Can the gentleman advise whether or not that is true?

Mr. KILDAY. I have the gentleman's point. Let me reply. I do not have the number nor how many they employ in the offices that are open. For the purpose of discussion I am willing to accept the gentleman's figures. However, that is not involved here; at least it is not involved in any matter pending before the Armed Services Committee, nor is it involved in any matter pending in this bill. Funds for Selective Service come in an entirely different bill, and the proper place, if the gentleman is vigilant, would be to strike out the money in that authorization.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will not the gentleman agree that, inasmuch as it is agreed that we are not drafting any more people, we stop these 3,500 offices, and the expense of stenographers, and so forth?

Mr. KILDAY. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman, because it has not been agreed that anyone is not going to be drafted, so that the premise does not permit of any discussion.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman tell the committee the effect of this amendment on Reserves?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, I do not know just where they would be. That is the trouble with writing legislation here on the floor. I do not know what the effect of it is going to be. This is an attempt to repeal existing law in an indirect manner. If it is to be repealed, let us bring in legislation and repeal it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 90, following line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 629. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee; no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any

officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment clearly imposes additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment today I am not attempting to offer something that has not been in previous appropriation bills. The exact language of the amendment I am offering has appeared in appropriation bills for the military and the naval establishments for the past 25 or 30 years. Without any hearings on this particular section of the bill it was stricken out by the subcommittee handling the bill before us this afternoon. The House has acted upon this very same amendment in the past, and it was considered germane. In a conference between the House and the Senate a year ago this provision was agreed on. I think the amendment is in order at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Rhode Island offers an amendment against which a point of order is made on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. While it would seem to be a limitation of appropriation, the Chair calls the attention of the Committee to the fact that the amendment does confer discretionary authority upon the Secretary. It is the opinion of the Chair that to that extent the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Committee on Appropriations now going on the third year, and I have been one of those who have opposed writing legislation into an appropriation bill. However, I did not think this would be legislation on an appropriation bill, since this House has passed on this very same language for about 25 years.

Last year for the first time this language was stricken from the bill when the House had this matter before it for consideration. The Senate restored the entire language that I have attempted to have restored here today. In conference on the naval appropriation bill a year ago, for the fiscal year 1949, the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate agreed on the language that was called section 112 in this year's appropriation bill. The section 112 of last year was carried in this bill until the committee marked up the bill, and then it was stricken from the bill without any hearings at all as to whether or not this language should be contained in the bill.

This is one of the most obnoxious practices that can be introduced into any naval establishment or any private industry. I know that from talking to the employees of the naval establishments in my own State of Rhode Island, and they do not take their hat off to anybody or any private concern when it comes to efficiency and production in their assembly and repair shop. We have figures showing that they can repair airplanes and repair parts more cheaply than any private company in the country at the present time.

I offered this amendment in good faith today because it was included in various appropriation bills in the past. I am sorry to see that the committee has raised a point of order against it at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island on his diligence with respect to this matter. It is true that for 35 years similar provisions have been in appropriation bills. However, 2 years ago the provision was stricken from the military appropriation bill because it was considered to be no longer needed. A similar version was in the Navy bill last year.

When the pending bill was sent to us by the budget this provision was stricken out. The striking out was not the original action of the committee. I do know that since that action was taken the gentleman from Rhode Island has been most diligent in undertaking to present the matter to the committee. I commend him but, under the circumstances, I think no injury will be done. These studies will be made in such a way that no one can possibly complain at the action taken.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not like to disagree with the chairman of the subcommittee, but I have had dealings with commandants of naval stations during the past 9 years that I have been a Member of Congress. I have met some very fine, honest, and sincere men at the head of those establishments. I have also met some that I did not have much respect for, and whom many of the employees in those stations did not have much respect for. If this legislation is stricken from the bill at this time, and if the bill is allowed to stand as it is, we are going to run up against that same type of obnoxious practice which has existed in private employment. We are going to disrupt the efficient working of these naval establishments all over the country at the present time. At the same time we are going to give the green light to the naval and military establishments in Washington to not allow any of this assembly and repair work to be done in their own establishments. And in every State in the Union, where these military and naval establishments are located, we will find them being closed up. It has happened before, and it will happen again. When we start letting out private contracts to private concerns, the first thing the private concerns will do to get the contract from the Navy will be to underbid the price that the naval assembly and repair shop is doing that particular job for. Then, as soon as they have succeeded in closing up the establishment at Corpus Christi or the plant in Norfolk, Va., or some of the plants out on the west coast, they will raise the price 50 percent above what they got the first contract for. That is the way they do in order to get in. It is the same sort of thing we have had operating against the small-business establishments of this country. Big business will underbid small-business firms just to get the contract away from them. As soon as they drive the small-business firms out of this business, they come in on the gravy train, because they have no competition. Every naval establishment all over the country is in competition with every other naval establishment. There are no more efficient establishments in this country than those that we have working for our armed services. There are no more efficient plants than these arsenals and naval establishments.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will include this language in the bill when they have it under consideration and that the conferees on the part of the House will accept the language when they meet in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, it takes but little retrospection to warn the most reticent Members of this House that this bill is one on which there should be the maximum agreement. It is evident that we have honest divergencies of opinion on the choice of methods we wish to employ in our determination to preserve peace and check the spreading of communism in the yet remaining free countries of this world, whether they be Christian or non-Christian. However, there must be no divergency of opinion on the fact that our good intention to suppress communism and preserve world peace is pure illusionism unless the intention is backed with the physical might that is necessary to give it meaning.

Let us retrospect a little. Commencing on March 8, 1917, strikes, riots, mutiny, assassinations, revolution, and counterrevolutions brought on the complete collapse of the Russian Army in World War I. On November 6 and 7 at the head of a rabble Bolshevik army, Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin seized the government and by a land decree ordered the immediate confiscation of the large estates and distribution to the peasants. On December 17, backed by an expanding Bolshevik army, all church property was confiscated and all religious instructions in schools was abolished. From January 1918 to 1922 with a merciless Bolshevik army executing the decrees, all land was nationalized and surplus food was confiscated; all banks were nationalized and private accounts confiscated; private trade was suppressed and all food and other commodities were confiscated and distributed under a Government rationing system; all industry was nationalized and free labor was abolished; and through terror, torture, and murder of millions of helpless men, women, and children, the communistic dictatorship was firmly established by this army.

Let us now turn to Italy. The end of World War I left this country with a vast national debt, a bankrupt and unstable economy, an impoverished and disunited people, a weak and confused Government that enjoyed no prestige and an Army that had neither will nor physical means to fight. Under these conditions, the Communist vermin under Socialist-front bored its cells into the vitals of the nation. On October 5–8, 1919, a Socialist Congress dominated by Communists, at Bologna, voted for adherence to the Third International. At the elections for Parliament on November 16 of that year the Communist-dominated Socialist Party secured 160 seats, and at the opening of Parliament refused to hail the King, and shouted, "Long live socialism," a striking demonstration of disloyalty. The Communist vermin bored rapidly, and before October 1922 it had demoralized the national economy by recurring strikes and complicated the political situation by its constant boring. The Government, with a spiritless and ill-equipped Army, was powerless to stop the spread of paralyzing Communist vermin. On October 31, 1922, Mussolini was summoned by the King to form a Cabinet. The ban on Fascists was lifted, and by force and violence the Communist vermin was extirpated.

Let us now turn to Germany. For several months before the end of World War I an expanded and war-strained German economy began to show signs of collapse. The long and sustained effort of the people in their support of the Imperial Army on all fronts began to show signs of abatement. In general, the entire German civilian population was in a state of complete exhaustion. Under these conditions, the Communist vermin began its boring through the labor masses of the nation. On November 8, 1917, the Communists, operating under a Socialist front and led by Kurt Eisner, succeeded in proclaiming a Republic in Bavaria. On November 9, the Socialist front proclaimed the National Republic and turned the Government over to the majority Socialists under Friedrich Ebert and Phillip Scheidemann.

This resulted in the complete collapse of the Imperial Army on all fronts. On January 5–15, 1919, the Spartacist revolutionists were joined by the Independent Socialists who by this time were the avowed Communists. Through February and March further Communist uprisings took place in Berlin, Munich, Hamburg, and other urban centers. On April 4 to May 1, a Soviet republic was proclaimed in Bavaria. Then followed Communist-inspired strikes, riots, and terror until the national economy was paralyzed. The government was helpless, and without a competent army to maintain its national economy and order. The Reichstag elections of September 14, 1930, resulted in the emergence of Hitler's National Socialists. This election ushered in a period of disorder and clashes with Communist bands. The army and civil authority were bored with Communist cells and ineffective to sustain law and order. On June 16, 1932, the government lifted its ban on Nazi storm troops. From this later date to January 30, 1933, these storm troops by force and violence completely annihilated the Communist vermin.

Mr. Chairman, we can see by this retrospection that the Communist vermin will fester and destroy the Nation when the Army lacks the physical means and will to give meaning to the national intention. The rise of both Mussolini and Hitler was predicated upon a benevolent concern for the public welfare in that their movements were aimed at the suppression of communism. The world, that by this time had fully appraised the Communist suppression of human freedom in Russia, hailed the Nazi and Fascist advent in Europe with mixed feelings of approval and disapproval. I was one who sympathized with any movement that aimed at the suppression of communism. However, my sympathy was not loyalty. When both nazism and fascism began to suppress human freedom, to toy with the right of men to worship God, to suppress the free thinking of men, and to suppress the political freedom of minority races and nations, their benevolent mission was ended and with it also ended my sympathy and that of all freedom-loving men.

Let us now come to the start of World War II. The economic world collapse of 1929 to 1936 left most of the free nations of Europe impoverished and without the financial means to support sufficient armies to insure their freedoms against the aggressive designs of either communism, nazism, or fascism. The Nazi leaders appear to have been aware that Communist miiltary power was the more formidable of any in either Europe or Asia. With this in mind, we can readily understand why the brutal Nazi leaders first loosed their armed legions eastward. The armies of France, England, the Low Countries, and those of the free governments of eastern Europe were like so many "sitting ducks." The Nazi showed no fear of the latter. They did fear the more formidable Communist Army. Thus, while communism and nazism were massing military power for a show-down as to which of the two should survive and impose its ideology upon the rest of the world, the United States contented itself with a land and naval force of less than 300,000 men. This gave no fear to the Nazi that a formidable American Army could reach Europe in time to give effective opposition. On the other hand, was not our fear of communism a fear shared in common with nazism and fascism? What the latter failed to foresee was that, comparing calculated risks, the United States would temporize with communism as a lesser threat to world peace than a Nazi army mightier than any that was ever assembled by the brains and effort of man. Our decision to temporize with communism was itself tempered with Communist Stalin's promise to recognize human and religious freedom for the people of Russia and the rest of the world. Stalin made the promise through fear of the mighty Nazi army. To what extent Communist Stalin has kept his promise is now a matter of history.

Mr. Chairman, I have retrospected on history to this extent in order to show that experience should teach us that the benevolent intentions or the sinister intention of a nation can only take shape if that intention is supported by physical means in the form of military might. If our benevolent intention is to insure the human freedom and peace of the world, it is our duty to provide the military power commensurate with that intention. It is my opinion that the bill now before us should be passed. If the appropriation made by the bill may be said to be great, it is better that our error be on the safe rather than the unsafe side.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, since the debate on the Interior appropriation bill last week, during which I revealed the tie-up between Guy "Flash" Myers, a Wall Street promoter, and the bureaucrats in the Bonneville area, I have received a flood of, personal letters and telegrams from individual citizens from the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and from most every section of our country.

All but one of these communications applauded my efforts to expose this thing. I have carefully analyzed these letters and telegrams. They came from farmers, small-business men, professional men, in fact from people in every walk of life who know their own best interests and the best interest of their country can best be served by protecting and preserving our free enterprise system.

I shall now read into the RECORD the full report of Robert E. Lee, chief of staff of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, and who was originally appointed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the present chairman of the Appropriations Committee, during the Seventy-ninth Congress. Mr. Lee, as I have stated, made an investigation of the political and financial activities of the Bonneville Administration last fall. From this report

I quoted but one letter last week; the balance of the report follows herewith and speaks for itself:

RE OBSERVATIONS ON THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to instructions of the chairman a spot-check examination was conducted of the Bonneville Power Administration from July 15 to July 27, 1948, with particular reference to the problem as to whether or not the Administration was pursuing a reasonable course in behalf of the promotion of Federal power.

We find that aggressiveness on the part of that administration in behalf of Federal power is closer to a crusade than to an administration and leaves implications that all free enterprise advocates might well cogitate upon.

If the elimination of the so-called free enterprise in this field is not the policy of Congress a solution must necessarily be found in one of two alternatives:

1. Amendments to existing legislation both Federal and State, or,

2. A courageous clear-cut Federal power policy.

Obviously it is the choice of the people as to what their desires are in this regard, however, there is a clear-cut difference between public power referring to municipalities, REA, PUD, county control, etc., and Federal power which means the domination of this field from Washington, D. C.

Numerous studies have been made on the subject of where the Federal Government's interest should and does end and no attempt is made here to present any further study into the technicalities and philosophies involved on the part of the proponents of the various alternatives.

Certain fundamental questions, however, do arise which are recorded here merely to illustrate the complexity of the problem without any specific suggested course of action.

1. Is it proper for the Federal Government to socialize any industry?

2. Where should the responsibility of the Federal Government end with respect to flood control, navigation, irrigation, and power expansion?

EXISTING POLICIES

Under date of January 3, 1946, the Secretary of the Interior issued a memorandum on power policy to all staffs of the Department of the Interior, and, among other things, this document contained the following instructions. This policy is the interpretation of existing law and is the bible of Interior.

"Active assistance, from the very beginning of the planning and authorization of the project, shall be given to the organization of public agencies and cooperatives for the distribution of power in each project area. The statutory objectives are not attained by merely waiting for a preferred customer to come forward and offer to purchase the power."

Administrative Order No. 33, dated September 16, 1940, was issued by Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, and, among other things, contained the following instructions:

"The Administration has a direct interest, in connection with its construction program, in proposals for system-wide acquisition of private-utility properties by public agencies which have applied or contracted for the purchase of power. The system acquisition staff will give reasonable technical assistance to public agencies which are attempting to acquire operating systems."

As a matter of interest concerning the attitude of the Interior Department, some quotations from the testimony of Secretary Krug at the time he was questioned concerning his confirmation before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the United States Senate are as follows:

"PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF POWER

"Senator CORDON. Do you feel that as an administrative officer of the Government, it would be your duty to proselyte or evangelize in the local field to induce local people to go into the power business on the retail or distribution side?

"Mr. KRUG. No; I don't think it would be. When I said that I probably will from time to time talk of the TVA experience I meant it, but I don't think the Federal Government has any business in the local field in telling communities what they should be doing.

"The local communities are intelligent enough to find out for themselves what they should do, and I think the less we have of Federal agencies telling local communities what to do, the better off the country will be.

"Senator CORDON. Thank you. That is the answer I hoped for, and the answer I got."

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The district power law was passed by the State of Washington in 1930, which permits the creation of so-called utility districts, based on a vote of the people. Subsequent to the affirmative vote of the people, three commissioners are elected, who may take over the property of private utilities either by negotiation or by condemnation, and may levy taxes to begin operations. They likewise may create a debt, which is generally done by the issuance of revenue bonds for the purpose of buying out the private utility. A careful reading of the act leaves no doubt but that it is specifically designed to eliminate private enterprise in this field, and, in the past decade, public utility districts have been voted in some 30 of the 39 counties in the State of Washington.

On April 27, 1948, the utility district commission adopted a resolution providing for the sale of $2,400,000 revenue bonds of Cowlitz County, Public Utility District No. 1, Washington, for purchase of properties in Cowlitz County from Puget Sound Power & Light Co. Bonds bought by Van Ingen and Nuveen jointly. No reoffering—bonds placed privately. Bond issue dated May 1, 1948, due $400,000 each year, 1969–74. Callable in 1950. First call at 103½—graduate reduction to par. Interest rate 3¼ percent.

The county treasurer reports (by telephone) that the credit on the books to the district from proceeds of sale is $2,283,900. This, if correct, would be sale at 95.1625.

Guy Myers was agent. His fee is 1 percent.

Chelan County, Wash., PUD No. 1

This district paid Puget $8,135,000 plus some sums to be later determined for certain properties in Chelan, Douglas, and Grant Counties. Van Ingen and Nuveen bought the bond issue of $9,035,000, at 95.

Nuveen reports bonds placed privately. The street generally questions private placement of the whole and expects to see an offering later. The bonds are divided in two serial issues, one at 3 percent callable 1952–67, and a second at 3¼ percent callable 1968–78 and a term issue of $3,220,000 at 3⅜ percent due 1983.

Guy Myers was agent at 1 percent. Payable one-tenth of 1 percent each year for 10 years. This to become an operating charge on district.

Attention is invited to the fact that the people of the district by discounting these bonds are being saddled from 5 to 7 percent of the issue before they even start. It is almost inconceivable that private interests would thus capitalize on a proposition that has been sold to the people as an economical device to insure cheap power.

ATTITUDE OF THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION CONCERNING FEDERAL POWER

It must be recognized that it is, of course, very difficult to determine what is located within a man's heart and the attitude of the administration of the Bonneville Power Administration must necessarily be determined from interviews with personnel and from examination of written records. During the course of the inquiry, Dr. Raver was absent on speaking engagements and it was possible only to visit with him very briefly. A series of questions were left with him for his written reply and pertinent ones are being included as a part of this report. Dr. Raver, when questioned about some of the material located in the files, indicated quite frankly that he was very much in favor of the Federal control of power in the Northwest and felt that it was inevitable that the private utility operators would necessarily have to liquidate their investment. He defended his activities on behalf of Federal power on the fact that the basic legislation justified such activity as he considered the Bonneville Project Act more social in nature than even the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

An exhaustive examination of clippings, news releases, speeches, and other records would justify the conclusion that Dr. Raver and his administration go beyond the scope of their duties in the administration of the act by conducting a crusade for Federal power which must necessarily lead to the further conclusion that private ownership has no place in this picture.

A quotation from a letter of February 16, 1943, from Paul J. Raver to the editor of the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman is set out hereinafter and its sincerity should be judged in light of the subsequent quotations from other correspondence located in the files of Bonneville Power Administration.

"Finally, I must deny categorically that I have a 'determination to destroy private ownership.' I believe thoroughly in the free-enterprise system."

The following quotation from the minutes of a meeting of June 29, 1948, of the Bonneville Power Administration executives is set out below. This meeting was called for a discussion of the pending negotiations for the acquisition of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co., by public utility districts.

"Dr. RAVER. My position is, this is a business approach to the thing. It has nothing to do with preference and priority clause of the Bonneville Act. As a business matter we feel we need some surplus to take care of the uncertainties but I would risk that if out of it we could get this whole Puget Sound Power & Light deal settled because I feel that it would be important enough to take that risk."

The following quotation is contained in a letter from Dr. Raver to Carlton Nau, of the American Public Power Association, of Washington, D. C., dated May 29, 1946:

"This will acknowledge your telegram requesting information regarding (name omitted). 'You request short factual statements of his activities and writings in opposition to public ownership.'

"(Name omitted) has not been one of the active outspoken opponents of public ownership in this region. There have been occasions when this company has been in the middle of a public ownership fight when he undoubtedly made statements and speeches in opposition to public ownership in defense of his own company and his own operating procedures. Certainly I do not place (name omitted) in the same category with some of the other private utility managers in this area who are continually misrepresenting the public-ownership problem and using underhanded tactics of one kind and another to defeat not only public ownership but to embarrass and retard the Bonneville Power Administration's program in this field."

On February 11, 1947, the American Public Power Association wrote to Dr. Raver asking his support for Lilienthal for Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He was asked to "Do all in your power to assure confirmation." The letter bore the notation, "Noted, Dr. Raver."

Excerpts from a letter from Carl D. Thompson to Dr. Raver of the Public Ownership League of America dated June 24, 1948:

"Judging from all reports that I hear from different parts of the country, and a study of 10 or 15 measures that have been introduced in Congress aimed at crippling and, if possible, destroying our public power movement in the Northwest (and, for that matter, all over the country), I am very deeply concerned about what is happening and likely to happen during the next few years.

"Obviously, if present conditions and present control of Congress continues, our public power movement in the Northwest and throughout the country is doomed. This, I take it, is the precise purpose of those that are now in control. * * *

"You are reported to have said at one of the meetings recently held somewhere in the Northwest that you are urging all elements in that area to join forces in helping to protect the public power movement there. * * *

"Fortunately there are elements that are already committed to some degree of public ownership of basic utilities. And more particularly they are concerned especially with the protection of our public power movement. * * *

"What I would like to see is some kind of a federation of progressive forces that would work together in the defense of our advantages so far gained. * * *

"Don't you think it would be possible to bring together representatives of these different groups and ultimately to federate their forces so that we could be more effective in protecting and promoting our public power movement? * * *

"I feel very deeply that we simply must not lose our public power movement" (meaning Federal power and control).

This particular letter was discussed with Dr. Raver and it was pointed out to him that the letter bore a notation "Answered July 2, 1948, no file copy." Dr. Raver professed lack of knowledge as to precisely what he had stated in reply to this letter but he indicated he would undertake to locate a copy of his answer and transmit it to the staff. This was subsequently received and is quoted hereinafter.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION,
Portland, Oreg., July 6, 1948.

DR. CARL D. THOMPSON,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR CARL: Thank you for your good letter of June 24.

I assume you have written in similar vein to Morton Tompkins and to your friends in the State of Washington.

It would be a fine thing if the federation of the sort you suggested could be developed; but as an observer, I doubt if it would be possible during the coming months. There are too many other issues occupying the public mind, such as the foreign situation. These will obscure the problem which concerns us. I believe the time will come when such a federation may be formed as a protective measure.

In the meantime, I should like personally to see a list of the organizations you mention if you can spare me one.

Sincerely,

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator.

Carl D. Thompson has for years been the guiding genius of the Public Ownership League of America. His public career has long been that of close association with the Socialist Party.

He was on the national committee of the Socialist Party in 1905 and his name was placed in nomination for president of the United States at the Socialist convention of 1908. From 1912 to 1916, he was director of information of the Socialist Party and in 1916 he managed the national Socialist campaign.

The file system of the Bonneville Power Administration provides for an abstracting device whereby incoming correspondence is abstracted on 3- by 5-inch cards. These cards were test-checked by the writer and in many cases the correspondence relating to the card was not readily available. However, the information on some of the abstract cards is reproduced as follows:

"American Public Power Association, Nau, Carlton L., general manager, 1129 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D. C., 10-29-47. Regarding support for continuation of policy exempting federally financed projects from taxation."

"Aluminum Co. of America, Thayer, C. S., works manager, Vancouver, Wash., 3-23-48. Attaching identical copy of letter sent to Washington and Oregon Congressmen re need of the Northwest for power development."

"Grange News Berry, Ted F., editor, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle 1, Wash., 5-27-48. Submitting comment re private utility party line emanating from Washington, D. C. and BPA statement on May 26 and quoted by the Associated Press."

The following letter is quoted in its entirety, presumably from Dr. Raver to Mr. C. G. Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated July 15, 1946. (This letter was not available to the writer at the time Dr. Raver was interviewed and consequently he was not asked concerning it.)

"I received your note while I was on my vacation and have turned it over to Bob Willard (former Acting General Counsel of the BPA, now with the Atomic Energy Commission) to formulate a reply for Cap, setting forth the minimum requirements for a private utility company contract.

"As to Loring (this may refer to Mr. Marlett, Assistant to Dr. Raver, whose middle name is Loring) and I am coming to Washington immediately, we realize the importance of having someone there during the formative period of your organization problem but it is simply out of the question for us to come down until we have formulated certain programs, which we have been working on strenuously the last few weeks.

"These three programs are as follows:

"1. Revitalizing the public power movement in the Northwest. Henry Alderman is heading this up and has the program pretty well outlined and we are working on it at the present time.

"2. Our long-range as well as 1948 construction program. On this I have insisted that our Engineering and System Planning organizations tie down a generator installation schedule with the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation for new dams on the Columbia and lay out our program for transmission line construction up to and including 1955 with plans for southern Idaho projected to 1965. Both of these forecasts of generator installations and transmission line construction, of course, are tied in with our load forecast for the region. I see no point in coming to Washington to talk about coordination until we are prepared to present a coordinated plan which can be used as a basis for such orders of the Secretary as he deems necessary to carry out the coordinated construction plan, assuming, of course that he agrees that our plan is feasible.

"3. With these two programs as a basis, we will also be in a position to present to the coordination committee and to the secretary, if it seems desirable, an organization plan to carry out the construction and operation program.

"All three of these programs are shaping up very rapidly and Loring expects to be in Washington on July 24. I will arrive there Sunday night, July 28.

"Loring, Henry Alderman, Frank Ward, and I have been working on the first step of our public-power program today in Seattle. This program involves pulling together all of the public-power forces of the region around an agreed program of public ownership and public acquisition of private utility company properties. As discussed with Cap, it involves fitting municipal ownership program with REA development in the rural areas into an existing public utility districts plan and enlisting the support of the public utility districts in carrying it out. In order to do this we are trying to work it out in harmony with plans of Carstensen and the Washington Grange so as not to upset their existing plans for private utility acquisition in the Puget and Washington Water Power Co. areas.

"We reviewed this program at some length with Tomkins (Mort, master of the Oregon State Grange) in Portland last Friday. He realizes the critical situation of the public-power program at the present time, particularly in the State of Oregon, and felt that our approach was sound but desired to check it with his executive committee before making any definite commitments. I told him I was planning to discuss the program with Carstensen (master of the Washington State Grange) in Seattle today and wanted to be sure that we had the full and wholehearted support of the Granges of both States on any program that we worked out. Tomkins called Carstensen after our meeting and reported to Hank that Carstensen was receptive to working out a cooperative program but was adamant in his opposition to mixing up a municipal ownership campaign with his plans for acquisition through public utility districts. He stated that Carstensen was not interested in a municipal-ownership campaign until after he knew the outcome of the election on Initiative 166 (this was a measure to provide for a vote of the public before revenue bonds were issued for the acquisition of private property. It was defeated.)

"We met with Carstensen at 10:30 this morning and I outlined the following situation to him: If the court case (now set for hearing on September 2 with a promise that the decision will be rendered within 10 days of the hearing) is favorable to the public utility districts, then the Puget deal must be made prior to December 5 if Initiative 166 carries.

"Carstensen stated that he was confident the court case would be favorable and that the deal would be made before the election on Initiative 166. He also stated that the Washington Water Power deal was already made and that the real purpose of the court case was to clear the way for making the Washington Water Power deal. They had expected to have the court case decided in May and the Washington Water Power deal out of the way before this time.

"I told him if this was the situation that he should use every effort to stop or at least delay the merger of Pacific Power & Light and Northwestern Electric until after the court decision, otherwise the Washington Water Power deal, which he claims is already made, would no longer be effective since Washington Water Power would be out from under Electric Bond & Share at the same time Pacific Power & Light and Northwestern Electric are merged. I am not sure that Washington Water Power will be divorced from the holding company at the same time Northwestern Electric and Pacific Power & Light are merged, but I do know that the plan is for Washington Water Power to acquire controlling interest in the common stock of the merged corporation.

"I pointed out to him that in my opinion the Northwestern Electric and Pacific Power & Light merger was being slipped through without the public realizing that it was only the first step in the further integration of operating companies in the area using Washington Water Power Co. as the original holding company and that subsequent steps might well include the Portland General Electric whose common stock, as a result of the reorganization of Pepco, was widely scattered in the hands of income bondholders and might well be acquired, as far as the controlling interest in concerned, by the new merged corporation or by the Washington Water Power Co. Furthermore, I pointed out to him that the company might be gambling that the court decision would be favorable to them and they could then step in, bail out Frank McLaughlin at $18 per share for the common stock of Puget and thus very quickly set up a major public utility company monopoly that would control the entire power development of the Northwest from here on out.

"This analysis was evidently new to Carstensen and he readily agreed to do anything we thought advisable to stop it. I suggested a number of hedges or efforts which various groups could make to stop or at least delay this merger until after the fall elections.

"1. Contact Governor Wallgren and ask him to telegraph the SEC to delay proceedings until such time as the State had had an opportunity to examine the implications of this merger. Henry readily agreed to this and suggested that the Governor might have his Advisory Commission study the matter. Henry felt that he could enlist the support of McLaughlin and Hemphill, who are members of this Commission, in formulating a protest because of the disadvantages to the development of the State and the development of its resources if the transmission and distribution of Government power came under the control of one large private utility monopoly. Carstensen agreed to take this up with the Governor tomorrow. It was also pointed out that the merger would probably have to come before the State Public Utility Commissioner for approval and the Governor would have an opportunity to discuss the matter with his own Public Utility Commissioner.

"2. I suggested to Carstensen that I explore the possibilities of developing municipal-ownership programs in the cities of Spokane, Yakima, and Walla Walla. He objected strenuously to starting anything in Spokane on the basis that the Spokane City Council has agreed to take no formal action on municipal ownership until the Washington Water Power deal is actually made and that the city council and the Grange leaders have agreed to let the people in Spokane decide for themselves whether they desire municipal ownership for a PUD after the deal has been made. Of course, he has stated unequivocally that this deal has been made with Aller and, therefore, he is quite anxious to stop this merger which presumably would take the properties out from under the control of Aller until after the court decision (which he expects to be favorable) at which time, according to Carstensen, the Washington Water Power deal will be made even before the Puget deal. Inasmuch as Carstensen maintained that if the city of Spokane voted for municipal ownership, the Washington Water Power deal would be killed, I agreed with him not to promote municipal ownership with the city council in my meeting with them next Tuesday morning. Consequently, I wish that you would have Cap check with Calder (chairman of the board of Electric Bond & Share Co.) and see if he can get the facts about Washington Water Power deal. It may be well that Carstensen has been misled by Meyers about the deal and if so, we should know about it and then be free to enlist his help or at least his consent in going ahead with the municipal-ownership program in Spokane.

"He also objected to our promoting municipal ownership in Yakima at this time but on a different basis. He stated that in his opinion two of the commissioners of the Yakima public utility district are strong for public ownership in Yakima County and that they have been misunderstood in their position because of a grange fight which arose out of the grange people trying to dictate to the newly elected commissioners what their position should be with respect to the sale of this property by Pacific Power & Light. Carstensen felt that it would be very bad at this time to support municipal ownership in Yakima as it would only tend to cause a wider rift between the commissioners and some of the grange officials and other public power supporters in Yakima. He stated that he was trying to pull all the public power forces together and he felt confident that all parties would be served best by having the public utility district take over instead of municipal ownership. He also stated that he was confident that a new public utility district commissioner would be elected this fall who is a strong supporter of acquisition.

"He also stated that the present public utility district commissioners had determined that if municipal ownership agitation started in Yakima they would institute condemnation proceedings against Pacific Power & Light in order to stop it. I made no definite comments about this except to state that we would not want to do anything to cause a break in our public power forces and wanted to pull them together. My own feeling is (although I did not express it to Carstensen) that some more individual work will have to be done on the situation with Carstensen and other public power leaders in the Yakima area before municipal ownership can be developed there with any possibility of success.

"In both the Spokane and Yakima situations, Carstensen agreed that if they were unsuccessful in fighting initiative 166 this fall (or in the case of Yakima, in electing a friendly public utility district commissioner this fall) that he would come all out for a strong municipal ownership campaign because, as he stated it, the public utility districts were on their last legs and they either had to win this fight or try some other alternative to accomplish the acquisition of the private companies in this State.

"We then discussed the Walla Walla situation and Carstensen agreed that municipal ownership in Walla Walla could go ahead without interfering in any way with their public utility district program. I requested that he support municipal ownership in Walla Walla if the city council decided to put it on the ballot this fall, but he gave no commitment as to his support.

"We also discussed with Carstensen certain other alternatives that need to be pushed now in order to strengthen the public power situation in the northwest and help defeat the merger. I pointed out that while the possibility of a competitive system in The Dalles and the existing competitive situation in the Hood River cooperative were Oregon developments, they had a bearing upon the situation in the State of Washington because they were in Pacific Power & Light territory and that, therefore, the grange should give its moral support and any other support that it could to these developments. Similarly, we pointed out that a public utility district election in Clatsop County (Astoria) was coming up on the fall ballot and that the leaders in the Oregon grange felt that if sufficient effort were placed on winning this election, they had a very good chance of winning it. I suggested to Carstensen that inasmuch as Nick Bez is a member of the governor's advisory commission and (according to Carstensen) is a strong supporter of the public utility districts that he might try to enlist the assistance of Bez in the problem of getting the issues properly before the people in Clatsop County.

"I mentioned also that Benton County had received an award of $1,250,000 and had been promised financing by Hassock. Carstensen's reaction to the Benton County award was that it was too high and that the PUD would find itself in the same embarrassing condition that Okanogan County finds itself in today as a result of paying too high a price for its properties. I did not mention to Carstensen the inconsistency of his position on the question of price.

"I told Carstensen that certain groups in Portland were interested in circulating a referendum petition when and if the city council acts favorably upon the Northwestern Electric and Pacific Power & Light application for city approval of their merger plans. Incidentally, Commissioner Lee made a statement in the Sunday morning paper to the effect that she had examined the proposed merger of the two companies and felt it should be approved by the city council because it would result in refinancing the company on a lower-interest rate. Our information is that a referendum requiring the city council's action to be submitted to the voters for approval can be secured by a petition containing 2,000 signatures in the city of Portland.

"When I told Carstensen about this possibility of delaying the merger proceedings, he inquired as the possibility of getting an initiative petition circulated and signed up in the city of Portland for muncipal ownership or for a PUD in time for the fall election. I indicated to him that I was not informed as to the number of signatures required but that I would look into this possibility purely as a delaying tactic and not with any feeling that such an election could be carried through to a successful conclusion.

"I neglected to mention in the proper place that Carstensen is having a meeting in Wenatchee on Monday, July 22, of all organizations interested in defeating Initiative 166. He expects to have the A. F. of L., the Public Power District Commissioners' Association, and the Grange as well as certain municipalities represented at this meeting. He proposed to have each of the organizations represented there send telegrams to the SEC protesting against the merger plans and asking for hearings on these plans in the Northwest. It is our feeling that if these hearings can be held in the Northwest, they can be used as a good public forum on the whole public power issue including the basic points in Initiative 166."

It is believed that a careful reading of this document illustrates rather forcefully that the zeal of the administration of the BPA goes beyond the mere function of Federal administration and becomes in the nature of a crusade for Federal power.

The following memorandum from Mr. O. G. Hittle to Paul J. Raver, dated May 2, 1947, is quoted in part:

"In discussing the desirability of the REA cooperatives in Oregon joining the Northwest Public Power Association with Guy I. Thomas, manager of West Oregon Electric Cooperative, I find that considerable educational work will be needed before the co-op people will accept the Northwest Public Power Association as their organization above the State REA Association. Guy stated that it was his present feeling that the cooperatives should first of all have their own organization and that in the case of a common struggle for public power they would then be in a position to join all other public power groups. He seems to be open-minded on the subject.

"I expect to attend the Board meeting of the West Oregon Electric Cooperative on May 13, 1947, at which time I will discuss this subject with the directors, hoping to get them to join the Northwest Public Power Association.

"The Tillamook PUD has at last received money from REA for the Trask River extension. We are doing everything in our power to expedite the delivery of power to the Trask River Lumber Mill."

The following memorandum from H. R. Richmond, Jr., district manager of the Bonneville Power Administration, to Paul J. Raver, is quoted;

"1. Attached is a copy of a letter sent by Mr. Aldrich of the Pendleton East Oregonian to the Secretary of War, with copies to the Chief of Staff of the Army and the President.

"2. As you may know, the city of Pendleton recently voted to change over to the city-manager form of government. The new city manager, Mr. Orin King, appears to be a very liberal, intelligent, and aggressive individual. I am going to suggest that he be invited to the next regional advisory council meeting, with the thought that he may eventually be invited to become a member."

EXTRACTS FROM A BONNEVILLE EMPLOYEE'S CONCEPTION OF HIS JOB

In September of 1946, the Bonneville Power Administration operated a booth at the Oregon State Fair, and one Mr. Olsen, a Bonneville employee, was in charge of the booth.

Notes left by Mr. Olsen indicated that he had tabulated the duties of a Bonneville Power employee in conformance with administrative order No. 33. The following quotations are believed to be of interest:

"I perform the following duties in accordance with provisions and limitations set up by administrative order No. 33.

"1. Explain why it is necessary for building of more dams.

"2. Explain the meaning of a balanced economy, show how low-cost Columbia River power will help bring a balanced economy.

"3. Prepare reports and explanations of growth and development of publicly owned distribution systems throughout the Nation, and especially in Columbia River drainage basin.

"4. Prepare and explain factual information on rates, savings, financial statements of publicly owned bodies now operating.

"5. Convincing people that public distribution of power is their inherent right.

"6. Preparing material to use in ads, pamphlets, and public-relations work.

"7. Speaking at meetings and fairs and answering questions about the public ownership of utilities. This involves much study and thought as to most effective method of presentation of the facts.

"8. Combatting private power company propaganda.

"9. Working with organizations—Grange, labor groups, farmers union, old-age pensions, POL, etc. (POL is assumed to be an abbreviation for Public Ownership League.)

"10. Selling idea of an economy of abundance.

"11. Selling public power.

"12. Selling idea that Columbia River power is nature's greatest gift to the people.

"13. Selling idea—it's theirs by prior right.

"14. Development operations requires study of public power throughout the entire Nation because NW public power development is a part of a Nation-wide program. Therefore, it is necessary for us to know about TVA, Boulder, Santee Cooper, Nebr., etc.—when one is attacked, all are attacked. Necessity for a unified national program."

EXTRACTS FROM NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS, SPEECHES, ETC.

Dr. Raver had been quite pointed in a number of articles, speeches, etc., concerning the difficulty of operating BPA under Congressional restraints, and advocates the removal of such restraints. Probably the most typical document that would illustrate the views on this matter is an excerpt from an address by Paul J. Raver at Reed College in Portland, Ore., on April 17, 1948. This is set out as follows:

"An aggressive private utility in our position with a serious power shortage, would expand its facilities as rapidly as possible, particularly the addition of generators at Grand Coulee. With the large investment in the dam already made, the proportionately small investment in generators would be returned within a few years from energy sales. Obviously from a business standpoint this is a prudent investment. But our procedure to obtain an additional generator is slow and cumbersome. First of all, we must secure the concurrence of the Bureau of Reclamation as to the immediate need for the generator. The Bureau will then estimate costs, establish schedules, and present these to the Bureau of the Budget for approval, after agreement with the Secretary of the Interior. With Bureau of Budget approval the request is then laid before Congress for authorization. Authorization will not always carry with it the necessary appropriation, and if not the Bureau of Reclamation must then go back to Congress for funds. Similarly, BPA must present its request for funds for transmission lines to carry the power to market when the generator is installed. A private utility would act immediately, presenting the problem to their board of directors, and then proceed positively. The TVA must go to Congress for necessary authorization, but having control over its own revenues, it can then proceed. The Bonneville Administration has an equal responsibility to the needs of its market area, but lacking control over its revenue and source of power supply, cannot carry out its obligation with dispatch.

"Another contrast with private business, is the situation we face in the keeping of our accounts. The only required accounting for a private utility is the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts. The Bonneville Administration is also required to utilize this system. On top of this, being a Federal agency, we are subject to all of the normal accounting requirements and procedures of the General Accounting Office. Furthermore, being responsible to the Department of Interior and subject to the budgetary control procedure of the Bureau of the Budget,, our accounting and fiscal controls must be established to meet their requirements. Another aspect of accounting control which is peculiar to our operation involves the Congressional limitation of funds to be expended on operation and maintenance. The uniform system of accounts establishes what charges shall go to operation and maintenance and to construction. This dual control contributes further to the inflexibility of our operations.

"Our day-by-day operations include all of the problems and responsibilities which are typical of a large private utility. In addition we have many which arise with a public agency. Maximum flexibility should be an objective of the management of a utility in preparing to meet these constant operating problems, many of which cannot be anticipated. To meet some of these problems, Congress has permitted modification in the original Bonneville Act. For example, we are now permitted to bargain collectively with hourly employees in several crafts, which provides us with a flexibility comparable to a private utility in dealing with this class of employees. The exception is that we have added controls and regulations placed upon us by the Civil Service Commission.

"In summing up these factors I have just cited, it might be stated that most of our trouble comes to a focus each year when we are subjected to what someone has termed the 'politics of the appropriations process.'

"Let me now give you some practical examples of how this political process affects us.

"1. Here is but one example of what occurs in our construction program. This happened last year.

"In the years prior to 1947, we had asked for and received authorization from the Congress which would permit us to order materials and start construction of a transmission line from the Dalles, Oreg., across the Columbia River to Goldendale, Wash.—a matter of 30 miles. This was to serve power to a fast-growing and power-short community which had a publicly owned utility distribution system.

"As I say, in the years prior to 1947, we had authority to order materials for this line and to start the construction upon receipt of the materials.

"For the fiscal year 1948 we needed money to complete setting the poles, stringing of the conductor, and installing the transformer facilities for delivery of power to the utility.

"Then the character of the Congress changed. The Eightieth Congress, which was to appropriate the funds to complete this job, decided as a matter of policy not to do so. There were new chairmen of the Appropriations Committee and of the subcommittee which refused our request. They had come into power on an announced over-all policy of national economy. They made broad cuts in all appropriations and, in the hurly-burly, the money for completion of this half-finished line was eliminated.

"When the House Appropriations Committee reported this cut, it was roughly 2 months before the end of the fiscal year and our crews had been working on the construction of the line.

"What was the Bonneville management to do? Were we to keep the crews plugging along in the hope the Senate committee would restore the amount and the restoration would survive conference, or should we fire the crews forthwith?

"Supposing we fired them and then got the money after all?

"Supposing we didn't get the money—what would we do about the stacks of insulators laid out along the line? There would not be even any money to pull them into storage.

"What about the holes that had been dug to set the poles in?

"While we debated this matter, a farmer threatened to sue us because one of his cows had fallen into one of these holes.

"But most important of all, what about the community that was depending upon delivery of power over that line? What about the commitments that the distributing utility had made to its customers based upon the assurance that power from Bonneville was on the way?

"There we were faced with the utility responsibility and with plenty of money in the bank from our revenues to do the job, but completely stymied.

"There was not one of us in the Bonneville Administration who believed there was anything arbitrary or wilful in this congressional action. We knew simply that the new membership of the committees had not yet had time to survey the problem for themselves. We had a new board of directors.

"Here is another example. The new Congress, with a good deal of reason on its side, was committed to the encouragement of private enterprise. As a means to this end, the Congress consciously put limitations on force account work by Federal bureaus and agencies. This was true in the case of the Bonneville Administration. Wording was written into our Appropriations Act which forbade us to do any of our own building. This had unforeseen consequences.

"All our construction work had to be contracted out. It was perhaps natural and inevitable for the bids of contractors to rise rapidly without the threat of competition by our own forces. It is impossible to document the increase in costs which this situation probably causes, but I am sure it must be large.

"Another difficulty that this abandonment of force account authority put us into was the increased complexity of our relationships with organized labor.

"Line construction is done by one group of unions. Operations of lines and substations is in the hands of another union.

"We had made special arrangements with the group of unions we do business with for the operation of a 'utility crew'. This was a group of workers who could do either construction work or operations work. It saved us an endless amount of time and money—which were important to meeting emergencies of various natures. But the change in the language of our appropriations act stopped all that. For a while it began to look as though we might have to contract out the operation of our lines—if we could find anybody who was willing to take that responsibility.

"Fortunately, before the appropriations procedure was finished we achieved some slight modification of the wording governing force account work.

"There is one other example of the practical difficulties Federal proprietorship gets into as a result of political pressures. It is one of the most anguishing experiences that can face a manager regardless of who owns his business.

"I refer to the arbitrary and often senseless ways in which reductions in force must be carried out.

"The brains and soul of any organization, whether it is government or privately owned, reside in the management and operations staffs. Bonneville is no different than any other enterprise in this respect.

"Beginning in 1938 when the Bonneville Administration had no business whatsoever, the Congress has allotted sums for operation, maintenance, and administration of the Bonneville system. The 1939 figure was, as I recall, $100,000. At that time we did not have a mile of transmission line, nor a kilowatt hour of power. As our business grew and as our operation and maintenance problem grew and our planning and sales problem grew, we asked the Congress each year for a little more money. Last year at this time we were spending operations, maintenance, and administration money at the rate of about $4,300,000 a year. This covered two general classes of items.

"1. The operation and maintenance of the physical plant—more than 3,000 miles of high-voltage transmission line; 59 substations. Operations of these facilities required crews of trained electrical operators and power dispatchers and switch tenders. Maintenance of these physical facilities required line patrols headquartered at strategic points throughout the Northwest region, repeated inspections for the purpose of preventing break-downs, availability of equipment for emergency work when break-downs did occur, and the operation and maintenance of an elaborate system of relay controls to minimize the danger of outages. About half our total expenditure of $4,300,000 was devoted to the maintenance of this physical system. During the war years we had been forced through lack of manpower and materials to neglect much maintenance that should have been attended to, and it was our hope last spring that we could obtain more money for this current year to catch up on this deferred maintenance.

"2. Less than half our operations and maintenance money was devoted to what might be called sales and administration. It was in this category that we made special effort to find highly creative people because it was in these administrative and sales departments that our planning and programming work had to be done. We were in a new business for the Government, the future was uncharted, bad guesses now would certainly wreck us in the future. Accordingly, over the 9-year period of my administration I made every effort to find people, not only with a good deal of technical training in the various branches of utility economics, but people with vision and understanding of the region which we serve.

"For example our sales staff was not composed of salesmen. It was headed, and still is headed, by a doctor of philosophy with vast training in utility economics, and utility rate making. It is his job to see that all the power is sold to the best possible advantage of the region and the Federal Treasury; that the rates at which this power is offered will pay out the Federal investment and at the same time be promotional enough to entice buyers and new types of consumption.

"Among his staff members is another highly trained economist and statistician whose sole job is to conduct a continuing study of trends in power consumption in various subareas of the Northwest region. Insofar as is economically possible, we must know where power is going to be needed in the Northwest 5 years from now because it takes 5 years to build a dam and about 3 years to build a transmission line; and if we are to plan these things adequately and without waste of money, we must know where they are going to be needed. This in turn requires some kind of a forecast. It takes an intimate knowledge of the highly complex techniques of power to make even an intelligent guess on these matters.

"In April the Appropriations Committee, newly staffed by Members of Congress who were unused to the study of the power business and who labored under the general impression that there was waste in all Government departments, trimmed our operations and maintenance budget from a current expenditure of $4,300,000 to $2,500,000. What this meant was that if the Senate did not give us more, we would have to cut back our operations by about 47 percent.

"The usual history of such things is that the House appropriates a minimum amount, the Senate increases it substantially and the difference is somhow split when the appropriation bill gets to conference.

"Obviously we did not want to wreck our organization any more than necessary. It was then apparent that we would have to trim the staff by July 1. We hoped we wouldn't have to trim it down to the House figure; but we could not be sure.

"So our personnel division and the controller's office worked out three alternatives: First, we guessed how much we might get if the Senate was generous and the House should soften up in conference. We thought we might get about $3,500,000. This would still be a substantial cut from the $4,300,000 we were then operating on, but we prepared a schedule for elimination of jobs and reduction of other items to fall within the $3,500,000.

"Then, on the chance that we were being optimistic with this $3,500,000 figure, we worked out a different schedule of economy for a $3,000,000 level.

"Finally, we took as a third possible alternative the worst that could happen—the amount allowed us by the House, $2,500,000.

"All this involved a terrific amount of work. The head of each division and office in the Administration had to figure out which jobs he would eliminate under each of the three possibilities. This was tough because there just didn't seem to be any way we could carry on any kind of a reasonable operation under the third alternative.

"The situation was further complicated by the various employee securities offered by the civil-service laws where length of service and veterans' preference quite often are the controlling factors in who is retained and who is fired. Quite often we found that if we eliminated the job, the person in it had prior rights to a job which was not eliminated. This situation resulted in a tremendous amount of displacement within the organization.

"To make a long story short, when the chips were down we found the worst had happened. We were forced to cut operations from $4,300,000 to $2,500,000.

"We abolished more than 650 jobs. The employees in many of these jobs displaced other employees by reason of their seniority rights. As a result of this perhaps a third of the remaining jobs in the organization had new occupants who were unfamiliar with the work.

"The wording of the appropriation law wiped out one entire division which we had been at particular pains to build over a period of 10 years. The wreckage to the staff was incalculable. Practically every one of our people got as good or better jobs elsewhere in the Government or in private enterprise.

"We reduced our line crews both in number and in size and the men who were displaced were snapped up immediately by the utility industry.

"We could trim our physical operations staff only so much—people had to be available to operate switch gear and dispatch power. So we took the biggest bite out of our planning staff—67 percent.

"Work which we had developed in the new fields of power use over a long period of time was abandoned. For example, we had been carrying on a correlation of studies in electric space heating. We had at one time a small staff—three men—working on this. We had established grants-in-aid with a couple of the Northwest colleges for research in this field. It is a subject about which far too little is known and in which there are many important problems to be solved. Electric space heat is inevitable in the Northwest. A considerable file had been built up and then we were forced to wipe the staff out. All of them got better jobs elsewhere. One man is working for the Navy; another man is working for one of the big electric supply companies; the third—an electrical engineer—decided there was nothing in Government employment and is now becoming extremely prosperous as a stock rancher. The great file of material which they had accumulated lies somewhere in the Bonneville archives. We constantly get requests for this information from utility systems and manufacturers, but there is no one to do more than acknowledge the letters.

"It is too soon to tell but things appear a good deal brighter this year. The Congressmen who were largely inexperienced in power and western development matters last year, have had a year to learn about it and to see the results of their clipping. They are intelligent, public-spirited men, and I am confident we will get a good deal more money this year than we got a year ago. But suppose we do get it? How am I going to staff up again on July 1? This year we had perhaps five survey crews laying out lines to be built with our badly cut funds. July 1 we may find ourselves with about $35,000,000 of construction money. To handle this we will have to have 18 crews. Are the survey men I fired last year going to come back to work for me now? I doubt it. How can I recruit survey men? I have only one recruitment officer in my decimated personnel office, and no money to hire any more.

"I can tell you now I am going to get it done some way, but I am afraid it will be more expensive than if we had been allowed to maintain a fairly stable level of employment during the past year. If I am to have these people available July 1, when we get our new money, I should start recruiting them now. But what can I tell them now? I can't make any really firm commitment of employment.

"There are numerous other examples of the special hazards which face Government-owned enterprises.

"I don't believe it is possible or proper to remove these hazards if removal means removal of control by the elected representatives of the people.

"I do believe, however, that a better balance can be struck between executive and legislative, State and Federal, forces on control of such operations.

"I believe that the Congress can guard its procedures against too free a reversal of policies via the appropriations route.

"In Bonneville's case, for example, I believe that Federal power sales policy could be better modified by amendment of the organic act with full debate thereon, rather than by language in the annual appropriation act.

"I believe further that agencies whose operations show a profit to the taxpayer and whose programs are self-liquidating could be trusted with more freedom in the use of revenues, subject, of course, to annual audit.

"Finally, I believe Federal budget making could be vastly improved by a segregation of self-liquidating public works from those which are not self-liquidating.

"All these beliefs of mine are based on the assumption that Federal proprietorship is with us to stay and will grow more extensive before it grows less so.

"I am not prepared to debate tonight whether this is good or bad.

"I can only recognize it as a condition."

Excerpts from newspaper articles which were reviewed by the writer for many years past are set out as follows which would indicate the fact that the administration of the Bonneville Power Administration is going beyond reasonable lengths in entering into political discussions and attempts to arouse the people for or against existing or proposed legislation.

The Oregon Journal of January 20, 1941—The Governor of Oregon apparently asked the opinion of Dr. Raver concerning the Oregon Public Utility District Act, the replies to which were published. Pertinent quotations from the newspaper article follow:

"Raver objects to the present law requiring two petitions to be filed in incorporation of a public utility district. * * * Raver wants the law amended so a public utility district may be incorporated within 30 days after filing the petition for incorporation. * * * Raver wants public utility districts to be given the right of immediate possession of property in condemnation proceedings. * * * Raver objects to the provision of existing law which subjects resolutions or ordinances of public utility district directors to referendum by district voters. * * * Raver would repeal the present law imposing direct and ad valorem taxes on district property. * * * Raver insists that provisions covering dissolution of a district are such that 'the need for drastic revision seems beyond dispute.'"

The Toledo (Oreg.) Leader of November 6, 1941:

"Mr. Fitts, representing Bonneville, was explaining advantages of the coast public utility district to local citizens along Main Street Tuesday."

The Condon (Oreg.) Globe-Times of November 7, 1941:

"A meeting was called by Morton Tompkins of the Bonneville Power Administration Friday evening in Arlington for the purpose of organizing a sponsoring committee as the preliminary step in forming a public utility district in those parts of Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow and Wheeler Counties now served by the Pacific Power & Light Co."

The Condon (Oreg.) Globe-Times of December 12, 1941:

"Morton Tompkins, State Grange officer and representative of the Bonneville Power Authority, who is interested in the people's utilities districts in Gilliam, Wheeler, Sherman, and Morrow Counties, was in Condon Saturday and picked the petitions from within this county which had been circulated and the registration attested by the county clerk."

Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of October 28, 1940:

"Appearing with Fred C. Shepard, urging peoples' utility district formation, Brazil stated that he represented Dr. Paul J. Raver, Bonneville Administrator, then urged that Bonneville power serve to bring new industry to central Oregon. He spoke of mineral resources which, he said, Bonneville power might serve to develop. Cheap transportation at tidewater is a factor in the aluminum operations on the Columbia which have contracted for power from Bonneville, he said.

"Shepard, who emphasized that his position does not put him under the provisions of the Hatch Act, read from a letter from Dr. Raver appearing recently in the editorial column of the bulletin as giving evidence that the possibility of power sales here as well as construction cost is a factor in determining feasibility of a Bonneville transmission line to central Oregon.

" 'If you vote against the public-utility district, you are voting against Bonneville power; that's what you are telling the administrator,' he elucidated.

"Speaking directly on the coming election, he affirmed that the men running for office 'are not going to plunge the district into the power business, necessarily, but will get the full facts as to feasibility.' "

Baker (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald of February 1, 1941—the address of Morton Tompkins, field representative of the Bonneville Power Administration:

"Mr. Tompkins traced the history of power and contended that the question today is 'Who is going to control power?' He asked the audience not to consider Bonneville power alone, but power development in all of the Northwest. He spoke of bringing Bonneville and Grand Coulee power together and even discussed connections with systems still farther away. * * *

" 'A great deal of the power reserved for public bodies has not been used. As a result the Bonneville Administration is dipping into the reserve for public bodies because of the call upon industry in the national emergency.'

"Later in his talk, Mr. Tompkins said, however, that 'Coming to Baker County is getting a long way from the source of supply. We can sell to private firms a lot closer to the dam, so at the present time the only power available for this area is that reserved for public bodies.'

"In discussing rates, Mr. Tompkins used charts to show a comparison of public-utilities district and private-utility rates. He said the present cost of 200 kilowatt hours per month in Baker County is $6.30, whereas it is estimated the cost under the public utility district would be $4.25. * * *

"The speaker said the district would pay for itself out of earnings, pay taxes and other expenses and give the people of Baker County earnings of $3,500,000 during a 30-year period."

Sherman County (Oreg.) Journal of April 11, 1941:

"Morton Tompkins, organizer of public-utility districts for the Bonneville Administration, was in town Thursday while on his way to Condon where a meeting was called for that night with the avowed purpose of petitioning for a district to be formed of the towns of Gilliam, Morrow, Sherman, and Wheeler Counties."

Baker, (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald of April 17, 1941:

"Assertion that savings of from 25 to 40 percent would be made in light and power rates in Baker County if the public-utility district gets into operation was made today by Morton Tompkins, representative of the Bonneville Administration who addressed the Lions Club at its weekly luncheon. * * *

"Mr. Tompkins presented five power bills which he said came from local concerns and pointed out savings which he claimed might be made."

Astoria (Oreg.) Astorian-Budget of April 25, 1941:

"THOMPSON, RAVER PROVIDE AMMUNITION AT PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT MEET

"Residential power rates under a public-utility district would still be 10 to 20 percent lower, rural rates 19 to 41 percent lower and commercial rates in cities 26 to 33 percent lower than under the latest announced reductions of the Pacific Power & Light Co., Dr. Carl Thompson of the Bonneville Administration told a meeting in Seaside Thursday night.

"Dr. Thompson, who is secretary of the Public Ownership League of America and former national campaign manager for the Socialist Party, spoke under auspices of a seaside public-utility district sponsors' group.

"Dr. Raver declared that the power company has only a 1-year contract.

" 'I can say definitely that I cannot guarantee under any circumstances to sell additional Columbia River power to the Pacific Power & Light Co.,' Dr. Raver wrote."

Baker (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald of May 24, 1941:

"With only a few days left before Baker County votes in the proposed people's utility-district ballot to accept or reject a public-utility district, D. L. Marlette, representing Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville Dam Administrator, appeared in the high-school auditorium to add his weight to the sponsors of the district.

"Mr. Marlette said, 'I do not say there never will be any power, but presently there is none available. We are not sure at all of having any power for the Eastern Oregon Light & Power Co.

" 'The only way for Baker to be sure of getting the power in any degree is to form a public-utility district.' "

A press release of August 21, 1941, by Dr. Raver concerning the signing of a preliminary agreement for the purchase of certain properties of the Mountain States Power Co. by a public-utility district contains the following quotation: "I believe this transfer which I am happy to have had a part in negotiating will facilitate the acquisition of private utility properties by other Oregon districts, nine of which have been organized for the purpose of marketing hydroelectric power on a nonprofit basis."

Grange News of January 17, 1948:

"Dr. Raver painted an optimistic picture for Bonneville and Coulee power, indicating his belief that the region was 'over the hump' of congressional opposition to public-power development in the region. He said the Federal Government had invested $360,000,000 and that sales of power to public agencies had reduced it already to $250,000,000. Bonneville's surplus as of last June, after all charges, amounted to over $22,000,000, Raver said. He urged a united front among all public-power agencies in appealing for future appropriations."

This specific quotation brings Bonneville very close to violating section 201 of title 18 which prohibits the use of Federal funds in attempting to influence legislation. Obviously Dr. Raver, who made the remarks in Seattle, was there on a Government expense account, and his salary was obviously running during the course of his remarks.

Walla Walla Union Bulletin of May 28, 1938, covered remarks of C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to the following effect: "The Assistant Secretary's statement was in answer to a report issued Wednesday by the House Appropriations Committee. The report criticized sales of Bonneville power to public-utility districts and said that public utility-district actions in condemning properties of private power companies represented Soviet power policy.

" 'The whole report shows the attitude of the Republican Congress in opposition to public power. The committee cut $84,000,000 from the President's requests, including $5,000,000 for the Columbia Basin, after these requests had been trimmed to a minimum by the Budget Bureau.' "

The Wenatchee World of June 15, 1948, carried the following comments of Dr. Raver in a speech before the public-utility district commissioners of Washington:

"I only hope that out of such organizations as these will come a rebirth of leadership. * * *

"But are we producing as much aluminum now as during the war? No, as a matter of fact, we are only producing 1½ billion pounds, a billion less, and why, because we cannot get the power. Then along comes a reduction in Bonneville appropriations for transmission lines and substations and reductions in maintenance and construction programs. This does not add up * * *.

"Dr. Raver told the public-utility district group no private utilities would be given contracts for delivery of power for longer than a year. 'We just cannot do it because we are gambling as it is on an average water supply and scheduled installation of new generation equipment. We just hope we won't have a dry year in 1951 for if all goes well our forecasts of needs indicates we can make it by then * * *'.

"Foster Creek is a must. If we had secured the appropriations for this year we might not be starting 1953 as a critical year. Who knows but what the international situation may demand that power then? The same is true for McNary, cutting appropriations means delay and a gamble with national security and an extra burden on our dwindling oil supply. In event of war, oil-burning power plants would be cut off. Our basic thinking must be changed and soon if we expect to develop this great country and assure peace. We need a closer working relationship based on sound business principles."

Oregon Journal, Wednesday, July 21, 1948—Addressing the American Society of Civil Engineers, Dr. Raver stated, "If the Federal Government is to do the job in the Northwest, it must recognize that the power aspects of the development are basic to the economy of the region and indeed, to the Nation. This means that power development on the Columbia River system must be differentiated from public works in both the planning and budgeting of the Federal Government."

The Salem (Oreg.) Capitol Press of October 25, 1946, quoting Dr. Raver stated:

"We will take care of the public power agencies first, our aluminum plant customers second, and what's left will go to the private power companies * * *.

"Only after private steam plants are running to full capacity, and the total output is still insufficient will we consider taking power away from our aluminum customers for the benefit of people served by private utilities."

A letter of April 17, 1940, from Dr. Raver to former Representative Nan Wood Honeyman contained the following quotation:

'Uninformed individuals are also accepting as fact, statements that increased taxation inevitably would result under a public-utility district, presumably because the public-utility district would not be paying taxes. So far as Oregon is concerned, this is obviously private-utility propaganda which, in fact, cannot be substantiated. Under the laws of Oregon the public-utility district is required to pay property taxes for the support of State and local governments and school and other taxing districts on the same basis as private-utility companies. In other words, the public-utility district would carry its share of the tax burden. Of course, it is true that the public-utility district would not pay city franchise taxes or taxes to the Federal Government. Franchise taxes seldom produce substantial revenue. So far as Federal tax payments are concerned, these in no way would affect the revenues to the city, county, and State."

GUY C. "FLASH" MYERS

Captioned individual is a rather fabulous figure in the field of public power promotion and presents an enigma in that he is a Wall Street operator who seems to be working against the so-called capitalist system and has made literally millions of dollars in commissions on the sale of revenue bonds created by public-power districts. It is a rather strange spectacle to understand that the so-called selfish interest of free enterprise is here employed to promote the very thing that will ultimately destroy such enterprise. These large fees, of course, that this promoter has received become a part of the debt of the community which must be paid off by the ultimate consumer of the utility.

It appears that Mr. Myers first entered this field through an acquaintanceship with J. D. Ross, who was originally with the Securities and Exchange Commission and was subsequently appointed as the first administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Guy C. Myers was born in Green Bay, Wis., and spent his early life in Wisconsin and New York. In 1907 he became employed by what is now known as the Illinois Power & Light Co. at Danville, Ill. In 1910 he became affiliated with the Eastern Montana Power Co., and in 1916 started in business for himself, buying and selling municipal bonds in Montana. In 1934 he moved to Seattle and is currently reported as residing in that city. He likewise maintains an office at 35 Wall Street, New York City.

He is reported in these early years to have organized the following: the Tri-State Rural Credit Association, the Farm Mortgage Corp., the Cane Irrigation District, the Red Lodge Canning Co., the Red Lodge-Rosebud Irrigation District, the Billings Canning Co., the Soule Apartments of Billings.

Some sources have indicated some of these early operations were highly speculative and failed to yield; however, no attempt has been made to check these early operations as the passage of time has dimmed their significance.

He apparently obtained the nickname "Flash" in Billings, Mont., and his phenomenal success seemed assured subsequent to his association with the late J. D. Ross, the great public-power pioneer.

For some years now Myers has been interested in promoting the sale of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. facilities and came close to closing the deal at a figure of $135,000,000. Myers, however, is still attempting to dissolve remaining private enterprise in the area.

A review of correspondence in the files of the Bonneville Power Administration illustrates the close relationship of Mr. Myers to that Administration during the period of time when Mr. J. D. Ross was Administrator. It is emphasized here that there was no indication in the files that the present Administrator has any personal relationship whatsoever with Mr. Myers. However, his very attitude in administering his responsibility makes it possible for Myers' success. In conversations with Dr. Raver it would appear rather definite that Dr. Raver does not approve of the tactics used by Mr. Myers and has, in fact, indicated that he felt many of the estimates made in connection with the purchase of the private utilities were unreasonably high.

Letter from Guy C. Myers to Mr. Ross, dated April 1, 1938:

"I am informed from several sources in Oregon that the PUD election on April 8 for the seven power districts will be defeated. I hope this is wrong.

"I also had hoped that the election could have been held under a new law we are working up that would make it much easier for them to proceed if they did win the election.

"Everything else is moving along splendidly and I hope to see you soon. Best regards from us all."

A telegram to Mr. Ross, dated December 30, 1937, from Herman E. Lafkey read as follows:

"Failure of Myers to comply with written and oral agreement to personally finance utility district warrants issued for legal fees causing undue hardship on attorneys. Duties necessarily require time and expense with other sources of income practically cut off. Do you have any suggestions?"

The following telegram from Mr. Ross to Mr. Myers dated December 30, 1937 (Government rate) stated:

"Have received following telegram from Herman E. Lafkey, Southwest Washington Utility District Association (above telegram quoted). What do you want me to advise him?"

Telegram from Mr. Myers to Mr. Ross dated December 31, 1937:

"Warrants Lafkey holds do not comply with legal requirement from an investor's standpoint. My agreement calls for legally issued warrants. Chick can explain this to you. He holds similar types of warrants as Lafkey and no complaints from him. I received same wire from Lafkey and I am answering him air mail. Happy New Year."

The following series of telegrams, during the pertinent period when a good many of the public utility districts were promoted, are to J. D. Ross from Guy C. Myers:

NOVEMBER 22, 1938.

Some day when you have time will you give me a list of all the Commissioners' names that were elected in the last election, showing their district and address. I suppose you have these, or if not, you will be able to secure them. Bob says Grays Harbor district was sending letter on to me. I hope I get it before I leave for the west coast, so I can make some progress here.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

JUNE 25, 1948.

Washington promises us decision on Nebraska contract next Tuesday. Would leave immediately for Seattle. Could handle bonds for Cascade Locks if you think they are sound. Will need some figures on company. Have you got them or shall we get them here?

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK CITY.

DECEMBER 2, 1938.

Arrive Portland Stream Liner Tuesday morning. Traveling with attorney and banker. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

DECEMBER 29, 1938.

Answering your night letter, I will help in every way possible and have arranged to secure facts and figures on Pacific power and Northwest. This information being compiled now. I will be in Portland early part January to turn them over to you for your study. Congratulations re Neb. Due more to you than anyone. This is the biggest step forward in settling the power program that has been done so far. We all wish you a healthy and happy 1939. Regards.

GUY MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 8, 1939.

Please wire when do we receive Grays Harbor interstate confidential figures for our own use.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 17, 1939.

Please air mail copy power contract between Bonneville and any Washington power district. Regards.

GUY MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 23, 1937.

Dawson willing work with Schuler but cannot split his fees. Better suggest that bankers take care of Schuler. He will not have much work to do anyhow but can keep Dawson advised as to moves made by Myers. Is this O. K.? Received Grays Harbor figures. Please wire amount for working capital improvements and betterments. Have you seen Solomon? Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

MARCH 6, 1939.

Just learned Supreme Court kicked out Wahkiakum case. Advise me what this means. What is physical value Grays Harbor property? Duff confirms deal off on water properties. Please advise me result your talk with Griffin so I can have his attitude in checking with people here. This I will keep confidential. Air mailed today answer balance your wires. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 5, 1939.

Sent following wire Chuck today, "Am assured this morning bankers will conclude Pacific and Wahkiakum financing by May 1." Talked to Barnes today. He is preparing letter to me setting forth conditions under which he will negotiate for acquisition by districts of Puget Sound Power & Light Co. Be sure and have Lund give balance information to Laing at Chicago. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 11, 1939.

Just received wire from Chuck stating districts covering Puget meeting Seattle Sunday. Wired him arrive Tuesday asking if meeting could be postponed. Will have Barnes' letter tomorrow, could forward you to read before commissioners if meeting cannot be postponed. Can you do anything about postponing meeting? Please wire if contract between Bonneville West Coast Power has been signed. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 12, 1939.

Sending Barnes letter Seattle. Urging Nichols telephone stating you can give as much information as if here. Advising impossible say when you could arrive. Advised further delay his decision Grays Harbor would cause commissioners institue condemnation. Also under no conditions would you recommend higher than $2,842,000. Stress these points if he telephones so can settle matter this week. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 14, 1939.

Air mailed you Portland yesterday copy Barnes letter. Original sent you Seattle both with covering letter. Leave New York 5 today. Wire me Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., Saturday until 6 p. m. in case you need additional ammunition. Have understanding with Nichols along lines you suggested. Do not tell commissioners anything unless they going Seattle meeting and then only you know I have made successful trade which will explain on arrival. Wired Judy asking commissioners pass resolution authorizing offer $300,000 water properties to forestall cities interfering district program. Wired Skamania pass resolution offer $40,000 Stevenson division. Arrive Tuesday streamliner. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

MAY 9, 1939.

Hope you settle West Coast Transmission purchase quickly. Air mailed yesterday Boner Prescott Laing copy Grays Harbor purchase contract. Your Lunds going today. Also copy power contract Grays Harbor Wilapa. Snider says you have description real estate. If not wire. All exhibits your hands immediately general principle purchase contract agreed to by district. Contacting Duff Skamania. Anxiously awaiting Grays Harbor engineers report. Regards.

GUY MYERS.

NEW YORK CITY.

MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS

For the information of the committee, a list of speeches, as made by Bonneville employees, is set out hereinafter. It is noted that in the year ending June 1948, Dr. Raver made 23 formal speeches which is a little over approximately two a month.

SPEECHES GIVEN BY DR. PAUL J. RAVER, ADMINISTRATOR, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, JULY 1947–JULY 1948

July 3, 1947: The Dalles, Oreg., Kiwanis Club.

July 12, 1947: Seattle, Wash., Building Trades, Washington A. F. of L. (extemporaneous).

August 6, 1947: Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, Idaho State Federation of Labor (extemporaneous).

August 15, 1947: Longview, Wash., Northwest Public Power Association (extemporaneous).

September 1, 1947: Prosser, Wash., States Day celebration.

September 4, 1947: Springfield, Ill., Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives.

September 17, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Labor Management Council (extemporaneous).

October 10, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Men's Club, White Temple Baptist Church (extemporaneous).

October 15, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Public Utilities Commissioners (extemporaneous).

November 25, 1947: Portland Oreg., Portland Council of Churches (extemporaneous).

December 12, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Board of Intergovernmental Relations (extemporaneous).

March 31, 1948: Portland, Oreg., Multnomah County Legion, Portland Post No. 1, Future of the Great Northwest.

April 5, 1948: Washington, D. C., review meeting with National Security Council.

April 13, 1948: Chicago, Ill., International Association of Operating Engineers (extemporaneous).

April 17, 1948: Portland, Oreg., Reed College, Northwest Political Science Association, Some Political Problems of Government Proprietorship.

April 22, 1948: Sacramento, Calif., Board of Intergovernmental Relations, Power Outlook for the Pacific Northwest.

May 6, 1948: Portland, Oreg., speech before supervisors of Bonneville Power Administration (extemporaneous).

May 11, 1948: Tacoma, Wash., Tacoma Kiwanis Club (extemporaneous).

May 28, 1948: Raymond, Wash., Pacific County Public Utility District, dedication of new building (extemporaneous).

June 12, 1948: Ephrata, Wash., Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association (semiannual convention) (extemporaneous).

July 10, 1948: Hungry Horse Dam, dedication Hungry Horse Dam (extemporaneous).

July 17, 1948: Quinault, Wash., Quinault Light Co. (extemporaneous).

July 21, 1948: Seattle, Wash., American Society of Civil Engineers, Production, Power, and the Pacific Northwest.

Exclusive of Dr. Raver the staff of Bonneville Power Administration made 59 public-speaking engagements, radio addresses, etc., during the fiscal year 1948. A review of material furnished indicates it is generally highly partial to Federal power and criticism of the Congress for failure to appropriate funds for expansion is found both directly and by implication. Copies of the material referred to is available in the staff files.

FORMER BONNEVILLE EMPLOYEES NOW EMPLOYED BY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS

In response to a query as to the identity of employees of Bonneville Power Administration now employed by public-utility district, reply was received as follows:

George F. Ward, manager, Skamania County public-utility district, Stevenson, Wash.

Lacy M. Peoples, assistant superintendent of operations, Cowlitz County public-utility district, Longview, Wash.

Al Rotta, assistant chief engineer, Clark County public-utility district, Vancouver, Wash.

Jack M. Gillham, manager of the Tillamook public-utility district, Tillamook, Oreg.

Paul Hand, manager, Central Lincoln County public-utility district, Newport, Oreg.

Lawrence Bauer, district manager, Central Lincoln County public-utility district, Newport, Oreg.

Owen Hurd, manager, Benton, Wash., public-utility district, Prosser, Wash.

James Phillip, engineer, Franklin, Wash., public-utility district, Pasco, Wash.

J. L. Shreve, engineer, Chelan, Wash., public-utility district, Wenatchee, Wash.

A. C. Jacquot, manager, Okanogan, Wash., public-utility district, Okanogan, Wash.

Charles Luce, attorney, Benton, Wash., public-utility district, Walla Walla, Wash.

Ralph Barber, attorney, Klickitat, Wash., public-utility district, Goldenale, Wash.

Ivan Bloch, formerly chief of the Bonneville Industrial and Resources Development Division, is now in private practice as a consulting engineer. One of his clients is the Snohomish, Wash., public-utility district, Everett, Wash.

George Hamilton, formerly a Bonneville consultant, is also retained by the Snohomish public-utility district as a consulting engineer.

James Metcalf, formerly in charge of Bonneville power sales, is now employed by the Harza Engineering Co. in Chicago, and has recently represented this firm as consultant for one or two public-utility districts in the State of Washington.

Consultants on rolls who did work for Bonneville during the fiscal year 1948:

McKinley, Charles (terminated December 13, 1947), coordinating committee: Consultant for Bonneville Power Administration from January 1947 to December 1947. Professor of political science at Reed College. At Reed College from September 1926 to June 1935, from February 1937 to September 1940, and from September 1942 to present. Consultant for State Department, Division of Economic Studies, from October 1943 to June 1944. Consultant for National Resources Planning Board from November 1942 to June 1943, and June 1939 to September 1939. Business specialist for War Production Board from June 1942 to September 1942. All charges for Mr. McKinley have been borne by the Pacific Northwest Coordinating Committee, and his being on our rolls has been merely as a convenience to the committee and the Department.

Starr, Eugene C., system engineering: Consultant with Bonneville Power Administration since August 1944; senior electrical engineer (expert) from July 1939 to August

1944 (part-time). With Office of Scientific Research and Development, Washington, D. C., from 1942 to 1945 (part time). Professor of electrical engineering at Oregon State College, where he has taught since 1927. Recognized specialist on high-voltage electrical systems.

Stevens, Henry R., power resources: Consultant for Bonneville Power Administration since July 1947. With Bonneville Power Administration since July 1938. Chief of power resources section July 1944 to July 1947. Chief of power planning section from June 1942 to July 1944. Senior hydraulic engineer from April 1940 to June 1942. Engineer in charge of power planning and assistant to consulting engineer from November 1939 to April 1940. Senior hydraulic engineer for United States engineers at Seattle, Wash., from November 1928 to August 1931. Self-employed as consulting engineer from August 1931 to January 1934.

Thompson, Carl D., Administrator's office: consultant with Bonneville Power Administration from November 1938 to June 1942, July 1942 to January 1945, and April 1945 to the present. Executive Secretary of Public Ownership League of America from 1912 to 1914, and 1920 to the present. Member Department of the Interior Power Policy Committee in 1936.

Consultants on rolls who did not work for Bonneville during fiscal year 1948:

Bailey, Van Evera, $25 per diem: Power management.

Bellaschi, Peter L., $50 per diem: System engineering.

Beyer, Otto S., $50 per diem: Personnel.

Cosman, Cornelius M., $35 per diem: Power management.

Goff, John H., $35 per diem: Branch load estimating.

Schaber, Carl F., $50 per diem: Power management.

Sussman, Gilbert W., $35 per diem: Administrator's office.

Udy, Marvin J., $50 per diem: Power management.

Wilkins, Roy, $50 per diem: Division of Engineering.

Zinder, Hanina, $50 per diem: Rates and Statistics.

Olson, Herbert A., terminated January 31, 1948, $50 per diem: Personnel.

Tompkins, Morton, $20 per diem: Administrator's office.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATIONS

In response to a query as to the identity of organizations that the Bonneville Power Administration belongs to, the following was furnished:

1. Special Libraries Association, 31 East Tenth Street, New York City, N. Y. Annual cost $15.

Membership provides the following material and services: Periodical Special Libraries; discounts on books, bibliographies, free books, and pamphlets, free reference services. Except for the periodical, the remaining material is available only to members.

2. American Public Power Association, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. Annual cost $50.

Membership provides the following material and services, most of which can only be obtained through membership. Two copies of a monthly periodical; 12 copies of a biweekly news bulletin; reference service in the field of electric-utility industry; free copies of publications issued by other organizations; discounts on publications issued by other agencies.

During fiscal year 1948 the library obtained, without cost from this organization, about $25 worth of publications. Also during this period the library saved $80 in the purchase of four copies of a Distribution Engineering Manual which sold for $25 each but were available to association members at $5 each.

3. National Safety Council, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. Annual cost: For fiscal 1949, the cost is $189.08. The annual cost fluctuates with the annual release of this organization's publication list.

Membership provides the following material and services: Periodicals, pamphlets, news letters and posters for distribution to employees; a special motor vehicle educational safety service for 60 truck drivers which includes a periodical and a periodical news letter, posters and awards; unlimited free consultation with the council's engineering and advisory staff; interlibrary loan facilities from its safety library; discounts on books, pamphlets and safety films.

4. Civil Service Assembly, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago 37, Ill. Annual cost $200.

Membership provides the following material and services: Copies of the quarterly periodical and the monthly news letter; test exchange service which provides for the loan of various occupational and other tests; use of the consultation service; receipt of a series of confidential personnel administration reports designed to help personnel officers; free interlibrary loan service.

5. Peninsula Light Co. at Gig Harbor, Wash. Initial membership fee purchased December of 1942 for $100. Annual costs subsequent thereto consist solely of the bills for metered-electric service. The administration had to join this cooperative in order to obtain local electric-power service for the operation of its Allyn substation. The Peninsula Light Co. is a small mutual organization which is the only source of this electric service in this area.

6. The Administration also has a number of library memberships with professional organizations, primarily for the purpose of obtaining their periodicals and proceedings. These associations include the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Society of Public Administration, and the American Institute of Accountants.

THE POLITICS OF THE APPROPRIATIVE PROCESS

As previously noted, Dr. Raver has apparently been quite outspoken in his criticism of the burdensome procedure of having to receive funds through congressional process. An editorial in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of September 29, 1947, criticized Dr. Raver for this attempt to get from under the will of Congress.

He was asked to comment on his attitude in this regard and advised as follows:

"The editorial referred to is one which appeared in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin on September 24, 1947.

"It refers to a phrase used by C. G. Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in an informal talk before the Bonneville Regional Advisory Council's thirteenth session in Portland, Oreg.

"You will find the minutes of this session, including Mr. Davidson's remarks, in the file attached to the reply to your interrogatory concerning advisory boards.

"The substance of the Bend Bulletin editorial is largely an expression of opinion. The Bulletin, in paragraph 6 of its editorial, admits the present fiscal arrangements under which the Bonneville Power Administration operates are a handicap, but it expresses the opinion that the answer is for the Government to get out of the power business. In this it disagrees with the Congress which has approved statutes putting the Government into the power business.

"There is an implication in the Bulletin editorial that the Bonneville Administrator would like to see the Administration freed from control by the Congress. This is not true. An accurate statement of my position would be that I would like to see the Bonneville Administration empowered to use its own revenues in accordance with congressional policies for business-type Government operations. I have suggested on several occasions, both to Members of Congress and to others, that this might be done by (1) amendment to the Bonneville Act; or (2) covering the Administration under the provisions of the Corporation Control Act.

"I have already informally discussed these ideas with some Members of the Congress, and I shall be glad to discuss them further with members of the committee at their convenience.

"In referring to the Bonneville Advisory Board, the Bulletin states: 'Administrator Raver, however, has had little commerce with this Board but instead has set up his own so-called regional advisory board with a handpicked membership. The meetings of this group, held from time to time at different points in the region, provide Dr. Raver with a sounding board for the presentation of his power ideas.'

"As explained in the reply to your interrogatory relative to Advisory Boards, the Bonneville Administrator is in regular contact with the members of the Bonneville Advisory Board through the circumstance that the members of this Advisory Board are also the members of the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee which meets monthly. At the time this committee was formed, it was agreed that matters previously taken up with the Bonneville Advisory Board would be taken up with the Inter-Agency Committee, and this has been done. In addition, I and members of my staff are in continual consultation with members of the Board in our day-to-day operations and business on policy and program matters.

"Information furnished you in reply to your interrogatory on advisory boards makes clear the character of the Bonneville Regional Advisory Council. A reading of the minutes furnished you shows that the Regional Advisory Council was not created as a substitute for the Advisory Board, and has operated in a different manner and for a different purpose.

"There is one other notable error of fact in the Bulletin editorial: 'Secretary Davidson makes no reference to the politics of the Bonneville administrative process that put such men as Morton Tompkins and Carl D. Thompson on its staff, that has denied publication of the project pay roll, that has tried pressuring private power operations into its control.'

"I have never refused requests for information relative to Bonneville personnel if such are at all reasonable and are within the limits of staff capacity to compile. I can find no record of a request for the project pay roll from the Bend Bulletin. I understand that the Bonneville employee lists have been published at regular intervals, along with the lists of all the Federal employees in Federal publications established for that purpose.

"I am at a loss as to what the Bulletin means when it refers to 'pressuring private power operations into its control.' It seems to me that this charge is inaccurate and requires a bill of particulars for a full understanding of it."

A great many other queries were left for reply by Dr. Raver and as of this writing have not yet been fully completed.

They appear to be rather voluminous and will not be included in this report. They will, however, be analyzed by the staff so that they might be more fully explored at the 1950 hearings.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT E. LEE,
Chief, Investigative Staff.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOLLIVER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with amendments reducing each item 5 percent.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question, on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO), there were—ayes 271, noes 1.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May anybody state that the gentleman from Iowa, who offered the motion to recommit, said he was opposed to the bill; and can it be indicated now that he did not vote?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman stated that he was opposed to the bill. The Chair cannot look into the operation of the gentleman's mind or into his actions, either.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 6, 1949, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2101. An act to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make disaster loans, and for other purposes.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1741) entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 184).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Lands.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY (H. DOC. NO. 158)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that legislation be enacted reorganizing certain Federal activities in the Columbia River Valley to the end that the Federal Government may play a more effective part in the development and conservation of the resources of the Pacific Northwest.

The resources activities of the Federal Government in this region are of great importance, not only because of the Government's responsibility with respect to the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, but also because of the extensive federally owned lands within the region.

Many Federal agencies have long participated in these activities to some degree, and the coordination of their separate activities presents a difficult organizational problem.

In general, two main objectives should guide the organization of the Government's resource activities. There should be unified treatment of the related resources within each natural area of the country—generally the watershed of a great river—and within the framework of sound Nation-wide policies. Furthermore, there should be the greatest possible decentralization of Federal powers, and the greatest possible local participation in their exercise, without lessening the necessary accountability of Federal officials to the President and to the Congress.

The traditional method of organizing the Government's resource activities, through departments and bureaus which carry on separate Nation-wide activities, does not itself provide for the unified consideration of each area's resources, which is so necessary, nor does it easily lend itself to decentralization. It has long been apparent that some organizational adjustments are necessary.

We have not found—nor do I expect that we shall find—a single organizational pattern that will fit perfectly the resource problems in the many diverse areas of the country.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, with headquarters in that valley, has been spectacularly successful in achieving many of the goals of a wise and balanced use of resources, through its own activities and through close cooperation with other Federal agencies and with State and local organizations. The integration of Federal activities, through the TVA, has contributed greatly to the growing prosperity of that region, and has met the acid test of satisfying the people who live there.

More recently, Federal interagency committees have been established in several of our western river basins, under the leadership of an interagency committee in Washington, D. C. These committees have proved useful in improving the coordination of Federal activities in those basins.

This committee system, however, has obvious limits, since none of the field representatives of the several departments and agencies concerned is responsible for an over-all view of all the resources of an area. Furthermore, the field committees have no power, other than the separate delegation of authority made to their members, and important problems must be referred through separate channels to headquarters in Washington, D. C., for decision there.

In improving the organization of Federal activities in the Pacific Northwest, we must recognize the unique features of that region. The Pacific Northwest—comprising principally Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana—is a relatively undeveloped area of our Nation, rich in resources and opportunities. The grand dimensions of the Columbia River give consistency to the problems, needs, and opportunities of the region.

The waters of the Columbia River system—among our rivers second only to the Mississippi in flow—are capable eventually of producing more than 30,000,000 kilowatts of electric power, of which only a little more than 3,000,000 kilowatts are now installed. There are possibilities or reclaiming many more acres of land by irrigation, as they may be needed, in addition to the 4,000,000 acres now irrigated. More than 40 percent of the Nation's saw timber and many important minerals, including 60 percent of our known phosphate reserves, are in the region. Properly developed and conserved, the resources of the Columbia Valley region can furnish enormous benefits to the people living there and to the Nation as a whole.

The Pacific Northwest has been developing very rapidly in recent years. The population has jumped 37 percent since 1940. The tonnage of agricultural production—not including livestock and livestock products—has risen about 25 percent in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho between 1940 and 1947. Total income payments have increased 200 percent since before the war in those three States, as compared to 150 percent for the country as a whole. The per capita income is among the highest in the Nation. These are signs of the progressive energy of the people of the region, and of the growth that can occur there.

However, this growth will not take place to the extent necessary to provide adequate employment for the growing population unless there is a steady program of investment in the development of basic resources in accordance with broadly conceived conservation and development plans.

The activities of the Federal Government have already been of great help. Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Bonneville power system, begun before the war, made possible the tremendous war and postwar expansion in population and in industry. Industrial development in aluminum, electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries, atomic energy, phosphates, and other lines is going forward rapidly. Each of these requires large amounts of low-cost power, in the production of which the Columbia River and its tributaries offer greater possibilities than any other river system in the country. Continued industrial progress depends upon turning these hydroelectric power potentialities into realities, since the present power supply is far short of the demand, and the region has no significant resources of coal or petroleum.

But far more than power is involved in the further development of the Columbia River for useful purposes. The disastrous flood of 1948 showed how much needs to be done, both in the river and on the land in the watershed, to reduce potential flood damage. The first irrigation water will soon be brought to the thirsty land in the Colorado Basin project below Grand Coulee Dam, and other irrigation projects are possible. The important lower Columbia fisheries program, to adjust the salmon-fishing industry to the dam-construction program, needs to be pushed forward. The use of the river for low-cost transportation of bulk goods can be greatly expanded.

Various Federal agencies are now at work on these phases of river development, and a considerable amount of competent planning has already been done. In particular, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have jointly worked out the framework for a comprehensive program of dam-building. McNary and Hungry Horse Dams are now under construction, and others are about to be started to meet urgent needs.

So far as river development is concerned, the task ahead is twofold. Present plans and schedules should be incorporated in a more-inclusive, better-balanced river-development program. And a unified operating system must be established for the many facilities already built or to be constructed. These objectives require better organizational arrangements than we now have.

Furthermore, a great deal needs to be done to bring the land, forest, and mineral activities of the Federal Government into step with the water-development program. It is questionable economy to spend millions of dollars for dams as part of a flood-control scheme, unless at the same time we are doing all we can in the way of forest and soil conservation and rehabilitation, so that floods will be minimized rather than aggravated. Similarly, it is not sensible to spend millions of dollars to reclaim land, in order to create new farms, if at the same time we fail to take appropriate steps to save existing farm lands from being washed into the rivers.

It is obvious that Federal activities and expenditures concerning land resources need to be planned in relation to those concerning water resources. Here again better organizational arrangements are needed than we now have.

I do not wish to minimize the substantial progress that has been made under the programs as they have been conducted in the past. However, we have now reached a point where the growing scope and complexity of the Federal activities in the region require much greater integration and the full-time attention of top-level administrators if the tremendous potentialities of the region are to be wisely and rapidly developed.

I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation to provide a means for welding together the many Federal activities concerned with the region's resources into a balanced, continuously developing program.

In so doing I recommend that certain Federal activities in the region be consolidated into a single agency, called the Columbia Valley Administration. To that agency should be transferred the Federal programs of constructing and operating physical facilities on the Columbia River and its tributaries for the multiple-purpose conservation and use of the water, including the generation and transmission of power. These programs are now carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and by the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army. This consolidation will provide not only for a balanced program of constructing dams, irrigation works, power transmission lines, and other facilities, but also for a workable operating plan for using these facilities simultaneously for flood control, navigation, power generation and transmission, fish protection, and other purposes. It is plain common sense that the planning and operation of the system of river structures is a job for a single agency.

The Columbia Valley Administration would have the advantages of a sound foundation of basic planning already done, and a large construction program already under way. The bulk of its staff would be secured from existing agencies. It would follow the practice of existing agencies in carrying on its construction work by contract so far as practicable. Under these circumstances, the establishment of the Columbia Valley Administration would result in no hesitation or delay in the development program. Instead, the Administration would carry forward the work already started in a more effective manner.

I do not recommend the consolidation of any other Federal activities in the Columbia Valley Administration. I do recommend, however, that the Administration be given direct responsibility for preparing definite plans and programs for soil and forest conservation, mineral exploration and development, fish and wildlife conservation, and the other aspects of Federal resource activities in the region, and the means to see that those plans and programs move ahead in step. Such plans and programs would be worked out in cooperation with all interested groups—local, State, and Federal, private and public.

In this way the activities of the Columbia Valley Administration and other Federal agencies would be properly adjusted to each other and to the activities of State and local agencies, and the maximum degree of joint and cooperative action would result. In this way the activities of all agencies concerned with water, land, forest, mineral, and fish and wildlife resources can be brought into a consistent pattern of conservation and development.

The Columbia River rises in Canada, and part of its watershed is in that country. Under long-standing treaties, the Government of Canada and the United States consult with each other on any development projects which affect international waters, including the Columbia River. The Columbia Valley Administration can work out, in cooperation with appropriate Canadian agencies and in accordance with our treaty obligations, practical means of developing the resources of the Columbia River region, on both sides of the international boundary, on an integrated basis. It is my hope that we will be able in this respect to demonstrate to the world new ways of achieving mutual benefit through international programs of resource development.

A further vital element in developing a better organization of Federal resources activities in the Columbia Valley region is to bring about a larger degree of local participation. To this end I recommend that the Columbia Valley Administration be required to have its headquarters in the region, easily accessible to the people who live there. I recommend further that the Administration be required, with respect to all phases of its activities, to seek the advice, assistance, and participation of State and local governments, agriculture, labor, and business groups, educational institutions, and other representative groups concerned. This can best be done, as the Tennessee Valley Authority experience has shown, not through formalistic statutory machinery, but through the establishment by the Administration of a large number of advisory groups for its different activities and in different parts of the region, and through the use, wherever possible, of

established local agencies to carry out the development program.

In these various ways the Columbia Valley Administration, while retaining its basic accountability to the President and the Congress, will be far more responsive to the needs and interests and desires of the people of the region than the present subordinate field establishments of the Government can be.

The Columbia Valley Administration should, of course, administer its activities in accordance with Federal policies which apply to the whole country. In seeking decentralization of Federal authority and appropriate flexibility to meet the unique characteristics of the Pacific Northwest, we should not establish different national policies for that region than for the rest of the country.

For example, the Administration should be required, in accordance with long-established Federal policy, to respect existing water rights and the water rights laws of the several States. The Administration should be required to follow the reclamation laws in contracting for the disposition of land or water in reclamation projects. It should be required to give the customary preferences and priorities to public agencies and cooperatives in disposing of electric energy. It should be required to demonstrate the economic soundness of the various projects it undertakes, and to repay reimbursable costs, in accordance with national policies. In short, its activities should harmonize, and not conflict, with Federal policies concerning agriculture, commerce, labor, and the other broad areas of national interest.

Finally, the Columbia Valley Administration should be given, with respect to its revenue-producing activities, appropriate financial and operating flexibility under the business-type budgeting, accounting, and auditing methods established by the Government Corporation Control Act. Without detracting from the necessary control of the Administration by the President and the Congress, this will permit more businesslike procedures and more steady and economical scheduling of construction and operations than are now possible.

These recommendations I regard as the fundamental elements of a better organization of Federal resource activities in the Pacific Northwest. They involve no expansion of Federal powers, no encroachment on the rights of States, communities, or individuals. Instead they are designed to achieve a more sensible and unified organization of Federal activities, which will result in a more effective program for resource development and more effective participation by the people of the region in shaping that program.

The enactment of legislation embodying these recommendations will bring Government closer to the people—closer to the grass roots. This means Government action that will be more responsive to the needs of the people.

In recent years the people of our country have come to understand that the progressive growth of our economy and the maintenance of national security depend largely upon the wise use of our natural resources. We have reached overwhelming agreement that our natural resources must not be wastefully exploited, but instead must be developed and used for the benefit of all our people, and at the same time must be conserved so far as possible to preserve their usefulness permanently.

We have been making great strides toward accomplishing these objectives. Private citizens and groups, local and State government, and the Federal Government have all been doing more and more as we have found new technical methods and new ways of working together.

Much remains to be done. We will need sustained private and public effort over many years, based on a realization of the importance of long-range investment in developing and conserving natural resources. This is an effort in which each citizen should feel a direct responsibility—not only the private owner of resources, whose management of his property has an immediate bearing on the public good, but every other citizen as well, since the welfare of all depends upon the preservation and wise expansion of our resources.

I believe that the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration along the lines I have recommended will enable the Federal Government to carry out, far more vigorously and effectively than is now the case, its part in the tremendous long-range task of developing and conserving the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest for the increasing welfare of the people.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 13, 1949.*

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks and that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

S. 1209

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 1209 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report for printing in the RECORD under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4029) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure for the Everglades National Park with available funds, including those made available by the State of Florida, the remaining lands and interest in lands within the boundary agreed upon between the State of Florida and the Secretary of the Interior, within and a part of that authorized by the act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816), and within which the State has already donated its lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Public Lands and, furthermore, that it means only the expenditure of State funds?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to consolidate the Federal ownership of lands within the boundary set forth in deed No. 19035 executed December 28, 1944, by the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida, and accepted by the Secretary of the Interior on March 14, 1947, for Everglades National Park purposes, the said Secretary is hereby authorized, within the aforesaid boundary and with any funds made available for that purpose, to procure lands or interests therein by purchase or otherwise. Whenever practicable and not in conflict with the public interest, the said Secretary shall allow owners to retain reservations of mineral and oil rights for limited periods of time depending upon the location of their lands and taking into consideration the purpose for which the park has been established.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 5, after the period strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 6 to 10, inclusive, and insert the following:

"The Secretary, shall, upon the request of the landowners, permit such owners to retain reservations of oil, gas, and mineral rights, including the right to explore and develop such lands for oil, gas, and mineral purposes, until February 1, 1956, and the right of ingress and egress on such lands under rules and regulations of the Secretary. In the event that oil, gas, or minerals are discovered and produced in commercial quantities within such time for such purpose on such lands or unit of which it may be a part, reservations so made shall automatically extend for so long as oil, gas, or minerals are being produced from said lands in commercial quantities from said unit. Such reservations shall, however, be made by the owners subject to reasonable rules and regulations which the Secretary may prescribe for the protection of the park but which shall permit the reserve rights to be exercised so that the oil, gas, and minerals may be explored for, developed, extracted, and removed from the park area. Said operations shall be carried on under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe to reasonably protect the lands and areas for such park purposes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short editorial.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD relative to an honor that has been bestowed upon the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep interest and great pride that my one-time comrade and now congressional colleague, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., has been voted a life membership in the Private Joseph R. Rotunda, Jr., Post No. 848, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the city of Newark, N. J. In evidence of this beautiful tribute, Congressman RODINO was given a solid gold membership card, which was signed by John D. Vincenzo, the commander, and also by Angelo R. Chicone, Jr., the quartermaster.

I had the honor to serve in Italy with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and I know how deeply and sincerely this tribute of his comrades of the VFW reflects their high regard for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] not only for his loyal wartime service in Italy but for his splendid contributions to the welfare of his country through his service in the Congress of the United States.

We, who have had the pleasure of getting rather intimately acquainted with the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER RODINO, know of his sincerity of his determination to be well informed on all questions, and of his undying loyalty to all men and women who served in the armed forces of our country in any of our past wars.

I hope that I, as a comrade and as a colleague of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], may convey my thanks and congratulations to the members of the Private Joseph R. Rotunda, Jr., Post for their thoughtfulness in giving this life membership. I am sure that this little gold card will always accompany the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and be a reminder of your faith in him and of his devotion and obligation to you.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill general debate in the Committee of the Whole shall not exceed 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and one-half of the time by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON ECA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rule, if a conference report on the ECA bill is not filed by midnight tonight, unanimous consent having been granted by the House, it may be in order for the House to consider the conference report if and when received any time tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 185, Rept. No. 439), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American Federal.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE BRITISH FILM QUOTA DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I must beg the indulgence of the House for I intend to talk today in frank and strong language. I regret the necessity, but my subject will brook no milder treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I indict the present ministry of Great Britain on a charge of perfidy.

The victim of this perfidy today is one of our largest American industries. Its eventual victim may be the entire world-recovery program; its ultimate victims may be the people of Europe, the people of Britain, the people of the United States, and the peoples of the civilized world.

I intend to support my indictment, Mr. Speaker, with a recitation of the overt acts.

Members of this House are aware in a general way, I am sure, that ever since the war the British Government's policy toward the American motion-picture industry has been one of steady harassment. Its obvious purpose is to drive American motion pictures from the British market. It has thrown up one barrier after another to the entry of American films.

Britain has attempted to excuse these actions on the grounds of its need to conserve dollars. That is an excuse—an alibi—which will not hold water, as I intend to show.

Britain glosses over the clear fact that its actions violate its own pledges in international agreements to work for reduction of trade restrictions and to churn stagnated world trade and commerce into new activity of mutual benefit to all.

The British attitude is in astonishing contrast with the long-standing position of the American motion-picture industry toward the British film industry and toward all others everywhere.

The American motion-picture industry has never asked this Congress to legislate protection for it from foreign competition. It has never even suggested a trade barrier against imported films. It has always taken the position that the motion picture is a medium of expression, and like a book, a newspaper, a periodical, should be able to circulate freely. The American market is wide open to all producers of motion pictures. They need not run to our Government for permission to send us films. Their pictures are welcomed here by our own industry which believes very heartily in the excellent old American tradition that competition is good business.

Foreign films in the United States must pass one test alone: the test of merit. A good foreign film does handsomely at our boxoffices; a bad one does bad business, but they all have an equal chance with American productions in the American market.

The American industry has always enjoyed the major share of the British market, but it has won the market through merit. The British people have always wanted American pictures. They still want them.

Moreover, British theaters also want and need American films. British exhibitors must have our pictures to keep in operation. At no time have British producers been able to supply, and they cannot now supply, sufficient films to keep British theaters open.

In the period preceding and during World War II, the British Government adopted a policy of giving reasonable protection to the home industry through quota laws reserving playing time on British screens for British pictures. Until less than a year ago the quota was 20 percent. Even at this figure—less than half the quota now in force—there were many defaults by exhibitors unable to obtain an adequate supply of home-made product.

Since the advent of the present Government in Britain, the policy toward foreign films has swung to one of aggressive hostility and severity. To any objective observer, this policy, flying in the face of economic realities and subversive of Britain's international trade commitments, must be considered as being deliberately intended to squeeze out American films.

This new British policy became manifest in 1947 when the British Government suddenly cracked down with an import tax of 75 percent on the earnings of foreign-made pictures in Britain. Seventy-five percent, Mr. Speaker. The seriousness of such an astronomical levy is rivaled only by its patent absurdity.

The American motion-picture industry had no alternative but to stop shipping films to Britain.

We were all sympathetic to Britain's dollar problem—none more so than the American motion-picture industry itself, as the record clearly proves.

What was the practical effect of this blatantly discriminatory tax? It created a grand uproar in the British motion picture industry itself. British theaters would have been closing down on a wholesale basis if the tax had been long continued—with great resulting unemployment. British producers felt the blow as well. Confidence in the industry's stability ebbed. Every element in the industry suffered. But the obdurate stand of the British ministry persisted for months.

Finally, in March of 1948, the ministry agreed to abandonment of the tax. It accepted the voluntary offer of the American motion picture industry to take only $17,000,000 a year of its earnings out of Britain. This was a generous proposition, Mr. Speaker, an extremely generous one, for $17,000,000 represents just about a third of the current earnings of American films in Britain, and the agreement is to run until June of 1950.

All of us felt this marked the beginning of better relations between two nations which most certainly should stand together in these sullen, sultry times.

But those fine hopes went down the drain. The effective date of the agreement had scarcely been reached when the British Government, once again in the form of a sudden crack-down, jumped the first-feature quota to 45 percent—more than double the previous quota. And this time the British Government had no excuse of saving dollars. The agreement had taken care of that, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I think very substantially indeed.

Effective next October, the quota is reduced by 5 percent to 40 percent, but we can skip further reference to that. For all practical purposes, a 40 percent quota and a 45 percent quota are the same thing. A 5 percent cut does not even begin to remove the causes of chaos in the British industry nor is it less discriminatory.

Let us look at the practical effects of this high quota in Britain. Once again, the entire British film industry is in a grand uproar. The quality of British-made films is further on the skids, producers are having trouble getting financed, the box office is falling off, and there is mounting unemployment in the industry.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, a 40 percent quota aimed directly at American-made films, when British producers could not make enough pictures to permit their own exhibitors to meet a quota only half as high!

Absurd? Ridiculous? Obviously. But there is no need to accept my view of it, or for that matter any views which may be entertained by the American motion picture industry.

The president of the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association is Sir Alexander King. I have not chosen to quote from Sir Alexander because we share the same name, but because I am happy to find his views on this distressing difficulty make such excellent sense. It is patently clear he knows his business.

On the occasion of his recent election to the presidency of the CEA, he called the 75 percent import tax a confiscation tax, and so it was.

He said the film agreement whereby American companies voluntarily limited their remittances to $17,000,000 a year from Britain "proves that our friends in the United States are still anxious to make a substantial contribution to Britain's economic difficulties." Then he turns to the imposition of the 45 percent quota:

> British producers rose magnificently to the occasion with promises. They promised to make 109 first features in 12 months—subsequently modified to 90. They promised British films would make more money than American films. This was to be a vintage year of British film production.
>
> They turned a muffled ear to the CEA when we said the quota was excessive, unreasonable, unnecessary, and inevitably hurtful to the welfare of the British film industry as a whole.
>
> They said the quota would make our industry flourish. Could one of them apply the word flourish to today's position?
>
> Our relations with America were never more strained. That state of affairs must not be allowed to continue. We must have closer cooperation between the British and American people. Any wedge between us today is dangerous to the cause of freedom and democracy.
>
> The time has come when bickering must stop and conflict cease on both sides of the Atlantic.
>
> I call for the rescinding of the 45 percent quota—

Said Sir Alexander King. Put in its place he urged—

> a figure that is workable. One year has proved that this high quota carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

Those are blunt words, Mr. Speaker, and admirably and tersely put. Now listen to another British authority.

The Honorable Tom O'Brien, a member of the House of Commons for West Nottingham, but in private life the general secretary of the largest British film trade-union—the National Association of Theatrical and Kine Employees—also has some trenchant observations to make. They are worth hearing. This is what he says:

> The remedies for the current misfortunes in film production are not to be sought in idle dreams or short cuts to salvation. The film industry has the largest number of regular weekly customers—33,000,000—yet it cannot finance its own product.
>
> It is no remedy to attempt to force cinema goers by statute or by regulations to see films they do not want to see, or to impose a quota that cannot be financed or fulfilled. That way lies discredit and disaster.
>
> It is no remedy to delude ourselves that permanent Government intervention can restore prosperity or produce miracles.

Out the mouths of Sir Alexander King, Mr. O'Brien, and other authoritative British spokesmen comes documentation for everything I have charged; that the 75-percent import tax was a confiscatory tax; that the 45-percent quota is discriminatory and that it cannot be fulfilled; and, finally, that any rift between Britain and America today is dangerous to the cause of democracy.

These same British spokesmen indicted their own film producers. Unsupported by their voices, I might have refrained from that myself, although there is no doubt that British producers must bear much of the blame for the insistent persecution of American films—and for their own misfortunes.

I will put my indictment of the British producers mildly. Shall we say that perhaps they misled the British Ministry into believing they could supply the British home market all by themselves? Let us say that they nudged the British Government into drastic acts against American interests with the understandable idea of garnering a greater return for themselves. But, as it turned out, they have simply outslickered themselves, and my primary indictment of the Ministry must stand.

The Ministry should have foreseen the result. It should have protected the broader interests of the entire industry—and for that matter, the interests of the entire British economy—and the interests of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am unable—literally unable—to find one vestige of economic rationality or justification in all this mess and muddle. I am unable to discover an iota of common sense in the British Government's flagrant violation of the spirit and intent of international agreements; I am unable even to imagine why Britain—a nation which so intensely depends upon foreign trade—should treat its solemn pledges to work for expanded trade and commerce as if they were so many scraps of paper.

Mr. Speaker, it is axiomatic that trade restrictions breed trade restrictions.

The British Ministry has chosen to bedevil one single American industry. Which is next?

The British Ministry gives beguiling lip service to the theory of reviving world trade but reneges on its word; we give our billions and keep our promises.

Not only in Britain, but almost everywhere around the world, the American motion picture must fight its way against a snarl of Government restrictions, trade barriers and special taxes.

Odd indeed, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that the gross offender in this unhappy situation should be Britain?

Bad as all these trade restrictions are from every economic point of view, they are even worse when viewed in the light of damming the free flow of ideas around the world—so necessary in this time of great challenge to all democracies.

The production headquarters of the American motion-picture industry, Mr. Speaker, are located in my State. It is one among the many prides of California, but in this case we gladly share our pride with all America. For there is no other industry more intimately intertwined with the daily lives of so many millions of our people.

I want this House to know, and I want the American people to know, Mr. Speaker, just what our American motion pictures are doing abroad today in our interests—and at great sacrifice to themselves.

In This Week magazine for April 3, Mr. Allen Chellas, an able writer, in no way connected with the motion-picture industry, tells the story of American motion pictures abroad today and tells it handsomely.

I want to quote a few pertinent paragraphs from his excellent article:

American movies are conquering the minds of Germans and Japanese as effectively as our troops conquered Germany and Japan—

He writes.

In Berlin, American movies are outdrawing Russian films, 6 to 1. Japanese movie attendance has doubled since 1945.

These movies are helping our military win the battle of ideas by making new friends and influencing erstwhile enemies along the bumpy road to democracy.

Mr. Chellas quotes from Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, and Mr. Johnston had this to say:

Wherever I traveled—France, England, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Germany—I realized that our movies are an immense mirror of life in America. In that mirror, millions—potentially pro or con America—see us, our habits, our ways of life. The motion picture with its intimacy, warmth and realism is the most potent medium to tell the American story abroad, particularly in Germany, where the struggle for possession of German minds is keenest and most critical.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that I have said some harsh words about the British Ministry. But I held long counsel with myself before I chose them. I asked myself if it were best to hold my peace. I reminded myself that even a mildly provocative remark by any representative of this Government—high or low—directed at the government of a partner in the Atlantic Pact might seem at first flush to be imprudent.

But then I reminded myself that the "C" in ECA stands for "cooperation." I should like to see a vast deal more of it from the British Ministry. I think most of us in this Chamber would. I think most of the American people would.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly committed to ECA; I entertain the warmest affection for the British people. I realize that there are sane and level heads in Britain who may eventually untangle this ugly knot—but let the present Ministry of Britain take heed:

American patience is not inexhaustible.

It is not too late for the British Government to regain the definite respect and standing it has lost in American eyes. Let it take a fresh look at itself and its unfair and capricious attitude. Let it reduce its monstrosity of a quota to a practical and reasonable figure—or, better still, eliminate it entirely. Let it do it voluntarily and without pressure. But let it by all means do it. I would strongly advise the British Government to do it and do it at once.

Mr. Speaker, because of the compelling importance of this matter, I shall ask the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, to investigate this situation.

MAMIE L. HURLEY

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "act", insert ": *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the nature of this bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. This is a claim bill. At the end of the bill the Senate has inserted *"Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY W. SHARPLEY

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 595) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "parties", insert ": *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SPINNICHIA

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of Laura Spinnichia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "McDonald" and insert "MacDonough."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 779) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL E. LAWSON

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New

York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, LANE, and JENNINGS.

ROSE MARY AMMIRATO

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. Private Law 447, Eightieth Congress, is hereby repealed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the situation with reference to this bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. A similar bill was passed by the Senate and signed by the President during the Eightieth Congress, but the phrase "any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" was omitted, and the Treasury would not pay the claim. This bill was reintroduced, and the Senate has amended the bill to provide "Section 2. Private Law 447, Eightieth Congress, is hereby repealed."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is so as to avoid double payment?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short articles.

Mr. MACY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a statement.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two news items.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch.

Mr. CHUDOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Daily News.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during the session of the House tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss proposed labor legislation which will soon come before this body. What we do with reference to this legislation will affect every citizen in the Nation. We want to be fair and just to all in writing this legislation. I think we should examine it under the following formula:

Will it encourage, protect, and be helpful to the laboring men, to agriculture, to business, and to all the people?

These three great segments—labor, business, and agriculture—all of which together make such a tremendous contribution to the Nation, must be encouraged equally with legislation that will move them all forward together in a harmonious and cooperative spirit which will not only render the greatest help to these three segments but will bring the greatest amount of domestic harmony and prosperity to the 140,000,000 people who make up this great America.

Two years ago the Congress made a 3-month comprehensive study in securing all possible facts upon which it wrote the Taft-Hartley law. In comparison, for political purposes and to keep campaign pledges, the party in power has reported out a bill after 2 weeks of hearings which recommends, in substance, the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the institution in its stead of the old one-sided Wagner Act, enacted 14 years ago.

The committee adopted the unheard-of procedure of refusing to consider amendments to the administration bill offered by those in the committee who opposed it. Such high-handed, steam-roller tactics in the past have been unknown to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, those who are supporting the administration bill, by their acts, take the position that regardless of the great expansion of business and labor organizations during the past 14 years, when the Nation has progressed in every other direction, that we shall not make any progress so far as labor and management relations are concerned. They would go back to the old Wagner Act and take us back to the jungle of tooth and claw, and to the chaotic conditions that often developed then between management and labor to the detriment of the entire Nation.

If I were not deeply interested in the welfare of the laboring men, of agriculture, business, and all of the people, and if I wanted to do a great disservice to labor and to all of the people, I would vote for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and for the substitution therefor of the vicious one-sided Wagner Act which has caused more strikes, more loss of time to labor, and more damage to the Nation than any piece of legislation passed during the past 14 years.

I think what we should do is to amend and correct any provisions in the present law that have proved under experience to be unjust to labor, and to take great pains in rewriting the act so that it will help the entire economy of the Nation. I believe the majority of the Republicans and Democrats in this House, regardless of the tremendous pressure put upon us, will have the courage to do what we think is best in legislation for labor, business, agriculture, and all of the people.

IS IT A SLAVE-LABOR LAW?

I should like to quote the following figures to show that the charges constantly made by some of the big labor leaders that the Taft-Hartley Act is a slave-labor law and would destroy the progress of unions is completely false. The big labor leaders who are good politicians and know the value of a slogan hurriedly got together after the law was enacted and coined the slogan branding it as a "Slave-labor law." Through their publications and over the radio they tried to pull down the iron curtain to prevent the laboring men from knowing the truth about this legislation.

To some extent they succeeded, but when the new law is written and the facts come out, as they are coming out now, I believe the laboring men will realize that they have been grossly deceived. Let me prove the falsity of these charges once and for all time by quoting figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

RAILROAD WORKERS

Let us see, for instance, how much it has enslaved the railway workers during the past 2 years of 1947-48.

Since this law became effective, railway workers have received wage increases totaling approximately $883,000,000, without the loss of 1 day's pay due to the stoppage of work.

During the past 2 weeks one contract has been negotiated between the railway unions and railway management increasing the pay of 100,000 railroad machinists and their helpers, along with many thousands of the 15 nonoperating railroad unions, by 26 percent, boosting their wages in this one settlement by about $650,000,000. In addition, they got a shorter hour workweek.

Certainly the threat of this act, even though the railway workers are exempted, has not enslaved them. Nevertheless, union railway officials continue to write us Congressmen urging that we repeal the Taft-Hartley law before it completely destroys labor. Such charges are an insult to the intelligence of the railway workers, and to the Members of the Congress.

BUILDING TRADES WORKERS

At the close of 1946, before the Taft-Hartley law became effective, the average pay of brick masons was about $2.06 an hour. Today the scale is $3 an hour, with $6 an hour in many instances if they work Saturdays.

Carpenters were receiving approximately $1.65 an hour in 1946. Today the scale is about $2 an hour.

Plumbers were receiving approximately $1.88 an hour in 1946. The pay scale today is around $2.50 to $3 an hour. I ask you, is there any slavery in these wages?

COAL MINERS

At the close of 1946 the average weekly pay of coal miners was $58.03 per week. The average weekly wage today is $72.70. In addition, coal miners who have worked 20 years and reached the age of 62 years are now receiving a pension of $100 a month. This happened during the past 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law, yet their leaders say it is a slave-labor law. How false.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

The millions of industrial workers in 1946 received an average wage of $43.74 per week. Their weekly wage today is $54.63. Do these wage increases enslave anyone?

During 1947-48 union membership in the United States has increased from 14,974,000 workers to 15,700,000, making a total gain in membership under the Taft-Hartley law of 726,000 new members.

These increases in wages, and the great increase in membership of unions proves completely false the charges the big labor leaders have made in their effort to deceive the rank and file of labor by calling this act a slave-labor law.

INJUNCTION PROVISION

I cannot conceive now that the heat of the campaign is over that the administration really wants the repeal of the provisions in the present law which provide for an 80-day period which gives the President and the governmental machinery set-up an opportunity through mediation and conciliation to prevent or settle a strike that would imperil the public health, safety, and the welfare of the entire Nation; particularly in view of the fact that in the past two years the President has found it necessary to use that power given him seven times in the successful settlements of such threatened strikes in the interest of all the people.

I think we must write the injunction provision into the new legislation if we cannot find some other approach that is just as good.

I understand an amendment will be offered in the Senate that the use of an injunction in a Nation-wide strike be done away with and that a mediation board be appointed to make a thorough investigation of a threatened strike and report its findings to the Congress immediately, if a settlement has not been reached.

Such an amendment might make the injunction process unnecessary, and serve the purpose. If both management and labor knew such a report would be referred to the Congress for action, such knowledge might encourage a settlement. I also feel that the Congress would immediately take proper action to enforce the findings of such a mediation board and prevent a strike that would do great damage to the public health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

Some legislation must be worked out to protect all of the people and the economy of the Nation. The Attorney General has testified in substance before the Senate committee that the President has inherent injunctive power to delay such a strike, if it is necessary. Evidently, the administration for political reasons is trying to dodge the injunctive issue by name at least on the surface.

Those who want to meet this issue openly and fairly before labor and the people of the Nation contend that if the President has such power—which they doubt he has—it should be pointed out. If he does not have such power, it should be written into law to cope with Nation-wide disputes between labor and management to protect the people.

By claiming it is not necessary to write the injunctive power into the law, it appears that they may be trying to bypass the injunction, yet at the same time they infer that they have and will use such injunctive power if an emergency makes it necessary.

The miners' organization, the union officials of the steel organization, or the officials of the railway organizations—any of these three at their will can close down and wreck the economy of this Nation to the great detriment of all of the people. Some power must be provided where the President, or the Congress, can prevent such a condition from occurring in the interest of all the people of the Nation.

Under the Taft-Hartley law we took mediation and conciliation out of the Labor Department and made them independent agencies. They must remain independent from the Labor Department so that business management and labor, who are engaged in negotiation, conciliation, or mediation will know the Board with which they are dealing is fair and impartial.

In other words, everyone wants a fair trial before an impartial jury.

Mr. Speaker, the administration puts the Conciliation and Mediation Service back under the Secretary of Labor, who testified before the committee for the administration bill, and whose duty under the law setting up the Labor Department, is to promote the interest of the laboring people of America. In fact, the CIO and the American Federation of Labor are generally each given the appointment of one Assistant Secretary of Labor each to help run the Department.

You can see at a glance if this is done, business management can have no confidence in mediation and conciliation. It will again put the labor leaders largely in charge of administration and will destroy any chance of bringing about improved relations between labor and management. The Department of Labor will then act as judge, jury, and prosecutor in settling disputes. This must not be done in the interest of labor, business, and the Nation.

THE CLOSED SHOP

I am not certain that the closed shop, as written in the law, should be retained.

All building-trade laborers, I think, should be exempted from the closed shop. I firmly believe that other corrections should be made in the closed-shop provision. I believe that where the employers and the employees agree the closed shop is beneficial to both, that they should have the right to go back to the closed shop.

The printer's trade may be an example, in addition to the building trades.

There are other amendments that might be written into the act liberalizing the closed-shop provision, and other provisions, I think, will be. We want the legislation to be fair and just to all.

Of course, as in all legislation, some mistakes were made, and they must and will be corrected.

NON-COMMUNIST OATH

The administration bill leaves out that section of the Taft-Hartley law which requires union labor officials to sign an affidavit they are not Communists. It should be included in new legislation.

They object on the grounds that such a provision is an insult to the loyalty of union officials. If such a requirement is an insult to them, then every Member of the Congress, and every employee of the Federal Government, up to and including the Cabinet officers are subject to the same insult. All of us Members of Congress, Cabinet officials, and others are required to and do sign such affidavits before we can receive our pay.

I cannot believe union officials are entitled to greater courtesy than are the Members of the Congress, and the members of the President's Cabinet. I would amend the law and also require management as well to sign the affidavit.

The signing of this non-Communist oath, which has helped to drive Communists out of union leadership, has been of great value to labor and the Nation.

The united electrical workers, fur workers, and farm-equipment workers unions, and others of the CIO have been particularly affected and dominated by Communist union leadership.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, working with Walter Reuther of the united auto workers, for the past 2 months has been putting on a drive to take over the farm-equipment workers union into the united automobile workers. Their publicly stated purpose is to change the control of this union, because it is Communist-dominated.

The failure of officers of the United Electrical Workers, many notoriously Communist, to file non-Communist affidavits was a primary ground on which the Atomic Energy Commission ordered the General Electric Co. to stop dealing with that union at two atomic-energy plants to protect our national security and the secrets of the atomic bombs. If this Communist section is not included in the new legislation the Atomic Energy Commission could not take such action to protect in the future atomic-energy secrets, because the law would then compel General Electric to recognize and deal with the Communist-affected United

Electrical Workers. I feel that the Congress should and will write this section, which has been left out of the administration bill, back into the new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the following provisions left out of the administration bill, most of which were written into the Taft-Hartley law for the protection of the workers from coercion from both union officials and management, should be incorporated into the new law.

First. Contracts arrived at through negotiation between employers and employees should be enforceable by law as to both parties.

Second. The right to determine to strike, or not to strike in the present law by a secret-ballot vote of the members of the union should be retained.

Third. Jurisdictional strikes which do such great harm to both the members of the A. F. of L. and the CIO through constant work stoppages in a fight between these unions should continue to be outlawed.

Fourth. I think union officials should be compelled to continue to give union members and the Government at the end of each year an itemized account of all money received in dues, what it was spent for, and to whom it was paid.

This clause written into the Taft-Hartley law has saved millions of dollars to the union members in the big cities that in the past was wasted by the extravagance of some union officials, and, in many instances, through graft.

I cannot see why, if the big labor leaders want to be fair to the men from whom they collect the dues, they would so strenuously object to this provision. It is left out of the administration bill.

Fifth. I believe the provision in the present law which prevents union officials going to the employer and having a member of the union fired off of his job so long as he pays his dues should be retained. It is left out of the administration bill.

This is one of the most important provisions in the act to protect the union men from abuse by union officials. Under the Wagner Act, when all they had to do was to take a man's union card away from him and go to the employer and have him fired, that not only took away from him the right to earn a living for his family, but took his freedom away from him to express his views on the floor of the union.

Few men were willing to stand upon the floor of the union and object to the way the officers were conducting their union when they knew they could be fired off of their jobs by the union boss in 24 hours. That is why union officials in the big industrial cities and elsewhere can perpetuate themselves in offices, some of which waste and graft the funds of the union, call the men out on strike without their consent, and completely control the men and the union in the way they desire.

Mr. Speaker, may I close by stating that I realize many of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law are not needed in many sections of the Nation outside of the big industrial centers and the big cities.

Many of the abuses which happen in the big industrial centers which the Taft-Hartley law sought to correct do not occur in many sections of the country outside of the big cities. Most union officials, particularly in the smaller towns and cities throughout the Nation, try to give the members good service and good leadership. Some in the larger cities do. However, to be constitutional, any law must apply to the entire Nation.

However, there have been such flagrant practices carried on by some labor leaders in the larger cities and industrial centers that it became necessary in the Eightieth Congress to try to develop legislation to curb these practices in the interest of labor, business, and the economy of the entire Nation.

Under the Taft-Hartley law some of the power vested in the big labor leaders under the Wagner Act was given back to the labor locals and to the rank and file of labor. It developed that some power had to be given to the Government to protect the national health and public safety of the Nation. The Taft-Hartley law sought to do this, and under this law during the past 2 years a better relationship has been brought about between management and labor which has kept production at a high level.

And during the past 2 years there has been less wages lost by labor through work stoppages. Labor has written the best contracts in its history, wages are the highest in its history, over 57,000,000 people are now employed and labor unions have had the phenomenal growth of an increase in membership of 740,000 new union members during the past 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law.

We who are interested in keeping labor steadily employed, we who are interested in the welfare of agriculture, business, and the whole Nation, are sincere in our belief that many of the provisions in the Taft-Hartley law beneficial to labor and to the economy of the Nation should be written into the new legislation that follows it.

It seems evident that the administration bill is a plain political approach to this most important problem of legislation. We do not believe that this labor legislation should be used as a political football for political advantage. It is too important to the rank and file of labor, to business, to agriculture, and to all the people of the Nation to deal with it on a political basis. The question of what is best for the entire Nation is the responsibility of us Members of Congress, and is the paramount question in our approach to this important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, when the Education and Labor Committee held hearings on a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and substitute an amended Wagner Act, a witness appeared for one of the trade associations suggesting that the obligation to bargain collectively be so defined as not to include bargaining over welfare funds.

Welfare funds and benefits have been provided in union contracts as a result of collective bargaining for many years, some as far back as the 1920's. There are, in addition, many other welfare programs, originally established by farsighted employers, which have since become the subjects of collective bargaining and have been modified in the process.

About 3,500,000 workers are now covered by welfare plans under collective bargaining. Some of the plans are very inclusive, while others cover only one or two hazards of workers, like old age, sickness or disability, or some parts of the expenditures incident to these hazards, like hospitalization or medical and surgical expenses. Under some of the plans the funds are provided by or through the employer, either as a general expense or as a royalty on production, while under other plans they are furnished jointly by the employer and the union.

The Taft-Hartley Act placed restrictions on the use and the administration of welfare funds and these restrictions are removed in H. R. 2032. The proposal of this witness was not to restore section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act. Instead, he proposed something much worse—nothing less than the removal of this most important subject from the obligation to bargain collectively, a matter which has so much to do with the compensation, the conditions of work and the welfare of wage earners.

In a number of cases the National Labor Relations Board, at the time it had the Taft-Hartley Act to administer, decided that the refusal to bargain over welfare funds was tantamount to a refusal to bargain in good faith—Inland Steel, W. W. Cross Co., and General Motors. The refusal to bargain over welfare funds was thus an unfair labor practice under both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. The decision of the NLRB that welfare funds are within the area of collective bargaining was based on the sound premise that welfare funds are a form of compensation similar to wages and also that some of the programs, like health benefits and retirement, affect the conditions of employment.

Since 1935 the Congress and the American people have thought they were pursuing a policy of encouraging collective bargaining over the terms and conditions of employment. This interpretation of the refusal to bargain made by the NLRB has been sustained in two circuit courts of appeals and is now before the United States Supreme Court.

The logic is so clear that we must feel confident that the Supreme Court will support the court of appeals and the NLRB.

The opposition to collective bargaining over welfare funds comes from some disgruntled employers and others who have never liked collective bargaining anyway, and who therefore think that the next best thing to going back to dictatorship by the employer is to limit the scope or the subjects concerning which they must bargain. They want to be able to determine these vital matters unilaterally, to limit the receipt of the benefits to employees who stay with a particular com-

pany for 5, 10, or 20 years, and to influence the workers to think that there is no need to rely on their unions for these benefits.

In my district I have been able to see what a difference it makes to the workers and their families and to the communities to have a well-financed welfare program in operation—a program which would have been impossible to attain if it had not been for the strength and the bargaining power of the United Mine Workers. Without this program we would have several hundred thousand injured miners suffering from want and misery. We are thankful for this humanitarian program.

All over the country miners have been killed, disabled, or seriously injured and have had nothing but the inadequate workmen's compensation to fall back upon. The social-security program is of little use to these injured men because they are not old enough to qualify for old-age insurance benefits. The mine workers welfare fund took over to do a complete job of care and rehabilitation, giving many of these men the opportunity to earn their livelihood again in new trades or occupations. As the United Mine Workers Journal reported on March 15, 1949, the mine workers welfare fund, in addition to its direct benefits, has also spurred State agencies to do a more complete job of rehabilitation within the sphere of their authority.

The rehabilitation program of the welfare fund has not only focused attention on the deficiencies of State vocational rehabilitation agencies, due in the main to inadequate funds and widespread indifference to the plight of the disabled, but has spurred public officials into action, to set about the long overdue task of improving facilities and securing adequate funds to do the job they are supposed to do, which will of course benefit all citizens.

When a disabled miner, after the necessary medical treatment, is ready for vocational training, the welfare fund steers him to the proper authorities, who determine his aptitudes and interests and map out a program of study or training to fit him for a new means of livelihood. The welfare fund works in close cooperation with State rehabilitation services in finding suitable employment objectives and opportunities.

It is a pioneer undertaking, on a scale never before attempted for the disabled victims of industry, despite the fact that a Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program for handicapped civilians has supposedly been operating for nearly 30 years.

Shall we go back on this and other programs which have meant so much to the security and welfare of American labor? Shall we withhold the promise of greater security and welfare from the millions of American workers who have not yet been able to attain it because their unions have been weak or because they are only now beginning to take up these issues with their employers?

We are not a people who go back on progressive steps that have proved successful. If we understand the issues, we will want to move forward. The least we can do is to encourage employers and their workers to solve these problems in the American way, by collective bargaining which takes into account the special problems in different industries and the financial burden of obtaining greater economic security which different employers and groups of workers are willing and able to undertake. We should defeat this effort to narrow the area of collective bargaining and to block the progress made in recent years in advancing the program of taking care of the men injured or disabled in industry.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ERITREA AND SOMALIA

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the Eighty-first Congress, under this special order granted me by the Speaker, I am taking the opportunity to bring before you a most flagrant injustice which is about to be perpetrated upon a defenseless people with dire and tragic consequences to this Nation and to our world.

The remarks which I am about to make will be transmitted to the political section of the United Nations Organization for their consideration.

World War II began when the world sat idly by and allowed Italy to rape Ethiopia. World war III will begin if this action is again allowed by the United Nations Organization. This is not a threat but a statement of logic.

The political section of the United Nations Organization is now considering the return to Italy of her former colony, Somalia, and the giving to Italy of a former portion of Ethiopia—Eritrea. I charge that this is in direct contradiction to the treaty with Italy, to the stated purposes of the United Nations Organization, and to every part of our conscience and religious concepts. It makes a complete mockery of World War II, and it definitely starts the world on the road to world war III.

Why does Italy want Eritrea and Somalia? For one of two reasons—either to help out their bankrupt economy or to help Somalia and Eritrea. I charge that neither can be done. In the first place, Somalia and Eritrea are able only to take care of their own particular economic problems. There is no surplus which could go to Italy or any other nation except at the expense of the pain and suffering and virtual chattel slavery of the inhabitants of those countries. In the second place, I charge that Italy is not able to help either of these provinces, because Italy is upon the very border of complete break-down even with all of the help of the Marshall plan.

In the balance of my remarks I will point out that Eritrea is first a province of Ethiopia that was taken away from Ethiopia by force. Second, that the Eritreans, the vast majority, over 90 percent, want to be reunited with their mother country. Third, that the British definitely and specifically promised them—as will be shown in the immediately following paragraphs—that they would be allowed to return to Ethiopia. This was done during the war period. Fourth, that the people of Somalia, in their own plebiscite and as presented to the United Nations by their representatives on April 5, 1949, are overwhelmingly against the returning to any form of Italian administration.

I am deeply shocked by the actions of the Members of Italian ancestry of this House, except for one, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], in asking President Truman to see that these colonies are returned. Colonialism has never helped the working classes of any country, especially Italy, and colonialism is a concept which we Americans abhor and reject.

I, therefore, on behalf of the 15,000,000 Negro people of America and the tens of millions of right-thinking whites, through the Congress of the United States, petition the United Nations to hold a plebiscite in Eritrea and return it immediately to Ethiopia; to set up a United Nations trusteeship for Somalia for not more than 5 years, such trusteeship charged with the specific task of not only raising the standard of living of the people but educating them in the processes of self-government and, at the end of 5 years, holding democratic elections and turning the government over to the duly elected people. The balance of these remarks is replete with factual material which I have gathered concerning the war crimes of Italy in Ethiopia, British attitude toward Eritrea, and the petition of the people of Somalia for self-government.

PART I. ERITREA

Proclamation of Emperor Haile Selassie distributed by the British Government:

Eritrean people and people of the Benadir. You were separated from your mother, Ethiopia, and were put under the yoke of the enemy, and under the yoke of the enemy you still remain.

Our cruel enemies, the Italians, have taken your green and fertile land; they prevent you from plowing it and from grazing your cattle on it.

But now the day has come when you will be saved from all this ignominy and hardship.

I have come to restore the independence of my country, including Eritrea and the Benadir, whose people will henceforth dwell under the shade of the Ethiopian flag.

In this struggle we are neither alone nor without arms. We have the help of Great Britain, therefore I summon you to strive to deliver yourselves from the alien slavery. * * *

Eritrean soldiers in the ranks of Italy, do not fire a single shot against the British, who come to help us.

Proclamation of the British Government distributed by the RAF:

Eritrean soldiers, listen.

Desert from the Italians and join us.

Whenever we have sent you a message you have heard it and responded. We give you our thanks.

We know the reason you would not fight against us was that you did not wish to be ruled by the Italians; you will receive your full reward.

You people who wish to live under the flag of His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie I, and to have your own flag, we give you our word you shall be allowed to choose what government you desire.

It should be noted that the greater part of Eritrea belongs to the main mountain massif of Ethiopia, that it is

inhabited by people of similar race and culture, namely, a blend of Arabian and African stocks, speaking a language derived from the dead language Gueze, the Latin of Ethiopia, and the parent of many Ethiopian languages. Eritrea, like the rest of Ethiopia, is inhabited by Christians of the Alexandrine or Coptic Church and by Mohammedans. They share the dress and habits of the other peoples of Ethiopia, including those of Addis Ababa. Their notables are termed Dedjazmatch, Grazmatch, Fitaurari, Balambaras, and so forth, just as in Ethiopia, despite half a century of Italian rule.

This report on conditions and policy in Eritrea should be read in conjunction with the proclamation by Emperor Haile Selassie I, dated June 8, 1940, which was prepared in consultation with the British military authorities, who printed it, and had it distributed in Eritrea and Ethiopia by the Royal Air Force.

This proclamation is addressed particularly to the people and soldiers inhabiting the ex-Italian colony of Eritrea, to whom it appeals to join the Ethiopian and British forces in defeating the Italians. It promises reunion with Ethiopia to the people of Eritrea:

Ethiopian people, chiefs, and soldiers.

You have remained firm and fought against our enemy aggressor for the past 5 years without losing hope or breaking your ranks.

The free people of the world have been astonished by your courage and have expressed their sympathy for your struggle. Your valor and sacrifice have brought upon you pain and suffering, but your hope was not in vain.

Henceforth the British Government will bring their irresistible armies to aid us to regain our full independence.

Behold! I come to you.

We must give thanks to Almighty God that He turned to us His face of mercy. We must give thanks to the thousands of our brave Ethiopians who fell on the field of battle, and to those who were massacred by the cruelty of Fascist Italy.

Ethiopian people, chiefs, and soldiers.

The Italians are now fighting against the British Government. The reason is this: When Italy invaded our country the British Government prevented her army from getting food supplies because she opposed the League of Nations.

You know what you must now do. You who are with the enemy must all of you leave them immediately and join the Ethiopian forces in order to assist your country. Not one of you should collaborate with the enemy. Whenever you find the enemy you must attack him, crush him, and bar his way so that he may never return again.

Ethiopian heroes and warriors. I know all about your good work, and now I am anxious to witness your glorious deeds. Brave soldiers, priests, and elders, give good advice to the people. Farmers, traders, people of every calling, be strong in aiding your country. You will all receive the reward of your good deeds.

People of Hamasien, Akeleguzai, Serale, Beni Amur, Habab, and Mensa, whether you are on this side of the frontier or over in Eritrea, you must all unite with your Ethiopian brothers; not one of you must be a collaborator with the Italians. You must not fight against your mother, Ethiopia, and your friend, the British Government. I know the desire of your hearts; it is my desire also, and the desire of all Ethiopians: Your place is with the other Ethiopian people.

Ethiopian peoples; you have to share together the pain of war, so, too, in peacetime you must share the fruit of civilization, by the aid of our allies, the League of Nations, and especially our ally the British Government. With their help we shall improve our government. The administration of the country will be developed on modern lines. Our relations with other peoples will enable us to keep in touch with them. We shall spread commerce, agriculture, and education. When Ethiopia regains her independence it is our wish that you will live together as one people. This opportunity for Ethiopia is in the hands of her brave sons. It is our duty, both old and young, to be united in order to drive our enemy from the country.

Ethiopian peoples.

We want you to know the kind help which has been given to us by the British Government. The British Government does not want anything from our country, it comes to destroy the Italian armies, which are the enemy of both Ethiopia and Great Britain, in order to help to regain the independence of Ethiopia. Whenever you find the English troops and officers you must receive them with pleasure, because they are bringing to us our independence. Do not forget they are our allies and guests.

May the Ethiopian Empire live forever.

May the British Government live forever.

JULY 8, 1940.

When the Italians were defeated the Eritrean people believed Eritrea would be at once united to Ethiopia. They also believed the Italians would be deprived of the land they had occupied in Eritrea according to promises made in certain leaflets dropped by the RAF.

The inhabitants of the village of Addi-Gadda, in Seraie Province, some 27 kilometers from Asmara, who had welcomed the British joyfully, in fact attempted to recover the land which had been seized by the Italian Count Marazzani some 30 years before. They requested the Italian farmer who occupied the land to vacate it, explaining what they believed to be the new position. On his refusal, they led their cattle to graze on the land. The farmer appealed to the British military authorities at Addi-Ugri, who, without investigation, accepted his version of the affair and sent armored cars and machine guns to attack the villagers, five of whom were killed and many wounded.

SINCE THE WAR

Soon after the British occupation of Eritrea the people of the capital, Asmara, began to demonstrate.

During the fight to defeat the Italians they had been promised liberation from Italian rule. Nevertheless, they found themselves still under the domination of Italians, who ill-treated and even killed them with impunity. It was only under the pressure of grievous wrongs that they approached the British military authorities to plead for redress.

There had existed under Italian rule the Carabinieri, an armed police force, and also the Policia Coloniale, the latter being a creation of Mussolini, and carefully selected in order that they might be 100 percent Fascist.

A number of Eritrean police were also embodied; these were termed Zapte. They occupied a completely subordinate position under the Italians.

These police were retained by the British military administration in their former rank and duties—the Italians still superior, the Eritreans subordinated to them.

Before the fall of Asmara the Italian administration had left the Zapte without pay for periods ranging from 1 to 3 months.

The fighting being at an end and the territory stabilized under a British administration, by whom all the police were now employed, the Zapte, at the beginning of May 1941, sent a deputation of some twenty of their number of the British military administration then called the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration—OETA—to ask for the arrears of pay which were due to them. They were received by an Italian captain of Carabinieri, who flew into a passion at their request, and demanded: "How dare you come here to ask for anything?" To the British officers he declared: "These people have come here simply to raise a riot." Then he ordered an Italian private of the Carabinieri to fire. The private obeyed the order, and one of the Zapte, Tesfa Selassie Hebt, fell dead just outside the OETA office. The rest of the Zapte deputation fled for their lives, chased by the Italian Carabinieri. One of the Zapte had run 2 kilometers when he was shot dead in front of the Eritrean Roman Catholic Church, which is named Kidane Mehret.

The murder outside this church went unpunished; the Italian Carabinieri who fired the shot which killed Tesfa Selassie Hebt outside the OETA office was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment, but the Italians in command of the gaol released him, and he was seen soon afterward strolling about the town. The officer who ordered the policeman to fire was not even charged with any offense.

Before the two Eritrean policemen had been murdered the whole Eritrean population of Asmara had been suffering grave anxiety and distress. Many unpunished murders were taking place. Between the two squalid quarters of Asmara which the Italians had built for the Eritrean people was a broad main road, by which the Eritreans were permitted to pass, but on which they were not permitted to loiter. On this road, morning after morning, had been discovered the bodies of Eritreans who had been shot after dark. There had hitherto been no certain proof that the Italians were guilty of these crimes, but the murder of the two Zapte was a new circumstance supporting the conviction that they were responsible.

It was notorious that at Decamare, some 42 kilometers from Asmara in the direction of Ethiopia, Italians had lain hidden for many days under a bridge and, thus concealed, had shot dead many Eritrean dignitaries. Dedjazmatch Ghebrai Toklu—who had been appointed by the Italians and had been retained in his office by the British—had reported these murders to the British military authorities, who had arrested the Italians, but there had been no announcement that the Italians had been, or would be punished.

Under all these circumstances, the leaders of the Eritreans decided to call their people to demonstrate. The instructions of the leaders were to march

quietly to the OETA office, avoiding Italian premises and making no attack upon Italians. Between 3,000 and 4,000 Eritreans marched in procession to the OETA, carrying at their head the Ethiopian flag and the union jack.

The British officers at the OETA invited them to choose three spokesmen, who stated the case and urged that the Eritreans had loyally supported the British, and that it was unfair to let them down by leaving them to be maltreated by the Italians.

The British officers heard the spokesmen politely, then told them to go ahead with the demonstration, and appointed a British captain to head the procession and police to accompany it to keep order.

Cheered by this courteous reception, the Eritrean demonstrators marched to the Ethiopian Church of Saint Mariam, where they offered up prayers for the alleviation of their hard lot, and then at the Protestant Church, at the Moslem Mosque, at the Greek Church, and finally at the Roman Catholic Church reserved for Eritreans.

Having made their round of prayer, the people dispersed quietly, hoping their appeal would bring about a better understanding between themselves and the British, and result in the removal of the Italians from positions of authority.

On the contrary, the chief British administrator immediately issued a proclamation prohibiting the assembly of more than three persons, and forbidding the display of the Ethiopian flag or any badge concerned with Ethiopia.

The position of the Eritreans in relation to the Italians was not improved. It is true the British police were increased the Italian decreased, but the Italians were still in a position of superiority as compared with the Eritreans; they were still retained as judges in the courts and in charge of the city's water system and the hospitals, for which reason the Eritreans refused to enter the hospitals. Under these circumstances relations could not improve.

All this could not pass without some repercussions in Ethiopia, where many of the people murdered or otherwise victimized by the Italians had relatives, and where the Eritreans have always been recognized as brothers and fellow nationals. Some thousands of Eritreans escaped over the border into Ethiopia; a number of them made their way to Addis Ababa. The Emperor took all possible steps for appeasement. The Ethiopian Government provided land in Arussi Province for Eritrean refugees and set aside 25,000 Maria Teresa thalers—£2,500—to establish them. A Hamasien house was provided for the refugees who had reached Addis Ababa.

Later, quite independently of the Government, a society for the liberation of Hamasien was spontaneously formed by prominent public men in the capital, most of whom were born in Eritrea or have relatives there.

After some time the British administration in Eritrea instructed the Eritrean people to select 12 representatives from the various parts of the territory to form a native council. The duty of these representatives would be to bring before the British authorities any difficulties or grievances, which would be discussed with British representatives at meetings of the native council which the British authorities would summon.

The Eritrean representatives soon afterwards presented a written report to the British senior civil-affairs officer, Colonel White, protesting and advising against Italian control. They urged that Italians be removed from the management of the water system of the city, which opened to them the possibility of poisoning the supply. They pleaded that Italian judges were passing unjust sentences upon Fritreans, and that Italian prison officials treated them with unwarrantable cruelty. Colonel White expressed appreciation of these views, and promised to pass them to higher British authorities.

On a second visit the 12 councilors reported further mischief by the Italians and informed Colonel White that two Italians employed under the British as civil-affairs officers, Dr. Spicace at Adbi Ugri, and Dr. Ellero at Adbi Cahaie, were giving heavy punishment for trivial offenses, and were also working against the British authorities. Colonel White did not welcome this information, but later the British authorities themselves discovered that Dr. Spicace was hiding armed Italians in the area which he was administrating, and Dr. Ellero was doing the same thing. It was necessary to surround Adbi Ugri and Adbi Cahaie with British forces in order to arrest Dr. Spicace and Dr. Ellero and put them in a prisoner-of-war camp.

At that time a British major was living with Dr. Spicace. The major was not seen again by the Eritreans, who assumed that he had been removed.

At the outset of these events Colonel Platt was commanding officer in Eritrea, Brigadier Kennedy Cook was military administrator, and Colonel White was senior civil-affairs officer for Asmara only. Colonel White was replaced by Count de Sales, Brigadier Kennedy Cook was replaced as chief administrator by Brigadier Stephen Longgrigg, who was afterward replaced by Brigadier McCarthy.

The 12 Eritrean spokesmen continued reporting grave injustices. The senior civil-affairs officer replied that these matters would be discussed at the forthcoming meeting of the native council administration, but the meeting, which had been monthly, was made quarterly, and finally Brigadier Longgrigg suspended the meetings. Brigadier Longgrigg was at this time the chief British representative in Eritrea.

After the suspension of the meetings of the native council the Eritrean people had no recognized medium of contact with the British administration. The representatives they had chosen for the native council were not received.

The Italians still control the courts, and it is claimed they still impose heavy sentences for trifling offenses.

Italian Fascists, who held high office under Mussolini and were sent out by him to replace former Italian administrators, still hold the offices he gave them. Major Papa, for instance, who was sent from Rome as a trusted Fascist, is still major of police and virtually chief under the British. Other Italian officials still in office include: Commendatore Antonio Buongiorno, president of the court of Asmara; Commendatore Emanuele Montefusco, procurator del re, attorney general; Dr. Tucci, public prosecutor; Judge Davozza; Judge Dr. Luigi Guerra; Dr. Tonarelli, judge in the district court, Asmara; Dr. Lauro, district commissioner, Asmara; Dr. Rogani, assistant district commissioner, Asmara; Dr. Chiti, assistant district commissioner, Asmara; Dr. Italo Pizzi, chief tax collector; Commendatore Inserra, mayor of Asmara; Maresciallo Baldini, NCO, market police station officer, well known as one of the most cruel Fascists under the Italian regime.

Why are these Italian Fascists retained in office?

The War Office Report on British Military Administration in Eritrea states that by May 1942 Italian officials had been reduced from over 3,000 to 2,000, and Eritrean officials from 750 to 250. This is surprising.

Discrimination against the Eritrean population continues.

Over the front doors of cafes, cinemas, restaurants, hotels, and so forth, appear the words, "Vietato per Nativi," "Vietato per Indigeni," or in English, "Prohibited for Natives."

Italian taxi-drivers may not accept Eritrean customers. Italian drivers have been given the following circular:

In base ad ordini ricevuto dall'autorita Brittanica e' fatto as'soluto divieto portare indigeni. Contravvenendo e questo ordine vi sara tolta la licenza—On the basis or orders received from the British authorities it is strictly forbidden to carry natives. Contravention of this order will entail withdrawal of the license.

Members of the Eritrean native council complained to me that while the British military administration grants import and export licenses to foreign residents of Eritrea to whom such licenses have been refused; the following names were mentioned: Adballs Gonafer, Kenyazmatch Ghebru Neggussi, Adbelkader Kebire, Said Haiti.

Members of the native council also complained that the British administration grants land to Italians, but refuses it to Eritreans. The grant to Italians in or near the following small towns was mentioned: Addi Woghera, district of Akelaguzai; Deghera Lebea, district of Akelaguazi; Ona Hayela, district of Seraie; Mai Gura, district of Akelaguzai; Merara, district of Hamasien.

This allegation in respect of land grants is confirmed by the following facts: The Ministry of Information pamphlet, "The First To Be Freed," states that the British administration had granted land to Italians and encouraged them to cultivate it, and has also given facilities to them to establish themselves in manufacturing enterprises.

Col. Stanley Parker, who was acting administrator when I arrived in Eritrea, stated to me that the Italians, in order to

make a lake, had evicted a number of Eritrean farmers from their land. These farmers appealed to the British administration to grant them other land, but had received the reply that, being only in provisional occupation of the territory, the British administration could not grant their request. This appears inconsistent with the fact that the British administration had granted land to Italians.

When at Addi Cahaie, I suggested to Major Lee, the British representative there, that it is unwise to increase the Italian hold on Eritrea by making grants of land to individual Italians, and by encouraging them to establish manufacturing and trading enterprises. Major Leigh replied that this had been done in order to reduce unemployment and save British revenue, and the Italians had been told that no guarantee could be given beyond the duration of the war.

Members of the native council further alleged that Eritreans may only cut dead wood even on their own land. If they are found to have cut wood which shows even a single green branch they are heavily fined.

Permits to cut green wood are given to the Italians. Such permits are refused to Eritreans. Among those whose applications for permits have been refused, the following were named: Ato (Mr.) Takle Tzelalu, Blatta Jacob Ogbagaber, Bashai Zeratzion Gilaghi.

On January 30, 1944, Ethiopian flags were displayed on many Eritrean homes. A daring demonstration was made by a group of Eritrean youth. They succeeded during the night in attaching 10 large flags in the Ethiopian colors, each 3 yards long, to electric-light standards in the main street, bearing the name of the former Italian Governor, Italo Balbo. They attached a similar flag to the principal mosque. On the flagstaffs of government house they flew two similar flags. At the police headquarters they covered the desk of the British colonel with an Ethiopian flag and put a portrait of the Emperor Haile Selassie on his chair.

They had had posters printed with a portrait of the Emperor, the Ethiopian colors, and a poem urging the British Government not to attempt to separate the people of Eritrea from their Emperor, for whom they were longing, and reminding the British that when they came to Eritrea in 1941 they pleaded with the Eritrean people to aid them, on the ground that they were bringing to the people their own Emperor and their own flag. The poem concluded with a warning that trouble would result if these promises were not fulfilled. Twenty of these posters were displayed in various parts of the town.

The British military authorities ordered the Eritrean police to tear down these manifestos, but they refused on the plea that they dare not thus incur popular resentment.

On Saturday, February 5, 1944, the Eritrean police made their own opinion felt. Two thousand eight hundred of them assembled at the police station in Corsa d' Italia and informed the officer in charge of the following decisions:

First. They refused to be judged any longer by Italian Fascist laws, which the British authorities had sanctioned.

Second. They protested against a recent order of withdrawal of their boots, and refused to go barefoot, or to wear the uniform the Italians had instituted for them, with the tarboosh, or fez.

Third. They refused to work under Italian police officers. They complained that when the British engaged them they had been assured they would work under British officers, but they were still under Italians.

Unless the above grievances were to be removed, they asked leave to resign.

Four thousand Eritrean police were involved; it would have been highly inconvenient to lose them all. To appease them, they were granted boots and British uniforms, but Italian superior officers, Italian judges, and Fascist laws were retained.

Steps were taken to prevent any further attempt by the police to display national aspiration or desire for a higher status. Some 200 constables were known to be able to read and write; they were therefore considered undesirable, and were accordingly dismissed. They were replaced by illiterate Takrurs from French Equatorial Africa, who had come to Eritrea to work as laborers, and by Arabs from the Yemen, who do not know either the local language, Tigrinya, or Amharic, the official language of Ethiopia.

Four Eritrean police officers, who were suspected because they held the more important positions in the force, were arrested: Inspector Assefau Agostino, Inspector Gabre Mariam, Inspector Gabre Jesus, Sergeant Takle Guiorguis Tamelso.

These officers were incarcerated without trial. They are still at the time of writing held untried in Fort Baldissera, so designated by the Italians after their general of that name, who replaced General Baratieri when the latter had been defeated by the Ethiopians at Adowa in 1896. The four police officers are prevented from communicating with either relatives or lawyers.

Agostino Zerit, father of Inspector Assefau Agostino, addressed a petition to the British administration, pleading for the release of his son. He received from Colonel Miller the following reply:

> With reference to your petition dated May 8, before Assefau Agostino, Inspector of Police, was interned I inquired into all the circumstances of the case.

After a long period in which Eritrean opinion appeared to be ignored by the British military administration, and no meeting of the native council has been officially summoned, Brigadier Longgrigg, the chief British administrator, initiated a curious sort of propaganda. He visited Addi Cahaie and there called together the representatives of the people, who are designated by the general term chief, and invited them to express their views on the future of Eritrea. He promised to forward their views to London. Having regard to the foregoing surprising events, the chiefs of Addi Cahaie were reluctant to express their true desire, which was for reunion to Ethiopia. They feared that by answering frankly they might incur the anger of the brigadier.

They therefore replied with caution, verbally, and afterwards in writing, that they represented but a small part of Eritrea, and could not therefore reply to so important a question without consulting other districts. They requested, however, to be informed in what way they should make their views known. Brigadier Longgrigg replied that they might do so through the columns of the Eritrean Weekly News, which is published in the local language, Tigrinya, by the British Ministry of Information in Asmara chiefs, eager, all of them, to formed the chiefs of Asmara of what Brigadier Longgrigg had said, and showed them their written reply to him. The Asmara Chiefs, eager, all of them, to rejoin Ethiopia—as are all the 12 members of the Eritrean native council appointed by the British—considered they must take action in reply to Brigadier Longgrigg's proposal. As public meetings were prohibited under the order that no more than three persons might assemble, they decided to meet in small groups in various houses to discuss the future and to take in this way a plebiscite. So far as it had gone, it was heavon the side of unity with Ethiopia. Meanwhile, the British authorities came to know of this move; on February 22, ily on the side of unity with Ethiopia. tables of Asmara, some of whom were members of the native council selected by the people and appointed by the British themselves. It should be noted that Grazmatch in Eritrea, as well as in Ethiopia, is a title signifying that the holder is occupying an administrative position, and that Blatta signifies both a man of learning and one who holds an administrative post.

Since the Italians occupied this part of the country the old importance of these titles and the positions their bearers formerly held has, of course, been reduced to a mere shadow: Grazmatch Zerre Bakit; Blatta Fasil Ogbazgi, brother of the present vice governor, or vice mayor, of Addis Ababa; Grazmatch Tesfa Michael Worke; Blatta Asfaha Abraha; Araya Sebhatu.

These arrests cast a curious light on Brigadier Longgrigg's professed desire to know the views of the Eritrean people on the future of their homeland and his promise to transmit their views to London. The Eritrean people were shocked by the arrest of the notables, and rallied courageously to their support. On February 23, 1944, a vast crowd of people assembled at the offices of the British military administration, where Col. Stanley Parker, at that time senior civil-affairs officer, received a deputation from them. Their spokesmen said, in part:

> Here we are gathered to say a few words to you. The people you British have arrested are good people; they are of good character and of good conduct; they do not steal or drink, kill or commit disorders. Therefore we know they can only have been arrested for political reasons. Please state why they have been arrested, and we will take the necessary measures. If it is for a political reason, we know that it is merely because they have expressed their desire

to join our own country, Ethiopia. They are patriots. We ask their release.

Colonel Parker replied that he personally regretted the arrests, in which he had had no part. He promised to bring the matter before his superiors.

We have seen that Brigadier Longgrigg, having invited Eritreans to express their opinion on the future of their homeland, the British military administration, under Brigadier Longgrigg, vigorously repressed the Eritrean attempt to manifest their desire for reunion with Ethiopia. An August 3, 1944, the Eritrean Weekly News, published in the local language, Tigrinya, by the British Ministry of Information in Asmara, under Major Mumford, opened the discussion Brigadier Longgrigg had suggested. The first article was anonymous, and there is little doubt it was composed in the editorial office. A translation of this article is attached. Its main points are:

First. Great Britain fought the Italians to give liberty to Ethiopia; therefore, Great Britain must be compensated.

Second. Ethiopia cannot manage Eritrea in a spiritual way, because she herself is twisted inside. Eritrea would be a ceaseless trouble to Ethiopia.

Third. The writer refers to a rebellion in the Ethiopian Province of Tigrai.

Fourth. The lowland part of Eritrea should be joined to the Sudan.

Fifth. The highland part or Ethiopia should be joined with Tigrai Province of Ethiopia, which should be annexed, with Axum, the Sacred City of Ethiopia, as its capital, and both placed under the protection of Britain for 25 years.

Sixth. After 25 years, more or less, the population will be invited to explain their ideas, and the protecting power can choose what proposal it likes. One bad thing about this article is that it assumes that what it advocates is going to happen, for it says:

The Government which is going to be established with the kind of help of Great Britain.

Thereby it tends to create the impression that the matter is settled, and that in their own interests prudent people will accept the inevitable. It should be observed that the proposal to add the western lowlands of Eritrea to the Sudan, and to put the highland part of Eritrea under British rule, annexing also the Tigrai Province of Ethiopia, had already been given prominence in the Sudan Star.

It must be emphasized that the Eritrean Weekly is published by the British Ministry of Information. The anonymous article was sharply replied to by Alazar Tesfa-Micheal, who signed his article, which is also attached, because he said, "Truth cannot be hidden and love cannot be denied." He made these points:

First, whether from the highlands or the lowlands, from Eritrea or the Tigrai, Tigrinya-speaking Ethiopians are not going to deny their mother, Ethiopia, or separate themselves from their brothers who speak Amharic.

Second. Every nation on the face of the earth has its different dialects and religions, so with Ethiopia, but this does not prevent Ethiopians being our people.

Third. Ethiopia is well organized and can manage her own affairs and this includes her lost territory, Eritrea.

Fourth. The rebellion in the Tigrai was instigated by a small group which made the rebellion.

Fifth. When Italy invaded Ethiopia in 1935, thousands of Eritreans fought beside their Ethiopian brothers to resist the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, which they regarded as their own motherland.

Sixth. Thousands of Eritreans are leaving their beloved homes and parents in order to be included in Ethiopia.

Seventh. Eritreans share the same church festivals as Ethiopians and at these festivals, Ethiopian flags are shown and Ethiopian patriotic songs are sung.

Eighth. Ninety percent of Eritrean people are praying for reunion to Ethiopia.

The discussion was continued for some time. The Eritreans were unable to discover the identity of the writers who advocated British rule, though titles were ascribed to them, which if genuine, would have made identification easy, had their true names been disclosed. An article published in the Eritrean Weekly of November 2, is ascribed to Balaambaras Fesaha Kefle. Eritreans have not been able to identify the writer, who declares that in his time he has been prosperous, for he was a Bulockbask—an African corporal in the Italian Colonial Forces.

Such men were seldom able to read or write. This alleged corporal deplores the Italian defeat, and adds:

Even if they do not return, may God protect our lords, the Italians, who gave us food, and drink, clothes and glory. We must not say anything against them. If we do we shall displease God.

This is strange propaganda for the British Ministry of Information to publish at the cost of British taxpayers. It is grievous that this hireling of the Italians—if in fact he exists—should have his article published at Britain's expense, whilst genuine representatives of the Eritrean people are coerced into silence.

The ex-Bulockbask is more ambitious in his claims for annexation of Ethiopian territory than the anonymous writer. He would have the enlarged Eritrea ruled by a descendant of the former emperor, Johannes. If that is not possible, he says, "the British Government will give us one of their best men." The same aim is uncovered—a new British colony.

There are a large number of Eritreans in Addis Ababa; a good number of them are chauffeurs and motor mechanics; they are exceedingly quick and intelligent and have a liking for machinery, and readily learn to handle motorcars.

Approximately 20 percent of the Ethiopian Government officials have been Eritreans ever since the Italian conquest of Eritrea which occurred between 1886 and 1890. The Ethiopian Government has always treated Eritreans as Ethiopian subjects. They could not pass into Ethiopia except by clandestine means. Many, however, did so in order to attend the Ethiopian Government schools. In Ethiopia there were, and are, prospects of material advancement and higher status for all of them. Recently, the Ethiopian Ministers in Moscow and Washington, Blatten Gheta Taezas and Blatta Ephraim Medhen, are Eritreans. Here is a list of some other Ethiopian officials who come from Eritrea:

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Ato Ambaye Wolde-Mariam (Vice Minister).
Ato Micael Tessema (Chief Inspector).
Ato Melesse Mikael (Chief of the Archives).
Ato Selemon Abraham (Chief Secretary to the Ministry).
Ato Mehane Gabre (Chief Treasurer).
Ato Kefle-Igzie Ihidego (High Court Judge).

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Ato Paolos Birhane (Chief Treasurer).

MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR

Ato Gabre-Mascal Kefle-Igze (Secretary General).

MINISTRY OF THE PEN

Ato Tesfa-Mariam Guedela (Director of the Archives).

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ato Guebre-Micael Fessihaye (Chief Treasurer).

MINISTRY OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS

Ato Gabre-Mascal Hapte-Mariam (Director General).

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Ato Hagos Tewolde-Medhen (Chief Inspector and Director General).

MINISTRY OF WAR

Lt. Col. Iyassoa Mangasha (Inspector of the Control Department).
Capt. Abebe Teferi (Commander of Fifth Regiment).
Capt. Tewolde-Berhanit Egzi (Chief of Stores to the First Regiment).
Lt. Guebrai Gabre-Igze (Chief of Staff).
Lt. Abreha Tadeos (Staff).

THE EMPEROR'S PERSONAL STAFF

Ato Johannes Reda-Igzi (Chief of the Secretariat).

NATIONAL LIBRARY

Ato Sereke Berhane Gabre-Igziabiher (Director).

Actually the British Government in Eritrea is not doing as much for education as the Ethiopian Government, as the following facts indicate.

Under British administration there is only one trained teacher for Eritrean children, Capt. Kynaston Snell, an ex-LCC schoolmaster. Capt. Kynaston Snell has the assistance of Mr. Isaac Tewolde Medhen, an able Eritrean, brother of the Ethiopian Minister in Washington. For the rest, he has untrained Eritreans, mainly without any previous experience of teaching, who replied to his advertisement for young men who would like to teach, and have had only a brief elementary education.

The school course for Eritrean children covers 4 years, and is intended for pupils from 8 to 12 years of age, but may begin later.

The school budget is £7,000 per annum, and has to cover also the education of European children.

Outside the capital, where some warehouses were being converted into a girls' school, the British administration provides no new schools. The people are told that if they desire more schools they

must build them at their own expense; the administration can only provide a teacher.

No secondary or technical education is provided by the British administration for Eritrean children.

The only language taught in the Eritrean schools is Tigrinya, a local language, which opens to the pupils no literature or opportunities of international intercourse.

In Ethiopia the present achievement and future aims of the Ministry of Education are more ambitious; £95,674 was spent on education by the Ministry of Education in the year 1943–44, and £167,245 is to be spent in 1944–45. There are a number of British, European, Indian, and Egyptian teachers. All schools teach Amharic and Gueze, the Latin of Ethiopia. English is introduced in the fourth class. Elementary schools go up to class three or four. Central schools have six classes. Secondary schools or secondary classes in central schools follow, and a number of pupils are sent abroad to complete their education at Cairo or Beirut. The Technical School, the School of Commerce, the Agricultural School, and the Haile Selassie I School of Arts and Sciences are all hopeful institutions necessary to a self-governing people.

The Eritrean people are strongly desirous of reunion with Ethiopia. They would not again accept Italian rule without active resistance.

It would be dishonorable for them to be given the territory. The Eritrean people would declare we had broken faith with them and make vigorous protest. The reputation of Britain and her influence in world affairs would be gravely damaged.

PART II. ITALY'S WAR CRIMES

From an appeal by Haile Selassie to the Christians of the world, July 31, 1937:

I charge the Italian Army with the following barbarities in addition to the great massacre:

The murder at various times and places of hundreds of men, women, and children by individual Italian soldiers who go entirely unpunished.

Reprisals upon various towns and villages in which many of the inhabitants have been shot on account of the presence or fear of armed bands of Ethiopians in the vicinity, the worst case having occurred at Lekempti, where 600 innocent inhabitants were shot.

The execution at different times of thousands of persons after summary trial by court martial for alleged offenses, such as possessing arms or inciting to disaffection.

The torture of prisoners and the burning alive in their huts of persons who defied the Italian authority.

The execution of Ras Desta and many other officers of my army taken prisoner on the field of battle.

The forcing of thousands of unmarried women and young widows in Addis Ababa and other towns into concentration camps and licensed brothels as prostitutes after medical examination, for which purpose Italian doctors may enter any house.

The killing of priests and Muslim sheiks when after the attempt on the life of General Graziani all Ethiopians present were surrounded and shot.

The denial of Christian burial to the victims of the executions and general massacre of February 19 to 21, their bodies being burned like rubbish in dumps with the aid of petrol, whilst their relatives were prohibited from removing them.

The destruction of the ancient church of the monastery of Debra Libanos and other churches by deliberately setting them on fire by way of reprisal.

The public execution of the Abuna (bishop) Petros at Addis Ababa in the month of July last year for refusing to sign an act of submission to the Italian authorities and refusing to pronounce the excommunication of Ethiopians who declined to make submission to the invader.

"Murder most foul as in the best it is,
But this most foul, strange and unnatural."
—Hamlet.

Provisional minimum estimate of the slaughter of Ethiopians compiled from the evidence thus far investigated—these figures are not final and there are in addition a large number of persons rendered permanent invalids:

Killed by poison gas	275,000
Patriots killed in battle during the 5 years of occupation	78,500
Children, women, old and infirm people killed by bombing during the occupation	17,800
Massacre of February 1937	30,000
Patriots condemned to death by court martial	24,000
Persons of both sexes who died in concentration camps from privation and maltreatment	35,000
Total	460,300

The unprovoked and unwarranted Italian invasion was effected by Italian and colonial troops in numbers far exceeding the forces for whom Ethiopia could provide even the most meager equipment, as well as by an immense superiority in arms of every description. This crime was above all rendered possible by the unrestricted employment of aircraft, the use of incendiary and high-explosive bombs, the indiscriminate machine gunning of the common people, the spraying of Ethiopian troop concentrations and vast areas of the country, towns, villages, farms, and lakes with poison gas.

The Italian warplanes did their murderous work unhindered, for Ethiopia possessed neither military airplanes nor antiaircraft guns. It was, however, the poison gas, sprayed as a deadly dew, destroying the eyes, burning through the clothing and the flesh to the very bones, which had the most devastating effect.

The hideous invasion was described by brave Dr. John Melly, who raised and led the British Ambulance Service in Ethiopia, in moving terms:

This isn't a war—it isn't even a slaughter—it's the torture of tens of thousands of defenseless men, women, and children, with bombs and poison gas. They're using gas incessantly; and we've treated hundreds of cases, including infants in arms. (From a letter of Dr. John Melly, December 4, 1936.)

The war thus ruthlessly prosecuted was the prelude to 5 years of equally atrocious and cruel usurpation, in which the robbery, rape, and murder of the conquered people by the Italian "master-race" was callously encouraged by the Fascist dictatorship in Rome.

Amid the record of sadist orgies, which disgraced Italian rule, certain monstrous policies can be discerned. There was an effort, which happily failed, to thrust a wedge between the Christian and Mohammedan peoples of Ethiopia and to stir up religious and racial enmity between them. Christians were singled out for special persecution and massacre in predominantly Mohammedan areas.

Dr. Martin, then Ethiopian Minister in London, received from a Mohammedan whom he had employed when governor of Chercher province, the following letter, written in Harar on September 7, 1936, and smuggled out of Ethiopia via Jibuti:

When I saw the wholesale massacre of Christian Ethiopians by Christian Italians, I stood and thanked God that he had not made me a Christian; yet I knew that the sin did not lie with Christ.

One Sunday I saw some Italian white soldiers enter an Ethiopian church and ring the bells. Sixteen old men thought it was time for prayer; before they could enter the church the Italians killed them. I heard the words of these poor old men: Egziabher Yasywo—May God open your eyes to the truth. I could not help crying, but the Italians were laughing; the dead bodies lay for 2 days on the steps of the church.

The first order given to the Italian armies was to kill everyone carrying the cross. I saw a man pick up a gold cross in the street, and whilst he had it in his hands an Italian soldier killed him, because he thought he was a Christian.

I saw an old man sitting in his house, his Bible in one hand and a white flag in the other. Italian soldiers entered the house and demanded the old man's money. He answered that he was poor, but offered them all he had, which amounted to but three thalers. They fired three bullets at him, and he crumpled up dead. Poor little Ethiopian children have been put to the sword or thrown into burning houses.

It must not be assumed, however, that Mohammedans were spared the iniquities of the occupation.

For instance, in May 1938 six Italian airplanes flew low over the town of Jimma, discharging their bombs on the Ethiopian houses, which were entirely burned to the ground; hundreds of innocent women and children chiefly Mohammedans, being burned to death in the inferno thus produced. This action was common.

In March 1938, the Italians took the eight leading men of a village near Gondar and carried them away by plane, ostensibly to visit the King of Italy in Rome. On the following day some young girls who had gone into the forest to collect firewood found, on the rocky banks of the Blue Nile the broken corpses of those poor men. This grim joke was played so often that "He went to Rome" became synonymous with, "He was murdered by the Italians."

A policy of extermination was carried out against all Ethiopians of superior education who had occupied administrative positions. In pursuance of this aim the Italians often invited chiefs and other notables to negotiate and then slaughtered them in cold blood. The Red Cross and the white flag of truce were violated by the Fascist barbarians with equal ruthlessness.

The terrible massacre in Addis Ababa and other towns of February 19, 20, and 21, was the apogee of Fascist barbarity; yet it must be emphasized that atrocities were constantly perpetrated throughout the entire 5 years of Italian usurpation.

It had long been customary for the Emperor of Ethiopia to make an annual

distribution of alms to the poor and infirm of the city on February 19. Marshal Graziani, holding the proud office of Italian Viceroy, decided to ape the Emperor at this ceremony, which was held in reverence by all Ethiopia. The archbishop and all the church and other dignitaries not in hiding or exile were ordered to attend. A Hungarian physician, Dr. Ladislas Sava, who remained in Ethiopia during the first years of the Italian occupation, has written the following poignant account of the tragedy which followed:

In the beginning the Ethiopian people behaved quietly, hiding their outraged feelings as best they could. Then suddenly bombs were thrown toward the table at which Graziani was sitting with his lieutenants. At the moment of the explosion he was hiding under the table, while the other Italian officers had flung themselves to the ground. The assailant was an Eritrean whom the Italians employed as interpreter.

A moment of silence followed, which lasted until the Italians realized that no more bombs were to be feared. Then the shooting was started by Cortese, who fired with his revolver into the group of Ethiopian dignitaries. The Italian Carabinieri followed this example. In a few moments there were more than 300 dead in the courtyard and around the palace alone.

Hardly a single Ethiopian escaped alive from the courtyard. The general massacre there was particularly senseless and revolting, for the people massed there were a crowd of aged invalids, blind, and crippled beggars and poor mothers of little children. The Blackshirts ran through the courtyard, seeking any Ethiopians still alive and shooting any still breathing.

The bomb had been thrown at 11 a. m. A few minutes later Blackshirts, Carabinieri and soldiers were running all over the town, ordering every shopkeeper to close his doors, and everyone else abroad to return home. In an hour there were no more people in the streets. Postal and telephonic communications were suspended. In the palace and the neighboring streets for within about 400 yards' radius the ground was covered with the dead.

Cortese convoked the Blackshirts to the seat of the Fascio, the chiefs to a consultation, the others to wait for orders. Soon they sped from the Fascio in every direction, fully armed. Everyone in the town was a prey to terrified anticipation, but what really happened was worse than any had feared. I am bound to say, for it is true, that blood was literally streaming down the streets. The corpses of men, women, and children, over which vultures hovered, were lying in all directions. Great flames from the burning houses illuminated the African night.

The organization of the massacre was systematic. The stopping of telegraphic and telephonic communication, in order to prevent people from giving any information to Europe, the closing of the shops and the evacuation of the streets were precautionary measures, carried out between 11 a. m. and 6 p. m. If the first shooting in the courtyard and around the palace occurred under the immediate fear and panic spread by the bomb thrown at Graziani, the massacre which started in the night was carefully prepared during 7 hours and cannot thus be excused.

During that awful night Ethiopians were thrust into lorries, heavily guarded by armed Blackshirts. Revolvers, truncheons, rifles, and daggers were used to murder unarmed black people, of both sexes and all ages. Every black person seen was arrested, bundled into a lorry and killed, either in the lorry or near the Emperor's palace, sometimes even at the moment when he met the Blackshirts. Ethiopian homes were searched and then burned with their inhabitants inside. To quicken the flames benzine and oil were used in great quantities. The shooting never ceased all night, but most of the murders were committed with daggers and truncheons. Whole streets were burned down, and if any of the occupants of the houses ran out from the flames they machine-gunned or stabbed with cries of "Duce! Duce!" From the lorries in which groups of prisoners were brought up to be murdered near the palace the blood flowed on to the streets, and again from the lorries we heard the cry, "Duce!"

I shall never forget that I saw that night Italian officers passing in their luxurious cars through the blood-drenched streets, stopping at some point whence they could have a better panorama of the murdering and the burning, accompanied by their wives, whom I am very reluctant to call women.

Graziana himself was taken to the Italian hospital. His wound did not prevent him from looking down from the window and like a second Nero delighting in the flames. He heard the cries "Duce! Duce!" and knew that each of these cries, each stab of a dagger or firing of a rifle meant another cruel murder.

It was a mass murder of men, women, and children, and also an immense slaughtering of animals. Ethiopian shepherds tried to herd some of the poor beasts into a corner, which appeared to them to offer some protection, but even the animals were not spared from rifles and machine guns.

The flames spread from the houses to some of the great trees which graced the streets; flaming, they collapsed with a tremendous noise.

In the morning the horror continued; homeless people wandered desperately through the streets, seeking their lost relatives. There were no cries, no loud weeping, no complaints which men could hear. Prayer is silent, the horror of the night left the people speechless.

There was blood in the stream, there were dead bodies under and over the Makonnen Bridge. I am not easily moved. A medical man, having dealt with the worst kinds of disease, having gone through the world war with front-line ambulances, should have good nerves; and I have good ones. Yet the things I saw were too much even for my medically trained and war-hardened nerves.

If anything can increase the horror of the bloody sight of thousands of dead, it is the feeling that we ourselves are safe, and that these people are not killed because they are enemies fighting with weapon against weapon, but defenseless civilians being murdered, and the knowledge, which I have in the present case, that while the lorries were still collecting the dead bodies from the streets, while the blood was still congealing on the ground, Blackshirts were already running to the Bank of Italy to change the thalers they had stolen in the night from Ethiopian homes, and the gold and silver ornaments from the necks of Ethiopian women whom they had killed.

No decent man could tell these things without reluctance, to reveal that they were done by white men like himself. But it is my duty to speak; it is my duty to tell that lorries were covered and dripping with blood, that Blackshirts put a stick from behind between the feet of running black men, in order to throw them to the ground, the more easily to murder them. It is my duty to say that I have seen men's heads split open by truncheons so that their brains gushed out; that murder was accompanied by robbery; that the massacre was so systematic that three places in the town were appointed for the collection of corpses.

Fascists in groups of four or five, heavily armed, again and again attacked a single unarmed Ethiopian. Machine guns were used even against women. No means of destroying human life was neglected on the night of the 19th of February, 1937.

A second night of massacre followed. I was again in my room. Since the beginning of the massacre I had kept my Ethiopian servant there with me, forbidding him even to show himself at the window, as any sight of him by an Italian might have meant his death. He had a little house beside mine, which was spared on the first night, but burned on the second. He sat during those terrible hours quite speechless, and with his head in his hands. I dared not ask him what he thought.

The killing was done in the night to prevent photographs being taken. If any white person ventured into the streets he was stopped at every corner and searched to see if he had a camera on him. The houses of white people were visited by Italian soldiers, who confiscated cameras.

There was military aviation in the town and these officers were dissatisfied that they had not been able to share the glory of the Blackshirt action on the 19th. So they were ordered to bomb the surroundings the next night, in order that they, too, should have their part in the massacre.

I have had many Italians in my surgery who told with great pride how many black people they had killed. One of them was very modest; he had killed only two. Others killed, or pretended to have killed, eighty or a hundred. I have heard them praising themselves for having stolen four or five hundred thalers in one night. Man-hunting was a much-appreciated sport.

The hours of daylight between the first and the second night of the massacre I shall never forget. We knew already before nightfall that the horror was not at an end; proclamations in Italian appeared in the streets, announcing that more blood would flow: "Graziana has hitherto shown his good heart to the Ethiopians; tonight he will show them his immense power."

The second night resembled the first in every way, except for some bombing around the town.

In the days which followed one could see black people meeting in the street, embracing each other and putting a hundred questions. It was a surprise to any Ethiopian in Addis Ababa to know that one or other of his relations or friends was not dead.

The massacre was closed by an incident which I relate, still trembling at the mere thought of it. A venerable Coptic priest had survived the war, the first terrible period of the occupation, and even the massacre of the 19th and 20th of February. He was still alive on the 21st, when the Italians finally stopped killing and robbing, though he was one of the men against whom the Fascist daggers were aimed. When the Italian authorities became aware that he was still alive, Cortese convoked the murderers to the seat of the Fascio. An order was given to Gallini, one of the most able dagger men, to stab the Coptic prelate. The priest was surprised in a house where some 20 to 25 Ethiopians, mostly women, were assembled to offer up a devoted prayer to the One who hears the cry of suffering humanity. While the prelate was kneeling in prayer, Gallini stabbed him with his dagger from behind, and retired with the satisfaction of one who had done his job.

It was also on the 19th and 20th of February that most of the black intelligentsia perished. Those cultured, educated, young Ethiopians, with whom our relations were so friendly before the invasion, had to perish for two reasons: First, because their learning and their position assured them a certain influence over their compatriots; secondly, because many of them possessed in their homes objects of value, especially from Europe, which the murderers distributed among themselves.

In a domiciliary search, ostensibly for British hand grenades, a group of Italians entered a human Ethiopian home near the Makonnen Bridge. Of course, they found no hand grenades, but there were thalers, kept for safety in a money box, and these were confiscated as a trophy of war, victory, and civilization. In the same room they found a picture of the Emperor Haile Selassie. For this symbol the whole family were condemned to death. In a few moments the house was in flames, and with it perished the members of the family locked inside. Their desperate cries were heard, but the Italians did not move from the place till they had ceased; they were anxious that none should escape the fire.

Gallows to which the bodies of patriots were always hanging were erected near the cathedral wall in Addis Ababa and throughout the peaceful countryside; Italian columns swept down on the villages, seized the mayor and the leading men and strung them up with neither trial nor inquiry. The massacre and destruction of entire villages was a common event.

The Ethiopian Church was the subject of bitter attack, because of the spiritual support it gave to the cause of national independence and resistance to the enemy; among many others which suffered, the historic Monastery of Debra Lebanos, along with the town, was wantonly burned to the ground and monks were murdered in their holy sanctuary.

In tendering this tragic collection of records I would urge you first to pause and consider what your feelings would have been if this wickedness had been perpetrated in our own land, and our dear ones had been its victims.

The evidence of these atrocities is voluminous. The criminals themselves have rendered it the more irrefutable by their own photographic testimony, of which I have many examples.

These brutalities have not been, and could not be, exceeded by the aggressors in any part of the world. Along with the whole invasion and occupation of Ethiopia, they are an integral part of the combined world aggression by Italy, Germany and Japan in World War II. The bombing of Ethiopian villages was a part of the same series of events as the destruction of Warsaw and Rotterdam, Lidice and Coventry, and the attack on Pearl Harbor. The heroic 5 years resistance of the Ethiopian patriots was part of the same global fight for liberty as the battle of Britain and the valiant defense of El Alamein, Bir Hakeim and Stalingrad.

I submit that the atrocities committed by the Italians in Ethiopia must be laid before the War Crimes Commission, upon which Ethiopian representatives should be invited to take their seat among those of the other injured peoples.

The Ethiopian people are entitled to compensation for the wrongs they have suffered, the greatest of which was the deliberate and systematic extermination of those of their nationals who possessed superior education and administrative or technical experience.

London Times, March 3, 1937:

There is reason to believe that the Italian reprisals in Addis Ababa after the attempt on Marshal Graziani, the Viceroy, were carried out with a savagery almost beyond description. For 3 days after the attempted assassination every able-bodied Italian in the place appears to have been encouraged to slaughter natives.

With rifles, pistols, bombs, knives, and clubs served out for the occasion, gangs of Blackshirts and workmen went through the native quarter killing every man, woman, and child they came across. Others, with flame throwers and tins of petrol fired the flimsy huts and houses and shot down those who tried to escape.

Immediately after the bomb was thrown at Marshal Graziani, Italian troops surrounded the area, and every Ethiopian within the circle was killed.

London News Chronicle, March 6, 1937:

The terrible account from an eyewitness which our Paris correspondent sends today of what happened in Addis Ababa confirms the rumors which have been in circulation of wholesale massacre and incendiarism.

The shooting of Ras Desta without even the pretense of a trial was an ominous indication of the brutal temper of the men now in power in Ethiopia.

Paris correspondent:

Funeral pyres are burning amid the blackened ruins of Addis Ababa, capital of conquered Ethiopia.

So many thousands of Ethiopian men, women and children were massacred that they cannot be buried, let alone counted.

The authorities are therefore piling the bodies into heaps, which are soused with petrol and set on fire.

In the first eyewitness account to reach official circles in Paris a Frenchman wrote:

The capital and its environs passed into a state of siege. Aeroplanes zoomed overhead, and tanks, and motorized machine guns patrolled all the roads shooting all whom they encountered.

From the legation we heard uninterrupted firing, punctuated from time to time with the sharp rat-a-tat of machine guns.

Bands of Blackshirts and Italian workers ran through the streets setting fire to the tukuls (native huts) with flame throwers.

Scores of inhabitants were unable to escape from their blazing huts and perished in the flames. The confusion was indescribable.

Eyewitness, Imperial Legation, April 7, 1937:

The gigantic birds of death soared in the sky from the aerodrome of Akaki, and with a frightful drone began to hurl bombs all over the city. From the fortified positions cannon and machine guns vomited a hail of shots without respite. In a few minutes the whole town was in conflagration. Smoke darkened the sky.

Terrified men, women, and children ran in all directions, only to be butchered by groups of 10, 20, 50, 100 Italian militiamen and Blackshirts.

Soon the streets were strewn with dead bodies.

One could see groups of Fascists chaining the poor men to lorries and amusing themselves by dragging them along from one part of the town to another until their bodies fell to pieces.

Others entertained themselves by scourging naked women to death under the eyes of their husbands or brothers, who were first rendered impotent.

Still others derived devilish pleasure out of crushing the little children made orphans a few minutes previously with their enormous heavy boots (godasses).

Blood flowed on all sides. Frightful screams of women and children mingled with the diabolical concert of modern arms.

During whole days this went on.

Official report, Imperial Ethiopian Government:

Many of the murdered were men of distinction. Many were forced to dig their graves, then, covered with bernouse capes, were mown down with machine guns. More than a hundred corpses have been recovered from one well alone. In some cases the victims were taken outside the town in trucks and ordered to dig a well. Whilst still in the well they were shot or blasted by hand grenades.

The Archbishop of Canterbury:

No one can think of those days and nights at Addis Ababa without a sense of horror.

The Archbishop of York:

It seems as though the springs of humanity are being dried up by continual pressure of horror upon horror, and we are in danger of becoming case-hardened.

It is amazing that this thing which took place in Addis Ababa has gone by without a howl from the whole of the civilized world. There has been some protest, and I am grateful for the words spoken lately in Parliament by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but protests on such matters should not come alone from the leaders of the churches.

The dean of Winchester:

Thousands of Ethiopians, who were engaged in peaceful pursuits, or even sleeping in their beds, were massacred like sheep, for no other offense than that of being Ethiopian. There is no Englishman, I think, who does not blush with shame when he reflects on the events of that year.

PART III. SOMALIA

MEMORANDUM TO THE UNITED NATIONS FROM THE SOMALI DELEGATION ON THE FUTURE OF EX-ITALIAN SOMALILAND

We, the lawful and duly authorized representatives of the Somali Youth League, representing the overwhelming majority of the Somalis, most respectfully submit this memorandum, supplementing previously submitted documents, to the General Assembly of the United Nations and its appropriate subdivisions, setting forth our position on the future of Somaliland, formerly held as an Italian colony.

2. Under the peace treaty, Italy has renounced all rights and titles to her former African colonies of which our country, Somalia, is one.

3. The Council of Foreign Ministers, failing to reach agreement in regard to the final disposal of these territories, submitted the matter to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Thus the Assembly is confronted with the responsibility of designating the administrative authority and setting up the trusteeship system for Somalia.

4. It is not our intention at this time to make concrete suggestions regarding the application of the trusteeship system to these territories, but we are vitally concerned with respect to the designation of the administering authority. We reserve for the future the right to present concrete suggestions for incorporation into any trusteeship plan for administering these territories.

5. It is generally understood that some of the great powers intend to support the unjust imperialist claims of the present Italian Government to readminister our country in spite of the report of the Four Power Commission of Investigation which unequivocally states that in Somalia, apart from "an insignificant number," none has asked for the restoration of the Italian administration. It is thus quite clear that the Somalis do not wish to live again under Italian rule. Therefore, we must state with emphasis that the restoration of Italian administration under any form or guise, even as a trustee under the supervision of the

United Nations, is totally unacceptable to our people.

6. We summarize briefly the main reasons for our opposition to the return of Italian rule:

A. The Somalis, under Italian rule, were deprived of education and enlightenment; they were not entitled to any form of education during her 50-year regime;

B. The Somalis were kept out of the economic field because Italian nationalists monopolized all commerce and industry, leaving our people to become peons, gatekeepers, orderlies, interpreters, cooks, coolies, porters, boys, waiters, etc.;

C. The Somalis were not allowed to form any association or political body. There was no freedom of speech and no freedom of action;

D. The Somalis were treated like chattels in the social sphere;

E. Italy is poor and she cannot finance her own country soundly much less our country of Somalia; and

F. The Somalis earnestly desire the unification of their country with the other Somali-inhabited territories, and by allowing Italy to return, they can never hope to achieve this greatest aim.

The points A, B, C, and D, above-mentioned, have, during the past 50 years of Italian rule, left their odious mark upon us so that it is impossible for Somalis to believe that they can ever be treated in a better manner by the Italians.

7. In addition to this, the administration has deprived the Somalis of fertile land in favor of Italian farmers and imposed forced labor, making the Somalis work for the Italians. This forced-labor problem, better known in Somalia as "colonia," is horrible and beyond description. To give you a rough idea of the barbarous and inhuman methods employed by the administration, we quote hereafter extracts from an official British publication of 1944:

"This labor shortage, which at one time threatened to stop production altogether, was caused by the wholesale refusal of the Somalis to continue to work for the Italians. This was hardly surprising. For when the circumstances under which labor had been recruited were investigated, a situation was disclosed even less tolerable than the state of Mogadishu jail. Under the colonial system men, women, and children had been taken by force from remote places and condemned to an indefinite period of servitude on Italian farms. To quote from an official report: 'Rations were grossly inadequate both in quality and quantity, and pay varied from 1 to 3 lire a day. Bachelors were forced to marry women who had been born and bred on the estate. Punishment, inflicted by the resident on the ex parte representations of the employer, was brutal and excessive. For a first offense of disobedience or indiscipline 50 lashes with a hippopotamus-hide whip was a common award, and for a second offense the victim was strung up for several hours on a gallows, with his toes just clear of the ground, suspended by chains attached to wooden billets under his armpits, and with his hands handcuffed behind his back. It is not unnatural that the native laboring population regarded our coming as a deliverance from their Italian oppressors and that they resolutely and determinedly refused to return to work for them, in spite of our efforts to persuade them to do so.' They had had enough of slavery." (The First To Be Freed, p. 60.)

8. The Somalis suffered enough of slavery, suppression and oppression under the Italian administration during and long before the Fascist regime. They will never forget the tyranny practiced by the administration. To Somalis, Italy is Italy, and Italians are Italians whether Demo-Christian, Fascist, Communist, Nazi, Socialist, Republican, Liberal. To them there is no difference whatsoever between Mussolini and Signor De Gasperi; between Count Ciano and Count Sforza; and between Signor Terruzzi and Signor Brusasca.

9. Italy lays claim to a share in the administration of her former colonies on the basis of the securing of an overseas outlet for her surplus population. As everyone knows Italian emigrants are now scattered all over the world. Millions are in the United States alone. Millions more are in Argentina, Brazil and other South American countries. Other millions reside in Great Britain, France and elsewhere in Europe. They are also in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world. These Italian emigrants live peacefully with the peoples of these countries and have their ordinary jobs as workers, traders, etc. None of them has ever dreamed of ruling or demanding the right to administer these countries to which they have migrated.

10. There is no reason why Italian residents in Somalia cannot remain and live peacefully with the inhabitants without again aspiring to rulership over the territory. This can be achieved if, and only if, they renounce their unjust imperialist claims and cease seeking to restore the Italian administration since the Somalis can never forget the records of the past Italian regime.

11. Besides the Italians, there are also other foreign elements in Somalia, the most important being Indians (Hindustani and Pakistani) and Arabs. The latter is the largest foreign community in Somalia as they actually number some 20,000. These immigrants have their ordinary jobs and none of them lays claim to sovereignty over the country.

12. Among the nations supporting the unjust imperialist claims of Italy some are rich, both in wealth and land. If they really wish—with good and sincere intention—to solve the problem of the Italian surplus population, they would do far better to let down the bars and permit a sufficient number of Italian immigrants into these prosperous lands rather than awarding to bankrupt Italy the infertile and desert lands of East Africa, where, because of former Italian oppression, emigrants from that land would not be welcome.

13. In addition to the problem of the Italian surplus, the new Government of Italy has repeatedly sought opportunity to send back to Africa some thousands of refugees from the former Italian colonies. Concluding its mission, the Four Power Commission of Investigation visited Italy and interviewed representatives of these refugees. These were avowed Fascists who had poured into Africa during and immediately after the Fascist conquest of Abyssinia. They are aptly and accurately described in the following excerpt from the First To Be Freed:

"In Somalia, too, the conditions found were similar in the main, though different in detail. True, Mogadishu had never suffered from the elephantiasis that had overtaken Asmara. True, the Italian population of the colony was only one-tenth of that of Eritrea; but they were more violently Fascist, incorrigibly corrupt, and cordially hated by the Somali, who is difficult to deal with even at his friendliest" (p. 12).

14. May we call your attention to the fact that the United Nations Declaration, which embodies the principles of the Atlantic Charter, upholds the right of self-determination. In Article 76 of the Charter, setting forth the objectives of the trusteeship system, such phrases as "freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," appear.

15. If against our wishes the First Committee and the General Assembly should decide to return Somalia to Italy, are we to assume that the Italian officials who are so bitterly hated by our people there are to be returned with the benediction of the United Nations? In such case, how can you expect us to trust and have faith in the United Nations?

16. In concluding our memorandum, we humbly and respectfully beg the Assembly to study carefully the contents of all that we have submitted and what we are going to submit.

17. Once again we stress that the Somalis do not desire and will not accept the restoration, in their country, of Italian administration under any form or guise even as a trustee under supervision of the United Nations.

18. May we draw the attention of the honorable members of the august Assembly to the fact that today they are the supreme judges of the fate of our country and its people. We wish to see these honorable members give more consideration and weight to the desires and welfare of the inhabitants. Furthermore, we trust that this august Assembly will not judge this issue on the basis of self-interest whether for political, religious or other reasons and will act as a neutral and impartial judge.

19. We faithfully hope that the august Assembly will carefully consider our just and legitimate demands expressed in this and other memoranda submitted.

We beg to remain, sirs,

Yours respectfully,

THE SOMALI REPRESENTATIVES,
ALI NOOR.
ABDULLAHI ISSA.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. FUGATE (at the request of Mr. BLAND), from April 13 to 27, 1949, inclusive, on account of official business.

To Mr. DEANE, for Thursday, April 14, 1949, on account of official business.

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BARING, for April 12, 13, 14, and 15, on account of official business.

To Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 2 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 851. An act to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district numbered 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of

Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1113. An act for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, Eightieth Congress), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein;

H. R. 2708. For the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.;

H. R. 3856. An act to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion;

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

523. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting separate reports on contracts and cooperative agreements entered into during fiscal year 1948 under the Research and Marketing Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

524. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

525. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard communications facilities for the reception and transmission of commercial messages"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

526. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide cumulative sick and emergency leave with pay for teachers and attendance officers in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

527. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

528. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Works Agency for the Fiscal Year 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2753. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; without amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3576. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws and parts of laws relating to the sale of public lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1953. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 438. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 185. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2989; a bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2702. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4225. A bill to provide for compulsory retirement from active service of judges and justices of the United States upon reaching the age of 70 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4226. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4227. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 4228. A bill to establish a Connecticut Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Connecticut River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4229. A bill to amend section 17 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4230. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist parents of children in elementary and secondary schools to provide transportation, library facilities, textbooks, and other reading materials, visual aids, and other instructional materials, recreation facilities, and school health programs and facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 4231. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4232. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 4233. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the sixtieth anniversary of the American edition of Izaak Walton's Compleat Angler and subsequent establishment of the Izaak Walton League in America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4234. A bill to amend further the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 4235. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital now under construction at Fresno, Calif., the Bertrand W. Gear-

hart Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4236. A bill to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Blackfeet Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4237. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 4238. A bill to provide that unclaimed animals in the pound of the District of Columbia be made available to licensed institutions for scientific purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 4239. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4240. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4241. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to make an allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4242. A bill to give former owners of certain Government real property a right to purchase such property if and when it is offered for sale; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4243. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 4244. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINEHAN:

H. R. 4245. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4246. A bill to raise the limit on individual postal savings accounts to $5,000; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 4247. A bill to amend section 2136 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to drawback on the exportation of tobacco, snuff, cigars, and cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4248. A bill to permit partially disabled World War II veterans to reenlist in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for limited duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 4249. A bill to transfer the trawlers *Alaska* and *Oregon* from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4250. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 4251. A bill to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 4252. A bill to transfer the trawlers *Alaska* and *Oregon* from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 186. Resolution providing for holding memorial services on Wednesday, May 25, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to minimum-wage legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take the initiative in requesting amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to strengthening the United Nations and limited world federal government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of John Irvin Clifford, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4254. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Sidney Blackhair; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KARST:

H. R. 4255. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Becherer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of James A. G. Martindale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4257. A bill for the relief of Fred Ericson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4258. A bill for the relief of James Starozynski, Brucha Laja Starozynski, his wife, and their daughter, Reveca Starozynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 4259. A bill for the relief of Louise Benedict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4260. A bill to authorize the appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols, O17498, professor of the United States Military Academy, in the permanent grade of colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 4261. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to L. J. Hand a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 4262. A bill for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

571. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Tippecanoe County, favoring repeal of the wartime tax on toiletries and cosmetics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

572. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of B. H. Jennings and 37 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging Congress to repeal the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

573. Also, petition of S. Mitchell and 42 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging Congress to repeal the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

574. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of 38 residents of Bogota, N. J., urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

575. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Wayne R. Lausterer, Omaha Pharmaceutical Association, Inc., Omaha, Nebr., affirming their unqualified opposition to S. 5 and H. R. 783 and any other form of national legislation that would permit further regimentation of any class of people or professions of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

576. Also, petition of Myrtle Ramos and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

577. Also, petition of Julian Acosta and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

578. Also, petition of Charles E. Bordeaux and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

579. Also, petition of I. C. Ellis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

580. Also, petition of S. R. Freeman and others, Clearwater, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

581. Also, petition of Mrs. E. E. O'Hara and others, Mount Dora, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in the holy pilgrimage of this sacred week we fain would join the devout multitudes under every sky

treading the way of sorrow. Give us eyes to see that a mocking robe may be more regal than cloth of gold, that a crown of thorns may glow with a splendor surpassing kingly coronets, and that a garden of suffering may hold more beauty and fragrance than a sheltered bower of delight. On the stepping stones of our dead selves may we mount to newness of life—to the singing Easter of the soul—as we pray, each at the inner shrine of his own heart:

"Nearer, my God, to thee,
E'en though it be a cross
That raiseth me."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 14, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 629) to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 779. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; and

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. LANE, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4029. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure for the Everglades National Park with available funds, including those made available by the State of Florida, the remaining lands and interest in lands within the boundary agreed upon between the State of Florida and the Secretary of the Interior, within and a part of that authorized by the act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816), and within which the State has already donated its lands, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4146. An act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 779. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 1757. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés, and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FISCAL MATTERS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE—THE JOURNAL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on March 25 I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 69, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters. Since the Reorganization Act provides that all measures proposing amendments to the Constitution shall go to the Committee on the Judiciary, I take it that inadvertently this joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution and that it be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A similar measure went to the Committee on Appropriations by request of the Senator from Maryland at the last session.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true, but the Committee on Appropriations reported it with the idea that it would go to the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand how the error was made at this session, but Senate Joint Resolution 69 should have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Appropriations having acted on it at the last session of the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that that was a different Congress, and that the previous joint resolution died with the expiration of that Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I should like to point out to the Chair that in the last Congress the joint resolution went to the Committee on Appropriations at my request simply for what might be called preliminary recommendation. The right place for it is before the Committee on the Judiciary, as I am sure the Parliamentarian will agree, and there would be no point in sending it again to the Committee on Appropriations for a mere preliminary survey.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Appropriations will be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that a moment, until I can have the Journal approved?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to have the Journal approved. I am not objecting to what has been requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator would prefer, the order will be rescinded.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care about that, but I think we should approve the Journal and have a quorum call, and then these other matters could be taken up, when more Senators are present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the Journal be approved without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. I had not finished, but I did not want to cut off the Senator from Nebraska. I understand the Senator from Nebraska said he had no objection, and the Chair has ruled that the joint resolution be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is my understanding correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that procedure, except that I think an announcement should be made by the President pro tempore, so that if any Senator desires to take exception and move to reconsider after a quorum, he may have that opportunity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the joint

resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Miller
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Baldwin	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bridges	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler	Ives	Pepper
Cain	Jenner	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tydings
Frear	McFarland	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McGrath	Watkins
George	McKellar	Wherry
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Withers
Hayden	Maybank	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official committee business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Monday next.

Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate on Monday and Tuesday next.

Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance at the session of the Senate on Monday next because of a very important speaking engagement taking him out of the city.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], I ask that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may hold hearings this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of the Senate Finance Committee may sit this afternoon in public hearing on nominations to the Tax Court, and that we may be absent from the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EARTHQUAKE IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to what happened yesterday in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, every Senator is conscious of the disaster which came yesterday in the form of an unexpected earthquake to the Pacific Northwest. Most Senators are aware that this is the second major catastrophe in less than a year which has brought suffering, loss of life, and great damage to the States of Oregon and Washington. I know that all Senators will share the feeling of deep distress which belongs to the senior and junior Senators and to all of the citizens of the two States across the land.

There is encouragement in being able to say that Gen. Philip Fleming of the Federal Works Agency, who represents the President and the executive branch of our Government in catastrophe situations, is already determining what might be done from Washington, D. C., to assist and help the stricken area. Preliminary reports indicate that most of the material damage, which runs into the millions of dollars, has been suffered by private property; but even so, every agency of the Government will help where it can. Should General Fleming have reason to think that legislation is required, he will present his views to the Congress; and I feel sure that they will be seriously considered by every Member.

During the course of the earthquake, which lasted many minutes, several citizens lost their lives. Our sympathy is extended to every family involved. One of these, Mr. President, was a promising young man of 11 years, the son of a splendid Jewish family in Tacoma, Wash. I knew Marvin Klegman well, for the home of his family, in which he enjoyed a happy existence, was removed from my home by a single city block. Marvin Klegman and my son Buzzy were inseparable companions. I hold his parents in high and affectionate regard.

Herbert Spencer must have been right when he once wrote that a short and full life was to be desired over a long and uneventful one. If this be true, the parents of Marvin Klegman, who was killed yesterday by the falling of bricks in a public grade school which the junior Senator from Washington attended years ago, can derive a sense of satisfaction and faith from knowing that their son lived a full life during the short years he spent among us. I think it proper, Mr. President, to recognize the passing of a promising youngster and to express for myself and for my son, who has never known death before, a sincere word of comprehension to a grief-stricken family who must find it difficult today to understand the mystery of life. I can only urge them to be grateful for the joy and love which young Marvin gave to his mother and father in such full measure.

The junior Senator from Washington and his colleagues from Washington and Oregon will keep the Senate advised as to how the Senate may assist in minimizing the hurt and damage which has come to so many across the Nation.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred, as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS (S. DOC. NO. 50)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, fiscal year 1950, in the form of an amendment to the Budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND INTERIOR, AND NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 49)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation, amounting to $15,841,000, fiscal year 1949, for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the National Military Establishment, in connection with the unusually severe winter conditions in 13 Western States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

STATEMENT ON RESEARCH WORK PERFORMED UNDER RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of research work being performed under contracts or cooperative agreements under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RECORDING OF NOTICES OF SETTLEMENT CLAIMS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF PAUL A. SMITH AS REPRESENTATIVE TO COUNCIL OF INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to appoint Paul A. Smith as representative of the United States to the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization without affecting his status and perquisites as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENJAY CONSTRUCTION CO.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, reporting, pursuant to law, on the claim of the Enjay Construction Co., to whom relief was granted under section 5, Public Law 657, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 902, 41 U. S. C. A. 106–n) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the General Court of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Joint resolution relating to world government

"Whereas we believe that world peace can be created and maintained only under a world federal government, universal and strong enough to prevent armed conflict between nations, and having direct jurisdiction over the individual in those matters within its authority; and

"Whereas in 1945 the General Court of New Hampshire solemnly declared 'that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the Federation of the World'; and

"Whereas we are mindful of, and endorse, the efforts of the United Nations to bring about a world community favorable to peace, and further believe that every avenue should be utilized so as to transform the existing organization of the United Nations into an effective world government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That our Representatives in the National Congress be, and hereby are, requested to urge the President and the Congress forthwith to take the initiative in requesting amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war. The secretary of state is directed to send a copy of this resolution to our representatives in the National Congress, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the President of the National Senate, and to the President of the United States.

"RICHARD F. UPTON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"PERKINS BASS,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved April 7, 1949.
"SHERMAN ADAMS,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress concerning minimum-wage legislation

"Whereas the economic well-being of its wage earners is of vital importance to this State; and

"Whereas it has been demonstrated that when the wages of labor are insufficient to enable it to purchase the products of agriculture and industry, depression and unemployment soon follow; and

"Whereas the rising cost of living has rendered obsolete the present Federal minimum-wage laws, and the minimum-wage scales therein contained are insufficient to allow labor to purchase the products of agriculture and industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress to enact legislation providing for a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate in the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution relative to reimbursing counties for the loss of revenue caused by Federal ownership of lands within the counties

"Whereas the Federal Government owns in excess of 46 percent of the total land area of the State of California and in excess of 47 percent of the total land area of the 11 Western States and in excess of 24 percent of the total land area of the United States; and

"Whereas these federally owned lands occupy a substantial part of the total land area of many of the counties of the United States; and

"Whereas the counties in the United States wherein federally owned lands are located furnish many services for such land for which there is no adequate return of revenue for such services; and

"Whereas Federal contributions to county government are uncertain, because the Federal Government is not under a duty to create any revenue in which local government can share; and

"Whereas such revenues being unpredictable in time and amount make it difficult to operate within the provisions of State constitutions and statutes regulating fluctuations in the budgets of local government; and

"Whereas there is an increasing demand for a critical reexamination of the Federal fiscal responsibility to local governments because of the ownership of Federal properties within the boundaries of such local governments; and

"Whereas lands in private ownership in the counties within the boundaries of which federally owned lands are located are required to assume an extra burden for the cost of services rendered by local government because of the location of such Federal lands in such counties: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to reimburse the counties for the loss of revenue caused by Federal ownership of land within such counties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 26

"Joint resolution relative to the participation of the United States in a world federal government

"Whereas war is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization, because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no sure defense; and

"Whereas the effective maintenance of world peace is the proper concern and responsibility of every American citizen; and

"Whereas the people of the State of California, while now enjoying domestic peace and security under the laws of their local, State, and Federal Government, deeply desire the guaranty of world peace; and

"Whereas all history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and that law and order are the product of government; and

"Whereas the United Nations, as presently constituted, although accomplishing great good in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret, or enforce world law, and under its present charter is incapable of restraining any major nations which may foster or foment war; and

"Whereas the charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in articles 108 and 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the charter; and

"Whereas the necessity for endowing the United Nations with limited powers rendering it capable of enacting, interpreting, or enforcing world law adequate to prevent war, and guaranteeing the inalienable rights of freedom for every human being on earth and the dignity of the individual as exemplified by the American Bill of Rights, has been recognized in the California state conventions and platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties; and

"Whereas many States have memorialized Congress, through resolutions by their State legislatures or in referenda by their voters, to initiate steps toward the creation of a world federal government reserving to the nations and to the people those rights not specifically granted as necessary to the establishment and the maintenance of world law and order; and

"Whereas several nations have recently adopted constitutional provisions to facilitate their entry into a world federal government by authorizing a delegation to such a world federal government of a portion of their sovereignty sufficient to endow it with powers adequate to prevent war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendment of the Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a world federal government, open to all nations, with powers which, while defined and limited, shall be adequate to preserve

peace, whether the proposed charter or constitution of such world federal government be presented in the form of amendments to the charter of the United Nations, or by a world constitutional convention, or otherwise; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures of the several States, requesting their cooperation."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"To the President and Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Interior, the Departments of the Army and the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Office of Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, all of Washington, D. C.; and the Alaska offices of the following: United States district engineer, the Alaska Railroad, the Alaska Road Commission, the Public Roads Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and the commanding general, Department of the Army, Alaska; and to the Delegate in Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas large percentages of the wealth produced and moneys expended in Alaska have long been drained out of Alaska and have not been available to circulate in and help develop the Territory's economy; and

"Whereas many Federal Government agencies have indicated and expressed an interest in a sound economic development of Alaska; and

"Whereas many such Federal Government agencies are now engaged in large-scale construction of various projects in Alaska and are spending large sums of Federal funds in Alaska; and

"Whereas most such agencies deal almost entirely with firms and individuals located outside of Alaska and enter into large contracts with stateside firms who employ and import practically all artisans and labor from stateside labor markets, often to the exclusion of, and to the detriment of, Alaskan labor; and

"Whereas such firms and labor take practically all of their contractual earnings and profits to the States and leave little, if any, of such funds to turn over in Alaska toward developing the Territory's economy, because of which Alaska's economy suffers severe dollar-buying-power shortages in the winter months; and

"Whereas a sound, well-developed economy functioning normally in Alaska is the most economical and safest adjunct to our military defense and security; and

"Whereas in order to attain such a well-developed normally functioning economy in Alaska it is necessary to encourage a sound technology comprising resident professional firms of engineers, architects, designers, and their staffs, resident contracting firms, resident material supplying firms and resident tradesmen and labor groups; and

"Whereas the present policy of most Federal Government agencies charged with construction projects in Alaska is to enter into large contracts in such manner as to be beyond the reach of Alaskan professional, contracting, and material supply firms, making Alaska a "happy hunting ground" for a few large stateside firms who will leave no lasting contribution to Alaska's development; and

"Whereas present policies of many such Government agencies virtually exclude resident Alaskan firms and workers from participating in such large Government projects to any material extent, and are shortsighted and restrictory in regard to Alaska's sound economic development and do not reflect a long-range consideration of the problem:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that large Government construction programs in Alaska be set up to allow the fullest participation of resident Alaskan firms of all sizes and types, to utilize Alaskan tradesmen and labor to the fullest possible extent, and to adjust the size of contracts to be let so that Alaskans are not excluded from a fair chance to participate, and that the policies adopted be broadened to include the long-range viewpoint of allowing as much of the Government construction money as possible to remain in, and turn over in the Alaskan economy, for its ultimate development, rather than be rapidly drained off for the enrichment of a few stateside groups with little, if any, continuing interest in Alaska's development.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 10, 1949.

"GUNNARD M. ENGEBRETH,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 24, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 5, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

"Senate Joint Memorial 16

"To the Honorable ALBEN BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate in Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the harbor project on the Snake River at Nome, Alaska, which was completed 30 years ago, has served a valuable purpose not only in the development of northwestern Alaska but in safeguarding Nome, which is the hub of national defense activity in northwestern Alaska; but

"Whereas a serious beach erosion problem has developed in the past 10 years, recently reaching an alarming proportion which endangers the city of Nome and resulting in passage by the Eightieth Congress of Public Law 649, authorizing improvement of the Nome harbor by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and providing an appropriation of $1,837,000; and

"Whereas the said $1,837,000 appropriation was stricken from Public Law 649 in the closing days of the Eightieth Congress; and

"Whereas the Chief of United States Engineers has requested from the Eighty-first Congress now in session, the sum of $1,020,000 to be expended on Nome harbor improvements, including the sea wall, during 1949:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges your support for an appropriation by the present Congress of $1,020,000 to carry out the sea-wall and harbor improvement project at Nome, Alaska, to safeguard said city and national defense operations in the vicinity thereof.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 26, 1949.

"GUNNARD M. ENGEBRETH,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 16, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 19, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

"Senate Joint Memorial 30

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Honorable Julius A. Krug, Secretary of Interior, and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas it is generally known that mining was one of the first commercial inducements to the white man to come and settle in Alaska since the purchase of the Territory by the United States; and

"Whereas for the long period that followed, the mining industry in Alaska furnished, on a large scale, continuous employment in the various communities. The results therefrom contributed to the development of transportation facilities; and

"Whereas the mining industry in Alaska, in our own opinion and supported by the known facts through investigations of the United States Geological Survey and the United States Bureau of Mines, lies mostly in the future and with the proper facilities and encouragement is capable of a most highly profitable expansion and development; and

"Whereas many thousands of mining claims, once active, are at present abandoned, due primarily to difficulties beyond the control of the owners, which in no way reflects on the merits of the many prospects. At present, more than 98 percent of this vast Territory, excluding the Government reserves, are open for location, with no incentive for which to strive; and

"Whereas the mining industry of the Territory of Alaska with needed support, either Federal or private, offers commercial returns second to none for the money invested—proven by the fact that out of eight fair-sized operations, five have achieved world records; and

"Whereas the widespread mineralization and the known discoveries of the different minerals, metals, and ores, also their abundance, commercial and strategic importance, with proper facilities cannot be overstated; and

"Whereas the Alaska mining industry has, along with other adverse conditions, been severally handicapped by the remoteness of transportation and the distance to the proper smelter by which, as a matter of necessity, the final extraction of the metal has to be made, all of which would be unnecessary if smelting charges, deductions, transportation, There is also the exorbitant expense of smelting charges, deductions, transportation, and the time element required to receive returns, all of which has levied a hardship on the industry and more especially the small and underfinanced operator; and

"Whereas the nearest smelter at which the simple gold, silver, copper ores and concentrates therefrom can be sold and treated is located at Tacoma, Wash., more than 1,000 miles from the point of production; and

"Whereas the nearest smelter at which the important metal, lead, can be treated, and the only one on the Pacific coast, is located another thousand miles farther south at Selby, Calif.; and

"Whereas tin and zinc must be shipped to the Atlantic coast, the interior of the United States or to foreign smelters for final treatment, a deplorable and absolutely economically unprofitable condition which has retarded the development, and future development and production of these metals in Alaska is next to impossible; and

"Whereas, the most important, strategic, economic, and indispensable metal, nickel, with its usual combinations of gold, silver, copper, and cobalt, has no smelter or refining plant in the United States, while the United States imports and consumes more than 50 percent of the world's production of this metal in normal times, which is ample

proof of the crying need for such plant; and

"Whereas Alaska, with no incentive for development nor attempt at production, due to the lack of smelting facilities, has, in Alaska alone, more than 25,000,000 tons of such nickel, copper ores, and materials, estimated by the work done by the United States Geological Survey and the United States Bureau of Mines, and by work done by private interests (see Bull. USG Survey No. 947C, 1946, pp. 39, 40, 50, 53, and 55); and

"Whereas a centrally located smelting plant built by the Federal Government could treat on the custom basis all such ores and others that may be produced from the many showings now known in Alaska, including gold, silver, ores, and concentrates, and thus stimulate mining production otherwise unlikely, increase the pay roll, the economy, and population of Alaska by many thousands, and at least in considerable measure free the United States industry and the Government from the complete dependence on the importation from foreign and monopolistic sources of this metal; and

"Whereas custom smelting is nothing new, is highly profitable, and stimulative of mining activities, and has been responsible in the past for the erection of new towns and settlements, examples of which are widespread in continental United States and elsewhere, none of which would have been attained but for the erection of smelting facilities and the stimulation thereby of the mining activities; and

"Whereas no private finances are available for the purpose under the present conditions, as has been proven by diligent efforts made by private interests to accomplish that purpose which have failed due to the lack of sufficient finances; and

"Whereas Henry M. Eakin, foremost geologist of the United States Geological Survey in 16 years in Alaska, and who directed the diamond drilling and chemical analysis of the ore development for the private interest mentioned, states in his report of 1934:

" 'Practical development of these deposits can make the United States an important factor in primary production of nickel; to do this at the present time can give immediate employment to several thousand men in the United States and Alaska and permanently divert a large part of our annual nickel import bill from foreign to domestic pay rolls.

" 'Upon the basis of costly pilot-test mills, which were run upon the property, the power surveys, proper plans were drawn up in 1931 for a nickel smelting and refining plant to treat the ores of the ——— mine. This execution has been prevented only by the drying up of normal sources of investment capital for this kind of enterprise.

" 'A central plant at this favorable locality, on the excellent harbor of ——— and furnished with abundant and cheap hydroelectric power, if large enough to offer custom service in addition to treatment of ——— mine output, would permit development and commercial production from smaller mines throughout the nickel-bearing province.

" 'Such production from numerous mines should quickly build up a general nickel-mining industry of large proportions in the same way that the central smelters at ——— and elesewhere led to major development of the copper industry some 40 years ago by affording commercial markets for shipment of ore from mines too small individually to afford smelting plants of their own.

" 'Early construction of the proposed ——— plant as a means to develop American production of nickel is apparently impossible through ordinary financial channels. The enterprise can qualify as self-liquidating within reasonable time, as a means to aid industrial recovery and progress through immediate and permanent reemployment of labor, as noncompetitive with any presently established domestic industry, as a means to free American industry from sole dependence upon foreign sources now under strong monopolistic control and as highly advantageous to the public interest from the viewpoint of national defense.

" 'The enterprise thus appears preeminently qualified for special action by the present loan agencies of the Government. It is submitted for possible executive consideration with a view to securing suspension of established rules that otherwise preclude Federal assistance to this general class of enterprise'; and

"Whereas since ample water power is available at several places in Alaska for the production of electric energy wherewith to operate a suitable smelting plant at minimum cost, as well as protected harbors along the regular steamship lanes serving western and interior Alaska, the construction and operation of such a plant at some such location would immediately stimulate the mining industry and incidentally solve, or at least greatly help to solve, the vexing transportation problems which have so injuriously confronted this Territory for years past and almost stymied its economic development; and

"Whereas the United States has made attempts to secure such metals by importation for the emergency use during World War II by building and assisting plant construction outside of the United States, with unsatisfactory results and comparatively small returns; and

"Whereas it appears to the Legislature of Alaska advisable and indispensable and for the best interests of Alaska and its defenses and the security of the United States as a whole that immediate steps be taken to secure the construction of such a plant or plants, centrally located in Alaska, if upon investigation such is found feasible and can be self-liquidated, to serve all the prospective miners and shippers of such ores and metals:

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully pray that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized and requested to investigate the advisability and feasibility of erecting a smelter at some strategic point in Alaska, and that, upon his recommendation, it be constructed by the Federal Government, as a 'custom smelter' to the end that the valuable mineral and metal deposits known to exist in the Territory of Alaska may be reduced to commercial value within its confines, and that $25,000,000 be appropriated, or so much thereof as found to be necessary, to accomplish that end.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 12, 1949.

"GUNNARD M. ENGEBRETH,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 18, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 24, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"To the President and Congress of the United States, the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Army, the Alaska Road Commission, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the city of Nome as the trading center and hub of national defense in northwestern Alaska, is seriously handicapped for lack of a road connection with the rest of Alaska; and

"Whereas the strategic importance of the second division of Alaska, of which Nome is headquarters, was attested during the war by location of a route for a road between the rail belt near Fairbanks and Teller, Alaska; and

"Whereas 80 miles of road on the Fairbanks end between Fairbanks and Livengood is already established with 50 additional miles between Livengood and Rampart, on the Yukon, partly constructed; and

"Whereas the narrow channel of the Yukon at Rampart enables crossing said river at that point; and

"Whereas 75 miles of road is already completed on the other end between Nome and Council, leaving a distance of approximately 700 miles yet to be covered between Rampart and Council; and

"Whereas location and preliminary surveys of the remainder of this route have already been completed; and

"Whereas establishment of said section of road is important not only from a military standpoint but to implement development and utilization of valuable mineral and other resources in the area which it would traverse as well as complete an over-all highway system for Alaska, and to provide the missing link between Nome and the rest of the Territory.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that action necessary to establishment of a road between Livengood, Alaska, and Nome, Alaska, be instituted next summer with a view to construction as soon as possible.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 1, 1949.

"GUNNARD M. ENGEBRETH,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 25, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 5, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

"Senate Joint Memorial 13

"To the President and Congress of the United States, the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Army, the Alaska Road Commission, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas it is desirable to build an adequate system of roads throughout the Territory of Alaska not only for national defense but also to facilitate economic development; and

"Whereas the town of Nenana located in the fertile farming district of the Tanana Valley at the headwaters of interior riverboat travel has no road connecting it with the highway system of the Territory; and

"Whereas a road from Nenana to Fairbanks would provide a connecting road link between Nenana and the main arteries of highways throughout the Territory, enabling farmers to more readily market their produce; and

"Whereas such a road would provide easier access to the Bonnifield and Kantishna mining country and to the important Stampede Antimony Mines; and

"Whereas such road would be the first link in extending the highway system of the Territory into the mining country of the upper Kuskokwim and the lower Yukon area; and

"Whereas said road could be extended 15 miles south of Nenana to Clear Airfield, thereby giving that airfield an overland connecting link with Fairbanks, making it possible for the Army to move men and equipment to and from the field without depending upon rail transportation.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that surveys necessary to establishment of a road between Nenana and Fairbanks be instituted next summer with a view to construction as soon as possible.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 13, 1949.

"GUNNARD M. ENGEBRETH,
President of the Senate.

"Passed by the House February 24, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 5, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution adopted by the Spokane (Wash.) Public Forum, protesting against the approval of the North Atlantic treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Menasha, Wis.; the St. Joseph's Polish Society, Inc., of Thorndike, and the Polish National Alliance, of Three Rivers, both in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Hungarian Building and Loan Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., signed by Charles F. Gerhard, solicitor, relating to the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; ordered to lie on the table.

RESTORATION OF ITALIAN COLONIES TO THE MOTHER COUNTRY—RESOLUTION OF COLUMBIAN CIVIC CLUB, NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Friday, April 1, I made a speech on the floor of this body in which I urged the restoration of the Italian colonies to the mother country. In support of the arguments which I then offered, I send to the desk for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Columbian Civic Club, of Newark, N. J., and ask unanimous consent that the contents thereof be incorporated in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the UN Assembly, at its next session, will take under consideration the trusteeship of the former Italian colonies; and

Whereas Italy, by geographical position, tradition, culture, and ideology, and now as a party to the North Atlantic Pact, is a definite part of the Alliance of Western Nations; and

Whereas by her victory at the recent national elections, achieved in the face of tremendous communistic opposition, Italy established herself, not only as a democracy, but as an impregnable barrier against the forces of communism; and

Whereas Italy's high rate of unemployment, due, in a great measure, to overpopulation, is being used as a basis for communistic propaganda, intended to strain her relations with the other western powers; and

Whereas the development of the African Continent will be a great contributing factor toward the social progress and economic rehabilitation of western Europe; and

Whereas Italy, prompted, not by selfish gain, but to relieve the sad state of her overpopulation, made great contributions in the development of her colonies, by the construction of railroads, airports, and seaports, by converting arid lands into rich farms, by transforming unknown places into industrial centers, and, through the application of scientific knowledge, methods, and skills, raising the standard of living far above that which had been enjoyed by the natives and hundreds of thousands of Italians who settled there; and

Whereas, by virtue of her enormous efforts and sacrifices in their development, and her proximity to her former colonies, and her technique, and her excessive population and manpower, Italy is deserving and qualified to undertake their further development; and

Whereas the awarding to Italy of the trusteeship of her former colonies will be a great step in her own economic rehabilitation and will further solidify the western nations against the common enemy; and

Whereas Italy is now the only friendly democracy which has not been given membership in the UN; and

Whereas by every action, since she threw off the yoke of fascism, and joined forces with America and the other free nations of the world—first against nazism and then against communism—Italy has earned the moral right to be a member of and participate in the UN: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Columbian Civic Club, in special meeting assembled, on this fourth day of April 1949, at its headquarters, 12 Hill Street, Newark, N. J., That:

1. Italy has every moral right to the trusteeship of her former colonies.

2. The UN would perform an act of supreme justice by awarding to Italy the trusteeship of her former colonies.

3. Italy's friendship to America and her many contributions toward the culture and way of life now enjoyed by our country has earned for her the sincere support of our delegates to the UN for the trusteeship of her former colonies.

4. Justice also requires that Italy be admitted as a member of the UN, so that her hopes and aspirations, for her own future and for the peace of the world, may be advocated by her own delegates.

5. That every means, consistent with loyalty and propriety, be employed to bring to the attention of the elected representatives and other leaders of our country, the moral considerations supporting Italy's claims and qualifications for the trusteeship of her former colonies, and her right to representation in the UN.

6. That a copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, in the hope that he will consider it a respectful appeal for his powerful aid by way of accomplishing these purposes and objectives.

WORLD GOVERNMENT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, apropos of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty and the trend toward some type of world government, I am pleased to send to the desk for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution adopted overwhelmingly by both houses of the New Jersey Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose amendments to the Federal Constitution whereunder the United States would be authorized to join in a world federal government. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 17

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize the United States to join in a world federal government

Whereas war is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization, because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no sure defense; and

Whereas the effective maintenance of world peace is the proper concern and responsibility of every American citizen; and

Whereas the people of the State of New Jersey, while now enjoying domestic peace and security under the laws of their local, State, and Federal Government, deeply desire the guaranty of world peace; and

Whereas the United Nations, as presently constituted, although accomplishing great good in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret or enforce world law, and under its present charter is incapable of restraining any major nations which may foster or foment war; and

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in articles 108 and 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the Charter; and

Whereas the necessity for enforceable world law has been recognized in the New Jersey State platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties; and

Whereas many States have memorialized Congress, through resolutions by their State Legislatures or in referenda by their voters to initiate steps toward the creation of a world federal government; and

Whereas several nations have recently adopted constitutional provisions to facilitate their entry into a world federal government by authorizing a delegation to such a world federal government of a portion of their sovereignty sufficient to endow it with powers adequate to prevent war; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the senate concurring):

1. That application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations, subject to later ratification, a constitution of a world federal government, open to all nations, with limited powers adequate to assure peace, or amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to ratify any world constitution which is presented to the United States by the United Nations, by a world constitutional convention or otherwise; and be it further

2. *Resolved*, That the clerk of the house of assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the United States Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures in the several States, requesting their cooperation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3333. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1950, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 265).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 988. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service, but prior to attainment of age 55; without amendment (Rept. No. 266);

S. 1023. A bill to amend section 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to grant credit in accordance with such section for service for which, through inadvertence, no deductions from salary are made; without amendment (Rept. No. 267); and

S. 1229. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; without amendment (Rept. No. 268).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to investigate certain economic problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 264); and

S. Res. 101. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to employ temporary assistants and make additional expenditures; with amendments (Rept. No. 263).

PRINTING OF EXTRA COPIES OF HEARINGS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 1579) to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

This bill relates to amendments to the Printing Act which permit an increase in the amount of printing which may be done upon a simple resolution of the Senate or the House. In 1895, $500 was the amount permitted. Printing costs have increased, and the House recommends that the amount be made $1,200. Similarly, with respect to the Committee on Printing, in 1895 the amount allowed was $200. It is proposed that that be increased to $700.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1579) to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS IN SENATE FILES TO DETROIT (MICH.) HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably Senate Resolution 97, to transmit to the Detroit (Mich.) Historical Commission certain documents in the Senate files, submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on March 29, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 262) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, as far as practicable, to have photostatic copies made of the following papers and documents in the files of the Senate; that such photostatic copies be deposited in the files, and that the originals be thereupon transmitted to the Detroit Historical Commission at Detroit, Mich., namely:

A grant or deed, signed at Detroit on December 23, 1760, from four principal Indian chiefs, on behalf of certain Indians, conveying to one Robert Rogers a certain tract of land on the south side of Lake Superior;

A report dated December 12, 1806, made by the Governor, the Chief Judge, and the Associate Judge of the Territory of Michigan to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to an act to provide for the adjustment of titles of land in the town of Detroit and Territory of Michigan, accompanied by a plan of one section of Detroit, January 1807, and a plan of the city of Detroit, drawn by Abyah Hull, Surveyor of Michigan, January 1807.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 14, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1579. A bill authorizing the development and administration of a program for construction of county agricultural buildings; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 1580. A bill concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DONNELL) introduced Senate bill 1581, to coordinate the health functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to authorize grants to States for extending and improving the provision of medical, hospital, and dental services; to authorize grants to States for providing health examinations for school children and medical and dental treatment in certain cases; to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act) to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals; to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units; to authorize studies and grants for increasing available manpower in the health professions; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGRATH (for Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1582. A bill for the relief of Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON introduced Senate bill 1583, to provide for the establishment of the Island Beach National Monument, in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1584. A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard communications facilities for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1585. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of the Allegheny and Genesee Rivers and their tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1586. A bill to provide for the payment of subsistence allowances to members of the armed forces who were held captive by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1587. A bill to extend the maximum amortization period of loans made under sections 3 and 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, from 35 years to 50 years; and

S. 1588. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1589. A bill to allow additional credits for income-tax purposes in the case of deafness;

S. 1590. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for a tariff on importation of undressed rabbit skins; and

S. 1591. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1592. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.", approved August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Classification Act of March 4, 1923, as amended, to create a Mechanical Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 1594. A bill to provide aid in stabilizing agriculture prices by providing an equalizing fee on imported fats and oils as an offset on exports of fats and oils, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 1595, approving plans for the development of the Columbia River Basin, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1596. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into special agreements for certain switching service by railway common carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 1597. A bill relating to air star routes; to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for experimental air-mail services to further develop safety, efficiency, and economy, and for other purposes," approved April 15, 1938; and for other purposes;

S. 1598. A bill granting equipment allowances to postmasters at offices in which post-office fixtures and equipment are furnished by the postmasters; and

S. 1599. A bill to provide for payment for motor vehicles used by carriers in the de-

livery of mail on an hourly basis instead of by contract; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1600. A bill to give former owners of certain Government real property a right to purchase such property if and when it is offered for sale; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1601. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Department of the Army to accept certain gifts and foreign decorations tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to correct the service records of Navy veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital or dispensary for heroic services to the officers and men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a national health bill, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by us, jointly, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1581) to coordinate the health functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to authorize grants to States for extending and improving the provision of medical, hospital, and dental services; to authorize grants to States for providing health examinations for school children and medical and dental treatment in certain cases; to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act) to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals; to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units; to authorize studies and grants for increasing available manpower in the health professions; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DONNELL), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATORS TAFT, OF OHIO, SMITH OF NEW JERSEY, AND DONNELL, OF MISSOURI, ON INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL HEALTH BILL

The bill which we introduce today seeks to apply the best knowledge at our disposal to the vast problem of promoting the health of the American people. This problem is composed of many factors, some of which, such as income levels and habits of living, are entirely beyond the reach of specific health legislation. Others, however, can to a great extent be guided or stimulated by law without violating our American traditions of personal freedom. Among these latter factors are the organization of Federal health functions, the supply and distribution of health facilities and health personnel, and the degree to which professional, medical, and hospital services are actually within reach of the people generally. It is with such manageable factors as these that we seek to deal in this bill.

The bill also represents certain fundamental beliefs concerning the nature of American Government and the principles of Government fiscal policy.

As to American Government, we recognize that the primary responsibility in the field of health, welfare, education, and housing rests with the State governments, and that there is no direct grant of power to the Federal Government in the Constitution to deal with these questions. On the other hand, the Federal Government does have an extensive spending power arising out of the provisions of article I, section 8 of the Constitution, giving the Congress power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises * * * to provide for the general welfare." The extent to which a State desires to provide health and welfare services to its people is a matter of such State to determine. When the States in general fail to meet any basic health or welfare problem, however, because of inability to finance a satisfactory method of dealing with it, the secondary obligation of the Federal Government comes into play, and it is the right of Congress to relieve the deficiencies of the States. This is a long way from proposing a "welfare state," in which government undertakes to supply all the wants of the people. We do not feel that there is either a duty or a power to undertake such a program. In general, our constitutional form of government and the danger of centralization forces a clear distinction between Federal participation and over-all Federal control.

The operating programs which the bill sets forth in titles II through IV would all be administered through the tested mechanism of Federal grants in aid. The major principles of this mechanism are Federal financial participation to stimulate activity in the general interest, and intergovernmental consultation—with only that minimum of Federal regulation which flows necessarily from the responsibility for expenditure of Federal funds in accordance with national policy. Especially in title II, which sets forth a new program for extending and improving medical care, the bill guarantees a maximum of State freedom to experiment in the methods by which the goal is to be sought.

We recognize the need for Federal participation in the realm of health, but we reject firmly the idea that the Federal Government should control all the funds spent, the detailed methods adopted, or the day-to-day administration of health activities in the States and localities.

As we have stated, the primary responsibility for health rests on the local community and the individual citizens. Since the local community lives under State laws, the States have also an inescapable responsibility. In this bill, we ask that the Federal Government accept its proper constitutional participation to the extent justified by the lack of ability on the part of States and local communities to do the whole job as it should be done.

These beliefs are reflected in the fiscal provisions of the bill. In the first year of operation, fiscal year 1950, it is estimated that new Federal expenditures under the various titles of the bill would come to about $280,000,000. A comparable sum, including funds already being expended, would be contributed as specific matching funds by the States, by localities, and by medical schools.

This scale of Federal expenditure is relatively modest in comparison to some proposals now before Congress. It is not supposed to represent the difference between what Americans are now spending for health in the United States and what the authors of this bill think they should spend. We believe that this bill will tend to stimulate such expenditures on both an individual basis and a community basis. We have no intention of using the Federal Treasury to make up the difference between what is and what ought to be. Our aim is rather that the Federal Government shall contribute not only of money, but of expert knowledge and cooperation, to the end that more of the wealth and creative energies of the American people may be devoted to achieving the highest level of physical and mental health.

TITLE I. FEDERAL ORGANIZATION

Adapted with a few changes from S. 545, Eightieth Congress (introduced in 1947 by the present sponsors), title I would set up an independent National Health Agency in the executive branch. The principle of centralizing the health functions of the Federal Government in a single agency, reporting directly to the President, has recently been endorsed by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, whose report entitled "Medical Activities," filed March 16, 1949, recommends the establishment of a United Medical Administration. While the present bill specifically excludes the health activities of the armed services and the Veterans' Administration, its purpose is similar. It would, however, leave the question of integrating health, social security, and educational activities in a single Cabinet Department as a matter for future congressional determination.

Summary: A National Health Agency is created, to be headed by an Administrator appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, who must be a citizen of the United States and a doctor of medicine outstanding in medicine and administration. The Public Health Service, Saint Elizabeths Hospital, and the Food and Drug Administration are transferred to the new Agency, together with the maternal and child health and health research functions of the Social Security Administration. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is instructed to study Federal health functions and recommend to Congress by December 31, 1949, any further transfers which he deems advisable. Five constituent units are prescribed for the Agency: The Office of the Administrator; the Public Health Service; the Office of Medical, Dental, and Hospital Services; the Office of Maternal and Child Health, with a special Advisory Council; and the Food and Drug Administration. The Administrator may establish any other constituent units which he finds necessary. The Office of Medical, Dental, and Hospital Services is to be headed by a Director who must be a doctor of medicine outstanding in medicine and administration. The Administrator is directed to study the organization and staffing of the new Agency and recommend any desirable changes to Congress within 1 year.

TITLE II. MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND HOSPITAL SERVICES

Like title I, this title expresses the basic principles of a corresponding title in S. 545, Eightieth Congress, though with a considerable consolidation of language and a number of important changes in substance.

Summary: Part A authorizes $5,000,000 for surveys by the States of their existing

medical, dental, and hospital services, both public and private. The appropriation would be divided among the States according to population on a 50-50 matching basis. The findings of the surveys are intended to form a basis for the State plans called for under part B.

Part B authorizes a total of $1,250,000,000 in appropriations over a period of 5 years, beginning with $150,000,000 in fiscal 1950 and reaching a level of $300,000,000 by fiscal 1952. This would be the Federal contribution, to be matched by an equal total from the States, for the operation of 5-year State plans. The allotment and matching provisions both vary with the per capita income of the various States, within limits of 33⅓ percent of Federal funds for wealthy States and 75 percent for low-income States. At the end of the 5 years Congress is instructed to determine what further appropriations, if any, are needed.

State plans must set forth a 5-year program for broadening the distribution of their medical and hospital services to a point where these services are available to all families and individuals unable to pay the whole cost of such services. At the State's discretion the plans may also encompass dental services for such families and individuals. Also at the State's discretion, up to 25 percent of the money spent under the plan in each year may be used for one or more of the following: Encouragement of voluntary nonprofit health insurance plans; establishment and improvement of general diagnostic facilities, and provision of inducements for physicians and dentists to practice in low-income areas. The medical and dental service aspect of the plans, on which at least 75 percent of the money must be spent, may be carried out through payments to voluntary health insurance plans or other public or private agencies, in the form of insurance premiums or otherwise. Partial charges may be collected from beneficiaries able to pay in part for the services rendered to them.

State plans must be administered or supervised by the State health agency, and must comply with certain minimum standards, including a merit system for employees, liberal eligibility rules respecting residence and citizenship, and safeguards against misuse of confidential information concerning beneficiaries.

The Director of the Office of Medical, Dental, and Hospital Services is obliged to approve any State plan which meets with the requirements set forth, regardless of what he thinks of the specific methods which the State proposes to adopt. If he disapproves a plan and his advisory council, which is provided for in the title, finds that the plan conforms to the requirements, he must approve it. Later he may suspend payments to a State for certain kinds of noncompliance specifically set forth, subject to review in the Federal courts.

TITLE III. SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES

Title III is adapted from S. 1411, the National School Health Services bill, drafted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and reported to the Senate on March 25 (S. Rept. 157). The only substantive change is the assignment of the administration of the program on the Federal level to the Director of the Office of Medical, Dental, and Hospital Services. Like S. 1411, it had antecedents in S. 1290, Eightieth Congress, and H. R. 1980, Eightieth Congress.

The title authorizes $35,000,000 a year for grants to the States to provide periodic medical and dental examinations to school children, and for treatment found by such examinations to be necessary in cases where the child's family is unable to pay the whole cost. The Director is instructed to make proportional payments directly to nonpublic schools in any State whose laws forbid this kind of State aid to such schools.

TITLE IV. HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION AMENDMENTS

Title IV is almost exactly the same as the pending S. 614, the "Hospital Survey and Construction Amendments of 1949," introduced by Mr. HILL, for himself and Mr. TAFT, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, on January 24, 1949. This title would increase the annual authorization for hospital construction grants from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000, would extend their duration through fiscal 1955, would provide a flexible matching formula in place of the present rigid Federal percentage of 33⅓, and would authorize the Surgeon General to let contracts up to a $1,200,000 ceiling for studies and demonstrations in coordination of hospital facilities. (For detailed statement, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 24, 1949, page 488.)

The only substantive change from S. 614 is a reduction in the amount of administrative funds which a State is required to furnish, to $15,000 or 1 percent (instead of 2 percent) of the cost of the State plan, whichever is higher.

TITLE V. LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS

Title V is adapted without any substantive change from the pending S. 522, the Local Public Health Units Act of 1949, introduced on January 17, 1949, by Mr. HILL for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KNOWLAND. It authorizes appropriation of such sums as may be necessary "to enable the Surgeon General to assist the States and their subdivisions in establishing and maintaining adequately staffed and equipped local public health units for the provision of basic public health services." It also authorizes the sums necessary for the Surgeon General to carry on, and to aid States and their localities to carry on, demonstrations and training of personnel for State and local health work. At present some of this work is being done in a fragmentary way under various Congressional enactments, but this provision would for the first time make possible the achievement of basic public health services for every locality in the Nation. (For detailed statement, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1949, p. 301.)

TITLE VI. STUDIES AND GRANTS FOR INCREASING AVAILABLE HEALTH MANPOWER

This title is in two parts. Part A, providing for a study of training facilities and manpower requirements, is modeled after Public Law 162, Eightieth Congress, which established the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (the Hoover Commission). It is predicated on the belief that no adequate information has yet been brought together on which a long-range program of aid for training in the health professions can be based. It calls for a thorough study of all aspects of the problem of training, distribution, and utilization of manpower in the health professions. A report to Congress with recommendations must be filed by January 15, 1952. The Commission is to consist of 16 members, including the Surgeon General, the Commissioner of Education, the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, and a representative of the armed services to be designated by the Secretary of National Defense. Eight of the other 12 members, to be appointed by the President, must be outstanding in the health professions or in higher education, and all of them must be familiar with the problems of health manpower and not otherwise employed by the Federal Government. The non-Federal commissioners are authorized to receive $50 per diem while actually on duty, and a subsistence allowance while they are serving away from home. Necessary appropriations are authorized.

Part B undertakes to fill temporarily part of the most urgent need in the current health training picture. It authorizes payments, during the fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952 to accredited schools of medicine of $500 for each enrolled student up to the school's average enrollment in the previous 3 years, and $750 for each student in excess of that average. Thus it provides a bonus for increased enrollment, but not a bonus so large as to encourage expansion at the expense of quality of instruction. Its primary purpose is temporarily to maintain existing enrollment in medical schools and to prevent a lowering of quality, with which many medical schools are today imminently threatened for lack of funds. It is intended that the study provided for in part A will make it possible to supplant this limited program with a long-range, comprehensive program in the field of health manpower, to begin in fiscal 1953. We have inserted no payments for schools of nursing, dentistry, dental hygiene, or public health engineering simply because we have not available the information showing that a subsidy for these schools is absolutely essential as it appears to be from our information in schools of medicine. We are loath to suggest a Federal subsidy for private educational institutions in the absence of a convincing case. We shall be glad to consider the inclusion of such schools in the temporary program if the evidence shows that they are in serious difficulty.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS

The only two substantive provisions of this title appeared also in S. 545, Eightieth Congress. The first would encourage employees of the Federal Government to enter voluntary nonprofit health insurance plans by directing Government departments and agencies to deduct, whenever an employee so requests, the amount of the premium for any such plan from the employee's pay, and to pay that amount to any such plan which the employee selects.

The second provision would require the Secretary of the Treasury to set up a special fund, equal to the total appropriations authorized by the bill for each year and derived solely from general revenue, and would prohibit payment on any such appropriation except from this fund. The purpose of this provision is to prevent any of the expenditures under the bill from being financed by Government borrowing.

CONCLUSION—SPIRIT IN WHICH THE BILL IS OFFERED

The authors of this bill do not suppose that they or anyone else has produced the final word in national health legislation. They have studied all the major legislative proposals now pending in this field and are conscious of the peculiar merits and defects of each approach. They fully expect that whatever legislation emerges from congressional deliberation on this subject will not embody the doctrine of any particular faction but will combine features of every major proposal. But they are convinced that no legislation is adequate unless it conforms to certain principles which this bill seeks to express. These principles are:

1. The quest for good health is a many-sided, long-range problem and demands a many-sided, long-range program.

2. The supply of health facilities and professional personnel must keep pace with the effective demand for health services. If this elementary principle is ignored, a serious lowering of quality is bound to follow.

3. No Government program should call for expenditures beyond the financial resources of Government, which in turn are limited by the degree of taxation which a free economy can support. Deficit financing merely puts off the day of reckoning and must never be resorted to for a welfare program except in cases of desperate emergency when sufficient

funds are not available out of general revenue.

4. No Government program should include activities or expenditures which can be supported by private individuals and groups or by lower levels of Government. On the contrary, government welfare programs must always be framed in a manner and spirit which will stimulate initiative and creative activity on the part of individuals, private groups, and smaller communities.

The authors of this bill are ready to cooperate with all who accept these principles, to the end that a legislative program may emerge from the Eighty-first Congress which will soundly advance the positive health of the Nation.

ISLAND BEACH NATIONAL MONUMENT, N. J.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Island Beach National Monument in the State of New Jersey. This bill is the result of many conferences and considerable investigation involving both State and Federal agencies of government. In fact, at the appropriate time, I shall present for the record, the endorsements of a number of State and national civic groups which will speak for themselves. At the moment it is sufficient to say that the enactment of this measure will not require any appropriation from the Federal Government since the lands to be acquired would, under the terms of the bill, be purchased entirely from donated funds.

It should be noted that the area to be acquired will serve not only the people of New Jersey but also the entire country.

I ask unanimous consent that, for the enlightenment of the Members of the Senate, the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with supporting data and information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be appropriately referred, and the bill, together with the supporting data and information, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1583) to provide for the establishment of the Island Beach National Monument, in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to accept donations of, or to purchase with donated funds, on behalf of the United States, any lands or interests in lands, buildings, structures, and other property within an area in the State of New Jersey, lying generally along Barnegat Bay, comprising the Borough of Island Beach, together with such adjacent lands and submerged lands as he shall deem to be desirable for the establishment of a national monument. The total area of such national monument, including interests in lands and submerged lands, as established or as enlarged pursuant to this act shall be not more than 13,500 acres.

SEC. 2. Upon a formal determination by the Secretary that sufficient lands in the area are in Federal control to permit the establishment of a suitable national monument, such lands or interests in lands shall be set apart as the Island Beach National Monument for the benefit and enjoyment of the people. Thereafter, additional lands or interests in lands may be acquired within the area in the manner described in section 1 of this act and shall become a part of such national monument upon acceptance by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The administration, protection, and development of such national monument shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That other departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall retain jurisdiction over lands administered by them within the exterior boundaries of such national monument. The jurisdiction of other departments or agencies over any lands described in section 1 of this act may be terminated at the discretion of such departments or agencies by the transfer of such jurisdiction to the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of such national monument.

Commercial fishing shall be permitted within the exterior boundaries of such national monument in accordance with the laws of the State of New Jersey and subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary may deem necessary in order to protect such area.

The supporting data and information presented by Mr. HENDRICKSON are as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 30, 1949.*

Senator ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building:

Being deeply interested in preservation of wildlife values of Island Beach, N. J., through creation of national park there, we request information about bill introduced by you for this purpose. Are anxious to create support for such legislation, also for appropriation bill. Shall appreciate full information as soon as possible. Address R. D. 3, Perkasie, Pa.

PEARL BUCK.
RICHARD J. WALSH.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
Trenton, January 19, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: I have been asked by the executive committee of the New Jersey Parks and Recreation Association, to put in your hands the enclosed material relative to the Island Beach area. This request has been made of me partly because the Department has in the past, actively sponsored the proposal for public acquisition of this area, and partly because I have in the Department files, the complete record of the movement in connection with this property for public ownership.

The area is so unique in its extent and in its unmarred natural condition, and would fit in under public administration so usefully as a part of any public seashore development on the Jersey coast, that any move which will facilitate and expedite its transfer to public ownership, unquestionably will have tremendous value to the State as time goes on.

As the material in the attached memorandum indicates, the matter is now in a position where it apparently is ready for congressional consideration of Federal action authorizing the National Park Service to take and develop it as a national seashore, and it is the hope of the association, as I am certain you will be informed directly by their officers, that it may recommend itself to you as a project which you will feel justified in taking a hold of aggressively.

Sincerely yours,

C. P. WILBER,
State Forester.

MEMORANDUM RELATIVE TO PROPOSED PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OF ISLAND BEACH, A 9-MILE STRIP OF UNSPOILED BEACH, DUNES, BAY SHORE BETWEEN SEASIDE PARK AND BARNEGAT INLET ON THE NEW JERSEY COAST

During 1939, a study of the Island Beach area was made by the National Park Service at the request of the Department of Conservation and Development. The result showed that the National Park Service felt that the area justified consideration of its designation as a National Park (National Seashore) similar to areas of the same sort under administration of the National Park Service on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

In October 1940, a conference of representatives of the board of conservation and development, the board of commerce and navigation, the State planning board, and the Atlantic Beach and Seashore Preservation Association, interviewed representatives of the National Park Service in Washington, to explore the possibility of the acquisition and development of this piece of seashore property by the Federal Government as a national park, on the basis of the Federal study and report.

In November 1940, as the outcome of the above-mentioned events, Governor Moore called a State-wide conference at Trenton. This conference included representatives of: (1) all of the State agencies which had or might have any interest or part in any use of the area; (2) Ocean County and all municipalities concerned; (3) the New Jersey Parks and Recreation Association, State Federation of Women's Clubs, State Congress of PTA, Committee on Preservation of Natural Areas Ecological Society of America, Field Committee Torrey Botanical Club, and numerous other civic groups; (4) the National Park Service. At this conference, the questions of Federal ownership, of State ownership, and private development were thoroughly discussed. On behalf of the Federal Government, authorized representatives of the National Park Service reported on their investigation of the project and their opinion in connection with it. The conference requested Governor Moore to appoint a committee from the membership of the conference to assemble further information and call back the conference for later action.

In July 1941, the conference was reassembled by this committee and arrived at a practically unanimous opinion that an effort should be made to secure authorization for the National Park Service to take over and administer the property as a national park, and the follow-up of this action was assigned to the New Jersey State Planning Board.

A number of conferences with Federal representatives and congressional representatives were held in the next year or two, in all of which both the National Park representatives and the others involved were apparently strongly in favor of the proposed project. The project was favorably recommended by the National Park Service to the Director; was approved by the Director and forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior and was approved by the Secretary for congressional action authorizing the project.

In 1947, the State Parks and Recreation Association undertook on its own initiative, the responsibility of reactivating and moving for some definite action on the property. At that time, through the activity of the Parks and Recreation Association, Senator Albert W. Hawkes, initiated action with the Federal administrative agencies, the outcome of which is indicated by the attached correspondence, involving Assistant Secretary of

the Interior C. Girard Davidson, Senator Hugh Butler, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, John R. Mahoney, of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Senator Hawkes, and President Frederick C. Sutro, of the Parks and Recreation Association.

The form of a bill covering Federal action on this matter furnished by the National Park Service is enclosed, together with a memorandum of key opinions and actions from the minutes of the Governor's conference and other specific groups.

The action needed and wanted now, is congressional action, authorizing Federal acquisition and use of Island Beach as a national seashore. No request for Federal appropriations is made at this time.

C. P. WILBER.

JANUARY 20, 1949.

MAY 19, 1947.

The Honorable ALBERT W. HAWKES,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAWKES: This association has for a long time taken a very intense interest in the problem of saving for permanent public use and enjoyment some of the New Jersey seacoast now almost entirely privately owned.

There has been a decided feeling on the part of all those interested in the park and outdoor recreation situation in this State and on the part of nature lovers as well that the so-called Island Beach area between Barnegat Bay and the ocean from Seaside Park to Barnegat Inlet should be publicly owned to protect it from commercial development. This area is unique on the entire Jersey coast in the beach and dune development, and in the fauna and flora it is unquestionably in the nature of a museum piece. It also offers opportunity under public ownership for the development of a badly needed public seashore area. It is extensive enough and so located as to be available for the establishment of a fully adequate recreation area for the public and the preservation of its natural features as well.

In the past there have been two State-wide conferences called by governors to consider the possibility for taking over and using this area under public ownership. The almost unanimous feeling of both of these conferences has been that the area was significant enough and was large enough to justify Federal acquisition and ownership as a national seashore under the National Park Service as a part of the Federal national-park program. Representatives of the National Park Service have made a number of studies of the area, have recommended the area to the Director of the National Park Service as suitable for such a national seashore, and the Director of the National Park Service has so recommended it to the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior has approved the recommendation.

A large body of New Jersey citizens are anxious to see action taken to permit the Federal Government to secure and operate this area as a national park. The National Park Service has formulated a plan under which the area would be developed by that agency if a provision for this is made by Congress and has suggested the wording of an authorizing act, a copy of which is given on pages 3 to 5 of the enclosed material. The balance of the enclosure gives opinions and comments on the project expressed and recorded in connection with the conferences on the subject above referred to.

I am writing to ask if you would be willing at the present session of Congress to introduce and sponsor an authorizing act along the lines of the form suggested by the National Park Service? This association is very anxious to secure such legislation as early as possible. It is our belief that, if the authorization of Congress could be secured for this project, danger of commercial emasculation of the area can be averted. It is our feeling also that, unless some specific action looking toward the setting aside of the area for public use and protection is taken before long, there is a real danger that the area will be encroached on by commercial development and use which would entirely ruin it for the purpose for which its public acquisition is desired.

Can we have your support and help in this initial step for the preservation of the area for its natural values and its potential significance as a recreation area on the Jersey seashore? The association will be glad to give you any further details about the matter that are available if what I am giving you herewith needs amplification in any way.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK C. SUTRO,
President, New Jersey Parks and Recreation Association.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1947.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Public Lands Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I am returning the letter addressed to you by the Honorable ALBERT W. HAWKES, Senator from New Jersey, together with some supplementary documents concerning the advisability of incorporating a certain area along the New Jersey coast as part of the system of national parks.

I have taken occasion to discuss this matter with executive officers of the National Park Service. Essentially, this same proposal was made in the thirties as a result of the study of the suitability, for national park purposes, of various areas along the Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic seashores. At that time, after an investigation, the National Park Service made a favorable report for the establishment of a national seashore park along Barnegat Bay in the State of New Jersey, but legislation was not enacted to carry out the proposal.

The chief merit of the proposal seems to be that it would add variety to our national park system. Since most of the seashore has already passed into private ownership, this would provide one area near large population centers where the natural shoreline would be preserved in its natural condition and available to the people of the country. You may want to have a bill introduced so that this matter could be brought officially before Congress.

The National Park Service has indicated that its staff would be able to make a reexamination of the area and make a report to the next session of Congress. This would also provide the means of determining whether there is sufficient local support from the State and local interests to secure control of the land and make it available for national park purposes in harmony with the pattern that has been set for establishment of national parks in settled areas.

Congress would then be in a position with these reports available to determine whether or not it would be advisable to incorporate this particular area in our system of national parks.

Should you desire any additional information on this project, I will try to meet your request.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. MAHONEY,
Senior Analyst in Conservation and the Public Domain.

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED ISLAND BEACH PROJECT—PREVIOUS ACTION

1. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

(a) Herbert Evison, Supervisor of Recreation and Land Planning (letter December 12, 1940):

"The basic act establishing the National Park Service contains no prohibition against expenditure of Federal funds for acquisition of land for inclusion in the national park system. There are, however, a number of acts of Congress authorizing establishment of specific areas which provide that the lands involved shall be donated to the Federal Government. In other cases, Congress has authorized appropriation of Federal moneys for acquisition of lands for inclusion in the Federal park system."

(b) Conrad L. Wirth, Supervisor of Recreation and Land Planning (statements at Governor's Conference, Trenton, N. J., July 1, 1941):

Mr. Wirth's prepared statement: "The National Park Service for a number of years has been interested in studying the recreation problems of the Nation. The fact that much of our natural seashore areas have been destroyed or subdivided and sold to private interests has deprived the people of the use of those fine sand beaches and the general natural habitat that we find along the seacoast. Our studies have indicated that there is less than 1 percent of the entire coast line in the United States now in public ownership. We feel that it is not unfair to ask that perhaps 10 percent of the entire coast line be held not only for our use today, but for the use of generations to come. Surely, if we are short of shore line today, we are going to be in an even worse condition as the years go along. We feel that there are more than one kind of shore line which should be preserved, those that are smaller, those that are of interest to and needed for local use as well as extensive tracts. We also feel that the shore line is as important, from a national standpoint, as our uplands, speaking from the standpoint of recreation and the preservation of natural scenery for ourselves and for others. There are, as you all know, very few pieces of suitable land left along the coast. We feel that the section from Barnegat Inlet north approximately 9 miles, is of national importance and should be preserved. I have had the pleasure of looking at it only yesterday when I spent an afternoon out there. I think it would be almost criminal to allow this area to be broken up and used as private estates. I realize that there is a certain amount of taxation derived from private use of the property. I do feel that lands properly selected, properly used and preserved for State and national uses will bring in a hundredfold more than you would get from private subdivisions of the land. There is business interest that follows a seashore recreation area like this and other national park areas which will equal at least your taxes. I do feel also, that there is an intangible value there that we will never be able to measure. After all, we work day after day to create a small amount of money for ourselves and an opportunity whereby we can accumulate time and enjoy life and I think it is up to us who can't afford a big estate of our own to see that we have public reservations to enjoy. I feel very definitely that you have such an area in this Barnegat Inlet beach area. There have been questions raised from time to time as to whether the Park Service, if the land was turned over to the Federal Government and under their administration, would put a fence around it and prohibit anybody from going in except the long-haired scientists who want to study the birds, flowers, trees, etc. The Park Service, while they do conserve certain sections

in their natural conditions, are interested also, however, in such projects from the standpoint of public use. We have recognized and are establishing now, areas which we call seashore recreation areas. This New Jersey area will be that kind. We feel, in looking at it, that there are some very fine fauna and flora there which should be preserved, and yet there is sufficient space there to provide adequate recreational features. There are, within a radius of 300 miles of this particular piece of land, over 40,000,000 people with a very limited amount of public beach for their use. I don't know what else to add. I don't know what you expect of me, but I do feel that the area is of national importance and should be set aside in one way or the other as a national seashore area."

Mr. Wirth's comments during discussion:

"If Congress appropriated the money, the Secretary would be very glad to buy the land.

"In every case where we have had similar legislation to this, the State has come out in the beginning and said they had no money. That is why a resolution is required from the State that the Federal Government should do it all. I do think this project is of national importance, sufficient to justify such a request.

"I certainly subscribe to that. We found a very fine beach at Cape Hatteras and nice vegetation, but both Ben Thompson and I remarked in seeing this Island Beach area that the cover and vegetation seem to have a far bigger variety and a better cover than the whole of Cape Hatteras, which is more of a sand-swept area, flatter, though with some nice dunes on it. However, when we got to the Barnegat Bay, we saw a much greater variety of interest compared with Hatteras. I certainly feel personally that this area we are referring to down at Barnegat Inlet is of national interest."

(c) Federal Act Authorizing Cape Hatteras Seashore Park:

"Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreation uses, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area."

(d) Three fundamental reasons why the movement is for Federal acquisition and management of the island beach area, as against its acquisition for a State park are:

1. There seems to be a good reason to believe that if the Federal Government should authorize the establishment of a national park there, the present owners of the property may be prevailed upon to make a gift of the land for such purposes under Federal management. Because of mistaken strategy earlier, including an approach to the owner for purchase by the State, it is questionable whether they would consider giving the land for State use.

2. The area is one which combines a double purpose: (1) for public recreation, and (2) for the preservation of a considerable part of the beach, dunes, and bar in its natural condition as a relic of the natural beach. All of those who have studied the matter are satisfied that under State ownership, pressure might quite possibly force the use of the entire area for recreation development, ruining it so far as its natural condition is concerned, whereas under Federal ownership the pressure which might reach a State administrative agency, would have little likelihood of being successful in securing the emasculation of the entire area once it was set up as a national seashore partly for a museum piece.

3. As a State project the large sum which will be required for the development of the area as proposed by the National Park Service and recommended by those interested in the matter in the State, would unquestionably mean a long delay if not complete abandonment of any other State seashore project along the Jersey coast, so that all those familiar with the matter feel it would be desirable to persuade the Federal authorities to take this particular beach over and leave the development of other smaller areas, less interesting from the natural standpoint, to development for recreation purposes by the State.

2. NEW JERSEY

(a) Resolution adopted by conference of Federal, State, and local officials, and others interested, called to consider the establishment of a Federal park at Island Beach, July 17, 1941:

"Whereas there is now no State park on the New Jersey Atlantic coast; and

"Whereas there is no prospect for State financing of seashore parks in the immediate future; and

"Whereas there are few still undeveloped coastal areas of which the section just north and south of Barnegat Inlet, and especially the municipality of Island Beach is the outstanding unspoiled portion; and

"Whereas there is an urgent need for publicly owned land and operated seashore properties in New Jersey; and

"Whereas private development of this Island Beach area is not unlikely and would both vastly increase the cost of its acquisition for public use and injure its value for such public use; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Interior, through the National Park Service, has declared this Barnegat Inlet section to be an appropriate and satisfactory area for the establishment of a national seashore at Federal expense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this conference, assembled by the governor of the State and representatives of the governing bodies, State agencies, civic bodies and citizens interested in the section concerned and in the provision of adequate public recreation in the State, does hereby record itself as favoring the acquisition and development of a national seashore in the section around Barnegat Inlet including the present of the Borough of Island Beach; and be it further

"Resolved, That the National Park Service and the New Jersey representatives in the Congress of the United States be urged to seek the necessary congressional authorization for the project and the necessary Federal appropriation for its realization."

(b) Resolution adopted by the New Jersey Parks and Recreation Association at annual meeting, June 1946:

"Whereas the beach and bar on the Atlantic coast from Seaside Park to Barnegat Inlet, commonly known as Island Beach, is the only considerable area of the New Jersey shore remaining undeveloped; and

"Whereas this area includes beach, dunes, vegetation, and wildlife of outstanding interest and value, which will be irrevocably lost if developed for normal seashore resort use; and

"Whereas the area is large enough to permit the use of a portion for public recreation, while conserving and perpetuating the great natural values of the balance; and

"Whereas there is an urgent need for publicly owned and operated seashore park properties in New Jersey; and

"Whereas this area has been studied and found suitable and desirable by the National Park Service and by the Secretary of the Interior and so recommended for Federal development and operation as a national seashore; and

"Whereas segregation of this area under Federal administration has been approved by the State planning board, by the board of conservation and development, by two Statewide conferences of those interested in conservation and recreation and by the New Jersey Parks and Recreation Association: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the New Jersey Parks and Recreation Association urge the New Jersey Members of Congress to secure congressional action authorizing the establishment of Island Beach as a national seashore and to seek the necessary Federal appropriations for the acquisitions and development of this area by the National Park Service."

(c) Statement of Professor John A. Small, Rutgers University, representing the Committee on Preservation of National Areas, Ecological Society of America, and the Field Committee, Torrey Botanical Club (statement at conference—Trenton, N. J., July 1, 1941):

"The Island Beach area is unique for the coast and generally recognized as such. Some of us are interested in having throughout the country, areas of which this is one, set aside as State parks, so that they may be preserved, but we can't have them unless they are acquired before they are developed. We could never reproduce vegetation as it is now found at Island Heights. In this connection, I have just visited Acadia National Park and, if you haven't visited it, I would like to assure you that the National Park Service is a grand outfit to develop parks. They have a well-instructed group. The cooperation between this staff and the State foresters is just one of fine fellowship. Another point on this matter is the tax return in bringing in people and there again you should see the people that go to Acadia, way over in eastern Maine, with not nearly the population we have on which to draw."

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill dealing with the general comprehensive plans for a coordinated development of the Columbia River Basin in the Pacific Northwest.

The White House has sent a message to the Congress recommending legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley authority patterned very closely along the lines of, but broader in scope than, the TVA.

Everyone in the Congress desires to study these CVA plans, just as they will want to study other plans, the most recent of which are those proposed by two of the administration's agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have long been active in planning and constructing projects for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and conservation of land and water resources in the Columbia Basin.

They have been authorized to construct very substantial projects in the region. Many of these projects have been completed and are in successful operation.

For the past 3 or 4 years both of these agencies have been carefully and thoroughly reviewing their plans and have supplemented them with Nation-wide investigations.

They have both completed reports recommending a comprehensive Nationwide development of the land and water resources which will provide the most feasible economic benefits for flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, and other water-conservation measures.

These reports have been completely coordinated between these two agencies, and on April 11, 1949, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior signed an agreement covering the coordination of the comprehensive plans.

These plans, together with the coordinated agreement, were submitted to the White House on April 11, but action by the White House has not as yet been taken.

Coordinated plans of the existing established Federal agencies are entitled to thoughtful study; plans for a CVA are entitled to comparable consideration, as are all other plans for the development of a great river system.

I ask unanimous consent to have this bill printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1595) approving plans for the development of the Columbia River Basin, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the general comprehensive plans for the coordinated development of the Columbia River Basin set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 1949 and in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation dated June 1948, all in accord with the agreement approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior on April 11, 1949, are hereby approved, and the initial stages recommended are hereby authorized and shall be prosecuted by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

2. (a) In addition to previous authorizations for improvements in the Columbia River Basin, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of the plans the sum of $500,000,000 for works to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and the sum of $500,000,000 for works to be undertaken by the Department of the Interior.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4029. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure for the Everglades National Park with available funds, including those made available by the State of Florida, the remaining lands and interests in lands within the boundary agreed upon between the State of Florida and the Secretary of the Interior, within and a part of that authorized by the act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816), and within which the State has already donated its lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4146. An act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RENTAL HOUSING ADJACENT TO MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 1184, to encourage construction of rental housing at or in areas adjacent to military and naval installations, and I ask to have the amendment printed.

My reason for sending the amendment to the desk at this time is so that those who will consider the bill may know that the amendment in the nature of a substitute is to come up, and that its purpose is to meet some of the suggestions which have been made by the Government agencies interested.

For example, under the substitute, the military authorities would have authority to negotiate leases for land, with builders willing to construct rental housing units for the military personnel at bases; and, in addition, the amendment would authorize the military to negotiate contracts to provide utilities, such as gas, light, heat, and so forth, for housing projects, located at or near military bases, which have been constructed for the accommodation of the base personnel; and, third, it would provide for an accelerated rate of amortization, so that the entire cost of the project could be amortized in 25 years.

Mr. President, we understand that this housing is to be built by private enterprise; but in the case of permanent installations, the suggested provisions will permit a guaranty of loans, which I think will cause private enterprise to become interested in all areas where low-rental housing is needed for enlisted personnel, especially, at, near, or on military bases.

So I submit the amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, printed, and lie on the table.

PROTEST AGAINST ARREST OF MISS VLASTA VRAZ

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution protesting against the brutal and unjustifiable arrest of an American citizen, Miss Vlasta Vraz, of Berwyn, Ill., by the Communist dominated puppet government of Czechoslovakia. Miss Vraz is a woman of the highest character who has been in charge of distributing medical supplies, food and clothing to the children of that unhappy country. Her work was purely humanitarian in character, but the Communist dominated government of that country evidently feared that the example of her kindness and that of the American Relief Committee for Czechoslovakia which she represented would convince the people of Czechoslovakia of the fact that we Americans are their true friends and want to help them. Determined to represent us falsely as an enemy, the Communist dominated government has now arrested her and is trying to discredit her noble activities and those of the American Relief Committee for Czechoslovakia which she represents. This resolution calls upon our State Department to protest her imprisonment and to seek her release.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 107) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas Miss Vlasta Vraz, an American citizen of Berwyn, Ill., in charge of the distribution of medical supplies, food, and clothing to the people of Czechoslovakia, has been arrested and is being held for questioning by the Communist dominated government of that now puppet state; and

Whereas Miss Vraz is a woman of the highest character who was trying not only to help the people of Czechoslovakia but also to show them that the people of the United States are their friends and want to aid them; and

Whereas such kindness seems to be regarded as intolerable by the Communist governors of Czechoslovakia as by all other countries behind the iron curtain; and

Whereas the Communists are apparently trying to convince the people of the countries which they dominate that we are seeking to do them harm and feel they must discredit our kindness in every way and are seeking to repay good with evil: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby approve the action of the State Department in seeking to protect Miss Vraz and call upon it to ask for the immediate release of Miss Vraz and to work for the protection of all American citizens still remaining in Czechoslovakia against unjust arrests and treatment.

PARDONS TO CERTAIN CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 108), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That the President is requested to grant pardons to all persons heretofore convicted and sentenced for failure to register or report for service in the military forces as provided in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and the Selective Service Act of 1948, by reason of their religious convictions.

OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES AT LAKE PLACID, N. Y.

Mr. IVES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 110), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic

Committee to hold the Olympic winter games in the United States at Lake Placid, N. Y., in 1956: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic winter games in the United States at Lake Placid, N. Y.; and expresses the hospitable hope that the United States may be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

PENNSYLVANIA WEEK—ADDRESS BY HON. FLOYD CHALFANT

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Pennsylvania Week, delivered by Hon. Floyd Chalfant before the Lyons Club of Greencastle and Waynesboro, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

DO WE NEED A POLITICAL REALINEMENT?—ARTICLE BY OREN ROOT

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Do We Need a Political Realinement?" written by Oren Root, and published in the April 15, 1949, issue of the Commonwealth, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES INCIDENT TO AWARD BY SPANISH GOVERNMENT TO VERY REV. FRANCIS X. TALBOT, S. J.

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from addresses by the Very Reverend Francis X. Talbot, S. J., president of Loyola College, Baltimore, and Mr. William J. Cassey, general chairman of the sponsoring committee of Baltimore, upon the occasion of the award to Father Talbot by the Government of Spain of the insignia of the Order of Isabella the Catholic, which appear in the Appendix.]

BRITONS SEE CHICAGO, WONDER ABOUT EXPORTS—ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Britons See Chicago, Wonder About Exports," published in the Chicago Daily News of April 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SMALL BUSINESS—EXCERPT FROM ARTICLE BY TRIS COFFIN

[Mr. MCGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an article on the subject of small business, written by Tris Coffin, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCIENCE AND A LASTING PEACE—ARTICLE BY WALDEMAR KAEMPFFERT

[Mr. FREAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Science and a Lasting Peace," written by Waldemar Kaempffert and published in the Washington Post of April 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—POLL ON TRUMAN HEALTH PLAN

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Opinion Leaders Strongly Favor Truman Health Plan," written by Maurice Mermey, and published in the American Druggist, March 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WINNING THEME SONG OF UNITED STATES TREASURY'S PEACETIME SAVINGS BOND DRIVE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the announcement of the winning theme song of the United States Treasury's peacetime savings bond drive, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Henry Lemke, to be postmaster at Wishek, N. Dak., which was ordered to lie on the table.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS—ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 222, making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes. This is a very unusual request, in that the amount involved in the bill is $595,890,000, but it affects about 3,000,000 veterans who are receiving unemployment compensation, and who are attending schools. There will be no money for them in about another 10 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I voted for this appropriation. I personally feel that if the House were not going into recess perhaps we could have reduced this appropriation somewhat and discussed it in conference. However, in view of all the circumstances, I believe it is all right to pass the joint resolution as it is, because it takes care of a deficit for which funds must be appropriated if the Veterans' Administration is to carry out its responsibilities under the law.

My purpose in speaking very briefly is to state that I hope the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and his committee will consider the entire method of Veterans' Administration spending and the method by which its accounting practice is carried on at the present time.

The Veterans' Administration in Washington has very little to say about the enormous expenditures which are made. This expenditure calls for $271,000,000 a month for educational training, job training, unemployment of veterans, and one or two other items. It is a bookkeeping job so far as the central office in Washington is concerned. I hope that, as a question of legislation, the Finance Committee will go into the subject this year before the session ends, in order that these enormous expenditures may perhaps be more efficiently and accurately handled, and we may make certain that these large sums of money are being wisely expended.

I believe that the joint resolution should be passed at this time, provided the subject matter is called to the attention of the Finance Committee as a question of possible legislation in order to improve the methods now employed for the expenditure of these large sums.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to supplement what the Senator from Massachusetts has said. When this joint resolution was before the Senate Committee on Appropriations the necessity for remedial legislation was developed, and by resolution of the Senate Committee on Appropriations the need for such legislation, and is to be brought to the attention of the Senate Committee on Finance. We requested and directed the officials of the Veterans' Administration promptly to appear before the Senate Finance Committee with proposals for remedial legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator make plain the reason why the joint resolution must be passed before the Easter recess?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. If Congress does not pass it at once, about 3,000,000 veterans in the United States will be adversely affected.

Mr. WHERRY. If the joint resolution is not passed, what will be the result?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Veterans' Administration has money enough to last for approximately another week.

Mr. WHERRY. It is because of that fact that the Senator from Arizona feels that this appropriation should be continued for 3 months. Was there not also discussed in the Appropriations Committee the need for the Independent Offices Subcommittee also to make a searching inquiry into the amount involved in the next quarter, with a view to a possible reduction?

Mr. HAYDEN. A rescission could be placed in the next annual appropriation bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. How much are we asked to appropriate for a deficiency in the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. HAYDEN. A little less than $600,000,000—to be exact, $595,890,000.

Mr. TAFT. How could the Veterans' Administration possibly fail to such a degree to estimate correctly its expenditures? Today it is insisted that we make a deficiency appropriation of $600,000,000, which the Veterans' Administration did not present with the other deficiencies. How can the Veterans' Administration possibly explain or justify its failure to estimate correctly expenditures which they now say are required?

Mr. HAYDEN. The explanation is comparatively simple. First, the Veterans' Administration was denied by the

last Congress approximately $250,000,000 of its budget estimate. Second, the Eightieth Congress passed two different acts, Public Laws 411 and 512, increasing the amounts to be paid to veterans, which has resulted in a requirement for an additional $209,960,800.

Mr. TAFT. What I ask is, Why was not this deficiency submitted with the other deficiencies 2 months ago? Why could it not have been estimated, so that proper consideration could have been given by the Appropriations Committee to these demands?

Mr. HAYDEN. The questions which the Senator from Ohio is asking were asked very vehemently by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House committee asked the reason for the delay in requesting this appropriation. It was stated that early in March the Veterans' Administration submitted an estimate to the Budget Bureau for what it thought it needed. This estimate was based on January figures. On examination the Bureau of the Budget questioned whether the increased figures were of a permanent or temporary nature and stated that it wanted to see the February figures. That delayed matters until the end of March, when the February figures were received. The Budget Bureau completed its review on April 4 and on April 8 the Veterans' Administration agreed with the Budget figures. The Veterans' Administration states that for weeks it has been urging the Bureau of the Budget to transmit the estimate to Congress. It arrived the day before yesterday.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator able to tell us what, in his opinion, has casused the increase over the original request? What are the particular factors?

Mr. HAYDEN. The particular factors set forth in the supplemental estimate are as follows: For education and training there was appropriated in 1949 $2,089,000,000. The revised estimate is $2,691,000,000, an increase over the amount appropriated of $602,000,000. With respect to the loan guaranty fund, the appropriation was $86,000,000. The revised estimate is $43,000,000, so there is a saving there of $43,000,000. With respect to the readjustment allowances, the amount appropriated was $412,000,000. The revised estimate is $490,000,000, or an increase of $78,000,000. These items total $637,630,000 and from that figure is deducted $41,700,000 which represents an increase in the carry-over funds from what was originally estimated. That is the way it works out.

Mr. TAFT. I still do not understand. Of course, we increased the allowances, but we did that more than 6 months ago. The requirements could have been calculated at that time. What other elements or new developments are there?

Mr. HAYDEN. One of the new developments is the very great increase in unemployment allowances.

Mr. TAFT. Twenty dollars a week for 52 weeks?

Mr. HAYDEN. The increase came about by reason of an increase in the number of unemployed veterans who applied for this assistance.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator referring to on-the-job training or college training?

Mr. HAYDEN. On-the-job training, and college and high-school training. Then there is the unemployment compensation itself.

Mr. TAFT. Twenty dollars a week for 52 weeks?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That has not yet expired, has it?

Mr. HAYDEN. It will expire in July 1949 for any veteran discharged before July 25, 1947.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As it was explained to us yesterday, the general law expires on July 1 of this year, except for those who have been taken into the armed services and who have left the service since the war ended. The actual number of unemployed veterans receiving compensation in the month of November was 246,000. In March of this year the number was 670,000. The increase comes about partly because of that fact, and partly because of the increased number taking on-the-job training and educational training.

Mr. HAYDEN. The increase under the two acts of Congress to which I have referred by reason of the additional allowances is $209,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the Senator a question, because in the committee the same inquiries were made which have been made by the senior Senator from Ohio here in the Chamber, in an effort to reduce the amount some $90,000,000, on the theory that the proponents of the measure stated that unemployment was leveling off somewhat, and might not be as great during the next 3 months as had been anticipated. So we asked whether a reduction of 10 percent, let us say, could be made. My understanding was that even with such a reduction, it would be doubtful whether the Veterans' Administration could continue to operate for this period with less money than approximately $600,000,000. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. HAYDEN. The opinion was expressed to the committee by those representing the Veterans' Administration that they doubted that this $595,000,000 would be sufficient, but that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration in the Independent Offices appropriation bill, for fiscal year 1950 might be made available immediately, to carry them along in June.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it not a fact that, although this matter came up almost as abruptly in the committee as it has here in the Senate, nevertheless a searching inquiry was made as to whether the amount could be reduced?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And does not the record show that if there be any leveling off or any further leveling off in unemployment, to an extent which can be taken advantage of by the veterans, adjustment for that can be made in the appropriations carried in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill when it comes before the Senate for consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And was not the real reason for our acting as we did the emergency which the members of the committee felt required the prompt handling of the matter, and their further belief that we should attempt to make the saving on another bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has correctly stated what occurred at the hearing before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to add a further observation: This is just another one of the appropriations that are coming along but are not included in the spending budget of this fiscal year. This is an additional amount. It is authorized by the Congress; but I wish to say once again that, when we make authorizations, we must expect to pay the tariff. That is exactly what happens. In this case the Congress has made the authorization; and the veterans are entitled to the money. It is a fixed charge which must be paid. The only hope of reducing the appropriations of this character is that unemployment may level off and there may not be so many veterans seeking to take advantage of the benefits as are now taking advantage of them.

I wish to say once again, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and especially in view of the joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution in regard to fiscal matters, referred to today by the Senator from Maryland, that we simply must put all such projects or proposals on the table and see what the Government's income is as compared to contemplated total expenditures. If we do not do that, in the final analysis we shall either have to provide additional taxes or resort to deficit spending. This is just one of the fixed charges occurring as a result of an authorization. All of us supported it, and I am not complaining about it; but when we authorize expenditures, we must pay the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona a question. When the testimony was had before the committee yesterday—and as the Senator from Arizona has stated, the matter came up suddenly in the committee—am I correct in recalling that statement was made that the proper figure for the number of unemployed was approximately 600,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has been that high. The average unemployment load was 435,000 veterans.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, there were 435,000 of them unemployed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. But was there not a statement that the unemployment figure had reached 600,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. In March 1949 it was 670,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thought so.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the representatives of the Veterans' Administration do not expect unemployment to be that great during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like very much to know what connection, if any, the deficit of approximately $600,000,000 has with the reduction of 1,600 beds in hospitals for veterans?

Mr. HAYDEN. The number of hospital beds has nothing at all to do with the pending resolution.

Mr. LANGER. If there were 1,600 fewer beds, the expenses would be less; would they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not in this item. This appropriation relates solely to veterans who go to school and receive instruction of one kind or another, or unemployed veterans who are entitled to unemployment benefits; that is all. In other words, there are approximately 3,000,000 physically sound veterans who are obtaining benefits of one kind or another. Congress promised them these benefits, and provided unemployment compensation for them, and Congress must now appropriate the money to meet those commitments.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with the pending joint resolution, I wish to say that I am in concurrence with some of the statements which have been made on the floor. I think the action of the Veterans' Administration in submitting the request as suddenly as it did is almost inexcusable. At the same time, what the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Nebraska have stated shows that we are in a position of not being able to do very much else.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. Nevertheless, the way this matter has been presented by the Veterans' Administration shows a lack of foresight, and it demonstrates that neither the House Appropriations Committee nor the Senate Appropriations Committee should ever again be forced into such a position, and that certainly there should be much longer-range planning.

But, Mr. President, as the Senator from Nebraska has stated, the committee was faced with an existing situation. Although I do not think the committee approves of the appropriation or of the method used in connection with it, anymore than I do, for instance, nevertheless the committee is faced with a situation which must be met. As indicated by the Senator from Arizona, the proposed method of meeting it is suggested with the thought in mind of surveying the situation and making cuts in another bill; and that seems to be the only solution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 164) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, Calif.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1169) for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. DENTON, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) to provide additional funds for the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations.

DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, during the recent campaign one of the burning issues was the question of displaced-persons legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress. Republicans were accused over and over again of discriminating against various groups of unfortunate refugees. They were publicly condemned by President Truman in South Bend, Ind., on October 26, 1948, as follows:

> Some people don't want the victims of World War II to come to the United States and get a fresh start in life. The Republican Eightieth Congress has a lot of men who felt this way, and their record proves it.
>
> A majority of the Republicans in both House and Senate voted to keep the laws they passed, because they don't want homeless, suffering Europeans of certain religions to get into the United States.

Throughout the entire campaign Democrats promised to change the law in line with their 1948 platform. I should like to quote the Democratic platform provision relating to displaced persons:

> We pledge ourselves to legislation to admit a minimum of 400,000 displaced persons found eligible for United States citizenship without discrimination as to race or religion. We condemn the undemocratic action of the Republican Eightieth Congress in passing an inadequate and bigoted bill for this purpose, which law imposes un-American restrictions based on race and religion upon such admissions.

Mr. President, I am reminded of these accusations and promises by an item appearing in Tuesday's New York Times. It is reported that the Senate committee with jurisdiction over displaced-persons measures has not held a single hearing on proposed amendments to the 1948 law, although Democrats have been in control for over 3 months. Such delay is difficult to understand, especially when Members recall the legislative program Republicans were expected to enact in 15 days last summer.

The newspaper report goes on to show how Republicans once more have taken the initiative in expediting the legislative program. Five Republican Senators have publicly requested the committee chairman to act so that the Senate will have the opportunity to consider the displaced-persons problem again.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to this matter as just another example of how the Democratic Party is long on promises but short on performance.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, before beginning the debate on Senate bill 1070 I desire to make a brief statement to the Senate. As chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I want to say, before the debate begins, that I desire to thank the members of the committee for their untiring work and cooperation, and I also wish to pay my respects to the chairman of the subcommittee, which I shall later do in my statement, for his great work, and also to pay my respects to the Senators, on both sides of the aisle, who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Several public-housing bills were sent to the committee, and from those bills the committee worked out Senate bill 1070. It differs very little from bills of a similar nature passed by the Senate in previous years under the able leadership of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and later under the leadership of the Senator from Ohio, with the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from New York.

The bill has some 23 names attached to it as sponsors. I hope that on both sides of the aisle we shall have the same cooperation of the Members of the Senate that the committee received, so that we may expedite the passage of the bill and dispose of the question of slum clearance and public housing in the United States.

Mr. President, as the Senate well knows, few subjects have received such exhaustive congressional study and consideration as the problem of housing. The Senators who were here during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses will recall the extended hearings and investigations which were conducted over a period of 4 years, both by special committees and by the Committee on Banking and Currency. They will likewise recall the extended hearings and investigations which were conducted over a

period of 4 years, both by special committees and by the Committee on Banking and Currency. They will likewise recall the thorough floor debates leading up to Senate approval, by wide majorities, of the bi-partisan general housing bills which were the product of those studies.

Nevertheless, despite this earnest and painstaking consideration of the problem and the wide areas of agreement reached in this body, the major content of those previous general bills is still not on the statute books. Various provisions in those bills dealing with further credit aids for privately financed housing were enacted separately at the special session last summer. But the most serious problem areas in housing covered by those bills still have not been dealt with. These are the establishment of a comprehensive national housing policy and objective, the authorization of Federal aid to communities for slum clearance, the renewal of Federal aid to communities for low-rent public housing, the establishment of an executive Federal program to improve housing conditions on farms and in rural areas, the authorization of a comprehensive program of housing research aimed at improving and modernizing the whole process of housing production and marketing and at placing the housing industry in a much stronger position to serve the large long-range housing needs of the Nation.

After the opening of the present session of the Congress, numerous bills dealing with a wide variety of housing proposals were introduced in the Senate. In particular, two bills dealt with the unenacted portions of the preceding general bills. Senate bill 138 embodied the recommendations of the administration. Senate bill 709 represented the views of a group of Republican Senators. While there were various differences as to details, the only substantial difference between these two bills was with respect to the size of the public housing authorization. In addition, bills were introduced dealing with other phases of the housing problem.

In the interest of expediting action on this serious problem, the Committee on Banking and Currency decided to consolidate hearings on these various bills. Under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Subcommittee on Housing and Rents held 13 days of hearing between February 3 and February 21 and heard more than 75 witnesses representative of all the major groups and organizations having a major stake in housing.

After the conclusion of the hearings, the committee determined to give first consideration to the major unenacted programs of the previous general housing bills—programs which have been thoroughly considered and on which substantial agreement has been reached. In pursuing this course, the committee is not contending that these programs cover every phase of the extremely complex housing problem or that they constitute together the full comprehensive housing programs which the Nation needs. However, on the basis of the testimony it has heard and of the evidence of earlier investigations, the Committee does feel strongly that these programs represent the essential foundation for such a comprehensive program.

Before reporting this bill favorably the committee gave full consideration to the numerous recommendations and criticisms advanced in the course of the testimony, as well as to the findings of previous congressional investigations. The Subcommittee on Housing and Rents went over the bill virtually line by line, and adopted numerous perfecting amendments before making its recommendations to the full committee. The full committee in turn gave very careful study to the major provisions of the bill. I venture to say that no major piece of legislation has received more thorough committee consideration than the pending measure.

The present bill, S. 1070, represents a general reconciliation of the differences between S. 138 and S. 709 with respect to the basic programs, and also incorporates a number of amendments based on recommendations and suggestions advanced by witnesses during the course of the hearings, or considered desirable by the committee during its consideration of the bill in executive session. I, for one, wish to express my deep gratification that it has been possible to achieve general agreement among the various sponsors of S. 138 and S. 709, and thus continue the bipartisan support of housing legislation which is merited by the national importance of the housing problem. I am confident that this sentiment is shared by the Senators on both sides of the aisle who have given such strong and consistent support to the solution of that problem.

In considering the bill in executive session, the committee reconciled a number of the differences between S. 138, the administration bill, and S. 709, the Republican bill. As I indicated previously, the most important difference related to the size of the proposed public-housing program, with the administration bill calling for 1,050,000 units over a 7-year period and the Republican bill calling for 600,000 units over a 6-year period. The committee felt that a reasonable compromise would be the figure of 810,000 units over a 6-year period, which is now the proposal in S. 1070.

The committee bill, S. 1070, also adopted a number of provisions which were contained in the Republican bill. For example, S. 1070 authorizes payments in lieu of taxes on public housing projects at the rate of 10 percent of shelter rents, which was the proposal in the Republican bill. It also continues the exemption from income taxation on local housing authority bonds, in line with the Republican bill, but contrary to the proposal in S. 138 for the removal of this exemption.

Mr. President, I digress here to ask that at the end of my remarks there be printed telegrams from the mayors of cities throughout the United States addressed to the secretary of the conference of mayors, Mr. Paul V. Betters, in approval of the pending bill. I am happy to have these telegrams printed. I was a member of the distinguished body called the conference of mayors many years ago, and I greatly appreciate the telegrams they have sent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina would like more fully to establish the position which is held by Mr. Paul Betters, to whom he has just referred. What is his official capacity?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have always known him to be the executive secretary to the United States Conference of Mayors. Prior to that, back in 1932 or 1933, I think he was in the board of trade here.

Mr. CAIN. I raised the question only because to my knowledge there are only two national associations to which municipal officials and mayors belong. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Betters is the executive director or secretary of the organization known as the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. As distinguished from the American Municipal Association.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall furnish for the RECORD a statement of the United States Conference of Mayors, along with the telegrams and statements of the mayors. I belonged to that association when I was mayor of Charleston, S. C., as I assume the Senator from Washington belonged to it when he was mayor of Tacoma.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to say that if I am not mistaken membership in the United States Conference of Mayors is confined to mayors of those cities whose population is in excess of 50,000?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the other municipal association, namely, the Federation of State Groups of Municipalities, has endorsed the principles of the pending bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding. I referred to the municipal association, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, because they were so much interested. No doubt they called on the Senator, as they called on me, in connection with Senate bill 138, as to the taxing of municipal bonds. We have had many conferences, and we conferred generally with them at one time.

I may say that, in my judgment, the United States Conference of Mayors is a great organization, doing a great work for the people of the cities of the United States, and a most capably organized group.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield for the presentation of a conference report on the ECA bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] if he would mind permitting me to conclude. It will take me but 5 minutes. I know the Senator has the right-of-way.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not interrupt the Senator at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, S. 1070 incorporates the language of the Republican bill in authorizing a census of housing as part of the 1950 and subsequent decennial censuses. In addition, a number of technical amendments were adopted in S. 1070 which followed the line of S. 709, or represented a reconciliation between the proposals in that bill and those in S. 138.

I believe I should make clear at this point that while the broad provisions of the bill now under consideration are fundamental to any comprehensive and effective housing program, there also are other relatively urgent phases of the housing problem which require attention and action. These include the need for developing a practical means for providing good housing for middle and lower middle income families who have been largely priced out of the new housing market by the costs, prices, and rents generally prevailing today. They include the need for modifications and improvements in FHA insurance of private sales, rental, and cooperative housing, in order to give greater stimulus to the production of housing of sound standards at more moderate sales prices and rents. They also include the related question of necessary revisions in the Federal Government's secondary market facilities for GI loans and FHA-insured mortgages.

Extensive testimony also was heard on these problems during the hearings, and the Committee on Banking and Currency intends to give prompt consideration to the bills dealing with these matters in order to make recommendations to the Senate on the further measures necessary to complete a well-rounded, comprehensive housing program.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the programs contained in S. 1070 attack the main, bedrock problem areas in housing, and therefore rightfully should be the first order of housing action by the Senate.

This bill would offer genuine and effective relief to the housing plight of many low-income families living in the slums or in substandard rural housing. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 21.8 percent of our non-farm families had total money incomes of less than $2,000 in 1947, and 33.2 percent had money incomes of less than $2,500. These are the families which have been worst hit by the housing shortage and by the persistence of bad housing conditions in this country; these are the families which would directly benefit from the program of low-rent public housing authorized in the pending bill, both in the cities and in rural nonfarm areas.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to my distinguished friend from the State of Washington, a member of the committee, that the conference report on ECA has the right-of-way, of course, and I do not think I should hold up that conference report. I shall be glad to yield when I conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, this bill would for the first time extend Federal financial assistance to communities for the acquisition and clearance of slums and blighted areas, so that those areas can be soundly redeveloped. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that approximately one out of every five city families is living today under slum conditions and that these conditions have existed and have spread for generations. Experience has shown conclusively that real progress in slum clearance is beyond the resources of private enterprsie and of State and local governments unless the Federal Government lends its assistance.

The bill would set into motion the kind of intensive research program that is needed to gear the operations of the housing industry to the long-range needs of the Nation and to make decisive progress in overcoming the basic problem of excessive housing costs.

The bill would aid in the solution of the problem of bad housing conditions on American farms and would do so in close coordination with over-all Federal programs of assistance to agriculture. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a much higher proportion of farm housing than of city housing is in bad condition and that many farm families have insufficient income to finance needed improvements to their homes and other farm buildings, without Federal help.

I attach great importance also to the fact that the pending bill would, for the first time, define our national housing policy and our national housing objectives. For 17 years, the Congress has been legislating on housing without having determined the broad goals we are seeking or the broad framework for our progress toward those goals. The lack of such a statement has been a handicap to the most effective administration of the piecemeal housing programs which the Congress has enacted. Industry, labor, and communities have been similarly handicapped by the absence of a clearly defined national policy and objective.

In my opinion, the declaration of national housing policy in section 2 of the pending bill is fully in keeping with the best ideals and traditions of the Nation, as well as with our unparalleled national resources and living standards. It recognizes the importance of decent housing and adequate housing production to the national welfare and sets up as a goal the realization as soon as feasible of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family—in cities and small towns, in rural areas, and on farms. It likewise recognizes the primary role of private enterprise and of community responsibility in meeting the housing problem, with Federal aid being based on helping to meet those needs which otherwise could not be met. It requires also that all the housing activities of the Federal Government shall be carried out within the letter and spirit of this policy declaration.

I should like to emphasize my firm belief in the entire philosophy of the bill. There is nothing in the bill which smacks to me of Federal dictation. There is no authority in it anywhere which would permit the Federal Government to force any program on any community. Throughout the bill and in our report we have emphasized the responsibility of the local authority in initiating, developing and managing the local programs and making the necessary determinations in connection with them. For instance, the responsibility for fixing income limits and for making any and all necessary revisions in them is a matter for local responsibility and determination, subject only to approval of such locally fixed limits by the Public Housing Agency.

The bill would aid and strengthen private enterprise. It recognizes that private enterprise must be relied upon to do most of the housing job and should be helped to serve more of the need than it now does. The bill would protect private enterprise against any competition from public housing and would give it maximum opportunity to participate in the rebuilding of slum areas. Finally, the full benefits of the housing-research program authorized in the bill would accrue to the private housing industry.

The enactment of the bill will be another historic milestone in the efforts of the Nation to protect and advance the welfare of the American people. The enactment of the bill will make it clear to all our people and to the world that the American Government will not stand by and allow millions of our families to live out their lives in slums or shacks. It will make clear our determination to proceed as rapidly as feasible toward a goal of decent homes for all families—urban and rural alike.

I am confident that the bill will move forward rapidly to final enactment.

EXHIBIT 1

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Washington, D. C.:

The housing and slum-clearance bill up for consideration this week in United States Senate is one of the most vital needs of the cities of our country. We urgently recommend its passage and as president of the United States Conference of Mayors, and in behalf of the United States cities, we respectfully ask of the Senate that they give this bill their earnest consideration, and we pray for the passage of this act, because from the slum areas of the cities we know crime, communism, and disease thrive and prosper. Housing in many cities is a dire necessity due to crowded conditions, especially in the lower-income groups. Sixty percent of the population of our country live in urban areas today, and we the mayors of the American cities deplore the slums and the housing situation, but financially we can do nothing without the passage of the housing and slum bill now before our Senate, and may I urge you as our executive director to let our Senators and Representatives know we will appreciate deeply their efforts to eliminate this cancerous growth on our American way of life.

W. COOPER GREEN,
President, United States Conference of Mayors, Mayor of Birmingham, Ala.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Washington, D. C.:

Pittsburgh desperately needs housing action contemplated in Senate bill 1070. Our local housing authority has long had applications pending for 7,000 low-rent homes. Our actual need is much greater. And it is my hope that we will double that figure when the bill is passed. Present new housing in Pittsburgh is not being built within price range of low or even little income families. Only public housing can meet needs of the lower-income groups and wipe out once and for all the slum environment which has been a blot on the boasted American way of life. For private housing developments the urban redevelopment sections of the bill are vital to restore solvency of American cities. Blighted areas must be cleared and rebuilt. We in Pennsylvania are combining State and city action for this purpose, depending on Federal aid to complement our program. I am sure that every public official in the city administration joins me in urging prompt congressional approval of Senate 1070.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
Mayor, City of Pittsburgh, Vice President, the United States Conference of Mayors.

BALTIMORE, MD., *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D. C.:

Senate housing bill S. 1070 offers best opportunity ever for cities such as Baltimore to carry out badly needed slum-clearance and redevelopment program. Our plans have been under way for a long time and we now urgently need financial assistance provided in S. 1070. Provision of adequate quantity of low-rent public housing for families of low income absolutely necessary in connection with slum-clearance and redevelopment program. Housing shortage in Baltimore still acute. Although high home-building rate in Baltimore area last 2 years, new houses started were 6,000 below increase in family formation. Large proportion of dwellings too high priced for most families. Slight increase available rental units does not meet demand of moderate- and low-income groups, either in quantity or in price. Housing authority has about 20,000 applications on file. Over 8,000 new applications received at housing authority last year. Recent survey of applicants shows more than two-thirds have total family incomes below $2,500. Over nine-tenths of all applicants lived under substandard conditions. Fifteen percent of applicants were eviction cases. Poorly housed low-income families in dire need of decent houses constitute bulk of applications on file. Steady flow of new applications is thus good index of continuing need for decent low-rent public housing in Baltimore. Passage of S. 1070 only way to provide for desired goal of slum clearance, redevelopment, and additional good housing for low-income families.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor of City of Baltimore, Chairman of Standing Committee on Legislation, United States Conference of Mayors.

APRIL 12, 1949.

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Director, the United States Conference of Mayors:

The housing shortage in New York City has been one of our most critical problems since the end of the war. Every action open to the city has been taken since January 1, 1946, and we have put under construction the largest program of low-rent housing ever attempted. Despite a record building program, New York City needs the help of the Federal Government to make any real headway in solving its serious problem of housing for families of low income.

The housing and slum-clearance bill reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is an excellent bill. It offers real hope of decent homes to the Nation's lowest income group. New York City is prepared to put its share of housing in planning immediately. We have sufficient construction firms and labor to build at least 10,000 apartments each year of the life of this program, in addition to our present construction program.

New York City recommends approval of the slum-clearance provision now in the Senate bill. Large areas of slums in New York City need clearance and redevelopment. The bill would permit a large amount of such work which could not be done without Federal assistance.

By passing the pending housing bill, Congress will take a positive step toward solving the housing crisis.

WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor of New York City.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 12, 1949.*

Hon. PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors:

The city of Philadelphia is doing everything humanly possible to recreate here the best possible environment for living and working. Because of financial limitations, it will be necessary to have the assistance of the Federal Government if we are to achieve our high goal of civic improvement.

In the program of redevelopment of old areas, Federal assistance will be necessary in helping to meet the cost.

This same assistance must be forthcoming to solve the problem of production of an adequate quantity and quality of housing for all elements of our population especially for families of low income.

Better housing conditions and slum clearance, of course, would be reflected in the cost of the operation of our police and fire units. Bright, cheerful homes, and adequate space for recreational activities would go a long way toward reducing delinquency among the youth of the city.

The method for giving us the required Federal assistance will be for Congress to determine.

BERNARD SAMUEL,
Mayor of Philadelphia.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D. C.:

Housing shortage Detroit city, estimated at 50,000 families lacking own home, living in rooms, trailers, or with another family. Additional 48,000 dwelling units needing major repairs or lacking water or minimum sanitary facilities. Present waiting list eligible families for public housing 8,700 families is highest ever, despite efforts of local authority to discourage applicants. Expressways, slum clearance, playgrounds, and other public improvements already programed expected dislodge 10,000 families next 5 years, of whom estimated 6,000 eligible public housing. In addition 6,500 families in temporary war and veterans housing to be rehoused. Estimated 40,000 families in Detroit have annual income below $2,000 and additional 70,000 between $2,000 and $3,000. Thus, approximately 100,000 families eligible public housing. Immediate need for low-rent housing conservatively estimated 50,000 families. Now have 5,000 permanent public housing units. Seven thousand three hundred and seventy-six private housing started year ending March 1 were only 45 percent previous 12 months. Total new multiples for rent started were 635. Virtually no rental housing built since war rents below $80 per month, 85 percent of it rents $90 or more, median rent available homes over $100. Slum clearance program essential to preserve city's tax base. City plan commission has designed 2,520 acres in need redevelopment. Present annual average tax revenue $864 per acre. If privately redeveloped would yield $2,304. Increase would pay city's third net project cost in 10 years. Public housing 10 percent shelter rent in lieu would amount to $700 per acre. Redevelopment 80 percent private, 20 percent public housing, would pay city's share costs in 12 years. Data juvenile delinquency, health, fire costs, and so forth, and more detailed data of above summary air-mailed to you today.

Mayor EUGENE I. VAN ANTWERP,
Per JAMES H. INGLIS,
Detroit Housing Commission.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 13, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D. C.:

San Francisco housing shortage still acute. No exact data available but vacancies hard to find anywhere in bay area. San Francisco Housing Authority waiting list 3,521; 7,700 temporary dwellings and 1,750 low-rent dwellings fully occupied. Housing authority has removed over half of families ineligible because of incomes over income limits; is removing more each month. San Francisco real property survey 1939 revealed approximately one dwelling of every six was substandard. Ratio today probably about the same. Low-rent housing market analysis 1945 showed approximately 26,000 families in need. Housing authority contemplates 5,000 new low-rent dwellings if housing bill enacted. This housing essential to relocated families living in areas scheduled for redevelopment. Redevelopment areas expensive to acquire and clear. City will need Federal loans and capital rent subsidies to enable private enterprise to rebuild in blighted areas. San Francisco planning and housing association, citizen's group 1947, compared same size good and bad neighborhoods. Studies showed the following: Bad neighborhood, 100 juvenile delinquents; 762 public welfare cases; 4,771 adult arrests. Good neighborhood, 17 juvenile delinquents; 38 public welfare cases, 39 adult arrests. Bad neighborhood had twice the fires, 36 times as many tuberculosis cases; 66 times as many city hospital cases; 3 times as many babies died. Municipal services in bad neighborhood cost $750,000; in good neighborhood $86,000. Tax revenues from bad neighborhood were $370,000; in good neighborhood, $543,000. Bad neighborhood is in area designated for redevelopment. Yesterday, April 11, 1949, San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed resolution endorsing S. 1,070, Housing Act of 1949.

ELMER E. ROBINSON,
Mayor of San Francisco.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 13, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors:

Please record my wholehearted support of S. 1070 which it is expected will reach the Senate floor this week. Boston is 300 years old and possibilities of clearance of substandard areas and erection of new housing for low-income families with Federal aid would be a boon to this city. These twin problems are so great that this city cannot solve its problem alone. The Federal Government with broader tax base is better equipped to give substantial help. Conservative estimates indicate 50,000 substandard homes in Boston out of 210,000 dwelling units or 24 percent, with depreciation and obsolescence growing daily. In this city 14,000 dwellings now standing were built before 1860. 37,000 built before 1880, 80,000, or 38 percent, built before the turn

of the century. Only one family out of five owns its own home, making Boston a city of rent payers. Whole areas of the city are in need of clearance, replanning, and redevelopment. Boston Housing Authority in receipt of 21,200 applications for tenancy between VJ-day and November 1948, at which time applications were shut off because of utter inability to offer hope to sorely pressed citizens, great majority of which are veterans with young families. Ten thousand new families formed in this city between decennial censuses of 1930 and 1940 with 10,000 marriages above average in four war years. Vacancies practically nonexistent here. Courts are clogged with eviction cases and are authorized by legislation to grant up to a year leeway before families are required to vacate. I have authorized expenditure of $20,000,000 city funds for housing and State program in Boston authorizes an additional $48,000,000, which, together only begins to solve the problem. Boston can use many millions of Federal aid to help in solving its problem. Urge the honorable, the Members of the Senate to pass S. 1070 substantially as written. Would, however, request that construction cost limits, which finally made United States Housing Act of 1937 unworkable, not be included in legislation. Better that such limits be tied to regional construction costs limits or left to administrative discretion. This is an excellent opportunity for the Senate to enact legislation to provide homes for good Americans, and thus bulwark the Nation against inroads of atheistic communism which nurtures where poor housing conditions exist.

JAMES M. CURLEY,
Mayor of Boston, Boston, Mass.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D. C.:

Estimate need for 5,000 additional units in Milwaukee to ease housing shortage. Estimate additional 35,000 units needed to replace substandard units. Approximately 20,000 units should be low rent. Without Federal aid it is impossible to build housing for those families which are low income. In 2 weeks time received almost 4,000 active applications for 578 units of veterans' permanent housing; also have received almost 1,000 applications for 232 low-rent slum-clearance units. City has almost exhausted its own resources in building veterans' permanent housing. Seventeen thousand veterans' applications on file with Red Cross bureau. Approximately 30 percent of city is blighted. Average weekly wage of skilled labor about $60, meaning worker can afford only $6,000 home. Lowest cost house at present level about $7,000, effectively blocking individual ownership because banks won't lend. Private rental units are $90 monthly and up. Greatest need in 50 to 60 bracket. Private builders not interested in slum clearance unless with Government subsidy. Present vacancy rate about four-tenths of 1 percent.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
Mayor of Milwaukee.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D. C.:

Kansas City has at present no public housing program. We are greatly in need of such enabling legislation. Housing authority and city plan commission estimate need for 4,500 units low-rent public housing. Kansas City's blighted areas cost city approximately 45 percent of city service costs and contribute only 6 percent real-estate-tax revenue. It is estimated 33 percent of population resides in blighted areas which account for five times city average of TB cases, six times the juvenile delinquency cases, three times the fire calls, and ten times the police calls above the city average. Sixty-nine and nine-tenths percent of commitments to local penal institutions are of persons residing in these areas and 74 percent of all new parole and probation cases are from same districts.

Mayor WILLIAM E. KEMP.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 13, 1949.*

Col. PAUL V. BETTERS,
Washington, D. C.:

Housing shortage here dangerous and unabated so far as low-income families are concerned. Overcrowding in this group at all-time high. Need estimated at four or five thousand low-rent public housing units during next few years. Our public health federation studies show white mortality in our slums three times higher for tuberculosis, pneumonia, and home accidents than in rest of city In one of our slum-clearance projects, Laurel Homes, tuberculosis, pneumonia, infant mortality rate, crime rate, and fires per 1,000 dwellings less than for city as a whole.

ALBERT D. CASH,
Mayor.

NEWARK, N. J., *April 13, 1949.*

PAUL BETTERS,
Secretary, United States Conference of
Mayors, Washington, D. C.:

Newark has 118,550 dwelling units of which 38,423 are of slum character. Of our 44,451 residential structures, 4,718 are not fit for human habitation; 98,041 units are occupied by renters, 27.6 percent of our residential structures were constructed before 1900, and 41.1 between 1900 and 1919. Average rental of units in Newark is $33.36. Nineteen percent rent for less than $20 per month per unit and 31.6 rent for between $20 and $30 per month. Only 4,000 private units constructed since 1930 and 3,000 public units. About 8 percent of Newark area occupied by substandard dwellings and total habitable area is only 20 square miles practically none of which is vacant land. Estimated present population, 480,000. We need 10,000 additional low-cost units and 15,000 additional units for moderate-income families. These cannot be supplied without first clearing land by slum elimination.

Mayor VINCENT J. MURPHY.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 13, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors:

Recent Seattle market survey completed this year by city and University of Washington shows 14,750 substandard units in Seattle proper of which 5,300 are tenant occupied by families of two to six persons. Recent study by Seattle Housing Authority based on figures revealed in market survey sets need for units to rent under $40 per month, conservatively, at 8,839. In contrast to this need, survey conducted early this year by VFW shows that of 261 units one to three rooms advertised for rent 74 percent rented for $50 or more while of 241 units four to six rooms 94 percent rented for $60 or more. Our Authority still receiving 120 applications weekly on average from veterans unable to afford market price for decent housing. In light of these facts, need for slum clearance to wipe out substandard housing and construction of housing for low income appears obvious. Best wishes to you in your efforts to get facts before Senate.

WILLIAM F. DEVIN,
Mayor, City of Seattle.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D. C.:

Four years after the war the housing shortage still exists in Minneapolis. Many examples of suffering and crowding still remain. The office of the Housing Administrator has a backlog of 2,200 applicants for housing. Sixty percent of these applicants are members of the marginal income group, with an annual income below $3,000. Ceiling prices of old homes have not decreased sufficiently for members of this group to make purchases, nor are they capable of buying new houses. The City Welfare Department with many indigent and others unable to command housing, is hard put to find shelter for those on relief. Families of six and eight people are often housed in hotel rooms.

Veterans groups are grateful for the temporary housing which was established in Minneapolis. However, the discomforts of such housing are more evocative of war-time life than the years of peace. Upon these veterans will fall the continued problems of housing unless permanent housing is provided for them and other people in Minneapolis.

Three thousand six hundred and seventy persons now occupy temporary housing units; 2,045 of this group are children, inheritors of the suffering indigenous to life among the prefabs and temporary housing units.

Between 1,000 and 2,000 low-rent housing units are needed in Minneapolis. The import of the term "low rent" is best exemplified in the statistics of a survey made by the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority. The surveyed area included a blighted section on the near north side of Minneapolis. A income group pays $38 per month rent in this area; B income group pays $30; and C income group, comprising one-fifth of the entire group, pays $21 per month. However, slum clearance cannot be effected without appropriate plans in hand for the establishment of low-rent housing units in the area cleared. Such a program of clearance and of redevelopment is hamstrung in Minneapolis by the lack of Federal funds. The tragedy of this situation is that substandard dwellings will have to remain to provide shelter. Such inadequate shelter has always been the breeding ground of juvenile delinquency. Families who live in such homes are highly susceptible to disease, just as they also become susceptible to criminal activities. Poor housing leads in part to increased cost in maintaining penitentiaries. Three statistics on the Sumner field housing project show that since the establishment of the project the number of fires in the area decreased one-third. Dollar loss per fire decreased between 1940 and 1948 to $36 per fire, as compared to $193 in the area previous to redevelopment. Police cost in the area dropped 90 percent. Prof. Stuart Chapin of the Department of Sociology at the University of Minnesota in his survey of the project in 1940 pointed out that people living in the Sumner field units developed twice as much social participation in the civic affairs of the neighborhood and city. This increased not only the moral tone of the city but the lives of these people. This comparison was made in terms of the people occupying substandard shelter in surrounding blighted areas.

The need for low-rent housing should be considered primarily in terms of the American principle of preserving American family life. Home life is the basis of family life, and the destruction of family life spiritually and materially has too often been caused in the years since the war by inadequate dwellings.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

ATLANTA, GA., *April 13, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors:

The city of Atlanta is vitally interested in the passage of a comprehensive housing

and slum-clearance bill. There is still great need for housing in the low-income class both white and colored. Also there are still large slum areas which need clearance in the central and semicentral portion of the city. There are thousands of applications for the housing units we now have which cannot be filled. Quite a number of apartment buildings have been built in Atlanta under FHA loans, but they are too far out in the suburbs to serve our working people and those of moderate income. Also the rents are completely above the low-income class. The city of Atlanta has great need for an additional program of slum clearance and low-cost housing.

WILLIAM B. HARTSFIELD,
Mayor of Atlanta.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Director,
United States Conference of Mayors:

We cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of legislation assisting cities with the elimination of slums and construction of housing for persons of low income. Today the most valuable areas in Toledo from the standpoint of facility and proximity to the center of activity are occupied by slums which create real problem in law enforcement and health.

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Mayor, City of Toledo.

MEMPHIS, TENN. *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Director, United States Conference of Mayors:

Because the central portion of Memphis is traversed by five major bayou systems the adjacent areas invited construction of poorest type of shelter. Most of the so-called housing was provided more than 40 years ago and represents nearly 14,000 units unfit for repair in an area of more than seven square miles. No slums have ever been cleared here except through public improvements and building of five public housing projects.. Believe private enterprise would cooperate in redevelopment if slum sites could be made available at reuse values. Memphis needs at least 7,000 low-rent public-housing units and should apply for at least half that number if present legislation is enacted. The existing public housing program of 3,300 units is divided 28 percent for white and 72 percent for Negro occupancy and future programs, based on need, should be apportioned likewise.

WATKINS OVERTON,
Mayor, City of Memphis, Tenn.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *April 12, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D. C.

Providence program for slum clearance and redevelopment requires passage of Senate bill 1070 to provide low-rent housing for displaced families of low income. Vital programs for new highways, playgrounds, industrial sites, as well as slum clearance are being delayed by a housing shortage.

DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Mayor of Providence.

NORFOLK, VA., *April 13, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Director,
United States Conference of Mayors:

Acute shortage exists here respecting housing accommodations at rentals within reach of vast majority of our people. Concern of commandant of Fifth Naval District is indicative of the general situation. Recent survey by commandant discloses 2,347 Navy personnel in Norfolk area who desire to bring their families to this area but who are unable to do so because of housing shortage; 3,077 families of Navy personnel in this area now occupying trailers, rooms, and other inadequate housing.

Estimated minimum need for low-rent public housing 3,000 units. Nineteen hundred and forty housing census revealed 9,000 substandard units occupied by Negroes, 6,000 substandard units occupied by whites. While there is no later survey available, this situation has certainly not improved. City now plagued with many blighted areas which we hope to eliminate progressively through redevelopment and public-housing projects.

Norfolk's interest in slum clearance and public housing evidenced by recent appropriation of $25,000 to the Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority for a study, planning and programing. Low-rent public housing in Norfolk efficiently operated, but grossly inadequate in scope. Administrative heads of health, fire, and police departments and judge of juvenile court report a very high rate of disease, delinquency, and crime in slum areas with correspondingly high servicing costs and very favorable demonstration of effectiveness of public housing. Study made in 1937 of certain slum areas comprising 1 percent of our total area and containing 14 percent of our population showed that the cost of city services in those areas exceeded the tax returns therefrom by $750,000. City vitally interested in passage of a comprehensive housing bill embracing public housing and urban redevelopment.

PRETLOW DARDEN,
Mayor, Norfolk, Va.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] desires to bring up for immediate consideration the conference report on the ECA bill, which is a privileged matter. I assured the Senator from Texas that when I had completed my statement I would first yield to him.

EXTENSION OF THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

I submit a conference report on Senate bill 1209, providing for the extension of the European recovery program, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the fourth and fifth sentences of section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 are hereby amended to read as follows: 'Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification of Europe, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided,* That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.'

"SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 104 (e) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out '$10,000 per annum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest rate authorized by such Act'.

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 105 (c) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949'.

"SEC. 4. Section 108 of such Act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'There shall be a Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. The Deputy United States Special Representative shall perform such functions as the United States Special Representative shall designate, and shall be Acting United States Special Representative during the absence or disability of the United States Special Representative or in the event of a vacancy in the office of United States Special Representative.'

"SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 109 (a) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: 'and the chief of the special mission shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or compensation and allowances in accordance with section 110 (a) of this title, as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or appropriate."

"SEC. 6. (a) The last sentence of paragraph (2) of section 111 (a) of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, as far as is practicable, that at least 50 per centum of the gross tonnage of commodities procured out of funds made available under this title and transported to or from the United States on ocean vessels, computed separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liner and tanker services, is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels; and, in the administration of this provision, the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the purposes of this title, endeavor to secure a fair and reasonable participation by United States flag vessels in cargoes by geographic area.'

"(b) Paragraph (3) of section 111 (b) of such Act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By inserting after 'projects' a comma and the following: 'including expansion, modernization, or development of existing enterprises' and a comma;

"(2) By inserting after 'media' the following: 'consistent with the national interests of the United States';

"(3) By striking out in the first proviso 'in the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act does not exceed $15,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof 'made in any fiscal year does not exceed $10,000,000';

"(4) By amending subparagraph (i) thereof to read as follows:

"'(i) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the Administrator plus actual earnings or profits on said project to the extent provided by such guaranty;';

"(5) By inserting after subparagraph (iii) thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"'(iv) as used in this paragraph, the term 'investment' includes the furnishing of capital goods items and related services, for use in connection with projects approved by the Administrator, pursuant to a contract providing for payment in whole or in part after June 30, 1950; and

"'(v) the guaranty to any person shall be limited to assuring the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies received by such person as earnings or profits from the approved investment, as repayment or return thereof, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof. When any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency or credits on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title, claim, or cause of action existing in connection therewith.'; and

"(6) By amending the next to last sentence thereof to read as follows: 'The total amount of the guaranties made under this paragraph (3) shall not exceed $150,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds allocated to a guaranty and remaining after all liability of the United States assumed in connection therewith has been released, discharged, or otherwise terminated, shall be available for allocation to other guaranties, the foregoing limitation notwithstanding.'

"(c) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (c) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By inserting after the second sentence thereof the following: 'In addition to the amount of notes above authorized, the Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section, to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $150,000,000 less any amount allocated prior to April 3, 1949, for such purpose, until all liabilities arising under guaranties made pursuant to this authorization have expired or been discharged.';

"(2) By striking out the first two words, 'Such notes' in the third sentence thereof and inserting 'The notes hereinabove authorized'; and

"(3) By inserting after 'Washington' in the sixth sentence thereof 'for assistance on credit terms'.

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 112 (c) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out '25 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '12½ per centum'.

"(b) Section 112 (d) of such Act is hereby amended by adding after the words 'any agricultural commodity, or product thereof' the following: 'or class, type, or specification thereof'.

"(c) Section 112 (g) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto,' and 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940, as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949'.

"(d) Section 112 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(i) (1) Insofar as practicable and to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, the Administrator shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds authorized under this title by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this title, and by making available or causing to be made available to prospective purchasers in the participating countries information as to commodities and services produced by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by otherwise helping to give small business an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds authorized under this title.

"'(2) The Administrator shall appoint a special assistant to advise and assist him in carrying out the foregoing paragraph (1). Each report transmitted to the Congress under section 123 shall include a report of all activities under this subsection.

"'(j) The Administrator shall, in providing assistance in the procurement of commodities in the United States, make available United States dollars for marine insurance on such commodities where such insurance is placed on a competitive basis in accordance with normal trade practices prevailing prior to the outbreak of World War II.

"'(k) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used in the United States for advertising foreign products or for advertising foreign travel.

"'(l) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to price-support programs required by law) at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment.'

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 114 (c) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That, in addition to the amount heretofore authorized and appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title not to exceed $1,150,000,000 for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1949, and not to exceed $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the foregoing, any balance, unobligated as of June 30, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for any period ending on or prior to that date is hereby authorized to be made available for obligation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and to be transferred to and consolidated with any appropriations for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for said fiscal year.'; and

"(2) By amending the last sentence of such section 114 (c) to read as follows: 'The authorizations in this title are limited to the period ending June 30, 1950, in order that the Congress may pass on any subsequent authorizations.'

"(b) Section 114 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation additional to that made by title I of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 793, Eightieth Congress), shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this title.'

"SEC. 9. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 115 (b) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out the period following the words 'grant basis' and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That the obligation to make such deposits may be waived, in the discretion of the Administrator, with respect to technical information or assistance furnished under section 111 (a) (3) of this title and with respect to ocean transportation furnished on United States flag vessels under section 111 of this title in an amount not exceeding the amount, as determined by the Administrator, by which the charges for such transportation exceed the cost of such transportation at world market rates.'

"(b) Such section 115 (b) (6) is hereby further amended by inserting after 'or for such other expenditures as may be consistent with' the words 'the declaration of policy contained in section 102 and'.

"(c) Section 115 (d) of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The Administrator shall encourage each participating country to insure, by an effective follow-up system, that efficient use is made of the commodities, facilities, and services furnished under this title. In order further to insure that each participating country makes efficient use of such commodities, facilities, and services, and of its own resources, the Administrator shall encourage the joint organization of the participating countries referred to in subsection (b) of this section to observe and review the operation of such follow-up systems.'

"(d) Section 115 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding two new subsections as follows:

"'(h) Not less than 5 per centum of each special local currency account established pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of this section shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources or for other local currency requirements of the United States.

"'(i) (1) The Administrator shall, to the greatest extent practicable, initiate projects for and assist the appropriate agencies of the United States Government in procuring and stimulating increased production in participating countries of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources; and in furtherance of these objectives the Administrator shall, in addition to the local currency allocated pursuant to subsection (h), use such other means available to him under this title as he may deem appropriate.

"'(2) In furtherance of such objectives and within the limits of the appropriations and contract authorizations of the Bureau of Federal Supply to procure strategic and critical materials, the Administrator, with the approval of the Director of such Bureau, shall enter into contracts in the name of the United States for the account of such Bureau for the purchase of strategic and critical materials in any participating country. Such contracts may provide for deliveries over definite periods, but not to exceed twenty years in any contract, and may provide for payments in advance of deliveries.

"'(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to restrict or limit in any manner the authority now held by any agency of the United States Government in procuring or stimulating increased production of the materials referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) in countries other than participating countries.'

"SEC. 10. (a) The first sentence of section 117 (c) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided,* That the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals through the mails.'

"(b) Section 117 (d) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949'.

"(c) Section 117 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(e) Whenever the Administrator shall determine that shipping capacity available to Italy is inadequate for such emigration from Italy as may be desirable to further the purposes of this title, the Administrator shall request the United States Maritime Commission to make available to Italy vessels capable of engaging in such service for the purpose of transporting emigrants from Italy to destinations other than the United States, and shall specify the terms and conditions under which such vessels shall thus be made available, and the United States Maritime Commission thereupon shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, make such vessels available to Italy in accordance with such terms and conditions: *Provided,* That the total number of such vessels made available for such purpose shall not at any one time exceed ten: *Provided further,* That title to each such vessel owned by the United States Government shall remain in the United States: *And provided further,* That the terms and conditions under which such vessels are made available to Italy shall obligate Italy to return the vessels forthwith upon demand of the President, and in any event not later than June 30, 1952.'

"SEC. 11. The second sentence of section 118 of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof 'or (3) the provision of such assistance would be inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventative or enforcement action'.

"SEC. 12. An amount, equal to any balance, unobligated as of April 2, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated by Public Law 793, approved June 28, 1948, for the purposes of the China Aid Act of 1948 is hereby made available to the President for obligation through February 15, 1950, for assistance in areas in China which he may deem to be not under Communist domination, to be furnished in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he may determine."

And the House agree to the same.

TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN KEE,
JAMES P. RICHARDS,
JOSEPH L. PFEIFER,
CHARLES A. EATON,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to consume much of the time of the Senate in discussing the report. It was approved by the House of Representatives a little while ago today, and I hope and expect similar action to be taken in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Baldwin	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Chavez	Jenner	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Donnell	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kem	Saltonstall
Downey	Kerr	Schoeppel
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Lucas	Taylor
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McClellan	Thye
Fulbright	McFarland	Tydings
George	McMahon	Vandenberg
Green	Martin	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wherry
Hendrickson	Miller	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have presented the report of the conference committee on the ECA bill, Senate bill 1209. It is not the purpose of the committee to consume much of the time of the Senate. However, it was thought desirable to have a quorum call in order that Senators might have no cause to complain that they did not know the conference report was coming before the Senate for consideration.

The conferees on the part of the Senate were the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Texas, chairman of the committee. The report is available for Senators who desire copies.

The conference report reveals that in the main the Senate conferees were able to sustain the views of the Senate and to secure action on the major amendments which were considered and adopted by the Senate. The House conferees agreed to a great number of provisions which were sanctioned by the Senate committee and the Senate. The managers on the part of the House agreed to accept the Senate language with respect to the 50–50 shipping provision, which is more or less an agreed-upon compromise between the ECA and the American merchant marine interests.

In the case of China, the language inserted in the bill by the Senate, on motion of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], was in effect adopted; so that item is cared for.

The House had passed an independent bill on the subject of China, but upon the insistence of the Senate conferees it was agreed that the provision inserted in the bill by the Senate should remain practically intact—that is, as to the time within which the $43,000,000, heretofore appropriated, but unexpended, may be expended.

The conferees on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment on the subject of the Indonesian question. That amendment was offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. There was nothing on the subject in the bill as passed by the House, so that item is disposed of.

The language inserted by the Senate, providing that the Administrator shall encourage each participating country to insure the efficient use of commodities and facilities by an effective follow-up system, was approved by the conferees on the part of the House. No similar provision had been contained in the bill as passed by the House. That provision is what is known as the Bridges-McCarran amendment.

In the case of the item for advertising and travel, the Senate version of the bill forbids the use of ECA funds for advertising in the United States of foreign products or foreign travel. No similar provision was contained in the bill as passed by the House. The House conferees accepted the action taken in that respect by the Senate.

As to agricultural commodities, in the Senate version of the bill the words "any agricultural commodity or product thereof," as used in the original bill, were enlarged to include classes, types, or specifications of such commodities or products. The conferees agreed to accept that provision. It was championed and presented, as I now recall, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and other Senators who were associated with him.

In the case of exported wheat flour, the Senate version of the bill contained a provision that at least 15 percent of the wheat shipped abroad should be in the form of milled products. Upon the insistence of the House conferees, the Senate provision was reduced to 12 percent; and the House conferees agreed to that.

In the case of marine insurance, the House version of the bill contained no

provision on the subject. The House conferees agreed to accept the first portion of the Senate amendment dealing with that subject, but rejected the last half. However, the final action represents a distinct advance, and more or less represents the Senate's view.

The Senate conferees receded on the provision relating to the exportation of corn. That amendment was sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and provided that 15 percent of the corn shipped abroad should be in processed form. Because of the objections of the ECA and testimony that it was hardly practicable and that in Europe there is really very little demand for corn, the Senate conferees agreed to recede, and to accept the view of the House conferees on that matter.

One other item of difference was that the Senate version of the bill provided $750,000,000 through the RFC to meet any anticipated necessities along that line. The House version of the bill provided for a billion dollars. The Senate conferees agreed to that provision, because it does not involve any appropriation; and if the billion dollars is needed, we feel that it would be a mistake to insist upon a reduction.

The Senate conferees receded on the provision, contained in the bill as passed by the Senate, authorizing $150,000,000 for forward contracting for long-range programing. That provision was removed from the bill, upon the insistence of the House conferees.

In regard to the shipping matter, or what is known as the Panamanian issue, the Senate conferees agreed to remove that provision from the bill, so that issue is eliminated from consideration. It related to vessels registered under the laws of a foreign country which is not a participating country under ECA, and of which the owners are not nationals of a participating country. In other words, it relates to ships under Panamanian registry. So far as the compromise on that matter is concerned, it may be pointed out that the House version of the bill contained exceptionally broad guaranty provisions, including compensation for losses as a result of riot, revolution, war, expropriation, and a number of other things. The House version of the bill provided that $300,000,000 should be available for those purposes. The Senate conferees vigorously dissented. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who was thoroughly advised about the proposal, along with other of the Senate conferees, insisted on opposition. The result was that all the provisions of guaranties, including the one as to original investment, but with the exception of the guaranty of convertibility of currency into United States dollars, were stricken out. The ceiling on guaranties was reduced from $300,000,000 to $150,000,000.

The Senate conferees thus succeeded in greatly modifying the far-reaching House proposal, and we were able to defeat what we thought would be a precedent on the question of guaranteeing the investments in foreign countries and the profits therefrom, with payment to be made from the Treasury of the United States. Such a provision, of course, might have far-reaching results in respect to other legislation. The Senator from Michigan deserves credit for his insistence on that point and for his very clear explanations before the Committee of Conference.

The House conferees agreed to restore the $50,000,000 item for the interim period, in order to leave the authorization intact. The House had reduced the amount of the appropriation by $50,000,000.

On our part, the Senate conferees agreed to eliminate the $150,000,000 item for forward contracting. That would not injure the operation of the bill, because it does not involve a direct appropriation at this time.

So far as the authorizations are concerned, therefore, the bill as finally agreed upon in the conference committee is strikingly like the version of the bill as sent to conference by the Senate.

Mr. President, I think the result of the conference has been wholly to the advantage of the attitude of the Senate, and will provide wisely for the extension for another year of the operations of the ECA.

Mr. President, as all of us know, this is one of the most far-reaching measures, so far as the international world is concerned, that has ever been undertaken by any government since the beginning of organized society. It represents the generosity of a great nation and the far-seeing vision as to its effects not alone for the moment but for the years to come. We believe it will have a tremendous impact upon the cause of peace. We believe it will have a profound effect in enabling European countries to stand upon their own legs and to rebuild their broken economies, thus strengthening the cause of free government in Europe, and setting an example for the entire world. We present the report and ask concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was the author of the provision requiring that 15 percent of the combined wheat and flour tonnage be in the form of flour. I appreciate very much the work of the Senate conferees in preserving 12½ percent. During the past 30 years the flour-milling industry of the United States has built up a foreign market. For 30 years 18 percent, on an average, of the combined wheat and flour tonnage which has gone abroad has been in the form of flour. I think the ECA Administrator has been wholly unreasonable and somewhat unfair to an American industry which has built up a business at its own expense. The 15-percent provision should have been preserved. But I appreciate what the conferees did, and I thank especially the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan for their work and help. The report is perfectly satisfactory to me, and I, of course, expect to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to take a very few minutes this afternoon to discuss two phases of problems affecting national health.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Oregon will suspend for a moment, the Chair understands the parliamentary situation to be that the Senator from South Carolina yielded to a privileged matter.

Mr. MORSE. He yielded the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I repeat, I want to take a few minutes this afternoon to discuss, as I see them, two phases of the national health legislation problem.

One of the biggest funds ever raised in this country to influence legislation is being collected by the American Medical Association by an assessment of its members to block action on President Truman's proposed health insurance program. The assessment of $25 against each member is expected to provide $3,500,000.

I wish to make perfectly clear at the outset of these remarks that I am opposed to the bill calling for compulsory national health insurance proposed by the Truman administration. As the record shows, I am one of the joint sponsors of Senate bill 1456, a health bill which I believe to be more consonant with basic American principles of private enterprise than the Truman bill. But I rise to protest the policy of the American Medical Association in respect to what amounts in fact to a political fund-raising program.

Many members of the AMA have objected to this assessment for political action by an organization formed for professional and scientific purposes. But it apparently is not healthy for doctors to voice objections to what the AMA hierarchy decides is best for the profession, and most doctors have gone along in order to keep out of trouble.

One group of prominent doctors, however, led by Dr. Edwards A. Park, of Johns Hopkins University, issued a public protest against the proposal to use these funds for lobbying or propaganda. These doctors suggested the AMA could put the money to better use in working out a practical program for getting medical care to the people who need it, than in lobbying against national health programs.

Their protest is an exceedingly interesting protest, and I take the time to read it:

A PROTEST AGAINST THE PRESENT ATTITUDES AND POLICIES OF THE AMA IN REGARD TO THE PROBLEM OF MEDICAL CARE

Numerous comments by medical colleagues in various parts of the country have convinced the undersigned physicians that a large segment of the medical profession is not in sympathy with many policies and actions of the American Medical Association on the extension of medical care. The $25 assessment levied in executive session on all members of the association will place several million dollars at the disposal of its officials. Only an indefinite and constructively inadequate program has been presented outlining the way in which this huge fund will be

used. The charge to association officials is exceedingly vague, leaving the methods to be employed at their discretion and subject to the possibility of grave abuse.

If the funds are to be used for propaganda and legislative lobbying instead of developing a comprehensive medical-care program, we are heartily opposed to the levy and shall refuse to pay it, and we urge all physicians with a sense of responsibility for the future of American medicine to register their protest. The significance of stand-pat propaganda will not escape the public. This will add to the already firmly rooted suspicion that the association's objectives are primarily economic and selfish and will further weaken its standing as an altruistic agency devoted to the improvement of medical practice, research, and education. We would gladly contribute if the funds were to be used to develop a carefully worked out, comprehensive plan to extend and improve medical care and education.

We believe that the fundamental failure of the American Medical Association in its attitudes and policies bearing on the general problem of medical care has been its unwillingness fully to acknowledge the need for improvement and to seize this particularly favorable opportunity to come forward with a comprehensive, constructive program which would be of clear advantage to the public as well as to the profession itself. Further, we believe that in the present crisis the obvious direct way to avoid an all-inclusive compulsory health insurance and to make secure the valuable features of our present system is for the association to develop a program that will be manifestly so considerate of the needs of the people and at the same time so eminently fair to the interests of the physicians that it will command general approbation.

The undersigned believe that now is the time to voice our disapproval of the leadership and policies of the association on the extension of medical care.

There follows a list of exceedingly prominent, well-recognized, highly qualified physicians who are protesting what I think the evidence to date at least seems to indicate is the program of the American Medical Association insofar as the proposed $3,500,000 slush fund is concerned, a program for political lobbying in order to deny to the American people any medical program upon which the American Medical Association does not put its stamp of approval. I ask unanimous consent to have the full protest published in the RECORD, at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the protest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROTEST AGAINST THE PRESENT ATTITUDES AND POLICIES OF THE AMA IN REGARD TO THE PROBLEM OF MEDICAL CARE

Numerous comments by medical colleagues in various parts of the country have convinced the undersigned physicians that a large segment of the medical profession is not in sympathy with many policies and actions of the American Medical Association on the extension of medical care. The $25 assessment levied in executive session on all members of the association will place several million dollars at the disposal of its officials. Only an indefinite and constructively inadequate program has been presented outlining the way in which this huge fund will be used. The charge to association officials is exceedingly vague, leaving the methods to be employed at their discretion and subject to the possibility of grave abuse.

If the funds are to be used for propaganda and legislative lobbying instead of developing a comprehensive medical-care program, we are heartily opposed to the levy and shall refuse to pay it, and we urge all physicians with a sense of responsibility for the future of American medicine to register their protest. The significance of stand-pat propaganda will not escape the public. This will add to the already firmly rooted suspicion that the association's objectives are primarily economic and selfish and will further weaken its standing as an altruistic agency devoted to the improvement of medical practice, research, and education. We would gladly contribute if the funds were to be used to develop a carefully worked out, comprehensive plan to extend and improve medical care and education.

We believe that the fundamental failure of the American Medical Association in its attitudes and policies bearing on the general problem of medical care has been its unwillingness fully to acknowledge the need for improvement and to seize this particularly favorable opportunity to come forward with a comprehensive, constructive program which would be of clear advantage to the public as well as to the profession itself. Further, we believe that in the present crisis the obvious direct way to avoid an all-inclusive compulsory health insurance and to make secure the valuable features of our present system is for the association to develop a program that will be manifestly so considerate of the needs of the people and at the same time so eminently fair to the interests of the physicians that it will command general approbation.

The undersigned believe that now is the time to voice our disapproval of the leadership and policies of the association on the extension of medical care:

Warfield T. Longcope, Samuel A. Levine, S. Burt Wolbach, Eugene F. Du Bois, Harold G. Wolff, David Barr, Ephraim Shorr, Paul Reznikoff, Earl Chapman, Nathaniel W. Faxon, Stanley Cobb, A. A. Weech, T. E. McKell, Paul J. Murison, Albert J. Sullivan, L. S. Meriweather, W. Barry Wood, William M. Allen, Theodore E. Walsh, Carl V. Moore, Rustin McIntosh, Robert Ward, William C. Von Glahn, James Howard Means, Theo. L. Soniat, Harry L. Alexander, Edwin F. Gildea, Alexis F. Hartmann, L. Emmett Holt, Jr., John H. Mulholland, W. B. Studdiford, S. Bernard Wortis, William S. Tillett, Currier McEwen, S. S. Kauvar, Grover F. Powers, Eugene B. Ferris, James L. Wilson, M. E Lapham, Alfred E. Cohn, Duncan E. Reid, Chester S. Keefer, Samuel Z. Levine, Thomas M. Rivers, Thomas A. C. Rennie, Harold L. Temple, Allen O. Whipple, Joseph Aub, Henry K. Beecher, James C. White, Jacob E. Finesinger, A. B. Sabin, Maurice Levine, R. V. Platou, Alton Ochsner, Julius L. Wilson, Thomas L. Findley, Oliver Cope, Hugh McCulloch, G. E. Wakerlin, Percival Bailey, W. W. Morrison, George Whipple, John J. Morton, I. S. Ravdin, Francis C. Grant, Nicholson J. Eastman, Wilburt C. Davison, Amos Christie, James R. Dawson, Jr., James Bordley, Clinton Van Zandt Hawn, J. E. Edwards, Edith M. Lincoln, Robert Loeb, A. J. Kauvar, Daniel C. Darrow, Howard H. Mason, Randolph West, Albert R. Lamb, Sr., George H. Humphreys, C. G. de Gutierrez-Mahoney, H. M. Keith, E. G. Hall, Paul A. O'Leary, E. G. Wakefield, Clark Dixon, Alfred Uihlein, James L. Gamble, William Parson, Thomas E. Weiss, M. B. Burris, Edgar H. Little, Evarts Graham, Louis Hellman, Paul Harper, John J. Wittmer, Lawson Wilkins, Edwards A. Park, Samuel Wolman, Sidney S. Chipman, Curtis J. Lund, Roy R. Grinker, Walter Bauer, Fuller Albright, Chester Frazier, Stanley Gibson, Francis L. Lederer, George Baehr, Henry G. Poncher, Dana Atchley, Fordyce B. St. John, Virgil G. Damon, John S. Lockwood, Samuel Amberg, Charles Watkins, Henry M. Helmholz, Harold Lillie, S. B. Mills, Bert E. Hempstead, Helen B. Taussig, Francis F. Schwentker, Alan Guttmacher, William S. Ladd, Edwin Crosby, Milton E. Kirkpatrick, Myron C. Wegman, Hugh Morgan, Harry H. Gordon, Chester M. Jones, Murray H. Bass, William S. McCann, Carl M. Wilson, Joseph Stokes, Grier Miller, Alexander J. Schaffer, Eugene A. Stead, Jr., J. Cyril Peterson, Ernest A. Goodpasture, T. Campbell Goodwin, Francis F. Harrison, George Minot, Samuel Claussen, I. Ogden Woodruff, A. McGehee Harvey.

Mr. MORSE. Here was a group of doctors exercising their right to free speech and their obligation as citizens to speak up for what they considered the best interests of their country. And yet this apparently is not considered proper by the men who run the AMA.

One of the signers of that protest has learned what it means to buck the AMA hierarchy. I shall not give his name, because it might get him into more trouble. But this doctor, who is a member of the faculty of one of our leading medical schools, had been invited to lecture at a postgraduate course for practicing physicians in Arkansas to help improve their techniques in caring for babies and protecting the lives of babies.

Shortly after his name was published as one of those protesting against the AMA policies, his invitation to lecture at this post-graduate course was cancelled at the request of the State Medical Society of Arkansas. It turned out that one of the leaders of that society is a member of the AMA committee conducting the $3,500,000 campaign against the President's program—not only against the President's program, but, I may say to the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. HILL], who is the chief author of the health bill of which it is my privilege to be one of the co-sponsors, I think it is perfectly clear that the AMA intends to use its funds in opposition to any program of which it does not approve.

The Arkansas State Medical Society was powerful enough to bring pressure to have the invitation withdrawn, although the program for the postgraduate course already had been published. As a result the doctors of Arkansas did not get the benefit of the knowledge of this expert on how to save the lives of babies.

In that connection I should like to call the Senate's attention to a study published only last week by the American Academy of Pediatrics showing how inadequate is the medical care provided in many parts of the country for new-born babies and their mothers. This report said "how to make good medical care available to all infants and children, no matter where they live or what their circumstances, is the number one health problem of this country."

Apparently, Mr. President, the AMA is more interested in winning this fight

for monopoly control of medicine than it is in what the Academy of Pediatrics calls "the number one health problem of this country," the saving of the lives of babies who die unnecessarily.

An even more ominous aspect of this incident, Mr. President, is the threat to one of our basic American rights—the right of free speech. This doctor is being penalized for the exercise of free speech—a right guaranteed by our traditions and our Constitution. He is being blacklisted and punished because the AMA and its hierarchy does not agree with him, and with him, the mothers and babies of America are being punished.

I believe the significance of this incident is best brought out in the words of the doctor against whom this action was taken. Writing to a friend, he said:

> While I am of course shocked that an expression of opinion on a controversial question before the profession and the public should be carried over into education and scientific work, I am afraid that it is not unexpected.

While I am not an advocate of national health insurance myself, I am shocked at this callous disregard of basic rights by the American Medical Association and its allies and satellites. I am informed that this is not an isolated case—that the AMA has brought pressure of one kind or another against many doctors in many parts of the country to prevent them from speaking their minds on the subject of what is best for the American people in the way of a health program.

This issue, Mr. President, involves far more than a question of civil rights and the rights of mothers and babies. It involves the whole working of our democracy. A President of the United States has been elected on a platform favoring national health insurance. Many Members of Congress have been elected on the same issue—notably the senior Senator from Montana, whom the doctors tried desperately to beat because of his sponsorship of this legislative proposal.

But the American Medical Society has decided to disregard the votes of the people and try, by spending millions of dollars, to continue its monopoly of the economics of medicine. It sounds a little too much like Mark Hanna to suit my taste.

I think, Mr. President, that the Senate cannot afford to ignore this campaign by the AMA, which is resulting in Senators being flooded with mail and propaganda against the President's health insurance legislation and against any other piece of health legislation introduced in this session of Congress. As one of the cosponsors of Senate bill 1456, I believe it is time for us to investigate this situation and determine who is bringing this kind of pressure on doctors and how they are exerting it. Short of such an investigation, I do not see how Senators can tell what the public sentiment on this issue may be. Certainly a campaign of propaganda and mail, paid for by millions of dollars, is no evidence of public sentiment.

Mr. President, I am a lawyer, and as a lawyer I never make such charges as I have made here this afternoon without having the evidence to back them up. I now want to read from two letters. In order to protect certain confidences, I shall delete reference to certain names; but I shall keep the letters, Mr. President, and, in due course of time, if it shall become necessary, I am sure the writers of the letters, in the public interest, will be willing to take a public stand on the very points they bring out in the letters.

Here is a letter dated February 24, 1949, written by the doctor who was supposed to have given a course of postgraduate lectures at the University of Arkansas Medical School, and who was one of the protestants who signed Dr. Park's petition of protest to the American Medical Association.

Listen to his testimony, Mr. President:

> DEAR DR. PARK: I wonder if I have the distinction of being the first to suffer the wrath of organized medicine in reprisal for my presumptuousness in signing the protest which you initiated.
>
> Let me give you some background first. About 2 months ago, Dr. ———, the professor of pediatrics at the University of ———, invited me to be one of the two guest lecturers at a postgraduate course for physicians to be held in Little Rock, March 10 to 12. I accepted and agreed to talk on infant feeding and immunization. As usual, I was asked to send a biographical sketch and photograph about a month ago. On Monday of this week, February 21, the announcement of the course was published and sent out, and apparently the wheels began to move. Pressure was brought to bear on the vice president of the university in charge of medical affairs, and on the State commissioner of health, insisting that I not be allowed to appear. Although ——— and ——— were very much embarrassed, they decided that the wisest course was to withdraw the invitation to me and to change the program. They have secured Dr. ——— as a replacement for me. Dr. ——— called me yesterday to apologize, and, of course, I assured him that I understood his position. It seems that one of the leaders in the Arkansas Medical Society is a member of the AMA committee charged with the direction of the present campaign.
>
> While I am, of course, shocked that an expression of opinion on a controversial question before the profession and the public should be carried over to education and scientific work, I am afraid that it is not unexpected. I am sending copies of this letter to some of my friends.

Mr. President, that is interesting evidence. In a trial of a lawsuit it would be considered precious evidence.

Now, let us listen to another bit of evidence, the letter canceling the invitation to this doctor, disclosing very clearly the motivation and cause behind the entire cancellation. This letter is dated February 22, 1949, and reads:

> DEAR DR. ———:
>
> The doctor to whom this letter was sent is the doctor who had previously been invited to give a series of lectures on pediatrics to the University of Arkansas Medical School and to doctors invited thereto.
>
> DEAR DR. ———: This letter is being written to you as a result of a special request made by the Arkansas State Medical Society and the Pulaski County Medical Society with reference to your appointment as a special consultant in pediatrics for the Arkansas State Board of Health for the postgraduate pediatrics course to be conducted at the University of Arkansas School of Medicine, Little Rock, Ark., during the period March 10 to 12, inclusive, 1949.
>
> The Arkansas State Medical Society and the Pulaski County Medical Society have been advised through authoritative sources that you were one of the 136 signers of certain papers and documents severely criticizing the American Medical Association.

Oh, what a serious offense that must be.

> Through this action on your part the Arkansas State Medical Society and the Pulaski County Medical Society request that you not appear on the postgraduate pediatric course to be conducted on the above referred to date.
>
> This department sincerely regrets that this most embarrassing situation has arisen and further regrets that it is necessary to cancel your appointment as special consultant for the Arkansas State Board of Health.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> T. T. Ross, M. D.,
> *State Health Officer.*

Mr. President, if you were trying a lawsuit and you put witnesses on the stand who presented such evidence in support of the major issue of a case, when they got through, as a lawyer you would be inclined to say, "Your honor, plaintiff rests." But, tempted as I am to rest at this point of proof, I wish to give the American Medical Association today from this desk a little gratuitous advice. I want to give this advice as a public servant whose record shows that he stands for the protection of the private enterprise principle in the American professions, including the medical profession, but a record which also shows that it is never safe for the public to turn over to any one segment of our population, any one group within our population, any one profession within our population, any economic group within our population, the sole and complete power to determine how the public shall be served by that group.

Mr. President, the United States is a democracy, and according to democratic theory all groups in our country are supposed to work for the advancement of the public welfare, for the social group as a whole. The Government sits in the position of an umpire, sometimes as regulator, sometimes as policeman, often as judge, determining whether or not any particular segment of our society is conducting its operations, its business, its professional activities, in the public interest, or whether it is seeking to take advantage of our private enterprise system in order to turn the private enterprise system into a license to advance selfish interests at the expense of the common welfare.

Mr. President, the principle of government which I have just enunciated is fundamental to the preservation of our system of democracy, and it is a tenet of government which I say to the doctors of this country, they had better grasp the meaning of before it is too late. I say that because those of us who are their friends, although they do not seem to want to recognize our friendship, those

of us who are willing to make a fight for the private enterprise system in connection with the medical profesison, are saying in increasing numbers in the Congress of the United States, to the American Medical Association and the doctors it represents, that they cannot succeed with their obvious intention of trying to get by with the program of no legislation at all in regard to national health problems. The doctors as a clan seem to think that there should be no health legislation affecting them or if there shall be any legislation, that it must be the legislation which the American Medical Association writes and dictates to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, they are going to lose that fight. Some of us may lose our political heads in the fight, because I do not deny that a slush fund of $3,500,000 can be very effective in political campaigns.

The American Medical Association apparently must learn that there are men in the Congress in increasing numbers who are willing to make a fight for better health service for all the American people, in the very face of AMA opposition, if necessary, and even take a political licking doing it, rather than bend a knee to such unconscionable political activity as the AMA is about to inaugurate.

Mr. President, a majority of the Senators and Representatives who stand up against the lobby tactics of the AMA are going to have the last laugh, too, because once the people of the country come to understand the unanswerable soundness of the fight we are making for better health facilities in America, they are going to support us when they go to the polls. The doctors will discover that they cannot get by with a political propaganda program based upon the advancement of their individual selfish interests at the expense and cost of the health and welfare of the people of America.

Oh, I know how strong that language is, and every sentence, Mr. President, is advisedly spoken, because I have been studying this problem for a long, long time. I have been studying it ever since I came to the Senate of the United States. I have pleaded with the doctors of the country. I have begged the doctors of the country to get busy and come forward with a health program, based upon private enterprise principles, which will protect them from the prairie fire which is sweeping the country in the form of the dissatisfaction of millions of our citizens with the cost of medical service. Their dissatisfaction is so great that many of them believe that the medical profession should be socialized. I am utterly opposed to any such program. I am utterly opposed to it because it is unfair to the doctors and because it cannot be reconciled with what I consider to be very basic and fundamental tenets of our system of political democracy and a capitalistic economy.

The doctors do not have a chance, Mr. President, in the years immediately ahead of stopping that prairie fire of public opinion which is sweeping the country for a compulsory national health insurance program, unless they get busy and build a proper backfire. A proper backfire, Mr. President, is not the AMA's program of having the doctors hold up their hands and say, "We are untouchable; we are untouchable. You must not touch us with legislation. You must not think of determining how national health programs shall be administered in this country. You must leave it to the doctors."

Mr. President, I shall leave to the doctors my head colds and other ailments, serious and minor, as they arise, but when it comes to determining what sound public policy is in respect to serving all the people in connection with their health needs, I say to the doctors, "That happens to be the responsibility and obligation of the Congress of the United States. We welcome your help, but if you are going to take the position that you have a monopoly insofar as medical policies in this country are concerned in relation to public health, do not count us on your team. Even in the face of your opposition you will find me in the Senate of the United States, so long as I am there, continuing to fight against compulsory national health insurance."

But the doctors will also find me trying to perfect sections of Senate bill 1456 into a very sound program for improving medical service in America. I say, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama has said, "We are not married to this bill." We have offered S. 1456, as the Presiding Officer knows, as a proposal to be considered as a backfire, if you will, to a national compulsory health insurance program. We did not write the bill. We did much in perfecting it into proper legislative form. But in offering the bill we did not set ourselves up as authorities on the type of health legislation that should be passed. We shall consider and adopt any changes in it which facts presented to us show are necessary in the interest of having the best possible piece of legislation. As the Presiding Officer well knows, we went to doctors, who also are concerned about the prairie fire of public criticism against the medical profession which is sweeping the country, a prairie fire which indicates that unless a backfire is quickly built there is real danger that a serious blow may be struck against the private-enterprise system so far as the medical profession is concerned.

We had the assistance of one of the great doctors of America, the president of the Pennsylvania Medical Association, Dr. Engel. From my conversations and correspondence with him I know there is no member of the American Medical Association's hierarchy who is more opposed to national compulsory health insurance than Dr. Engel, of the Pennsylvania Medical Association.

Mr. President, we came forward with a bill which Dr. Engel tells us 44 presidents of State medical associations have endorsed, at least to the extent of making clear that our bill contains a great many provisions which presidents of those medical associations believe have great merit, and are entitled to the type of careful public hearings the sponsors of the bill propose to give to it. Dr. Engel has also submitted to us clear evidence that great hospital associations favor the basic principles of the Hill bill. He has told us that even some leaders in the AMA are giving favorable consideration to the bill.

I regret that some leading doctors in my State, including the president of my State's medical association, do not approve of Senate bill 1456. They believe it puts the Government in the brokerage business, as they term it, in connection with the medical profession, and that it is but a step toward socialism. That great emotional sanction, socialism, is fast developing itself into a great fear bogey in American discussion. In many circles in America it is so much in evidence that we can hardly sit down and engage in a reasoned discourse about the type of legislation which may be needed in order to solve some of the great social and economic problems that confront millions of our fellow citizens. If one even suggests that a pretty strong case can be made for Federal aid to education or Federal aid in building up a hospital and medical service program, one is smeared with the brush of socialism.

The American people, however, are going to see through it. Oh, they can be confused and disconcerted for a time by fear arguments, but just leave it up to the American people, give them the time, and they will see through emotional sanctions. They will come down to the intellectual kernel of the problem. They will consider the evidence. I am afraid that a great many doctors are going to learn too late that they cannot protect their desire for a monopoly in national health policies by trying to scare the American people.

Thus, as the Presiding Officer knows, before Senate bill 1456 was introduced I received a telegram from the president of the medical association in my State in opposition to the proposal. If I were the fearful kind, Mr. President, knowing that I am running for reelection in 1950, and knowing that I will have to run on a financial shoestring, and knowing that large campaign funds of the opposition are always helpful to the opposition, I might have developed a weakness of the knees when I received that telegram. I might have said to the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Alabama, "I am sorry, LISTER, but I have just discovered that the president of the medical association of my State is against our bill. I am up for reelection in 1950, and I think I had better not take a chance." If I ever exhibit such cowardice, I hope I shall be defeated the next time the people in my State have the opportunity to pass judgment upon me.

The Senator from Alabama knows what I did. I said, "I am sorry they do not understand the sound principles of our bill. They are wrong in their hasty judgment on it. The public interest must come first. Therefore I shall go along with you and introduce the bill for the purpose of hearings before the Senate committee and we will take the case to the people in the various States in support of our bill." That is what I shall do. Something tells me that I do not have to worry about it, because the people of my State can see through emotional sanctions. They are not going to be di-

verted from their course of supporting sound medical legislation which protects the private enterprise principle in medicine in this country by the cry of any number of doctors, in my State or across the Nation, that the adoption of such legislation as Senate bill 1456 would fasten the great bogey of socialism upon them. The people of my State are going to be impressed by the fact that hovering over every roof top in America today is a potential mortgage on the home which would descend upon it if a serious illness should occur in that home. The American people are more fearful of that than they are of the wolf cry of the medical profession, "Look out for socialism in medicine in America."

It is our job in the Congress to take the legislative steps necessary to see to it that socialism does not take over the medical profession. It is also our job to see to it that there is some freedom from the fear which plagues the hearts of mothers and fathers who have worked hard to pay for their home. So frequently they say in conversation with each other, "But, Mary—" or "John, what would happen to us if little Timmy developed a long illness, or you, John, had to quit your work because of TB, or a heart attack, or cancer?"

The doctors of this country must stop playing the part of infallible oracles. The doctors must learn that their noble profession has a tremendous social obligation to perform in our great democracy. They must recognize before it is too late that they have a citizenship obligation as doctors. That obligation is to cooperate with Government officials who are trying to work out a national health program far to the right of socialism, but a health program which will remove fear from the minds and hearts of John and Mary. They must help devise a health program which will give reassurance to the American people that the medical profession will rise to its great social obligation of working cooperatively with the Congress in trying to secure the passage of legislation which will remove the hovering potential mortgage from the roof tops of the homes of America. They must support a program which will open up for the common good the great resources of scientific knowledge and humanitarian service of the medical profession.

Mr. President, if I seem to be very critical of the medical profession as a profession, I wish to make it clear that I am not critical of doctors as doctors. Comparisons are always dangerous. It is always difficult to place a qualitative valuation on men, or groups, or things. But I mean it from the depths of this heart of mine, Mr. President, when I say here and now that I know of no group of men and women in America to which we as individuals owe so much by way of a debt of social gratitude for the great humanitarian service they perform for our people, as we owe to members of the medical profession. In that tribute of appreciation I include not only doctors, but technicians, nurses, and attendants—all those who seek to restore health to a broken body.

This is no time for bitterness against individuals. My sense of deep gratitude to doctors is so great that all I can say to them today as individuals is that, "I am not your enemy when it comes to trying to help you make it possible to expand and extend the humanitarian service of the medical profession within the framework of free enterprise." But I would not be fair to the doctors if today I did not issue the warning that, as associations, I think they need to do some rethinking about their professional relationships, as a profession, to the American people.

In the interest of fairness and accuracy it also needs to be pointed out for the record that the doctors themselves are the recipients of great service and accommodation from the American people. In the last analysis the American people, with their tax dollars, pay for the great medical schools, laboratories, and hospitals in which the doctors have the privilege and the sacred trust of carrying on their humanitarian health-giving work.

I am sometimes amused when I talk to groups of doctors and see the stiffening of back and tenseness of muscle when it is suggested to them that there is very strong likelihood that in the not too distant future some legislation in regard to national health programs is going to be passed whether they like it or not. On occasion I have sought to point out to doctors that they could not begin to pay for the facilities which have made it possible for them to develop the skills, the knowledge, and the scientific techniques with which they serve the American people, through their profession, in such a humanitariar way. Sometimes, Mr. President, when we listen to the doctors, we almost get the idea, that any suggestion that a legislative limitation of any kind whatsoever be placed on the medical profession constitutes a suggestion of the confiscation of some great property value or property right which the doctors of the country have.

Mr. President, let us look for a moment to see how fallacious that notion is. The evidence is perfectly clear. I have just finished several weeks of hearings as a member of the subcommittee on veterans' affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; our subcommittee has been conducting hearings into the hospital program of the Veterans' Administration. When we go into the question of the cost of maintaining medical schools and hospitals, we soon appreciate that, after all, the doctor financially has contributed only a very, very small part of what it would cost if he had to pay for all those facilities as a member of a profession in order to carry on his practice. Yet how many doctors have we heard, Mr. President, fuss and fume about subsidies being granted to different segments of the American economy, when the truth of the matter is that the doctors of the country are the beneficiaries of some of the largest subsidies going to any class in America.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator from Oregon ever considered that there is a somewhat comparable problem in the difficulties the poor people have in obtaining access to our courts?

Mr. MORSE. By all means.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Oregon familiar with the legal-aid programs which have been instituted in trying to approach a solution of that problem?

Mr. MORSE. I am pleased to be able to tell the Senator from Maine that I have been active in that program for a great many years.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Oregon aware that very serious injustices develop as a result of the inability of the poor people to be able to secure the competent legal guidance which the great corporations are able to afford?

Mr. MORSE. Unquestionably that is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. Therefore, would it not be equally logical that we should nationalize the legal services of the country, so that the poor people could have available to them legal talent comparable to the medical talent advocated for the poor people by the chief advocate of the health bill, Mr. Oscar Ewing, who, until he made the great sacrifice of entering the public service, I assume perhaps was making a million dollars a year as a lawyer serving great corporations? Would not it be equally appropriate to have the lawyers of the country nationalized in a similar way?

Mr. MORSE. I would be just as opposed to nationalizing the legal profession as I am opposed to any proposal to nationalize the medical profession. But I am sure that the Senator from Maine joins with me as a lawyer, when I say that, as a lawyer, I shall continue to work for the spread of a voluntary legal-aid program through State and local bar associations, so that no poor person in the United States need ever be in want for adequate legal service.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Oregon feel that that approach meets the problem?

Mr. MORSE. It could meet the problem——

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not my question, Mr. President.

Mr. MORSE. I shall answer the question: It could meet the problem if the legal profession would rise, as I think it should, to greater heights in taking care of legal-aid needs in this country.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to intimate that it is not the case that very many lawyers do a great deal of what is essentially charity work, a great deal of which is done by very many doctors?

Mr. MORSE. They do a very great amount of free work. I wish to say, both in regard to the lawyers and the doctors, that when we come to consider them as individuals, we do not have to worry about their humanitarian impulses and their willingess to give free service in individual cases.

But, of course, as the Senator from Maine knows, one of our great medical problems is that there is not a sufficient number of doctors to do the job. That is the next point to which I shall address myself.

I wish to thank the Senator from Maine for his contribution to my discussion.

Mr. President, I had just finished discussing the point that the doctors of the country are, after all, the recipients of a great deal of governmental aid, when we take into account the cost of the facilities which are necessary in order to make it possible for them to develop their scientific knowledge and techniques.

Then, too, let me point out in passing that I think it is well to observe that although there are some able researchers among the doctors and some valuable scientific findings developed by the practicing profession of medicine—and I would not discount that for a moment—nevertheless, I think someone should be frank enough also to point out to the doctors what many persons recognize—and those of us who have had to study this problem have not been able to escape the conclusion—namely, that the rank and file of the doctors of the country, the great mass of average practitioners, are primarily technicians, not researchers. They are not the ones making the great medical discoveries. By and large, Mr. President, such discoveries are coming out of the medical schools and the laboratories, even from work in the pure sciences, where there may not even be a doctor on the scientific staff. I think we should be frank about the matter, frank enough to say to the doctors of the country, "After all, you are putting into technical practice the findings of the great scientists and researchers in medicine." We must not hold the doctors in awe, or form the impression that every doctor is a learned scientific research scholar. Of course, they develop great skill; they become specialists and experts in certain types of surgery; they specialize, and become experts in certain diseases and ailments. I do not deny that, nor would I discount it. But I would point out that, by and large, they are practitioners, not researchers. They are plying a trade, Mr. President—a professional trade, a highly skilled trade, a great humanitarian trade. I notice that in the hearings on national health problems, some persons get the idea that each and every doctor is a great scientist, when for the most part they are only very able and skillful technicians practicing medicine.

We need the help of the doctors in solving one of the great problems of medicine, namely, the necessity for more doctors. If we are going to meet the health needs of the country we must have not only more facilities, which we seek to advance by way of the Federal-aid program set forth in Senate bill 1456, under complete and total State administration and control in the determination of State health policies, but we need more doctors.

I referred to the hearings we have just closed in connection with the veterans' hospital program. The American people I think need to be told that there is a serious lack of doctors in the armed forces today. Officers in the Pentagon Building might not like to hear it stated publicly, but I am satisfied, on the basis of the evidence we have studied, that there is not a sufficient number of doctors in the armed forces today to give the men in the uniform of our country the adequate medical care they need. The officers in the Pentagon are trying to figure out how to get doctors to enlist in the armed forces to meet this shortage without resort to a draft. There are many suggestions, but, as I have done in committee, I want here this afternoon to endorse with tentative approval, the suggestion that if we are going to meet the security needs of the country relating to providing adequate medical services for our men in uniform, then we need to recognize that the medical schools are entitled to some Federal aid. Call it subsidy if you will, Mr. President, but our medical schools need Federal aid in order to take on the added chore and burden of giving medical education and training to young men who through aptitude tests have demonstrated that they have special abilities in respect to medical training. We should give to those young men the medical training they need, with the full understanding and subject to the condition that, as the cadet goes to Annapolis or West Point, so when they go to State and private schools for medical training under a subsidy from the Federal Government they will serve a substantial number of years as doctors in uniform, taking care of the soldiers and the aviators and the seamen in our Army, Air Force, and Navy. I think that suggestion has great merit. I think it is much superior, as some of the medical authorities in the armed forces have testified in our committee, to the suggestion one hears frequently that there should be established a great Army-Navy-Air Force medical school comparable to an Annapolis or a West Point.

There are many reasons why I do not consider that to be a sound suggestion. I shall enumerate only one or two, because I intend to speak on this subject later as the proposed legislation comes before the Senate for debate. There is a question of staffing such a school with competent scientists and specialists and medical teachers. There is a danger too many of them would be drained off by way of pirating inducements from the medical teaching staffs of State and private medical schools. There is also the danger of what is referred to as medical inbreeding. There is a danger that if there is established a Government medical school for training doctors for the armed services, it will narrow itself in its offerings and in its teachings and in its research work, and soon find itself out of touch with more modern developments in other schools. As a great naval medical officer said before us in committee, we ought to avoid the danger of what he called "medical training inbreeding" which he feared would result from the establishment of a military medical school.

The last major point I want to make, Mr. President, is that some very interesting things are happening in the Senate these days. Some interesting trends, it seems to me, in political thought are developing which I thing augur very well for the future; and, if the Presiding Officer will permit a partisan remark, I think they also augur well for the future of the Republican Party.

I hold in my hand a press release of today entitled "Statement by Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, and FORREST C. DONNELL, of Missouri, on introduction of a national health bill." Mr. President, I extend to the three Senators my sincere commendation. I am jubilantly gratified that these three distinguished Republicans brought to the floor of the Senate today this document on a national health bill. Many of the principles running thorugh that document and running through the bill which the Senators are proposing I enthusiastically endorse. I think we are getting somewhere. I hope the American Medical Association takes note of the offerings today of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and my good and close friend, the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I am sure that not a single one of the three would harbor for the flicker of a second the slightest resentment upon my expressing this opinion. Mr. President, if I had been asked 3 years ago if the Republicans in the Congress of the United States would bring forth such a fine document as this, I would have said, "I do not have much hope." So, Mr. President, I mean it when I say I am jubilant to think these three leaders of my Party have come forward with such a statesmanlike document on national health legislation as the one they have offered today.

As the debate progresses I may, and I undoubtedly shall, differ with them on certain of the details of their program. I may say, "Gentlemen, I like Senate bill 1456 on this issue better." I may say about S. 1456, we have two Republicans sponsoring it, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself. It is interesting, Mr. President, that we should have two national health bills sponsored by Republicans. There are differences between them, but there are many similarities, too. Both bills join on the principle of protecting private enterprise in the medical profession, and both bills join on the principle that the States after all should determine health policy. There are many other similarities, such as financing by Federal aid. But what I was about to say, Mr. President, is that it is rather interesting to note that when we count off the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself, the junior Senator from Oregon, we count off the five Republican members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Does that have significance? I think it has tremendous significance. What do I think is the significance? It is just this, Mr. President: Here are five Republicans; and the record of our hearings over the years shows that they

are five Republicans who certainly have wide differences in points of view on many subjects coming before that committee. They have reached the conclusion that national health legislation is needed. That is of great significance because they are also five Republicans whose record makes it perfectly clear that they are striving to find the answers to the questions which come before the committee on the basis of the facts. They are trying to find the answer on the basis of the needs of our people. They are motivated completely by a desire to meet national needs within the framework of our constitutional form of government. We may differ with this detail or that detail. One may say, "I think you go too far with this," and another may say, "I do not think you go far enough in your proposal." However, we are in agreement upon objectives. That is what is so significant about this development within the Republican Party.

Mr. President, I would say to the Republicans across the Nation that these two national health bills introduced by these five Republicans show the conscientious endeavor and striving now going on in the Republican Party in the United States Senate to try to meet the needs of our people which the facts presented to us show must be met. We shall try to have the Republican Party give the American people the health protection which I think our capitalistic economy is capable of giving to them, without in any way endangering our political democracy.

Listen to some of the language, Mr. President, in the report of the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from Missouri. Unless one has gone through, as the Presiding Officer has gone through, many weeks of committee hearings and many hours of committee discussion, it is rather difficult fully to appreciate the thrill and great political significance which is really embodied in the language which I am about to read. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, it is a very thrilling thing. I would, in all kindness, say, from this desk, to the American Medical Association, "Do not make the mistake of discounting the fact that five Republicans on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as the result of their experiences as members of that committee, and based upon the knowledge they have developed and gained through many hearings on the question of the need for improved medical service and medical facilities in this country, have come forward with two proposed pieces of legislation on national health legislation. Although the bills differ in some respects, they have so many common similarities that I think the American Medical Association can take their introduction in the Senate as pretty striking evidence that Republican leaders who have been called upon directly to deal with this problem in the Senate of the United States have reached the conclusion that something needs to be done."

We have yet to determine just what form of action we shall take. But listen, Mr. President, to what the Senators say in this report. I read from page 8–B:

SPIRIT IN WHICH THE BILL IS OFFERED

The authors of this bill do not suppose that they or any one else has produced the final word in national health legislation. They have studied all the major legislative proposals now pending in this field and are conscious of the peculiar merits and defects of each approach. They fully expect that whatever legislation emerges from congressional deliberation on this subject will not embody the doctrine of any particular faction but will combine features of every major proposal.

I am sure my good friend from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would not object to my saying that earlier this afternoon, when I went over and congratulated him upon offering this document today—I think I quote him absolutely accurately, if not verbatim—he said:

WAYNE, there are a great many things in common between our proposal and your proposal. I do not think we are going to have any serious difficulty in working out a combined program before we get through with this that will give us the best possible bill consistent with the basic principles upon which both groups are, in general, agreed.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio. I accept the language in his report which I have just read this afternoon, and I want to repeat it, because I think it is characteristic of the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I think it is clear that he is undertaking, in this session of Congress, to narrow the areas of differences and disagreements within our party in the Senate, trying to come forward with a constructive program based upon the facts; trying, at the same time, as stated, in effect, in this magnificent report, to preserve this great way of life which we call the American system, and which, earlier in my remarks today, I called "this system of political and economic democracy."

With that objective, whether it be in health legislation, labor legislation, tax legislation, veterans' affairs, or any other great piece of social legislation coming before the Congress, I want to say here and now that I shall endeavor to narrow to the smallest possible area my differences with my distinguished colleagues on this side of the aisle, differing only in case we reach a point where, in good conscience, I believe our difference may involve one of fundamental principle and policy.

So, Mr. President, when the Senator from Ohio, in this magnificent report, joined by the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Missouri, said they fully expect that whatever legislation emerges from congressional deliberation on this subject will not embody the doctrine of any particular faction, but will combine features of every major proposal, as one of the cosponsors of Senate bill 1456, I am sure that I speak the view of all the Senators whose names appear on that bill when I say that we stand ready and willing at all times to try to work out a common agreement and a common understanding with the sponsors of the health bill introduced today. We shall cooperate with them in the hope that we can come out of the Eighty-first Congress with a piece of legislation on this subject which will fairly solve what, after all, is a nonpartisan issue.

I think I should be pardoned and excused, Mr. President, if I express this feeling of pleasure and pride because of the contributions made today by the three Republican Senators to whom I have referred. In my judgment, it constitutes a great step forward in bringing about a degree of teamwork on the Republican side which for a long time past I have felt we did not have.

I do not want to embarrass anyone, but I read the newspaper this morning, and I desire to say one other word about the Senator from Ohio. I want to say that the statement published in the newspaper this morning of his views, as expressed yesterday, concerning the obligations of our party to go forward with constructive legislation which will meet the needs of the American people, is a statement I once again heartily endorse. It is a cry for liberalism in the Republican Party which some of us, often subjected to bitter criticism for uttering, nevertheless have continued to utter for years and years gone by. We welcome new recruits always. I shall always be happy to join with the Senator from Ohio in trying to lead the Republican Party down the straight road of constructive liberalism for which liberalism the press this morning reports he pleaded yesterday.

I repeat, I think we are getting somewhere. I think we are going to be a different party when we go to the polls in 1950 and 1952 than we were when we went to the polls in 1948. Not only do I think we are going to be a party that pledges itself to constructive liberalism, but if we can go forward with the type of legislation the Senator from Ohio pleaded for yesterday and which the Senator from Ohio and two of his colleagues presented in their statement today, we can go to the polls in 1950 and 1952 with a record of constructive liberalism. Some of us urged more of such legislation in both the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. I think if the Republicans had adopted some of our liberal proposals we would have won in 1948.

There are a couple of more paragraphs I wish to read from what I think is a notable statement, issued today by the Senator from Ohio and his two colleagues respecting the bill. The statement is:

But they are convinced that no legislation is adequate unless it conforms to certain principles which this bill seeks to express. These principles are:

1. The quest for good health is a many-sided, long-range problem and demands a many-sided, long-range program.

I agree, Mr. President.

2. The supply of health facilities and professional personnel must keep pace with the effective demand for health services. If this elementary principle is ignored, a serious lowering of quality is bound to follow.

I completely agree.

3. No Government program should call for expenditures beyond the financial resources of Government, which in turn are limited by the degree of taxation which a free economy can support. Deficit financing

merely puts off the day of reckoning and must never be resorted to for a welfare program except in cases of desperate emergency when sufficient funds are not available out of general revenue.

I enthusiastically agree, Mr. President.

I digress for a moment to say that the statement raises a great many interesting overtones to which I think the Republican Party must hearken, if we are going to do the type of constructive job for which the Senator from Ohio pleaded yesterday and for which he has manifested his support again in the document on national health presented today. When my friends, in point 3 of this statement, talk about the general revenue of the Federal Government, and at the same time about meeting the need to promote the welfare of our people, I suggest once again that closely related to this program as well as so many others is the program of tax revision.

I am not going to make a tax speech, Mr. President. I will only say that I want to recommend to my Republican brethren that we do less talking in the Republican Party about tax increases or tax decreases; that we adopt a program of tax revision. I give this little advance notice now that I am going to offer once again, until someone can offer something better, the tax program of the Committee for Economic Development which calls for drastic overhauling of the tax structure. I will say to my Republican friends that the job of tax revision which needs to be done if the type of welfare program the Senator from Ohio is talking about in this document is to be financed on a sound basis can be accomplished to a remarkable degree if the Republican Party will give favorable consideration to the tax proposals of the Committee for Economic Development. We must stop foisting upon the American economy the inequities which are inherent in our present tax structure.

The fourth point of the Taft-Smith-Donnell report today is as follows:

4. No Government program should include activities or expenditures which can be supported by private individuals and groups or by lower levels of Government. On the contrary, Government welfare programs must always be framed in a manner and spirit which will stimulate initiative and creative activity on the part of individuals, private groups, and smaller communities.

Mr. President, I do not see how anyone who believes in our system of political and economic democracy could find fault with that statement. It sets forth an ideal, it sets forth an objective. We will run into problems when we come to implementing and effectuating it, but certainly the objective is one we should strive to attain.

Then the three Senators close by saying:

The authors of this bill are ready to cooperate with all who accept these principles, to the end that a legislative program may emerge from the Eighty-first Congress which will soundly advance the positive health of the Nation.

I think I would not be in error if I said that the authors and sponsors of Senate bill 1456 accept the offer of cooperation on the part of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Missouri, and pledge in return our cooperation in trying to work out in the weeks and months ahead a dovetailing of these two proposed pieces of legislation dealing with the national health problem so that there may emerge a constructive bill which will be consonant with the principles of government we strive to maintain.

I now issue an invitation, Mr. President. I issue an invitation to the American Medical Association. I issue an invitation to the thousands upon thousands of doctors across this land to join forces with us in trying to bring forth in the first Congress it is possible to bring it forth—the Eighty-first Congress, if possible; the Eighty-second certainly—a piece of health legislation which will properly serve the needs of the people of the country, avoid the nationalization of the medical profession, but also make it possible for the medical profession to carry out, and truly carry out, the great social obligation and trust which is theirs. I invite the American Medical Association and the doctors to follow that course of citizen-statesmanship action. I advise them to divert themselves, to turn completely around in the course which they seem now to be pursuing—of beating the tom-toms and the political war drums against Members of Congress who take the position that they as doctors and as doctors' associations do not have the right to say that only such legislation as they write and propose shall pass the Congress. I extend that invitation with great sincerity, but also with the warning that if it is a political fight the American Medical Association wants, it certainly can have it.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, during the debate on the housing bill the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], coauthor of the bill, will be unavoidably absent from the Senate. I wish to say for him that the bill meets with his hearty approval. He hopes and trusts that it may shortly be enacted into law. The Senator from New York was one of the pioneers in the Senate in housing legislation. He was constantly consulted in the formulation and the revision of the bill before us, which as reported represents his best and considered judgment on this important subject with which he has had so much to do and to which he has contributed so much during his long and brilliant public career.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am besieged by the State Department and others to make a very brief statement on the significance of Pan-American Day. Would it annoy the Senator from Alabama if I were to ask him to yield to me for a few brief remarks at this time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; the Senator from Texas could not annoy the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will file that for future reference. [Laughter.] I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, this is Pan-American Day. Once again we in the United States strike hands with our neighbors to the south who live in that great expanse of land stretching from the Rio Grande to Tierra del Fuego and Cape Horn.

On this Pan-American Day all of our peoples can look back with pride upon a heroic and cultured past that is filled with decisive steps of progress. This gives us confidence that we are building firmly a future of civilization and peace.

If we turn back but 59 years, we come upon the origin of the Organization of American States. Here is a persistent story of learning how to live together in peace. Here is the dramatic example of a great international organization that was born in the New World 30 years before the League of Nations saw the light of day. Here is a model of free regional association taking its form more recently in the conference at Mexico City, and under the Rio treaty.

When the United States, under the gallant leadership of Washington, gained its independence upon the field of battle we gave inspiration to the peoples of South America and Central America to look toward the eventual realization of their aspirations. As a result, over a long period of years revolutions in Latin-America resulted in the liberation of all the nations of which we now speak.

From the days of Washington and Bolivar the inter-American path has been the path to human liberty and human welfare. It has captured the imagination of the peoples of our republics and the loyalties of their governments. Our firm desire to defend our pacific way of life has not been lost upon the like-minded free people of Europe, for the Rio Treaty has served as a guide for the North Atlantic treaty signed a few days ago. The so-called Rio Treaty, signed at Rio de Janeiro, perpetuated, as it were, the Monroe Doctrine, and placed it in the form of a statute. The Monroe Doctrine laid down the principle that the freedom and independence, the territory, and the integrity of the governments of the Western Hemisphere should not be violated by any European power seeking to establish anywhere in this hemisphere a part of the European system.

Yet our own continental community, our own regional association, has not been self-centered. At the very outset the American Republics played a prominent part in the development of the United Nations. The statesmen of all of our countries have served in this cause with distinction. At Bogotá we all resolved "to persevere in the noble undertaking that humanity has conferred upon the United Nations." Again we solemnly

reaffirmed the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

An eminent citizen of one of the Latin-American countries has said, "America began as an ideal and continues to be an ideal." This is true. And this ideal gains daily in its practical significance for us pan-Americans—and for the world.

So, Mr. President, on this historic day, the anniversary of the creation and formation of the Pan American Union, later the Association of American States, we of the United States send a message through the pulsating waves of the ether between us and Central and South America, that we shall continue in the future, as in the past, to be the exemplars of freedom, free government, constitutional processes, and peace, and the preservation of the integrity and sanctity of the territories of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Texas, and to make a further statement in my own behalf.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this is my maiden speech in the Senate. I am happy it is made on Pan-American Day and has to do with the Pan-American Republics and the union which they have brought about, which is a subject dear to my heart.

Mr. President, there was a time not so long ago—all of us are old enough to remember it well—when the average American and most of us felt that international relations and foreign policy could be taken for granted, and the impact of one national ideology or system of government on another simply never entered into our calculations. That happy-go-lucky period of peace and calm has, as all of us are only too well aware, definitely become a thing of the past.

Among the lessons which we have had to learn in respect to the relationships among nations and people is the fact that the wise admonition that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" holds as well for our policies and attitudes abroad as it does for our programs and activities at home. With our very way of life under peril from without and within, we have no alternative to spending much time, much thought, and much effort in making certain that the bulwarks of our country stand firm and that our international policies be so devised as to create confidence abroad and to demonstrate a consistency of purpose that all can understand and recognize.

In our relations with many of the countries of Europe and with most of the regions of Asia, our foreign policy leaves much to be desired, and many times it seems that we are struggling around in uncertain seas on an uncharted course. I think it is fitting, however, that on this day—Pan-American Day, the day of the Americas—we pause from our many other duties for a few minutes to emphasize the fact that at least here in the Western Hemisphere, as has so well been pointed out by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], we people of the American Republics—and in the use of this term I include Canada as as a full-fledged member—have worked out a formula for cooperation and for a peaceful existence which should encourage a weary world to realize that there are ways by which wars can be averted and international friendships made firm.

Today we can look across friendly frontiers to the sister nations of this hemisphere, both to the north and south, whose goals, like ours, are peace, prosperity, and plenty for all. We can take heart from the knowledge that our country is one of this great sisterhood of American Republics, each of which was born of man's determination to be free, and was nourished in that friendly faith. It is a great thing to know and reflect on the solidarity that welds this hemisphere into one mighty stronghold of freedom. That basic fact of freedom is like a granite bedrock in the Americas, and extends underneath all surface differentiations of race and language in our lands.

There are pacts and treaties of many kinds binding the American Republics together. In the first instance, there is the organization of American states itself, comprised of all our countries, and affording the framework for common action. There is a treaty for bringing about peaceful settlement of differences among our countries and for furthering economic and cultural development and interchange. There is the great Pan-American building itself, here in Washington, which provides a tangible demonstration that people of different countries can meet around the council tables to adjust their differences and promote the common cause. There is the act of Chapultepec which gives force to our good intentions, and provides the means of assuring good international behavior of each of the members of our international fraternity.

However, on this Pan-American Day, I should like to approach our inter-American relations from another angle, and stress what seems to me to be one of the most important elements in the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. What I have in mind are the countless, constant unofficial interchanges of people and programs crossing and recrossing boundary lines as friendly visitors in search of knowledge or on missions of good will. I refer here, Mr. President, not to the action of our governments or to the travel of diplomats and people moving with official passports; I refer, instead, to the friendly individual gestures on the part of our citizens, that may not even be officially noticed, but that, nevertheless, help build a mighty bridge of understanding across the gulf of differences, just as coral islands are built up cell by cell.

There are innumerable such interchanges, involving literally hundreds of thousands of citizens acting either singly or in groups in specialized organizations of one type or another. They are not concerned primarily with foreign policy, as such, or with protocol or with material profit. To use an old phrase, they are making friends by being friends, through demonstrating and exercising a friendship transcending the boundaries of race, language, or religion.

Let me point out just a few of these nongovernmental, nonofficial activities which contribute to the great fabric of inter-American understanding and good will. Each comprises a small but important step up the stairway leading to the permanent peace which all of us envision as a continuing climate for the Western Hemisphere.

It is not surprising that women are among the leaders in such activities. Many of us will recall the inspiring, inclusive program carried out all over the country a year or so ago by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, along the lines of history, physiography, and the achievements of the other American Republics. Doubtless, most of us read in last week's newspapers about the arrival here of visitors representative of five women's organizations in Latin America. They are here to spend 3 months as guest observers of the General Federation, the National League of Women Voters, the YWCA, the American Association of University Women, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and other splendid organizations of women in the United States. These same clubs and others, representing both men and women, frequently offer scholarships so that young Latin Americans may study in colleges and universities in this country, and so that young students from the United States may have similar opportunities to study and travel in Latin America. These friendships, made in the formative years of youth, may well have incalculable influence in later life. One such association is the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which not only arranges for scholarships for Latin American students in colleges here, and vice versa, but offers an educational news service in Spanish. Industry, likewise, makes possible specialized training in many fields, from which mutual benefits are reaped both north and south of the Rio Grande River and both north and south of the southern border of Canada.

Then there is another kind of approach, through bringing about a better understanding of the respective national heroes of the American Republics. The statue of Bolivar in Central Park is every year the scene of tribute to that great hero of independence. To take another instance, the school children of Uruguay have contributed their pennies for the purpose of purchasing a statue of the great liberator of that country, General Artigas, as a gift to the people of the United States. That noble piece of sculpture is scheduled to be unveiled here in Washington before another Pan-American Day rolls around. Our schools also help build up friendship, not only by the exchange of students and professors, but through the medium of numerous special courses on Latin America. In my own State, the University of South Dakota, at Vermillion, has for many years laid stress on the importance of inter-American relations.

Still another example of friendly relationship is offered by the flourishing little city of Montevideo, Minn., which every year celebrates a fiesta to which come as guests of honor representatives of the great Uruguayan capital of the same name. While this fiesta is being held among Minnesota's 10,000 glistening lakes, the newspapers of Montevideo, on the River Plate, thousands of miles to the south, as well as those in Minnesota, report the news of this annual festive occasion with equal gusto in most comradely fashion, and the radio carries word of this neighborly act of friendship to the people throughout both areas.

In Minnesota, also, the little city of Worthington has carried this program into an area of further friendship and understanding by its adoption of the city of Crailsheim, Germany, by which means the people of that part of Minnesota are carrying the tradition of freedom and democracy to the people of Germany, who so long have been denied the rights and privileges which come as a matter of course to the people of America.

The press and radio of the Western Hemisphere, in fact, have made innumerable contributions to better inter-American understanding. Instead of engaging in attacks upon the good intentions and good motives of each other's area, our press in the Western Hemisphere has worked constructively to create and widen areas of understanding and appreciation among the people of this entire area. Among many examples, I might call attention to the New York Herald Tribune Forum for High Schools which brought about an interchange of visits in their respective homes between teenage boys and girls of the other American Republics and of the United States. The New York Mirror Forum likewise arranged a few months ago for Latin Americans of high-school age to acquire a first-hand acquaintance with our way of life in this country. The Midwest's great Chicago Tribune and its publisher have long placed special emphasis upon developing an inter-American understanding and the creation of inter-American good will.

Recently we had the privilege of entertaining in this country the Sea Scouts from Colombia, who viewed the Brooklyn Navy Yard; the Naval Academy of Annapolis; the harbors at Philadelphia and New Orleans; and points in between, and who were accorded the courtesy of making an inspection of the presidential yacht.

Still a different angle is provided by the baseball project just launched by United States businessmen in Venezuela. Baseball, as we all know, is the great amalgamator among red-blooded, freedom-loving, law-abiding citizens, no matter in what language the umpire yells "Strike three," nor in what language the crowd good-naturedly suggests that the time has come to "kill the umpire." Countless lessons in good citizenship and in good sportsmanship, which play such an important part in making self-government a going institution, grow from the fact that the batter goes back to the dug-out after the umpire calls "Strike three," no matter how loudly he may grumble about the decision, and it is significant that the mortality of baseball umpires is no higher than that of the average citizen here in the Western Hemisphere. These businessmen in Venezuela, in recognition, are awarding to the two best amateur baseball players of that country, who will be chosen by popular vote of the local fans, an all-expense-paid trip to the United States this year to see the big-league games in action. No one in all our country would dare to say that these young Venezuelans would not return to their native habitat better citizens with a keener understanding of the virtues and values of freedom as a consequence of the experience which they are to have.

All the foregoing reminds me, Mr. President, of a great truth recently uttered by the great Mexican statesman and educator, who is also a most useful and constructive citizen of this hemisphere and of the world. I refer to Mr. Torres Bodet, the new Director General of UNESCO. If I may be pardoned for a personal reference, may I say that I take justifiable pride that it was my pleasure to sponsor in the House of Representatives the original national legislation authorizing the adherence to UNESCO of the United States and creating the base from which UNESCO has grown into a flourishing international agency for promoting and perpetuating peace. Mr. Torres Bodet, who has proclaimed his faith in what he calls union through peace by means of a culture of peace, declared 2 weeks ago at the great meeting of the UNESCO Commission in Cleveland, "War can be made between the great capitals; but peace has to be built in the slums and in the villages." That, Mr. President, is an enduring truth which I leave with the Senate and with each citizen of the Pan American Republics to think over on this Pan American Day.

Finally, Mr. President, I express the fervent hope that the splendid example of cooperation and peaceful living which the republics of the Western Hemisphere have placed before the world somehow and in some way will hold on to the imagination and the purposes of the people living in the areas of the world where self-government is permitted to function either in full or in part, regardless of the hemisphere in which the countries may be located.

It was on March 1, 1943, Mr. President, when as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress I introduced House Resolution 2034. This resolution provided ways and means for stepping up the individual interchange of student scholars and visitors among the members of the American Republics. When it failed to receive committee consideration, on June 24, 1945, I introduced into the Seventy-ninth Congress House Resolution 1740, which proposed further expansion of the areas of movement across boundaries of individual citizens on missions of good will or on tours in search of knowledge and information, but that resolution also was limited to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

However, on April 9, 1945, I introduced House Resolution 215, which sought to crystallize a larger vision and implement it into action because the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations was on and it seemed desirable that the dividends of good will realized from our international relationships in the Western Hemisphere might well be extended to the world at large.

On April 30, 1945, Mr. President, at my suggestion the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] introduced in the Senate a resolution similar to H. R. 215, which was identified as Senate Resolution 122. Before the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference, with the aid of our great colleague in this body, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], whom I am pleased to see before me as I speak, our respective resolutions were given congressional approval, and then our delegates there received the contents of the resolutions by telephone. As a result of their good efforts, the basic outline of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization was formulated at the San Francisco Conference and it was authorized to become a participating member of that organization.

In the preamble of House Resolution 215 I listed as the second reason for its passage these words:

> The future peace and security of the American and all other peoples rests upon the achievement of mutual understanding among the people of the world, the universal application of the principle of the Golden Rule, the application of reason and knowledge to the solution of domestic as well as international problems, and effective education at all levels.

Mr. President, I firmly believed those words to be true when I wrote them into House Resolution 215 in 1945, and I am more firmly convinced today than ever of their eternal verity.

In its short existence the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has made progress in the implementation of the principles set forth in the enabling legislation. Among the other countries of the world, however, both with regard to the other American republics and the countries of Europe, Africa, and Asia, great steps in the direction of utilizing mutual understanding and common rules of international decency have been achieved by UNESCO. It is my hope, Mr. President, that the clear-cut demonstration that the republics of the Western Hemisphere have given to the other portions of the world may encourage much greater steps of progress not only by UNESCO but by other policies and programs which will destroy the seeds of hatred that grow into harvest of war and create instead the areas of understanding which alone are able to make for permanent peace.

Let me conclude my remarks on Pan-American Day of 1949 by quoting a few words from the testimony with which I concluded my appeal to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1945 in urging it to give early and favorable consideration to House Resolution 215. I said then what I now reiterate:

> I think the crusade for peace today needs what we might call an ethical echelon. We have approached peace problems from the standpoint of a man's stomach, in the matter

of food supply; we have approached peace from the standpoint of the pocketbook in the Bretton Woods Conference; we have approached it from the standpoint of military might; we have approached it from the standpoint of diplomatic agreements at San Francisco; but we have not gotten around to approaching it from the standpoint of a man's heart. This resolution now before you focuses on that. Therefore I refer to this program as an ethical echelon in the battle for a permanent peace.

Mr. President, let us join in the hope that by the time Pan-American Day rolls around in 1950, we may all meet in a more peaceful climate with less strain and stress and worry among the nations of the world. Let us even dare to hope that by next Pan-American Day or soon thereafter conditions may come which will enable countries everywhere around the globe to enjoy the same fraternal cooperation and easy, friendly relationships which we of the American republics are happy to commemorate this day.

Mr. President, I have conferred with the majority and minority leaders, and with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I have before me a resolution of felicitation on the part of this body to our neighbors, the South American Republics, which I send to the desk at this time and ask unanimous consent to have read and immediately considered. To that end I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 109) was read as follows:

Whereas April 14, the founding date of the Pan American Union 59 years ago by the First International Conference of American States in Washington, has been designated "Pan American Day" and is traditionally observed by the legislatures of the American Republics; and

Whereas the Ninth International Conference of American States at Bogotá, Colombia, established the position of the Pan American Union as central permanent organ and General Secretariat of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the formation of the Organization of American States, as the consequence of more than half a century's development, and the entry into force of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance during the year 1948 are events of far-reaching significance, testifying to the vitality of the cooperation among the peoples and countries of the Americas so effectively served by the Pan American Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate extends its most cordial greetings to the representative bodies of each of the other American Republics on the occasion of Pan American Day, in recognition of the democratic system they exemplify and in reaffirmation of inter-American solidarity.

Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed through appropriate channels to the legislatures of the other American Republics and to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] for his kindness and generosity in yielding to me.

FAR EASTERN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 2, there was some discussion in the Senate relative to the China aid program, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, starting on page 3765.

I should like to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, certain documents which I desire to present. I wish briefly to say that as one Member of the Senate, I have been concerned with the far eastern policy of this Government. I am not unmindful of the problems with which the Government of the United States is faced in the very critical situation which confronts us in China and in the Far East today. There are no simple solutions of the problems which confront the world. Historically, since 1868 the "open door" policy in China has been second only to the Monroe Doctrine in long-time interest to the American people. Over a long period of time this Government has had traditionally a cordial friendship with the people of China, and has been interested in preserving and respecting its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Mr. President, we should keep in mind what General MacArthur said to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a year ago when he communicated with that body. I want briefly to quote from his statement. He said:

The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety. * * * Fragmentary decisions in disconnected sectors of the world (meaning Greece, Turkey, and western Europe) will not bring an integrated solution. * * * It would be utterly fallacious to underrate either China's needs or her importance. For if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all.

Mr. President, I hold in my hands a copy of a document called "International Press Correspondence," published on the 12th of December, 1928, volume 8, No. 88, under the general heading of "Theses and resolutions of the VI World Congress of the Communist International, Third Series." On page 1672 of that document, subsection 33, I find this language:

In China, the future growth of the revolution will place before the party as an immediate practical task the preparation for and carrying through of armed insurrection as the sole path to the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and to the overthrow of the power of the imperialists, landlords and national bourgeoisie—the power of the Kuomintang.

Under existing circumstances, characterized fundamentally by the absence of a revolutionary impulse among the wide masses of the Chinese people, the general line of the party must be the struggle for the masses. The carrying through of this line under the conditions of the strengthening of the anti-Imperialist movement of a certain revival of the strike struggle and of the continuing peasant activity, demands from the party the exertion of all its strength for gathering, consolidating, and uniting the proletariat around the basic slogans of the party an immense organizational work for the strengthening of the revolutionary trade-union and peasant associations, maximum attention to the conduct of the everyday economic and political work among the masses of the proletariat and peasantry, and intense activity in explaining to the proletariat the experience of the preceding period of the revolution. At the same time, the party must explain to the masses the possibility of a radical improvement in their position, the impossibility of the overthrow of the imperialist domination and solution of the tasks of the agrarian revolution, without the overthrow from power of the Kuomintang and militarists, and the creation of the rule of Soviets.

Mr. President, I merely read this from this special document of the Communist International to show a consistent policy on the part of the Communists. While our Government has deviated and has at times had sand thrown in its eyes, the policy of the Communists has been consistent in an endeavor to undermine and to destroy the constitutional Government of China. Even while we are meeting in the Senate today, negotiations are going on which may result in 450,000,000 Chinese being taken behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter, on the stationery of the Communist Party of New York State, dated March 1, 1949, together with the accompanying documents, which conclusively show, I believe, that the party line in this country has been to do everything possible to disrupt help to the constitutional Government of China, and to do everything possible to uphold the hands of the Communist movement in China.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949.

To All Sections and Counties:

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find program for action on China policy, as voted upon by a united front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the national education committee on Communist policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our district education department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Comradely yours,

MAY MILLER,
Assistant Organizing Secretary.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION ON CHINA POLICY AS SUGGESTED BY THE ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1949

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Demand a congressional investigation.

A. Of the Chinese lobby in Washington. One of the largest spending foreign influences in our Capital; not registered as foreign agents.

B. Of the billions of dollars of private accumulation deposited in American banks and investments by Chinese officials and individuals.

2. Demand a new China policy.

A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing.

C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

3. Get the facts and implications of the Government's China policy to the American people.

IMMEDIATE STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT THE ACTION PROGRAM

1. Get your organization immediately to pass a resolution on China policy (use the enclosed January conference resolution for suggestions). Send copies of your organization's resolution to your Senators and your Congressmen; give it publicity in your organization's publication and elsewhere; send a copy to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

2. Make use of the "political ammunition" of facts: the American people, if they know, will act.

A. Make a drive to get readers and subscribers to Far East Spotlight, the committee's monthly magazine. This is the indispensable tool for every fighter for a new and friendly policy toward China. Previous sources of reliable information about China and the Far East now have an NAM slant; only Far East Spotlight gives you the positive and encouraging facts about the Chinese people's great and successful fight against American reaction, and keeps you up to date about Washington's evil plans to go on backing reaction in China and the Far East. Subscription: $2 a year. Introductory offer: $1 for 8 months. Members of the CDFEP get this free.

B. Push the sale and reading of Anna Louise Strong's Tomorrow's China. Paper bound, 65 cents; cloth bound, $2. Organizational orders for five or more: 25-percent discount.

C. Have meetings on the China policy issue

(a) The committee can furnish speakers:

In the New York City area: Telephone the Speaker's Bureau of the committee any afternoon, Bryant 9–6343.

In California, the San Francisco area: contact Mr. William Kerner, 1841 Ellis Street, San Francisco.

Los Angeles area: Contact Mrs. Jeanette Orel, 362 South Columbia Avenue, Los Angeles.

(b) Send your organization's own speakers to the Briefing Session on China. First session: Friday night, February 18, 7:30 sharp. Telephone the committee for registration blanks; Bryant 9–6342. No fee.

You can't fight without facts. Far East Spotlight is your basic source of information. Meetings on China will bring facts to hundreds of others * * *.

3. See to it that the President and the Members of Congress hear from hundreds of individuals on China policy right now.

Order prepared postcards from the committee—1 cent each. Write your own messages. Make calls—in person and by telephone—on your Senators and Congressmen.

4. Have your organization make an immediate contribution to the work of the committee or plan to give a regular (monthly, quarterly, or yearly) contribution.

5. Support the committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

A. By becoming members and by getting your friends to join. Membership includes subscription to Far East Spotlight.

B. By securing individual contributions for the committee. Your own; your friends; throw a party for the committee.

C. By doing volunteer work at the committee's office; 111 West Forty-second Street, fifth floor—any time; any day.

Every Thursday night the staff is at home to friends who come to help.

The Chinese people are defeating the American reactionaries. So can we.

China policy reveals the over-all character of Washington's foreign policy—it harms the American people.

China policy is directly related to our domestic struggle for homes, for more consumption goods, for lower prices, for increased social security, for healthy international trade, for freedom from depression and militarism.

China shows up the weak spot in our reactionaries' program.

Let's fight on China policy and take advantage of the blow the Chinese people have dealt the American reactionaries.

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY.

ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK, JANUARY 29, 1949—RESOLUTION ON CHINA POLICY

This Action Conference on China Policy, meeting in New York City on January 29, 1949, and attended by 182 registered delegates and observers from 80 organizations and including 48 individual participants, voted to send to every Member of the Eighty-first Congress, through the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, under whose auspices the conference was held, the following resolution:

"In view of the following facts:

"1. That our Government since VJ-day has violated both the democratic objective of World War II and the Charter of the United Nations in giving support to the antidemocratic and dictatorial Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek.

"2. That our Government since VJ-day has made available to the Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek over $6,000,000,000 worth of the resources of the American people for use in civil war against the people of China who are our historic friends and allies in the task of building a peaceful, prosperous, and democratic world.

"3. That American guns, bullets, airplanes, bombs, poison gas, gasoline jelly, and flame throwers have brought suffering, death, and destruction to millions of people in China, thus threatening the alienation of the 1,500,000,000 people of Asia who are our natural allies in a democratic world.

"4. That we Americans whose resources have been wasted and misused in China are still waiting for adequate and decent housing, for lower prices on consumption goods and food, for increased social security, for mutually beneficial trade relations between our two countries as a factor in preventing a depression, and for freedom from militarism and for the security which only peaceful and cooperative relations among nations can give.

"5. That our Government's policy toward China is causing frictions and misunderstandings that can easily lead to conflicts and even to war.

"6. That the people of China have decisively demonstrated their purpose and power to rid themselves of the callous, cruel, antidemocratic, and outworn feudal regime which for the past years has existed only with outside (American) support and have shown their power to negate all the military advice, training, and equipment given by the United States to the Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek, and are now establishing a functioning government of their own creating;

"7. That there are nationally prominent American political, military, and publishing figures openly and secretly advocating and working for continued and intensified intervention in the internal affairs of China against the Chinese people;

"8. That a strong Chinese lobby is at work in Washington (one of the biggest money-spending foreign influences in our Capital but not registered as a foreign agent) trying to influence our Government authorities to continue support of the antidemocratic and unpopular Kuomintang elements;

"9. That the very Chinese officials and individuals who are urging more pouring out of the American people's money in China are known to have accumulated billions of dollars (wrung from the suffering people of China and stolen from the pockets of the American taxpayers) and now stowed away in American banks and investments: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That we go on record as demanding:

"1. That there be a congressional investigation—

"A. Into the activities of the Chinese lobby in this country; and

"B. Into the private wealth which Chinese officials and individuals have stowed away in American banks and investments.

"2. That there be an immediate end to all forms of American intervention in China including an end to any dealings with any elements or remnants of the Kuomintang regime, recognizing the right of the Chinese people to make decisions about their country free of all pressure or interference on the part of our Government.

"3. That our Government prepare to recognize the government which the Chinese people are now establishing for themselves and that our authorities begin planning for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with that government, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Toronto Evening Telegram of January 15, 1949, written by Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev, who was formerly a Soviet jet and air-research expert who carried out secret tasks for the Politburo and was privy to the innermost councils of the Kremlin, who fled his country to find freedom in Great Britain, and who has a very clear analysis of the importance which the Communist Government in Russia gives to the activities which have been taking place in China. I ask to have it printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS DELAY CRISIS IN WEST AND CONCENTRATE ON ORIENT IN PLAN OF WORLD CONQUEST—LACK OF A-BOMB, ANGLO-UNITED STATES AIR SUPERIORITY AND UNREST IN RUSSIA FORCE STALIN TO HOLD BACK IN GERMANY—UNITED STATES BLUNDERS LOSING CHINA

(By Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev)

The most important fact about the U. S. S. R. that you of the west must get into your heads is that Stalin means business.

By business I mean world domination by any means, including war. There would in all probability already have been war, or at least a red-hot incident, over Berlin, but for three facts:

1. American monopoly of the atomic bomb.
2. Anglo-American air superiority.
3. Widespread discontent inside the U. S. S. R., not only in the armed forces and the population, but also in the ruling circles.

The last fact was perhaps the most important of all, and needs a little explanation. The Politburo made a number of promises to the population during the war, but immediately the urgent need for popular backing was past, it became evident that these promises would not be kept.

QUIETED BY LIQUIDATION

The immediate reaction of the Politburo to the widespread discontent which became manifest was a large-scale purge in all the spheres of Soviet life, and in particular a thorough purge of the intelligentsia under the personal supervision of the late Zhadanov, one of the most hated of Soviet leaders.

The ultimate aim of Soviet policy is the creation, by armed conflict, if necessary, of a universal Soviet Union. The argument is stated repeatedly in primer-clear language in all the principal works of bolshevism—and by none more forcefully than Stalin himself. Stalin said: "The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a specifically Russian theory but a theory compulsory for all countries." The temptation in the west is to put down bolshevism's fantastic ambitions as sheer claptrap, but the Soviet Union is rearming as fast as the Politburo can drive the exhausted, disenchanted, and unhappy people in its power.

TEMPO IS FEVERISH

Preparations for the struggle proceed at a feverish tempo in every branch of Soviet life. No single event since the revolution itself—not even the sudden German onslaught in 1939—ever caused more consternation among the members of the Politburo than the dropping of the first atom bomb on Hiroshima. The realization that the most powerful of the capitalist countries had come into possession of a weapon which at a stroke, had outmoded all the war machines of Communist politics was a stunning blow.

CHANGE IN STRATEGY

Since 1945, by Stalin's specific orders, Soviet strategy started to be completely overhauled to accord with the potentialities of the so-called American experiment. For 3½ years Soviet science has been striving to solve the atom problem in a practical way. Everything connected with the problem commands supertop priority. Great numbers of workmen and the brains of the leading physicists and technologists are concentrated upon this single objective. If all goes as at present a practical as distinct from an experimental atomic bomb will not be in possession of the Soviet Union before 1951–53.

DATES STILL HELD

Those dates were still the basic planning dates in Soviet policy when I left Soviet service some months ago. Since a war with the United States on anything like equal terms was unthinkable without the atomic bomb, the Politburo was compelled to take a number of strategic and tactical steps in order to avoid a direct hot war. The outstanding example of one of these steps is the war now being waged in southeast Asia. I do not say that war will necessarily come in 3 to 5 years, but I warn you that Stalin will be ready then. Stalin is the same old Stalin. Mr. Roosevelt failed to charm him, and Mr. Churchill to move him. The fantastic burgeoning of western power has temporarily puzzled and frustrated him. But as a Marxist dialectician he will undoubtedly take any chance which may present itself in any future crisis and/or upheavals in the capitalist world provided the atom bomb problem is solved.

POLITBURO POLICY

The next question is: Where is Soviet policy headed right now? There is no such thing as Soviet foreign policy. There is only a Politburo policy. The 13 men who stand at the summit of power inside the Soviet Union conduct its foreign affairs. Looking out from Moscow, Stalin and Co. visualize the Soviet revolutionary destiny in terms of two immense tasks. Task one is Europe generally, beginning with Germany, task two—Asia, beginning with China. For obvious reasons, Europe was in the beginning, and still remains, task one.

The collapse of Germany, leaving an apparent vacuum in Europe, presented the Politburo with an incredible opportunity. It concentrated at once on task one, confident that in a matter of a few years, possibly by the end of 1950, it would be master of the European Continent. However, many things went wrong.

DRIVES FAILED

The failure of Communist drives in Italy, France, and Germany; the inherently anti-Communist cast of British labor; the defection of Tito; the fact that western Communists exposed themselves as closely linked with the Kremlin; the return of United States power to Europe in the form of the Marshall plan—all these combined to bring the drive westward to a temporary standstill. These difficulties compelled a reappraisal of strategy. It was conceded by the Politburo that the struggle for Europe would prove much harder than had been assumed; and it would be dangerous to attempt to pursue it to conclusion so long as task two remained unmastered. Therefore the Politburo decided to shift its attention to Asia—with consequences now plain to everybody.

MASTERING CHINA

They have so far failed in Europe, but they are on the verge of mastering China. The Politburo has achieved in China success on a scale that the west has not yet even begun to realize. There is a popular theory that the next world war will start over China. No matter what happens elsewhere, the Politburo is basing its strategy upon the assumption that the war will be decided in Europe. As soon as task two approaches completion—perhaps in the next few months, perhaps in another year—then the Politburo will return, with whetted appetite and confidence, to Europe. Therein lies the true significance of China's collapse. From the Soviet strategic point of view, the fact that Mao Tse-tung has finally all but brought Chiang Kai-shek down after 2 decades of incessant struggle is only of incidental importance.

REAR IS PROTECTED

The great thing is that the ever-vulnerable rear of the Soviet Union is in the process of being secured; China's open door is closing against the west, which first pried it ajar. The collapse of China has advanced with a speed which must have surprised even the most optimistic Soviet military experts. Two mistakes have obviously helped to bring on the avalanche. The lackadaisical attitude of the west to the Soviet grip on Outer Mongolia, which has since become the main Soviet arsenal in Asia, is the first and most outstanding reason for the present collapse of China. The second mistake was that through General Marshall's efforts to impose a coalition government, the United States, in effect championed the Chinese Communists as true "agrarian liberals" and contributed to the undermining of the established government. The attempts of General Marshall to reconcile Chiang Kai-shek with Mao Tse-tung proved that the Americans have not yet clearly understood the basic principles of communism; that is, the fact that never, or under any conditions, would Communists accept loyal collaboration with non-Communists.

SOVIET AMAZED

Inside the Soviet Union, Marshall's strange efforts to divide Chiang Kai-shek's power with Mao Tse-tung's Communist regime were followed with incredulous satisfaction. For one intoxicating moment it almost appeared that the distinguished American would actually succeed where even Vanming, one member of the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party, an outstanding Comintern personality and a close friend of Stalin's, had failed. Though Marshall's coalition scheme finally broke upon the rock of Chiang's opposition, his withdrawal from China, accompanied by a virtual cessation of all United States aid to the Chiang Kai-shek government, in effect represented a strategic victory for Mao against Chiang. It cleared the way for the current Communist offensives. With Chiang left to his fate, the way was open for a Soviet thrust into Asia at practically no risk. Soviet arms and military might flowed into the vacuum, and Chiang's unsupported armies were brushed aside. It would seem now that another mistake is to be added to the previous ones.

WOULD AID REDS

Mr. Hoffman, of the Economic Cooperation Administration, has been quoted as saying in Shanghai that even in the event of the Communists coming into control of the Government, United States economic aid to China would continue. Is it possible that the western diplomats have not yet understood that any kind of compromise with the Communists is a danger to world peace?

There is a myth, fostered with consummate skill and assiduity by Soviet propagandists, that the Chinese Communists, far from owing allegiance to theoretical Marxism or the Cominform, are only simple Oriental agrarians hungry for land and democracy. I have also heard the hope expressed by otherwise intelligent people in the west that Mao Tse-tung, though a self-avowed Communist, is really an agrarian nationalist, who, if pressed hard by the Kremlin, would rebel as Tito has done.

Concerning the Chinese masses enlisted under the Red banner, it can be confidently stated that their views will have no more influence upon Mao's decisions than is the case under other Communist dictatorships.

A TRUE BELIEVER

Mao himself is a dedicated Communist, a true believer. He has never deviated from the party line and was the first of the non-Soviet proconsuls to denounce Tito's heresy. If his victories continue, he will certainly go down in Asiatic history as the Lenin of China. Chu-teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Communists armies, is a talented military leader. A highly placed Soviet general described him in the following terms: "He could without any further training be put in command of any Soviet front and would carry out his duties as well as any Soviet marshal."

Chu-teh is not only a revolutionary Communist, but also an officer who went through the "correspondence course" of the Soviet General Staff Academy.

He is supported by good Soviet staff officers, the greater part of whom are of Chinese nationality. I saw him for the first time in Moscow in or about 1934, but I know that he visited the U. S. S. R. quite often, and I also know that he commands unbounded authority among the Soviet military leaders.

WORKS WITH SOVIET

I could name a number of Soviet officers of all ranks who have been working under

him for the past 10 to 15 years. The adroitness with which Chi-teh has maneuvered his armies during the past years suggests a special aptitude for managing mass armies. He and Mao complement each other. They form a powerful combination, the most dangerous pair now tramping the Asiatic stage, and are the revolutionary barometer in Asia. But to assume that they have produced these colossal results themselves as many do, is to miss the whole point of the struggle for Asia.

I myself never went to China for the Soviet government, but I have served with officers who know the situation well, and I have also studied the question thoroughly.

The Chinese Communist army is some 2,300,000 strong. (The Chinese Communist party has 2,800,000 members.)

The higher staff posts are held by Soviet officers of Chinese, Korean, and Mongolian nationalities. Many of these were recently serving in the Soviet Army, went through the Soviet military academies and colleges, or else commanded Soviet military formations in the East.

EASILY OBTAINED

No one can estimate the number of Soviet officers now holding high-ranking commands or staff posts in Chu-teh's and Mao Tse-tung's armies. One thing is certain. There are many more of them than is realized in the West. One must also remember that there are a great many Chinese, Koreans, and Mongolians in the U. S. S. R. Finally, one should also bear in mind the existence of the Mongolian People's Republic under Choi Bolsan. The basis of the higher political personnel in the Chinese Communist army was made up of graduates from the Communist University of the Workers of the East (KUTV) in Moscow, and also from the Institute of the Peoples of the East in Leningrad, plus various workers' faculties, institutes, and universities in the U. S. S. R.

PLENTY OF WEAPONS

The Soviet areas of China now possess their own armament factories, most of which were built under Soviet direction. But there are not enough of them for the needs of the Chinese Communist army. After the defeat of Japan the Chinese Communists received masses of Japanese arms from the Soviet; in addition they are getting great quantities of arms of Soviet manufacture, but stamped with foreign markings. These include automatic weapons, artillery, machine guns, grenades, pistols, mortars, etc.

The Chinese Communist army has a large number of Soviet aircraft, mostly obsolescent. Radio equipment is practically wholly Soviet, except for that captured from Chiang Kai-shek, which is American. Paper used by Chinese Communists is practically all from the Soviet Union. An odd fact is that according to a treaty of June, 1945, the Soviet Government agreed to supply Chiang Kai-shek's government with arms. (This agreement was the biggest and most stupid mistake Chiang ever made.)

For the arms never reached Chiang. Mao-tse-tung's forces intercepted most of them on the way from the Soviet Union to Nanking.

CALLED WAR BOOTY

In this way the Chinese Communists could always claim that arms of Soviet origin in their possession were not actually supplied by the U. S. S. R. but came under the heading of war booty. They thus saved any diplomatic embarrassment which might have arisen. The hidden source of power of Chinese communism is Outer Mongolia, now the so-called Mongolian People's Republic. This is the Soviet fortress. It maintains a very large, well-equipped national army which, in the higher echelons, is almost entirely Soviet-officered. Besides this, a purely Soviet formation—comprising all types of arms, air force, artillery, tanks, infantry, etc.—are quartered in Outer Mongolia. Soviet formations are being sent there quite openly for duty as they are sent to any other part of the Soviet Union. There was no demobilization of this force after the war—a significant fact.

CHIANG'S NEEDS

Chiang has been discredited as a military leader, but he still retains some political influence. What Chiang always lacked was a clean-cut progressive policy and slogans which would rouse the people to his support in a struggle. In order to remedy the present situation special attention should be paid to what I have just said.

Chiang also needs strong military advisers, capable of appreciating the present serious situation. But all this will not be sufficient if Chiang does not get imediate support in arms, supplies, and technical equipment. If he fails and China passes under Mao's control the rest of the Asiatic pot, now simmering, will boil over.

The unexpected opportunities for mischief now opening to the Politburo in Asia are almost unlimited. Rehearsals have already taken place in Indochina, Burma, Malaya, and the Netherlands East Indies, and the Politburo has a stern picture of the situation there. The Politburo will now do everything possible and even strive to do the impossible in order to make the western powers disperse their armed forces in all the corners of the world—thus striking a mighty strategical blow. It is vital to the West to understand this. Stalin would then consider task two as under control. He could then turn to task one (Europe) with relatively free hands. If the West fails to challenge and check him in the East, the inevitable show-down in the West will almost certainly come much more quickly and under conditions increasingly to Stalin's advantage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed an article which appeared in the Washington Post of April 4, 1949, referring to the statement of Mao Tze-tung, one of the top Communist leaders in China, who clearly stated that in the event of a show-down between Communist Russia and the western powers, the Communist forces in China would be found on the side of the Soviet Union

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS PLEDGE CHINA TO WAR FOR RUSSIA—COMMUNISTS ISSUE STATEMENT ATTACKING NORTH ATLANTIC PACT AMID PEACE PARLEYS

NANKING, April 3.—The Chinese Communists said amid peace negotiations with the Nationalists tonight that they would unite the people of China to fight for Russia in any war between the Soviet Union and the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

A Communist broadcast quoted a statement signed by No. 1 Communist Mao Tze-tung and other leftist leaders, denouncing the western treaty and pledging aid to Russia in event of war.

Discussions for settling the 22-year-old war between the Reds and the Nationalist government continued behind closed doors in Peiping.

CEASE-FIRE PROPOSED

Details of the talks were kept secret, but the government party newspaper Central Daily News said the six-man Nationalist delegation led off with proposals for a cease-fire and the calling of a multiparty political consultation conference.

This report drew an indirect denial from official sources who said the early stages were devoted to mapping an agenda for discussion.

The Communist broadcast tonight said that, in event of war between east and west, even if it should start on the other side of the world, the Communists and their associated democratic parties would unite the people to "march forward hand in hand with the ally of China, the Soviet Union."

TREATY CALLED AGGRESSIVE

The joint Communist-leftist statement condemned the North Atlantic Treaty as endangering "peace and the security of mankind" by aiming at a "new aggressive world war."

It was signed by Mao and leaders of the Democratic League, which recently moved its headquarters north from Hongkong; the National Democratic Association, peasants-workers groups, and the National Salvation Society.

Meanwhile, travelers from North China reported that more than 3,000 university students suspected of anti-Communist thinking have been massed in a huge concentration camp near Peiping.

Thousands of persons—students, former government officials and private individuals—were reported fleeing southward in increasing numbers daily, trying to get into areas still held by the Nationalists.

The refugees journeying to South China travel mostly by rail and bus to Tsinan in Shantung province or to Tangku, the port for Tientsin, and then by ship to government-held cities.

The official military news agency reported that Gen. Lin Piao's Manchurian Communists had arrived in central China and attacked Hsinyang, strategic rail town 100 miles north of Hankow. Lin Piao's troops earlier were reported moving in a southerly direction toward Nanking.

Gen. Liu Po-shen's Communists at the same time were reported attacking Huayan, 50 miles to the south.

Communist attacks on the Yangtze River port of Anking, 145 miles southwest of Nanking, continued with increasing fury, the agency said, while a small Nationalist bridgehead at Tuchiao, 50 miles northeast of Anking, was believed to have fallen to the Reds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say that it seems to me that before this country develops its final plan for the implementation of the North Atlantic treaty, with such military assistance as may be necessary to preserve free nations of western Europe, this Government should take into consideration the needs of not only what is left of free China, but should also take into consideration the needs of the constitutional government of Korea.

Mr. President, the facts of the matter are that the military situation in south Korea is very precarious, and if not corrected immediately, it may lead to the ultimate destruction of the legal government of Korea.

I merely wish to point out facts which can be substantiated that indicate the north Korea Communist government has some 196,530 armed men at its disposal, while the legally constituted government of Korea, in south Korea, recognized by the United States, and established under a mandate of the United Nations, has less than half that number. The legal government of Korea is in urgent need of arms from this country if the people of that nation are to protect themselves against ultimately being overrun.

Mr. President, I again express the hope that those charged under the Constitution with the foreign policy of this Gov-

ernment, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the able Foreign Relations Committee which we have representing the Senate, will start immediately to give their attention to developing a sound and consistent far eastern policy. At the present time it appears that we have no far eastern policy. The most recent statement attributed to the State Department is that, insofar as China is concerned, they are merely waiting until the smoke blows away to see what happens. By the time the smoke blows away 450,000,000 Chinese may be behind the iron curtain.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, S. 1070, the Housing Act of 1949, is one of the most fundamental measures for the betterment of the living conditions of the American people ever to be considered by this body. Housing is a national problem, in the same profound sense that the cost of living, the conditions of industrial employment and production, the well-being of our agricultural economy, and the protection of our citizens against insecurity in employment and old age, are all national problems. The effect of bad housing conditions is felt in every city in the country, in small towns, in rural villages, and on the farms. Their effect bears heavily on the welfare of millions of American families, and on the welfare of their children, who will make up a high percentage of the next generation of American workers, farmers, businessmen, housewives, and mothers.

This legislation represents a long-studied and long-overdue effort to overcome the basic causes of these bad housing conditions. It seeks to apply the lesson taught by long and painful experience, that these causes can only be overcome through the resources of the Federal Government, operating in conjunction with the resources of local communities and private enterprise. This lesson is illustrated by the long existence of millions of city slums, rural shacks and dilapidated farm houses, and by the inadequacy of our private housing production as measured against the needs of the people as a whole.

Mr. President, I am sure that other Senators among the sponsors and supporters of S. 1070 will discuss the background and philosophy of the proposed legislation, and will describe the intensive study and consideration of these proposals in the course of the past 4 years. I intend to devote most of my remarks to the major provisions of the bill.

However, before discussing those provisions I want to emphasize that they have received perhaps more exhaustive consideration than any other major legislative proposal within my memory. If any Senator has a question in his mind on that point, I would refer him to the 2,218 printed pages of testimony taken by the special Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1944 and 1945. The basic recommendations growing out of that study, and still unenacted, are encompassed in S. 1070. I would refer him to the 1,212 pages of testimony taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency in 1945 and 1946 on the first general housing bill, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which was approved by the Senate in 1946, and which also covered the subject matter now contained in S. 1070. I would refer him again to the 863 pages of testimony taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency in 1947 and 1948 on the second general housing bill, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which we passed in this body a year ago, and which also covered the same general subject matter. I would refer him also to the 6,148 pages of testimony taken in 1947 and 1948 by the Joint Committee on Housing, of which I was a member, in hearings throughout the country. The investigation likewise resulted in strong recommendations for the same basic programs that are encompassed in S. 1070.

Mr. President, this year we have again held hearings on these proposals. Between February 3 and February 21, the subcommittee held 13 days of hearings, and heard more than 75 witnesses, representing all the major organizations and interests with an active stake in housing. Their testimony and statements fill another 1,001 pages of printed hearings. As chairman of the subcommittee, I heard every word of this testimony. Included in it were many constructive comments and suggestions, which resulted in further refinements and improvements to the bill in committee.

But if I should summarize my impression of the consensus of that testimony, it was that the time for hearings, for study, and for investigation of these important housing problems has passed and that positive action by the Congress to relieve those problems is long overdue. The prolonged consideration which has been devoted in the Congress to the basic lines of action incorporated in S. 1070, has, it is true, resulted in numerous minor perfections in the details of these legislative proposals and in increasing agreement as to their necessity and importance. But no amount of study and debate concerning these matters can serve as a substitute for positive action. It is for these reasons that I am confident the Congress will now carry these proposals beyond the discussion stage and will enact the legislative foundation for an immediate attack on the basic problem areas in housing.

The Housing Act of 1949 deals primarily with those basic problem areas. It is not my contention nor the contention of the other sponsors of this legislation that the bill deals with all the matters necessary for a complete comprehensive national housing program. In fact, there are various important phases of the complex housing problem which are not touched upon in the bill and which will shortly be dealt with by the Committee on Banking and Currency in its recommendations on other housing legislation. But it is my contention that S. 1070 does deal decisively and constructively with the basic problem areas in housing where experience has clearly shown that direct Federal assistance is essential. These areas cover the whole broad problem of providing decent housing for families with incomes too low to pay an economic rent for decent privately owned housing, new or old. They cover the problem of the slums and of how to clear them so as to permit sound redevelopment. They cover the separate problem of providing decent farm housing and other essential farm structures for farmers unable to finance adequate facilities through their own limited resources. They cover the underlying problem of excessive housing costs and of ways and means for reducing them through research on construction methods, materials, and all the complex problems involved in the production, marketing, and operation of housing.

The Housing Act of 1949 also would define for the first time our broad national housing objectives and the basic policies to be followed in progressing toward those objectives. Such a declaration of policy has been one of the primary recommendations of all the congressional investigations of housing during recent years. In reaffirming this recommendation, the committee report on the pending bill had this to say as to the importance of establishing such a policy:

> There has never been a statement by the Congress of our national housing objectives or of basic policy as to respective spheres of activity for industry, labor, communities, and the Federal Government in the attainment of those objectives. Neither the Congress in considering specific housing legislation, nor the administrative agencies in executing those programs, have been in a position to appraise housing activities and housing progress in relation to a clearly defined national housing policy and objective. Industry, labor, and communities have been similarly handicapped.
>
> The need for such a policy declaration is increased by the housing programs authorized by this bill, and which are clearly essential if the Nation is to make real progress in overcoming its deeply rooted housing problems.

Section 2 of the bill establishes as our national housing objective the attainment as soon as feasible of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. It recognizes that this objective requires the achievement of a rate of housing production sufficient to overcome the housing shortage, to replace slums and other substandard housing, and to make a full contribution toward the maintenance of national production and employment at high levels. This section further recognizes that private enterprise must be relied upon to do the major part of this job and should be given all feasible encouragement and assistance by the Federal Government. It calls for assistance to communities in encouraging the production of lower cost

housing of good quality. It makes clear that Federal assistance for slum clearance and for the provision of decent housing for low-income families, in cities and rural areas will be made available to the extent that those needs cannot be met through reliance upon private enterprise. It establishes specific standards to assure that all housing activities of the Federal Government will be administered so as to accomplish specific objectives consistent with and necessary for the achievement of this national housing policy.

This national housing policy would apply not only to the operating programs contained in the pending bill but also to the administration of existing programs as well as of the further programs that may be authorized in the future. The application of such a consistent policy to all the programs in which the Federal Government participates is particularly important in view of the very large size of the housing job that needs to be done.

In this connection, the committee examined carefully all the significant evidence concerning the size of the housing need. I direct the attention of the Senate to a rather detailed analysis of that evidence on pages 5 through 8 of the committee report. In summary, the committee concluded that between 17 million and 18 million dwellings would have to be provided by 1960 through new construction or rehabilitation in order to overcome the present shortage, meet the needs of our increasing population, and replace or rehabilitate slum housing and other substandard dwellings. The operating program contained in the pending bill, while directed at the worst problem areas in housing and therefore indispensable to achieving the progress in housing which the Nation needs, would provide only a small percentage of the over-all needs found by the committee. The balance would in large measure at least be the job of private enterprise, operating with or without Federal assistance. For this reason, it is all the more essential that clear lines of responsibilities be established now for the concerted and sustained efforts by industry, labor, communities, and the Federal Government which will be necessary to accomplish the whole task.

Mr. President, before commenting on the major provisions of the program titles of this bill, I should like to touch briefly on the very careful consideration which this measure received in the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee had before it two major bills dealing with this general subject matter: S. 138, the administration bill, and S. 709, sponsored by a group of Republican Senators. On the specific subject of farm housing, the committee also had before it S. 685. In its executive sessions, the committee combined the best features of these bills and also adopted various amendments recommended during the hearings and by members of the committee. It is extremely gratifying that the resulting bill, S. 1070, has commanded broad bi-partisan support as reflected by its 22 sponsors representing equally both sides of the aisle.

I will now attempt to describe the major provisions of the basic programs contained in this bill. The first of these is the authorization of title I of the bill for Federal aid for slum clearance. I understand that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who contributed most constructively to the committee's work on this and other matters in the bill, will discuss this important and pioneering program in considerable detail. Accordingly, I will limit my remarks to the principal provisions of this title.

First, I would like to read to the Senate a few excerpts from the committee report on the bill as to the background and justification for a federally assisted slum clearance program.

Speaking of the stubborn existence of slums and the failure of past efforts to deal with them, the report says:

> These slums and blighted areas have existed and have grown for generations. Approximately one out of every five of our urban families is living today under slum conditions, which, in turn, are the breeding ground for disease, juvenile delinquency, and crime. Your committee is convinced that the Nation cannot and should not tolerate indefinitely the social costs resulting from the impact of these conditions.
>
> The millions of families now living in slums do not live there by choice. They live there from economic necessity arising out of their inability to pay even the lowest rents at which decent housing is available. Correspondingly, the demonstrated failure of private enterprise and local communities in coping with the slum problem does not reflect any lack of community awareness of the seriousness of that problem, but rather is indicative of the inadequacy of private and municipal resources alone to meet the economic costs of effective slum-clearance programs.
>
> The testimony presented during the hearings on the bill, as well as that presented in previous congressional investigations during the past 4 years, makes it clear that the high prices commanded by land in the central areas of cities, even when those areas are blighted or deteriorated, are at the heart of the slum-clearance problem. It emphasizes the necessity for Federal aid if a real start is ever to be made in the solution of this problem.
>
> These high prices for slum land, particularly in relation to the prices at which builders can acquire outlying sites, have effectively barred the purchase and the redevelopment of slum sites by private enterprise on anything but the most piecemeal and sporadic basis. This barrier of high price has been greatly augmented by the difficulties, which for private operators are usually insuperable, of assembling large enough tracts in close-in areas to permit an economical scale of redevelopment operations.
>
> The evidence is also clear that the reuse value of cleared slum land will generally be substantially less than the costs of acquisition, clearance, and preparation for redevelopment if the land is to be rebuilt at appropriate densities and in accordance with sound redevelopment plans which will prevent the recurrence of slum conditions. Experience has shown that State and local governments lack the financial resources to absorb the full cost of this necessary write-down in anything like the volume needed for the clearance of any substantial proportion of existing slums. States and cities are increasingly aware of the social costs of slums, of the threat to municipal solvency arising from the spread of new building to the outskirts of cities, and of the heavy municipal outlays for city services in slum areas which greatly exceed the tax revenues derived from those areas. Nevertheless, they have lacked the financial resources to undertake more than a few scattered slum-clearance projects under the redevelopment legislation which is now on the statute books of half of the States.
>
> On the basis of these facts, and the findings of previous Congressional investigations during the past 5 years, it seems clearly established that only through an effective program of Federal aid can real progress be made in the clearance of slums.

Under title I, a local public agency undertaking a program of slum clearance will be able to obtain from the Federal Government repayable loans financing the acquisition, clearance and preparation of project areas for appropriate private or public development or redevelopment, in accordance with locally approved plans. After the area has been sold to redevelopers, or after its reuse value has been established through long-term leases, the Federal Government will make available grants absorbing up to two-thirds of the loss which the community has sustained in the entire operation. Local communities may credit as part of their share of the net cost of the projects, the cost of public improvements built to serve the project areas. Over a 5-year period, $1,000,000,000 in loan funds, on a revolving basis, and $500,000,000 in grants would be authorized.

The benefits of this title are to be applied to acquisition, clearance and site preparation, and not to the financing of major rebuilding operations. It is entirely separate in operation from the public housing program covered in Title II. While some cleared sites will be undoubtedly available for public housing projects at the reuse value, the bill requires maximum opportunity for private redevelopment under local plans. But it is equally clear that without an adequate public housing program, such as is provided in Title II of the bill, our local communities will be unable to make any substantial progress in clearing slums. Most of the families who live in the slums are there because they are unable to afford adequate private housing, and most of them will be able to find acceptable quarters only in public housing projects built on or off the slum sites.

Consistent with the findings of earlier congressional studies, the committee felt that the primary purpose of the slum-clearance program should be to help remove the impact of the slums on human lives. Accordingly the bill would require that Federal aid be limited to sites which are either predominantly residential in character or are to be developed or redeveloped primarily for residential use. This provision is sufficiently flexible, we believe, to permit the carrying out of local programs in accordance with sound plans for the development and redevelopment of communities.

To avoid any undue hardship to present slum dwellers, the bill prohibits the undertaking of slum-clearance projects unless the local public agencies have available feasible means for their temporary relocation and unless adequate permanent housing is or will be available to them. Demolition of dwellings prior to July 1, 1951, will not be permitted if

the local governing body determines undue housing hardship would result. These restrictions, however, offer no excuse for further delay in the enactment of this program. Planning and site assembly are time-consuming processes, and it is essential that the local communities be prepared to move ahead with actual clearance as soon as local conditions permit.

The public-housing provisions contained in title VI of S. 1070 represent the indispensable core of any effective program aimed at meeting the most acute problem areas in housing in American cities and towns. As I pointed out a moment ago, no large-scale activities for the clearance and redevelopment of slums could hope to succeed without the provision of decent low-rent housing for the low-income families now occupying the slums. These are the families who haye no hope of obtaining decent homes and decent surroundings for their children to grow up in unless the Federal Government lends its assistance to communities for the development of public housing.

As we all know, public housing has been the principal point of controversy in the housing legislation before the Congress during recent years. It is the main focal point for opposition on the part of certain real-estate groups. But in the light of the clear and long-demonstrated fact that private enterprise cannot provide decent housing, new or old, for families of low income, there is increasing agreement throughout the country that public housing represents the only solution to an intolerable problem. Furthermore, as I will make clear more fully a little later on, the protective provisions contained in this bill will prevent any possible competition between public housing and private housing of adequate standards. The only private owners facing competition from public housing are the owners of slum housing and other dwellings unfit for human habitation.

The report of the Committee on Banking and Currency points out, on the basis of Census Bureau figures, that almost 20 percent of all urban families in the United States had money incomes of less than $2,000 in 1947 and that slightly more than 30 percent had incomes of less than $2,500. For this group, housing is required at an average rent of about $27 per month, including utilities, if the cost of shelter is not to exceed 20 percent of their incomes.

The committee's report likewise makes it clear that, aside from public housing, the only substantial volume of housing now available to these families at this average rent is slum housing, or other substandard quarters. In 1947, the estimated average rent charged for substandard housing in urban areas was slightly more than $28 a month. In that same year, the average rent charged in presently existing low-rent public housing was $27 a month.

Mr. President, in the light of these facts, I believe the case for public housing is indisputable. And, again in the light of these facts, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to this statement in the committee's report:

> It is unthinkable that this Nation, the richest and most powerful in the world, will longer permit so many of its citizens to live and grow up under the degrading and unhealthy conditions of the slums.

The bill extends this program for the provision of 810,000 additional low-rent dwellings. Some of us felt that because of the urgent need and the long delay in providing the means of meeting it, we should provide for the full 1,050,000 units recommended by the President. Others felt that despite these factors we should proceed more cautiously in consideration of changing economic conditions. The final figure represents a mutually acceptable reconciliation of these differences. The construction of the 810,000 dwellings would be spread over a period of 6 years, but the President would have the authority to accelerate or decelerate the authorized construction rate within certain limits, after receiving advice from the Council of Economic Advisers as to the impact on building and general economic conditions.

S. 1070 continues the system of Federal annual contributions which have proved so successful in the present low-rent housing program. These Federal annual contributions, together with local contributions, which are made through the exemption of projects from taxation, are necessary in order to achieve low rents within the means of families coming from the slums.

The maximum annual contribution which can be paid in any one year on a given project is limited under S. 1070 to a percentage of the total development cost of the project, the percentage being 2 percent greater than the applicable going Federal rate of interest. Since the going Federal rate of interest is now 2½ percent, the annual contribution rate would be 4½ percent on contracts entered into under present conditions.

The maximum annual contributions which could be contracted for under S. 1070 are $308,000,000 per year. On the basis of the present maximum annual contribution rate this would be sufficient to provide contributions on projects with a total development cost of $6,845,000,000. As an illustration, on a project costing $1,000,000 the maximum annual contribution would be $45,000 per year.

The annual contribution thus determined for a project as a percentage of its development cost is the maximum amount which can be paid in any one year. The amount actually paid is limited to the cash deficit incurred by the project during the year, that is, to the total annual cost, including debt service, less the amount of rent actually collected.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the very able chairman of our committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. The $308,000,000 of which the Senator speaks represents the maximum annual contribution. The annual contribution is limited to the actual deficit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I think the Senator means what I have in mind. In other words, the deficit represents the difference between the rents collected by the local authority and what would be necessary in order to take care of a project in the manner I have described. The Federal contribution is to help meet the deficit.

Mr. MAYBANK. A deficit could arise only by reason of the fact that the rentals were less than the operating income to the local authority.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is exactly correct. The administration is all in the hands of the local authorities.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Past experience with a few of these projects has shown that in some instances there has been no deficit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true. I shall bring out that point a little later, as well as the point which the able chairman made in his first question. The $308,000,000 represents the absolute maximum. That does not mean that that sum will be paid out each year. In many instances it will be much less than that. In fact, past experience has shown, as I shall indicate a little later, that the annual contribution has amounted to only 58 percent. In practice annual contributions are rarely, if ever, paid in the maximum amount. For example, on the low-rent projects developed under the original United States Housing Act, the annual contributions actually paid have averaged only 58.5 percent of the maximum amount which could have been paid.

Further in reply to the question which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina asked, I do not know whether we shall have the same experience in the future that we have had in the past. I am not saying that we shall have or shall not have the same experience. It will depend very largely upon local conditions. But if we have the same experience in the future that we have had in the past, the annual contribution will be only about $180,000,000 a year, or less than $200,000,000, instead of $308,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then the Senator agrees that the thought of a long-range program running into tens of billions of dollars is erroneous, if business continues normal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly the annual contribution will not be the maximum amount which we are discussing.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is left to the local authorities in the communities to decide who shall be in the housing projects, what rents they shall pay, and what deficit is created after we pay the 10 percent service charge, or the 10 percent in lieu of taxes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct, subject, of course, to certain conditions which we write into the law.

Under the new program it is anticipated that not more than two-thirds or three-quarters of the maximum amount will be paid on the average.

The annual contributions under S. 1070 may be paid over a period not exceeding 40 years. Since they are not needed after the payment of debt service on capital cost is terminated, the PHA contracts provide that contributions cease at an earlier date if capital costs are liquidated earlier. With the interest rates which can reasonably be expected in today's market, it is estimated that capital costs can be liquidated in 30 to 33 years instead of running on to the full 40 years permitted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. When the capital costs are liquidated, who owns the property?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The local housing authority. In fact, it owns the property all the time. I am glad the Senator brought out that point, because many people in this country do not understand it. We use the term "public housing." In some respects it is a misnomer. Many people get the idea that public housing is owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Government never owns it. It is owned by the local communities and by the local housing authorities which are established under their own ordinances and under State laws.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under ordinances and State laws they sell the bonds to the lowest bidder.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Again the Senator from South Carolina brings out a very important point.

Mr. President, many persons think the Federal Government pays the money for the construction of this housing, and judging from some of the communications which I have received, apparently many persons think the Federal Government uses its own workers and does the building itself and purchases the material or supplies the material itself. However, the Federal Government does nothing of the kind. As a matter of fact, the local housing authority of Charleston, S. C., or Huntsville, Ala., or elsewhere in the United States, makes contracts with private builders, with whomever it pleases, and under whatever procedure it pleases. It issues its bonds and sells them in the commercial market. The very able chairman of the committee knows that the market is eager to buy those bonds today, because everyone knows how good they are.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing out that point, because many persons think the Federal Government is putting up a great deal of money in this connection. However, all that the Federal Government does is to authorize the local community, upon its own request, to sell bonds, which are tax free, as are other municipal bonds; and the bonds are sold at the lowest rate bid. These projects are built by private industry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, in effect the Federal Government says to the local city or community, "If you care to go into this program, you are to build the housing and are to provide the financing and the construction facilities; and if thereafter you rent the quarters at rent which the people can afford to pay, the Federal Government will help you make up the deficit in the rent." In effect, that is what the local housing authority is doing.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the Federal Government simply helps make up the deficit in that connection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama is making an extremely able argument and is presenting facts which in my judgment the people of the country generally do not fully appreciate. So I wonder whether the Senator will yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the thought which motivates the distinguished chairman of our committee in making that suggestion, but I must decline to yield for that purpose. I know a great many Members of the Senate are, at this moment, attending important committee meetings, and I know that some Members of the Senate are meeting in conference committees, trying to work out conference committee agreements. I know that the chairman of our own committee, the Senator from South Carolina himself, has had to run back and forth between this Chamber and the Appropriations Committee during the day.

So, although I appreciate the suggestion, I must decline to yield for the purpose the Senator has suggested; and at this time I shall proceed with the further presentation of my remarks.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that the Senator from Alabama does not wish to yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum—and I realize that he is aware of the numerous committee meetings which are being held, as authorized by the numerous unanimous-consent requests which have been granted during the day for the holding of those meetings—let me say that I hope that over the week end every Senator will read the statements made in this debate, particularly the statements made by the Senator from Alabama, pertaining to the fact that private industry builds the houses, and that the local authorities govern these projects; and also the statements in regard to the great benefit to the people in those communities, during the years to come, and the statements that these projects may be liquidated much sooner than may have been anticipated, and thus the cost may be perhaps only 50 percent or 60 percent of that estimated.

I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks which have been made by the able chairman of our committee. I hope every Senator will read, not particularly my remarks, but also the remarks made by the chairman of the committee and the remarks which will be made by one of the pioneer sponsors of this legislation, the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I hope Senators will also read the committee report.

Mr. President, I cannot help but believe that any person who studies this problem with an unbiased mind will invariably and inevitably come to the conclusion that we need this program and that it is only right and fair. I deplore the fact that throughout the country there is so much misinformation and misunderstanding of the entire subject of the so-called public housing program.

Mr. President, with the amendments in this bill perfecting the security of local housing authority bonds, we expect that the local authorities will be able to obtain all their capital financing from private lending sources, and that there will be few calls, if any, for Federal loans. The availability of Federal advances, however, must be pledged in order to obtain low-interest, temporary private loans during construction. This has necessitated an increase in the total loan authorization to $1,500,000,000, from $800,000,000, for the new program, and the placing of this authorization on a revolving fund basis.

I have heard of no other solution, in all the testimony that has been presented, that gives any promise of meeting the needs of low-income families. Under the present public housing program, despite the congressional restriction until last August against removal of over-income tenants, the median income of all families in prewar projects in 1948 was $1,944 while the median income of families admitted to those projects last year was only $1,481. I do not know where else we can look for any substantial amount of decent housing for the 30 percent of our urban families whose incomes are less than $2,500.

We have incorporated in this bill, however, some additional requirements to assure that the low-rent purpose will be achieved and that the program will not be competitive with private enterprise. We require that a gap of at least 20 percent be left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise unaided by public subsidy is providing through new construction and available existing structures a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing. The local authorities must establish maximum income limits for admission and continued occupancy and must remove from the projects families found in annual reexaminations to be ineligible. We require that tenants be selected in accordance with most urgent housing needs and that there be no discrimination against welfare families.

Another change is the revision of construction cost limits for public housing.

We have eliminated, first, the limits on dwelling unit cost and have substituted a per room cost limitation in order to permit more adequate provision of housing for the larger families. Second, we have removed the differential in cost limits between larger and smaller cities in view of the fact that substantial construction cost differences between neighboring communities like Chicago, and Gary, Ind., are now nonexistent. We have provided a maximum per room cost limitation of $1,750. In exceptionally high-cost areas where the Administrator finds that it is not possible to build a low-rent housing project within this cost limitation without sacrificing sound standards of construction, design, and livability and he finds that there is an acute shortage for such housing, he may allow the cost limitation to be exceeded, but in no event by more than $750 per room. The experience of a few local authorities which have gone ahead recently with deferred projects under the provisions of Public Law 301 enacted by the last Congress had indicated the necessity of such latitude if low-income families in certain high-cost areas are to realize the benefits of this program.

The increase generally provided in S. 1070 is substantially less than the actual rise in building costs which has occurred since 1937 when the present limitations were adopted. Nevertheless, there has been some criticism of these increases. Such criticism might have some validity if we assumed that the construction cost of projects for the country as a whole would approach the proposed maximum limitations. This assumption is refuted by the experience under the present program.

Projects undertaken by local housing authorities before the war under the present Act and during the war under the defense amendment were built at average costs substantially below the limitations then in the statute. The total development cost, including land, slum clearance and non-dwelling facilities, averaged $4,649 per unit. This is an extremely low figure in view of the fact that these projects were by necessity designed and constructed for a long economic life and generally involved fireproof construction. Furthermore, there is absorbed in this average cost the high cost of slum sites for many of these projects and the installation of certain features by local authorities, such as internal utility distribution systems, which have resulted in long-range operating economies.

The average costs were substantially below the pre-war maximum permitted under the law. Thus the controlling factor in most areas has not been the dollar cost limitations, but rather the statutory requirements that the projects shall not be of elaborate or expensive design or materials and that economy shall be promoted in construction and operation. These requirements are contained in S. 1070 and are strengthened by the additional stipulation for advance approval of all construction contracts by the Public Housing Administration in the light of prevailing construction costs in the locality.

The development of 810,000 dwellings within the annual contributions authorized under this bill, moreover, cannot be achieved unless the average total development cost, including land and all other facilities, does not exceed about $8,500 per unit. In view of the excellent record for economy achieved by the local authorities, I believe that the importance of making the benefits of the public housing program available to all localities fully justifies the latitude in cost limits contained in S. 1070.

The evidence presented to the committee fully confirmed the findings of previous congressional investigations as to the acute need for decent low-rent housing in rural areas as well as in cities. In fact, some of the worst housing is occupied by low-income rural families, including farm laborers residing off the farms.

Proposals for extension of the public-housing programs have always clearly contemplated that the pressing needs of these families would be included in the over-all public-housing authorization. However, the committee felt it important to make sure that rural communities which are not presently organized or equipped to qualify for participation in the program should have full opportunity to do so before all the funds are allocated. We have, therefore, required that 10 percent of the authorization for all contributions be reserved for rural nonfarm housing for 3 years after the dates on which the funds are made available. These provisions are, of course, separate and distinct from the program for farm housing which I will discuss in a few minutes.

Mr. President, one of the primary reasons why Federal financial assistance is needed for the programs which I have just described is the inability of the housing industry over the years to produce housing of good quality at a price or rent within the reach of a majority of families. The high cost of new housing has limited the market for new housing to perhaps the top third of the income range and has prevented the development of any effective private-enterprise technique for the replacement of worn-out and substandard used housing.

As Senators know, the problem of attacking these excessive costs and of placing the housing industry in a much stronger position to serve the housing needs of the Nation has been long studied in the Congress. These studies have made it clear that the lagging progress in this direction stems largely from the complexity of the housing industry and the fact that it is predominantly comprised of small-business firms with insufficient resources to undertake the kind of research that has paved the way for the impressive technical progress in other industries of comparable over-all size.

All this has pointed to the necessity for Federal leadership and assistance in housing research, which is the program contained in title III of the bill. In this connection, I would like to read this brief excerpt from the committee's comments on this subject in its report on S. 1070:

> The imperative need for the Federal research program that would be authorized by title III of the bill has been emphasized over and over again, in earlier reports of your committee, in the reports of the Joint Committee on Housing, and in the reports and studies of many official and unofficial groups. These reports have pointed out the relative technological backwardness of the housing industry, compared to other major industries, and have described some of the conditioning social, economic, and political factors that have caused this lag. The housing business is far too important a segment of our economy, and the benefits that could be derived from modernizing it are too large in terms of the improvement in the housing conditions of American families as well as in stability of employment and investment, to permit us to accept this situation any longer.

I know of no better justification for the housing research program in title III than that contained in a news story in the New York Times, Thursday, February 23, written from Chicago by its real-estate editor. He reported that rows of unsold new houses have risen in key cities over the country to plague builders, "despite the continuing housing shortage. Inflated construction costs, high prices, and buyer resistance, together with a tightness of mortgage money, have kept these houses from finding purchasers and are forcing many builders to abandon or curtail their operations," he said. He estimates, with support from at least one important builder, that not more than 750,000 dwellings will be built this year.

This situation, in the face of the needs of several millions of veterans and others for decent places in which to live, epitomizes what has been wrong for many years with our housing situation. The reason we have slums and overcrowding and doubling up is that we have not yet produced homes that enough people can afford to buy or rent.

The most important purpose of the research title is to seek the means of bringing housing costs down to a closer relationship with average consumer incomes and of developing the housing industry more in line with the Nation's large long-range housing needs. The Housing Administrator would be directed to encourage the development of new and improved techniques, materials, and methods which will result in better products at reduced costs and to demonstrate them and promote their acceptance. This would be much broader than the present program limited to building codes and modular coordination, although this present program is retained under the pending bill. Also authorized in the program is the development of more precise economic and market data on housing which is badly needed by the industry, communities, and the Federal Government.

What this title does primarily is to provide leadership in housing research which no single element in the industry is able to provide and which is presently lacking in Government. The Housing Administrator would identify the problems; arrange, through contracts and other

means, for the conduct of research projects; evaluate the results and make available and encourage their acceptance by industry, and by State and local Governments, to the extent that they are applicable, to building codes and other local regulations. The bill contemplates that the Administrator will utilize to the fullest extent existing research facilities available in Government, educational institutions, and other nonprofit organizations.

The great potentialities of such a program in reducing costs, and thus expanding housing production, justify the enactment of this title and the assurance, when annual appropriations are considered, of sufficient funds to permit it to go forward.

In title IV, the bill would establish an urgently needed program for a separate and distinct phase of the housing problem—the problem of providing decent farm housing. This is a matter to which I have given a great deal of personal study and investigation, in the light of the farm-housing problems in my own section of the country. As Senators know, I introduced a farm-housing bill earlier in this session, Senate bill 685, and I am gratified that the farm-housing title adopted by the committee in S. 1070 incorporates a number of the proposals contained in S. 685.

In my opinion, which I believe is shared by other sponsors of this legislation, the farm housing program proposed in S. 1070 is definitely superior to the comparable program contained in the previous general housing bills considered by this body in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. The most important improvement, I believe, lies in the broader coordination of the program with the farm as an economic unit and a corresponding extension of the program to provide assistance for essential farm buildings as well as for farm houses.

The urgent need for such a program is concisely stated in the following two paragraphs from the committee's report:

> The provision of Federal financial assistance for the improvement of housing conditions on farms is an indispensable part of any housing program. The effects of bad housing apply with equal force on farm families, and on the health and character of their children, as they do in our cities and towns. Your committee is further concerned with the importance of adequate housing in the creation of a living environment that will attract and hold to the land, as a source of livelihood, those best able to utilize our soil resources to meet present and future needs for agricultural products.
>
> While there has been considerable improvement in farm housing since 1940, the fact remains that after nearly a decade of unparalleled farm prosperity, a much higher proportion of farm than urban dwellings are in bad physical condition, and the majority of farm families lack in their homes many of the amenities new considered essential in urban dwellings. Evidence before your committee indicates that nearly a third of the Nation's farm families derive insufficient income from their farming operations to finance the needed improvements to their homes (and other building improvements essential to successful farm operations).

The committee report goes on to emphasize the need for a special program of financial assistance designed specifically to meet the needs of the farmers who cannot get credit elsewhere. It states:

> The uncertainty of agricultural income, in addition to other hazards of agricultural production, have prohibited long-time financing of building improvements on many farms. The types and extent of conventional credit which is available to farmers is usually needed in the acquisition or operation of the farm buildings. Neither the insurance of private investments by the Government nor the urban type of public housing assistance will meet the needs of more than a million farm families for adequate, decent, safe, and sanitary housing, and other necessary farm buildings.

The financial aids in title IV are directed principally to assisting self-sufficient or potentially self-sufficient farmers who are unable otherwise to provide adequate housing and other necessary farm buildings for themselves or for their tenants, share-croppers, or laborers.

In the case of self-sufficient farmers, the assistance would be in the form of 33-year loans, with a maximum interest rate of 4 percent, to finance such improvements. The farmer's equity in his farm would provide the security for the loan.

If, however, the farmer's income was presently insufficient to carry the loan, in addition to other expenses and obligations, but if he agrees to carry on a program of farm enlargement, improvement, or adjusted practices that will put him on a self-sufficient basis, the loan could be supplemented by annual contributions, for not more than 10 years, to be applied as a partial credit on debt service on the loan.

While the Committee recognized that it is not feasible or desirable to finance new permanent improvements on farms which are not presently or potentially self-sufficient, it believed that it is essential to eliminate conditions on such farms which are hazardous to health and safety. Title IV, therefore, provides loans and grants for minor improvements, such as roof repairs, safe water supply, sanitary privies, screens, and building supports, which will remove such hazards and protect the occupant's property. The maximum assistance for such purposes to any farm, dwelling, or building may not exceed $1,000, of which not more than $500 may be a grant, and the maximum available to any individual regardless of the number of farms or farm buildings, may not exceed $2,000.

The bill authorizes loans which may reach a maximum of $250,000,000 after the fourth year, annual contributions not exceeding $5,000,000 in any year, and grants totaling $12,500,000. The financial aids will be administered through the Farmer's Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture since they are closely related to other programs of this agency.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in addition, to expand existing technical services to farmers and to conduct a broad research program, both pointed toward more efficient and economical construction of farmhouses and buildings.

The volume of financial assistance authorized in title IV is modest in relation to the size of the farm-housing need. Nevertheless, it will permit substantial progress to be made in improving conditions on farms. As experience is gained under this new program, the Congress will be in a position to appraise the necessity and desirability of further action. In the meantime, I consider this farm-housing program to be an indispensable part of basic housing legislation.

Title V of the bill contains a number of miscellaneous provisions important to the effective execution and administration of the various housing programs. Since the purpose and content of these provisions are fully explained in parts 1 and 2 of the committee's report, I will not take the time of the Senate in further discussion of them except to stress the importance of the authorization contained in section 507 for a decennial census of housing by the Bureau of the Census, commencing in 1950. The comprehensive body of facts on the size and quality of the Nation's housing inventory which would be supplied by this housing census is essential for the effective attack on the national housing problem, which is the purpose of this whole legislation.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks, I wish to emphasize again the urgent and far-reaching nature of this legislation. This is a bill which has been exhaustively studied and restudied. Throughout its lengthy consideration in this body it has had substantial bipartisan sponsorship and backing. It has the strong support of citizen groups, veterans' organizations, labor organizations, civic and professional organizations, and local officials throughout the land.

When the Senate first approved legislation similar to this bill, in April 1946, it was clearly the sense of this body that these programs were both urgent and of great importance to the national welfare. Every development in housing during the 3 years since that time has made the urgency and importance of these programs still more apparent. I am therefore confident that the Senate will proceed promptly to approve this greatly needed legislation and that this time the legislation will move on to final enactment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading cerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 56) providing for adjournment of the House until April 25, 1949, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1209. An act to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; and

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the outset, I wish to say that no Member

of this Senate has taken a keener interest in the field of housing than the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who for many years served as chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I shall always remain grateful to him for having selected me as chairman of a subcommittee on housing for low-income families.

It will be recalled that prior to the adoption of the Reorganization Act, all housing legislation for low-income families, slum clearance, and the publicly financed portion of the war housing program was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. Senator THOMAS was always most helpful and under his guidance I became very much interested in the subject of housing. He has always been most cooperative with Members of the Senate assigned to the task of attempting to solve our housing needs.

Although my name has been identified principally as an advocate of housing for low-income groups, my interest has not been, and is not now, confined solely to that one phase of our housing problem. On the contrary, I have fostered legislation providing for ways and means of assisting all segments of our society in attaining decent, safe, and sanitary homes in which to live.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that the most realistic way to defeat communism, fascism, and in fact any other "ism," is to make democracy work—make it a living, breathing institution, responsive to the needs of our people, by placing within their reach the basic necessities for a happy life. Foreign ideologies will not appeal to our people if they can obtain decent shelter in which to live and pleasant surroundings in which to rear their children; if they can acquire a fair amount of education, so that they may know and appreciate the multifold advantages of the American way of life; and if adequate hospitalization and other health facilities can be made available to them within their ability to pay. I will confine my remarks to one of those three basic needs—housing.

My voting record in Congress will bear out that I have always supported all legislation that has for its purpose the stimulation of home building and home ownership, through Federal guarantee of mortgages and other Federal aids. I have just as consistently opposed any housing legislation that did not include adequate safeguards for the right of private enterprise to undertake the job of providing all housing needs, if it were willing and able to do so. I have not sponsored any legislation that would encroach upon private financing or private construction of housing. There is a specific field wherein the Federal Government, with its vast resources and capital, can materially assist in making real the dream of every family for a comfortable home. It does not overlap the field of private enterprise.

Many of my colleagues will recall that when the original FHA legislation was considered in Congress, concern was expressed by bankers, building and loan organizations, contractors, and others interested in the field of housing. The cry went up that the Federal Government was trying to take over the building industry. Just the opposite occurred. Federal assistance provided under the FHA program has been a boon to the housing industry. I believe we all agree now that FHA has proven to be one of the soundest programs to come out of the New Deal. It has proven its need and worth, and it is now endorsed by almost everyone. That universal approval arises because the program was based on the premise that Federal aid would supplement private enterprise, rather than substitute for private enterprise. As a result, everybody has benefited—industry, investment, government, and the masses of our people. Millions of families are today living in decent, comfortable, wholesome surroundings as a direct result of the FHA program.

In spite of the fact that building materials are now becoming plentiful, and building costs are leveing off, there has been a decided slump in residential construction since September 1948.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator, who has been one of the leaders in the housing fight for many years, and who was the first witness before our committee, if it is not a fact that one of the reasons why there was some trouble about housing legislation during the last Congress was a lack of labor and a shortage of building materials. The Senator has just stated that there is now an ample supply, to which I thoroughly agree, and I was wondering if the Senator could enlarge a little on the matter of the ample supply of building materials and workers today. Today the Senator voted for a bill making an appropriation of $600,000,000 in behalf of the veterans, and does not that make it all the more necessary to go forward with the housing program?

Mr. ELLENDER. I expect to point out that the bill will be of assistance in avoiding some kind of slump.

Mr. MAYBANK. In providing assistance in avoidance of a slump it will reduce the amount of money Congress will have to appropriate to prevent unemployment, will it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Reports from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that during the 6-month period from September 1948 through February 1949, 57,300 fewer new residential units and structures were started than in the corresponding period of September 1947 through February 1948. The Bureau's reporting does not cover residential units converted or rehabilitated, but it is safe to assume that there has been a decrease in that category also, due to the fact that the major portion of suitable buildings were converted or rehabilitated during or shortly after the war.

Stimulation in private building is most needed at this time in the low-cost field. A person today has no difficulty in building or purchasing a home in the $10,000 and over class. The supply of homes in that price range is plentiful, and contractors are ready and willing to build for those who can finance the project. There are few takers, because the majority of the people cannot afford to pay such prices. We must provide ways and means for the head of a family to build a comfortable home for less than $10,000. If we do not, the whole Nation, and the building industry in particular, will suffer. The greatest number of potential customers lie in the lower bracket of the middle-income group.

The need for stimulation of home building in the lower bracket of the middle income group has developed principally for two reasons:

First, the savings which American families accumulated during the war have dwindled considerably, and few families have enough money on hand or in banks, or enough bonds, to make up the difference between the selling price of modern day homes, and the FHA mortgage commitment.

Second, those who have sufficient capital to finance the undertaking are hesitant because they fear that hard times are around the corner.

There can be no doubt that the lush days of the postwar boom are over. The signs are unmistakable. Housing construction can play a vital role in easing the impact of the deflationary period that confronts us. New houses are one of the items for which there is a large backlog of demand.

To stimulate building, I am cosponsoring with seven other Senators a bill (S. 712) which, when enacted, will stimulate the construction of low-cost private homes, low-rent housing projects, and cooperative developments. We realize that the bill we have introduced does not meet altogether the needs for financing housing for the lower half of the middle income groups, and we are working, together with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and the Federal housing officials, in an effort to further improve the bill.

There is another segment of our population that is badly in need of adequate housing, but unfortunately, these people do not earn enough money each month to pay an economic rent, or to make the monthly payments that are necessary to purchase a private home. I refer to the people who are at the bottom of the heap, insofar as earnings are concerned. Let us not fool ourselves. Even during the war, and in the boom days after the war, a substantial portion of our population were too poor to pay an economic rent or to undertake the purchase of even the most modest home. As unemployment increases, more and more families are finding themselves in this category.

My activities in behalf of this segment of our population go back to 1937, when I took my seat in the United States Senate as a freshman Senator from Louisiana. One of the first major bills to come before the Senate that year was the United States housing bill of 1937, which was also called the Wagner slum-clearance bill. I supported the enactment of that bill, both in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which held hearings on it, and on the floor of the Senate. Under its authorization,

119,101 housing units were constructed by local housing authorities before the war. During the war, under Public Law 671, 51,288 units were built to house war workers. The act stipulates that these units will be converted to low-rent public housing projects as soon as feasible at the conclusion of the war. A total of 170,389 low-rent public housing units were built by local housing authorities, at a total cost, including land, buildings, tearing down of slum areas, and so forth, of approximately $4,650 per unit.

Bear in mind that all these units were built by local housing authorities, and the local authorities have full control over their operation. The projects would never have been initiated had not the local authorities requested them. And I believe I can state without fear of contradiction that the projects would never have been erected had not the Federal Government, under the authority contained in the United States Housing Act of 1937, provided the means to finance the projects, by a system of annual contributions, whereby families with low incomes were given assistance, proportionate to their earnings, to meet an economic rent.

Under the program, families that lived in the slums were lifted out of that deadly environment and placed in clean, comfortable, sanitary dwellings. For every new unit that was built before the war, a slum unit was demolished. Prior to the war, not a single family was given housing except those who could not afford to pay the rent required by private enterprise for decent housing. The program was strictly noncompetitive with private enterprise. Throughout the country, before the war, the average rent, without utility charges, was $12.79 per family per month for a family with an annual average income of $832. I ask, who, even before the war, could undertake a respectable housing development that would rent for $12.79 per unit per month? Those families, because of their lack of income, would have been doomed to live in filth and misery had not the local authorities, aided by the Federal Government, undertaken to bring them relief.

The war brought with it a disruption of the low-rent public housing program. Populations shifted overnight. Prosperity was everywhere, jobs were plentiful, and the weekly pay check was higher than ever before in our history. In order to meet a serious housing shortage that developed in those areas where war production was highly concentrated, permission was given to the local authorities to convert some of the uncompleted low-rent projects, when they were completed, into war housing for the duration of the war. Again the local authorities had jurisdiction, and the decision was left entirely to them. The rent charged was based on the occupant's income. When an occupant's income was high enough to afford an economic rent, the Federal and local subsidy stopped, and he paid his way just like anybody else.

Now that the war is over, the local authorities are going about the business of moving out the war workers, who can afford an economic rent, and moving in low-income families who cannot afford an economic rent. Also, during the war many of the low-income families were able to better their incomes, improve their standard of living, and no longer need assistance from public-housing authorities. These families are likewise being moved out, to make room for the less fortunate. There has been some criticism leveled against the local authorities because this turn-over has not proceeded at a more rapid pace. But when we consider the housing shortage that exists today, we realize that the progress must necessarily be slow. The local authorities cannot be expected to evict families, regardless of their income, if there is no other place for them to go.

I now come to the housing bill of 1949, Senate bill 1070. This bill was introduced by me, together with 10 Democratic and 11 Republican Senators, on February 25. It is not a new bill. Indeed, its basic provisions have received intensive congressional study over a period of 5 years. They have twice been enacted by the Senate, once in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and again in the Eightieth Congress. A review of the bill's history will make it plain that it is truly a product of careful congressional work carried on over a long period of time, in a nonpartisan spirit.

The bill itself was perfected in the Committee on Banking and Currency after hearings on a number of similar bills which were held by the housing subcommittee under the chairmanship of the able junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] from February 3 through February 21. Senate bill 1070 combines the best features of these similar bills and of amendments or additional proposals which were suggested by members of the committee or by witnesses at the hearings. The bill also represents a compromise which was reached in committee with respect to the size of the low-rent public housing program which should be undertaken at this time.

It should be noted, too, that the committee, in reporting the bill to the Senate, did not offer it as a complete solution to the housing problem, or as the sole important legislative measure which is needed in the field of housing. However, the committee was convinced that the bill represents a major step forward in dealing with five important problems in this field. Thus—and I quote from the committee's report dated February 25—

> First, it provides for a necessary and desirable declaration by the Congress of our national objectives in housing and the policies to be followed in attaining them.
>
> Second, it provides the authorization of Federal financial assistance to communities for a long-delayed, but vitally needed, start on the clearance of slums and blighted areas for redevelopment.
>
> Third, it provides the authorization for a continuation and expansion of the program of extending Federal financial assistance to communities for low-rent public housing for families of low income.
>
> Fourth, it provides the authorization for a comprehensive program of Federal research in housing aimed at relieving the many technical, social, and economic problems which beset the whole field of housing.
>
> Fifth, it provides the authorization for a program of Federal financial assistance for the provision of decent housing for those families who live and work on the farms of the Nation, particularly for farm families of low income.

The origin of these basic provisions may be traced very directly to a Senate resolution submitted in March 1943, and cosponsored by myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. This resolution would have provided for a special Senate committee to conduct a housing study and to prepare a comprehensive plan for a postwar housing program. However, in order to integrate this study with the over-all activities of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], there was appointed in that committee a Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment to which the task was assigned.

This subcommittee, of which I was a member, and headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], made a very thorough investigation and study of housing and related problems. Hearings were held by us from June 1944 to February 1945, and extensive testimony was presented by many private persons expert in the field and by most of the national organizations interested in housing, as well as by appropriate officials of the Government. I well recall the painstaking consideration and study which we gave to the testimony received and to the wealth of other material collected by means of questionnaires and staff research. In August of 1945 the subcommittee's unanimous report was published, setting forth its recommendations concerning a postwar housing program.

The recommended program included the following major points:

First. A clear statement of a national housing policy and objectives.

Second. The establishment of a permanent over-all Federal Housing Agency.

Third. The continuance and improvement of Federal financial aids to private enterprise, such as those already established in the Federal Housing Administration.

Fourth. The development of a plan for the guaranty of a minimum yield on fully debt-free investments in moderate-rental housing.

Fifth. The extension and perfection of the urban low-rent housing program authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

Sixth. The establishment of a new form of Federal financial assistance to cities to help them eliminate slum and blighted areas.

Seventh. The development of plans for a comprehensive attack on bad farm housing conditions.

Eighth. The amplification of the Federal Government's research facilities in the field of housing and construction, particularly in gathering and dissem-

inating economic data with respect to the housing market, and information regarding the better utilization of materials and regarding more economical methods of construction and land use.

It was to carry out these recommendations that three of the sponsors of the bill now under consideration, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and myself, introduced S. 1592 in November of 1945, during the Seventy-ninth Congress. Detailed hearings on that bill were held by the Committee on Banking and Currency from November 1945 through January 1946. On the basis of the testimony received, the bill was gone over by the committee line by line. It was perfected and reported out in April 1946, and was passed by the Senate. However, when the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned, the bill was still being considered in the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The basic legislative proposals which had been made by the Senate Postwar Subcommittee and incorporated in S. 1592 were the subject of further study and investigation by three committees in the Eightieth Congress. Senate bill 866 of the Eightieth Congress, introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and myself, as a successor to S. 1592, was the subject of extensive hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. That committee reported the bill favorably.

Shortly thereafter, a Joint Committee on Housing was proposed, and was created in mid-1947 to conduct a thorough study of the entire field of housing. In carrying out its task, this committee held hearings over a period of many months in Washington, D. C., and in 32 other cities throughout the Nation. Its final majority report issued in March of 1948 verified the conclusions reached by the Senate Postwar Subcommittee 3 years earlier and formed the basis for amendments to S. 866, to bring it up to date.

S. 866, with the amendments recommended by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], was passed by the Senate in April last year, after efforts to strike out the vital public-housing program were rejected by a substantial majority on both sides of the aisle. This legislation thus went to the House of Representatives with bipartisan support.

After hearings extending more than a month, a majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably a bill containing the substantive provisions of S. 866. The Members of the House, however, were denied the opportunity to vote on this legislation, when the Rules Committee tabled the bill. A substitute bill containing only some of the recommended aids to private enterprise was subsequently passed by the House, but I opposed consideration of only piecemeal legislation during the closing hours of the regular session and no action was taken.

After the President called the Congress back in special session with the further consideration of housing legislation as one of the principal purposes, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee amended the bill passed by the House to restore all the basic provisions, like slum clearance, public housing, farm housing, and a broad research program, which had been recommended on many occasions by congressional committees and by the President. When the Senate was advised that the House would not consider legislation containing these provisions, it passed a modified bill containing improvements in the field of financial aids to private enterprise which are administered by the Federal Housing Administration; the new FHA program for guaranteeing a minimum yield on direct investments in moderate-rental housing; and some provisions which authorized a limited program of technical research. Another provision which had been put into effect even earlier was the establishment of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as the over-all permanent housing agency of the Government.

Now I would be the last to say that the Housing Act of 1948 has not been beneficial. The extension of the emergency provisions under section 608 of the National Housing Act has been instrumental in keeping a considerable volume of rental-housing construction under way. As the home-building industry finds its market for higher-priced houses drying up, it is taking increasing interest in the FHA financing aids directed at lower-cost production.

Prefabricators are finding the special production aids of some assistance. The mortgage-insurance provisions for cooperatives is stimulating interest in that field and savings banks and others are exploring the possibilities of direct housing investment under yield insurance. I think we should feel encouraged by the increased interest shown within a period of 8 months in these new financing aids, several of them entirely new. At the same time, a modest start has been possible on some phases of research. Nevertheless, we still fall far short of having the kind of housing legislation essential to grapple with this complex problem.

The pending bill, S. 1070, consists basically of the unenacted portions of the housing legislation, the history of which I have traced. Thus, as we have seen, the bill, in addition to containing a clear statement of national housing policy, provides for a program of Federal aid to local communities for the clearance of their slums and blighted areas; for the extension and improvement of the low-rent public housing program established under the United States Housing Act of 1937; for a better rounded program of housing research; and for financial assistance to provide adequate housing on farms.

In this connection, I invite attention to one feature of the very helpful and interesting committee report—Senate Report 84, Eighty-first Congress—which was submitted on February 25 by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. Starting at page 30 of that report, there are set forth, verbatim, the recommendations made by the Senate Postwar Subcommittee in August 1945 and by the Joint Housing Committee in March 1948 with respect to each of the five major areas dealt with by S. 1070. A comparison of these recommendations with the provisions of the pending bill clearly demonstrates my thesis that this bill is truly a product of long and careful and nonpartisan congressional study.

The basic agreement on the over-all approach required to cope with the housing problem leaves open only one possible question regarding this legislation. This question is whether expanding housing production since the Congress began studying the problem nearly 5 years ago has lessened the need for this kind of a program. The answer is "No." Rather, the delay that has already occurred makes prompt enactment of these measures all the more urgent and increases the size of the job that is to be done.

In every study to which I have referred the conclusion has been that this country will have to produce many more houses than it has heretofore produced in order adequately to serve our needs. The report from the Committee on Banking and Currency accompanying the bill estimates that this country will have to provide from 1,500,000 to 1,600,000 homes a year for the next dozen years if we are to keep pace with population growth and eliminate slums and other bad housing conditions. The nonfarm need alone is 1,300,000 dwellings a year. Better conservation and use of the present supply may take care of some of this need, but new construction will have to fill most of it. These figures are in substantial agreement with those in earlier studies.

The production of 930,000 new nonfarm dwellings by the private home-building industry last year, the third full year since the end of the war, is no mean accomplishment. But it does not measure up to the total job that has to be done. It does not quite equal the production record achieved in 1925, nearly a quarter of a century ago, when this country had 30 percent fewer families and was producing from its industries less than half as much goods as it is today.

What is more disturbing is that since last August, as I have pointed out, the rate of housing production has been declining. The reason housing production is declining is that the market for houses at the prices and rents at which the industry is building is becoming saturated. That does not mean that all housing needs are being served. There are hundreds of thousands of families living with their in-laws or in trailers, shacks, and other temporary accommodations who are being frustrated in their desire to have their own homes. There are still over 6,000,000 families in our cities and towns, and over 1,000,000 farm families, who are living under conditions which are hazardous to their health and safety.

We are having another demonstration of the fact that private enterprise, even with the aids presently available to it, is unable to meet the total housing needs of the American people. Private enterprise cannot do so because it cannot produce houses at the prices and rents which a large portion of the American people

can afford. The conclusions of the Banking and Currency Committee this year are just as valid as they were 4 years ago when they were stated by the postwar subcommittee and as they were last year when they were stated by the Joint Committee on Housing. Public action is necessary if we are to do the kind of housing job that should be done.

Public action is necessary if the slums are to be cleared. The clearance of slums and the preparation of sites for the right kind of redevelopment is a deficit operation that private enterprise obviously is unwilling to undertake. It is a job of such proportions that the local communities cannot tackle it effectively alone. Yet, if we allow the slums to persist, we shall be continuing a huge deficit in our national life—a deficit in human values as more generations of children are brought up under conditions that breed misery, delinquency, and disease, a deficit in monetary values as our communities bear the costs of municipal services which these conditions make necessary. It is, therefore, essential that the Federal Government provide the kind of assistance made available in S. 1070 for the clearance of slums.

Public action is necessary if adequate housing is to be made available to families who live in slums and other bad housing in our cities and towns. Making decent housing available at prices and rents which low-income families can afford is also a deficit operation that private enterprise obviously is unwilling to undertake, and it is also a job of such proportions that the local communities cannot tackle it effectively alone. But we shall make little progress in eliminating the deficits in human values and monetary values created by the slums and bad housing unless good housing is provided for the low-income families who now live under these deplorable conditions. Public assistance, in the form of subsidies, will be required to provide adequate housing for those families, and the Federal Government will have to supply a substantial part of this assistance. In view of the fact that there are more than 6,000,000 families living in substandard dwellings in our cities and towns, the program of 810,000 low-rent public housing units authorized in S. 1070 is the least that we should undertake.

Public action is necessary if decent housing is to be made available for low-income families on our farms. More than a million farm homes are hazardous to health and safety. In this area of agricultural prosperity nearly a third of our farm families realize insufficient income to finance substantial improvements to their homes and other necessary farm buildings. If low-income farm families are to have decent housing, long-term, low-interest loans from the Federal Government are essential if we are to make a start on the farm-housing problem.

Public action is necessary if we are to make the broad attack on high housing costs which is preventing private enterprise from serving as much of the housing need as it should. Comprehensive research, too, is a deficit operation which no single element in the housing industry can afford to undertake. Certainly the individual homebuilder is in no position to experiment in new techniques and methods and to develop new materials. Past experience has indicated that neither the homebuilders collectively, nor any other group in the industry, have been able to undertake a comprehensive attack on costs. Individual communities are unable to undertake the kind of studies that are necessary to modernize building codes and other regulations and their administration. Only through the kind of research program under the leadership of the Federal Government provided in S. 1070 can we hope to obtain substantial reductions in costs for good housing. Only through this kind of program can private enterprise hope to broaden its market so that it will be serving most of the housing need.

These are the conclusions which, as I have outlined before, have been reached repeatedly over the last several years on congressional studies. These are the conclusions which have been presented to congressional committees repeatedly by representatives of national organizations representing a wide variety of citizens. On the basis of this evidence, it is my firm conviction that the enactment of this bill is a matter of utmost urgency, and that the activities which it would make possible are already too long delayed. The bill contains provisions which are absolutely necessary if effective assistance is to be given to the families whose housing needs are most critical. Further delay will doom yet another generation of children who are now living in urban slums or rural shacks or in makeshift shelter to spend their remaining childhood years under conditions which breed disease, delinquency, crime, and misery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a series of questions and answers pertinent to the pending housing bill.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949 (S. 1070)

Question. Why is this legislation necessary and desirable?

Answer. The persistence of the acute housing shortage and the disgraceful conditions under which millions of American families are forced to live have made it clear that comprehensive Federal assistance is essential if real progress is to be made toward achieving decent homes and a satisfactory home environment for the American people as a whole. Doubling up and overcrowding are still widespread. Even under the prosperous conditions of today, the prices and rents of decent housing, new or old, are beyond the financial reach of a substantial portion of our population. As a result, more than 5,000,000 low-income families are crowded into city slums or other substandard housing. Virtually no progress is being made in the clearance and redevelopment of slums. Bad housing is also widely prevalent on American farms.

The purpose of the Housing Act of 1949 is to provide the foundation for the comprehensive action needed to overcome these problems. It would do so on four fronts: (1) Through authorization of Federal financial assistance to communities for a long-delayed but vitally needed start on the clearance of slums and blighted areas for redevelopment; (2) through continuation and expansion of Federal financial assistance to communities for low-rent public housing for families of low income; (3) through authorization of a comprehensive program of Federal research in housing aimed at relieving the many technical, social, and economic problems which beset the whole field of housing; and (4) through the authorization of Federal financial assistance for the provision of decent housing for farm families and particularly for farm families of low income. The bill also would establish, for the first time, a broad national housing objective aimed at achieving as soon as feasible the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, and would define the policies to be followed in attaining that objective.

Question. What is the background of this legislation?

Answer. The basic provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 are the product of exhaustive congressional investigation and consideration during the past 4 years. They are in accord with the principles recommended in 1945 by the Special Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment, after extended hearings. They likewise are consistent with the recommendations made by the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing in March 1948, after further intensive investigation of housing conditions throughout the Nation.

The subject matter in the pending bill has twice been approved by the Senate—in S. 1592 during the Seventy-ninth Congress (the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill) and in S. 866 during the Eightieth Congress (the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill). The Housing Act of 1949 incorporates the major unenacted provisions of those previous comprehensive bills, with certain revisions to meet changing conditions and needs.

Question. Does the bill cover all phases of the housing problem which require attention by the Congress at this session?

Answer. The provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 are fundamental to any comprehensive and effective housing program and attack the chronic problem areas in housing—slum clearance and the redevelopment of blighted areas, low-rent public housing, a comprehensive program of housing research, and farm housing.

It is recognized that there are other important phases of the housing problem which also require attention and which are not covered in the pending bill. These include such matters as the development of sound means for providing good housing for middle- and lower-middle-income families who are largely priced out of the new-housing market today; improvements in the existing programs of FHA insurance of private mortgage investments in sales, rental, and cooperative housing; necessary revisions in the Federal Government's secondary-market facilities for GI loans and FHA-insured mortgages; and proposals for Federal aid for the construction of needed housing at colleges and universities.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has made it clear that it is recommending the passage of the pending bill now to provide the foundation for the comprehensive program that is needed and to avoid any further delay in the enactment of these basic provisions which have been so thoroughly considered and on which wide agreement has been reached. The committee also has made it clear that it will proceed with its consideration of the other phases of the housing problem as rapidly as practicable and will recommend subsequently the further measures needed to round out a comprehensive program in ample time for consideration at this session of the Congress.

Question. Is it true, as sometimes charged, that this bill would give the Federal Govern-

ment dictatorial powers over local communities and would threaten to nationalize or socialize the housing industry?

Answer. This is not true, on either count. Participation by communities in either the slum-clearance program or the low-rent public housing program would be entirely at the option and initiative of local governments. Projects would be locally planned and locally executed. The role of the Federal Government would be restricted to the provision of financial assistance, the furnishing of technical aid and advice, and the administration of statutory requirements to assure that the intent and standards of the law are faithfully observed.

Neither is there anything in the bill that would threaten or undermine the position of private enterprise in housing. On the contrary, there is much that would strengthen it. The declaration of national housing policy stipulates that private housing enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can and that governmental assistance should be utilized to the extent feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need. The slum-clearance title requires that the plans for redevelopment of slums or blighted areas afford maximum opportunity for participation by private enterprise. The public-housing title requires a gap of at least 20 percent between the upper rental income limits for admission to public housing and the lowest rents at which private housing is providing an adequate supply of decent housing, new or old, for rent or sale in the locality involved, thus assuring no competition between public housing and private enterprise. Under the farm-housing title loans would be made only to those farmers who are unable to secure credit from other sources at terms within their paying ability. Finally, a primary objective of the Federal research program is to place the private housing industry in a much stronger position to serve a much broader market than today through improved methods and organization.

Question. What justification is there for Federal financial assistance to communities for slum clearance? Why cannot the localities and States handle this problem themselves without Federal aid?

Answer. The continued use of well over 5,000,000 slum dwellings and other substandard housing raises issues of national importance from the standpoint of the health and morals of millions of families and millions of children who will represent a substantial percentage of our citizenry in the coming generation. These slums and blighted areas have existed and have spread for generations, and experience has shown that they will continue to exist and to spread unless Federal financial aid is made available for their clearance.

The heart of the slum-clearance problem is the high price commanded by land in the central areas of cities, even when those areas are blighted or deteriorated, and the necessity for a substantial write-off of that price if slum areas are to be redeveloped on a sound basis which will prevent the recurrence of slum conditions.

States and cities are increasingly aware of the social costs of slums, of the threat to municipal solvency arising from the spread of slums and from the increasing spread of new building to the outskirts of cities, and of the heavy municipal outlays for city services in slum areas which greatly exceed the tax revenues derived from those areas. Nevertheless, they have lacked the financial resources to undertake more than a few scattered slum-clearance projects under the redevelopment legislation which is now on the statute books of half of the States. This, in turn, reflects the basic limitations on the sources of revenue for both State and local governments and the mounting costs of established public services.

Question. Are the provisions of the slum-clearance title sufficiently broad to assist comprehensive local redevelopment programs?

Answer. The basic justification for Federal assistance in slum clearance is the serious impact of slum conditions on the lives and development of millions of American families and their children. For that reason, the bill limits Federal financial assistance to the assembly and clearance of areas which either are predominantly residential slums or are blighted and commercial areas which will be redeveloped primarily for residential use.

However, this requirement in no sense will interfere with the carrying out of local programs combining slum clearance with comprehensive plans for the development and redevelopment of communities as a whole. Most slums and blighted areas are predominantly residential in character and, in these cases, the bill would permit their redevelopment for whatever new uses are considered best by the locality. Where blighted commercial or industrial areas are isolated from residential slum areas and hence must be redeveloped separately, Federal loans and grants would still be available but with a requirement that they are to be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses. This would not preclude the inclusion of a variety of other land uses within the redeveloped area provided its predominant character was residential.

The bill also recognizes that the clearance of crowded city slums will frequently make necessary a dispersion of the families now living in those slums into new housing developed on presently open urban or suburban land. It therefore makes loans (but not grants) available for the acquisition and preparation of such sites, including temporary loans for the construction of schools or other public facilities necessary to serve the new area.

Question. What about the claim that slums can be cleared or rehabilitated simply through the enforcement of local health and safety regulations?

Answer. While the development and enforcement of sound local housing codes establishing minimum standards of health, safety, and sanitation is a desirable objective, such codes in no sense can be considered as an acceptable substitute for effective slum-clearance programs. In the first place, most of the housing in slum areas is not worth permanent rehabilitation, by reason of deficiencies in design, structure, and location. Second, to the extent that some slum buildings could be restored to standard condition through substantial repairs and remodeling, the rents charged for those accommodations would necessarily have to be increased sufficiently to finance those expenditures, thereby removing that housing from the supply available to the low-income families now living in slums.

Again, even if local ordinances compelled the demolition or boarding-up of unsafe and unsanitary slum structures that are beyond economic repair, such demolition could not be expected to remove fully the principal barrier against sound redevelopment of slum areas, i. e., the high cost of central city land. The piecemeal character of such action also would stand in the way of redevelopment on an economic scale. Finally, reliance upon health and safety regulations as the total answer to the slum problem would completely ignore the basic problem of the low-income families now living in slums. Those families do not live there by choice but rather from economic necessity arising out of their inability to pay even the lowest rents at which decent housing is available.

Question. What is the reason for basing Federal subsidy assistance for slum clearance on capital grants instead of on annual contributions as used for low-rent public housing?

Answer. As contrasted with low-rent public housing where the amount of subsidies required may vary sharply from year to year, the loss involved in slum clearance is finally determined once the slum properties have been acquired and cleared, the necessary site improvements have been made, and the land is sold or leased for redevelopment, and the loss cannot in any way be reduced by subsequent operations. Consequently, the settlement of the Federal share of that cost through a lump-sum capital grant rather than through annual contributions over a long period of years is not only feasible but permits simplification both in the legislative formula and in the administrative work load involved.

Question. Why cannot private enterprise meet the housing needs of all income groups, either through new low-cost housing or through the "trickling-down" of used housing?

Answer. According to the Bureau of the Census, 19.7 percent of urban American families had money incomes in 1947 of less than $2,000 and 30.3 percent had incomes of less than $2,500. On the generally accepted basis of paying one-fifth of their incomes for housing, the average rent which the families in this lowest income group can afford to pay would be approximately $27 per month, the financial reach of these families.

With new housing construction concentrated in price brackets above $7,000 and rental brackets above $70 a month, it is clear that new private housing is far beyond the reach of these families.

With respect to the supply of used private housing available to these families, experience has shown that generally only that portion of the housing supply which has deteriorated to substandard condition has declined sufficiently in economic rental value to be within the rent-paying ability of low-income families. The very existence of the slums and their predominant occupancy by low-income families is proof of that experience. It is further borne out by the fact that the average rent being charged for substandard dwellings in urban areas is $28.50 per month.

Question. Why cannot cities make a substantial capital contribution toward the cost of additional public housing?

Answer. Under the Housing Act of 1949, the contribution of local governments to the subsidized rents in public housing projects is in the form of local tax exemption. While this form of local financial participation is workable, and makes a substantial contribution to the low rents in public housing projects, the imposition of a local capital contribution requirement would greatly diminish if not entirely destroy the workability of the program. The severely limited sources of local tax revenue and the constantly increasing cost of essential municipal services would rule out most cities from participation in such a program. In Senator WAGNER'S survey of slum clearance for the Joint Committee on Housing during the Eightieth Congress, the mayors of principal cities were asked whether their municipality was in a financial position to share in the capital cost of constructing low-rent public housing; 63 out of 69 mayors replied in the negative. The effect of a local capital grant requirement for low-rent public housing might well be to permit a few wealthy cities to secure Federal benefits while barring less wealthy cities where the need for public housing is at least as great.

Question. Is it true, as sometimes claimed, that public housing projects do not house low-income families and discriminate against those families most in need of aid?

Answer. The best answer to this claim is the actual experience in the present federally assisted low-rent public housing projects. In 1948, the average income of the families admitted to those original projects was $1,481 or 17 percent below the median income of urban families in the lowest income third. Even with a considerable proportion of families whose incomes have increased beyond the maximum limits for continued occupancy but which had not as yet been removed from the projects, the average family income of all tenants in those projects was $1,884 in 1948, or well within the range of the lowest income third.

The claim is also sometimes made that families on relief or other welfare cases are discriminated against in public housing. This is not so. The policy of the public housing program is to recognize the responsibility for housing families who are being assisted by welfare agencies, along with other low-income families in equal or greater need of low-rent housing. However, the public housing program does not and cannot set rents so low as to accommodate indigent families without the means of existence; in such cases welfare agencies are looked to to provide such families with a minimum subsistence income and rents are then set in proper relation to their actual incomes regardless of its source.

Under the pending bill, local housing authorities would be required to set maximum income levels for admission to public housing and for continued occupancy, subject to review and approval by the Public Housing Administration. The bill would also put into law present policies on tenant eligibility by prohibiting any discrimination against families on relief and by requiring that due consideration be given to the urgency of the families' housing needs in selecting families for admission.

Question. What about the claim that the cost of the public housing to be assisted under this bill would be greatly in excess of the average cost of new private housing?

Answer. The public housing projects to be assisted under this bill would be constructed by qualified private contractors under contracts let by local housing authorities after competitive bidding. As has been the case since the inception of the public housing program, the bill requires the Public Housing Administration to make certain that the projects not be of elaborate or extravagant design and materials and that economy be promoted in construction and operation. The bill also would require the PHA to approve specifically the amount of each main construction contract, after taking into account the level of construction costs prevailing in the locality involved.

These requirements and safeguards provide assurance that public housing projects will be constructed economically and at costs no greater than for comparable private housing built under similar conditions. The fact that economy has been observed in such construction is borne out by the record of the low-rent projects built under the existing United States Housing Act program, principally during the years 1938 to 1942. The average net construction cost of the dwellings built under that program was $2,882 per unit and the average over-all development costs, including sites, utilities, and all other expenses, was $4,649 per dwelling. While these are largely prewar costs and could not be duplicated today, they compare very favorably with the costs of comparable private construction during the same period.

Question. Will the public housing proposed in this bill compete with private housing?

Answer. Occupancy of the low-rent public housing to be assisted under this bill will be restricted to families with incomes too low to afford adequate new or existing private housing. In fact, the bill requires that local housing authorities, in establishing maximum income limits for admission to low-rent projects, leave a gap of at least 20 percent between the upper rental limits for admission and the lowest rents at which decent private housing, new or old, is generally available for rent or for sale in the locality involved.

The bill further requires the local authorities to set maximum income limits for continued occupancy of the projects, to reexamine the incomes of all tenant families each year, and to require those families whose incomes have increased beyond the maximum for continued occupancy to move from the project.

Under these requirements, there clearly can be no competition between low-rent public housing and decent privately owned housing, whether new or old.

Question. Since the comprehensive bills before previous Congresses would have authorized a program of only 500,000 public housing units, what justification is there for the program of 810,000 units proposed in the pending bill?

Answer. The first comprehensive housing bill, passed by the Senate in April, 1946, but not finally enacted, proposed a public housing program of 125,000 dwellings a year for 4 years, or a total of 500,000 units. The succeeding general bill, passed by the Senate in April, 1948, but again not enacted, also proposed 500,000 units. The pending bill calls for 135,000 units a year over 6 years, or a total of 810,000 units.

The earlier bills approved by the Senate clearly contemplated that before the completion of their proposed public housing programs, Congress would reexamine the whole need for public housing, measure the results accomplished, and make provision for whatever additional action was shown to be justified. In no way was it the consensus of the Senate that 500,000 public housing units would meet more than a small fraction of the need for decent shelter on the part of low-income families living in the slums.

Since that time, with no action taken to authorize a resumption of the low-rent public housing program, the need for such a program has been reexamined by the Congress in studies which have shown conclusively the prevalence of bad housing for millions of low-income families. In the light of those findings, the extension of the public housing program proposed in the pending bill represents a minimum program in terms of the acute housing needs of underprivileged families, as well as an effort in some measure to make up for past delays in the resumption of the program.

Question. What about the claim that the public housing program in this bill would increase the inflationary pressure on the supply of materials and labor?

Answer. The bill would authorize the construction of 135,000 dwelling units per year, representing about 10 percent of the total annual housing construction which the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency estimates to be the average requirement if real progress is to be made in solving the housing problem.

Building-materials production has expanded remarkably since the end of the war and the supply situation has greatly improved. Similarly, there has been steady growth in the supply of trained building labor. On the basis of this past experience, it is reasonable to anticipate that the supply of both materials and labor will continue to expand as total housing production is built up to the needed levels. In the light of the over-all level of needed housing production, the volume of public housing authorized in this bill clearly would represent a minor factor in the supply situation.

The bill also would authorize the President to increase the number of public housing starts authorized in any one fiscal year to not more than 250,000 units, or to decrease them to not less than 50,000 units, if he finds such action to be in the public interest, after advice from the Council of Economic Advisers as to the effect of such increase or decrease upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy.

Question. Would it not be preferable to substitute a Federal capital grant for the system of Federal annual contributions for public housing?

Answer. The purpose of the annual Federal contributions for low-rent housing is to provide the subsidy needed, in combination with local tax exemption, to achieve the low rents required by low-income tenants. Over the life of a public housing project, this annual subsidy varies substantially from year to year, in accordance with changes in economic conditions and in the income level of tenants. Under the annual-contributions system, only the actual amount needed for the particular year is paid by the Federal Government—up to the maximum rate specified in the contract with the locality. As is shown by the experience during recent years, under special circumstances the actual contributions paid by the Federal Government may represent only a small percentage of the maximum amount contracted for.

If, instead, a capital-grant system were used, a grant equal to the total cost of developing a public housing project would be necessary if the same low rents were to be achievable as under the maximum annual contributions contracted for in the present system. But under a capital-grant system, the Federal Government's contribution would be frozen at the maximum amount; there would be no basis of recovery of any part of this grant if in later years conditions so changed as to make a lesser subsidy actually necessary. In the meantime, the full cost of the Federal grant would be a charge on the public debt. Furthermore, a capital-grant system would make it impossible to take advantage of the savings attainable through financing the cost of public housing projects through local housing authority bonds. This would be possible under the annual-contributions system as perfected in the Housing Act of 1949.

Question. Why is it necessary or desirable for the Federal Government to undertake a comprehensive program of housing research?

Answer. There is wide agreement that the basic cause of the excessive cost of housing is the relative technical backwardness of the housing industry as compared with other mass industries. At the same time, because of the complexity of the industry and the fact that it is composed largely of a wide range of specialized, small business firms, no single firm or group of firms has either the resources or a sufficiently broad stake in the industry as a whole to undertake the comprehensive program needed to modernize the whole process of housing production and marketing.

For this reason, it is clear that leadership and assistance by the Federal Government is essential if real progress is to be made. The establishment of a comprehensive Federal program of housing research was strongly recommended by the Special Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1945 and again by the Joint Committee on Housing in 1948. Legislative authority to that effect, largely similar to that in the Housing Act of 1949, was contained in the

previous comprehensive housing bills approved by the Senate in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses.

Under the pending bill, the Housing and Home Finance Agency would coordinate the housing research now in progress both publicly and privately, cooperate with both private and public institutions and with industry in stimulating additional needed research, undertake through its own facilities the types of research which cannot otherwise be accomplished, and make widely available the results of these coordinated activities for application by the housing industry and communities. This research program would seek to make possible basic improvement in the whole range of technical, social, and economic problems involved in the field of housing.

Question. Is there any merit to the argument that the authority for research should be placed elsewhere in the Federal Government rather than in the Housing Agency in order to avoid distortions in information?

Answer. There would appear to be no merit in this argument. Under the same reasoning, Federal research in agricultural problems should be divorced from the Department of Agriculture, research on monetary and banking problems should be divorced from the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board, and research on atomic energy should be divorced from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Clearly, the responsibility for housing research should be placed in the agency which has responsibility for the principal housing programs of the Federal Government and which is the central point of contact on housing for the Congress, industry, communities, and the general public. While important research activities affecting housing are conducted in other Federal agencies and departments, these are incidental to other programs and in no case are housing problems as such the primary concern.

Under the pending bill, the Housing Administrator would be directed to utilize to the fullest extent feasible the available research facilities of other Federal departments and agencies. But the responsibility for conducting the research activities needed to overcome many of the basic housing problems long confronting the Nation would necessarily and logically be centered in the same agency which has the primary responsibility for the other major housing programs aimed at relieving those same problems through Federal financial aid and assistance.

Question. What is the justification for a special program of Federal aid for farm housing?

Answer. While there has been improvement in farm housing conditions during recent years, nevertheless a much higher proportion of farm dwellings than urban dwellings are in bad physical condition and a large majority of farm houses lack many of the facilities considered essential in urban housing. Furthermore, nearly a third of the Nation's farm families do not receive sufficient income from their farming operations to finance the needed improvements to their homes and the other building improvements essential to successful farm operations.

At the same time, it is clear that a farm housing program must be closely related to the farm economy and that housing programs developed primarily to meet the needs of city dwellers, either through private housing or public housing, are not adaptable to the special requirements of the farmer.

The farm-housing title in the pending bill recognizes, first, that Federal financial assistance for the improvement of housing conditions on farms is an indispensable part of any broad housing program, and, second, that such assistance should be closely related to the Federal Government's over-all program of aids to farmers.

The bill therefore authorizes a special program of financial assistance through the Department of Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration. This program is designed specifically to meet the problems of farmers who cannot get credit elsewhere to finance the construction of adequate homes or other essential farm buildings. The program would also provide research and technical services, pointed toward more efficient and more economical construction of farm dwellings and buildings.

Question. What will be the cost to the Federal Government of the various programs proposed in the pending bill?

Answer. Aside from certain administrative expenses, the direct costs to the Federal Government would be through capital grants for local slum-clearance programs, annual contributions for low-rent public housing, and grants and contributions for farm housing.

The bill authorizes contracts for capital grants for slum-clearance projects at an annual rate of $100,000,000 for 5 years, or a total of $500,000,000. Contracts for annual contributions for low-rent public housing could be made for a maximum of $85,000,000 in the first year and could be increased by annual increments to an over-all maximum of $308,000,000 a year after the sixth year. These annual contributions could run over a 40-year period. The figure of $308,000,000 represents the maximum which could be paid in annual contributions for public housing in any one year; on the basis of past experience it is anticipated that actual payments will not average over two-thirds to three-quarters of this maximum. For farm housing, the bill authorizes an aggregate of $12,500,000 in grants over a 4-year period and commitments for annual contributions starting at $500,000 the first year and reaching a peak of $5,000,000 after the fourth year. These annual contributions could not be paid for more than 10 years.

At all stages, these direct costs would amount to less than 1 percent of the present Federal budget.

The loan authorizations in the bill for slum clearance, low-rent public housing, and farm housing would all be repayable with interest. The cost of the program of housing research would be determined from year to year by the Congress through the normal appropriations procedure.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to make a statement on the housing bill until later in the course of the debate. However, in view of the fact that the House of Representatives is still considering a continuing resolution in respect to the deficiency appropriation bill, and I do not believe the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill has yet reached us, I think I shall take a little time to make a brief statement with respect to the present housing bill.

Mr. President, we have before us a measure which affects the lives of millions of our fellow Americans. Housing is probably the most important thing in the lives of the people. The need for decent shelter is a fundamental human need.

We know that a severe shortage of housing still exists in America. Here in the Senate we had to pass a rent-control bill not long ago, because we realized that millions of people cannot find housing at prices within their means. In the United States today, in the richest country in the world, families are crowded into living quarters with other families because there are not enough low-priced homes to go around. Many thousands of Americans are forced to live year after year in shacks, trailers, tourist cabins, or other temporary dwellings, because they cannot afford to purchase permanent homes.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Housing, which made a thorough investigation of this problem, found that there are at least 3,300,000 families doubled up with others or packed into make-shift dwellings.

I ask whether that is a satisfactory way of living for Americans.

I ask whether it is a situation which makes for national health.

I ask whether such conditions do not breed crime and disease, misery, and, perhaps ultimately, rebellion.

I ask whether such conditions offer a proper environment in which to bring up children—the citizens of tomorrow.

I ask whether such conditions do not give an opportunity for Communism—which, to my way of thinking, is the most deadly menace of all—to thrive and prosper in communities of that kind.

There should be no room in America for slums. The ghastly areas of ramshackle tenements which blight so many of our cities today are un-American. Yet approximately one out of every five of our urban families now exists in a blighted area. Such conditions cannot continue if America is to continue, in the future, on the road to happiness and progress.

It is a shameful fact that more than 5,000,000 families in the United States are forced to struggle along in the most sordid surroundings, marked by filth and dilapidation. These people do not live in such places because they want to do so. The desire for a decent home is just as strong in a poor man as it is in a man with a high income. But the families of poor men stay in the slums because they simply do not have the money to pay even the lowest rents at which satisfactory housing is available. I do not say that is true of every person, but 90 percent of the people who are poor—and I know something about people who come from families with low incomes—have the urge to leave such environments and to do better

for themselves. Many times all that is needed is the right kind of start, the right kind of push; and certainly a decent home or a decent room—decent shelter—is one of the fundamental things which will make better citizens for the United States of tomorrow.

Private builders cannot construct housing for these people at present costs and make enough profit to remain in business. If the problem could be solved by private industry, I would be very willing to leave it in the hands of private builders. Yet the builders themselves have admitted that they need Government aid in this field.

The findings of congressional investigations during the last 5 years have made it clear that only through an effective program of Federal assistance can real progress be made in clearing away our slums. This is amply supported by the testimony presented on behalf of the United States Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association.

The Surgeon General of the United States has testified that a Federal housing program on a large scale is urgently needed to remove the evil effects of slums on the lives and development of millions of American families and their children.

Mr. President, all of us pay a steep price for the existence of slums. We pay in medical bills and hospital bills, because diseases which often begin in the slums spread rapidly to other areas. We pay in taxes for law-enforcement agencies, homes for delinquent children, and great numbers of jails and prisons for young criminals who rise from slums. We pay in time of war, when we find that hundreds of thousands of young men from slums are not physically fit to fight for our country. We pay in social and moral ways, because slums weigh on the consciences of many citizens and provide propaganda for communistic and radical groups.

Mr. President, cities are not the only places where slums spread their blight. We have slums in our rural areas, too. The provision of Federal financial assistance for the improvement of housing conditions on farms is an indispensable part of any housing program. The effects of bad housing apply with equal force on farm families, on the health and character of their children, as they do on families in our cities and towns.

While there has been great improvement in farm housing since 1940, the truth is that after nearly 10 years of farm prosperity, nearly one-third of the Nation's farm families do not have sufficient income to finance the needed improvements on their homes and to build the new homes urgently needed. The man who runs a farm does does not have a choice of dwellings comparable to the choice generally available to the worker in the city. The uncertainty of agricultural income, in addition to other hazards of farming, has prohibited long-time financing of building improvements on many farms. Neither the insurance of private investments by the Government nor the urban type of public-housing assistance will meet the need of more than 1,000,000 farm families for adequate, decent, safe, and sanitary housing and other necessary farm buildings.

A special type of financial aid, designed to meet the problems of the farmers who cannot get credit elsewhere, and a program of research and technical services, pointed toward more efficient and more economical construction of farm buildings, must be undertaken by the Federal Government.

The authority for such assistance is provided in title IV of S. 1070.

In S. 1070, we have a housing bill which will assure the building of enough homes to satisfy most American needs, reduce costs, clear the slums, and provide decent living places for most of the low-income families on the farms and in the cities and towns.

Mr. President, we can render no greater service to the American people than we can give through the passage of this bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am exceedingly interested in what the Senator has just been discussing. If I correctly heard the Senator's reference, he mentioned Senate bill 1070 as assuring a sufficient number of houses to satisfy the needs of America.

Mr. LUCAS. Most of the needs.

Mr. CAIN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. LUCAS. If I said that, I made a mistake. In Senate bill 1070 we have a housing bill which will assure the building of a sufficient number of homes to satisfy most of the American needs, reduce costs, clear the slums, and provide decent living places for most of the low-income families on the farms and in the cities and towns. However, I should say that includes most of the low-income groups. In other words, in the judgment of the Senator from Illinois, this would make a magnificent start toward providing low-income families, not only in the cities and towns, but on the farms as well, with decent places in which to live.

Mr. CAIN. I am certain the Senator will agree with me that the homes to be constructed under the bill are designed to satisfy the needs of the low-income groups. That entirely neglects at this time a consideration of the over-all housing requirements of the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is eminently correct. I concur wholeheartedly in the statement he makes. We see eye to eye on that very important question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course the Senator from Illinois, our distinguished majority leader, does not lose sight of the fact that this is only one part of the general over-all housing program, but an important part, if we are to have an adequate housing program. Is that not correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator of course is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say I had planned to be on the floor to ask certain questions of the Senator from Alabama. The Senator has yielded the floor. The matter is important to me, and I should like to ask a question and receive an answer tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama will stay on the floor, if the Senator from Wisconsin starts interrogating the Senator from Illinois, because I may say, or rather confess, I may have to lean heavily upon the Senator from Alabama, who is an expert on housing. I merely pay the rent.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say as a preface to my question I think that——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question of the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois, or the Senator from Wisconsin, yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. We yield all around.

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield to my good friend from Nebraska, who I am sure has something important to say.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know how important it is.

Mr. LUCAS. I saw the Senator talking to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. When the Senator from Arizona is around, that means it is something important.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may inquire of the majority leader, it is not the purpose to consider the continuing resolution on the deficiency bill tonight, is it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee said he would be in the Appropriations Committee room, and when the continuing resolution came from the House we should send for him immediately. I now request someone to notify the Senator from Tennessee. As soon as he arrives on the floor we shall discuss the continuing resolution on the deficiency appropriation bill. I now yield to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Alabama is present. He may want to supply the answer. It is very important to me that I have an answer to the question tonight. The answer will determine to a large extent just what amendment, if any, I shall offer Monday morning. First, let me say, referring to the public housing section, I think the bill is infinitely better than any other public housing bill which has ever been introduced previously on the Senate floor, by reason of certain changes in the yardstick to be used in the selection of tenants. I think the slum-clearance pro-

vision is excellent. I do not think too much of one part of the farm housing section, but if the Senator will turn to page 27, line 16——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the question of the Senator from Wisconsin addressed to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I was waiting momentarily for the Senator. If the Senator will turn to page 27, line 16, of Senate bill 1070, he will notice under (i) a provision to remove the apparent discrimination against families who are receiving any part of their income from relief, widow's pension, and so forth. I believe the Senator and I wholeheartedly agree on that. We come then to the subsection starting in line 20, reading as follows:

(ii) in initially selecting families for admission to dwellings of given sizes and at specified rents the public housing agency shall (subject to the preferences prescribed in subsection 10 (g) of this Act) give preference to families having the most urgent housing need, and therefore, in selecting families for admission to such dwellings, shall give due consideration to the urgency of th~ families' housing needs.

What is the Senator's interpretation of that particular phrase? Let me put the question differently. Does the Senator understand it to mean that in selecting tenants initially, the determining factor shall be the question of housing need, regardless of income, so long as it comes under the income level that is set?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I may say the provision received about as careful consideration by the committee as did any other provision of the bill. We discussed almost every conceivable formula for making certain that the people who ought to have the housing should have it. We discussed it, and an amendment was offered to set an arbitrary income level. We then realized that sometimes it might operate successfully, at other times not; so we decided that the best way was to say that in the initial selection the applicant with the most urgent housing need should be accepted. Of course, it would have to be a family within the prescribed income level. That is the first condition to be met.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, the provision does not contemplate a minimum income which a man must have; the bill merely establishes a maximum; is that correct? In other words, it is not said in effect that unless an individual is making $1,000, $1,200, or $1,500 a year, he shall not be eligible, is it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, not at all; nor does the bill measure the need by the little amount that he may be making. One person might have no children in his family; another might have half a dozen. Certainly there ought to be a difference in income. One may live in a fairly decent house; another may be living in a slum, or in a place that is not a sanitary or decent place in which to live.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, the purpose of the subsection is to provide that in selecting tenants, the size of the family, the income, and conditions of health shall be taken into consideration. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. All the things which the Senator from Wisconsin mentions would be taken into consideration in determining the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope I am wrong, but I am firmly convinced, I may say to the Senator, that the language does not do what the Senator and I want it to do. It is trick language. I refer to line 21. The wording is "at specified rents." I have talked to a number of men familiar with public housing matters. They requested that I not use their names on the Senate floor, but they tell me that in selecting a tenant initially, after the project has been built, of course, there is a determination of the average rent that must be obtained in order to cover the cost of administration. Very well. In other words, the subsidy does not cover the cost of administration. We may say that in different cases the rent runs $30, $31, or $32 a month. If presently someone who has an income enabling him to pay $40 or $42 a month goes into the particular public-housing unit, someone else in a lower-income bracket may be accommodated. In other words, if the average rent which must be obtained is $30 a month, unless some one is paying $40 a month, a tenant cannot be put in at $20 a month. Does the Senator follow me?

Representatives of the Public Housing Administration claim they have studied the language very carefully and that it does not provide, in effect, that the yardstick to be used in selecting tenants shall be the greatest housing need. They say, in effect, that unless there are some over-income tenants in the project, they cannot give those in the lower-income scale the opportunity of occupying public housing. They say, first, that we must eliminate specified rents, and, second, provide an aditional subsidy in case all the families are $22.50-a-month tenants. I am wondering if the Senator would consent to go along with me to the extent of changing the bill to accomplish that which he has just stated will be accomplished and which the legal minds of the Housing Administration say will not be accomplished.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin regarding the bill. I know how earnestly he worked on the housing bill in the Eightieth Congress, and I know he pays a great deal of attention to matters of this kind. It may be that the Senator has a point on the question regarding specific rents. Frankly, I have not thought of it in that way. I shall be very glad to study that particular suggestion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator understand that I am not advocating taking solely welfare cases. I merely want the language sufficiently clear so that the Housing Administrator in Milwaukee or in Alabama has an absolute right to say he will select those who most need the public housing, and then go on up the line. I shall state what it would mean, and I call it to the Senator's attention so that he may give it some thought over the week end. It would mean that the Administrator would first fix the average rent. Let us assume the average rent is $32 a month. I understand rents are fixed not to cover amortization, or any interest charge or taxes. Those matters are taken care of by the city and the Federal Government in the subsidy. Under the language of the bill at this time, the Administrator would go a step further and say, "We want to get some of the poorer people in the project." He would go down to the $20-a-month level. That would mean that if there were one tenant who could pay no more than $20 a month, the Administrator would have to select one who could pay $40 a month, to make up the difference. He would first specify how many he wanted of the $35 class, how many of the $45 class, how many of the $30 class, and how many of the $20 class. Then he would try to determine the housing needs in those particular classes. Let us say that John Jones is earning $600 a year, and he has six or seven children. With food costs what they are, I assume the Housing Administrator would decide that John Jones could pay no more than $20 a month. That would mean that if the $20-a-month class were filled, and there were apartments which should rent for $42 a month, some person who had a tremendous housing need would not be eligible for the housing. I am sure the Senator does not want that to be the result. I think the language should be radically changed. We must recognize, if it is changed, that the cost of public housing will be slightly greater; but, so long as we will spend $15,000,000,000 on this program, anyway, I should say that another three or four hundred million dollars would accomplish the task we want to accomplish.

In closing, I should like to ask this question so that the Senator from Alabama may think about it over the week-end. May I have the Senator's assurance that he will go over the language carefully and will join me in any necessary amendments to provide that the sole determining factor in selecting tenants for public housing will be housing need?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall certainly be glad to study the language carefully, particularly in view of the theories which have been expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin. Personally, I think his fears are unfounded. Certainly it is not the intention of the committee that the law shall operate in the way the Senator has suggested it will operate. As a matter of fact, I do not believe there will be any need for the additional contribution, anyway, because experience has shown during the first 6 months of 1948—and I think these are rather interesting figures—that of the new admissions of families with incomes of less than $500 a year, nine-tenths of 1 percent in that class were taken in. Of families with incomes of $500 up to $1,000, 11.5 percent of the new admissions were in that class. In the class of $1,000 up to $1,500, there were 39.7 percent. In the class receiving incomes of $1,500 to $2,000, there were 38.6 percent. In the class receiving $2,000 to $2,500, there were 8.2

percent. In the class receiving $2,500 up to $3,000, there were 1.1 percent.

That represents the distribution. It has not resulted from any deliberate picking, such as the Senator has suggested. It is simply the manner in which tenants came and were admitted. I think we can rely on a similar schedule.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois bear with me a little longer?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a concurrent resolution has just come over from the House, and if I can have it considered by the Senate, because the House is waiting on it, it will be perfectly all right with me to debate the housing bill as long as may be desired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk House Concurrent Resolution 56, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 56) was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 14, 1949, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, April 25, 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the majority leader has asked for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution. I understand it has no bearing upon the plans of the Senate, and that the Senate, according to the announcement previously made, will convene again on Monday next. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 56) was considered and agreed to.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949—CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House have failed to reach a conclusion on the first deficiency appropriation bill which was passed by the Senate yesterday. There are several points of difference. The House has passed and sent to the Senate a continuing resolution. But, as the Senate will meet on Monday next, as I am informed by the distinguished majority leader, I make the request that the continuing resolution go over until next Monday, when it can be given careful consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he does not think that is the proper procedure?

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me it is the only procedure the Senate can, with propriety, follow at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I am in agreement with him. I feel that that is the only proper course which can be taken at this time. I am in total agreement with the Senator that we should hold the resolution over until Monday, and take action at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I propound a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama will take the floor so that I may ask him questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator knows, I have been spending a great deal of time going through the bill with a fine-tooth comb, and I think that essentially it is a good measure. I think the Senator has done good work as a whole, and I hope he will not consider my questions as critical of the work done by the committee.

Is it the Senator's thought that we should provide under the legislation, first, that there should be a ceiling on incomes, as the bill presently provides?

Second, does the Senator think that there should be no minimum whatsoever; in other words, that no person should be excluded because his income is not sufficient?

Third—and this is the important matter, the one we have been discussing so long—does the Senator agree with me that we should provide definitely that the sole determining factor in selecting tenants originally should be housing needs, remembering that we are not restricting it to any class? Do we agree that that should be the sole yardstick?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Within the income level. I believe that is what we do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Within the income ceiling, the Senator means?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, and of course it should be kept in mind that the ceiling is not necessarily a fixed ceiling. For instance, take the case the Senator was discussing a while ago, the phrase to which he took exception; about specified rents, again going back to the example the Senator cited, where the Authority arrived at the price it should get for a certain rental unit. If a person had an income more than five times the rent of that unit, he would not be eligible to occupy the unit.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I mention that in order that we may get out of our minds the idea that the income ceiling is fixed, because it may be flexible.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the Senator will pardon me for being so technical, but I think we must be, in connection with this bill. I think we must tie it down to accomplish what we desire to accomplish.

Let us assume that project A in Chicago, Ill., has been built, and the local administrator estimates the cost of operation as the administrative cost, and arrives at a figure of an average rent which he must charge in order to cover the cost of administration. Let us say that average cost is $30.

Let us assume that when he has finished sifting all the prospective tenants, he finds that their incomes are so low and their families so large that none of them can afford to pay more than $20 a month. Is it the Senator's understanding that all those families, who can pay no more than $20 a month, will be given priority, even though the administrator says, "I must collect an average rent of $30 in order to cover the cost of administration"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator must keep in mind——

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will pardon me, my reason for bringing that up is that I think if we are to accomplish the purpose desired we must add an amendment to the bill so as to provide, in cases where the incomes are so low that, in selecting those who most need the housing, we get down below what is called an economic rent, that a greater subsidy shall be paid in order to take care of the cost of administration. If we do what I have always wanted to do in public housing and what the Senator I am sure wants to do, we must advance a step further in granting a subsidy and make the subsidy cover not merely the cost of amortization, the taxes, and the interest charges, as it does today, but, where it is found necessary, where the tenants' incomes are so low they cannot pay an economic rent, make the subsidy sufficient to cover a part of the cost of administration. That is why I call it to the Senator's attention.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If we felt that the condition the Senator has described was going to exist, it might be that such language as he has suggested would be helpful. But, as a matter of fact, experience has shown that that condition will not exist. I believe that in propounding his question the Senator is thinking of need in terms of income.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I am not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is only one of the factors, and is one among so many that I do not believe the condition the Senator mentions may reasonably be expected ever to exist.

Let us say that there are 100 people on a list for vacant units in a project. Of the 100 people it is not likely that those who are going to be most urgently in need of housing are those at the bottom of the scale of income. One family

of the 100 may have an income of $2,500, and yet perhaps may need housing the worst, and perhaps can qualify. There may be half a dozen children; the family may have been burned out, be doubled up with relatives, or they may have been evicted from some other place. They may live in a house which has been condemned, and that family with several children and with a $2,500 income might be the very family that needs housing most.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am disturbed about this because of what I found in our investigation last year. The Senator knows I visited every sizable city in the United States, from San Francisco to New York, from New Orleans to St. Paul. We found some very unusual conditions existing in the administration of the housing act, not because of incompetence on the part of the public housing administrator, either local or national, but because of the congressional mandate under which they had to work.

For example, in Detroit we found there was a vast number of over-income tenants. We did not have a chance to talk to the administrator himself, but we talked to a number of people concerned about the project, and they said, "We must have the over-income tenants in order to accommodate those in the lower brackets, because unless we get over-income tenants in the project, from whom we can collect sizable rents, then we cannot take those in the lowest scale."

There came before us a widow, who happened to be a war widow, who had four children. She was getting the usual widow's pension. She was told by the local administrator that she would not qualify, she could not get into public housing, because she fell in a particular income bracket. In other words, the apartments which would rent for around $25 a month were all filled, and they had to have wealthier clients to fill up the $45 apartments in order to balance the cost of administration. That condition exists in a number of places. There should be no object on the Senator's part, or on the part of anyone else, to saying, "We will provide in the public housing legislation, which we all say is to take care of those who need housing the worst, that the local administrator shall not only have the duty, but we will write the law in such form that he shall have the power, to take into consideration only one thing, that is, housing need." If we do that, then we have a good public-housing bill. If we do not do it, then I say we should under no circumstances ever pass a public-housing measure, because we should not have a continuation of the situation which exists today, when a man with five or six children and a sick wife is excluded from public housing because the rules and regulations which are issued, not by the Public Housing Administrator, whom we are all inclined to criticize when there is improper administration, but the rules and regulations prescribed by the Congress, tie the Administrator's hands so that he cannot provide housing for those who need it worst.

Under the circumstances, I very seriously request that the Senator join with me in sitting down with the legal staff of the Housing Administration and redrafting the bill so that it will accomplish the thing which he and I are now discussing, that is, provide only one yardstick. I repeat over and over purposely, so that there will be no mistake, my reference to the question of housing needs, regardless of where people are in the income scale, just so they keep below the maximum figure set. If the Senator will do that I am convinced we will have a good housing bill, one which can become a permanent part of our over-all housing program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have the suggestion made by the able Senator from Wisconsin. I do not know how many cases of the type he mentions there may be throughout the country. Naturally we will occasionally run into situations like the one he has described.

One thing, however, shoud be kept in mind, and that is that we have never really had a fair test of public housing. We started public housing before the war, and before we really had a chance to test it we were in the war. Then along came the matter of defense housing, Lanham Act housing, war-workers housing, temporary housing, housing of every kind, and we even let people move into public housing projects without regard to their income levels, because they were needed in connection with war work at the place where the housing was. After the war was over the authorities began putting out persons whose incomes were too high. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that in our committee we received a great many complaints about the types of families that were placed in certain types of housing. When the authorities began evicting them we received a good many complaints because those who were evicted said they had no place to go. Then there was a statutory enactment authorizing and directing the authorities to permit those whom they proposed to evict to remain, until a few months ago, when the act expired. The act has now expired. People who do not qualify are being evicted.

The best experience we have had is that which obtained in 1948. The figures for that year I read to the Senator a few minutes ago.

We wrote the language in question into the bill purposely. It does not appear in the bill as a result of accident. As a matter of fact, the language we are talking about was written in the committee. We wrote into the bill a requirement that in the selection of tenants initially—I think it is only fair to emphasize the word "initially" in the beginning—the first preference should be given to those in most urgent need of housing. We did that because we felt that the purposes of public housing were to do that very thing.

Mr. President, I shall be very glad to discuss this matter with legal authorities, both on our staff and in the housing agency, in order to determine if the fears expressed by the able Senator from Wisconsin are justified, and if so, I shall be very glad to join with him in offering such language as may be required in order to carry out the real purpose of the committee in writing the language into the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator was absolutely correct when he said there had never been a fair test of public housing, but that has largely been because of a congressional mandate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I think the Senator should go further and say it has been because of the war and the conditions surrounding the war effort, even back before the war started, when the defense program got underway. We have never had a fair chance to test the program.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me explain. Until this bill was drafted it had always been the congressional intent to provide public housing only for what are known as stable wage earners. The Senator will recall that last year when the question of public housing was being considered we had a very heated and lengthy debate on the floor when I attempted to insert an amendment in line 16 to the effect that there shall be no further discrimination against anyone because of the source of his or her income. In other words, the purpose was that no one could be excluded because a woman, for example, was receiving a widow's pension, or because a man or woman was on relief, or what not. At that time the argument was made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was that if we were, in the first place, to provide that there should be no discrimination against those receiving widow's pensions, and, in the second place, to provide, in effect, that the greatest housing need should be the controlling factor, then in effect we would have more or less of a poorhouse.

The Senator and I realize that if we are to take care of those who need housing the most, it will be much harder to administer the measure than if we continue as we have in the past, that is, to provide housing only for the stable wage earners.

Mr. President, I am disturbed about the language appearing in lines 20 and 21. Last year, when I offered an amendment which, incidentally, I am happy to state, the Senator from Alabama did not oppose, providing that the question of greatest housing need should be controlling in selecting new tenants, the amendment was very vigorously objected to by the sponsors of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so finally, we watered it down by saying that those who were in the greatest need of housing should be given the first consideration. When I suggested that those who had the greatest need should be given priority in obtaining housing accommodations, the suggestion was fought vigorously and successfully. I am frank to say that it disturbs me to see what I call trick language in lines 20 and 21.

Mr. President, I am not saying this on the spur of the moment, for I have gone over it in great detail. I have discussed it with 10 lawyers, some in the Housing Administration, and they all agree with me that this language defeats the purpose the Senator has in mind; that it will not provide for tenancy on the basis of greatest housing need.

Now that I am sure we both agree as to what we want to do, I know that over the week end we can sit down and draft language which will accomplish the purpose we have in mind.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate what the Senator has pointed out, and I assure him that I shall be very glad to study the matter.

Mr. President, if there is no further business, to come before the Senate, I move——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, while the Senator is on the floor, I wish to point out another thing to him. The bill contains a farm housing section which I think is ridiculous to the point of being ludicrous. It is a farm housing section which provides for a number of unusual things. One section in the bill is what we referred to last year as the "toilet section" and provides that a farmer may secure a grant of $500 for repairing his toilets. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint in each county and in each parish of the whole country three commissioners. They will be paid on a per diem and an expense basis. As I look over that section of the bill and see the amount of money we have appropriated, I cannot help but be convinced that after we get through paying the three commissioners in each county their per diem and their expenses, there will be no money left to make grants for toilets. The provision would mean the setting up of a great mass of employees throughout the Nation who would investigate and find all the farmers who needed their toilets repaired, but by the time they had completed their work of investigation, and had come to the point of making the grants of the money, all the money appropriated would have been used for the commissioners' salaries and expenses.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will over the week end consider joining with us in a motion to strike out this rather ridiculous section from the farm housing title of the bill. I am not referring to the entire farm housing portion of the bill. The first and second sections I believe to be good. They cover the marginal farms. They cover those which are self-supporting. When we get down to the farms that never can be self-supporting, and appropriate for them merely a small amount of money, simply enough to pay the horde of bureaucrats we shall be obliged to hire, thereby trying to create the impression of giving the farmer something, I think such a provision is simply deceptive. I do not know how many counties and parishes there are in the United States, but there are a great many.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Three thousand rural counties.

Mr. McCARTHY. That will mean the employment of 9,000 commissioners to be paid on a per diem and expense basis. If we check the amount of money we are authorizing, by the time we get through paying the political army—and there is no question that it will be just that—there will be nothing left. In fact, if I were running for reelection tomorrow I would not mind having the right to appoint the members of this army in my State.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess; but before doing so, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I hope he will think about this subject over the week end.

Section 404, the section to which he referred as being ridiculous and ludicrous, is not so at all. I wish to say in all earnestness that this is the only part of the bill that provides anything like slum clearance for the great mass of farmers who are living in slums on farms. We are willing to spend one and a half billion dollars to help clear slums in the cities; and I think that $12,500,000 to do a little something to improve slum conditions in the country is not to be taken lightly, or to be termed ridiculous or ludicrous.

With regard to the horde of Federal workers, 9,000 of them, as alleged, the bill does not provide for a single additional worker. There will be just as many workers if section 404 is stricken out as there will be if section 404 is left in.

Furthermore, speaking of the committeemen, I am sure that the able Senator from Wisconsin knows that the Farmers Home Administration, which will administer this farm-housing section, already has a committee in every rural county of the United States, or practically so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said, "Or practically so." Wherever the Farmers Home Administration administers its program, it has a committee. That is one of the principal reasons why we provide that the Farmers Home Administration shall administer this part of the program, because by doing so it could use exactly the same committee which it already has in the county. I do not know of any Government agency which is doing a better job than the Farmers Home Administration. By the way, it is already doing some of the work which the Senator from Wisconsin terms ludicrous. It is already doing it in the case of the tenant-purchase program.

Mr. McCARTHY. They are not building toilets.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is already doing some of the work in the case of those under its rehabilitation program.

I wish to say for the benefit of those who may read the RECORD over the week end that they should not take this program lightly, or consider it as ludicrous. It refers to the possibility of building sanitary privies; and because it provides for that, in addition to putting screens on houses, repairing roofs, digging wells, and furnishing sanitary water supplies, and all those things the correction of which is so badly needed in order to prevent health hazards in the communities, someone who wants to criticize the program dubs it the "toilet" section of the bill. Let them call it what they may. It is a very fine and helpful part of this program, and an effort to do something to relieve to some extent slum conditions as they exist on the farms of the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was about to move a recess. I must leave. I wonder if we could not postpone further questions until Monday. We are to be in session on Monday, and the bill will be before the Senate then. I am sure that we can go into these questions most thoroughly.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is certainly agreeable to me.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 18, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 14 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

POSTMASTER

NORTH DAKOTA

Henry Lemke to be postmaster at Wishek, in the State of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

Beloved Father, fountainhead of goodness, enlightenment, and love, make the light of Thy countenance shine benignly upon the Speaker of this House and upon all the Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

Grant wisdom in abundance, we beseech Thee, to the President of our country as well as to all his counselors.

Heavenly Father, look down with favor upon Thy children in the American Republics and Canada on this fifth official celebration of Pan-American Day on Capitol Hill.

Help Thy sons and daughters in the Americas to understand each other better; shower down Thy graces upon the intellects and wills of those who work for brotherly love among all races, nationalities, and creeds in the Western Hemisphere as well as in the entire world.

Unite us, Dear Saviour, whose blood was shed for the salvation and happiness of all mankind.

May the gifts of Thy holy spirit be poured forth copiously upon the people of the Argentine, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Inspire our minds and our hearts with the principles of true friendship, mutual respect, and an abiding attachment to liberty, representative government, democracy, and peace. This we ask in the name of the most blessed Trinity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2632. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1757) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended."

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. By House Resolution 151, the House has designated today, Thursday, April 14, 1949, for the celebration of Pan-American Day.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Allen, La.	Gilmer	Larcade
Andrews	Gordon	LeCompte
Barden	Gorski, Ill.	Lichtenwalter
Baring	Granahan	Macy
Barrett, Pa.	Grant	Magee
Bolton, Md.	Green	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Hart	Miles
Buckley, N. Y.	Hedrick	Morrison
Bulwinkle	Heller	Morton
Burke	Herter	Moulder
Burnside	Hill	Multer
Chiperfield	Hoeven	Murphy
Clevenger	Hoffman, Ill.	Murray, Wis.
Cole, Kans.	Horan	O'Konski
Dawson	Hull	Pace
Deane	Jackson, Calif.	Passman
DeGraffenried	Javits	Pickett
Dingell	Jenkins	Plumley
Dollinger	Jennings	Poulson
Elliott	Jensen	Powell
Elston	Jonas	Quinn
Feighan	Jones, Ala.	Ramsay
Fernandez	Karst	Regan
Frazier	Kearney	Riehlman
Fugate	Kennedy	Sanborn
Furcolo	Kilburn	Scott, Hardie
Gamble	Kirwan	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Garmatz	Klein	Sheppard
Gavin	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Gillette	Lane	Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio	Vursell	Willis
Smith, Va.	Walsh	Wilson, Ind.
Smith, Wis.	Welch, Mo.	Withrow
Taylor	Werdel	Wolcott
Thomas, N. J	Whitaker	Wood
Thompson	White, Idaho	Woodhouse
Velde	Wickersham	Woodruff
	Wier	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 311 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2632, an act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KERR, RABAUT, TABER, and WIGGLESWORTH.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. As the Chair previously announced, this day has been set aside to celebrate Pan-American Day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, we meet again to observe Pan-American Day. First. A day of recognition of the common goals of our great countries. A day of recognition of our good will, understanding, and mutual respect for each other.

Second. My friend and our former colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama—the Honorable Pete Jarman—has taken charge of this significant occasion many times. Therefore I want to pay a special tribute to him in recognition of the splendid work that he has done to cement the friendship with our Pan-American neighbors. His outstanding achievements have by no means been limited to the promotion of better understanding and good will between these great countries but he has truly done yeoman service for this cause.

Mr. Speaker, for many years now we and our sister republics of this hemisphere have been observing April 14 as Pan-American Day. There is particular significance in this date. It is the anniversary of the resolution that created the Pan American Union in 1890.

The Pan American Union, in a sense, has been the hub of inter-American solidarity. The Union was not the original manifestation of cooperation among the American republics—that historic cooperation goes back to the early days of the nineteenth century. But the establishment of the Union proved to be an important milepost in the step-by-step development that brought inter-American relations to their present high state of development, where mutual respect, mutual interest, and mutual defense are the guiding principles.

Down through the years the Pan American Union has been an active entity that has kept alive the spirit and the fact of Western Hemisphere cooperation. Today it is the permanent core—the general secretariat—of the organization of American states which is the culmination of some 60 years of joint effort. This organization is living proof that men and nations, when prompted by good will, can get along together for their own self-advancement and for the benefit of all.

The American republics have extended the experience of their cooperative efforts to the broad problem of world peace and security by membership in the United Nations. They are all members in good standing of that organization, applying to it the good will that has made its beneficent imprint on this hemisphere.

The good-neighbor relationship among the American republics has found itself unmistakably expressed in the field of international efforts toward peace and security. In 1947 we joined with our Latin neighbors in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. This marked our first acceptance, as a formal treaty commitment, of the principle that an armed attack by any state on one of the American states is an attack on all. Moreover, in this treaty, we and our good neighbors, recognizing that our security depends on the security of the rest of the world, accept the obligation to consult on action when a situation anywhere in the world is believed to threaten the peace and security of the Americas.

Only a few days ago, here in Washington, a momentous ceremony took place in which representatives of 12 nations signed the North Atlantic Treaty. The American republics can feel that they have played a creative part in the developments that led to this great event. Certainly there can be no doubt that the collective achievement of the American republics represented by the treaty of Rio contributed in positive fashion in the formulation of the North Atlantic Pact.

Nor is it too much to say that some of the other major courses of action the United States Government is now following in its global foreign relations have been inspired by the experience of the American republics in their relations with one another.

One striking example is the President's four-point program of technical and scientific cooperation. The success of activities of this kind in the Americas stands as proof of their feasibility. The experience acquired in carrying them out will undoubtedly be freely drawn upon in launching the new program on a broader scale.

It is appropriate, then, on this day, not only to extend our greetings and pledges of continued cooperation to our partners in the organization of American states, but it is fitting, as well, to draw attention to the wealth of successful experience of the American republics in their mutual relations as an example to be drawn upon in world efforts toward justice, prosperity, and peace.

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the crowded and sometimes somber calendar of postwar international events April 14 is a date which brings with it a recurrence of cheer and optimism. Throughout the length and breadth of the Americas this day celebrates that solidarity which has grown, slowly and hesitantly at times and with impressive strength at others, between the republics which comprise our hemisphere.

It may be interesting to recall briefly two or three outstanding events in the history of Pan Americanism by which we may measure the road we have journeyed. The idea of an American community of nations cannot be traced to one person or one country or one period. Rather it had its beginnings in the very births of the American republics themselves and is a composite of the thoughts of statesmen and poets, scholars and plain people, for over a century. However, some men and dates and occurrences are planted like milestones along this road and gather unto themselves a certain special significance.

Such was Simon Bolívar and the Congress of Panama, which he summoned in 1826. The story of that Congress is too familiar to need recounting. However, I would like to repeat the words of Bolívar in his invitation to the former Spanish colonies to send representatives to the congress—and he could have been speaking yesterday—as he suggested a congress of plenipotentiaries from each state that should act as a council in great conflicts, to be appealed to in case of common danger, and be a faithful interpreter of public treaties when difficulties arise, and conciliate, in short, all our difficulties. Bolívar died in bitterness thinking he had plowed the sea but our generation has seen his wish largely translated into fact.

Another date we like to remember marked the sessions of the first intercontinental Conference of American States in Washington in 1889–90. The United States Congress played a substantial role in the convening of that conference. For several years before it was held resolutions were introduced in the House and Senate advocating such a meeting. In 1884 an act of Congress provided for a commission of investigation to visit South and Central America and ascertain the feelings of the people on the subject of a conference and in 1888, as a result of the report of the commission, an act of Congress authorized the President to invite delegates from all the independent countries of Latin America to meet in Washington the following year. The then American Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, to whom Pan Americanism owes so great a debt, expressed in his opening address that feeling of cooperation and sensitivity to the interests of each nation represented, great and small, which has characterized Pan American conferences down to our day. He said that the assembled delegates could "show to the world an honorable and peaceful conference of independent American powers, which will seek nothing, propose nothing, endure nothing that is not in the general sense of all the delegates timely, wise, and peaceful."

We in this audience have ourselves witnessed the most heartening advances in inter-American unity. That brings me to a recent date, a day which signalized a definite slant away from the narrow road of the past into a new highway of international effort. I know many of my listeners must have heard President Roosevelt in the flesh on the day of his inaugural address in 1933 when he spoke these words:

> I dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor, the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.
>
> I do not think those wise precepts could be recalled too often.

These men—Bolívar and Blaine and Roosevelt—removed in time from one another and yet alike in spirit and objectives—spoke not only for themselves but for the neighborhood of the Americas. The peoples of the American community, although of differing languages, cultures, races, and religions, and presenting contrasts of power and weakness, of poverty and wealth, have yet evolved, jointly and by trials and errors, a certain core of common principles to rule their mutual relationships. The principle of the independence and juridical equality of each member state has been affirmed and reaffirmed at many inter-American conferences. From the desire to maintain this principle has grown the determination collectively to resist aggression and to proscribe outside interference in the internal or external affairs of any state. The principle of the pacific settlement of disputes has had a similar repeated emphasis. The American States have encouraged respect for international law and the obligations incurred through treaties. And they have cherished the ideals of representative government and of the basic human rights of the individual. These are the foundations of the inter-American system.

During the 1930's the rise of aggressive totalitarianism in Europe caused the Americas to draw ever closer together and, with the added impetus of the changed attitude of the United States as expressed in the good neighbor policy, resulted in a multiplication and strengthening of the agencies and procedures of inter-American solidarity. When World War II flared in all its multiple horror in Europe and Asia and reached over into the Western Hemisphere, the paramount need for security caused an accelerated evolution of the mechanisms for common resistance, and the American republics found themselves acting more and more in unison to repel the enemy. It came to be realized irrefutably, during those perilous years, that an attack against one American state endangered all and should be resisted by all together.

By 1945 public opinion up and down the reaches of the Americas was ready to back up that declaration known as the Act of Chapultepec made at Mexico City, and to envisage putting into permanent treaty form the methods and procedures and principles of a system of regional self-defense. The United Nations Charter signed at San Francisco during the summer of that same year made provisions for regional arrangements such as the one proposed at Mexico.

After mutual consultations and discussions and compromises, in the American manner, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance was signed at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in September of 1947. This treaty is no scrap of paper which will be discarded by a new government or shoved aside when a new policy is adopted in some state. It is based solidly on the desires and principles and collective needs of the American states. It represents no arbitrary imposition of any state but is the result of a will-to-agree among them all. It is designed for the protection of all and imposes upon all certain duties and obligations. In contrast with the voting procedure in the Security Council of the United Nations, it is of significant note that all decisions by the organ of consultation provided by this treaty, when it is convoked to consider a particular situation, are to be taken by a vote of two-thirds of the ratifying states, all of which states obligate themselves to comply with such decisions and put into effect whatever measures may be agreed upon, except that no state is required to use armed force without its consent. That is indeed a measure of the democratic methods of the American family of nations.

Parallel with the desire for security against aggression, and as its necessary concomitant, has been the unflagging search for ways of settling all disputes by peaceful means. Down through the years of the pan-American conferences, resolutions, recommendations, and agreements have been proposed and adopted by the American republics providing for peaceful settlement of disputes through conciliation, judicial procedure, arbitration, and so forth. At the ninth Inter-American Conference at Bogotá last year these multiplied and overlapping agreements were codified into one instrument which provides machinery for the settlement by peaceful means of all disputes among the ratifying States. If the American republics will adopt and consistently make use of this instrument it will represent a firm step forward toward world order under law, the need for which is so apparent in our age.

Although economic cooperation was the primary reason for calling the first International Conference of American states in 1889, much needs yet to be accomplished in this vital area of the life of the hemisphere. Freedom from want is basic to political stability, as the riots in Bogotá last year so strongly illustrated. Security and the evolution of democratic institutions are predicated on the elimination of poverty and ignorance. The United States has reason to be proud of its activities along this line. Through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation and the Export-Import Bank we have joined in cooperative enterprises with our sister

states to develop their humane and material resources. However, the economic problems by the hemisphere, swelled by the disruptions caused by the war, require a multilateral cooperative approach. The economic agreement reached at Bogota provides a basis of principles upon which to build. The best minds and efforts of our continents could well lend themselves to the task.

And now just a word of reminder to close these remarks. The last war demonstrated all too clearly that there can be no compartmentalization of international affairs. Time and the oceans are no longer barriers to separate our world from other worlds. There are, in fact, no worlds in the plural any longer. Hemispheric isolation is just as impossible as national isolation proved to be in the last war. This fact was universally recognized by the organization of the United Nations and, in spite of the disappointments which have attended its efforts, it still represents our best hope of peace.

The path, not of regional alone, but of world-wide international cooperation is the pathway leading to security, peace, and well-being. May it be the destiny of the American Republics to lead the way down that path.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we again welcome the opportunity to celebrate Pan-American Day. April 14 marks the date on which the resolution creating Pan-American Day was adopted in 1890 at the first International Conference of American States, and it is truly a day of historical significance.

It was 19 years ago that the governing board of the Pan American Union recommended that all member nations join in ceremonies on this day as "a commemorative symbol of the sovereignty of the American Republics and the voluntary union of all in one continental community."

Eighteen years ago President Hoover proclaimed April 14, 1931, as Pan-American Day. For us in the New World it is a day peculiarly our own—the day of the Americas—when Americans both to the north and south join hands to bring about a better understanding of one another and cement hemispheric solidarity.

The day is being observed with appropriate ceremonies throughout the 21 Republics of the Americas.

The slogan adopted by all of them this year as signifying some particular value of the inter-American community is "juridical equality, economic cooperation, and continental solidarity."

Those words convey values of peculiar importance to us of the United States.

We most often divide the world into the Western Hemisphere and the Eastern Hemisphere. When we are considering world affairs we can perhaps more logically approach such problems by considering them from the Northern Hemisphere and Southern Hemisphere angle.

Our Nation, alone among the major powers, lies in both the Western and the Northern Hemispheres, the two regions in which the great land masses and the population masses of the world are located.

It is peculiar to our history that we have been involved directly in the great strategical and political considerations of two worlds—the old and the new.

Our position as a power in the Northern Hemisphere has always had a direct impact upon our position as a nation in the Western Hemisphere. Our position among the Republics of the Americas, with which we are bound by durable mutual ties of obligation and respect, has likewise affected greatly our role as a power in the Northern Hemisphere. The forces of the two hemispheres encounter each other in our history as in no other.

In recent years we have seen a tremendous multiplication of responsibilities and burdens take place in relation to our position in the Northern Hemisphere. We have not allowed these new tasks and commitments to preoccupy us at the expense of our relationships in the American hemisphere, and I trust we never shall. Rather, let us today state our awareness of the tremendous degree in which our position as a Western Hemisphere nation bulwarks our position as a Northern Hemisphere nation.

We live in this western community in the midst of friends. We—our friends and ourselves—have developed traditions and techniques of international living that have been of indispensable usefulness as patterns for the rest of the world.

The provisions of the United Nations Charter relevant to regional security but reflected the pattern worked out previously at the Chapultepec Conference.

The North Atlantic Pact is but the adaptation in another frame of reference to a principle already applied in the undertaking of mutual defense of the Americas adopted in 1947 at Quitandinha, Brazil.

So let us today recognize that our relationships in the Western Hemisphere are in no wise secondary to our problems in the Northern Hemisphere. Rather, we have developed in the former patterns of action for the latter.

I do not wish to detail here the pattern of institutional and treaty relationships that bind the two American continents. Let me but summarize by saying that the best hope for the world is that other regions may come to realize the same completeness of arrangements and the same high objectives in international life as we have created in the Americas.

It was my good fortune to represent the House of Representatives of the United States at an international conference of representatives of legislative bodies of the Americas at Santiago, Chile, on April 14, 1944. And again last December I had the privilege of visiting 12 countries in Central and South America as chairman of the Western Hemisphere subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. From these personal contacts I have gained the strong conviction that the Americas, of all the areas of the world, are best suited for geographical unity. They comprise an area equal to 25 percent of the globe, consisting of 12,000,000 square miles of the richest and most diversified resources of the world. Their climates and crops supplement each other which in and of itself draws the peoples of the hemisphere closer together and creates bonds of solidarity.

Just as we in the years past fought and died for our independence in the New World, so did the patriots of our neighbors to the south fight for the independence of their respective countries. This too provides a common bond of understanding as all these countries have heritages dedicated to the same ideals of nations.

I need not add that in the fields of culture, music, art, and sciences, there are great opportunities for progress because contacts of this character ignore national borders and local differences.

One of the best examples of the friendly feeling between ourselves and our American neighbors is that in the Americas alone of all the world there are no quota restrictions on immigration to this country.

As I have said on previous occasions, the so-called good neighbor policy is not dependent on any one administration for its execution. This policy is a continuing one and rests upon a much sounder foundation. It is the universal desire of the vast majority of our people, which transcends partisan considerations, to have hemispheric unity for the betterment of us all—not just for the present but as a permanent policy.

As has so well been said, let us improve the inter-American system and remember its interdependence is its foundation, cooperation is its keystone.

Let us recall the words of the great liberator, Simon Bolívar:

> We, for our part, shall hasten with the most lively interest to establish the American compact, which forming all our republics into a single body politic, will present America to the world in an aspect of majesty and grandeur unexampled among the nations of antiquity. America thus united, if Heaven grant our desire, may be called the queen of nations and the mother of republics.

I consider it a rare privilege to include as part of my remarks an address delivered by His Excellency Rafael de la Colina, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Mexico to the United States, on the significance of Pan-American Day before the Club de Las Americas in celebration of Pan-American Day:

SIGNIFICANCE OF PAN-AMERICAN DAY

(Remarks by Rafael de la Colina, Ambassador of Mexico to the United States of America, Club de las Americas, Auditorium of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., April 12, 1949)

Ladies and gentleman, permit me at the outset to my brief remarks to express my sincere appreciation of the kind invitation extended to me by my old and esteemed friend, Dr. Francisco Banda, and the Club de las Americas, which owes so much to his untiring zeal.

Let me also congratulate the members of this club and its numerous friends for their efforts to keep the fires of pan-Americanism burning at a time when Latin America no longer is a subject of paramount importance to the press of this country. You are performing a praiseworthy task—one that deserves our enthusiastic support.

We are celebrating Pan-American Day and by doing so we are trying to focus our minds

upon the realities of an association of peoples and states that, in spite of its shortcomings, is still the noblest and most constructive international body that the world has known.

Selected to commemorate the humble birth of the Pan American Union on April 14, 1890, under the title of "The International Union of American Republics" for the prompt collection and distribution of commercial information, Pan-American Day has become as the years have gone by, both a memorial and a symbol. It thus serves to bring back to our memory the modest beginning, slow growth, and quiet strength of what we now proudly call the Organization of American States. It also represents the steadfast adherence of the Republics of the New World to the ideal of continental solidarity—a solidarity that in the last 15 years has been based on the full recognition of the principle of the equality of states and its corollary, the principle of nonintervention. Let us not forget that it was Secretary of State Cordell Hull—one of the chief architects of our mighty edifice—who one fateful afternoon of the month of December 1933, announced to the cheering delegates meeting at Montevideo that the United States would give its unqualified approval to the Treaty on the Rights and Duties of States, article 8 of which reads: "No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another."

Since then, other momentous steps have been taken. From the merely passive doctrine of nonintervention there evolved the positive conception of full partnership. We are indebted to the wise leadership of Sumner Welles for a large share of the accomplishments of that period. Our joint war efforts signalized the highest point of this remarkable development.

Today, however, grave doubts stir the minds of many Latin Americans. They fear that the close cooperation achieved during the war has been nearly lost. They feel that the serious economic ills afflicting Hispanic America are not completely understood by the people of the United States, preoccupied as they are with the problems confronting other regions of the world. They wonder whether the keen sense of fellowship that characterized the good-neighbor policy in its heyday can ever be regained.

I, for one, feel certain that the virtual black-out of news from Latin America is a passing phenomenon, to be attributed to the extraordinary nature of recent events. More reliable signs of the true feelings of the North American people are, in my opinion, such happenings as the magnificent welcome accorded President Aleman when he visited the United States 2 years ago.

The stubborn facts of geographical proximity, common interest, and parallel destinies will incessantly emerge to contradict those who deny the essential unity of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

There are no doubt enormous differences in climate, population, culture, wealth, and power between the American Republics. There are profound inequalities in the standards of living and in the scale of human values. Yet, the general orientation, ultimate objectives, and inspiring ideals are strikingly similar.

Furthermore, what has been principally neglected in all superficial analyses of the differences between Anglo-Saxon and Latin America is the fact that many of the existing diversities make for a greater reciprocal attraction; that the highly technical, efficient, aggressive North American often longs for the unhurried, graceful life that is still characteristic of Latin America. Conversely, more and more Latin Americans endeavor to emulate the dynamic progressiveness of the United States and its wise utilization of natural and human resources.

Latin America is in the process of a deep and far-reaching transformation. A great native art movement is slowly taking shape. Mexican painting perhaps in the same manner that painting ushered in the Renaissance in Europe is rapidly pushing ahead other artistic forms. A mighty creative force is being generated. Out of the apparently chaotic changes that agitate the southern Republics, a new and better commonwealth is surging forth, one where social justice and racial tolerance will predominate.

Latin America is a microcosm. The principal races of mankind—the Caucasian, the African, the Mongoloid Amerindian—have been brought together as never before. Out of their daily contacts they have evolved through the centuries the beginning of a harmonious understanding, an awareness of common values that bids fair to hold the solution of the cultural conflicts besetting our planet.

Every ethnic element has made a significant contribution, none has been permanently submerged, all are endeavoring to work out a more intimate and fraternal association.

When we finally succeed in combining these factors with the scientific techniques, the orderly process of government, the truly democratic institutions that have achieved the unsurpassed greatness of this mighty Republic, our New World will fulfill the noblest dreams of our founding fathers.

Let us renew our faith in the Americas, let us take courage in the inflexible resolution of our liberators, let us joyfully advance on the path of understanding, cooperation, and friendship.

Thank you.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was especially fitting and proper that on Pan-American Day the prayer opening this day's session was given by a beloved priest and a distinguished scholar, a great churchman, Dr. Joseph Thorning, who is one of the recognized authorities in this country on relations with our friends in the southern Republics of Central and South America. Dr. Thorning, I remember when I was at the Embassy in Lima several years ago, was the founder of the Inter-American Seminar at the University of San Marcos in Lima, and at the National University of Mexico City, and at the great university in Habana, Cuba. So to have him ask God's word in this great forum of democracy today was, I repeat, most fitting.

Indeed, it is good to know that all of the nations in this hemisphere set aside today as a day of tribute to the belief in democracy, and to express a mutual hope and mutual understanding of relations between the sovereign nations and the sovereign powers of this hemisphere as an example to the nations of the world.

This month in which was born the Atlantic Pact could well be the example again for extending that pact until it is known as well as the "South Atlantic Pact;" and these our good neighbors to the south, these nations that love liberty and democracy more than life itself, can join hands with us in another bridge of humanity, and understanding, and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in this great Holy Week, this week when we who are Christians welcome the joyous season of Easter, and on this day as well when our Jewish friends are celebrating the joyous festival of the passover, when they memorialize their escape from the bondage of the Egyptians of over 3,500 years ago, all peoples all over this great hemisphere can, during this solemn yet joyous festival of spring and rejuvenation and rededication to liberty, civil and religious, these great western Christian democracies who are the last remaining bulwark against the onrushing tide of atheistic communism, can find in the pan-American nations and in these countries of this hemisphere the challenge, and, albeit, the warning to these modern anti-Christs of communism that in the belief, and in the doctrines, and in the philosophy of pan-Americanism there remains forever the symbol of unity for God and country and a just and lasting world peace saludos amigos.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and former chairman of that great committee, the beloved gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely inadequate for any man to discuss this great universal fact of the relationship between our country and the South American countries in a few minutes. I just wish to call attention to the fact that we have set an example to the rest of the world in the problems of cooperation and understanding between States of different nationalities, different racial backgrounds, different necessities, and policies. I am happy to see that in these North and South American continents with our teeming populations, with our great economic and political problems, we are identical in our purpose to stand together, not against the world, but for each other and for the service of mankind.

I should like, since I was born in Nova Scotia, to include Canada in this family of nations, because Canada by virtue of the high quality of its citizenship, and with its tremendous undeveloped natural resources is the land of the future. I am sure that the Canadian people and the Canadian Government join with the Government and people of this great Republic in their attitude of friendship and cooperation with our distinguished and progressive neighbors of the south.

We are going to show the world and continue to show the world that the ideal of communism is a false ideal. The idea of brotherhood, understanding and cooperation is the foundation for future civilization and here in the two Americas we are giving a daily exhibition and confirmation of that great reality.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the privilege of saying these few words. As a citizen of this country I rejoice in the splendid cooperation which our country has been giving and will continue to give to the great Republics to the south of us.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear our distinguished and beloved colleague from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, say that he favors the furtherance of closer ties with the Dominion of Canada and the inclusion of that great nation in the Pan American Union. Last Congress I introduced a House concurrent resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that an invitation should be extended to the Dominion of Canada to participate in the deliber-

ations and constructive work of the Pan American Union. It seems fitting on Pan-American Day to reintroduce this resolution, which I have done this morning.

Commendably, we expend unlimited time and patience in an effort to understand the aims and objectives of those countries which seem to differ with us on fundamental issues. We should not lose sight of every opportunity, however, to cement the ties and bind ourselves ever closer to those who have demonstrated over the years their close friendship to the United States.

Two years ago the Canadian Under Secretary of State for External Affairs indicated that Canada might welcome and accept such an invitation.

Although we are only one member of the Union, it seems appropriate that we should take the lead in insuring that steps are taken to extend this gesture of friendliness and warm regard to our neighbor on the north. I hope this action may have the generous approval of the House.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, representing the district which is geographically the link between the Americas, I feel it fitting for me to add a word of affirmation on the declaration of a Pan-American Day. In the words of G. V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State, "Pan-American Day is an occasion on which we celebrate friendship among nations—not friendship as an ideal only, but friendship as an accomplished fact among 21 sovereign states." This solidarity speaks well for a peaceful and prosperous future for this hemisphere.

The part which the city of Miami, Fla., has played in fostering this friendship is deserving of recognition and commendation. No other city in the United States is each year host to so many of our Latin friends. Miami has warmly and generously welcomed these visitors to our country and has on almost every instance given the Latin Americans a favorable impression of the United States.

In March of last year, Miami International Airport handled 33,557 international air passengers as compared to New York City's 25,606; 63.26 percent of the passengers traveling between the United States and the West Indies, Central, and South America in the years 1941 through 1946 left or entered the United States at Miami. Many of those passengers were Latin Americans who went no farther north than Miami, so that their opinions of our people were formed and based on their experiences in the city of Miami. I am proud, as can be the Nation, that the reception given these people has done much to stimulate and increase travel and trade between this country and our neighbors to the south.

On this Pan-American Day, I can assure my colleagues that Miami and the State of Florida have, are, and will continue to make their contributions toward reinforcing and expanding an international relationship which, in the words of Cordell Hull, "Is the path to human liberty and human welfare."

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

LESSONS FROM LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that the House of Representatives should observe Pan-American Day once a year.

It was the inspiration and the leadership of the Thirteen Colonies, moved by the spirit of independence from 1776 on, which led the countries of Hispanic America to break with their mother country, too. And it was the events of the early part of the nineteenth century, the exploits of leaders like San Martín, Bolívar, and O'Higgins, which not only brought independence to our neighbors to the south, but also led, in turn, to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, which was a doctrine of hemispheric solidarity.

It seems to me, however, to be appropriate on Pan-American Day, that we not only pat ourselves on the back for our leadership and not only pause and pay our respects to our gallant neighbors and their national heroes, but that we also pay tribute to the contribution which the peoples of Latin America have made to the progress of civilization.

Something has been said of the problems which confront the world today. It seems to me it would be appropriate if we recognized that the countries of Hispanic America have learned something about racial tolerance and have demonstrated that mixed races can live together. In that in particular, they have made a contribution which we in North America, in the United States, might well study with profit.

And, further, in this day of a troubled international scene, we might also gain some inspiration and help if we would take cognizance of the spirit which moved them to place that statue of the Christ high in the Andes as a symbol that the nations should not war any more.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to salute our nations to the south on Pan-American Day, and I hope that we may continue to bring about a solidarity of purpose and that under freedom and enjoying democracy, we may bring a better way of life to the peoples of our respective nations.

It grieves me that on this holy Thursday the gentleman from Mississippi should seek to excuse for their acts those who were guilty of crimes against humanity. These archcriminals committed crimes not only against the peoples of other European nations but they also sold their own brother Germans into slavery, brutal torture, and death.

Mr. Speaker, Robert E. Lee and General Grant were never guilty of crucifying little children and casting their bodies into the incinerators of Europe. The blood of 6,000,000 was shed there. I stood in that horror chamber in Dachau, and I saw the powdered bones in the incinerator; the remnants of little boys and girls. If prosecuting these monsters that were responsible for that will bring about justice and peace in the future, I say we should have more prosecution.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 187).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas April 14, the founding date of the Pan American Union 59 years ago by the First International Conference of American States in Washington, has been designated Pan-American Day and is traditionally observed by the legislatures of the American Republics; and

Whereas the Ninth International Conference of American States at Bogota, Colombia, established the position of the Pan American Union as central permanent organ and general secretariat of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the formation of the Organization of American States, as the consequence of more than half a century's development, and the entry into force of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance during the year 1948 are events of far-reaching significance, testifying to the vitality of the cooperation among the peoples and countries of the Americas so effectively served by the Pan American Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its most cordial greetings to the representative bodies of each of the other American Republics on the occasion of Pan-American Day, in recognition of the democratic system they exemplify and in reaffirmation of inter-American solidarity.

Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed through appropriate channels to the legislatures of the other American Republics and to the secretary general of the Organization of American States.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Daily American Republic of Poplar Bluff, Mo.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include certain statements and excerpts, and further, to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today on the independent offices appropriation bill and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. BARTLETT (at the request of Mr. MITCHELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Panama Canal tolls.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the death of our former colleague, Mr. Fitzpatrick, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the question of slum clearance and housing.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Army Air Force.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on April 11 of this week, the House adopted H. R. 3758 authorizing the expenditure of over $5,000,000,000 to continue our program of rehabilitating the western powers of Europe and of stabilizing their economy. The authorization of this expenditure, we are all agreed, involves a tremendous amount of money which the American taxpayers are called upon to pay so that the friendly nations of Europe can be aided and placed on a firm basis once again.

As I stated yesterday on the floor of the House, I seriously considered voting to reduce this amount by at least a billion dollars, but after listening to the general debate, I became convinced that the full amount should be voted because the security of our Nation depends on the strengthening of these friendly European countries against the threatening clouds of communism and Russia.

It was pungently brought out that if the democracies of Europe were left to themselves with no further aid from the United States; Russia, who, from all evidence and indications, seeks to conquer, rule, and spread its communistic tentacles all over the world, would do its best to destroy all democracies.

If the Nations of Europe friendly to us should fall before the onslaught of Russia, then the safety of our country would be directly threatened, because with modern and long-range bombing planes, oceans are no longer a barrier to an aggressive nation. In voting for the authorization to expend this money, I looked at it as a form of insurance in which the United States was investing. I realize that in the spending of such large amounts of money, there is much waste. However, in the over-all picture and when the future safety of our country is involved, I feel it will be money well spent and that I was acting in the best interests of our country.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House adopted H. R. 4146 calling for an appropriation of $15,716,416,800 for the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. This amount of money to be used by all of the branches of our armed services in their preparedness program. The President of the United States recommended the appropriation of $15,263,114,700 but the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to supplement the President's figure by $498,302,100 which I did not support because I felt that the figure arrived at by the President and his expert advisers would be more nearly correct.

Another reason why I refused to support the amendment to increase the President's budget was because of the reports, all during World War II and since hostilities have ceased, of the tremendous amount of waste that has taken place; that all branches of our armed forces, through poor, or lack of, business methods, have with utter disregard wasted millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. The waste of moneys by the armed forces has been so wanton that it is really amazing and beyond the comprehension of the average person.

These facts were all brought to light during the general debate on the floor of the House. The Hoover Commission substantiated all of the charges of wanton waste by our armed forces in its reports published in the press. In his report, former President Hoover accused the armed services of waste, extravagance, and of padding their demands. He cited Air Force plans to build houses in Alaska costing $58,350 each and Army requests to modernize tanks it does not have. These are but two of many instances of waste and extravagance cited by the former President in his report.

Now you may ask in the face of this evidence of waste and inefficiency why I, as a Member of the House of Representatives, vote for such an appropriation; why I do not raise my voice in protest at such a waste of the taxpayers' money.

My answer to these questions is that first, I voted against increasing the President's requested figure and secondly, after careful study and consideration of this vital matter, I feel that the safety of our Nation is at stake. With the signing of the Atlantic pact and the threatening attitude of communistic Russia to take over as many European nations as it possibly can, it is of vital importance that these funds be appropriated without delay so that the United States can be prepared for any eventuality.

Even with the evidence of waste as substantiated by the reports of the Hoover Commission, we cannot afford to have the Nation unprepared in the event that war should break out. It would be a tragedy to allow a thing of this kind to happen.

However, I believe this waste and extravagance can be reduced to a minimum if an investigation of the armed forces were made by a congressional committee which would look into the whole situation thoroughly and see to it that the armed forces really became unified to avoid duplication and to employ modern business methods. In my opinion, one of the chief reasons for waste and inefficiency is the duplication of functions and the utter lack of business methods. The "brass hats" abhor giving up any of their practices and traditions and feel that just because money has been appropriated for their own particular branches, it must be spent whether actually needed or not.

I firmly believe that the only way to remedy this situation is to authorize a thorough and complete investigation by a congressional committee.

It is my intention to give this matter further study and, after I have read the complete reports of the Hoover Commission, as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I intend to submit a resolution asking that a committee be appointed by the Speaker of the House to make a complete investigation of the armed forces.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Good Friday and upon that day of solemn observances millions of religious people of all faiths and creeds throughout the world will engage in a day of solemn dedication and prayer for world peace and for human freedom. People everywhere are deeply concerned about world conditions.

Recently a meeting was held at Lufkin, Angelina County, Tex., in the district which I have the honor to represent, typical of many such meetings, and in which the citizens assembled passed a resolution condemning and denouncing as un-Christian and barbaric "the wholesale persecution of Christian priests, ministers, and laymen by the Soviet Union and their satellites in occupied territories." The chairman of the meeting appointed a committee of five, consisting of Mr. Benjamin J. Weber, Mr. Elbert Clark, Mr. John B. Riley, Dr. E. G. Taylor, and Father Fred Julien, to prepare a suitable resolution and from which I quote:

Freedom of religious worship and conscience is the most fundamental and sacred right which God intended and ordained that every person should enjoy. No government or king or dictatorship has any right to take away or abridge this God-given right. The very foundation of Christian civilization is the religious and political freedom of every person, regardless of race, color, or creed. There can never be peace or justice on this earth, so long as any of the people are denied the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. It is, therefore, a matter of the deepest concern to us, that our brethren in the Balkan states, now controlled by the atheistic and pagan dictatorship of communism, are being subjected to indescribable torture because of their religious faith and practice. It is unbelievable that, in this age of enlightenment, a large part of the world should revert to the horrors

and cruelties of religious persecution and suppression.

And after denouncing as unwise and un-Christian any policy that seeks to appease the heinous crimes now being committed against God and man and expressing the belief that the future of the United Nations depends upon its ability and willingness to deal firmly with any nation who violates the God-given rights of its citizens, the resolution continued:

We reaffirm our faith in and devotion to the fundamental principles of Americanism that every person, whether in our own or foreign lands, is entitled to enjoy his God-given right to absolute and unfettered religious freedom. We condemn, as un-American and un-Christian and as unspeakably barbarous, every form, shape, or kind of bigotry and intolerance. We beseech our Government to go on record, formally and officially, against bigotry, persecution, intolerance and the suppression of the rights of any minority.

In our religious observances tomorrow we should mentally take stock and search our own consciences while we at the same time think of world conditions. It is the privilege of America and Americans to lead the march of progress to liberty and freedom throughout the world. It is a great privilege and a solemn obligation to practice reverence and tolerance as a people, and to exemplify full democratic government as a Nation. On tomorrow let us reflect upon these priceless things that are ours lest we forget.

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a minimum-wage bill, H. R. 4272, which is the result of about a months' diligent work by members of the House Committee on Labor, and other Members. This bill has been prepared for the purpose of being offered as a substitute when the Lesinski "cover everything" measure is up for consideration on the floor.

It is a clean bill. It does not extend the coverage of the present Fair Labor Standards Act except in the child-labor provisions and in a few other minor instances. It contains the Hays-McConnell flexible minimum—tied to the cost of living—starting at 65 cents an hour. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BROOKS HAYS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAM MCCONNELL], have produced this idea which I think is a splendid one. The bill includes a definite, brief, and understandable exemption of retail and service establishments. It contains a provision permitting so-called Belo contracts, which the Supreme Court has twice approved but which the Lesinski "cover everything" bill specifically outlaws.

Many Members of Congress have inquired of me what the Lesinski "cover everything" bill exempts and I have answered that it is so broad that in order to keep from putting newspaper-delivery boys under the act the authors had to include a specific exemption. Even the tips of the waitresses in cafes are regulated.

I first estimated that it would take 1,000 extra lawyers in the Department of Labor to enforce the Lesinski bill. I was wrong. After studying the bill further I am convinced it would take 10,000. Of course, my bill does not provide for such autocratic power in the hands of the Secretary of Labor. I have not believed, and I do not think that you believe, that the Labor Department should be granted such extraordinary and unprecedented powers.

You will like this new bill, H. R. 4272, I am introducing. It is as clear and understandable as any legislation of this character can be. I invite you to get a copy of it and study it because you will be given an opportunity to vote for it and save the country from the vicious Lesinski "cover everything" bill.

PALESTINE—A MONUMENT TO HUMAN COURAGE AND WISDOM

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Israel, soon to be 1 year old, already stands as a monument to human courage and wisdom. A new nation has arisen in an ancient and historic land. Its people, fired by the spirit of freedom, are determined to make a new life for themselves. They are engaged in the many and varied tasks of building up an economy that has suffered through centuries of neglect and indifference. By hard work, careful training, and utilizing the best that modern technology can offer, the people of Israel are creating new wealth to be shared by all.

One of the great necessary tasks ahead is the creation of a Jordan Valley Authority. American scientists and engineers have examined the resource development potentials of Palestine and have found that a Jordan Valley Authority is a feasible undertaking. Full development of water resources would provide opportunities for more than 3,000,000 new settlers. Diversion of sweet waters from the upper Jordan and its tributaries into a network of irrigation canals would multiply the acreage of productive farm land. Power would be generated by drawing water of the Mediterranean into the Dead Sea to compensate for water diverted for irrigation. A 1,300-foot drop of sea water into the Jordan rift would make possible the harnessing of energy for new industries. The mineral wealth of the Dead Sea, through the application of power technology, has limitless industrial possibilities.

The people of Israel have learned the lessons of unified river basin development taught by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Just as we in the United States seek to apply these lessons for the development of the Columbia and other great river basins, so the people of Israel are anxious to develop the River Jordan.

Neighboring lands in the Middle East will share in the benefits to be created by a Jordan Valley Authority. Jew and Arab will be drawn together by the common economic bond implicit in the full development of a river's resources. The Jordan Valley Authority contains the promise of peace and prosperity for the Middle East.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CHURNTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 164) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School district, California, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 8, after "conclusive" insert ": *Provided*, That the Churntown Elementary School district of California shall pay 50 per centum of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARION T. SCHWARTZ

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1169) for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, DENTON, and JENNINGS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to attend his remarks in the RECORD and include an exchange of correspondence.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include three short articles.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by him on the subject of socialized medicine.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the great variety of talent which characterizes the district which I have the honor to represent. It has not only been the home of Presidents, Governors, and leaders in the business, social welfare, and labor walks of life, but it harbors also the great in the world of art and drama.

My attention has been called recently to the presentation of the National Academy of Vocal Arts Plaque for 1949 to one of my constituents for outstanding achievement in coordination of theatrical acts. He also has been a past recipient of the drama-critics award. I refer to the great singer, Alfred Drake, who has so successfully entertained so many with his highly dramatic art.

Mr. Drake is a real New Yorker. He was born in the Bronx, spent his childhood in Brooklyn, and his adult life so far has been reserved for Manhattan. Not only does he limit himself to acting in serious and musical roles, but is also a playwright and director of no mean distinction. Millions of people have seen and heard him on the stage, screen, and radio, and his record recordings have reached many more millions of ears. His performance in Oklahoma will not be forgotten by those who have had the good fortune to enjoy it. He is back entertaining visitors in the Seventeenth Congressional District in another successful musical play, Kiss Me Kate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials.

RE PATMAN AMENDMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I favor the Patman amendment.

Granting that the committee has not given any evidence of deliberate intention of crippling the prosecution of illegal monopolies, it does appear there is some question that the cut will reasonably limit to at least some extent the most prompt prosecution of antimonopoly prosecutions. I am opposed to any plan which could possibly result in slowing up prosecutions of illegal monopolies. Rather, we should forthrightly declare that illegal monopoly is not consistent with the best interests of our Nation. Prompt prosecution is an essential element of democratic processes. Only prompt investigation and prompt prosecution results in fairness to the legal rights to both the people and to the claimed illegal monopoly. Forced delay on account of inadequate funds or personnel is intolerable when the rights and security of small business is involved. Legal big business is as necessary as legal small business. But, illegal monopoly is destructive of the very spirit and fact of competitive free enterprise and must not be tolerated. The economic security of our Nation depends upon the observance of established law and because illegal monopoly is immense money and economic resources it is more destructive to the democratic processes than is just ordinary illegal act or procedure. Illegal monopoly must be checked and must be prosecuted promptly and diligently and I want our legal department to be adequately financed so to do. Competitive free enterprise cannot survive protracted delay in the prosecution of illegal monopoly and there should be no such condition permitted to grow up. Small business must not be expected to compete with illegal monopoly—no; not even in one case. And insufficient money to prosecute promptly and fully puts small business up against illegal competition entirely too long to suit me.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. Harold E. Stassen at Boston.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the fourth and fifth sentences of section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 are hereby amended to read as follows: 'Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification of Europe, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.'

"SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 104 (e) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out '$10,000 per annum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest rate authorized by such Act.'

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 105 (c) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949.'

"SEC. 4. Section 108 of such Act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'There shall be a Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. The Deputy United States Special Representative shall perform such functions as the United States Special Representative shall designate, and shall be Acting United States Special Representative during the absence or disability of the United States Special Representative or in the event of a vacancy in the office of United States Special Representative.'

"SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 109 (a) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: 'and the chief of the special mission shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or compensation and allowances in accordance with section 110 (a) of this title, as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or appropriate.'

"SEC. 6. (a) The last sentence of paragraph (2) of section 111 (a) of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, as far as is practicable, that at least 50 per centum of the gross tonnage of com-

modities procured out of funds made available under this title and transported to or from the United States on ocean vessels, computed separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liner and tanker services, is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels; and, in the administration of this provision, the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable and consistent with the purposes of this title, endeavor to secure a fair and reasonable participation by United States flag vessels in cargoes by geographic area.'

"(b) Paragraph (3) of section 111 (b) of such Act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By inserting after 'projects' a comma and the following: 'including expansion, modernization, or development of existing enterprises' and a comma;

"(2) By inserting after 'media' the following: consistent with the national interests of the United States';

"(3) By striking out in the first proviso 'in the first year after the date of the enactment of this Act does not exceed $15,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof 'made in any fiscal year does not exceed $10,000,000';

"(4) By amending subparagraph (i) thereof to read as follows:

"'(i) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the Administrator plus actual earnings or profits on said project to the extent provided by such guaranty;';

"(5) By inserting after subparagraph (iii) thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"'(iv) as used in this paragraph, the term "investment" includes the furnishing of capital goods items and related services, for use in connection with projects approved by the Administrator, pursuant to a contract providing for payment in whole or in part after June 30, 1950; and

"'(v) the guaranty to any person shall be limited to assuring the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies received by such person as earnings or profits from the approved investment, as repayment or return thereof, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof. When any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency or credits on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title, claim, or cause of action existing in connection therewith.'; and

"(6) By amending the next to last sentence thereof to read as follows: "The total amount of the guaranties made under this paragraph (3) shall not exceed $150,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds allocated to a guaranty and remaining after all liability of the United States assumed in connection therewith has been released, discharged, or otherwise terminated, shall be available for allocation to other guaranties, the foregoing limitation notwithstanding."

"(c) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (c) of such Act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By inserting after the second sentence thereof the following: 'In addition to the amount of notes above authorized, the Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section, to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $150,000,000 less any amount allocated prior to April 3, 1949, for such purpose, until all liabilities arising under guaranties made pursuant to this authorization have expired or been discharged.';

"(2) By striking out the first two words, "Such notes" in the third sentence thereof and inserting "The notes hereinabove authorized"; and

"(3) By inserting after "Washington" in the sixth sentence thereof "for assistance on credit terms".

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 112 (c) of such act is hereby amended by striking out '25 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '12½ per centum".

"(b) Section 112 (d) of such Act is hereby amended by adding after the words 'any agricultural commodity, or product thereof' the following: 'or class, type, or specification thereof'.

"(c) Section 112 (g) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto,' and 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940, as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949'.

"(d) Section 112 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(i) (1) Insofar as practicable and to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, the Administrator shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds authorized under this title by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this title, and by making available or causing to be made available to prospective purchasers in the participating countries information as to commodities and services produced by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by otherwise helping to give small business an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds authorized under this title.

"'(2) The Administrator shall appoint a special assistant to advise and assist him in carrying out the foregoing paragraph (1). Each report transmitted to the Congress under section 123 shall include a report of all activities under this subsection.

"'(j) The Administrator shall, in providing assistance in the procurement of commodities in the United States, make available United States dollars for marine insurance on such commodities where such insurance is placed on a competitive basis in accordance with normal trade practices prevailing prior to the outbreak of World War II.

"'(k) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used in the United States for advertising foreign products or for advertising foreign travel.

"'(l) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to price-support programs required by law) at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment.'

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 114 (c) of such Act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

"(1) By striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That, in addition to the amount heretofore authorized and appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title not to exceed $1,150,000,000 for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1949, and not to exceed $4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the foregoing, any balance, unobligated as of June 30, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for any period ending on or prior to that date is hereby authorized to be made available for obligation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and to be transferred to and consolidated with any appropriations for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for said fiscal year.'; and

"(2) By amending the last sentence of such section 114 (c) to read as follows: 'The authorizations in this title are limited to the period ending June 30, 1950, in order that the Congress may pass on any subsequent authorizations.'

"(b) Section 114 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation additional to that made by title I of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 793, Eightieth Congress), shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this title.'

"SEC. 9. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 115 (b) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out the period following the words 'grant basis' and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That the obligation to make such deposits may be waived, in the discretion of the Administrator, with respect to technical information or assistance furnished under section 111 (a) (3) of this title and with respect to ocean transportation furnished on United States flag vessels under section 111 of this title in an amount not exceeding the amount, as determined by the Administrator, by which the charges for such transportation exceed the cost of such transportation at world market rates.'

"(b) Such section 115 (b) (6) is hereby further amended by inserting after 'or for such other expenditures as may be consistent with' the words 'the declaration of policy contained in section 102 and'.

"(c) Section 115 (d) of such Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The Administrator shall encourage each participating country to insure, by an effective follow-up system, that efficient use is made of the commodities, facilities, and services furnished under this title. In order further to insure that each participating country makes efficient use of such commodities, facilities, and services, and of its own resources, the Administrator shall encourage the joint organization of the participating countries referred to in subsection (b) of this section to observe and review the operation of such follow-up systems.'

"(d) Section 115 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding two new subsections as follows:

"'(h) Not less than 5 per centum of each special local currency account established pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of this section shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for materials which are required

by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources or for other local currency requirements of the United States.

"'(i) (1) The Administrator shall to the greatest extent practicable, initiate projects for and assist the appropriate agencies of the United States Government is procuring and stimulating increased production in participating countries of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources; and in furtherance of those objectives the Administrator shall, in addition to the local currency allocated pursuant to subsection (h), use such other means available to him under this title as he may deem appropriate.

"'(2) In furtherance of such objectives and within the limits of the appropriations and contract authorizations of the Bureau of Federal Supply to procure strategic and critical materials, the Administrator, with the approval of the Director of such Bureau, shall enter into contracts in the name of the United States for the account of such Bureau for the purchase of strategic and critical materials in any participating country. Such contracts may provide for deliveries over definite periods, but not to exceed twenty years in any contract, and may provide for payments in advance of deliveries.

"'(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to restrict or limit in any manner the authority now held by any agency of the United States Government in procuring or stimulating increased production of the materials referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) in countries other than participating countries.'

"SEC. 10. (a) The first sentence of section 117 (c) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals through the mails.'

"(b) Section 117 (d) of such Act is hereby amended by striking out 'section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Export Control Act of 1949'.

"(c) Section 117 of such Act is hereby further amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(e) Whenever the Administrator shall determine that shipping capacity available to Italy is inadequate for such emigration from Italy as may be desirable to further the purposes of this title, the Administrator shall request the United States Maritime Commission to make available to Italy vessels capable of engaging in such service for the purpose of transporting emigrants from Italy to destinations other than the United States, and shall specify the terms and conditions under which such vessels shall thus be made available, and the United States Maritime Commission thereupon shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of law and without reimbursement by the Administrator, make such vessels available to Italy in accordance with such terms and conditions: *Provided*, That the total number of such vessels made available for such purpose shall not at any one time exceed ten: *Provided further*, That title to each such vessels owned by the United States Government shall remain in the United States: *And provided further*, That the terms and conditions under which such vessels are made available to Italy shall obligate Italy to return the vessels forthwith upon demand of the President, and in any event not later than June 30, 1952.'

"SEC. 11. The second sentence of section 118 of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof 'or (3) the provision of such assistance would be inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventative or enforcement action'.

"SEC. 12. An amount, equal to any balance unobligated as of April 2, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated by Public Law 793, approved June 28, 1948, for the purposes of the China Aid Act of 1948 is hereby made available to the President for obligation through February 15, 1950, for assistance in areas in China which he may deem to be not under Communist domination, to be furnished in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he may determine."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN KEE,
JAMES P. RICHARDS,
JOSEPH L. PFEIFER,
CHARLES A. EATON,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for the differences explained below, and except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS

The following table summarizes the results of the deliberations of the committee of conference so far as they relate to financial aspects of the bill:

Authorizations

	House bill	Senate bill	Conference
Guaranties	[1]$272,300,000	[2]	$150,000,000
Interim authorization	1,100,000,000	$1,150,000,000	1,150,000,000
1949-50 authorization	4,280,000,000	4,280,000,000	4,280,000,000
Forward contracting		150,000,000	
RFC advance	1,000,000,000	750,000,000	1,000,000,000

[1] Approximate ($300,000,000 less amounts already set aside).

[2] Funds for guaranties to come out of interim and 1949-50 authorizations.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY (SEC. 1)

Section 1 of the Senate version states encouragement of the unification of Europe as an objective of United States policy. The House version, in section 1, adds the federation of Europe, as well as the unification of Europe, as an objective; it also recognizes that the formation of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation is the first, not the final, step—as an opportunity, not a goal—and urges the participating nations "to achieve speedily" the economic cooperation indispensable to the realization of the world's best hopes. The language accepted by the committee of conference in section 1 includes all of the language of the House version except the reference to the federation of Europe.

GUARANTIES (SEC. 6)

The bill as it comes from the conference is limited to convertibility of currency, but has been broadened to cover earnings as well as the original investment as provided in the House bill. It removes the House coverage of losses incurred by seizure, confiscation, expropriation, destruction by riot, revolution, or war, laws, ordinances, regulations, decrees or administrative actions preventing further transaction of the business envisaged in the guaranty entered into by the Administrator. The ceiling on guaranties is fixed at $150,000,000 rather than the $300,000,000 envisaged by the House. The new provision marks an advance beyond the scope of guaranties as set forth in the existing Act, but the managers on the part of the House concede it is not a substantial advance. The policy that will attract American private enterprise more fully and directly into the great task of solving the economic problems of Europe remains a task that must properly and adequately be dealt with in future legislation.

SHIPPING PROVISIONS (SEC. 6 (A))

Section 6 (a) of the House version specifies that the provision in section 111 (a) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, requiring the Administrator to seek for United States flag vessels at least a 50 percent share of the cargoes originating in the United States and financed by funds authorized in pursuance of the Economic Cooperation Act, shall be subject to the availability of the United States flag vessels at the market rate for United States flag vessels, "not to exceed a reasonable differential above current world market rates."

The managers on the part of the House receded on the words "not to exceed a reasonable differential above current world market rates." They receded also in accepting the language in section 14 of the Senate version, which represents an agreed compromise between the Economic Cooperation Administration and American merchant marine interests, and is reported to be workable.

The managers on the part of the Senate receded on an accompanying provision in section 15 of the Senate version forbidding the use of funds authorized under the Act for charter hire, freight or passenger charges, or for any other purpose relevant to transportation in vessels documented under the laws of a foreign country which is not a participating country and of which the owner of the vessel is not a national (Panamanian and similar charters), as the substance pertains to the maritime policy of the United States Government rather than bearing directly upon policies involved in the European recovery program.

INFORMATIONAL MEDIA (SEC. 6 (B) (2) AND (3))

The limitation on convertibility guaranties related to informational media is $10,000,000 per year in section 6 (a) of the Senate version, and $15,000,000 per year in section 6 (b) of the House version. The managers on the part of the House receded and concurred in the figure of the Senate version. The managers on the part of the Senate agreed to the requirement in section 6 (b) (2) of the House version that such informational media should be consistent with the national interests of the United States. This language was not included in the Senate version. The significance of the

language is explained on page 22 of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H. R. 3748, House Report No. 323.

FLOUR AND CORN (SEC. 7 (A))

Section 7 (a) of the Senate version scales down from 25 to 15 percent the reservation for flour in proportion to the total wheat shipped from the United States and financed by Economic Cooperation Administration authorizations. The House version, in section 7 (b), would repeal the flour provision outright. The differences are compromised in a provision reserving for flour a 12½ percent portion of such wheat shipments—a point halfway between the House version and the existing practice.

The managers on the part of the Senate receded on a similar provision reserving for processed corn a 15 percent share of all corn shipments financed by funds authorized under the Economic Cooperation Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES (SEC. 7 (B))

The managers on the part of the House receded with regard to section 7 (c) of the Senate version specifying that the words "any agriculturtal commodity, or product thereof" as used in section 112 (d) of the Act shall be enlarged to include classes, types, or specifications of such commodities or products. It is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that the new language in nowise prejudices operations of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

SMALL BUSINESS (SEC. 7 (D))

Two different small-business amendments were adopted on the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate. The language accepted by the committee of conference is a compromise. It seeks to safeguard the interests of small business without employing language that would force the Administrator to convert the Economic Cooperation Administration into a procurement agency, to resort to the techniques of state trading, and to abandon the principle of private channels of trade as a fundamental of the Act. It was believed to be undesirable to give the Administrator, as an official of the United States Government, the power to impose a pattern of foreign trade upon the economy of the United States.

The committee of conference took into consideration the following statement of Administrator Hoffman addressed to Chairman Kee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"I am writing this letter with regard to the Patman small-business amendment contained in the House bill as referred to the conference, because I feel so deeply that its adoption would be a tragic mistake. As the House and Senate reports recognized, the ECA has from its inception, in accordance with the clearly expressed wishes of the Congress, fostered the use of private channels of trade to the greatest extent possible. ECA has accomplished this by operating as a financing, not as a procurement agency.

"The Patman amendment would change the ECA program fundamentally. In my opinion, it would be impossible to carry out the provisions of the amendment through mere regulation of private trade. In order to force business into the pattern imposed by the amendment, as against allowing business to flow in a normal way through normal, private trade channels, ECA would of necessity have to take over the actual placing of individual orders, directly or indirectly. Thus, ECA would have to become a gigantic procurement agency. Unavoidably, as a result of such centralized procurement, greatly increased personnel would be required. Moreover, inherent in such a procurement program are influences that would lead to increased intervention on the part of European Governments in the economies of their respective countries.

"The amendment would certainly make more difficult the attainment of the objectives for which ECA was created. In setting up ECA it was the clear intent of Congress that this new agency would help Europe to achieve a self-supporting status in the shortest possible time and at the lowest possible cost. Any such fundamental change as would be incident to a changeover from the use of private channels of trade to a completely government-controlled pattern of procurement would inevitably cause major disruptions in the flow of commodities to Europe. The ERP countries have made remarkable strides toward recovery in the first year of the program. But as I have repeatedly emphasized, this is the crucial year and we must capitalize on the momentum that we have now gained. This amendment would disrupt the program to an extent that would in large measure dissipate the progress made to date and would make impossible the successful completion of the European recovery program on schedule.

"I wish to give you my personal assurances that ECA will devote every effort to make it possible for American small business to obtain the greatest possible participation in the program. We are eager to take any possible steps in this direction, and you may rest assured that we are open to any constructive suggestions that will further the opportunities of small business.

"I cannot urge upon you too strongly the necessity of eliminating this amendment."

The new language places new duties on the Administrator and the Administrator is to discharge these new duties in an affirmative manner. The Economic Cooperation Administration is expected to take a positive and forceful approach in affording small business the information necessary to give it the opportunity to participate in this program on the broadest practicable scale.

The new language is embodied in section 7 (d) of the bill as reported by the committee of conference. It should be interpreted in the light of the principle of private channels of trade set forth in the subsection of the Act immediately preceding. Within the limits of that principle, the new language charges the Administrator to see that information relating to purchases proposed to be made with funds provided for the Economic Cooperation Administration is made available as far in advance as possible to suppliers in the United States, particularly to small independent enterprises, so that they may participate equitably, and to get to prospective purchasers in the participating countries information concerning commodities and services produced by small, independent enterprises in the United States. The Administrator is to assist in other ways consonant with the purposes of the Act the participation of small business in trade financed by funds authorized under the Economic Cooperation Act. The new language specifically obliges the inclusion of the subject of small-business participation in the reports required quarterly or oftener under section 123 of the Economic Cooperation Act. A Special Assistant to the Administrator is established with the specific duty of effectuating these new obligations.

The managers on the part of the House take note of the concern of the Economic Cooperation Administrator lest the new language lead small business to false expectations that he can or will direct a large volume of business to small business enterprises. This could be done only by turning the Economic Cooperation Administration into a procurement agency—a result wholly undesirable for private enterprise. Small business should have access to the information on which to make its plans and on which to seek new outlets of trade. Information concerning its products should also be made available to purchasers in the participating countries. It is not desired, however, that the Economic Cooperation Administration shall, by becoming a channel for foreign trade remove the "enterprise" from private enterprise.

MARINE INSURANCE (SEC. 7 (D))

Section 12 (c) of the Senate version contains a provision instructing the Administrator to make United States dollars available for marine insurance on commodities procured in the United States with funds provided in this program where such insurance is placed on a competitive basis in accordance with normal trade practices prevailing before World War II. It contains also language intended to foreclose any participating country from discriminating against United States insurance companies in connection with the marine insurance of commodities procured in this country and financed under this program. The House version contains no equivalent language. It was the view of the managers on the part of the House that it would be a mistake to compel marine insurance on cargoes owned by foreign governments. It was believed also that to impede foreign governments from applying, insofar as related to marine insurance, the exchange restrictions necessary to their compliance with their obligations under the European recovery program would be contradictory to the tenor of the Act. In keeping with this view, the managers on the part of the Senate receded on the latter portion of the section in question, while the managers on the part of the House receded on the former portion.

ADVERTISING FOREIGN PRODUCTS AND TRAVEL (SEC. 7 (D))

Section 17 of the Senate version forbids the use of funds authorized under the Economic Cooperation Act for advertising in the United States of foreign products or foreign travel. No equivalent provision is contained in the House version. The managers on the part of the House receded. It is their belief that the use of funds supplied by the United States directly for the advertising of activities which are competitive with the economic interests of American citizens is undesirable. This in nowise prejudices the use by participating countries or their nationals of dollars earned through their own efforts for the same ends.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPROPRIATIONS (SEC. 8 (A))

The amounts authorized for appropriation are contained in section 8 (a) of both the House and Senate versions. The principal distinctions were as to the amount for the interim period, which the House had reduced by $50,000,000, and the provision for forward contracting, which was not included in the House version. The managers on the part of the House receded on the former, and the managers on the part of the Senate receded on the latter. The conferees felt that it would be better to leave the authorization intact rather than, by cutting $50,000,000, to prejudice complete review by the Appropriations Committee.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE (SEC. 11)

Relevant to the Indonesian situation, section 16 of the Senate version would require the Administrator to terminate assistance to any country when "such assistance would be inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventative or enforcement action." No equivalent provision is contained in the House version. The managers on the part of the House receded. It is their view that the relevant language underscores but in nowise changes the obligations of the United States to make the

conduct of this program consonant with economic action taken in pursuance of article 41 of the United Nations Charter. The relevant discussion on page 13 of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H. R. 3748 remains valid. The language accepted in the bill as reported by the committee of conference in nowise exposes the United States to the obligation to act alone in applying economic sanctions to any country.

DOMESTIC SURPLUSES

The bill as it leaves the committee of conference keeps intact the principles of the original Act in placing the recovery of Europe as the paramount objective of the Economic Cooperation Administrator. The Administrator may be expected in the future, as in the past, to be alert to the availability of surplus products of the American economy for supplying the needs of Europe.

AID TO CHINA (SEC. 12)

Section 13 of the Senate version extends until February 15, 1950, the availability of residual funds appropriated in pursuance of the authorization contained in the China Aid Act of 1948, title IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, title I of which is the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. A bill of similar intent was passed by the House as H. R. 3830. A distinction between the House bill and the relevant section of the Senate version refers to the discretion of the President. The House bill retains the restrictions contained in the statement of policy of the China Aid Act of 1948. The Senate section leaves the President with discretion to determine the manner, terms, and conditions of furnishing assistance in the extended period, subject only to the restriction that such assistance must not be extended to areas which the President may deem to be under Communist domination. The managers on the part of the House receded with minor amendments which clarify the Senate version. The consideration which determined their recession is that the parliamentary situation in the Senate would preclude early action if it should be necessary for the Senate to act on separate legislation, and the need of promptness is pressing in view of the fact that the authorization under the China Aid Act of 1948 has expired.

JOHN KEE,
JAMES P. RICHARDS,
JOSEPH L. PFEIFER,
CHARLES A. EATON,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have no doubt noted by the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House that the report comes to you as a unanimous report and agreement of the conference committee upon the provisions of this measure. In many instances the Senate receded from its position on provisions in the bill, while in others the House receded; but in most of the provisions of the bill that were in controversy there was a compromise. In the opinion of the conferees, the bill as now brought to you by the conference committee is a stronger and finer measure than either the original Senate or House bill. You will notice that no change was made in the original measures as introduced in both bodies in the amount of the authorized appropriations; $4,280,000,000 is authorized for the fiscal year 1950 and $1,100,000,000 for the 3 months' period left of the fiscal year 1949. These were the figures arrived at, not only by the ECA organization, but by the European organization as the absolute minimum necessary to carry the Marshall plan on through the 15 months' period. The requested authorization of $1,150,000,000 to carry the program through the last 3 months of the present fiscal year had been amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs by a reduction of $50,000,000. The Senate had left the figure as it stood. Despite some evidence before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that our reduction was justified, the conference committee restored the $50,000,000 and permitted the authorization to remain at $1,150,000,000, as carried in the original bill. The figure $4,280,000,000 was left unchanged by the Senate in its bill and likewise by the House.

Other provisions in controversy were amendments added both in the Senate and in the House. Possibly one of the most important was the amendment with reference to the shipping provisions requiring 50 percent of the commodities shipped to be carried on ships under the American flag. That provision is left in the bill in such form as to be satisfactory to the merchant marine and shipping interests of the country.

The provision with reference to the milling of wheat was the subject of some controversy. The bill passed last year required 25 percent of the wheat purchased in this country by ECA shipment to Europe to be milled in this country. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House struck the provision out; the Senate cut it to 15 percent, and the conference committee agreed on 12½ percent. This, we understand, is likewise satisfactory to the proponents of the amendment.

The amendment with reference to the guaranty of investments by Americans in new plants in Europe is a very strong amendment. The Senate version of the bill contained no such provision. That provision has been amended and is likewise satisfactory.

I believe all of the Members of the House, if they will take the time to read the report of the conference committee and the accompanying statement of the managers on the part of the House, they will be satisfied with the work of the conference committee. May I express the hope that your committee's report will meet with your approval.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us is like many conference reports, the product of compromise. Our chairman has covered the matter quite completely.

Your conferees worked up to midnight last night to draft the statement which is in the RECORD. It is also available in pamphlet form this morning, and no doubt you are all familiar with it.

In view of the amount of time that has been spent on this legislation here in the House in the last few days, I feel it should not be necessary to delay the House much longer. I have no requests for time to speak over here on the minority side.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD in reference to this conference report.

I urge that the report be approved by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 103 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic salary rate of $2,300 per annum for the employment of an additional expert transcriber in the office of the Official Reporters of Debates, to be appointed by the Official Reporters of Debates.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion t reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 157 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 107, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 172 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ one additional clerical assistant, to be assigned to handle legislation pertaining to private claims, and to be paid from the contingent fund of the House at rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, created by title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is authorized after December 31, 1948, and for a period not to exceed one month following the date this resolution is agreed to, to incur expenses not to exceed $13,975.80, which shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the matter that came up the other day on the calendar?

Mrs. NORTON. No; this did not come up the other day. This is a joint resolution which provides the enabling legislation necessary to implement the plans formulated by the Commission as authorized by Public Law 203 of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does it include any appropriation?

Mrs. NORTON. It does not. This is just an authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia," approved July 18, 1947, established the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission for the purpose of preparing plans and developing programs commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia in the year 1800; and

Whereas pursuant to said joint resolution the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission has, after extending invitations to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, the governments of other nations, and various other civic bodies, organizations, and agencies to join in such celebration by the presentation of exhibits and participation in other programs, adopted a plan or plans which the Commission feels will appropriately and suitably manifest the significance of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the Congress finds that such commemoration and celebration are worthy and deserving of the support and encouragement of the people of the United States and that the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission should be authorized to proceed immediately with the execution of the plan or plans for such commemorative exercise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") is hereby authorized to carry out the plans adopted by it in accordance with the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia," approved July 18, 1947, for celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and to modify such plans wherever in the discretion of the Commission such action is necessary and desirable.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall prescribe the duties of the Director appointed under the authority of said joint resolution and may delegate to him such powers and functions as it shall deem advisable in order to give effect to the provisions of this joint resolution. The Director shall exercise such powers as are delegated to him by the Commission and in order to facilitate the functioning of his office may subdelegate such powers as may be deemed advisable by the Commission to those in the employ of, or detailed to, the Commission.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution, the Commission is authorized—

(a) to appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, such clerks, stenographers, skilled and technical assistants, and other personnel as may be needed in organizing and carrying out the plans of the Commission; to purchase such materials, and to contract for such labor and other services as may be necessary in connection with the performance of the functions of the Commission, including the preparation and production of exhibits and plays:

(b) to erect a building or buildings, or other structures, for its own use, and to further the purposes of the sesquicentennial celebration, and to provide for the landscaping of the site or sites thereof; to provide for the decoration and maintenance of such buildings, structures, sites, and grounds during the period deemed necessary by the Commission; to rent such space in the District of Columbia without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, as the Commission may deem necessary: *Provided*, That the erection or construction of the buildings and landscaping of sites shall be under agreements mutually acceptable to the Commission and the Federal and District of Columbia agencies having jurisdiction and control over the area or areas involved, and shall be approved by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission: *Provided further*, That in the construction of buildings and exhibits requiring skilled and unskilled labor the prevailing rate of wages as provided in the Act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1494), as amended, shall be paid.

(c) to allot funds appropriated for the purposes of this joint resolution to any executive department, independent office, or establishment of the Federal Government, with the consent of the head thereof, or to the District of Columbia Government, with the consent of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for direct expenditure in executing the duties or functions delegated to it by the Commission;

(d) to fix and collect charges for admission to exhibits, plays, and dramatic productions: *Provided*, That all revenues received by the Commission from such source shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation to be made pursuant to the authority contained herein and may be expended and shall be accounted for in the same manner as other funds authorized for expenditures by the Commission;

(e) to receive contributions of money, materials, and other property from any source to aid in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution; to borrow materials or exhibits; to accept the services of any skilled or unskilled labor that may be made available to it; and to accept reimbursement from private organizations or individuals for rights or privileges granted by it: *Provided*, That all contributions and reimbursements shal be expended and accounted for in the same manner as the funds made available under an appropriation made pursuant to the authorization contained in this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. (a) The heads of the executive departments, independent agencies, and establishments of the Federal Government, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are authorized to cooperate with the Commission in the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits, and to lend to the Commission such articles, specimens, and exhibits as the Commission shall deem to be in the interest of the United States and in keeping with the purposes of the sesquicentennial celebration; to appoint without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, such draftsmen and other skilled assistants as may be necessary; to contract for such labor and other services as shall be deemed necessary; and to designate officials or employees in their respective spheres to assist the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to allot to the departments, offices, and establishments of the Federal Government to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of the United States, and the governments of other nations, that have signified their desire to create exhibits for the sesquicentennial celebration, space within any structure or structures erected pursuant to the authority conferred by this joint resolution. The Commission shall arrange for the selection, presentation, assembling, transportation, installation, safekeeping, exposition, demonstration, and return of such articles and materials as the Commission shall decide to include in the exhibits of such celebration.

(c) At the close of the sesquicentennial celebration, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, the Commission shall return such property as may have been borrowed. Any expense incident to the restoration, modification, and revision of such property to a condition which will permit its use at subsequent expositions and fairs, and the expense

incident to continuing the employment of personnel necessary to close out the fiscal and other records and to prepare the required reports of the participating organizations, may be paid from the funds made available pursuant to the authorization contained herein. If the return of any such property loaned by a department, agency, or establishment of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, is not feasible, the Commission may, with the consent of the lender, make such disposition thereof as may be deemed advisable and in the public interest. The Commission shall dispose of all remaining property and materials, including buildings and structures, at public sale to the highest bidder and the proceeds thereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That the Commission may upon request, if it deems it to be in the public interest, transfer without consideration the title to any permanent building or structure constructed hereunder to any agency of the United States having control and jurisdiction over the land on which such building or structure is located, subject to the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commission shall account for all property, materials, buildings, or structures disposed of pursuant to this subsection.

SEC. 5. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution are hereby authorized to be appropriated, and shall remain available until expended; except that upon the termination of the Commission any unexpended or unobligated balances shall be covered back into the Treasury of the United States. The appropriation authorized by this joint resolution shall be available for the operation of the building or buildings, structure or structures, improvement or improvements, including light, heat, water, gas, janitor, and other required services; for the rental of space in the District of Columbia; for the selection, purchase, preparation, assembling, transportation, installation, arrangement, repair, safekeeping, exhibition, demonstration, and return of such articles and materials as the Commission may decide shall be included in Government exhibits; for the purchase of uniforms; for the compensation of the Director, and other officers and employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; for actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred by the commissioners, the Director, and other officers and employees of the Commission in the discharge of their duties under this joint resolution; for telephone service; for the purchase or rental of furniture and equipment (including typewriting and other office machines), stationery and supplies, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers, and all other appropriate publications: *Provided*, That payment for telephone service, rents, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and other similar purposes, may be made in advance; for the hire and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles in the District of Columbia; for printing and binding to be done, in the discretion of the Commission, by establishments other than the Government Printing Office; for entertaining of distinguished visitors; and for all other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Commission to fulfill properly the purposes of this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That all purchases, expenditures, and disbursements of any moneys made available by authority of this joint resolution shall be made under the direction of the Commission in accordance with law. All accounts and vouchers covering expenditures shall be approved by the Director or by such assistants as the Commission may designate, except for such allotments as may be made to the various executive departments, independent offices, and establishments, or the District of Columbia government for direct expenditure; but these provisions shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit.

SEC. 6. Upon request of the Commission, the Director of the Bureau of the Mint is authorized to cause to be issued an appropriate medal commemorating the celebration of the sesquicentennial hereby authorized, which medal shall be sold to the public by the Commission at such price as may be determined by it: *Provided*, That all revenues received by the Commission from such source shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation to be made pursuant to the authority contained herein and may be expended and shall be accounted for in the same manner as other funds authorized for expenditures by the Commission. The Director of the Bureau of the Mint is further authorized to cause to be issued badge medals in such quantity as the Commission shall determine, to be awarded to individuals or organizations in recognition of their participation in the celebrations hereby authorized, or for other outstanding service. The Commission shall reimburse the Bureau of the Mint for the cost of the medals and emblems.

SEC. 7. All articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the sesquicentennial celebration, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits during such celebration, upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall enjoy, to the same extent and in the same manner the privileges conferred by Public Law 614, Eightieth Congress, approved June 8, 1948. The provisions of the last proviso of said Public Law 614, and the procedures prescribed therein, shall be applicable to merchandise imported for use in the sesquicentennial celebration, and the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission shall be regarded as standing in the place and stead of the International Industrial Exposition, Incorporated, designated therein, with respect to any merchandise imported for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 8. It shall be the duty of the Commission to transmit to the Congress, within 6 months after the close of the sesquicentennial, a detailed statement of all expenditures and such other reports as may be deemed proper or called for. Upon the transmission of such report to the Congress the Commission established by and all appointments made under the authority of this joint resolution shall terminate.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address given by the Reverend William J. Smith, of the Society of Jesus.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that during the past 2 hours I have been in attendance at a meeting of the Atomic Energy Commission, along with the members of the Montana delegation and our governor, I was unable to be here and participate in the celebration of Pan-American Day. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following those of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE], and that the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] may immediately follow mine. I further wish to inform the House that I will attend the meeting of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee scheduled at 2:30 p. m., this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a tabulation of the spending that we have been doing here in 3 days, showing that we have spent $28,709,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are going a whooping full steam ahead—spending, spending. Nothing like it in history in peacetime. These are memorable 3 days before we adjourn today for Easter holidays.

What have you done? Let us just review the 3 days.

Monday: ECA, giving away to foreign countries in direct authorization, $5,400,000,000. The bill also provides $300,000,000 in guaranties for American business abroad. A total gift of $5,700,000,000 to foreigners of American dollars. Where will you get the money?

Tuesday: Armed services, the greatest peacetime preparation for war, $13,269,115,800; and contract authorization, $2,636,301,000, a total for armed forces, $15,905,416,800.

Wednesday: Today, independent offices appropriation, $7,104,571,603, over $260,000,000 more than last year. Total for 3 days, $28,709,998,403. I left off the cents, for there is no sense in such work by the Eighty-first Congress.

THE WOOD BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for recognition in order to make the statement that later during the day a new and revised version of the so-called Wood bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act will be introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time that this new bill be incorporated in the RECORD following these

remarks, and that I may also have unanimous consent for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a detailed analysis of the new bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a Democratic administration bill or is this the Wood bill or the gentleman's bill?

Mr. COX. This is Mr. WOOD's bill. If the gentleman is familiar with the work done in the preparation of this bill, he understands that it is the outgrowth of the joint committee that was set up under the Taft-Hartley Act at the time of its adoption.

Mr. FULTON. So that is really, then, the Democratic administration bill or the committee bill?

Mr. COX. I would say the Wood bill is not the administration bill. I take the Lesinski bill is the administration bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me make this further explanation: The procedure will be that when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union on the Lesinski bill, following the reading of the first paragraph of the bill, the Wood bill will be offered as a substitute, and will, of course, be open to amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

H. R. 4290

A bill to establish fair and equitable rules of conduct to govern labor and management in their relations with one another, with individual workers, and with the public, to protect the interests of the public in controversies between labor and management, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949."

(b) Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and above all recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

It is the purpose and policy of this act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to define and proscribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare, and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce.

TITLE I

REPEAL OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AND REENACTMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT WITH CERTAIN AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby repealed. The National Labor Relations Act, as it existed prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND POLICIES

"SECTION 1. The denial by some employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by some employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest, which have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by (a) impairing the efficiency, safety, or operation of the instrumentalities of commerce; (b) occurring in the current of commerce; (c) materially affecting, restraining, or controlling the flow of raw materials or manufactured or processed goods from or into the channels of commerce, or the prices of such materials or goods in commerce; or (d) causing diminution of employment and wages in such volume as substantially to impair or disrupt the market for goods flowing from or into the channels of commerce.

"The inequality of bargaining power between employees who do not possess full freedom of association or actual liberty of contract, and employers who are organized in the corporate or other forms of ownership association substantially burdens and affects the flow of commerce, and tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions, by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners in industry and by preventing the stabilization of competitive wage rates and working conditions within and between industries.

"Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

"Experience has further demonstrated that certain practices by some labor organizations, their officers, and members have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by preventing the free flow of goods in such commerce through strikes and other forms of industrial unrest or through concerted activities which impair the interest of the public in the free flow of such commerce. The elimination of such practices is a necessary condition to the assurance of the rights herein guaranteed.

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. When used in this act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

"(2) The term 'employer' includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporations, or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

"(3) The term 'employee' shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute or because of any unfair labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse, or any individual having the status of an independent contractor, or any individual employed as a supervisor, or any individual employed by an employer subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or by any other person who is not an employer as herein defined.

"(4) The term 'representatives' includes any individual or labor organization.

"(5) The term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"(6) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

"(7) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(8) The term 'unfair labor practice' means any unfair labor practice listed in section 8.

"(9) The term 'labor dispute' includes any controversy concerning terms, tenure or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee.

"(10) The term 'National Labor Relations Board' means the National Labor Relations Board provided for in section 3 of this Act.

"(11) The term 'supervisor' means any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibly to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment.

"(12) The term 'professional employee' means—

"(a) any employee engaged in work (i) predominantly intellectual and varied in character as opposed to routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work; (ii) involving the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance; (iii) of such a character that the output produced

or the result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time; (iv) requiring knowledge of an advance type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning or a hospital, as distinguished from a general academic education or from an apprenticeship or from training in the performance of routine mental, manual, or physical processes; or

"(b) any employee, who (i) has completed the courses of specialized intellectual instruction and study described in clause (iv) of paragraph (a), and (ii) is performing related work under the supervision of a professional person to qualify himself to become a professional employee as defined in paragraph (a).

"(13) In determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling.

"NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"SEC. 3. (a) The National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter called the "Board"), consisting of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949, the terms of office of the members of the Board in office on the date of the enactment of such Act shall expire as provided by law at the time of their appointment. Their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, excepting that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) The Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers which it may itself exercise. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board, and three members of the Board shall, at all times constitute a quorum of the Board, except that two members shall constitute a quorum of any group designated pursuant to the first sentence hereof. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

"(d) There shall be a general counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949, the term of office of the general counsel in office on the date of the enactment of such act shall expire as provided by law at the time of his appointment. The general connsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law.

"SEC. 4. (a) Each member of the Board and the General Counsel of the Board shall receive a salary of $12,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties. The Board may not employ any attorneys for the purpose of reviewing transcripts of hearings or preparing drafts of opinions except that any attorney employed for assignment as a legal assistant to any Board member may for such Board member review such transcripts and prepare such drafts. No trial examiner's report shall be reviewed, either before or after its publication, by any person other than a member of the Board or his legal assistant, and no trial examiner shall advise or consult with the Board with respect to exceptions taken to his findings, rulings, or recommendations. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Board, appear for and represent the Board in any case in court. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Board to appoint individuals for the purpose of conciliation or mediation, or for economic analysis.

"(b) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"SEC. 5. The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. A member who participates in such an inquiry shall not be disqualified from subsequently participating in a decision of the Board in the same case.

"SEC. 6. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 8 (a) (3).

"UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

"(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7;

"(2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it: *Provided*, That subject to rules and regulations made and published by the Board pursuant to section 6, an employer shall not be prohibited from permitting employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of time or pay;

"(3) by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization: *Provided*, That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice) to require as a condition of employment membership therein on or after the thirtieth day following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of such agreement, whichever is the later, (i) if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9 (a), in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made and has complied with all the requirements imposed by sections 9 (f), (g), and (h); and (ii) if, in case an election has been held under section 9 (e) (1) within 1 year preceding the effective date of such agreement, the Board shall not have certified that at least a majority of the employees eligible to vote in such election have voted to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make such an agreement: *Provided further*, That no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, or (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than (1) the employee's failure to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (2) the employee's participation in, or encouragement of other employees to engage in, a strike or concerted activity in violation of the collective-bargaining agreement between such labor organization and the employer, or (3) the employee's membership or affiliation with the Communist Party or his support thereof, or his membership in, affiliation with, or support of any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or any illegal or unconstitutional methods: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall make it an unfair labor practice for an employer merely to notify a labor organization of opportunities for employment;

"(4) to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this Act;

"(5) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a).

"(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

"(1) to restrain or coerce (A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein; or (B) an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances;

"(2) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of subsection (a) (3) or to discriminate against an employee with respect to whom membership in such organization has been denied or terminated on some

ground other than (1) the employee's failure to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (2) the employee's participation in, or encouragement of other employees to engage in, a strike or concerted activity in violation of the collective-bargaining agreement between such labor organization and the employer, or (3) the employee's membership or affiliation with the Communist Party or his support thereof, or his membership in, affiliation with, or support of any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or any illegal or unconstitutional methods;

"(3) to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, provided it is the representative of his employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a);

"(4) to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is: (A) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person, unless such strike or concerted refusal is authorized by a clause or stipulation in a collective-bargaining contract permitting employees covered by such contract to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose employees, who would normally perform such work, are engaged in a lawful strike approved or ratified by their representative whom such employer is required to recognize under this act, if such representative is the same local labor organization which is a party to such collective-bargaining contract; (B) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (C) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (D) forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class, unless such employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under this act;

"(5) to require of employees covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a) (3) the payment, as a condition precedent to becoming a member of such organization, of a fee in an amount which the board finds excessive or discriminatory under all the circumstances. In making such a finding, the board shall consider, among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organizations in the particular industry, and the wages currently paid to the employees affected;

"(6) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed or not to be performed; and

"(c) The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession: *Provided,* That where there is in effect a collective-bargaining contract covering employees in an industry affecting commerce, the duty to bargain collectively shall also mean that no party to such contract shall terminate or modify such contract, unless the party desiring such termination or modification—

"(1) serves a written notice upon the other party to the contract of the proposed termination or modification 60 days prior to the expiration date thereof, or in the event such contract contains no expiration date, or such contract contains reopening provisions for purposes of modification, 60 days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification;

"(2) offers to meet and confer with the other party for the purpose of negotiating a new contract or a contract containing the proposed modifications;

"(3) notifies the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service within 30 days after such notice of the existence of a dispute, and simultaneously therewith notifies any State or Territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or Territory where the dispute occurred, provided no agreement has been reached by that time; and

"(4) continues in full force and effect, without resorting to strike or lock-out, all the terms and conditions of the existing contract for a period of 60 days after such notice is given:

The duties imposed upon employers, employees, and labor organizations by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall become inapplicable upon an intervening certification of the Board, under which the labor organization or individual, which is a party to the contract, has been superseded as or ceased to be the representative of the employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a), and the duties so imposed shall not be construed as requiring either party to discuss or agree to any modification of the terms and conditions contained in a contract for a fixed period, if such modification is to become effective before such terms and conditions can be reopened under the provisions of the contract.

"REPRESENTATIVES AND ELECTIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) Representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment: *Provided,* That any individual employee or a group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer and to have such grievances adjusted, without the intervention of the bargaining representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining contract or agreement then in effect: *Provided further,* That the bargaining representative has been given opportunity to be present at such adjustment.

"(b) The Board shall decide in each case whether, in order to assure to employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this act, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof: *Provided,* That the Board shall not (1) decide that any unit is appropriate for such purposes if such unit includes both professional employees and employees who are not professional employees unless a majority of such professional employees vote for inclusion in such unit; or (2) decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purposes on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination, unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation or (3) decide that any unit is appropriate for such purposes if it includes, together with other employees, any individual employed as a guard to enforce against employees and other persons rules to protect property of the employer or to protect the safety of persons on the employer's premises; but no labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

"(c) (1) Whenever a petition shall have been filed, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Board—

"(A) by an employee or group of employees or any individual or labor organization acting in their behalf alleging that a substantial number of employees (i) wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their employer declines to recognize their representative as the representative defined in section 9(a), or (ii) assert that the individual or labor organization, which has been certified or is being currently recognized by their employer as the bargaining representative, is no longer a representative as defined in section 9 (a); or

"(B) by an employer, alleging that one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim to be recognized as the representative defined in section 9 (a); the Board shall investigate such petition and if it has reasonable cause to believe that a question of representation affecting commerce exists shall provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice. Such hearing may be conducted by an officer or employee of the regional office, who shall not make any recommendations with respect thereto. If the Board finds upon the record of such hearing that such a question of representation exists, it shall direct an election by secret ballot and shall certify the results thereof.

"(2) In determining whether or not a question of representation affecting commerce exists, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of the identity of the persons filing the petition or the kind of relief sought and in no case shall the Board deny a labor organization a place on the ballot by reason of an order with respect to such labor organization or its predecessor not issued in conformity with section 10 (c).

"(3) No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within

which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held. An employee on strike shall be eligible to vote (A) if he is entitled to reinstatement, or (B) even though he is not entitled to reinstatement, if his place has not been validly filled by a permanent replacement for 90 days or more preceding the date of the election. In any election where none of the choices on the ballot receives a majority, a run-off shall be conducted, the ballot providing for a selection between the two choices receiving the largest and second largest number of valid votes cast in the election.

"(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the waiving of hearings by stipulation for the purpose of a consent election in conformity with regulations and rules of decision of the Board.

"(5) In determining whether a unit is appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b) the extent to which the employees have organized shall not be controlling.

"(d) Whenever an order of the Board made pursuant to section 10 (c) is based in whole or in part upon facts certified following an investigation pursuant to subsection (c) of this section and there is a petition for the enforcement or review of such order, such certification and the record of such investigation shall be included in the transcript of the entire record required to be filed under section 10 (e) or 10 (f), and thereupon the decree of the court enforcing, modifying, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board shall be made and entered upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript.

"(e) (1) Upon the filing with the Board by 30 per centum or more of the employees in an appropriate collective-bargaining unit of whom a labor organization is the representative as provided in section 9 (a), of a petition alleging that they desire to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make an agreement with the employer of such employees requiring membership in such labor organization as a condition of employment in such unit, the Board shall take a secret ballot of the employees in such unit and shall certify the results thereof to such labor organization and to the employer.

"(2) No election shall be conducted pursuant to this subsection in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held.

"(f) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, unless such labor organization and any national or international labor organization of which such labor organization is an affiliate or constituent unit (A) shall have prior thereto filed with the Secretary of Labor copies of its constitution and bylaws and a report, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, showing—

"(1) the name of such labor organization and the address of its principal place of business;

"(2) the names, titles, and compensation and allowances of its three principal offices and of any of its other officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the preceding year exceeded $5,000, and the amount of the compensation and allowances paid to each such officer or agent during such year;

"(3) the manner in which the officers and agents referred to in clause (2) were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected;

"(4) the initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay on becoming members of such labor organization;

"(5) the regular dues or fees which members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing of such labor organization;

"(6) a detailed statement of, or reference to provisions of its constitution and bylaws showing the procedure followed with respect to, (a) qualification for or restrictions on membership, (b) election of officers and stewards, (c) calling of regular and special meetings, (d) levying of assessments, (e) imposition of fines, (f) authorization for bargaining demands, (g) ratification of contract terms, (h) authorization for strikes, (i) authorization for disbursement of union funds, (j) audit of union financial transactions, (k) participation in insurance or other benefit plans, and (l) expulsion of members and the grounds therefor;

and (B) can show that prior thereto it has—

"(1) filed with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, a report showing all of (a) its receipts of any kind and the sources of such receipts, (b) its total assets and liabilities as of the end of its last fiscal year, (c) the disbursements made by it during such fiscal year, including the purposes for which made, which report shall be filed within 120 days of the end of such fiscal year; and

"(2) furnished to all of the members of such labor organization copies of the financial report required by paragraph (1) hereof to be filed with the Secretary of Labor.

"(g) It shall be the obligation of all labor organizations to file annually with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, reports bringing up to date the information required to be supplied in the initial filing by subsection (f) (A) of this section, and to file with the Secretary of Labor, and furnish to its members annually financial reports in the form and manner prescribed in subsection (f) (B). No labor organization shall be eligible for certification under this section as the representative of any employees, and no complaint shall issue under section 10 with respect to a charge filed by a labor organization unless it can show that it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit has complied with its obligation under this subsection.

"(h) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees under subsection (c) of this section raised by, and no complaint shall be issued under subsection (b) of section 10, pursuant to a charge made by—

"(i) a labor organization unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by each officer of such labor organization and the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit; or

"(ii) an employer, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by such employer, if a natural person or persons, or each officer of such employer—

stating that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of, or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 35–A of the Criminal Code shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits.

"PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 10. (a) The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in sec. 8) affecting commerce. This power shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry (other than mining, manufacturing, communications, and transportation except where predominantly local in character) even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce, unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

"(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect, and containing a notice of hearing before the Board or a member thereof, or before a designated agent or agency, at a place therein fixed, not less than 5 days after the serving of said complaint: *Provided*, That no complaint shall issue based upon any unfair labor practice occurring more than 6 months prior to the filing of the charge with the Board and the service of a copy thereof upon the person against whom such charge is made, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the armed forces, in which event the 6-month period shall be computed from the day of his discharge. Any such complaint may be amended by the member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or the Board in its discretion at any time prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to the original or amended complaint and to appear in person or otherwise and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint. In the discretion of the member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or the Board, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the said proceeding and to present testimony. Any such proceeding shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure for the district courts of the United States, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 723–B, 723–C).

"(c) The testimony taken by such member, agent, or agency or the Board shall be reduced to writing and filed with the Board. Thereafter, in its discretion, the Board upon notice may take further testimony or hear argument. If upon the preponderance of the testimony taken the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act: *Provided*, That where an order directs reinstatement of an employee, back pay may be required of the employer or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination suffered by him: *And provided further*, That in determining whether a complaint shall issue alleging a violation of section 8 (a) (1) or section 8 (a) (2), and in deciding such cases, the same regulations and rules of de-

cision shall apply irrespective of whether or not the labor organization affected is affiliated with a labor organization national or international in scope. Such order may further require such person to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If upon the preponderance of the testimony taken the Board shall not be of the opinion that the person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint. No order of the Board shall require the reinstatement of any individual as an employee who has been suspended or discharged, or the payment to him of any back pay, if such individual was suspended or discharged for cause. In case the evidence is presented before a member of the Board, or before an examiner or examiners thereof, such member, or such examiner or examiners, as the case may be, shall issue and cause to be served on the parties to the proceeding a proposed report, together with a recommended order, which shall be filed with the Board, and if no exceptions are filed within 20 days after service thereof upon such parties, or within such further period as the Board may authorize, such recommended order shall become the order of the Board and become effective as therein prescribed.

"(d) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the Board may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(e) The Board shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia), or if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application may be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia), within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair labor practice in question occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceedings, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board. No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board, its members, agent, or agency, and to be made a part of the transcript. The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals if application was made to the district court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judical Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 247).

"(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Board granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, including the pleading and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered, and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Board under subsection (e), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Board such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board; the findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall in like manner be conclusive.

"(g) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (e) or (f) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Board's order.

"(h) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Board, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 29, secs. 101–115).

"(i) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously, and if possible within 10 days after they have been docketed.

"(j) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice under this act, the general counsel may petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter. Upon the filing of any such petition the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further,* That no order shall be issued without notice unless a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party will be unavoidable and such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and will become void at the expiration of such period. Upon filing of any such petition the courts shall cause notice thereof to be served upon any person involved in the charge and such person, including the charging party, shall be given an opportunity to appear by counsel and present any relevant testimony: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this subsection district courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of an employer or a labor organization (1) in the district in which such employer or labor organization, as the case may be, maintains its principal office, or (2) in any district in which (in the case of an employer) the employer transacts business, or (in the case of a labor organization) in which the labor organization's authorized officers or agents are engaged in promoting or protecting the interests of employee members, and in the case of a labor organization the service of legal process upon such an authorized officer or agent shall constitute service upon the labor organization and make such organization a party to the suit.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 11. For the purpose of all hearings and investigations, which, in the opinion of the Board, are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by section 9 and section 10—

"(1) The Board, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and th right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. The Board, or any member thereof, shall upon application of any party to such proceedings, forthwith issue to such party subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such proceeding or investigation requested in such application. Within five days after the service of a subpena on any person requiring the production of any evidence in his possession or under his control, such person may petition the Board to revoke, and the Board shall revoke, such subpena if in its opinion the evidence whose production is required does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if in its opinion such subpena does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence whose production is required. Any member of the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or posession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Board shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court

may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

"(3) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(4) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Board, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(5) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(6) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

"SEC. 12. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Board or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 13. Nothing in this act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.

"SEC. 14. (a) Nothing herein shall prohibit any individual employed as a supervisor from becoming or remaining a member of a labor organization, but no employer subject to this act shall be compelled to deem individuals defined herein as supervisors as employees for the purpose of any law, either national or local, relating to collective bargaining.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

"SEC. 15. Wherever the application of the provisions of section 272 of chapter 10 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States', approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (U. S. C., title 11, sec. 672), conflicts with the application of the provisions of this act, this act shall prevail: *Provided*, That in any situation where the provisions of this act cannot be validly enforced, the provisions of such other acts shall remain in full force and effect.

"SEC. 16. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 17. This act may be cited as the 'National Labor Relations Act'."

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. No proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board shall abate, and no order or certification of the Board in effect on the date of the enactment of this act shall be invalidated, by reason of any of the provisions of this act or of the amendments made by this act, but such proceeding shall be continued, and such orders and certifications continue in effect, as if this act had not been enacted; and no provision of this act shall prevent the Board from entertaining, processing, making, or enforcing any petition, charge, complaint, or order with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this act; except that the Board shall not, in any of the above cases, entertain, process, make, or enforce any petition, charge, complaint, or order with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this act unless such petition, charge, complaint, or order could be entertained, processed, made, or enforced by the Board with respect to a like act or omission occurring after the date of the enactment of this act.

TITLE II—CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES IN INDUSTRIES AFFECTING COMMERCE; NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

SEC. 201. It is the policy of the United States that—

(a) sound and stable industrial peace and the advancement of the general welfare, health, and safety of the Nation and of the best interests of employers and employees can most satisfactorily be secured by the settlement of issues between employers and employees through the processes of conference and collective bargaining between employers and the representatives of their employees;

(b) the settlement of issues between employers and employees through collective bargaining may be advanced by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, and to make all reasonable efforts to settle their differences by mutual agreement reached through conferences and collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes; and

(c) certain controversies which arise between parties to collective-bargaining agreements may be avoided or minimized by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for furnishing assistance to employers and the representatives of their employees in formulating for inclusion within such agreements provision for adequate notice of any proposed changes in the terms of such agreements, for the final adjustment of grievances or questions regarding the application or interpretation of such agreements, and other provisions designed to prevent the subsequent arising of such controversies.

SEC. 202. (a) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 101 of this act, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is hereby continued as an independent agency of the United States. The Service shall be under the direction of a Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"), appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate but section 101 of this act shall not have the effect of vacating or abolishing the office of Director in office on the date of the enactment of this act. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The Director shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(b) The Director is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to appoint such clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the execution of the functions of the Service, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and may, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such conciliators and mediators as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Service. The Director is authorized to make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as he deems necessary. Such expenditures shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Director or by any employee designated by him for that purpose.

(c) The principal office of the Service shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Director may establish regional offices convenient to localities in which labor controversies are likely to arise. The Director may by order, subject to revocation at any time, delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him by this act to any regional director, or other officer or employee of the Service. The Director may establish suitable procedures for cooperation with State and local mediation agencies. The Director shall make an annual report in writing to Congress at the end of the fiscal year.

(d) All mediation and conciliation functions vested, prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the Secretary of Labor or the United States Conciliation Service under section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor", approved March 4, 1913 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 51), and all functions vested, prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the United States Conciliation Service under any other law shall continue as functions of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The Director and the Service shall not be subject in any way to the jurisdiction or authority of the Secretary of Labor or any official or division of the Department of Labor.

FUNCTIONS OF THE SERVICE

SEC. 203. (a) It shall be the duty of the Service, in order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, to assist parties to labor disputes in industries affecting commerce to settle such disputes through conciliation and mediation.

(b) The Service may proffer its services in any labor dispute in any industry affecting commerce, either upon its own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute, whenever in its judgment such dispute threatens to cause a substantial interruption of commerce. The Director and the Service are directed to avoid attempting to mediate disputes which would have only a minor effect on interstate commerce if State or other conciliation services are available to the parties. Whenever the Service does proffer its services in any dispute, it shall be the duty of the Service promptly to put itself in communication with the parties and to use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement.

(c) If the Director is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation within a reasonable time, he shall seek to induce the parties voluntarily to seek other means of settling the dispute without resort to strike, lock-out, or other coercion. The failure or refusal of either party to agree to any procedure suggested by the Director shall not be deemed a violation of any duty or obligation imposed by this act.

(d) Final adjustment by a method agreed upon by the parties is hereby declared to be the desirable method for settlement of grievance disputes arising over the application or interpretation of an existing collective-bargaining agreement. The Service is directed to make its conciliation and mediation services available in the settlement of such grievance disputes only as a last resort and in exceptional cases.

SEC. 204. (a) In order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, employers and employees and their representatives, in any industry affecting commerce, shall—

(1) exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, including provision for adequate notice of any proposed change in the terms of such agreements;

(2) whenever a dispute arises over the terms or application of a collective-bargaining agreement and a conference is requested by a party or prospective party thereto, arrange promptly for such a conference to be held and endeavor in such conference to settle such dispute expeditiously; and

(3) in case such dispute is not settled by conference, participate fully and promptly in such meetings as may be undertaken by the Service under this act for the purpose of aiding in a settlement of the dispute.

SEC. 205. (a) There shall be a national labor-management panel which shall be composed of 12 members appointed by the President, 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of management and 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of labor. Each member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, four at the end of the first year, four at the end of the second year, and four at the end of the third year after the date of appointment. Notwithstanding section 101 of this act, the terms of office of the members in office on the date of the enactment of this act shall expire as provided by law at the time of their appointment. Members of the panel, when serving on business of the panel, shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

(b) It shall be the duty of the panel, at the request of the Director, to advise in the avoidance of industrial controversies and the manner in which mediation and voluntary adjustment shall be administered, particularly with reference to controversies affecting the general welfare of the country.

NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

SEC. 206. (a) Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof, and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out—

(i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and

(ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

(b) In any case the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall not be applicable.

(c) The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 346 and 347).

SEC. 207. (a) Whenever a district court has issued an order under section 206 enjoining acts or practices which imperil or threaten to imperil the national health or safety, it shall be the duty of the parties to the labor dispute giving rise to such order to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, with the assistance of the Service created by this act. Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, and proposal of settlement made by the Service.

(b) Upon the issuance of such an order, the President shall appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the disputes, including each party's statement of its position but shall not contain any recommendation. The President shall file a copy of such report with the Service and shall make its contents available to the public.

(c) At the end of an 80-day period after the issuance of any order by a district court (unless the dispute has been settled by that time), the board of inquiry shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement, and shall include a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. The President shall make such report available to the public.

SEC. 208. Upon the expiration of such 80-day period or upon a settlement being reached, whichever happens sooner, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged. When such motion is granted, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, including the findings of the board of inquiry, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action.

SEC. 209. (a) A board of inquiry shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

(b) Members of a board of inquiry shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

(c) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. 19, title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

COMPILATION OF COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS, AND SO FORTH

SEC. 210. (a) For the guidance and information of interested representatives of employees, and the general public, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor shall maintain a file of copies of all available collective-bargaining agreements and other available agreements and actions thereunder settling or adjusting labor disputes. Such file shall be open to inspection under appropriate conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, except that no specific information submitted in confidence shall be disclosed.

(b) The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor is authorized to furnish upon request of the Service, or employers, employees, or their representatives, all available data and factual information which may aid in the settlement of any labor dispute, except that no specific information submitted in confidence shall be disclosed.

EXEMPTION OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

SEC. 211. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time.

TITLE III

SUITS BY AND AGAINST LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this act, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties.

(b) Any labor organization which represents employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this act and any employer whose activities affect commerce as defined in this act shall be bound by the acts of its agents. Any such labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity and in behalf of the employees whom it represents in the courts of the United States. Any money judgment against a labor organization in a district court of the United States shall be enforceable only against the organization as an entity and against its assets, and shall not be enforceable against any individual member or his assets.

(c) For the purposes of actions and proceedings by or against labor organizations in the district courts of the United States, district courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of a labor organization (1) in the district in which such organization maintains its principal office, or (2) in any district in which its duly authorized officers or agents are engaged in representing or acting for employee members.

(d) The service of summons, subpena, or other legal process of any court of the United States upon an officer or agent of a labor organization, in his capacity as such, shall constitute service upon the labor organization.

(e) For the purposes of this section, in determining whether any person is acting as an "agent" of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling.

RESTRICTIONS ON PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 302. (a) It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of his employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any representative of any employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce to receive or accept or to agree to receive or accept, from the employer of such employees any money or other thing of value.

(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable (1) with respect to any money or other thing of value payable by an employer to any representative who is an employee or former employee of such employer, as compensation for, or by reason of, his services as an employee of such employer; (2) with respect to the payment or delivery of any money or other thing of value in satisfaction of a judgment of any court or a decision or award of an arbitrator or impartial chairman or in compromise, adjustment, settlement, or release of any claim, complaint, grievance, or dispute in the absence of fraud or duress; (3) with respect to the sale or purchase of an article or commodity at the prevailing market price in the regular course of business; (4) with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization: *Provided,* That the employer has received from each employee, on whose account such deductions are made, a written assignment which by its terms is not effective beyond whichever of the following dates first occurs (i) 1 year from the date of its execution or (ii) the termination date of the applicable collective-bargaining agreement; or (5) with respect to money or other thing of value paid to a trust fund established by such representative, for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents): *Provided,* That (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or unemployment benefits or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; (B) the detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer, and employees and employers are equally represented in the administration of such fund, together with such neutral persons as the representatives of the employers and the representatives of the employees may agree upon and in the event the employer and employee groups deadlock on the administration of such fund and there are no neutral persons empowered to break such deadlock, such agreement provides that the two groups shall agree on an impartial umpire to decide such dispute, or in event of their failure to agree within a reasonable length of time, an impartial umpire to decide such dispute shall, on petition of either group, be appointed by the district court of the United States for the district where the trust fund has its principal office, and shall also contain provisions for an annual audit of the trust fund, a statement of the results of which shall be available for inspection by interested persons at the principal office of the trust fund and at such other places as may be designated in such written agreement; and (C) such payments as are intended to be used for the purpose of providing pensions or annuities for employees are made to a separate trust which provides that the funds held therein cannot be used for any purpose other than paying such pensions or annuities.

(d) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(e) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories and possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain violations of this section, without regard to the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of such act of October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 17, and title 29, sec. 52), and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

(f) Compliance with the restrictions contained in subsection (c) (5) (B) upon contributions to trust funds, otherwise lawful, shall not be applicable to contributions to such trust funds established by collective agreement prior to January 1, 1946, nor shall subsection (c) (5) (A) be construed as prohibiting contributions to such trust funds if prior to January 1, 1947, such funds contained provisions for pooled vacation benefits.

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, for the purposes of this section only, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is—

(1) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person, unless such strike or concerted refusal is authorized by a clause or stipulation in a collective-bargaining contract permitting employees covered by such contract to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose employees, who would normally perform such work, are engaged in a lawful strike approved or ratified by their representative whom such employer is required to recognize under this act, if such representative is the same local labor organization which is a party to such collective-bargaining contract;

(2) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work.

Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of the suit.

RESTRICTION ON POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 304. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251; supp. V, title 50, App., sec. 1509), is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which presidential and vice-presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

STRIKES BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

SEC. 305. It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations to participate in any strike. Any individual employed by the United States or by any such agency who strikes shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil-

service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for reemployment for 3 years by the United States or any such agency.

TITLE IV

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 401. When used in this act—

(1) The term "industry affecting commerce" means any industry or activity in commerce or in which a labor dispute would burden or obstruct commerce or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(2) The term "strike" includes any strike or other concerted stoppage of work by employees (including a stoppage by reason of the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) and any concerted slow-down or other concerted interruption of operations by employees.

(3) The terms "commerce," "labor disputes," "employer," "employee," "labor organization," "representative," "person," and "supervisor" shall have the same meaning as when used in the National Labor Relations Act as amended by this act.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 402. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent; nor shall the quitting of labor by an employee or employees in good faith because of abnormally dangerous conditions for work at the place of employment of such employee or employees be deemed a strike under this act.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 403. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of the general debate the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is understood that if the bill is considered read it will be open to points of order before amendments are in order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4177, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent granted on yesterday, general debate is limited to 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and 1 hour by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee had two things uppermost in its mind, and I might say only two, in writing this bill. The first was to provide and to provide adequately all the funds necessary to carry on every essential function covered in this bill. I might add that we think we did just exactly that. No essential service has been hurt. No. 2 was to give the taxpayers a break.

The budget estimates for all the agencies covered in the bill, including cash and contract authorization, amount to eight billion and approximately three hundred million dollars. The committee reduced that amount by $735,000,000. These cuts were carefully and selectively made, and I again state that in the humble judgment of your committee we have not hurt or curtailed any of the essential functions of any of the agencies in the bill.

The bill covers 33 agencies of Government. That is quite a number, when you have to hear all of them and listen to all of the evidence and go through all the ramifications of the various agencies. The great majority of these agencies are bipartisan, composed of Republicans and Democrats alike. They are usually three- or five-man commissions, quasi-judicial in character. Our committee certainly did not indulge in partisanship, and we have reported the bill with about as much unanimity in the committee as it is humanly possible to get among five men. There is substantial unanimity on practically every major item. Let me say again, there is no partisanship on the committee, and very little, if any—I might say none—in the bill. I think I would be remiss if I did not say something about the fine and capable clerks that we have on this committee—Mr. Duvall and his assistant, Mr. Skarin. Certainly they are fine men. They are hard workers. They know this bill from top to bottom. Without their assistance, the committee would have had a much harder time in writing this bill than we had. We are deeply indebted to Mr. Duvall and Mr. Skarin for their invaluable help.

May I say that men do not come any finer or more conscientious and with more level-headed understanding and judgment than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. They bring to the committee balance and good judgment. Certainly their efforts in writing the bill have been invaluable to us. I often marvel at the capacity for work of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

While we were working on this bill, on several occasions it became his duty to preside over the deliberations of the House. Of course that meant that he had to work day and night. I might say the same with every degree of accuracy and sincerity about the members of the minority on our subcommittee. There is our friend, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who, I might add, has one of the great minds of the House. He stands out in the membership of the House as a great beacon. We all recognize his leadership and his outstanding ability.

The other member of the minority, our genial friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] knows this bill like he knows his A B C's. He has been a member of the committee for many years. He is a tireless worker and his efforts have been outstanding and most helpful to the committee. His efforts are usually effective, not only for his great district, but for the State of California, and I might add again those good people of his district know a good man and a capable man when they have him as their Representative. No doubt they will have him for the next 30 or 40 years if he cares to remain.

I might say that the bill provides for many agencies who have able public men serving as administrators or commissioners. I will not mention them all because there are too many, but I will mention a few of them. I might say that they are all good men and the committee has nothing but the very highest regard for them.

There is General Fleming, Administrator of Public Works. He is an outstanding administrator in Government service and, in my judgment, one of the finest men and one of the most capable men in public office.

There is Mr. W. E. Reynolds, of the Public Buildings Administration, an old-timer, I might say, in Government service, and one that the committee has a very high regard for. He is one of the great men in Government service.

Then there is Thomas H. MacDonald, Administrator of Public Roads. We affectionately call him "Mr. Mac." He is one of the great men, and the committee respects his judgment.

Then there is Mr. Nelson Lee Smith, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and his able fellow commissioners. Those gentlemen are doing an effective job.

There is Mr. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and his fellow commissioners. They are faced with a backlog of work, but we are confident they will catch up with it during the next fiscal year.

Then there is our own Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General. The membership of this committee knows General Warren. He is one of the outstanding men in Government service. He certainly was one of the ablest men in this House for over 20 years. He also is doing excellent work, and I know the membership of the House joins me in wishing him many, many more years of effective Government service. He is a great American.

Then there is Mr. Charles D. Mahaffie, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce

Commission. He certainly is an able executive. The committee recognizes Chairman Mahaffie as a young man, but he is carrying a great load and making a great Chairman for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and we wish him well.

Then there is Dr. J. C. Hunsaker, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. He is an outstanding scientist. He is now head of the department dealing with aeronautical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is chairman of NACA, and I would like to see him become the permanent head of the NACA.

Then there is Mr. Frank Richards, Commissioner of FHA. He, too, is a capable administrator.

There is our old and distinguished friend, and I say that affectionately, Gen. Carl Gray of the Veterans' Administration. He is making a good administrator of veterans' affairs. Dr. Magnuson, his chief medical officer, is not only one of the outstanding doctors in the United States but he has done a grand job in bringing perhaps the best medicine in the United States to the veterans.

There are too many others of these very distinguished gentlemen who are heads of agencies to mention them all, but the committee has a high regard for all of them and I feel they are all worthy of commendation.

I should like to make a further report to the committee on behalf of your subcommittee on a few of the general trends in government with reference to costs. I regret to advise the committee that, generally, there is in the great majority of agencies in this bill, an increase in the cost of operations rather than a decrease. The committee also reports with regret that it finds little or no evidence looking toward an increase in efficiency in personnel, and this in spite of the fact that in the last several years there have been increases in pay and we had hoped that along with those increases there would be some increase in efficiency. I regret to report to you that your committee finds very little evidence indicating that increase in efficiency that we had all hoped and desired would come about.

Again, I must inform you that it is the committee's considered judgment that most of the agencies are still overstaffed. Now, let us look at a few of the agencies such as Veterans' Administration, Atomic Energy, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, the Maritime Commission, and one or two others; then I will yield to questions and yield the floor, because other Members will explain the bill.

The Veterans' Administration had a request, as far as the budget recommendation was concerned, of $5,654,182,000. The committee cut that by $508,750,000. We have provided in this bill for approximately 172,000 employees for the Veterans' Administration. That is almost a young army in itself; is it not? And it is interesting to note that of that number 12,300 are provided for the District of Columbia.

You will recall that last year it was practically unanimously agreed in the House that the Veterans' Administration should get rid of its 13 branch offices which cost the taxpayers of the United States in the neighborhood of $75,000,000 in fiscal year 1948 and employed 21,000 people in addition to the approximately 14,800 they had in the District of Columbia in 1948. Those 13 offices have been closed and in their stead are 7 district offices that have been set up. We are told by our distinguished friend and Administrator, General Gray, that in closing the 13 branch offices $10,000,000 have been saved.

The committee was terribly disappointed. It seems to some of us that they could have saved at least $50,000,000 of that $75,000,000. Every bit of this work should have been placed in the regional offices where they are in close contact with the veterans. That is where it belongs, and we have indicated in no uncertain language in our report that in our judgment that is what should be done. You are going to save not only cost, you are going to save time, you are going to save what thousands of veterans call the run-around. It is not a run-around so far as the insurance work is concerned.

We are getting hundreds of complaints because you have three layers insofar as insurance work is concerned. Part of it is done here in the District of Columbia. In connection with insurance, everything that deals with other than World Wars I and II is handled in the District of Columbia, which embraces some 10 or 12 different items, the Spanish-American War, the Civil War and so forth. I think we will save time and expense by consolidating those insurance problems. Of course, that is one of the many things that is bringing a lot of criticism on the head of the Veterans' Administration today, and I refer particularly to the handling of insurance matters. They are taking a lot of time of the veterans. They write to one place and do not get an answer; and then they write to the established branch office, and do not get an answer. Then they write to Washington and they refer them back to the branch office, and so forth and so on. That is what we are attempting to correct.

Let us go to the veterans' hospital. Before I go into the curtailment or the would-be curtailment, let me speak briefly of the medical program. Out of 172,000 employees of the Veterans' Administration, do you know how many of them deal with medicine and hospitalization in all branches? Of the 172,000 there are 110,356 who are working at hospitals and in various sections and segments of medicine in the Veterans' Administration.

The committee does not touch one penny, which totals exactly $566,666,400, to keep those 110,356 employees and all the hospitals in operation and we direct the Veterans' Administration not to touch one penny of it.

You know what has happened in the past. There was a cut-back order reducing the veterans hospital construction program by 16,000 beds, eliminating 24 proposed hospitals that the Congress has heretofore approved not once but twice, and also reducing the size of some 15 other hospitals. Heretofore the Congress has approved, not once but twice, $237,000,000 in contract authorizations. The Budget came over and asked us to rescind the $237,000,000. But we did not do that. We were not satisfied where the program originated. We thought it originated in the Budget Bureau, not in the Veterans' Administration. We thought it was not well considered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to know if the committee restored the appropriations for the construction of veterans' hospitals that were deleted by the Veterans Administration or at the direction of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We left it just exactly like the gentleman's committee authorized it and just exactly like this Congress had approved it during the fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi. We left it that way. In other words, the President still has the $237,000,000 and can use that authorization for all or any part of the 39 hospitals which were proposed for elimination or reduction in the 1950 budget in connection with the hospital program.

Mr. RANKIN. I believe 24 hospitals were eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Altogether?

Mr. RANKIN. Two in my State; one in Tupelo, as well as a Negro hospital. The veterans of my State think that they are very necessary, and I just want to know if the funds provided in this bill will be sufficient to cover the construction of those hospitals and the other hospitals that have been eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The answer is, yes, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The thing that troubles me very much is the fact that General Gray asked for $48,000,000 more, or his medical section did, to staff the hospitals, to keep the present staff on, and to staff the hospitals as they opened. I am told reliably by the Medical Service that if that money is not restored, from seven to eight thousand beds will have to be closed and some hospitals within a month or so, and as the other hospitals open they will not have the personnel.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. May I say that there is no person on this floor that has ever done more for the veterans than has the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. She certainly has been kind and thoughtful and generous, and all of us admire the gentlewoman for using a level head in managing veterans' affairs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say to the gentleman from Texas that one

reason I am particularly interested in these hospitals is that many of these old veterans of World War I are crowding into these hospitals that are registered as soldiers' homes, and it seems to me that we are going to need every one of those beds that have been eliminated at the direction of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. None of those beds in the various State homes has been eliminated. In answering the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, we granted every penny for hospitals and medicine that the Bureau of the Budget requested, and to be perfectly frank about it, we were informed that they asked for $48,000,000 more than the budget granted to take care of new beds that were in contemplation during 1950. We have several months to go in 1949. The committee took the position that those 4,000 new beds were not in existence now and they would not be in existence for a number of months. If, as, and when they do come into existence and they need funds for operation, the committee would certainly consider their request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was just going to confirm what the gentleman from Texas said. The Veterans' Administration was not in a position at this time to tell us how many new hospital beds would be opened during the year or at what time during the year. Obviously, then, they could not tell now how much help would be needed to operate them. They could not tell us whether they could get full staffs. So the only thing to do was to say, "as these new hospitals come in, and you need additional money, come in and let us know."

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I would like, next, to make a few remarks concerning one of the most important items in the bill—the Atomic Energy Commission. We have included in the bill a total of cash and contract authorization for the fiscal year 1950 amounting to $1,090,120,397. This sum is $76,879,603 less than the budget estimates, which totaled $1,167,000,000 in cash and contract authorization.

In connection with the above reduction I would like to point out that we have recommended substantially no cut in funds for program 300-Weapons and program 400-Reactor development which is about one-third of the total AEC program. These two programs dealing with projects which might be described as our first line of defense are regarded as of the utmost importance to our national security and the committee does not feel justified in effecting economies in this field of atomic development. The net result of the recommendation of the committee as to these two programs, due to the decrease in the cost of materials, supplies, and equipment since this estimate was prepared last fall, is to provide funds and authorizations about 15 percent in excess of that contemplated in the estimates.

Referring to the reductions made by the committee in other programs, it is believed that sufficient funds and authorizations have been allowed to permit continuation and obtain satisfactory progress in the several fields in which the commission is operating. However, there is no intention to cripple any activity of this important agency and we feel that if the commission practices the economy it should in its industrial operations, town management program and its Washington office, that additional substantial savings can be made in these programs.

We have allowed $14,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Civil Service Commission, which is $1,641,000 less than the 1949 appropriation and $3,520,000 below the budget estimates. We have specifically denied a request of $1,202,400 for allocation to the FBI in connection with the investigation of sensitive positions. Funds were not provided the Commission during the current year for this type of investigation by the FBI, and we are of the opinion that the Commission should perform such work as may be essential in this connection with its existing staff.

Figures presented by the Commission were to the effect that in excess of 50 percent of placements during the next fiscal year will be made as a result of examining and recruiting work to be performed by the agencies. The committee is of the opinion that this is a conservative estimate and that a much larger percentage of this work could be performed by the departments with resulting economy and efficiency. This procedure would be in line, also, with the recommendations of your committee in providing a reduction in funds for the fiscal year 1950.

Previously in my speech I referred to the backlog of work which is pending in the Federal Communications Commission. I would like to elaborate a bit on that reference and advise you as to the program we have recommended to overcome that backlog. The primary difficulty is in the field of processing applications for radio broadcasting and safety and special-service licenses.

The committee ascertained, during hearings on the bill, that many applications on file have been pending for more than a year. The Commission testified that the work could be regarded as current if radio broadcasting applications were acted upon within a 6-month period and that a 30-day period would be regarded as current in connection with applications for safety and special-service licenses. In order that the Commission may achieve this goal the committee has stricken from the bill the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia heretofore carried and has inserted a provision excepting from the Apportionment Act funds required for application processing in connection with broadcast activities and special and safety services. This latter provision will permit the Commission to spend funds without regard to apportionment during the first part of the next fiscal year and should be of assistance in expediting action on applications. The removal of the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia will give more flexibility to the appropriation and it is the intention of the committee that services in connection with radio monitoring and other field operations shall be diminished and that funds saved through this means shall be applied to use in connection with application processing.

The Commission should have no difficulty in clearing up its backlog under this recommendation.

The major item in the bill under the Federal Works Agency is that for the construction of Federal Aid and forest highways in the United States. The bill includes a total of $395,991,000 for these purposes which is $52,397,854 below the 1949 appropriation and $27,509,000 less than the budget estimates of $423,500,000. For Federal-aid postwar highways, the committee has made a reduction of $26,509,000 in the budget estimate. The actual reduction in this item is $25,000,000 since an unobligated balance of $1,509,000 for access roads is also appropriated for this purpose. In explanation of its action in reducing this fund, the committee wishes to point out that during consideration of the 1949 bill, it was advised that the full amount of the budget estimate would be required. Testimony given during the hearings on the 1950 estimates, however, was to the effect that there would be a carry-over of approximately $41,300,000. This indicates clearly that funds are being provided at a greater rate than is essential, and, in fact, the committee was advised that there had been more delay than was anticipated in recent years between the time of allocation of funds and when such funds were actually required. Also, reductions in the cost of material and supplies should result in lower prices for road construction. In view of these conditions, we are of the opinion that funds recommended in the bill for this purpose will be entirely adequate.

In referring again to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I would like to point out that we have made some reduction in the estimates for both salaries and expenses. The net effect is to hold the salary and expense item to the current year level and to provide funds for construction to a level somewhat below the 1949 allowances.

During hearings on the estimates the committee made inquiry as to the legislative background of this agency. Questioning by the committee developed the information that no substantial amendment to the basic law of 1915 referred to above has ever been made, nor have any substantial hearings been held recently by any legislative committee as to its operations. The committee was advised that the amendment of May 25, 1948, made no substantial change in the 1915 act.

The committee is of the opinion that an agency which has grown to the size and importance attained by NACA should have broad, basic legislation authorizing all functions, including authorization for the construction of specific projects. This latter situation has not existed in connection with NACA. The committee was informed that all authorizations for construction have been in the form of appropriations recommended by

the Appropriations Committee and approved by the Congress without prior consideration by the appropriate legislative committee. In view of this situation, we are recommending that the legislative committee having jurisdiction over this agency, Armed Services, should completely review the legislative background of NACA with a view to enacting a comprehensive basic law authorizing the various activities and construction programs which it regards as necessary.

In its consideration of funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority the committee considered estimates totaling $56,400,000—aside from administrative-expense funds—and we have provided in the bill a total of $49,359,150, which is a reduction of $7,040,850 in the budget estimate. The reduction has been applied to the construction program, and while we have not cut out any part of the program we feel that in view of the decrease in construction costs, they will be able to get along with the amount allowed.

Through June 30, 1948, the Congress had appropriated $736,223,270 for use by the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which $444,817 was unobligated as of that date. For the 1949 fiscal year Congress has appropriated an additional $27,389,061, and a supplemental appropriation of $3,450,000 is estimated. All funds appropriated in fiscal year 1949, together with the balance from prior appropriations, will be obligated by June 30, 1949. The proposed 1950 budget program involves a request for $56,400,000 of appropriated funds and $78,766,000 of corporate funds made available from the sale of power, fertilizer products, and other sources. The total of $135,175,000 to be applied under the 1950 program consists of $69,116,000 for acquisition of assets, $60,294,000 for operating expenses, $5,500,000 for retirement of borrowings and payments to the United States Treasury, and $265,000 to increase working capital.

For the several items requested in the budget estimates for the United States Maritime Commission we have recommended $62,380,424, which is a reduction of $9,760,966 below the budget estimate. The estimates also included a contract authorization request in the sum of $82,500,000, and the committee has included in the bill an authorization of $70,125,000 for this purpose.

For administrative expenses we have recommended $8,950,142 together with an unobligated balance of $586,648, making a total of $9,536,790 available for this purpose. This is an actual reduction of $1,342,210 under the budget estimate. We have specifically disallowed $68,000 in connection with employees engaged on the work of auditing voyage accounts. The committee has also effected a reduction of $237,900 in connection with the estimate for salaries and other expenses of 111 employees in coast director's offices. We are of the opinion that much of the work performed in these offices is not essential and that such part of it as the Commission may regard as necessary should be transferred to other offices within funds available. In providing funds for approximately one-half of the present staff, the committee is permitting this work to continue into a portion of the next fiscal year and until plans can be made for liquidation or transfer to other offices. It also seemed to the committee that many of the other divisions in this agency are greatly overstaffed and it is supported in its stand by the recently published report of the Senate Committee on Expenditures which recommended that appropriations for this function be reduced approximately 20 percent during the next fiscal year. Page (v) of this report contains the following comment in this connection:

> A reasonable estimate of the savings which should result is about 20 percent of the administrative expenses of the agency, or about $2,000,000 a year.

In connection with the ship-construction program of the Maritime Commission we have approved an appropriation of $26,875,000 together with a contract authorization of $70,125,000. This is a reduction below the budget estimates of $2,625,000 in the cash request and $12,375,000 less than the contract authorization. The committee has reduced funds and contract authorization for new construction by 15 percent because of the general decline in construction costs as reported to the committee during hearings on the bill.

In addition to the funds provided for the 1950 construction program we have continued available a total of $104,000,000 provided in the current fiscal year for construction purposes. This provides a total of approximately $200,000,000 in cash and contract authorization for use during the fiscal year 1950.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

BURIED IN THE RECORD

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago the House had the privilege of having in its membership a very distinguished Member from New York by the name of Crowther. "Dr. Crowther," we called him. He was a Member of the House for a great many years. I remember walking across between here and the House Office Building with him one day, when we were commenting on a speech which someone had made. We both agreed it was an outstanding speech. "Doc" said to me, "CASE, there were not very many Members on the floor to hear that speech today, and probably there was not any press release ready in advance of it, so the public will never hear about it. It will be buried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

BURIED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

I have thought of that many times, that many good speeches are buried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

When I think about the work that went into the preparation of this bill and all the testimony that was taken, to make these two volumes of hearings, one of which runs to 1,495 pages and the other to over 1,200 pages, a total of about 2,750 pages, and realize all the agencies that are there represented and what they said about their work, I can merely say to the committee at this time, there is a lot of good material buried in the printed hearings, buried, that is, unless you dig it out for yourself or bring it out in questioning here today.

SCOPE OF THIS BILL

There is a lot of information on many agencies of the Government contained in the hearings on the independent offices bill. This bill has the largest scope of any of the regular appropriation bills. It deals with such agencies as the Veterans' Administration, which has been mentioned. It deals with the Public Roads Administration, the Bureau of Community Facilities, and the Public Buildings Administration, all of which are in the Federal Works Agency. It deals with the Civil Service Commission. It deals with the Atomic Energy Commission. It deals with the Inland Waterways Corporation. It deals with the several housing agencies. It deals with the American Battle Monuments Commission, which maintains cemeteries overseas. It deals with the Office of the President, the White House. It deals with the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It deals with such new agencies as the Indian Claims Commission and the Displaced Persons Commission. And that is only a part of the list. So that this bill does have the broadest scope of any of the regular appropriation bills. It is an interesting bill for those who want to know the ramifications of our great Government.

It is not my intention to try to make a comprehensive statement covering all of the bill. Time forbids. So does patience. So I am going to invite your attention to the last few pages of the report, which give the tables showing the amount appropriated for each agency for 1949, the budget requests for 1950, and the amount that is carried in this bill for 1950. I shall comment on some of the items in passing.

FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT

First of all, we appropriated for the Executive office of the President. There we allowed the full budget estimates, including the amount authorized by the first legislation that was passed by the Eighty-first Congress, increasing the salary of the President and the funds for the expenses of the White House office.

There is one definite change that possibly should be noted in relation to the funds of the President which otherwise might not come to the attention of the Congress. Heretofore we have had two funds which the President could spend in his discretion for purposes not directly connected with the White House. One of those was the emergency fund of the President and the other was the disaster-relief fund. Last year they received separate appropriations. This year they are consolidated under language which incorporates the purposes of both funds previously.

The disaster-relief fund is that which has been used for the relief of some of the extreme disasters in the blizzards of the West this past year. A year ago it was used for some of the flood relief out in the Northwest.

BOARD OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Going down the list, on page 42, we come to the Council of Economic Advisers. Many times during the past I have wondered why we should provide a Board of Economic Advisers any money whatsoever. We have a chairman of the Board, who says that the country is in a period of disinflation. Then we have two other members of the Board who are more voluble even than the chairman, and they say the Nation is threatened with inflation. They recommend that the President insist upon his request for control legislation.

In any event, the committee reported the same amount that this agency had last year, which will require them to absorb the salary increases which were provided by what is known as Public Law 900. So, in effect, they will have to make some reduction in their hypothecations and predictions although the bill does not go as far as I had hoped it would in that regard.

OVERSEAS CEMETERIES

The next item I would call to your attention is the item for the American Battle Monuments Commission. Here we allowed $5,920,800. This provides approximately $4,300,000 to initiate work on the overseas cemeteries. If the members will refer to the hearings at page 1026 they will find that the American Battle Monuments Commission is engaged upon a program of building overseas cemeteries eventually to cost about $43,000,000.

There are 14 of these cemeteries scattered all the way from Europe to the Philippine Islands. In these cemeteries will rest our sacred dead, the men who gave their lives on far-flung battlefields to defend the United States. I suggest that Members who are interested, look up the hearings, because there they will find a great deal of very interesting information on this subject.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The next agency is the Atomic Energy Commission—for which we recommend $702,930,000, plus some unobligated balances of prior years and contract authority to the extent of $387,000,000, providing in all for the Atomic Energy Commission approximately $1,000,000,000.

If there is any single agency of Government to which the average Member of Congress would find difficulty in applying any ordinary yardstick of sound appropriation, it is the Atomic Energy Commission. The average layman, who listens to these scientists discussing reactors, neutrons, protons, moderators, and fissionable materials, and what they propose to do with this weapon, or what they propose to do in the application of atomic power to commercial, industrial, or medicinal uses, finds himself seriously handicapped.

At the same time I commend the work of my colleagues on the committee for the diligence with which they addressed themselves to the survey of the Atomic Energy Commission. It would be impossible, even if I wanted to, either in time or in my capacity, to make an adequate discussion of the Atomic Energy Commission's funds. But I may suggest this to the committee—that here, as in most other things, if you will take a segment of an activity which you do understand and to which you can apply some ordinary standards, you can find an index which will give a fairly reliable guide in determining the efficiency of the spending operations of any particular agency.

COMMUNITY OPERATIONS

In that connection the committee was considerably bothered by the loose operations it found in the handling of the three principal communities which the Atomic Energy Commission has been operating at Oak Ridge, at Hanford, and at Los Alamos. That was true when we came to determining how they spent their money for ordinary civic activities, schools, fire control, and police protection. It was also true when we came to the question of housing rentals.

We found, for example, that houses owned by the Government at these centers were rented to employees of the Atomic Energy Commission at rates far less than the rates that people can buy housing in any other community in the United States. Yet the average pay rate to employees is considerably above that in other activities of the Federal Government.

For example, I asked the question as to what it would cost for an average house, with utilities provided, with heating provided, with no taxes for schools, no taxes for police protection or anything of that sort. Mr. Ford testified that at Oak Ridge, for example, $38 a month would pay the rental for a one-bedroom house with all utilities; $56 would get a two-bedroom house, and $68.50 and $73 would get a three-bedroom house, depending on the variety of house. Then I asked, "Does that cover utilities?" And Mr. Ford said, "That includes utilities."

> Does that mean electricity?
> Mr. FORD. Electricity.
> Does it include heating?
> Mr. FORD. It includes fuel for heating.
> And it includes water?
> Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Then I asked Mr. Wilson if the Commission were giving any consideration to these rent schedules. Mr. Wilson said:

> We have had surveys of our rentals and the composition of them made at Hanford and Oak Ridge by real-estate management and appraisal people. As a result of those studies it is clear that the rentals for housing units in these towns are substantially below the prevailing rentals for similar facilities in the area.

So the committee felt that we should not recommend the full amount that they were asking for construction of new housing until they adopted a rental schedule that would be somewhat in line with the prevailing rentals in surrounding communities.

SCHOOL COSTS AT CENTERS

Another index to the loose manner in which these communities have been conducted is in the handling of the school problem. It was testified that it was costing the Government $297 per pupil at Oak Ridge; at Los Alamos, N. Mex., $280 per pupil, and at Hanford, Wash., it was costing only $140, that is, at Hanford it is costing exactly one-half what it is costing at Los Alamos. The explanation given was that at Oak Ridge, where it is $297, and Los Alamos, where it is $280, there is no contribution from the State toward the school system operation. Then I asked: "None whatever?" and Mr. Wilson said, "None whatever."

In addition to that, it developed that in New Mexico a State sales tax is collected, which the employees who live in Los Alamos have to pay. That State sales tax goes into the State treasury of New Mexico, and is then allocated back to the counties of the State. There is allocated back to the county in which Los Alamos community is located, approximately $185,000, but not one penny of that $185,000 goes to defray the cost of the schools on the Los Alamos reservation. The county in which Los Alamos is located has a population outside the reservation of 3,000 people.

In other words, you and the taxpayers in your district are putting up $280 per pupil for educating the children in Los Alamos. The employees there are paying a State sales tax which raises $185,000, which does not go to defray the operation of their school, but goes to defray the operation of the remainder of the schools in a county of 3,000 people.

As I say, you can take instances like this, things which everyone can understand, and apply that picture to the operations of the agency and say, "If you are slipshod in activities like this, what about your main operation?" So naturally we wondered about the funds they were asking for in the larger amounts of money and the more intricate items of their budget.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. When you were discussing this matter with the Atomic Energy Committee, did they give you any hope that they might try to work out a solution of that problem with the State of New Mexico?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. They said they had initiated some negotiations, and they were hopeful that something would come out of it now. They said they felt that the rather thorough way in which we went into the matter in these hearings would give them some strength in their negotiations with the State of New Mexico.

We had a very interesting hearing with those gentlemen and their hearings occupy over 200 pages of printed testimony. If you read them you will find that the atomic energy proposition is a very important thing for this country, not only in military operations but in its future industrial life as well. I urge interested members to read the hearings in volume 1, from page 1068 on.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

I must hurry on. Members who are interested in the problem of displaced persons should read beginning with page 444 of part 1 the portion of our hearings which deals with the procedure for entry

of displaced persons. There are set forth the 14 steps which have to be taken for the admission of a DP to this country, and you will find a rather complete discussion of how this Commission is set up and the work it is doing.

In connection with the Federal Communications Commission, it was interesting to find that the Federal Communications Commission believes that the excise tax should be repealed on telephone messages and telegraph messages. I asked them particularly about that. Mr. Wayne Coy, the Chairman of the Commission, said that they were unhesitating in their belief that this wartime excise tax on communications should be abolished by the Congress, and, as you know, the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has introduced a bill to that end which I hope will receive the favorable consideration of Congress.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

FAVOR REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX

Mr. REES. Approximately how much money is involved in connection with the tax on telephone and telegraph messages?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For the whole country on private industry?

Mr. REES. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Norfleet told us that in 1948 the excise taxes in the Bell Telephone system amounted to $406,000,000. That, of course, does not include the tax on telegrams.

Mr. REES. I am in favor of the repeal of this tax. It was a wartime measure and should have been repealed long ago. I am glad the Commission feels that way about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They certainly do feel that way. Mr. Coy said:

> We at the Commission think it is an atrocious thing to have a tax on a communication system today.

The Federal Communications Commission is far behind in its radio work. We found that it had a tremendous backlog of applications. Their work is increasing by reason of the application for walkie-talkies and two-way cab communication, and all those things to say nothing of the fields of frequency modulation and television. The committee has, as earnestly as it could, recommended that the Federal Communications Commission assign a definite team to the clearing up of its backlog and getting current.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. Let me say that in my judgment this subcommittee of which the gentleman from South Dakota is the ranking member, has done a remarkable piece of work. There are more agencies in this bill than in any other bill with which the Committee on Appropriations has to deal, and this subcommittee has done an excellent job. I wish to ask with reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission about the cut on the Bureau of Valuation in the amount of $250,000; where does that cut fall?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The cut primarily should fall in the Board of Valuation. I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that when I first went on the subcommittee—I have been away from it for 2 years up to the present time—but some years ago I recall that I had a discussion with them about how rapidly their valuation work got out of date. It seems that they never can keep current, changes come so rapidly. They had a valuation some years ago that was used as a sort of basis, but to keep that current they have to use an index number and apply it.

I asked Mr. Mahaffie, the Chairman of the Commission, during our hearings if they were to have a cut in their appropriations where it might most appropriately fall. I told him that I did not want him just to give me an off-hand answer, because I knew if he gave me an offhand answer he would say that they could not afford to take a cut anywhere. I told him that he should seriously recognize the fact that if he did not give some suggestion that the members of the Committee on Appropriations might take it in mind to make an arbitrary cut and it might fall in an inappropriate place; so I asked him for his suggestion that if a cut were to be made where it could best be made. His reply was the Bureau of Valuation.

Mr. GATHINGS. He said the Bureau of Valuation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct, under section 19 (a) of their act which relates to railroad valuations and reproductions.

Mr. GATHINGS. I read the gentleman's question to Mr. Mahaffie and the answer of Mr. Mahaffie. He did not come right out and recommend a cut in that bureau.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; that was not to be expected. Every agency wants the full budget estimate and most of them intimate that we should even raise the budget estimate. But this subcommittee, and I wish to pay my respects to all members of the subcommittee, this subcommittee was not in a budget-raising frame of mind, and we took seriously our responsibility of trying to effect some reductions.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

We did so even to tackling such a ticklish proposition as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Now, if there is any one thing for which I am sort of a soft touch it is in the field of research. I have a feeling that more return has been received by the Government from money spent in research by the Army, the Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and other branches of the Government than from any other like money that is spent. Yet with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics we found they were proposing to build some new facilities for which there was no authorization of law. So we took it upon ourselves to take the funds off to start these new projects until they are considered by the appropriate legislative committee and until they could get specific legislative authorization therefor. This may be the first time that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has ever had that done. It was not done in a spirit of hostility, however, but as a means of achieving sounder Government practice. We did, however, provide money to carry on all the construction projects that they have under way so that they could complete those, but we said that so far as the new stuff is concerned they should get legislative authorization.

I recognize that I have taken as much time as I probably should, but I should like to go on to some other things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say some things that certainly should be said about the membership of the committee.

The chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] proved himself to be one of the most able interrogators I ever heard on any appropriation subcommittee of which I have been a member. When he asked a question, he used it as a foundation and followed it up until he got the information he wanted. None of the agencies were able to avoid his relentless and insistent questioning.

The other members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] were all faithful in their attendance, diligent in their study and most penetrating in the questions they asked.

It was a pleasure to work with all of them and also to have the assistance of Mr. Duvall, clerk of the committee, who is one of the most experienced clerks in the entire Appropriations Committee. Certainly he is irreplaceable so far as this particular subcommittee is concerned.

As I stated, it was a pleasure to work with all these gentlemen. Every one is a loyal American who seeks to serve his country well.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Has the committee appropriated enough funds for the Veterans' Administration to handle repayment of the insurance money that belongs to the veterans under their contract?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We did not have a budget estimate on that. In fact, the gentleman will find if he will refer to page 300 of the hearings, part 2, and following, that the Veterans' Administration does not know yet how much is to be paid in those insurance dividends. But we did provide them with the money to continue their study; however, the bill for the actual refunds has not been presented as yet.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. There has been a considerable amount of questioning of the chairman of this subcommittee with respect to the number of employees required in the various agencies. Can the gentleman give us an estimate as a result of his study whether we will have more employees or less employees across the board in these various agencies?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There will be several hundred fewer employees across the board if the committee sustains our subcommittee in the position it took on this bill.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I understand that the authorizations for hospitals in the Veterans' Administration have been left intact. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman mean for construction purposes?

Mr. VORYS. For construction purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. The gentleman is aware that last fall the President and the Bureau of the Budget directed the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration not to proceed with the construction of certain hospitals. The estimated contract authority involved amounted to $237,000,000. The committee did nothing with reference to that. It was suggested that we might rescind that much of existing contract authority. We did not and would not unless we could conduct an intensive study of each individual hospital and determine which ones should be retained and which ones should be thrown out. We thought it might be possible some of that contract authority would be absorbed or would be needed in the completion of hospitals already started. The situation is that the contract authority still remains if the Administrator and the Bureau of the Budget agree that the original hospital-construction program should proceed with respect to any particular hospital, in which case they have the authority to do so.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman has answered my question which was: Does not the Veterans' Administration have full authority to decide where hospitals should be built?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Federal Board of Hospitals passes upon the location of the hospitals but, of course, looks to the Veterans' Administration for recommendations on sites for veterans' hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I may ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will explain to the members of the Committee just what was the intent of his subcommittee in recommending an appropriation for the Selective Service System for the ensuing year? As a member of the Committee on Armed Services it is my understanding that the Department of the Army has reported to the Congress that it does not need any more draftees at the present time, and, as I think all of the members of the commitee know, the Navy and Air Force have not requested any draftees at any time since the present Selective Service Act was enacted. Can the gentleman tell us how the committe intended that the Selective Service System would function during the coming year?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I will be delighted to answer the gentleman from California. Our information is just exactly as he has detailed it, and with that though in mind we cut their funds tremendously, about 50 percent, or in the neighborhood of that, on the theory that the armed services were not going to call any of these boys as they registered. Certainly, they are still subject to a penal offense if they do not register, so what we did was to leave each of the local boards a part-time employee to classify and register them, and that is all. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. HAVENNER. The intent of the committee is that the Selective Service System for the present will function on a stand-by basis?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is it exactly.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Texas. I note on page 463 of the hearings that the head of Selective Service was seeking as many employees for his headquarters office for 1950 as he had in 1949, and 25 or 30 more than he had in 1948, and still we are told that there is to be no more draft. In fact, the same follows down in the field; the number of employees is about the same. Can the gentleman explain why it is that they do need all of these employees when we are told by the Army that there is no need for a draft?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I believe my distinguished friend from New York will agree with me that they do not need them all. They are overstaffed in the District of Columbia, and we clearly indicated that in the hearings. The number requested is far in excess of their needs, and what we did, I will say to the gentleman, was to cut that appropriation about 40 percent and gave to them the discretion to apply the cuts; but they must, of course, under that formula laid down, reduce the administrative costs in the District of Columbia, because if they do not, they will not have enough money to maintain a skeleton force back in their local offices.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman does feel, then, that they do need half as many employees without the draft operating as if the draft were in operation.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is about right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman about an item in the report under Public Housing Administration. As I understand, that was the Administration that took care of the so-called slum clearances, and settlements like that, in the different cities in the various States.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is my understanding that there has not been a house built for around 8 or 9 years, and we carried an appropriation last year of $9,500,000. The committee has cut it almost $1,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts there is no construction money in here for public housing. We are waiting for the legislative committee to pass some type of bill, whatever it may be. The funds the gentleman sees in there represent the Government's contribution, that has been made from year to year since the act was passed in 1937, looking toward maintenance and operation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am a little disturbed about one omission in this bill, which has to do with the training program of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, a subject which comes within the field of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on which I serve. The Committee on Appropriations has cut the recommendation for maritime training approximately in half. I think the total sum provided was originally $6,000,000, and that has been cut to some $3,000,000. There may well have been ample excuse to make a substantial cut in this training program; I am not sure about that; there may have been some chance here for economy. But in connection with cutting down that appropriation for maritime training the committee has in effect, and deliberately, because their report indicates it, cut all pay for cadet midshipmen at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, I think on the assumption that perhaps there is a sufficient supply of trained merchant marine officers presently and that this program is not worth the money it is costing the country. The truth is that the cadets at Kings Point in the Merchant Marine Academy, like the cadets at West Point and at Annapolis and in the Coast Guard Academy at New London, all receive a monthly allowance. It is not a salary, it is not pocket money or spending money, it is an allowance which is needed for those boys to maintain themselves in that school unless they have independent means.

Some break-down of the average use of that $65 per month has been handed me by members of their Alumni Association, who are very much concerned about this problem. Among other things, they

have to spend an average of about $15 for uniforms every month, and their textbooks cost them $4 in addition to those that are supplied. They have laundry and cleaning, too. Their uniforms, of course, have to be spick and span.

The result of cutting out this $65 monthly allowance to the cadets at the Merchant Marine Academy is feared to be that those cadets or a great many of them (it has been estimated as high as 50 percent), may have to leave that school, and that it will be very difficult to get a proper type of men to enter that school in the following year. In my judgment, that would be a very disastrous thing.

I call your attention to the fact that during the last World War, 2,000 men who were trained as merchant marine officers at Kings Point served on naval vessels as officers in connection with our naval activities, and that a great many others, the balance of the men, almost, who had been trained there, served in our merchant marine.

Yesterday we appropriated some $16,000,000,000 for our armed services. We appropriated to the Navy, as I recall, in excess of $5,000,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that our Navy now is probably three or four times as large and as strong as all the navies in the world put together. On the following day, having given the Navy $5,000,000,000 and having given the armed services $16,000,000,000, we are cutting out this $65 allowance to cadets of the Merchant Marine Academy who are training to be merchant marine officers, without which the Navy and without which the merchant marine of this country cannot operate in the future.

I think, to use a very trite phrase, that we have again been penny-wise and pound-foolish in striking out this comparatively small amount; in my judgment, striking out what will make for efficiency and the future welfare of that very fine Academy at Kings Point, and the merchant marine generally.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I call to the attention of the Members a resolution of the American Legion at its twenty-ninth annual convention in New York City in August 1947, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That we urge the continuance by the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps in its Academy at King's Point, N. Y., and its cadet schools at San Mateo, Calif., and Pass Christian, Miss., so that needed naval reserve officers may be trained for the merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has retained the $620,500,000 appropriation for veterans' hospitals, already twice passed by this House.

Many of us who have interested ourselves in the veterans' problems realize that in many areas we do not have sufficient hospitalization facilities.

Especially is this true in California, where the war boom has nearly doubled our population and where, due to the kindness of climate and other attractive features, our veteran population has increased at an even higher ratio than the regular population.

Following a critical survey of long duration, the Veterans' Administration last year announced the need for the establishment of a 200-bed general medical hospital. Money was earmarked for construction, bids were called for, land acquired, and the contract was prepared and ready to sign when, out of a blue sky on January 10 of this year, the Administration suddenly canceled construction of this hospital, together with 23 others which this House had appropriated funds for.

What we cannot understand in San Diego is why this hospital was declared necessary in 1948 and suddenly, after 10 days of a new year, was declared unnecessary.

The veteran population has not decreased. The need for hospitalization was just as acute. All the factors that had led to the decision to build the hospital in the first place were still the same.

Upon the basis of evidence, I am sure that if the President, the budget office, and the Veterans' Administration will review the need for additional veterans' hospital facilities throughout the country, they will change their decision of January 10.

That is why I am gratified that this appropriations bill continues the House action twice sustained by providing the money necessary to build the 24 hospitals and thus allowing the Administration the opportunity to review the veterans' hospital problem and correct a mistake made early this year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], my colleague on the committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is so obviously impossible to discuss a bill of this length, having in it so many agencies of Government, in so short a time, that the principal problem of any speaker, and especially of any member of the subcommittee, is to try to cover a few important points without duplicating what has already been said by the preceding members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on this committee for, now, a matter of 3 years. I did not ask to be assigned to this committee. I doubt if, knowing what I now know about the committee and the work assigned to it, I would have had the courage to ask to be assigned to it. But, being on the committee, I have found it one of the most interesting experiences in my legislative career.

I say with sincerity that I have served under two of the most able chairmen I have ever known, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], during the last Congress, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] this Congress. Both gentlemen have a great background of knowledge and a real ability in examination. In the case of my chairman this year, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], he has a memory which is constantly my personal envy. The other members of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], have served on the committee before, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who returns to the committee bringing with him his background of knowledge. My work on the committee has been made very interesting by these gentlemen.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Members of the House realize that in the hands of 10 Members of the Congress, 5 on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Independent Offices, the appropriation bill for which is now before you, and 5 on the Committee on Armed Services appropriations, which bill you passed a day or so ago—as I say, in the hands of these 10 Members of the Congress rest the examination and decisions on budgetary items representing 60 percent of the budget of the Federal Government. It is a very serious responsibility, as well as a personal honor, to those who are the subcommittees. I have felt that we did not do a wise thing in the whole Committee on Appropriations in doing away this year with the research staff which the Eightieth Congress had set up as an aid and adjunct. I think further it is to the credit of the chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] that we have been able to bring you a bill which is as well analyzed and of which I am as proud as I am of the present bill. We have a good staff. We have Bill Duvall, who is on the floor today. We have Homer Skarin, who is our apprentice clerk and comes to this subcommittee for the first time this year. Without them we would not have been able to do the job we have been doing.

The result of this is not only good will in the committee and friendly relations among the members, but what is much more important to my mind, a good budget when it comes to the floor. I do not mean to say that I agree with everything in the budget. I do not. We do not make laws that way. We make laws by working things out.

For example, it is a sort of family joke in our subcommittee that every time the Council of Economic Advisers is mentioned, and the money for them, I will object.

If you want to read some fantastic testimony, you ought to read the testimony of the Council of Economic Advisers in the budget hearings a year ago. We have here three distinguished gentlemen who do not agree, yet who advise the President. At the moment two of those distinguished advisers think we are approaching inflation, while the other one thinks we are approaching what he calls a wholesome disinflation. Yet I accept that item, if it is the will of the committee, and the will of the

Congress, to put that in, hoping that some day the Members will read the hearings and then we will be able to save the people of the United States $300,000 a year.

In the same way, as I said the other day, every time the representative of the Solicitor's division in any of the bureaus or departments comes before a subcommittee, the attorneys on that subcommittee go after him because they know that the lawyers are spending too much money. In the same way, I know that the analysts are spending too much money.

I do not fully agree with the actual figures for one or two other items, yet I was well satisfied on the whole. This budget comes to the floor with the greatest reduction made by any of the subcommittees on budgetary work this year. As I said a moment ago, I am proud of it.

I made only one reservation in the subcommittee. You know, it is customary, if you cannot go along with the committee on some decision, to say, "Well, on that point I will take a reservation." I have not felt that I could go along with the cut in the Maritime Academies, which represented the amount of money paid to the student trainees and for the enlisted men, in such courses as electricians or bakers. I felt that I could not go along with it, meritorious as some of the arguments were, because I think I am defending the integrity of the United States Congress.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Does the gentleman not feel that we have a moral obligation to those young men who are now students, 1,351 of them, and does not the gentleman feel further that we are repudiating our obligation to those men who have been receiving that payment of $65 a month?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman's point has a great deal of merit. I hope the gentleman will take time under the 5-minute rule to expand it. The point I was making was that in reality this involves a policy change in connection with the Maritime Academies. If policy changes are to be made, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that those policy changes should be made by the Congress. I dislike to have the Bureau of the Budget which, already, in my opinion, is getting a little big for its breeches, making policy changes and sending them down to the Congress of the United States. I am hopeful that this subject will have thorough consideration by a legislative committee in the immediate future. That is, even before this bill has gone to or through the Senate, that we may have some expression from Members of the legislative committee as to what, in their minds, was the intent of the Congress in making subventions and payments to students, as we have made to the Maritime Academies.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the Eightieth session seeking recognition. I wish to say that in my opinion there is very serious question as to whether or not the expenditure of $80,000,000 or $60,000,000, whatever it is to be, for one very large passenger ship is something that should be done without legislative expression by the Congress. Are we to put $20,000,000 of the company's money and $20,000,000 of the taxpayers' money as a subsidy into its building, and then add another $20,000,000 of taxpayers' money under some presumption of defense need to build the largest ship afloat despite testimony we have had recently—I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL], who is here, will agree and the other members of the committee—a ship that could be sunk by a bomb, and when there is danger from snorkel submarines—certainly, such expenditure should receive an expression of approval by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I should like to ask the gentleman if the $65-a-month allowance is eliminated, does not the gentleman believe effectively destroys the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I, myself, think that it does; I think it either closes the academies or at least it destroys the basis upon which we established them, which was a basis of opportunity for all classes of students without regard to financial status or background; in other words, we might as well say we will close West Point and Annapolis because we do not need any more officers than we have now, or that the students there shall pay their own expenses.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

Mr. WEICHEL. I should like to ask this question: In view of the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations yesterday that another war might last only 3 weeks, talking about the atom bomb, and about the air forces, did the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the Maritime Commission have the benefit of his thinking when they put up the $80,000,000 for one single ship which could be sunk by one bomb, instead of appropriating money for three smaller ships?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman has brought up a most interesting point. The committee does not put up the money for the $80,000,000 ship; the committee puts up the money, under acts passed by this Congress, for a large amount of money to be spent by the Maritime Commission for such ships as they think should be built for the benefit of the United States or for similar expenditures under the law. Now, my thinking, and undoubtedly it is in the gentleman's mind also, is that when we come to the expenditure for one single boat of a size over 25,000 tons, or something like that, the issue becomes so large, and the expenditures so great, that it should be passed upon by the Congress just as it was proposed, in the case of extra-size battleships or flat-tops, that they should come to the proper legislative committees for an expression of the views of Congress.

Mr. WEICHEL. It should not be within the power of one Commission to spend $80,000,000 without congressional approval.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It should not. Eighty million dollars to me is still a good deal of money, especially in these days of atomic bombs and very good submarines.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. I just referred to the American Legion's expression concerning this Academy and its work.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I heard the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is this not true: If we cut out these allowances, the only students who will be able to attend the Academy will be students of means, thereby setting up a class distinction?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That argument is very ably supported, and I do not want to stand here and say I know the answer; but to me it is a subject of sufficient importance to be decided not by the Bureau of the Budget but by a legislative committee; and, certainly, I hope it will have consideration on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. CANFIELD. One further observation, if the gentleman please: I think it is most unfortunate that the one witness who was heard on this item made this statement: "Let's put Kings Point in mothballs."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California, my colleague [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. I wonder if the gentleman could explain this item in the report of the committee which refers to the President's budget that cut out some 16,000 beds from veterans hospitals. First, let me read it:

> The committee is of the opinion that this reduction program originated in the Bureau of the Budget and perhaps was not thoroughly considered; therefore it has eliminated the proposed recission of $237,000,000 for contract authorization from this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will take time under the 5-minute rule and ask me that question again, I will have time to answer. That money was never removed, it has always been ready for expenditure. It is a contract authorization and not cash. The gentleman is correct, the Bureau of the Budget proposed that this committee rescind it, but the committee did not agree with the Bureau of the Budget. If the gentleman will ask me later I will answer more fully.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to serve on this subcommittee. This bill, in my opinion, is a good one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there is one program I never heard any criticism of from any one in

the country. That is taking care of our disabled veterans in the hospitals. The country was shocked when, at the direction of the budget, with the President's approval, because he issued the order, there was a cut-back in construction and additions to some 24 hospitals. This appropriations committee has done nothing to further the President's directive but, on the contrary, has left the authorization for the appropriation in this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I do not want to take the gentlewoman's time, but may I say if she will ask for time under the 5-minute rule I will then answer that question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to discuss it then.

Mr. Chairman, we appropriate billions and billions of dollars, we spend hours and hours of debate in reference to relief for other countries. This country has a big program of help for hospitals in Latin America. I realize that today it will be impossible, without the making of the point of order that a quorum is not present, to get a vote on the $48,000,000 which I would like to have added to this bill, the amount that General Gray says he needs for 15,549 additional employees. He said they were necessary over and above the budget as reported out of the committee. In other words, the committee has taken the budget's recommendation on the amount of money to be expended for hospital employees—doctors, nurses, dentists, the laboratory staff. It might be that out of the 15,000 there would be a thousand or so employees in regional offices. They would be chiefly doctors, nurses, dentists, and some clerks. The other employees would all be Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary homes.

It is my understanding that there are now 3,484 beds unavailable because of a shortage of personnel today and if more money is not appropriated still more beds will be unavailable. Every Member of Congress knows that he has veterans in his district who require prompt hospitalization.

The care of the veterans by the Veterans' Administration has been very nearly above reproach. Visiting doctors from other countries have told me that they consider it the finest medical service for the service men in any country they have visited. Many persons believe that the Veterans' Administration Medical Service is by far the finest in our country, and for the Congress to do anything that would curtail that service seems to me unthinkable. I realize there are very few Members on the floor today. Those living at a distance have gone to spend Easter at home, not for a holiday, because I do not think there is a holiday for a Member of Congress when he is in his district or in Washington. We probably could not get a quorum to get the amendment through, but I am sure the Senate will add the $48,000,000 that General Gray has requested for the keeping of the personnel necessary to take care of the veterans, to staff the hospitals that are already constructed or under construction now and ready within a few months. I am very sure that in the other body the gentleman from Florida, Senator PEPPER, at the head of that subcommittee, will give the $48,000,000 additional for hospital personnel. I attended very fine hearings that the Senator held regarding the cut-back of the hospitals at the direction of the Bureau of the Budget last autumn. Our own House committee is calling the Director of the Budget before it, and I hope that we will have valuable information along that line and that our Committee on Veterans Affairs will insist that the work on hospitals that were cut back last year be continued.

It is obvious to me that a doctor should be placed on Budget Groups that make recommendations for hospitals and care of patients.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to endorse the action taken by this committee in recommending the continuation of the $237,000,000 contract authorizations for the construction of the various Veterans' Administration hospitals. I hope the administrative and executive authorities who made the cut in January 1949 will take this action by the committee and the Congress as an indication of the attitude of this Congress.

Back in 1945 or 1946 a very careful and detailed analysis and study was made by competent authorities and at that time it was determined that 32,000 additional beds should be constructed in the next few years under the Veterans' Administration hospital building program. The study was carefully made; the problem was scrutinized in great detail. It was determined by these authorities that there was a "need and necessity" for the additional VA hospital beds. Suddenly, in January 1949, when the program was well on its way, a hurried determination was made obviating the careful work which had previously been done. During the early period of hospital construction under this plan a number of hospitals were started; others in late 1948 and early 1949 were on the planning board. For one reason or another a few of the proposed hospitals had not been started as quickly as others. I say to anyone that the determination made in January to cut a part of the program was not made after a thorough analysis. It was hurriedly decided, and as the result we have an aggravation of a condition that had previously existed to some extent, namely, in some geographical areas in this country we have a surplus of VA hospital beds and in other geographical areas we have too few.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It so happens that the cut that was made affects the State of Michigan most adversely, because it took away from us two hospitals that we are badly in need of to take care of the veterans who really need aid.

Mr. FORD. That is correct. The gentleman from Michigan has said it very well. The State of Michigan has suffered for a number of years from a lack of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities, and this program, if it had gone through with change, would have rectified those mistakes. Michigan needs the 200-bed general medical hospital in Grand Rapids and the TB hospital in the Detroit area. I repeat that the cut has only aggravated the previous condition, namely, too few beds for veterans in the State of Michigan.

I should like to bring out some testimony that was heard before this subcommittee, and I think it emphasizes the point I have just made. Dr. Magnuson was testifying. He is a ranking executive with the Veterans' Administration. Dr. Magnuson said this:

> Iron Mountain, Mich. I do not think we are going to be able to staff that.
>
> Mr. THOMAS. Where do you want to move it?
>
> Dr. MAGNUSON. Either Grand Rapids, or increase the size of Ann Arbor.
>
> General GRAY. Iron Mountain is up in the Upper Peninsula; is it not?

That illustrates this simple point. Cuts were made on an illogical basis. Iron Mountain, Mich., is in the far western part of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. Under the original program it was to have a 200 or 250-bed general medical hospital. Iron Mountain is in a somewhat isolated area. It is in an inaccessible area to most of the veterans in the State of Michigan, and furthermore it is in an area where it will be difficult to provide properly trained staffs.

In contrast, Grand Rapids, where the VA cut out a 200-bed general hospital, we can provide an adequate staff, and the hospital facilities would be easily available to most of Michigan's veterans. That hospital, by Dr. Magnuson's own testimony, is far preferable as far as a location for facilities for the treatment of the veterans in the State of Michigan. I have no objection to the completion of the VA hospital at Iron Mountain, but if Dr. Magnuson thinks we need the one in Grand Rapids as he so indicated, it certainly ought to be constructed under the program with the present contract authorizations. By supporting this bill we demonstrate the attitude of Congress on the VA hospital program. It should go forward where there is a true need and necessity, and by Dr. Magnuson's own testimony the hospital in Grand Rapids should be built.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I see from the committee report and the splendid report of committee hearings that the estimated veterans population of the United States as of January 1, 1949, is approximately 19,000,000. I have before me the official figures from the veterans' department of my native State of California showing that on January 1, 1949, the veterans population in my native State of California was 1,700,000. Therefore, it is plain that the State of California has approximately one-tenth of the total veterans population of the United States at this time.

As I read the accumulated and uncontradicted evidence of need, it is clear

that the hospitalization of veterans is at present not adequately provided for.

Granting that the distinguished leaders of the veterans' organizations are very, very close to the problems of the veterans, I know it to be a fact that tireless, intelligent work by them in protecting the hospitalization needs of the veterans has produced proof of too much slack in such matters.

For your guidance and favorable consideration I submit documentary statements by several sound, reliable, citizens on the subject. Therefore, after I produced my own statement before the Senate committee on March 16, 1949, I produced data to guide your approval of further hospitalization for veterans.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

(Statement of Representative CLYDE DOYLE, Eighteenth District, Los Angeles County, Calif., before Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, March 16, 1949)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you for the invitation extended that I express to you my opinion with regard to the hospital problem, especially in the State of California, as it relates to veterans. I appreciate this invitation because I have been and am especially interested in this problem of our treatment, as a nation, of those who have served in the armed forces in the defense of our democracy.

Thousands of veterans who are presently in these hospitals throughout the Nation are now and always will be unable to perform any normal function of life, excepting that of breathing and taking in the necessary food values. Arms, legs, portions of bodies and minds have been irreparably damaged, or almost completely, if not completely, destroyed. I take it for granted, Mr. Chairman, that no one with any humanity in his soul wants any such crippled and damaged veteran to have less than the best of hospitalization. But only to a little less degree is it likewise essential and just that the taxpayers of the nation see to it that adequate hospitalization is given to any veteran needing it who has served in the armed forces. On this principle I base my remarks and state as follows:

My information, from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, from the office of Alvin F. Kime, department commander, San Francisco, Calif., through his director of rehabilitation service, the distinguished veteran, Nelson Bushey, as furnished me on February 15, 1949, is as follows:

"We have seven Veterans' Administration hospitals in the State with a capacity of 11,332 beds; also eight Army and Navy and four private hospitals under contract to the Veterans' Administration with a capacity of 1,692 beds. Of the 11,332 beds, 3,388 are domiciliary beds. I find there is a waiting list of 735 non-service-connected cases at this time of which 29 are general medical, 174 are tubercular, and 539 are NP (mental). I also learned that we have over 1,900 NP patients who are veterans in the State mental hospitals. Simple analysis indicates a need of 3,500 beds over and above the Veterans' Administration's present capacity. We also find a large number of patients are out on furloughs from the hospitals, many of which may again need hospitalization. There are over 1,000 NP or mental patients being treated in Veterans' Administration clinics in addition to those hospitalized. The Veterans' Administration reports that there are no service connected cases on any waiting list. New hospitals proposed in this State will provide 2,000 NP beds and 450 general medical beds plus 249 tubercular beds in addition to existing hospitals at Livermore and San Fernando. In my opinion we need at least 15,000 beds for all purposes in the State of California."

The patriotic service and endeavor of the Veterans of Foreign Wars throughout the United States for the protection of disabled veterans and the sick and the lame and the halt and the blind and the service-connected disabled veterans of our Nation is so well known that I just need to barely remind you of their outstanding service over a long term of years. From my personal knowledge and observation, Department Commander Alvin F. Kime of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of the Department of California, and all his associates have and are doing a consistent, patriotic, unselfish piece of splendid work in this necessary field, and I feel the information I have given you, as furnished to me by Commander Kime, is of utmost and immediate value and guidance. You will note, gentlemen, that, through Commander Kime, I am told that the opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of my native State of California is that we need at least 15,000 beds for all purposes in the State of California.

And upon inquiry, and in like manner, I am pleased to have been furnished by Lewis S. Sloneker, director of rehabilitation of the American Legion, Department of California, Los Angeles, Calif., a statement that substantially shows that the rapid growth of California's veterans population continues to be a much heavier burden on the taxpayers of the State of California than is ordinarily the case in any other State. Director Sloneker writes me, and I quote:

"This is true because the Federal Government is not assuming its responsibility of caring for the sick and disabled veteran."

I think it appropriate to include in my remarks two statements sent me by Director Sloneker, as follows:

"Some important people in Washington are advocating that the Federal Government curtail its responsibility to the veteran, while others order cut-backs in construction of badly needed hospitals previously approved by every branch of the Federal Government concerned. These same people at the same time are shirking their responsibility to the very men and women who made it possible for our Nation to remain free, are supporting expenditures of large amounts of our taxpayers' money for foreign relief throughout the world. Some of this money is going to our former enemies who caused so many of our own to be sick, disabled, and in need of hospital and medical care today. We do not intend to stand idly by and see our veterans suffering while our former enemies are cared for with our taxpayers' dollars.

"Again, the Veterans' Administration continues to put out misleading information. The figures given out by them on the number of veterans waiting and in need of Veterans' Administration hospitalization, are far from the true picture. This sometimes leads one to believe that they have cast their lot with certain commercially-minded organizations with high-paid lobbyists in Washington who would sabotage the Veterans' Administration hospital program."

No doubt you have heretofore, or will be furnished a complete statement of veterans hospital needs in California as reported for the rehabilitation commission of the American Legion, Department of California, by Director Sloneker, so I will not now quote much of the content thereof, but it is significant and should be of controlling guidance to Congress that this commission of the American Legion states that there is needed "a total of 599 additional tuberculosis beds that the Veterans' Administration should have today to take care of the present needs in California." This conclusion is arrived at by said commission after an apparently thoroughly considered analysis of the facts as related to the actual needs.

In connection with the hospital at Corona, Riverside County, Calif., I have received many communications to the effect that this very valuable and strategically located hospital unit which proved of such great value during the war could be and should be logically used primarily for tuberculosis cases. I will not here argue in detail for this necessary development because I know you have already heard or will hear from those more intimately in possession of facts governing that feature of the situation. But I am again informed by the American Legion, Department of California, that there are many tuberculosis patients in California who are hospitalized under contracts in private sanitariums; and all of such are service-connected cases.

Would it not seem, gentlemen, that these should have a deserved preference or admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals, where they could have the most superior medical and hospital care it is possible to receive? I say that without any criticism of private sanitariums, either.

Likewise, I was informed that there were something over 100 active tuberculosis cases which were still in military service being hospitalized at the tuberculosis unit at the Corona naval hospital, of which I have just spoken. Would it not be in the interests of best treatment possible and efficient administration that, if Veterans' Administration tuberculosis beds were at all available, that then they should be reasonably transferred to the Veterans' Administration hospitals and be discharged from military service? Manifestly, to become a veteran and then receive compensation for 100 percent service-connected disability would mean additional finance to most of the cases.

I am reliably informed by the American Legion survey, as follows:

"In Los Angeles County alone, during the year 1948 there were a total of 953 veterans before the courts. Of this number, 248 were alcoholics. There were 110 dismissed, 418 committed to State hospitals, 235 committed to Veterans' Administration hospitals, and 117 to supervision. In other words, 24⅔ percent were committed to Veterans' Administration hospitals, 43⅘ percent committed to State hospitals, 18⅔ percent placed on supervision of the court and 12⅗ percent dismissed."

My home, being in Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., I am interested to note that the very important and necessary Naval hospital situated in Long Beach under contract with the Veterans' Administration has 400 beds therein, which is the equal number of any Navy or Army hospital in my native State of California. I am glad that the Long Beach Naval Hospital has this available facility and is rendering this necessary accommodation.

May I just briefly relate that one of the chief reasons why I am particularly pleased in accepting your cordial invitation to speak with you on this important subject is that I am well aware that had my own distinguished son survived the fatal injuries received in his service as first lieutenant in the Army Air Forces, he, no doubt, would have been seriously invalided for life; and, therefore, might well have become a patient for the remainder of his life in one or more of the hospitals provided in the United States Government for its veterans who have fought and almost died for democracy—but who have not quite been called upon to make the supreme sacrifice. Perhaps it is better than otherwise that many of these boys who would have suffered physical tortures the rest of their days should have been called on ahead of the rest of the procession to future life.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL NEEDS IN CALIFORNIA AS REPORTED FOR THE REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA

(By Lewis S. Sloneker, director of rehabilitation)

The reports made by the Veterans' Administration as to the number of eligible veterans awaiting hospital admission is misleading and does not show by any stretch of the imagination their real need as to the number of hospital beds required.

It seems that their method or system of reporting waiting lists is more or less left up to the individual hospitals. A good example of this is that a hospital may actually have processed 100 applications for hospitalization, placing 50 of them on the waiting list and giving 50 of them an appointment as to when they could be admitted. The appointments may run anywhere from 1 to 30 days. The true picture is that 100 are awaiting admission to the hospital. Their report will show only 50. Another good example is that a hospital will have 100 applications for admission, 50 of them will be from individual veterans and the other 50 will be from requests for transfer from other Veterans' Administration hospitals. The Veterans' Administration will then show that the hospital involved has only 50 waiting admission, when the true picture is that they have 100 waiting. The latter example is especially true as it affects their reports from tuberculosis hospitals.

A good example of this is that on January 31, 1949, their tuberculosis hospital at San Fernando showed 63 as actually being on the waiting list, when a true report would show that they had 108 on the waiting list, because they had 45 applications awaiting transfer from other Veterans' Administration hospitals. To say that 45 veterans admitted to General Medical and Surgical Hospitals and later found to have active tuberculosis, and not counting them among those in need of beds in tuberculosis hospitals, is plain evasion of the issue.

On December 31, 1948, the Veterans' Administration listed in their reports, the number of veterans as actually being on the waiting lists in California, as listed below:

Tuberculosis:	
Livermore	43
San Fernando	49
Van Nuys (Birmingham)	45
Neuropsychiatric:	
Brentwood	259
Palo Alto	277
Van Nuys (Birmingham)	11
General medical and surgical:	
Wadsworth General	6
Oakland	20
San Francisco	1
Van Nuys (Birmingham)	2

To accept these figures as actual, is most misleading. The latter part of September 1948, Livermore Tuberculosis Hospital reported 126 as being on the waiting list; at the close of October 1948, 143; at the close of November 1948, 133, and then at the close of December 1948, 43. They just don't clean up tuberculosis waiting lists that fast without tuberculosis beds. It is true that many of them had been on the waiting list for such a long period of time that they died. Others managed to get into county hospitals. Others went elsewhere within the United States seeking medical and hospital care. Many remained home and exposed their children and other members of the family to the dreaded disease.

Another factor discovered, preventing the true picture of the number of veterans actually awaiting hospitalization, has to do with applications being held in some of the Veterans' Administration offices formerly known as sub-regional offices. Such applications do not show any place in the Veterans' Administration records as veterans awaiting hospitalization.

Many tubercular patients are hospitalized under contract in private sanitariums. All are service-connected cases. They should have preference on admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals where they could have the more superior medical and hospital care than they are now receiving. Over 100 active tuberculosis cases still in military service are being hospitalized at the tuberculosis unit at Corona Naval Hospital. If Veterans' Administration tuberculosis beds were available it is reasonable to assume that they would all be transferred to the Veterans' Administration and discharged from military service. There is little, if any, question but what they are all service-connected. To become a veteran and receive compensation for a 100-percent service-connected disability would be additional finance to them. As for the most part, it would be over and above their service pay. It is not reasonable to assume that any of them will be returned to active duty. They should be counted to show the need for tuberculosis beds for veterans.

Some time later in the year it is hoped that additions to the tuberculosis hospitals in Livermore and San Fernando will be available. This will make available an additional 250 beds. We should not be misled to believe that this will be sufficient to take care of the load. The waiting list at present will more than fill them.

Within the past few months the Veterans' Administration has hospitalized in round figures 100 of our veterans suffering with active tuberculosis in Fitzsimons General Hospital (Army) at Denver, Colo., and Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Bayer, N. Mex. The medical authorities agree that one of the first and most important phases of the treatment of tubercular patients is to have them have a high morale, and to do this they must be hospitalized near their loved ones and friends in California. This would put them in a more proper frame of mind to respond more readily to treatment. A more true figure of the number of veterans immediately in need of tuberculosis beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals in California would be as follows:

Their December 31 waiting list admitted to be 137; 75 under contract in private sanitariums, 50 in general medical and surgical hospitals, 100 sent from California elsewhere, and should be returned; 100 still in service at Corona Naval Hospital. It is very reasonable to assume that there are at least as many veterans suffering with active tuberculosis in California who have not filed an application for Veterans' Administration hospitalization, as there are those admitted by them on the waiting list. The Veterans' Administration never had enough tuberculosis beds for veteran patients in California. Many veterans fail to file applications when they know it would do no good. A conservative figure would be to add 137. This would make a total of 599 additional tuberculosis beds that the Veterans' Administration should have today to take care of the present needs in California.

NEUROPSYCHIATRIC CASES

The actual number of veterans suffering with mental disabilities admitted on December 31, 1948, as being on their waiting list in California, were 547. To estimate how this figure increased, they reported at that time 259 awaiting admission at their Brentwood Neuropsychiatric Hospital. Today there are 357. Just 2 short of 100 more in a 40-day period. It is hard to describe the need without being ashamed of our Federal Government for its neglect in constructing enough hospitals for the proper care of these patients.

On the 14th of January we took part in a panel discussion in Sacramento sponsored by the California State Department of Veterans Affairs, at which time Mrs. Dora Shaw Heffner, director of department of mental hygiene, State of California, stated that there were 1,990 veteran patients in State mental hospitals, and further that during the entire year of 1948 that only 106 veteran patients had been transferred from State mental hospitals to Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is doubtful if there is a jail in the State which is not holding one or more veterans at this minute, waiting for them to be transferred to the psychopathic ward to their county hospital for later commitment to a State mental hospital.

In Los Angeles County alone, during the year 1948 there were a total of 953 veterans before the courts. Of this number, 248 were alcoholics. There were 110 dismissed, 418 committed to State hospitals, 235 committed to Veterans' Administration hospitals and 117 to supervision. In other words, 24⅔ percent were committed to Veterans' Administration hospitals, 43⅘ percent committed to State hospitals, 18⅔ percent placed on supervision of the court and 12⅔ percent dismissed.

We have no figures as to the number of veterans suffering with neuropsychiatric disabilities who may be in private institutions or fumbling and floundering around trying as best they can, with not too much assistance, to make a satisfactory social and economic adjustment.

GENERAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL CASES

The veteran in need of hospitalization by reason of disability coming under general medical and surgical, has for the most part been more fortunate than the ones suffering from tuberculosis or mental diseases. This has only been made possible by the contracts the Veterans' Administration has in California with Army and Navy hospitals. In addition to the 29 admitted on their waiting list as of December 31, 1948, we find that each of the Army and Navy contract hospitals are carrying a heavier veteran-patient load today than their contracts call for.

California, no doubt, has more veteran patients hospitalized in Army and Navy hospitals under contract with the Veterans' Administration than any other State in the Union. Their contracts are as follows:

	Beds
San Diego Navy	200
Corona Navy	225
Long Beach Navy	400
McCornack General (Army)	100
Oak Knoll Navy (Oakland)	400
Mare Island Navy	150
Letterman General (Army)	175
United States Marine	50
Total	1,700

Making a total number of 1,700 contract beds in Government hospitals other than Veterans' Administration. As stated above, there are more than 1,700 veterans hospitalized in them today.

Serious consideration should be given to what will become of the patients in these contract hospitals with the consolidation or unification of the Armed Service Hospitals under way. Some hospitals will be closed. The service patients in those to be closed will be moved or absorbed by other hospitals. Is this to freeze the veteran patient out? It is already reported that the Army's McCornack General Hospital in Pasadena is to be closed. Immediately we wonder what is to become of the 100 veteran patients under contract there.

In addition to the Veterans' Administration hospitals and those veteran patients that are under contract in other Federal hospitals, the State of California is doing as best it can to relieve the burden by operating the Veterans' Home at Yountville, Napa County. They have today approximately 200 general medical and surgical cases in their hospital and 1,150 members in the home.

They have a waiting list of 295. This includes those waiting for hospitalization and domiciliary care. Each and every veteran hospitalized and domiciled at the Veterans' Home at Yountville are medically and legally eligible for care by the Veterans' Administration. The requirements for their admittance is identically the same as for the Veterans' Administration with the exception that they must have resided in California for a period of 10 years. Speaking of domiciliary, there are well over 300 veterans on the waiting list for domiciliary care at the Veterans' Administration Center, Los Angeles.

To sum up just a bit as to the present need for hospital and domiciliary beds for veterans in California, in addition to those now in existence, we find that we need 599 beds to take care of the present tuberculosis load; 1,750, if we are to count those in contract hospitals as showing the Veterans' Administration needs for general medical and surgical care; 745 known to be waiting for Veterans' Administration hospital admittance by reason of their mental disabilities. If we added only one-half of those in State hospitals we would bring this figure up to 1,745; and finally, 600 awaiting domiciliary care.

The question has been asked from time to time: How far does the Congress want the Veterans' Administration to go in building hospitals for veterans? Invariably one notes in the development of answers to this question that there seems to be no doubt as to the right of the service-connected veteran to be cared for for his service disablements. Moreover, it appears to be conceded by all who have studied this question that veterans suffering from tuberculosis and mental ailments should also be cared for by the Government. Private and State institutions are already filled, and there are no accommodations for them elsewhere. We find there is a total of 73,785 veterans, approximately half of whom are service connected, and the other half afflicted with tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric disabilities, nonservice connected. This leaves 30,116 classified as general medical and surgical, nonservice connected. The greater percentage of this group is hospitalized for chronic conditions. The Veterans' Administration reports that only 8 percent of all patient-days is taken up by the non-service-connected general medical and surgical patients remaining 30 days or less. It has been said that there is no need for financial screening of chronic cases as substantially all of these are soon made medically indigent by their disease. Can it be that all the agitation against the Veterans' Administration hospitalizing non-service-connected cases is stimulated by the meager 8 percent of patient-days taken up by the non-service-connected general medical and surgical patients remaining 30 days or less?

Another point that cannot be overlooked is that among the so-called nonservice connected requiring hospital care within 3, 4, or 5 years after the cessation of hostilities will be found many with damage to mind or body that can be traced to service. As of the present writing there are over 50,000 disability compensation claims pending adjudication. As of November 30, 1948, there were approximately 2,000,000 World Wars I and II veterans rated as service connected and in receipt of compensation for service-connected disability. Compensation claims are being filed right along, 16,655 having been filed during the month of November 1948, for instance.

As of November 30, 1948, 14,907 veterans were awaiting admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals. These are the ones whose applications have been processed and certified. Statistics available from the Veterans' Administration do not reflect the hundreds of veterans who have become disheartened in waiting for hospital care, who are mentally ill and are being cared for in city or State institutions, and the tuberculars who may even be staying at home because there are no beds in any kind of institution available for them.

When the number of chronically ill veterans now being hospitalized; the number of claims being filed and still pending adjudication; the number of veterans awaiting hospital admission; the untold numbers who are being cared for otherwise; and the definite plan for hospitalizing veterans established by Congress in 1924 and re-affirmed by Public Law 312 in 1935, are seriously considered, it is difficult to see the justification of economizing by restricting or even removing the privilege of hospitalization in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Under date of June 25, 1948, an executive order of the President abolished the Federal Board of Hospitalization and assigned all of its duties to the Bureau of the Budget. This looks very significant. Some hold to the view that the Board even when it was actively functioning really had no great authority and that whatever it recommended or approved was subject to the final verdict of the Bureau of the Budget. Be that as it may, the fact remains that this Board was manned by high Government officials who presumably devoted some of their time to carrying out the instructions handed down by the President six years ago. To an outsider it seems quite evident that now the Bureau of the Budget has full sway in passing upon and coordinating all hospital construction activities of the Government. Probably that was what was originally intended.

From the above it may be found that the executive branch of the Government known as the Bureau of the Budget is more responsible for the cut-back, curtailment, delays and other confusion in making sufficient hospital facilities available for veterans than any other branch of the Government. Regardless of where the fault lies there is some necessary action needed now by the Congress of the United States.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., January 20, 1949.

MEMORANDUM

To: Department commander.
Subject: Hospital bed survey.

In compliance with your request a survey of the hospital bed facilities in the State of California indicates we have seven Veterans' Administration hospitals in the State with a capacity of 11,332 beds; also eight Army and Navy and four private hospitals under contract to the Veterans' Administration with a capacity of 1,692 beds. Of the 11,332 beds, 3,388 are domiciliary beds. I find there is a waiting list of 735 non-service-connected cases at this time of which 29 are general medical, 174 are tubercular, and 539 are NP (mental). I also learned that we have over 1,900 NP patients who are veterans in the State mental hospitals. Simple analysis indicates a need of 3,500 beds over and above the Veterans' Administration's present capacity. We also find a large number of patients are out on furloughs from the hospitals, many of which may again need hospitalization. There are over 1,000 NP or mental patients being treated in Veterans' Administration clinics in addition to those hospitalized. The Veterans' Administration reports that there are no service-connected cases on any waiting list. New hospitals proposed in this State will provide 2,000 NP beds and 450 general medical beds plus 249 tubercular beds in addition to existing hospitals at Livermore and San Fernando. In my opinion we need at least 15,000 beds for all purposes in the State of California.

NELSON BUSHEY,
Director, Rehabilitation Service.

SAMUEL THOMAS POST, No. 326,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Long Beach, Calif., January 3, 1949.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is absolutely unnecessary for hundreds of our war veterans in California suffering with active tuberculosis to continue to be deprived of hospital care.

The Veterans' Administration have no tuberculosis beds available. At each of their tuberculosis hospitals is a large list of veterans known to have active tuberculosis awaiting hospitalization. In addition to their own hospitals being filled with patients, the Veterans' Administration is unable to obtain any further contract beds in State, county, or private hospitals for tuberculosis patients.

Medical authorities assure us that treatment in the early stages of tuberculosis is most important for recovery or arrest. At Corona, Calif., the United States Navy has 600-bed tuberculosis hospital which is one of the finest, if not the finest, in the Nation. There are at present approximately 500 vacant beds in this hospital. These vacant beds should be utilized to hospitalize our veterans suffering with tuberculosis by:

(1) The Navy extending its contract with the Veterans' Administration to include tuberculosis patients, or

(2) The entire tuberculosis unit of the hospital at Corona should be turned over to the Veterans' Administration. When either No. 1 or 2 is accomplished, the 100 Navy and Marine Corps tuberculosis patients could then be discharged from active service and become Veterans' Administration patients as they should be.

I urge you, as our Representative in Congress from this district, to immediately make contacts with the Veterans' Administration and the Department of the Navy in the interest of having them come to agreement without any further delay, to provide hospitalization for the veteran tuberculosis patients at Corona. It is requested further that you follow through with whatever contacts may be necessary, such as the Bureau of the Budget, or any other executive branch of the Government.

Yours respectfully,
D. W. HOWIE, *Adjutant.*

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1949.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Recently the Veterans' Administration announced the cancellation of the construction of 16,000 veterans' hospital beds which that organization had previously recommended be constructed, and which recommendation had been approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States. This cancellation order affects the construction program in 18 or 20 States in the Union, and if the order stands it will mean that badly disabled veterans in need of hospitalization cannot receive hospital care from their Government.

I am attaching hereto copy of a resolution unanimously passed on February 18, 1949, by the National Welfare and Service Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at its meeting held here in Washington. I have sent a copy of the resolution to the President and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and have requested that the President's order be rescinded.

We feel confident you have heard from the veterans of your State regarding the need for the beds eliminated as this office has received petitions and resolutions from all parts of the country.

There are certain groups in this country who have always been opposed to the Federal hospitalization of our veterans. These groups were active after World War I but fortunately their efforts were resisted by the officials of our Government and the necessary number of beds were provided. These same groups are active again and are seeking to defeat the hospital-building program which has heretofore been approved by the appropriate Federal officials. The attached resolution will clearly indicate the stand of the V. F. W., and we sincerely hope that all of the 16,000 beds eliminated, and such others as may be needed to adequately care for our disabled veterans will be built.

Your efforts in bringing about the construction of all of these beds will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE E. IJAMS, *Director.*

Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has announced the approval by the President of the United States, of a reduction of the veterans hospital construction program to the extent of 16,000 beds located in various sections of the United States; and

Whereas all of these beds were found to be needed and were recommended by the Veterans' Administration after a thorough study of the entire country; and

Whereas the previous recommendations of the Veterans' Administration for the construction of these beds received the approval of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States; and

Whereas there is even a greater need for these beds today than there was at the time they were recommended and approved by the United States Government officials; and

Whereas it is impossible in most sections of the country to secure adequate hospitalization for the veterans now seriously ill and needing hospital care; and

Whereas it is our opinion that the 16,000 beds recently eliminated from the construction program and additional beds for veterans in the various sections of the country are greatly needed to insure adequate hospitalization of those men who have offered their lives for our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Welfare and Service Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, request and urge the President and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to cancel the order recently issued for the elimination of these 16,000 beds; and further

That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be urged to expedite the construction of these and any other beds required for adequate care of America's disabled veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to appropriate Committees and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

STATEMENT OF ALVIN F. KIME, COMMANDER, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, TO BE PRESENTED TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, ROOM 42, CAPITOL BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRESIDENT'S ORDER REDUCING THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL BED PROGRAM

MARCH 16, 1949.

In view of the fact that the President's order reducing the Veterans' Administration hospital bed program affects only one proposed hospital in California, I will confine my statement to data concerning the need for this hosptal in the San Diego area. Let us first take the over-all picture of veteran population covering increases from the year ending the war, 1945, up to our last figures of 1948. These figures are cited in order that some approximate anticipation of the veteran population in this area in years to come can be arrived at. The number of veterans filing tax exemptions in the County of San Diego for the year 1945 was 15,967; for the year 1946 there were 22,466; for the year 1947 there were 28,017; and 1948 there were 34,002. Because of the steady increase from year to year, these figures speak for themselves. This tax-exemption report includes veterans who are entitled to an exemption by owning personal property, and come under the minimum of $5,000 valuation. Therefore, we can conclude that there is a tremendous number outside of these figures that cannot be ascertained in any other way than by strict veterans census. It is estimated by reliable sources that the approximate veteran population in the County of San Diego, Calif., is 160,000. It also must be taken into consideration that the regional office of the Veterans' Administration located in San Diego, Calif., is also responsible for the hospitalization of veterans residing in Imperial County and for which we have no factual figures.

A report from the Veterans' Administration on the case load in the San Diego regional office is 20,692. Thousands of veterans have never filed with the Veterans' Administration. However, they are entitled to hospitalization and can be anticipated to file at some later date. Case files transferred into the San Diego office from other facilities for the months of January 1949, were 308, and February 1949, were 270. There is nothing that leaves us to believe that this influx of veterans will decrease, but it is our opinion that they will increase in the immediate future.

The only hospital facilities in the San Diego area at the present time is the Naval Hospital, with whom the Veterans' Administration has a contract for 200 beds per day. Figures compiled from the report of the Veterans' Administration office in the Naval Hospital show that from January 1, 1949, through March 6, 1949, 1,446 veterans were hospitalized and medication administered to many more than the 200-bed quota would provide for. In other words, there are more veterans in the hospital every day than the Veterans' Administration quota allows. Recent actions reducing the following hospitals to the status of first-aid stations is bound to create an unprecedented demand upon the Naval Hospital to care for its own personnel to the exclusion of veterans:

Naval Training Station, which contains 80,000 Navy personnel.

Marine Recruiting Depot, personnel unknown.

Marine Camp Pendleton, personnel unknown.

Naval Amphibious Base, personnel unknown.

North Island, personnel unknown.

Navy Repair Base, personnel unknown.

All ships at sea that have San Diego as home base.

With the shortage of naval personnel, shortage of medical staff, the shortage of bed space, it is very questionable as to extensive distances in order to be taken care of its own personnel, let alone the Veterans' Administration patients. It might be well to point out that any emergency or epidemic in the San Diego area would require the Navy to take care of its own personnel first, thus requiring Veterans' Administration patients needing hospitalization either to secure it in private hospitals within the area or travel extensive distances in order to be taken care of in Veterans' Administration Hospitals which, according to all reports, are all overloaded at the present time. It should be noted here that a tremendous number of neuropsychiatric patients are being taken care of in either private or county hospitals, due to the fact that hospitalization is not possible through the Veterans' Administration. This pertains also to persons having communicable diseases and which require segregation.

The San Diego area is also peculiar in that it contains a great number of retired Army, Navy, and Marine personnel, along with their dependents who also are entitled to hospitalization either as retired personnel or as Veterans' Administration patients.

The temperate climate of the San Diego area attracts countless numbers of veterans having disabilities which would be aggravated by severe climate, and who have been advised by either private or Veterans' Administration doctors to seek a residence in an area having the climate enjoyed in the San Diego area. In my opinion, while a 200-bed Veterans' Administration hospital would be of tremendous value, it still would not be adequate to handle the case load of the San Diego area.

ALVIN F. KIME,
Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this consideration by the committee. I have asked for this time in order to explain to the members of the subcommittee and to the Committee of the Whole why I, or perhaps a Member on the other side of the House, intend to offer an amendment to insert into this bill funds for the War Claims Commission for its operation during fiscal year 1950.

I recognize that the first deficiency appropriation bill passed this House and went to the Senate, where an amendment was placed in the bill providing $100,000 for the initial operation of the War Claims Commission, established pursuant to the enactment into law of what was in the Eightieth Congress the bill H. R. 4044, now Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress. I would like to explain to the subcommittee that H. R. 4044 was a combination of several bills. One bill was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], and that was concerned principally with the veterans of Bataan. Another bill was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and concerned itself with the Alien Property Custodian and the closing into the Treasury of the United States all of the assets of Germany and Japan which were in the hands of the United States, and setting those funds up in what is called the war-claims fund. Then there was a bill introduced by me which had to do with some recompense to the 6,000 or 7,000 Americans who were interned by the Japanese after the capture of Manila, and the invasion of the rest of the islands of the Philippines. In the other body there were included certain provisions relating to the employees of Navy contractors on Midway and Guam and Cavite. This bill passed the House and Senate in the final days of the Eightieth Congress. It was not broadly debated. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was unanimously approved by the House under suspension of the rules. It was unanimously approved, after amendment, in the Senate, and the conference report was also unanimously approved. I noticed in the

course of the hearings before this subcommittee that very little was said by the budget officer, who testified—or else he did not express himself very clearly. Of course, the committee itself had little reason to know why the War Claims Commission had been established. But if you will remember, before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, almost a year before that, the State Department of the United States gave warning to American citizens in all parts of the Orient, with the exception of the Philippines, to leave because of the imminence of war.

In the Philippine Islands, however, which was American soil, over which flew the American flag, the citizens of the United States who happened to be residents there—some 7,000 or so of them—were not only not given a warning to leave, but were, in fact, encouraged to stay as a morale booster for the Filipinos. No provision whatsoever was made for them to leave. No ships were offered for them to leave on. I may say to the ladies and gentlemen of the House that while it was true that the civilians in the Philippine Islands were not given any such warning, the families of military personnel were removed from the Philippines by orders of the military, the Army and the Navy, almost a year before Pearl Harbor, thus leaving in the Philippines only those who were there as school teachers or employees of electric-light plants or whatever work they might have been engaged in in the course of their personal undertakings. In the course of the 37 or 38 or 39 months, whatever it was, of their internment, these people were brutally mistreated and humiliated by the Japanese. They were starved and beaten. Many of them were killed. Their possessions were taken from them and those possessions were either taken by the Japanese or ruthlessly destroyed. The veterans of Bataan, who were included in this bill, are given $1 per day for each day of imprisonment by the Japanese in lieu of subsistence which they did not get from the Japs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, these veterans of Bataan, who suffered even more brutal treatment, are given $1 per day in lieu of subsistence, which they certainly did not get as prisoners of the Japanese. They, too, were most brutally treated by the Japanese, and to an ever greater degree than the civilian internees, they were beaten and starved and kicked around and forced to work in the rice paddies, and all that sort of thing. Will we forget the "death march" so soon. The $600,000 which I hope to put in this bill was recommended in the President's budget as a tentative estimate. Since then I talked with Mr. Lawton, of the Bureau of the Budget, who testified before this committee. He states that it probably will be too late before the first deficiency appropriation is put into operation and the Commission set up, to make a real firm estimate as to the cost of this business for the next year. But he believes, in accordance with his own figures, as he testified before the committee in favor of this appropriation, that it will require approximately $600,000 for the War Claims Commission in the fiscal year ending 1950, which money does not come out of the Federal Treasury, but comes from the assets of Germany and Japan, which are in the hands of the War Claims Commission.

Mr. Chairman, there is no excuse for not providing operating funds for the War Claims Commission. Until it gets under way Americans—not Asiatics or Europeans but Americans—are dying for lack of care and subsistence enough to live on.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent granted, the reading of the bill has been dispensed with.

Before amendments are considered, the Chair will consider points of order.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that section 310, appearing on page 79 of the bill, is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The committee concedes that the point of order is good, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded by the gentleman from Texas. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, on page 63 of the bill, is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 39, beginning with the comma, in line 14, reading as follows: "including the salary of a chairman at $15,000 per annum, to be appointed for a term of 4 years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;" ending with the semicolon in line 17. I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Only to the point of expressing my regret that my distinguished friend from California makes the point of order. But the committee is obliged to admit the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Are there any other points of order?

The Chair will not consider any points of order after we begin to consider amendments.

The Chair hears none.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in behalf of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 63, line 3, insert a new section in lieu thereof, as follows:

"SEC. 109. No part of any appropriations made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor: *Provided further*, That in the event of an emergency, when the Congress is not in session, approval may be given by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, within the limits of available funds."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that that is legislation on an appropriation bill, the latter part of the amendment giving additional power and responsibility to the Director of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 63, line 3, insert a new section in lieu thereof as follows:

"SEC. 109. No part of any appropriations made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the language as now submitted merely protects the appropriations that are made from unapproved diversion. It applies only to funds in this bill. It is language suggested by the committee and has, I believe, the full support of the entire membership of the committee. I ask for its adoption.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us realize what this amendment means. I do not want it to go through with the simple statement made by my friend from South Dakota. The committee put in section 109, which was stricken out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE]. Section 109 was an encroachment upon the rights and the privileges and the duties of the executive branch of the Government.

I may say that if section 109 had remained in, this bill faced the danger of a veto. I have here a memorandum that comes from very competent authority:

From the point of view of interference with administration—

I am talking about section 109, yet this amendment is a follow-up of that—

From the point of view of interference with administration, this provision is much worse than an outright prohibition on the use of funds, because it sets up two subcommittees of the House and Senate as

superadministrators over every agency in the bill with respect to the purchase and sale of real estate and the establishment of new offices. If—

Section 109 I am talking about now, this particular section, and the pending amendment is a follow-up. It has got to be viewed with some considerable justifiable suspicion.

If section 109 can be enacted into law there is nothing to prevent the extension of this principle to every administrative action, and consequently, in effect, to shift the functions of the executive branch to not the Congress but the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee.

It seems to me that we should view this with very careful consideration. The words of limitation encroach upon the prerogatives of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. DURHAM and Mr. CASE of South Dakota rose.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Does not the gentleman believe that this would hamper our atomic energy program at the present time? It would be almost impossible to carry out the functions of that important arm of governmental activity.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know, and that is why I have taken the floor. The gentleman's observation may be correct. All I can say is that this particular section more seriously disturbed the President of the United States than anything I have known of for a long while. I am talking about section 109. It is very far reaching. I assumed that when it was stricken out that it would stay out. I just do not know how far this goes. I would take the same position without regard to who might be President of the United States, but certainly I am going to take the position in the case where the President of the United States is a member of my own party, but I would do it likewise were a Republican the occupant of the White House. I do not know how far reaching this is likely to be. I do not want to put myself in the position of opposing it, but, on the other hand, I have got to take that position at this moment by indirection because I do not know how far reaching this is going to be in light of information I have received.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The references which the gentleman has made might be interpreted to suggest there was something involved in the fact that the amendment was offered from this side of the aisle. I am sure he did not intend that.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I said anything that led to that inference I want the RECORD to show that that did not enter my mind or is not in my mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was merely the suggestion that regardless of who might be President would make no difference in the gentleman's attitude. Simply to clarify, I will say I did not initiate this language.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to put in there emphatically "No" so far as the gentleman is concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not want to cripple any important activity of the Government. I might point out that all this amendment does is merely to protect the money that is appropriated and says that agencies shall not establish new offices with money to be provided for them unless they have submitted a request for that purpose. If they have submitted a program and asked for money to establish a new office or to buy some real estate and it has been approved and appropriated for, they can go ahead. All the limitation says is they cannot go out and establish some new offices unless they have submitted the program and the program has been approved and they have the money to do it with.

Mr. McCORMACK. I realize the gentleman's amendment is different from section 109. I appreciate that fact. On the other hand, the gentleman from South Carolina has expressed some uncertainties as far as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned. I do not know how far reaching this is liable to be. As I stated, I do not want to be put in the position of opposing it. May I suggest to the gentleman that he not press the amendment. In the meantime the bill will go over to the Senate, the matter can be given further consideration over there and if it is put in the bill we will have an opportunity in the meanwhile to know what the results may be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say that if the amendment is placed in the bill and the matter goes to conference, I will approach it with an open mind. If it will impede the program of the Atomic Commission or anything else that relates to the national security I would see that it went out in conference. I would like to have the opinion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot conceive of my friend from South Dakota approaching any matter, in conference particularly, with other than an open mind. That statement is based upon my years of association with him and the deep respect I have for the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think the gentleman from South Dakota has expressed the committee's attitude very accurately. Section 109, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, did have some teeth in it. The language submitted by the gentleman from South Dakota is wide open. It only applies to those programs which have heretofore been approved by the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask the gentleman a question, and I have great confidence in him, I respect him very much and I follow him. The gentleman knows that. Is he willing as chairman of the subcommittee to take the responsibility of accepting this particular amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes. I may say to the majority leader that I do not think the language will do the executive branch of the Government one bit of harm. If it did, I would say, "Take it out now." If anything develops in conference that it is going to hurt or hamstring the executive branch—and I do not care who the President may be or which party he belongs to—we do not want it. As far as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is concerned, our distinguished friend who has referred to the Atomic Energy Commission, there are about $21,000,000 in here for the Atomic Energy Commission to buy some land this year. This cannot affect that in the slightest so far as next year's purchases are concerned.

Mr. DURHAM. I am not so much concerned about that. Here is the question that might come up: Suppose we were to discover an uranium mine this year and had to build a building at that point. How would this affect such operation?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. If you are going to discover uranium in the United States or in Chile, and I do not know where you are going to discover it—I hope we can discover some—and if you want to build a building there is nothing in this language which would prevent you from building it. I hope we are not going to do like we did during the war, of a branch of the Government going out and building a building on somebody else's land before we got title to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. It occurs to me from what the majority leader said that this amendment has not been fully considered. I think at this late date it is a little dangerous to put in here something that might not have been fully considered. In reference to the Veterans' Administration, how would that amendment affect the purchase of a hospital site or anything of that sort? Will it affect it at all?

Mr. McCORMACK. The reason for my presence on the floor is my interest in the matter, like that of the gentleman from Louisiana. My mind is completely vacant as to any knowledge of the result, if this amendment is adopted. I am groping for information, and I was hoping that either the gentleman from South Dakota or the gentleman from Texas could give us that information.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to have the question answered.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think either the gentleman from South Caroline or California or anybody else can answer that question. In other words, if there is a site that the Veterans' Administration would like to buy, if it has been approved by the Congress, then they are certainly authorized to proceed to purchase it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as a matter of fact, the Veterans' Administration has over $600,000,000 in contract authority for the construction of hospitals, which includes site acquisition.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have to make a Solomon decision. As majority leader it is my job and duty to support the chairman of the subcommittee handling a bill on the floor. I have to support my friend from Texas in the light of the present situation. In view of his assuming full responsibility, and my friend from South Dakota having assumed the responsibility, if they find out later that the amendment goes further than they intended, I am relying on them, as well as the other members of the subcommittee, to have the situation clarified.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has my assurance on that.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The gentleman has the assurance of the entire committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think I could relieve the Members of a little concern expressed on the floor if I gave you the practical background for this. The gentleman from South Dakota has perhaps oversimplified it, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is overly concerned. An agency of the Government comes before a subcommittee on appropriations, and it lists, and it justifies, as we say, the places where it intends to spend its money. It would list the real property and the physical properties, upon which it wished to spend money. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts and everybody on this floor would like to go home in July with some assurance that those are the places where the money is to be spent. On the question of the atomic material properties, the Atomic Energy Commission has an appreciable amount of money, for just that purpose. The National Resources Board has the power to buy strategic material. There would seem to be adequate money for anything that might come up in emergency. Congress will be here into July and back in January. Remember that if we do not put some provision of that kind in the bill, which I think should be written in all bills, you gentlemen who have hospitals in your area, you gentlemen who have agricultural experiment stations, you gentlemen who have air fields, you gentlemen who have reclamation projects, or any properties, have no restrictive assurance that the money appropriated for such purchases will be spent, and that some other project not yet justified before your agency, the subcommittee, will not have money spent for it. It may be technical, and it may be remote, but without this amendment the condition exists.

I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts should have any concern. I did not think there would be any concern expressed by the executive agencies, to the amendment as it was offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. As one member of the conference committee, I assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that if I find this has in it anything which we have been unable to see after long study, I will vote to change it in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH: On page 52, line 12, strike out "$3,151,050" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$4,212,435: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for pay of cadet midshipmen in Federal or State maritime training schools who are enrolled after May 1, 1949."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed amendment to add $1,061,385 to the proposed bill to cover the young Americans who are now students in our Federal and State maritime schools.

There is present now a deep regret that I find myself in disagreement with this committee and still deeper regret that I cannot follow the capable leadership of the gentleman from Missouri. On any question that was close, I would subject my limited knowledge to the judgment of the committee but in this instance the course that is right is so obvious that I must follow that course.

For some years our Government has paid $65 per month to the students in the maritime schools. The Federal schools are located in Kings Point, N. Y.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Pass Christian, Miss.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; and the United States Maritime Service Institution. The four State schools are in California, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York.

The subcommittee has evaluated the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and has decided that the appropriations will now cease for all students, present and future, embarked upon training in these schools. The proposed amendment is very limited. Since the committee has held that in all future cases the $65 monthly payment should cease, I have carefully limited this proposed amendment to cover only the 772 students in the Federal maritime schools and the 589 in the State schools. I submit the cause to the members of this House upon the basis of justice. I recommend for your consideration from the viewpoint of a quasi contractual obligation. Last year and the year before that and 3 years ago, young men from every State in the Union, young American boys, were faced with that eternal problem that presents itself to the ambitious youths of our Nation. "Our high school days are over. How can we best fit ourselves to take a place in the society of American life?"

The opportunity of college life and the selection of an institution held their attention. They weighed all the benefits and the advantages. Perhaps in some minds the importance of attending a name school or being part of the crowd that could either play or cheer on their heroes of the gridiron were important considerations. To others it may have been the social life, the ability to attend dances and enjoy themselves at the same time they were attending classes that was important. Still others selected colleges near their homes so that they could enjoy the companionship of their immediate families.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I do not want to interrupt the continuity of the gentleman's statement, but I should like to know just what the amendment does, in just a few words.

Mr. McGRATH. The amendment provides that the payment of $65 a month will continue only for those 1,361 students who are now enrolled in these schools.

Mr. COLMER. In what schools?

Mr. McGRATH. In the schools I have just enumerated, the Federal schools at Kings Point, N. Y.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Pass Christian, Miss.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; and the United States Maritime Service Institution, and the four State schools in California, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York.

Mr. COLMER. Would that restore the full amount that was cut out?

Mr. McGRATH. It would not. That appropriation would run close to five or six million dollars. But to the 1,361 young men who are in our Federal marine schools and in State maritime schools, it was something else that held their attention. It was a life on the sea. It was the attendance at a Federal or State maritime school and what did it mean? It meant subjecting themselves to the rigors of naval discipline. It meant forgetting some of the comforts of the fireside. It meant not attending social functions unless they first got a leave from their commandant. They recognized that the fancy clothing of their youthful companions would not be theirs. They would have no selection as to what they would wear, but they

would wear with pride the uniform of their school. It meant no Saturday afternoons cheering on a team to victory but it meant Saturday afternoons polishing up and keeping the ship in repair.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, these boys understood and took their obligation seriously and willingly. They knew what their duties would be and they did not fail them. They knew, too, that not your Government, and not mine, but their Government would pay them $65 a month during the 4 years of their training. We kept that promise for some of them 2 years, for some 3 years, and some 1 year. Now we tell them that the payments will be stopped.

If there is ever a case of a quasi contract, it has been in this fact situation.

Now let us see what they do with this $65 a month. $15 goes for their uniforms; $4 for textbooks; and about $10 for laundry, and $28.50 for haircuts, canteen, personal clothing, and miscellaneous expenses.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. McGRATH. I assure the gentleman it is a pleasure to yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I have just come into the Chamber. I am very much interested in the gentleman's amendment. Will the gentleman be good enough to explain exactly what his amendment does.

Mr. McGRATH. It continues the payments of $65 a month.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How much money is involved?

Mr. McGRATH. The amount involved is one-million-sixty-one-thousand-and-some-odd dollars.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. So that you restore, out of the more than $3,000,000 that the committee has cut from the appropriation approximately $1,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; $1,061,000.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Out of that million dollars that your amendment seeks to restore no funds are made available for administrative expenses of the training organizations of the Maritime Commission?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct. This is only for the $65 per month for those students now in the schools, to continue until such time as they finish their courses.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request additional time.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas—that is what makes it so difficult to offer the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McGRATH. Surely.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I note that the gentleman's amendment applies only to cadets. But in his statement he mentioned Sheepshead Bay. It occurs to me that perhaps the gentleman did not intend to include Sheepshead Bay.

Mr. McGRATH. I believe that the committee, by that section, covers that. I think the section covers that.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. And you intend to include some of the operating schools, then, other than the cadet schools; is that correct?

Mr. McGRATH. Just the schools that I have mentioned. And the number of students involved is 1,300.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Might I also inquire whether the gentleman intends to include the subsistence payments to State marine schools after May 1, 1949.

Mr. McGRATH. I believe the gentleman has covered that in his main bill. You stated the other day in committee that the subsistence provision was continued, together with the $50,000 for the various State schools, plus the $370,000 appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Does the gentleman intend that the subsistence payments shall continue after May 1?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; because the gentleman has already provided that in the main bill. The gentleman knows that.

These young men come from every kind of a home—the rich and the poor boy, the lad whose father can well afford to pay for his education, the poor youngster who has no father to support him. And now you tell them in the middle of their course, "You have to buy all your own uniforms. You have to buy your own textbooks and even though you have lived up to your obligations, we repudiate ours."

Now I can anticipate the argument of my genial friend from Texas. He will bang this table and he will smile that charming smile and point out that we do not do this for medical students, we do not give a payment to students who are engaged in scientific studies and the like and he will ask why do it for this particular group.

There are two reasons. One is that we have made a promise to these particular students. We have no contract with other students. The second is that these men are trained to the sea. On a moment's notice, if the Congress calls them, they are already trained and we are saved a course of training. If Congress calls, they will respond, fully trained. The gentleman from Texas, if I might again anticipate his argument, will say that even after these boys finish their training there is no mandatory provision in law that makes them go into the Navy or that makes them go into the maritime service. And that is a true statement under the law. But where do these boys go? The record will show that last year every graduate—save one lad who was sick—got a job on the ships and the record will show also that in the last war practically every one of these graduates served in some one of the marine services of our country.

There is one other argument that could be advanced. At the present time it is claimed that there is some surplus of seagoing men. But certainly these 1,350 men spread over a period of 3 years, amounting to about 450 each year, for the next 3 years, spread throughout the entire United States, will certainly not upset the employment picture in that industry.

This case resolves itself to the good faith and integrity of our Government. We are dealing here with boys who love the American way and know the American tradition. We are dealing with boys from your State, and yours, and mine—boys whose patriotism is on fire. Do not squelch that patriotism by doing an act of repudiation on a promise made. Their Uncle Sam is to them the finest and the biggest man in the world. In their eyes their Government's word is the word of truth, integrity, and honesty. Do not change their concepts. Each morning as these boys go out to drill or get on their boat, and whether it is over the land or sea that the flag is hoisted, let it not be said that there is hoisted another banner, invisible yet crystal clear, that reads, "These marine schools are only for rich men's sons."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am very sorry, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to see that our committee has determined to change the policy respecting these academies, and in the case of Kings Point, N. Y., to go along with the suggestion made before the subcommittee that this Federal institution, which has served our country so much in time of war, and in time of peace, should be placed in mothballs.

The idea of a Federal Merchant Marine Academy was initiated by the Third Merchant Marine Conference in 1930. Out of 6,479 persons interested in the maritime industry answering a questionnaire on the subject, 5,242 at that time favored such an academy. After 10 years' study and work it was established first in temporary quarters at New London, Conn., in 1940 and at its present site at Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., in 1942, after Congress by law—Public Law 472, Seventy-seventh Congress—authorized the purchase of the land and buildings for a permanent Academy—see committee report. Therefore, the Academy was definitely not a wartime project.

The pay of $65 a month was authorized for cadet-midshipmen in June 1941 and was a permanent peacetime and not a wartime arrangement. It has been paid continuously ever since.

In October 1940 the cadets were enrolled in the United States Naval Reserve and have been so enrolled ever since. They may not withdraw from the Naval Reserve and thus escape liability for active duty in the Navy except at

the pleasure of the Secretary of the Navy. Upon graduation they are commissioned as ensigns in the Naval Reserve and cannot withdraw except at the pleasure of the President, and are subject to call to active duty at any time. Over 2,000 of them were called to active duty in the Navy in World War II. Most of the remainder served on merchant vessels during the war. Those entering training since 1948 sign an agreement with the Secretary of National Defense to serve 2 years on active duty in the Navy if called. Therefore, they are not free agents. They are trained in naval science and tactics to serve as officers in the merchant marine as an auxiliary to the armed forces and therefore to serve the Nation and not just private industry. Section 302 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, requires all officers serving on subsidized or Government-operated vessels to be members of the Naval Reserve if qualified.

The cadet-midshipmen and graduates of the four State maritime academies have also had the same Naval Reserve status as those of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps since 1938.

About 250 cadet-midshipmen and graduate officers lost their lives while serving on merchant or naval vessels during World War II.

The Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps gives the same general training in naval science to students at 52 universities and pays the tuition of its enrollees at those universities, pays them $50 a month, and furnishes free uniforms and textbooks.

The term "pay" to cadet-midshipmen while in training is a misnomer. It is an allowance for actual expenses including all uniforms, clothing, and textbooks which they must buy, taxes, various fees, laundry and cleaning, haircuts, supplies, canteen, travel expenses, and so forth. It is barely and not always sufficient to cover these expenses. The cadets at the other Federal Academies of West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard receive $78 a month for similar purposes.

The information that the number of trainees completing a course who actually enter the shipping industry is negligible is in error. Approximately 85 percent of classes graduating in the last 2 years has gone to sea either on merchant or naval vessels. During the war the number was nearly 100 percent.

The Government has an investment of $10,000,000 in the Academy at Kings Point with over 60 acres of land and buildings. Congress has always considered it permanent. Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, established a Congressional Board of Visitors. Public Law 214, Eightieth Congress, established an Academic Advisory Board. Public Law 705, Seventy-ninth Congress, authorized the granting of a bachelor of science degree. All of these laws are similar to those for the other Federal Academies of West Point, Annapolis and the Coast Guard. Public Law 485, Eightieth Congress, authorized the construction of a chapel and library.

Congress also authorized the appointment and pay while in training of Filipino and Latin American cadets now at the Academy with a national commitment that will prove embarrassing internationally if eliminated.

The Academy cannot continue to exist if the expense allowance is eliminated. At best, the only students who could attend would be those with means, thereby shutting off many worthy citizens without means who wish to serve their country. Presently the cadets are drawn by competition and State quotas from all 48 States and Territories. Only those living nearby would be likely to attend, thereby destroying the Nation-wide character of the Academy and service in the merchant marine.

While there is some present unemployment of merchant marine officers, the 2,000 ships in our Reserve Fleet held for national defense will require 20,000 officers to man them. It takes time to make an officer. If we destroy our Academy this job cannot be adequately done.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who in the summer of 1944 served in the United States merchant marine.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is making a fine statement and is speaking out of an interest which is grounded in his own service as an ordinary seaman in the merchant marine during World War II. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that, if we need to man these ships of ours hurriedly in time of emergency or war, would we not need about 125,000 men in 2 or 3 months' time, and if we do not take care of the Merchant Marine Academy where are we going to get the men?

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is correct. I hope he is in his seat when the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] reads the endorsement of this Academy and its program by our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana for the McGrath amendment: On page 52, line 12, strike out "$3,151,050" and substitute "$6,586,000."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to this section of the bill, as I understand it, would simply restore the pay for cadet-midshipmen and for trainees in the United States maritime training schools. I further understand that it would not provide any pay for cadets entering these schools whether they be State schools or Federal schools beyond the current classes in the schools.

The amendment which I have just offered as a substitute restores to this item of the bill the full amount as originally recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. As I understand what the Committee has done, the Committee has recommended approximately $3,000,000 and further recommended that all of the present training facilities of the United States Maritime Commission be carried on. I understand that this drastic cut, as set forth in the report, reduces by about a million dollars the pay for trainees and cadets and reduces by another $2,000,000, approximately, administrative costs and expenses, but it does not cut any of the training facilities—those located in New York, in Florida, in Mississippi, in California, and in State maritime institutions. In other words, the Congress is telling the Maritime Commission to operate these schools but is not providing the funds.

I offer my substitute for several reasons which I consider entirely valid, and I trust that the Committee will support my substitute. To begin with, when this Congress passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 it expressed the mandate of the people to the effect that we would establish an American merchant marine to be manned by trained and efficient American personnel. Under the great Magna Carta of the Merchant Marine Act we have established in this Nation the greatest merchant marine we have ever had. In addition to that we have again instilled within the hearts and the minds of our young men the adventure of the sea. It is all very well to talk about building ships, and it is important to build ships and to establish shipbuilding facilities, but without the men trained to man those ships they are vain and useless things.

The argument will be advanced here today that there is an unemployment problem in the maritime industry, that there are many licensed men now "on the beach," and that because of these men who are temporarily "on the beach" that we can abolish this training program. Mr. Chairman, in my humble judgment, were we to do that we would be making a very fatal mistake.

Now, on yesterday we voted the colossal sum of $16,000,000,000 for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. We voted that sum with only one dissenting vote. To me it seems the height of folly to provide $16,000,000,000 for the Army, the Navy and the Air Force and then quibble here about $3,000,000 for the training of men to man our merchant marine.

I know something about this program. The charge has been made that there has been waste, extravagance, and so forth, but this program has operated in my section or close to my section. I know the effect it has had on raising the morale of the men who go to sea. Certainly it cannot be said that we are following the course of wisdom in crippling these facilities which are needed for the training of personnel in the American merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, out of the sum which is requested here, the amount of $6,500,000, approximately, if the substitute is agreed to, the United States Maritime Commission will provide funds for four or five State maritime academies which have been established and which have been operating for many years. One is located in New York, another in Maine, another in California, and I believe there is one in Pennsylvania and in Massachusetts. Young men are trained for the rank of officers in the merchant marine at Kings Point, N. Y., and at Pass Christian, Miss.

The Government has spent four, five, or six million dollars at Kings Point. It is a magnificent institution, and in many ways compares favorably with West Point and with Annapolis. The Congress has recognized the value of that institution. We have made it possible for the institution to confer the degree of bachelor of science. It has brought to the institution faculty men who are trained as professors and who have the necessary college education and the necessary degrees to be able to train these young men so that they not only acquire a knowledge of the sea but acquire an education as well.

The institution located at Pass Christian is a subsidiary institution to the one at Kings Point. Last year the Bureau of the Budget came in and said, "Let us abolish the institution at Pass Christian." The Congress overruled the Bureau of the Budget, and despite the fact that a hurricane had struck the institution some months before and had caused damage in excess of $100,000, we wrote into the legislation then the necessary appropriation to rehabilitate this institution and to train students there beginning last September.

Now, what we are doing after we invest four, five, or six millions at Kings Point and after we voted another $100,000 at Pass Christian just a few months ago? We come along and say that in order to save $3,000,000 we are going to so divest those institutions of administrative personnel, we are going to deprive the cadets of pay to such an extent that we may as well completely abolish the program.

Let me show you how inconsistent we are. We passed an appropriation bill for the State Department in which we said that we were bringing into this country a certain number of Philippine students for training in the merchant marine, and we would pay them the same amount that we are paying the American cadets and those of Latin America. But now we are going to wipe out the money for the Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my substitute is adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the substitute amendment because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York does not go far enough. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted, it means that the Committee on Appropriations has made a policy for this Congress which will, in effect, close Kings Point Academy on Long Island.

The proposed cut in the maritime training fund—and I might as well mince no words about it—would strike a fatal blow at the Kings Point Academy. It would wipe out what is now a truly great national service institution—what is now one of the Big Four in our service academies.

I want to make an urgent appeal to the membership for the restoration of the training pay for cadet-midshipmen at Kings Point. Looking at the question from the viewpoint of our national security, from the viewpoint of the morale that is involved, and from the viewpoint of our rather blighted history so far as our American merchant marine is concerned, I think that the restoration of the training pay in this bill is absolutely vital. The Appropriations Committee has cut the budget for the maritime training fund in half.

The training pay for the cadet-midshipmen at Kings Point, as well as the four State merchant-marine academies, amounts to $65 per man, monthly. The phrase, "training pay," is absolutely a misnomer. It is not really pay at all. It is an allowance. The Committee should know that this $65 per month is the difference between making it possible for a young man to go through Kings Point or to be denied the privilege. The average young man simply is not able to meet the costs that this monthly allowance now makes possible for him. With this sum of money he purchases his own uniforms, he purchases his own textbooks, and he buys such services as laundry and cleaning, toilet articles, underclothes, haircuts, canteen, travel, and other expenses. There is absolutely no disagreement on this one point—that if this $65 monthly allowance to the cadet-midshipmen is eliminated that it will spell out practically the end of this great and beneficial training program and the end of Kings Point Academy.

Elimination of this training allowance would produce a wave of resignations. It may be young men from families more than moderately well off would stay at the Academy. But so far as the average boy is concerned—the kind of young fellows that we would like to see develop into officers in our American merchant marine, who would be officers in our Navy—he could be expected to have to quit the Academy for the simple reason that he could not, himself, absorb an expense of $65 a month.

As the gentleman from Louisiana has said, our Government now has many millions of dollars invested in Kings Point Academy. Upward of $10,000,000 has been invested there and the membership should know that that money was not invested initially or solely as a wartime measure, as is implied by the report of the committee. President Roosevelt was at the helm of government when the Kings Point Academy was dedicated. Let me bring to the attention of the Committee what he had to say as to the Academy, and the great plan that it should carry forward and how it should endure as a permanent national service institution. These are his words:

> Dedication of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., is a momentous forward stride in the Nation's planned program of maritime progress. Not since enactment by the Congress of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 has there been an event of greater import to America's world commerce—either in maintenance of our wartime life lines or our future peacetime economy.

These are his words, too:

> This Academy serves the merchant marine as West Point serves the Army and Annapolis serves the Navy.

He goes on further to say this:

> This Academy serves the merchant marine those past generations who have handed down so noble a heritage, will spur on present and future generations of our men of the sea to even greater achievement. It will equip them to be skilled navigators and engineers, worthy of the great vessels they will sail and of respect in every port throughout the world—men of whom all Americans will be proud.

The Kings Point Academy grew out of a national demand that this country create an institution for instruction and training to develop officers for our American merchant marine. Unhappily, there are some who seem to have forgotten the maritime position of our country in the middle thirties. The country recognized the dangers inherent in the situation and there was a surging demand for the revitalization of our shipping position. It was at this time in our history when we shook off our lethargy and determined, grimly, to take positive and vigorous action for the rehabilitation of our American merchant marine. It was indeed fortunate that we did this because it was only a few years later that we were catapulted into World War II.

And we know that there were many times during the thirties that we were not too proud of those who manned our ships in foreign ports. We know well that some of those men did not believe too much in the institutions of America. And I think I can say here that it was understood generally that the union in charge of the men on some of the ships—and this was a tragic thing—had a greater infiltration of Communists than practically any other union in the United States. Some of the leadership who brought our merchant marine to disgrace in those years and some of whom appeared before the committee are in opposition to the continuance of the policy established at Kings Point.

I have in my hand a copy of The Pilot put out by the CIO National Maritime Union. In it is some very revealing news. In this organ the CIO Maritime Union boastingly claims credit for the proposal which I assert would wreck the training program and which would, in the language of one of the union officials, put the Kings Point Academy in moth balls.

In this newspaper the CIO Maritime Union describes a visit to the White House made by some of its officers including Joe Curran, Levine, and others. Their visit there was in opposition to the continuance of the training program.

Members of this group also appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. It is obvious from their statement before that committee, and also in their own newspaper, The Pilot, that what they want to see more than anything else, perhaps, is the growth of cobwebs across the doors of Kings Point Academy. They want to see this great service institution closed. It comes as rather an amazing thing to have these officials from Joe Curran's union argue as one of their serious points that Kings Point is wasting the taxpayers' money. I do not recall these particular officials ever before showing solicitude for the taxpayers. This same newspaper, The Pilot, and as I have said, it is the CIO Maritime Union organ, has also another very revealing page in it. It shows a picture of the cadets of the Kings Point Academy on parade on inauguration day here in Washington, to do honor to President Truman. It shows them marching from Pennsylvania Avenue to Fifteenth Street, only two blocks away from the White House. Here is how Joe Curran's newspaper titles this picture and also comments underneath it:

BRASS WON'T MAKE SEAMEN

Kings Point boys led by their top brass and accompanied by their brass band go strutting. There may be fewer strutters if Congress takes President Truman's recommendation to slash the maritime training service's budget estimate 50 percent—put the emphasis on upgrading.

Let each of us form our own impressions or conclusions on what I think is certainly a low level in the characterization of American young men who strive, through Kings Point, to become ships' officers.

It is becoming pretty obvious that the CIO Maritime Union is the real source of opposition to the Kings Point Academy and to the continuance of the overall maritime-training program. It was at their visit to the White House, I am convinced, that the action was taken to reduce the training fund. But no matter how any of us may feel, it is the definite fact that Joe Curran's union makes the claim that it was through his efforts that the cut was engineered.

In this bill before us today, there is provision for an amount in excess of $6,500,000 to keep 2,000 ships in stand-by condition. These vessels belong to our reserve fleet. They are being maintained for an emergency. The Appropriations Committee recognized the wisdom of this policy and has recommended the expenditure of this sum of money for this coming year to keep this reserve fleet in condition and available. Yet we have the very paradoxical situation that while we are maintaining a reserve fleet, we are eliminating a fund for the training of these very men whom we must count on to man this reserve fleet. It would take 125,000 men to man these 2,000 ships. Twenty thousand of these men would have to be officers. Yet, in this bill, we are cutting the heart out of the whole training system for officers. Seemingly, the administration, or somebody, has made up its mind that while we should be making provision for officers, either by direct appointment or through schools, for our Army, Air Force, and Navy, that we will not need officers in the event of an emergency to man our reserve fleet. We are cutting out this whole training program for a vital complementary service—a merchant marine as an auxiliary arm of the Navy—while we have a national draft law in effect. We are building up our enlisted manpower through enlistments and the draft; we are building up our air power, we are strengthening our Army and Navy; we are emphasizing every effort we can for the training of efficient personnel for our military; yet, at the same time, this administration, seemingly, takes the position that we do not have to pay any attention to training for our merchant marine, that we do not need any more officers, but somehow or other, from some mystic place, officers will appear to man our reserve fleet in the event of an emergency; that we can scuttle a merchant marine training program that has proved its vital qualities and benefits and, at the same time demolish a concept and policy to which the Nation has given its full approval—that we do not return to the days prior to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The administration takes the position, as a practical proposition, if this training fund is cut, as proposed, to scuttle one of our great national service institutions—the Kings Point Academy.

Let me again renew my appeal that we do not make what I think would be a costly and tragic mistake in not providing an increase in the training funds.

I trust that the substitute will prevail.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize we are all under some stress here now, the stress of haste, trying to get through. I regret in a way that we have to face this very important issue here under these conditions, because this is a very important matter.

There have been quite a few angles of this matter pointed out to you. My time will not permit going into it fully. Let me say first in all candor and frankness that I am personally involved in this in that one of these schools is located in my district at Pass Christian, Miss., but I would be for this substitute amendment if there was not a school located within 100,000 miles of my district.

Why do I say that? I say it because this thing goes to the very future of the national defense of this country. I want you to hear me on that. Form your own conclusions after you have heard me, but just hear me. That is all I am asking.

As was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from New York a moment ago, certain subversive influences attempted to wreck this program. Let us call a spade a spade. When we vote 271 to 1 for a bill appropriating $16,000,000,000 for the defense of this country, as we did on yesterday we ought to be bold enough to call things by their proper name.

During the war I twice brought a bill to the floor of this House from the Rules Committee to deport one Harry Bridges, the head of the maritime union on the west coast. Twice this House passed that bill. Twice it was defeated or was not brought up on the other side. That is the influence that is opposing this program of training these cadets for our merchant marine today, and the testimony before this committee bears out that statement.

When they did not get the results they were apprehensive they would not get, the results that they wanted, they went down to the White House. Whom they saw down there I do not know. I hope they did not see the President. But there came a message from the White House up here to curtail this program. Was this a coincidence? It happened just 2 or 3 days after the newspapers carried that story that these maritime union officials had been to the White House.

Remember this: You are training men to carry on that program in time of war. Will this startle you or do you already know it? During the war and immediately after the war—and I have authority to back up my statement; I have never advertised it before—better than 70 percent of those men who operated the communications systems upon our Army transports and sent out the messages about the movements of the fleet, were members of that maritime union and were also carrying in their pockets the card of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, that is a serious situation. Please do not misunderstand me. I am not charging that all members of that union are Communists. The average member of a labor union is just as patriotic as you and I. But you know, as a matter of common sense, that the Communists have tried to infiltrate into the key positions in this country. What could be more strategic than to have them in the operation of our fleet? I am not charging that the maritime union is a communistic organization. I am not charging that they are trying to defeat this program, because they want to see the country taken over by the Communists. Do not read that into my statement. But I have recited the facts to you and I am saying to you that they get the same results when they cut down this training program and prevent these boys, these patriotic high-school lads from being trained to officer and to man these ships.

Few of us realize it here today, but I say to you with all the sincerity of my being, that in my humble judgment, this question is most fundamental and goes to the very basis of the defense of our country. It will be pointed out by the very distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, my warm personal friend the gentleman from Texas, Congressman THOMAS, that these men do not have to go into the Reserves. I think they ought to go into the Reserves. If the Committee will agree to the amendment, which

would be subject to a point of order, I would like to see written into it that they have to go into the Reserves. But I ask you, I plead with you, to give this matter your serious consideration and not to follow the leadership under the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I am, of course, in full accord with my warm personal friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman BOGGS, who served during the war so ably in the merchant marine, who has offered this amendment on behalf of some dozen of us who are interested. I hope the House will adopt this amendment. Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I want to submit the following timely editorial which appeared only yesterday in the Times-Picayune, an outstanding southern newspaper at New Orleans, La.:

MARINE CADET SCHOOL

Despite the confidence asserted in 1945 by the War Shipping Administration that the United States Merchant Marine Cadet School at Pass Christian would be retained on a permanent basis, the institution has had to weather repeated storms—meteorological and man-made—in order to fulfill its promise. Again its fate is threatened, and it may require the concerted appeal of Gulf coast interests to save for it the $568,000 preliminary appropriation for the coming fiscal year which failed to appear in the Federal budget.

The cadet school was authorized under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as part of a permanent training plan designed to fit in with the vital development and maintenance of the United States merchant marine, and particularly with wartime needs. After the Marine Cadet Corps was established in 1938, this became one of the first two schools offering basic officer training, in conjunction with Kings Point Academy work.

Its location in provisional quarters at Henderson Point dates from September 1942; and its magnificent contribution to war needs is a matter of record. Its permanent quarters, valued in grounds, buildings, and equipment at $2,000,000, were completed early in 1946; but even then its elimination was being proposed as the training budget decreased. Methods were happily found to preserve it on a sharply reduced basis. Next year the same crisis arose, but the House Appropriations Committee and House conferees saved the day.

Then in the fall of 1947 the school was badly damaged by hurricane; and on the question of reopening, there was another congressional battle in 1948, in which the House won finally the concurrence of the Senate in repairing the damage and carrying on the school's work. Riding out another physical hurricane that same year, the institution now heads into a puzzling maelstrom in which the Maritime Commission itself proposed its abolition, along with another school at St. Petersburg.

Just as the merchant marine and the proper training and provision of officers mean much to the United States in war and peacetimes, the school means much to Gulf coast shipping, due to its advantageous location and to the links these interests have been able to form with officer material. In return, the Gulf coast offers year-around small-boat training, and there is a record of remarkable per capita economy in relation both to other schools of the type, and to the great military academies. We hope Congress will not reverse itself, but will give this institution the chance for permanence which was intended for it and which its record and advantages support. The House Appropriations Committee has responded so far with a $550,000 allotment in the independent offices bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the statements made with reference to the training program show clearly the need for that program. It happened to be my privilege to be on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when the training program was authorized. There was a direct mandate from the Congress in the Merchant Marine Act for this training program. It is set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1938 and amendments. There was a peacetime program initiated by the Congress after a long series of hearings, by the committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. It became part of the merchant-marine program to build ships and to man those ships with American seamen. There was a period of time in this country when the commerce of America, or at least a great portion of it, was being carried in foreign-flag ships. Then, even after we started to build ships in this country, a great number of the seamen on those American ships were foreign seamen. Then it became necessary in the Merchant Marine Act to set up year by year higher and higher percentages required to be American seamen, even on American ships. It became important to train American seamen. We are training the unlicensed personnel at St. Petersburg, and the licensed personnel at Kings Point, and are training at the other schools that have been set forth—the particular details of which I will not burden you with, because they have already been stated. But the point I want to definitely impress upon you is that the failure to provide these funds for the payment of these trainees and cadets will be to go back on the mandate of the Congress itself, so there would be no shortage of American seamen in this country. There are those who do not want to see us build an American merchant marine and who fought so much when the original Merchant Marine Act was passed, that it was passed only by about a 15-vote majority in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. The point of this substitute amendment is this, is it not, that we will have American-trained officers for the American merchant marine.

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; American-trained officers and unlicensed personnel. That is the point of it. There are men on the beach today, but the men on the beach are not graduates of these schools and they are glad to have these men. They are well trained. They are fine, clean young men. They are doing a great job, and when they go into the ports of the world they are building good will for us.

On the anniversary of Maritime Day I heard Admiral Land say it was just as important to have trained seamen as it was to have good ships, in order to make the American merchant marine something of which we could be proud. They carry the commerce to all parts of the world. We wanted American-made ships and we wanted them manned with American seamen. I went through this when we fought for the original training program. At one time some even wanted to build American ships in foreign shipyards. We had to go into that situation. There are people who do not want an adequate number of American seamen. They want to create a shortage. It would require 125,000 seamen to man the ships that are in the moth-ball fleet today.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any claim being made that these cadets, when graduated, are dominated by the maritime union, which is a Communist-dominated union, or claimed to be Communist-dominated?

Mr. PETERSON. Quite the opposite.

Mr. DONDERO. They are not dominated?

Mr. PETERSON. They are not. They are men of whom we can be proud. Those are the men who were manning the guns and went down with their guns blazing in the maritime service. They lost their lives along with the Navy men, and I am a Navy man myself, but they did a splendid job and I pay tribute to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the required number of words, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to differ with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and with the committee. They have done a grand job on a very difficult bill, but I feel that a serious mistake will be made if we do not restore the pay for trainees and midshipmen in the maritime training schools.

Those schools are intended to train men to man the Nation's merchant fleet, to keep the American flag flying on the high seas, and to provide essential reserves in time of war. Already the purpose of the schools and what they do has been stated. The schools for cadets and midshipmen at Kings Point and Pass Christian offer 4-year courses. In addition, there are four State schools—in California, Maine, Massachusets, and New York respectively—performing the same important function. There are also the specialists and up-grading schools in Alameda and at Sheepshead Bay. Most of their courses are for 30 days, and they train seamen and officers for higher positions or for specialist ratings. Then, finally, there is the trainees school at St. Petersburg, which takes new men, unlicensed men, for 6 months and gives them training for deck jobs, engine jobs, and steward jobs on board ship.

Now, why pay these men? The answer is simple enough. If we do not pay them we will not get the cadets and trainees,

and if we do not get them we will not keep the schools in operation, and the time may come when there will not be American merchant ships on the high seas.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I want to endorse every word the gentleman is saying and what has been said by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] and the others who advocate this larger appropriation. The matter was gone into fully by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I was chairman at the time. I would say that it followed also the great disasters of the *Mohawk* and another vessel in which there was a great loss of life. We wanted men who had been trained in order that it might help protect the security of the people traveling on ships, as well as to help in preparation for war. It was a matter that was fully investigated.

Mr. SIKES. I hope every Member heard what the gentleman from Virginia said. There is no better informed, more able, or more beloved Member of this House; and when he speaks about merchant shipping and the merchant marine he speaks with authority.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that our colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] is the father of the American merchant marine?

Mr. SIKES. That is very true.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is also true that it is going to be a great misfortune to this House to have him retire during the current Congress.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Quite a bit has been said about the defense value of this particular work. I believe it is very significant that Winston Churchill in the second volume of his memoirs which were reviewed recently in Life magazine, made the statement that the one factor that was even more serious than the bombings of England was that at one time there was a question as to whether or not the merchant marine could continue to bring food to England. He stressed that one point as being perhaps the one most significant to that country's holding out and being able to sustain itself. In view of that I fail to see how this Congress can afford to take at this time what might be a backward step as far as the defense of this country is concerned.

Mr. SIKES. All that the gentleman has said is completely correct and highly apropos.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I leave this point with the committee: The merchant marine constantly needs new men. The average time that a man spends at sea is 10 years; he then retires or goes into another line of endeavor. The hundreds of thousands of men who were trained during the war have drifted back to other pursuits, just as those who served in the Army, the Navy, and the Marines have drifted back into other pursuits. They were engaged in the war activity then, but now they have gone into other work. In the merchant marine we need a constant supply of new men; we must have new men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. It has been stated that there are unemployed seamen on the beaches. But it has also been stated that these unemployed are not graduates of these academies; that is an important point to remember. Well-trained men are always needed in our maritime service, and there are jobs for them.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. For the information of the Committee I wish to mention to the gentleman that one of the reasons for unemployment among seamen in the merchant marine is the fact that the United States Coast Guard is the certifying agency for people generally who go to sea in ranks less than officer rank. The Coast Guard for the last several years has been issuing seamen's papers right and left, and that has had more effect upon employment than any single factor.

Mr. SIKES. That is true; seamen's papers were issued freely to applicants, sometimes apparently without regard to qualification.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SIKES. It is also true that in the first 3 months of the year shipping is at its lowest point and fewer men are employed because of the difficulty of winter conditions.

The point is going to be made that this is a war measure, a defense measure; that for all practical purposes the war is now over, and that therefore the program has fulfilled its purpose. The program was inaugurated in 1938; that is when the merchant seamen's training program was authorized. Actual training was started in September of 1938 at Hoffman Island, N. Y. My authority is the Maritime Commission and I know the committee will be interested in the fact that all of the schools except Sheepshead Bay were in operation before World War II. The Kings Point training was started at New London on January 1, 1940, and later transferred to Kings Point. The St. Petersburg trainee school opened in August 1940.

Thus it will be seen that the maritime training schools were in operation before 1941, and we did not get into war until December 7, 1941.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that this matter can be amicably settled. There is a somewhat complicated situation before us, and I sincerely hope that an understanding can be reached with the committee for the adoption of language permitting pay for cadets and trainees. It is the function of Congress to decide these matters on their merit.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is not the point the gentleman is now making correct, that it is a complicated matter? I say that as a member of the subcommittee who would support the amendment, but has the gentleman included the correct figure? As he states, it is a complicated matter.

Mr. SIKES. What we propose here is a worthy investment in the future of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good illustration of how we can have some honest differences of opinion in the House of Representatives. The RECORD would not be complete if it were to be accepted that the action of the subcommittee had been predicated upon the assumed arguments in behalf of that action which have been advanced by those who are opposed to the action which the committee took. Certainly one thing should be made clear. That is, the action of the subcommittee was not dictated by the CIO or the maritime union or any Communist organization or any organizations suspected of Communist affiliation. The action of the committee was not unanimous; there was some difference of opinion on the subcommittee, an honest difference of opinion just as there is here today.

A majority of the committee thought, however, that here was a situation where you have 42,000 people seeking 27,000 jobs, 42,000 registered men seeking 27,000 available jobs about the ships. And there are 12,891 licensed deck officers seeking the 5,000 jobs that were available. So that there was not and is not any shortage and it seemed unnecessary to pay students to take training to create more trained personnel to compete for those jobs.

Mr. Chairman, there is also another factor to be stated. We did not do this before the war—that is, we did not pay students. We did it during the war. We have created quite a reserve of these people. Those who get this pay to attend college are not under obligation to enter the maritime service, so the situation is not analogous to West Point or Annapolis.

In the bill the committee does provide for a continuation of subsistence and lodging. We do not close the schools out. We do not say these boys cannot come and still get free lodging and free board. But we just wondered how long we ought to continue to pay $65 a month in addition to encourage boys to take maritime training. There is a very serious shortage of doctors and nurses in the country. If we are going to take care of shortages and make educational training available and attractive to young men and women, perhaps we ought to start to pay $65 a month and

board and lodging to those who will take up a medical course or some other vocation of life where there is a shortage.

It did seem to a majority of the committee that with the reserve that had been created of trained men in both fields the time had come to say: "We cannot forever pay $65 a month in addition to providing board and lodging to those who want to attend these schools."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman used certain figures regarding the number of men who were presently unemployed. Would the gentleman be willing to state the source of those figures?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The source in one case was the secretary of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots Association, and the other figure in reference to those registered for employment, came from the National Maritime Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. At Kings Point Academy they train around six or seven hundred men a year to be officers. Does the gentleman feel that training six or seven hundred men to be officers of American-flag ships is a waste of money?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, I do not, unless you do not need them, and unless you have an ample supply. And this should be added about Kings Point. The budget included money to continue Kings Point. There was no proposal in the budget's recommendation and none here to put Kings Point in moth balls as some have feared.

The question that is involved between the two amendments, or the principal question involved, is this: The original amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], would make the money available only to pay the $65 a month to those who are presently enrolled in the schools and would not apply to those who enrolled after May 1.

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] would make the $65 a month available to all who may be enrolled or continue to enroll during the year for which these funds are appropriated.

I would like to say in conclusion, I recognize that a great many Members have very definite feelings one way or the other on this, but at least the good faith of the committee ought to be made clear. Our action was not dictated by any Communist organization. It was simply a rational looking at the picture, an objective looking at the picture. Some of us thought with an ample supply of these trained people on hand now, we ought not to continue to pay $65 a month in addition to the subsistence allowances and other attractions for study at these maritime training schools.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, with 8 minutes to be reserved for the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the memories of people are very short in reference to this problem of training or maintaining an adequate supply of merchant-marine officers. All during the war the radios blared out asking that those people who held officers' commissions or tickets in the merchant marine report by telegraph to Washington. They would be placed on the pay roll from the date of their telegram and continue until they were assigned to duty on a ship. We needed merchant-marine officers that badly in order to maintain our fleet, that was so much a part of our wartime effort.

An adequate merchant fleet is an arm of the Navy, and this defense institution of our country is made up of a number of integrated parts, the ships themselves, the facilities for building and maintaining them, and also, and it is not the least of these parts, the trained personnel that can man the ships.

An argument has been made that men are on the beach, that there are no jobs. We maintain a reserve for the Army, a reserve for the Navy, and a reserve for the Air Corps. There are not fitting jobs for those people today, but we recognize that in the future when we need them we are going to need them badly.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman from South Dakota quoted as his authority for the amount of unemployment in the field the Masters, Mates, and Pilots Association. For the information of the gentleman from California, in that same communication it was advocated that the Academy at Kings Point be abolished, so that what they are really trying to do is use this as a smoke screen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I think with respect to the Maritime Training Division it might well be said that it should be judged by the enemies it has made. As far as those of us who have had anything to do with respect to the training division, and particularly with respect to the Merchant Marine Academy, are concerned, we can urge upon those who have not had an opportunity to observe the facilities that were created not as a war agency but rather under the provisions of the Shipping Act of 1936, that this amendment be adopted. It is a great tribute to the foresight of such distinguished Members of Congress as were its sponsors that that act was enacted when it was. The service that was performed during and since the war, and the service that will be performed in the future by these fine, respectable, patriotic, and intelligent young Americans will redound forever to the credit of this body and the country.

I take the liberty, Mr. Chairman, of bringing to the attention of the committee an excerpt from a statement prepared by the Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps which, I feel, properly states the mission and the value of the Merchant Marine Academy:

> The United States Merchant Marine Academy guarantees a continuous influx of Naval Reserve officers to this vital military auxiliary of the armed forces. Section 302 (g) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 requires officers of subsidized vessels to be members of the Naval Reserve. Kings Pointers are recognized as one of the best ready supplies of Naval Reserve officers. Aboard American merchant vessels is probably the strongest contingent of well-organized Communists existing in the entire country. In the event of a war, such a dangerous condition could prove detrimental to the security of the citizens of this country. Applicants to Kings Point are screened by naval intelligence and the FBI. Graduates can be counted on in time of emergency as stalwart, trustworthy citizens, capable of carrying out the mission for which they were so thoroughly trained. But in addition to these assets, the United States Merchant Marine Academy serves its country in peace as well as in war. The merchant ships have in the past attracted a great number of shifters, misfits, and incompetent help. Kings Point's mission is to attract a high type young American from all 48 States (on a quota basis) to American ships. They have already made an enviable record in good ship management and skilled leadership, thereby reducing the cost of operation of American subsidized and unsubsidized ships which are so hard-pressed to out sail foreign competitors. The small influx of these young men is a healthy influence on an industry plagued with many ills. The return, then, to the Government is in actual dollars and cents on vessels under Government operating differential subsidies as well as in increased economic assets stemming from a healthy, growing American merchant marine. Kings Pointers are also known unofficially as ambassadors of good will because of the favorable impressions made on peoples in many foreign lands. There is actually, then, a greater return to the Government through graduates of Kings Point than through the various military training programs whose purposes are to train solely for the defense of our country.

I am sure this subcommittee of the great Committee on Appropriations must have been preoccupied with what it thought more important subjects when it treated the training division as it did. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to the young men who made a contract with us, to restore to that training division the funds that are required to maintain an institution the like of which this country has never previously seen. I sincerely urge upon this Committee the favorable consideration of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I should certainly be the last person in the world to impugn the motives of the members of the subcommittee or the members of the committee who omitted this item from the appropriation bill, but I do very respectfully think they are very seriously mistaken.

Three years ago I had the distinction of serving on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and as a member of that committee I was a visitor to the Kings Point Academy. I know something about that Academy and I know something about the work it is doing. I know something about the Maine Maritime Academy, which is located in Castine, Maine. In recent years I have done a certain amount of traveling on American merchant ships and have been privileged to go on the bridge of those ships and watch the work which these merchant marine officers are doing. I know something about their responsibilities in that work, and let me say that they are not merely responsibilities of navigation and seamanship; for when those men get into port they are often confronted with all sorts of situations of a civil nature, political situations and what not, where men need the levelest heads, the best training, and the broadest educational backgrounds; and that is exactly what these schools are giving them.

I should like, if I may be permitted to do so, to read an extract from a letter written me by the president of the board of trustees of the Maine Maritime Academy.

His letter reads in part as follows:

The attack on the schools is spearheaded by the Masters, Mates, and Pilots Association, who are taking advantage of seasonal unemployment caused by the fact that the Great Lakes fleet does not sail during the winter months and the lull in American shipping caused by certain rulings of ECA.

The argument on the other side is that you can't stop and start training of officers with every fluctuation in employment or unemployment. Schools, to be of any value must have continuity of program. There are millions of dollars worth of equipment in these schools, faculties have been built up over a period of years, and everybody who has any forethought at all can see that these boys will be needed badly in 2 or 3 years. In fact, from every indication that we can find, we will have no trouble in placing the graduating class in July despite the talk about unemployment.

You and I both know that there will always be unemployment among seafaring personnel because many men earn a large wage for several months at sea and prefer to stay home for several months in order to enjoy their families and to live like other human beings for a while. Therefore the unemployment figure of seafaring men is a misleading argument which can be conjured up at any time by the Masters, Mates, and Pilots. The same condition has prevailed many times before, and yet the graduates of the State maritime academies have always been able to find employment. Many lines wait with great anticipation for our classes to graduate. This year they are especially impatient because we are graduating for the first time boys who have completed their 3- and 4-year courses, and it is hoped that they will be even better officers than those who have come out before.

Mr. Chairman, I very earnestly hope that the Boggs amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know anything about Kings Point, but I do know about the Massachusetts training ship, and what work we have done for over half a century. These boys who go on our training ship are all high-school graduates. They take a stiff examination to get on the training ship. They put in their time, and when they graduate, they can be officers in the merchant marine. Further than that, Mr. Chairman, in the First World War, over 80 percent of the graduates of the Massachusetts training ship were officers in the United States Navy, and in this last war, the situation was about the same. It seems to me that if we pay these boys $65 a month, they are getting $10 less than the ordinary seaman in the United States Navy, who do not get the training that our boys get on these ships. We turn out a high-class group of men. Regardless of what may be said, when there is a captain of a boat around our neck of the woods—usually he is a graduate of our training ship. Such a man looks around for boys who have also graduated from these training schools, and he knows that he can depend on them. I think that perhaps we may be able to cut out of some of these other appropriations in the bill enough money to make up for this item. I hope the Congress will take that into consideration, that we have been doing this work for over half a century, and not try to stop it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are faced with this situation: If we do not adopt this amendment, we are confronted with two horns of a dilemma. If they get the $65 a month they will be able to go to school. If they do not get the $65 a month they will not be able to go. That means that instead of the average boy from the average home going to the maritime school, we will only have sons of wealthy parents going to the school. I believe it is the sentiment of the House of Representatives that all boys should be treated alike. In my State of New York we have two schools. We have the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, a Federal institution, and we also have the New York State Merchant Marine Academy, in Bronx County, a part of which county I represent. Therefore, I am particularly interested in this proposition. But I am more interested in it for the reason that the father of the American merchant marine, the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND, has approved this amendment. If he thinks it is all right, so far as its effect on the merchant marine is concerned, then I want to tell you that I think it is all right.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman agree that if this pay provision were cut out, it would just mean the slow death of the schools?

Mr. LYNCH. It would mean one of two things—either the time would come when the school would be attended only by the sons of wealthy parents, or the school would be abolished because it had no students.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and the appropriation for the support of these schools carries me back to 1935 when the Ways and Means Committee of the California Legislature endeavored to do away with the functioning of the California Nautical School, one of those contained in this appropriation bill. It was quite a difficult task to make a fight during the depression for the restoration of any type of school, but we were able to point out that every boy who attended that school had a good job waiting for him when he got out. He was in competition with people who were not of the same type educationally as he. Therefore, as he was graduated from that school a job was always open.

I know that many of those boys played an important part in the late war, and I was very happy to be a party to keeping alive that school while I was a member of the State legislature.

I feel that this amendment is very necessary because our future is doubtful. I feel that these young men who are graduated from this school will be in a position to play an important part in the defense of our country should war ever come upon us.

I urge the restoration of this appropriation. I feel it is just good sound thinking to keep these schools alive and functioning, and so I ask that you vote in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, a quick review of the evidence produced in the hearings at page 681 explains one reason why I speak in favor of the Boggs substitute, because the State marine school in California estimates that there will be trained 150 trainees during the year; that at the United States Maritime School in Alameda, Calif., there will be trained 1,568 men during the year. I wish to emphasize, especially to the Members from inland States, that the State of California has the second largest number of miles on its coast line of any State in the Union. I believe Virginia is first. California is a great maritime State. It is highly important to California that this Boggs amendment be agreed to.

On page 685 of the hearings, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] brought out the fact that the amount involved per cadet per year is only $1,053.75, if he has

75 cents per day allowance for subsistence.

I strongly urge that the Boggs substitute be approved. I have personal knowledge of the extreme value of such training as the Boggs substitute will permit. The State of California asks for this Federal aid in this important field of only $50,000, for these young maritime cadets.

I have been aboard the splendid ship maintained by the State of California to train these lads. This ship and this school can well be regarded as a necessary adjunct to national maritime efficiency. That the merchant marine rendered a necessary and patriotic service is undisputed. That the State of California needs this Federal assistance and cooperation is undisputed. That it is a sound investment is clear as crystal. Let us vote it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, as my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] said a few moments ago, and as I will proceed to demonstrate, the minority is not united on this particular subject. I myself think that we should make policy in the Congress, and that when we decide to change a policy it should be done with the consent of the Congress and not by the Bureau of the Budget.

There are two things that I do want to point out. The first is that figures have been cited, which appear in the budget hearings, that there are men out of work, or, as one Member expressed it, on the beach. I point out that this is unsupported testimony; and that in another part of the hearings there is a statement from a representative of the State schools that no graduate of the State schools today who wishes a job is without a job.

My colleague also said there are many students in the United States who would like it if they could have help from the Government, to take courses in medicine or nursing. May I respectfully suggest that is not the comparison; the comparison would be properly: If the Government of the United States had decided to send students to medical schools and had decided to pay them a supporting amount of money while they were in school, would it then be proper for the Bureau of the Budget to decide, in the face of that legislative action by the Congress, not to give them any more money?

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that there are about a thousand vacant ships in the so-called mothball fleet. In the event of an emergency, if those ships were made ready for use, it would require about 100,000 men to man them.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It would require 125,000 men within a few weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for and support H. R. 4177, the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, it happens that the California Maritime Academy is located in my congressional district in the city of Vallejo. The chairman of the Board of Governors is Mr. Henry Blackstone. I wish to use my short time by reading a few statements from a letter from him to me, dated April 1, this year. He writes:

DEAR SIR: I have just received a copy of a letter dated March 25, 1949, addressed to the United States Maritime Commission by Capt. C. F. May, president of the national organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America. This letter contains a recommendation, which if carried out, might seriously impede the splendid training program which has been carried on for many years by the State Maritime Academies of California, New York, Maine, and Massachusetts.

The specific recommendations of Captain May's letter to withdraw certain aspects of Federal aid from the State maritime academies has in our opinion for its primary purpose a reversion to the unsound principle that merchant marine officers can adequately be trained by casual experience in the various vessels of the merchant marine without any plan as to academic excellence or the higher standards of performance which must exist among the future officers of our merchant marine if it is to survive an increasingly competitive position in world shipping.

There are also indirect implications in Captain May's letter to the effect that the entire training program should be carried out under the sponsorship of the various maritime unions. I believe it will be obvious that this is an entirely new approach to the inherent American principle that education and training for the professions of all kind in American business and industry is an obligation of the educational systems of the various States.

You are undoubtedly well aware of the present weakened condition of the American merchant marine, arising largely from existing, and undoubtedly temporary, world conditions. In the planning for the inevitable great future of a most significant and vital industry, any cut-backs which fail to recognize the inherent soundness of the future of the industry, would obviously be unwise, and it is doubtful if a parallel can be found in any other industry.

The panel on training of merchant marine officers under the chairmanship of Capt. Harold Milde, president of the Master Mariners Guild, and other outstanding shipping executives at the annual merchant marine conference in New York last October gave overwhelming support to the soundness of the training programs conducted by the State maritime academies, and voiced the opinion that the graduates of such training programs had proved in practical operations of ships that the training given was well worthwhile and should be further implemented. This is high praise from the ranking men of the American merchant marine, and should give thought when considering recommendations such as those submitted by union organizations. It will, furthermore, be obvious that the tremendous strides in technical and professional training and education of the American educational system has contributed most significantly to the advancement of American industry. The merchant marine can be no exception.

I can assure you that the California Maritime Academy in its recent budget hearings in Sacramento received the most encouraging support and praise from the major chambers of commerce, civic bodies, executives of the shipping industry, the State department of education, and the parents of the students themselves. We feel that we have a well-established academy on the State college level, which turns out outstanding graduates that are a credit to the State, the Nation, and to the industry, and we feel, furthermore, that the maritime future of our State is inevitable and fully warrants the financial support necessary to maintain it as one of the best of its kind in the world.

In the consideration of the budgetary estimates, insofar as they apply to the State maritime academies, we request your support for the passage of the recommended increase in the Federal grant, the $65 pay per month for cadet midshipmen, and the 75 cents per day subsistence. It should be noted that the summation of the total financial aids to all the academies (California, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York) is considerably less than one-third the amount submitted by the Maritime Commission for the support of the Federal academy at Kings Point and its basic training school at Pass Christian.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it would be only common sense to pass this amendment and grant to each cadet at the maritime academies the $65 per month allowance which they have previously enjoyed.

The arguments made by Mr. Blackstone are so convincing that I could add nothing to them. He knows whereof he is speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] is recognized.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken once on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 8 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the membership on the high order of this debate. It has been good, and it has been instructive. Two statements were made, however, that were not correct; they were innocent misstatements, but I wish to correct them. First, let me see if I can summarize the entire picture for you: In the first place, you have Federal schools on the one hand, and State schools on the other. The great States of California, Maine, Massachusetts, and New York have their own government schools to train deck officers, not enlisted men. The period of instruction is 3 years. Those schools are many, many years of age. One of them is around 75 years old. But the Federal Government instituted this program of helping State schools and established its own program for Federal schools when? Only after the war had been started. If anybody challenges that statement I will tell them exactly the day when the program was started for each school. Let us keep the record straight. If anyone wants to challenge that statement, now is the time to do it.

Mr. BLAND. Was it not established in 1938?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. It was authorized in 1938, but the schools were

started in 1941, 1942, and 1943 as war schools.

Mr. CANFIELD. What was the date in 1941 when this institution began its work?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Now, I only have a few minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman wants to be fair, I know.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. On which school does the gentleman want the date? I will call it off for him.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am talking about Kings Point, N. Y.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Kings Point, N. Y., was started in 1941.

Mr. CANFIELD. The month of June.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is right. In 1941.

Mr. JOHNSON. When was the California school started?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is an old school that was started many years before that time. The gentleman is talking about the State school in California?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Long before the war started, and that is what I said to start with. The Maine school was started in 1941, Massachusetts 1893, New York 1874; but Federal Government aid in the form of pay and subsistence was not given to the State schools until July 1, 1942.

This was purely a wartime program.

Somebody has said that these schools were going to be closed down. There is not one bit of evidence any place that we are going to close down these schools. We are not closing them down. On the other hand, we are still giving them subsistence, if you please. There are $221,000 in here for food alone for the State schools. You have these State schools getting subsistence, you are paying the men $65 a month, then giving them food. That is true at Kings Point and at Pass Christian.

Certainly the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York does not take care of the deck schools. You do not give them pay. You just give it to the officers. In fairness to everybody, if you want to do anything you ought to pay the deckhands to go to school as well as the young officers who are going to school.

Mr. Chairman, this was a war training program and like all other war programs, it is high time to bring it to an end. How are you going to defend it with your voters and taxpayers? How are you going to defend sending this group of young men to school? Certainly, they are fine men, but the industry is crowded. You have thousands of men walking the beach. Yet you are still educating them. How can you go back to your districts and defend the spending of the taxpayers' money for supplying an already overcrowded industry?

Would it not be a fine thing, if you are going to put it on that basis, and we have a shortage of 10,000 to 20,000 doctors and dentists in this country, to pay them $65 a month and let them go to school? If we have another war, will there be anything more scarce than civil, mechanical, and electrical engineers?

So, why not give those boys, who are just as deserving, $65 a month and let them go to school and also feed them? That is what you are doing for the cadet-midshipmen.

Now, gentlemen, it is time to stop this. I know it is difficult. We are not closing down any schools. We are still going to feed them. Under this bill we are still feeding them and we are still giving them a free education, and all we are doing under this bill is just taking away from them $65 a month. There is no Government program in existence today for the Army or the Air Force that is comparable to this. You cannot force one of these boys to serve a day on a ship after they graduate. You cannot force one of them to go into the naval reserve after they graduate. So, this program has not one scintilla of value for national defense.

You recall that during the war the Navy had 3½ million men in service. They are trained today to man our merchant marine fleet and our battleships, if we need them.

Gentlemen, the committee has studied this problem for a long time, and we think we have come to a sound conclusion. We ask your support, in all fairness to the thousands of men who are now on the beach looking for a job and cannot get one, and in fairness to the doctors and the lawyers and the civil engineers and the mechanical engineers who want to go to college at Government expense, and yet you are not providing for them. Why not give it to those people also?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion it would be both a tragic mistake and a breach of faith to our student merchant marine officers if this substitute amendment is not adopted.

None of the schools affected by this legislation are in my district. I do, however, live near the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy. I have visited the Academy on several occasions and know personally many of the young men who are students there.

I can tell you that they are an unusually loyal, hard working and highly intelligent group of young Americans, who are engaged in very rigorous scholastic training. From all that I have learned in my experience on the Merchant Marine Committee of the House, and my naval service, I can say unqualifiedly that they are the type of men we need to man our merchant marine fleet.

I know of my own knowledge that many of these young men come from poor families. I believe that the great majority who hail from all over the United States, come from families of modest incomes. I am told that if they lose this monthly allowance perhaps 60 percent may discontinue their studies, of necessity, some of them with 2 years or more of schooling behind them.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot let these men down. We cannot afford not to adopt this substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS of Texas) there were—ayes 82, noes 32.

So the substitute was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] as amended by the substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time merely to point out to the Members of the Congress and the country the great disparity between the number of hospital beds provided for in this bill and the number recommended in the Presidential edict, the Budget Bureau recommendation, which would have left us with 16,000 fewer beds in the new construction program. I congratulate the subcommittee on refusing to accept the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget to make the rescission of $235,000,000, which would actually cut out 16,000 beds.

I do not like to charge discrimination against Pennsylvania, but we realize that in conforming to this Presidential edict of reducing hospital beds to 16,000 the Veterans' Administration had a very difficult problem. However, we feel there are some very important factors which make Pennsylvania a special case in this instance.

For years, almost from the beginning of the Veterans' Administration, Pennsylvania has had far fewer veterans hospitals and beds for veteran patients than any comparable State; in fact, fewer than a number of smaller States, States with far fewer veterans. For comparison, and I do not mean to cast aspersions on any particular State because they are fully entitled to any hospital beds they have, as far as I am concerned, we find that 5 States comparable with Pennsylvania have far more hospitals than Pennsylvania and far more hospital beds. New York, with a veterans population of 2,043,000, has 10 hospitals with 10,829 beds. Illinois has a veterans population of 1,211,000 and has 5 hospitals with over 8,000 beds. California with a veterans population of 1,345,000 has 9 hospitals with 11,548 beds. On the other hand, Pennsylvania, which has the second largest veterans population in the country, 1,424,000, has only 4 hospitals and 4,084 beds. Yet under this new program, this new edict, they are cutting Pennsylvania's proposed bed capacity by 1,450 beds.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I commend the gentleman on bringing out these facts, which I think are very important. May I say that I think one of

the difficulties is that the Veterans' Administration is not using the current census figures either for States or veterans in making up this program.

Mr. FENTON. As I said before, I do not want to criticize what other States have. More power to them, because the veterans should be taken care of. However, I do point out the discrepancy between the number of beds Pennsylvania has and the number other States have.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I sat next to the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the Committee on Military Affairs for 4 years. I know how diligent he is in trying to get medical attention for people in the Army and also for veterans. I concur in what my colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] said, that the figures the gentleman from Pennsylvania gave for California are entirely out of line with what the actual veterans' population is.

Mr. FENTON. That may be so, but I am quoting figures, carefully compiled by the veteran organizations in Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON. We have a million veterans in our State, and we do not have anywhere near the proper facilities for them.

Mr. FENTON. I think that is true of every State, I will say to my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I am making clear to the committee that our protest primarily is based upon the fact that Pennsylvania for many years has been required to get along with far fewer beds for our veterans than any fair ratio would dictate. The proposed hospitalization program would not have corrected this disproportion, but it would have helped to ameliorate the acute shortage of hospital space for our veterans. Now, however, we find that 9 percent of the hospital space has been canceled under the order for Pennsylvania construction.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. My recollection was that this order cutting out the construction of these hospitals dispensed with the construction of 2,000 beds in Pennsylvania. That is my recollection. I wonder if the gentleman checked those figures?

Mr. MORGAN. The figure is 1,450 beds.

Mr. FENTON. Yes; that was my figure, 1,450 beds.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to state for the record from my own knowledge the interest that the gentleman has had in individual veterans as well as in veterans generally all over his State. I know what he has done in recommending medical care and many other things for them.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentlewoman.

As a physician and veteran of World War I, myself, I know what it means to a veteran to go pleading to be hospitalized. There is not a week that I go home to my office when there are not a great many veterans there pleading for hospitalization. There are various factors that should be taken into a hospitalization program. There is the factor of the number of the veteran population in each State and whether those hospitals can be properly staffed. In Philadelphia, the proposed 1,000-bed hospital has been cut 500 beds. Everyone will have to agree that Philadelphia is one of the greatest medical centers in the country and perhaps the world. Certainly they can staff such a hospital.

Mr. MORGAN. Is that not also true in the Pittsburgh district?

Mr. FENTON. It is absolutely true for Pittsburgh, as I was about to say.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The Veterans' Administration has reactivated the Schick Hospital in Iowa, which is also available for veterans of Nebraska and surrounding States. But the complaint is that they are not using the space that is available to them there, in spite of the fact that many veterans are clamoring for hospitalization.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, that may be true in some sections, but certainly for years in my area veterans have had to go many miles to Philadelphia or Pittsburgh for their hospitalization. So I think it is a program that should not be cut without any basic reason for it.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I congratulate the gentleman for his statement as well as the committee. We have had the same condition at Billings Hospital in Indianapolis where almost half of the beds, I understand, nearly 500 beds, are available, if the hospital could be properly staffed to take care of the large backlog of veterans who need physical hospitalization.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly agree with the Veterans' Administration that these hospitals should be located in areas where they can be properly staffed.

In Pennsylvania they have the necessary facilities to supply the medical personnel in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. There is no rhyme nor reason why they should cut 500 beds from Philadelphia and give Philadelphia only 500 beds. They are cutting Pittsburgh 750 beds. In Harrisburg, the capital of the great State of Pennsylvania, which has quite a population and quite a veteran population, there are a great many physicians who are capable of staffing the hospital there, and they propose to eliminate that proposed hospital entirely. While I do not like to charge discrimination, yet I do say there is a line of demarcation that comes pretty nearly to discrimination.

I trust the hospital construction for the veterans of this country will go forward as provided for by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has again expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee on not agreeing with the Bureau of the Budget in rescinding $237,000,000 that was originally proposed, which would have reduced the hospitals by some 24 institutions, and which would have cut out some 16,000 beds in veterans' hospitals across the Nation.

In the brief time I have, I want to impress upon the Members of the House the necessity of this problem and its acuteness in the State of California. I appreciate the problem of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]. He is certainly entitled to his share of what the $237,000,000 will provide, if it is left in the bill. What I am saying is that I hope the Veterans' Administration will read this record, because in the allocation of Veterans' Administration facilities in the State of California they have considered everything on the basis of the 1940 census. That is about as inaccurate as anything could be, because I doubt if there is any section of the United States that has increased in population equal to the State of California, and let me further divide that into Southern California.

During the hearings before the committee, my colleague from California [Mr. HINSHAW], gave some very valuable statistics in connection with this matter. He showed that the number of neuropsychiatric cases has increased to the point where veterans who should be treated in veterans' hospitals are being left in jails and being sent to State institutions. The waiting list for veterans requiring hospitalization for tuberculosis, and other chronic diseases is growing in numbers to the extent that even temporary facilities left there since the war are not adequate.

I do not know whether any of the committee members can answer these questions, but I would like to ask any of them whether if the $237,000,000 is left in the bill, we can have assurance that the Veterans' Administration will use the estimated census at the present time, instead of the 1940 census, especially as it applies to Southern California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman's point is well taken. It is a point I had hoped the Members of Congress today would understand. The money was never taken out of the budget. The $237,000,000 has always been

in there. It was merely a proposal to take it out, which proposal was refused by the subcommittee. But the gentleman is absolutely right in that the decision regarding the location or the expenditure does not rest with this subcommittee, nor actually with the Congress. It seems to me that the legislative committee should quickly review the situation regarding hospitals and see whether figures have been made up from recent figures, whether they have been made up on the basis of need, or whether they have been made up by some board appointed by some executive agency and answerable to that agency.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] was on the floor during the debate on the rule. She called the attention of the House to the fact that there was not sufficient money in the bill as it stands now to provide personnel, in the event the $237,000,000 is left in, for additional hospitals. That is a matter of consideration that should be decided, I think, before the bill goes to the Senate.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very unfortunate that it could not be decided here, but we would have to have a building schedule of the hospitals, and on the basis of the building schedule for hospitals which are not yet begun and which as of this moment it is perhaps not the intention of the administrative agency to approve——

Mr. McDONOUGH. That should go in another bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We cannot include the money when we do not know the amount.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am informed by the Veterans' Administration that as of the present time there are 3,484 beds unavailable because of the shortage of money for medical personnel, and they will need more as the other hospitals are constructed.

We should not allow this deplorable condition to last much longer. Surely we owe it to our veterans to provide them with adequate hospitalization. The Hoover task force report on our medical institutions indicates that they need a thorough overhauling and that there is a great deal of inefficiency and too much divided authority which should be corrected. The veteran population of California is much higher than the Veterans' Administration admits and according to the latest figures I have is nearly 1,700,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement on time. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would modify his request to include a provision that each amendment pending at the desk be allowed 5 minutes, 3 minutes to be allowed the author of the amendment and 2 minutes to the committee in opposition. I understand there are other amendments which are not at the desk.

Mr. KEATING. I have an amendment which is not at the desk.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, these amendments are considered to be of some importance. I hope the Members offering the amendments will have time in which to support them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Further under my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman, I think the provision should be included that the author of the amendment be allowed at least 3 minutes, and the committee 2 minutes in opposition; that the others be allowed to speak as the balance of the time may permit.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman amend his request to make it an hour and a quarter? There are many Members who would like to speak on the hospital program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would make it possible for the committee to complete its deliberations by approximately 5:30.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to be clear about the proposal made by the gentleman from South Dakota as to whether he anticipates other Members who have asked for time may speak to a specific amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To the extent that the Chair can identify them and recognize them.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 5:30, and that on each amendment 6 minutes be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVINS: On page 17, line 24, strike out "$3,450,000" and insert "$3,739,000."

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the Subcommittee on Appropriations has had a most difficult job and in the main has done an excellent work. However, I feel that if in our study of the hearings we find a situation which needs correction that such correction should be made. The attention of the committee and the Members of the House should be called to the drastic reduction made in the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission.

The amendment which the Clerk has just read relates to the Federal Trade Commission and provides for increasing the budget for that agency by $289,000—making a total budget for the FTC for the fiscal 1950 of $3,739,000—the amount the Bureau of the Budget and the President recommended. The committee has reduced the budget request while stating that there was an increase. The report is not entirely accurate or true because the committee failed to take into consideration that a deficiency appropriation in the amount of $173,000 was provided by the Congress for FTC during the last session of Congress—this was necessary then and there may be necessity again for additional funds if this appropriation is not provided.

What does this amendment do? It restores to the Commission the amount of funds which will be necessary to continue the employment of from 80 to 90 stenographers, secretaries, and low-paid Government employees. The committee report indicates they had not cut any funds for monopolistic work of the Commission—this is true in one sense of the word. But why have competent lawyers waiting for stenographers to be called from a pool? The failure to provide the necessary clerical hire and administrative help, I think, is false economy. We are in fact impeding the monopolistic work of the Commission if sufficient secretarial help is not provided. I do not think the committee or the Congress desires to do that. To my mind that is like providing a salary for a Member of Congress but not providing for the necessary office assistance. It is like providing for the fire chief but cutting out the fire wagon. It is false economy, it is being penny-wise and pound-foolish, to reduce the number of low-paid secretarial workers which is so vitally needed by this important agency. I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress has no desire to curtail the important anti-monopoly work of the Commission.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a couple of statements of the Hoover Commission on the work of the Commission. The task force division of the Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission states that the Commission throughout its life has been hampered by inadequate funds. The great agency was created during the Wilson administration and since that time, at various periods, there have been those who would like to cut down on the monopolistic work of this agency.

Mr. Chairman, instead of being penny-wise and pound-foolish, I think the appropriation for the FTC should be increased not only by the amount of my amendment but to the extent of one or two million dollars additional so that we may have a vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws.

On page 128, as regards the Economic Division of the Commission, the Hoover Commission reports that the economic work of the Commission should be greatly expanded if the Commission is to approximate its proper role in the maintenance of free competition in this country.

These are but a few of the many splendid statements that have been made as to the workings of the Commission and of its importance in maintaining fair competition in our country. The FTC is one of the two primary agencies created by the Congress for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. It is an independent, bipartisan Commission—an arm of the Congress and that reports annually

to the Congress. Its work is concerned with the promotion of fair competition and the protection of the members of the consuming public as well as the prevention of unfair methods of competition and unfair acts and practices in commerce and the suppression of the growth of monopoly. The Commission is charged with the enforcement of certain acts of the Clayton Antitrust Act, sections of the Sherman Antitrust law, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Wool Products Labeling Act, the Wheeler-Lea Drug and Cosmetic Act, the Webb-Pomerine Export Trade law—in all some 12 or 15 statutes enacted by the Congress—the enforcement of which is the responsibility and function of the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, we appropriate funds for foreign aid and assistance and funds for national defense but yet we seemingly like to take a cut at agencies of the Government that are doing good work in the interest of free and fair competition, and I certainly deplore the action of the committee in failing to provide the funds requested by the Commission and the Bureau of the Budget and the President in this instance. I sincerely trust that the amendment which I have proposed may be adopted and that the committee will restore the modest authorization requested. Let us not cut off these 80 or 90 stenographers, secretaries and low-paid Government employees, thus jeopardizing the vital and important work of this agency of the Government. I hope the amendment offered may be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain telegrams, statements, and excerpts, permission for which was granted me in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. It only asks the House to restore what the President and the Bureau of the Budget recommended. As the bill reads, this is a devastating blow to one of the most important agencies of our Government. It must be restored if we want to enforce the antitrust laws. The House has expressed itself a number of times in favor of the antitrust laws, and this is striking right at the heart of it, and we must not permit this to happen. Of all times when we need strict, rigid, and vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws, it is now, when a few large concerns are getting control of our country. We do not want that to happen. We must restore this appropriation. It is vital, and we cannot say that we are for antitrust enforcement and then not provide them with the money to enforce the law.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would like to make one observation—that the percentage cut in this particular Division was 45 percent, whereas in other similar divisions the percentage cut was 10 to 15. This is too drastic.

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely too drastic.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. STEFAN. The committee, in making appropriations for the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice, increased their appropriation $100,000 over what the President recommended.

Mr. PATMAN. Why not give this agency as much as the President recommended?

Mr. STEFAN. We gave them $100,000 more than the President recommended.

Mr. PATMAN. This is just as important. You are striking at the heart of an agency here that is just as important as the Department of Justice. We must have it function properly. We cannot see this agency destroyed; and while you are willing to increase the funds for the Department of Justice $100,000, you should not decrease this agency.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following telegrams and excerpts as a part of my remarks:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 14, 1949.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

CIO strongly opposes $289,000 reduction in Federal Trade Commission appropriation recommended by committee and urges full amount of $3,450,000 recommended by Budget Bureau be approved. Economy at the expense of this antitrust agency will cost the people many times what the Government will save. We need more enforcement of antitrust laws, not less.

NATHAN COWAN, *Legislative Director.*

Recommendation that the United States Congress shall be urged to grant adequate appropriations to the antitrust division of the Department of Justice, and to the Federal Trade Commission to the end that monopoly which threatens the welfare of our country shall be exposed and so that violators of the antitrust laws shall be prosecuted.

Adopted, April 13, 1949, by the Economic Action Conference, in which representatives of organized farmers, organized wage earners, and cooperatives of all kinds participated. Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 13, 1949.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of the National Farmers Union, I urge you to use your influence and prestige to bring about restoration of reductions made in appropriations for Federal Trade Commission. When the bill for independent offices is considered by the House of Representatives these appropriation cuts in view of the present great wave of antitrust law violations are more unjustified than ever before in our history. By cutting administrative funds of the FTC by $289,000, the House Appropriation Committee is virtually wiping out the clerical staff which handles most of the Commission's work. The Eightieth Republican Congress reduced the staff from 700 to 681 and this further reduction will seriously handicap enforcement of our antitrust laws.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1949.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Small Business Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Small business of this Nation was promised by both political parties during the recent presidential campaign all-out aid to protect small business through a vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws. In view of the definite commitments pledging adherence to party planks by the presidential nominees small business believed at last what they hoped and prayed for, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, would actually be put in operation.

Although the reduced appropriations recommended by the House Appropriations Committee may appear minor in the over-all recommended appropriations, nevertheless this reduced appropriation, in our opinion, can be a disastrous blow for the Commission to carry on its necessary and needed activities to protect small business of this Nation.

In view of this the federation, in behalf of its Nation-wide membership, and having the largest individual membership of any business organization in this Nation, vigorously opposes the reduction recommended by the House Appropriations Committee and requests that Congress restore the amount to the Commission.

I am attaching herewith a copy of a press release made on yesterday's date, and a copy of a day-letter telegram to various Members of Congress. An unexpected call came to me from the Mutual Broadcasting System to speak on this subject last night from Station WOL, Washington, D. C. Apparently the actions of the Appropriations Committee must be of importance due to the interest expressed by the raido press.

I trust that you will read this into the record, with the attachments, in support of your efforts to have the cut restored to the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President in Charge, Washington Office.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C.

Vital activities of the Federal Trade Commission would be drastically curtailed and a premium put on waste and inefficiency unless cuts authorized by the House Appropriations Committee in its independent offices appropriation bill for 1950 are restored, it was charged today by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Small Business. (Specifically, the committee has cut the figure for the Federal Trade Commission by $289,000 which will mean a reduction of about 60 positions, largely stenographers, typists and research workers who prepare accounting material used in antimonopoly cases.)

"In the face of growing monopolistic practices and restraints, there is a desperate need for action to preserve a free economy," Mr. Burger stated, "yet in spite of this we are treated to the tragic spectacle of the Appropriations Committee, instead of greatly increasing—as it should—the funds for this vital antimonopoly agency, actually reducing them below their present, pitifully inadequate levels."

Mr. Burger emphasized that the Appropriations Committee had focused its cut in such a way as to "penalize efficient operations in Government and to put a premium upon waste and inefficiency." The FTC, he said, is one of a few Government agencies which puts all of its stenographers and typists in a secretarial pool, thus keeping them all busy. Yet, instead of being commended for this

efficiency, the commission is severely penalized.

The committee's admonition that "no part of the reduction recommended has been applied to antimonopoly work of the commission" is misleading and inaccurate," Mr. Burger declared. Without secretaries and typists, he asked, how can cease and desist orders, stipulations, findings of fact, and other vital factors in assembling antimonopoly cases be compiled?

"It is difficult indeed to conceive of a more effective method of completely sabotaging and crippling an antimonopoly program than to eliminate the funds required for necessary stenographic and typing help," Mr. Burger said.

The Appropriations Committee suggests a curtailment of the FTC's Bureau of Industrial Economics, saying that, while it is performing valuable service, it can be reduced without seriously interfering with its essential work. In reply to this Mr. Burger pointed out that this division prepares all of the accounting material used in antimonopoly cases, particularly on Robinson-Patman cases, prepares figures on corporate profits and the commissions' economic reports on concentration, monopoly, and small business.

"Which of these functions does the Appropriations Committee wish to curtail?" asks Mr. Burger. "Apparently it does not wish to cut the accounting and economic work on antimonopoly cases, since it has recommended that antimonopoly work should not be curtailed. This leaves the reports on corporate profits and economic concentration and monopoly. Does the committee seriously believe that the Government should be deprived of its official figures on corporate profits? Does it believe that the work of the FTC in keeping Congress and the public informed of the growth of economic concentration and monopoly should be discontinued?"

The only real answer to these questions, and the solution, Mr. Burger concluded, is for the full House of Representatives to restore to the FTC the $289,000 cut made to insure continuance of the commission's work.

Mr. Burger characterized the Appropriations Committee action as "peanut politics" coming at a time when "all must" is being put on in the ECA program and for general armament of Atlantic Pact countries. He also stated that the Federation is not interested in charity but makes the demand for the restoration of the cut as a matter of self-interest for the welfare of small business of this Nation. A similar argument, he stated, was used yesterday in the House of Representatives in urging approval of the full amount of appropriations for the European recovery program.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 13, 1949.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Hon. FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, Hon. LEONARD HALL, Hon. CLARENCE G. BURTON, Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL, Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK.

House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The House majority leader yesterday in urging full requested appropriations for ERP stated quote it is self-interest—not charity unquote. The same argument can be used in urging full complete requested appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission. Although the reduced amount reported by the Appropriations Committee for the commission may appear minor, it is in our opinion a major cut which will reduce needed and necessary employment in the Federal Trade Commission. So that we may have continued all-out help of the commission to protect free enterprise and small business of this Nation, we are not asking for charity but urging your support that the cut be restored solely in the quote, self-interest unquote of our Nation's welfare. May we look for your support on this when the subject matter comes up in the House?

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President in Charge, Washington Office, National Federation of Small Business.

APRIL 14, 1949.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to any action which will reduce capacity of Federal Trade Commission and Justice Department to prosecute monopolies. We urge restoration of appropriation for Federal Trade Commission work in this field to amount recommended by budget.

ROGER FLEMING,
Director of Washington Office, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

What is this Congress trying to do? Is it trying to give the green go light to monopoly while it gives the red stop light to small business and competition? The committee proposal to cut 80 positions more or less from the Federal Trade Commission below the Eightieth Congress and 140 below the prewar level seems to me a sheer abdication to monopoly and to the questionable forces constantly operating in Washington to throttle competition. The effectiveness of the Federal Trade Commission work on behalf of small business and competition can be killed off by cutting its staff. This is how the monopolists operate when they cannot repeal the antitrust laws by a frontal attack. I believe that, when the labor union people of this country hear about this move by the House Appropriations Committee they will ask every Congressman why both parties are talking in favor of small business and in favor of competition and actually voting the way private monopoly wants them to vote. I believe this move challenges the good faith of all believers in free competitive enterprise in America. I ask you to exert all your efforts to defeat this move and to make the Federal Trade Commission an effective tool for preserving a free-enterprise system.

A. F. WHITNEY, *President,*
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a bill today, carrying out the message of yesterday of the President of the United States calling for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration in the Pacific Northwest.

Most of the people of my State want this law passed.

They want it passed because they are convinced that private enterprise in their State will vastly benefit from a more orderly development of the resources in the Columbia River.

They want it passed because they know its passage is necessary for the proper conservation of important natural resources.

They would stand ready to do this job themselves without Federal help were it not for the fact that they know that the Columbia River has an importance to the Nation far beyond any local consideration. They would do it themselves were it not for the fact that the Columbia River system does not recognize State boundaries and that the needs of their neighboring States must be met as well as their own needs.

The generators at Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington cannot be made fully efficient without water which flows into the Columbia from the States of Idaho and Montana.

Some of the more important dam sites on the Columbia River are at spots where the river forms the boundary between Oregon and Washington. The State of Washington cannot develop these sites alone. The State of Oregon must be taken into consideration.

The evidence is overwhelming that if this river is to be adequately developed, it is a Federal job. The people of my State know this.

People in the State of Washington do not believe that the Federal responsibilities for such development are now organized in such a way as to do this job effectively.

Therefore they want this bill enacted into law.

A good beginning was made in Federal development of the Columbia in the years between 1933 and 1942 when Bonneville and Grand Coulee dams were built—but it was only a beginning. Then came the war, and that great beginning offered the Nation much in the way of armament through its Federal river development. Because of the contingencies brought on by the war, people in the Northwest were content to see certain phases of the program slowed down. After the war, they expected that their Government would make some effort to make up for lost time and keep the development rolling with adequate authorizations for new multipurpose projects.

In the years immediately following the war, the people were disappointed. Federal development was slow, and this slowdown, coupled with the delays which were inevitable results of the war, have placed the people of the Northwest region in an intolerable economic position. There is a power shortage on the banks of the greatest power stream in America. Last summer the Columbia Valley suffered a $100,000,000 loss in property losses due to floods.

The lack of a sound, well-coordinated development program, plus the lack of an adequate fiscal policy supporting that program, are the two causes for this failure.

This bill, if enacted, will solve these two problems.

This bill will insure the development of a long-range, well-balanced program for the river development. It will provide a sound financial basis for implementing this development under the control of Congress.

It will not enlarge the purview of present Federal responsibility. Much will be left to be accomplished by the State and local governments.

The people of my State recognize that, if this bill is passed, they will have heavy responsibilities of their own to meet. They have shown they recognize this by the passage of laws establishing local agencies to implement and support the Federal program at the State level.

The Federal responsibilities to which this bill is limited are responsibilities for investment which is, to a remarkable degree, reimbursable, with interest.

These responsibilities include reclamation development under existing laws which establish standards of feasibility for all projects. They include navigation and flood control developments with adequate statutory support of western water laws.

Finally, these responsibilities recognize fully adequate control of program and expenditure by the legislative area as well as the rights of the people of the region to a voice in the policies of the enterprise.

In view of these facts, the bill represents a minimum program which the Federal Government should undertake.

I urge that the Congress take expeditious action on this legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, the President has sent a special message to the Congress recommending the reorganization of certain major Federal agencies in the Pacific Northwest into a Columbia Valley Administration. I am introducing a CVA bill to accord with the President's recommendation.

The new CVA bill is the product of extended and careful study; it represents the joint efforts of many good minds. Persons long interested in CVA legislation have contributed valuable advice and suggestions. The earlier CVA bill which I sponsored in the Senate of the Seventy-ninth Congress has been carefully reworked in the light of recent experience.

I urge the members to examine the CVA bill in detail, for it will lay to rest many ghosts of criticism conjured up by a few groups or persons unfriendly to such legislation. The CVA which this bill proposes will not create a superstate; it is not a vehicle for socialism; it will not preempt activities appropriately carried on by private enterprise; it will not impair States' rights as conceived and judicially interpreted under our constitutional system; it will not prejudice the policy-making powers of Congress with respect to the matters under its administration; it will not disrupt progress in operations presently authorized or under way.

It is necessary to emphasize so strongly what the CVA will not do, because a fabulous array of misinformation has been built up, inspired largely by die-hard opponents of CVA. Intelligent criticism and honest debate are always helpful. No single legislative charter can settle all problems for all times. Persons who have doubts or reservations, or who seek further information, on particular aspects of the proposed CVA have a right to raise pertinent questions and seek answers. But the die-hard opponents of CVA are not interested in the merits of the case; they ply their trade of professional opposition with epithets and slogans which do violence to the truth.

What the CVA bill sets forth basically is a new and better way of doing things that already are being done by the Federal Government in the region of the Columbia. The impelling logic of the CVA bill is the reorganization of major Federal activities in the region to achieve unity of purpose, economy, and efficiency in operation.

The CVA is the administrative means for realizing the principle of unified river basin development. Modern technology and economy have demonstrated the validity of this principle. The evolution of Federal activities in resources development through the years has been in this direction. Activities originally directed toward single and separate objectives, such as flood control or land reclamation, have broadened out and merged, with resulting confusion in traditional administrative responsibilities. Federal agencies have just grown, sometimes overlapping and duplicative in effort, sometimes working at cross purposes. Thus we have the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation both building huge multipurpose dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries. Both agencies, recognizing the logic of unified river basin development, have prepared voluminous reports on the Columbia Basin. These reports differ in many ways, and even if they are reconciled by subsequent adjustment, neither agency has the requisite jurisdiction to do all things necessary to accomplish the desired objective.

A CVA is necessary because the requirements of modern technology applied to the facts of nature have outrun the administrative arrangements presently existing for resource development. By creating a CVA we will be simply putting our administrative house for this region in order, bringing it up to date, and providing an effective method for unified river basin development.

The Hoover Commission has documented the case for unified administration of river basin resources. And although there are some differences of opinion among the commissioners as to the most effective form of reorganization in this field, three commissioners have eloquently stated the problem and its solution in these words:

> Man's proverbial managerial genius is conspicuously lacking when one contrasts the splintered administrative machinery of resources development with the unity of the problem imposed by nature. Unlike some other Government activity, where the results of ill-conceived administration are difficult to measure, this violation of nature's unity of waters and soils is only too apparent.
>
> We are trying to administer natural resources, which demand unified treatment as a physical unity where they are located, through traditionally centralized administrative agencies. The seat of decision and integration is too far removed from the natural subject matter dealt with, and from the State, local, and private persons directly concerned with the programs involved.
>
> One cannot break up nature's unity in the region and then successfully recreate this unity through coordination in Washington. Yet that is precisely what we try to do.
>
> We can work in accordance with natural laws—yet we persist in working against them.
>
> Each part of this multiple-purpose development of a region's resources is, despite the unity imposed by nature, now administratively allocated to several separate agencies. No single agency has the responsibility, as has the Tennessee Valley Authority, for studying the natural endowments of a particular region, working out a plan for their best development, and acting as the directing and synthesizing force which is required. The Authority has demonstrated that the responsible agency need not do all the work itself. Indeed, it should not. But by centering responsibility in one agency for one drainage basin area it was possible for the Tennessee Valley Authority to stimulate effectively the auxiliary efforts of other Federal agencies.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Tennessee Valley Authority Act wisely recognized that responsibility for over-all multiple-purpose resources development in a river basin must be centered in one agency, if an effective job is to be done. Federal responsibilities should not, of course, encroach upon the established water rights of individuals, municipalities, and States. Rather, it should make it easier for such individuals or agencies to cooperate with the Federal Government.
>
> All our regions, other than the Tennessee Valley, are witnessing bickering and conflicts between Federal agencies. Public funds are being wasted to stake out or protect claims of separate agencies and interest groups. Resources are being dissipated or are not being utilized to bolster the well-being of the region and of the Nation.

The CVA, as the President has so well explained in his message, will enable the work of regional development to go forward in a sound, efficient and orderly way. It will bring a new and dynamic direction to this work. Primary administrative decisions will be made in the field, close to the people, not in some remote central offices in Washington, D. C. The energies and initiative of the people in the region will be utilized to the full. Cooperating with local groups, public and private, and carrying out the Federal responsibilities in the most effective way, the CVA will build wisely for the future.

In summary, the bill for the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration provides for the reorganization and consolidation into a single agency of certain key functions now exercised by Federal agencies in the Columbia Basin area. The bill does not give the Federal Government any new authority beyond the functions now being exercised by Federal agencies in the region.

Under the terms of the bill, the CVA will absorb all the activities of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Pacific Northwest, with the exception of channel and harbor improvement work now being carried on by the Corps of Engineers in tidal waters.

The CVA, in cooperation with other public and private groups, would also be charged with preparing definite programs for soil and and forest conserva-

tion, mineral exploration and development, commercial and sports fish and wildlife protection, pollution control, and recreation in the region. After approval by the President and the Congress, these programs would guide the other Federal agencies in the region in carrying out their activities.

The bill, comprising 19 sections, would establish the CVA as a Federal corporation headed by a board of three directors serving staggered 6-year terms.

It requires that two of the directors be selected from bona fide residents of the Northwest, and that the administration have its headquarters in the region.

It provides for the transfer of projects, contracts, property, and budgets of the Reclamation Bureau, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Corps of Engineers in the Columbia Valley to the new Administration with a minimum of delay after the directors are appointed, so that work on existing projects will be continued to speedy conclusion.

The bill contains strong home-rule provisions.

The measure makes it mandatory that the Columbia Valley Administration shall seek the advice, assistance, and participation of the people of the region and their State and local governments and organizations. The Administration will be required to establish advisory boards and councils representative of all interests within the Columbia Valley affected by the Administration's activities. These boards would be permitted to report directly to the President their findings on the board's operations through the medium of its annual reports.

The bill contains a clause protecting western water rights and applying existing reclamation laws. It states that no provision for works of irrigation in or under this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water, or any vested right acquired thereunder.

The proposed measure contains strong public-power provisions similar to those existing in the reclamation laws, the Bonneville Project Act, and the Tennessee Valley Act. Preference in the sale of power to public agencies and cooperatives and methods for the acquisition of utility systems for resale to such public bodies are included.

A section on financing and repayment provisions includes the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration fund consisting of amounts appropriated thereto by the Congress, amounts paid into the fund by the Administration, and any amounts transferred to the Administration by the absorbed agencies. This section of the bill permits the Treasury to make advances to the Administration from this fund to meet construction and operating costs in connection with revenue-producing activities.

A number of provisions in the bill are so-called safety clauses, which will protect the public interest. There are, for instance, specific restrictions upon the rights of condemnation which may be exercised by the CVA.

Under the provisions of the bill, the CVA would be prohibited from using any political tests or qualifications for employment or promotion, which must be made on the basis of merit and efficiency. CVA employees would be protected in their jobs in the same way as Federal civil-service employees in regard to tenure, injuries while on duty, and pension upon retirement.

A more detailed summary analysis of the bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION BILL

SECTION 1. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The proposed bill will reorganize and consolidate certain functions now performed by various Federal agencies in the Columbia Valley region, by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration "to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development in the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands."

Section 1 also provides that the act may be cited as the "Columbia Valley Administration Act."

SECTION 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2 declares the policy of the act to be to assist "in achieving the full and unified conservation, development and use of the * * * natural resources of the region, for the purpose of fostering and protecting commerce among the several States, strengthening the national defense, developing the lands and preserving the property of the United States, and promoting the general welfare."

Section 2 also describes the region affected by the act, namely that portion of the Columbia River, its tributaries and watershed, which is within the boundaries of the United States, and those portions of the States of Washington and Oregon (except the Klamath River and Goose Lake Basins) which are not within the Columbia River watershed. The region thus includes all of the State of Washington, most of Oregon and Idaho, western Montana and portions of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

In carrying out this policy:

The Federal activities in the region shall be effectively coordinated with related national policies.

The advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region and their public and private organizations must be sought and relied upon "to the fullest practicable extent."

The cooperation of the Canadians shall be sought so that the development and conservation of the natural resources of the region and adjacent areas in Canada may be integrated.

The doctrine of beneficial consumptive use of water is recognized and there are enumerated certain preferred purposes for which waters of the Columbia Valley region shall be used.

SECTION 3. CREATES COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION, VENUE AND REMOVAL OF SUITS

Section 3 establishes the Columbia Valley Administration as a Federal instrumentality, with its principal offices located at a convenient place in the Columbia Valley Region.

The Administration would be an inhabitant of any Federal judicial district, wholly or partly in the region, in which it carries on activities, for purposes of commencing suit for or against it. Proceedings against the Administration in any State court may be removed by the Administration to the district court of the United States for the district in which the proceeding is pending.

SECTION 4. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Management of the Administration is vested in a board of three full-time directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least two of the directors must be bona fide residents of the Columbia Valley region at the time of appointment, and each director is required to maintain his residence in the region. The Board must appoint a single chief executive officer.

Terms of office for directors are set at 6 years, with terms of initial directors so staggered that one term will expire each 2 years.

The section provides for vacancies in the Board, the salary of Board members, and prohibits a Board member from engaging in any other business or having a financial interest in any public utility company engaged in the power business.

The Board is required to submit an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, in December of each year.

SECTION 5. STATE AND LOCAL PARTICIPATION

The Administration is directed to seek the advice, assistance and participation of the people of the region and their State and local governments and organizations, public and private, to the fullest practicable extent, in carrying out the purposes of the act. The Administration must make arrangements for consultation and interchange of views with appropriate representative of State and local governments and agriculture (including irrigation and reclamation), labor and business interests, as well as the general public, relating to all phases of its activities, and must establish such advisory boards and councils (including as a minimum boards or councils concerned with irrigation and reclamation, power, fishery resources, and navigation) as may be necessary or appropriate to achieve the objectives stated in this section. Any comments which such boards and councils submit for the purpose must be included in the annual reports of the Administration.

SECTION 6. GENERAL POWER AND DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

This section sets forth the general powers of the corporation, including the housekeeping powers, e. g., the right of the Administration to sue and be sued in its own name.

Subject to the policies, conditions, and limitations stated in the act, the Administration is authorized to construct and operate projects and carry out activities necessary for the promotion of navigation (except for channel and harbor improvement work in tidal waters tributary to the Pacific Ocean), for the control and prevention of floods, for the conservation and reclamation of lands and land resources, for the development and conservation of forests, mineral, and fish and wildlife resources, and for the generation, transmission and disposition of electric energy at wholesale. In connection with any of the foregoing, the Administration may also provide for the development and conservation of the recreational resources and the promotion of sanitation and pollution control.

In the location, design, and construction of any facility the Administration must endeavor to foster, protect, and facilitate the access of all anadromous fish to and from their spawning areas throughout the Columbia Valley region.

To the extent found necessary in carrying out these responsibilities, but subject to certain explicit conditions and limitations, the Administration is authorized to appoint personnel, acquire and dispose of property, conduct studies and research, and carry on other necessary activities.

With respect to the acquisition of property the Administration is given the same right

of condemnation now exercised by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, but the Administration is further limited by a provision that it cannot condemn any water right unless it is appurtenant to land acquired incident to the construction of dams, reservoirs, or other facilities.

The Administration is directed to carry out its construction work by contract so far as practicable, but may undertake construction work directly under certain limited conditions.

The Administration is authorized, and may be required by the President, to conduct any of its activities through or in cooperation with other Federal agencies. It also is authorized to conduct its activities through or in cooperation with States and local governmental agencies, educational, and scientific institutions, or other bodies or agencies, public or private. It also is authorized to use its funds in connection with such joint and cooperative arrangements.

SECTION 7. COORDINATION OF FEDERAL PLANS AND PROGRAMS FOR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT, REGIONAL BUDGET

The Administration is made responsible for preparing multiple-purpose and unified plans and programs for the conservation, development and use of the natural resources of the region. These plans and programs would be prepared for the use of the President and the Congress in guiding and controlling the nature, extent and sequence of Federal activities in the Columbia Valley region and in coordinating such activities with related national policies and programs.

In preparing such plans and programs, the Administration is required to consider existing surveys and plans and to obtain the advice and assistance of appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, educational institutions, and private organizations and persons.

Such plans and programs shall cover irrigation, navigation, flood control, electric power, commercial and sport fish and wildlife protection, soil and forest and range conservation, mineral exploration and development, pollution control, and recreation. The plans must set forth the major projects and activities recommended and the method by which such projects and activities would be undertaken, including arrangements for joint and cooperative action by the Administration, other Federal agencies, and State, local and other agencies. The plans and programs must also include evidence that each major project or activity is economically sound and in the public interest.

The Administration is directed to prepare, in cooperation with other Federal agencies concerned, and submit annually to the President in connection with its budget program, a statement of the anticipated program for the conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the region by the Administration and other Federal agencies concerned with those activities.

SECTION 8. TRANSFER OF PROJECTS, PROPERTY, AND FUNCTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATION

This section provides for the transfer to the Administration of the properties, projects, and functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, and, except for channel and harbor improvement work in tidal waters tributary to the Pacific Ocean, of the civil works projects and activities of the Corps of Engineers within the Columbia Valley region. No other transfers of properties, projects, and functions are made by the act.

SECTION 9. DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY

The Administration is authorized to dispose of surplus electric energy, at wholesale, under policies established by existing Federal legislation, such as the Bonneville Project Act, under which the Bonneville Power Administration operates. These policies include the construction of necessary transmission facilities, the encouragement of the widest possible use of available electric energy at the lowest possible rates to consumers, particularly domestic and rural consumers, and the granting of preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives in the disposition of electric energy.

The section sets forth minimum requirements for rate schedules. To aid in the disposition of the surplus power of the Administration and to give effect to the preference accorded to public and cooperative agencies in the purchase of such power, the Administration is authorized to acquire, although not by condemnation, electric utility systems, and is directed to dispose of any distribution facilities so acquired, to public bodies and cooperatives, as rapidly as possible.

SECTION 10. RECLAMATION PROVISIONS

The Administration is authorized to construct and operate projects for the reclamation of lands in the region. Such work will be carried out generally in accordance with the policies prescribed in the Federal reclamation laws, such as the limitation of acreage of irrigable land, and the periods and manner of repayment by water users organizations.

Existing water rights will be protected and future water rights will be acquired in accordance with the provisions of State law in the same manner as these rights are protected and provided for in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 under which the Bureau of Reclamation has been operating for more than 45 years.

In connection with reclamation projects the Administration may acquire and improve lands for disposition to persons desiring to settle thereon, preference being given to veterans. Lands may not be acquired by condemnation for this purpose.

SECTION 11. ALLOCATIONS AND ACCOUNTS

The Administration is required to allocate the costs of constructing and acquiring and the costs of operating and maintaining all facilities under its management and control among the various purposes served by such facilities. Costs of water-control projects may be allocated among only certain specified purposes.

The allocations of construction costs and the periods and rates of depreciation and of amortization of repayment obligations, which the Administration determines, must be approved by the President before they are effective.

A statement of the allocation of construction costs, and depreciation and amortization schedules, must be submitted to the President for transmission to the Congress within 5 years from the date of enactment of the act. Thereafter a similar statement for additional facilities is to be filed annually.

The Administration must at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account. Accounts with respect to generation, transmission and disposition of electric energy are to be kept in the manner provided by section 303 of the Federal Power Act.

SECTION 12. FINANCING AND REPAYMENT PROVISIONS

The Government Corporation Control Act is made applicable to the Administration and its transactions and operations shall be subject to the controls provided in that act.

In addition, the Administration may not initiate construction of any major water control or electric generating project or major transmission line into a new service area or undertake any new major type of activity authorized by the act unless the project or activity has been approved by the Congress in the Administration's budget program. Once the initiation of construction is so authorized, however, arrangements are contemplated whereby the Administration will have contract authority to assure completion of such projects in accordance with the most economical construction schedules.

There is established in the Treasury a Columbia Valley Administration fund consisting of amounts appropriated thereto by the Congress, amounts paid into the fund by the Administration and any amounts transferred to the Administration under section 8. In general, advances from the fund may be made to the Administration to meet construction and operating costs in connection with revenue-producing activities.

Costs of projects and activities for which advances are not authorized (generally, non-revenue-producing operations) may be met by appropriations following the inclusion of estimates in the Administration's annual budget program.

Advances from the fund to pay costs allocated to predominantly revenue-producing purposes, such as power, irrigation, and municipal water supply must be fully repaid to the fund, together with interest on all such advances with the exception of those used to pay costs allocated to irrigation. The interest rate is to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. Existing policies relating to repayment of Federal investment in power and water facilities are adopted on a region-wide basis.

Receipts derived from revenue-producing activities may be used for the payment of the costs insured in connection with such activities. However, receipts in excess of those necessary for the Administration's working capital requirements must be paid into the Columbia Valley Administration fund.

SECTION 13. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Administration is directed to make payments in lieu of State and local property taxes to States and local taxing units pursuant to the formulae established by this section. In general, the payments are designed to make the State or local taxing unit whole for any loss of tax revenues resulting from the Administration's acquisition of property. Additional payments may be made to State or local governments to help defray the expense of any special requirements for State and local government services arising from the Administration's activities.

SECTION 14. PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

This section provides for purchases and contracts for supplies or services, except for personal services on a competitive bidding basis, with certain minor exceptions, consistent with general Federal policy.

SECTION 15. PERSONNEL PROVISIONS

This section provides for personnel matters including compensation for employees suffering injury, social security benefits for employees not covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act, and unemployment compensation benefits, to the extent permitted by State laws, for a portion of the administration's employees, chiefly laborers, mechanics, and workmen engaged in construction work or operation and maintenance of the administration's properties and facilities.

Construction contractors must pay prevailing rates of wages in accordance with the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act, applicable generally to Government construction contracts.

The administration is prohibited from using political tests or qualifications for employment or promotion; and employees will have the same protection in their jobs as Federal civil service employees. Provision is also made for collective bargaining agreements with the administration's employees.

SECTION 16. INDIAN LANDS

The general authority of the administration extends to Indian lands to the same extent as to other lands. However, special

provision is made to fulfill the Government's obligations as trustee for any Indians where Indian lands are affected by the administration's activities.

SECTIONS 17, 18, 19

These sections cover repealer and savings provisions, separability, and the construction of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I hope every member of the Committee has a copy of the committee report in front of him.

Now, let us not kid ourselves about this. If you are going to save money, you have got to start saving money somewhere.

The bill before you gives the Federal Trade Commission more money than it had last year. On page 45 of the committee report you will find that last year they had $3,448,000. This year we are proposing to give them $3,450,000 which is a bit more than they had last year, even though we do lop off $289,000 of the requested increase.

Take the report and turn to page 12. There you will find this language:

No part of the reduction recommended by the committee has been applied to the antimonopoly work of the Commission.

If the Commission will apply the cuts where the committee says to make those cuts, they will have all the money that the budget recommended for this antimonopoly work.

Let me read further:

The reduction of $289,000 is applied in substantial part to employees of the Bureau of Administration which is greatly overstaffed in relation to the operating personnel of the Commission. Figures presented to the committee show that the divisions making up the Bureau of Administration have a total of 187 employees and that the entire Commission pay roll totals 681.

Think of it. There have been 187 employees out of 681 devoted to housekeeping operations.

No other agency asked to have that many housekeeping employees for such a small total pay roll.

If the Commission will follow the committee report and apply this reduction to cutting down on its housekeeping activities, it will have all of its money for the antimonopoly work.

We also suggest that they cut some in the Bureau of Industrial Economics, but the antimonopoly work is fully provided for.

If we are going to do anything on economy, if we mean anything at all in our words about stopping the growth of bureaucracy, let us stand fast once in a while when the committee, while giving an agency more money than it had last year, still tries to cut down on some of the superfluous administrative employees. If you are going to reduce anywhere, you have to reduce somewhere. Here is a place to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I think from the speech just made by the gentleman from South Dakota one might get the impression that under this proposal by the committee a lot of people would be cut out of jobs who are just standing around doing nothing. As I understand the proposed cut, its most drastic effect would be to curtail the activities of the stenographic pool, which is included in the group of people who are mentioned in the report the gentleman from South Dakota has just read. In other words, if we are to follow the Appropriation Committee's recommendation, while they tell us they have not taken out any money that would be used for antitrust work, actually what we would have is a group of high-paid professionals around who would have no stenographic service at their disposal. This would be very short-sighted economy, in which we would have lawyers and economists, who are being paid well by the Government, who are highly trained for their work, but who could not get any work accomplished because there would be no stenographers ready to do their job when needed.

That seems to me a very short-sighted policy. In effect, we would be handicapping the work of the Antitrust Division.

I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee on bringing in this amendment. I think it is desirable. I think we need it very much, indeed. I hope that the committee will see fit to restore these funds which the Committee on Appropriations has stricken, and that we will, in other words, maintain the Federal Trade Commission's efficiency in the fine work it has always done in protecting small business in the United States. Certainly we need all the protection we can get against the ever growing threat of monopoly.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am pleased to yield to my good friend the able and distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I understood the gentleman from South Dakota to say the committee is giving this agency more money than it got last year. I think we ought to make the point that of this money, $222,500 is accounted for by salary increases granted by the Congress last year.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, which is well taken and to the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO].

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for offering this amendment to restore the $289,000 to this agency. I believe, like the other gentlemen who have spoken here, that if this money is not restored to this agency their function will be impaired to the degree where small businesses will not be able to get the help we are talking about giving them. From day to day we see big business gobble up small business, drive small business to the wall, where they are ruined. They need some help from us who sit here making the laws for this great country of ours.

I heartily support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, that this money be restored to this agency so that we can give the little merchants, who are the backbone of this country, every assistance we possibly can, so that big business will not gobble them up and drive them out of business. I ask that you support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me summarize, if I may, just what this is all about. In the first place, the Federal Trade Commission has received perhaps one of the smallest cuts of any agency in this entire bill. It will figure out just about 7 percent. This agency has seven different functions. The big function is antimonopoly. Someone said we were crippling them and cutting them down. As a matter of fact, we have directed and asked the Commission not to curtail one job from the number authorized. How many have been authorized for antimonopoly work in 1949? Two hundred and ninety-two. How many for 1950 did we cut out? Instead of the number being 292, we have increased that number by 4 positions, which makes a total of 296 jobs. Yet they say we are trying to cripple antimonopoly work, while we are actually increasing it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact, though, that you are depriving them of the necessary clerical and stenographic assistance?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Not a bit in the world, I will say to my distinguished colleague from Texas. They have six-hundred-and-eighty-and-some-odd employees, and 187 of them are devoting their time to housekeeping activities.

Do you know of any type of personnel in the Government that we have more of than economists and statisticians? Every Government agency of any magnitude has economists and statisticians, and the taxpayers of this country are sick and tired of a lot of statisticians and economists and fact-finders burdening business. There are 51 engaged in this work, which is twice too many. We have directed that some of the cut come out of those 51 economists. We also have directed that some of the cut come out of housekeeping facilities. We directed that not a singl. cut come out of the antimonopoly work, which is really the backbone of this agency's entire operations. Of course, the Wool Labeling Act had 64 employees last year and the year before last and the year before that. Certainly the employees engaged in the administration of that act, which has been in effect for 10 years, should have become more efficient and can render better service because of the experience they have gained over that period. We have not hurt this agency in the slightest.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman may be correct in figuring that the percentage

cut over all was 7 percent, but the percentage cut on this particular Division was 45 percent.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Which Division does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. EVINS. The Economic Division and the Administrative Division.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I beg my friend's pardon. We did not direct how much of a cut should be taken from those Divisions. We just directed that some of the cut be made there, and we directed that not one man be taken from antimonopoly work.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EVINS) there were—ayes 23, noes 71.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: On page 8, line 20, insert the following:

"WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission; $600,000, to be derived from the war-claims fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948)."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, when the Japanese landed at Leyte Gulf in 1941 and moved forward into Manila, they captured there some six or seven thousand American citizens and placed them in internment camps in the Philippines. They drove our troops onto the Bataan Peninsula and eventually captured those who remained, and then occurred the famous death march of Bataan. The Japanese then proceeded to Guam, to Wake Island, and there they captured workers who were employed there by contractors for the Navy, and took them to Japan. All of those prisoners were citizens of the United States, taken on soil under the American flag. They were brutally mistreated, they were starved, beaten, kicked, and many of them killed, some of them beheaded.

We of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brought you a bill last year which is now known as Public Law 896 of the Eightieth Congress. The bill was cosponsored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] as it was a combination of our three bills that covered into the United States Treasury all of the assets of Germans and Japanese in the possession of the United States, and set them up in a war-claims fund. We provided for certain payments to be made by the Federal Security Agency out of that war-claims fund and we provided the setting up of this War Claims Commission. That Commission cannot be set up until the first appropriation has been made. That appropriation has not been made by this House. It was inserted in the first deficiency bill in the other body, and that first appropriation will probably be agreed to, we hope, by the House when the conference committee report comes to the House.

Now we have fiscal year 1950 to consider, and still no appropriation is carried for this War Claims Commission in the 1950 fiscal year.

I have proposed an amount in the pending amendment which was proposed by the representative of the Bureau of the Budget when he came before the Committee on Appropriations, in the amount of $600,000. That is not tax money of the people of the United States. That is money that we had in our possession—in the possession of the Alien Property Custodian—and the total is composed of German and Japanese assets in our possession in the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has 6 minutes. If he will yield me some of his time, I will be glad to yield.

I hope the Committee will do something about this. The members of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce tried to do it, because large numbers of these people are literally on public charity in the United States today. We have taken care of the Filipinos and the Europeans, if you please, but we have not done a thing for our own American citizens who were captured and suffered torture and starvation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from California to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Your amendment covers 1950, $600,000, as I understand it.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I am authorized by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to state, and also authorized by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], that if the gentleman saw fit to withdraw his amendment at this time, the deficiency committee would take up in due course, when they were considering the final deficiency, the item for administrative expense or other expenses necessary for 1950.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has said they will take it up. Does that mean that they will bring in a deficiency for 1950 as has been advocated by the Bureau of the Budget, or that they will take it up?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I cannot tell the gentleman what they will do. They told me they would consider it, and I am sure they will, in good faith.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure they will, in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has again expired.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. Mr. Chairman, in view of the lack of time, which has been fixed, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to transfer my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to state that it was my understanding of the colloquy between the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee that the situation here is that this Commission to get started does need some funds in 1949, and that some funds to permit its getting started in fiscal 1949 are proposed in a deficiency bill pending in the other body. Obviously, unless the Commission is started in 1949, it does not need funds for 1950.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But if agreement is reached on that, if the Commission is granted some funds to get started, then an opening will be made in the deficiency bill for funds for 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the Hinshaw amendment. It is disgraceful that this Commission has not been activated, and that Congress has not heretofore appropriated the necessary moneys for it to function. In the much maligned Eightieth Congress one of the first bills that was considered in 1948 was the measure to set up the War Claims Commission. The House of Representatives passed this bill on January 26, 1948, and passed it unanimously. It is, therefore, clear that the deplorable delay which had attended the examination and payment of these claims was not then the fault of the House.

The bill was caught in the legislative jam, which sometimes occurs at the other end of the Capitol, but nevertheless it was finally passed, and was approved by the President on July 3, 1948. By this time the Congress had adjourned, and the question of appropriations was necessarily deferred to the opening of the Eighty-first Congress.

However, we have now been in session 3½ months and still there is no action. On January 24, 1949, the White House forwarded supplemental estimates of appropriations and included therein was an appropriation to at least get started the War Claims Commission.

Notwithstanding the fact that this legislation is very nearly a year old, and that it has the unanimous approval of the Congress, and that the President has asked that it be implemented by an appropriation, the Appropriations Committee apparently has not yet acted. The

House has considered and passed the first deficiency appropriation bill, but no provision was made therein.

On April 8, 1949, when the House was considering the second deficiency appropriation bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], who handled this original legislation in the Republican Eightieth Congress, offered an amendment in the precise terms which had been recommended by the President, and urged that it be adopted without any further delay. To my astonishment, the appropriation was opposed by the committee leadership on the rather flimsy ground that the committee was now considering it, and that it will get further consideration in due course, and because of this opposition the amendment was defeated.

Now the due course which was referred to certainly must have been the appropriation bill for independent offices which is now before the House, and which still does not include an appropriation for the War Claims Commission. The bill appropriates about $7,000,000,000, and among the many items that are in it are appropriations for Indian claims, and appropriations for Filipino claims, but again, as is so often the case, our own citizens are ignored.

Mr. Chairman, I had the recent pleasure of being a guest at the national convention of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corrigidor which was held in Atlantic City. Among the glorious pages of American history this hopeless and gallant defense of the Philippines will always stand out. I talked to men there who, as a result of imprisonment at the hands of the Japanese, came back to this country as complete physical wrecks. It was not extraordinary for healthy, mature men to return to this country weighing 95 pounds. They were beaten, tortured, and starved, and the overwhelming number of them did not come back at all. I talked to the national commander of this organization, Mr. Simme Pickman, of Boston. I talked to Gen. Clifford Bluemel of my own State of New Jersey. I talked to the rank and file of the organization. This group in particular is worthy of our help to the fullest extent. God knows they are not asking very much. If we ever get around to setting up this Claims Commission it can allow them a dollar a day for the time spent in brutal incarceration. What will be more often the case, it can allow the widows and orphans such compensation.

How we can delay a moment longer this long-overdue act of justice to these heroic soldiers is more than I can understand.

Their stubborn bravery in the face of insurmountable odds was one of the most inspiring events of the war, and did much to encourage America in its blackest hour. There is no excuse for deferring longer the immediate recognition of their modest claims.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted at once, and if it should not be, that we can rely on its inclusion in the third deficiency appropriation bill, to be considered very soon.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to use 1 minute of the time allotted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the point I wished to make in answer to the gentleman from California, my distinguished colleague, was that there is no reason whatever to think that the money will not be appropriated, as every action of Congress on that line has been unanimous in both Houses, and there has been no resistance in either the regular committee or the Deficiency Committee to the matter, but we should handle it in some orderly fashion by getting an estimate of appropriation from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will yield to me to reply, I will say that the deficiency estimate was on the desk of the Committee on Appropriations in January, and the Committee on Appropriations did nothing about it in January. It is contained in House Document 44, dated January 25. The first deficiency bill came out on the 14th of February. If I am going to have that kind of assurance, it is not worth much; but I think the assurance we are getting today is considerably better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with what the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has said. Our committee worked a long time to bring out a bill that authorized the setting up of the War Claims Commission.

It is interesting to note what is happening. I have in my possession a report from the Justice Department showing that $10,000,000 has already been given back to people, many of whom are not citizens of the United States, people who are obtaining property from the alien-property fund today. There are some interesting facts about alien property. I want to repeat what I have said on the floor a number of times previously: At the beginning of World War I we took over much alien property. Within a very short time many of those people who were regarded as enemy aliens got that property back. At the beginning of World War II we took possession of approximately $400,000,000 worth of enemy property. People—noncitizens again—are getting back this alien property now. While we are waiting, soldier boys who have been promised a dollar a day because they were impropertly fed are waiting for this Congress to act. President Truman asked that we pass the legislation last July, requested that the Congress give adequate money during the special session that was called soon after July. I say that anything short of a commitment to make this money available is certainly not keeping faith with our own soldiers and civilians who suffered at the hands of the enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get recognized so that I could yield my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I just want to say that we see eye to eye on this proposition, but we were getting a little bit worried because we thought action should be taken by the committee on the first deficiency in this House. It was not. It has been left up to the Senate to do something about this deficiency in 1949 and I am very happy to hear the chairman of this subcommittee give us the word of the chairman of the full committee that something will be done when they get some kind of an estimate for the fiscal year 1950, because the only ones who are being taken care of are religious organizations, civilian internees during the war, and prisoners of war of the Japanese, most all of them in the Pacific.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, under these assurances I believe that we probably will get this Commission organized and going pretty soon.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California:

Page 63, line 23, after the word "intermittent", strike out "employee of the agency concerned" and insert in lieu thereof "positions which can be financed under the funds available to the agency concerned."

Page 64, line 8, strike out the period and insert ": *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section any employee engaged in personnel work who is on extended sick leave of 30 days or more shall not be included in determining the ratio."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it includes legislation and imposes additional duties. It is affirmative legislation in defining what employees might be considered eligible.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

This is merely an extension of the language in the bill limiting the number of employees that may be employed for personnel work to 1 to 125. What I seek to do is to clarify the situation that makes the present application of this restriction that is written in the bill unworkable. It in no way changes that which is in the bill. It merely takes cognizance of the practical application of the proposed legislation in the bill now limiting personnel workers to 1 to 125.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The language of the amendment, in the judgment of the Chair, is entirely

proper. It is a restatement of the language contained in the bill. The point or order is therefore overruled.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment. The present amendment goes to title I of the bill, the general provisions. The same general provision appears in title II of the bill on other pages. It is exactly the same proposition repeated and I ask unanimous consent to consider both amendments at once in the interest of economy of time.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think there is any disagreement between the gentleman from California and the committee. I may say it was the intention of the committee to cover the point involved as pointed out by the gentleman from California. In other words, if you have a man on extended sick leave, this amendment will not affect him. There is no difference in the gentleman's viewpoint and that of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the same language be considered in connection with section 202 on page 74, starting with line 6. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we object at this time. We understand there is no difference of opinion between the gentleman from California and the committee and we hope he will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Just for the sake of the record, I would like to say that I appreciate what the committee is trying to do. I subscribe to it wholeheartedly. The rigid language in the bill sets up an unworkable condition that would be costly to the Government, particularly in those agencies that employ seasonal labor. They would not be able to employ the whole number of their personnel people until after they had gotten their full number of employees. The same is true where there is fluctuation in employment; it would require daily reports to determine the varying number of personnel people authorized, and then again, as was pointed out, the confusion with respect to sick leave.

With the assurance of the chairman of the subcommittee that it is understood that it is not the intention to have this provision rigidly enforced so that it does reflect and destroy the very thing that the committee is trying to do—increase efficiency in this field—I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 45, line 14, strike out the figure "$9,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$4,500,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I wish that all the Members of the House could read, as I have, the examination of the head of Selective Service as it was conducted by our distinguished and genial friend the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. THOMAS]. His unusual talents were never put to better use. I am sure that in reading that, no one would reach any conclusion other than that we should give Selective Service for next year a considerably less sum of money than is provided in this measure; $9,000,000 is, to state it conservatively, twice what they need.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Would it not be a very good idea to save a big block of money right here?

Mr. KEATING. Well, it certainly seems so to me, may I say to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. TABER. Instead of paying people for doing nothing.

Mr. KEATING. Exactly. Last year they were given $16,700,000 at the time when we had the draft in operation, and for next year, when there is to be no draft, when the Army and the Air Force and the Navy and all say there will be no draft, they are given over half as much as they had last year.

One might ask why is the figure $4,500,000 used? I think, if anything, it errs on the side of generosity. If the Members will just look at page 463 of the hearings, they would find this question by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. He said:

In other words, you are seeking as many employees in the headquarters office for 1950 as you had in 1949, and about 25 or 30 more than you had in 1948.

Now, it must in all fairness be said that, by reducing the figure almost in half, naturally the Director would have to cut down on his employees. But, this is certainly one agency, if there ever was one, which is overstaffed, and where the Congress can do a job of cutting far beyond the figure that has been presented here.

It is true, it may be necessary to hold together a skeleton organization. There is not a man sitting here that wants to interfere with the defense or the security of our country, but certainly a skeleton organization is all that is needed, and a skeleton organization can be kept with a figure of $4,500,000.

On page 465 of the hearings there is a reference, and this would be amusing if we were not dealing with the money that comes out of the pockets of our people. This relates to travel for the representatives of Selective Service. The Chairman of the subcommittee goes into it at some length and he ends up by saying that, "It goes on and on until you finally make up a total of $50,000 in travel." And, I am quoting the words of the chairman of the subcommittee. He must have had his tongue very deep in his cheek when he recommended $9,000,000 for this item.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the speech of the gentleman from New York is by far the best one I have listened to today. I and the rest of the members of the subcommittee regret that we did not have the honor, the pleasure, and the privilege of having our distinguished friend from New York serve on the subcommittee with us, because all the other speeches so far today have been to boost the committee's figures, and here is one that was most refreshing because it was to lower the committee's figures.

This is the situation, Mr. Chairman. This agency wanted $16,700,000, and we cut them to $9,000,000. That is a whale of a cut. Remember, there are 3,022 draft boards in the country to be staffed. The draft is still in effect. The law requires that headquarters must be established and maintained in each State. Since the draft is still in effect, the boys must register upon coming of age. It would be a terrible thing if we were not to supply enough money to keep these draft boards open. We may have to close a few, but I hope not too many. Instead of having a full-time employee plus a part-time employee in many of these offices, we cut out the full-time employee and left the part-time employee. I think it would be a dangerous thing to cut much more. I think we might make a mistake here if we go any lower than we have gone, because we have given them a pretty good cut. I agree with my distinguished friend from New York that we did point out to the gentleman of the Selective Service that perhaps they were overstaffed in the District of Columbia. Perhaps we did point out to them that they had too much travel money. But bear in mind that we have these 3,022 local draft boards, and we must give them at least a part-time employee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I call the gentleman's recollection back to his questioning about the matter of registration, and his bringing out the fact that there are 3,022 draft boards in the country and that on an average there would be about 30 people a month that would have to register? The gentleman at that time said to General Hershey that comparatively speaking, that is a pretty light work load.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I am afraid I cannot argue too strongly with my distinguished friend from New York. All I am asking you to do is not to tear it up completely. Whatever the House thinks, we are not going to fall out with you about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is important that the registration be maintained, because the law requires the boys to register when they become of age. However, it does occur to me that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York should be adopted it would not be too hard to live with the situation. This matter will be reviewed

in the other body. Also, if the Selective Service System finds itself handicapped at the end of the year, we will be in session again in January and a supplemental appropriation might be asked for. So I would join with the gentleman in admitting that the testimony and the logic are with the gentleman from New York, and if his amendment should prevail it would not be too disastrous.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The gentleman from New York should have been on our committee to start with, so we will adopt his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 82, noes 9.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question in regard to the atomic-energy appropriation this year. I notice there is a reduction of about $38,000,000 in the Budget Bureau's request and the President's request for this agency. In general the program which we had in mind, and we have been studying this operation in the committee ever since last October, was that roughly 64 percent of the recommended budget by the department be for production of weapons. Twenty-six percent was for research and development, and about 6 percent was for biological research and medicine, and 4 percent for operation. I would like to be assured that this reduction in no way affects the program of the production of weapons.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we will go one step further and say to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that we requested the Commission not to touch their weapons money nor their reactor money. Let me point out to you that those two programs involve about $400,000,000. About 60 percent of that $400,000,000 is for new construction. We should have cut that 15 percent, because the cost of construction is going down. But we did not. So it means that we are increasing those two items by 15 percent, instead of cutting them.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman of course is referring to the authorization of construction?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. That program, as the gentleman well knows, is one that should never be cut.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am not referring to the authorization. I am referring to the funds in this bill.

Mr. DURHAM. That is, the funds to be appropriated? Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. DURHAM. I am glad to be assured of that, I congratulate the gentleman.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1950

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the Atomic Energy Commission's budget for fiscal year 1950. I might say, at this point, that it is not my intention, nor is it possible from a security standpoint, to reveal any classified information. I will, however, dwell briefly upon the major programs encompassed in the fiscal year 1950 budget as indicated in the AEC's unclassified summary budget.

The Atomic Energy Commission budget as recommended by the President is a request for a cash appropriation of $740,200,000 and contract authorization in the amount of $427,000,000—a total of $1,167,200,000. Stating this total another way, it represents requested obligational authority for fiscal year 1950 of $792,000,000 plus $375,000,000 cash money to liquidate obligations incurred under previously granted contract authority.

Although it is a separate fiscal matter, I would mention also in passing that the President has transmitted a request for a fiscal year 1949 supplemental appropriation for the AEC of $110,000,000. The reason given is that expenditures against obligations incurred under prior year contract authority are proceeding at a rate in excess of that estimated when the original fiscal year 1949 budget was prepared.

The Atomic Energy Commission, which was established by the McMahon Act, is a unique governmental agency in many ways. It has the difficult responsibility of, on the one hand, contributing significantly to the country's national defense, and on the other hand, advancing the United States position in science and human welfare through the development of atomic energy for peacetime applications. This great natural phenomena, only slightly understood at the present, has tremendous possibilities of serving mankind beneficially. For these two general purposes, the work of the Atomic Energy Commission must go forward on all fronts with as much drive and energy as may be recruited. It would seem, in view of its possible rewards to mankind in general, that expenditures in this field should be as great as possible, but such expenditures should be wisely managed and fully accounted for.

In general, the fiscal year 1950 budget has been proportioned into roughly 64 percent or $509,000,000 for the production of source and fissionable material and weapons; 26 percent, or $208,300,000 for research and development—reactor development, physical, medical, and biological research; 6 percent, or $45,400,000, to operate the communities which support the production and research program, and 4 percent, or $29,200,000, for the supporting administrative services.

The Atomic Energy Commission has set for itself five major programs, each of which is under a division director who is responsible to the general manager. These programs have been arrived at after careful consideration of each as a separate entity and also as a completely integrated whole. They represent the best-considered opinions of the Commission as to how its several responsibilities under the act may best be discharged.

1. SOURCE AND FISSIONABLE MATERIAL PROGRAM

This program includes all of the activities concerned with the exploration for acquisition, transportation, and storage of raw materials such as uranium ore. From these raw materials, the program provides for the processing and manufacture of feed materials for the two production plants. Next, the program provides for the production of finished fissionable materials for use in weapons, for reactor fuel, and for experimental needs. Included also is such research and development, and plant construction and operations as may be required to carry out this program.

To carry out the program for source and fissionable material program it is planned to obligate during the fiscal year 1950 $73,000,000 for procurement and production, $13,000,000, for research and development, and $121,000,000 for the necessary plant and equipment. This total program is $75,500,000 more than during fiscal year 1949 and $36,100,000 more than fiscal year 1948.

2. WEAPONS PROGRAM

Included in this program are all activities concerned with the production of weapons, including their nonfissionable components and their associated field service equipment. Also included is the necessary research and development needed to support such production as well as the necessary plants and facilities.

For the weapons program it is proposed to obligate during fiscal year 1950 a total of $210,200,000. This is $19,000,000 more than was obligated during fiscal year 1949, and $63,400,000 more than during fiscal year 1948.

3. REACTOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

This new and independent program which is aimed at solving the many complicated and as yet unknown problems of building reactors for military power requirements as well as for the development of commercial power. It also contemplates the development of other new and improved reactors for research purposes.

During fiscal year 1950 the AEC proposes to obligate, in behalf of the reactor program, $5,500,000 for procurement and production of reactor materials; $40,600,000 for research and development, $74,100,000 for plant construction and equipment. This is roughly twice the money obligated during fiscal year 1949 and two and one-half times that obligated during fiscal year 1948. A major item in this program is the proposed reactor farm, tentatively planned to be built in the Pocatello, Idaho, area. During fiscal year 1950 it is planned to obligate $21,000,000 of the total preliminary estimated cost of $36,769,000 to prepare the site by grading, paving roads, installing utility lines, and so forth. This work is just the initial investment to develop the site. Additional sums to construct the actual reactors, their buildings, and associated equipment over the next 5 to 10 years may reach a total investment approximating $500,000,000.

4. PHYSICAL SCIENCES RESEARCH PROGRAM

This is the program which is designed to push back the frontiers of fundamental knowledge of the atom. Embracing activities in all the physical sciences it is hoped that such a program will increase the store of knowledge so largely expended in the early days of the war. To facilitate these studies there

is included provision for such facilities as may be needed.

In carrying out the physical-research program, the Atomic Energy Commission proposes to obligate $1,670,000 for the production of radioactive and stable isotopes. These are the telltale tracers which have contributed so much to research in fundamental processes, and which are made available free of charge or at a nominal sum to qualified researchers and institutions. This is about the same level of obligation as was reached during fiscal years 1949 and 1948. A sum of $35,000,000 will be obligated during fiscal year 1950 for research and development. Two-thirds or $20,800,000 of this is in the field of physics, the balance of $15,000,000 is for chemistry, metallurgy, mathematics and training, and university cooperation—the training program amounts to $1,584,000. Plant and equipment will amount to $19,000,000.

5. BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE PROGRAM

This program is designed to protect the health of those working with atomic energy and to investigate the manner in which radiation and the toxic effects of fissionable materials affect living tissue and organisms. Since the answer to the latter problem is necessary to set safe working standards the whole program is highly essential and must be prosecuted with great vigor. Included of course are the necessary facilities and materials for this work.

In support of the above five major programs are the necessary community and administrative service programs. These involve the construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance of towns and communities at Hanford, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and so forth, and the necessary administrative and supervisory functions performed by Atomic Energy Commission personnel.

To operate the communities at Hanford, Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, Sandia, and Grand Junction, Colo., will require the obligation of $45,300,000. This compares with $87,300,000 for fiscal year 1948, and $77,400,000 for fiscal year 1949. The steady reduction in costs of the municipal services might be attributed to progress made in bringing these communities up to date by replacing wartime, temporary houses and buildings with permanent-type structures whose maintenance is much more economical. Also the program to permanentize the utilities, sidewalks, and streets has been largely completed. Another factor which tends to reduce the costs of operating these communities is the increased income received from concessions, and in the future the recently announced policy of the AEC to adjust rental rates to those of surrounding communities.

For providing the necessary supervision and administrative services, the Commission proposes to obligate $29,212,000 over fiscal year 1950. This provides for approximately 4,950 man-years of supervisory and administrative personnel to guide the operations of some 73,000 contractor employees. Of the foregoing sums, $7,600,000 is for the Washington office; $2,300,000 for the New York office; $1,350,000 for the Chicago office; $8,900,000 for Oak Ridge; $6,600,000 for Los Alamos, and $2,440,000 for Hanford. Personnel strength for each of these offices is: Washington, 955; New York, 471; Chicago, 279; Oak Ridge, 1,606; Los Alamos, 1,211; and Hanford, 409.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone into what seems to be a considerably detailed discussion of this Atomic Energy Commission budget for fiscal year 1950, but as you can readily visualize, it is just a highlight survey. The members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have reviewed this budget and much supplemental information in the light of general program goals. The members have been assured by the Atomic Energy Commission that this budget permits the maximum effort which can be expended within the limitations of the qualified manpower available to it in the research and development field. It has been further stated that to meet the Presidential directive to produce fissionable materials and weapons, sufficient money, manpower, facilities, and materials have been programed.

I therefore earnestly recommend it for thoughtful consideration and favorable action by the Members of this House.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Texas: On page 62, line 24, after the word "Act", insert a period, strike out the remainder of line 24, line 25, and all of lines 1 and 2 on page 63.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, one of the difficult problems in dealing with readjustment benefits for veterans is the question of flight training. I congratulate the subcommittee on meeting this question by the careful wording used at page 57 of the bill. I approve the language used, which recognizes the special status of this training inasmuch as there are some defense aspects to it. These aspects flow from the training being useful in case of war and from the maintenance of training facilities such as airports, as well as from other things. Yet, the language protects against the funds being used for purely recreational purposes; and I think this protection is needed, as long as it is clear that other more greatly needed expenditures for defense and for other veterans' benefits—such as hospital beds—are not being adequately met for fiscal reasons. I congratulate the subcommittee again on its handling of this difficult problem of statutory wording.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, when the announcement came that the veterans' hospital construction program had been cut many of us were shocked. In my home city, which is in the heart of a veterans' center, a 200-bed general hospital had been authorized, the land purchased and paid for at a cost of approximately a quarter of a million dollars, plans had been completed and bids were about to be asked for the erection of the building.

Following the announcement the citizens of my district, and also of my State, rose as a body in protest. Later the Governor with our entire congressional delegation, representatives of all veterans' associations, and other leading citizens, appeared before the special Senate committee headed by Senator PEPPER, of Florida, in an effort to have the cut-back of veterans' hospitals rescinded. Thereafter, I have been in constant touch with members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations headed by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. And I am delighted that today we are afforded an opportunity to reaffirm our former acts by affirmatively expressing the desire of Congress to adequately provide for veterans who need hospitalization. I compliment the members of the subcommittee and I trust before the end of the day I may be permitted to compliment the entire House as the result of its action upon that portion of H. R. 4177 providing funds for the hospital program.

Two questions are involved in this controversy: First, is there a need for these additional veteran hospital beds? Second, can such additional hospitals be staffed? I propose to answer the two questions in the affirmative.

Mr. Chairman, this program involves the complete elimination of 24 projects and an alteration downward of 14 others. The facilities for a total of approximately 16,000 hospital beds will thus be eliminated, including 11,000 in the projects completely abandoned and 5,000 in the projects which are scheduled for reduction.

After a study of the available facts and data I am opposed to this cut-back. Neither the interests of the veterans nor the country as a whole will be served if this cancellation of the construction program is allowed to stand. In my own State of South Carolina there is at present only one veterans' hospital in operation. This hospital is located at Columbia and has a standard bed capacity of 606 beds. According to available figures there are 167,000 World War II veterans in the State and an additional 34,000 veterans from other wars, making a total of 201,000 veterans. With the standard bed capacity of this hospital being 606, that makes an average of 332 veterans for each bed. However, the hospital has made use of 94 emergency beds to expand the facilities to a total of 700 beds, 670 of which are currently in use, and the remaining 30 are being held in reserve for emergencies. Even with this use of emegency beds, there is still available an average of only 1 bed per 290 veterans. This figure shows that available facilities are only one-third those of 1945 and the ratio is even lower if the standard figure of 606 beds, which is the maximum available over a long pe-

riod of time, is used. This situation was to be remedied considerably by the expansion of the hospital at Columbia to a standard operating capacity of 800 beds, an increase of 194 over the present facilities. There was also to be constructed at Greenville a new 200-bed hospital. Both of these projects are among those to be eliminated. Even with the addition of these 394 beds the ratio of veterans to beds in South Carolina would remain at 200 to 1. The national figures, which are considered far too high for the safety of our veterans' health, are in the vicinity of 178 veterans for each bed. It is obvious from these figures that the average in South Carolina would still be above the present national average even with the addition of the 394 beds. That these beds are sorely needed is evidenced by the waiting lists. As of January 31, 1949, there was a total of 964 veterans who had been cleared for admission through the former branch office at Atlanta, Ga. This office was headquarters for South Carolina and for other Southern States, so the figures as to how many were waiting for admission to the hospital at Columbia are not available. Nevertheless, the number was substantial, probably running into the hundreds. Of these 964 veterans awaiting admission to hospitals, 370 were forced to wait up to 20 days, 191 waited from 21 to 40 days, and 403 were waiting over 40 days. These are appalling figures. Almost two-thirds of these veterans had to wait over 20 days, and almost one-half had to wait over 40 days. As alarming as these figures are, they still do not tell the whole story. Often only veterans with emergency nonservice connected afflictions are being admitted because of the bed shortage, and when the veterans or their representatives learn this fact, they do not even apply for admission. These facts are incontrovertible evidence that more veterans' hospitals are urgently needed in South Carolina.

In explaining the reduction of the hospital program the Veterans' Administration officials stated that, while more hospitals may be needed, there are not enough doctors to staff them. I am not prepared to discuss this aspect of the question as a whole for the country at large, but I am familiar with conditions in South Carolina. In Greenville the hospital under construction was to be of the general medical type. There does not appear to be a great shortage of general medical doctors in this area, at least not a sufficiently great shortage to warrant the cancellation of the project.

An additional reason to continue building the hospital at Greenville is to prevent a large sum of money from being wasted with no benefits accruing to anyone. A total of $303,000 has been spent on the project so far. All of this money will be lost if the project is not finished. I am not one who believes in throwing good money after bad, but that analogy will not hold in this instance. This hospital is badly needed, and it is needed now. We owe it to the veterans on the waiting lists to see that it is completed. Nothing that Veterans' Administration officials say can change the following facts: First, that although the number of veterans has jumped from 66,000 to 201,000, the number of authorized hospital beds is being maintained at 606; the fact that 94 more beds have been temporarily made available by the use of porches and corridors is no argument at all, since the standard figure is still 606. Second, that hundreds of veterans are awaiting admission and the average number of beds available in this area is far below the national average, which is itself too low. Third, that plans have been laid, hundred of thousands of dollars spent, and that facilities and personnel are available to run this hospital upon its completion. Any arguments against the completion of this hospital seem spurious if we are sincere in the belief that our veterans must be protected.

Now let us examine the national picture concerning this cut-back. I do not pretend to have as much knowledge about the national situation as about my home State. However, many of the general facts have been made available to me, and it is not difficult to draw conclusions.

It was the Veterans' Administration which originally recommended the construction of the hospital facilities which have now been ordered canceled. Before the cancellation, this recommendation had been approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States. The cancellation order affects construction in 18 States and the District of Columbia. While it is evident that certain sections of the country need additional hospitals more than others, available figures show that more hospitals are needed everywhere. On January 31 of this year there were 16,188 veterans who had had their applications approved and were awaiting hospitalization. The number who did not apply because of the long waiting lists is naturally not known, but such number is undoubtedly huge. From a moral standpoint, this is a sad state of affairs, but from the practical viewpoint, it seems even more foolish. Failure to hospitalize veterans promptly will in many cases result in aggravation of injuries, not to mention the suffering, and these injuries may some day result in added claims against the Government. If this program of reduction is being promoted in the interest of economy, its authors had better think twice. In the long run it will cost the Government far more than the cost of completing the hospitals.

The national ratio of hospital beds per veteran is today 1 to 178. That figure is supposed to drop to 142 when the construction now under way is completed, but it would drop to 124 if the canceled projects are restored. In 1940, less than 10 years ago, the Federal Board of Hospitalization approved, and the President approved in principle, a construction program which would have made a ratio of 1 bed per 40 veterans available within 10 years. Any figure which is three times that amount seems high. Any figure more than three times as high seems entirely out of reason if the interests and the welfare of the veterans are to be protected.

As I previously stated, I am not entirely familiar with all of the special problems concerning the veterans' hospitals in other sections of the country, but every section has a problem of some type. In certain sections of the far West hospitals are so far apart as to be almost inaccessible. In my own section of the country there is such a scarcity of available beds that veterans in direst need must often wait long periods of time before being admitted. Just when a partial solution to these problems was in sight, the solution suddenly vanished. We must not allow this to happen. In spite of the argument advanced that doctors are not available to staff these proposed hospitals, several of the cities in question have submitted evidence that the medical talent is available.

In view of these facts and figures, I am of the firm opinion that the cancellation of the hospital program must not be allowed to stand. In the case of my own State a particular hardship will be visited upon the veterans, who have, and will continue to have, facilities so far below the national average that the situation is almost disgraceful. I sincerely believe that a restoration of the program for 16,000 additional beds is desirable and necessary for the veterans and that the whole country will be benefited by this program.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee for restoring the appropriation of $237,000,000 for hospital construction. I sat on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and heard General Bradley talk about this matter. He said that all the beds were necessary, 16,000 of them, so if they were necessary then, they should be necessary now. With reference to the 500-bed general medical hospital to be built in my city of Charlotte, I know that there will be no trouble in staffing the hospital. The medical society will see to that. We had some experience there about 2 years ago with a 500-bed civilian hospital, and we staffed the hospital in about 2 months.

The veterans and Nation should be grateful to the Committee for eliminating the proposed rescission of $237,000,000 of contractual authorization from the bill so that should the President decide that all or any part of the proposed hospital program which the budget had eliminated is necessary, the authorization to proceed with the work will be available.

The program when completed will mean a new day for the many veterans needing hospitalization and medical treatment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the request of numerous Members of the House, I want to interrogate the chairman in connection with the item on page 57 which has to do with flight training.

The gentleman will recall that I offered an amendment last year, which was adopted, which would continue

flight training. That amendment remains in the bill at this time. I have been receiving many complaints from trainees and GI's who have have been refused fight training under this act. We are told that over 12,000 who have made application for flight training have been refused that training. I would like to know what occurred in committee when you interrogated the Veteran's Administration in connection with the amendment that we have in this bill, whether or not flight training is continuing, whether or not it is true that these veterans who are applying for flight training are being refused that advantage.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. In the first place, as the House well knows, the language on page 57 in the form of a limitation, is more or less the amendment adopted by the House under the direction of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I might say that the committee has not changed the crossing of a single "t" or the dotting of an "i" as it was written last year. I might further say, if the gentleman is having some complaints from his own district, the committee will be glad to ask the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to look into the situation and see that this bill is enforced as the House wrote it.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thought perhaps I could shorten some of the discussion by calling attention to the fact that on February 28, a total of 46,686 had been approved, of which 19,044 had been approved for flight training, and only 2,053 had actually been refused. The difficulty found in the district represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] or the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] probably rests in the total of approximately 12,000 applications concerning which there has been some question, and the applicants have been advised to get further information regarding what they wanted to do. The attitude of the committee is that the Veterans' Bureau should deal with those matters as the subcommittee has directed. We have had word from representatives of schools where conditions are working out satisfactorily. I would supplement what our chairman has said by suggesting to the Members, if there is some specific case that they take that up individually with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. In connection with what the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has said, I want the record clear. When the question was asked of Mr. Stirling at page 361, part II of the hearings:

Does that indicate that the veterans are getting all the training they want?

Mr. Stirling replied:

Mr. Phillips, I think the chairman asked me yesterday if this new amendment to the appropriation bill last year was working, and I answered, "Yes, sir; it is."

As a matter of fact, I am informed that there are pending in the Boston region many cases classified as "deferred," and I am informed further by a letter of a gentleman who talked with the regional office that the Boston regional office has ruled that being an Air Force officer is not an authorized career for veterans. That is the source of my concern. I am glad to hear the committee say they do not agree with that sort of interpretation of this regulation.

I have with me the files on two recent cases. It seems to me most significant that in both cases the Veterans' Administration should write:

An elementary flight or private pilot course or a commercial pilot course elected by a veteran in an approved school shall not be considered avocational or recreational if the veteran submits to the regional office (1) complete justification that such a course is in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation.

Let me emphasize the requirement of "complete justification." Of course that regulation is the source of this difficulty. On August 3 and 4, 1948 the problem was carefully explored in hearings before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. At that hearing, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who were the coauthors of the amendment, expressed themselves most ably. There was a considerable account of the discussion on the floor when the amendment was adopted. Both General Gray and Mr. Stirling testified at some length. Other Members of this House added their testimony. While all of the testimony was most significant in terms of the clarification of Congressional intention, some of it is particularly significant.

I want to refer to certain portions. Mr. Stirling, at page 94 of the hearings, stated that he would assume responsibility for the language of the regulation and added:

Well, of course I have to concede, Congressman, there is nothing in the law that says anything about "complete justification."

Previously, at page 82, Mr. Stirling said:

I do not recognize at all that the purpose of Congress was to cut out flight training. I understand it was the purpose of Congress that if any boy wished to take flight training in connection with his business or contemplated business that he would receive it.

At page 98, Mr. Stirling testified:

Congressman TEAGUE, before you came in, that question was asked of me by Mr. Ross; he asked me whether I had read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before we prepared this instruction, and I said, "Yes." Then he came to the question whether I took into consideration the attitude of the Congress on the floor during the consideration of this bill, and I said I surely did; that I understood the intent of the Congress was to eliminate any course or any training where the veteran would be pursuing for purely avocational or recreational purposes, but that Congress did not intend to eliminate flight training as such, but wanted the veterans to have flight training whenever it was determined that the boy was taking it for purposes that were vocational, but if it were for avocational or recreational purposes that the Congress did not wish the veterans to receive such training under this bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] replied:

Mr. Stirling, I think that is as fair and square as anything on earth and I think if you could get that statement you have just made here over to the minds of the regional directors this week end, the whole thing would be cleared up.

Mr. Stirling then added:

That is what we propose to do.

Many Members stressed the apparent rigidity which would defeat the intention of Congress by emphasizing the requirement of complete justification. I urged upon General Gray the substitution of the adjective "satisfactory" and others suggested similar and more reasonable standards which would comply with the congressional intention as expressed in the amendment adopted.

I happen to know of one instance where a veteran had been able to pass the education and mechanical aptitude tests for entrance into the Air Force cadet program with especially high marks, and yet was unsuccessful in obtaining this flight training. He told me that he had submitted his reasons for intending and believing that he could secure employment in this field, but, because he recognized that unanticipated events could happen during his period of training, he was not willing to make more definite statements, because he did not feel he could do that truthfully. He assured me that he would make every effort to reach his objective, and I am confident from his record and endorsements by employees and former associates that he would have done that. Yet he was turned down.

I want to add just a further brief comment on the general situation as it has been reported to me. I have been advised that many of these veterans have been forced to submit incontrovertible evidence that their selection of aviation as a career is not a great big joke; and to prove that they are not fooling by submission of a letter from the individual or firm who guarantees to employ them immediately upon the completion of the training for which they apply. Any such requirement would be an obvious distortion not only of the amendment but even of the regulation drafted to carry out the purposes of the amendment. In this connection, I have been advised that the Air Force circulated some 300,000 copies of a 20-page booklet entitled "Opportunity on Wings." Accompanying these booklets were brochures, Form P–X–121–RPB, entitled "Here's Your Opportunity for a Real Career in Aviation." It was urged that veterans take advantage of their GI flight training, enroll as aviation cadets, and win their commissions as pilots in the United States Air Force. It is impossible for me to reconcile this sort of an appeal in the interests of our national defense with any ruling by any regional office that being an Air Force officer is not an authorized career for veterans. Yet I am advised that such a ruling was made in the Boston office on March 14. While I appreciate the suggestion that individual cases might be taken up with the Veterans' Administration and the fur-

ther suggestion that the committee would be glad to ask the Administrator to look into the situation and see that the bill is enforced as the House wrote it, I am also concerned about those cases which may not be brought to the attention of Members where real injustices may have been done because of the rigid interpretation of words in a regulation which itself seems to continue to violate the very purpose of the amendment adopted last year. I shall welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with members of the committee more fully. But I do feel the record should be established in terms of Mr. Stirling's apparent conviction that the amendment is working.

If he intended that reply to be a direct response to the question of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] as to whether the veterans were getting all the training they want, I think it is clear from what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has said as well as from the comments of both the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] that there are a very substantial number of cases which deserve immediate reconsideration on the part of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4177, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1950, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1579. An act to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1209) entitled "An act to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948."

ADJOURNMENT FROM APRIL 14 TO APRIL 25

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 56) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 14, 1949, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, April 25, 1949.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4147, the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said today about the order stopping the construction of veterans' hospitals. As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I expect to take up that proposition at an early date, investigate it, and see what can be done. As I understand it, you provide here the funds necessary to construct those hospitals.

I heard what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] said, and I heard the argument of the other gentlemen. If the present pension law stays as it is today, you are going to see these hospitals crowded with old veterans, because a great many of the hospitals are what we call soldiers' homes.

Two of these hospitals that were eliminated by the recent order were to be in my State, and one of them was at Tupelo, my home town. They have already purchased the ground and were ready to let the contract for its construction when somebody stopped the program.

That hospital should be built, because it is necessary to take care of the veterans in that part of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee.

They had another one scheduled for construction at Mound Bayou. You never hear any one on this floor saying anything for the Negroes in this country unless it is for political purposes; but you are hearing now one man who is not talking for political purposes. We had provided for the construction of this Negro veterans' hospital at Mound Bayou, Miss. There is not a white person living in Mound Bayou.

The land on which the town was built was given to those Negroes by the brother of Jefferson Davis, Joe Davis. They have their own doctors, they have their own policemen, they have their own officials, and there is one Negro doctor there who has a clinic which is getting along fairly well.

We have seen this experiment carried out at Tuskegee, Ala. I know what I am talking about. The Negroes in the hospital at Tuskegee, Ala., all get along better than they do where they have been crowded into white hospitals in either the Northern or the Southern States.

The building of this Negro hospital at Mound Bayou would be a great advantage to the Negroes of that section of the country. It would enable them to show what they can do for each other, and at the same time it would add greatly to the peaceful relations that now exist throughout that part of the country between the whites and the Negroes.

I am going to insist that these two hospitals be included, and that all the others be included wherever they are necessary to take care of the veterans' load.

I felt that I ought to make this statement today, since some of the Members have been asking why the Veterans' Committee have not acted. When this appropriation is passed, then the Veterans' Committee will be in position to take the proposition up and find out why these hospitals are not constructed immediately.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. KRUSE. Will the gentleman tell the members of the committee whether or not the Veterans' Affairs Committee has given consideration to the further use of existing facilities in the State of Indiana? We have Billings Hospital out there, in which the facilities are not being used to their full capacity.

Mr. RANKIN. We had that question up recently. All the facilities in that hospital ought to be made available.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if he or members of his committee have had an opportunity to read the report of the task force of the Hoover Commission in discussing the medical activities of the Federal Government?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I have not gone over it thoroughly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is well worth reading.

Mr. RANKIN. I have looked over it hurriedly, but not carefully. However, I will examine it carefully as soon as I can find the time to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to speak about the curtailment of the hospitals but to say that I believe the Budget put something over on the committee when it induced that committee not to allow the $48,000,000 which General Gray asked for in order to provide an additional medical personnel of from 15,000 to 16,000 which he needs not only for the hospitals that will be finished within a few months but in the hospitals that are now in existence. You can have all the buildings in the world, but if you do not have trained personnel you cannot take care of your patients. In the hiring and firing of people like nurses, doctors, and dentists you may lose fine people. You may not be able to hire the trained personnel back again. The civilian hospitals will get them, other people will get

them, and our veterans will not have the care they should have.

I desire to read some figures I secured from the Veterans' Administration showing what is being done. I am positive the Senate will put the $48,000,000 needed for hospital personnel in their bill, but I had hoped that the House would first.

In 1948 the Veterans' Administration spent for its 8,000 program, which is for medical, hospital, and domiciliary care, a total of $536,651,333. In 1949 the Veterans' Administration estimates that it will spend for the same program $560,245,200, while in 1950 the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee has recommended a total of $539,707,200 for the same purpose, which is in effect a cut. I think the budget was not frank in explaining to the Subcommittee on Appropriations what the Veterans' Administration really had in mind.

I would like to suggest to the members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that they try to insist that a doctor be placed upon the budget committee that considers veterans' appropriations.

In 1948 for the operation of hospitals alone, the Veterans' Administration spent $373,045,027. In 1949 the Veterans' Administration estimates that it will spend for this purpose $403,731,000, while it has been allowed in 1950 for this same purpose a total of $401,465,900, which proves to my mind that the budget is planning for a cut in hospital beds in 1950, because it does not give us as much as we had in 1949 for medical personnel.

I am informed that the Veterans' Administration will operate during 1949 an average of 113,177 beds. In 1950 the Veterans' Administration expects to add, by the completion of construction, 9,937 beds during the year to its system. It is expected to operate its present beds plus the new beds being added on a total personnel allowance of 110,356.

I am informed that on March 31, 1949, the Veterans' Administration had on duty or had committed for the operation of its medical program 117,030 personnel, or an excess of 6,674 over the number allowed in the 1950 budget.

If the budget recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is passed, the Veterans' Administration will be required to reduce the personnel now on duty for the operation of its medical program by this number not later than July 1, 1949, in order to be within the limits allowed by the budget, and there will be no provision for the operation of the additional beds which are scheduled to come in in 1950.

General Gray testified before the subcommittee on independent offices that 15,549 additional employees, at a total cost of $48,000,000, were necessary over and above the budget as reported out of the committee, in order to maintain the staff now on duty in hospitals and homes and properly staff the additional beds being added in 1950—see page 215. This additional amount would also permit the opening of beds now closed because of lack of personnel. It is my understanding that 3,484 beds are now unavailable for this reason.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the consideration of H. R. 4177, which includes the appropriation for the veterans' hospitals, I would like to take exception to a statement attributed to Dr. Magnuson, of the Veterans' Administration, which appeared in an Associated Press release appearing in the Daily American Republic, of Poplar Bluff, Mo., under date of Tuesday, April 12, 1949.

The press dispatch under a Washington date line, together with the comment of the editor of the Daily American Republic, reads as follows:

SO WE ARE ISOLATED—VA MEDIC FAVORS MOVING HOSPITAL—SAYS IT IS NOT GIVING SERVICE

WASHINGTON, April 12.—The chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration has told the House Appropriations Committee he should like to see veterans' hospitals moved from isolated locations.

Dr. P. B. Magnuson, the director, suggested that the Excelsior Springs, Mo., hospital be moved to Kansas City and the Poplar Bluff, Mo., hospital to Springfield, Mo.

He listed the Excelsior Springs and Poplar Bluff hospitals among 18 where the veterans are not getting the kind of service we want to give them.

Poplar Bluffians, stunned by the VA hospital official's assertion the city is isolated, marveled today at his deduction that the new hospital here is not giving the kind of service the VA wants to give veterans.

Some local citizens expressed the belief that when the hospital is finished and placed in use, it may be able to give better service than now—when it is only about two-thirds completed.

While I recognize that the recommendation of Dr. Magnuson as reported on page 179 of part 2 of the complete hearings before the subcommittee is not reflected in the official recommendation of the Veterans' Administration, I do take exception to the expression of the Chief Medical Director when he infers that "the veterans are not getting the kind of service we want to give them" at the new veterans' hospital which is now under construction at Poplar Bluff, Mo., and which will in all probability not be opened until the latter part of this year or early in 1950, and I further suggest that he appears to be misinformed when he suggests that Poplar Bluff provides an "isolated location" for a veterans' hospital which will serve an area with a total population of approximately 1,000,000 people.

At this time I would like to commend the committee for its action in providing the funds which will make possible the continuation of, although on a reduced scale, the program which is so urgently needed by the veterans of all wars. I would also like to commend and express my appreciation, as well as that of the thousands of veterans in southeast Missouri who will enjoy the benefits of this new hospital, to those who were responsible for and who had the vision to locate this hospital in southeast Missouri where its location will be more than justified throughout the next few years.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed and further that the clerks be granted permission to correct section numbers in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there are almost 3,500,000 unemployed in our land today. There were almost 2,000,000 unemployed last November. The number of unemployed has increased progressively since December of last year. It continues to increase. The trend is obvious. It is not my purpose today to discuss this rising tide of unemployment. I may do so

later. Today my purpose is quite different.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Federal agencies created for the relief or prevention of unemployment is the United States Employment Service. That agency is supported exclusively from funds appropriated by Congress—that means from the taxes that we impose upon all our people, not any special group of our people, but upon all our people. There is, therefore, a reasonable presumption that it should serve all our people. But valid as that presumption should be, sir, it is rebutted by the facts—by the manner in which this agency performs its functions, and by the conduct of its army of petty, domineering bureaucrats.

This agency of the Federal Government, intended to render the people a most vital economic service, teems with an inept and repulsive personnel, untrained, unqualified, unskilled, and unfit for the jobs for which they have been especially selected—public relations activities. They are so numerous that they sit about largely in idleness, antagonistically awaiting the opportunity to display openly and brazenly their unsympathetic and derisive disdain of any so unfortunate as to be forced by the fortuitousness of circumstances to have recourse to them. The more refined, the more cultured, the more gentle the applicant, the more derogatory, the more derisive is the treatment accorded her—or him—by these petty bureaucratic tyrants. These derisive bureaucrats, sir, themselves fattened by the taxes wrung from our people, delight in insolently demonstrating their power, which, though petty per se, is nonetheless as humiliating and degrading as though it emanated from a higher—though perhaps a more refined—authority.

Mr. Speaker, what I now relate is not hearsay. It is exemplified by the factual record of the treatment accorded by this malicious agency a few days ago to a very scholarly gentleman of no mean attainments. He is a veteran of the First World War. For a quarter century he was engaged in several of our leading universities in chairs of highest rank, inspiring the youth of this land with a profound faith in our American way of life. He was awarded, among other honors, the certificate of merit by Town Hall for his essay upon the influence of our American home. For many years he rendered loyal, faithful, and notable service to both branches of the Congress in the field of research—a service acknowledged in writing by more than 100 Members of this body, and by more than 50 Senators.

Yet when this gentleman sought the services of this iniquitous bureaucratic agency he was treated in a manner so degrading, so derisive, and so repulsive as to defy adequate description, for it is not possible to describe what the mind cannot conceive. He was shouted at, impudently and insolently. He was browbeaten. He was bullied. He was not permitted to sit in the presence of these offensive bureaucrats. When he attempted to do so one chair was pulled away from him, another was pulled from under him. And when he quietly protested this insolent and insulting treatment an armed guard was called in swaggeringly to threaten him with arrest for loitering.

Can you conceive of that kind of treatment in a public relations service of this Government sustained by public taxation? Yet it does exist! It exists within 1 mile of this Chamber.

How long, Mr. Speaker, how long, do you think our people can continue to tolerate this evil thing that has been pressed down upon us? How long do you think our people will continue to tolerate crucifixion by a mongrel mob of petty bureaucrats elevated during recent years to positions of domineering power and influence and authority? Our people will not tolerate it much longer. They will not permit to be done indirectly and clandestinely what cannot be done, what dare not be done, directly and openly. Our people will not permit to be done through infiltration and fiat that which cannot be accomplished either by law or through their personal consent. Our people will not much longer submit to uncivil and unrighteous practices.

Mr. Speaker, this malicious, degrading bureaucracy must be struck down. Its present incongruous, repulsive, unfit and insolent mongrel horde must be cast out. If and when revived it can be upon only one principle, namely, that it serve, rather than humiliate and deride the people.

May I not hope that you, my friends, who sit upon the other side of this aisle, and who watch with microscopic eye the appropriations that are requested to this House, will consider the withholding of your approval of funds for this iniquitous and arrogant bureaucracy. May I not suggest to you that here lies a great opportunity and the greatest justification for economy in cutting down our present teeming, largely idle, and malicious bureaucracy. We must destroy this monstrous evil.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I submit a privileged resolution (H. J. Res. 226) making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenue, receipts, and funds, such amounts as may be necessary to permit Government departments, agencies, and corporations for which appropriations or other funds would be made available by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (H. R. 2632), as passed by the House of Representatives on February 16, 1949, or as passed by the Senate on April 13, 1949, to carry out their functions, until the approval of said act, at the rate which would be provided for in appropriations, funds, or other authority granted by said act: *Provided*, That in any case where the amount which would be made available under said act as passed by the House of Representatives is different from the amount which would be made available under the act as passed by the Senate, the rate herein provided for shall be based on the lesser amount: *Provided further*, That expenditures hereunder shall be charged to the appropriate appropriation or fund contained in the aforesaid act (H. R. 2632) when it becomes law: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall be used for salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees have been in session on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the first deficiency appropriation bill and have not yet reached an agreement.

This joint resolution is submitted, therefore, in order to continue necessary Government facilities which will be affected by the delay in the enactment of the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely impossible to get an agreement on the first deficiency bill. Inasmuch as we are told that there are agencies that would be out of funds if this resolution were not passed, it probably is necessary and desirable that this resolution be passed. Frankly, I do not think any serious situation would be created if it laid over until an agreement could be arrived at, but anyway, this will clear it up and there can be no question but that these agencies can get the money they may need, if the resolution is passed by the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 188) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective April 1, 1949, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $1,260 each per annum for the employment of two additional laborers in the office of the Doorkeeper.

SEC. 2. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the stenographer in the office of the Doorkeeper shall be at the basic rate of $2,400 per annum.

SEC. 3. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the disbursing clerk shall be at the basic rate of $6,000 per annum.

SEC. 4. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the chief bill clerk shall be at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum.

SEC. 5. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the assistant tally clerk shall be at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum plus $500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

SEC. 6. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the assistant Journal clerks shall be at the basic rate of $3,600 and $3,000 per annum, respectively, and the compensation of the stenographer to the Journal clerk shall be at the basic rate of $2,000 per annum.

SEC. 7. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the locksmith and typewriter repairer shall be at the basic rate of $2,400 per annum.

SEC. 8. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the clerk to the Official Committee Reporters shall be at the basic rate of $4,000 per annum.

SEC. 9. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the Superintendent of the House Radio Press Gallery shall be at the basic rate of $4,200 per annum, the compensation of the Assistant Superintendent of the House Radio Press Gallery shall be at the basic rate of $2,700 per annum, and the compensation of the messenger in the House Radio Press Gallery shall be at the basic rate of $2,400 per annum.

SEC. 10. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the stationery clerk shall be at the basic rate of $3,600 per annum plus an additional amount of $400 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; the compensation of the assistant stationery clerk shall be at the basic rate of $2,400 per annum; the compensation of the bookkeeper and cashier, and of the bookkeeper and voucher clerk, shall be at the basic rate of $2,400 per annum; and the compensation of the messenger in the House stationery room shall be at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum.

SEC. 11. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the Superintendent of the folding room shall be at the basic rate of $3,600 per annum.

SEC. 12. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the first assistant property custodian shall be at the basic rate of $3,800 per annum.

SEC. 13. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the floor manager, telephones (majority) and the floor manager, telephones (minority) shall each be at the basic rate of $3,180 plus $1,320 per annum so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents.

SEC. 14. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the chief page (majority) and the chief page (minority) shall be at the basic rate of $3,000 per annum plus $800 per annum, each, so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents.

SEC. 15. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs shall be at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum.

SEC. 16. That, effective April 1, 1949, the compensation of the special employee, Office of the Doorkeeper, shall be at the basic rate of $4,300.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I notice one section in this privileged resolution, Mr. Speaker, provides for a very substantial increase for the disbursing clerk of this House. In view of his limited experience and the very short time this gentleman has held this job, I intend to vote against the resolution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In 3 days you have spent over $29,000,000,000. It seems to me we ought to rest over Easter until we get our breath, yet you are bringing in all these other bills. This is only going to wreck us. We are headed toward bankruptcy in a hurry, and we ought to wait a little while.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, are we being asked to pass this resolution or merely have it printed for information? Are we being asked to adopt this resolution?

The SPEAKER. This is a privileged resolution.

Mr. PHILLIPS or California. And grant these increases in salaries?

The SPEAKER. This will do it. These payments will be made out of the contingent fund of the House.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTING STATES IN COLLECTION OF SALES AND USE TAXES ON CIGARETTES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 190, Rept. No. 457), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 195) to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DECENNIAL CENSUS OF HOUSING

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 189, Rept. No. 456), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2203) to provide for a decennial census of housing. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Attorney General.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 191, Rept. No. 458), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 114, Rept. No. 455), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and in-

vestigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table prepared by him.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, together with an editorial from the North Pittsburgh Times; and in another instance, to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

AMERICAN BERRY-GROWING INDUSTRY

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to a critical situation which confronts one of the important industries of my State; namely, the berry-growing industry. The berry growers complain that they are being subjected to unfair and ruinous competition by importation of fresh berries from Canada. They most certainly have genuine cause for concern, and just reason to complain. Canadian labor costs are so much lower than those existing in our country that American berry growers will be forced out of business if they are compelled to meet Canadian prices.

Originally they had a measure of protection by way of a tariff in the amount of 1¼ cents per pound. This has been reduced through the reciprocal trade agreements to a mere one-half cent a pound during the entire growing season. This does not begin to offset the difference in labor costs.

If the imports of fresh Canadian berries were sold directly to the United States consumer, the effect upon domestic growers would not have been too serious. But last year great quantities were sold, not to the consumer, but to United States processors with the net result that carloads of American berries were not processed and still remain in storage in warehouses. Unless the Federal Government acts, the same thing will occur this year and our own berry growers will be on their way out of business. Remedial action must be taken soon to protect an important part of the agricultural output of the State of Washington. I call upon the State Department to act without delay before the next growing season begins.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some testimony offered before the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE BONNEVILLE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a report from the Bonneville Administration, certain tables, and also excerpts from the Interior Department hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bonneville Administration is rather important to my section of the country and when, on yesterday, the report of an investigation was placed in the body of the RECORD, I felt that it was only fair that the report of the Bonneville Administration and the remarks made by Dr. Paul Raver during the Interior Department hearings be included also. I have taken this time merely to present to the House the other side of this argument. I have no objection to an investigation into the Bonneville Administration, but I do want it to be done fairly and equally on both sides.

Mr. RAVER. The report begins with a hypothesis and builds up, from various scattered bits of material, a justification for the thesis. In other words, you start with a hypothesis that a man is out to destroy free, private enterprise and then you go through everything he has said and you build up quite a case for it, as an attorney or as an investigator is skilled in doing. I suppose you can build a justification for the thesis. All I want to say is I do not agree with the thesis, regardless of what kind of letters, newspaper reports, and statements he has picked out.

I cannot speak for the other people who are quoted there, but I can speak for myself. There is a great public interest in this fight for development, and, basically, there are times when the question is: Who is going to control this development, the private utility companies or the Government? And at periods when the utilities have moved in on an offensive to, as I saw it, liquidate the Government program that I was responsible for, I have taken a positive and active part in opposing that kind of a movement. And I think I have stopped some things, frankly, that were contrary to the basic public interest involved in the Government development of this kind.

I did it by notifying and talking to the public power leaders of that area who are the elected representatives of local districts and local communities and warned them of what was going on as I saw it. On many occasions, as a result of that, they have immediately gone into action on their own and stopped some movements that could well have resulted in completely throttling this great Government development in harnessing the Columbia River.

I have no apologies to make for that kind of action. A man in my position as administrator of a great Government program must feel certain responsibilities to the people of that area, sometimes outside of his responsibilities purely as an administrator. It is like standing out on the street when a house is on fire. You may not have any authority to break into that house and warn the people, but there are times when you do that. You do not wait until you have a law passed or have the fire department out or policeman there. You go in and do the thing which you see obviously is required.

Now, I am not a mouse or a shrinking violet in these matters. I feel some responsibilities, and when I see them I go into action on a basis of a purely public-interest problem. I may make mistakes on that, Mr. Congressman, but it is not with the idea of destroying any free, private enterprise; it is primarily with the idea of making it possible for this program to go ahead and not be stopped by a so-called free private enterprise group in that area which, I think, is not truly a free private enterprise group anyway; it is a monopoly group from the beginning. It has a place, but it needs to be recognized for what it is.

Mr. JENSEN. You do not contend that any private utilities have any monopoly with the competition they have from Bonneville Power Administration, do you?

Mr. RAVER. I can tell you what some of the situations were—where the house was on fire—that are described in the report of your investigator, where the objective was the development of one single private power monopoly in that region, which, when it was completed—if the steps had been completed—which I described in some of those letters, incidentally—would have resulted in one iron-clad private power monopoly in the Northwest. And the next step of that group was to take over the Government transmission system.

That is what I mean by meeting and recognizing what is going on and taking some action to stop them when I see them, which I have done on more than one occasion.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you believe it is criminal for people to get together and to join forces to throw their combined weight against any forces——

Mr. RAVER. Including against our Government?

Mr. JENSEN. That threaten to destroy them? Yes, including our Government.

Mr. RAVER. I think our Government is the agency that will make the decision as to what action it is going to take. I think our Government stated it very clearly in the Bonneville Act—that they wanted to prevent the monopolization of this resource, and that is what I am talking about. It is so clear in the act that anyone reading it can have no question about it.

They do not want the monopoly set up out there to control this resource. That is what the act says. That is why the Bonneville Act was created. The people who wrote that act had that thing in mind, I believe, and that is the reason they did not want bus-bar sales from Government dams.

Mr. JENSEN. Have you ever had any idea that the Congress of the United States, after we have appropriated all this money that we have for the Bonneville Power Administration and for the Columbia River Basin, amounting now to possibly $300,000,000—that the Congress would let any private monopoly, or so-called private monopoly of which you speak, disrupt and take over the Government operations in that area that this Congress and this committee has approved? I have been on this committee 6 years. I have sat here and agreed to at least half of that amount—at least $150,000,000 of the amount that we are spending in your area—and last year we appropriated more money than you ever had before for the development of that area. And when you say you are scared of a private monopoly which seeks to take you over, or take over the Bonneville Power Administration—everything, lock, stock, and barrel—it does not quite square with the actions of this Congress and this committee, Dr. Raver.

Mr. RAVER. I agree with that, Congressman.

Mr. JENSEN. Why make such a big fuss about it, then, and be so scared of private industry?

Mr. RAVER. Well, we had a number of bills in this last Congress addressed to that same

basic philosophy, which were all bus-bar sales, as you will recall. One of them applied to the Northwest.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it was a good bill and I hope we can keep it.

Mr. RAVER. That is enitrely up to the Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. I think, since this report is so controversial—this Lee report on the Bonneville Power Administration—and we have talked about it now in a little scattered detail, that, in fairness to everyone, it should be made a part of the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will object to it, and I object to it on this ground: I think we sent that report to one of the committees. We said it belonged under their jurisdiction.

Mr. JENSEN. Not this report.

Mr. KIRWAN. I object to it on this ground: The same man made a report that the TVA should never have been built.

Mr. FENTON. Do you not think we should do this after the hearings?

Mr. KIRWAN. He made a report that the TVA should never have been built. The following Sunday after I read his report, in the New York Times was an article stating that TVA was now a paying proposition and was one of the greatest things that was ever put in effect in the United States. Here was a man who not only missed the boat but missed the ocean.

Wendell Willkie, before he died, said he was 5 years late in apologizing; that the TVA was the greatest thing in the South. Now this man comes up here with this report.

REPORT BY MR. ROBERT E. LEE, INVESTIGATOR FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, ON FEDERAL POWER POLICY

1. Mr. Lee, under date of December 20, 1948, submitted a "Memorandum for the Chairman" re "Federal Power Policy Study" covering Federal power operations in the Tennessee Valley, the Southwest, the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere. Presumably this was a report to the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

2. The report purports to show, among other things, that the revenues of the Columbia River power system[1] should be doubled (from slightly more than $18,000,000 in fiscal year 1946, the year upon which the analysis was based) to roughly $36,500,000.

3. The investigator accomplished his result in the following principal ways:

(a) The study was based on fiscal year 1946, the system's low year as regards the amount of revenues. Revenues in 1948 were $24,500,000 and are estimated at $27,400,000 for 1949. In 1946, the first postwar year, revenues obviously slumped because a good deal of the power from the Columbia River power system was devoted to production of war materials through 1945. In addition, the investigator deleted certain cancellation charge revenues, inasmuch as they are nonrecurring, but such adjustment was not equitable inasmuch as the very purpose of the cancellation charges was, among other things, to furnish revenues during the postwar dip and recovery period, during which the large blocks of power that had been voted to war purposes would be remarketed.

(b) He made a number of "adjustments" to power costs as reported in the system's certified financial statements.

(c) He assessed nonpower costs at the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects against power operations.

(d) He made a number of "adjustments" to nonpower costs and then assessed such additional amounts against power operations.

(e) He added "payments in lieu of taxes" aggregating $8,865,000 for both power and nonpower operations.

4. The "adjustments" may be summarized as follows:

Summary of adjustments made by the investigator

Nonrecurring revenues deleted	$1,814,000
Nonrecurring costs deleted	(750,000)
Adjustments to power costs:	
Additional depreciation expense—to convert to straight line at the dams (see table A–1)	3,339,000
Additional amortization—to convert to straight line	5,073,000
Additional interest—to change from 2½ to 3 percent at Grand Coulee	352,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	6,597,000
Total	15,361,000
Nonpower costs transferred to power:	
Bonneville Dam operation and maintenance expenses for navigation[1]	232,000
Bonneville Dam depreciation expenses for navigation	123,000
Bonneville Dam interest expenses for navigation	651,000
Grand Coulee operation and maintenance expenses for irrigation[1]	([2])
Total	1,006,000
Adjustments to nonpower costs transferred to power:	
Additional depreciation at Bonneville Dam on nonpower investment—to convert to straight line	299,000
Allowance for amortization (on a straight line, 50-year basis) of nonpower investment at Bonneville Dam	498,000
Payments in lieu of taxes on nonpower investment at Bonneville Dam	622,000
Total	1,419,000
Allowance for straight-line depreciation on irrigation[1] investment at Grand Coulee	1,118,000
Payments in lieu of taxes on irrigation[1] investment at Grand Coulee	1,646,000
Allowance for amortization (on a straight line, 50-year basis) of irrigation investment at Grand Coulee	1,438,000
Total	4,202,000
Net total additional costs assessed against power by the investigator	23,052,000
Less surplus reported by BPA in certified financial statement	4,579,000
Total	18,473,000

[1] And other nonpower purposes.

[2] These costs of $176,000 (net after credit of $3,000 of other income) are not added here inasmuch as they were already deducted in the certified financial statement before arriving at the $4,579,000 surplus, such costs being paid from power revenues by special agreement between BPA and USBR.

Figures in parentheses denote red figure.

5. The so-called adjustments made by the investigator are analyzed in detail in tables A, A–1, and A–2 attached hereto. In general, there are three principal issues that may be raised with respect to the investigator's work. These are:

(a) A policy question for determination by the Congress, namely, the matter of payments in lieu of taxes.[2] This is the largest single item in the adjustments.

(b) Adjustments contrary to the traditional policy of the Congress that costs of navigation, flood control, etc., are nonreimbursable, and that irrigation costs are reimbursable without interest.

(c) Technical errors in accounting and finance.

6. The accounting and financial aspects of the investigator's study contain a number of important errors with respect to amortization, depreciation, and replacements. In general, it may be observed with respect to the investigator's adjustments of the power costs in the certified financial statements that the independent auditors, Arthur Andersen & Co., the Nation's outstanding firm of certified public accountants in the electric utility field, did not take any exception in their certificate to the aspects of power costs that the investigator has adjusted.

7. The investigator duplicates requirements when he includes both straight-line depreciation expense and provision for amortization. Amortization is not a cost but a financial transaction which is properly reflected in a pay-out or financial analysis but in such an analysis provision for replacements would be included in lieu of depreciation. This point is more fully explained later.

8. The investigator further inflates costs unreasonably by adjusting the provision for depreciation expense to the straight-line method. The sinking-fund method used at the dams is proper when taken in conjunction with a plan for the actual amortization of the investment. The straight-line method would result in excessive charges against rate payers in the early years rather than even charges throughout the repayment period, such even charges being accomplished by the methods employed in the projects' accounting and pay-out operations.

9. The investigator's report repeatedly demonstrates a lack of understanding of the complex problems of amortization, depreciation, and replacements. The report is also confused as to the problems of cost accounting and reporting on one hand, and cash and financial transactions of raising funds and repaying them with interest on the other hand. The report implies (page R1) that these matters should be the same in the cost financial statements and in the pay-out schedules. Such is not the case, as they are two different problems.

10. As further illustration of the investigator's lack of understanding of the basic problems in his claim on page R1 that "another source of confusion is that the income and expense statements are on an accrual basis, while the rate and pay-out schedules are based upon cash receipts and disbursements, sometimes including provisions for replacements." The quoted statement is clear indication of confusion on the part of the investigator. Obviously, the one statement is on an accrual basis because it is re-

---

[1] Consisting of the Bonneville Power Administration's transmission system and the power components of the Bonneville Dam project and the Columbia Basin project.

[2] Incidentally, in making the adjustment for payments in lieu of taxes the investigator overlooks the fact that power revenues from the Columbia River Power System will make substantial payments on account of irrigation costs in excess of the ability of the water users to repay such costs. This so-called subsidy, which will amount to approximately $400,000,000 in the case of the Columbia Basin project alone, and which will average from three to five million dollars a year depending upon the period for repayment, is in effect a tax equivalent.

quired by law to follow the FPC system, which is an accrual system. The pay-out schedules, however, are obviously concerned with the repayment of the cash invested by the Government in the projects. Nevertheless, the pay-out schedules do set forth the accrual data and the adjustment necessary to make the transition from accrual to cash (except for the Coulee Dam schedule, which is governed by different statutes.) Each of the pay-out schedules does make provisions for replacements.

11. The failure of the investigator to understand depreciation, etc., is further illustrated on page R5. The purpose of depreciation is not to maintain the equipment but to recover costs and to keep the capital investment intact and unimpaired. Equipment is kept in operating condition through maintenance and in some instances through replacements (sometimes referred to as extraordinary maintenance), but replacements are treated as capital investment under the FPC system.

In the same category is the statement on page R6 "that provisions for depreciation are to provide for replacements after the 50-year pay-out of the long-term debt." Such is not in fact true.

12. Another error, which conveniently inflates requirements, found on page S3 and elsewhere in the report, is the use of straight-line amortization. The report claims that the straight-line method of amortizing debt is comparable to the use of serial revenue bonds. This is not supported by actual practice. For these issues the amount of principal maturing year by year increases and, of course, the interest burden decreases, with the result that the total of interest and principal remains a reasonably even annual requirement. This same policy is widely followed in all sorts of financing, such as home mortgages. It is the commonly accepted practice. It is particularly logical in the case of a project such as a hydroelectric development which has a large initial investment with a long life followed by relatively little subsequent capital investment. Such a project furnishes substantially the same benefits in all years of its life. Stranght-line amortization would create a heavy burden in the early years. For example, the first year would call for 2.5 percent for interest and 2 percent for amortization on a straight-line basis, a total of 4.5 percent, whereas the conventional requirement is 3.53 percent per year for interest and amortization. The investigator uses the maximum figure in his adjustments, despite the fact that even if straight-line amortization were to be followed this percentage would apply in only the first year and would not be representative of any average requirement over a pay-out period. Obviously, as the investment is paid off, the amount of interest would be computed against a diminishing balance and would not represent thereafter the same fixed percentage of the initial investment.

13. On this same point it might be noted that the investigator used administrative memorandum No. 12 of the Federal Power Commission as a source of his percentage ratios applied in computing payments in lieu of taxes but ignored the fact that the same source used the conventional percentage for interest and amortization, and the further fact that the same source does not support his use of the straight-line method of depreciation. The FPC memorandum at page 5 states "In the computation of annual depreciation costs the sinking fund method has been selected because it is applied to an undepreciated base throughout the life span." The investigator's adjustments applied the straight-line percentage to the undepreciated plant accounts.

14. Without exception every PUD in the States of Washington and Oregon which has issued revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring electric distribution systems has set up a schedule of annual debt-service payments (principal and interest) which were substantially equal. Although the laws of the States do not stipulate repayment procedure, the bond ordinances and plan and system resolutions have required a maturity schedule of this kind, a practice adopted on the advice of investment bankers.

15. In general, in commonly accepted accounting practice such as the FPC system of accounts that the Columbia River power system is required to follow, provision is made for depreciation expense but not for replacements expense or amortization of principal. Replacements are accounted for as capital additions, the same as any other construction cost but the cost of facilities being replaced are retired from the plant accounts, thus keeping the account consistent with the physical plant. The purpose of depreciation expense is to recover the cost of plant being consumed in service so that the cost is completely recovered by the time the plant is retired. In this fashion the capital investment remains unimpaired. So much for the conventional cost accounting procedure.

16. In a financial or pay-out plan, on the other hand, provision is made for repaying the cost of the initial construction and for repaying the cost of any subsequent replacements. This is a more severe burden than the usual depreciation and cost accounting plan described in the preceding paragraph, inasmuch as this plan results in the complete recovery of the capital investment within a fixed period, including cost of replacements within that same period, to the end that at the end of the pay-out period, there is a debt-free plant maintained in good operating condition.

17. A further illustration of the investigator's lack of understanding of these problems is found on page R1 and elsewhere where it is maintained that it is erroneous to reflect replacements in the year (in pay-out schedules covering a certain period of years) in which they are expected to occur rather than on the basis of a sinking-fund annuity. The facts are that either method gives precisely the same result, that is, precisely the same total annual financial requirements. This is simply a problem in compound interest. The method of showing the replacements in the year in which they are expected to occur conforms to the FPC accounting treatment and is more practical than the annuity method since the latter would not actually be in accord with the way the Federal projects operate and handle their funds. Along the same line, at page R7, it is concluded that the replacements method followed by the Columbia River Power System "results in an undue burden on future rate payers and inadequate charges in the years in which the replacement provisions are at the lower portion of the cyclic curve." The investigator, obviously, does not understand the complexities of compound interest involved in the calculations. As already stated, the results are exactly the same as the annuity basis and give an even annual burden over the period.

18. The investigator's lack of knowledge with respect to depreciation and replacements is further demonstrated by the paragraph at the bottom of page R34 and continuing on page R35. He states that under the straight-line depreciation method interim replacements would be charged to the reserve for depreciation. As a matter of fact, a replacement would be capitalized, that is, charged to the plant account, and the original cost of the property being replaced would be retired from (i. e., credited to) the plant account and charged to the depreciation reserve which would be credited for salvage and charged for costs of retirement.

19. In addition to inflating power costs through duplication and erroneous methods, the Investigator assesses nonpower costs against power revenues, even though nonpower costs for flood control, navigation, etc., have been traditionally nonreimbursable. See, for example, paragraph 9a on page S5. In this same category, the data on page S7 as to investment per installed kilowatts at Army projects apparently include all nonpower as well as power investment. The same error appears in the tabulation on page R19. The costs in this case are total costs including specific navigation and other nonpower items.

20. On page R35 it is stated "the present indefinite and fluctuating pay-out should be replaced by an equal annual payment over a period of, say, 50 years." The pay-out reports are in fact definite. An even annual payment for the total of interest and amortization (including replacements) is used and is consistent with general financial practice as already pointed out.

21. On page R13 the investigator sets forth turn-over ratios (the ratio of gross investment to operating revenues) and operating ratios (operating revenue deductions to operating revenues) for several Federal projects and an average for 28 privately owned utilities. The comparison is so illogical as to make one wonder on what possible basis any claim for probative value could be made. The comparison is invalid because (1) hydro-projects, as everyone knows, have a much higher investment per dollar revenue but a correspondingly lower operating ratio, which comparative facts the investigator's figures actually show, (2) the Federal projects are wholesale projects which normally have slower turn-over than retail distribution projects, which make use of a greater proportion of short-lived properties, and (3) the resulting ratios depend in part upon rate levels. Obviously, favorable ratios can be shown if rates are excessive. The Federal projects do not attempt to charge the highest possible rates. Conclusions based upon such fallacious comparisons such as the conclusions appearing at the top of page R14 are obviously not valid.

22. On page R37 and following, the report recommends a fund-accounting plan. The plan is in error in including both depreciation and repayment. The difference between depreciation for cost-accounting purposes and the repayment of principal, including replacements for pay-out or financial purposes, has already been explained. Not only would the fund plan duplicate the financial requirement but it would cause confusion due to the difference between cost accounting on one hand and the pay-out (a cash transaction) on the other.

23. At the top of page R38, and elsewhere in the discussion of the fund plan, there is lack of clarity in the fact that accrued cost accounts are used to designate the amounts to be repaid when actually it is the expenditures in connection with such functions that would be repaid. For example, O. and M. on the FPC cost basis includes noncash items such as depreciation on equipment used in operation.

24. The investigator compares typical retail electric bills of public agencies in the Northwest with those of private power companies after reducing the bills of the latter by a tax factor. Ignored are the facts that the public agencies do make substantial tax payments and also make payments to the general fund in the case of municipal electric systems.

TABLE A.—*Columbia River power system—Statement showing certified income account for fiscal year 1946 and adjustments made by investigator for House of Representatives' committee*

[In thousands of dollars]

	As reported in BPA certified financial statement	Committee investigator's adjustments	Adjusted statement
Electric sales revenue [1]	18,017		18,017
Contract cancellation charges [2]	1,814	(1,814)	
Other operating revenue	53		53
Total operating revenue	19,884	(1,814)	18,070
Operating expenses [3]	6,310	(750)	5,560
Provision for depreciation (see also table A-1) [4]	3,210	3,339	6,549
Loss on abandoned property	275		275
Taxes, payments in lieu of (see table A-1) [5]		6,597	6,597
Total operating revenue deductions	9,795	9,186	18,981
Net operating revenues	10,089	(11,000)	(911)
Other income	10		10
Gross income	10,099		(901)
Income deductions:			
Interest [6]	5,245	352	5,597
Other	99		99
Total	5,344	352	5,696
Net income	4,755	(11,352)	(6,597)
Net revenues applied to irrigation expenses (see also note on table A-1) [7]	176	4,202	4,378
Balance	4,579	(15,554)	(10,975)
Amortization (see table A-1)	(8)		5,073
Adjusted total for power			(16,048)
Further nonpower items assessed to power in adjustments (see table A-2) [9]			2,425
Final balance per investigator			(18,473)

[1] The investigator picked the Administration's low year in power sales. By contrast, power sales for fiscal year 1948 were $24,320,000 and are estimated for the current fiscal year (1949) at $27.3 million dollars.

[2] Contract cancellation charges were eliminated on the basis of their being nonrecurring. The very purpose of the cancellation charges was, among other things, to furnish revenues during the postwar dip and recovery period when it would be necessary to remarket large blocks of power that had been devoted to war purposes. Therefore, the elimination is not an equitable adjustment.

[3] Expenses in connection with the rental and temporary use of two generator units borrowed from Shasta Dam for emergency war use at Grand Coulee Dam are eliminated on the ground that they are nonrecurring. While such expenses were nonrecurring, their elimination should not have been made because revenues include proceeds from the sale of energy generated by the Shasta units. The corresponding special expenses would therefore be appropriately included as a charge against those additional revenues.

[4] Depreciation expense was adjusted to place it on a straight-line basis. That method has been used by BPA for transmission but the compound-interest method is used at the two dams. The bulk of the adjustment accordingly applies to the dams. Depreciation is a complex and controversial subject. Briefly, however, the compound-interest method is fair and reasonable for a project such as a large hydroelectric dam having a long life and for which the investment is actually being amortized, because this combination results in the greatest equalization of total costs over the pay-out period. It may be noted that Arthur Andersen & Co., the Nation's outstanding firm of certified public accountants, take no exception to the provisions for depreciation in certifying to the financial statements. The investigator's adjustment was a rough one based upon the application of an over-all percentage to the plant account. The percentage, taken from a report of the Federal Power Commission, is applicable only to depreciable property but the investigator applied it to the total plant account without correcting the total for nondepreciable items and for work in progress not yet subject to depreciation. Moreover, the ratio of 2.28 percent applied in the case of the dams is excessive. It was an arithmetic average of certain data in the FPC report for 1945 but it may be noted that the FPC apparently realized the fallacy of such an arithmetic average because in its corresponding report for 1947 the FPC did not show such an average. The reports are entitled "Electric Utility Depreciation Practices," the 1945 issue being designated as Bulletin S-52 and the 1947 study as S-59.

[5] The investigator made an allowance for taxes by applying percentage ratios to the plant accounts. State and local tax equivalents were figured at 1.40 percent of the plant account and the Federal tax equivalent at 1.00 percent, a total of 2.40 percent for taxes. The matter of payments in lieu of taxes is obviously one for determination by the Congress as a matter of Federal power policy.

[6] Interest expense is increased in order to bring the amount in the case of Grand Coulee Dam to a 3-percent basis instead of the 2½ percent basis used in the certified financial statement. This adjustment is based upon the assumption that the Reclamation Law requires 3 percent interest. The investigator obviously does not understand the provisions of section 9 of the Reclamation Law. While rates must be fixed at a level adequate to cover interest at 3 percent, the law does not require the repayment of interest on reclamation projects. However, in an effort to set forth "cost" in the financial statement an allowance at the rate of 2½ percent (which has been determined to be a reasonable allowance for the cost of money to the Government) was applied.

[7] The adjustment of $4,202,000 as additional revenues applied to irrigation, navigation, and other nonpower expenses, consists of the investigator's computation of depreciation, taxes, and amortization on the nonpower features of Columbia Basin project. See tables A-1 and A-2.

[8] The investigator arbitrarily allowed for straight-line amortization on a 50-year basis, which amounts to 2 percent a year. This procedure is obviously arbitrary and unreasonable. The usual process of amortization is to require an even annual payment for the total of interest and amortization, a fact that can be established by reference to prospectuses on important serial bond sales. See examples attached. As the principal is paid off the interest burden falls but the principal repayment rises by a corresponding amount in order to maintain the even annual payment and thus equalize the burden over the period on the rate payers. For example, the annual payment (on a 2½ percent, 50-year basis) according to this usual method for the total of interest and amortization is $3.53 for each $100 of principal. The investigator takes interest at the full rate of 2½ percent and adds 2 percent for straight-line amortization, thus making a total of 4½ percent, or $4.50 per $100 of principal. Moreover amortization should not be charged in addition to straight-line depreciation. When amortization charges are used, provision should be made for replacements rather than depreciation. This is a complex and little-understood subject. Accordingly, it is a good field in which to create confusion.

[9] The adjustment of $2,425,000 is the sum of nonpower costs, as adjusted by the investigator, at Bonneville Dam for operation, maintenance, depreciation (straight line), taxes, interest, and amortization. This item is analyzed in detail in table A-2.

TABLE A-1.—*Columbia River power system data as of June 30, 1946—Statement showing in detail the adjustments made by the committee investigator for depreciation, taxes, and amortization*

	Construction costs (in thousands of dollars)			Net unpaid Federal investment (in thousands of dollars)		
	Allocated to power	Allocated to nonpower	Total	Allocated to power	Allocated to nonpower	Total
Grand Coulee	128,970	68,603	197,573	126,507	71,915	198,422
Bonneville Dam	57,949	25,906	83,855	53,872	24,895	78,767
Subtotal for dam	186,919	94,509	281,428	180,379	96,810	277,189
BPA transmission	87,956		87,956	73,275		73,275
Total	274,875	94,509	369,384	253,654	96,810	350,464
Ratios used by committee investigator in his adjustment:						
Depreciation on dams (percent)	2.28	1.63				
Depreciation on transmission (percent)	2.60					
Taxes:						
State and local (percent)	1.40	1.40				
Federal (percent)	1.00	1.00				
Amortization (percent)				2.00	2.00	

The investigator applied the foregoing percentages to the construction costs and unpaid investment data to obtain the following results (in thousands of dollars):

	BPA transmission	Grand Coulee Dam			Bonneville Dam			Total for the 2 dams and transmission		
		Power	Nonpower	Total	Power	Nonpower	Total	Power	Nonpower	Total
2.28 percent depreciation on dams		2,941	1,118	4,059	1,321	422	1,743	4,262	1,540	5,802
2.60 percent depreciation on transmission	2,287							2,287		2,287
Subtotal	2,287	2,941	1,118	4,059	1,321	422	1,743	6,549	1,540	8,089
Les. amount in certified reports	2,134	548		548	528	123	651	3,210	123	3,333
Amount added by investigator	153	2,393	[1] 1,118	3,511	793	299	1,092	[2] 3,339	1,417	4,756
2.40 percent for taxes	2,111	3,096	[1] 1,646	4,742	1,390	622	2,012	[3] 6,597	2,268	8,865
2 percent for amortization	1,466	2,530	1,438	3,968	1,077	498	1,575	[4] 5,073	1,936	7,009
Amount reported by BPA	2,508	1,678		1,678	1,003		1,003	5,189		5,189
Amount added by investigator	[5] (1,042)	852	[1] 1,438	2,290	74	498	572	[5] (116)	1,936	1,820

[1] These 3 items total $4,202,000 and comprise the adjustment described in note 7 on table A.
[2] See adjustment described in note 4 on table A.
[3] See adjustment described in note 5 on table A.
[4] See note 8 on table A.
[5] Red figure.

TABLE A–2.—*Columbia River power system statement showing derivation of net deficit of $2,425,000 for nonpower operations after committee staff adjustment*

A. Costs of nonpower operations reflected in schedules in auditors' report for fiscal year 1946:	
1. Operation and maintenance expenses of Columbia Basin project allocated to irrigation	$179,000
2. Credit for other income allocated to irrigation	3,000
3. Net amount absorbed by power revenues by agreement with Bureau of Reclamation	176,000
4. Operation and maintenance expenses at Bonneville Dam allocated to navigation and other nonpower functions	232,000
5. Depreciation expense on navigation and other nonpower facilities at Bonneville Dam	123,000
6. Interest expense on navigation and other nonpower investment at Bonneville Dam	651,000
Subtotal	1,182,000
7. Deduct amount reimbursed from power revenues	176,000
8. Remainder, nonreimbursable inasmuch as it consists entirely of charges to navigation and other nonpower functions at Bonneville Dam	1,006,000
B. In addition to the foregoing nonreimbursable, nonpower costs appearing in the auditors' report, the committee investigator added the following adjustment:	
1. Additional depreciation expense on nonpower facilities at Bonneville Dam to convert to straight-line method	299,000
2. Provision for payments in lieu of taxes on nonpower investment at Bonneville Dam	622,000
3. Allowance for amortization on a 50-year, straight-line basis on the nonpower investment at Bonneville Dam	$498,000
Total	1,419,000
Adjusted net deficit from nonpower operations, Bonneville Dam	2,425,000

NOTE.—The committee investigator added this adjusted amount of Bonneville Dam nonpower costs to the items to be repaid from power revenues. In addition, adjusted nonpower costs of $4,202,000 at the Columbia Basin project were assessed against power, as per the adjustment described by note 7 in table A. That adjustment consisted of the following:

1. Allowance for straight-line depreciation on nonpower investment at Coulee Dam	$1,118,000
2. Allowance for payments in lieu of taxes on the nonpower facilities at Coulee Dam	1,646,000
3. Provision for straight-line amortization in 50 years on the nonpower investment at Coulee Dam	1,438,000
Total	4,202,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain correspondence.)

A LABOR LEADER WHO DOES NOT SPEAK FOR RANK AND FILE "TELLS ME OFF" AND I GIVE HIM MY ANSWER

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been told off by a labor leader in my home State of New Jersey. He is Mr. F. C. Mooney, State representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. He would like to have me act as a legislative automaton. His concept of my congressional responsibility is as distasteful to me as that of any dictator. If being myself and following the dictates of my own conscience and best judgment means what he terms "a political demise," I am ready to say: "Death, where is thy sting?"

The story appears in the following exchange of correspondence:

NEW JERSEY STATE
LEGISLATIVE BOARD,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
March 23, 1949.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Eighth Congressional District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: The purpose of this letter is to acquaint you with the opposition of the New Jersey State Legislative Board to the present Taft-Hartley law and of our increasing efforts to have same repealed.

You may recall that in the November 1948 election a Democratic Senator was elected in Passaic County for the first time in many years and that you barely squeezed through, whereas in former years your election was practically conceded. What was the reason for this change? The reason was the voting record of GORDON CANFIELD in the Eightieth Congress. What caused that change in the voting record of GORDON CANFIELD? That change was the result of CANFIELD neglecting personally to get the opinions of his constituents and accepting in lieu thereof, the reactionary capitalistic opinions of the slowly dying State and National Republican Parties. A strong candidate in the field against you in 1948 would have meant your political demise. Representing a district where the voters may practically be classified as workers your vote on the Taft-Hartley law was inexcusable. Your line of reasoning never operated in that manner in the past, therefore, one must conclude that your vote was decided by an outside influence. Could that influence have been State Chairman Marsh? Mr. Marsh, as you well know, and the rest of the Republican Party in the State of New Jersey have become so abject to the whims of corporate interests that the average Republican voter of the past has become nauseated and

will either vote the Democratic or some other ticket in 1949. The whole thing boils down to the simple fact that the Republican Party in New Jersey has degenerated into what may be known as the Corporate Interests Party and as the immortal Lincoln said, "You can't fool all of the people all of the time." November 1948, should have been a revelation to you.

In 1946, you received the support of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in New Jersey, the same as you received in many previous elections, but, by your vote in the Eightieth Congress you repudiated that support. There is not any alibi whatsoever for Congressman CANFIELD coming from a district such as the Eighth, New Jersey, for supporting such a measure as the Taft-Hartley law.

You may be assured that additional Democratic victories will be attained in New Jersey in 1949 and that these victories will be stable victories that are based upon a simple premise that human rights are more valuable than property rights.

I am urging that you support the Taft-Hartley repealer when same appears before the House thereby, again restoring yourself to those that formerly believed in you.

With best personal wishes I am,

Very truly yours,

F. C. MOONEY,
State Representative.

APRIL 14, 1949.

Mr. F. C. MOONEY,
State Representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Keyport, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. MOONEY: This is in answer to your letter of March 23 lecturing me on my responsibility to the people I represent, condemning me for voting in accordance with my conscience and best judgment, and boasting that I almost suffered a "political demise" in the 1948 election when, with Truman carrying my district, I was returned to office although I was hospitalized during the entire campaign and was prevented from making a single appearance or speech.

First, let me say that I have grown up with railroad men, I have worked with them on the railroad, and I respect them most highly. I know that rank and file resent your letter almost, if not more, than I because they are telling me so. I have shown your letter to representatives of the brotherhoods here in Washington and here are three of their comments:

"I would not dignify the letter with a reply."

"You have been most fair and kind to us and you don't have to take this."

"This hurts us more than it does you."

Following through, I am making a practice of showing your letter to workers on the trains and some of their reactions are too scorching to attach to this paper. And as I write I cannot help but think of your vice chairman, Mr. Martin J. Donohue of my home city of Paterson, who years ago formed what was called the Railroad Nonpartisan Labor League and endorsed the Democratic opponent of my late chief and predecessor, the Honorable George N. Seger, the former being the father of my 1948 opponent. When I went to Mr. Donohue and showed him the endorsements received by Mr. Seger from all the railroad brotherhood national chiefs his face became red and he said, "I've made a terrible mistake." You know that Mr. Donohue worked day and night to defeat me last fall and national brotherhood chiefs here in the capital, who remember my work for the Crosser and other bills, have come to my office to say "this was most regrettable."

Regarding the Honorable Lloyd B. Marsh, Republican State and Passaic County chairman, let me say that he has never attempted to tell me how to vote on any issue. He has more faith in his Representative. Were he or any other party leader to seek to control my voting by remote control I would immediately repudiate such leadership, and if I could not continue to follow my conscience and best judgment I would walk out of this assignment.

It is not my concept of my responsibility that I am obliged to hew to any group's line. I represent more than the railroad workers of my district. I represent the other organized labor groups, that large army of unorganized workers, ownership and management, the unemployed, the veterans of our wars, the housewives, the taxpayers, and all who go to make up what we call the public. I cannot and I seek not to maintain a perfect batting average with any one segment and when I get that way it is time for the public to retire me. Certain labor organizations demand that their Congressman be in his voting record something Joe DiMaggio cannot ever approximate on the diamond. One wrong vote in 10 and political demise is ordered. It should be said in all fairness the National Association of Manufacturers is just as unfair in this respect.

I voted against the Hartley bill as it passed the House and I told my colleagues on the floor I would not support any conference report containing the ban on industry-wide bargaining and the provision permitting private injunctions. When the Senate knocked these out I voted for the bill, and that is when you and Mr. Donohue started to march. I shall vote for revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act I believe will tend to promote industrial peace. I shall not be railroaded or pushed around by you or any other individual or group. The stakes are too serious. My only mandate is to reason and do what I believe best for the common good.

It has been many years since I have seen you and I feel quite certain that knowing of my kindnesses to the railroad men of our country you would never say to my face what you dictated in your letter. I am constrained to wonder if you did not act hastily as did your national chief, Mr. A. F. Whitney, when he threatened to erase President Truman from public life for his draft-railroad-labor proposal and to spend for the President's political demise the sum of $30,000,000, represented in most part by workers' trust funds.

And by the way, Mr. Mooney, I almost forgot to make reference to the letter my 1948 opponent received from Mr. Whitney shortly after the election wherein he expressed regret that my opponent had lost and sought to cheer him with the assurance that his election to the House of Representatives was only deferred for 2 years.

Closing, I am sorry to note that you have also planned another political demise, that of the Honorable Alfred E. Driscoll, one of the most progressive governors in our Nation. I predict you will have a difficult time selling the prescription to rank and file.

Very sincerely,

GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—The delay in acknowledging your letter is occasioned by some research work on our relationship which may be the basis of a future announcement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 25, 1949, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my participation in the debate on the bill H. R. 4177 in Committee of the Whole, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks some appropriate documents about veterans' hospitals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REVIEW OF EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, TO EASTER RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as the Eighty-first Congress recesses for the Easter holiday its members can return home with assurance to their constituents that the program of the House of Representatives is well under way.

The House of Representatives, in fact, is far ahead of its normal schedule. All of the regular appropriation bills for the executive departments and independent offices have been approved in less than 4 months. This is an all-time record and no small accomplishment in itself, as those of you who have worked upon them know. It has been achieved by streamlined reorganization of the Appropriations Committee into nine subcommittees with each committee member serving on only one of these groups, so that all could meet at the same time, and by prompt action of the House the effect should be to avoid the usual log jam which develops around appropriation bills at the end of a session. I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the members of his committee for this great work.

But we have done much more than that. Legislation covering many major points in the President's state of the Union message—either has been favorably reported by committees, is in the hearing stage, or already has been enacted into law. The main exceptions are: Aid to the schools, which will be considered after the recess by the House Education and Labor Committee which has been occupied with the Taft-Hartley substitute and minimum wages; health insurance on which a special message from the President is awaited; taxes, and civil rights.

PEACE AND SECURITY

The first consideration of the United States Government in the present uncertain state of world affairs is the maintenance of peace. It has been amply demonstrated that peace can only be achieved through strengthening of our armed forces, not only to protect America's own security, but as a deterrent to any would-be aggressor.

The President's state of the Union message of January 5 said:

Until a system of world security is established further improvements in our national security legislation are necessary.

In this connection the Congress has moved with commendable dispatch. By overwhelming majorities in both branches it has authorized expenditure of the funds requested for the second year of 4-year financing of European recovery under the Marshall plan. This is our bulwark against the world spread of communism and to later roll it back, and by our action we have buttressed it and given new sustenance to the economic and moral fiber of those people, in countries abroad, who stand in the first line of resistance.

The House, in addition, has approved and sent to the Senate a bill making available for the aid of China $54,000,000, the balance of unobligated funds originally apropriated in 1948.

The establishment by the Secretary of the Air Force of a radar network, or system of land-based air-warning and control installations, has been authorized by act of this Congress, signed by the President. This vital screen, a key feature of our defense system, will help safeguard America from attack by air.

Likewise, both branches of the Congress have granted authority for construction of a joint long-range, guided-missile proving ground by our armed services to facilitate the perfection of modern rocket weapons.

The House has passed and the Senate has on its calendar for early action a bill to grant to the Central Intelligence Agency the authority necessary for its proper administration. This measure fixes the scope and status in our Nation's defense plans of the Agency which is the clearing house for security data gathered by our eyes and ears around the world.

The House has passed and a Senate committee is considering the bill providing for the nature, scope, and composition of the Army and Air Force, authorizing 70 air groups.

In line with the general tightening of unification and greater streamlining for efficiency of the national defense organization, the Congress has provided for creation of the Office of Under Secretary of the National Defense.

Hearings are under way in the Senate on a measure to establish the responsibility and authority of the Secretary of Defense, and to convert the National Military Establishment into the Department of Defense along lines indicated by the Hoover Commission.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The President's Message of January 5 asked for restoration of the Reciprocal Trade Act to full effectiveness and its extension for 3 years.

While seeking to maintain peace and defending our security, the United States at the same time is making every effort to encourage the restoration of the free flow of trade and normal commercial relations between the nations of the world.

The House has passed and the Senate has on its calendar a bill to extend our reciprocal trade agreements law for another 3 years. This measure eliminates certain amendments enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

Nevertheless, in the face of world-wide scarcities of certain types of products, we must maintain a constant check upon the flow of certain items to assure that we do not deplete our own resources of critical materials, and that our exports are apportioned to reach those countries where they are most needed. To cover this situation the Congress has extended to June 30, 1951, the authority of the President to control exports, which otherwise would have expired on February 28.

AGRICULTURE

The President's message of January 5 urged use of supports for farm prices, increased storage space for crops, expanded rural electrification, and consideration of rural areas in connection with all social problems.

On the domestic side, among the first items of legislation by this Congress were appropriations to the President of $1,000,000 for disaster relief in the western blizzard area. This was an example of prompt action in the face of emergency and in response to immediate public need. In addition, the Congress has enacted and the President has signed a measure making $44,000,000 available to the Agriculture Department for loans to farmers whose crops suffered destruction in this disaster.

The regular appropriation bill for this Department, passed by the House and sent to the Senate, carries authorization for $350,000,000 in rural electrification loans, and an additional $150,000,000 subject to the discretion of the Secretary. This total authorization is $100,000,000 more than last year. The Farmers Home Administration is granted $101,750,000 for its various loan programs.

And for the first time a committee of the House has favorably reported enabling legislation under which the REA would have authority to make loans for construction of rural telephone lines.

Under bills which have been favorably reported to both House and the Senate, the Commodity Credit Corporation's authority to provide adequate storage space for crops would be restored. It was the action of the Eightieth Congress in cutting the CCC appropriation which deprived farmers of storage space for their corn crops last fall, forced them to throw their product on the market, and brought a decline in prices.

The House also has before it a favorable report on a bill to permit expansion of the crop-insurance program.

The over-all problem of agriculture is the subject of hearings in progress on the question of price supports. The appropriate House committee is giving careful study to the best method of preventing a decline in prices of farm products, of adjusting production to consumer demands, and promoting good land use.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The President, in his message of January 5, asked extension and strengthening of rent control, continued authority to allocate and establish priorities in transportation and key materials in short supply.

Rent control, which would have expired on March 31, has been extended for another 15 months by action of both branches of the Congress. The law has been strengthened in several respects, despite desperate efforts of opposition lobbies to kill this legislation protecting millions of American families who rent their homes.

In the earliest weeks of this session the Congress enacted a number of other vital measures in the field of economic controls found to be necessary for the maintenance of the Nation's prosperity.

We have renewed the authority of the President to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, and speculative trading in commodities which basically affect the cost of living. Had we not done so, his power to make and to effectively enforce such voluntary agreements would have expired March 31 under the so-called Anti-Inflation Act of 1947. The new law, extending authority through September 30, 1949, also continued the voluntary-agreement method of priority location of key materials in short supply.

LABOR

The President's message of January 5 asked for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, increase in the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour.

Bills to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and to reenact the Wagner Act with certain improvements have been favorably reported in both branches of the Congress. The House bill has been given the right-of-way by the Rules Committee for open debate when we reconvene after the holiday. The Senate's bill is also on its calendar.

The House Education and Labor Committee has also reported favorably upon amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which would raise the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents and extend the application of this law to many workers not now covered. The Senate has begun hearings on similar bills.

HOUSING

The President's message of January 5 asked enactment of low-rent public housing, slum clearance, farm housing, and housing research legislation.

The housing-shortage problem has been tackled in both branches of the Congress. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has favorably reported a measure fixing a national housing policy, and setting a goal of construction of 810,000 units in 6 years, with a sliding scale authorized in any one year. The House Banking and Currency Committee is conducting hearings on its own similar bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The President's message of January 5 asked expansion of the social-security program both as to the extent of its coverage and the size of the benefits; enactment of a national health insurance program; Federal-aid appropriation for schools.

The House Ways and Means Committee has been conducting thorough hearings on proposals to increase the payments under the Social Security Act and to broaden the number of beneficiaries. With those hearings now approaching a close, action on the pertinent bills is expected soon.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments meanwhile has reported favorably a bill creating a new Department of Public Welfare to embody all Federal social-security functions.

The Congress has authorized a special appropriation of $1,500,000 for the current fiscal year to meet emergency needs for crippled children, resulting from an epidemic of polio and lack of hospital facilities for these and other afflicted children. This is in addition to the regular annual program of grants-in-aid to the States.

Federal aid to education to the extent of $300,000,000 in grants to the States would be provided under a measure reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The House Committee on Education and Labor plans to hold hearings on similar proposals immediately after the recess.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The President's message of January 5 said:

We should open our doors to displaced persons without unfair discrimination.

In both Houses of the Congress, bills are being whipped into shape to undo the gross wrongs enacted into the displaced-persons law by the Eightieth Congress. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives is ready to submit its recommendations to liberalize the eligibility clauses that would eliminate discrimination against Catholics and Jews.

A special contribution of $16,000,000 to the United Nations has been authorized by the Congress for the relief of refugees from the recent war in Palestine. The President has signed the measure which will aid 500,000 Arabs and 7,000 Jews who were displaced from their homes.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The President's message of January 5 asked promotion of the development of rivers for power, irigation, navigation, and flood control.

In pursuance of the policy of protection of our natural resources, the House of Representatives has passed and sent to the Senate the Army civil-functions bill under which $593,300,000 is provided for improvements to rivers and harbors and for flood control.

The House has also passed and sent to the Senate the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior carrying provision for regional power development and reclamation projects.

Both Houses of Congress have approved and the President has signed a bill giving Federal approval to the compact between States along the Colorado River.

REORGANIZATION

Presidential authority to reorganize the executive departments would be granted under bills which have made good progress in the present session. The House has approved one measure authorizing a streamlining of departments to bring about economies, eliminate duplication, and increase efficiency. In addition to the House-approved bill the Senate has before it a measure of its own.

The Congress as a whole has enacted 38 public and 11 private laws.

The House, in addition, has passed 315 other public and private bills.

OTHER BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE (NOT INCLUDING THOSE PASSED ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR), JANUARY 3–APRIL 12, 1949

H. R. 164, California, Churntown Elementary School district.

H. R. 858, Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, amends. It would exclude from the regular rate of pay, for purposes of overtime computation premiums paid for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work and for work at undesirable hours.

H. R. 967, El Paso, Tex. (private bill).

H. R. 1211, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949. Extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to June 12, 1951, and eliminating amendments written into the act by the Eightieth Congress.

H. R. 1243, Hatch Act, amend, penalty. Relates to governmental employees who engage in political activity. Under the present law the penalty is automatic discharge. The bill permits the Civil Service Commission to fix the penalty.

H. R. 1401, Michigan, Mount Hope Cemetery Association.

H. R. 1998, Florida, Pinellas County, land description corrected.

H. R. 2361, Reorganization Act of 1949. Provides for the reorganization of the Federal Government.

H. R. 2632, appropriations, first deficiency steam plant.

House Joint Resolution 85, Inauguration tax, admission tickets.

H. R. 199, provides for granting immigration quotas to Asian and Pacific people.

H. R. 3082, District of Columbia appropriation Bill.

H. R. 3083, Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. This measure provides a total of $3,072,817,903.93, of which $1,027,608,403.93 is provided for the agencies of the Treasury Department, while the balance of $2,045,209,500 is provided for the Post Office Department. The amount provided in the bill is $99,848,846.07 below the budget estimate.

Senate Joint Resolution 42, consent of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

H. R. 20, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

H. R. 554, to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of school building in Hoopa, Calif.

H. R. 994, to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of Navajo Tribe of Indians.

H. R. 1755, to authorize a $100 per capita payment of members of Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from proceeds of timber sales.

H. R. 1950, for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Foreign Economic Administration.

H. R. 1959, for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.

H. R. 2660, to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon property owned by the United States for postal purposes.

H. R. 157, to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to recognize deeds of bravery and award a medal known as the Young American Medal for Bravery to outstanding courageous young Americans.

H. R. 220, to amend section 3 of act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301).

H. R. 942, to amend Public Law 593 (80th Cong.) relative to patented mining claims in Alaska.

H. R. 1337, to authorize sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America.

H. J. Res. 160, to authorize completion of processing visa cases, and admission into the United States of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members or former members of armed forces.

H. R. 2663, grants to the Central Intelligence Agency the authorities necessary for its proper administration.

H. R. 3333, Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency appropriation bill. The bill as sent to the Senate carries a total of $2,211,794,085, which is $23,271,600 below the budget estimate, and $353,838,775 more than the 1949 appropriation.

H. R. 1741, authorizes the establishment of a joint long-range guided missiles proving ground.

H. R. 1579, to amend the printing act to allow the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents to the amount of $1,200 (formerly $500) by simple resolution.

H. R. 2513, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States."

H. R. 2877, to add certain lands to the Big Bend National Park, Tex.

H. R. 1357, to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument in the State of Maine.

H. R. 2373, regarding hearing of complaints of violations of the act establishing Hot Springs National Park and penalties therefor.

H. R. 2672, to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Army for damage to or loss of personal property incident to their service.

H. R. 1757, District of Columbia Rent Act. Extends the rent-control law in the District of Columbia until June 30, 1950, and recontrols housing accommodations decontrolled by the reconversion provision where the cost is less than $1,500. Also prohibits, under certain circumstances, eviction of tenants in a housing unit sold cooperatively.

H. R. 1437, provides for the nature, scope, and composition of the Army and Air Force and to define their components and general activities. Authorizes 70 air groups.

H. R. 3734, Army civil-functions appropriation bill.

H. R. 3704, District of Columbia sales tax and revenue bill.

H. R. 3838, Interior Department appropriation bill. Two amendments were adopted: (1) Deletes language from the bill barring Indians who receive social-security benefits from the relief and rehabilitation program; (2) the other amendment adds $250,000 for Bureau of Mines for use in control of fires in inactive coal deposits.

H. R. 2023, oleomargarine tax repeal. All colored margarine sold in public eating places be of a three-sided shape so as to readily distinguish it from butter. The bill repeals the tax on oleomargarine, sets out the definition of yellow margarine, calls for posting of signs in public eating places where margarine is served, and provides for interstate movement of colored margarine.

H. R. 3875, to amend Immigation Act with respect to suspension of deportation of aliens.

H. R. 3856, to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.

H. J. Res. 212, authorizing an appropriation for the Federal Security Administrator, in addition to those authorized under the Social Security Act to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during fiscal year 1949.

H. R. 3997, Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1950. The measure carries a total of $701,122,079 in direct appropriations which is $25,798,829 below the budget estimate for direct appropriations for 1950. The bill contains a $350,000,000 authorization in REA loans with language authorizing the use of $150,000,000 additional when deemed advisable by the Secretary; also has loan authorizations of $101,750,000 for the several loan programs under the Farmers Home Administration.

H. R. 4016. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary appropriation bill for 1950. The measure carries a cash appropriation of $684,616,102 allotted to the four departments as follows: State Department, $271,405,656; Justice Department, $132,579,141; Commerce Department, $259,927,605; Federal Judiciary, $20,703,700. The total appropriated by this bill is $55,407,354 less than the budget estimates.

H. R. 4046, second deficiency appropriation bill for 1949. Appropriated $671,074,172.84 to supply deficiencies in various branches of Government departments. The amount provided by this bill is $26,981,225 below the budget estimates.

PUBLIC LAWS ENACTED BY THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, JANUARY 3, 1949–APRIL 12, 1949

Senate Joint Resolution 16, Federal employees, holidays.

S. 103, President, Vice President, Speaker of House of Representatives, salary increases.

House Joint Resolution 112, appropriations disaster relief.

House Joint Resolution 88, railroad equipment, free entry, amend (Merci Train).

House Joint Resolution 136, appropriations, disaster relief.

S. 547, prices, stabilization of, amend. Continues authority of the President to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, and speculative trading in commodities which basically affect the cost of living.

H. R. 2402, War Assets Administration, continue.

H. R. 1252, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, amend. Provided that profession No. 1 staff of congressional committees may be hired by executive branch of Government when such persons are terminated from committee staff.

S. 492, stamps, commemorative, Alexandria, Va.

S. 713, General Accounting Office, building, increase limit of cost.

S. 548, Export Control Act of 1949. Extends until June 30, 1951, the authority of the President to control exports.

House Joint Resolution 92, to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels.

House Joint Resolution 84, acquisition of freedom train.

S. 198, relief of San Francisco, Calif., for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring a power-transmission line and loss of power revenue.

S. 630, Navy Supply Corps age limit

House Joint Resolution 89, Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution.

S. 29, relating to property loss of aliens.

S. 170, transfers certain lands to Interior Department.

S. 593, relief of certain post-office employees.

S. 673, Naval Reserve pay and allowances.

Senate Joint Resolution 22, commemorative stamp issue for Annapolis.

Senate Joint Resolution 56, Olympic games, Detroit, Mich.

H. R. 2485, authorized the Marine Band to play at encampment of Grand Army of the Republic.

Senate Joint Resolution 36, contribution to United Nations for Palestine refugees.

Senate Joint Resolution 52, iron ore shipped by Canadian vessels.

S. 271, District Judge for Georgia.

H. R. 128, cotton acreage.

H. R. 253, postmaster appointments.

H. R. 2546, authorized Air Force to establish air warning and control installations.

H. R. 1731, extends Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

S. 135. District of Columbia daylight-saving time.

H. R. 2313, exemption from import tax on copper and copper-bearing ores.

H. R. 3910, District of Columbia rent control extended for 1 month.

House Joint Resolution 203, taxation on transportation via Newfoundland.

H. R. 2216, provides for office of Under Secretary of National Defense.

S. 790, approves the Colorado River Basin compact.

H. R. 2101, extends authority of Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. April 6.

H. R. 54, jurisdiction of Los Alamos Atomic Energy project.

NOTE.—This brings to 38 the total of public laws enacted to date by the Eighty-first Congress.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 56. An act providing for the adjournment of the House of Representatives on April 14, 1949.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRANT (at the request of Mr. HOBBS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE (at the request of Mr. MURDOCK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 779. An act to amend title 28 of the United States code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 1757. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended; and

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1209. An act to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 594. An act for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley;

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 779. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 1757. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés, and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 56, adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Monday, April 25, 1949.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

529. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

530. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from January 1 through March 31, 1949; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

531. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution

authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital or dispensary for heroic services to the officers and men of the United States Navy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

532. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Department of the Army to accept certain gifts and foreign decorations tendered by foreign governments"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 103. Resolution providing for the employment of an additional expert transcriber in the Office of the Official Reporters of Debates; without amendment (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 157. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 107; without amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 172. Resolution providing for one additional clerk for the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10. Concurrent resolution to provide additional funds for the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations; without amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 200. Joint resolution to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversay of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1754. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2984. A bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; with an amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4152. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1920. A bill to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1922. A bill to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; with an amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2001. A bill to amend section 9 on the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2770. A bill to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with an amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 226. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 188. Resolution specifying salary rates for various House employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 114. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 189. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2203, a bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 190. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 195, a bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 191. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2032, a bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 848. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 4263. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to combat the citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4264. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4265. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the thirtieth anniversary of the first flight across the Atlantic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4266. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to make employees eligible for annuities after 40 years of service, regardless of age, and to make widows eligible for annuities, regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4267. A bill to readjust the pay of certain postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service in the Territory of Hawaii, for the period June 16, 1943, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4268. A bill granting additional time for filing claims for refunds of overpayments of income tax by members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4269. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to honor the veterans of the Civil War on the occasion of the final encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4270. A bill to clarify and amend section 2 of the act of Congress of February 11, 1929, with respect to the granting of relief by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in cases in which certain special assessments have been paid and later held to be void or erroneous; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4271. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into special agreements for certain switching service by railway common carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 4272. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4273. A bill to provide for the maintaining of the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy and the Regiment of Midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4274. A bill authorizing the erection of a memorial fountain to Pierre Charles L'Enfant in the city of Washington; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4275. A bill to extend the status of veterans of World War I to persons enrolled or enlisted and serving on United States Shipping Board vessels during World War I in war zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 4276. A bill to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the scientific investigation of tuna, signed at Mexico City January 25, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4277. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture

for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4278. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at El Monte, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4279. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Temple City, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4280. A bill to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Columbia River and completion of alterations to the Hood River Bridge made necessary by Bonneville Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4281. A bill to amend the license law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4282. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit retirement with full annuity at age 60 after 30 years' service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4283. A bill to authorize the construction of a memorial parkway from Nashville, Tenn., to the Hermitage, home of Andrew Jackson, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4284. A bill to amend chapter 85, title 28, United States Code, by adding a new section 1360 relating to jurisdiction of district courts over certain military-preference cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4285. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4286. A bill to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 4287. A bill to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4288. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4289. A bill to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 4290. A bill to establish fair and equitable rules of conduct to govern labor and management in their relations with one another, with individual workers, and with the public, to protect the interest of the public in controversies between labor and management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois:

H. R. 4291. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school-health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 4292. A bill to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 (approved Oct. 14, 1940, Public Law No. 850, 76th Cong., 3d sess.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4293. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts; to the Commttee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4294. A bill amending the act approved May 15, 1928, for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, by including the construction of certain works of improvement in the Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto area, Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 4295. A bill to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4296. A bill to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the scientific investigation of tuna, signed at Mexico City, January 25, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 4297. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4298. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4299. A bill authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4300. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to apportion officers' retirement pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request):

H. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to correct the service records of Navy veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that an invitation be extended to the Dominion of Canada to join the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that in all future appropriations for reclamation projects Congress be urged to make provision to safeguard the public interest in recreation, fish, and wildlife resources on a nonreimbursable basis; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a law preserving the American sporting heritage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the study, control, and eradication of fruitfly pests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available to the Territory of Hawaii the housing and recreational facilities at the Kaneohe Naval Air Station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4301. A bill for the relief of Y. S. Hu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4302. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Blydenburgh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4303. A bill for the relief of Louis Kesselman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4304. A bill for the relief of Adelmo Buzzelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4305. A bill for the relief of Joseph Barraja-Frauenfelder, William Chamberlain Magee, John Henry Thomas, and Phillip "P" Krug—United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4306. A bill for the relief of Zora B. Vulich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4307. A bill for the relief of Ever Ready Supply Co. and Harold A. Dahlborg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4308. A bill for the relief of Russell S. Fothergill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4309. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4310. A bill for the relief of the Interstate Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 4311. A bill for the relief of George McMullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

582. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the City Council of the City of Central Falls, R. I.,

protesting the action of the Communist-controlled government in Sofia, Bulgaria, with regard to the trial of 15 Protestant clergymen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

583. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Central Falls, R. I., memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

584. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 38 residents of Bessemer, Pa., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

585. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the people of Sherborn, Mass., in town meeting, favoring amendment of the United Nations Charter to make the United Nations into a world government; to the committee on Foreign Affairs.

586. By Mr. NORBLAD: Memorial of the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning that through proper budgetary action and financial support, provision be made for the extension of the term of experimental or temporary certificates of convenience and necessity of local and feeder air lines, including that of Empire Air Lines, Inc., from 3 to 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

587. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of Donald F. Rieger, West Haven, Conn., and 132 World War II veterans of the greater New Haven area, requesting full support of H. R. 87, 927, 939, 1704, and S. 644 and 689 and calling for the correction of the injustice of Public Law 134, which was passed in July 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

588. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of E. W. Pfeiffer and 134 residents of Bergen County, N. J., urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

589. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. H. Thomas and others, Tice, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

590. Also, petition of George A. Mero and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

591. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

592. Also, petition of Margarita Falcon and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

593. Also, petition of J. H. Tompkins and others, Milton, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

594. Also, petition of Flora I. Smith and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

595. Also, petition of Mrs. R. M. Dillon and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

596. Also, petition of the president of the National Association of Retired Police-Firemen, Inc., Miami, Fla., requesting passage of legislation granting income-tax exemption on pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and of the living dead; from the beauty of altar lilies in the afterglow of Easter, we come girding ourselves with its deathless message, as we take up our tasks again, feeling through all this earthly dress bright shoots of everlastingness. In our own risen lives, seeking those things which are above, enable us to challenge with the conquering truth of Easter all tyrants who, denying it, exploit and degrade the holy temple of human personality.

May we face whatever the future holds, calm and confident in the assurance that—

"There lives the beauty that man cannot kill,
Yea, that shall kill all ugliness at last;
And Christ in love's white vesture moveth still among us;
May we hold that faith, and hold it fast."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCMAHON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 14, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Repretatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4177. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 164. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California; and

H. R. 1579. An act to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that permission be granted for the introduction of bills and other routine business, including insertions in the RECORD, without affecting the present parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And without debate.

Mr. MCMAHON. Yes, and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REVISED ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. DOC. NO. 51)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation involving a decrease of $25,000 for the Federal Security Agency, and an increase of $18,000, Department of Labor, fiscal year 1949, in the form of amendments to the attachment to his submission of March 30, 1949 (H. Doc. 149), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, many estimates have been placed on the cost of President Truman's spending budget, both foreign and domestic. For the most part they have been piecemeal estimates, dealing with only segments of his proposals.

I believe that his whole program, both foreign and domestic, should be laid right out on the table. Each integral part should be considered so that the spending budget would not exceed the receipts for the next fiscal year, for, as I have already warned, if Federal expenditures do exceed receipts, it means increased taxes or deficit financing.

It has been most difficult to get a complete compilation of the staggering amount of appropriations the President has requested.

Yesterday, in the Sunday Baltimore Sun, appeared the first of a series of articles prepared by Mr. Rodney Crowther, on the social welfare proposals submitted to Congress by the President, which have been assembled in one complete program, to which I call the attention of the Senate. The second installment appeared this morning.

Since we are now at the beginning of the debate on public housing and other social legislation, I again ask, What is the cost to be, and who is to pay the bill?

I read from the article in the Baltimore Sun:

SOCIAL SECURITY—$1,250,000,000,000

This is the first of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social welfare proposals.

This is an important fact:

The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed at this point in my remarks. I ask every Senator to read it. It is the best compilation of facts concerning this subject I have ever seen. It brings out all the details in one package, and that is what we need as we meet here to appropriate the money for the social welfare program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—$1,250,000,000,000

(This is the first of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

If Congress approves President Truman's program, social security will cost the American people $1,250,000,000,000 in the next 50 years.

That figure is not million or billion.

It is one and a quarter trillion dollars.

It is a conservative estimate.

And it is not an estimate concocted by opponents of Mr. Truman's program.

One trillion two hundred and fifty billion dollars is simply the total of the figures worked out by official Government agencies.

The Government figures represent the total cost for 50 years if Congress accepts the President's proposals and broadens the scope of social security, increases benefits, and adds compulsory health insurance and disability benefits.

EVENTUALLY, 15 CENTS OF EVERY PAY-ROLL DOLLAR

And at the end of 50 years, the bill every 12 months will be running between $30,000,000,000 and $40,000,000,000.

That's almost the entire national budget for 1950.

For the Nation's workers it would mean 15 cents out of every dollar of pay roll for insurance against old-age, sickness, and unemployment.

This would be in addition to all other taxes.

Looking ahead 50 years, the President's program—which Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner, this week called "a pretty big package"—probably would be costing $1,250,000,000,000 every 30 years.

ALMOST BEYOND HUMAN COMPREHENSION

How much money is $1,250,000,000,000?

It is so much money that it is virtually beyond the comprehension of the human mind.

A few homely comparisons may help:

One trillion two hundred and fifty billion dollars is twice the total cost of the United States Government from George Washington to Harry Truman, including all our wars.

It is 30 times as much as this year's record-breaking peacetime budget.

It is 250 times the 1949 cost of the Marshall plan.

It is more than eight times the total assessed value of all real property in the United States, as reported in the 1940 census.

It is one and one-half times the amount of money that would be collected in individual Federal income taxes, at the present rate, from now to the year 2000.

It is more money than there is in the whole world.

One trillion two hundred and fifty billion dollars looks like this—$1,250,000,000,000.

All the money in the world looks like this—[1] $70,000,000,000.

One trillion two hundred and fifty billion dollars is 32 times the total amount of monetary gold in the world.

It is 17 times the total amount of currency in the entire world.

There is another way of looking at $1,250,000,000,000 and trying to comprehend what it means.

At this point, it becomes possible to get a faint glimmering of what $1,250,000,000,000 amounts to—at least physically.

It is not a stratospheric figure. The stratosphere is only 7½ miles above the surface of the earth.

It is not even an ionospheric figure. The ionosphere is only 65 miles above the surface of the earth.

A stack of 1,250,000,000,000 silver dollars would penetrate the stratosphere almost before it was begun.

It would penetrate the ionosphere.

It would exceed the greatest height known to have been attained by the most powerful rocket.

SEVEN STACKS OF DOLLARS TO THE MOON

It would reach the moon—with nearly two million miles to spare.

A stack of 1,250,000,000,000 silver dollars would be 2,096,000 miles high.

One trillion two hundred and fifty billion silver dollars would make seven stacks to the moon (mean distance from the earth, 238,857 miles), and there would be enough dollars left over to pay the national debt ($251,500,000,000) and to pay all personal income taxes paid during the fiscal year 1948 on 1947 income ($21,895,904,012).

Fantastic? Yes. But it's true.

The estimate of $1,250,000,000,000 as the cost of social welfare in the next 50 years is not only a simple addition of official figures, it is also based on an official Government assumption that there will be a continuous high level of employment during those next 50 years.

The cost could be higher. Much higher.

Even under present high employment conditions, the cost of social insurance would jump $1,500,000,000 next year if the President's program goes through.

Within fifty years, without any new legislation, the cost of old-age benefits alone will rise to somewhere between six billion and ten billion dollars a year.

Under the President's fair deal program, it would rise faster and farther.

UP TO $40,000,000,000 A YEAR

Within 50 years, old-age, health and other social security schemes would be costing the American people between $29,000,000,000 and $40,000,000,000 every year.

Here are the costs, decade by decade, from a compilation of official Government figures:

Fiscal year	Low cost estimate	High cost estimate
1950	$6,225,000,000	$6,725,000,000
1960	16,000,000,000	22,000,000,000
1970	20,600,000,000	27,570,000,000
1980	23,110,000,000	32,400,000,000
1990	27,260,000,000	37,000,000,000
2000	29,200,000,000	39,900,000,000

[1] This figure excludes Russia, for which no reliable figures are available.

It should be emphasized that these are not fanciful figures, the estimates of hostile critics, or mere guesses.

The official estimate of the cost of the old-age program alone, including permanent-disability insurance but not temporary-disability payments, is between $13,000,000,000 a year and $21,000,000,000 a year at the end of the next 50 years.

FIGURES OFFICIALLY PRESENTED TO CONGRESS

These estimates were presented to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 24 by Arthur J. Altmeyer, social security commissioner.

The figures were prepared by Robert J. Meyers and E. A. Rasor, actuaries of the Federal Security Administration.

When you add to old-age costs railroad retirement, costing about $500,000,000 a year; civil-service benefits, health insurance—estimated between $3,600,000,000 and $8,000,000,000 a year—the aggregate quickly mounts.

And it is based on the optimistic assumption that unemployment costs will never rise above $4,000,000,000 a year.

In the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the total cost of all forms of social security is $4,270,000,000.

That is a little less than 2 percent of our present national income.

INCREASE BETWEEN TWENTY-FOUR AND THIRTY-FOUR BILLION A YEAR

In the budget now before Congress for the next fiscal year, the total cost of social security is set at $6,518,000,000.

That is about 3 percent of a national income estimated at $215,000,000,000.

If President Truman's expanded social-security program is enacted into law, the cost will rise until, within 50 years, it is taking an average of about 11½ percent of our total national income.

The cost each year, within the lifetime of millions of actual and potential taxpayers now living, will rise to between $29,200,000,000 and $40,000,000,000.

At the least, that represents an increase of more than $24,000,000,000 a year.

At the estimated worst, it represents an increase of more than $34,000,000,000 a year.

But isn't the United States still growing? Isn't our population still increasing? Yes. Isn't our national income going to increase? Probably, yes.

THIRTEEN PERCENT OF NATION'S ANNUAL INCOME

Suppose that in the next 50 years our population increases as expected and the national income rises from the 1948 level of $224,400,000,000 to $300,000,000,000 a year in the year 2000.

Actually, in the last 50 years, according to Mr. Altmeyer, it has risen 2 percent a year, and if it expanded the same way for the next 50 years would rise to more than $400,000,000,000 a year.

But taking a $300,000,000,000 top, the average for 50 years would be $262,000,000,000 a year.

For 50 years, therefore, the aggregate income would be $13,100,000,000,000—thirteen trillion one hundred billion.

And the officially estimated cost of social security, including health, disability, and unemployment, would be $1,250,000,000,000 of that total—about 10 percent.

But at the end of 50 years these social-security schemes would be taking approximately 13 percent of the Nation's entire income every year.

And of workers' pay rolls—estimated at about $190,000,000,000 for the year 2000—they would be taking a total of 20 percent.

Estimate of total cost of social security, health, and welfare for 50 years, 1950–2000, on basis of administration proposals (assuming high-level employment throughout period)

	Old-age and survivors insurance [1]	Railroad retirement [2]	Civil-service benefits and retirement [3]	Health insurance [4]	Public assistance [5]	General health and welfare [6]	Temporary disability [7]	Unemployment insurance [8]	Total annual cost
1950—Low	$2,300,000,000	$500,000,000	$250,000,000	$15,000,000	$1,050,000,000	$600,000,000	----------	$1,500,000,000	$6,225,000,000
High	2,300,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000	15,000,000	1,050,000,000	600,000,000	----------	2,000,000,000	6,725,000,000
1960—Low	4,700,000,000	750,000,000	300,000,000	3,600,000,000	900,000,000	2,300,000,000	$1,450,000,000	2,000,000,000	16,000,000,000
High	7,100,000,000	950,000,000	300,000,000	6,000,000,000	900,000,000	2,300,000,000	1,460,000,000	4,000,000,000	22,000,000,000
1970—Low	7,600,000,000	800,000,000	350,000,000	6,000,000,000	800,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,560,000,000	2,000,000,000	20,600,000,000
High	10,900,000,000	950,000,000	350,000,000	6,500,000,000	800,000,000	2,500,000,000	1,570,000,000	4,000,000,000	27,500,000,000
1980—Low	10,100,000,000	800,000,000	400,000,000	6,500,000,000	700,000,000	2,000,000,000	1,620,000,000	2,000,000,000	23,110,000,000
High	14,700,000,000	950,000,000	400,000,000	7,000,000,000	700,000,000	3,000,000,000	1,650,000,000	4,000,000,000	32,400,000,000
1990—Low	12,150,000,000	900,000,000	450,000,000	7,000,000,000	600,000,000	2,500,000,000	1,660,000,000	2,000,000,000	27,260,000,000
High	18,200,000,000	1,000,000,000	450,000,000	7,500,000,000	600,000,000	3,500,000,000	1,750,000,000	4,000,000,000	37,000,000,000
2000—Low	13,100,000,000	900,000,000	500,000,000	7,500,000,000	500,000,000	3,000,000,000	1,660,000,000	2,000,000,000	29,200,000,000
High	20,600,000,000	1,000,000,000	500,000,000	8,000,000,000	500,000,000	3,500,000,000	1,870,000,000	4,000,000,000	39,900,000,000

[1] Includes extended, or permanent disability.

Estimates of old-age and survivor insurance costs were prepared by Rober J. Meyers and E. A. Rasor, actuaries for the Federal Security Agency.

They were submitted Mar. 24 to the House Ways and Means Committee by Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner under the title "Actuarial Study No. 28."

As such, they are the official forecasts of the possible high and low costs of old-age and survivor insurance under proposals of the administration bill, H. R. 2893, now pending before the House of Representatives.

Both the highs and lows assume a constant high level of employment.

[2] Railroad retirement figures are estimates based on the system's report of rate of benefit payments in January 1949.

In that month retirement benefits for railroad workers were $285,000,000, railroad unemployment $50,000,000, and sickness benefits $30,000,000.

Retirements in this system, as in old-age and survivor insurance, are expected to accelerate in the next 10 years and probably reach a peak soon after 1960.

[3] Estimates in this column are based on figures supplied by Civil Service Commission. Government employee retirement benefits, death claims, and refunds to employees leaving the service last year amounted to $241,000,000.

Estimates for future years assume no larger Federal pay roll than the present, but an accelerated rate of retirements.

Public Law 426, 80th Cong., liberalized retirement benefits for Government workers, who now contribute 6 percent to the fund.

The independent offices appropriation bill now before Congress carries $295,553,700 of Government appropriations to the civil-service fund, this being an increase of $71,553,700 over a year ago.

[4] Health insurance includes the estimated costs of what the President refers to as prepaid medical insurance—that is, the costs of doctors, hospitals, nurses, medicines—which the Government would administer similar to the system of health insurance now in effect in Great Britain.

An official administration health bill, according to Mr. Altmeyer, will be sent to Congress by the administration.

[5] The 1950 figure is the estimate set forth in President Truman's January budget.

The public assistance bill is still before the House Ways and Means Committee. President Truman's proposal that assistance be extended to all needy persons has not yet been approved by the committee.

The declining trend of grants to States for public assistance in future years is based on the assumption that Congress will broaden old-age and survivor insurance and thus as Mr. Altmeyer has forecast, will progressively lessen the need for public welfare.

These figures include aid to the needy aged, needy blind, and dependent children.

[6] These costs represent general health, welfare, and security costs, paid from the General Treasury.

They do not include the health insurance program of the President which appears in a separate column above.

These general costs include grants to States for hospital construction and maintenance and are based on a forecast made by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, in a special report to the President last September.

[7] Temporary disability costs, according to Mr. Altmeyer, would be 1 percent of taxable pay rolls under the Administration proposals.

Under the expanded coverage proposed by the President, the taxable pay roll would be about $100,000,000,000 at present employment levels and disability benefits about $1,000,000,000 a year.

Figures for future years are 1 percent of the estimated high and low pay-roll forecasts made by the FSA actuaries and submitted to the Ways and Means Committee Mar. 24.

[8] These unemployment figures are merely minimum guesses based on the fact that at the present high level of employment outlays for unemployment benefits are running in excess of a billion dollars a year.

The Federal Security Administration says that no man on earth can foretell the possible costs of unemployment in future years because there is no way to forecast the economic cycles.

Officials agree that in event of a business depression of any magnitude the figures above would be gross underestimates.

SOCIAL-SECURITY GLOSSARY

WASHINGTON.—The comprehensive system—commonly known as social security—which Congress launched in 1935 as a means of preventing and alleviating destitution, and which President Truman now asks Congress to broaden—has many features.

The following glossary, prepared with the assistance of the Federal Security Agency, briefly describes the major items in the existing and proposed programs:

Social security: Social security is a program to eliminate individual want by preventing loss of income and affording protection against large and unforeseen economic hazards, such as loss of the family wage earner, sudden costly illness or hospitalization. Under the existing program social security embraces social insurance and public assistance. Under the President's proposals the program would be enlarged to include disability and health insurance.

Social insurance: Social insurance at present embraces three specific programs, all designed to protect workers against loss of income arising from (1) retirement due to old age; (2) death of the family wage earner; and (3) temporary loss of employment. Old-age and survivors insurance cover items 1 and 2, and unemployment insurance, item No. 3. The President has proposed that a fourth program be added—disability insurance to protect workers against loss of income arising from sickness or other incapacities.

Temporary disability: Temporary disability is that inability of a wage earner to perform his usual job arising out of illness or other incapacity which does not last for a period of more than 26 weeks.

Permanent disability: Permapent disability is defined in proposed legislation as extended disability, or inability of a worker to engage in any gainful employment and in which the inability continues for more than 26 weeks.

Social welfare: Social welfare is concerned with promoting social assistance and other services designed to strengthen family life. Under this program care and protection is extended to special groups such as children, the aged, and the mentally, physically, and socially handicapped. It embraces a wide variety of activities such as public assistance, vocational rehabilitation, and the prevention of crime.

Public assistance: Public assistance provides money payments to needy aged, needy blind, and dependent children. The Federal Government grants funds to States to meet part of the cost of such needy individuals. The programs are administered by the States. President Truman has proposed extending the assistance to all needy persons.

Unemployment insurance: Unemployment insurance provides covered workers protection against loss of income arising from loss of their jobs. Protection is limited to a maximum period of 26 weeks. The cost is borne by employers through contributions based on pay rolls, up to $3,000 maximum for each employee. The States administer the program and the Federal Government pays the cost of administration.

Health insurance: Health insurance, or prepaid medical and hospital insurance, is a system of contributory insurance based on a percentage of workers' pay rolls under which workers are protected against the costs of medical care, including hospitalization, doctors' and dentists' fees, the costs of nurses, costly medicines, and special health devices, such as hearing aids, eyeglasses, and wheel chairs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the second article appeared this morning, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD. It is entitled "New Plan Would Take More Taxes at Once." It will be a revelation as to what this tax is going to mean to wage earners, as well as others who will pay the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—NEW PLAN WOULD TAKE MORE TAXES AT ONCE

(This is the second of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but, simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 17.—If President Truman's multibillion "cradle-to-the-grave" social-security program is accepted by Congress, the immediate effect will be more taxes for everybody.

If you are already an insured worker it will mean a bigger bite out of your weekly pay envelope.

If you are not already insured, it means you probably will be—and that you will begin paying taxes for your new insurance.

What is this social insurance, and what would it offer you?

It is a Government-sponsored program to insure as many as possible of the Nation's workers against all the major economic hazards of life.

It would insure you against the financial hazards incident to birth, the medical and hospital costs of childhood and youth, the medical costs of maturity, old age, and death itself.

It would insure you partially against loss of income due to unemployment, against loss of the family income due to illness or other incapacity, against the hazard of destitution due to permanent disability.

It would assure you a retirement income in old age, a decent burial, and for certain of your nearest survivors it would assure monthly benefits.

This is the "cradle-to-the-grave" program President Truman recommended to Congress in January and is now urging that it enact before July.

WOULD INSURE 20,000,000 NOT NOW INSURED

The proposal is to insure some 20,000,000 persons not now insured—farm workers, domestics, and employees of nonprofit organizations such as lodges, churches, and clubs, and to insure all the self-employed.

If you are one of the self-employed—a lawyer, doctor, small merchant, accountant—your tax would begin with 1949.

You would pay it with your income tax next March 15.

For all the rest of the newly insured the payments would start January 1.

But for workers already insured the tax increase would be virtually immediate.

If Congress approves the President's plan, it would mean for these workers a pay-roll-tax increase of 50 percent on July 1.

Everybody insured is now paying 1 percent out of the first $3,000 of his pay. His employer is matching this with another 1 percent, making a total pay-roll tax for old-age and survivor insurance of 2 percent.

On July 1 this would jump to 1½ percent for each one—a total of 3 percent.

That is, if you are now having 60 cents a week withheld from your pay for old-age insurance, on July 1 the deduction would rise to 90 cents a week for you and to 90 cents a week for your employer.

But that is just the start.

Under the President's proposal, there would be another tax increase on January 1—and a steeper one.

The old-age pay-roll deduction would then jump to 2 percent for the worker and to 2 percent for employer.

EXTRA HEALTH-INSURANCE TAX INCLUDED

And if Congress approves, on top of this there would be an extra one-fourth percent for the worker and an extra one-fourth percent for the employer.

This is for the proposed new health insurance which the President wishes Congress to enact this year.

The extra one-half percent for the worker, with a similar addition for his employer, proposed for January 1 would be to cover the cost of a new system of insurance.

This is the so-called disability insurance which the President says is needed to round out the social-insurance program.

This insurance, designed to give you partial protection against loss of income in case you are ill, is estimated to cost at the start about $1,000,000,000 a year.

If you earn $3,000 a year you pay now, $30; you pay January 1, 1950, $67.50, 125 percent more; you pay July 1, 1951, $105, 250 percent more.

If you earn $5,000 a year you pay now, $30; you pay January 1, 1950, $108, 260 percent more; you pay July 1, 1951, $168, 460 percent more.

At the present 2-percent rate, equally shared by you and your employer, the Government is collecting about $1,800,000,000 a year.

For old-age benefits it is paying out something over $700,000,000 a year.

Under the new coverage, higher taxes and higher benefits proposed in the President's plan these figures would more than double.

But the amount you pay and your employer pays for old-age insurance, and the extra amount you will pay if the President's program goes through, isn't all the cost by any means.

If you look in the President's 1950 budget you will find a total of $2,500,000,000 for social welfare, health, and security.

CONSTITUTES 6 PERCENT OF BUDGET

That is in addition to old-age and survivor insurance. And you pay that, too. Pay it through your income taxes.

This sum, which includes such things as grants to States for aid to the needy blind, the needy aged, dependent children, promotion of public health, crime control, and school lunches, is about 6 percent of the budget.

In other words, $1 out of every $17 in the Federal budget is for welfare—on top of your taxes for old-age insurance.

And the higher your income, and the lower your personal need for welfare aid, the more you pay both in pay-roll contribution for old-age and income taxes for welfare.

Ultimately, say the social security authorities, the demand for public assistance will decline if more and more people are insured under old-age and survivors insurance.

If you would know your total personal responsibility for social security, health, and welfare you must bear in mind the extra costs for this 6 percent of the budget.

Here's the way it figures out:

Your portion of social welfare, health, and security in 1950 to be paid through income taxes at existing rates

[Assuming a married man with 2 dependents]

Income level	Total tax	Portion (6 percent) for welfare
$1,200	0	0
$2,500	$16.60	$1.00
$3,000	99.60	5.98
$4,000	265.60	15.94
$5,000	431.60	25.90
$10,000	1,360.90	81.65
$25,000	5,475.84	328.55
$50,000	16,577.92	994.68

The administration's social-security plans spell for you not only some more pay-roll taxes, but also a bigger slice out of your general income taxes for welfare.

INCREASE TO 3 PERCENT IN 18 MONTHS PLANNED

To be sure, for the moment, the extra slice for the proposed new health program seems modest enough—½ percent.

This is to cover the costs of the tooling up or preparatory period. This year's budget carries only $15,000,000 to help get the system set up.

The President's bill, which is soon to reach Congress, would eventually cost for health alone somewhere between $3,600,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 a year.

Eighteen months after the modest ½ percent rate goes into effect, the plan is for the total health rate to jump to 3 percent—1½ percent for workers, 1½ percent for employers.

So the outlook for your pay-roll taxes under the Fair Deal social-security program sums up as follows:

July 1, 1949, 1½ percent for you, 1½ percent for your employer.

January 1, 1950, 2¼ percent for you, 2¼ percent for your employer.

July 1, 1951, 3½ percent for you, 3½ percent for your employer.

Or if you are self-employed, 2¼ percent for old-age insurance for 1940, with ¼ percent added for health insurance on January 1, 1950, and 1½ percent for health July 1, 1951.

Later on, after the health system gets launched, there might be an additional ½ percent for dental service, according to the health report of Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator.

TAX CONTRIBUTIONS BY ANNUAL INCOMES

Here is the way social security and health contributions would rise for various classifications of workers:

A $1,200-a-year man, who now pays $12 a year (withheld from his pay) would find $18 withheld after July 1, and then $27 a year after January 1, and $42 a year after July 1, 1951.

A $2,400-a-year worker now pays $24 in old-age taxes. This would jump to an annual rate of $36 on July 1, and to $54 on January 1, and to $84 on July 1, 1951.

For a $3,000 worker, who now pays $30, the steps would be to $45 on July 1, to $67.50 a year on January 1, to $105 a year on July 1, 1951.

And, if the income-tax rates were still unchanged, and the budget the same on July 1, 1951, this man would also have an extra $5.98 in his income taxes for social welfare.

For workers who earn more than $3,000, the tax jump would be even steeper. The administration proposes to jump the taxable base from $3,000 to $4,800.

Thus, if you are a $5,000-a-year man, who now pays $30—1 percent on the first $3,000 of your income—you would begin next January 1 to pay 2¼ percent on the first $4,800 of your income.

Your pay-roll tax would jump to $108—260 percent more than at present—and on July 1, 1951, if the administration plan goes through, it would rise to $168, a 460 percent jump.

For the additional millions who would be added to the system under the President's "fair deal" program, the new taxes would start January 1.

SERVICEMEN WOULD RECEIVE CREDITS

Virtually everyone who works for a living in any way would be covered under these proposals.

Members of the armed services would receive appropriate insurance credits for the period of time spent in the service.

The plan also contemplates extending insurance to employees of State governments and municipal and local employees under voluntary agreements with the States.

If the administration plans go through Congress as proposed, it will mean that millions of people who have never thought very much about it are going to find a new interest in the cost of insuring against the hazards of old-age, unemployment, illness and other economic distress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I trust that my admonition will be taken constructively, because at this point my only motive is not to attack the merits of these proposals, but to show what the costs are to be, as assembled by a great newspaper in a series of articles which I think merit the attention of every American.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous consent granted was that matters might be put in the RECORD, but without debate. The Chair hopes Senators will observe the agreement.

MISSOURI-SOURIS PROJECT—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF UPHAM, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Upham, N. Dak., signed by the mayor and city auditor, favoring the Missouri-Souris project as part of the Missouri Basin development program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Upham:

Whereas the diversion of the Missouri-Souris will help restore the water level of western North Dakota and assure a sufficient

supply of potable water for municipal and other uses; and

Whereas the return of Devils Lake to its former levels will bring benefits to people of North Dakota in the form of recreation not enjoyed since the lake receded; and

Whereas western North Dakota, and particularly our own area, have faced almost insolvency because of periodic droughts which prevailed in the 1930's, diversion and irrigation will solve and guarantee financial security both to farmers and business people in our particular area as well as that of western North Dakota: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Upham hereby expresses its faith in and support of the Missouri-Souris project as part of the Missouri Basin development program; and further be it

Resolved, That the Bureau of Reclamation make every effort to launch immediate construction of the project so as to bring its many benefits to the people of North Dakota at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of said resolution be sent to the following Congressmen in Washington, D. C., Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, and Congressman WILLIAM LEMKE and Congressman USHER L. BURDICK; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of said resolution be transmitted to the Bureau of Reclamation, Minot, N. Dak., and the Missouri-Souris Projects Association, Minot, N. Dak.

The above resolution was passed by the City Council of Upham at its regular meeting held on March 7, 1949.

REUBEN T. FONGSLIE,
Mayor.

A. G. KIRKEBY,
City Auditor.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have recently received from Rev. Joseph P. Springob, chairman of the Milwaukee, Wis., chapter of the American Association of Social Workers, an important resolution. This resolution was drafted by the national committee on international cooperation for social welfare of the American Association of Social Workers.

The subject of the resolution is revision of the present DP statute.

Much progress has already been made toward that objective, and I am hoping that further progress can be promptly made. A House Judiciary Subcommittee has already reported suggested revisions to the present law. Here on the Senate side, it has been my pleasure to introduce several amendments to the law in the form of S. 1055, S. 1315, S. 1316, and S. 1317.

I trust that my amendments, other amendments of my colleagues, and Senate bill 311, introduced by Senators MCGRATH and NEELY, will have the careful and early attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution adopted by the aforementioned American Association of Social Workers be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas despite the efforts of the IRO and some 20 governments to provide new homes for them, there are still over 700,000 displaced persons in Europe living under temporary and unsatisfactory conditions; and

Whereas the cumbersome restrictive and discriminatory provisions of United States Public Law 774 have contributed materially to the disappointedly slow rate at which new immigrants have been able to come to the United States under this law; and

Whereas the McGrath-Neely displaced persons bill (S. 311) provides for the correction of the injustices in the present law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the national board of the American Association of Social Workers endorse the generous purpose, principles and philosophy of the McGrath-Neely displaced persons bill (S. 311) and call upon the Congress to enact this measure without crippling amendments; and be it further

Resolved, That the national committee on international cooperation for social welfare and the chapters of the association be requested to press through all appropriate means for expeditious enactment of the McGrath-Neely bill.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1359. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and sections 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable; with an amendment (Rept. No. 269).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 15, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1949.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1602. A bill to extend the benefits of titles II and III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to certain persons who have remained in active service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1603, to reduce certain taxes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1604. A bill for the relief of F. DuWayne Blankley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1605. A bill to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1606. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine the validity of titles to lands acquired in the administration of the reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1607. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Delta, Utah;

S. 1608. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in American Fork, Utah;

S. 1609. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in St. George, Utah;

S. 1610. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Midvale, Utah;

S. 1611. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Bountiful, Utah;

S. 1612. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Layton, Utah;

S. 1613. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Kaysville, Utah;

S. 1614. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Clearfield, Utah;

S. 1615. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Orem, Utah;

S. 1616. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Tremonton, Utah;

S. 1617. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Heber City, Utah;

S. 1618. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Fillmore, Utah;

S. 1619. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Manti, Utah;

S. 1620. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Salina, Utah;

S. 1621. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Magna, Utah;

S. 1622. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Payson, Utah;

S. 1623. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Roy, Utah;

S. 1624. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Roosevelt, Utah; and

S. 1625. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Lehi, Utah; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1626. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1627. A bill for the relief of Francis Laforge, Fred Morrison, and Robert Yellowtail; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1628. A bill for the relief of E. E. Drury & Sons, Troy, Mont.; and

S. 1629. A bill for the relief of Kalispell Pole Co., Kalispell, Mont.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1630. A bill to correct an inequity existing between the rates of controller circulation business publications, such as trade, technical, scientific, and professional periodicals, and other publications mailed under the second-class mailing privilege; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 1631, to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands.)

REDUCTION OF CERTAIN TAXES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reduce certain taxes. It provides that taxes in the United States be reduced exactly as they have been reduced in Canada.

The bill (S. 1603) to reduce certain taxes, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration, to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, and so forth, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reference of the bill will be deferred pending disposition of the President's message on the same subject, and,

without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1631) to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

The bill deals with the administration's plans for coordinating development of the Columbia River Basin in the Pacific northwest. Should this bill be approved in its present form it would establish a Columbia Valley Administration.

As one who lives in the Pacific northwest and is concerned with the growth and development of that great region I share a great uncertainty with many other thoughtful citizens concerning what plan ought to be adopted to insure a maximum development and utilization of the resources of the region. Every constructive suggestion and plan ought to be minutely analyzed and studied by the Congress. I think that the administration CVA proposal is completely deserving of a serious consideration at this time. I am submitting the bill in question to assist in securing that consideration. Two companion bills were introduced in the House on April 14, 1949 and both bills were referred to the Committee on Public Works.

On April 14 I introduced S. 1595 which would approve the Columbia River Basin development and construction plans and programs which have recently been agreed to by the Secretary of the Army, speaking for the United States Army engineers, and the Secretary of the Interior. These two agencies of the Government have signed an agreement covering the coordination of their comprehensive plans for the future development of the Pacific Northwest.

As I understand it there would be no need for the Congress to approve the development plan and program which has been approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior if the Congress first approves legislation to create a Columbia Valley Administration. It likewise follows that the reverse of this statement is true.

On April 13 in his message to Congress, which requested the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration, the President pointed up an obvious fact when he said in part:

"The waters of the Columbia River system (among our rivers second only to the Mississippi in flow) are capable eventually of producing more than 30,000,000 kilowatts of electric power, of which only a little more than 3,000,000 kilowatts are now installed. There are possibilities of reclaiming many more acres of land by irrigation, as they may be needed, in addition to the 4,000,000 acres now irrigated. More than 40 percent of the Nation's saw timber and many important minerals, including 60 percent of our known phosphate reserves, are in the Columbia Valley region. Properly developed and conserved, the resources of the Columbia Valley region can furnish enormous benefits to the people living there and to the Nation as a whole."

The problem before the Congress is to make as certain as it can that the very best procedures are employed in securing the maximum beneficial good from the broadest utilization of the resources of the Columbia River Basin. It is to be hoped that the Congress will concern itself only with economic fact rather than with political considerations and prejudices. Unless the Congress is very careful a consideration of the resources requirements of the Pacific Northwest will become a political question and little more. This potentially sad situation must be avoided at all cost because every citizen in the Nation will benefit or suffer from the Columbia River Basin development program which are finally to be approved by the Congress.

I would encourage every Member of the Congress to thoughtfully examine as time permits all of the plans which have been offered for the Columbia River Basin. The suggestions made by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior result from long experience in the field. The suggestions incorporated in the administration's proposed CVA have been offered by thoughtful persons. All of us should be grateful for having an opportunity for analyzing the proposals which have come from these several directions.

In regard to S. 1595, which would approve the Columbia River Basin plans which have been submitted to the President by the Secretary of the Army and by the Secretary of the Interior, I may say that, despite the fact that obviously I have no connection with the administration, I have thought it proper to introduce the bill, partly because no other Senator has seen fit to introduce proposed legislation covering the administration's CVA plan, in order that all the proposed development programs for the Pacific Northwest might be before the committee having jurisdiction and the Congress at the same time.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT, ETC.

Mr. ANDERSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE SUPER NAVAL AIR CARRIER

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, this morning I understand that at Norfolk the keel was laid for the super carrier which has been estimated by some reliable persons to cost about $220,000,000. With the shielding force which will be required around the ship a total of about half a billion dollars will be involved. I think it would be appropriate and a source of congratulations to everybody concerned if we could believe what Admiral D. V. Gallery says about this ship in an illustrated article entitled "Don't Damn the Carriers," published in the magazine Science of the issue of February 1949. I wish to read three sentences from the article:

So far as attack from above is concerned, CVA–58's—

That is the temporary designation of the ship—

armored flight deck will render her practically immune to damage by bombs or rockets.

I do not know whether Admiral Gallery believes that, but I do not. He goes on further to say:

Of course, if an atomic explosion such as the Bikini underwater blast should occur directly beneath CVA–58—

I am glad of this confession—

she probably would be sunk. But a near miss wouldn't hurt her. And a high-speed maneuverable and heavily defended ship such as this one is very easy to miss.

I simply do not take any stock in it, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T DAMN THE CARRIERS—THE UNITED STATES IS BUILDING A GIANT FLOATING AIRSTRIP FOR ATOM-AGE WAR

(By Rear Adm. D. V. Gallery, U. S. N.)

Our new 65,000-ton carrier, the first great warship of the atomic age, will be the most powerful military machine ever created by modern science.

Any physicist or engineer, no matter how highly specialized his field, will find something in this floating airstrip to arouse his excited interest. Metallurgy and medicine, thermodynamics and aerodynamics, nuclear physics and electronics, aerology and sociology, and many other fields, meet within the hull of "CVA–58" and cooperate toward a single purpose: to project United States air power to any point in the world where it may be needed.

The first scientific marvel is the hull, which will contain more steel than the Empire State Building and almost as much as the Golden Gate Bridge. The most striking hull feature is that nothing sticks up above the flight deck. This vast expanse of steel will stretch away 1,090 feet into the horizon, and will be 130 feet wide. The absence of the usual bridge structure, smokestacks and masts is graphic evidence of several things that recent scientific developments have thrust upon us.

For one thing, the human eye is no longer the best means by which a captain can determine what is going on around him. Radar will enable him to "see" even better from his new station below decks than he could from the captain's traditional station on the bridge.

Another thing: The increasing size of jet bombers has decreed that the stacks, bridges, and masts must go. Horizontal smokestacks at the flight deck level will take the flue gases overboard.

The hull itself is a huge girder, designed to withstand the pounding and the rapidly changing loads slammed against it by the biggest storm waves the ocean can muster. At times the ship will be suspended like a bridge across the trough of a heavy sea; a few seconds later she will be over the barrel of a huge roller amidships.

Just as the Empire State building must bend with the wind when a gale blows, our ship must bend with the waves. At the bow and stern this bending can amount to almost 12 inches.

In addition to battering seas, the monster hull must absorb and defeat the heaviest blows which man can strike. It will have built into it all the things which 4 years of all-out war in the Pacific taught us about protecting against bombs, torpedoes, and fire.

A big carrier is a tank farm, an ammunition dump and an airfield all rolled up into one tight package. This is a highly inflammable combination. We lost four big carriers in the first year of World War II before we learned how to fight fires. But in the last 3 years, when we were carrying the war to the doorstep of Tokyo, not a single big carrier was lost. The Japs started roaring fires on the *Hancock*, the *Bunker Hill*, the *Intrepid*, and the *Franklin*. But we put them out. Today those ships are in the "mothball fleet," ready to go again in case we need them.

The things that we learned in those ships about the use of fog spray and foam, about isolating a conflagration, beating it down and washing it overboard, and about survival in heat and smoke, have all gone into the hull of this ship while it was still on the drawing board. She will be able to confine, control, and snuff out any fire in short order.

So far as attack from above is concerned, CVA–58's armored flight deck will render her practically immune to damage by bombs or rockets.

As a result of our experience against the Japanese air force, including the fanatical Kamikaze "guided missile," our Navy discovered that it can chase these suicide birds back home and even destroy the nests, for carrier task forces can be operated wherever there is seven fathoms of salt water. That's enough to put an air group within striking distance of almost any land airbase on the globe.

TORPEDO MENACE

The greatest menace to a large ship these days, however, comes from below. It is the submarine torpedo. You can't stop a torpedo explosion with brute force. You have to "roll with the punch" and absorb it. We know from caisson experiments exactly how much damage one torpedo can do, and our watertight compartments are designed accordingly. So the ship will be minutely subdivided into watertight compartments below the water line. Damage from any one torpedo will be confined and localized.

Powerful pumps, connecting to every compartment, will enable the ship to keep herself upright and under control even in the very unlikely event that she is hit by many torpedoes at once. You can pump the water out of a leaking compartment, or, if necessary, counterflood the corresponding compartment on the opposite side of the ship. The total capacity of the pumping system is equal to that of a city the size of Washington.

The speed of the ship and the screen of escort vessels which will surround her makes it very improbable that an enemy submarine will even get a shot at her. Her hull construction insures survival even if she does get hit.

Of course, if an atomic explosion such as the Bikini underwater blast should occur directly beneath CVA–58, she probably would be sunk. But a near miss wouldn't hurt her. And a high-speed, maneuverable, and heavily defended ship such as this one is very easy to miss.

To send this 65,000-ton mass of steel spearing through the sea at 30 knots, or anything like it, takes a steam power plant capable of supplying about one-third the power generated at Boulder Dam. Her turbines, reduction gears, boilers, and generators are the end products of many years of basic research in thermodynamics, metallurgy, and electricity, and will give her an economical built-in speed that will be the highest ever attained by a ship of this size.

Speed is important in several ways. It means that the flyers taking off from her desk will always have from 30 to 40 knots of wind helping to lift them off. That's a lot of wind, and it makes a big difference in the take-off run required by a jet aircraft.

Speed is also one of the vital factors governing the whole concept of carrier task-force operations. A task force which is pinpointed at a certain spot in the open sea today can, within 24 hours, be anywhere inside a circle of radius 600 miles, even if it only steams at 25 knots. This circle has an area of over 1,000,000 square miles. And if you're the kind of person who likes a graphic description, that number of square miles would cover the circular area extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border and from Denver to Knoxville.

To achieve real zip in a ship as big as CVA–58 takes some fancy handsprings in the field of high-temperature metallurgy. It calls for brand-new kinds of innards like boiler tubes, turbine blades, and steam pipes that will be capable of standing temperatures that 1930's engineers wouldn't have considered necessary for propulsion this side of Hades. Steam lines in this ship will be so hot that if the asbestos covering were removed they would glow in the dark. The use of highly superheated steam increases thermodynamic efficiency, decreases fuel consumption, and reduces the size and weight of the entire engineering plant. Thus, the size of the ship can be decreased, or the space available for carrying fuel increased. The net result is greatly increased cruising radius.

CRUISING RADIUS IS VITAL

Cruising radius is important in any ship, but it is vital in a modern aircraft carrier. For when you increase her cruising radius you also increase the combat radius of her airplanes. The combat radius of any naval aircraft is never just the distance it can fly on the fuel it carries in its own tanks. It is that plus the cruising radius of the ship from which it operates.

Or, if you want, look at it this way: Every carrier plane is a transoceanic bomber. Its transoceanic range is built into the fuel tanks of the ship which carries it.

I spent my first 3 years after graduating from the Naval Academy in engineering duty, and still know my way around in an engine room. If I could, I would spend hours comparing this plant with the coal-burning boilers and reciprocating engines of the *Delaware*, in which I first learned what makes the wheels go round. But there are too many other things to discuss about CVA–58.

Planes which are now merely small-scale models in wind tunnels exploring the mysteries of supersonic flight, will take off and land from the big carrier's broad expanse of flight deck. Actually, its area will be only about one-thirtieth that of the runway ashore necessary to operate planes of corresponding radius. The reasons why it can do the same job are: The 35 knots of wind which always blows straight down the center line where aircraft are operating; the powerful catapults installed under the deck; and the now familiar JATO (jet-assisted take-off).

Air groups of any kind will be launched and taken aboard with lightning speed never before possible.

The CVB *Midway* class and a few other big carriers had three elevators—one forward, one aft, and one outboard opposite the island. This meant that when planes were landing, the after elevator had to be in deck position and couldn't be used. On take-offs, the forward elevator was out of use for the same reason.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The CVB's also had two forward catapults capable of launching Navy twin-engined bombers. But the two could not launch simultaneously. One would have to load while the other was discharging its roaring cargo. The new floating air strip eliminates this slowdown. Of her four elevators, three are outboard—and none are in the take-off area. Four catapults are each capable of launching a plane as large as a B–24. The two aft can operate independently of each other, while those off the bow will be on a staggered schedule. This arrangement will cut to one-third the time in which an entire squadron can be air-borne.)

The new ship also has telescopic bridges and radar antennae low on the ship's sides, so they can be hydraulically dropped when planes are catapulted over them. There is duplicate equipment below decks, too, so that the topside equipment can be knocked out and still not black-out the ship's nerve center—the CIC room.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Against the Midway class capacity of over 100 single-engine or twin close-in jet fighters and bombers, the CVA will put even more fighters in the air. More likely, her air group will include medium twin-engine bombers like the Mercator and Neptune, and fast jet fighter bombers. However, there will be little to stop her from loading on deck and launching some B–47's (Boeing's superfast, swept-wing, four-jet bomber), B–54's or other massive bombers, which could shuttle over a target and land some place ashore—a repeat of the Doolittle B-25 operations on an A-war scale.)

Supersonic jet fighters will have plenty of room to take off and land on this deck. The Navy already has operated McDonnell Phantoms and North American Furies from the Saipan and Philippine Sea, and has proven that jet planes can be handled easily even by our older carriers.

Long-range jet bombers present another problem. The Navy is confident that it has the answers to this problem, but until CVA-58 goes to sea the experimental proof will be lacking.

Until the advent of jet aircraft, Navy planes designed to operate from carriers were at a disadvantage compared to similar planes designed to operate from land bases. They had to be built to take much higher landing stresses. However, take-off is now the critical operation in designing jet aircraft, and the jets operating from a carrier have such a big advantage in take-off over shore-based planes that the landing problem is neutralized. As ranges and speed increase we can expect carrier-based planes to out-perform similar shore-based types because of their take-off advantage.

The big advantage for jets in this unobstructed flight deck, lies in its powerful catapults and its "built-in wind." Furthermore, no spot in the world is more than 1,700 miles from salt water in which CVA-58 can operate. The Navy has finally removed the bottleneck of the island which restricted the wing span of carrier airplanes. Now the aircraft designer can put all the performance he wants into a carrier plane without

being handicapped by the fact that his wing tip must be able to squeeze past the island on take-off.

Technically, there is no reason why planes as large as the B-36 should not take off and land on this flight deck. Of course, we never expect to operate a plane as big as the B-36, because working from a mobile base, with transoceanic range built into the fuel tanks of the ship, there is no reason for building a plane that big. A plane of about one-third that size can reach any target in the world. Incidentally, such a plane might have Air Force insignia on it just as well as Navy.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Whether the planes are Air Force or Navy, they will be guided on their missions by men who never actually see them "in the flesh." All operations will be carried on from "bridges," and from the combat formation center (CIC) below decks. The CIC is the brain center of the ship. Here, in an atmosphere of dim red and green fluorescent lighting, modern science really reigns supreme. Radar and television, Loran and Sonar, radio and ultrafax all cooperate to collect data for use in CIC. All intelligence and information is fed into this center, and displayed on flickering radar scopes, status boards and dead reckoning tracer plots. The information is evaluated there, decisions are made and orders to execute these decisions are originated and transmitted from this center.)

As aircraft and ship speeds increase, what you see with your eyes becomes less and less important. You don't see a jet bomber with your eyes until it is too late. If you hope to knock him down you must "see" him on a radar scope.

The time is rapidly approaching when an enemy bomber will be detected, intercepted and shot down, without even having been actually seen visually by anyone in the defending forces.

MACHINES WITH COLLEGE EDUCATION

To handle such problems as this, and the fire control problem of placing a high velocity shell within lethal range of a jet bomber, requires computing machines with a college education. Analogue and digital computers, integrators and differential analyzers will be available to solve these problems. These fantastic machines figure in split seconds the course and trajectory of oncoming rockets and other projectiles. They are radar-controlled gadgets, and will give fire control officers on the ship enough fast information to destroy such projectiles in mid-air. Guns, aimed by radar-controlled direction-finder, will pick them off before they approach within critical distance of the ship.

The lads who set the dials on these machines may not have finished high school, but the machines will grind out solutions to problems which might puzzle many a scientist. And a surprising number of those sailor operators will know plenty about what goes on inside the black boxes on which they set the dials.

Of course, the biggest problem of all on any ship is one to which no scientific machine will ever provide the answer. It is the problem of leadership, of how to direct the efforts of 3,000 or more young Americans so as to get the most out of the equipment which modern science has provided for them.

A smart captain will therefore watch what goes on in the galley, the bake shop, and the laundry, just as closely as he watches his CIC. Domestic science plays a very fundamental part in the running of a large ship such as this one. The chef of the Waldorf would be delighted with the electric ranges, steam kettles and serving tables which are going into this carrier. Automatic spud peelers, dishwashers and driers will make life a lot easier for the cooks. The cold storage plant will hold 89 tons of meat and the bake ovens will turn out 3,500 loaves of bread per day.

FACILITIES OF GOOD-SIZED TOWN

The new ship will have all the facilities of a good-sized town, including a tailor shop, cobbler shop, library, post office, soda fountain, movie, church, and a completely equipped hospital.

After hearing about all the scientific wonders which will go into this ship you may wonder what kind of a superman it will take to command it. There are two simple and fundamental requirements which he must meet. He must be both a seaman and a flyer. He must have a seaman's knowledge of the ocean's moods and its strength, and of the eccentricities and limitations of his ship. He must have a flyer's appreciation of the weather and of what airplanes can and cannot do. To command the respect of both his sailors and his flyers he must know these things from his own experience, not from the advice of others who know more about it than he does.

ANSWER TO IMPORTANT QUESTION

Many people are asking today why we can't put the Navy's airplanes under the Air Force and let the Navy run the carriers. I can best answer that by relating an incident which occurred in the early days of the war.

Our Naval Air Admiral "Black Jack" Reeves visited a British carrier, where this system was in effect, and where there was much friction and mutual distrust between the ship's captain and the RAF air group commander. In private conversations each one of these individuals told Admiral Reeves the same set of grievances.

The Royal Navy ship captain said "You will understand my position because you are a seaman."

The RAF group captain said, "You will understand my position because you are a flyer." The strength of our present United States Navy system is that it produces exactly that kind of men.

A NOTE ABOUT MILITARY SCIENCE

In conclusion, since we are talking about science, I think it is appropriate to close with a note about military science. P. T. Barnum came very close to expressing an axiom of military science when he said, "Never give a sucker an even break." Change sucker to the enemy and you have one of the fundamental principles of war.

I have heard people say, in regard to naval air power in general and to this carrier in particular, that the Navy must be prevented from saddling this country with two air forces. Our Navy, with its mobile air bases, such as CVA-58, gives us a decisive advantage in the air over any possible opponent. A hard-hitting, fast-moving naval air force, striking from wherever there is salt water, can be the difference that makes our command of the air overwhelming. If we have the wisdom to exploit and improve this advantage in conjunction with our 70-group air force, it can make this country invincible in the air.

We are not saddled with this advantage, we are blessed with it.

SHOULD WE FINANCE NATIONAL SOCIALISM IN EUROPE?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEM

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Should We Finance National Socialism in Europe?" delivered by him over radio station WBAL, Baltimore, Md., on April 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUTURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the future of the Republican Party, prepared by him, and published in the March-April issue of the Northwest Republican, of Minneapolis, Minn., which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LANGER BY E. L. DELANEY

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Senator LANGER, by E. L. Delaney, broadcast from Station KPRO, Riverside, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE DAY IN A "DO-NOTHING" CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "One Day in a 'Do-Nothing' Congress," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of April 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF SYNTHETIC OIL—LETTER FROM E. V. MURPHREE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the development of synthetic oil addressed to him by E. V. Murphree, president of the Standard Oil Development Co., which appears in the Appendix.]

MARSHALL-AID COUNTRIES REPORTED OVERPRODUCING—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Marshall-Aid Countries Reported Overproducing," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Sunday Star of April 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—LETTER FROM ROBERT J. KLEBERG, JR.

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to a proposal to build a laboratory for research in foot-and-mouth disease, from Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., to Representative JOHN H. KERR, chairman, Deficiency Committee of Committee on Appropriations, which appears in the Appendix.]

GUARANTEED FARMING—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Guaranteed Farming," published in the Washington Post of April 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENT BY GEORGE SOKOLSKY ON ADDRESS BY HAROLD STASSEN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comment by George Sokolsky on an address delivered by Harold Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, before the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONEY SPENT BY THE UNITED STATES FOR FOREIGN AID SINCE WORLD WAR I—ARTICLE BY JOHN O'DONNELL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell, showing the amount of money spent by the United States for foreign aid since World War I, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFTER COLLEGE, WHAT?—ARTICLE BY JAMES P. LYNCH

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "After College, What?" by James P. Lynch, editor of the Exeter News-Letter, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT ABOUT FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS—ARTICLE BY HENRY F. AND KATHERINE PRINGLE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What About Federal Aid for Schools?" by Henry F. and Katherine Pringle, published in the April 16, 1949, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF ARKANSAS, WHITE, AND RED RIVER BASINS—EDITORIAL BY C. F. BYRNS

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to plans for the development of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins, written by C. F. Byrns, and published in the Southwest American Times-Record of Fort Smith, Ark., of April 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DOMESTIC TRANSPORTATION SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Transportation Policy," published in the New York Times of April 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BACK TO THE GOLD STANDARD?—ADDRESS BY PROF. WALTER E. SPAHR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am sure we are all firm believers in the principle that a sound monetary system is an integral part of a good economy. With that thought in mind, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by Prof. Walter E. Spahr on the subject Back to the Gold Standard?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK TO THE GOLD STANDARD?

By Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University; executive vice president, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy)

A sound monetary system is an integral part of a good economy. It is a basic instrument in the assurance of human freedom. It is one of mankind's best protectors against socialism or a governmentally managed economy in some other form.

An irredeemable paper money system is neither sound nor honest. It is one of the most potent instruments that can be employed by a government against a people's freedom. The government that authorizes its issuance is either morally or financially bankrupt, or both. Perhaps next to war, mankind has never devised a more destructive instrument of human welfare than that of irredeemable paper money.

I. A DESCRIPTION OF OUR MONETARY SYSTEM

Today, the people of the United States have an irredeemable money system insofar as direct redeemability in gold is concerned. Silver certificates are redeemable in an overvalued silver, but the silver is not redeemable directly in gold.

Our Treasury and Federal Reserve banks are authorized to issue promises to pay which they do not redeem except in other irredeemable money, silver certificates excepted.

The promises to pay, or the statements as to the security underlying, or both, printed on our paper money are all inaccurate or misleading except in the case of silver certificates.

Our Federal Reserve banks are required to hold reserves in the form of gold certificates against their notes and deposits, and yet, at the same time, they are not permitted to pay out these reserves to the people of the United States. The Treasury cannot pay out to our people any of the gold which it is required to hold against part of its outstanding paper money.

This arrangement is a case of granting institutions the privilege of issuing promises to pay without at the same time imposing upon them a corresponding responsibility to redeem these promises.

Privilege without corresponding responsibility would appear to be without any valid defense. We have, in this country, a great body of contract law designed to compel people to fulfill their promises to pay. But despite the general acceptance by our people of the principle that it is the duty of the issuer of promises to pay to meet them when they mature, we have exempted from such obligation both our Treasury and our Federal Reserve banks.

Although the gold reserves held by the Treasury against part of its currency and the gold-certificate reserves held by the Federal Reserve banks against their Federal Reserve notes and deposits cannot be paid out to the people of this country, they can be, and are, paid out upon demand to foreign central banks.

The reason for this discrimination in favor of foreign central banks and against the people of the United States lies in the fact that our Government can regiment the people of the United States but cannot compel foreign central banks to accept our irredeemable paper currency or overvalued silver except at a discount. Therefore, our Reserve banks must stand ready to pay out our best money, not our cheapest, on demand to foreign central banks in order to maintain the parity between our irredeemable currency and gold. Our own people, on the other hand, must be satisfied with irredeemable paper money and overvalued silver and minor coin, so long as we continue with our present system.

The peculiarities of the so-called reserves of the Federal Reserve banks call for emphasis. Only gold certificates are lawful money for reserves against Federal Reserve notes and the deposits of these banks. But these so-called reserves, which are ostensibly held against all these notes and deposits, can in fact be used to meet the claims of foreign central banks only, some of which are under the control of governments that are either Socialist or managers of the people and their economy in some other form.

The only asset cash which the Federal Reserve banks can pay out domestically against their notes and deposits is composed of silver, silver certificates, United States notes, and minor coin. But this money is not lawful for reserves in our Federal Reserve banks, although it is treated by our Government as good enough for the people of the United States in the conduct of their daily transactions.

In other words, the money that is lawful for reserves in Federal Reserve banks cannot be paid out domestically, while the only asset cash that can be paid out is not lawful money for reserve in these banks.

It is also important to understand that the only asset cash which the Reserve banks can pay out against their Federal Reserve notes and deposits at any time is generally a relatively small item. For example, on February 2, the Federal Reserve banks held only $370,000,000, approximately, of asset cash against $46,000,000,000, roughly, of Federal Reserve notes and deposits. On that same date they held in gold certificates reserves over $23,000,000,000 against their $46,000,000,000 of notes and deposits. They could not pay out the gold-certificate reserves which amounted to over 50 percent of their note and deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks; all that they could pay out was the $370,000,000 of asset cash which amounted to approximately only eight-tenths of 1 percent of their note and deposit liabilities.

A noteworthy aspect of this situation is that when it is suggested that we return to a redeemable currency and require the Federal Reserve banks to pay out their reserves to meet their note and deposit liabilities, it is promptly and vigorously urged that we do not have enough gold to go around. Nothing is said about the fact that the only asset cash that the Federal Reserve banks can pay out against their notes and deposits ranges ordinarily from one-seventieth to one one-hundredth of what they would have to pay out if we were on a gold-coin standard.

Since the argument that there is not enough gold to go around is so common, it justifies examination. Briefly, it is indefensible for two reasons:

First, there is never enough of anything to go around if it has value. Scarcity is a fundamental requisite of value. There are never enough bridges or elevators or ships to go around if all who have a right to use them were to demand their services at the same time. Special devices are required to meet unusual and unexpected loads thrown upon scarce and valuable goods which, in the interests of economy, are designed, ordinarily, to carry an average load or to meet a typical demand. There are enough, only, of those goods to go around that have no value.

Second, the ratio of our gold stock to money and deposits is relatively high. It is approximately 13 percent as compared with an average of roughly 8 percent for the years 1915–1932, during which time our country and our Federal Reserve System operated on a gold-coin standard.

Today, private enterprisers cannot obtain gold for use in foreign trade. Our Government and our governmental institutions control foreign exchange, trade, and foreign investments. The consequence is that foreign trade is tied in knots and there is no reason to suppose that it can develop properly until private enterprisers are enabled to obtain gold and silver and to go where they will, when they will, in their search for profit.

In short, we have slipped into a system of liability currency. Our people must use the note and deposit liabilities of banks, both of which are irredeemable insofar as gold is concerned.

This shift from an asset to a liability currency has been gradual and subtle. It seems reasonably clear that most people have no understanding of this shift or of its significance. There is today widespread acceptance of this system in this country.

Both the shift to this type of currency and the acceptance of it have involved a gradual loosening of the bonds of integrity. It is a remarkable thing that the people of the United States should be willing to approve the issuance by the Treasury and Reserve banks of an irredeemable currency since such a currency is dishonest. Our acceptance of this practice means that we think promises to pay which will not be redeemed are preferable to promises to pay that could and should be redeemed.

II. SOME OF THE CONSEQUENCES FLOWING FROM OUR IRREDEEMABLE CURRENCY SYSTEM

One of the consequences flowing from our irredeemable currency system is the loss by our people of their control over the Government's use of the people's public purse. Since individuals cannot demand redemption of these promises to pay, the Treasury and the Reserve banks can issue many more promises, and the Government can spend more money than otherwise would be possible.

The result is that the control of the people's purse has passed to pressure groups, both domestic and foreign, whose good will

the majority of Congress endeavors constantly to buy. Congress, in turn, controls the Treasury, and the Treasury controls the Federal Reserve banks. Congress can bow to, and attempt to buy the support of, vote-delivering pressure groups because it is easy for it to require the Treasury and Reserve banks to issue additional promises to pay since they are irredeemable and since the people can place no restraints on such issuance by demands for redemption.

The connection between the loss by our people of a redeemable currency and the subsequent orgy of Government spending, profligate waste of our national patrimony, heavy and destructive taxation, and huge Federal debt seems not to be generally or clearly understood.

Another consequence of our employment of an irredeemable currency has been that it has depreciated rapidly in recent years. The value of people's savings, of their income from bonds, annuities, and insurance policies has declined sharply in a relatively short space of time. Billions upon billions of dollars of purchasing power have been destroyed by this depreciation of our currency.

Because foreign trade, exchange, and investments are under Government control, we have distortion and stagnation in foreign trade and foreign exchange, and currency stabilization and recovery in foreign countries have been retarded.

Only eight little countries do not today require import or export permits—Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, and Tangier. The Union of South Africa has some controls of minor importance.

When a government extends its controls through the channels of money, it touches every person and transaction that employs money. This is a subtle type of control and it has exceedingly far-reaching implications. It is a case of planting a deadly germ in the bloodstream of a nation's economy. This is not obvious to the general public. It requires time for them to perceive the fact that their vitality is being undermined, that their savings are slowly disappearing and are becoming a hollow shell, that a cancerous growth is eating deeply into the economic, social, and political fabric of the nation.

Probably the greatest step thus far taken to rob the people of the United States of their appropriate liberties was that which deprived the people of the gold coin standard and system and, consequently, of control over the public purse.

An irredeemable currency constitutes a moral, economic, and political rot that eats into practically every fiber of strength of a nation.

The disease is particularly insidious because, at its outset, there is generally a feeling of increased well-being; and, remembering this when later stages of the disease reveal distresses, the common practice is to demand more doses of the same intoxicant, in larger and larger amounts and with greater and greater frequency, until the patient collapses. We have not run this course yet; but the people of the United States have the disease which accompanies an irredeemable currency. They like the artificial stimulation it has given. They cry out in protest, like the person hopelessly addicted to a drug, when it is recommended that this intoxicating poison be taken from them. They manufacture all sorts of arguments as to why we should continue with our irredeemable currency.

Our people would do well to review the parallelism between our situation and popular attitude today in respect to irredeemable paper money and that which prevailed in France 159 years ago as described by Andrew D. White in his Fiat Money Inflation in France. We "secure" our irredeemable paper money by gold taken from our people and which they cannot obtain. The French "secured" their irredeemable paper money by confiscated church lands which the people could not employ in redemption. The majority of the French assembly, and apparently of the mass of people, contended that they understood better the virtues and dangers of an irredeemable paper money than did their most expert monetary economists and their fathers who utilized irredeemable currency with sad results some 70 years earlier under John Law.

They were, they claimed, not despots, but real democrats, the true representatives of the people; they were, they insisted, enlightened, progressive, and liberal. They ran some of their most experts monetary economists out of France so that they could pursue their "enlightened" course without having their sins and stupidities pointed out by those uncooperatives and old-fashioned economists.

The reasons why our Treasury and Federal Reserve authorities defend our irredeemable currency system should be understood. They like present arrangements because they are freed from any responsibility to redeem their promises to pay. This system allows them to escape the problems inherent in a fractional reserve system. An irredeemable currency is an easy, but it is not the proper, solution to the problems involved in the fractional reserve system on which banks operate.

It was a man on horseback—Napoleon—who rode into power on the heels of the French irredeemable currency of approximately 160 years ago. Fortunately for France, he at least swept that out and instituted a gold standard and a redeemable currency, after which France struggled painfully back to recovery from the devastation caused by irredeemable money, the Revolution, and Napoleonic wars.

The sequence of events in which the use of irredeemable paper currencies is followed by dictators has repeated itself too often in this world to permit any responsible person to assume that we in the United States will not provide another illustration of it.

A sound currency is perhaps the best single guaranty a people can have that they will not be led into socialism or a governmentally managed economy in some other form. We are waiving that guaranty and we are keeping wide open this gate to socialism.

We have fallen into the European practice of cheapening our monetary standard and of manipulating our currency, and, should we be engulfed in a severe depression, it seems highly probable that there would be an overwhelming drive for further devaluation of our dollar and currency depreciation in other forms. We seem not yet to have learned the virtues of and necessity for a fixed monetary unit and a redeemable currency. We do not seem to understand that both are necessary if the bloodstream of industry and commerce is to be healthy and if our Nation is to flourish.

Now is the time to correct our defective currency system. We have been fortunate in escaping some of the worst consequences that often flow from the use of this economic poison. But we have some dangerous reactions now. One is the drive of the gold-mine interests for a higher price for gold because their costs, partly as a result of our currency depreciation, have risen sharply in the face of the fixed price of their product. Many, if not most, of these gold-mine interests seem to put their desire for profits ahead of the importance of maintaining a fixed monetary standard for our people. The situation is rapidly becoming one of the gold-mine interests versus the welfare of the people of the United States.

Besides this group that would devalue our dollar again because of their high costs, we have in this country a multitude of powerful groups that would fight for further currency depreciation should we slip into a severe business recession.

If our peach crop should fail, we would not consider reducing the size of our bushel basket in order to have more bushels of peaches. We expect our established bushel to measure the fluctuations in our supply of peaches. But if our costs and selling prices do not suit us, we seem ready to manipulate our monetary standard.

If problems of production, scarcities, and of unemployment could be solved by manipulating monetary standards and by issuing irredeemable money, such problems surely would have been solved long ago. We know nothing of importance about currency manipulation that people of many generations ago did not know. What our generation does not seem to have learned from the experiences of the past are the virtues of a fixed monetary standard and of a redeemable currency and the deadly evils inherent in irredeemable currencies and manipulated monetary standards.

III. WHAT A RETURN TO A REDEEMABLE CURRENCY SYSTEM SHOULD ACCOMPLISH

1. A return by the United States to a redeemable currency would restore to the people of this country control over their public purse and would enable them to put a brake on the public spending and further depreciation in the value of our money.

2. It would provide the Federal Reserve banks with from 70 to 100 times more asset cash than they now have to pay out against their note and deposit liabilities.

3. It would provide our people with an honest money. It should restore standards of honesty in the administration of our money and credit system. It should discourage agitation for further manipulation of our monetary standard and currency.

4. Because we would have a redeemable and a sound currency, savings, investment, long-time commitments, and production should be encouraged. Resumption of specie payments if often, probably usually, followed by business recovery and expansion. For example, when we resumed in 1879, we went promptly into a period of business expansion.

The notion seems widespread today that an irredeemable currency provides some sort of guaranty against business recessions. There is no factual basis for this assumption. Our very severe business depression of 1873–78 came during the period, 1862–78, when we had an irredeemable currency. The recession of 1937–38 came under our present system of irredeemable money; and the drop in the index of industrial production for the period involved in those years was sharper than for any corresponding period during the years 1929–33. (The high was 118 for May 1937; and the low was 76 for May 1938, a drop of 36 percent. In 1929, the high was 125 for June; in June 1930, the index was 98, a drop of 21 percent.) Widespread fear of a depression now would seem to indicate some fear that irredeemable currency may not prevent a depression despite the commonly expressed arguments in behalf of the virtues of this dangerous type of money.

No monetary system devised by man can prevent business booms or recessions. But the point is that an irredeemable currency causes more trouble than any other monetary system thus far known.

We would not, ordinarily, one may suppose, blame a fine automobile for an accident caused by a reckless driver and, as a matter of principle, adopt cheap automobiles on the theory that they are safer than the most expensive ones. But we do something analogous to that in respect to monetary standards. Because a gold standard holds people in check and applies strong brakes when we attempt to go to extremes in our use of

credit, we blame the gold standard for the results flowing from our abuses of credit. The gold standard has been criticized because it did not prevent, or because it caused, the depression beginning in 1929. The facts are that the gold standard did not cause the recession and depression following 1929, and it could not prevent them. We have been as irrational on that point as would be a person who would blame a fine automobile for an accident caused by an unreliable driver.

5. With private enterprise able to obtain and to use gold in foreign trade, there should be expansion in foreign exchange, trade, and investments of all kinds, and foreign countries should be able, sooner than otherwise would be the case, to stabilize their currencies in terms of gold and to increase their production.

It is sometimes alleged that we cannot return to a gold coin system until currencies abroad are stabilized. This is a case of putting the cart before the horse; we should lead the way, and this leadership should make it much easier for other countries to reconstruct their currencies and to open up foreign trade.

6. A restoration of the gold coin system, at our present rate of $35 per ounce of fine gold, should be a potent force in ending our march toward socialism or toward more and more Government management of our economy and people in some other form.

Since an irredeemable currency provides the Government with an instrument of control over the people that reaches to every transaction and person utilizing money, it provides an easy means of regimenting a people, a subtle instrument by which their savings and enterprise can be impaired or destroyed, and an open gate to socialism.

No man or woman may properly assume for one moment that he or she is fighting socialism or a governmentally managed economy, or for a return to the people of some direct control over their public purse, or for economy and honesty in Government, or for private enterprise, or for the opening up of foreign trade to private ingenuity if he or she is not fighting against our irredeemable paper money.

IV. CONDITIONS FOR A RETURN TO A GOLD COIN SYSTEM ARE MOST FAVORABLE

If the United States is to have a redeemable currency the present is a most favorable time in which to make this change. The United States has more than an ample supply of gold to accomplish this very desirable purpose.

The ratio of the Federal Reserve banks' reserve of gold certificates to their note and deposit liabilities is approximately 50 percent. That is twice the legal requirement. Their surplus reserves on February 16 were over $115,000,000,000 in gold certificates. The ratio of our gold stock to all nongold money and to all bank deposits is about 13 percent. The average for 1915–32 was about 8 percent.

If past experience is any guide, the typical withdrawals by our people from our gold stock should be about $2,300,000,000 of gold. With our system of deposit insurance there should be less inclination on the part of people to withdraw gold than has been the case in the past, although no one can possibly know what our people and foreign depositors might decide to do in respect to withdrawal of gold from the banks and Treasury.

From October 1929 to March 1933, which included the period of heavy runs on banks from November 1932 to March 1933, at which time we did not have a national system of insurance of deposits, there was an increase in money in circulation of $1,706,883,000—that is, from $4,838,185,000 in October 1929 to $6,545,068,000 in February 1933. The increase of gold coin in circulation for this period was $208,015,000—that is, from $363,051,000 to $571,066,000. The monetary gold stock of the United States was $110,000,000 larger in February 1933 than it was in October 1929. (In October 1929 it was $4,381,000,000; in February 1933 it was $4,491,000,000.) During that period the gold stock rose to its peak of $4,975,000,000 in August 1931. The low point was $3,941,000,000 in July 1932, showing a maximum swing of $1,034,000,000 from the high to the low. Of this sum a heavy proportion was exported and earmarked for export. During the period of maximum variation, the increase of gold coin in circulation was $91,077,000. The increase of money in circulation, including the $91,077,000 of gold coin, was $674,235,000. Even when the gold stock for that period was at its low of $3,941,000,000 it was $1,092,537,000 above the $2,848,463,000 of May 1920, when the price level was 167 as compared with 64.5 in July 1932. On February 2, with a gold stock of $24,279,000,000, our wholesale price level was 158.8.

These data obviously do not support the widespread notion that our gold standard broke down in 1929–33 or that our gold supply could not withstand the people's withdrawals. The trouble lay chiefly in the nonliquid nongold assets of the banks. The people were afraid that their deposits would not be paid and they wanted cash. They did not seem to care whether it was in paper money or gold, for the very good reason that our paper money was redeemable in gold. Therefore, they withdrew relatively little gold.

Our people were not deprived of the gold coin system in 1933 because of scarcity of gold or because the gold standard broke down; they were taken off that standard simply because the Government wished to substitute a "managed" irredeemable paper money. All the evidence is to the effect that when the banks were opened in 1933 we should have been able to resume gold payments without a ripple. But at that time the administration told our people that there was not enough gold to go around and that, therefore, it was necessary to suspend redemption.

That was probably one of the greatest pieces of economic illiteracy or political trickery, whatever the case may have been, to which our people have ever been subjected by their Government.

Nevertheless many of our people continue to allege, as though it were a fact, that there was not enough gold to go around then and there is not enough gold to go around now, and that, therefore, we could not maintain the gold standard then, and we cannot do it now.

Our people are in the main uninformed regarding our gold holdings and ratios then and now, and they seem not to understand that there is never enough of anything to go around at once if it has value.

The simple fact is that we can easily return to a redeemable currency now, and we should do so. Our suspension of gold payments has now run 16 years. In one more year we will equal the 17-year period of suspension of 1862–78. In 1940 to 1942, inclusive, the ratios of our gold stock to money and deposits ranged from 21.7 to 24.6 percent as compared with about 13 percent now. Those were the years in which we could have returned to redeemability with greatest ease.

V A. BIG PROBLEM IS THE GENERAL PUBLIC'S MISUNDERSTANDING AND APATHY

It is not to be expected that people in general will understand the intricacies and principles of good and bad monetary standards and systems; the public in general never do. It is the duty of statesmen to understand these problems and principles and to inform the people of the major issues involved. It might be supposed that the mass of people of this generation would understand that an irredeemable currency is the worst type of currency ever devised by man. Nevertheless, our people are showing a remarkable apathy regarding that lesson and the fact that we have an irredeemable currency system.

Apparently, this apathy arises in large degree from the fact that people in general confuse the convenience of paper money as a medium of exchange with the other vitally important functions performed by gold—that is, its virtues as a means of storing up value, as a standard of deferred payments, as a standard of value, as a reserve against paper money and bank deposits, as a clearing agent, as a means of carrying on foreign trade and of settling adverse balances of payments.

Any intelligent adult should understand that gold is a less satisfactory medium of exchange for general use then is a redeemable paper money or deposit currency. Our people, obviously, have missed the essential point and, as a consequence, they regard themselves as satisfied with a liability currency. The lack of honesty involved in such a currency is a matter that we try to ignore today; we attempt to pass over that subject in silence; we do not wish to discuss it. In short, we do not wish to meet what is perhaps the most fundamental issue involved.

The general public does not understand that they have lost control over the public purse through the loss of the gold-coin system. They do not understand that it is our system of irredeemable money that has invited profligate Government spending, a dissipation of our national patrimony, a depreciation in the purchasing power of our dollar, and our march into the death valley of socialism.

The public does not seem to understand the fact that gold and silver exist as money because irredeemable paper money is a dangerous and unreliable instrument—that irredeemable paper money is a product of the printing press and that gold represents stored labor and will buy other people's goods and services anywhere, anytime.

The public does not seem to understand that an irredeemable paper money and a governmentally managed economy go hand in hand.

This apathy of our people reflects itself in our Congress and administration where we have a right to expect leadership and guidance in this vitally important matter.

Effective leadership in this field does not exist in Congress. Both major political parties have accepted the view that the task of each is to do whatever is necessary to obtain votes. The question of the wisdom or soundness of a proposal is altogether secondary in both parties to the consideration of obtaining votes. Both parties regard their function as that of playing a game—a game based upon hypocrisy, cynicism, hollow pretense, lack of principle and conviction, moral cowardice, the assumption that they must pretend to fool the people though they know the people realize the nature of this degrading performance.

The terrible need of this country is for an opposition party to watch those in power—an opposition that will have as its basic principle the sole consideration that it be right, not that it be elected. Such an opposition needs leaders who will state and fight for the truth and for what is known to be best for our country regardless of popular attitudes and public understanding of the issues involved. It is their task to protect and to educate the general public as to what those in power are doing.

Many Government problems, like those involved in a people's money, are completely beyond the ability of the mass of people to understand properly. The general public cannot themselves obtain the data needed

and there is the further question of the ability of the majority of the people to analyze the data properly. It is the duty of Government officials to use the needed facilities to gather the required data and to see to it that they are analyzed scientifically by competent experts. Thereafter it is the duty of our officials to explain to our people what the facts and principles involved are and to fight for them against all odds. That is what responsible and intelligent leadership involves. It the duty of the organized opposition to see to it that these things are done and done properly. Once the essential facts are laid before the people accurately and properly, they should be free to respond as best they can. Education is one thing; regimentation is something else.

In general we do not proceed in this manner today. Our so-called leaders in office simply attempt to find out what their constituents think they want. The opposition pursues the same course. Both parties seem to think they can solve important problems properly by the use of labels such as liberal, progressive, conservative, or reactionary, without defining these terms precisely as intelligent people are supposed to do.

If our physicians should abandon the principles of their science and should simply ask their patients what they would have, and then put on their prescriptions labels designed to please, we would have a situation comparable to what now prevails in the field of so-called political leadership.

As to money, the people in this country seem to support an irredeemable currency in preference to a redeemable one. The reasons for this are several and their explanation is not easy. The central contention made by Bryan in his famous speech, Crucified on the Cross of Gold, appears to have been thoroughly diffused among our people as a fundamental truth regardless of facts or of what monetary economists may say. Our people are temperamentally against gold. They want paper money, preferably irredeemable money, and this makes it easy for our Congressmen who also want it because of what it enables them to do.

Since both political parties are in the business of buying votes with this irredeemable money, it is doubtful whether our people can be saved from the evils of irredeemable currency unless there is built across this Nation an organization composed of intelligent and fearless leaders in which no self-server would be tolerated if discovered. The need is for statesmanship, for people of absolute integrity and with determination to be right.

Since both political parties are bankrupt insofar as high and proper standards of leadership are concerned, and since both are busy day and night seeking to please self-serving pressure groups, with the consequence that the people of the United States are being sold down the river to the slavery of socialism, it seems reasonably clear that the only hope to save our people from socialism and to obtain a sound currency again lies in the creation of a Nation-wide organization to which people of understanding and integrity can repair.

Five thousand men and women of high purpose could create such an organization. It seems reasonable to suppose that the minority of statesmen of both parties in Congress would welcome an opportunity to join a group devoted to the truth and to statesmanship and to nothing else.

Past generations did not work, and save, and invest, and develop, and fight, and die to pass on to us a great national patrimony and freedom merely to give the degenerate political parties of this generation an opportunity to dissipate this patrimony and to impair or destroy the freedoms for which mankind has struggled throughout the ages.

Our generation is the trustee of this great heritage. But, if we are to prove ourselves worthy and reliable custodians of it, let all who would aid in the fulfillment of this great responsibility promptly organize to save this Nation from those who feel no such responsibility and who are either indifferent or thoughtless or are busy undermining and dissipating our priceless heritage.

VI. WHAT OUR MONETARY PROGRAM SHOULD BE

1. If we are to have a redeemable currency again someone in Congress must introduce a bill. But considering the present attitude and lethargy in Congress and our Federal administration, outstanding citizen groups must apparently provide the support, and perhaps the leadership, for such a bill. A large group of outstanding leaders should be able to stir up enough support in Congress to get the proper law enacted. If, not, then a third party composed of our leading citizens should settle down to the job of driving the majority of our present officeholders out of power.

It is futile to expect the general public to understand or to demand a redeemable money. The restoration of a redeemable currency is a task for intelligent and resolute leaders. Once this gold-coin bill is introduced in Congress, our leading citizens must, by resolution and otherwise, fight for its passage.

2. The weight of our standard gold unit—$35 per fine ounce—should not be altered. It has been fixed for 15 years, and fixity is a fundamental requisite of a good monetary standard.

3. Since we, in recent years, have embraced the notion that we can stabilize our economy by manipulating our currency and have not yet learned the fallacies in that idea, since there is a very great probability that, should we slip into another severe business recession and depression, our Government may again depreciate our currency in some form in an effort to stimulate recovery, we should do our best now to remove our huge Federal debt into a position of safety. In times of business depression debt burdens are regarded as a particularly important problem and easily provide a major excuse for currency depreciation.

It is a good old custom in the United States to attempt to pay off our public debt. But now our debt, because of its huge size, carries new dangers. One is the invitation to currency manipulation in time of business depression. The other is the destructive effect of taxes sufficiently high to retire much of it in any reasonably short period of time.

The safer course for us now would seem to be to accept this debt as a permanent institution, as the British accepted their debt at the close of the Napoleonic wars, and to refund most of it into a permanent debt—that is, into United States consols—carrying an interest rate high enough to induce private and nonbank savers to hold most of it even in times of business depression. In this manner we would remove as best we can that problem from the troublesome position it now occupies, and provide greater assurance that it will not prove dangerous to our monetary standard should we experience a severe business recession and depression.

While in the last Congress, Howard Buffet, then a Representative from Nebraska and the author of a bill to return this country to a gold coin system, issued a warning that we should heed. Said he:

"The American heritage of an honest money redeemable in gold was not given to this generation to squander. It was entrusted to our hands as custodians. Unless restored, we shall be recorded by history as faithless both to our ancestors and our posterity. For the blessings of this land of liberty, and its unparalleled achievements, are intimately connected with the right of the individual freely to obtain gold in exchange for the fruits of his labors" (Our Irredeemable Paper Money, Human Events, Washington, D. C., July 28, 1948).

THE FUND, GOLD, AND STABILIZATION—STATEMENT BY BRONSON TREVOR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, much along the line of the address I have just asked to have printed in the RECORD is a statement entitled "The Fund, Gold, and Stabilization," prepared by Bronson Trevor, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUND, GOLD, AND STABILIZATION

(By Bronson Trevor)

The recent announcement by the Government of South Africa that it planned to sell gold for $41.50 a fine ounce has focused public attention on the operations of the International Monetary Fund. That body claims jurisdiction over the price of monetary gold, though not asserting authority over the price of gold used for industrial, professional, or artistic purposes, a distinction with reference to the metal which is without discernible basis in the fund's articles of agreement.

The Articles of Agreement, International Monetary Fund, drawn up at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July 1944 is an ambiguously worded document, the interpretation of whose Delphic phrases is in the hands of its executive directors, from whom the only appeal is to the Board of Governors, whose decision is final. The importance which is attached to the Board of Governors may be gaged by the fact that at its meetings even the most trifling scribbles of its members are recorded for posterity on scratch pads of high-grade rag content bond paper.

Article I of the amazing document to which we have referred lists six paragraphs of high-sounding purposes by which the fund shall be guided in its decisions, of which the second is a fair sample:

"(ii) To facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade and to contribute thereby to the promotion and maintenance of high levels of employment and real income and to the development of the productive resources of all members as primary objectives of economic policy."

The following excerpt from the agreement would seem to indicate that it was planned to bring about all these wonderful results in a very simple manner:

"Article V, section 2. Limitation on the fund's operations: Except as otherwise provided in this agreement, operations on the account of the fund shall be limited to transactions for the purpose of supplying a member, on the initiative of such member, with the currency of another member in exchange for gold or for the currency of the member desiring to make the purchase."

This is the procedure by which good American dollars are traded by the fund in exchange for paper money issued by insolvent governments throughout the world.

Each member undertakes to collaborate with the fund to promote exchange stability. It was obviously this undertaking upon which Camille Gutt, managing director of fund, relied when, in 1947, he called on member nations to prevent transactions in gold at premium prices. He said that sales of gold in the free market at premium prices threatened world exchange stability. This decision of the fund spells the doom of any real monetary stability, if that term under the tortured interpretations of the fund corresponds in any way to its usual meaning, which is that of a fixed relationship of a monetary unit to gold. The following provision of the fund agreement indicates that

the framers of that document considered this definition correct:

"ARTICLE IV. PAR VALUE OF CURRENCIES

"SECTION 1. Expression of par values.—(a) The par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold as a common denominator or in terms of the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1944."

Furthermore, the fund places no obstacle, in its articles of agreement, to the sale of gold by a member at a price above par value, as a close reading of article IV, section 2, will disclose:

"SEC. 2. Gold purchases based on par values.—The fund shall prescribe a margin above and below par value for transactions in gold by members, and no member shall buy gold at a price above par value plus the prescribed margin, or sell gold at a price below par value minus the prescribed margin."

Of course, a sale of gold at a price above par value would have to be made to a nonmember of the fund as a member is forbidden to buy gold at a price above par value, but is not forbidden to sell at such a price.

In fact, the language of the articles of agreement gives the impression that sales of gold at prices above parity are contemplated. For example, article V, section 6, reads as follows:

"SEC. 6. Purchases of currencies from the fund for gold.—(a) Any member desiring to obtain, directly or indirectly, the currency of another member for gold shall, provided that it can do so with equal advantage, acquire it by the sale of gold to the fund.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude any member from selling in any market, gold newly produced from mines located within its territories."

It would seem from these provisions that section 6 (a) in the phrase "provided it can do so with equal advantage" envisions the possibility of a nation having a greater advantage, which in all probability would mean a higher price, in selling gold elsewhere rather than to the fund, and obviously confers no power to restrict such a transaction. Section 6 (b) is even more explicit as to the freedom of members in disposing of newly mined gold.

Monetary stability is a fact, the existence of which is relatively easy to ascertain. There are various free gold markets throughout the world in which virtually every currency is traded at a value in gold showing a considerable depreciation from par value. Even the dollar is in this category as the fact that there is a demand for gold at $41.50, an ounce, attests.

The policy of the International Monetary Fund toward these phenomena is to attempt to suppress such transactions rather than to follow out the obvious intention of the framers of the articles of agreement which was to make the transactions unprofitable. That is why the agreement did not forbid the sale of gold at prices above parity, because it would take less gold by that method to absorb the surplus dollars which are causing the depreciation.

It must be pointed out that the United States, at the instigation of the fund, does not appear to be fulfilling its obligations under article IV, section 4 (b) of the agreement, which reads as follows:

"(b) Each member undertakes, through appropriate measures consistent with this agreement, to permit within its territories exchange transactions between its currency and the currencies of other members only within the limits prescribed under section 3 of this article. A member whose monetary authorities, for the settlement of international transactions, in fact freely buy and sell gold within the limits prescribed by the fund under section 2 of this article shall be deemed to be fulfilling this undertaking."

If the United States were in fact freely selling gold there would not be the slightest difficulty, with its tremendous stock of gold, in maintaining the value of the dollar in relation to gold. It would be of interest to know whether or not the threat of even the relatively small amount of South African sales was not the cause for the recent decline of 10 percent or more in the franc value of gold on the Paris Bourse.

There is a sinister implication in this policy of preventing a legitimate outflow of gold from the United States, which is that the International Monetary Fund is in fact attempting to destroy the world market for gold. If this should come to pass, the United States would become the dumping ground for an unsalable mass of yellow metal, the presence of which in excessive quantities could have gravely inflationary effects. In this connection it is important to remember that the fund can compel a nation, against its will to buy gold, under the provisions of article VII, section 2 (ii) which reads as follows:

"ARTICLE VII. SCARCE CURRENCIES

* * * * *

"SEC. 2. Measures to replenish the fund's holdings of scarce currencies: The fund may, if it deems such action appropriate to replenish its holdings of any member's currency, take either or both of the following steps—

"(i) * * *

"(ii) Require the member to sell its currency to the fund for gold."

Before this power of the fund, the United States lies helpless as long as it remains a member.

The operations of the fund indicate a belief on the part of its managers that world recovery would be impaired by any attempt on the part of the United States to maintain genuine monetary stability of the dollar in relation to gold. If this be so, what is the purpose of trying to maintain a fictitious stabilization with a whole series of meaningless parities which are ignored throughout the world in countless transactions? Of course, we know that such a performance serves no useful purpose, unless it be to demonstrate the ingenuity of man in evading reality.

Monetary instability is merely a symptom of economic disturbance within the nation whose currency is affected. This trouble cannot be corrected from the outside but must be corrected from within; yet, under article XII, section 8, of the fund agreement, the fund is forbidden to publish a report involving changes in the fundamental structure of the economic organization of members It is conceivable that the weakness of a nation's currency might be due to that nation maintaining a socialist government which was unable to produce a volume of exports sufficient to meet its demand for imports. The fund could not refer to this fact but would have to content itself with wrestling with the uncontrollable disequilibria produced by the unmentionable situation.

Another unrealistic feature of the fund agreement is the attempt to divorce capital movements from current transactions when it is obvious that if a nation consumes its assets of gold and foreign exchange in capital movements, this act will ipso facto compel a greater reliance on the facilities of the fund. Of course, members undertake that capital movements will be in accordance with the purposes of the fund. These purposes are so vague that a capital movement away from a country with a weak currency, something which ordinarily would be considered injurious to monetary stability, could be construed as a course which would strengthen that currency because the income on the investment abroad ultimately would constitute a credit item. This seems to be the interpretation of the fund because it has not made any serious attempt to reduce foreign investment in the United States, in spite of the weakness of foreign currencies.

Would it be injurious for us to admit that the operations of the International Monetary Fund are futile, and for us to abandon its unrealistic approach to the solution of world economic problems? The answer is, "No." Many foreign nations require payment in dollars for their exports to the United States. They would receive just as many dollars under a flexible system of exchange rates as under a rigid one so that their buying power would not be affected. Prices fluctuate for so many reasons that eliminating exchange variations, which can be hedged against, is not the stimulus to trade that might be expected by a theoretical economist safely insulated in his ivory tower from all contact with reality. Of course, foreign nations would no longer be in a position to print money, hand it to the International Monetary Fund, and receive dollars in return.

A flexible system of foreign-exchange rates in which all currencies are freely traded in an open market stimulates international commerce. This is because exporters recognize the quotations as being genuinely representative of the value of a given currency, and, therefore, they are less reluctant to accept payment in it than if they had to value currencies on the basis of a fictitious parity. The paralysis of trade in France became so serious under the fund's rules that France recently has instituted a free market for gold in apparent violation of the fund's directives, in order to relieve the situation.

It is time that the American people awake to the futility of the International Monetary Fund with its arbitrary and wasteful practices, and that they demand its dissolution as it constitutes an impediment to real economic recovery and true monetary stabilization throughout the world.

PROPOSED WEATHER BUREAU STATION AT OR NEAR SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a short statement I have prepared in connection with a letter addressed to the Chief of the United States Weather Bureau by A. Eugene Haylett, secretary-manager, Scottsbluff Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter to Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, from Mr. A. Eugene Haylett, secretary-manager of the Scottsbluff Chamber of Commerce in Scottsbluff, Nebr.

Mr. President, for some time the people of Scottsbluff have been very much concerned at the inaccuracy of the weather prediction service they have been receiving. During the recent series of blizzards, the people of the Scottsbluff area have suffered severely as the result of these inaccurate predictions. On many occasions, blizzards have been predicted and then have not materialized. In other cases, the blizzards have come without warning, while the Weather Bureau was predicting fair weather. As a result, the people of the area have suffered extensive property loss, and even loss of life, simply because they were not in position to make preparations for the onslaught of severe weather.

This matter has been thoroughly discussed with officials of the Weather Bureau by Mr. Haylett and others from Scottsbluff, and by members of the congressional delegation. The Weather Bureau has conceded that a station at or near Scottsbluff would be desirable. At the same time, Dr. Reichelderfer apparently gave the impression to the House Appropriations Subcommittee that minor

improvements in the station at Goodland, Kans., would meet the situation adequately.

In my opinion, this letter that I have received shows clearly how utterly inadequate is the present forecasting service for the Scottsbluff area. A blizzard was predicted for that area a few days ago, and it completely failed to materialize. I believe that the people of western Nebraska have a right to demand better service than this and to expect Weather Bureau officials to support their requests. Otherwise the Weather Bureau must take full responsibility for this failure to provide the people of Scottsbluff with adequate forecasting service.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senate committee, on reviewing this question, will find it possible to allow the comparatively small sum necessary to provide the people of the Scottsbluff area with decent forecasting.

APRIL 14, 1949.

Dr. F. W. REICHELDERFER,
Chief, United States Weather Bureau, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. REICHELDERFER: Enclosed is a copy of a telegram received yesterday afternoon by Radio Station KOLT, and broadcast throughout the area at 4 p. m. and 9 p. m. on Wednesday, April 13, 1949. The reason I forward this forecast to you is to call to your attention again the inaccuracy of weather forecasts for the North Platte Valley as made from the Kansas City station.

This forecast is additional convincing evidence as to why our people continue to ignore weather predictions as now made. May I call your particular attention to the following statements in the forecast: Special livestock and blizzard warning; strong northerly winds 40 to 60 miles per hour west and north portions causing blizzard conditions; total snowfall likely several inches west and central portions; continue livestock warnings and local blizzard warnings for west and central portions Nebraska through Thursday.

As I dictate this letter at 10 o'clock Thursday morning, April 14, we have experienced no such weather in the North Platte Valley. There was no precipitation throughout the night. At the present moment, a few scattered flakes of snow are falling—not enough to even wet the pavement. I have checked with the local CAA Station and they report the following to me.

During last night, the wind velocity did not at any time exceed 17 miles per hour and the lowest temperature was 30 degrees. At 10 o'clock this morning, the wind velocity is 12 miles an hour and the temperature is 38 degrees.

This sort of weather forecasting in the North Platte Valley is the usual thing, not the exception. We still contend that every possible effort should be made toward the immediate establishment of a first-order weather station in Scottsbluff in an effort to give us better local forecasting service. I know we can count on you to do everything within your power to see that such service is established.

Very truly yours,
A. EUGENE HAYLETT,
Secretary-Manager,
Scottsbluff Chamber of Commerce.

P. S.—At the time this letter is typed, 11 a. m., the sun is shining and there is practically no wind. A. E. H.

ULTIMATUM IN CHINA—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YCRK TIMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers carried dispatches that the Communists of China had given a three-day ultimatum to the Nationalist Government. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very fine editorial which appeared in the New York Times this morning, which clearly states the situation with which this country is now faced.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ULTIMATUM IN CHINA

When the Chinese Communist radio announced that the representatives of the Chinese Government had just 72 hours to accept Mao Tze-tung's surrender terms it tore away the last shred of pretense that what was happening in Peiping was a peace conference. If the government wants peace it can capitulate. It won't get it otherwise.

Much hullabaloo has been raised over whether the Communists might be allowed to cross the Yangtze unopposed, and over the definition of a "war criminal," repentant or otherwise. These are side issues, useful to the Communists for kicking up dust and possibly useful to the Government negotiators for saving face. What is at stake is whether or not the Government of the Republic of China is to survive. The Communists have already decided that it shall not. This is a more serious matter than whether or not the now fully poised Communist armies cross the Yangtze and force a physical surrender that has already been made morally.

The minimum Communist terms for peace include the abolition of the Chinese Constitution, which was hailed in this country as an important forward political step. They include also the abrogation of China's treaty structure, an abrogation aimed especially at the close and honorable relationship between China and the United States. They include the establishment of a regime in the Soviet pattern that is not in any sense democratic or representative.

This political program is the counterpart of the long-declared Communist military program whose obective was not to defeat the Government but to destroy it. The target was not the troops of Chiang Kai-shek but the whole economy of China. The purpose was to bring about a total physical and moral collapse. Much of this has been achieved. And it is to this pass that these circumstances, together with the well-meant, but often blundering policy of the United States, have reduced the republic that was once our indomitable ally and our faithful friend.

It is now apparent that some of our efforts were misguided. At one point we sought a Communist coalition in China, urged a series of truces, and put as much moral and economic pressure as we could on Chiang Kai-shek. When that failed, we carried out a virtual 2-year embargo on military assistance to his government. At the end of that time, we reached the sorry conclusion that our previous efforts had been largely wasted. Through all of this we were possessed with a praiseworthy zeal to bring about reform in China, for which, of course, there was room. But that very zeal has prompted our faltering in policy that has contributed to the republic's threatened extinction.

What we can hope for now is that in all of China the readily understandable wish for peace will not entirely overcome the will to be free. The legitimate government of the Republic of China, the government that we have recognized, and the government that we entreated to stand fast against our Japanese enemy, appears now to have small chance of survival. But we can pray that China herself will not be entirely inundated by the Red flood. It may be that some part of China, some island of resistance, will be obliged for the time being to resist the foe, alone. Once more we shall be obliged to depend on the magnificent patience of the Chinese, their gigantic ability to endure.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any further routine matters to be presented? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

"THOUGHT WAR" AGAINST THE KREMLIN

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on Wednesday, April 13, I addressed the Senate on the subject of shifting from the defensive to the offensive in our cold war with Russia. As a result of the suggestions made I have had quite a bit of discussion with others on the subject as to just how the offensive could be carried out in detail. It has seemed to some that it was a good general idea but rather difficult to put in practical terms.

I am now prepared to suggest more in detail how this offensive could be carried out. I am doing so by delivering at this time a "ghost-written" speech. I suspect that this is not the first time that a ghost-written speech has been delivered on this floor. I hope, however, that I can make senatorial history by reading into the record the name of the ghost writer whose work I hold in my hands.

After I had prepared the material which I used in the earlier talk I had a call from Mr. Bonner Fellers. He is now a civilian retired from the Army with the rank of brigadier general. In active service during the war he was in charge of the psychological warfare office against Japan serving under General MacArthur.

I should like to read his citation for Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster:

Brig. Gen. Bonner F. Fellers, as psychological warfare officer for the Southwest Pacific area, later United States Army Forces, Pacific, performed meritorious and distinuished service from May to November 1944 and May 1945 to March 1946. He displayed deep insight into the traits of the Japanese and exercised superior ability and initiative in organizing, planning and directing the psychological warfare campaign against the Japanese armed forces and home-land population. Through his outstanding professional ability and resourcefulness, General Fellers contributed in a marked degree to Japan's surrender and to the initial success of the military occupation.

I now return to the document. I was delighted to find in him a man who was not approaching the problem theoretically but with a wealth of practical, successful experience. I offer no apologies, therefore, for reading to the Senate the document which he brought me, with whose ideas and sentiments I can identify myself almost completely.

General Fellers' statement follows:

"THOUGHT WAR" AGAINST THE KREMLIN

(By Bonner Fellers)

In the cold war now under way, Stalin strikes and we parry the blows.

He blockades Berlin and we are forced to mount a massive and costly airlift. He attacks the sovereignty of Greece through his satellites and we counter with a Truman Doctrine. His fifth-columns undermine recovery

in western Europe and America responds with a multi-billion-dollar Marshall plan. His Red Army, portentously armed, faces west and we come up with plans for military assistance, our second multi-billion-dollar program for Europe.

Unfortunately, there is no guaranty that these passive defense measures can keep the peace. Each sweeps us into deeper responsibility. The advantages in modern warfare, however, are overwhelmingly with the offensive. This is as true in a cold war as in a hot or shooting war. Our defensive strategy may postpone defeat—it cannot guarantee victory. If we want to win the present bloodless contest, and thus head off a shooting war, we must seize the initiative. We must shift to the offensive.

Our most lucrative and immediate opportunity in this respect is in the field of psychological or thought warfare. We have a rich experience in the last conflict, particularly our success in penetrating the minds of the Japanese people, to guide us. And the Soviet Union, for all its iron curtains, is especially vulnerable to this kind of offensive action.

In a psychological drive we would strike at the weakest spot in the Kremlin's armor, which is its conflict with the people in Russia itself and in the forcibly communized countries of eastern Europe. What the Soviet dictatorship fears most, and with good reason, is that the sullen, passive discontent of its subjects may burst into open rebellion.

The gigantic secret police system—dozens of times bigger than the Czars had or needed—provides a measure of the Soviet regime's distrust of its people. The continuous purges, the millions of political prisoners, the everlasting panicky campaigns against internal espionage and sabotage are all evidences of the deep gulf dividing the governing clique and the masses.

In the thirty-second year of its rule, the Soviet government still does not dare relax its total censorships, still finds it necessary to step up its police terror. It forbids its subjects to leave the country on pain of long imprisonment or death. It goes to fantastic extremes to isolate them from foreigners and foreign ideas.

The iron curtain, it is clear, is primarly designed to keep out dangerous thoughts; to keep the truth about the outside world and its intentions from reaching the people on the Soviet side.

For reasons of morale the Allies helped conceal telltale war facts which now can and should be told. The fact that in the early stages Red troops, by the hundreds of thousands, surrendered to the Germans without real resistance. The fact that at least a million Soviet citizens joined the German Army to fight against bolshevism. The fact that initially, most of the Russian people on the southern front greeted the invaders joyously as liberators until Nazi cruelty and atrocities compelled them to resist. In effect, the Soviet Government initially fought a war on two fronts: against the Germans and against its own people.

This experience has made the Kremlin more sensitive than ever to psychological pressures aimed at the hearts and minds of its populace. We can and must exploit this weakness to the limit in order to win the cold war—and at worst, to short cut the shooting war if we are compelled to fight one notwithstanding.

The terrorized populations under Communist dominion are potentially our allies in the common struggle of mankind against the totalitarian Bolshevik threat. The increasing and frightening specter of resistence and revolt at home will serve as a brake on Kremlin adventures abroad. It will at once drive Stalin and his associates into a defensive position.

That is the job cut out for thought warfare—bold, imaginative, flexible, continuous, and on a constantly expanding scale—under American leadership.

Before the 1917 Russian Revolution, those who resisted the czarist government were aware of understanding and warm sympathy in America. That fact raised their morale. It fortified the underground revolutionary movement.

The time has come to make the disaffected peoples in Stalin's domain conscious of friendship and concrete support beyond their sealed frontiers. They must be given to understand that America and the democracies generally are in sympathy with their hopes of liberation; that we are not opposed to Russia and the Russians, but only to the Communist despotism.

On the basis of my work in the psychological campaign against Japan and a study of the Russian picture, I am convinced that this can be done. The cost would be negligible compared with our present foreign assistance and defense expenditures. If the campaign is successful, millions of lives and billions in treasures will have been saved.

We have every moral and political right to wage thought warfare against the Kremlin dictators. The Soviets themselves have drawn the pattern. For more than three decades they have used false propaganda, subversion, and infiltration tactics unsparingly against the rest of the world. Since the war's end they have devoted an ever larger slice of their resources to this kind of warfare. What we propose comes down to a belated acceptance of their challenge.

Where Moscow could not conveniently function openly through its Government, it has used special organizations like the Communist International, the recently formed Cominform, and literally dozens of false-front cultural, trade-union, youth, and other groups. Repeatedly it has set up on its own soil exile committees, cabinets, and even armed contingents for struggle against existing foreign governments.

We, too, can operate through nongovernmental organizations and channels. "Totalitarian Russia's aggrandizement," an American Federation of Labor resolution declared, "presents a dire threat to the entire free world. * * * We must develop a new awareness of enemy activity." That awareness on the part of labor organizations, religious bodies, other democratic groups in all non-Soviet countries can readily be translated into positive action.

In this fateful contest on the psychological level we have an advantage of terrific power—the truth. The Kremlin is obliged to invent and propagate lies. Much of its energy must be devoted to concealing unsavory facts such as its slave labor and mass terror. Our thought offensive, by contrast, will be geared to the simple truths of our democratic freedoms, our higher economic standards, our genuine eagerness for friendship and peace with all peoples.

Only those who still think in the futile terms of appeasement will fear to venture on this road. The rest of us are by this time convinced that dictators understand, respect, and fear courageous policies. Every bold action, of course, involves risks—but none of them is half as dangerous as the risk of timid inaction.

Japan was the oldest empire in the world. Its people were fanatically united by emperor worship; steeped in mystic dreams of national destiny. Their mental processes were strange and unresponsive to Western logic. They had been duped by fanatical militarists who preferred the destruction of their race to the humiliation of surrender.

Yet we succeeded. Against Japan, thought warfare was an instrument of precision which penetrated barriers, broke down mental resistance and made the Japanese surrender-conscious. Our principal weapons were radio broadcasts and the spread, by air-drop, of scientifically prepared news sheets and leaflets.

We did not ourselves realize how effective our psychological drive had been until the war's end enabled us to check. We then learned from the Emperor himself that our leaflets from the sky convinced his subjects that the war was lost long before the atom bombs fell.

The late Gen. Hideki Tojo, interrogated in an American hospital on September 25, 1945, said he had been confident that the Japanese were impervious to our propaganda. But he acknowledged his mistake. "Sinkings and bombings," he said sadly, "had their effect, but there was no doubt that Allied leaflets weakened the people's will to fight and thus shortened the war."

Can we duplicate in Russia and Soviet-dominated countries in peace what we accomplished in Japan in war?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. In a moment.

Mr. President, I read further:

I believe we can. Obviously we were able to use certain methods under war conditions which are not open to us, at least directly, in a cold war. This handicap, however, is more than balanced by the more favorable situation in the Soviet sphere.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Since I rose, I think the Senator has started to discuss the very topic I wanted him to discuss, namely, how he proposes to drop the leaflets in Russia in time of peace, although we know we are in a cold war with Russia, without ourselves committing a war act.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am glad the Senator from Oregon has asked that question, because it is the $64 question. I think I could answer only about $32 worth of it, and the other $32 worth should not have public discussion.

I read further, Mr. President:

In the Japanese case our assignment was to drive a wedge between the ruling military clique and the masses. In the Soviet case the wedge is already in place. We need only drive it deeper and deeper.

Stalin's subjects are not only highly receptive to our message but famished for news and sympathy from the outside world, distrustful of their dictators and for the most part intensely discontented. There are millions of Kosenkinas and Kravchenkos waiting their chance to assert their hatred of the regime. In every Communist-held nation, Russia included, we start with a potential fifth column embracing the majority of its population.

Mr. President, I should have said to the Senator from Oregon that that point is discussed a little later in the paper.

I read further:

Despite 30 years' indoctrination the Russian mind remains wide open to Western thought—the frantic efforts of the despots to keep it out is proof enough. Moreover, we have at our disposal hundreds of thousands of able and energetic fugitives from communism, Russian and natives of the satellite states, eager to serve as shock troops in the psychological struggle.

Once we have made the basic decision to launch a thought offensive, the techniques of operation can be worked out. The general strategy having been formulated, tactics and weapons will be adapted to meet developing conditions and to solve specific problems.

What follows is therefore in no sense a complete or definitive program. Many of the

possible approaches, indeed, do not lend themselves to public discussion. My intention is to suggest the nature and scope of the undertaking.

For clarity in our strategy we must be clear in our own thinking on the subject. We must learn to draw a sharp line between the dictatorships and the peoples being dictated to. Every time we assail the Russians or the Poles or the Hungarians when we mean their masters we are playing into the Kremlin's hands. It was primarily the German failure to make the differentiation that drove the Russians, as the war progressed, to rally around the regime they hated.

"If the Russian people had a voice in the government of Russia," President Truman said recently, "I am sure we would have no trouble in getting along with them." And Governor Dewey, in one of his campaign speeches, declared: "The people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of the Soviet Union. * * * We know they are not the authors of the Kremlin's aggressive ambitions. They're its victims."

Such statements by American leaders, we may be sure, send a chill down the Bolshevik spine. For they attest that at long last the democratic world has discovered the sorest spot in the Soviet anatomy: the bitter hostility between regime and subjects.

Russia, like the small nations under its heel, is in effect an occupied country. Democratic statesmen should grasp this central fact—and let the oppressed peoples know that they have grasped it. From this time forward they must speak loudly and clearly to the masses in Communist areas over the heads of their governments. They must use every occasion to assert—

That they do not blame the Russian people for the peace-wrecking tactics of the Kremlin clique;

That credit for Russia's glorious war record belongs to its population, not to Stalin and his gang.

That our concern for human rights does not stop short at the iron curtain, but embraces the Soviet masses.

That we share the aspirations of the Russian people for freedom, and are eager to help them earn it.

That we seek the friendship of the Russian people.

Thus, taking a leaf from the Bolshevik book, we shall begin to forge a united front with these people for peace and democracy.

The United Nations and other international bodies provide resonant sounding boards for reaching world opinion. The Communists are past masters in exploiting such opportunities, and we have given them little, if any, competition. But once we shed our inhibitions, we can beat them at their own game. In raising the issue of forced labor before the Security Council recently, the A. F. of L. gave a concrete example of how the game can be played.

After all, we hold the trumps of truth. Blunt truth-telling—about Kremlin aggressions, democratic achievements, suffering and terror in Communist areas—will offset Communist propaganda. And some of it will filter through the iron curtains no matter how carefully they are soundproofed.

Our over-all objective is to project the truth to the Soviet peoples. As a basic procedure, we must set up a chain of broadcasting stations around the entire periphery of Stalin's empire. The Voice of America, a worthy effort, is no more than a small beginning. In the nature of the case, it is hobbled by its official status.

There will be no such constraints on stations run by nonofficial groups, operated by people intimately familiar with the minds being addressed, and on wavelengths geared to the receiving facilities in the target areas.

From wartime results, we know that effective broadcasts, though heard only by thousands, percolate to the millions. Countries denied freedom of press and speech tend to become huge whispering galleries; suppressed facts and ideas often carry farther than the official propaganda. We have been informed that several hours after the Voice of America announced Mrs. Kosenkina's jump from a Soviet consulate window, all Moscow was buzzing with the story.

The possibility of mobile secret radio stations of the kind developed by all resistance movements during the war is not excluded. The immense Russian spaces cannot all be policed, even by a millionfold secret service. The ingenuity of patriots, if adequately supported from outside, can work miracles.

No government can engage in dropping leaflets, newspapers, and other printed matter under peace conditions. But private agencies can do so. Radar-guided aircraft and gliders freighted with thought-bombs, mystery planes sowing the truth can invade the Soviet skies. Among the fugitives there are hundreds of patriotic fliers ready to risk their necks to free their homelands, Russia included.

Again, war experience has proved that not even the threat of death will keep people hungry for news and sympathy from reading illicit stuff. One ingenious suggestion that has come to me is to make some of the printed matter look exactly like Izvestia and Pravda, or like a popular Soviet magazine (Ogonick, for example), so that they can be passed along more safely.

A concentrated and significant audience for radio and leaflet saturation is provided by the Red occupation troops everywhere from Korea to Germany. These forces are within easiest reach. Their contact with the non-Soviet world has made them especially receptive to our message of peace and friendship.

Hundreds of thousands of them are continually returning to their homes. It is Soviet policy not to expose them too long to the disturbing influences of foreign surroundings. Each of them can become a carrier of explosive truths to his countrymen.

He should be told in simple sloganized terms: "Here is what you must tell your friends and relatives * * *" Stalin has good reason to fear the Red soldier who has glimpsed Europe; we can give him much better reason. The demobilized occupation soldier and officer can readily be turned into a focus of anti-Communist infection.

In the first year after the cessation of hostilities, an estimated 25,000 Red soldiers and officers (many of those of high rank) fled to western Europe. Several times as many discarded their uniforms and lost themselves in the Slav populations of eastern Europe. The process has continued unabated, despite our fantastic policy, until recently, of handing over fugitive soldiers to Red Army firing squads.

The present Allied toleration of deserters should be openly changed to encouragement. Stalin's occupation troops must be apprised that the democratic right of political asylum will protect them. More than that, private organizations to care for military exiles, to help them find work and homes, must be set up. The flow of deserters—often as high as 10,000 a month—can be turned into a flood, disintegrating the Red forces.

At least half a million Soviet citizens who chose freedom, refusing to return to their enslaved country, are today living wretched, hunted lives in western Europe, Greece, and Turkey. So are hundreds of thousands of escapees from the satellite areas, and their numbers are growing.

Neither the size nor the significance of this human potential has been sufficiently understood. We have failed signally to welcome and to help these refugees, most of whom do not qualify for aid under the International Relief Organization set-up. Yet they are passionate partisans of freedom—our best allies.

In terms of thought warfare, these exiles represent so much dynamite against the enemy in the cold war. Most of them have staked their lives to escape communism and will stake them again to destroy communism and liberate their enslaved people.

Though they have neither funds nor facilities, some of them are already engaging in psychological guerrilla raids on their own. One group of fugitives is smuggling anti-Soviet papers to Red occupation troops. Another group has established an underground into Russia. What wonders these people could accomplish if they were provided with the means.

Obviously our plans to penetrate the iron curtain should contemplate the maximum use of these conscious enemies of the Soviets. Infiltration of Communist countries and Russia itself is difficult but by no means impossible. The Soviet perimeter is so vast—equivalent to three-quarters of the circumference of this planet—that the whole Red Army would not suffice to guard it all. Provided the enterprise is ably planned and directed, underground agents and couriers can be introduced.

Tens of thousands of the fugitives from communism are ablebodied men with military backgrounds. If given the chance they will flock to enlist in military formations of the "foreign legion" or some other type. A useful precedent and practical blueprint have been provided by the "international brigades" which the Communist International threw into the Spanish civil war.

Isolated resistance movements are working in all the communized countries. They require the kind of external help which their compatriots on our side of the frontiers can give them. They need, what is no less important, the moral confidence and the hope that come with realization that there are devoted and efficient friends outside.

Already leaders among the escapees, whose names inspire faith in their native lands, have begun to form governments-in-exile and liberation committees. A Russian liberation movement, uniting all the democratically-minded fugitives, is essential; fortunately they include scores of trustworthy people, some of them recent exiles raised under the Soviets.

As the cold war unfolds, it will become feasible and useful to grant to some of these groups an official status. In any case, they must receive tacit backing and adequate financing. In due time they will become the most effective instruments in the psychological contest.

All these things will take time—and time, admittedly is running out. The more reason why the thought offensive should be organized without delay. If armed conflict does not break out for 4 or 5 years, the offensive will have a better than even chance of succeeding—and thereby preventing war.

But even if war should start, the effort put into a large-scale thought campaign will have helped undermine the Soviet dictatorship and its fighting capacity. It will have deepened the gulf between the regime and the people, softened the resistance of the Red forces, and assured us of millions of zealous sympathizers behind the enemy lines.

Discontent is widespread in Stalin's empire, not only among the masses but in the new ruling classes. But the people feel themselves hopelessly isolated from the free world. The first effects of an intelligent psychological campaign will be to break that isolation, which in turn will touch off a surge of hope and renewed courage.

We must find the means and the wisdom to carry to Stalin's victims the truth that we seek not enmity and war but friendship and peace; that we have no purpose beyond their liberation.

Mr. President, I have received, I suppose, hundreds of letters, of which 95

percent are favorable to my first suggestion of this project of a thought war last week. I desire to read a part of one of the letters. It is from Mr. J. Anthony Marcus, president of the Institute of Foreign Trade. He says:

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: I have read the newspaper report of your yesterday's address and am glad you have taken the time and trouble to remind our administration that it is not doing its whole duty.

During the past 3 years in all my lectures I have pointed out that, even if we bankrupt ourselves in aiding the European countries, we will not win the cold war unless we help liberate the Russian people. In order to accomplish this we have tens of millions of allies in the Soviet Union and hundreds of thousands of Russian DP's in Europe. They are all ready to sacrifice their lives to bring about the liquidation of the Soviet tyranny. Now, what are we doing to make use of this force? I doubt if there is anyone in a policy-position in the State Department who fully appreciates this fact.

* * * * *

A vigorous offensive must be undertaken to save time and billions to the American taxpayers. Having spent many years in the Federal Government, I feel that the job should be done by our citizens in cooperation with those of other lands contiguous to the Soviet Union. The moment the Government bureaucrats lay their hands upon something it is a mess. I would be glad to discuss this with you if you care.

I merely wish to say that I am not subscribing to the sentiment of next to the last sentence. The problem is infiniately difficult, infinitely perplexing, and I am sure the State Department is as much concerned and as much worried about the direction in which we are going as are the Congress and the people of the country. This effort should be rather a means of pouring suggestions and offers of assistance into the Department, rather than a placing of ourselves in opposition to the State Department.

In concluding I desire again to call the attention of the Senate to an address made on February 7 by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], in which, among other things, he suggested that we were losing out in our psychological warfare by turning down every suggestion which came from the other side of the iron curtain looking toward peace conferences or anything of the sort, and he made, it seems to me, the very useful suggestion that we follow up these proposals, whether set for Stockholm or elsewhere, adding to it the proviso that the United Nations should have a free use of the air to broadcast the proceedings and the conclusions of such a conference to all the nations of the world, including the area behind the iron curtain. That would throw the ball right back into the hands of the proposers: We are not throwing the balls back at this time. We are like the man at the county fair whose head through a hole in the curtain is the target for baseballs thrown by a group of interested people behind the fence. We are simply dodging them. Let us pick up those balls and throw them back.

Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut has advanced a very useful idea which I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will consider.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I listened with deep interest and with great appreciation to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont. It seems to me that most persons in the United States have not realized that there can be no permanent peace unless and until we pierce the iron curtain. For more than 30 years the Soviet government has poured forth its lies, its slanders, and its libels day after day, until it is a wonder that the prestige of the United States is as high as it is today.

There are those who believe that the signing of the Atlantic Pact, with its military implementation, and the ECA appropriation constitute, in and of themselves, all that is necessary to be done if we are to come out successfully in the struggle for peace. No thought or idea could be further from the truth. We are engaged in a contest for men's minds on a world-wide scale. Two ideologies are contesting for the possession of men's allegiances all over the earth. It seems to me that the recent speech of Mr. Winston Churchill, for whom I have a great regard, had one outstanding weakness, which was that he conjured up a situation in which we might be victorious if only we put together sufficient strength to maintain our existence long enough so that the Soviets may in time disintegrate. His allusion to what happened to Genghis Khan, 600 years ago seemed to me to be particularly—shall I say, antiquated? I am reminded of the fact that in his invasion of the West Genghis Khan's army advanced on ponies, but the next invasion of the West will not be made upon the backs of ponies.

No, Mr. President, as I see it, we must guarantee as best we can the territorial integrity of the West, and we must be about the business of getting behind the iron curtain, if we are to stop a process which threatens to endanger a free world.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut seen the interview with Ambassador Bedell Smith with regard to the health of Mr. Stalin?

Mr. McMAHON. I have not.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I remember, the hordes of Genghis Kahn went back to central Asia and engaged in a political campaign with regard to his successor. I surmise that Churchill's reference to that historic event may have had some relation to Mr. Stalin's health. Ambassador Smith says that, so far as he can judge, Mr. Stalin is in full health and vigor, and that the Georgians are notoriously long-lived. I think we had better write off that possibility.

Mr. McMAHON. It has long seemed to me that a reliance upon the fact that Mr. Stalin might have trouble from within the Soviet Union is what I would call a Micawber-like policy—waiting for something to turn up and hoping desperately that it will turn up. Even if Mr. Stalin were to pass away, I doubt very much whether those who control the Politburo would find themselves at odds upon the basic premise upon which their religion of world conquest is built.

Mr. President, on October 29, 1948, in a speech in New York, I said:

Until truth penetrates into the vast regions of the earth controlled by the Soviets, Russia will never agree to a reasonable solution of the problems which vex mankind.

There will be no hope of reaching an agreement for the effective control of atomic energy, no hope for universal disarmament, no hope for settling the problems of Germany, Korea, or Austria. These will never be solved until the Russian people have the same access to the facts that our people enjoy. Only the Kremlin and its black-out on truth stand between the American people and the Russian people.

On that occasion I also pointed out that Soviet leaders use the United Nations as a forum to spread big lies about the United States while the iron curtain prevents us from reaching the Russian people, and I added:

The very existence of the iron curtain is proof that the No. 1 enemy of the Soviet system is truth itself.

Until truth pierces the iron curtain, there will be no safety for Europe or for the United States or for the world.

Mr. President, one of the finest things which the administration could do, in my opinion, would be to assemble the leading public relations men, the leading advertising men, and the leading radio and newspaper men in a grand convention in Washington, and endeavor to seek ways and means and devise plans for a new and fresh approach to this most vital of all problems, because, unless the problem is solved, there will be no peace.

I again congratulate the Senator from Vermont for his approach to the problem, and I wish to give him the assurance that I shall be glad, as one Senator, to work with him to see if we cannot bring this problem into proper perspective, so that all of us will realize that the policy we are pursuing of spending billions of dollars of our treasure can go on for only a certain length of time, and that if some change is not brought about in the thinking of the Russian people, we are bound to lose by exhaustion. I say it is time to do something about it before that event shall come to pass.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks regarding title IV of Senate bill 1070.

All too often we think of America's housing problem exclusively in terms of the slums and overcrowded housing of our big cities.

Many people tend to have too rosy a picture of our farm housing and to think of it as standing out in marked contrast to our city slums. Unfortunately, this is not true in the case of too much of our farm housing. Some of the worst overcrowding occurs in small farm houses containing large families. Some of the

most dilapidated housing is to be found in rural communities.

It is indeed distressing that such a small proportion of all farm houses have the basic sanitary facilities which most city families have come to take for granted.

In April 1947, for example, when the Bureau of the Census made a very comprehensive study of the quality of the Nation's housing inventory, it found that 19 percent of farm dwellings were in need of major repairs, whereas only 7 percent of urban dwellings were in this condition.

It found that 67.3 percent of farm dwellings lacked running water, whereas only 4.5 percent of urban dwellings lacked this facility. It found that only 20 percent of farm dwellings had inside bathroom facilities, while about 85 percent of urban dwellings were so equipped.

It found that only 60 percent of farm dwellings had electric lights, whereas 98 percent of urban dwellings had electric lights.

It found that only 19 percent of all farm dwellings had all modern facilities, such as electric lights and inside bathrooms. In contrast, 83 percent of city houses were so equipped. Taken as a whole, farm houses are inferior in quality and equipment to those available to most nonfarm families.

In view of these facts, it is essential that the Congress give full attention to the urgent problem of improving the housing standards of farm families at the same time that it is considering the nonfarm housing problem, if our objective is to achieve a truly comprehensive housing program.

Increased farm incomes in the last several years have enabled a large number of farmers, particularly those who had been able to save enough cash or who were able to take advantage of conventional types of credit, to improve their homes and their service buildings. Nevertheless, there are still many farm families who lack the means of improving their living conditions even in the prosperous times we have enjoyed. In fact, the Department of Agriculture estimates that in the year 1947, in the midst of the period of greatest prosperity our country has ever known, the value of farm products for sale and home use produced by two and a quarter million farmers amounted to less than $1,500 per farm. The average value of the farm products for this group obviously would be considerably below $1,500.

Clearly, many of these low-income farm families need the helping hand of the Federal Government if they are to have decent housing conditions.

That is the purpose of the farm-housing provisions of the Housing Act of 1949.

Title IV of the bill is designed to make it possible for farm families to obtain the necessary financial assistance for building new houses and related buildings, or for improving run-down farm properties.

The bill recognizes, however, that any program for improving the quality of farm housing must be conditioned by the fact that farm housing is not like city or suburban housing. The farm dwelling is an intrinsic part of the whole farm plant, and must be closely integrated in the operation of the farm. In many cases, a farm will support an adequate house only if its service buildings can be improved so as to increase the earning capacity of the farm. In the main, those farm homes which are without an adequate credit basis to obtain conventional credit to improve the farm dwelling, are equally lacking in adequate credit to improve the service buildings as well.

Section 401 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to farm owners to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and other farm buildings on their farms.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Is it the Senator's intention to explain the farm portion of the bill rather fully, and then to justify the extension of loans and grants to be used or employed on submarginal land?

Mr. FREAR. I think the Senator will find that part of his question will be answered as I proceed with my remarks. If not, I shall certainly yield for a question, after I shall have concluded.

Mr. CAIN. I merely desire to suggest to the Senator that many of us have a deep interest in a justification particularly for the extending of grants on submarginal territory. I thought the Senator would be interested in our concern.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

In order to be eligible for this assistance, the farmer must show that he is without sufficient resources to provide the necessary housing and buildings on his own, and that he is unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing and service buildings from other sources at terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

The bill also wisely recognizes that there are in our rural area many families who are attempting to eke out an existence on land which is too poor to be farmed profitably. In order not to encourage families to remain on submarginal land, the bill distinguishes between the assistance to be given the adequate or potentially adequate farms and those which should ultimately be abandoned.

Sections 402 and 403 specifically limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans for housing and buildings to farms which are either adequate to insure a reasonable standard of living for the occupants of the farm, or to farms which in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture can be improved or enlarged to the point where they can be self-sufficient.

In the latter case, the bill authorizes potential credits against annual debt service on the loans for a period of not exceeding 10 years.

In those cases where it is the judgment of the Department of Agriculture that the farm is not now adequate and cannot be made to be adequate, the bill provides in section 404 for special loans and grants for making only those minor improvements to farm housing and service buildings that are necessary to remove hazards to the health and safety of the farm family and the community.

It is the purpose of this section to provide only interim aid pending a more satisfactory permanent solution of the farm family's problem and their re-establishment as a self-supporting economic group.

The bill goes beyond merely concerning itself with the plight of our most needy farm families.

In section 406 it provides for a program of research, technical studies, and the development and promotion of adequate farm dwellings and service buildings. The Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to furnish to all interested persons technical services, such as building plans, specifications, instruction, supervision and inspection, and related aids to the construction of farm dwellings and service buildings. The basic purposes of these provisions are to make it possible for farm communities, as a whole, to have available the latest techniques in building construction, in order that they, along with urban dwellers, may obtain the maximum benefit of all cost economy resulting from new construction techniques and designs.

Passage of this bill will give the farmers a badly needed helping hand in improving their living and working conditions. After all, the farmhouse and the related-service buildings are the center of the farm operation. They serve for a home, workshop, office, canning factory, bakery, restaurant, hospital, social and recreation center, and, above all, Mr. President, a place where the ideas and ideals of more than a quarter of America's future citizens are being developed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to say that the Senator from Delaware, although he was not a member of our subcommittee, participated in many of the hearings, took an active part in them, and in the full committee was particularly helpful in formulating the legislation. I want to commend him for the very fine presentation he has made with reference to this title, about which he knows a great deal, and about which many people have little concern.

I wish to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator from Delaware feel that in order to have an adequate overall housing program certainly there should be a title dealing with farm housing which, as the Senator has so well pointed out, is badly needed throughout all sections of the country?

Mr. FREAR. I do. I agree with the Senator. I thank him very much for his commendation. I would say that a bill which did not include farm housing would be very inadequate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that this is the first real effort which has been made to incorporate farm housing in a general housing bill, is he not?

Mr. FREAR. That is true. And I want to commend the chairman and the members of the committee for that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the last Congress the Senate passed a farm-housing provision, the so-called Russell-Young amendment to the housing bill, but it was not adopted by the House. The present farm title follows, does it not, very closely the lines of the Russell-Young amendment to which the Senate agreed last year?

Mr. FREAR. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator know how many submarginal operations in terms of individual farms there may be within the country? If the information is not available I would encourage the Senator, through members of the committee staff, to try to provide the information for the debate which will follow tomorrow.

Mr. FREAR. I may say to the Senator from Washington that I think the farms which are presently submarginal are obviously more than can be provided for in this bill, if it shall be passed. But, as a round figure, perhaps a million farm families at the present time are living and engaged full time in operating farms which may be classified as submarginal. There are probably another million or so who are engaged part time on submarginal farms.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I may say that I am glad to have the privilege of addressing the Senate at this time, because I was about to ask the permission of the Senate to be absent tomorrow. I shall now make the unanimous-consent request to be absent tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, a woman visiting this country from India, was interested in studying the conditions of our low-income groups. A member of the staff of the Czechoslovak Embassy volunteered with understandable enthusiasm to show this visitor the American way of life here in Washington. She was taken to the southwest part of our city. There, within five or six blocks of the Capitol, she was shown row upon row of houses without plumbing, lighting, or heat. She was shown blocks where outhouses were the only form of sanitation. She was shown alleys where the residents had to cook their meals outside. She was shown places where 13 people lived in a single room. After an hour or so, she was so aroused that she could not help but comment on the hypocrisy of America. "In India, we have conditions as bad as these but we do not boast of our way of life to the rest of the world."

I might interpolate in my manuscript the suggestion that Senators might do well to examine the alley conditions in the area which is to be taken over for the new Senate Office Building. I have not done so myself, but I understand the conditions there are very bad.

Before the Members of the Senate vote on this bill, I ask that they go just a few blocks down toward the river. I went there and was shocked and incensed that such conditions could exist in this country. I cannot convey to the Senate the absolute squalor of life for many thousands right here in the Nation's capitol. High disease rates combine with high crime rates to create a threatening and dangerous situation. Public health and police officials feel they can do little to fight the filth and crime of this section. There are too many people living in too small an area, in houses too old and neglected for salvation. These people have no place to go. They cannot within any stretch of the imagination afford new housing built by private enterprise. The rents they must pay now consume 30 and 40 percent of their incomes. Many of them are prevented from moving to other sections by restrictive covenants.

Fortunately, there is a bright side to this story. At one end of this section, there is a public housing project. The buildings in the project are low-cost brick structures of simplified design. They are spaced apart to allow plenty of light and air. Lawns give ample areas for play. Although the units house families from some of the worst slum sections, they are immaculate. A District health officer who was with me reported that the transfer of these people into clean quarters brought an almost unbelievable drop in the crime and disease rates. What was equally important, it brought a new-found pride in being a human and a citizen. Many of these people who had previously been shiftless and unsettled when living in the sordid atmosphere of the slums gained a new sense of responsibility and ambition.

I cannot overemphasize the power that a public housing and slum clearance project can have in transforming a submarginal population into a responsible and useful segment of society. What was done with a small group in Washington can be done on a larger scale both here in Washington and all over the country.

Now, I should like to mention one important feature in the bill which was in the original Republican housing bill, one of the parents of S. 1070. That is the so-called escalator clause. It was inserted to provide a stabilization feature and to prevent possible competition by public housing for materials and labor that private enterprise needed. It directs that the annual rate of construction should be increased to 250,000 or decreased to 50,000 from the annual rate of 135,000, depending upon conditions in the building industry. This provision would cut back the public-housing program when private enterprise was building at peak capacity and would accelerate the public program when private building activity slackened.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that the cost of this program in money is comparatively small. The maximum annual amount is equal to our military expenditures every 7 days of peace. I feel that decent housing has far greater value in our war against totalitarianism.

The cost is small but the saving in human life is incalculable. I ask for the passage of this bill as a basic step toward the rehabilitation of a distressed portion of our people.

RECESS

Mr. McMAHON. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Ralph C. John, assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, as we bow in the afterglow of the season which stands as the birthright to undying hope, we pray that Thou wilt give us courage and grace for the living of these days. Forbid it that small frustrations should loom as insurmountable obstacles. Recognizing great issues to be what they are, help us to be stern in our opposition to that motivated by evil, and yielding before all that is consonant with the greatness of the spirit of Him who is our Lord and Master.

As the highways of a shaken world converge on this place, make us in all things to be marked as those who are Thine. This we ask in His blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McMAHON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 18, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 14, 1949:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Baboace;

S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; and

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop.

On April 19, 1949:

S. 1209. An act to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Millikin
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Baldwin	Humphrey	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Sparkman
Donnell	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Kilgore	Taft
Ecton	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McClellan	Vandenberg
George	McFarland	Watkins
Gillette	McGrath	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Withers
Hickenlooper	Martin	
Hill	Maybank	

Mr. McMAHON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that routine business may be transacted at this time, without speeches or debate in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION BY POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE ON DEATH OF SENATOR BROUGHTON

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee expressing its profound sorrow and deep regret at the death of the late Senator J. Melville Broughton.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas death has removed from our midst a colleague whose outstanding qualities of heart and mind had won the utmost respect and affection of everyone; and

Whereas those of us who were privileged to know him intimately and to call him friend in the years before his entrance upon his senatorial duties have particular reason to be distressed at his untimely going; and

Whereas both the United States Senate and this committee are deprived thereby of a Member whose deep interest in his important duties, and whose exceptional abilities marked him as worthy to an exceptional degree of the confidence reposed in him by the electorate of his great State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service hereby expresses its profound sorrow and deep regret at the death of Hon. J. Melville Broughton, late Senator from the State of North Carolina and a member of this committee; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FARM LOAN ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize loans through national farm loan associations in Puerto Rico; to modify the limitations on Federal land-bank loans to any one borrower; to repeal provisions for subscriptions to paid-in surplus of Federal land banks and cover the entire amount appropriated therefor into the surplus fund of the Treasury; to effect certain economies in reporting and recording payments on mortgages deposited with the registrars as bond collateral, and canceling the mortgage and satisfying and discharging the lien of record; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, together with a complete set of the Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions, as supplements to the annual report (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Western Regional Convention of the National Baptist Convention of America, Mobile, Ala., relating to civil-rights legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from C. F. Nichols, of Morganfield, Ky., praying for an increase in parcel-post rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THYE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

"Whereas the right of most veterans of World War II to receive readjustment allowances under title V of the Federal Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (known as the GI bill of rights) expires July 25, 1949; and

"Whereas only about one-half of unemployed Minnesota veterans of World War II have rights to benefits under the Minnesota employment and security law; and

"Whereas unemployment amongst Minnesota veterans is increasing; and

"Whereas economic conditions in the near future may be such as to cause great hardship and financial distress to such veterans and their families: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota do herewith memorialize and petition the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America, now in session in the city of Washington, D. C., to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"Approved April 12, 1949.
"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, concerning the granting of loans to members of the fur-farming industry in the State of Colorado

"Whereas the fur-farming industry in the State of Colorado is fighting for its very existence due to economic conditions in the industry beyond its control and brought about in part through ruthless competition resulting from the importation of furs from Russia and elsewhere and in part due to the inability of the members of the industry to obtain adequate financing; and

"Whereas the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation which has been authorized by the Congress of the United States to grant

loans to legitimate fur farmers fails and refuses for various technical and other reasons best known to itself to grant loans quickly enough and in the proper amounts to give relief to the members of the industry in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation on behalf of the officers and directors and members of the Rocky Mountain Fur Farmers Association and the officers, directors and members of the G. I. Fur Farm School, to take all necessary steps and such administrative action as is necessary to cause the officials of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to relax the restrictions on the making of loans by the Corporation to fur farmers in this State and elsewhere as was the intention of Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That in order to make such loans available immediately in this area either the local branch of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Denver, Colo., or the Production Credit Corporation office at Fort Collins, Colo., be vested with the power to grant loans to fur farmers in this State within the shortest possible time and with the least adminstrative detail for the purpose of facilitating the making thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation urging the relief herein set forth.

"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.
"PAT MAGILL, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the forty-fifth legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas since the founding of our Nation, the States have exercised sovereignty over the tidelands, the submerged lands, including the soil under navigable inland waters, and soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not; and

"Whereas under the common law and civil law the State's sovereignty and authority over and title to said lands has been long acknowledged, affirmed, and respected by the Federal Government whose only powers were expressly delegated to it by the States at the time of the formation of our Government; and

"Whereas the States did not delegate unto the Federal Government authority or power over or title to said lands but retained same to and for the States; and

"Whereas the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *U. S. v. California,* while not deciding the question of ownership of the tidewater lands of California, casts a cloud on that State's title to said lands and the minerals and other natural resources beneath; and

"Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the matter of ownership of said tidewater lands is still a question for the Congress to decide; and

"Whereas the title to the tidelands and submerged lands of the States is clouded by this decision and the language therein is so broad as to be extendible to the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under the navigable waters within the territorial jurisdiction of the States, and even to the minerals and other natural resources or important elements on or beneath the soil of the States; and

"Whereas this cloud of uncertainty affects minerals, fisheries, and all other natural resources and should be removed by the Congress, thereby acknowledging and reaffirming ownership to the States; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress passed a bill, reaffirming and acknowledging ownership in the submerged lands and resources of the respective States and quitclaiming all right and title thereto to the respective States, reserving only a paramount right to the Government in case of national defense, by a vote of 198 for to 26 against but the measure died in the Senate by the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is memorialized to further consider and enact suitable legislation for the purpose of acknowledging and affirming ownership of submerged lands and resources thereof to the respective States in accordance with the heretofore long recognized constitutional rights of the States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each House of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon and to each of the United States Senators from this State, and urge that they individually and collectively give wholehearted support to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

"Adopted by senate March 7, 1949.
"WM. E. WALSH,
"President of Senate.
"Concurred in by House March 28, 1949.
"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
"Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the Empire Air Lines, Inc., is a temporarily certified local service air line now operating air mail route No. 78 under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity which will expire on September 28, 1949, unless extended by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

"Whereas said Empire Air Lines, Inc., extends its operations over several States of the Northwest, including Oregon, and by its transportation of air mail, passengers, and express renders an invaluable service throughout said territory; and

"Whereas the future need for such air service in the Northwest is so apparent: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the President and the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, memorialized, and this Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon hereby does petition that through proper budgetary action and financial support provision be made for the extension of the term of experimental or temporary certificates of convenience and necessity of local and feeder air lines, including that of Empire Air Lines, Inc., from 3 to 5 years; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Hon. Guy Cordon and Hon. Wayne L. Morse, Senators from the State of Oregon; and Hon. Homer D. Angell, Hon. Lowell Stockman, Hon. Walter Norblad, and Hon. Harris Ellsworth, Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate March 26, 1949.
"WM. E. WALSH,
"President of Senate.
"Concurred in by house March 31, 1949.
"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
"Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas for lack of adequate transportation facilities, the development of southwestern Oregon, and particularly Curry County, has been and is hampered and held back; and

"Whereas in particular vast areas of virgin timber in the said area have remained and still remain largely undeveloped, much of which said timber is now overripe and deteriorating in quality and condition due to the attacks of disease and insects attendant upon overmaturity; and

"Whereas the development of said timber resources under present conditions is unduly wasteful and uneconomical by reason of the high costs of such transportation facilities as now are available; and

"Whereas the mouth of the Rogue River on the Oregon coast is a potential harbor, which if developed, would be adequate and sufficient for the economical transportation to market of the timber products and other commodities of Curry County and for the development of the timber and other natural resources of the said county; and

"Whereas the mouth of the said Rogue River is centrally located in a strip of undeveloped coast line more than 100 miles in length, the longest piece of coast line in continental United States without development of harbor facilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation and to make appropriations for the development of a harbor suitable and sufficient for ocean shipping at the mouth of the Rogue River on the Oregon coast in Curry County, Oreg.; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to each Senator and Representative therein representing the people of the State of Oregon.

"Adopted by house March 31, 1949.
"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
"Speaker of House.
"Adopted by senate April 6, 1949.
"WM. E. WALSH,
"President of Senate."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 47 citizens of Sussex County, Del., in support of House bill 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FORT DES MOINES (IOWA) REAL ESTATE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF IOWA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7, of the Iowa General Assembly, with a certificate by Melvin D. Synhorst, secretary of state, certifying it to be a true copy. It deals with acceptance by the State of Iowa of the Fort Des Moines real estate at Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution and certificate were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IOWA,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Melvin D. Synhorst, secretary of state of the State of Iowa, custodian of the acts of the general assembly, do hereby certify that the attached is a true photostatic copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7, acts of the Fifty-third General Assembly, State of Iowa.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the secretary of state at the capitol, in Des Moines, this 12th day of April A. D. 1949.

[SEAL] MELVIN D. SYNHORST,
Secretary of State.

Whereas there is situated in Polk County a property of the Federal Government known as Fort Des Moines Army Post, which property was for many years used as a military post of some consequence; and

Whereas said military post has been now permanently abandoned and the property, containing numerous buildings, is now controlled by various agencies of the Federal Government and used for the different purposes of such agencies, and it has come to the attention of the citizens of this State that the Federal Government desires to dispose of the property; and

Whereas Fort Des Moines has been in existence for many years and is closely bound to the history of Iowa, and the conversion of the property to a useful purpose is of primary concern and importance to the people of this State; and

Whereas said property was originally given to the Federal Government by the State of Iowa for use as a military post and the purpose of said grant has now been abrogated, and the State now desires that said property be returned to the State of Iowa, and if now so returned it can be used to good advantage by the people of this State: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-third General Assembly (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urgently requested to enact the necessary legislation to return the grounds and buildings of the Fort Des Moines Army Post to the State of Iowa that the same may be put to good and timely use and purposes by this State; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to Senators and Representatives in Congress from Iowa, to the Federal Housing Authority, to the War Assets Administration, and the Secretary of Defense, and the secretary of state of Iowa is hereby directed to forward said copies under the seal of his office.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I have received from W. Kerr Scott, Governor of the State of North Carolina, a certified copy of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of that State, favoring legislation confirming the title of the several States of the Union to submerged lands within their borders and protecting the title, ownership, and rights of the several States therein, and I request that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution requesting United States Senators from North Carolina and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from North Carolina to give their support to Federal legislation confirming the title of the several States of the Union to submerged lands within their borders and protecting the title, ownership, and rights of the several States therein

Whereas by chapter 1031 of the session laws of 1947, the General Assembly of North Carolina enacted a statute which declared that the eastern limit and boundary of the State of North Carolina on the Atlantic seaboard, having always been, since the Treaty of Peace with Great Britain in 1783 and the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, one marine league eastward from the Atlantic seashore, measured from the extreme low-water mark, and declaring that the said boundary should remain fixed as it always had been, one marine league eastward from the seashore of the Atlantic Ocean bordering the State of North Carolina, measured from the extreme low-water mark of the Atlantic Ocean seashore aforesaid, and declaring that this State shall continue, as it always had, to exercise jurisdiction over the territory within the littoral waters and ownership of the lands under the same within the boundaries of the State, subject only to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over navigation within such territorial waters, and said act further called upon the Governor and the attorney general to take all such action as might be found appropriate to defend the jurisdiction of the State over its littoral waters and the ownership of the lands beneath the same; and

Whereas the large area of land beneath the inland sounds and tributary streams in eastern North Carolina and the large area of land beneath the ocean and within one marine league of the Atlantic seaboard of the North Carolina coast forms an integral and important part of the landed area of this State which is held in trust for the benefit of all the people of the State; and

Whereas the protection of the State's jurisdiction and authority over said land and waters is vital and necessary to the economy of the State, in particular regard to the large fishing interests of the State; and

Whereas the fishing interests of the State could be destroyed by failure to protect the entrance of migratory fish through the several inlets entering into North Carolina waters from the Atlantic Ocean, which the State has always protected by laws against practices which would destroy the entrance of migratory fish into our inland sounds and tributary waters; and

Whereas a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States entitled *"Toomer* v. *Whitsell"* (334 U. S. 385) decided in 1948, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the power of the State to regulate fishing in the marginal sea area within its boundaries may be exercised only "in absence of conflicting Federal claim", basing its decision upon the former case of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19); and

Whereas the President of the United States has heretofore issued an Executive order, authorizing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior to recommend the establishment of zones for Federal regulation and control of fishery resources and fishing activities in those areas of the high seas contiguous to the coast of the United States, and the Department of State, in December 1948, notified coastal State officials that it will begin to put this program into effect; and

Whereas the Federal executive agencies have introduced in Congress and are attempting to speed the passage of legislation declaring Federal ownership and control of the marginal seas on all the coastal States; and

Whereas such legislation presents a serious challenge to the time-honored jurisdiction and control of the State of North Carolina over its inland and coastline tidelands, overthrowing more than 150 years of established precedent and legislation enacted by this and other States protecting said waters and exercising jurisdiction thereover: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the United States Senators from North Carolina and Members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina be and they hereby are memorialized and requested to lend their active support to legislation which will be considered by the Eighty-first Congress to protect the continued ownership and control by the several States of the lands and resources within and beneath the navigable waters thereof and within the boundaries of the respective States, subject only to constitutionally delegated Federal powers with respect to such areas, and to oppose all pending and proposed legislation in Congress which would create Federal ownership or control of land, fish, or other resources beneath the navigable waters within the State boundaries. That the members of the North Carolina delegation in Congress be requested to give their active support to Federal legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership and jurisdiction over lands and waters within their territorial jurisdiction as heretofore recognized and acknowledged by State and Federal authorities.

SEC. 2. That copy of this resolution shall be transmitted by the Governor to each Senator and Representative from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

H. P. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.
KERR CRAIGE RAMSAY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution

adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1070, relating to the national housing program, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting the United States Congress to enact Senate bill 1070 or similar legislation

Whereas the city of Minneapolis has by resolution of its city council on November 9, 1945, and on January 3, 1946, recognized the existence of a housing emergency; and

Whereas the city has availed itself of Federal assistance in the form of temporary dwellings for the housing of veterans; and

Whereas the city, in addition, has spent over $2,000,000 of its own funds to provide both semipermanent and permanent dwellings for its citizens most in need of housing; and

Whereas there remains a great unfilled need for rental housing which private enterprise cannot meet and which there is no prospect of its meeting in the foreseeable future; and

Whereas the city has authorized the organization of a housing and redevelopment authority and has financed the early studies of this authority; and

Whereas it is now apparent that the only feasible means of providing housing of minimum adequate standard to certain of the families of the city is by a program of Federal assistance to localities for the construction and operation of public low-rent housing developments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the City Council of Minneapolis hereby requests the United States Congress to enact Senate bill 1070 or legislation substantially the same; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Members of the Congress representing Minnesota and that a copy be transmitted to Congressman BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, for inclusion in the record of the hearings of that committee on any bill or bills containing substantially the public housing provisions of Senate bill 1070.

Passed April 8, 1949.

ERIC G. HOYER,
President of the Council.

Approved April 11, 1949.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Acting Mayor.

Attest:

CHAS. C. SWANSON,
City Clerk.

RURAL TELEPHONE LINES—RESOLUTION OF NORTH PRAIRIE TELEPHONE CO., VELVA, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the North Prairie Telephone Co., at Velva, N. Dak., relating to rural telephone lines, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the North Prairie Telephone Co., of Velva, N. Dak., at their annual meeting, do here go on record as being in favor of bill H. R. 2960, Poage bill, pertaining to making Federal funds available at 2 percent interest, for the purpose of building and rebuilding rural telephone lines. The above resolution passed unanimously, by show of hands.

Motion made and passed instructing secretary to send copy of the above resolution to our Congressmen.

JEROME EFFERTZ,
Secretary.

PARITY ON FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTIONS OF WILLIAMS COUNTY FARMERS UNION, RAY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted by members of the Williams County Farmers Union, meeting in quarterly convention at Ray, N. Dak., on the 2d instant, relating to parity on farm products, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we as members of the Williams County Farmers Union meeting in quarterly convention at Ray, N. Dak., April 2, 1949, believe that support prices, soil conservation, and the ever-normal granary constitute the basis of an effective program in fighting an agricultural depression; and

Whereas we feel that assurance of an adequate share of the Nation's income to agriculture is a major weapon to prevent depression: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend to the Eighty-first Congress to enact legislation in 1949 which will provide 100 percent of parity to farmers; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the North Dakota Farmers Union, the National Farmers Union, and our Senators and Congressmen.

Be it resolved, That we, as members of the Williams County Farmers Union, meeting in quarterly convention at Ray, N. Dak., April 2, 1949, do hereby reaffirm our positive stand favoring a Missouri Valley Authority; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the North Dakota Farmers Union, the National Farmers Union, and to our Senators and Congressmen.

The above resolutions adopted unanimously.

WILLIAMS COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
ALVIN ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON STATE GRANGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of letters from Morton Tompkins, Master of the Oregon State Grange, Portland, Oreg., dated April 5, 7, 13, and 18, 1949, enclosing resolutions adopted by Redland Grange No. 796, of Clackamas County; Myrtle Grange No. 289; Plainview Grange No. 624, of Deschutes County; Pacific Grange No. 413, of Clatsop County; Harding Grange No. 122, of Clackamas County; Wolf Creek Grange No. 596, of Union County; Home Economics Club of the Wolf Creek Grange, of Union County; Cricket Flat Grange No. 606, of Union County; Chetco Grange No. 765, of Harbor; Terrebonne Grange, of Deschutes County; Olney Grange No. 793, of Clatsop County; Silverton Hills Grange No. 752; Barlow Gate Grange No. 157, of Wasco County; Vale Grange No. 696; Greendell Grange No. 834; and Dixie Mountain Grange No. 860, all in the State of Oregon, relating to the Columbia Valley Authority. I ask unanimous consent that the letters and resolutions be appropriately referred, and that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letters and resolutions will be received and referred to the Committee on Public Works, and without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The resolutions are as follows:

MARCH 19, 1949.

To Our President and the Congress of the United States:

At our meeting of Redland Grange No. 796 March 17, we the members agreed unanimously in favor for the Columbia Valley Authority.

In our beautiful Pacific Northwest there has been a critical shortage on electricity, and the CVA would prevent this matter.

It would also increase factories and these would make employment for our large increase in population and unemployment.

It would also control floods and make water available for irrigation which is needed for our fertile soil. Some of the desert lands could be made into cultivative lands.

The fishing industries can be protected by developing a river plan which is very much needed.

Therefore, Redland Grange is in favor that the Columbia Valley Authority be resolved.

GERTRUDE DEININGER,
Secretary.

(Redland Grange, No. 796, Clackamas County; number of members, 114.)

To the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the people of this region need more electrical energy, more water available for irrigation, more flood control, and for the development of local deposits of fertilizer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America create a CVA (Columbia Valley Authority) for the development of our national resources of the Northwest States.

Adopted by Myrtle Grange No. 289 at a regular meeting the 19th day of March 1949.

DOROTHY ADAMS,
Secretary.
J. C. CAUDLE,
Master.
C. B. HOLLAND,
Executive Committee.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas the Eighty-first Congress of these United States has on its agenda the consideration of the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration; and

Whereas it is long past time when the great unlimited and varied resources of the Columbia watershed should be allowed exploitation, without regard to an over-all pattern for the common good of the residents of the area and of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, with utmost haste, enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration for the full coordination and development of the resources of the Columbia Valley.

Adopted by Plainview Grange No. 624 at a regular meeting of its members this 5th day of March 1949.

GRACE H. TRACHSEL,
Secretary.
JESSE C. EDGINGTON,
Master.
ELLIS H. EDGINGTON,
E. M. HARRINGTON,
CHAS. W. TRACHSEL,
Executive Committee.

(Plainview Grange, No. 624, Deschutes County; number of members, 54.)

MARCH 12, 1949.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We, the members of Pacific Grange, No. 413, Warrenton, Oreg., favor the establishment of CVA.

D. C. BELL,
Master.
E. HARSHBERGER,
Secretary.

(Pacific Grange, No. 413, Clatsop County, 125 members.)

Resolution favoring a CVA

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia River Authority, we the undersigned go on record as favoring this program for the following reasons:

1. We need more cheap power and more industry encouraged by such cheap power to take care of a vast increase in population.

2. We need extensive flood control and more cheap fertilizer to protect our soil and provide for this increase in population.

3. We need rivers control for irrigation, industry and other public uses.

4. We believe that coordinated on the ground authority will best serve to bring these things to pass: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Harding Grange, No. 122, of Clackamas County, State of Oregon, go on record as favoring the establishment of a CVA and urge the Congress to enact a law.

Resolution adopted in regular session assembled March 5, 1949. Grange organized in 1874; membership, 90.

DELLA M. NEVILL,
Secretary.
EARL LANKINS,
Master.
E. W. FICKEN,
H. G. NEVILL,
W. H. WYATT,
Executive Committee.

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas President Truman has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority, after taking into consideration all the problems and needs of the region, and taking into account all interests to be affected; and

Whereas the acute shortage of power has been a hindrance to the proper development of the great potential wealth which could be enjoyed through creation of new industries, thousands of new jobs, for development of phosphate fertilizer for our farms; and

Whereas at present there is no unified program that can reclaim our desert land, protect our $20,000,000 fish industry, reforest and maintain our forests, to furnace aluminum and other strategic materials for national defense, to stop soil erosion, and prevent a repetition of the Columbia Valley flood experienced within the past year which took over 40 lives and a property damage of over $100,000,000. We believe that a properly organized Columbia Valley Authority is the only way that we can obtain the best economic development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress enact legislation to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate full develop- of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley, also, flood control, soil conservation, irrigation, navigation, industrial, and domestic water supply, and electric power.

Adopted by the Wolf Creek Grange, No. 596, at a regular meeting of its members this 19th day of March 1949.

J. A. NICE,
Secretary.
F. E. LINDLEY,
Master.
J. D. NEWMAN,
HAROLD L. CRAIG,
VILLA GORHAM,
Executive Committee.

(Wolf Creek Grange, No. 596, Union County; number of members, 76.)

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the power shortage is a major problem in the Pacific Northwest in both home and industry; and

Whereas there is insufficient power in homes already served by electricity, and there is a definite need to extend lines into communities not yet served, since farmers find it difficult to hire labor where electricity is lacking; and

Whereas the lack of electricity causes farm people to live away from the farm where they do find conveniences; and

Whereas more people would settle in rural communities if electricity were available:

Therefore, we, the Home Economics Club of the Wolf Creek Grange, do hereby resolve to endorse the CVA in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

CELESTA NICE,
Chairman.
RUTH CARNES,
Secretary.

(Home Economics Club of the Wolf Creek Grange, Union County; number of members, 23.)

To the President and Congress of the United States of America:

Whereas the Pacific Northwest has a large amount of undeveloped resources, most of which are more or less concerned with the Columbia River: The large volume of water of the Columbia may be allowed to rush to the sea, eroding on farms and causing floods such as the $100,000,000 disaster of last year, or it can be made to irrigate more farms, provide water transportation, produce enormous tonnage of fish, and generate more power than any other river in the world excepting the Zambezi of Africa;

Whereas the Pacific Northwest at present has an acute power shortage and needs more power for industrial development:

We, Cricket Flat Grange, No. 606, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority in order that all of this development may be brought about systematically according to one plan for the entire Columbia Valley.

JACK HALSEY, *Master.*
MARGARET WEATHERSPOON,
Secretary.
W. H. WEATHERSPOON,
EMIL MILLER,
RAYMOND WALLTY,
Executive Committee.

(Cricket Flat Grange, No. 606, Union County; 76 members.)

Mr. MORTON TOMPKINS,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR WORTHY MASTER: Chetco Grange, No. 765, Harbor, Oreg., in regular session, March 4, 1949, voted in favor of a Columbia Valley Authority.

VERNA ASCHE,
Secretary.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority taking into consideration all the needs of the region; and

Whereas such full development of the resources of the Columbia Valley requires a coordinated river-development plan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States establish a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley, including flood control, irrigation, industrial and domestic water supply and electric power.

Adopted by Terrebonne Grange in regular session of its members this 22d day of March 1949.

NELLIE L. ALLEN,
Secretary.
EVA THORNBAUGH,
Master.
EARL DEXTER,
J. J. PHILLIPS,
Executive Committee.

(Terrebonne Grange, Deschutes County; number of members, 106.)

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the lower Columbia Valley has experienced a most critical power shortage because of a lack of a coordinated river development; and

Whereas the farmers in this area have experienced extensive soil erosion because of heavy rainfall and are greatly in need of a cheap fertilizer in order that they may continue a successful development of their lands; and

Whereas the fishing industry is in need of a body of men who are directly interested in the preservation of the fishing industry as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the members of Olney Grange, No. 793, are in favor of a Columbia Valley Authority.

Adopted by Olney Grange, No. 793, at a regular meeting of its members this 11th day of March 1949.

MARGARET F. BAKER,
Secretary.
C. E. WADE,
Master.

(Olney Grange, No. 793, Clatsop County; number of members, 69.)

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the development of the Pacific Northwest depends on cheap power; and

Whereas our national resources should be developed and conserved; and

Whereas CVA would eliminate existing overlapping and conflicting bureaus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President and Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of a CVA to coordinate the full development of the water and all other resources of Columbia Valley, including benefits as flood control, navigation, irrigation, industry, and electric power.

Adopted by Silverton Hills Grange, No. 752, at a regular meeting of its members this 5th day of March 1949.

EDITH BERGLI,
Secretary.
IRA LORON,
EDITH BEUGLI,
VICTOR J. HADLEY,
Executive Committee.

(Silverton Hills Grange; number of members, 85.)

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the lack of coordinated river development is causing a critical shortage of power; and

Whereas there is a definite need of more and cheaper fertilizer in this locality and elsewhere; and

Whereas there is no unified program for conservation of range, forest, and farm lands; and

Whereas full development of our resources cannot be fulfilled under the present numerous bureaus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the full development of the water and all other resources of the Columbia Valley.

Adopted by Barlow Gate Grange, No. 157, at a regular meeting of its members this 18th day of March 1949.

MAE BERNHAGEN,
Secretary.
LOLA DODSON,
Master.
W. L. STOKTON,
BEN DODSON,
P. B. DRIVER,
Executive Committee.

(Barlow Gate Grange, No. 157, Wasco County.)

MARCH 8, 1949.

Whereas the TVA has proved so successful, fulfilling the most optimistic predictions, bringing to the Tennessee Valley great economic benefits, we, the members of Vale Grange, No. 696, in regular session, do approve the program of the Federal Government to bring to the Columbia Valley and its tributaries, the benefits of a unified plan of rehabilitation, known as the Columbia Valley Authority.

E. B. METCALF,
Master.
CARRIE M. BERRY,
Secretary.

MARCH 15, 1949.

Be it resolved, That the Greendell Grange, No. 834, go on record as being in favor of Columbia Valley Authority: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of Columbia Valley Authority for promoting quick and just settlements. Whereas so-called Government (red tape) takes so much time.

Whereas it would help our home industry, being lumber and dairying.

Whereas would promote quicker transportation, also better our one and only railroad, by promoting contesting companies for transportation.

This resolution made in regular session of Greendell Grange, No. 834. At Greendell Grange Hall March 15, 1949.

CALVIN S. LUSCOMBE,
Master.
DOLA B. LUSCOMBE,
Secretary.

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority; and

Whereas the Columbia Valley is experiencing its most critical power shortage in its history because of the Army engineers' inefficient progress; and

Whereas the urgent requirements of phosphates for farmers in the Columbia Valley and the rest of the Nation are more pressing daily; and

Whereas the urgent need for more irrigation will bring on more security for the Nation.

Adopted by Dixie Mount Grange, 860, at a regular meeting of its members this 1st day of April 1949.

PAULINE LAMPA,
Secretary.
SELNOR HENDRICKSON,
Master.
T. N. NELSON,
BERT LAMPA,
Executive Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3932. A bill to exempt artificial limbs from duty if imported for personal use and not for sale; without amendment (Rept. No. 270).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1527. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 271).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 110. Resolution extending an invitation of the Senate to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic winter games at Lake Placid, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 272).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive B, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1948, signed at London on June 10, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 27 other states (Ex. Rept. No. 4); and Executive C, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the convention of the world meteorological organization, which was opened for signature at Washington on October 11, 1947, for a period of 120 days, and was signed, during that period, by representatives of the United States of America and of 41 other states, and a protocol relating thereto which was signed at the same time (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan; and

Theodore C. Achilles, and sundry other Foreign Service officers for promotion.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 1632, to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes, which appears under a separate heading, and subsequently referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

(Mr. HUMPHREY introduced Senate bill 1633, to transfer control over Indian tribal funds to the Indian tribes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1634. A bill for the relief of Aksir Miah;

S. 1635. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfred Josef Fialla; and

S. 1636. A bill for the relief of Askor Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1637. A bill for the relief of Marie Henriette de Bruyn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1638. A bill to provide for the review of certain cases by Retiring Boards and Medical Survey Boards of the National Military Establishment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1639. A bill to amend section 1452, Revised Statutes, relating to presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1640. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. 962; 16 U. S. C. 513), relating to membership of the National Forest Reservation Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1641. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 1642. A bill to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the scientific investigation of tuna, signed at Mexico City, January 25, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1643. A bill to provide price support for citrus fruit and for other purposes; and

S. 1644. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas) introduced Senate bill 1645, to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1646. A bill for the relief of Alex Harfenist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1647. A bill to eliminate premium payments in the purchase of Government royalty

oil under existing contracts entered into pursuant to the act of July 13, 1946 (30 U. S. C., sec. 192); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1648. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to mothers of veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COLUMBIA INTERSTATE COMMISSION

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, authored and recently introduced in the House by Representative WALT HORAN, of Washington State, which would establish a Columbia Interstate Commission.

This is the third and last of three proposals regarding development of the Columbia Basin, which, in line with the policy I outlined yesterday, would give the Senate the opportunity to study each and every plan fairly and on its merits. The two previous bills are S. 1595, which was referred to the Senate Public Works Committee, and S. 1631, which awaits the decision of the Chair for proper reference. Two companion bills to S. 1631 were introduced in the House of Representatives. They are H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287, both of which were referred to the House Public Works Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reference of the bill will be deferred pending disposition of the President's message on the same subject. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1632) to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title, and subsequently referred to the Committee on Public Works.

INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to transfer control of Indian tribal funds to Indian tribes, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1633) to transfer control over Indian tribal funds to the Indian tribes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

The tribal funds bill, which I am introducing today, would go a long way in transferring control of Indian funds from the Indian Bureau to the Indian tribes themselves. In this respect the bill goes beyond a number of proposals which have been discussed and which would make all action by tribal councils in withdrawing their own funds from the United States Treasury subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Under this bill no departmental approval is required where the tribe wishes to spend current income. On the other hand, if the tribe wants to dip into past accumulations of capital, the approval of the Interior Department would still be required. This compromise has been informally discussed with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and I have every reason to believe will receive its approval as a fair compromise.

This bill has been approved in principle by all civic organizations, Indian and non-Indian, which have given the matter their consideration. These include the National Congress of American Indians, the Home Missions Council, the Association on American Indian Affairs, the Indian Rights Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

A companion bill has been introduced by Congressman D'EWART, H. R. 4025, and by Senators MURRAY and ECTON, S. 1564.

The provisions of this bill would be applicable to any Indian tribe, band, pueblo, or other municipal corporation in the United States. Under the terms of this bill, the moneys belonging to such an Indian group would be turned over to the group upon its request for disbursement in ways determined by the Indians themselves. If the council of the group operates under any tribal constitution or charter, it would have to conform to the provisions of that constitution or charter in withdrawing funds from the United States Treasury. In the past, it has been necessary for tribes to send delegations to Congress to try to secure special appropriation items by which Congress authorized the Indians to use their own money for specific purposes. Under the new bill, if it passes, the tribes will become the masters of their own income.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT and Mr. LANGER each submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects, initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on April 7, I offered an amendment to the reciprocal trade bill which is pending on the Senate Calendar. I ask unanimous consent to submit a further amendment, which is a clarification of the prior amendment. I ask that it lie on the table. I merely wish to point out that what I desire to accomplish by the amendment is to discourage foreign countries discriminating against the commerce of the United States or from withdrawing trade benefits granted to the United States in trade agreements with immunity and continue to enjoy the trade concessions and benefits granted by the United States in a trade agreement. The practices which I wish to discourage on the part of foreign governments are exemplified by the restrictions imposed by Great Britain against the importation of United States motion pictures, the recent quotas and embargoes imposed by Canada against the importation of American fruits, nuts, and vegetables under the terms of the Geneva agreement on tariffs and trade, and the action taken by Mexico in 1947 withdrawing all of the concessions made to the United States in the 1942 trade agreement and imposing embargoes, import quotas and increased import duties even more restrictive of American imports than those imposed prior to the negotiation of the 1942 trade agreement. Under the existing law and the trade agreements negotiated thereunder, these and other countries have been completely free to withdraw their concessions made to the United States and to impose even more restrictive import regulations and discriminations against commerce with the United States without fear of having the trade agreement concessions made to them by the United States withdrawn.

I believe, Mr. President, the amendment will furnish a means by which this Government can meet the situation.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. KNOWLAND to the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of sufficient funds for the Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River, in Washington State, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALUTE TO BURMA—BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a salute to Burma, made by him in commemoration of Burma's first anniversary of independence, April 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH AND MR. LE GRAND P. BACKMAN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 30, 1949, received by him from Mr. Le Grand P. Backman, president of the Board of Education of Salt Lake City, concerning Federal aid to education, and his letter in reply dated April 9, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME—ARTICLE BY MRS. ELEANOR B. ALLEN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "An Idea Whose Time Has Come," written by Mrs. Eleanor B. Allen, member of the board of education, Los Angeles schools, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE AND WAR—ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS BEFORE THE NATION ASSOCIATES

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on peace and war, delivered

by Hon. William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, at a dinner forum under the auspices of the Nation Associates, at New York City on April 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENOCIDE—ARTICLE BY RAPHAEL LEMKIN

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Genocide," written by Raphael Lemkin and published in the March 1949 issue of the World Alliance News Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR MORE ELECTRIC POWER—ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "We Need More Electric Power," delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. Girard Davidson, before the Economic Action Conference, Washington, D. C., on April 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—EDITORIALS FROM THE MONTANA KAIMIN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials concerning the proposed Missouri Valley Authority from the Montana Kaimin, one entitled "MVA To Continue Battle," in the issue of January 20, 1949, and another entitled "Pick-Sloan Wedding Not Working," in the issue of January 28, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

HOOVER COMMISSION'S ANALYSIS OF THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN—ARTICLE BY ROSCOE FLEMING

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Blasting Pick-Sloan—Hoover Commission Heaps Criticism," by Roscoe Fleming, published in the Lincoln (Nebr.) State Journal of April 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MEDWAY PLAN FOR WORLD PEACE THROUGH WORLD BROTHERHOOD—ADDRESS BY RT. REV. JOSEPH L. O'BRIEN

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Medway Plan," delivered by Rt. Rev. Joseph L. O'Brien, S. T. D.; LL. D., pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Charleston, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—LETTER FROM HENRY HOKE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Henry Hoke, suggesting certain changes in the Post Office Department, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN OLD AND EVIL SCHEME SEEKS TO END OUR LIBERTY—EDITORIAL BY E. T. LEECH

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Old and Evil Scheme Seeks To End Our Liberty," by E. T. Leech, editor, the Pittsburgh Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COYOTE—OFFICIAL STATE ANIMAL OF SOUTH DAKOTA

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Badger Clark, poet laureate of South Dakota, to the Huron (S. Dak.) Plainsman, lauding the coyote as official State animal of South Dakota, which appears in the Appendix.]

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE FIRST TO SUGGEST ATLANTIC PACT

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Clare Boothe Luce Broached Idea for Atlantic Pact in 1943," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of April 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUILDING ARMED SERVICES INTO A TEAM—ARTICLE BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Building Armed Services Into a Team," by Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, from the Christian Science Monitor of April 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATLANTIC PACT AND THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Atlantic Pact and the United Nations," by Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, from the Christian Science Monitor of March 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUTCH PROBLEM—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dutch Problem," from the Washington Post of April 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

M. D. ANDERSON CANCER FOUNDATION, HOUSTON, TEX.—ADDRESS BY PAUL BOLTON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Mr. Paul Bolton regarding the M. D. Anderson Cancer Foundation in Houston, Tex., which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS—ARTICLE BY FRASER S. GARDNER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "On the Legal Side," written by Fraser S. Gardner and published in the Army and Navy Union News for January 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today, beginning at 2:30 p. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent given by the Senate, there was printed in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings the first two articles of a series appearing in the Baltimore Sun on the monetary cost of President Truman's social-welfare proposals.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD the third article in this series, entitled "'Hidden Taxes' Raise Actual Cost 423 Percent."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—HIDDEN TAXES RAISE ACTUAL COST 423 PERCENT

(This is the third of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 18.—Everyone—each one of the country's 148,000,000 people—helps to pay for the system known as Social Security.

But only about one-third of the people are entitled to old-age and survivor benefits.

The other two-thirds help to pay for the security of the more fortunate one-third.

That's because there are a lot of hidden taxes in social security.

When your employer withholds a dollar from your pay envelope for old-age insurance, he must match it with a dollar contribution of his own.

He sends the $2 to the collector of internal revenue and it becomes a part of the old-age and survivor trust fund.

THE CONSUMER PAYS THAT SECOND DOLLAR

But the dollar contributed by your employer really does not come out of his pocket. It is passed on by him to the consumers of the things he has to sell.

Through the prices of things you buy and services you pay for, you as a consumer, help to pay for the other half of the money which goes into old-age benefits.

In the first 7 months of this fiscal year, employer and employees together paid in more than $900,000,000 to the old-age fund.

But the half which employers paid was a cost of doing business. Through the pricing system, this added cost will be distributed to the consuming public.

In that way not only those who will draw benefits but those who will never benefit a penny help to pay for social security.

Nobody escapes.

And the "hidden costs" are bigger than you think.

Under the present social security program these hidden taxes an indidividual pays through expenses passed on to the consumer may raise the visible cost as much as 423 percent.

Of the $1,800,000,000 which will be paid into the old-age fund this year, half will be paid by the insured and half by employers.

Most of the employers' half will be passed on to consumers, which means you.

But that is only a part of what you really will pay during the year for social welfare, health, and security.

EIGHT PROGRAMS NOW, FOUR MORE PROPOSED

At present there are eight programs grouped under the general heading of social security:

They are: (1) Unemployment insurance; (2) old-age and survivor insurance; (3) old-age assistance; (4) aid to the needy blind; (5) aid to dependent children; (6) maternal and child-health services; (7) services for crippled children; and (8) child-welfare services.

To these the administration now proposes that there be added: (1) General assistance for all needy persons; (2) temporary disability insurance; (3) permanent disability insurance; and (4) compulsory health insurance.

But there is more—the existing welfare programs of the Federal Security Agency, promotion of public health, school-lunch programs, vocational rehabilitation and crime control and correction.

WHERE THE INVISIBLE COSTS ARE HIDDEN

For all the existing programs you pay more now than you think.

For all the proposed new programs you will pay more than you anticipate.

For example, take unemployment insurance. The Nation's employers pay all the contributions into the unemployment trust fund.

Their contributions now average 1.2 percent on the pay roll of all insured workers, an aggregate of about $1,300,000,000 a year.

A small corporation having 100 employees and a taxable pay roll of, say, $250,000 would make these contributions:

To the old-age fund	$2,500
For unemployment at the average national rate of 1.2 percent	3,000
Total contribution	5,500

Even this is not the whole of that small company's social security costs.

It must maintain records, make reports and returns to the Government. And this, too, costs money.

THE CONSUMER PAYS FOR THE BOOKKEEPERS

For a small concern the bookkeeper or cashier can keep account of the social security data. But large corporations maintain large staffs just to keep social security records.

All of this is an expense of operation and is passed on to consumers in the form of prices.

You as a consumer pay.

If Congress approves the administration program now before it, both contributions and the costs of maintaining company records will rise sharply.

If the rate for old age and health jumps next January to 2¼ percent, as planned, the above small concern will have to put up $5,625 for the old-age and health funds and about $3,000 for unemployment.

That makes a total of $8,625—an increase of 56.5 percent.

But, this is only the beginning.

Under the Fair Deal program, total payments into the social security, health, and unemployment funds would rise to more than $5,600,000,000 in fiscal 1949-50.

More than half of this would come from employers—which means that, ultimately, it would be paid by the consuming public.

WHAT IT MEANS TO A $3,000 INCOME

Let's see how all of this may apply to you as an individual taxpayer.

Let's take just the $1,800,000,000 to be paid into the old-age-retirement fund—$900,000,000 from the insured, and $900,000,000 from employers.

If the entire $900,000,000 were passed on in prices by the employers, the average would work out to $6 apiece for every man, woman, and child in the country.

If you earn $3,000 a year and have a family of four it means for you, under the existing rates of contribution:

1 percent on your $3,000 wage	$30
Your part of distributed contributions by employers (4 times $6)	24
Your contribution for old age	54

But that's just a start. Remember there is unemployment insurance, amounting to $1,300,000,000, which is paid by the consuming public through prices.

That comes to $8.75 apiece for every citizen.

For your family of four, that comes to $35. This, added to the $54 above, brings your old-age and unemployment taxes to $89—under existing rates and before the Fair Deal program gets enacted.

THEN THERE'S $2,509,000,000 MORE

But hold everything. You are not through figuring your tax contribution yet.

Remember there is in the 1950 budget a total of about $2,509,000,000 out of general funds for "health, welfare, and security?"

That comes out of your pocket, too—either through the income tax you pay, or the income taxes you pay for employers through the medium of prices.

This item figures out to $17 apiece for each one of the 148,000,000 people in the country.

For a family of four that represents $68.

Now if you add that to the $89 above for old age and unemployment you get $157—which comes close to representing the total cost to you of social security.

CLEARING UP THE COST IS THE OBJECTIVE

No question is raised here as to the worthiness or unworthiness of the whole program—the sole consideration is to show what it really costs an average man or an average family.

As described by the social security authorities, the whole related social security program has as its objective the insuring of the people "against destitution" and "providing a minimum of basic security for the millions."

The President has told Congress and the country that as it stands the program does not include enough people. Too many workers are still not insured.

Too many people pay through "hidden" and other taxes but draw no benefits, the administration has been telling the Ways and Means Committee for the past 2 weeks.

But the enlarged program will cost a great deal of money—the visible and invisible costs will rise rapidly and mount to a colossal height in a dozen or so years.

VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE COSTS IN 1960

To illustrate how the costs will rise in the future let's take our $3,000 a year family of four described above and see what social security will be costing them in 1960.

By then your weekly tax will be 5½ percent—2½ percent for old age, 2½ percent for health, and ½ percent for disability. That would mean $165 a year out of your pay.

Employers in that year would be paying $9,200,000,000 in contributions, which would be a charge on the general economy through prices.

As one of 155,000,000 citizens your share of that would be $60, or $240 for your family of four.

General health, welfare and security by then will be taking $3,200,000,000 a year, and your share of that will be $80.

Add to this about $35 for your share of the cost of unemployment in the country and the whole cost adds up to $520 a year for you—a $3,000-a-year worker.

If Congress adopts the administration old-age and survivor insurance program intact—with permanent and temporary disability added in—the annual cost by the year 1960 will rise to somewhere between $6,150,000,000 and $8,560,000,000.

That's for old age and disability alone. Those are the official figures computed by the social-security actuaries.

If it adds health insurance the whole broad program by 1960 will be costing somewhere between $16,000,000,000 and $22,000,000,000.

Both your visible and invisible costs will rise high.

PROBABLE 1960 COST FOR $3,000 FAMILY

The $520 a year mentioned above falls practically in the middle between the high-cost estimate and the low cost.

The low, $16,400,000,000 would work out to $106 a person for a population of 155,000,000, or $424 for a family of four.

The high cost, $22,200,000,000, works out $143 a person, or $572 for a family of four.

That would be the cost, assuming high employment, and a tax rate of 5½ percent for the worker, and 5½ percent for the employer.

Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner, a few days ago told Congress that ultimately contribution rates might have to rise to 8½ or, perhaps, 10 percent.

Altmeyer told the Ways and Means members that a top rate of 6 percent shared equally by workers and employer, would carry old-age insurance permanently.

But, on top of this, the administration wants health insurance—which may rise to 3 or 4 percent—1 percent for disability, and an improved unemployment system which now costs 1.2 percent.

THE INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, today, after centuries of patriotic effort rarely, if ever, matched in the world's history, the people of Ireland enjoy the status of an independent republic. Lovers of freedom throughout the world will join with them, I know, in celebrating the realization of their hope so long deferred, the attainment of their goal so long sought.

America owes so much to its citizens of Irish birth or descent that our Nation, perhaps above all others, will rejoice at this accession to complete and independent statehood of their neighbors from across the sea.

Never was there an emergency in our long history, from pre-Revolutionary days to the present, but there were at hand gallant legions in whose veins pulsed the blood of old Ireland, to lend a helping hand for the country of their adoption.

Nor was theirs a divided allegiance. While they cherished wholeheartedly and sought ever to protect and safeguard the land of Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln, they never for a moment forgot the champions of Irish freedom or faltered in their loyalty to that modern Irish effort for freedom initiated on Easter Monday of 1916.

Today Irishmen all over the world, in England as well as America, in Australia, and throughout the Far East, all look with joy and reverence to their capital city of Dublin where, 33 years ago, Patrick Pearse first planted the green-white and gold flag of Ireland atop the Dublin Post Office where it flies in serene majesty today.

Champions of freedom in the United States, not limited to persons of Irish birth and descent, while rejoicing with the citizens of the new Republic of Ireland, look hopefully to the day when that Government will embrace not only the 26 southern counties but the six northern counties, now partitioned and still a part of Great Britain.

It is our hope, too, that Great Britain, which in other parts of its world empire has met the demands of national hopes and ambitions will lend its good offices to the attainment of unity and lasting peace in Ireland.

So today we salute the green, white, and gold flag of Ireland. May it, in the not too distant future, signify an Ireland independent from sea to sea, a self-sufficient commonwealth whose economy will be strengthened and whose age-old culture will be its symbol of honorable admission to the company of free nations of the world.

RESTORATION OF CERTAIN FOREST SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday I filed with the Senate Appropriations Committee a statement on behalf of restoration of certain appropriations dealing with forest service, forest products laboratory, forest utilization work, and related activities—a matter of deep interest to the people of my State, and I believe, to many other States.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL FOR RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT AND FOR FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY AT MADISON, WIS.

(Statement filed by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, with Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, Monday, April 18, 1949)

Mr. Chairman, I know how busy you gentlemen are, just as I am in turn taken up with a wide variety of matters. I do, however, feel that the subject which I am commenting upon today is so important as to warrant my taking up these few moments to present these comments. I have, incidentally, addressed your committee on similar matters many times in recent years.

I am respectfully asking for the following:

(a) Restoration of as much as possible of the equivalent of the $3,000,000 in cuts in the present appropriation bill as against the amount for forest-service work provided in the last fiscal year.

(b) Restoration of cuts and provision of a million and one-half dollars for the work of the Forest Products Laboratory and the Forest Utilization Service.

WE SHOULD NOT BE PENNY-WISE AND POUND-FOOLISH

It may seem somewhat odd that I as a Republican Senator who am deeply interested in Government economy should appear before you on behalf of increased rather than decreased funds in this instance. I fervently believe, however, that in connection with preservation of our national resources we cannot follow a policy which would be penny-wise and pound foolish, we cannot deprive ourselves of vital, mutually self-liquidating projects.

I believe, for example—

(a) The reduction in national forests funds which the House of Representatives has made will reduce the effectiveness of needed fire protection. Further staggering losses because of fire simply cannot be afforded in this land which has already been so negligent in protecting its timber.

(b) Reduction in funds for the national forests will limit recreational facilities, will prevent the setting up of adequate sanitary facilities and camp grounds.

(c) The reforestation effort will be considerably hurt. This reforestation is needed not only for flood prevention work, but for protection of timber needed for our future lumber supply. Unfortunately, the proposed cut in planting funds will mean plowing under hundreds of thousands of seedlings which have been growing in nursery beds preparatory to field planting.

(d) The proposed cut of one-quarter million dollars in forest and ranch research work is an unfortunate step backwards in a much needed field.

(e) The reduction in funds available for forest development (access) roads amounting to around one-half million dollars will mean that national forest timber which should be harvested soon will not be placed on the market. It is important to remember that returns to our own Treasury from stumpage will eventually pay for these access roads, thus making our investment a self-liquidating one.

(f) The House's reduction of $300,000 in flood control surveys will obviously seriously hamper that vital work.

I will not presume to state down to a dollar and penny amount exactly how much funds you gentlemen should vote. You are most familiar with the financial situation facing our Nation. You in turn are familiar with the vital forestry needs of the Nation. I am sure therefore that you will give your careful attention to this appeal for an increase over the funds voted by the House of Representatives.

FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY

I should like now to turn to the subject of the forest products laboratory and the forest utilization service. As in the entire instance of forestry management, the laboratory represents a subject dear to the heart of the people of my State. It is not, however, only as a Wisconsin Senator that I speak today, but as a United States Senator interested in the development of the wood and related industries throughout the Nation. Only the other day, I spoke on the Senate floor on the need for a cooperative research program to be spearheaded by the forest products laboratory in order to treat industrial wastes which are causing stream pollution.

What I am asking for is that this committee restore to the laboratory and to the Forest Utilization Service the appropriation of $1,500,000 which was the level before cuts in the past 2 years were made.

Two years ago the combined appropriation for the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison and for the Forest Utilization Service, which consists of small technical outposts of the laboratory located in several of the forested regions of the country, was reduced from $1,500,000 to $1,250,000. Last year a further reduction brought the total to $1,125,000. This reduced the laboratory's allotment to something over $900,000. The $1,172,000 appropriation in the House bill fails to provide in full for Pay Act increases, which in effect means another reduction. These reductions are seriously impairing the effectiveness of the laboratory's work, limiting its scope of activity and reducing those outposts in other parts of the country almost to a point of ineffectiveness.

UTILIZING MANY TYPES OF WOODS

To me, this seems ill-advised at a time when we must stretch our forest resources to the limit. We are all aware of the serious shortages that the country has found during the past few years in the form of timber and lumber products and of pulp and paper. Years ago there was plenty of the best woods, woods we knew how to handle, but the time has come when we must use more and more of the several hundred species of trees that make up our forests and farm woodlands: The laboratory has already demonstrated what it can do in this regard by pointing the way to the use of many species of wood for pulp and paper as opposed to the two or three preferred species we first used. More needs to be done, particularly aimed at a wider use of our hardwoods for pulp and of waste wood for roofing felt, building boards, etc.

In brief we need a more complete use of forest material that only research can bring about. What this amounts to, and it is of great economic significance, is that we need to make an acre of forest material produce more goods and provide more jobs, thereby lessening the drain on the more preferred species and qualities. By way of example, there was a time when we did not think much of aspen and jack pine in Wisconsin. That was when we had white pine, Norway pine, maple, and other preferred woods left in considerable quantity. But with our white pine most gone, we are finding wider uses for our aspen both for lumber products and for pulp as a result of the Forest Products Laboratory demonstrating how this wood can be used to advantage.

In addition to a more complete use we need to reduce avoidable waste, to produce chemicals from unavoidable manufacturing waste, and to make lumber and timber products of all kinds last longer. In this field, too, the laboratory has demonstrated what it can do. Railroad ties and telephone poles which used to last 8 or 10 years now last 25 or 30 because they are preservatively treated with chemicals by methods developed through research. The laboratory has led the country in developing methods and equipment for the proper drying of lumber with annual savings of millions of dollars. The present pace in the country, however, demands that kiln drying be further speeded up without undue losses from checking, splitting, etc. I am confident that the Forest Products Laboratory can meet this demand.

NEW LINES OF WORK ARE NECESSARY

The illustrations I have used represent only a small segment of the varied activities which the laboratory is charged to encompass within its field of responsibility. I understand that its present program of research includes some 70 or 75 broad lines of work each of which breaks down into smaller jobs. These drastic reductions in appropriations not only have reduced the intensity with which these phases of wood utilization can be attacked but have prevented the undertaking of new pressing lines of work. For example, I understand that the increased import of foreign woods has brought many technical questions to the laboratory from the manufacturing industry and from the consumers of goods made of foreign woods which it cannot answer. While the laboratory has had authorization for a good many years to test foreign woods, it never has received an appropriation for this purpose. Certainly the only Federal institution of its kind in the country should be enabled to study and test the principal imported woods for the help and protection of manufacturer and consumer. I would say that a sum of $50,000 for such work alone would be amply justified.

By way of background, let me say that when the establishment of such a laboratory was contemplated, my State offered the best inducement for its location there. At the time, this consisted of free rent, light, heat. Today, with the laboratory in its own building, erected on land donated by the State of Wisconsin, the State, through the university, still contributes toward its maintenance to the extent of $17,000 per year. I mention this because many uninformed people have confused ideas of the relationship of the laboratory to the State and the State university.

May I thank you for your kind attention to this statement. Following it, may I ask your consent to have several important messages to me from Mr. John C. Chapple, Mr. Robert Leahy, and Mr. O. T. Swan, of Wisconsin, printed in the record of hearings.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the

acting majority leader. I should like to ask him what his plan is for today, and how long he thinks the Senate will be in session. Members of the committee are very hopeful that we can expedite consideration of the housing bill.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the Senator from South Carolina that his wishes would weigh very heavily with me. I think we should try to remain in session until approximately 6 o'clock, and see how far we can get with the bill. If we cannot finish it today, we should aim to finish it tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several telegrams and letters relating to the pending housing bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 14, 1949.

Col. PAUL V. BETTERS,
United States Conference of Mayors:

City administration of St. Louis urges early and favorable action on Senate bill 1070. Our public housing program originally envisioned 12,000 dwelling units, but only 1,100 have been built. Site has been acquired, ground cleared, and legal obstacles removed for another project to house 550 low-income families; only barrier is lack of Federal funds. Over-all housing situation here still critical. Slum clearance is also mandatory. More than one-third our dwelling units constructed before 1900. City plan commission estimates that our slum and blighted districts cost city $4,000,000 a year. This figure represents difference in cost of various municipal services and tax yield from such district. From both humanitarian and economic viewpoint slums are bad business. Respectfully refer you to my testimony before Joint Congressional Committee on Housing, October 24, 1947. What I said then is just as true today.

ALOYS P. KAUFMANN,
Mayor of St. Louis.

CITY OF ST. PAUL, MINN.,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
April 16, 1949.

Col. PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Director, United States Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL BETTERS: The housing condition in St. Paul is still acute. I cannot see that there is any improvement, and there are indications that it is getting worse.

The high cost of construction and the lack of proper financing facilities and arrangements have made it practically impossible for a family in the low-income bracket to build or purchase a new home.

There is no rental property available to the low-income group, and families with children have a difficult time in renting any home at any price.

We have hundreds of people living in converted stores and office buildings, and many living in our cheap loop hotels under conditions that are far from desirable. These people are compelled to pay fantastic rentals—as much as $210 a month for a family of seven, including five children, for two little rooms without private toilet facilities.

Our welfare board, on a check of 23 welfare families, is paying an average of $137.50 per month per family for rent alone, to keep them in these cheap hotels.

The quonset huts, which were to provide temporary housing for the returned veteran, are more in demand than ever, and we have a long list of emergency applications from veterans who have no better housing facilities for themselves and families.

We are looking forward to the passage of Federal legislation which will ease the situation by making possible low-rent public housing.

The slum areas are a disgrace to the city, and in many cases are a health and social menace. We had over 4,000 units before the war that were unfit for human habitation. These units have been increased in number, bringing practically no revenue by way of taxation, and costing our city a substantial amount of money to maintain. We can see no way of correcting this situation, other than through the enactment of a slum-clearance program by our Congress.

I do hope that the Eighty-first Congress will give us some help on the matters mentioned herein, and would appreciate being advised by you as to the progress of the housing legislation now pending.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD K. DELANEY,
Mayor.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 16, 1949.*

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Vice President,
United States Conference of Mayors:

Regarding general housing bill, Senate bill 1070, in December 1944 Dallas filed an interim application for 2,800 additional low rent public housing dwelling units which represent a small portion of present need. Conservative minimum estimate of substandard dwellings now 40,000. It is further estimated that a minimum of 10,000 additional families live under overcrowded conditions, doubling up in single-family dwellings. Greatest housing need in Dallas is for rental units under $50 for families of low income and modest income. Reduction of excessive expenditures for municipal services to slum areas and reduction of basic causes of disease, crime, fires, and juvenile delinquency can be effected by participation in proposed program offered in Senate bill 1070.

RODERIC B. THOMAS,
City Manager, City of Dallas, Tex.

CITY OF LOUISVILLE, KY.,
April 12, 1949.

Mr. PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Director,
United States Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BETTERS: The housing situation in Louisville is still very acute for low-income families whose budgets will not permit the payment of rent between $30 and $50 per month without utilities. We have approximately 5,000 applications from veterans for 567 units of temporary veterans' housing. All of these apartments are presently filled. We have 3,004 units of public housing, all of which are filled, and our lists show a backlog of approximately 2,500 applications for public housing. Of these two lists in excess of 500 families have been evicted and are presently living with relatives or friends under dangerously overcrowded conditions, or have received eviction notices and are unable to find a place to move into within their means when the eviction becomes a reality.

Families who are doubled up because they cannot afford to pay rent for such housing as is presently available are conservatively estimated at several thousand. The larger part of these families are ineligible for public housing but are looking for a home to buy or rent as soon as private enterprise can supply it within their means. No actual survey has been made but one is contemplated. But based on the applications for veterans' temporary housing and public housing in which we have actual information as to their incomes, we estimate conservatively that Louisville needs approximately 1,500 units of public housing for whites and Negroes, and several thousand units of housing to be provided by private enterprise for rent at $40 to $75 per month with utilities, and for sale with a small or no down payment at prices from $5,000 to $7,000.

Just prior to the building of our first public housing project in Louisville in 1935 our planning and zoning commission made a survey of 12 city blocks in a slum area, which were subsequently cleared, and found that police, health, fire, and other city services in that area cost the city $65,000, whereas it collected approximately $14,000 in taxes.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES P. FARNSLEY,
Mayor of Louisville.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while I am strongly in favor of this housing bill as a whole, I want to speak primarily about title I, which deals with slum clearance and community redevelopment. Since I know that the time of the Senate is very valuable, I shall try to be brief and to conclude my discussion in 20 minutes. I should be grateful, therefore, if my colleagues would be willing to withhold their questioning until I have finished and then I will be glad to try to answer any questions which they may have.

The purpose of title I is to get rid of as many slum areas as possible. We all know what slums are and that they exist in virtually every city of reasonable size, and that they are particularly bad in the big cities of half a million or more. Since we can see these conditions better with our eyes than understand them with our ears, I have had a series of photographs taken in different cities of the country and then had them enlarged. I am showing these from the stand at my left. I shall begin here in Washington and show two photographs, the first of Schotts Alley, which is only 100 feet from our Senate Office Building and which is one of the worst slums I have seen. The second is a few blocks northwest from here but with the dome of the Capitol clearly evident.

Incidentally, may I say that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and I would be very glad, indeed, to have such Senators as wish to accompany us, join us at approximately 1 o'clock for a half-hour tour of the Washington slums, so that we may actually see what we are trying to legislate upon.

SOME SLUM AREAS OF THE COUNTRY

Since confession is good for the soul, I should like to show some photographs of my own city of Chicago, which, I am sorry to say, has some of the worst slums in the country. These pictures were all taken just last month. The first is a typical South Side back-of-the-yards residential section occupied by white families, mainly stockyard employees.

The second is a South Side Negro slum dwelling under slum clearance by the Chicago Housing Authority. This is a community bathroom which is shared by three families. Despite the dilapidation of walls and floor, note that the bathroom fixtures are immaculately clean.

The next two pictures were taken on the near North Side of Chicago. It is easy to see the danger of fires in crowded run-down slum areas such as this.

The last Chicago picture was taken on the West Side. Four families are now living in the shack seen in the foreground.

We have from 12 to 20 square miles of so-called blighted areas of which perhaps 6 to 8 square miles are badly blighted territory. We are trying hard to clean this up and both the city and State governments have appropriated many millions of dollars to help clear the slums, but the job is too big for us, as for other cities, to handle alone. Then I should like to show additional photographs from Baltimore, New Orleans, Detroit, Kansas City, Dallas and Los Angeles, and to indicate that this is also a problem in many smaller cities, I am also showing photographs from such cities as Savannah, Ga., Meridian, Miss., Texas City, Tex., Oklahoma City, and one with particularly human poignancy of a small child in a slum in Gadsden, Ala. I could have collected many more photographs from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, San Francisco, and countless other cities, but because of the expense and because I did not want to overstress the point, if that is possible, I am stopping here and letting your own knowledge and imagination fill out the gaps.

While it is somewhat hard to get a total picture of the extent of slums in the country as a whole, it is very safe to say that there are many millions of people living in them. The 1940 census, for example, reported that there were 5,735,000 city dwelling units or 28.6 percent of the city units studied which either needed major repairs or lacked either a private bath or private sanitary facilities—Sixteenth Census, 1940, Housing, first series, page 4; of these totals 11.4 percent needed major repairs while the others lacked vital sanitary facilities.

While we cannot say that all of these are necessarily slum dwellings, a large proportion are. In any event, we have a major problem on our hands. The slums are growing like cancers, generally ringing the central business districts and more or less rapidly spreading outward with their truly horrible blight. Somewhere between ten and fifteen millions of people are living in these slums with the true number probably closer to the upper than to the lower figure.

The evil is not merely an aesthetic one. The slums are a moral cancer, a health hazard, and an economic loss. I could give pages of statistics upon these points, but in the interest of brevity, I shall merely cite a few, and shall put others in an appendix to my remarks. Nearly all of us have children, and we know how we would hate to have them grow up in any such environment. Children in the slums get into trouble and become delinquent far more frequently than do those who live in decent residential areas. This is true no matter which racial group occupies these areas.

In Chicago we have had in the slums successive waves of different racial groups; but as one group becomes more prosperous and moves out, and another group moves in, the delinquency ratio still remains high, at many times the ratio in the outer residential area. This is proof that it is primarily the slum and not the quality of a given race which produces delinquency. Similarly, slum kids get sick more frequently than do others and are far more subject to street accidents. They lose most of the proper joys of childhood.

Similarly, adults in the slums have a much higher crime rate than do those who live elsewhere; they suffer from tuberculosis, typhoid, and other diseases more than others; and there are far more fires among them. I shall give just a few figures. Thus, in Cleveland, a slum area with 2.47 percent of the city's population had three times the average juvenile delinquency rate for the city, over four times the illegitimate birth rate for the city, and over eight times the murder rate.

The solicitor general of Fulton County, Ga., stated before the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing about a year ago that—

In Atlanta, we have 137,000 people living in filthy, dirty slums, cesspools, and human junkyards, breeding places for juvenile delinquency and disease, immorality and crime. Twenty percent of the city's area contains 39 percent of the population and 59 percent of the crimes committed in Atlanta come from that section. In the same area occurs 72 percent of the city's juvenile delinquency, 69 percent of Atlanta's tuberculosis.

The county health officer for Jefferson County, Ala., had this to say about conditions in Birmingham from 1938 to 1942:

From all causes the death rate was 72 percent higher in the area of lowest rental as compared with the area of highest rental. The tuberculosis rate was 507 percent higher. The infant mortality rate, or death of infant children, was 117 percent higher. Stillbirths, or infants born dead, 136 percent higher and deaths of mothers from causes related to childbirth, 128 percent higher. Furthermore, the adult crime rate was 122 percent higher in the lowest rental area as compared with the highest and there was an excess of 416 percent in juvenile delinquency. The illegitimacy rate was 383 percent higher in the low-rent area as compared with the high.

Because of all these factors, the cities have to spend far more in services to these areas than they get back in taxes. Thus, in Cleveland, the slum area referred to costs two and one-half times its proportional share in police protection, three times its share of health expenditures, about five times its share in social services, and nearly six times its share in fire protection. In Atlanta, according to the local housing authority, while the slum areas contributed only 5½ percent of the city's real-property-tax revenues, they cost the city 53 percent of its expenditures for fire, health, police, and other service costs—not of all the city's costs, but of only those costs.

A summary estimate was made by the urban redevelopment committee of the American Bar Association which has been quoted by the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

Based on composite figures representing many leading American cities, it may be stated that such blighted areas yield only 6 percent of the average city's total tax revenue while absorbing 45 percent of its service costs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some figures on the economic costs and the bad social effects of poor housing such as exist in slum and blighted areas.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAD HOUSING COSTS MORE

The cost of slums to the taxpayer has been measured in dollars and cents.

In Boston, where the city planning board made a study in 1935, it was discovered that the per capita deficit to the city from a slum area was $48.24; from all other residential areas the average deficit was $10.81.

In Indianapolis, Ind., the average per capita cost of city services to a slum area was $61.85 compared to $38.56 per capita for the city as a whole.

In Cleveland it was found that the per capita cost of operating a slum area was $61.22. The deficit here was $51.10 per capita. (Source: Introduction to Housing by Edith Elmer Wood, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.; National Housing Agency Chart VIII E–1, "Municipal Expenditures in Slum Areas, Cleveland and Indianapolis"; National Housing Agency Chart VIII D, "City Revenues and Expenditures for Various Types of Housing Areas" (based on city-wide survey, Boston, 1935).)

In Birmingham, Ala., municipal expenditures in 22 blighted areas were three times the income. In four good areas the expenditures were five-sixths of income.

In Atlanta, Ga., slum areas contributed 5½ percent of the city's real property tax revenues, but cost 53 percent of the city's police, fire, health, and other service costs.

In Philadelphia, Pa., the per capita cost of crime in a typical slum area was $14.56, compared with $5.36 on a city-wide basis. (Source: National Housing Agency Chart VIII E–2, "Municipal Expenditures in Slum Areas.")

A municipal income-and-expense study in Buffalo, based on a report of the department of audit and control for 1933, showed the following comparison of average annual cost per family between the city-as-a-whole and slum areas:

	City as a whole	Slum area
Police protection	$19.19	$27.16
Fire protection	15.40	35.79
Juvenile delinquency	.25	.60
Public health services	15.52	52.56
Public welfare services	89.50	224.01

Source: 10 Years of Progress, 1934–44. Buffalo (New York) Municipal Housing Authority.

The net cost of Newark's slums each year is over $14,000,000.

The normal municipal cost of maintaining a dwelling of minimum safety and comfort in a fairly good neighborhood is approximately $150. The municipal cost of maintaining a slum dwelling is $380. The difference of $230 would be the municipal cost per dwelling attributable to the slum conditions, or the excess cost of a slum dwelling. (Source: The Cost of Slums in Newark, a study by Dr. Jay Rumney and Sara Shuman. Published by the Newark (N. J.) Housing Authority, 1946.)

Part of the high cost of slum and blighted areas is the high tax delinquency. In St. Louis, delinquency in slum areas ranged from 25 to 40 percent as against 2 to 5 percent in newer residential districts. In Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Detroit, and Peoria tax delinquency and blight were closely related.

Cleveland, Cambridge, Mass., and New York City show the same pattern. (Source: (Tax) "Delinquency in Slum Areas," American Housing, Problems and Prospects. Twentieth Century Fund, 1944.)

Thirteen primarily residential areas in Manhattan contained almost one-half of all the properties in Manhattan which had been tax delinquent for more than 3 years, although the areas themselves constituted less than one-fifth of Manhattan's area and contained only about one-third of the number of its (land) parcels.

In dollars and cents, tax delinquencies in the 13 areas, measured on a percentage basis, were 2½ times as serious as in the remainder of Manhattan.

Tax-dollar delinquency in the 13 blighted areas was approximately double that of nonblighted residential areas.

The taxes which these 13 blighted areas should bear but fail to pay are borne by healthy real estate elsewhere. (Source: Ailing City Areas. Economic Study of Thirteen Depressed Districts in Manhattan. Citizens' Housing Council of New York, May 1941.)

OTHER MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES IN SLUM AREAS

Cleveland, Ohio: Slum area comprising 0.73 percent of the land area of the city and containing 2.47 percent of the city's population.

Percent required of the city's expenditures for—

Police protection	6.47
Health	7.3
Social services	12.29
Fire protection	14.44

(Source: R. B. Navin Analysis of a Slum Area (1934).)

Indianapolis, Ind.: Slum area containing 10.4 percent of the city's population.

Percent required of the city's expenditures for—

Fire costs	16.7
Social services	26.0
Misdemeanants	25.0
Felons	36.0

(Source: E. E. Wood, "Introduction to Housing," Slum and Blighted Areas in the United States (based on 1933 study).)

Although slum and blighted districts comprise about 20 percent of the metropolitan residential areas they account for 33 percent of the population, 45 percent of the major crimes, 55 percent of the juvenile delinquency, 50 percent of the arrests, 60 percent of the tuberculosis victims, 50 percent of the disease, 35 percent of the fires, 45 percent of the city service costs, 6 percent of the tax revenues (real estate). Percentages are adjusted averages for various cities throughout the country. (Source: Post-War Urban Redevelopment, published by the Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration, 1939.)

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF BAD HOUSING

Areas of bad housing and high rates of disease, delinquency and crime coincide.

Tuberculosis is shown to be most prevalent in overcrowded homes. Highest rates of digestive diseases are found in homes without private inside flush toilet. Home accidents are most numerous in homes renting for less than $10 monthly. Common communicable diseases of childhood are most frequent in homes with more than 1.5 persons per room. (Source: NHA chart VIII H., Relationship of Housing Conditions to Health, based on National Health Survey, 1935–36, U. S. Public Health Service; New Light on Relationship of Housing to Health, by Rollo H. Britten; American Journal of Public Health, February 1942.)

Infant mortality rate is higher in overcrowded homes. Figures from eight cities show that the infant mortality rate in families averaging less than one person per room was 52 per 1,000 live births. Where the room density was between 1 and 2, the rate was 94.9, and for 2 persons per room and over, it was 135.7. With adjustment for income and race, it was found that the infant mortality rate in congested homes was still about twice as high as in homes where there was enough space. (Source: Casual Factors in Infant Mortality, 1925. Quoted in Slums and Blighted Areas in the United States, by Edith Elmer Wood. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.)

Another major contributing factor to juvenile delinquency is the shortage of good low-cost and low-rent housing. It compels families to crowd up and to occupy inadequate houses because no better accommodations are available to them. It forces the occupancy of housing units which have deteriorated beyond repair and should long since have been replaced.

"The cumulative housing shortage has been accompanied by an alarming increase in the break-up of family life and the increase of juvenile delinquency."

"The most influential character-guiding force in the life of the child is his relationship with his parents. That relationship is conditioned by the physical and environmental surroundings of home and neighborhood. A family lost in the slums and blighted area of a metropolitan center or the inadequate housing and community facilities of a depressed rural section finds itself victimized by antisocial forces beyond its control."

The correlation between unsatisfactory and inadequate housing and juvenile delinquency is clearly established.

Good housing affords an environment within the home where each member of the family can enjoy privacy and where the surroundings facilitate growth. (Source: Report on Housing, Community Development and Juvenile Delinquency. National Conference for the Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, November 1946. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.)

School truants, juvenile delinquents, and adult offenders tend to be concentrated in slum areas. From 1900, Chicago areas studied showed several changes in racial make-up of the population, but rates of delinquency continued high throughout. Thus one-fourth of all juvenile delinquents came from 10.9 percent of the juvenile population crowded into 6 percent of the city area. Concentration of people in the slum neighborhoods is more than twice the average for the city, and the concentration of truancy among inhabitants is two and a half times the city average. (Source: Slums and Blighted Areas in the United States, by Edith Elmer Wood, quoting Delinquency Areas, a study of the geographic distribution of school truants, juvenile delinquents, and adult offenders in Chicago, by Dr. Clifford B. Shaw, 1929.)

Chicago study results are paralleled in studies of other cities, where the relationship between concentration of population on the land and high delinquency rates among the concentrated population have been shown as follows:

City	Percent of city delinquency	Percent of juvenile population	Percent of city area
Chicago	25.0	10.9	6.0
Philadelphia	46.0	25.1	9.4
Cleveland	47.4	26.3	17.3
Birmingham	25.0	12.2	12.1
Richmond	50.0	31.0	18.8
Denver	25.0	11.0	5.7
Seattle	25.0	11.2	6.3

Source: Slums and Blighted Areas in the United States, by Edith Elmer Wood, quoting from vol. II, "Causes and Cure of Crime," Wickersham Report, 1931.

In Detroit, Mich., a housing commission survey showed that the pneumonia death rate in a slum area was 3 times the rate in a normal residential area; crimes were 5 times as numerous; infant mortality 6 times as great; the tuberculosis death rate 10½ times as great; and criminals were 15 times more numerous than in normal residential areas.

In Cleveland, Ohio, a slum area containing 2.47 of the city's population, had, of the city's total, 4 percent of the larcenies, 5.7 percent of the robberies, 7.8 percent of the juvenile delinquencies, 10.4 percent of the illegitimate births, and 21.3 percent of the murders. (Source: NHA chart VIII G, Social Aspects of Slum Areas. Quoted from Report of City of Detroit Housing Commission; R. B. Navin's Analysis of a Slum Area in Cleveland; and Iowa State Planning Board.)

A comparison of housing maps with the delinquency-rate maps shows that inadequate housing exists much more frequently in the areas of high delinquency. The heavily shaded areas of the delinquency maps correspond closely to the heavily shaded areas of the housing maps. Conversely, those which have the fewest delinquents also have the fewest substandard dwellings.

"In the five tracts of highest delinquency, 65.6 percent of the occupied dwelling units needed major repairs or had no private bath, as compared with 3.9 percent of occupied dwelling units in the five tracts of lowest delinquency. Likewise, the five tracts of highest delinquency had overcrowding in 28.5 percent of their dwelling units, in contrast with 3.3 percent in the five tracts of lowest delinquency." (Source: The Houston Delinquent in His Community Setting. Research Bureau, Council of Social Agencies, Houston, Tex., June 1945.)

Poor housing blights youth, figures show blight raises prison costs. Blight zooms prison costs; records in city cited. (Source: Headlines on articles by Richard S. Davis, in Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, April 26, May 12, and June 2, 1946, based on city records of crime and juvenile delinquency, showing that one blighted ward cost taxpayers nearly $150,000 in 1945 for prison inmates.)

Slum areas in the District of Columbia show Army rejection rates for personality disorders 1½ times as great as in areas with good housing, according to a sample study of records of 5,800 men examined at Fort Myer, Va., during a 2-year period ending May 1944. (Source: E. E. Hadley, Military Psychiatry: An Ecological Note. Psychiatry, November 1944.)

A slum area of less than 3 square miles (the fifth police district) with about 300,000 inhabitants crowded into it, in 1945 produced more than 21 percent of Chicago's murders, 12.3 percent of all robberies, and 24.9 percent of all rape offenses. Furthermore, the years 1944 and 1943 showed substantially the same statistics.

A principal factor in the high crime rate in the fifth police district is the inadequate housing situation that prevails there. From the observation of Chicago Crime Commission investigators and through interviews with numerous representative citizens the conclusion is inescapable that undesirable living conditions in this area contribute materially to a high incidence of criminality. (Source: Crime Conditions in Fifth Police District, by Virgil W. Peterson, operating director, Chicago Crime Commission, published in Criminal Justice, May 1946.)

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF SLUM AREAS IN THREE CITIES

Detroit, Mich.: Comparing slum area with normal residential area.

Pneumonia death rate, 3 times greater in slum area.

Crimes, 5 times greater in slum area.

Infant mortality, 6 times greater in slum area.

Tuberculosis death rate, 10½ times greater in slum area.

Criminals, 15 times greater in slum area.
(Source: Report of City of Detroit Housing Commission.)

Cleveland, Ohio: Percent of city's population contained in slum area, 2.47 percent.

This slum area had of the city's total: Larcenies, 4 percent; robberies, 5.7 percent; juvenile delinquencies, 7.8 percent; illegitimate births, 10.4 percent; murders, 21.3 percent. (Source: R. B. Navin, Analysis of a Slum Area.)

Mason City, Iowa:

Cases per 100 families

	Tuberculosis	Maladjusted children	Child mortality	Child delinquency	Major and minor crimes
Rest of city	1½	1	2½	3½	1
Slum area A	2½	10	10	13	9
Slum area B	5	8	11	9	5

Source: Iowa State Planning Board (1935).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we need not spend too much time on the reasons why slums exist. In most cases, the rush of low-paid workers into our cities who have to live close to their jobs resulted in overcrowding, both of buildings and lots. The houses in many cases were originally poor, and absentee landlords did not keep up the properties. Virtually no amortization funds were set aside out of current earnings to replace the slum dwellings when they were worn out. Many people depended on the assumed appreciation of land values to offset the depreciation of building values; but they never in fact provided for the actual depreciation of buildings, for their replacement, or for their adequate repair. As a result, the slum dwellings have become steadily worse and the blight has spread.

So widespread are the slums that it is hopeless to expect that they can be redeemed by improvements carried out by individual landlords, desirable as these are.

I should like now to display very rapidly a series of charts showing the extent of slum areas in various cities and proposed redevelopment areas.

First, here is a map of Chicago. The black portion of the map shows the badly blighted area; the red portion shows the areas of near blight. We can see how the slum cancer is spreading outward from the central business district of my city.

Next, I show a chart of St. Louis. All the area I now indicate is blighted; while the smaller area I indicate is that which the authorities in St. Louis have chosen for redevelopment if Senate bill 1070 is enacted into law.

Then, here is a chart of the blighted areas of San Francisco. The area to which I now point is the one chosen for redevelopment.

Next, I show a chart for the District of Columbia. I may say that in the District of Columbia the problem is peculiar, because the slum areas are somewhat spotty by blocks and by small sections; but, in the main, the portion of the chart I now indicate is the one where housing should be replaced. These are very bad slums.

I now show briefly a chart for Providence, R. I. There the cancer is scattered all over the city. We can see the magnitude of the problem there.

There is a chart for the progressive city of Milwaukee, which has badly blighted territories both north and south of the central business district.

Next I show a chart for Philadelphia. All the area to which I now point is blighted, but the areas shown in darker coloring on the chart are those which have been chosen for redevelopment if the bill is enacted.

We now see a chart for the city of Baltimore. The entire area to which I now point on the chart is blighted, but the portion marked in green and the portion marked in red indicate areas which it is hoped may be redeveloped and cleared if this bill is enacted.

Next I show a chart for the city of Detroit. The slum areas are in the portion to which I now point. The areas marked "C" and "D" are those where it is hoped redevelopment plans may be carried through.

Finally, I show a chart for the comparatively new city of Los Angeles. The territory I now indicate on the chart is the blighted territory. The region which it is hoped may be redeveloped is shown on the chart in red.

THE SLUMS CAN ONLY BE ELIMINATED BY A MAJOR SURGICAL OPERATION

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, so widespread are the slums that it is hopeless to expect that they can be redeemed by improvements carried out by individual landlords, desirable as this would be, for in the case of the slums and blighted areas it is not merely the individual houses which are substandard, but the general neighborhood. One cannot redeem the slums house by house, desirable as it is to obtain improvements in individual houses. Furthermore, banks will not loan nor will the Federal Housing Authority insure appreciable loans for modernizing or rebuilding in the slum areas. They have written the slums off as hopeless.

Some groups say that the answer is to enforce the city health, building, and fire ordinances requiring minimum standards, as is being done in Baltimore.

This would help, but, as Mayor D'Alesandro of that city testified before our committee:

> The Baltimore plan might be compared to first aid administered in the temporary absence of a doctor which would not be necessary if the doctor were present to begin with and which in no way eliminates the eventual need for the doctor's services. * * * I strongly believe that cities should consider adoption of the Baltimore plan as an interim method of relieving slum conditions to some extent, but don't let anybody kid you into thinking that it is in any sense a substitute for an adequate slum-clearance, redevelopment, and public low-rent housing program. (Hearings on General Housing Before Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 1949, p. 731.)

If the slums are to be cleared, therefore, it must be by a major surgical operation which will cut out these horrible cancers from our cities. Instead of contenting ourselves with improving a house here or there, we must make a mass attack on the evil. If this is so, it may be asked, why cannot private industry and capital do this? If it could, I want to assure this body most solemnly, I would favor it. But with the best will in the world, it has not done so, while the slums have been getting worse and there is no prospect that it can. There are several very good reasons for this inability to deal with the evil. First, the existing cost of slum areas is generally much in excess of what the same land would be able to yield if used primarily for decent residence purposes with some commercial purposes included. Thus I quote some estimates of the land cost of a number of possible projects. I have them here for a number of cities, some 11 projects from 6 cities. The estimates for those projects are as follows:

City	Project	Estimated land cost per square foot	Estimated land cost per acre
Milwaukee, Wis	A	$1.45	$63,162
Philadelphia, Pa	A	2.70	117,612
Philadelphia, Pa	B	2.10	91,476
Philadelphia, Pa	C	1.95	84,942
Baltimore, Md	A	1.50	65,340
Baltimore, Md	B	3.50	152,460
Detroit, Mich	A	1.16	50,530
Detroit, Mich	B	1.33	57,935
Chicago, Ill	A	2.75	119,890
Providence, R. I	A	2.00	87,120
Providence, R. I	B	2.00	87,120

It will be noticed that I have not given any figures for New York City. If we were to take Manhattan, the land costs would probably run above $5 a square foot or over $215,000 an acre; and in many cases it would amount to from $7 to $8 a square foot. That would be the cost to acquire the slum land.

Now in practice the average commercial value of this land, if used for non-overcrowded housing purposes, is generally about 50 cents a square foot or a little less than $22,000 an acre. We can hardly ask private industry to shoulder a loss which in most cases will be appreciable and which in many cases will be $40,000 to $60,000 or even more per acre in order to clear the slums. Public spirited as these men may be, they may properly ask why they should be singled out for sacrifice and ask if it is not a community responsibility for which the community should assume the cost.

Secondly, even in those few cases where private industry has cleared very small sections of slums, they have commonly been compelled as Stuyvesant Town in New York to build so high in the air as to overcrowd the area. And I may say in that project, as I remember the situation, they were given the power of eminent domain to acquire the land. Thirdly, private owners commonly lack the power of eminent domain and hence can be held up for excessively high prices by strategic individual landowners, while finally, private industry cannot provide or be expected to provide for rehousing the people who are displaced from the slum areas which are being cleared. We cannot disregard the plight of these people. Bad as the slums are, they at least put a roof over the heads of these families and the community owes some duty to see that they are rehoused as they are displaced from the slum areas which are being cleared.

These are the main reasons why private industry and finance cannot clear the slums and that if the job is to be done, it must be done by the community. The figures which I have given indicate that it would be a good investment for the community to undertake it.

THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC GAINS OF SLUM CLEARANCE AND DECENT HOUSING

As the slums are transformed and the families are rehoused either there or elsewhere, juvenile delinquency will drop. Thus in New Haven, the delinquency rate for children between 7 and 17 years in 317 families who were taken out of the slums and rehoused in a public-housing project was cut in half.

The crime rate will fall; the sickness and death rates will fall. The community will not have to spend as much on fire and police protection and public services. These areas and others which will be developed will foster a healthier family and individual life and both the direct and indirect gains to the community will be great. In the long run it is going to pay society and the United States of America to remove these slums.

One of the most interesting studies in this connection was made in Cleveland where part of the slum area I have referred to was cleared and used for public housing. It was found that the community saved yearly after 1943, $25,000 on relief rents, $11,000 on fire protection, and $25,250 on tuberculosis care and hospitalization. This amounted to total savings of $61,250 a year. In addition, the crime rate was cut 34 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some figures on the social effects of rehousing.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF REHOUSING

Study under the auspices of the Newark (N. J.) Housing Authority shows decrease in public-housing projects of children's communicable diseases, infant mortality, tuberculosis, fatal home accidents, juvenile delinquency, and fires, as compared with areas of substandard housing. Conducted by Dr. Jay Rumney, professor of sociology, University of Newark, the study compared records of tenants in three representative projects of the housing authority with records of population of three areas of substandard housing typical of those from which public housing draws its tenants. The study was conducted over a 2-year period, 1942 and 1943. It reports the following:

	Public housing	3 wards
Tuberculosis: New cases per 1,000 in age group 15 to 40	3.3	6
Infant deaths per 1,000 births	34.7	40.6
Children's communicable diseases (whooping cough, measles, scarlet fever, chickenpox, German measles, mumps) per 1,000 children under 15	114.2	163.5
Birth rate per 1,000 women 15 to 40	118.5	86.2
Delinquents on probation per 1,000 juveniles aged 10 to 17	11	14
Fire, per 1,000 persons	0.79	2.93
Cost of fire runs at $100 each per 1,000 dwellings	$295	$1,115
Fatal home accident per 10,000 persons	0	25

In percentages, the statistics show that the public housing projects had 45 percent fewer cases of tuberculosis, 15 percent fewer infant deaths, 31 percent fewer cases of children's diseases, 37 percent more births, 21 percent fewer cases of juvenile delinquency, 74 percent fewer fires, 100 percent fewer deaths from home accidents. (Source: Public Housing in Newark. Report of the Newark (N. J.) Housing Authority, November 1944.)

Rehoused children in Newark showed improvement in school records, over records before rehousing, as follows: Seven percent in attendance, 10 percent in academic grades, 16 percent in personality development grades, 19 percent in health habit grades. (Source: Newark (N. J.) Housing Authority, 1944.)

Philadelphia public housing projects showed a tuberculosis death rate (per thousand) of .34 percent compared with a city rate of .598; pneumonia deaths in projects .17 percent, city rate .586 percent; criminal offenses in projects 3.14 percent, city rate 33.18 percent; and juvenile delinquency in projects 1.27 percent, city rate 2.84 percent.

The cleanliness of the grounds, the good housekeeping and the generally excellent deportment and conduct of the tenants and their spirit of cooperation and responsiveness to constructive suggestions, their pride and satisfaction in their surroundings are ample evidence that they appreciate and are making the most of their opportunities to live and raise their families on a plane consistent with the highest levels of social behavior to be found in our better urban communities. (Source: Homes for War Workers and Families of Low Income. Report of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Housing Authority, July 1941–June 1943.)

In Cincinnati, Ohio, a 1940 study was made of the families in a public housing development and figures compared with those of an adjacent slum area and the entire city. In the new homes, the juvenile delinquency per 1,000 population was one-seventh of that in the adjacent tract. The number of criminal offenses committed in the new homes per 1,000 population was less than one-third of that in the adjacent tract. There were no fires per 1,000 dwellings in the project, compared with 18 in the adjacent tract. Deaths from pneumonia per 1,000 population in the project was one-seventh of that of the adjacent tract and less than one-third of the entire city. Deaths from tuberculosis per 1,000 population in the project numbered less than one-half of that in the adjacent tract and somewhat less than that of the entire city. The infant mortality per 1,000 population was one-fifth of the adjacent tract and less than one-third of the entire city. (Source: Tenth Annual Report, December 1943. Cincinnati (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.)

The delinquency rate for children of 317 families dropped 1.54 percent after their entrance into a public housing development in New Haven. In the years 1924 to 1940, before moving into the project, the delinquency rate was 3.18 per 100 children per year. During the years 1940 to 1944, after becoming residents of the project, the delinquency rate dropped to 1.64 per 100 children per year. These statistics are significant since total juvenile delinquency in New Haven showed an increase of 9.1 percent for the years 1940–41 as compared with 1927–40. "It seems, therefore, that a substantial improvement in the social adjustment of children in a given group of families may be reasonably attributed to the conditions of project life." (Source: Naomi Barer, Department of Public Health, Yale School of Medicine, reporting on a study of 317 families living in a New Haven public housing development.)

Records of juvenile delinquency and illegitimate births, compared for Smithfield Court, Birmingham, and the area before the project was built, showed two cases of delinquency from the project, compared with five cases in a previous year. Nineteen illegitimate births in the area compared with none reported since the project was built. (Source: 1940 annual report, Housing Authority of Birmingham, Ala.)

"Incomplete studies of the health of slum dwellers who have been rehoused in public-housing projects in several cities indicate that their morbidity experience improves after they have left slum dwellings. It must be pointed out, however, that community interests developed among the tenants of public-housing projects may well result in the improvement of their nutrition and in making them more conscious of, and hence more alert to use, local public health and preventive medical services. Furthermore, it is easier to provide these people with health services." (Source: How Does Housing Affect Health? by M. Allen Pond, Sanitary Engineer, United States Public Health Service. Published in Public Health Reports, May 10, 1946.)

Most families in Terrace Village formerly lived in slum or poor areas, but, given the opportunity to live in better surroundings, are tending to rise to the level of the community. Some are not able to do so, but these people can be isolated and treated individually, according to need. For example, William Jones and his two brothers missed about 40 days of school each semester after their mother died in 1936. The father, formerly a good worker, became discouraged and became more and more negligent. The public-health nurses assisted the school in getting a WPA housekeeper in the home for a limited period of time, but it was evident we were losing out. Then came a change when the family moved into Terrace Village; the transformation was slow, and for a time we feared too much damage had been done, but finally a good home and a good community helped to bring back the pride of home life that had been there formerly. We feel now that success is possible. Note that teachers, public-health nurses, WPA housekeepers, recreation leaders, and others were active, but we didn't see results until a decent home was acquired. (Source: Citizens Look at Public Hearing, a symposium. Published by the Pittsburgh Housing Association; quoting John H. Mogart, principal, Herron Hill, Jr., High School.)

Almost 14 percent of the families that moved out of low-rent projects during the year ended June 30, 1945, gave purchasing of home as the reason for moving. This is somewhat higher than the 11 percent of move-outs which occurred for this reason during the earlier 6-month period for which data are available. (Source: Families moving out of low-rent housing projects, July 1, 1944 to June 30, 1945. Report S–561, Federal Public Housing Authority.)

Fifty of our tenants were able to purchase homes during 1943, and many more rented homes or apartments so that they could move out of our projects. During the first 6 months of 1944, 35 of our tenants purchased homes. (Source: Annual Report, 1943–44, Housing Authority of Omaha, Nebr.)

Fifty-one low-income residents felt their financial condition sufficiently improved to justify home ownership. As soon as these families were able to take the next step in self-improvement, they left the housing communities and thus made available apartments for other low-income families living in substandard dwellings. (Source: Annual Report, 1942, Birmingham (Ala.) Housing Authority.)

Twenty-nine families moved out of Brewster Homes into homes purchased by themselves. At Charles Terrace, 13 tenants built or bought their own homes. At John W. Smith Homes, 6 purchased their own homes. (Source: Ninth Annual Report, 1943, Detroit (Mich.) Housing Commission.)

Story of a steel worker and his wife and 3 children (family income, $954 a year), before and after they moved from a slum dwelling,

cooped up five in one room, into a four-room apartment in a public housing project. (Source: Home: A True-Picture Story of the Lester Churchfield Family, 1940–41, Pittsburgh (Pa.) Housing Authority.)

The three low-rent Government housing projects have been quick to demonstrate the positive effects upon healthful living which good housing offers. * * * The housing project is becoming the generator of healthful living, immediately influencing the lives of its residents as well as those in the surrounding areas. * * * Of the families included in this study, 15 or 20 percent had better health as a result of improved living conditions. (Source: Miss Theresa K. McGrath, Family Society, New Haven, Conn.; quoted in the Fourth Annual Report of the Housing Authority of New Haven, 1941–42, on a case study of 30 families living in Elm Haven project.)

A curious byproduct of the establishment of each of the projects of this authority has been the general improvement of the neighborhood outside of the authority's own premises. Houses have been repaired and repainted and the whole level of the locality noticeably raised in each instance. The fear that a housing project would destroy values in the immediate neighborhood has likewise proven to be fallacious. (Source: Annual Report, 1945, Housing Authority of Brownsville, Tex.)

THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT IS NEEDED TO DO THE JOB

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, but I suppose the objectors will argue that while this may be a community concern, it should be tackled by the cities and States, but not by our National Government. The truth of the matter, however, is that our cities and local governments are more or less broke and simply do not have the income to shoulder either all or a major part of the load. They get their revenues in the main from real estate which is paying about all that it can. They have about reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. If the slums are to be cleared, therefore, the Federal Government will have to do the main part of the job, although the cities should, of course, help as they are required to under the provisions of this bill.

I take it that the constitutional question as to whether the National Government has the power to act has long since been approved by a solid line of Supreme Court decisions. As I remember, James Madison for a long time thought that Congress was limited in its spending powers to the specific purposes authorized by the Constitution. But it has been decided by the Supreme Court that the Congress can appropriate to further the general welfare. I need only cite Massachusetts against Mellon and the other cases which followed it in this connection.

THE DETAILED FEATURES OF TITLE I

That is the purpose of the pending bill, and certainly the purpose of title I. By title I the Federal Government will loan up to $1,000,000,000 to cities which, under State laws, have set up slum clearance and redevelopment authorities. There are, as I shall show on this map, 26 States which now have urban redevelopment laws. This billion dollars will then be used for this work and should make a very appreciable inroad upon our slums. Let me emphasize the fact that the States are not by-passed. They are to pass redevelopment acts giving local authorities the power to clear slum areas and to redevelop them. Nor can the Federal Government force the cities to act against their will. If a city does not want such a program, it does not have to undertake it. If it does, it draws up its own redevelopment program governing what areas shall be cleared and the uses to which the land will be put. The plan must not only be drawn up by the redevelopment authority, but must be approved by the governing board of the city. The local authorities buy the land, although the Federal Government is charged with keeping a watchful eye on these proceedings to see that while the owners get a fair price, excessive prices are not paid to inside or political groups. The city then clears the land through demolition.

After the area has been once cleared, it can be used for various purposes. Probably the major portion of it will be sold to private interests which can use it for housing upper income, middle income, and upper working-class groups. A part, although we hope not too much, can be sold or leased for commercial purposes. Part may be reserved for low-rent public housing projects. It is probable that the major portion of the land which will be thus cleared for redevelopment will be sold to private parties. As I have pointed out, however, the resale price of this land to private industry will necessarily, in almost every case, be less than the price which the redevelopment authority originally paid for it. There will be a loss on the resale, due to the fact that the use of the land for residential purposes will be less than its present slum value.

The Federal Government will shoulder this write-down loss by a total grant of $500,000,000 and hence will give a subsidy to private industry. The other $500,000,000 of the original loans will have to be repaid out of the resale price or lease rentals on the land which is disposed of to private parties. In addition, the local governments are to put up sums equal to one-half the outright Federal grants. These local contributions may be in the form of cash, but are more likely to take the form of facilities such as streets, relocation of water and sewer facilities, lighting, the provision of parks and schools, and so forth. This quarter of a billion dollars of city money added to the $500,000,000 grants and the $500,000,000 of repaid loans will provide, therefore, a total of approximately a billion and a quarter dollars with which to help clear the slums.

It will be noticed that by section 110 (c), on pages 20 and 21 of the bill, the local redevelopment authority is authorized to acquire, in addition to the slum land, platted urban or suburban land which is largely open, or in other words, the subdivisions of the 1920's which were laid out in profusion on the outskirts of our city, but which went "sour" and have never been built up, and a large proportion of which are tax delinquent, and open and unplatted urban and suburban land. It is frequently asked why, if our job is slum clearance, we should help the localities to acquire this land, and various groups have objected because such provision is granted. The reasons for this are very simple and compelling.

It will be necessary to get land to rehouse the slum dwellers who are being displaced before the initial slum-clearance program can go forward. These people cannot be rehoused in the slums for, at first, these will be full. It will be necessary to rehouse them on the outskirts of the cities, and hence the redevelopment authority will need the authority to acquire and develop this land. Secondly, since we want to decrease the density of population in the slum areas, there will necessarily be a spill-over of people who cannot be rehoused there, but must be housed on the outskirts of the cities. This will be particularly necessary, since, under the redevelopment plans, a large portion of the hitherto slum areas will be used for the housing of higher-income groups. This will be another added force compelling the communities to provide housing facilities. Perhaps I should say, finally, that in view of the danger of atomic attack, it is desirable that our cities be more diffused than they now are. This provision would help markedly in that direction. In the main, it is hoped that we can utilize the abandoned subdivisions for this purpose where streets, lights, water, and sewage facilities have already been provided, but which are not now used and which have heavy tax delinquencies upon them. We can thus restore to use some of the dead land which now rings our cities and bring it back into productive and tax-paying use. This would be a double gain. But where unplatted open land is used, there is to be no capital grant and the cost of the original purchase price advanced by the Federal Government is to be repaid from the amounts realized by the local authority after development.

Taken in the large, I think this title and this bill should do more for the people of this country than virtually any measure of which I know. It will help to rid us of one of the greatest blemishes upon our civilization. It will strengthen the real foundations of our democracy and will deprive those who are waging a propaganda war against us of some of the talking points which they use. In spite of our slums, we are still the best country on earth. But if we can eliminate them, we will be still better.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I desire to commend the Senator for his very fine presentation of one of the most perplexing problems with which the bill is endeavoring to deal, but I should like to ask him a question particularly with reference to section 102 (d), found on page 7 of the bill. I do this in order that the RECORD may clearly show just what the legislative intent is under that particular subsection. It provides that advance funds can be paid to local public agen-

cies for surveys and plans in preparation of projects which may be assisted. Under most city laws the local public agency which is charged with responsibility for carrying out the specific land assembly and redevelopment operation is also charged with responsibilities for making the necessary local surveys and plans for such projects. However, as the Senator knows, under some State laws the local planning commission, or some similar official local agency, other than the public redevelopment agency, is given the responsibility for making all necessary local surveys, plans, and projects.

I should like to know whether, under the provisions of the bill with respect to these advances, such cases as I have mentioned are covered. I presume such advances would be made to the local public redevelopment agency, but I should like to have the able Senator from Illinois, who has given so much time to the study and preparation of this part of the bill, give us his opinion with reference to the matter which I have suggested to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The distinguished junior Senator from Alabama is completely correct on this point, as he always is. In such cases as those which the Senator has mentioned advances would be made to the local public redevelopment agency, which would then make the funds available to such other official agency as is responsible, under the State law, for making all project surveys and plans. In such cases, even if the project surveys and plans are made by some other local agency, the advances would have to be made to the local public redevelopment agency, since it is the latter agency which is charged with the funds which become available to it for the undertaking of the project involved.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. Under the terms of title II, as I understand, perhaps as many as 810,000 units of subsidized low-rent housing will be constructed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is our hope.

Mr. CAIN. As a result of the building of 810,000 units of subsidized low-rent housing, how many units of slum housing will be eliminated? I ask that question, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, because I share his deep concern regarding the continuance in this country of what is commonly referred to as the American slum, and I should like to know whether the construction of the subsidized units will actually and in fact result in minimizing the slum areas in America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think it can be said that exactly 810,000 slum units will be torn down, because of the high cost of slum land. I was very careful not to make any such claim. I do say, however, that the billion and a quarter dollars referred to will enable us to make a very appreciable inroad upon the slums.

I think, in most cases, as illustrated by the charts which I have exhibited, we can enable redevelopment projects, such as those outlined, to be carried through. It will not be the end of the slums, but it will be the beginning of the end of the slums.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator that, with reference to his statement just made, I thoroughly agree that the sums to be made available as loans by the Government in the redevelopment section will begin to minimize and get rid of the slums in America, but I am certain the Senator agrees with me that the job is very much bigger than can be cured by the redevelopment section, and that we should look for every conceivable way in which further elimination of slums can be brought about.

In 1937, when this country for the first time embarked on a program of low-cost housing, it was provided that for every unit of low-cost public housing to be constructed, one unit within an American slum must be torn down. I wish to ask the Senator in all seriousness whether we should not consider providing in the pending bill for the elimination of a slum unit for every unit of subsidized low-rental housing the bill provides shall be constructed. If we agreed, that would make certain that if we built 810,000 units at a very heavy, though justifiable, cost on the American taxpayer, at the same time we would be reducing the existing slums by 810,000 substandard dwellings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The whole purpose of title I is directed to this end. As I remember the 1937 law, which the Senator has quoted with complete accuracy, it was passed at a time when there was not a housing shortage.

Mr. CAIN. That is indeed correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was felt that public housing should not add to the total number of rental units, but should merely displace other units. We are now faced with the fact that there is a housing shortage, and that in the short run it may be desirable to add to the total number of housing units by building more housing units than are actually torn down. But the purpose of title I is to get rid of as large a volume of slums as possible.

Mr. CAIN. But the slums to be gotten rid of are considerably larger in number than can be gotten rid of by tile I of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have to make a beginning. I should like to point out also that in the buildings which are constructed, whether in the slum areas themselves or on the outskirts, the people who will have first call upon rental accommodations will be slum families. So that even if we do not tear down 810,000 slum units, we will gradually clear 810,000 families living in slums into the new buildings, and gradually, we hope, a lot of the population will be sucked out of the slums.

Mr. CAIN. What provision of the bill makes certain that those who live in slums today are to be taken care of in any of these 810,000 units?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will ask the Senator to look at title II of the bill, section 201 (b), pages 26 and 27.

Mr. CAIN. The reason back of these questions lies in the obvious fact, as I read the bill and understand it, that it can quite readily come to pass that we can do one fine thing, namely, build 810,000 units of subsidized low-cost housing, which are not presently available, but if we do, we will still make no inroad of any character, by the erection of those 810,000 units, on prevailing slum conditions, under title II of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me point out to the very distinguished Senator from Washington that on page 27 of the bill it is stated that the local housing authority must certify that the families who occupy the new housing must not only be low-income families, but must have "lived in an unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwelling, or was to be displaced by another low-rent housing project or by a public slum-clearance or redevelopment project, or actually was without housing, or was about to be without housing as a result of a court order of eviction, due to causes other than the fault of the tenant."

In other words, slum dwellers are to get first call upon the new housing units which are to be constructed, and in some cases, we hope in a very large percentage of the cases, they will come from slum dwellings which are being destroyed. In other cases they will come from slum dwellings which are being allowed to continue to exist, but the population will be sucked out of those slum areas.

Mr. CAIN. If it is true, as I am sure the Senator hopes will be a fact, that those who live today in a slum housing unit will be taken care of in a federally constructed subsidized low-rent unit, why should we not make certain that the house from which the family has been removed, namely, a house in the slums, shall not be lived in by any other American citizen or American family? We could accomplish that by merely preserving the basic premise of the original law of 1937, which provided that as we create a unit under the act that is good, we tear down, by regulation, a unit that is bad? I think the Senate should give serious consideration to making certain that we continue to do what was the intent of the Congress only a few short years ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator recall, however, that as the housing shortage developed later, Congress specifically wrote into the law a provision that the public housing projects should not be used for the purpose of replacing slums? That was written into the Lanham Act, and it was done because Congress realized that a much greater housing shortage was being developed than could be taken care of. While I desire to see as many slums done away with as possible, yet I think we should certainly take into consideration, in erecting housing units, that we are still faced with a tremendous housing shortage.

Furthermore, I think it is highly important that we keep in mind the separation of slum clearance and public housing. A public housing unit may replace a slum-clearance unit, but, on the

other hand, it may not. They are not necessarily dependent one upon the other. They are two separate and distinct programs, each one able to stand on its own feet, but, of course, related, because we hope to make some inroad by getting people to move out of the slum areas as fast as possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his statement.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield that I may ask a question of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I think that in referring to the Lanham Act the Senator from Alabama has referred to a piece of wartime legislation. As I construe it, the discussion before the Congress at this time is in the interest of a peacetime economy, which should be and must be separated from such temporary acts of legislation as that referred to by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course the Senator from Washington is correct, but the point I was trying to make was that the purpose behind the provision of the Lanham Act to which I have referred was the increasing housing shortage with which we were confronted, and the point I make with reference to the present situation, which is somewhat analogous to the circumstances as they existed when the Lanham Act was passed, is that we are still confronted with a housing shortage.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama. One thing which concerns me, and which I wish to point out to the Senator from Illinois, is that if we remove an American family from a slum unit, and properly house it, only to find that the slum out of which it has come has been reoccupied by some other American family, we are simply not keeping faith with the declaration of principle, intent, and purpose, so beautifully outlined in the beginning of the pending bill; but if we could say to the American people, and prove it, that "For every unit of housing which we are asking you to subsidize for those who, other than yourselves, are going to live in them, we are going to make certain that there has been removed forever from the American scene some disgraceful unit of housing"—if we could make such a guarantee, which to me seems very reasonable, I think we would begin to gain public support for the attempt to solve the problem of subsidized public housing, which certainly is not too generously agreed to by many people today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not true that for every slum-clearance project which is carried through and for every slum family which is displaced, under the proposed legislation the community would be required to provide decent housing facilities? Is not that true?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's question is simply whether there will be enough slum-clearance projects. That is the Senator's question, is it not?

Mr. CAIN. I want the Congress to do the very best possible in the way of accomplishment, through legislation which presumably will shortly be passed by the Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I join with the Senator from Washington in that expression. I am very pleased to know that the Senator has not yet, at least, taken exception to the fact that the new projects may also be on the outskirts of cities, as well as in the very centers of the cities.

Mr. CAIN. No, I do not agree that they should of necessity be in the center of the city. So we have no ground of disagreement in that respect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, projects will be needed on the outskirts of cities to take care of families temporarily displaced, to provide for lower living densities, to take care of the persons of lower income who are displaced by those of middle incomes as well as by persons in the upper income brackets who come to live within these areas.

Mr. CAIN. We are not in disagreement on that point. If the Senator will permit me I should like to use one example? It happens that the junior Senator from Washington lives in a typical American community. Its name is Tacoma. It has a population of about 140,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a very beautiful city, I may say, and upon occasion, as a tourist in that region, I have gone up to the hill above Tacoma and looked through a telescope, which has above it the words "Watch Tacoma Grow".

Mr. CAIN. I may suggest for the benefit of those at home and for my colleagues here that Tacoma has grown increasingly with the years. But about 1937 Tacoma, like many another city, was given an opportunity to accept some Federal funds for the purpose of constructing low-rent accommodations. I am not satisfied what the city's final decision would have been, but the war came on and it was decided to use available Federal funds for the purpose of constructing homes for war workers. So we necessarily found ourselves faced with a prohibition against the removal of substandard housing; or at least no reference was made in any way to the matter of tearing down one unit for every new unit constructed. The net result, however, has been a construction in that average American city of, I think, about 2,500 units of pretty good housing in which lower income groups live today. But in that city not one single unit in these recent years has been torn down. Admittedly we have 2,500 new units of housing, but we still have every single unit of substandard housing that we had in that community 7 or 8 or 9 years ago.

I am as satisfied as I am that I am standing here now, that if we pass the proposed legislation in its present form, without any assurance that one unit shall be torn down for every one that goes up, we are going to build 810,000 units of pretty good housing, but we shall in consequence have done nothing whatsoever to minimize the hazard of prevailing slums.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Washington tell me whether the housing in Tacoma to which he refers was constructed under the 1937 Public Housing Act?

Mr. CAIN. For the reason that the war came along, the housing was constructed under several Lanham Act provisions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Lanham Act contained no provision whatsoever respecting slum clearance, and that there was no obligation on the public authorities to clear the slums.

Mr. CAIN. Exactly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the proposed act which we are considering would create an obligation upon the authorities to clear the slums.

Mr. CAIN. Under title I.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; under title I.

Mr. CAIN. I am completely in agreement with that approach through title I. But the point I am trying to make is that not only ought we to do as much as we can to eliminate slums under title I but likewise under title II. If there is an opportunity by an amendment to destroy 810,000 units of substandard housing under title II, I think we should consider the advisability of doing so. I know if we should do that there would be a degree of public support for the approach to the problem of subsidized low-rent housing which is not generally, or too generously, available at the present time.

I wonder if the Senator from Illinois could point out to me his reasons for opposing a provision in the bill, which could be added by way of an amendment, that for every new unit of subsidized federally supported housing we shall be able to say to the American people, "We have removed from the scene one substandard unit of housing." It would not slow up the program very much, I may suggest to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are not certain that the one and a quarter billion dollars which will be provided under title I would be adequate to do that, because the total cash subsidy provided would only be $500,000,000; or approximately $600 per dwelling.

Mr. CAIN. Are we not trying to get rid of the American slums? If we really are, then I think we can afford to spend whatever time is necessary in order to make provision for adequate money to do that work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Approximately one and one-quarter billion dollars is all that will be provided, as I stated, under title I, and the question is whether that amount is adequate for such purpose.

Mr. CAIN. I am deeply appreciative of the time which the Senator from Illinois has permitted me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a privilege on my part.

Mr. CAIN. I had not intended to raise these questions on my part, because I have on my desk an amendment which would merely provide that the provisions of the law of 1937 shall be adopted in connection with the passage of this bill, but I consider it a real favor that the Senator has given to me his point of view.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Washington very much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Illinois in connection with his presentation of titles I and II of Senate bill 1070, whether title I does not offer an incentive toward slum clearance to meet the suggestions and the requests of the Senator from Washington? Does it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I think it does. Experience has shown that it is not desirable to rely on public housing alone as a means of eliminating slums. I should be very glad to have the Senator from Minnesota develop that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I merely wanted to have it made quite clear that title I—slum clearance and community development and redevelopment, actually does give an incentive to the community which is seeking a tax base—and about 90 percent of the tax base in a municipality is the real-estate tax or the property tax—that is actually does give an incentive toward the demolition of slum areas; and not merely slum residential areas, but slum business areas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Provided they ultimately become primarily residential.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Is it not true, I ask the Senator from Illinois, that the municipal officials who testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency pointed out the importance of having areas within their jurisdictional limits in which they could develop housing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the testimony of virtually every major and virtually every public official who appeared before the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that one of the basic problems which confronts a municipality, in terms of its revenues, is the constant problem of the suburb, where the new taxable property is constructed, and to which people are fleeing, leaving the old city to rot from within?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is happening in virtually every major American city. The cities are rotting from within, and people are fleeing to the suburbs to obtain the benefit of cheaper rentals. The bill provides a process of taking this overvalued land, with its rotten buildings, and clearing it, making it possible for people to live nearer their work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The new family groups coming into the new housing can, in most cases, pay for the services, so it will be a good business proposition for private redevelopment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also true that the people who move into the new suburban areas frequently use the public services of the major metropolitan centers?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is most certainly true. In the city of Chicago we are maintaining elaborate highways so that people may reach the suburbs more quickly, where they evade paying taxes to the city for the services which we maintain for them. That is true in virtually every major city of the United States. The proposal in the bill will help to bring many of these suburbanites home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois, in reference to the question propounded by the Senator from Washington, whether or not title I actually performs the service which the Senator from Washington wants, and not only performs the service of slum clearance, but slum clearance which provides a tax base for the continued development of public services within the municipality.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The territory which is cleared will probably be sold primarily to private interests, who will use the territory for upper-income housing, middle-income housing, upper-working class housing, and some commercial purposes. Those will yield a revenue sufficient to pay the local redevelopers, and to pay taxes, and will increase municipal revenues.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois has made the observation that if we were to put into title II, the public housing title, the requirement that for every public housing unit which is constructed an old slum unit should be torn down, the amount of appropriations which would be required under this proposed law would have to be augmented by at least 50 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The appropriation would possibly have to be increased very greatly. If the Senator from Washington, at the same time he proposes this amendment, also proposes an amendment to increase the total loans to $1,500,000,000, and additional grants of $500,000,000, then I think we can discuss that issue; but I am a little reluctant to tie our hands to $1,000,000,000, and at the same time impose the obligation for clearing 810,000 units.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. If I may be permitted to respond briefly, let me say that I am satisfied that what the junior Senator from Washington not only had in mind, but said, was that if the idea of 1-for-1 is agreed to be right, then we ought to satisfy our other obligation, which is to provide whatever moneys may be required to insure the tearing down of units of substandard or slum housing, to be replaced by what we all want, which is better housing. So if the principle is agreed to, I shall be glad to resolve with the Senate the question as to how much money will be required to insure that 810,000 bad houses are torn down to make way for 810,000 good houses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator say that he intends to propose two amendments, one to increase the total grants and loans under title I, and the other to impose the obligation of tearing down 810,000 units? If he does that, we may approach an agreement. I should like to talk with the Senator on that question over a cup of coffee.

Mr. CAIN. I want to determine first—and I know the Senator from Illinois will agree with me—whether or not others besides myself think it would be good for the program of public housing in America and for our society and economy as well, to make certain that in return for every good housing unit we construct, we make equally certain to tear down a bad housing unit. If we could come to an agreement on that point, I should be most pleased to join the Senator over a cup of coffee, or to argue the merits of the case on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Washington should also consult the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is chairman of the committee, and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who have borne the major share of the battle. I am merely one of the lesser lights, appearing on the third day.

Mr. CAIN. As I recall, the Senator from Illinois raised this question. I should be delighted to satisfy his requirements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator has gathered from the remarks of the junior Senator from Washington that the policy statements which have come from the Republican Policy Committee on the matter of economy are now to be somewhat shoved aside in an effort to increase the funds to be made available for loans and grants under title I and title II of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to the junior Senator from Minnesota that I do not like to discuss these questions in a political setting. I wish to pay tribute to the fine work done by a number of Republican Senators on this bill, such as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who have rendered yeoman service, and who deserve as much credit for this bill as any Senator on our side of the aisle. So I do not wish to make this a partisan issue in any sense. However, I will say to those who in the past have been somewhat dubious about this matter that there goes through my mind a little hymn which as a boy I used to sing in church. If this does not fit anyone's case, he does not have to apply it. Two lines of that hymn ran as follows:

> And while the lamp remains to burn
> The vilest sinner may return.

I can say that we have the lamp in the window, and if any of the sinners on this subject—and I do not like to draw such a distinction—want to come in through the door, the past will be forgotten. We will throw our arms around them, and we will come through with an even bigger slum-clearance program. And we will never raise the issue as to whether or not it is in conflict with the Republican platform.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do not want the Senator from Illinois to feel that this is not in my mind a nonpartisan measure. The only thing I am concerned about is whether or not, if we were to adopt an amendment such as is proposed by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], it might stymie the progress of this particular bill. I am convinced that the Committee on Banking and Currency has weighed the financial requirements of this measure very carefully, in terms of the budget proposals and in terms of the revenues which will be available to the Government. To talk in terms of things that we could never realize, and to say that we ought to have perfection, and ought to increase the amount of the appropriation to attain perfection, may mean the death of the very measure which we are trying to place upon the statute books of the Nation. I think it is only fitting and proper to ask the question whether or not we are better off by trying to move ahead on the basis of the proposal in Senate bill 1070 than we would be if we were to set our sights on something which could not be realized, even though it might be a great social panacea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. While the computation of the precise amount necessary to clear 810,000 slum units would be difficult, nevertheless, the total appropriation of $1,000,000,000, of which half would be sunk, would provide for an average purchase price of approximately $1,200, of which about $600 would be sunk, and $600 carried over into the cost.

Taking the country as a whole, I think that might not be too far from the correct amount; but I should be quite reluctant, offhand, to tie the program down with the specific provision that 810,000 specific units are to be torn down. For one thing, I am not quite certain what it would do to the question of veterans' preferences.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Slum families have first preference, and within the group of slum families veterans living in slums have A-1 preference. After we get out of the class of slum families and into the community as a whole, veterans are at the top of the second list. I am not quite certain what the proposal would do to veterans' preferences.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask the Senator from Illinois if he would not like to think that the day will come when for every good unit of housing which is constructed through Federal subsidies of one kind or another, a bad unit of housing will be destroyed and taken away.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is something devoutly to be wished, and I hope that in the administration of this act the Housing Administrator will not primarily bypass slum clearance for development on the outskirts. I hope we can make on the floor of the Senate a record sufficiently strong as to make plain that his primary obligation is to clear the slums under title I. Anything the Senator can say, or anything I can say in that direction will be in the right direction. There will, of course, have to be areas developed on the outskirts to provide new housing for displaced families.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator from Illinois will indulge me for a minute or two, I take very seriously the declaration of a national housing policy, and I think every other Member of Congress ought to do the same thing—and presumably most of them do. But one of the great ambitions included within this declaration of policy is the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas. I have just raised the question whether this is not the opportunity to say, because it is the first time America has ever undertaken to provide publicity constructed housing in large volume, that we should take advantage of that coming fact and should make certain that as we construct better housing, on the one hand, we shall remove the menace to health, happiness, freedom, and so forth, on the other hand, as represented by bad housing. Should we not look for some means to insure that we shall get rid of the bad at the same time we increase the good?

So I come back to the simple example, which I gave in the case of Tacoma, Wash., which has 2,500 more houses, built with public money, than it had before the war, but it has precisely the same number of slum units which existed in that city in the thirties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I point out again to the Senator from Washington that there was no obligation in the act under which the 2,500 houses were constructed in Tacoma, Wash., to clear the slums; but that under this bill there is an obligation that the slums be cleared.

Mr. CAIN. I certainly agree with the Senator from Illinois that there was no requirement of that sort anywhere in the Lanham Act, so far as I know.

But I am still conscious that in 1937, when the Congress and the country thought the time had come to embark upon a public-housing program, one of the requirements for making public taxdollars available for housing which would be good in America was that we would make certain that housing which was bad would be torn down. I point out that if the bill now before the Senate is passed in its present form, we shall have backed down on that requirement of the 1937 act, and in effect we shall have lost ground, rather than gained it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me point out that there is no time connection between slum clearance and the building of low-rent housing, as provided in the bill. For instance, the Senator has brought into the Chamber a map of the city of Detroit. In referring to that map, if we decided that in the city of Detroit we wish to build some low-rent housing projects, under the bill it will not be necessary to tear down a certain number of slums before building the new housing projects. In other words, under the bill Detroit will have an option. She may have slum clearance and public housing or she may have public housing alone, to be built on farm lands within the city limits, possibly. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The cities will have an option.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I mean; each city will have an option in that respect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not our purpose to insist that each locality conform to a rigid standard; but if they have slums and wish to clear them, the Federal Government will provide two-thirds of the funds required to do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that. But under the bill there is no tie-in, so that some 800,000 houses in America must be torn down, although they are of the worst type to be found in America. In this connection let me say that I pointed out, the other day, on the floor of the Senate that the houses referred to in Washington, D. C., are no worse than certain houses in other cities or even in certain small villages in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. So we are not here attempting to tie in the question of getting rid of slum areas with the question of building low-rent houses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think we are. We are not making it a 1-to-1 relationship; but obviously the two are connected. I do not know the city of Detroit very well, but I imagine that the slum area indicated on the chart now before us is just outside the central business district; is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is the Woodward Avenue district, coming down between the areas marked "C" and "D" on the map.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These are relatively blighted areas; are they?

Mr. FERGUSON. They are. They are in the old section of the city.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. If those sections can be cleared, certainly we must not say that in the future they must necessarily be occupied entirely by families which have been slum families. There may be upper-income families—those whose children have grown up, families who formerly lived in the suburbs and had the advantages of suburban residence—who now wish to move in close to their work. They can move into private dwellings or private apartments, constructed by private capital, and occupying a portion of this area. But the new buildings for the slum families can either be entirely in the former slum area or in part there and in part in the suburbs.

Mr. FERGUSON. But is there not this tendency? When we clear the slum area, the land there, being in the old section of the city—as in the case of Chicago—is held by its owners at such high prices that, even though the area is cleared, private builders cannot afford to construct private housing in that area?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is just that condition which is holding up the present clearance of the slums.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I quoted figures of from $1.16 to $1.33 a square foot, or from $50,000 to $58,000 an acre for Detroit. It is because the land is so high-priced that private capital cannot

clear it and use it for better housing facilities.

But under title I of the bill the local redevelopment authority with Federal money will clear that and then will resell it to private parties, at a price which will enable them to construct decent housing on it, with the Federal Government assuming a part of the write-down cost. In other words, the Federal Government will be subsidizing private industry in order to clear the slums and get this new construction built.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks this would be a good idea: When a city clears a part of the slums, and the land becomes vacant and is not used for park purposes or recreational facilities, then, instead of giving the city Federal dollars with which to construct a low-rent housing project on vacant land outside that area, require the city to construct houses in the blighted area, so as to take away the blight.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean to require the present owners to do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; or require it of the city; so that instead of building such houses on a tract of land out in the country or where no houses are located now, actually the houses would be built on the blighted land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the expectation that a portion of this cleared land would be so used.

Mr. FERGUSON. It may be the expectation, but it is not tied in any way, under the bill. In other words, there is no requirement of that sort in the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question at this point, for I am certainly concerned with the thinking of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. As I understand this bill—and I was a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee which gave consideration to it—it provides any American community with four choices: The community can take advantage of the slum-clearance-redevelopment provisions of title I; or it can take advantage of the provisions of title II; or it therefore can, logically, take advantage of a combination of both; or, in the fourth instance, it can consider both measures and can decide that it wants nothing to do with either of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is mathematically correct, for if one has two variables there are four possibilities.

Mr. CAIN. Yes. From this point of view, I think it is certain that a number of American communities may decide that they want to go into the field of subsidized low-rent housing, to the exclusion of slum clearance. If those communities created 15,000 units of subsidized low-rent housing, but did nothing about slum elimination, there would be 15,000 more houses, without having removed a single blighted area from the cities in question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I point out that that would be done by local decision.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, presumably, I thought that the Senator from Washington and also the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] were very strong exponents of the principle that the municipalities should make the fundamental decisions on these points.

Mr. CAIN. We are, indeed, sir.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a question as to how this program may end. I am not talking about what a municipality may decide, but I am suggesting it may end up merely by a shifting of the slums, if the blighted areas are torn down and it is then decided not to build new housing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. New housing must be built to take the place of the buildings torn down. The bill provides that you cannot clear unless you can provide decent housing for those living in the slums to be torn down.

Mr. FERGUSON. I refer to the situation in Puerto Rico, where I saw some 5,000 or 6,000 new houses built on the seashore. The slums which had been built up in the city are still occupied. Both the new and the old areas are being occupied at the present time. In other words, the slum was not cleared; the structures were not torn down. In the event old structures are torn down and new housing is not built in their place, it is possible the slum would merely be shifted to another place, to structures in the next oldest section.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield. I want to pay a tribute to the Senator from South Carolina by saying we would not have had the pending housing bill in its present form, had it not been for his devotion and hard work.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator I appreciate his remarks. I appreciate the hard work done by every member of the committee, including the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished Senator from Illinois, as well as the present distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. FREAR in the chair]. But for their hard work and splendid cooperation we would not now have the bill in its present form. There is, however, one point which I think has not been sufficiently stressed, and that is relative to the costs. Is it not true that the number of units has been reduced from 1,050,000 to 810,000, and is it not also true that the estimate of $445,000,000 a year has been reduced to about $308,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have tried to make every concession possible in order not to overwhelm the financial resources of the Government, and in order to take into the partnership as many of our Republican brethren as possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I desire to ask him a further question. The committee studied the cost of the program, concluding that it might be less if business continues good. The last thought in our minds was to interfere with the budget, or to interfere in any way with the finances of the country in the handling of this problem, the solving of which will mean so much to the country, as the Senator has so ably stated, in connection with the cleaning up of slums.

The Senator has shown a number of charts relative to the cities of Detroit, Chicago, and New York. The Senator has also given many statistics on the cost per acre of land in those highly congested areas. Is it not true that in order to provide a suitable safeguard to the States, we wrote into the bill, in both titles, language with which the Senator is familiar—and I ask this only for the RECORD—that not more than 10 percent of the funds provided in the bill, either in the form of loans or grants, shall be expended in any one State?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. We thereby protected the States, to that end.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We put a limit on the amounts that Illinois and New York could receive, in order that the remainder of the country could get more. I may say, though in my own State of Illinois we could use more than 10 percent, since we probably have more than 10 percent of the housing needs of the country, we nevertheless accept the limitation very gladly.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator for his full cooperation as a member both of the subcommittee and of the full committee. He has at all times endeavored to be fair to all the American people, and to divide the funds so that each State shall receive its proper portion, and so that no one large State shall receive more than 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks an editorial entitled "The Goal of a Decent Home," published in the New York Times of April 19, which was written in the interest of the Ellender housing bill which we now have under consideration. In view of the fact that the New York Times is a highly conservative newspaper not given to advocating radical measures, I think it will be valuable to have the editorial printed immediately following my remarks. I should also like to say, if any Senators wish to accompany the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself on a short tour of the Washington slums, we shall be at the west entrance.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOAL OF A DECENT HOME

Before the Senate adjourned yesterday it was in the second day of its discussion of the Ellender housing bill, introduced by the Louisiana Senator with the support of 10 other Democrats and 11 Republicans. Housing bills are always complicated. Their objectives are not. This one proposes "the realization, as soon as feasible, of the goal of a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family." The principles are at least as old as the Wagner Housing Act of 1937. They do not involve an attack on private enterprise. Indeed, the bill says specifically that "private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can." Federal loans and subsidies for housing are intended to plug the gap which the private builders cannot fill.

The present bill is a compromise in the number of units which may be built within

the next 6 years with Federal aid. The administration had asked for 1,050,000. This has been scaled down to 810,000. Along with the low-rent building program will go a slum-clearance program. The total cost for the next fiscal year will be about $185,000,000. Over a course of 40 years, as Federal commitments rise, the average will be about $308,000,000 a year. This is not a large sum compared with other Federal expenditures. It is small change when put beside the amount of housing for the low-income groups that it can bring into existence.

There is a good argument for undertaking this program now. Building materials are more readily available than they were a year or so ago. The need for decent housing has been urgent since the end of the war. There is particular justice in providing for the veterans of the Second World War, who, during their term of service, had no chance to qualify for housing and little opportunity to save money or get ahead in the world. The Ellender bill would make provision for the veterans and for farmers, whose housing problems have been largely neglected. It would provide for research in a field in which waste and obsolete practices still continue. This is not socialism any more than a post office is socialism—or as much.

We hope that the arguments for action in this field will be put forward when the housing bill reaches the House of Representatives, which was the graveyard of Senate-approved housing bills in 1946 and 1948. This time public opinion will certainly demand that housing be brought out of committee and given a fair chance of passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Neely
Anderson	Hoey	O'Conor
Baldwin	Holland	Pepper
Bricker	Hunt	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kefauver	Sparkman
Connally	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Kerr	Taft
Douglas	Knowland	Taylor
Ecton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tydings
Frear	McKellar	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
George	Malone	Wherry
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Withers
Gurney	Mundt	
Hickenlooper	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive M, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a certified copy of the international wheat agreement, in the English and French languages, which was open for signature in Washington from March 23, 1949, to April 15, 1949, and was signed during that period on behalf of the Government of the United States and the governments of 40 other countries, and that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the agreement, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the international wheat agreement, in the English and French languages, which was open for signature in Washington from March 23, 1949, to April 15, 1949, and was signed during that period on behalf of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 40 other countries.

Because of the necessity, under the terms of the agreement, that instruments of acceptance thereof be deposited by July 1, 1949, in order to bring the agreement into force with a view to its operation during the next crop year, it is my hope that the Senate will find it possible to give early consideration to the agreement.

The purposes and provisions of the agreement are set forth in greater detail in the enclosed report of the Secretary of State and its enclosures.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 19, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State, with enclosures. 2. International wheat agreement.)

THE COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, out of order, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I introduce a bill relating to the Columbia Valley development, and ask that it be received and properly referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message from the President which was received on the 14th instant relating to this subject, and which was ordered to lie on the table at that time, will now be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], for himself and other Senators, will also be referred to that committee, as well as the bills heretofore introduced by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The bill (S. 1645) to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The bill (S. 1631) to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands, introduced by Mr. CAIN on April 18, 1949, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there are several other Senators on both sides of the aisle interested in the proposed legislation who would probably like to add their names to the bill as cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that within this calendar day, if any other Senators wish to add their names, they be permitted to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced is commonly known as the Columbia Valley Administration bill. It provides for a so-called Columbia Valley Administration somewhat similar to what has been set up for the development of the Tennessee Valley, and somewhat similar to what has been proposed for other great river valleys of the United States, including the Missouri Valley, the Arkansas Valley, the Connecticut Valley, and other great river valleys and river systems.

Mr. President, other bills have been introduced on this subject, and yesterday my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] introduced a similar bill, and submitted to the Senate an explanatory statement. I read from the RECORD of yesterday the conclusion of his statement, as follows:

In regard to S. 1595, which would approve the Columbia River Basin plans which have been submitted to the President by the Secretary of the Army and by the Secretary of the Interior, I may say that, despite the fact that obviously I have no connection with the administration, I have thought it proper to introduce the bill, partly because no other Senator has seen fit to introduce proposed legislation covering the administration's

CVA plan, in order that all the proposed development programs for the Pacific Northwest might be before the committee having jurisdiction and the Congress at the same time.

Mr. President, last week, on April 13 the President of the United States sent to the Congress a very comprehensive message on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration. It was not accompanied by a bill at that time, for the simple reason that a draft had not been prepared of this very comprehensive bill, which must be comprehensive in nature, and in broad terms, because it deals with the whole economy of a great river valley. The proposed draft of the bill was being circulated among various Senators in the hope that those who approved of the President's proposal might join and be cosponsors of the bill. The result is that last week the many Senators whom I have enumerated joined as sponsors of the bill introduced today in the Senate.

At the time the message was sent to the Senate there was also some question in the minds of those of us who looked at the parliamentary procedure, because of the comprehensive nature of the bill, as to just what committee or committees it might be referred. There is some basis for a referral of a bill of this nature to the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate. There is some basis for a referral of a bill of this nature to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. There is other basis for referral to the Committee on Public Works, which probably has a broader jurisdiction over the major parts of the bill than the other two committees. So, after the bill had been circulated among the various Senators who took some time to study it and read it—and, Mr. President, it is a long bill—it was finally agreed that we were ready to introduce it, and it was agreed that we would introduce the bill as soon as possible this week. That was common knowledge among those concerned with this vital piece of legislation, particularly those of us who had the opportunity to read the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to yield when I have concluded.

But even before that, Mr. President, I took the floor of the Senate, on April 13, the day the message came to the Senate. The majority leader made the observation that the reference of the message should probably be held up until the introduction of this very comprehensive bill. At that time I said, and I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13:

> Mr. President, I should like to make an observation in support of the suggestion which has been made by the majority leader. This message will be accompanied by a bill which will be introduced later; but because of the fact that the House of Representatives will take an Easter adjournment, the bill accompanying the message will not be introduced in either the House or the Senate until a week from Monday.

So, Mr. President, I am presenting the bill, containing as sponsors the names of many distinguished Members on both sides of the aisle, who have given a great deal of study to the problem. I announced to the Senate on Wednesday last that a bill would be presented, that an administrative bill would be presented, that the bill was very comprehensive in its nature, and must be studied by those who would want to act as its cosponsors. Distinguished Senators on both sides of the aisle have placed their names on it as cosponsors. I also have asked unanimous consent that many other Senators, who have long been familiar with the problem, who have worked on it for weeks and months, might also add their names on this calendar day.

Mr. President, this session of Congress has been asked during recent weeks to consider many broad and sweeping proposals for the improvement of the national welfare.

I come now to ask prompt and earnest consideration for the measure which I introduced yesterday, which is so clearly within the framework of our democratic way of doing things and which, if passed, will accomplish so much for our national economy, that I cannot but feel it will receive favorable consideration.

Forty years ago the Pacific Northwest was considered by those who gave the matter any thought at all as a remote and rugged spot, with little value to the Nation except as a source of raw materials.

There were too few people in the Northwest at that time to make it an important market. It took a week or better to get there from the East.

Eastern business was interested in the Northwest purely from the standpoint of its timber and other resources which were shipped out in bulk and processed in more populous areas.

In those days, the Pacific Northwest was small potatoes in the "national economy," a phrase, by the way, which was not in common usage or public consciousness.

In the past four decades a great change has come.

The Nation has become increasingly dependent upon mechanical horsepower to maintain the level of production requisite to support its growing population. As the need for mechanical horsepower has increased, the national reserves of oil and coal and natural gas have diminished, and the importance of hydroelectricity produced from the water of our swift rivers has grown in a geometric progression.

This development in the production habits and requirements of our Nation since the turn of the century has at last made the Pacific Northwest a vastly more important factor in our national prosperity.

The Columbia River and its tributaries, flowing through portions of five States, comprise the Nation's largest swift-river system—the Nation's most important source of hydroelectricity.

The proper development of this stream for all its values, therefore, must not be considered merely a local problem, of regional significance only, but a national problem.

In a democracy such as ours, we have a tendency to avoid facing our complex problems until they become sufficiently troublesome to hit us in the face.

That is what happened in the years from 1929 to 1939. The great depression of that time focused public attention on a basic national problem of economics and forced the beginning of an answer.

In those years, the Nation, through its Congress, undertook many solutions. The Tennessee Valley Act was passed, the the Bonneville Project Act was passed; the Public Works Administration was established, and provided funds for many huge public projects in the West. All these were aimed, basically, at stimulating our national production for the purpose of providing pay rolls and buying power—for the purpose of a more equitable development of our national resources.

Much of this was done on a frankly experimental and provisional basis. The Tennessee Valley Authority was one such great experiment. The Bonneville Project Act was a similar experiment on a more limited scale.

Now, 15 years later, we can make an estimate of these experiments and we find greater progress and a better balance of economic benefits have been attained in the Tennessee Valley than have been attained in the Columbia Valley. This, coupled with the fact that the Bonneville Project Act was provisional by definition, brings us to the logical conclusion that it is now time to reevaluate the Federal policy in the Columbia Valley and to make such adjustments as appear in the light of our experience to be desirable. Accordingly, the Senate now has before it the bill which I introduced today "to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands."

This bill, if enacted into law, will prove, I am confident, of tremendous national benefit.

It is interesting to note that just today the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers have announced agreement—among themselves—as to which agency should build what dams on the Columbia and its tributaries. They say:

> This agreement provides an inventory and framework which will be extremely valuable to the proposed Columbia Valley Administration, recommended by the President.

I welcome this announcement. It represents recognition, by these two great agencies, of the crying need for coordination of Federal activities in the region. It is a step in the right direction.

The Bureau and the Corps of Engineers indicate, however, that this is not a complete answer—nor is it intended to be—when they say:

> The agreement provides for inclusion when proper of appropriate agency's plans for forest management, land treatment, protection and propagation of fish and wildlife, reereation development, material needs and rights of Indians, agency and interagency procedures for interagency operation of river-control projects.

In other words, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have gone as far as they can, as two

separate agencies, with limited jurisdiction in reaching agreement on what each will do. They, of course, have no authority to go further than issue an invitation to the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Mines, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and others to join them in the effort. It is precisely because of this limited jurisdiction on the part of each Federal agency operating in the basin that an over-all regional administration is necessary.

There are some 30,000,000 potential kilowatts of hydroelectricity in the Columbia River system, of which only 2,000,000 have actually been harnessed.

There are at least 8,000,000 acres of rich but arid lands in the Columbia River basin. Yet only 50 percent of this land actually is being irrigated, and much of it quite inadequately. The 18,000,000 acres of croplands in the Pacific Northwest can be increased by another 6,000,000.

There are 8,000,000,000 tons of immensely valuable phosphate rock deposits in this basin which, if processed into phosphorus fertilizer, could provide relief from decreasing crop yields for about 2,500,000 farmers. Yet these deposits provide only 5 percent of national requirements each year. There are immensely valuable supplies of lead, zinc, manganese, and ferrous ores in the Columbia Valley which await only the availability of low-cost hydroelectricity to make their production available to the Nation. Yet even with our development as it is, we have the cheapest source of hydroelectricity in the world—$17.50 per kilowatt-hour per year.

The Tennessee Valley Authority law has permitted that valley to fulfill in the short space of 15 years a large percentage of its own economic potential. A multiplicity of Federal agencies, without coordination, has managed to do little more than make a bare beginning in the valley of the Columbia. The bill now before us, if it becomes law, will equalize this contrast.

It should be noted that the proposal contained in this measure is quite different from the statute which established the Tennessee Valley Authority; and this difference is due to the differences in the character of the two regions. In introducing the bill I stated that all the valley authority bills are similar to the extent that their broad purpose, their goal, is the development of the great resources and potentialities of the great river systems of America for the welfare of all the people of America.

This bill does not propose to set up a new agency with new powers which were heretofore not exercised by the Federal Government in the region.

Rather, it makes possible the reorganization of existing Federal powers so that they may be exercised with more efficiency and so that responsibility for the success or failure of the program may be accurately fixed to the satisfaction of the people in the region and the Congress of the United States.

It should be noted also that the functions of the agency created by this bill are not as all embracing as those of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Basically, only those functions which experience has shown now overlap among the several agencies insofar as control of water is concerned are to be immediately consolidated in this proposed organization.

This is an extremely wise provision, since it allows for a reorganization with a minimum of dislocation in the administration of Federal affairs along the Columbia.

Therefore, it might well be said that to classify this proposed enterprise as a valley authority is something of a misnomer. It is, literally and actually, a reorganization of some, not all, of the Federal establishments now operating within the Columbia River region. That is why the bill proposes a "Columbia Valley Administration"—not a "Columbia Valley Authority".

This, therefore, is no superstate. It is just what the title of the bill says—a reorganization.

The bill provides that a Federal corporation—Columbia Valley Administration—will take control of "all properties under the jurisdiction of the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, all civil projects now operated, constructed, or authorized to be constructed in the region by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army—except for channel and harbor improvement work in tidal waters tributary to the Pacific Ocean—and all projects now operated, constructed, or authorized to be constructed in the region by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior together with all property, real and personal, including dams, locks, powerhouses, transmission facilities and equipment used in connection with or incident to the foregoing and all functions, powers, duties, and responsibilities in connection therewith now exercised by the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Army, or any officials of either Department."

Such action contemplates little or no addition to the existing powers of these agencies.

In addition to its assumption of the functions and responsibilities of these three agencies, the Columbia Valley Administration shall be responsible for preparing unified plans and programs for the conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the region. The new Administration will serve as a guide and a control on the nature, extent, and sequence of Federal programs. It will be held responsible for the coordination of these programs with related national policies and programs.

In the preparation of these unified Federal activities the bill will require the Columbia Valley Administration to recommend methods for harmonization of navigation, flood control, power, reclamation, commercial and sport fishing, soil and forest conservation, pollution control, and recreation.

It must recommend coordinated programs fostering the use of lands in the region for purposes for which they may be best suited, with particular attention to the most efficient conservation and sustained-yield management of timber to assure the protection of watersheds and to increase the usefulness of cultivated lands, grazing lands, and forests, and to minimize damage by floods, from which we have suffered greatly in the past year and a half.

In presenting unified plans for the development of the region, the Columbia Valley Administration must fully evaluate the requirements of birds, fish, and wildlife conservation. We have a great sport area in that region. The fish, wildlife, and game support a great industry in the Pacific Northwest. People come from all over the world to participate. This administration would have the duty also to see that those resources were conserved for the best possible use of all the people of the United States.

Its plans should provide for fostering the use of mineral resources in such a way as to permit optimum development in relation to the development of other resources.

The Columbia Valley Administration will be expected to translate these recommended programs—and they will be only recommended—for regional development into terms of major projects and activities which it proposes to undertake itself and to show the relationship of these Federal activities to those projects and activities which will be undertaken by other Federal agencies and by State and local agencies.

Five States will be involved. They, of course, have their own plans. There will be no attempt on the part of myself or the other sponsors of the bill to invade the rights of any State. The States will be permitted to play their full part in the development of this region, and to harmonize their programs with the program of such an administration as is proposed in the bill.

Finally, in its presentation of a regional development program, the Columbia Valley Administration will be expected to present to the Congress and to the President evidence that its proposals for Federal activities—either Federal activities alone or Federal activities coordinated with the programs of the States involved—are sound and in the public interest of the residents of those States, and not alone in the interest of some Federal bureaucracy. To that end it should submit estimates of costs and benefits and should recommend the allocation of costs to the various purposes to be served.

Mr. President, in summarizing these provisions, the essence of this proposed reorganization becomes clear:

First. It consolidates under a single executive agency the functions and programs of the three existing Federal agencies immediately concerned with the construction and beneficial operation of the great multiple-purpose water-control works on the Columbia River. Those great projects, Mr. President, I have not enumerated here, but they are so well known to the people of the United States, and what they stand for is so well known, that they are almost household words. When we speak of those water-control works and projects, we speak of some of the greatest projects ever built by man, the Bonneville Dam; the McNary Dam, named after our late distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon; the

Chief Joseph Dam; the Ice Harbor Dam; and the Grand Coulee Dam, the greatest potential power producer known in the world, and the greatest project ever built by man. It fixes responsibility for coordinated planning at the Federal level for all major resources development in the Columbia River region for the purpose of providing the Congress and the national Administration with guidance in budget-making and for the purpose of gearing Federal activity adequately into similar activities undertaken by the region's local governments. I stress the word "local."

Such an Administration could be of immense help to the great committees of Congress, to the administrative departments of the Government, to the Bureau of the Budget, and to all others connected with the development of these great projects in the West, to enable them to spend wisely the tax moneys of all the peoples of the United States. For instance, Mr. President, the State of Washington will receive from the Congress in this year, for expenditure, probably close to a billion dollars. Much of that will go into developments. Much of that money probably could be spent more wisely with the help of such an Administration.

The proposed Administration cannot be called a valley authority in the sense that the Tennessee Valley Authority functions, and I think that this is a very important difference which may well be given careful consideration by the Congress.

This difference in organization takes account of fundamental differences between the Tennessee and Columbia River regions.

It recognizes the value and abilities of many established agencies now functioning in the Columbia Basin, and it consolidates immediately the functions of only those agencies which will perform best by a closer coordination of their activities than is now possible under prevailing statutes.

In order to obtain the maximum degree of coordination between the Columbia Valley Administration, other Federal agencies, and State and local agencies concerned with resources development, this bill carries three important provisions:

First. It provides that the Columbia Valley Administration "may, and when directed to do so by the President shall, construct or operate any of its projects or conduct any of its activities through or in cooperation with other departments and agencies of the United States, or with States"—I emphasize the word "States"—"counties, municipalities, cooperatives, individuals, educational and scientific institutions."

Second. It provides that the Columbia Valley Administration "shall, in cooperation with other Federal agencies concerned, prepare and submit annually to the President in connection with its budget program a statement and explanation of the anticipated program, for the current year and such ensuing periods as the President may determine, for the initiation and prosecution by the Administration and other Federal agencies of all major Federal projects and activities having to do with the conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the region."

Third. It provides that departments and agencies of the United States are authorized to participate in the construction or operations of the Columbia Valley Administration's projects or in the conduct of its other activities on mutually agreeable terms.

Mr. President, in the analysis which I have given during the past few minutes, I have described the proposed legal machinery whereby the Federal activities now existing within the Columbia River region can be coordinated in such a way as to permit more efficient development of the resources and economies in the Federal development of those resources.

It is clear, therefore, that this bill concerns itself principally with the reorganization of existing power and functions now held by existing agencies.

There is little in the bill having to do with an accretion to the sum total of these existing powers. Only two provisions of the bill can, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered as adding to the sum total of Federal powers now existing.

One of these provides that the Columbia Valley Administration can conduct economic, scientific, and technologic investigations and studies, to establish, maintain, and operate research facilities, and to undertake experiments and practical demonstrations. Actually, both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration already have some authority to undertake this kind of activity; and these two agencies, as I have said, will, under this bill, be consolidated within the Columbia Valley Administration along with their functions. The Bureau of Mines, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and a number of other agencies now operating in the Northwest also have statutory permission or mandate in varying degree to do this sort of work; and, under the sections of the bill providing for coordinated planning, they will undoubtedly continue to do it in their respective fields. It appears desirable, therefore, that the Columbia Valley Administration should have statutory authority to participate in and act as a coordinating influence on such activities.

Another provision in the bill provides that under certain circumstances, and by negotiation only, the Columbia Valley Administration may acquire, operate, maintain, extend, and improve electric-utility systems. However, the bill specifically states that this may not be done by condemnation, and may be done only after the administration has determined that any electric distribution facilities thus acquired can be promptly disposed of to public or cooperative agencies. In other words, Mr. President, under this bill there will be no attempt to give the Columbia Valley Administration any type of authority which would allow it to do what is done in many other instances in the case of similar authorities, namely, condemn any electrical utility system for its own purposes. Under this bill, that could be done only by negotiation, and only when such a utility could promptly be disposed of to public or to cooperative agencies. In other words, the Administration created under this bill would be only a depository or an agency to make the transfer, if negotiations could be completed, but not to run electrical-utility systems itself.

This provision of the proposed law, restricted as it is by legal safeguards to preserve the public interest in the rights of property, will do much, in my opinion, to protect the power consumers and the utilities in the Northwest States against the confusion and insecurity which now hamper free transactions of this nature between willing buyers and willing sellers.

One section of this bill, concerned with financing and repayment provisions, establishes the Columbia Valley Administration as a wholly owned Government corporation under section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, and its transactions and operations shall be subject to control as provided in that act which has been approved many times by Congress. Insofar as the three existing agencies to be covered into the Columbia Valley Administration are concerned, these provisions of the act constitute a change. Neither the Bonneville Power Administration nor the Corps of Engineers, nor the Bureau of Reclamation are Government corporations. Therefore, these provisions might be considered by some as an extension of powers. I think such a viewpoint is a narrow one. The principles behind the Corporation Control Act have proved desirable for Federal service organizations of the proprietary type. All agree that it has operated successfully.

Federal corporations face the same strict accountability to the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget as do other agencies. To me, this provision of the proposed bill is perhaps the most important single provision in it. Insofar as the bill reorganizes fiscal powers and procedures, it cannot be called an extension of powers. It is rather a change in the manner of exercising congressional or Federal budget controls.

To summarize briefly again:

The bill is, first, a consolidation of three agencies whose functions are concerned primarily with the use of water, and whose functions now overlap in some degree.

This bill is, second, a measure to achieve economies and efficiency at the Federal level through a coordination of planning by existing Federal and other agencies now operating in the region, with adequate protection in the administration of the bill itself of all the States and all the State rights that may be involved.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder whether the Senator in the course of his remarks will cover the point I am about to mention. I have spent considerable time in the Pacific Northwest, and I agree heartily that a program is very important and very necessary for the development of power projects in that area. However, I found a vast number of individuals, all honest and sincere, as the Senator is,

who differed very radically on the question of how we should go about the task. I understand there is one plan, which, as I recall—I am no authority on the matter—has the approval of the Corps of Army Engineers. It is a plan which would call for the development of the Columbia Basin, a development of all the power projects the Senator has in mind; but control would be kept within the power of the three States principally concerned. That is opposed to the CVA plan which the President has recommended. I wonder whether the Senator has yet touched upon that. If not, I shall very much appreciate his dwelling upon the merits of the two plans, either of which of course proposes development of power in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad the Senator asked the question. I remember when TVA was first established, a great many critics wanted to know whether the Federal Government was moving in to exercise some superimposed power over the people of the region, in violation of State rights, local rights, and individual rights. There was a great deal of misunderstanding. What the able Senator from Wisconsin says is correct. I think there is much misunderstanding in my area as to what those of us, who feel that we should develop the region along the lines of such a proposal as this, are trying to do. I am sure the Senator appreciates, as I do, that one of the great arguments originally concerning TVA was whether the directors of the TVA should be local people, or whether they should be in some bureau in Washington exercising control over the people of the area and their resources. As it turned out that question was satisfactorily answered. The misunderstanding disappeared. I suppose if a vote were to be taken today on withdrawal of the Federal Government's part in the development of the area, it would probably be defeated 99 to 1.

The same problem exists with respect to CVA. The same problem is involved in the Missouri Valley proposal, in the Arkansas Valley proposal, and in the Connecticut Valley proposal. But what we are trying to do and what we hope to do is to have the Government supplement, by its vast resources, by its vast financial aid, the development of the great economic potential of the areas, and for Government representatives to have minimum control in the area. The rights of States and individuals and the rights of private property and of private power and of private development in the area can all be sustained, because everybody is going to benefit.

Answering the Senator's question directly, the bill, as the Senator says embodies one of several proposals. The Army engineers had one plan. Yesterday they announced agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation. They are not going to fight each other. In fact, they have not done much fighting in that area. Both have done a marvelous job in the building of dams and in the development of the area. Once in a while a conflict arose which slowed matters up for a while. In the House, two of my colleagues from the State of Washington, and in the Senate, my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington, introduced a bill yesterday pertaining to this development. The bill has been studied and worked over by many people, both in the Bureau of Reclamation and in the Department of the Interior, and by the Army engineers, the White House, Senators, Representatives, public power people, private power people, and everybody else involved.

Naturally there must be some direction to an administration. We provide that such direction shall be given by three people, two of whom shall be citizens and residents of the area, and all three of whom shall at all times be residents of the area.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish the Senator to keep in mind that I am not at this time attempting to criticize the CVA plan. I frankly do not know which of the two plans is preferable. That is why I should like to have the Senator discuss them. I hope the Senator will also keep in mind that I think the vast majority of Senators are willing to spend the necessary money in order to develop the power potential of the Pacific Northwest, which has been sadly neglected. Men of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, advocates of private power and advocates of public power, seem to differ, I should say rather violently, as to which of the two plans will accomplish more while spending less money. I may be in error, but if I understand the arguments, there is one school of thought that in effect says we can do the job better and cheaper, we can get more power and get it sooner, by leaving control largely within the States principally concerned. Another group, equally sincere, says it can be done much more efficiently if we follow the experience of the TVA, and follow pretty much the same line of action. As I say, I personally have not decided which of the two plans is preferable. I hope the Senator will in some detail compare the merits of the two plans. In effect, it gets down to a fight between State control and Federal control.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think I may best answer the Senator by saying that the plan which I advocate is contrasted to a plan providing for piecemeal development of different areas. I think any plan, including the one under discussion, can be harmonized with all the conflicting interests, so there will be a maximum development. I should be unalterably opposed to any plan with respect to development of any valley, whether it be the Columbia, the Missouri, or the TVA, that would encroach upon the right of the States or of the local people to participate along with the Federal agencies, in the use of vast financial resources for the development of the area. Of course, that is one of the fine points. I believe a bill of this nature, a bill so comprehensive as this, which necessarily involves the whole economy and, the proper planning of the economy of a great region, with a population probably of from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 people should be thoroughly studied. Whether the bill be proposed by me or by others, it should be subjected not only to exhaustive hearings but also to exhaustive research in the local area, so that the people of the region, those who represent the State, those who represent the counties and the public utility districts, those who represent the cooperatives, the farm organizations, those who represent the public and the private power interests, shall all have an opportunity not only to testify but to make suggestions. This bill is drawn in somewhat general terms for that specific purpose.

I wish we might receive suggestions from both sides, because everyone agrees on one thing, namely, that if we can achieve some sort of cohesion in a great valley such as that of the Columbia River, as to planning for the use of its great power and economic potential, irrigation, fish, and wildlife resources—if we can achieve some proper planning, if we can achieve an administration which can accomplish that without conflicting with the rights of other persons, we shall have greatly improved the public welfare. That is the purpose of the bill. We shall meet with the same arguments which met those who fostered the Tennessee Valley Authority, in the beginning. People become suspicious as to the motives of the Federal Government and of the powers of an administrator or a group of administrators. They are always suspicious when carpetbaggers, as they are called, are brought in. All those matters should be and can be worked out. They have been worked out successfully in the areas of the United States in which we have achieved great developments of resources.

Here is a river, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, which some day, in my opinion, will furnish cheap power for the State of Wisconsin. I think the State of Wisconsin needs it in some places. Here is a river which some day can be coordinated with other great power projects in the United States for the welfare of all the people. We shall not give any power unless we have a surplus. But here is a river which, if it is ultimately developed to its full potential, and if the planning is correct, will produce an abundance of cheap power not only for our own great needs in that area, which will double, triple, and possibly quadruple, in the next 10 years, but we shall be able to use it for all the people of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I spent considerable time in the Columbia Valley, and I heartily agree that the Columbia River has a more powerful potential than has any other river in the Nation. I heartily agree that it can be developed, but I have found a very decided difference of opinion in that area as between public-power advocates and private-power advocates. But they agree as to the development of the river, differing vigorously on which of the two plans should be adopted. Frankly I have no idea as to which of the two plans I personally would favor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not think there are two plans. I think there is one plan provided for in the bill. There is no comprehensive plan on the

part of those who oppose it. Some of them think there should not be an administration for the Columbia Valley; that we should go ahead and construct dams as we are doing at this time, with the Army engineers building one dam and the Bureau of Reclamation building another, with the Fish and Wildlife Service being concerned with salmon conservation in one area, the Forest Service concerned with the watersheds in the same area. All those agencies have done a good job; but some of us believe that we could have a much better development if we adopted such a plan as is provided for in the bill for the development of the natural resource potential of the area. I agree with the Senator, and I am sure that my colleague from the State of Washington, and Senators from other States, will agree that it has been a matter of great controversy. The same thing was true with regard to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The same thing will be true with regard to the Missouri Valley Authority, which is even more all embracing in its comprehensiveness with respect to a great portion of the United States.

Mr. CAIN and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment before I leave the Chamber?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I hope this will not engender an argument as to whether we should develop the the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think, as a unit, we are pretty much agreed on that, and I think we should spend a great deal of time in endeavoring to get all of the ideas from that area. I have found very intelligent persons differing very vigorously on this question. I think we shall be able to work out a plan which may satisfy both groups in that territory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator. I do not think the development of the Pacific Northwest will stop, or that this is any argument with reference to that point. We believe it will be developed to a much greater extent, with better planning, and that we shall be able to get more out of the great resources which are available through some such administration as is suggested. It will give the people who oppose the plan a much better way of life. There are those who believe we should leave things to move along as they are. But I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I hope it will not get us into any argument as to whether the Pacific Northwest is capable of further development, because it will be developed. The bill is for the benefit of more of the little people of the area and for the large number of persons who will migrate to the great Pacific Northwest in the next two or three generations, because of cheap power, because of irrigated land, and because of much better living, I must say, modestly, than is to be found in some other parts of the United States.

Mr. President, this bill is, third, a measure to permit the adoption of a business-type budget with sufficient flexibility in its fiscal operations to permit the use of modern management procedures.

These three points comprise the essence of this proposed legislation. It is conservative legislation, fitted to the needs of the region, within the framework of present national policies.

There are many other provisions in this bill, but most of these might be accurately termed "safety devices"—provisions which safeguard the various aspects of the public interest.

Some of these are strong home-rule clauses.

One provides that the Columbia Valley Administration shall maintain its principal office in the region and shall be considered an inhabitant and resident within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to the venue of civil suits of any jurisdictional district within the region in which it carries on activities.

Another home-rule provision requires that at least two of the three directors of the Columbia Valley Administration shall be bona fide residents of the region at the time of appointment and that each director shall maintain his residence in the region.

A third provision makes it mandatory that the Columbia Valley Administration shall seek the advice, assistance, and participation of the people of the region and their State and local governments and organizations, public and private, in the formulation and execution of its programs. This provision requires that the Administration establish advisory boards and councils representative of all interests within the Columbia Valley, and that it shall consult these groups on all policies pertinent to their interest.

I know there may be the criticism that advisory boards have no real powers, and that the creation of such boards may not prove effective.

I am sure most Members of the Congress realize, as I do, that the pressure of public opinion really works in this country, and that advisory boards, as a practical matter, receive a great deal of attention by both the executive and legislative arms of our Government.

The home-rule provision gives the Columbia Valley Administration a mandate to listen to such groups. Furthermore, it provides that any advisory group, if it so wishes, may report its findings, on those policies of the Administration which concern it, directly to the President and the Congress, through the inclusion of its views in the Columbia Valley Administration's annual report.

In other words, if there is a group in the area, whether it be State or local, public or private, that is advisory to this authority on great matters pertaining to the valley, should they meet and advise with the directors, and the policy of the administration were contrary to their views, they need not concern themselves with those directors, they could report directly to the President and to the Congress of the United States. I am sure that if they follow that method they will not go very far wrong.

The Columbia Valley bill has many other safety clauses which will adequately protect the public interest.

It provides that the Administration shall carry out its construction work by contract so far as it is practicable.

It contains specific restrictions upon the rights of eminent domain.

Among the provisions governing its responsibilities on land reclamation, the proposed law states: "No provision for works of irrigation in or under this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Administration, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing in this act shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof."

In other words, it will have no authority to interfere with any right a State can give to its people, and no authority in any of the five States involved to change or to interfere with such a right in the use or distribution of water for all these great purposes.

Mr. President, I am quite sure that all those States—I know it is true as to three of them—have what we call adequate water acts. The proposed administration will have no authority in any way, whether on a navigable or nonnavigable stream, to interfere with water rights. In other words, the proposed act would protect the present water rights, and apply the existing reclamation law, which we in the West know has worked very successfully.

There are still other important safety clauses in the measure. There is a section which provides for payments by the Columbia Valley Administration in lieu of taxes. This will be a protection to State and local governments and taxing bodies, such as school districts and public utility districts. There are provisions relative to the personnel policies of the Administration, which protect the rights of Federal employees, and preserve the preferential rights of veterans. There are clauses which protect the rights of labor, and provide for collective bargaining. There are clauses which provide for the protection and indemnification of Indian tribes and which require the Columbia Valley Administration to cooperate with the Bureau of Indian Affairs on such matters, and this is a mandate.

I think the bill is a good bill. It has been carefully tailored to fit the peculiar needs of the Columbia River region. If passed it will save the taxpayers from the needless expense inherent in overlapping authority and piece-meal planning.

Paramount to all of these factors is the factor of the national interest. No country is any stronger than its parts.

Economic health in every region is a minimum requisite to prosperity for the whole. Conservative and efficient development of our natural resources, particularly our mineral, agricultural, and energy resources, is the most important single ingredient in the preservation of our national security.

I may say also, Mr. President, that both the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia Valley today have even a much more important part to play in the national interest than ever before. In those two valleys, because of the great abundance of cheap electric power developed there, lies one of the great sources of strength in America. Those two valleys and that cheap electric power are worth more to the defense of the United States than any battleship, tank, or airplane, because in them we have the jump on the world in the development of atomic energy.

Mr. President, good planning such as the proposed law provides is not only necessary to the national health and welfare, it is necessary not only to make our region strong, but it means much also to all the peoples in the world who have hopes that America will keep the peace of the world.

The bill provides for an intelligent preservation of the free enterprise system, which can be attained by giving our people tools with which to work.

Mr. President, I have stated the great objectives of the measure, and they are the great objectives of our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, five editorials on the Columbia Valley Administration bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of April 17, 1949]

COLUMBIA RIVER PROJECT

The weight of logic and common sense seems to be on the side of President Truman's proposal for the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration to unify Federal activities connected with the development and conservation of resources in the Pacific Northwest.

As set forth in his message to Congress, the President's proposal—which is embodied in legislation already introduced in both Houses—does not call for the launching of a gigantic new project. It calls, rather, for the establishment of a special agency, in principle somewhat like the Tennessee Valley Authority, to pull together in a single regional unit the planning and redevelopment work now being carried out in the Columbia River area by such separate Federal organizations as the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

In the President's opinion, this organizational change is necessary, because we have now reached a point where the growing scope and complexity of the Federal activities in the region require much greater integration and the full-time attention of top-level administrators. As he sees the situation, the proposed CVA would constitute an important step forward for several reasons, among them the following: (1) Administratively, it would increase the efficiency of current operations; (2) it would permit closer cooperation with the States and localities concerned and with private groups representing business, agriculture, and labor; and (3) it would open the way to a balanced, continuously developing program designed to make the most of the valley's tremendous potentialities as wisely and rapidly as possible.

Certainly the Pacific Northwest, made up chiefly of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana, is naturally equipped for expanded development of the sort envisioned by the President. The population of the region has increased 37 percent since 1940. More than 40 percent of the Nation's saw timber is located there, together with a number of important minerals, including 60 percent of our known phosphate reserves. Industrially and otherwise, with the Columbia River capable of eventually producing 30,000,000 kilowatts of electric power, the area shows every promise of a future growth that can be of enormous benefit not only to the multiplying numbers of people living there but also to the strength and economic well-being of the country as a whole.

But the promise implicit in the Pacific Northwest can be fulfilled only if the Columbia River is harnessed intelligently for such things as flood control, irrigation, soil and forest conservation, low-cost transportation and the generation of hydroelectric power for expansion in the aluminum, electrochemical, electrometallurgical, atomic, and other industries. In the President's view, the proposed CVA is essential to that end, not simply for the good of the valley region itself but for the good of the Nation at large—a nation whose over-all population is steadily growing and whose future prosperity and security depend on the wise use of the natural resources.

Some objections have already been raised to the CVA idea, but they are vague so far. Unless and until they are spelled out in detail to show just how the establishment of such an agency would be unsound, the President will have by far the better of the argument.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1949]

UNIFICATION ON THE COLUMBIA

Mr. Truman's plan for a Columbia Valley Administration, embodied in his message of Wednesday and represented in legislation introduced in Congress yesterday, is not as controversial as it looks. Mr. Truman, as he says, is not suggesting an expansion of Federal powers or an encroachment on the rights of States, communities, or individuals. Power is already being developed and sold in the Columbia Valley by the Bonneville Power Administration under legislation running back some 14 years. The Truman plan would require the CVA in its sales of electricity to give the customary preferences and priorities to public agencies and cooperatives in disposing of electric energy. There is nothing new in that.

What is new, so far as the Columbia is concerned, is the proposed creation of a regional agency which would represent the Federal Government in that area in various important functions relating to the use and control of Columbia Basin water. This agency would have some resemblance to TVA, but there would be differences created by a different environment. For example, irrigation is important in the Columbia Valley but not in the Tennessee Valley. The underlying principle, however, in both cases is that it is a waste of time and money to have a multitude of Federal agencies with wires running from a river valley into Washington and from Washington back into the river valley. The CVA would be for the Columbia something like what unification is, or ought to be, in the national defense. It would reduce interdepartmental squabbles and jealousies and, as we would hope, get things done.

These points are carefully made in Mr. Truman's message. The watershed of a great river, as he says, demands unified treatment. When the Federal Government comes into that watershed, it should try to deal on a democratic basis with the people living there. It should try to get State and municipal governments to cooperate with it. It should make use of voluntary organizations which have a constructive purpose. It should keep on good terms with every legitimate economic interest. These principles should be self-evident. The reason for unified development by a Federal agency in a watershed is the welfare of the inhabitants of the watershed and the increase of the national wealth.

Opposition to the new plan is bound to come from two sources. There are Federal agencies which may not like to give up their present powers. There are private groups and interests that fear any extension of the public ownership and sale of electric energy. These latter interests doubtless have the greater influence. If they take Mr. Truman's estimate of a possible 30,000,000 kilowatts potentially existent in the Columbia River system, and if they see this enormous block of energy coming under Federal control, they may have reasonable cause for anxiety. All that can be said at the moment on that score is that if such a block of power is to be under one ownership, the owner had better be the Federal Government. It may be possible, of course, to turn some of this energy into private channels of distribution, provided that the distributors are regulated in such a way as to prevent them from exerting an undemocratic influence over the people of the region. Certainly if we have faith in private enterprise, we must want to see as much of it as possible in the Columbia Valley and everywhere else.

The whole problem, which includes not only power but flood control, irrigation, navigation, and the systematic development of an underdeveloped region, does require an over-all plan. This plan need not be, and we hope never will be, comparable with the 5-year plans and 10-year plans of the autocratic nations. It should rather be a constantly changing program in which all concerned will have a voice.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian of April 15, 1949]

WHAT KIND OF A CVA?

On the Tennessee River and its tributaries, the Tennessee Valley Authority has developed about 2,300,000 kilowatts of generating power, which is not far from the maximum the river can produce. Not more than 400,000 kilowatts remain, and this capacity is more or less questionable.

Meanwhile, on the Columbia River—the principal power stream of the Nation—the Government dams, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, have a capacity of approximately 1,600,000 kilowatts, while the total potential is in the neighborhood of 12,000,000.

Thus the Tennessee is producing half again as much power as the Columbia, though the Columbia has close to five times the capacity of the Tennessee.

And every reader of the Oregonian, and every resident of the Pacific Northwest, in mulling over this disparity, should take into consideration some very important facts. Our part of the country has undergone a great growth of population as a result of the war and its aftermath. The Bureau of Census estimates indicate Oregon is up from 1,088,284 in 1940 to 1,626,000 on July 1, 1948, with Washington up from 1,719,143 to 2,487,000. And lumber, which has been our chief industrial resource up to the present, cannot indefinitely bear the burden. We are up against the problem of supporting the population which is upon us, and the one obvious unexhausted resource which could ease the crisis lies in those undeveloped kilowatts.

We must have them for our own economic safety. And we should have them for the military safety of the Nation. The late war brought out the national dependency upon great power pools, and now atomic-energy production vastly increases the need.

All of which is preliminary to saying, on the occasion of President Truman's message to Congress and the submission of new CVA bills, that the time seems to have come when this area must recognize the necessity of unifying the several Federal agencies which up to this time have shared in the development of the river.

The identical bills introduced in the House by Representatives MITCHELL and JACKSON, Washington Democrats, and in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON, Washington Democrat, are not the automatic answer. First reactions from the two Houses are that they go so far in repeating the TVA pattern in an area which does not need this pattern, that little chance exists of adoption in the present session of Congress. It is true, the bills as they are introduced meet the problem of unification, which we believe all thinking persons acknowledge must be met, but they go so much beyond mere unification as to require complete scrutiny and probably radical amendment.

If this turns out to be the case—and the Oregonian has not yet had an opportunity to study the bills—we find it a matter for regret. It would be much better to have legislation which pooled Federal activities in this area, providing over-all coordination and over-all requests to Congress, and have this adopted promptly, than enter into long argument and delay over legislation involving new powers having to do with planned economy and a so-called supergovernment.

Why can't we have an intelligent and reasonably prompt compromise in the matter? Surely it is clear that the piecemeal system under which the various bureaus and agencies, representing reclamation, Bonneville, fisheries, and all the others, present their cases to Congress, is holding back the potential of our region. And surely it is equally clear that a fight to the finish is certain before the plan devised for the backward Tennessee Valley can be imposed upon the highly developed economy and society of the Columbia region.

Between the extremes there is a proper meeting of minds, and that would appear to us to involve bringing under one head—under one board, predominantly Northwest in its character—the present powers and activities scattered among the bureaus.

Then this board could go to Congress and say such and such is what we need. That would make possible the rapid and uncontroversial development of the Columbia River under authorization of Congress, in accordance with the requirements of the area and the Nation. It would meet the problem of our Northwest and at the same time not make us, against our will, an experiment in Federal planning.

In summary: We could have coordination of present Federal powers in this region, and promptly, without subjecting this region to new and controversial Federal powers.

A CVA is needed. It is needed now. But the TVA pattern is not ordained.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1949]

THE CVA PROPOSAL

President Truman has made an excellent case for creation of a Columbia Valley Administration to develop power, irrigation, and flood control in the Pacific Northwest States.

The project, in many respects, would resemble the Tennessee Valley Authority, but with important differences.

Whereas TVA started almost from scratch, two huge dams—Grand Coulee in Washington and Bonneville in Oregon—already have been built on the Columbia. They have been major factors in the rapid growth of population, industry and agriculture in the region. Mr. Truman believes that the river's present output of electric power can be multiplied 10 times by future construction of other dams.

At present, development of the Columbia is being directed by field representatives of various Federal agencies, headquartered in Washington. The proposed CVA, taking over the work these agencies are doing, would have its headquarters in the Columbia Valley, easily accessible to the people who live there. It would be accountable to President and Congress, but could keep closely in touch with the wants and needs of the region it serves—a principle which has worked well in the case of TVA.

The CVA, under Mr. Truman's proposal, would not be given control of Federal programs for soil and forest conservation, mineral explorations and development, fish and wildlife conservation and the like. It would, however, be held responsible for helping to plan and coordinate such programs.

Among United States rivers, the Columbia ranks second only to the Mississippi in the volume of water carried to the sea. It is one of our greatest natural resources. Congress should give earnest consideration to the President's plan for its better development.

[From the Washington Post of April 18, 1949]

VALLEY TYPE

President Truman has resolved several sets of dilemmas in his program for a Columbia Valley Administration. First, he has recognized the principle that in any undertaking so vast, and involving such tremendous expenditures of public funds, direction by the Federal Government must be paramount. Second, he has accepted the valley type of authority, decentralized in the region, as the proper vehicle to administer the development.

Actually the President's proposal, encompassed in bills introduced in Congress last Thursday, is not so sweeping as it seems. What it does is to merge the separate and sometimes conflicting activities of the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Columbia Valley—something the Hoover Commission has recommended for the country as a whole. Certainly the elimination of divergencies and duplications between Federal agencies themselves is an important step forward. The President made the case for integration when he said:

A great deal needs to be done to bring the land, forest and mineral activities of the Federal Government into step with the water development program. It is questionable economy to spend millions of dollars for dams as part of a flood-control scheme, unless at the same time we are doing all we can in the way of forest and soil conservation and rehabilitation so that floods will be minimized rather than aggravated.

To insure that there will be no paralyzing conflicts with other Federal agencies dealing with natural resources, the Columbia Valley Administration would be vested with final responsibility for carrying out soil conservation, watershed protection and the like within the area. Cooperation of the other agencies would be sought in multiple-purpose, unified development plans. But if these bureaus should not concur, or if their funds should be insufficient, then the CVA could go ahead on its own. This seems to us a practical method of providing in the Columbia Valley the continuity of resource treatment that the country as a whole still lacks. It is an improvement over the situation in the Tennessee Valley, where the TVA and the Soil Conservation Service have been feuding.

In several other aspects the CVA proposal differs from the TVA, and the differences show a healthy adaptation to the particular needs of the Pacific Northwest. The CVA would be concerned with irrigation, applying the same principles in effect on reclamation lands elsewhere. Also, the scope of its power development activities would be far greater than TVA's. Existing power facilities in the Columbia Valley are greater than the total TVA development, and the goal is to increase these tenfold to a level of 30,000,000 kilowatts.

On this score private power interests already have attacked the CVA plan with cries of "socialism." Actually, however, the principle of Federal power development is well established. Indeed, without the Bonneville Dam, the Hanford (Wash.) atomic energy project would have been impossible. The plain fact is that there is a shortage of power in the Northwest. The CVA plan permits of distribution through private as well as public channels, and in reality more power in the area should prove a boon to the expansion of private enterprise.

Some further concessions to local representation might have been made in the CVA proposal without impairing ultimate Federal authority. The important thing, however, is to tie together the divergent programs now operating in the Columbia Valley, and in this the CVA project makes a good start. The optimum development of the natural resources of any area is properly the concern of all the people of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a group of questions and answers on the Columbia Valley Administration bill and a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the questions and answers and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION BILL

Question. What is the purpose of the bill?

Answer. The proposed bill is a reorganization bill designed to get a job done faster, cheaper, and more efficiently. It provides for the coordination by a single agency of the resources development activities now exercised by various Federal agencies operating in the Columbia Valley region. It provides for locating that single agency in the Pacific Northwest, where the work is to be done, instead of in Washington, D. C.

Question. Does the bill provide for new Federal functions in the Pacific Northwest?

Answer. No. The bill definitely does not add any functions not now authorized by Congress and not now exercised by Federal agencies in the region. It is a reorganization act.

Question. What agency will carry out the purpose of the bill?

Answer. A new agency called the Columbia Valley Administration (CVA), which is established by the bill.

Question. Will CVA delay plans already made or proposed by existing Federal agencies?

Answer. No. The CVA will carry on existing work without delay. It is required to consider all plans, and to harmonize them into over-all plans.

Question. Can the proposed CVA be compared with TVA?

Answer. The proposed CVA has the same goal as the TVA: The full and unified conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the respective regions. TVA and CVA both provide for coordination of Federal operations and both provide for a complete decentralization of these functions away from Washington and in the respective regions. The CVA proposal, however, is not as all-embracing as the TVA. The CVA bill is tailored specifically to suit

the particular situation in the Columbia Valley, which differs in many respects from the Tennessee Valley.

Question. What will be the specific functions of the CVA?

Answer. The Administration will be responsible for the preparation of unified programs for the conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest. These programs will cover irrigation, flood control, electric power, commercial and sport fish and wildlife protection, recreation, mineral exploration and development, soil and forest and range conservation, pollution control, and related functions.

Question. How will the CVA carry out these functions?

Answer. The bill directs the Administration to set forth in these unified programs the major projects and activities which the Administration proposes to undertake, those which it recommends be undertaken by the Federal agencies, and those which State, local, and other agencies propose to undertake. CVA then recommends these programs to the President and to the Congress for their use in guiding and coordinating the resources activities of all the Federal agencies in the Columbia Valley region. For the first time, it will provide for a duly authorized over-all plan of development, as contrasted with the present often competitive patchwork of individual plans prepared by individual agencies.

Question. Will the CVA take over, lock, stock, and barrel, all the resources functions of existing Federal agencies?

Answer. No. The bill provides only for the transfer to the Administration of (1) Pacific Northwest operations of the Bureau of Reclamation (U. S. Department of the Interior), (2) Bonneville Power Administration (U. S. Department of the Interior), and (3) Pacific Northwest operations of the Corps of Engineers (U. S. Department of the Army), with the exception of the engineers' channel and harbor improvement work in tidal waters.

Question. Will the functions of the United States Forest Service, United States Soil Conservation Service, United States Bureau of Mines, United States National Park Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and other Federal agencies be taken over by the CVA?

Answer. No.

Question. What arrangements are made for cooperation between CVA and other agencies?

Answer. The Administration is authorized and, as a matter of fact, may be required by the President, to conduct any of its activities through or in cooperation with other Federal agencies. The same applies to the conduct of activities through or in cooperation with State and local governmental units, educational and scientific institutions, and other private or public bodies.

Question. Will the activities of the CVA be carried out independently from national policies?

Answer. No. The bill provides for the effective coordination of Federal activities in the region with related national policies.

Question. How is the CVA to be administered?

Answer. The CVA will be established with its principal office located in the Columbia Valley region. It will be governed by a board of directors to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least two of the three directors will be bona fide residents of the Columbia Valley region and each director will be required to maintain residence in the region. The terms of office for the directors will be 6 years but with their terms so staggered that vacancies will occur every 2 years.

Question. Will the people of the region and their local agencies have a voice in the management of the CVA?

Answer. Yes, a large voice. The bill provides, in several places, for a strong degree of "home rule." The bill specifically enunciates the policy that the CVA shall seek and rely upon the advice and assistance of and shall cooperate with the people of the region, their State and local governments, and their public and private organizations.

Question. How will the CVA work with local people and agencies?

Answer. The bill specifically directs the administration to arrange for consultation and interchange of views with appropriate representatives of State and local government units, agriculture, labor, and business interests, as well as the general public. The bill also makes it mandatory for the administration to establish advisory boards and councils. The bill provides that these boards and councils may make their own reports on the operation of the administration, which must be included in the annual reports of the administration to the Congress and the President.

Question. What area is to be covered by the CVA?

Answer. The CVA will operate in the Pacific Northwest region. The bill describes the territory to be covered as that portion of the Columbia River and its tributaries and watershed which is within the United States. Therefore, it includes nearly all of Oregon (except the Klamath River and Goose Lake basins), all of Washington, all of Idaho, the western part of Montana, and small portions of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

Question. What about the watershed of the Columbia in British Columbia?

Answer. The bill makes it mandatory that the administration cooperate with Canada so that the development and conservation of the entire region, both in the United States and in Canada, may be harmonized at all steps.

Question. What effect will the bill have on water rights?

Answer. The bill specifically declares that existing water rights will be protected and that future rights will be acquired in accordance with the provisions of State laws and of the Reclamation Act of 1902.

Question. What recognition does the bill give to the doctrine of beneficial consumptive use of water?

Answer. The bill not only recognizes this doctrine but also enumerates certain preferred purposes for which water of the Columbia Valley region may be used.

Question. What will the CVA do for irrigation and reclamation of lands?

Answer. The bill specifically authorizes the Administration to construct and operate projects for the reclamation of lands in the region. It specifically directs that such work will be carried out in accordance with the policies prescribed in existing Federal Reclamation laws.

Question. Can the CVA condemn land for reclamation?

Answer. No. The bill specifies that in connection with reclamation projects, the Administration may not acquire land by condemnation.

Question. What about veterans' preference for reclamation lands?

Answer. In accordance with existing Federal laws, preference will be given to veterans desiring to settle on reclaimed land acquired by the Administration.

Question. What will the CVA do about fish?

Answer. Specific attention is called in the bill to the important problem of migratory and other fish in the Columbia Valley region. The bill specifically states that in the location, design, and construction of any facility, the Administration must endeavor to foster, protect, and facilitate the access of anadromous fish to and from their spawning areas throughout the Columbia Valley region.

Question. Does the bill change any existing Federal power policies?

Answer. No. The Administration is authorized to dispose of surplus electric energy, at wholesale, under policies already well established in existing Federal legislation. These policies established by law include the construction of transmission systems so as to encourage widest possible use of electric energy at lowest possible rates to consumers, to provide adequate markets and outlets for them, and to prevent monopolization by limited groups. They also include provisions for priorities of sales to public power bodies and cooperatives, for regulation of resale rates, and for power supplies for essential national defense requirements.

Question. Does the bill permit the CVA to condemn electric utility systems?

Answer. No. The bill specifically does not authorize the Administration to condemn electric utility systems. However, it does authorize the Administration to acquire such systems for resale to public bodies and cooperatives in order to aid in the disposition of surplus power and to accord preference and priorities to public and cooperative agencies as now stipulated by existing Federal laws.

Question. To what extent will the CVA affect Indian lands?

Answer. The activities of the Administration extend to Indian lands to the same extent as to other lands. However, special provisions are made to fulfill the Government's obligations as trustees for the Indians where Indian lands are affected by the Administration's activities.

Question. What about wage scales for construction labor?

Answer. The bill specifies that prevailing rates of wages must be paid by construction contractors in accordance with the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act, applicable generally to Government construction contractors.

Question. Will the CVA bargain collectively with its employees?

Answer. Yes. The bill authorizes the CVA "to deal collectively with its employees through representatives of their own choosing."

Question. Can CVA jobs be given to political appointees?

Answer. No. The Administration would be prohibited from using political tests or qualifications for employment or promotion, which must be made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

Question. Will CVA employees be protected in their jobs?

Answer. Yes. They will have the same protection as civil-service employees of the Federal Government in regard to tenure, injuries while on duty, pensions upon retirement.

Question. What about local and State property taxes?

Answer. The Administration is specifically directed to make payments in lieu of State and local property taxes to State and local taxing units.

Question. On what basis will the Administration make payments in lieu of taxes?

Answer. In general, the bill provides for payments which will compensate State or local taxing units for any loss of tax revenues resulting by virtue of the Administration's acquisition of property. In addition, however, other payments may be made to State or local Governments to defray expenses of any special requirements for State and local government services resulting from the Administration's activities.

Question. In what manner will the CVA carry out its construction work?

Answer. The Administration is specifically directed to carry out construction work by contract with private contractors. It may also undertake construction work directly under certain limited, usually emergency, conditions.

Question. Will it be possible for the CVA to start any kind of construction program without approval of the Congress?

Answer. No. The bill specifically restricts the Administration. For example, it may not initiate construction on any major water control or electric generating project, major transmission line, or any new major type of construction generally authorized by the bill, unless the Congress specifically approves such projects or activities.

Question. What control will Congress have upon the construction activities of the CVA?

Answer. Congress must approve the projects to be submitted annually by the Administration, and will pass upon its annual budgets.

Question. Will the CVA be able to complete projects in the most efficient manner, once they are started?

Answer. The bill provides arrangements whereby, once initial construction is authorized by Congress, the Administration will have full contract authority to assure completion of such projects in accordance with most economical and expeditious construction schedules.

Question. What about allocation of cost of construction, and of operation and maintenance under the bill?

Answer. No changes in accepted Federal practices in cost allocation are indicated in this bill. The Administration will be required to allocate these costs among the various purposes served by the facilities to be constructed, acquired, operated, and maintained. Costs of water-control projects, however, may be allocated among only certain specified purposes.

Question. What control will there be on the allocation of costs?

Answer. The allocation by the CVA of construction costs as well as periods and rates of depreciation and of amortization of repayment will not become final until approved by the President. As indicated above, these allocations will be determined in accord with accepted Federal practices.

Question. Will Congress have anything to say on allocation of costs?

Answer. Yes. The bill specifically directs the Administration to submit to the President for transmission to the Congress, statements of the allocation of construction costs, and depreciation and amortization schedules. The first statement will be submitted within 5 years from the date of enactment of the Columbia Valley Administration law. Thereafter statements are to be filed annually.

Question. Will the CVA maintain complete and accurate books of account?

Answer. Yes. The Administration is specifically directed at all times to maintain complete and accurate books of account. Those which relate to power are to be kept in the manner provided by the Federal Power Act.

Question. What other control acts will be applicable on a CVA?

Answer. The Government Corporation Control Act. CVA transactions and operations shall be subject to the controls provided in that Act.

Question. Will the CVA be authorized to undertake research work?

Answer. Yes. The Administration is authorized to conduct economic, scientific, and technological investigations, to operate research facilities and to undertake experiments and practical demonstrations. However, the bill also directs the Administration to carry out such work as far as practicable in cooperation with existing Federal, State, local, and private agencies, including educational institutions.

Question. How will the funds of the CVA be administered?

Answer. The bill provides for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration fund in the United States Treasury. This will contain amounts appropriated by Congress, amounts paid into the fund by the Administration from its revenue-producing activities and any amounts transferred to the Administration with transfer of the functions of the Corps of Engineers, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation under the terms of this bill.

Question. How will the CVA fund in the Treasury be utilized?

Answer. The bill provides that advances may be made by the Treasury to the Administration from this fund to meet construction and operating costs in connection with revenue-producing activities.

Question. Will the CVA fund in the Treasury permit the Administration to undertake any type of program?

Answer. No. First of all, Congress retains full rights to approve or disapprove suggested programs by the Administration. Furthermore the costs of projects and activities for which advances are not authorized can be met only by specific approval by Congress. These could be made only after the inclusion of such estimates in the Administration's annual program and its review by the President and the Congress.

Question. Will the CVA be able to utilize receipts from its power, sales, water revenues, etc.?

Answer. Receipts derived from revenue-producing activities may be used for the payment of costs incurred in carrying out such activities. However, any receipts in excess of these necessary for the Administration's working capital requirements must be repaid into the CVA fund.

Question. Will advances from the CVA fund be repaid?

Answer. Yes. Advances from this fund to pay costs allocated to revenue-producing projects must be fully repaid to the fund. In addition, interests on all such advances will have to be repaid with the exception of those used to pay costs allocated to irrigation in accordance with the reclamation laws.

Question. What about the interest rates?

Answer. All interest rates are to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to a prescribed formula. Existing laws relating to Federal investment in power and water facilities are not changed, but are adopted on a region-wide basis.

Section-by-Section Analysis of Columbia Valley Administration Bill

PURPOSE OF THE BILL—SECTION 1

The proposed bill will reorganize and consolidate certain functions now performed by various Federal agencies in the Columbia Valley region, by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration "to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands."

Section 1 also provides that the act may be cited as the "Columbia Valley Administration Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY—SECTION 2

Section 2 declares the policy of the act to be to assist "in achieving the full and unified conservation, development and use of the—natural resources of the region, for the purpose of fostering and protecting commerce among the several States, strengthening the national defense, developing the lands and preserving the property of the United States, and promoting the general welfare."

Section 2 also describes the region affected by the act, namely that portion of the Columbia River, its tributaries and watershed, which is within the boundaries of the United States, and those portions of the States of Washington and Oregon (except the Klamath River and Goose Lake Basins) which are not within the Columbia River watershed. The region thus includes all of the State of Washington, most of Oregon and Idaho, western Montana and portions of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

In carrying out this policy:

The Federal activities in the region shall be effectively coordinated with related national policies.

The advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region and their public and private organizations must be sought and relied upon "to the fullest practicable extent."

The cooperation of the Canadians must be sought so that the development and conservation of the natural resources of the region and adjacent areas in Canada may be integrated.

The doctrine of beneficial consumptive use of water is recognized and there are enumerated certain preferred purposes for which waters of the Columbia Valley region shall be used.

CREATES "COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION"—VENUE AND REMOVAL OF SUITS—SECTION 3

Section 3 establishes the Columbia Valley Administration as a Federal instrumentality, with its principal offices located at a convenient place in the Columbia Valley region.

The Administration would be an inhabitant of any Federal judicial district, wholly or partly in the region, in which it carries on activities, for purposes of commencing suit for or against it. Proceedings against the Administration in any State court may be removed by the Administration to the district court of the United States for the district in which the proceeding is pending.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS—SECTION 4

Management of the Administration is vested in a board of three full-time directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least two of the directors must be bona fide residents of the Columbia Valley region at the time of appointment, and each director is required to maintain his residence in the region. The Board must appoint a single chief executive officer.

Terms of office for directors are set at 6 years, with terms of initial directors so staggered that one term will expire each 2 years.

The section provides for vacancies in the Board, the salary of Board members, and prohibits a Board member from engaging in any other business or having a financial interest in any public utility company engaged in the power business.

The Board is required to submit an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, in December of each year.

STATE AND LOCAL PARTICIPATION—SECTION 5

The Administration is directed to seek the advice, assistance, and participation of the people of the region and their State and local governments and organizations, public and private, to the fullest practicable extent, in carrying out the purposes of the act. The Administration must make arrangements for consultation and interchange of views with appropriate representatives of State and local governments and agriculture (including irrigation and reclamation), labor and business interests, as well as the general public, relating to all phases of its activities, and must establish such advisory boards and councils (including as a minimum boards or councils concerned with irrigation and reclamation, power, fishery resources, and navigation) as may be necessary or appropriate to achieve the objectives stated in this section. Any comments which such boards and councils submit for

the purpose must be included in the annual reports of the Administration.

GENERALS POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION—SECTION 6

This section sets forth the general powers of the corporation, including the housekeeping power, e. g., the right of the Administration to sue and be sued in its own name.

Subject to the policies, conditions, and limitations stated in the act, the Administration is authorized to construct and operate projects and carry out activities necessary for the promotion of navigation (except for channel and harbor improvement work in tidal waters tributary to the Pacific Ocean), for the control and prevention of floods, for the conservation and reclamation of lands and land resources, for the development and conservation of forests, mineral, and fish and wildlife resources, and for the generation, transmission, and disposition of electric energy at wholesale. In connection with any of the foregoing, the Administration may also provide for the development and conservation of the recreational resources and the promotion of sanitation and pollution control.

In the location, design, and construction of any facility the Administration must endeavor to foster, protect, and facilitate the access of all anadromous fish to and from their spawning areas throughout the Columbia Valley region.

To the extent found necessary in carrying out these responsibilities, but subject to certain explicit conditions and limitations, the Administration is authorized to appoint personnel, acquire and dispose of property, conduct studies and research, and carry on other necessary activities.

With respect to the acquisition of property the Administration is given the same right of condemnation now exercised by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, but the Administration is further limited by a provision that it cannot condemn any water right unless it is appurtenant to land acquired incident to the construction of dams, reservoirs, or other facilities.

The Administration is prohibited from using political tests or qualifications for employment or promotion; and employees will have the same protection in their jobs as Federal civil service employees. Provision is also made for collective bargaining agreements with the Administration's employees.

The Administration is directed to carry out its construction work by contract so far as practicable, but may undertake construction work directly under certain limited conditions.

The Administration is authorized, and may be required by the President, to conduct any of its activities through or in cooperation with other Federal agencies. It also is authorized to conduct its activities through or in cooperation with States and local governmental agencies, educational, and scientific institutions, or other bodies or agencies, public or private. It also is authorized to use its funds in connection with such joint and cooperative arrangements.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL PLANS AND PROGRAMS FOR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT — REGIONAL BUDGET—SECTION 7

The Administration is made responsible for preparing multiple-purpose and unified plans and programs for the conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the region. These plans and programs would be prepared for the use of the President and the Congress in guiding and controlling the nature, extent, and sequence of Federal activities in the Columbia Valley region and in coordinating such activities with related national policies and programs.

In preparing such plans and programs, the Administration is required to consider existing surveys and plans and to obtain the advice and assistance of appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, educational institutions, and private organizations and persons.

Such plans and programs shall cover irrigation, navigation, flood control, electric power, commercial and sport fish and wildlife protection, soil and forest and range conservation, mineral exploration and development, pollution control, and recreation. The plans must set forth the major projects and activities recommended and the method by which such projects and activities would be undertaken, including arrangements for joint and cooperative action by the Administration, other Federal agencies, and State, local, and other agencies. The plans and programs must also include evidence that each major project or activity is economically sound and in the public interest.

The Administration is directed to prepare, in cooperation with other Federal agencies concerned, and submit annually to the President in connection with its budget program, a statement of the anticipated program for the conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the region by the Administration and other Federal agencies concerned with those activities.

TRANSFER OF PROJECTS, PROPERTY, AND FUNCTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATION—SECTION 8

This section provides for the transfer to the Administration of the properties, projects, and functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, and, except for channel and harbor improvement work in tidal waters tributary to the Pacific Ocean, of the civil works projects and activities of the Corps of Engineers within the Columbia Valley region. No other transfers of properties, projects, and functions are made by the act.

DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY—SECTION 9

The Administration is authorized to dispose of surplus electric energy, at wholesale, under policies established by existing Federal legislation, such as the Bonneville Project Act, under which the Bonneville Power Administration operates. These policies include the construction of necessary transmission facilities, the encouragement of the widest possible use of available electric energy at the lowest possible rates to consumers, particularly domestic and rural consumers, and the granting of preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives in the disposition of electric energy.

The section sets forth minimum requirements for rate schedules. To aid in the disposition of the surplus power of the Administration and to give effect to the preference accorded to public and cooperative agencies in the purchase of such power, the Administration is authorized to acquire, although not by condemnation, electric utility systems, and is directed to dispose of any distribution facilities so acquired, to public bodies and cooperatives, as rapidly as possible.

RECLAMATION PROVISIONS—SECTION 10

The Administration is authorized to construct and operate projects for the reclamation of lands in the region. Such work will be carried out generally in accordance with the policies prescribed in the Federal reclamation laws, such as the limitation of acreage of irrigable land, and the periods and manner of repayment by water users organizations.

Existing water rights will be protected and future water rights will be acquired in accordance with the provisions of State law in the same manner as these rights are protected and provided for in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 under which the Bureau of Reclamation has been operating for more than 45 years.

In connection with reclamation projects the Administration may acquire and improve lands for disposition to persons desiring to settle thereon, preference being given to veterans. Lands may not be acquired by condemnation for this purpose.

ALLOCATIONS AND ACCOUNTS—SECTION 11

The Administration is required to allocate the costs of constructing and acquiring and the costs of operating and maintaining all facilities under its management and control among the various purposes served by such facilities. Costs of water-control projects may be allocated among only certain specified purposes.

The allocations of construction costs and the periods and rates of depreciation and of amortization of repayment obligations, which the Administration determines, must be approved by the President before they are effective.

A statement of the allocation of construction costs, and depreciation and amortization schedules, must be submitted to the President for transmission to the Congress within 5 years from the date of enactment of the act. Thereafter a similar statement for additional facilities is to be filed annually.

The Administration must at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account. Accounts with respect to generation, transmission, and disposition of electric energy are to be kept in the manner provided by section 303 of the Federal Power Act.

FINANCING AND REPAYMENT PROVISIONS—SECTION 12

The Government Corporation Control Act is made applicable to the administration and its transactions and operations shall be subject to the controls provided in that act.

In addition, the Administration may not initiate construction of any major water-control or electric-generating project or major transmission line into a new service area or undertake any new major type of activity authorized by the act unless the project or activity has been approved by the Congress in the Administration's budget program. Once the initiation of construction is so authorized, however, arrangements are contemplated whereby the Administration will have contract authority to assure completion of such projects in accordance with the most economical construction schedules.

There is established in the Treasury a Columbia Valley Administration fund consisting of amounts appropriated thereto by the Congress, amounts paid into the fund by the Administration and any amounts transferred to the Administration under section 8. In general, advances from the fund may be made to the Administration to meet construction and operating costs in connection with the revenue-producing activities.

Costs of projects and activities for which advances are not authorized (generally, nonrevenue-producing operations) may be met by appropriations following the inclusion of estimates in the Administration's annual budget program.

Advances from the fund to pay costs allocated to predominantly revenue-producing purposes, such as power, irrigation, and municipal water supply must be fully repaid to the fund, together with interest on all such advances with the exception of those used to pay costs allocated to irrigation. The interest rate is to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. Existing policies relating to repayment of Federal investment in power and water facilities are adopted on a region-wide basis.

Receipts derived from revenue-producing activities may be used for the payment of the costs incurred in connection with such activities. However, receipts in excess of those necessary for the Administration's working capital requirements must be paid into the Columbia Valley Administration fund.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES—SECTION 13

The Administration is directed to make payments in lieu of State and local property taxes to States and local taxing units pursuant to the formulas established by this section. In general, the payments are designed to make the State or local taxing unit whole for any loss of tax revenues resulting from the Administration's acquisition of property. Additional payments may be made to State or local governments to help defray the expense of any special requirements for State and local government services arising from the Administration's activities.

PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES—SECTION 14

This section provides for purchases and contracts for supplies or services, except for personal services, on a competitive-bidding basis, with certain minor exceptions, consistent with general Federal policy.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL PROVISIONS—SECTION 15

This section provides for miscellaneous personnel matters including compensation for employees suffering injury, social-security benefits for employees not covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act, and unemployment-compensation benefits, to the extent permitted by State laws, for a portion of the administration's employees, chiefly laborers, mechanics, and workmen engaged in construction work or operation and maintenance of the Administration's properties and facilities.

Construction contractors must pay prevailing rates of wages in accordance with the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act, applicable generally to Government construction contracts.

INDIAN LANDS—SECTION 16

The general authority of the Administration extends to Indian lands to the same extent as to other lands. However, special provision is made to fulfill the Government's obligations as trustee for any Indians where Indian lands are affected by the Administration's activities.

SECTIONS 17, 18, 19

These sections cover repealer and savings provisions, separability, and the construction of the act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], in his address on the bill which he has just introduced for the establishment of the Columbia Valley Authority, made a number of references to the TVA. I was delighted to hear him make those references. As one who has lived close to the TVA from its very beginning, one who has watched its development and its growth day by day and year after year, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that he was absolutely correct in stating that the Columbia Valley Authority would not be a local project, but a development for the whole Nation.

The Senator from Washington is proposing a great enterprise, which will redound not only to the benefit of the great Pacific Northwest, but will redound to the benefit of the people in all the States of the United States. I have seen the TVA since its establishment serve the interests and the needs of the entire country. Before TVA the Nation as a whole had to pay a big flood bill every year because of the floods on the Tennessee River. Today the people of the Nation are relieved of the cost of floods on that river. The country saves each year a bill of $11,000,000 because of the flood-control benefits of the TVA.

The people of the entire Nation suffered because of the low income of the people of the Tennessee Valley. The people of the entire Nation felt the impact of the smaller crop output in the Tennessee Valley because of the depleted soils there. The low income of the valley meant less business for the rest of the country, in the way goods, products, and commodities bought by the people of the valley.

Today, thanks to the TVA, the valley is a new region, a much richer region, a far more developed region.

It is interesting to note that in addition to the flood-control benefits in the Tennessee Valley the farmers on 6,000,000 acres of ground outside the Tennessee Valley, farmers living along the Ohio River and in the Mississippi Basin, have their crops protected by dams built hundreds of miles away on the Tennessee and its tributaries.

The electric power produced since TVA was first established has increased more than tenfold. Because of this production of electric power we have seen a striking impetus to industrial development not only in the valley but throughout the United States. Last year the people of the Tennessee Valley bought from States outside the valley more than $50,000,000 worth of electrical appliances. If we had not had this development through the TVA the $50,000,000 worth of business for companies and business concerns outside the valley would not have been possible.

The aluminum, the chemicals, the textiles, the ferro-alloys, and the many other commodities produced in that valley go to plants throughout the United States for further processing. This processing provides jobs and profits and income in manufacturing plants in other States.

I recall that a year ago testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that the aluminum produced by the Aluminum Co. of America in the Tennessee Valley goes into all the other 47 States for other processing or other work to be done. So, just as a river having its headwaters in one State may flow down through many States, carrying its benefits and its blessings to all the people of those States, so the benefits and the blessings of TVA are not limited to the Tennessee Valley. They flow out into all the States. I will say to the Senator from Washington, as he so well knows and as he so well stated the other day, that if we develop the Columbia Valley Authority the benefits and blessings from that great development will inure to the growth, the prosperity, and the strength of the whole United States.

The Senator from Washington referred to the fact that today some 29,000,000 kilowatts of water power on the Columbia River remain to be converted into electric power. Today all this tremendous power is going wastefully down to the sea. It is waiting for us to be wise enough and frugal enough and far-seeing enough to harness it and put it to work for all the people of the United States and for the greater strength and greater security of our Nation.

Surely we will be lax, we will fail to meet our responsibilities, if we permit this enormous waste to continue.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] well and properly asked the question as to the kind of development proposed, having in mind the thought of a central authority or perhaps more diverse and different authorities. The experience in the Tennessee Valley has demonstrated that for the maximum benefits, for the greatest and widest and best development, we must have an over-all administration—an over-all administration seeking to bring about an integrated development through the greatest use of the initiative, the energies, and the wisdom of the local communities and their people. That is what the TVA has demonstrated, Mr. President. It has demonstrated that we can use Federal power and Federal funds to give leadership, guidance, and financial assistance for the development of a great region, and at the same time do the job primarily and basically through the local grass-roots instrumentalities.

This is exactly what the CVA bill proposes: There must be integrated plans. There must be integrated action. But in securing that integrated action we do not surrender in any way our local authority or our local action.

Mr. President, I simply rose to commend the Senator from Washington on the introduction of the bill and to say to him that the path blazed by TVA has demonstrated how timely and how wise is the legislation introduced by him.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with reference to the development of our great river valley systems. I am deeply interested in this matter because of the situation existing in my own State of Montana. Montana is divided between two great river basin systems. In the west we are in the Columbia Valley system, and in the east we are a part of the Missouri Valley system. So we are greatly interested in these programs for the development of these river valley systems.

Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the Columbia Valley Administration bill, which has just been presented and explained by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I desire briefly to comment on this program as it relates to my State.

A large part of western Montana is comprised in the Columbia Valley Basin, and the people of my State are deeply interested in this undertaking. The State of Montana, though blessed with enormous natural resources, has been marking time in its economic development, largely through lack of any well coordinated plan of resource development. This great need will now be met through the Columbia Valley Administration program.

The area in Montana west of the Continental Divide is one of the greatest underdeveloped regions of the United

States. Covering some 25,000 square miles, it has a population of slightly over 120,000 people, or less than 5 per square mile. Most of this population is concentrated in fertile valleys: The Flathead, the Bitterroot, the Clark Fork, the Kootenai.

A large portion of western Montana is mountainous. To the east are the ramparts of the Continental Divide; to the south and to the west, the Bitterroots. In the valleys are rich farm lands devoted to the raising of livestock, alfalfa, sugar beets, potatoes, and small grains and corn, small fruits and vegetables. Irrigation is of primary importance to the stability of agriculture in these sections. A large part of the total area is timbered with forests of saw-timber size. The forest industry is concentrated in the Missoula, Libby, and Kalispell areas. Mineral-wise, aside from copper which has been highly developed, the area is largely undeveloped. Gold, silver, lead, zinc and copper, and manganese offer great opportunities. Overshadowing all these minerals at this time are the phosphate deposits of the Garrison-Phillipsburg fields—a part of the great western phosphate reserves. The development of these deposits will provide a huge and prosperous industry which will check our present dwindling population.

This region has never lived up to its great development potentials. In 1940, 50 percent of employed workers were in trades and services; 17 percent were in agriculture; 18.5 percent in mining and nonferrous metals industries; 6 percent in forest and forest industries; 4½ percent in construction, and only 4 percent in food and kindred products and manufacturing.

This general lack of development and consequent opportunities for secure livelihood have been reflected in a very small rate of population increase in western Montana, and a definite loss in the State as a whole. Population is now below the 1940 peak in the western part, and in the State as a whole there has been a 12-percent loss of population.

The extent to which resources in western Montana are undeveloped is dramatically demonstrated by considering its hydroelectric power potentials. Today, less than 100,000 kilowatts of installed capacity have been developed. This does not include Hungry Horse Dam, on which construction is starting. Recent estimates indicate that as much as 3,000,000 kilowatts could be installed at such proposed dam sites as Hungry Horse, Libby, Glacier View or Paradise, Canyon Creek, Coram, Ninemile Prarie, Quart Creek, Trout Creek, Noxon Rapids, and Cabinet Gorge. The last dam is actually one-half mile across the Montana-Idaho border.

Inasmuch as power capacity and consumption go hand in hand with industrial and economic development, on this one score alone western Montana cannot be expected to fulfill the promise of its resources until its power potentials are more adequately developed. It will therefore be necessary to accelerate the construction of such projects as Hungry Horse and Libby to make up for this critical deficiency. It will be necessary to build high-capacity transmission lines to bring the power to those centers where the electrical energy can be utilized to process western Montana's forest, agricultural, and mineral resources, thereby stimulating the development of pay rolls in the area.

In conjunction with some of the power developments, abundant water can be provided for new irrigation acreage and for supplemental irrigation. There are at least 150,000 acres in western Montana which could thus be profitably brought into new and better production. Power will help pay for this development and will make it possible to use sprinkler irrigation to a larger extent than now practicable.

Of course, the major ultimate use for hydroelectric power yet to be developed will undoubtedly be found in electroprocess industries based on the mineral resources of the area. Most immediately apparent are the potentials of western Montana's phosphate deposits. These are thought to be particularly amenable to treatment into phosphorus chemicals and phosphate fertilizer by means of the electric furnace. However, their utilization has been held back in large measure by the lack of large blocks of low-cost hydroelectric power in proximity to the deposits.

I have already mentioned the manganese and chrome resources of western Montana; there, too, low-cost power in large blocks will permit their use in chemicals and in specialized types of ferro-alloys. There are undoubtedly other minerals which could be processed by electric power, but our state of knowledge is very meager; western Montana has been most inadequately explored from a geological and mineral point of view.

Today we find many Federal agencies active in various developmental activities in western Montana. Splendid as their programs may have been in the past, it is my opinion that the scale and direction of the effort have been wholly inadequate to provide the area with the stimulus of full-scale exploratory and research programs on its resources and with the tools which its citizens need. Actually, it is only during the past 6 years or so that the hydroelectric potentials have received much attention from Federal agencies. Today, however, we find at least two agencies actively vying with one another in the formulation of plans and programs for the full-scale development of the Flathead, Kootenai, and Clark Fork Rivers. Hungry Horse Dam is now under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, but with eventual power sales under the Bonneville Power Administration—both in the Department of the Interior. The Corps of Engineers' Review Report of the Columbia River and Tributaries recommends the immediate construction of Libby Dam on the Kootenai River and recommends consideration of Glacier View Dam. On the other hand, the Department of the Interior opposes Glacier View Dam and, as an alternative, proposes Paradise Dam, which is definitely not recommended by the Corps of Engineers and is opposed by local interests. I call this to the attention of the Senate to show that the conflict in jurisdictions and judgment is already beginning in the first stages of what will be a major resource-development program. Judging from experience elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest, this is only the beginning of what may be expected: how many fish-versus-dam controversies are we to expect in western Montana? How many separate, distinct, and costly investigations are we to expect on every phase of development? To what extent can we expect departmental considerations and Bureau of the Budget reviews to reflect the urgent needs of the area, instead of bureau jurisdictions and absentee judgments in Washington?

Western Montana needs an integrated program of collaborating Federal activities, meshed closely with State and local effort. We need a well-knit program of geological and mineral investigations, closely coordinated with programs of hydroelectric development. We must have a program of water and land development so harmonized that we can secure fullest benefits from flood-control reservoirs without sacrificing fertile acres of land. We must see to it that our forest reserves are utilized to the full, and yet on a sustained-yield basis. Our agriculture will only flourish if soil conservation is practiced, and ample supplies of fertilizer are provided to maintain soil fertility. All these desirable features of development are well recognized Federal functions. What we need is to make sure they are harmonized and meshed together effectively, and that they respond closely at all times with the ideas of local people, and of their local agencies.

I am convinced that the principles involved in the President's message on CVA are plain common sense. And it therefore seems to me that this Congress has an obligation to consider these objectives and to respond to them in a direct manner. To do less will be to deny this western section of the Nation the right to efficient Federal services, and hence the right to develop its potentials. As a Nation, we cannot afford to let any one section of the country languish, particularly one so rich in potential promise.

I therefore express the hope that this proposed legislation will be given early and favorable consideration, to the end that this great program may be carried into effect without delay.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of saying a few words in regard to Senate bill 1070, the housing bill, which is now before the Senate, and which I trust will soon be voted upon.

I make these observations because of certain communications which have come to my office from the mayors of some of the larger cities in the United

States. I have before me a series of telegrams and letters from the mayors of approximately 60 major cities. Each and every one of the telegrams and letters brings to the attention of the Congress the importance of the pending housing legislation. These telegrams and letters further emphasize what the housing legislation will mean to the municipalities and the local communities in terms of better living, sounder finance or tax bases for the communities, and a better social environment.

Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations in regard to Senate bill 1070.

First I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the policy which will be established when this bill is enacted, and to the national housing objectives as outlined in the bill. I think it very important that we consider the full policy and statement of objectives, rather than confine our attention solely to titles I and II, which refer to slum clearance and to the public-housing features of the bill, respectively.

I read from the statement of policy contained in the bill:

> The policy to be followed in attaining the national housing objective hereby established shall be: (1) private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; (2) governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need; (3) appropriate local public bodies shall be encouraged and assisted to undertake positive programs of encouraging and assisting the development of well-planned, integrated residential neighborhoods, the development and redevelopment of communities, and the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life; (4) governmental assistance to eliminate substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, to facilitate community development and redevelopment, and to provide adequate housing for urban and rural nonfarm families with incomes so low that they are not being decently housed in new or existing housing shall be extended to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs are not being met through reliance solely upon private enterprise, and without such aid; and (5) governmental assistance for decent, safe, and sanitary farm dwellings and related facilities shall be extended where the farm owner demonstrates that he lacks sufficient resources to provide such housing on his own account and is unable to secure necessary credit for such housing from other sources on terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

I mention this, Mr. President, because all too often in the general observations on the bill we are led to believe that it is nothing but a public-housing measure. As a matter of fact, this is a comprehensive bill which applies to all areas of our economic life, and certainly applies to all types of housing.

Further, Mr. President, at this point I wish to place particular stress upon the two titles of the bill: Title I, dealing with slum clearance; and title II, relating to low-cost public housing.

I make reference to these titles because just prior to my service in the Senate of the United States, it was my privilege to serve as mayor of a rather large city of approximately 500,000 persons; and during my service as mayor, I attended the conferences of the American Municipal Association and of the United States Conference of Mayors. I well recall that at each and every one of those annual conventions, as the mayors and other public officials gathered to discuss their mutual problems, the problem which stood foremost before every public official was the great housing problem, which of course was seriously aggravated by the war, and grew in proportion each and every day following the war.

In view of my personal acquaintanceships with a number of the public officials of the country, I took the opportunity to send a telegram to approximately 60 of my friends and acquaintances and associates, as follows:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 11, 1949.*
>
> Senate bill 1070 providing urban redevelopment, public housing, farm housing, and housing research scheduled before Senate this week, probably Wednesday. For use in floor debate, would appreciate wire from you concerning housing shortage in your city and estimated need for low-cost public housing. On basis of your experience, can you give me also statement regarding effect of slum clearance and public housing in your city with reference to health, fire, and police costs, and any information regarding effect on juvenile delinquency. With appreciation.
>
> Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. President, I should like now to read, for the purpose of the RECORD, and also to demonstrate to my former colleagues that their messages to me did not come unnoticed, a few of the telegrams I received in response to the one I sent. For example, I hold in my hand the following telegram from Mr. A. P. Kaufmann, mayor of St. Louis, Mo.:

> ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 14, 1949.*
>
> Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> City administration of St. Louis urges early and favorable action on Senate bill 1070. Our public housing program originally envisioned 12,000 dwelling units. But only 1,100 have been built. Site has been acquired, ground cleared, and legal obstacles removed for another project to house 550 low-income families. Only barrier is lack of Federal funds. Over-all housing situation here still critical. Slum clearance is also mandatory. More than one-third our dwelling units constructed before 1900. City plan commission estimates that our slum and blighted districts cost city $4,000,000 a year. This figure represents difference in cost of various municipal services and tax yield from such districts. From both humanitarian and economic viewpoint slums are bad business. Respectfully refer you to my testimony before joint congressional Committee on Housing, October 24, 1947. What I said then is just as true today.
>
> ALOYS P. KAUFMANN,
> *Mayor.*

Mayor Kaufmann represents a great city, the city of St. Louis. He speaks, as I think most municipal officials do, with a close and intimate knowledge of the needs of his people.

I also have before me a telegram from Clarence G. Miles, mayor of Lincoln, Nebr. I think his is an interesting observation, because Nebraska is considered to be one of the rural Midwestern States:

> LINCOLN, NEBR., *April 14, 1949.*
>
> Senator H. H. HUMPHREY,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Replying to your telegram of April 11 regarding public housing. Local housing authority of Lincoln has applied for 700 low-rent public units. 1940 census showed 7,000 substandard dwellings in Lincoln. A housing shortage exists here particularly in middle-class income bracket.
>
> CLARENCE G. MILES,
> *Mayor, City of Lincoln, Nebr.*

The mayor of Lincoln, Nebr., points out particularly the need in that connection.

Mr. President, I also have before me a telegram from Mayor Bernard J. Dowd, of Buffalo, N. Y. Without reading all of his telegram or all of the other telegrams, because obviously to do so would be to impose upon the time of the Senate, let me read a portion of it:

> Reaffirm local authority estimate of minimum need 5,000 additional public low-rent units as presented to Federal Public Housing Administration in 1945. Cannot house all low-income families in public developments. Am hopeful private enterprise will make some advance in this field.

So he calls to our attention the need for at least 5,000 additional public low-rent housing units.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have the entire telegram printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 14, 1949.*
>
> Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> Reurtel regarding S. 1070 and Buffalo housing need. Housing inventory and population end of 1948 shows 14,000 families in excess of total dwelling unit. Estimated 30,000 families living in substandard areas of which estimated 14,000 within incomes too low for known private housing market. Local housing authority operates 2,570 permanent low-rent units. One hundred percent occupied. Average annual income tenants taken in last 6 months, $2,004. More than 6,000 applications on file. Reaffirm local authority estimate of minimum need 5,000 additional public low-rent units as presented to Federal Public Housing Administration in 1945. Cannot house all low-income families in public developments. Am hopeful private enterprise will make some advance in this field.
>
> BERNARD J. DOWD,
> *Mayor.*

Mayor Cartwright, of the city of Galveston, Tex., likewise brings to our attention the importance of this legislation. Here I think is quite an important statement on the part of Mayor Cartwright. He says:

> Housing shortage still acute here especially large low-income families. Urgently need 2,000 or more low-rent units. Slum clearance and public housing as in 1070 would certainly improve general health conditions, fire hazards, end crime incidence. Juvenile delinquency would receive staggering blow under improved family living conditions. Present program proves these points. Bill badly needed, we urge quick passage.

I make note of the fact that these two gentlemen are mayors of cities, representing people of both political parties.

They are primarily community-minded citizens. Many of the mayors are elected on a strictly nonpartisan basis. Many of them came into public office, as I found out as a former mayor of a city, not under a Federal program of slum clearance or of public housing, but with a feeling that such a program represented Federal interference and imposed some kind of Federal restriction. But, to a man, I do not know of a single one, after he has served his municipality for a period of a year or even a few months, who has not come to the conclusion that the program as outlined in the Senate bill is absolutely essential.

I call to the attention of Senators the telegram from the mayor of Fresno, Calif., and one from the mayor of Dallas, Tex. The mayor of Dallas, in a very extensive telegram, has pointed out:

Dallas has five low-rent housing projects, operating from 5 to 9 years: and one low-rent PWA project operating nearly 12 years. These projects have cleared bad housing areas. Have been a stimulating influence toward betterment of surrounding areas, have materially contributed to reduction in disease, fires, crime, and juvenile delinquency due to elimination of basic causes. Existing slum areas in Dallas require in excess of $3 for each tax dollar paid for municipal services which necessitates excessive expenditure of funds derived from other areas.

I could cite many other telegrams. In each one the mayor points out that actually each slum area requires an excess of $3 of city expenditure for each tax dollar the municipality gets back. One of the arguments which has been used against Federal assistance in housing is the cost to the Government. The pending bill contemplates a sizable sum of money, exceeding well over a billion dollars. I think it can be conclusively stated without fear of successful contradiction, that for every dollar the Federal Government puts into slum clearance and into public housing, at least another dollar will be saved in local taxes, at the local level, in the respective communities of America which will be served.

I know that in my city of Minneapolis, Minn., we found out that the social service costs and the police and fire service costs were from 8 to 15 times more in slum areas than they were in what may be called decent, livable housing areas.

Every major city of the United States, without exception—I know of not one—is concerned today with a serious financial problem. What is the nature of this financial problem? An inadequate tax base is the first aspect of it. Secondly, many cities are circumscribed by legal requirements of their State legislature, which prevent them from raising necessary funds. But the real nub of the problem is that the cities have rotted from within, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois so ably pointed out this morning, that every major city in America today has a blighted or slum area which for all practical purposes is a cancer upon the economic situation, an economic cancer which is literally consuming the ability of the municipalities to provide decent municipal services.

To continue with the list of some of the mayors who have been so kind as to indicate their preference for, and support of, the bill S. 1070, the mayor of Gary, Ind., Mayor Swartz, has called to our attention the importance of this bill, in these words:

Gary needs a minimum of 500 low-rent, public-housing units to empty the basements, attics, and other substandard, unhealthy places occupied by families of low income. Comparative figures conclusively show that police, fire, health and sanitation department cost less per family in our public housing than in our slums. Independent study shows that there are fewer criminals, fewer illegitimate children, fewer juvenile cases, fewer broken marriages, better school grades, and better workers in families rehoused in public housing than those in our slums. I urge the passage of Senate bill 1070.

The mayor of Atlanta, Ga., in a very cogent telegram calls for passage of the bill.

There are telegrams from the mayor of Phoenix, Ariz.; the mayor of Jersey City, N. J.; the major of Bristol, Va., and the mayor of Syracuse, N. Y. I think it is quite significant that Mayor Costello, of Syracuse, N. Y., says in his telegram:

Our public housing project—

The one they have now in Syracuse—

developed with Federal aid replaced some of the worst slums of the city definitely reducing health, fire, and police cost. Study of effect of juvenile delinquency indicated substantially lower delinquency in project than in adjacent blighted areas.

FRANK J. COSTELLO,
Mayor of Syracuse.

I have a telegram from the mayor of Vancouver, Wash. The mayor of San Francisco has called to our attention that a San Francisco real-estate survey revealed approximately one dwelling of every six was substandard, and he calls upon the Senate to pass the bill S. 1070.

I have a telegram from the mayor of Paducah, Ky., which certainly should be of some concern to the Senate of the United States.

The mayor of Kansas City, Mayor William E. Kemp, has brought to our attention specific facts which I think are worthy of consideration. Mayor Kemp says that Kansas City's blighted areas cost the city approximately 45 percent of city service costs, 45 percent of the entire municipal budget, and contribute only 6 percent of the real-estate-tax revenue.

It is estimated that 33 percent of the Kansas City population resides in blighted areas, which account for 5 times the city average of TB cases, 6 times the juvenile delinquency cases, 3 times the fire calls, and 10 times the police calls above the city average.

I have a telegram from the mayor of Providence, R. I.

Mayor Albert D. Cash, of Cincinnati, Ohio, has called again upon the Congress of the United States, as he has at other times, for this type of housing legislation.

The mayor of Detroit, Mich., one of the major cities of the country, speaks particularly of title I. In his telegram, he says:

Slum-clearance program essential to preserve city's tax base. City plan commission has designed 2,520 acres in need redevelopment. Present annual average tax revenue, $864 per acre. If privately redeveloped would yield $2,304. Increase would pay city's third net project costs in 10 years. Public housing 10 percent shelter rent in lieu would amount $700 per acre.

What the mayor is pointing out is that even public housing with gifts of this kind, in lieu of taxes, would yield more than double what the city of Detroit is receiving from the slum areas at the present time.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] this morning referred to the progressive city of Milwaukee and to its blighted areas. I think the telegram from the mayor of Milwaukee is very significant. He says:

Without Federal aid it is impossible to build housing for those families which are low income. In 2 weeks' time received almost 4,000 active applications for 578 units of veterans permanent housing, also have received almost 1,000 applications for 232 low-rent slum-clearance units. City has almost exhausted its own resources in building veterans permanent housing.

Seventeen thousand veterans applications on file with Red Cross bureau, approximately 30 percent of city is blighted.

A city of the size of Milwaukee surely has a problem.

Mayor Begley, of Schenectady, N. Y., has called to our attention the importance of this problem.

The mayor of Denver, Colo., Mayor Newton, says:

Denver housing shortage for low-income families still critical. Active applications with Denver housing authority indicate an immediate need for 3,000 low-rental units. Our experience clearly shows that slum clearance is vital factor in curbing delinquency and improving sanitation in Denver as well as substantially reducing the cost of fire and police protection.

The mayor of New Orleans, Mayor Morrison, says with reference to Senate bill 1070:

Housing shortage has always been with us. Believe Senate bill 1070 will materially assist New Orleans to improve public health and reduce the cost of all municipal services.

Mr. President, in order to conserve the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the mayors who sent letters and telegrams favoring Senate bill 1070 be printed in the RECORD. There are included the mayors of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Seattle, Los Angeles, Hartford, Minneapolis, Boston, and many cities in categories of smaller populations.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Seattle, Wash., William F. Devin, mayor.
Dallas, Tex., James R. Temple, mayor.
Galveston, Tex., H. Y. Cartwright, Jr., mayor.
Fresno, Calif., Glenn M. Devore, mayor.
Gary, Ind., Eugene Swartz, mayor.
Atlanta, Ga., William B. Hartsfield, mayor.
Phoenix, Ariz., Nicholas Udall, mayor.
Jersey City, N. J., Frank Eggers, mayor.
Bristol, Va., T. W. Preston, mayor.
Syracuse, N. Y., Frank J. Costello, mayor.
Vancouver, Wash., Vern Anderson, mayor.
San Francisco, Calif., Elmer E. Robinson, mayor.
Paducah, Ky., Victor C. Hobday, city manager.
Kansas City, Mo., William E. Kemp, mayor.
Providence, R. I., Dennis J. Roberts, mayor.
Cincinnati, Ohio, Albert D. Cash, mayor.

Detroit, Mich., Eugene I. Van Antwerp, mayor.
Milwaukee, Wis., Frank P. Zeidler, mayor.
Schenectady, N. Y., Owen M. Begley, mayor.
Denver, Colo., Quigg Newton, mayor.
New Orleans, La., Delesseps S. Morrison, mayor.
Pittsburgh, Pa., David L. Lawrence, mayor.
Philadelphia, Pa., Bernard Samuel, mayor.
Seattle, Wash., William F. Devin, mayor.
Los Angeles, Calif., Fletcher Bowron, mayor.
Hartford, Conn., Cyril Coleman, mayor.
Boston, Mass., James M. Curley, mayor.
Newport, R. I., Edmund W. Pardee, mayor.
St. Petersburg, Fla., B. B. Blackburn, mayor.
Newbern, N. C., E. H. Wood, mayor.
Baltimore, Md., Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor.
Little Rock, Ark., Paul E. Parks for Sam Wassell, mayor.
Miami, Fla., Robert L. Floyd, mayor.
Memphis, Tenn., Watkins Overton, mayor.
Charlotte, N. C., H. H. Baxter, mayor.
Newport, R. I., Edmund W. Pardee, mayor.
Atlantic City, N. J., Joseph Altman, mayor.
New York, N. Y., William O'Dwyer, mayor.
Nashville, Tenn., Thomas L. Cummings, mayor.
Knoxville, Tenn., J. W. Elmore, Jr., mayor.
Lexington, Ky., Tom G. Mooney, mayor.
Norfolk, Va., C. A. Harrell, city manager.
Savannah, Ga., Olin F. Fulmer, mayor.
Newark, N. J., Vincent J. Murphy, mayor.
Raleigh, N. C., Roy S. Braden, city manager.
New Haven, Conn., William C. Celentano, mayor.
Minneapolis, Minn., Eric G. Hoyer, acting mayor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I heard this morning the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] make a comment regarding the necessity for a unit of substandard housing being demolished every time a unit of public housing is constructed. I desire to say in reference to his statement that I concur with the ideal which has been expressed, but I think it is very important that we clearly understand the nature of the particular proposal. The Housing Act of 1937 did not provide for community development and redevelopment as does Senate bill 1070. The Housing Act of 1937 was basically a public-housing act. This particular bill incorporates within its context a specific provision which is pointedly directed at slum clearance. The purpose of slum clearance is not necessarily in connection with public housing, but it is slum clearance within the jurisdictional limits of a municipality to provide private redevelopment. Let it be quite clear that municipalities cannot live on public housing. Public housing meets a humanitarian need; public housing may meet a social need; but municipalities which are required to pay for education, health protection, sanitation, police and fire costs and to take on more burdens because of greater population, cannot live on the rents coming from public-housing projects. Therefore, to my way of thinking, as mayor who has for 3½ years battled the problem of the housing shortage and seen a city, block after block, being consumed by blight and by slum areas, the most important title in this particular bill, the one which will do the most for municipalities and, in the long run, will do the most for the citizens of the community, is title I, which provides for community development and redevelopment, which offers financial assistance to municipalities for planning, and to expand and reorganize business districts, parks, and recreation areas. We cannot ignore the financial requirements of a city. The bill permits and makes available the use of land for private purposes, thereby making it productive from the standpoint of municipal revenues. Title I of this bill is one of the basic answers to meeting municipal financial requirements and needs. It serves the social purpose of cleaning out, or at least making possible the cleaning out, of many very seriously blighted areas in the community.

It should also be crystal clear that any family removed because of the action taken under title I has preference in a public unit. So, what the Senator from Washington is asking for—and it is a noble and legitimate request, and I truly think he should be commended for bringing it to our attention—is that when we construct a public-housing unit, we destroy a slum unit. While it is not mandatory, I may say to the junior Senator from Washington, it is possible that when we tear down a slum unit in which there is a family residing, that family has preference in a public-housing unit.

What the junior Senator from Washington was asking for was that title II, with reference to public housing, should provide that for every one of the public-housing projects constructed, a similar number of dwelling units in a slum area be demolished. I should like to see that written into the bill, but, as I reminded the Senator this morning, I estimate—and I have talked it over with some of the persons who consult with the Banking and Currency Committee—that it would require an additional $500,000,000 of grants to get the same number of public housing units, which is a maximum of 810,000 units in 6 years. I should like to see that made possible. In other words, if that additional amount of money could be provided without any serious implications with reference to the bill, if the bill could be passed providing for that additional amount of money, then I say it would be a desirable requirement to write into the bill. But if it should mean failure to pass the bill, if it should mean that because of serious financial limitations of the Government the bill should fail to pass because of providing for the expenditure of that sum of money, then we should rest our case upon the provisions of title I, which is the slum-clearance provision, and title II, which provides for housing projects to be constructed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. If I correctly understood the Senator, he has estimated it would require $500,000,000 to demolish, as a maximum, 810,000 units. Is that what the Senator from Minnesota wants us to understand?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The total amount of grants which would be needed in terms of public housing and slum clearance, to buy up land, for example, to tear down houses, and to make the land available for the 810,000 units as replacement, would be approximately, as I understand, $500,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. It is apparently a guess hazarded by some staff members who admittedly have not had time to go further into the subject. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That kind of an estimate would have to be literally a guess, which surely could not be conclusive, because, obviously, it is difficult to estimate the problems confronted in demolition, as we in Washington can well understand in connection with the repairing of the White House. It was not thought that it would be a $5,000,000 project, but by the time it was gone into it was found it would be rather expensive. It costs a great deal to tear down, to clear the land, dispose of the debris, and to rebuild.

One of the purposes of title I of the bill is to solicit Federal and private cooperation in connection with the land which has been cleared for sale or for lease for purposes of private redevelopment. I certainly concur in the philosophy which is behind title I of the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one more question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator apparently does not believe that under title I there is sufficient money to make the 1-for-1 provision practicable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I respond to that question by saying that I do not, because some municipalities have made estimates as to what the costs would be in terms of slum clearance, for making the land available, for reassembling for private construction, and for cleaning. The cost of destroying houses, removing them, and reassembling the land necessary for redevelopment purposes is a rather expensive operation.

Mr. CAIN. I have thought of another question, if the Senator will indulge me one moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator remember how many units of subsidized low-rent housing there are, for example, in the city of Minneapolis?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The city of Minneapolis, being one of the political subdivisions of the State of Minnesota, was never privileged to benefit under the United States Housing Act of 1937. We have one public-housing project, which was constructed under the provisions of the Public Works Administration, I believe in about 1936. I think the junior Senator from Washington would be interested in knowing what the acting mayor of the city of Minneapolis has had to say about that particular project.

Mr. CAIN. I would, indeed, and I think the Senate would.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I quote from his statement, which was sent to me on April 12. The acting mayor is Hon. Eric G. Hoyer. He states as follows:

Between 1,000 and 2,000 low-rent housing units are needed in Minneapolis. The import of the term "low rent" is best exemplified in

the statistics of a survey made by the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority. The surveyed area included a blighted section on the near north side of Minneapolis. A income group pays $38 per month rent in this area; B income group pays $30; and C income group, comprising one-fifth of the entire group, pays $21 a month.

However, slum clearance cannot be effected without appropriate plans in hand for the establishment of low-rent housing units in the area cleared. Such a program of clearance and of redevelopment is hamstrung in Minneapolis by the lack of Federal funds. The tragedy of this situation is that substandard dwellings will have to remain to provide shelter. Such inadequate shelter has always been the breeding ground of juvenile delinquency. Families who live in such homes are highly susceptible to disease, just as they also become susceptible to criminal activities. Poor housing leads in part to increased cost in maintaining penitentiaries.

This is the point which I wanted to emphasize, and to call to the attention of the junior Senator from Washington:

Statistics on the Sumner Field housing project—

Which is a public-housing project—

show that since the establishment of the project the number of fires in the area decreased one-third. Dollar loss per fire decreased between 1940 and 1948 to $36 per fire, as compared to $193 in the area previous to redevelopment. Police cost in the area dropped 90 percent. Professor Stuart Chapin, of the Department of Sociology at the University of Minnesota, in his survey of the project in 1940 pointed out that people living in the Sumner Field units developed twice as much social participation in the civic affairs of the neighborhood and city. This increased not only the moral tone of the city but the lives of these people. This comparison was made in terms of the people occupying substandard shelter in surrounding blighted areas.

The need for low-rent housing should be considered primarily in terms of the American principle of preserving American family life.

Mr. CAIN. One further question. If these grants and loans are made available, using Minneapolis as an example, in the Senator's opinion would the mayor construct the subsidized low-rent units on land which had formerly consisted of slums, or would he, as will happen in many places, select land which is already cleared and available for the construction of such projects? If the latter course is followed, what happens to the continuing life of the slum dweller in Minneapolis, which is no different, in that sense, from any other American city? How are we to get rid of those slums at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make this observation in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Washington: There is a temptation, in view of the reduced costs of construction, to build a public housing project on what we might call clean land.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is a temptation, in other words, without a specific prohibition against it, to leave the slums, and to go to clean land, just as other developments do.

Mr. CAIN. We are in complete agreement that that is all too likely to happen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But I submit to the junior Senator from Washington that the reason why that temptation has been a reality in the past is that there was no specific provision for Federal funds, or for State and local cooperation, for the cleaning out of blighted or slum district areas, such as is provided by title I of the bill. That is why I say the bill is so much more comprehensive than anything we have ever known in our past experience.

Mr. CAIN. In that sense, I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We must look to the mayors and the governing bodies of our cities. By the way, every one of the plans must be approved by the governing body, not merely by the local public housing administrators, who are appointed, but by the governing body, which is elected. There is a different response from people who are appointed than from those who are elected. Every one of the plans must be approved by the governing body of the elected officials.

I submit to the junior Senator from Washington that municipal officials are under tremendous pressure from every conceivable interest in their municipalities to ease the tax burden. There is not a city in this Nation today that I know of—and I have tried to keep somewhat abreast of municipal finance—that is not staggering under the load of its municipal financial burdens, primarily because of the fact that the real-estate taxes it has to collect come from such a limited area because of the blighted areas and slum conditions.

Every municipal official is looking for the opportunity to get some tax-yielding property within the jurisdictional limits of the municipality. They are watching warehouses being erected across the line, they are watching housing developments taking place just over the river, beyond the jurisdictional limits of the city. What the city officials are interested in is in being able to provide a project within the municipalities which is properly planned, properly zoned, properly protected in terms of public facilities and health, which will be available for construction by private enterprise.

Mr. CAIN. Let me suggest that from my point of view there should be included in the pending bill a provision commonly referred to as being one unit of slum housing removed for one unit of good housing constructed. Then I think we would be in a position to make certain that not only would the municipal officials hope to build up the interiors of their cities, but by law they would be required to give that prime consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think anyone can find grounds of dispute with the moral and idealistic position the Senator is taking. There is no doubt that is what should be done.

I merely wish to place before the Senate a statement as to the increased costs which would necessarily be involved. I do not want anyone to accept the figures I have placed before the Senate, because I am confident that they should be studied, but there is no doubt at all in my mind that there would be a substantial increase in costs.

The great question before the Senate is whether if we should include the increased cost, we would get any kind of a bill. I do not wish to seem too pessimistic, because I know the bill has wonderful sponsorship. It is very pleasing to know that the problem of housing in America has been taken out of the realm of what we may call partisan politics. The bill has joint sponsorship on the part of both political parties. It has sponsors from all sections of the Nation.

I am concerned about the fact, however, that we are called upon for Federal aid to education; we are called upon for Federal aid to public health; we have the Marshall plan, the ECA authorization and the appropriation, we have a heavy Government budget, and the Veterans' Administration expenses; we have all these things which are positive requirements upon the Congress. If the choice is between no public-housing bill and a public-housing bill which does not provide the mandatory procedure, then I am for Senate bill 1070, because in that bill is provided the mechanism which at least can further the elimination of slums, and which does offer protection to families in slums where the slums are cleared out, because preference is given to such families in public-housing units.

I hope that other Senators feel as I do, that if we cannot get what we are seeking as the ideal proposition, this is the kind of bill which takes into consideration private interests, public interests, basic municipal needs, and also, as I may point out, in title I of the bill, this attacks another basic problem the modernization of building codes and the use of better building materials and techniques in new construction. Likewise in the bill, we are not unmindful of the needs of farm housing, and in many areas of the United States improvement of farm housing is just as important and vital as municipal housing, about which we are now talking.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few brief questions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Minnesota hear the magnificent speech delivered earlier today by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly did.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Minnesota hear the Senator from Illinois, in the course of his speech, invite Members of the Senate to make a slum inspection tour this afternoon to environs within three, four, five, and six blocks from the spot where the Senator from Minnesota is now speaking?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Minnesota was unable, was he not, to attend that inspection tour because of a meeting he had to attend?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the Senator from Minnesota took the inspection our

last week. I covered the areas in the city of Washington which the junior Senator from Illinois has talked about. I had my eyes opened to the conditions existing in the alley just beyond the Senate Office Building. The front looks pretty good, but the inside is rather bad.

Mr. MORSE. That will be very helpful to the junior Senator from Oregon in asking the questions he now wishes to put to the Senator from Minnesota. It is not the intention of the Senator from Oregon to take the time of the Senate to make a speech on this deplorable situation, but he does think it important that the great speech of the Senator from Illinois made earlier today be reinforced a bit this afternoon by a question and answer period, shall we say, for the purpose of the RECORD.

Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that within a distance of six short blocks of this building, the Capitol of the United States, we can go to a spot where in one room, a room not larger than 12 by 12, ten people live and sleep, if it can be called living, obtaining whatever water supply they can get from a faucet in a back yard, without there being in the domicile in which they live either electric light or heat or water or any of the sanitary facilities which the Senator from Minnesota and I know are essential to the maintenance of health? Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that that condition exists within six blocks from this building?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to report that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is a great educator as well as a great Senator, took me into his confidence in the days prior to the discussion of this bill, and discussed with me the existence of many of the blighted areas of the city of Washington. I am likewise happy to report that the distinguished executive director of the conference of mayors, Mr. Paul V. Betters, called these areas of the city to my attention, and I did make a tour of the city. I did not visit the particular areas the Senator from Oregon is talking about, or the particular residences, but I think I am somewhat acquainted with the deplorable conditions which exist in the Nation's capital, literally in the shadow of the dome of the Capitol.

Mr. MORSE. In the tour of the Washington slums which the Senator from Minnesota took did he find conditions such as I now shall describe: For example, a shambles of a four-room house in which from 16 to 25 people live, without running water or sanitary facilities or heat, and having in the back yard, littered with refuse, a faucet, and such facilities that a mere view presents real evidence as to their being a health menace?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, such conditions are prevalent in the Nation's Capital. I may say that I am quite confident that the Senator from Oregon does not have to go six blocks to find such conditions. We can go, as the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois pointed out, less than 100 yards from the entrance of the Senate Office Building and find deplorable conditions.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to state for the RECORD that the type of housing facility I have just described is not limited to one or two dwellings, but in the radius of a few blocks from the Capitol dome there are scores and scores of such dwellings?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that the appropriate answer would be to say that there are not only hundreds, but thousands of such dwellings in the Nation's Capital. And the pattern here, I may say to the Senator from Oregon, is the pattern in every major city of the United States of America. Despite the attempts of "Baltimore plans" to clean them up, in spite of attempts of municipal officials to enforce ordinances pertaining to fire and health protection, despite all attempts, there is no way to meet the problem of the slum except to eradicate it. It cannot be tampered with or fooled with. The slums must either be cleaned out, or they will clean us out over a long period of time.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree that Congress, after all, has some direct responsibility for the slum conditions which can be found within the immediate environs of the Capitol itself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am surely aware of the fact that the Congress has unique responsibility for the District of Columbia. I should like to point out, however, that while I am, of course, appreciative of the splendor of the District of Columbia and of the fact that it was well provided for by the founding fathers, yet the Congress of the United States has equal responsibility for the protection of the general welfare of all the people of the United States of America, and not merely the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Minnesota, as I am sure he must be, aware of the fact that the slum dwellings which I have just described are good revenue-producing income property for the owners thereof?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am familiar with that fact. I should like to cite, for the Senator from Oregon, this example: As the mayor of my municipality I ascertained that in a period of 10 years, from 1937 to 1947, the board of public welfare of the city of Minneapolis paid out $5,000,000 in rents to house people who were on public relief; that they were housed in accommodations which were literally unfit for human habitation; and that many of these accommodations had paid for themselves not once but twice and three and four times, in terms of the income derived by the owners.

There is no particular piece of property, on the average, which is more productive for those who are able to exploit the last nickel out of it than slum property. In a period of a housing shortage, perhaps even during a period of depression, when people cannot pay good rents for good homes, and oftentimes become in need of public assistance, the public assistance bodies in their need for economy all too often rent these low-grade facilities.

I am perfectly convinced in my own mind, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that one of the major groups of pressure and resistance to the kind of legislation which is being proposed here today, and which I pray will be enacted consists of persons who have been able to make a rather lucrative profit out of their holdings of submarginal, substandard, blighted housing which is literally forced upon the people if they are going to have any place in which to live.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that those who own such property and who insist, in the name of property rights, on an alleged right to continue to rent such property in fact abuse the purpose of the capitalistic system?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to make this observation: I do not believe that anyone has the right to insist upon the use, in terms of commerce or business activity, of a facility, a piece of property, or any kind of an institution which is detrimental to the public health, the public morals, the public safety, or the public welfare. Surely blighted housing, slum housing, stands guilty of tearing down the moral fabric and structure of our society. It is uneconomic, in that it consumes three or four times as much as it produces, and it surely is not conducive to family welfare or to human dignity. Measured by every factor and every measurement that can be applied to it, it is an abuse of what we may call property rights to talk about being able to continue to use it for business purposes, in the name of free enterprise or in the name of property rights.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact—as I am sure he must be—that a great many of the wretched dwellings I have described, within a six-block radius of the Capitol, have been condemned, in some instances for several years, and that the courts of the District of Columbia are constantly granting extensions because there is no other place to accommodate the occupants of the condemned houses?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware of that fact; and I am aware that the same conditions prevail in other municipalities.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that, especially during the hot months, the physical occupancy of such houses becomes so unbearable that the occupants seek the parks and sleep on God's green grass, and that a law in the District of Columbia denies to them the right even to sleep in the parks, but forces them either to go back to those wretched rooms or else sleep in the back yards, which are littered with filth and refuse?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have heard that. It was brought to my attention by those in the District who are much interested in home rule and other progressive plans.

Mr. MORSE. It was brought to our attention this afternoon by officials of the Health Department of the District, as well as sanitation officials.

Did the Senator from Minnesota, on his tour of the slum conditions within a six-block radius of this building, also observe several small public-housing projects?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Minnesota heard the very common argument that if those people are moved out of wretched hovels into decent houses it will be only a matter of time before the decent houses will be reduced to the same level of wretchedness as the slum houses from which they are moved?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have heard that historic argument. It has been used repeatedly. It is commonly known in academic parlance as the coal-in-the-bathtub argument. The statement is made that the people place coal in the bath facilities. However, I believe that the records throughout the Nation clearly indicate that wherever a public housing project has been developed in a blighted or slum area the public-housing project stands out as a sort of social oasis. It is a beautiful little area within a wilderness of blight and slums.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that exhibit A in proof of the conclusion which he has just stated can be shown anyone with eyes to see, within six blocks of the Capitol, where on one side of the street can be seen wretched hovels, and a few feet away can be seen a public-housing project which has been in operation for several years, in which the proof is crystal clear that the result has not been to reduce the public-housing project to the wretched condition of the slum area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am convinced in my own mind that public housing is not only a sound investment in terms of economics, but it is a sound investment in terms of human betterment. I have noticed very many illustrations from my own observations. I have visited housing projects in St. Louis, Cleveland, New York City, Philadelphia, and Buffalo. I have seen housing projects in Denver, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. As mayor of a city I made an extensive tour of the major housing projects of the country. I can say from my own observation, without any hesitancy, that each housing project improved the physical environment of the community in which it was established. It improved business conditions in the area. There is a direct relationship between a good housing project and the general condition of the business activity surrounding it. Not only do the housing projects bring about such physical improvement, but as we build decent, clean homes, it seems to do something to the spirit of the occupants. It seems to give them a sense of health. Their children become healthier. Husbands and wives become happier in their relationships. Family conditions are improved. There is not the shadow of a doubt that one of the great factors in the improvement of the social life, the economic well being, and the moral fabric of family life in the blighted and slum areas has been the development and construction of low-cost public-housing units. It literally made them over, and gave the people an opportunity to walk down the streets with dignity and point with pride to the little area which they held as their own.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator agrees, does he not, that the building of a public-housing project or the clearance of slum areas is itself a part of the educational and conditioning and training process which we must enter into if we are to raise those people from the extremely low level of human existence which is now their plight to a level of healthful, decent living which instills in them at least some hope for a normal life in this capitalistic society of ours?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do; and I am happy that the Senator has introduced the phrase this capitalistic society of ours, because sometimes those who are the opponents of public housing brand this kind of activity as socialism, or some sort of subversive type of activity, when in fact what is being done is to lift up the standard of the people so that they can be successful and healthy participants in the economic society of a free economy.

I do not wish to seem dogmatic. I realize that there are reasonable arguments on both sides of the question; but looking at the problem from the standpoint of one who has been seriously and intimately concerned with it, I have yet to find anyone who is concerned about the spiritual lives of our people, or any members of the clergy, who do not recognize what a slum or a blighted area does to the soul and to the human spirit. One of my clerical friends said to me, "It is easier to save souls when they live in surroundings which are conducive to soul saving."

So far as social workers, police officers, public health officers, and officials of municipalities, counties, or local communities are concerned—those who deal with the intimate personal problems of people—every local official agrees that great benefit is derived from a slum clearance project and from the public housing program. I remind my colleagues that no group of officials are more intimately associated with their constituents than are local officials. Let me say to the junior Senator from Oregon that I do not believe that the arguments of the opposition to this kind of legislation attract very many adherents any longer.

I think the only argument today is with regard to the program within the realm of reasonableness. There are many of us who would like to see many more public housing units. I think the need is crystal clear for many more than are provided for in the bill. There are those who are opposed to this—many; but I think the chairman and members of the Committee on Banking and Currency are to be commended for writing into the bill a comprehensive housing program which, as I previously stated, includes recognition of private enterprise in this field, as well as the need for slum clearance, community planning, and redevelopment. It includes housing research, and the breaking down of restrictive practices in obsolete building codes, and deals with the problem of farm housing. I know of no bill which has done more to crystallize the thinking of all Americans who are concerned about the basic approach to the housing problem than this particular bill has done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with the officer of the District Board of Health who discussed this problem with us this afternoon with respect to the very serious danger of an epidemic of highly contagious disease breaking out within six blocks of the Capitol of the United States? He stated that if such an epidemic should break out, it would not confine itself to that section of the District, but would extend into the high-priced apartments occupied even by Members of Congress in some sections of the city, and would very likely take their dear ones as well as the people living in the congested areas so close to the Capitol.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In my opinion, there is no greater threat to the health of the residents of the city of Washington than the deplorable, unspeakable slum conditions existing in this city, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that it is a national disgrace that the Nation's Capital, the most beautiful city in the world, at least in its superficial aspects as viewed by persons on conducted tours of the city, should find in its fabric unbelievable slums and blighted conditions. If we do nothing else, we should at least in this great city set the national pattern not only for the elimination of slums and blighted areas but for improvement in other fields, for this city is under the complete control of the Congress of the United States. But lest anyone misinterpret my remarks, let it be crystal clear that the citizens of Memphis, Tenn., of Atlanta, Ga., of Birmingham, Ala., of Jackson, Miss., and of Minneapolis, Minn., are just as important as are the citizens of Washington, D. C.; and I submit that today those cities have been stymied and blocked in their various attempts even to scratch the surface in respect to meeting the housing problem, because of the inability to obtain the necessary funds and the lack of congressional authority to move ahead on a broad housing program.

Mr. President, that is what this bill is all about, and I think we are ready to vote on it. Accordingly I shall yield the floor so that we can reach a vote, unless there are further questions to be asked of me. I simply wished to place in the RECORD the telegraphic responses sent me by a number of mayors following my request of them by telegram to give me their views of their local situations.

Again I submit to the Senate that not one of the mayors of the 60 major cities in the United States which were selected in that cross section has expressed anything but approval for the type of legislation we now have before us, and each of them has pointed out the imperative need for such legislation so far as his community is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my last question, if the Senator will yield once

more, goes to the policy of having the Government spend public funds for the conservation of human resources, as we find those resources being wasted in our slum areas and thus endangering the health of all the rest of our people. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that if it is sound public policy—as I submit it is—to spend millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to conserve the natural resources of our country, to conserve the soil of the Nation, to develop even a livestock-conservation program, from the standpoint of bettering the conditions of American livestock, then likewise it is sound public policy for us to spend public funds to try to conserve and better the human resources which we find deteriorating at such a rapid rate in the slum areas of our great cities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I could do nothing else but concur in the very splendid remarks of the Senator from Oregon with reference to our human resources. In fact, let me say that, although very seldom do we hear any suggestion about curtailing national-defense appropriations—and I believe in them, and I stood for the full authorization under ECA—yet the main weapon this country has for its defense is its people. Let me point out that the larger families of the United States, the men and women who oftentimes are called upon to bear the brunt of sacrifice in this Nation, are to be found, in the main—of course, I can make no more than a broad generalization, because there are specific instances which are aside from any general group—in what we call the lower-income families. Those groups in the Nation are entitled at least to be able to meet the economic conditions of their times, without having too many handicaps placed upon them; and one of the privileges which they should have as American citizens is at least the privilege of living in reasonably decent accommodations. I do not think anyone is asking for palaces or for beautiful, big apartments; but we are asking for sanitary, safe dwelling units, with adequate space in which to take care of a family.

Let me emphasize the point of taking care of a family by way of providing rental housing, because one thing which seems to be happening in this country is that if a person has a family and is looking for a place to rent for himself and his family, he will find that children are rather undesirable in the economic market of rental housing facilities. Thank goodness, Mr. President, the program under this bill recognizes the family institution and makes available to the fathers and mothers of the country accommodations for families with children.

I have had some experience with this matter; and nothing is more sickening to a person who has been brought up to believe that our Nation is dedicated to the welfare of boys and girls and the family life, than to find, when looking for a place to rent, that if a person who is seeking rental accommodations has two children, he is not wanted. In many rental units, accommodations are available for married couples with two cats, but not with two children. Thank God, Mr. President, that the public policy of the Congress and of the Government generally is established around the theory that we are going to try to build some kind of housing facilities which will be constructed with walls sufficiently durable to endure family life. If for no other reason, I would favor the enactment of this bill; and I speak with some feeling, after I tried to find a place which I regarded as a desirable one for a family with children to live in.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a question, in view of the very able statement made yesterday by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and also in view of the speech made today by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] regarding the conditions to which the Senator from Minnesota has also referred, namely, slum conditions in the city of Washington.

Of course, the Congress serves in a dual capacity, both as a national legislature and as more or less a city council for the city of Washington, D. C. Accordingly, I should like to ask whether it is the view of the Senator from Minnesota that there has been a violation of sanitary ordinances of the city of Washington and also of certain safety regulations, in the existence of the slum conditions to which the Senator has referred; and also whether as a municipal body we, as a Congress, may have been lax in not attacking this problem through the health and safety ordinances and regulations which may be on the statute books?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from California may be correct. I am not particularly familiar with conditions prevailing in the city of Washington, D. C.; but I imagine they are similar to conditions in other areas. Of course, since the war it has been rather difficult for the local authorities rigidly to enforce local health, safety, and fire-protection ordinances; in other words, to provide the rigid enforcement which goes so far as to say to a landlord, "You must repair the premises, or else all the tenants must leave." After all, it does not make sense to provide such rigid enforcement if the persons who thus would have to leave the rental premises because of a lack of observance of a public health law or a fire-prevention law would then have to sleep outdoors, on the ground. I imagine that some such conditions exist here in the city of Washington, D. C. In fact, I have had some young ladies come to my office and tell me that they are to be evicted from what is known as Arlington Farms, as I believe it is called. Some persons state that ample rental accommodations are available in the city of Washington. If there are adequate rental accommodations available in Washington, I dare say they are in facilities which are not conducive to the kind of environment or social life in which young men and women should be placed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has made a very fine presentation. I know he wants to quit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall not prolong his discussion, but in that connection I should like to call attention to the fact that the National Capital Housing Authority, over the years it has been in operation, has improved 27 slum squares in the District of Columbia. It has provided good dwellings for 1,091 low-income families on former slum sites. It has provided low-rent dwellings for 882 other low-income families on sparsely settled sites, and for 1,286 low-income families on sites formerly vacant. In other words, a total of more than 3,200 homes has been provided by it, and yet in spite of all that, we see these slum conditions still here, and we see these unsanitary conditions that still prevail over the city, and as the Senator has so well pointed out, what we see here is typical of what we can see in every city and sizable town in the United States of America.

It does not matter how good it looks from the outside. I remember flying into Miami one time to hold some housing hearings, and what a beautiful city it looked from the air and as we were riding through the streets. Imagine my amazement at the hearings when they got to talking about the terrible slum conditions existing in the city of Miami.

The question I want to ask is this: We have had some excellent discussions here today of title I of the bill, slum clearance. I do not think there has been a dissenting voice in all the Senate. Everyone who has had anything to say about it has said, "Yes, by all means we ought to go in for slum clearance." What are we going to do about the people we move out, when we clear the slums, if we do not provide an adequate public housing program to go along hand in hand with it?

By the way, that was pointed up to me this very afternoon. I think the Senator would be interested in this. I am a member of the Senate Office Building Commission, and we have recently condemned a property nearby that includes Schott Alley, one of the slum areas. All the people who live in Schott Alley have had notice to move. A colored man came to me this afternoon and said, "I have a brother who lives there, he and his wife and 10 children, and they have no place to go, and yet there is a court order telling them to go." That could be multiplied by thousands of times and hundreds of thousands of times throughout America. What are we going to do if we clear the slums and do not provide for any public housing to help take care of the people who will be forced to move out of the slums?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that the answer is so crystal clear it hardly needs to be stated, that we never will be able to clear the slums unless a place is provided for the people who live there so that great personal sacrifice will not be inflicted upon those who may be affected. Personally, I should say that in a community, let us say, a city

like Memphis, Tenn.; or Minneapolis, Minn.; or San Francisco, Calif.; or Philadelphia, where the members of the governing body are elected public officials, they would not dare clear the slums without having a place to house those who are moved out, no matter how poor the new housing may be. That has been the dilemma, I may say to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, in the pending bill we provide it shall not be done until they have a place where they may obtain better housing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Also in the bill there is provided, for example, a type of preference. The preference first is that families who are displaced or about to be displaced by public slum clearance or redevelopment projects shall be given first preference to admission to low-cost or low-rent housing; so that title I and title II are supplemental measures—slum clearance, yes; slum clearance with preference in public housing projects for people whose homes were cleaned away. The only preference above it is veterans' preference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield for another brief question, it is this: If we eliminate the 810,000 public-housing units, would there be any need of enacting title I?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Frankly, if we eliminate 810,000 public units, title I of the bill would be totally useless so far as municipalities are concerned.

I had in my hands here, but dropped it, a telegram from the mayor of Detroit. Detroit is undertaking or contemplating a large building program, and it is also contemplating building recreational facilities. The telegram from the mayor of Detroit points out that these projects if completed will necessitate the removal of 10,000 families. He points out in his telegram that they cannot complete the projects until public-housing facilities are made available. So it is perfectly obvious that title II is the heart, the meat, the substance, of the entire bill, S. 1070. That is why I said the committee should be commended for the balance they have exhibited in the bill, providing development, slum clearance, community planning, housing research, the breaking down of old, restrictive, obsolete building codes, farm housing, and public housing. I think it is a great step forward. I only hope it will be consummated, and the bill enacted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I heard the Senator from Minnesota referring to the difficulty I presume he experienced, in finding suitable accommodations by reason of having children. Did I draw the correct inference?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The inference is correct. The word "difficulty" I may say is a bit on the moderate side.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I went through all that when I first came to Washington. I thought I might call attention to the fact. If the American people were made aware of it, it might promote a feeling of kinship between the people and their Senators to know that when a Senator is looking for a place in which to live, the Senator's children become so many more kids.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to observe, I hope to live long enough to see the day that we propose legislation for a housing project in which we provide that a tenant cannot get accommodations unless he has children. That might be a good step by way of reversing the present discrimination. I do not mean any reflection upon my bachelor friends here. Of course, we would make special exceptions for those who have lived such a good life.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have been amazed this afternoon, as I was amazed yesterday, by what some of the Democratic Senators have been saying regarding public housing. I hold in my hand the platform of the Democratic Party, not that of last year, not that of the previous 4 years, but the platform of 1932. It says in one of its paragraphs:

> We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people, to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe.

That, Mr. President, was written in 1932. They said they were going to wipe out slums. In their platform of 1936 they also said they were going to wipe out slums. This is the Democratic Party speaking, Mr. President, and I shall show later on how they repudiated every single promise they made in connection with it. Thirteen long, long years ago they spoke of the poor people, who have been so eloquently described by Senators on the other side of the aisle today, who had gone without baths, sleeping 10 or 12 in a room, the smell being so nauseating that it was said it would make one sick. What did they say in 1936? They said:

> We maintain that our people are entitled to decent, adequate housing at a price which they can afford. In the past 3 years the Federal Government, having saved more than 2,000,000 homes from foreclosure—

I may say, Mr. President, that of those 2,000,000 homes very many were saved by Republican governors; all the Democrats did was to follow the plan of the Republican governors; I know because I headed them—

> has taken the first steps in her history to provide decent housing for people of meager income. We believe every encouragement should be given to the building of new homes by private enterprise and that the Government should steadily extend the housing program toward a goal of adequate housing for those forced through economic necessities to live in unhealthy and slum conditions.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives was then controlled, 3 to 1, by the Democrats. Over on this side they controlled the Senate 3 to 1. What did they do, Mr. President? Nothing, except to talk, as they are talking yet today. When Mr. Delano was chairman of the National Resources Board he said everything that was said yesterday and today by my Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The Democrats did nothing. They are the most beautiful talkers on earth, but when it comes to accomplishing something, they have to get the Republicans to do it for them, apparently, especially when it comes to cleaning out slums.

They went on with their idle promises, Mr. President, when they controlled the House of Representatives and the Senate 3 to 1, and they did nothing. I have heard the same kind of speeches to which I have listened today in political campaigns all over the United States of America—what the Democrats would do when they got in office. What do they propose to do about this bill, Mr. President? They propose to spend a great sum of money—$25,000,000 a year. Believe it or not. They propose to spend that in order to wipe out all the slums. Senators have read telegrams from the mayors of all the big cities all over the United States. They propose to continue to spend money over 5 years, when they will have spent $500,000.

What did the Democrats do when they had a chance? It will be remembered that they gave Great Britain $3,750,000,000 in 1946. Three years ago I offered an amendment which provided that instead of giving that money to Great Britain, each war veteran be given a $10,000 house for nothing. How many votes did that amendment receive? Eleven, as I remember. So they sent $3,750,000,000 to England. What were the terms? England was to pay no interest for 5 years, and then, if she should be prosperous enough and decided she could pay interest, she would pay interest at the rate of 2 percent. Today, Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I shall not yield at the present time. I should like to finish my remarks. I hope the distinguished Senator will mark his question down, because I want him to ask it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at the very time when, according to President Roosevelt's own relative, who was head of the National Resources Board of the United States, and who said that within two blocks of the Capitol the living conditions were terrible, what did the Democrats do? They proceeded to send money to other nations, to Austria, Belgium, Luxemburg, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Poland, Germany, Greece, Russia, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Yugoslavia, Netherlands, Norway, Philippine Islands, Portugal, Turkey, and to the 13 American Republics.

They did not keep their platform pledges, Mr. President. I could take the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and show him a place within three blocks of the Capitol in which the people occupying it do not have electric lights, or even a lamp. They still use what is used among the sharecroppers down South and in several other places a wick which is dipped in tallow.

Mind you, Mr. President, the situation I have described has been brought to the attention of the Senate by myself

in three separate speeches I have made upon this subject, and for 16 years we have had a Democratic President, but nothing has been done about it. I hope that the new Senators will help us and it looks like they would.

Mr. President, this afternoon I wish to take up the matter of the housing bill as it relates to the farmers of the United States of America. I have very carefully examined paragraph 8 of the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the Housing Act of 1949 and in order that the farmers may understand what is being done to them by the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that all of title IV be printed at this point in my remarks, so that they can understand just what is happening to them at the hands of the Democratic administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE IV—FARM HOUSING

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, subject to the terms and conditions of this title, to extend financial assistance, through the Farmers Home Administration, to owners of farms in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and other farm buildings on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions and adequate farm buildings as specified in this title.

(b) For the purpose of this title, the term "farm" shall mean a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and which customarily produces or is capable of producing such commodities for sale and for home use of a gross annual value of not less than the equivalent of a gross annual value of $400 in 1944, as determined by the Secretary. The Secretary shall promptly determine whether any parcel or parcels of land constitute a farm for the purposes of this title whenever requested to do so by any interested Federal, State, or local public agency, and his determination shall be conclusive.

(c) In order to be eligible for the assistance authorized by paragraph (a), the applicant must show (1) that he is the owner of a farm which is without a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling for himself and his family and necessary resident farm labor, or for the family of the operating tenant, lessee, or sharecropper, or without other farm buildings adequate for the type of farming in which he engages or desires to engage; (2) that he is without sufficient resources to provide the necessary housing and buildings on his own account; and (3) that he is unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing and buildings from other sources upon terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

LOANS FOR HOUSING AND BUILDINGS ON ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 402. (a) If the Secretary determines that an applicant is eligible for assistance as provided in section 401 and that the applicant has the ability to repay in full the sum to be loaned, with interest, giving due consideration to the income and earning capacity of the applicant and his family from the farm and other sources, and the maintenance of a reasonable standard of living for the owner and the occupants of said farm, a loan may be made by the Secretary to said applicant for a period of not to exceed 33 years from the making of the loan with interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the unpaid balance of principal.

(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and the security given shall—

(1) provide for security upon the applicant's equity in the farm and such additional security or collateral, if any, as may be found necessary by the Secretary reasonably to assure repayment of the indebtedness;

(2) provide for the repayment of principal and interest in accordance with schedules and repayment plans prescribed by the Secretary;

(3) contain the agreement of the borrower that he will, at the request of the Secretary, proceed with diligence to refinance the balance of the indebtedness through cooperative or other responsible private credit sources whenever the Secretary determines, in the light of the borrower's circumstances, including his earning capacity and the income from the farm, that he is able to do so upon reasonable terms and conditions;

(4) be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the loan with interest, protect the security, and assure that the farm will be maintained in repair and that waste and exhaustion of the farm will be prevented.

LOANS FOR HOUSING AND BUILDINGS ON POTENTIALLY ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 403. If the Secretary determines (a) that, because of the inadequacy of the income of an eligible applicant from the farm to be improved and from other sources, said applicant may not reasonably be expected to make annual repayments of principal and interest in an amount sufficient to repay the loan in full within the period of time prescribed by the Secretary as authorized in this title; (b) that the income of the applicant may be sufficiently increased within a period of not to exceed 10 years by improvement or enlargement of the farm or an adjustment of the farm practices or methods; and (c) that the applicant has adopted and may reasonably be expected to put into effect a plan of farm improvement, enlargement, or adjusted practices which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will increase the applicant's income from said farm within a period of not to exceed 10 years to the extent that the applicant may be expected thereafter to make annual repayments of principal and interest sufficient to repay the balance of the indebtedness less payments in cash and credits for the contributions to be made by the Secretary as hereinafter provided, the Secretary may make a loan in an amount necessary to provide adequate farm dwellings and buildings on said farm under the terms and conditions prescribed in section 402. In addition, the Secretary may agree with the borrower to make annual contributions during the said 10-year period in the form of credits on the borrower's indebtedness in an amount not to exceed the annual installment of interest and 50 percent of the principal payments accruing during any installment year up to and including the tenth installment year, subject to the conditions that the borrower's income is, in fact, insufficient to enable the borrower to make payments in accordance with the plan or schedule prescribed by the Secretary and that the borrower pursues his plan of farm reorganization and improvements or enlargement with due diligence.

This agreement with respect to credits of principal and interest upon the borrower's indebtedness shall not be assignable nor accrue to the benefit of any third party without the written consent of the Secretary and the Secretary shall have the right, at his option, to cancel the agreement upon the sale of the farm or the execution or creation of any lien thereon subsequent to the lien given to the Secretary, or to refuse to release the lien given to the Secretary except upon payment in cash of the entire original principal plus accrued interest thereon less actual cash payments of principal and interest when the Secretary determines that the release of the lien would permit the benefits of this section to accrue to a person not eligible to receive such benefits.

OTHER SPECIAL LOANS AND GRANTS FOR MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO FARM HOUSING AND BUILDINGS

SEC. 404. In the event the Secretary determines that an eligible applicant cannot qualify for a loan under the provisions of sections 402 and 403 and that repairs or improvements should be made to a farm dwelling occupied by him, or his tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, or laborers, in order to make such dwelling safe and sanitary and remove hazards to the health of the occupant, his family, or the community, and that repairs should be made to farm buildings in order to remove hazards and make such buildings safe, the Secretary may make a grant or a combined loan and grant, to the applicant to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a convenient and sanitary water supply, supplying screens, repairing or providing structural supports, or making other similar repairs or improvements. No assistance shall be extended to any one individual under the provisions of this section in the form of a loan or grant or combination thereof in excess of $1,000 for any one farm or dwelling or building owned by such individual, or in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any one such individual, and the grant portion with respect to any one farm or dwelling or building shall not exceed $500. Any portion of the sums advanced to the borrower treated as a loan shall be secured and be repayable in accordance with the principles and conditions set forth in this title. Sums made available by grant may be made subject to the conditions set out in this title for the protection of the Government with respect to contributions made on loans by the Secretary. In the case of such loan or grant with respect to a farm not occupied by the owner of the land, the Secretary may, as a condition precedent to the grant, require that the landowner enter into such stipulations and agreements with the Secretary and the occupants of the farm as will make it possible for the occupant to obtain the full benefits of the grant.

MORATORIUM ON PAYMENTS UNDER LOANS

SEC. 405. During any time that any such loan is outstanding, the Secretary is authorized under regulations to be prescribed by him to grant a moratorium upon the payment of interest and principal on such loan for so long a period as he deems necessary, upon a showing by the borrower that due to circumstances beyond his control, he is unable to continue making payments of such principal and interest when due without unduly impairing his standard of living. In cases of extreme hardship under the foregoing circumstances, the Secretary is further authorized to cancel interest due and payable on such loans during the moratorium. Should any foreclosure of such a mortgage securing such a loan upon which a moratorium has been granted occur, no deficiency judgment shall be taken against the mortgagor if he shall have faithfully tried to meet his obligation.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

SEC. 406. (a) In connection with financial assistance authorized in sections 401 to 404, inclusive, the Secretary shall require that all

new buildings and repairs financed under this title shall be substantially constructed and in accordance with such building plans and specifications as may be required by the Secretary. Buildings and repairs constructed with funds advanced pursuant to this title shall be supervised and inspected, as may be required by the Secretary, by competent employees of the Secretary. In addition to the financial assistance authorized in sections 401 to 404, inclusive, the Secretary is authorized to furnish, through such agencies as he may determine, to any person, including a person eligible for financial assistance under this title, without charge or at such charges as the Secretary may determine, technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding farm dwellings and other buildings. The Secretary is further authorized to conduct research and technical studies including the development, demonstration, and promotion of construction of adequate farm dwellings and other buildings for the purposes of stimulating construction, improving the architectural design and utility of such dwellings and buildings, utilizing new and native materials, economies in materials and construction methods, new methods of production, distribution, assembly, and construction, with a view to reducing the cost of farm dwellings and buildings and adapting and developing fixtures and appurtenances for more efficient and economical farm use.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress estimates of national farm housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs, and correlate and recommend proposals for such executive action or legislation necessary or desirable for the furtherance of the national housing objective and policy established by this act with respect to farm housing, together with such other reports or information as may be required of the Secretary by the President or the Congress.

PREFERENCES FOR VETERANS AND FAMILIES OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

SEC. 407. As between eligible applicants seeking assistance under this title, the Secretary shall give preference to veterans and the families of deceased servicemen. As used herein, a "veteran" shall be a person who served in the land or naval forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom on conditions other than dishonorable. "Deceased servicemen" shall mean men or women who served in the land or naval forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation and who died in service before the termination of such war.

LOCAL COMMITTEES TO ASSIST SECRETARY

SEC. 408. (a) For the purposes of this subsection and subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary may use the services of any existing committee of farmers operating (pursuant to laws or regulations carried out by the Department of Agriculture) in any county or parish in which activities are carried on under this title. In any county or parish in which activities are carried on under this title and in which no existing satisfactory committee is available, the Secretary is authorized to appoint a committee composed of three persons residing in the county or parish. Each member of such existing or newly appointed committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of $5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this title and, in addition, shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses. One member of the committee shall be designated by the Secretary as chairman. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedures of the committees, furnish forms and equipment necessary for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he deems may be required by any committee.

(b) The committees utilized or appointed pursuant to this section shall examine applications of persons desiring to obtain the benefits of this title and shall submit recommendations to the Secretary with respect to each applicant as to whether the applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, whether by reason of his character, ability, and experience, he is likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under a loan or grant under this title, and whether the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the making of the loan or grant requested will carry out the purposes of this title. The committees shall also certify to the Secretary their opinions of the reasonable values of the farms. The committees shall, in addition, perform such other duties under this title as the Secretary may require.

GENERAL POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 409. (a) The Secretary, for the purposes of this title, shall have the power to determine and prescribe the standards of adequate farm housing and other buildings, by farms or localities, taking into consideration, among other factors, the type of housing which will provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling for the needs of the family using the housing, the type and character of the farming operations to be conducted, and the size and earning capacity of the land.

(b) The Secretary may require any recipient of a loan or grant to agree that the availability of improvements constructed or repaired with the proceeds of the loan or grant under this title shall not be a justification for directly or indirectly changing the terms or conditions of the lease or occupancy agreement with the occupants of such farms to the latter's disadvantage without the approval of the Secretary.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 410. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) make contracts for services and supplies without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300;

(b) enter into subordination, subrogation, or other agreements satisfactory to the Secretary;

(c) compromise claims and obligations arising out of sections 402 to 405, inclusive, of this title and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into as circumstances may require, including the release from personal liability, without payments of further consideration, of—

(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume that portion of the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the Secretary determines that the original borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities;

(d) collect all claims and obligations arising out of or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to this title and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, to pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the prosecution and defense of all litigation under this title shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General and the legal representation shall be by the United States attorneys for the districts, respectively, in which such litigation may arise and by such other attorney or attorneys as may, under law, be designated by the Attorney General;

(e) bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise to acquire the property pledged or mortgaged to secure a loan or other indebtedness owing under this title, to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired, to operate or lease such property for such period as may be necessary or advisable, to protect the interest of the United States therein and to sell or otherwise dispose of the property so purchased or acquired by such terms and for such considerations as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and to make loans as provided herein to provide adequate farm dwellings and buildings for the purchasers of such property;

(f) utilize with respect to the indebtedness arising from loans and payments made under this title, all the powers and authorities given to him under the act approved December 20, 1944, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes" (58 Stat. 836), as such act now provides or may hereafter be amended;

(g) make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

LOAN FUNDS

SEC. 411. The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to make loans under this title not in excess of $25,000,000 on and after July 1, 1949, an additional $50,000,000 on and after July 1, 1950, an additional $75,000,000 on and after July 1, 1951, and an additional $100,000,000 on and after July 1, 1952. The notes and obligations issued by the Secretary shall be secured by the obligations of borrowers and the Secretary's commitments to make contributions under this title and shall be repaid from the payment of principal and interest on the obligations of the borrowers and from funds appropriated hereunder. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or obligations by the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Secretary issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 412. In connection with loans made pursuant to section 403, the Secretary is authorized, on and after July 1, 1949, to make commitments for contributions aggregating not to exceed $500,000 per annum and to make additional commitments, on and after July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively, which shall require additional contributions aggregating not more than $1,000,000, $1,500,000, and $2,000,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 413. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary (a) such sums as may be necessary to meet payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary under section 411 equal to (i) the aggregate of the contributions made by the Secretary in the form of credits on principal due on loans made pursuant to section 403, and (ii) the interest due on a similar sum represented by notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary; (b) an additional $1,000,000 for grants pursuant to section 404 on and after July 1, 1949, which amount shall be increased by further amounts of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively; and (c) such further sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in my opinion paragraph 8 corroborates my statements frequently made that the only time the farmers are consulted by the candidates is a few days before election. Then they are promptly forgotten, until the next election rolls around.

So far as farm housing is concerned in the bill, it might just as well be forgotten because it is utterly and entirely useless to the farmer. We have given away billions upon billions of dollars, and I repeat, we loan England nearly $4,000,000,000 without charging them any interest for 5 years, and 2 percent thereafter. But under the pending bill, if it shall be enacted, the farmer who is so poor that he is unable to buy his own home, unable to buy lumber, or nails, or cement, is to be charged—not to exceed 4 percent interest, double what we charge England, and not to exceed 4 percent interest, as every Senator knows, means a floor of 4 percent.

These loans of 4 percent are made to owners of self-sustaining farms. The report says that these loans would not require a first mortgage on the farm property and could be secured by the farmers' equity in the farm, by the miserable little pittance they have left after they have already given first mortgages on their farms.

Mr. President, what did the Democrats do during the drought? They are running true to form. What they are doing now reminds me of what our Government did before, when it took a mortgage not only on the farmer's farm, not only on his cattle, not only on his machinery, but it took a mortgage on his chickens, and provided that the eggs which the chickens laid were subject to a mortgage. Every single egg had to be accounted for. A farmer near Dickinson, in Stark County, N. Dak., had to report not only as to the cows and stock, but the increase. There was a poor farmer there, with nothing to eat but a little calf. Mr. President, what do you suppose he got at the hands of the great Democratic Party? He got 3 years in the penitentiary for butchering one calf. That is the sentence that farmer in Stark County, near Dickinson, N. Dak., received.

In those days farmers had to account for a definite number of eggs, and a careful watch was conducted to determine how many eggs the hens laid.

Paragraph 2 of the report says that the farmer could get "subsidies applied as a partial credit on interest, and principal payments could not be made available" to any farmer who is broke "for more than 10 years and, in the aggregate, could not exceed $5,000,000."

Mark you, Mr. President, $5,000,000 is all the farmers in America can obtain for this purpose.

Mr. President, in Representative VAN ZANDT's figures a few days ago it appeared that Great Britain alone has received over $44,000,000,000 as gifts from our country, and Russia has received, to be accurate, $12,793,400,000. All that is left for one-third of 5,859,000 United States farmers is $5,000,000.

The report on page 24 says that the committee went into this very carefully to find out how many farmers were broke and how many were self-sustaining. The report states that, roughly, one-third of all the farms in the United States are not self-sustaining. There we have it in their own report on the Housing Act of 1949.

There are, roughly, nearly 6,000,000 farmers in this country, and they say one-third of them are not self-sustaining. So these 2,000,000 farmers are going to have this $5,000,000, $2.50 apiece, in order to fix up their buildings, fix up their outhouses, and get the technical help and all the rest of it, as I shall explain in just a few moments.

On page 24 the report says, and I quote it so that every Democrat on the other side of the aisle may have the words:

Evidence before your committee indicates that nearly a third of the Nation's farm families derive insufficient income from their farming operations to finance the needed improvements to their homes (and other building improvements essential to successful farm operations).

So of the 6,000,000 farmers in the United States, one third would get $5,000,000, which would give each farmer, roughly, $2.50 with which to build himself a house, outbuildings, machine sheds, hen houses, and barns. But he does not get that until after the third year of the program. Very generously the committee adds:

Lesser amounts would be authorized for the earlier years.

So he would not get $2.50 the first or second year, he would get a lesser amount. Assuming that the farmer gets $2.50 after the third year, he may get 75 cents or 80 cents the second year, and 50 cents the first year, in order to build these buildings he needs so badly.

Of course, Mr. President, the bill is very, very generous in paragraph 3. It provides "Loans and grants for minor improvements and minimum repairs to farm dwellings and other farm buildings on farms which, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, could not be made self-sustaining. The amount available would be limited to $1,000 for any one farm or dwelling or building owned by one individual." But, Mr. President, inasmuch as last year we passed the community-property tax law, which provides that the farms are now owned jointly by the husband and wife, this amount therefore would not be available to the man and wife jointly, because it is available to only "one individual" who owns the farm. So it would apply only to bachelors and maids. Bachelors and maids are the only persons under the terms of the proposed law who will be able to borrow any money at all. And a loan cannot be in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any one bachelor or maid.

However, the bill is still very generous, for the report, on page 25, contains this language:

The grant portion with respect to any one dwelling or building could not exceed $500.

Which in my State would pay for exactly one-third of a garage, and if exceptional care was taken in the building and the supplies were purchased at rock-bottom prices, it might build an outhouse complete, provided it was not too large a one.

In paragraph 2 of the report, on page 25, we find the usual crocodile tears shed for the poor farmer—very reminiscent of literature sent out by candidates the week before election.

As I said, paragraph 3 of the report, on page 24 states that—

Nearly one-third of the Nation's farm families derive insufficient income from their farming operations to finance the needed improvements to their homes—

Which would amount to roughly 2,000,000 farms. The bill will take care of these under title IV of the bill, which provides:

The financing aids provided in this title consist of loans, which after the fourth year, could aggregate $250,000,000, and, in certain cases, annual contributions and grants.

The report continues with remarkable generosity and says:

They would be made available on such farms to be desirable, it believes some provision should be made for minor improvements, such as roof repairs, toilet facilities, sanitary water supply, to eliminate conditions hazardous to health and safety (and to protect the borrowers property) until the occupants are satisfactorily relocated. Grants totaling $12,500,000 are authorized over a 4-year period.

Or roughly $3,000,000 a year for 2,000,000 families, which would give them on an average of $1.50 apiece, which would mean roughly a dollar and a half per family with which to fix up the roof, and so forth, which is under the grant, for I am now not talking about the loans. The grant would provide $1.50 per family to fix up the roof, provide proper toilet facilities and sanitary water supply and to eliminate conditions hazardous to health and safety, and to protect the property in general.

But, Mr. President, I have not told all the beautiful parts of this bill because it contains something that no other bill has ever contained before in all history, and it is a part of the grand bipartisan policy

of Democrats and Republicans alike, because this bill has been reported unanimously by the committee, as I understand.

What the farmer has needed all this time, and which he is getting for the first time, Mr. President, under the generous terms of the bill before us, but which he never received before, is "technical services." That is what he is going to get under the bill. "Technical services" will keep the rain off his roof and keep it out of the house. These "technical services," for all of which the farmer must pay, will provide roof repairs and toilet facilities, and a sanitary water supply. These "technical services" include "plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information in the Department of Agriculture, and authorizes the Secretary to conduct a program of research with a view to reducing costs, and to make market studies and assemble data in the farm-housing field."

The sponsors of the bill say they are going to send a great number of individuals into the farming districts to watch how the farmer spends this $1.50 which he receives in the form of a grant, and the $2.50 the individual farmer receives in the form of a loan. They do not want the farmer to waste that money.

The bill provides for another bureaucracy in the Department of Agriculture—to send out men to find exactly how the farmer is going to spend his few pennies to improve his toilet facilities, repair his roof, get a sanitary water supply, and eliminate conditions hazardous to his health.

So there, as the Democratic orators say—there, my beloved friends, you have the administration's new farm housing program. There it is, Mr. President.

The administration gave the people of Italy $4,700,000,000 in gifts, Saudi Arabia $46,200,000, Yugoslavia $117,200,000, Netherlands and possessions $979,000,000, Greece $681,000,000, Turkey $305,400,000, Belgium and Luxemburg $1,744,000,000, Austria $885,118,000, Israel $63,000,000, and the South American Republics $1,651,392,000.

But the farmers of the United States, one-third of whom, according to the Democrats themselves, cannot make enough to provide themselves with decent buildings, are going to get loans—not gifts, but loans—at not to exceed 4-percent interest. They are going to get loans which in the fourth year must not aggregate over $250,000,000, and grants totaling not over $12,500,000.

The report further says that this is—

A special type of financial assistance—

Oh, they are always giving something special, Mr. President, and this time it is a special type of financial assistance. That is what is set out in the report.

A special type of financial assistance designed specifically to meet the problems of the farmers who cannot get credit elsewhere and of research and technical services, pointed toward more efficient and more economical construction of farm buildings.

If these grants and loans are like the ones given to the farmer during the drought period for seed and feed, then the farmer already knows that he must repay the loan, including the interest, although similar loans have long since been canceled for the farmers of Canada and farmers of some other countries.

Mr. President, I can mention instances of the Government, under its bureaucrats, having taken from the farm the last dollar or it. In one case a farmer died and left his widow with fatherless children. This man had patriotically borrowed money with which to buy seed and feed. He is typical of farmers all over the great Northwest. That was done when the Government asked the farmers to raise a large crop, in order that there might not be a shortage of feed and a shortage of wheat. Then what happened? There were no exemptions against recovery of these loans. When a man dies a lien is filed against him in the probate court. I know of instances where everything the farm contained was taken, and in the case of the man who died, the woman and children were left absolutely destitute.

Mr. President, I do not believe the farmers of England should be treated any better than the farmers of the United States. Therefore, I have prepared some amendments which I am offering.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wonder if the Senator has made an examination of what we have done for England, and whether the Senator has found that the farmers there are getting the same kind of technical help which he says the farmers of this country will get under the pending bill?

Mr. LANGER. I have not ascertained that. Was that all free of charge?

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely wondered about it.

Mr. LANGER. Let me tell the distinguished Senator that this help is not free to the farmers. Under the terms of the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture may charge for it if he so desires.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is this technical help? If I were a farmer in North Dakota, what could I expect to get in the way of technical help?

Mr. LANGER. The inspector would come around and look over the roof of the farmer's house, or his barn, or other buildings. The farmer might say, "I think I will put linoleum or tarpaper on the roof." The inspector might say, "No, I do not think I would do that. I would put a certain kind of shingle on it." The farmer might say, "That is too expensive." The inspector might reply, "Well, those are the rules laid down by the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture. We find that this particular kind of shingle, of a certain width and laid in a certain way, even though more expensive, should be used." So long as the farmer is getting a loan from the bureaucrat, that is the kind of shingle he will use.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is pretty simple, then.

Mr. LANGER. When it comes to the outhouse, the farmer is told how the outhouse should be built, just as was done during drought days. Special agents were appointed to go around——

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator speaks of an outhouse. Does he mean a Chic Sale?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I mean exactly that.

Mr. BRIDGES. They specified the exact proportions?

Mr. LANGER. They specified whether it should be a one-holer, a two-holer, a three-holer, or a four-holer. They specified what lumber should be used and what kind of cement should be used to keep out rats and mice, the type of floor, and everything else. To enforce the regulations there was a horde of employees traveling all over the State. I was Governor of the State at that time. I investigated some of the "Chic Sales" which the Senator mentions. I know all about them. I know what they cost. They cost plenty.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have wondered for a long time what some of the New Deal bureaucrats are good for. Now I think the Senator has opened up an opportunity of service for them. I think they might be good inspectors for outhouses.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to close by saying that I believe that the amendments which I have submitted should be adopted. I believe they would be of tremendous help to farmers all over the country. They would increase the amount to the same amount which we gave England, $3,750,000,000, on exactly the same terms on which we loaned money to the farmers of England. We propose to give our farmers the same kind of a deal.

Under the Marshall plan England is receiving roughly one-third of the amount of money which is going abroad, and, therefore, the farmers of this country and the GI's who are farmers ought to get the same consideration as the farmer and the GI of Great Britain. Instead of getting grants totaling $12,500,000, they should get grants totaling $3,750,000,000, with the provision that for the next few years they can receive an equal amount each year. That is what England is getting under the Marshall plan.

I am one of those who believe that the farmer does not need any bureaucrats, spies, assistants, or helpers, or anyone else to see how he builds his outhouse or fixes his roof. Therefore I believe that the regulations as they relate to the farmer could be taken care of by the farmer simply certifying the amount of money he has actually spent and what he has used it for. If it were desired, he could attach the receipts which he received from those to whom he paid his money. All I ask is simple justice for the farmers.

Compare the farmer, under the terms of this bill, with the city man. The city man would get $750 a room. Under certain conditions he would get $1,750 a room. In certain circumstances he could add the $750 to the $1,750. The house would cost perhaps as much as $12,000 for a man living in town, but the farmer would get $500 in the form of a grant, and then he could borrow not to

exceed $1,000. He is supposed to get along the best way he can.

I submit that we ought to have absolute equality, especially in view of one fact, a fact which I believe the Democrats should never forget. It was the farmers who elected Mr. Truman the last time, and the farmers should be given at least the same kind of fair deal which it is proposed to give to the city man.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator speaks of the possible cost under this bill, rising to $12,500 per unit in the cities. I wonder if the Senator can tell us the value of the average farm home in America.

Mr. LANGER. I am not sufficiently acquainted with conditions in the South, but I am acquainted with the Senator's territory, and with the Northwest. I have been in practically every State in the Union. As the Senator knows, in the South houses do not cost as much, partly by reason of the climate. However, I should say that in the State of North Dakota it would not be possible to build the kind of house in which the average North Dakota farmer would care to live for less than $10,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the approximate value of the average farm residence in North Dakota? I may say that in the State of New Hampshire and other New England States the average farm home would probably have a value of $5,000, $6,000, or $7,000, while the bill provides for houses costing up to $12,500 for people in the city. The vast majority of citizens in my area live in $5,000, $6,000, or $7,000 houses. They would be contributing twice as much to build units in the larger cities.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my distinguished friend that there are hundreds of farmers in North Dakota who have homes which are valued at between $15,000 and $25,000, especially in the Red River Valley. It is not unusual to find a farm on which the buildings are worth $50,000. There will be two or three silos, immense barns, and other buildings. In some portions of the State the value of the buildings is not so great, but I should say that the average value is certainly $9,000 or $10,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am speaking about the residence itself, the farm home. The bill refers to the $12,500 unit as a home. That does not include all the outbuildings. I assume that in the case of the $12,500 houses, the occupants will not use outhouses, but will use modern bathrooms.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Speaking of the value of the average home itself in North Dakota, what would the Senator say as to the average value?

Mr. LANGER. I should say $7,500 at the very lowest, for the average home.

Mr. BRIDGES. As a whole, the people have pretty good homes in North Dakota, have they not?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. We would have even better and more expensive homes except for the trouble during the past few years in obtaining building materials, including nails, steel, and many other things—even paint.

Mr. BRIDGES. Under this bill the farmers of North Dakota will receive technical services, so there will be a new feature.

Mr. LANGER. Yes. If the bill is enacted, a man will come around to look over the roof, the outhouses, and the sanitary conditions, to see whether the water flows up or down; and we shall find out just how wide the little pipes are which bring water from the artesian wells. We are going to have technical assistance, and if the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to charge the farmer for it, the farmer will have to pay for that service. There is no limit to what can be charged.

Mr. BRIDGES. The technical service might cost quite a sum, might it not?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. How much does the Senator think it might amount to?

Mr. LANGER. That depends on how long the bureaucrat stays. If the farmer has a good looking daughter as by far the majority are in North Dakota the bureaucrat may stay longer than if she were homely. The Senator is a man of the world, and he knows how such things are. The bureaucrat might stay one day; he might stay a week. It would depend somewhat, too, upon whether the farmer had a two-story house or a three-story house, and also might depend upon the amount of work to be done there.

Mr. BRIDGES. If a great amount of work were to be done, he might not be able to stay so long; might he?

Mr. LANGER. Of course, it would all depend on the amount of work which he thought should be done.

Mr. BRIDGES. I see.

Mr. LANGER. So let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that the farmer and the bureaucrat might debate for several days, around the breakfast table and also around the dinner table, before deciding on just what kind of shingles to put on the roof and where to put the baseboard and whether a foundation was needed; and if so, what the foundation should consist of, what percentage of cement to use, and whether to use stone or brick.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In the event that the farmer and the bureaucrat did debate, who would win, if the farmer were to receive the service?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly the bureaucrat would win.

Mr. BRIDGES. So the farmer would be brought under control by this measure. When the farmer received this service, he would have to submit to dictation; would he?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. I particularly call the attention of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire to the portion of title IV dealing with technical services. That portion is found toward the end of the bill; it begins on page 58, and I shall read the entire section:

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

SEC. 406. (a) In connection with financial assistance authorized in sections 401 to 404, inclusive—

That is what we have been discussing—

the Secretary shall require that all new buildings and repairs financed under this title shall be substantially constructed and in accordance with such building plans and specifications as may be required by the Secretary. Buildings and repairs constructed with funds advanced pursuant to this title shall be supervised and inspected, as may be required by the Secretary, by competent employees of the Secretary.

That is plain enough.

Mr. BRIDGES. That makes it rather definite. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LANGER. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to wait a moment, please; I wish to show who will pay for it:

In addition to the financial assistance authorized in sections 401 to 404, inclusive, the Secretary is authorized to furnish, through such agencies as he may determine, to any person, including a person eligible for financial assistance under this title, without charge or at such charges as the Secretary may determine, technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding farm dwellings and other buildings. The Secretary is further authorized to conduct research and technical studies including the development, demonstration, and promotion of construction of adequate farm dwellings and other buildings for the purposes of stimulating construction, improving the architectural design and utility of such dwellings and buildings, utilizing new and native materials, economies in materials and construction methods, new methods of production, distribution, assembly, and construction, with a view to reducing the cost of farm dwellings and buildings and adapting and developing fixtures and appurtenances for more efficient and economical farm use.

So, Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that if the inspector who is sent there by the Secretary determines that the farmer should not move the materials from the town to his farm by motortruck, but should use a horse and wagon for that purpose, he could say to the farmer, "It is much more efficient, economically, for you to use a team of horses and a wagon, rather than to use a motortruck."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the farmer submitted to such arrangements in order to procure the small amount of financial assistance which would be furnished by the bill under such circumstances, is it the judgment of the Senator from North Dakota that the farmer also would be subjecting himself to complete regulation?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. For instance, if the farmer were to get a $350 loan, mileage would have to be paid to whoever went there to inspect; and if the inspector stayed there 3 or 4 days, to get

the work started, and then returned some days later to inspect the work which had been done, there would be a further charge. However, we can readily see that for a $350 loan, a $50 charge would be too much—certainly it would be too much, in my opinion—for the farmer to bear.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I gather from the Senator's remarks that he is attempting to show that the aid given by this measure would be immaterial, but that in receiving the aid the farmer would have to subject himself to an extent of regulation, rules, and so forth, which would seriously handicap him, and that he would be almost forever in extricating himself from them.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, that would depend entirely upon who was the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I can conceive of a Secretary of Agriculture who could do a great deal of good in such circumstances; but on the other hand, there might be a Secretary of Agriculture who simply would not be a good public servant, and who might wish to make conditions rather "tough" for a certain group of farmers—for instance, possibly a group of farmers who did not vote "the right way" in a certain State. Let us take such a case as an extreme example: In such case, certainly a Secretary of Agriculture could make things "very tough" for such a group of farmers.

I am reminded of the election in North Dakota in 1934. Before that election, certain voters who needed relief did not get it, but certain other voters who were not in such great need for relief, did get it.

Mr. BRIDGES. In that case, the ones who obtained the relief had voted for the New Deal candidate for President; had they?

Mr. LANGER. No; it was not a Presidential election. It was a State election. Certain people were supported on the coalition ticket made up of Democrats and Republicans, who were conservatives. They got help. The poor people who needed it the worst, who voted against the conservatives, did not get it. I may say the gifts included some mighty fine things, such for example as Hart, Schaffner & Marx overcoats. They were given away free. I refer particularly to the city of Bismarck, and the articles which were handed out. Some of the fellows sold them and came and told me how much they got for them. Some of them did not need them. Strangely enough, they were given out only 2 days before the election.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator sure that Hart, Schaffner & Marx overcoats were given?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is getting into a pretty good brand of overcoats, is it not?

Mr. LANGER. A very, very good overcoat.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is a new point in the administration of relief. I had not heard of it before. I am very much interested in what the Senator has told us about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the distinguished Senator has been talking not only about grants and loans, but also about adequate housing assistance which may be had under the provisions of the act. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator this question: Under the provisions of the bill, one of the requirements for obtaining a grant or loan is that the applicant go first to a commercial institution, and if he does not qualify, then the applicant becomes eligible for a loan of $500; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then where does the farmer go who wants to obtain assistance, who does not take it under a grant, but who gets a loan? What is the maximum amount that particular farmer can get?

Mr. LANGER. One thousand dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. One thousand dollars for a farm and $2,000 for an individual; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. For an individual.

Mr. WHERRY. No matter how many farms he has, is that the limit?

Mr. LANGER. No. It says an individual. I maintain where there is a community-property tax and real estate is owned jointly, not only the husband, not merely one individual any more, but two people own it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any other provision of the act relating to assistance to farm homes, outside the ones I have just mentioned?

Mr. LANGER. That is all.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the statement which has just been made correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I followed the Senator from North Dakota correctly, he was referring only to section 404.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking about.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That relates to submarginal farming only. There are different provisions with reference to those which are economically sufficient, or those which may be potentially economically sufficient.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood what the distinguished Senator from North Dakota said. I am asking the Senator from Alabama now, if there is contained in the bill any provision for any other type of loan for farm construction, outside the ones mentioned—the one where the grant is made in the amount of $500, or the one where the individual can apply for a loan and obtain $1,000 on any one farm, for any buildings which are approved, or $2,000 on any number of farms he may have?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me make it clear, if I can, in the mind of the able Senator from Nebraska. The limitation of a $500 grant, or $1,000 loan, on any one building, or $2,000 on any group of buildings, relates only to section 404. Both section 402 and section 403 provide for loans to farmers. Section 402 provides for loans to farmers whose farms are adequate, that is, farms which are producing and the land of which is good.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the minimum earning the farm must show in order that a farmer qualify for a loan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the formula is $400.

Mr. LANGER. Four hundred dollars gross.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is a time fixed, there is a year given. It is as of the 1944 value.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the maximum amount of the loan a farmer can get under section 402, if he qualifies? The reason I ask the question is that I cannot find a maximum stated.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama permit me to make an observation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield. However, I can answer the question first, if I may.

Mr. WHERRY. Please do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is no limit provided.

Mr. WHERRY. Then how much money would be appropriated in the bill to take care of loans under section 402?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The money appropriated under the bill is set forth in section 411, on page 65.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that the amount mentioned as $250,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Twenty-five thousand dollars to start with, and it goes on up to $250,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What I am trying to find out is this: I think I understand the grants, and I understand the submarginal loans on land that is inadequate. What I am asking is a comparison between the housing provided in urban districts and that provided for farms. The point was very forcefully made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. Under section 402 a gross earning of $400 makes a farmer eligible. A farmer is eligible if he has an adequate farm. What I should like to know is, what is the total amount of the appropriation under the bill, whereby the individual farmer could obtain a loan? If there is no limit, what is the proposal, so we can have some idea of how the money will be made available to farmers under the provisions of section 402?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the able Senator from Nebraska that I am referring to the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Where is it in the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is in section 411.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator tell me what the maximum amount is, which

is the total of appropriation that will be made?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Until July 1, 1950, the total amount appropriated is $25,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all that will be available for the first fiscal year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, for loans.

Mr. WHERRY. Who is eligible for the $25,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Three classes of farmers are eligible: First, the farmer with an adequate farm; that is, a farm which is economically adequate. That farmer is eligible for a loan. Second, the farm that is capable of being made adequate.

Mr. WHERRY. It is inadequate now. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It may be, or it may perhaps need some terracing and soil improvement, or something of the kind. That farmer is eligible for a loan. He may also be eligible for a contribution to help him carry the loan for a period not to exceed 10 years. It is somewhat comparable to our rehabilitation program under the Farmers Home Administration, or the old Farm Security Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then the third class of farmer who is entitled to a loan is, under section 404, where the farm is inadequate, and where we are not trying to root him to the soil; we want him to leave, but we realize it is better for him to remain than to be forced to go to a place where there is a slum condition. He can get a certain amount of money. He can also get a grant. Those are the three classes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The total amount of funds available for those three classes is a maximum of $25,000,000, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. For the first year.

Mr. WHERRY. What is it for the second year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I refer the Senator to page 65.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is $50,000,000, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Fifty million dollars for the second year; that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And what is it for the third year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Seventy-five million dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. What is it the fourth year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. One hundred million dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. And that is the end, is it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It levels off at $100,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That makes the total of $250,000,000, does it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. That is the total.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the reason I mentioned the total. So the total amount available for all classes of farm loans, for all types, adequate and inadequate, over the 4-year period, is the sum total of $250,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct—for loans.

Mr. WHERRY. For loans and grants.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. That is for loans. I remind the Senator that each time he asked me about loans. Now, the grants are set forth just below, if the Senator wants to refer to them. The first is $1,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a $5,000,000 total, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, the amounts increase yearly as follows after the first year: $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000. It totals $12,500,000. Under the potentially adequate farm provision, a $50,000,000 maximum is also authorized for contributions.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator reading from the report?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator point it out in the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is on page 67.

Mr. WHERRY. The total is $12,500,000 over the whole 6-year period, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, for grants.

Mr. WHERRY. So the total for grants, if the Senator will yield for another question, is $12,500,000, and the total amount of funds available for all types of loans for farms, adequate and inadequate, is $250,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the total amount the farmers can receive during the life of this program——

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is another $50,000,000 which may be used for contributions in connection with the program for potentially adequate farms. If I correctly follow the figures, the total amount carried in the bill for farmers is $312,500,000.

Mr. WHERRY. And the average would be approximately $80,000,000 a year; is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It would be nearer $71,000,000 in round numbers, taking into consideration the maximum contributions for potentially adequate farms that could be made the first 4 years. I think I anticipate the thought of the Senator from Nebraska, and I certainly followed the comments of the able Senator from North Dakota. I certainly feel that this is a mere pittance, but I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is the first time we have ever gone even this far. I want to remind Senators that we have had considerable difficulty in getting this amount in the bill. There is one good argument, and I should like to mention it. This is very largely an untried field. We have not done very much with farm housing. We have done a little under the Farmers Home Administration. I think most of the members of the committee felt we should start off lightly until the program proves itself. We tied the Farmers Home Administration into this program because it has had the experience of building houses on farm-tenant purchase projects, and also in doing a similar type of rehabilitation work, but we have started modestly. My hope is—and I am expressing my own personal opinion—that over the 4 years the program will prove itself to the extent that we can go into a program which will be worth a great deal to the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Alabama to the fact that there are many States which have no laws governing rural housing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am intensely interested in this portion of the bill, and I was somewhat amazed as I went into it with reference to farm housing and the number of farmers eligible. In the report there is an admission that one-third of the farm families of the country receive insufficient income. For the information of the Senator from Alabama, let me say that in the State of Nebraska 65 percent of our population is in rural communities. Nebraska is not an industrialized State. It is primarily a farm State. It seemed to me that there were 2,000,000 farmers who would have very little opportunity in the next 4 years, for the reason that of 2,000,000 only a handful will receive the benefits.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the bill, it can reach a total of approximately $15,000,000,000 for other purposes, over the complete period of 40 years. How long will the farm families have to wait? If it is good for the man in the city, it is good for the man on the farm. Why should a dwelling in a city be financed at a going rate of not less than 2½ percent, and why should there be a rate of 4 percent on farm loans? I am speaking of housing for those who have inadequate incomes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Most of the housing provided for farmers is not what would be called public housing or relief housing. It more nearly compares with the FHA, because it is on a loan basis.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree; but I ask the Senator this question: We are attempting to do for those who live on farms something which is comparable to what is being done for those who live in urban communities. It takes a different approach, it seems to me, from the approach to private loans. Who will determine who is eligible for farm loans? Who is to make the determination?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know there is validity to the argument which the Senator is making. I remember that in 1937, when the first program for farm tenants came up, I was a Member of the House. As a matter of fact, the first speech I ever made in Congress was on that bill. The argument was then made that we were providing only $10,000,000 for farm-tenant purchases all over the United States; there were 3,000 rural

counties, and that $10,000,000 would provide for the purchase of only one farm in each of those counties.

That argument almost defeated the program. Yet, we saw the program prove itself. I do not think there has ever been a program which has better proved itself than has the farm-tenant purchase program. It went from $10,000,000 until—I do not know how much we are providing this year, probably $150,000,000. It was allowed to grow and develop in an orderly manner. I am hopeful that is what will happen with this program, that we may approve a program and that it will be allowed to grow and develop in a similar manner. We are calling upon the same agency to handle this program.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please answer the question regarding the difference in interest rates? I cannot understand that feature of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do not fix a rate of interest in cities.

Mr. WHERRY. But we fix a rate on the farms.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the lowest rate of interest we fix on anything, except possibly rural electrification. Some loans are made at 2 percent. On public housing the Federal Government does not fix the rate of interest.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Who fixes the rate of interest?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The local housing authority issues bonds and sells them on the commercial market. The Federal Government has nothing to do with that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why should not the rate of interest be comparable to what is charged on an urban loan? Why should not the one who is receiving the same type of aid on the farm be charged an interest rate comparable to that which the urban tenant pays?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Usually in Government loans something above the going rate of interest is charged, ordinarily, to take care of the costs of administration. We do not say they shall be charged 4 percent; we say not to exceed 4 percent. We set the ceiling.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, let me say that the Federal Government does charge the municipality the interest rate, and that interest rate, no doubt, is reflected in the charges which the municipality or the local authority charges the tenants. Is not that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not understand the Senator's question. The Housing Authority is not financed through the Federal Government.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the rate of interest?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whatever the city may set in its sale of bonds.

Mr. WHERRY. Who loans the money?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whoever buys the bonds. The Housing Authority issues bonds and sells them on the open market.

Mr. WHERRY. At what rate of interest?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Whatever rate it can sell them for.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question? I do not want to delay the Senator; that is not my purpose at all. I still feel that inasmuch as the Government sets the pattern of what the interest rate shall be, because the Housing Authority issues bonds and sells them, whether it be a direct loan or a grant, it seems to me the rate should be comparable. I understand there is a maximum rate of 4 percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me the same interest rate, or an interest rate that is comparable, should be charged to all those who seek loans.

I ask the Senator further if he does not feel that out of the total amount of between $12,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000 to be spent on public housing there is too little allocated to farm loans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly will agree with the Senator that I should like to see much more allotted, but I wish to go back to the statement I made a moment ago. I think the committee looked at the matter in the way I tried to explain, and I think it was justified in doing so, that is, that the program had not proved itself, that we should start off modestly, prove it, and develop it. As a matter of fact, there were members of the committee who felt that we should not put any farm housing program into effect because it was yet new and untried.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Eightieth Congress did not make any provision, and the only thing done toward assistance for farmers was by way of an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Many of the States of the Union have provided no enabling legislation under which we could deal with them. I should like to make it perfectly clear that I was dissatisfied with the small appropriations the farmers would get for their homes in the way of grants or loans, as are the distinguished Senators from Nebraska, North Dakota, and Alabama. But let us be fair. This is a trial, and we did not have anything to use as a yardstick. There is no past experience, as there was in city development.

The only thing that has ever been done, as I have said, was the adoption of an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Georgia a year ago, and I know the Senator from Nebraska supported it, as I did. We did the best we could, and I for one would stand on the Senate floor and fight for better appropriations for farmers, I hope my Republican friends will join me in the fight for 90 percent of parity, and the other assistance city people can afford to extend to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In a moment I shall yield.

I should like to remind the Senator from Nebraska that on the direct loans we provided to GI's for home building we charged 4 percent. On the FHA loans the GI's get we provide even 4½ percent, and we have had difficulty, the greatest difficulty, in getting those loans financed at that low rate of interest.

Mr. WHERRY. Once again, that was the maximum rate of interest which was charged.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that particular case, 4 percent became the minimum to such an extent that it was not possible to get the loans.

Mr. WHERRY. They are not charging that, according to my understanding. It is a maximum rate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is charged; it has been charged.

Mr. WHERRY. They are charging 4 percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That still does not answer the question I asked. I understand on that type of loan that is an adequate rate. In the case of loans to people who are seeking to borrow on submarginal lands, inadequate farms, the loans are comparable to those made in welfare housing. The Federal Government does fix the rate of interest, because it sells the bonds and says what the interest rate is to be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; the Federal Government does not sell the bonds. The Senator from Nebraska has fallen into one of the most common errors in the thinking of the people of this country with reference to public housing.

First, the Federal Government does not build the houses. Second, it does not control the building of the houses. Third, it does not furnish the money for them. It does not lend any money on them. It has nothing to do with making the money available. Instead, the local housing authorities issue the bonds and sell them on the open market, and the Federal Government has nothing to do with the sale of the bonds.

Mr. WHERRY. Then what does the Federal Government do?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Year by year it gives a subsidy to the housing authorities to help make up the deficit of the rents collected after the houses are built and the tenants are in them.

Mr. WHERRY. And they sell the bonds to make good the guarantee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Government bonds, I mean.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Where do they get the money with which to make good the guarantee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The $308,000,000?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. The interest rate is 2¼ to 2½ percent. That is the point I make.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is not the money with which the houses are built.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care with what money they build the houses. In the final analysis, I suggest to the Senator again, and I appeal to his fairness, if there is a guarantee to be sustained, it has to be by Government money, and the

Government money, as in the case of the sale of bonds, comes out of the general Treasury or some Government fund pays it, and the interest rate is 2½ percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator wants to talk about the going rate of interest, yes, it may be 2½ percent. As a matter of fact, I think what we call the going cost of the money is something over 2 percent. So far as I am concerned, if I had my own way, I would certainly join with the Senator in making loans available to the farmers.

Mr. WHERRY. On inadequate farms.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. But as a matter of fact the committee thought best to support the pending bill, in the form in which it reported it, and as the able Senator from South Carolina so well pointed out, we have gone much further than we have ever been able to go before. I am hopeful that we will be able to get the title in question written into the law, and from it to develop a program which will justify us in coming to Congress 4 years hence and saying, "The program has proved itself. Let us now really expand it and put in a real program for the farmers."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, Senators continue to talk about $308,000,000. That is a maximum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Past experience shows that about 58 percent of that amount would be expended.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I never expect to see this amount expended as a subsidy, or whatever one may wish to call it, unless business goes to pot, as we might say. I look at this program as more or less self-liquidating. Only 58 percent of the available subsidy has ever been called upon for actual use under the 1937 program, and I look upon the present program as likely to lead to a similar result.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask him a question about his statement concerning parity payments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to have unanimous consent to permit the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the consent is granted.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from South Carolina said something about a bill being reported providing for 90 percent parity payments, which he said he would support, and he wanted to know whether the Senator from North Dakota would support it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not ask the Senator from North Dakota that question, because I do not think the Senator from North Dakota and I have ever differed on parity payments to farmers.

Mr. LANGER. I appreciate the Senator's statement, but I am going to vote for 100 percent parity, and if we cannot get that, I shall vote for 90 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am happy to hear the Senator say that. He voted for the 92½ percent of parity on cotton.

Mr. LANGER. I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for the fine record he has made for agriculture in this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am happy to have been associated with the Senator from North Dakota in making that record.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether he presented certain amendments to be printed and to lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I so requested.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment "4–13–49–A," in the hope that it might be made the pending question before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, line 11, following the word "and" at the end thereof it is proposed to insert the following: "(iii) unless the project or projects in the locality, which are to be assisted under this act, shall have been approved by referendum of the voters in the locality at a general or special election; and."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the distinguished acting majority leader and the distinguished minority leader if they believe it is possible to complete action on the bill tomorrow? There is much legislation yet before our committee, on which we should like to begin hearings. There is another housing bill before the committee upon which the committee is very anxious to take action. I hope the Senate may stay in session long enough tomorrow so we may finish the pending bill tomorrow, in order that the committee may proceed to take action on other matters.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I expressed the hope a few weeks ago that we might finish legislation then pending before the Senate on the following day, and there were some Biblical or Latin quotations used when I expressed that hope. I wish to say that we all hope we may finish action on the pending bill tomorrow. I am sure the minority leader will join with us in making every effort to reach a final vote tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very happy to give the acting majority leader the assurance that we on this side will do everything we can to have a final vote on the bill tomorrow. I think most of the speeches Senators desired to make on the bill have been made. There has been much debate on various features of the bill. I think we are ready to vote. I would not be at all surprised if we could finish action on the bill tomorrow evening. Most of the amendments offered to the bill have been discussed. I assure the Senator we will attempt to expedite action on the bill in every way.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is our intention to drive for a final vote tomorrow evening. Perhaps we will stay in session an hour or so later than this evening if it looks as though we can secure a final vote on the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I thank the acting majority leader and the minority leader for their statements. I trust final action will be taken on the bill tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance:

James A. Shannon

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Emlen J. Bell

Assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Arthur S. Keats

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Dennis E. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 7, 1949.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose fellowship our spirits are renewed, grant that this may be a day when we shall seek again to serve our generation according to Thy holy will.

Show us how we may lead groping and struggling humanity out of darkness and confusion into the glorious light and confidence of the sons of God.

Fill us with an eager desire to preserve the splendor and the continuity of those spiritual values which Thou hast implanted within the soul of man.

May Thine be the glory and the honor and ours the blessing which Thou dost bestow upon those who do justly, who love mercy, and who walk humbly with the Lord, their God.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 19, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, all Senators will be permitted to present petitions, memorials, and other routine matters, without debate, and without speeches.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. DOC. NO. 55)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice, amounting to $50,000, fiscal year 1950, in the form of an amendment to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 54)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department, amounting to $16,100,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 53)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $1,500,000, for the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISED SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 52)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation involving an increase of $2,267,869.53 in the estimate of appropriation for payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA GAME LAW

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Alaska game law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of that Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period January 1, 1949, through March 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN PERSONS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Public Health Service to admit to its hospitals persons committed by State courts who are beneficiaries of the service or narcotic addicts, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IN CATOCTIN RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREA, MARYLAND

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Erik Nestor Ernfried Back and Jesus Villa from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on January 15, 1948, and April 15, 1948, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial relating to the propagation of fish

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Approximately 72 percent of the land area of Arizona is federally owned and controlled, and about 30 percent of that area consists of Indian reservations on which the tribes charge fees for fishing. Most of the thousand miles of fishing waters and lakes of Arizona are located on Federal lands.

"The State of Arizona, through the Arizona Game and Fish Commission operates three trout hatcheries and three sets of rearing ponds and pays the major part of the cost of operating the Federal trout hatchery at Williams Creek, but its efforts are insufficient to adequately stock the streams. The State does not have the facilities to adequately stock the warm-water lakes and streams of the State, all of which would provide excellent large- and small-mouth bass fishing.

"The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has expended or is expending $141,740 in the construction or improvement of hatcheries in this region and during the past fiscal year expended $225,149.15 for the hatching, rearing, and stocking of fish, but less than $9,000 of the total amount was spent in the State of Arizona. This expenditure was confined to the Williams Creek Trout Hatchery, on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, and was and is insufficient to operate even that hatchery without the much greater contributions of the State of Arizona.

"A combination trout and pond-fish hatchery, to be located in the north central part of Arizona is a service very much needed to relieve the demand for fishing facilities which has been apparent since World War II, caused largely by the settlement in Arizona of approximately 100,000 young war veterans.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That the Eighty-first Congress appropriate the sum of $96,098 for the operation of the Williams Creek Trout Hatchery, and in addition thereto $258,141.28 for the construction and operation of a combination trout and pond-fish hatchery, to be located in the north central part of Arizona.

"Passed the house March 10, 1949.

"Passed the senate March 16, 1949.

"Approved by the Governor March 26, 1949."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 42

"Whereas the State of Tennessee has seen fit to impose a tax on the privilege of selling and using cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Tennessee that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law of this State; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are constantly flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of this State have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously disadvantaged by such use of the postal offices and mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of Tennessee; and that Tennessee faces and is now suffering serious losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and Senate of Tennessee that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which would aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States, be, and the same is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; or to enact such other bill to the aid of the several States affected as may be proper; be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the presiding officers of the respective Houses of Congress, and to each of the individual Members of the respective Houses of Congress from Tennessee."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution 28

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the United States mint to strike off a commemoraive silver half dollar, appropriately designed, a number to be dated 1948, the greater number to be dated 1949, in commemoration of a century of railroad operation out of Chicago, Ill.

"Whereas the Chicago Railroad Fair of 1948, commemorating a century of railroad operation out of Chicago, was so successfully staged and so popularly attended that it has taken on the status of a world's fair, and is to be repeated this year; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Michigan have a peculiarly high interest in the fair because the locomotive Pioneer, whose historic feat of hauling the first train out of Chicago is being immortalized by the fair, was once owned by the people of our State when Michigan operated railroads, from 1837 to 1846; and

"Whereas in 1848 the locomotive Pioneer was sold to a Chicago railroad and there it pulled the first train ever to operate out of Chicago, a 5-mile run now being commemorated by the centennial fair; and

"Whereas it is confidently expected that even more than the 2,000,000 persons who visited the fair in 1948 will be spectators there in 1949; and

"Whereas there were many requests by the 1948 visitors for emblems, rings, or monetary tokens to be kept as souvenirs of their visit to the fair, which requests could not be filled; and

"Whereas Michigan Day at the fair is tentatively set for Thursday, August 11, 1949, at which time thousands of Michigan citizens will visit the fair: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature request the Congress of the United States to direct the United States mint to strike off a commemorative silver half dollar, appropriately designed a number to be dated 1948, the greater number to be dated 1949, in quantities sufficient to meet the certain large demand from the anticipated several million 1949 visitors; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

"Adopted by the house, March 25, 1949.

"Adopted by the senate, April 6, 1949."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Resolution 13

"Whereas all sports-minded Americans have been shocked by the brazen attempts of certain disreputable individuals to "fix" athletic contests and sporting events by bribing participants therein; and

"Whereas these nefarious activities tend to bring all sports into disrepute and, unless effectively checked, may cause the ruin of American athletics; and

"Whereas sporting events provide needed entertainment for millions of Americans, and participation in wholesome athletic endeavor builds strong bodies and inculcates lofty moral ideals among the youth of America, so that sports may truly be considered the backbone of our Nation, and their protection a matter of national concern; and

"Whereas the laws of the several States are inadequate to cope with the menace of bribery where interstate activity is involved, unless supplemented by effective legislation on a national scale: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to exert its earnest efforts to preserve the American sporting heritage by the prompt enactment of a stern and effective law designed to eliminate attempts to influence the results of sporting events and athletic contests by bribing competitors or officials; and, be it further

"Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be prepared by the secretary of state and forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each of the United States Senators from Illinois, and to each of the Representatives in the Congress of the United States from Illinois.

"Adopted by the senate, April 6, 1949.

"SHERWOOD DUNN,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relating to the disposal of temporary housing

"Whereas the housing shortage of this State and others remains very critical; and

"Whereas this housing shortage has been made more acute by an unprecedented depression, followed by an exhausting world war, and finally by spiraling inflation with its resultant shortages and increase in costs; and

"Whereas the population of the State has swelled from 7,000,000 people in 1940 to over 10,000,000 in the short period of 8 years, resulting in one of the greatest voluntary peacetime migrations in recorded history, to accentuate the housing problem; and

"Whereas the temporary veterans' housing constructed by the Federal Government during the national emergency is still sorely needed, and many existing units of said temporary housing are still serviceable and will be serviceable for several years in the future; and

"Whereas section 313 of the Lanham War Housing Act requires removal of all temporary housing from the jurisdiction of the Housing Administrator by January 1, 1950; and

"Whereas thousands of deserving war veterans and their families will be made homeless unless the Congress acts to extend such removal date: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend section 313 of the Lanham Act to extend the removal date with respect to temporary veterans' housing from January 1, 1950, to January 31, 1951; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 21

"Joint resolution relating to memorializing the Federal Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Federal Government in relation to reimbursing the State of California and the reconstruction of flood-control works on the Sacramento River

"Whereas starting at about 6 a. m., May 14 1948, the Bureau of Reclamation partially closed the outlet gates on Shasta Dam, and by 10 p. m., all flow of water through the dam had been completely stopped, apparently without consideration of the damage that might thereby result to the flood-control works of the Sacramento River, and, without advance warning to those responsible for the maintenance of said works, suddenly lowered the flow of water in the Sacramento River, thereby releasing the supporting hydraulic pressure against river banks as far south as Knights Landing with the result that the sudden withdrawal of such supporting pressure caused the collapse and slippage into the river of extensive sections of saturated river banks supporting levees between Colusa and Knights Landing, a distance of about 50 miles; and

"Whereas the said levees must be renewed and rebuilt at a cost estimated at $4,000,000; and

"Whereas the rebuilding and relocation of said levees compel the State of California to make an expenditure estimated at $500,000; and

"Whereas the above-stated causes are the major reasons causing such: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, hereby is requested that they take full consideration of this situation and that they reimburse the State of California for all such costs arising out of this situation; be it further

"Resolved, That the Reclamation Board of the State of California shall keep a strict account of all expenditures made that can be attributed to the above-mentioned situation, and that the board periodically address the Federal Reclamation Bureau for reimbursement, and that they continually urge for such reimbursement; and be it further

"Resolved, That the reclamation board secure the assistance of the Governor, the Senators and Congressmen of the State of California in urging this claim; and be it further

"Resolved, That the reclamation board report to this legislature prior to its adjournment of the progress and results secured in this matter, and that they make subsequent reports until this matter is entirely cleared up; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Joint Resolution 24

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Third Assistant Postmaster General at Washington, D. C., in relation to issuing special stamp commemorating heroism and self-sacrifice of Manly and Jayhawker parties

"Whereas California is now in the midst of celebrating the centennial of its gold rush and statehood; and

"Whereas one of the great epic stories of the gold-rush period was the heroic treks made by various overland parties of emigrants traveling westward by covered wagon; and

"Whereas several of these parties sought a short-cut route to the gold fields of California through desolate and bleak Death Valley, among whom were the famed William P. Manly and Jayhawker parties, who finally reached the coast after almost insuperable and soul-stirring hardships; and

"Whereas the one hundredth anniversary of these treks will be commemorated with a magnificent and historic pageant at Desolation Canyon in Death Valley this November: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the Post Office Department of the United States to issue a special stamp next November to commemorate the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Manly and Jayhawker parties as typical of the fortitude and self-reliance which contributed so much

in making the West a land of promise for millions of our citizens; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate shall prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, and to the Third Assistant Postmaster General at Washington, D. C."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution relative to the work of Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche in bringing about a peaceful settlement of the Arabian-Israeli dispute

"Whereas Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche, acting United Nations mediator in the Middle East, has been awarded the thirty-fourth Springarn medal, which is awarded annually to an American Negro for distinguished achievent in human endeavor; and

"Whereas Dr. Bunche, through his enduring patience, courage, and political skill, has been cited for his priceless contribution to all mankind by bringing a satisfactory and peaceful settlement to the Middle East question involving armed conflict between the Arabians and Israeli Republic in Palestine; and

"Whereas Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, a graduate of the University of Califorina at Los Angeles and a product of our educational system, has caused high honor to be reflected on our great State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the California Legislature acknowledges this achievement in a war-conscious and strife-torn world; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the assembly be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 78

"Whereas the reclamation laws of the United States do not specifically recognize the use of water for (1) recreational purposes, (2) the maintenance of valuable runs of fishes, and (3) the conservation of wildlife as beneficial public uses; and

"Whereas such recognition of the use of water is becoming increasingly important to the future economic and social welfare of the American people, and especially in the State of California with its rapidly growing population; and

"Whereas until the reclamation laws clearly recognize the use of water for the purposes enumerated, those in administrative charge of reclamation projects will continue to be in doubt as to the clear intent of Congress relative thereto: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact an amendment or amendments to the reclamation laws so that they will clearly define the use of water for the purposes enumerated as beneficial public uses; and be it further

"Resolved, That in all future appropriations for reclamation projects Congress be urged to make provision to safeguard the public interest in recreation, fishes, and wildlife resources on a nonreimbursable basis; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 34

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate funds for the study, control, and eradication of fruitfly pests

"Whereas when Hawaii was the base of military operations in the Pacific area during World War II and civilian authority was superseded by martial rule, many serious fruitfly pests, including the oriental fruitfly (dacus dorsalis Hendl.) were introduced into the Territory from the southwest and west Pacific areas, due to the absence of proper inspection of incoming cargoes, by sea and air, and the absence of other protective measures against such fruitfly pests; and

"Whereas the discovery of larvae of the oriental fruitfly (dacus dorsalis Hendl.) in the vanda orchid, and the embargo of shipments of this orchid from Hawaii, effective March 23, 1949, in addition to many other products previously quarantined, points clearly to vastly increased potential danger to American agriculture; and

"Whereas this danger is of such nature as to necessitate, in the national interest, an expanded emergency program of study and development of remedial measures, involving the oriental fruitfly and other fruit and vegetable flies; and

"Whereas the oriental fruitfly has proven itself, in the 34 months since it first appeared in the Territory of Hawaii, to be one of the more destructive of insect pests attacking fruit and vegetable crops ever to appear in the United States and incorporated territories; and

"Whereas the oriental fruitfly multiplies with extreme rapidity and exhibits exceptional vitality, having been found almost simultaneously over the entire 250-mile extent of the major Hawaiian island chain; and

"Whereas such fruitfly pests attack almost all fruit crops to which it has been exposed, puncturing the skin and depositing eggs which develop into maggotlike larvae which soon result in the fruit becoming masses of pulpy decay; and

"Whereas this and similar fruitfly pests damage a wide variety of vegetables such as tomatoes and eggplant, and also the young bolls of cotton, and do damage to certain commercial flowers, growing nuts, and many other crops; and

"Whereas these pests have been regarded as primarily tropical, various of them show considerable adaptability, being found in large numbers at cooler temperatures on the slopes of Hawaii's mountains; and

"Whereas they adapt themselves to and live in a wide variety of wild plants in inaccessible areas; and

"Whereas the oriental fly particularly attacks not only growing fruit crops in the field, but may do extensive damage to such agriculture produce in transit to markets and actually when on display in markets; and

"Whereas Hawaii's efforts to achieve needed diversification of its agriculture through expansion of noncompetitive tropical crops, is blocked by lack of adequate control of fruitfly pests, even though the two major crops of its present limited agriculture are not those most susceptible to fruitfly infestation; and

"Whereas Hawaiian agricultural industry has independently borne most of the cost of agricultural research in Hawaii, to the extent of many millions of dollars, and has leaned but slightly on Federal funds for these purposes in the past; and

"Whereas due to the introduction of many of such fruitfly pests into Hawaii as a result of the war effort of the entire United States, it is just and equitable that the expenses of eradicating such pests should be borne by the entire United States; and

"Whereas agencies of the Federal Government promptly spent millions on the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly when it appeared in Florida 20 years ago; and

"Whereas oriental fruitfly ravages in Hawaii are but one of the several extraneous effects of World War II which have disrupted and injured the economy of the Territory of Hawaii, because war influences sharply curtailed basic Hawaiian agricultural industries during the period of hostilities while agriculture expanded in the continental United States; and

"Whereas placing of quarantines on shipments of fresh fruits and vegetables from Hawaii and other infested areas has already been carried to extreme measures, such as the recent placing of an embargo on shipments of vanda orchids although there is considerable doubt among entomologists that a viable larva or egg could be transported on vanda orchids under conditions which would permit transfer on arrival to other plants upon which they could complete their life cycle; and

"Whereas quarantine measures are negative only, and cannot guarantee that this or similar insect pests may not reach continental United States through Central American countries or by other routes; and

"Whereas only immediate and thorough study and research by adequately staffed and financed agencies can accomplish the control and eradication of the said fruitfly pests: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate a sum of not less than $2,000,000, to be expended by appropriate agencies of the Federal Government in carrying out prompt, large-scale, affirmative measures to combat, and to seek to reduce, control or eradicate, the oriental fruitfly and other similar fruitflies, in cooperation with experienced Hawaiian and other agencies; and be it further

"Resolved, That it be, and it is hereby respectfully suggested to the Congress of the United States of America that the aforesaid minimum appropriation should be allocated to concurrent, large-scale, intensive studies, as follows:

"(a) Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the expansion of the explorations in quest of parasites destructive to fruitfly pests, now in progress in the western Pacific area, India, and in South Africa, it being apparent that if success is to be achieved by this biological-control method, the prospect of early progress will be greatly enhanced by an increase in the number of missions in these and other fields, with increased facilities for reception, rearing, testing, and liberation of parasites and predators;

"(b) One hundred and fifty thousand dollars to studies of the biology and ecology of fruitfly pests, especially the oriental fruitfly, since comparatively little is now known of how it lives and how it responds to different conditions and environments, and such information is vital to control and possible eradication in any area in which it may appear;

"(c) Five hundred thousand dollars to the study of sterilization and fumigation of fruits, vegetables, and flowers, since there is a wide area of unexplored or only partially

explored possibilities for physicists, chemists, and biochemists with adequate laboratory equipment, including use of fumigants and gases, supersonic or ultrasonic waves and electromagnetic rays; and, furthermore, development of successful methods will stand for years to come as a vital safeguard to all agricultural areas which may be threatened by these or similar pests;

"(d) Five hundred thousand dollars to intensive studies of methods of area treatments and controls, such as spraying from aircraft, various uses of chemicals, and eradication of host plants, inasmuch as such controls will be immediately needed should the fruitfly or a similar pest appear in any area in continental United States unprotected by ocean barriers;

"(e) Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to intensive development and testing of new insecticides, since there are already thousands of new chemical products of laboratories developed during the war which have yet to be properly tested against these specific insects under various conditions; and

"(f) Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars to research in disinsectizing materials and procedures on local and global common carriers, since rapid development of air travel has brought all continents within a few hours of each other; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the members of the respective Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, to the members of agricultural subcommittees of the said Senate and the said House of Representatives Appropriations Committees, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Concurrent Resolution 29

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that the Navy Department is contemplating the placing of the naval air station, at Kaneohe, Hawaii, on an inactive status; and

"Whereas there are ample facilities at Kaneohe Naval Air Station for housing and recreation which the Territory needs and can put to good use for its people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to make available to the Territory of Hawaii the housing and recreational facilities at the Kaneohe Naval Air Station to be used for the public purposes contemplated in this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the commandant of the Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-fourth legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Secretary of Defense and the Committee on Civilian Components, commonly known as the Gray Board, have recommended the federalization of the National Guard by the organization of a single Federal Reserve Force under the Army clause of the Constitution, instead of under the militia clauses of the Constitution as the National Guard is now organized and under which the sovereign States retain the authority for the appointment of the officers of the National Guard and the training of the National Guard in time of peace in accordance with the discipline prescribed by the Congress; and

"Whereas federalization of the National Guard would destroy the National Guard as it now exists and which has rendered exceptional and valiant service to the Nation in two world wars, and in time of peace would impose extraordinary costs beyond the ability of the Nation to meet, and would result in the centralization of all military power in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the States would be left without an internal security force and would be compelled to organize and maintain State troops at great cost to the States, with the result that there would thus be maintained a Federal Reserve and State military force, creating a duplication of effort and expense while the National Guard, as it is now constituted and controlled, not only furnishes the necessary internal security for the States, but, in addition, serves as a component of the Army of the United States and a first line of defense thereof as provided by the National Defense Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to oppose all legislation designed to establish a single Federal Reserve Force and to retain intact the National Guard as it is now organized thus reserving to the States the controls provided by the Constitution and insuring that the National Guard will be at the disposal of the State in time of peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the chairman of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relating to the strengthening of the United Nations and limited world federal government; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BREWSTER on April 13, 1949, p. 4447, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the extension of the rights of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THYE on April 19, 1949, p. 4719, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relating to the development of a harbor suitable and sufficient for ocean shipping at the mouth of the Rogue River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MORSE on April 19, 1949, p. 4720, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the return to the State of Iowa of the grounds and buildings of the Fort Des Moines Army Post; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER on April 19, 1949, p. 4721, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., relating to the policy of the occupation authorities in Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Youth for a Free World, of New York, N. Y., signed by Doris Senk, executive secretary, relating to the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument for world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the student body of Kaimuki High School, of Honolulu, T. H., signed by Henry Au Hoy, president, enclosing a declaration relating to communism in that school; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Vallejo, Calif.; the Common Council of the City of Plattsburg, N. Y.; the St. Stanislaus Polish Lyceum, of Three Rivers, and the Polish Women's Club, of Bondsville, both in the State of Massachusetts; the Common Council of the City of Central Falls, R. I.; and the Common Council of the City of Pulaski, Tenn., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Delaware State Dental Society, of Wilmington, Del.; the Franklin County Medical Society, of Frankfort, Ky.; the Omaha Pharmaceutical Association, Inc., of Omaha, and the Region Six Association of Chiropodists, of Omaha, both in the State of Nebraska, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Textile Workers Union of America, of Cohoes, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Clinton, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation providing a new post office in Clinton, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the enactment of legislation to return to the State of Iowa the grounds and buildings of Fort Des Moines Army Post; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Third District Democratic Organization, of Louisville, Ky., signed by W. Augustus Jones, A. E. Meyzeek, and Mark Anthony, relating to home rule for the District of Columbia; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to amendment of Federal income-tax law; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income-tax law

"Whereas the present Federal income-tax law is so drawn that in the event a taxpayer pays more income taxes than necessary for him to pay the overpayment is refunded to the taxpayer, plus interest thereon at 6 percent per annum; and

"Whereas as a result of this provision of the income-tax law, many taxpayers take advantage thereof by overpaying the amount of

their taxes in order to procure interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum during the time such overpayment is in the hands of the Government; and

"Whereas this practice is resulting in an undue and unjust burden upon the Federal Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the income-tax law so as to provide that an interest rate of 2 percent be paid on the amount of income tax overpaid by a taxpayer during the period such overpayment is in the hands of the Government; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved April 15, 1949.

"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

(Mr. HUMPHREY presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to payment of funds to Mahnomen County, Minn., in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and Congress to enact legislation to provide payment of funds to Mahnomen County, Minn., by reason of Federal ownership of certain lands with said county resulting in removal thereof from tax lists

"Whereas in 1940, the United States of America purchased in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota, the so-called Schermerhorn ranch consisting of 8,166.07 acres, situated in the towns of Clover, Beaulieu, and La Gard in Mahnomen County, Minn., a highly developed farm unit, and that as a result of such acquisition said lands were taken off the tax rolls and became nontaxable with an estimated real-estate-tax loss to the county of $23,952.50 for the years 1940 to 1947, inclusive; that in addition thereto large sums were lost annually on account of personal property taxes paid during private ownership but wholly discontinued during Federal ownership; and

"Whereas said lands were acquired for use to provide encouragement and instructions to Indians in agriculture and also to provide employment for Indians; and

"Whereas such use was discontinued in 1947 and said lands rented to individuals to be operated as any other farm; and

"Whereas it appears to be the desire of the council and officers of said tribe that said farm be sold and returned to private ownership; and

"Whereas the United States of America now owns a total of 37,064.59 acres in the County of Mahnomen, Minn., either acquired by purchase between the years 1935 to 1940 or held in trust for Indians, said total including the acreage of the Schermerhorn ranch above-mentioned, with the result that there has been a total estimated tax loss to said county of $86,437.66 by reason of such acquisition and holding, for the 5-year period from 1943 to 1947, inclusive; and

"Whereas the financial burden to the State of Minnesota and county within which said lands are located is becoming increasingly serious; and

"Whereas the financial responsibility for the acquisition of said lands for the educational benefits to Indians in agriculture or otherwise, is rightly and justly a Federal problem: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring herein), That recognition be given this problem by the President and the Congress of the United States to the end that appropriate legislation be enacted at the present session to provide for payment by the Federal Government to the State of Minnesota and Mahnomen County in lieu of taxes on such lands, and further that the lands involved be returned to the tax rolls as soon as possible; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved April 15, 1949.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

(Mr. HUMPHREY presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to excise taxes on furs; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to excise taxes on furs, and to amend House roll No. 1211 to provide suitable import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer.

"Whereas the fur-farming business in the United States is in critical condition due to abolishing of import quotas on foreign furs by Executive order of the President of the United States; and

"Whereas the 20-percent luxury tax now imposed by Congress on domestic furs is prohibitive, and has seriously curtailed the consumer demand for furs in the United States; and

"Whereas existing legislation enacted by the Congress intended to subsidize fur farming has failed in its purpose in that the requirements for loans to fur farmers by the Federal Government are such that almost all of those engaged in the fur-farming business within the United States have been unable to meet the requirements to secure a loan; and

"Whereas fur farmers throughout the Nation have investments of millions of dollars in animals and equipment, and Minnesota is particularly affected in that it is the second largest fur-producing State in the Union: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring herein, as follows), (1) That the President of the United States is hereby memorialized to vacate his Executive order abolishing import quotas on foreign furs; (2) that the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to excise taxes on furs; and (3) that Congress amend House roll No. 1211 now pending to provide import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer, and that the foregoing action be taken by the President and Congress of the United States during the present session of Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be directed to forward a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved April 14, 1949.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

(Mr. THYE presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

AID TO STATES FOR FISH-MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from the director of conservation of my State an important resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Conservation Commission endorsing Federal aid to the respective States for fish-management programs. I know how deeply interested my colleagues are in the subject of adequate facilities for the Nation's sportsmen as well as conservation of our natural resources, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, April 16, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The following is a resolution which has been adopted by the Wisconsin Conservation Commission at its meeting on April 12, 1949:

"Whereas Congressman DINGELL has introduced bill H. R. No. 1746 which provides Federal aid to the States for fish-management programs; and

"Whereas according to the provisions of this bill no new taxes will be created but the funds arising from existing taxes will be diverted to a fund similar to the Pittman-Robertson fund for State aid in game management: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the conservation commission approves of the bill H. R. No. 1746 and strongly urges its passage; it is further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Wisconsin Members of Congress, the author of the bill, the President of the United States, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service."

It is sincerely hoped that you will approve of this bill and give it your support at the proper time. Since no new taxes are provided or created the Wisconsin Conservation Commission feels that a tremendous amount of good could be done for conservation in the United States if such funds were diverted for Federal aid for fisheries similar to the Pittman-Robertson Act.

We will greatly appreciate your cooperation on this matter.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST SWIFT,
Conservation Director.

GREAT LAKES WATERWAY—RESOLUTION OF MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted at the twenty-third an-

nual stockholders' meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, March 28, 29, and 30, 1949, relating to the Great Lakes waterway, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 18, 1949.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At the twenty-third annual stockholders' meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale held on March 28, 29, and 30, the delegates, representing 250,000 families from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and northern Iowa, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the long struggle to secure the passage of the Great Lakes waterway bill through Congress now appears closer to realization than ever before; and

"Whereas it is generally recognized that the economic welfare of this section of the United States will be greatly enhanced when the Great Lakes waterway is completed: Therefore be it

"Resolved by this twenty-third annual meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, That our Representatives and Senators in Congress be urged to do whatever is possible to secure prompt approval of the Great Lakes waterway project so that work may start without further delay."

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to all Representatives and Senators in Congress from the trade territory of Midland Cooperative Wholesale.

Yours very truly,
FRANK LAIR, *Secretary.*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from the Midland Cooperative Wholesale, representing a quarter of a million families in my own State, Minnesota, and northern Iowa, a resolution identical with that just presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] urging final approval of the long-delayed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. As the Senator from Minnesota has had the resolution printed in the RECORD, I shall not, of course, ask that it be duplicated, but it relates to a subject for which we of the Midwest have been fighting for many years. It is my hope that shortly a new seaway bill will be introduced in the Senate to accomplish the worthy objective set forth in the resolution.

LETTER OF APPRECIATION FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have recently received from Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, reporting that the board of directors of that organization had instructed him to express the appreciation of the board to those Members of the Senate who voted to uphold the ruling of Vice President BARKLEY on the application of cloture on a motion to take up a bill or resolution, and against the so-called Wherry compromise resolution which is now a part of rule XXII of the Senate.

I ask that this go into the RECORD, not for any purpose of calling attention to a personal tribute to me or to my vote but in order to call the attention of the Senate to the reaction of this outstanding organization to the Senate's action in this historic and far-reaching issue involving the change in our rules.

I think I can assure Mr. White and the board of directors of his organization that those of us who supported the Barkley ruling and who opposed the rules change which is now saddled upon the Senate, seriously damaging our hopes of passing civil-rights legislation, will, indeed, continue to fight uncompromisingly until a rule is enacted which will end the disgrace of filibustering.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N. Y., April 14, 1949.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: By official vote of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at its meeting on April 11, I was instructed to express the appreciation of the board to those Members of the United States Senate who voted to uphold the Barkley ruling on cloture and against the so-called Wherry compromise resolution.

It is a great pleasure to transmit to you the thanks of the board of directors and our conviction that you will continue to fight uncompromisingly until a rule is enacted which will end the disgrace of filibustering.

Ever sincerely,
WALTER WHITE,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 187. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 273);

S. 292. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Saint Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 274); and

S. 835. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to James Madison Burton; without amendment (Rept. No. 275).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. 836. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 276);

S. 837. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Irene Scott Bassett; with an amendment (Rept. No. 280);

S. 1057. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Kathleen Doyle Harris; with an amendment (Rept. No. 279);

S. 1058. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to June Scott Skoog; without amendment (Rept. No. 277); and

S. 1142. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes; without amendment (Rept. No. 278).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1036. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lavantia Pearson; without amendment (Rept. No. 281);

S. 1037. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Virginia Pearson; without amendment (Rept. No. 282);

S. 1038. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ethel M. Pearson George; without amendment (Rept. No. 283); and

S. 1040. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Leah L. Pearson Louk; with an amendment (Rept. No. 284).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1649. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1650. A bill to amend sections 292 and 293 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1651. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in rheumatism and arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and epilepsy, and other diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MAGNUSON also introduced Senate bill 1652, to amend certain sections of title 46 of the United States Code, relating to shipping, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1653. A bill to provide for the admission of not more than 25,000 war orphans into the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1654. A bill for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1655. A bill to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1656. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Murray, Utah; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1657. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey for the construction of a channel, basin, and other improvements for Sesuit Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1658. A bill to extend coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to employees of certain transportation systems and other public utilities operated by political subdivisions and instrumentalities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 1659. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 1660. A bill providing for the conveyance to the Franciscan Fathers of California of approximately 40 acres of land located on the Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation,

Monterey County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MYERS (for Mr. LUCAS):

S. 1661. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor of the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO SHIPPING

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend certain sections of title 46 of the United States Code, relating to shipping, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanatory statement prepared by me showing the amendments proposed and the law as proposed to be amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1652) to amend certain sections of title 46 of the United States Code, relating to shipping, was read twice by title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO OUTSTANDING MARITIME LAWS, WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES

I. Amend section 222 of title 46 of the United States Code so as to change the first sentence thereof to read as follows:

"No vessel of the United States subject to the provisions of title 52 of the revised statutes or to the inspection laws of the United State shall be navigated or *maintained in port* unless she shall have in her service and on board such complement of licensed officers and crew, including certified lifeboat men, separately stated, as may in the judgment of the Coast Guard be necessary for her safe navigation *or maintenance in port provided that at all times the minimum engine department watch complement shall consist of one licensed officer, one oiler, and one fireman.*"

1. The italicized material constitutes the amendment.

2. This amendment proposed to establish the following: The Coast Guard has interpreted section 222 as to preclude any authority on the part of the Coast Guard to establish minimum manning scales based on safety for vessels while in port. The amendment would extend the authority of the Coast Guard to vessels while maintained in port. In addition, a minimum standard is established. For safety purposes, the Coast Guard will have the discretion to fix requirements above such minimum.

II. Amend section 223 of title 46 of the United States Code to read as follows:

"SEC. 223. *Minimum number of officers.* The Coast Guard shall make an entry in the certificate of inspection of every ocean and coastwise seagoing merchant vessel of the United States propelled by machinery, and every oceangoing vessel carrying passengers, the minimum number of licensed [deck] officers required for her safe navigation according to the following scale:

"No such vessel shall be navigated unless she shall have on board and in her service one duly licensed master *and one duly licensed chief engineer.*

"Every such vessel of 1,000 gross tons and over, propelled by machinery, shall have in her service and on board a *minimum* of three licensed mates *and three licensed assistant engineers,* who shall stand in three watches while such vessel is being navigated, unless such vessel is engaged in a run of less than [400 miles] *16 hours* from the port of departure to the port of [final] destination, then such vessel shall have two licensed mates *and two licensed assistant engineers;* and every vessel of 200 gross tons and less than 1,000 gross tons, propelled by machinery, shall have two licensed mates *and two licensed assistant engineers.*

"Every such vessel of 100 gross tons and under 200 gross tons, propelled by machinery, shall have on board and in her service one licensed mate *and one licensed assistant engineer,* but if such vessel is engaged in a trade in which the time required to make the passage from the port of departure to the port of destination exceeds 24 hours, then such vessel shall have two licensed mates *and two licensed assistant engineers.*

"Nothing in this section shall be so construed as to prevent the Coast Guard from increasing the number of licensed officers on any vessel subject to the inspection laws of the United States if, in their judgment, such vessel is not sufficiently manned for her safe navigation: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to fishing or whaling vessels, yachts, or motorboats as defined in act June 9, 1910 (ch. 268, 36 Stat. 462), or to wrecking vessels."

1. The italicized material constitutes the proposed amendments. The material in brackets is to be omitted as part of the proposed amendment.

2. This amendment would establish minimum requirements for licensed engineers as well as deck officers.

III. Amend section 673 of title 46 of the United States Code to read as follows:

"SEC. 673. Requirements as to watches; duties of seamen; hours of work; penalty; right of seaman to discharge; effective date: In all merchant vessels of the United States of more than 100 tons gross, excepting those navigating rivers, harbors, lakes (other than Great Lakes), bays, sounds, bayous, and canals, exclusively, the licensed officers and sailors, coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders shall, while at sea, be divided into at least three *equal* watches, which shall be kept on duty successively for the performance of ordinary work incident to the sailing and management of the vessel: *Provided,* That in the case of radio-telegraph operators this requirement shall be applicable only when three or more radio officers are employed. No licensed officer or seaman in the deck or engine department of any tug documented under the laws of the United States (except boats or vessels used exclusively for fishing purposes) navigating the Great Lakes, harbors of the Great Lakes, and connecting the tributary waters between Gary, Ind.; Duluth, Minn.; Niagara Falls, N. Y.; and Ogdensburg, N. Y., shall be required or permitted to work more than 8 hours in 1 day except in case of extraordinary emergency affecting the safety of the vessel and/or life or property. The seamen shall not be shipped to work alternately in the fireroom and on deck, nor shall those shipped for deck duty be required to work in the fireroom or vice versa; nor shall any licensed officer or seaman in the deck or engine department be required to work more than 8 hours in 1 day *without the payment of overtime for work performed in excess of 8 hours;* but these provisions shall not limit either the authority of the master or other officer or the obedience of the seamen when in the judgment of the master or other officer the whole or any part of the crew are needed for maneuvering, shifting berth, mooring, or unmooring the vessel or the performance of work necessary for the safety of the vessel, her passengers, crew, and cargo, or for the saving of life aboard other vessels in jeopardy, or when in port or at sea, from requiring the whole or any part of the crew to participate in the performance of fire, lifeboat, or other drills. While such vessel is in a safe harbor no seaman shall be required to do any unnecessary work on Sundays or the following-named days: New Year's Day, the Fourth of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day; but this shall not prevent the dispatch of a vessel on regular schedule or when ready to proceed on her voyage. And at all times while such vessel is in a safe harbor, 8 hours, inclusive of the anchor watch, shall constitute a day's work. Whenever the master of any vessel shall fail to comply with this section and the regulation issued thereunder, the owner or operator shall be liable to a penalty not to exceed $500, and the seamen shall be entitled to discharge from such vessel and to receive the wages earned. But this section shall not apply to vessels engaged in salvage operations: *Provided,* That in all tugs and barges subject to this section when engaged on a voyage of less than 16 *hours,* the licensed officers and the members of crews other than coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders may, while at sea, be divided into not less than two watches, but nothing in this proviso shall be construed as repealing any part of section 222 of this title. This section shall take effect 6 months after June 25, 1936. As amended May 12, 1948 (ch. 286, sec. 4 (a), 62 Stat. 233)."

1. Italicized material constitutes the proposed amendments.

2. This amendment would make it clear that the minimum of three watches must be divided on an equal basis for all the personnel. In addition, working in excess of 8 hours per day would be permitted provided the personnel so working overtime will be paid at the overtime rates.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES' LONGEVITY—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 931) for postal employees' longevity, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WORLD PEACE?—RADIO INTERVIEW OF SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE BY COMMENTATOR ED HART

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio interview of Senator SMITH of Maine, by Commentator Ed Hart, on the subject World Peace, on the program "Is Congress Doing Its Job?" over WWDC, on April 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUTCH INDONESIAN CONTROVERSY—LETTER OF 25 SENATORS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD copy of a letter regarding the United Nations action in the Dutch-Indonesian controversy, sent by 25 Senators to the President of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH DRIVE TO PROMOTE SALES IN THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article

entitled "British Map Drive To Push Sales Here," by Clifton Daniel, from the New York Times of April 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUNDAY IN THE CONSTITUTION—STATEMENT BY THE LORD'S DAY ALLIANCE OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Sunday in the Constitution of the United States—The United States a Christian Nation," issued by the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keep Taft-Hartley Gains in Labor Law Revision," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW MUCH CAN WE DO WITH SAFETY?—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Much Can We Do With Safety?" from the Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FROM ZION'S HILL—SERMON BY RABBI MORRIS GORDON

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "From Zion's Hill," delivered by Rabbi Morris Gordon at the Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church, Minneapolis, Minn., on February 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate for the next 2 days.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for several months past I have had engagements in my State. I had hoped that the housing bill would have been disposed of before this. It is necessary that I catch a train in about 40 minutes. I therefore ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the balance of the present week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to meet tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to conduct a hearing tomorrow at 2 o'clock during the session of the Senate, on subjects pertaining to aviation.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I trust that Members of the Senate have been reading the current series of articles in the Baltimore Sun on the monetary cost of the social-welfare program which President Truman has submitted to Congress for enactment into law.

It has been pointed out in these articles that over a period of 50 years the cost would be more than $1,250,000,000,000. The Baltimore Sun pointed out that this staggering total was obtained from official testimony.

The articles do not discuss the merits or demerits of the President's program—only the dollar cost. This information should be of great value to the Senate as it considers all the spending proposals of the President, especially in view of the fact that if all of them were approved, higher taxes or deficit spending, or both, would be necessary to avert national bankruptcy, and those higher taxes or highly inflationary deficit financing would add to the downward trend of business and upward trend in unemployment.

I ask unanimous consent for insertion at this point in the body of the RECORD of the fourth article in the Baltimore Sun series, bearing the heading, "Increased Payments Could Start in July."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—INCREASED PAYMENTS COULD START IN JULY

(This is the fourth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—If Congress acts quickly—as the President has urged—the proposed expansion of the social-security program would raise old-age and survivor benefits this year.

The proposed higher taxes, as well as the enlarged benefits which the President has proposed, would begin July 1.

Aged persons already retired and those retiring after July 1 would receive monthly pay chcks 65 percent to 115 percent higher than those they now receive.

Surviving widows with children would receive monthly checks ranging from 63 percent to 91 percent higher than at present.

The whole range of minimum benefits—the lowest the law says shall be paid any persons who had very low earnings—would be increased. Most of them would be more than doubled.

A retired individual who now receives only $10 a month because his earnings were very low would be raised to $25.

A retired man and wife, who, under similar conditions, now receive only the minimum of $15 for couples, would be boosted to $37.50.

A widow and two children of a deceased worker whose earnings might have entitled them to only $17.50 minimum, would be boosted to $50 under the pending bill, an increase of 185 percent.

The maximum family benefit, now $85 a month, would be increased to $150.

Prevailing benefit rates for old-age and survivors insurance were adopted in 1939.

Even before the war some authorities said the rates were too low. Since then wage levels and the cost of living have risen very sharply.

Today there is general agreement among all of the authorities—in and out of the Government—that monthly benefits under old-age and survivors insurance are too low.

But there is some disagreement as to how high they should be raised.

EXISTING BENEFITS WOULD DOUBLE

The increases proposed in the pending administration bill would just about double existing benefits for old age and for survivors.

Proposed outlays for those two purposes, as outlined in the President's budget message in January, would rise from $745,000,000 this year to $2,245,000,000 next year.

From then on, as more and more aged persons retire, and more and more survivors claim benefits, the costs would rise until by 1960 they would range between $4,700,000,000 and $7,100,000,000 a year.

In 50 years, the cost of benefits would range between $13,000,000,000 and $20,000,000,000 a year for old-age and survivors insurance alone.

What would these higher benefits mean to you as an insured worker?

Let's assume you are single, just 65 years old, and ready to retire after working for 12 years in an insured job—the full time that is, since social security started.

Your wages for the last 12 years have averaged $200 a month.

Under the existing benefit formula you would retire with $39.20 a month—and this would continue as long as you live, or unless you go back to work and earn more than $14.99 a month in some job covered by social security.

Under the administration program now before Congress, your monthly benefit check would be raised in July to $63.

Now let's assume you are married and ready to retire. Your wife also is 65 years old. Your average pay for 12 years has been $200 a month.

Under present benefits, the two of you together would draw $58.80 a month. You would get $39.20—the same as the single man—and your wife would get one-half as much—$19.60.

But if your wife is only 55 years old, say, then under present law she would draw nothing for the next 10 years—or until she reaches age 65.

The two of you would have to live for 10 years on your $39.20 unless you had some outside source of income.

The President's bill would raise the amount of benefit for you and your wife to $94.50 if you are both at retirement age.

LOWER AGE LIMITS PROPOSED

The bill would also lower the retirement age for women from 65 to 60 years. This would apply to insured women workers as well as wives of workers.

Let's assume another case. You are the widow of a worker who has just died after working in covered employment for 12 years. His average wage for the period was $200 a month.

As the law now stands, you and your two minor children—both under 18 years old—would get a monthly benefit check of $88.60.

This would last until the youngest child reaches 18. Then if you were not 65, benefits would cease until you are 65.

The President's bill, now before the Ways and Means Committee, would jump your benefit check to $126 a month.

And after your youngest child reaches 18 and benefits cease, you would only have to wait until age 60 for your widow's benefit.

Lowering the retirement age for women from 65 years to 60 would ultimately raise the costs of old-age benefits between $1,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000 a year.

But the authorities point out that most wives—four out of five—are younger than their husbands and that the present 65-year requirement often works a great hardship on old couples.

If the proposed bill would give a husband $79.80 retirement pay at age 65, it would give

his wife half of that amount, or $39.90, when she reaches age 60.

The following table, prepared by the social-security commissioner's office, illustrates the increases insured workers would get for retirement purposes under the administration bill.

Old-age insurance payments

Average monthly wage	Present payments	Proposed payments	Percent increase
$200	$58.80	$94.50	60
$300	67.20	119.70	78
$400	67.20	144.90	115

Old-age insurance benefits of retired persons who have been covered in the system for 12 years

Average wage, monthly	Present law		Proposed legislation	
	Single person, 65 and over	Couple, both 65	Single person, 65 and over	Couple, man 65, wife 60
$100	$28.00	$42.00	$46.20	$69.30
$200	39.20	58.80	63.00	94.50
$300	44.80	67.20	79.80	119.70
$400	44.80	67.20	96.60	144.90

Illustration of survivors' insurance benefits for a worker's widow and two children, assuming 12 years' coverage

Average wage, monthly	Monthly benefit, present law	Proposed legislation, monthly benefit
$100	$49.60	$80.00
$200	68.60	126.00
$300	78.40	150.00
$400	78.40	150.00

If you figure out the percentage increases proposed in the top table, you will find that the benefit of the man who averages $100 a month will go up 65 percent while the $400 man will rise 115 percent.

The bigger benefits payable to everybody will result from a more liberal benefit formula.

But the bigger percentage gain for the $400-a-month man will result from raising the taxable base from the present $3,000 to $4,800.

Insurance actuaries have complained to Congress that this proposed 115 percent increase for the $400-a-month worker is a free ride for the wealthy.

Here's how it would work out:

A $400-a-month couple now draws $67.20 retirement benefits.

Under the administration bill they would receive $144.90—based on an average of $400 a month.

If the base were left at $3,000 this couple would only draw $107.10 a month benefits.

Thus by raising the base $1,800, a worker earning the maximum taxable wage—$400 a month—would enjoy a $37.80 a month jump in benefits.

COST OF PROPOSED INCREASE

What would this extra $37.80 a month cost the worker?

If he is already retired—nothing.

But if he is still working in a covered job, the extra $1,800 taxable salary basis would cost $72 a year, or $6 a month—$3 paid by the worker, and $3 by the employer.

In short, for $6 a month extra premium, the worker stands to gain $37.80 a month extra benefit.

There is a big argument going on before the Ways and Means Committee as to whether this is a proper procedure.

The life-insurance companies have told Congress that in their judgment the proposal is not proper. The biggest percentage rise in benefits would go to persons who—they say—"are amply able through their own efforts to supplement social-security benefits."

But the administration has told Congress that in its judgment the proposed new scale of benefits is wholly justified because of the increased cost of living.

LIVING COSTS UP 75 PERCENT

Since 1939—when benefit rates were established—living costs, according to Arthur J. Altmeyer's testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, have gone up 75 percent.

So they have proposed, he said, both a new formula for computing benefits and an increase of the wage base to $4,800.

In 1939 about 97 percent of all covered workers received wages below $3,000.

At today's wage level, a $4,800 base would include the total wages of about 96 percent of all workers, Altmeyer said.

The change is necessary to give workers the same degree of protection as they were accorded in 1939, he said.

As to the higher percentage increase to be given higher paid workers, Altmeyer said that unless there is this differential, the difference between the levels of living of the two families will not be properly represented.

THE SENATORIAL VISIT TO CERTAIN SLUM AREAS—STATEMENT BY EDGAR G. BROWN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by Edgar G. Brown, director of the National Negro Council.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREE LIBERAL REPUBLICAN SENATORS AND THE TWO LIBERAL DEMOCRATIC SENATORS HAVE DRAMATIZED THE SYMPTOMS OF THE NEGRO SLUMS IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL BUT MISSED THE CAUSE—RACIAL SEGREGATION

(Statement of Edgar G. Brown, director, National Negro Council)

The distinguished Republican and Democratic Senators successfully dramatized the plight of the innocent Negro slum dwellers in the shadow of the Capitol on yesterday, 24 hours approximately before the Senate votes on the Bricker antidiscrimination and antisegregation amendment to the multi-billion-dollar national housing bill.

The National Negro Council would like to call the Senators' attention to the hearings on the housing bill, particularly pages 369 to 384, the testimony of Edgar G. Brown and the study of the National Committee on Segregation and Housing in the Nation's Capital.

The liberal Senators, but announced opponents of equal housing accommodations and antidiscrimination provision in S. 1070 as guaranteed by the Constitution, are on the wrong scent, in touring the Negro slums in the shadow of the Capitol. In the Negro voters' book the Senators' favorable vote on the Bricker antidiscrimination and antisegregation amendment will be recorded as a vote for civil rights and a negative vote as an alinement with the Dixiecrats.

We wish to quote from the hearings on page 372:

"It might surprise the people we liberated from Nazi ghettoes to know that race segregation is defended as both natural and American by the business and property interests that dominate the Nation's Capital. * * * What is important to most whites is the value of property as a place to live, and this value is threatened by the construction of racial barricades. With each Negro segregated, the fear increases in adjacent white communities as if a dam were about to break. When a crack appears, panic may ensue and the white owner may suffer an actual monetary loss. The fact that the Negro's exclusion can be capitalized is their main worry. What they fear is the high price colored people are forced and willing to offer. They don't want to sell."

THE AIRPLANE AS A FARM IMPLEMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, through public and private research institutions I have prepared a statement showing the value of the airplane as a farm implement. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AIRPLANE AS A FARM IMPLEMENT

I wish to recognize and to point out for the record the new application of a great and truly modern, American product—the airplane. I would like to specifically portray the airplane in its least glamorous light and consider its entry into the field of our largest and most essential industry, agriculture. In the past, the farmer has been exceedingly reluctant, at times, to apply new ways and means in the production of America's foodstuff. The old-fashioned methods have been hard to discard. The farmer has been some 30 years in the process of final acceptance of the gasoline tractor as a farm implement. And although the airplane has been active in agriculture through the period of the last 25 years in cotton dusting down South it has gained very slowly as a useful farm implement until recently, when the American farmer has welcomed the airplane as a new farm implement necessary to his operations.

The leaders in the fields of agriculture and aviation are to be commended for any assistance they may have given in this matter. One of the most serious problems facing our Government today are the matters relating to the tremendous problems of soil conservation and restoration. The airplane as a new farm implement will exert a mighty influence in the solution of these problems as well as many other problems in agriculture. Let each of us consider the picture familiar in our minds of the nonproductive farm lands in our respective States. In my fine State of Oklahoma we are unfortunate in having over 10,000,000 of our 35,000,000 acres of agriculture lands rendered nonproductive by the invasion of useless brush. This growth is a result of the disturbance of the balance of nature and its growth is accelerating at an alarming rate. Something must be done to solve this problem. One of the most recent answers seems to be in the proper application of the very highly potent hormone type chemical. And since the majority of our nonproductive lands, as a rule, are in the more rolling terrains, the airplane has a very definite use in the application of these chemicals which cannot be properly applied from ground sprayers due to the brush growth and rough contours. Satisfactory progress has already been made in the brush-control problem through the aerial application of agricultural chemicals now being developed. It is possible and logical to control this brush invasion with the airplane and the new chemicals in a period of 5 years, but without the new chemicals and the airplane it would take us over 200 years to solve this problem alone. Now, of course, the actual control in the growth of brush is not alone sufficient. We must then reseed the soil into legumes and native grasses which nature had previously carefully selected and adapted to the locality, or the new plants which have been proven most useful by chemurgy.

There has also been developed a pelletized seed which has been sown by airplane on several hundred thousand acres in the past 3

years. These pellets are made of suitable soil and contain the right number of seeds. Also, in each pellet is a fertilizer element, an insect, bird, and rodent repellent. The seed will germinate with only a little moisture. These added materials give the pellet sufficient weight that it will stay where it falls, and although some of the pellets may rest upon soil of low fertility there is sufficient soil and fertilizer to germinate the seed. Satisfactory progress has been made in this respect. Considerable emphasis has been placed upon a program clearly outlining the need for good farm-management programs which when complete should assure permanent productivity of millions of acres of agricultural land returned to this country as a gift from our acceptance of the airplane as a new farm implement. In the rich and fertile coastal plains of Texas and Louisiana far-sighted young men in both agriculture and aviation have used the airplane as an implement in planting, fertilizing, and weed control of their rice crops. In 8 hours of flying one airplane can plant or fertilize or control the weeds in 1,500 acres of rice. On the west coast approximately 80 percent of their entire rice crop is planted, fertilized, and weeded with the airplane. The airplane is most efficient as an implement for the control of weeds and insects in every crop in every section of our land. It will be used extensively this year, and it is the duty of all concerned to see that the mistakes will be lessened by the research and experimentation work which has barely started in the fields of chemistry, agriculture, and aviation.

It is also quite logical that the spread of malaria, and we have a serious malaria condition in this country, despite our public health standards, can be stopped in a matter of minutes, since mosquito control is within our grasp through the aerial application of the new insecticides.

We must recognize the great amount of damage done annually by grasshopper infestation, which requires fast and effective control. The airplane, by the distribution of poison bran spread in their paths, can stop them in their tracks in a matter of hours. Any other disease-carrying insects can be eliminated through the use of selective chemicals which we now have, and with the help of the airplane this material can be quickly applied over huge areas.

These are merely a few of the uses of this new farm implement. Other services the airplane is performing on the farm today include plant pollenization, crop defoliation, forest patrol, patrolling fences, checking cattle, aerial photography, and mapping. During this last winter the airplane gained many friends as a means of emergency distribution of foods, medicines, and attention for both the farmer and his livestock. The airplane is used extensively in game survey, forest-fire fighting, and jobs around the farm.

No doubt one of the greatest social changes which has been wrought by the airplane is the elimination of rural isolation for many farm and ranch families. The airplane has joined the radio and the automobile in this great revolution, and to illustrate there is a small aggressive town in the State of Kansas, of approximately 750, in which the town dads, mindful of the hitching posts that used to line both sides of the street, dedicated one street to airplane parking.

Flying farmers and ranchmen have been so using this street since the summer of 1946. It is not unusual to find this modern farm implement, the airplane, parked on a side street, in front of the grocery store, the bank, the lumber yard, or restaurant. A few minutes from their home and the farmers are in town, have the supplies loaded and are on their way back.

That is what I mean by recognizing that the farmer has welcomed the airplane as a modern implement with his open arms, and the result cannot help but be a more satisfactory and useful and productive agricultural industry, so necessary to the well-being of this country and the world.

Now, the airplane is not restricted, by any means, to the field of agriculture. It is important to the industries of this Nation and has some 100 uses throughout the entire field of industry, from abrasives through zippers. Nor is the airplane and its great influence felt alone in the branches of Government concerned with agriculture and industry. It has likewise contributed greatly to the solution of the problems of every other department of this Government. Although the airplane was one of our most mighty weapons throughout the last war, it can and has become a most useful implement of peace. The State Department has recognized its great value in this field on numerous occasions. When our farmers and ranchers are interested in promoting good will with the agricultural people of our neighbors, both near and those far removed from our shores, a sincere and lasting friendship between the countries will be developed. It is commendable to recognize those 26 farmers who chartered an airplane and flew from their homes in the midwest and visited the farmers in England, Denmark, France, and Holland last November. It is also well to recognize and encourage the tentative flying farmers' good will tour in South America and their sponsorship of the first agriculture-aviation conference scheduled for Kansas City this week. In peace we must work to build for the future. Peace is not a passive concept. It is an active state of well-being of our people and the people of the world. It is not theoretical. It is practical. It is tangible. It is food, clothing, and shelter. It is drugs for health and sanitation. It is books and papers and pencils for learning. It is machines, agricultural and industrial. It is test tubes and chemicals and scientific equipment. It is minerals and plants. It is human beings. It is the minds of men. It is their physical and mental labor. It is the proper relationship between men and countries. The airplane has expedited this relationship by bringing men and countries and their minds much closer together. Let us encourage and foster and develop the airplane in all its potentialities as the mechanical symbol of peace.

The airplane is a useful implement to our Department of Justice. It has rendered invaluable service in the apprehension of criminals and immigration matters along our borders. The airplane is an important implement in the distribution of our mails. It will not tax your imagination to assume that within a few years the delivery of a greater portion of our first-class mail can and should be carried by air. We should closely watch and encourage the experimentation in aerial star routes and fast feeder-line service of mail into our air trunk-line terminals.

The airplane is a most useful implement to the Department of the Interior. It has brought the various sections of our country into a more closely knit compact, more clearly understood group. Through the field of education, it has injected itself now into every classroom in every school, city or country. Our school children are aware and are deeply interested in the impacts of the airplane upon the everyday life of the peoples of the world. They are demanding further instruction and further knowledge of aviation. They are revising and streamlining the curricula of our great educational institutions. The fields of science, mathematics, and the vocations have been broadened to include the essentials of aviation. The fields of the social studies have felt the impacts of the airplane, even as society and civilization itself has felt its impact. The schools must keep abreast of aviation in all its civil and military importance. In turn, aviation must look to the schools in matters of technical development and trained personnel. In the general classrooms of every public school of this country, education is bringing to the youth of the Nation understandings and attitudes essential to continued leadership in world affairs.

Our military departments recall the value of aviation, both military and civil, in the execution of the last war program. It is well that they look to each field in aviation for the fullest utilization of its facilities in case of another national emergency. Therefore, we must and have considered the needs of military aviation paramount and in so doing the necessary steps have been taken to assure its maximum usefulness.

Our fields of civil aviation may be classified into two phases—scheduled and nonscheduled with the farsighted programs of the appropriate departments. The Government has encouraged, fostered, and developed the scheduled phase of aviation into the most magnificent system of quick, comfortable, efficient transportation that the world has ever known. We propose to continue to maintain this leadership. The scheduled aviation contribution to air transportation of military personnel and matériel in the last war was of tremendous value. The airlines have contributed in mounting importance to the spreading of world understanding through the facilitation of world travel. Nothing can bring about world understanding and lasting peace without the ability of the peoples of the world to actually see and to understand one another. The airlines contributions to world commerce are recognized by every person in this body. It should be a matter of great pride to the American public to recognize the phenominal growth of this phase of civil aviation.

Unfortunately nonscheduled aviation has progressed more slowly and this phase of civil aviation includes all of this industry not previously discussed under the military and scheduled phases. It includes the thousands of airports located throughout our entire country, both private and Government-owned.

It includes tens of thousands of airplanes interwoven into the daily operation of every industry. It includes the hundreds of thousands of pilots, mechanics, and other personnel, each contributing to our American way of life. It is, therefore, extremely important that we make every effort possible to remove the obstacles in the path of progress of this phase of aviation, which has so closely paralleled the history of the development of the automobile. I predict that it will be the farmer and not the soldier who will create the need for the airplane in sufficient quantities which will bring it within the financial reach of the general public within a very few short years. I charge those responsible in both Government and industry to effect a more coordinated relationship between these several phases of aviation and to prepare it for the great advantages of mass production and general public acceptance to follow. Nonscheduled civil aviation does not wish nor will it be permitted to escape the great responsibility assumed to our country, its Government, and the public. By the same token, neither do we in Government propose to evade our responsibilities to properly promote, foster, and develop this phase of aviation, which will permit it to attain its rightful envious position on an equal comparable basis with the rest of aviation in our domestic and world affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further routine matters, the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to Senate bill 1070, the housing bill.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. WILTON B. PERSONS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, before speaking to the pending question and, though very briefly, about the bill in general, I should first like to say a happy

word about a man whose friendship is shared by most Senators, and about a man who is shortly to be seen in civilian dress. Soon to retire from the United States Army, after 32 years of service, is an officer who is personally better known to Senators and Representatives than are most other officers in our armed services.

The officer, who is held in high esteem by all Members of this body, is Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, who has earned and achieved a highly distinguished record of service to his country. For the past 7 years he has been the day-by-day link between the Senate and the National Military Establishment. It has been through his completely splendid and reliable efforts that a better understanding of military affairs has been gained by the representatives of the people, who in turn were better able to acquaint the general public with War Department matters.

Many a young soldier, or his mother and father, who wrote to his Senator or Representative for help, received aid or satisfaction, or the answer to their inquiry, through the assistance of General Persons. General Persons leaves the Army to retire to private life, but he will continue to serve his country in guiding the youth who desire to enter into military life or want a knowledge of military training, to help them in their future lives. General Persons will become superintendent of the Staunton, Va., Military Academy on August 1 of this year.

I know I speak for nearly every Member of this body in wishing General Persons Godspeed, good fortune, and sincere congratulations. All of us have respected him, admired him, and considered it a privilege to be a friend of "Jerry" Persons, a good American and a fine man.

Mr. President, the Army Times, on its editorial page of April 16, 1949, paid tribute to General Persons. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, together with a biography of General Persons, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial, together with the biographical sketch, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Army Times of April 16, 1949]

ONE GOOD LOBBYIST

Because the term "lobbyist" is in such disrepute these days, we'd like to say just a word about one of them, Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, who is retiring from the Army this summer after 32 years' service, the last 7 of them spent in this "disreputable" occupation.

Every person in the Army owes a lot to General Persons. His tact, his patience, the esteem in which Members of Congress held him, were responsible for the enactment into law of a mass of important service legislation.

As legislative chief, Persons acted very little like the general officer in the field. It was not his role to command, but to ask; not to summon, but to go. If he told a Congressman that his complaint was justified, he would do something about it, so that when that legislator had another complaint, and "Jerry" Persons—he wasn't "general" on Capitol Hill—said it was unfounded, the solon would go away satisfied, knowing that Jerry wasn't covering up.

Congressmen and their committees have a lot to do. It was Persons' job to sell these busy men into acting on matters which meant little to them back home on election day but which meant much to the national defense and its personnel.

Jerry was a lobbyist, and a good one, fortunately for the Army.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF WILTON BURTON PERSONS, MAJOR GENERAL, O-7088

Wilton B. Persons was born in Montgomery, Ala., on January 19, 1896. Attended Starke University School (military preparatory) 4 years, and graduated from Sidney Lanier High School, Montgomery, Ala. (1913). He was graduated in 1916 from Alabama Polytechnic Institute with the degree of bachelor of science in electrical engineering (cadet captain color company ROTC), and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Reserve on August 5, 1917. He served on active duty until October 26, 1917, when he was commissioned a second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps, in the Regular Army.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to first lieutenant on the same date, October 26, 1917; to captain (temporary) on July 27, 1918; to captain (permanent) on July 1, 1920; to major on August 1, 1935; to lieutenant colonel on August 18, 1940; to colonel (temporary) on December 24, 1941; to brigadier general (temporary) on June 24, 1942; to major general (temporary) on November 9, 1944. (He was appointed brigadier general of the line, Regular Army, May 23, 1947.) Appointed major general, Regular Army, January 24, 1948.

SERVICE

From May until August 1917 he was assigned as an officer candidate to the Seventh Provisional Training Regiment at Fort McPherson, Ga. He was next assigned to the coast defenses of Baltimore, Md., at Fort Howard, Md. In May 1918 he went to France with the Fifty-eighth Coast Artillery and served as a battery commander on the Western Front. He returned to the United States in June 1919 after a period of service in the army of occupation.

He then joined the Thirty-first Artillery Brigade at Fort Winfield Scott, Calif., and in December 1919 was transferred to the Eighth Field Signal Battalion at Camp Dodge, Iowa. In 1920 he went to Camp Lewis, Wash., where he was assigned to the Fourth Signal Company. In July 1921 he was assigned as acting officer in charge and later officer in charge of the Alaskan military submarine cable system, and he served on that assignment until June 1924. In March 1923 he was transferred from the Coast Artillery Corps to the Signal Corps.

In June 1924 he went to Springfield, Ohio, to supervise development and manufacture of new apparatus for the Alaskan cable; and in September 1924 he went to the University of Minnesota serving as a professor of military science and tactics for 5 years. In September 1929 he entered the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, and was graduated in June 1931, with the degree of master of business administration (magna cum laude).

He then was assigned to the office of the Chief Signal Officer in Washington, D. C., in charge of purchasing and contracting, and in August 1933 was transferred to the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, where he supervised procurement for the Army, and served as liaison officer with the Military Affairs Committee (House of Representatives) until August 1937. He entered the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and upon graduation there in September 1938, went to Maxwell Field, Ala., to attend the Air Corps Tactical School.

In June 1939 he was graduated at Maxwell Field, and was rated aircraft observer; he then went to Fort Hamilton, N. Y., as signal officer of the First Division. In July 1939 he returned to Washington, D. C., for duty in the Office of the Chief of Staff, as aide to the Secretary of War, handling all War Department liaison with Congress.

In December 1941 he became Chief of the Liaison Branch, Office of the Chief of Staff, and in March 1942 was named Chief of the Legislative and Liaison Division, Office of the Chief of Staff, which position he held until July 1948. In this capacity he served as a member of the War Department General Staff as personal representative for Gen. George C. Marshall in conducting War Department relations with the Congress, including processing of all legislation necessary to the conduct of the war. Later he held the same position under Generals Eisenhower and Bradley. During this period he made several aerial inspection trips to Europe and the Middle East for the Chief of Staff of the Army including the amphibious landing in southern France in 1944, and the joint congressional inspection of German atrocity camps in April 1945 under the leadership of Vice President Barkley.

In July 1948 was named Director, Office of Legislative Liaison, Secretary of Defense, where as personal representative of Mr. Forrestal, he had responsibility for direction, control, and presentation to the Congress of an integrated legislative program for the National Military Establishment.

DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Distinguished Service Medal.
Legion of Merit.
Grand Officer of the Cross of the Sun (Brazil).
The Order of Abdon Calderon from the Government of Ecuador.
Medal of War (Brazilian).
World War I Victory Medal.
Army of Occupation World War I.
American Defense Medal.
European Theater World War II.
North American Theater.
World War II Victory Medal.

In addition to the above listed schools, the Department of the Army has granted him constructive credits for the following:

Basic Signal Corps School.
Advanced Signal Corps School.
National War College.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hill	Murray
Bricker	Hoey	Myers
Butler	Holland	Neely
Cain	Humphrey	O'Conor
Capehart	Ives	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Knowland	Sparkman
Ferguson	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McGrath	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Withers
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hendrickson	Millikin	
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr.

DOUGLAS], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

INVITATION TO HOLD 1956 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES AT LAKE PLACID, N. Y.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Resolution 110, Calendar 251, extending an invitation to hold the 1956 winter Olympic games at Lake Placid, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from New York the views of the Foreign Relations Committee respecting the resolution.

Mr. IVES. I was going to do so, Mr. President.

Mr. MYERS. Further, reserving the right to object, I will say that I now have received information from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], that the resolution was reported from the committee unanimously, and that Members on both sides of the aisle are supporting the bill.

Mr. IVES. Yes. I should like to read a brief extract from the very brief report of the committee on the subject, in order that the Senate may thoroughly understand the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I should like to have the Vice President state the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to the housing bill, Senate bill 1070. If unanimous consent is granted for the consideration of the resolution and the resolution is adopted, the Senate will automatically return to the consideration of the unfinished business.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Resolution 110?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I quote briefly from the report of the committee:

> Having agreed upon Lake Placid as the site to be suggested for the Olympic winter games in 1956, the United States Olympic Association has extended an invitation to the International Olympic Committee which is meeting to act upon such applications in the very near future. Senate Resolution 110 gives official Senate sanction to this invitation. The extension of the invitation will involve no fiscal expense to the United States Government.
>
> On March 16, 1949, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 56, which became Public Law 22 on March 23, 1949, joining the United States Government in the invitation to hold the Olympic games in Detroit, Mich. This arrangement does not conflict with the present invitation relating to the winter games.

Mr. President, the International Olympic Committee meets in Rome on April 24 to act on invitations for the 1956 winter Olympics.

I am advised that in previous years the country selected as the host to the summer field Olympics is usually given priority consideration for the winter Olympics of the same year.

Inasmuch as time is of the essence, I earnestly request the adoption by the Senate of this resolution so that it may be transmitted to the International Olympic Committee at Rome in time to lend support to the invitation previously extended by the village of Lake Placid.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to say to the Senator and to the Senate that the resolution upon which the able Senator from New York seeks action is a logical supplement to the invitation already issued for the general summer Olympic games to be held in Detroit. The winter games are held at a different point, but should be held in the same country. This is a part of the general pattern. Not only is the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in agreement, but so are those who are responsible for the Detroit invitation for the general games.

Mr. IVES. I thank the able Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 110) was agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1956 Olympic winter games in the United States at Lake Placid, N. Y.; and expresses the hospitable hope that the United States may be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.
>
> SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

The preamble was agreed to.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

A REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in this not-so-brave new world communications have played an ever-increasing vital role. Indispensable in war, powerful instrument of peace, this art has served tyranny and democracy alike. From the crude tom-tom of the jungle to miraculous radar, communications have marked the progress of man. Realizing its power for good and for evil, Congress created the Federal Communications Commission to promote the development of communications and to protect the people against monopoly and the exploitation inherent in an industry requiring regulation.

By specific law it is the duty of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to supervise the Commission's actions and conduct. Therefore it would be nothing short of dereliction of duty if I did not report candidly the deplorable conditions which I have found to prevail in this independent quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative agency of our Government. I have waited until I had an opportunity to probe and double check the patent situation before making this report on communications to Congress. Now with deep reluctance I shall undertake this more or less unpleasant duty.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the Commission's functions are more precious to this Republic than gold and more vital to it than bread. Its power to destroy the soul of America is far greater than 300 divisions of armed men under the direction of a ruthless foe. On the other hand, its potential to bless America equals, if it does not surpass, our vast educational system of public schools. With firm determination the Congress must seriously contemplate these sobering thoughts.

As conditions in this agency of Government have grown from bad to worse, I feel compelled to employ the harsh method of a public denouncement of the

evils which have grown up. To remain silent longer would reflect on my integrity and demonstrate my failure to be alert in the protection of the people's interest.

Individually the members of the Commission are persons of highest character and integrity. Taken one by one, each has superior qualities for the common task. I have voted for the confirmation of every Commissioner now serving because I believed each possessed the capacity to do an outstanding job. I would not change one of those votes today. Yet strangely enough, as a body exercising vital quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions, they have failed utterly in protecting the people against monopolistic exploitation by not blocking the plans of the conniving clear-channel lobby, bent on radio domination; by not moving promptly to correct the Commission's earlier error in adopting a narrow television system which insured the control of television in a few patent holding corporations; and by not formulating a television plan which would guarantee the widest and freest competition.

I want to make it crystal clear that I believe in the American private-enterprise system without reservation; I believe in the minimum of Government controls consistent with maintaining and promoting the general welfare; I believe that the greatest good to the greatest number will result from free and vigorous competition, and that it is the duty of Government to prevent monopoly and root it out wherever it appears. In radio, and particularly in television, the people of the United States and the world are dealing with the most powerful and effective propaganda medium ever known to man. I do not want that medium to fall into Government ownership; neither do I want it to fall into the hands of private monopoly. Free and unhampered competition is the answer. Therefore, my primary objective in everything I say today is to promote the widest and strongest competition in its development and use.

Mr. President, radio and television are not a complicated, involved technical matter which laymen can complacently dismiss as an engineering problem. In fact, this very idea of complexity and confusion and technical abstruseness has been sown in the Congress and spread deliberately both within and outside the Commission to shut out prying minds. Every Member of Congress can understand it once it is stripped of its technical jargon and deliberately distorted complexities. Simply put, a series of basic policy decisions and alert, industrious and honest administration are all that is required. Most emphatically, I say we had better seek to understand it, lest by complacency we allow an antidemocratic system to grow into a Frankenstein.

INDUSTRY TAKES OVER

Specifically, it is charged that the bewildered Commissioners, bogged down in the technicalities and red tape of their own creation, are the captives of their own staff; and that their own staff, in turn, is the captive of the high and the mighty in the very industry the Commission was created to regulate. The plow horse has usurped the plow handles and seized the whip, and the Commission is now pulling the plow, Mr. President. This is a shocking indictment, but there is abundant evidence that it is true.

CASES COLLECT DUST

It is charged that awaiting decision by the Commission is a huge backlog of cases important to the people of this Nation, many of which have been collecting dust down there for 2 or 3 years, with little or no prospect of action. Apparently, Mr. President, no one disputes that serious charge. In fact the staff boasts about it and cites it as evidence that an even larger staff is needed. In my opinion, under the present set-up a larger staff would result only in more finagling and wrangling and fewer decisions. It is easier to drive a camel through the eye of a needle than it is to get a decision out of the Federal Communications Commission.

PREMEDITATED DELAYS WICKED

It is charged that through the Commission's failure to make decisions, great harm has been done not only to individuals but to whole communities. It is charged that there are private interests who thrive on inaction and reap a profit out of the organized and premeditated delays which harass alert citizens planning improved service for the people. Certainly, Mr. President, in many instances failure to take any action is far more deadly and disastrous than an adverse action might be. When pending matters are delayed year after year, the Commission's victims are tied up without recourse. They can make no plans for the future and they cannot go to the courts for relief.

FEAR RIDES THE ETHER

It is charged that the communications industry operates in an atmosphere of fear of the Commission. It is charged there is an even greater fear, in that the networks and the powerful manufacturing and patent-holding interests, working hand in glove with the Commission, can and do exact their own economic sanctions. Mr. President, at least "fear" is an understatement in this case. There is genuine fear among the 2,000 small and medium radio broadcasters in this country. In fact, no one in the industry is free from it. Nothing behind the iron curtain compares with it, except that in Russia physical punishment is invoked; over here the penalty is the threat of financial ruin. Under the law, the Commission holds the power of life or death over radio broadcasters.

ABSENTEEISM RAMPANT

It is charged that absenteeism within the Commission has reached an alarming stage, and that when the chairman is not making a speech in some near or distant city he is busy preparing one.

During the last 6 months one commissioner has been compelled to attend the high-frequency conference in Mexico City; another has had to spend considerable time in Europe on mobile and safety service matters; most of them will be involved in the Fourth Inter-American Radio Conference here in Washington late this month, and two of them leave next month for Paris, where they will have to spend several months taking part in the telegraph conference, beginning in May. The North American Regional Broadcasting Conference is tentatively scheduled for September, in Quebec. There is just one international conference after another.

Doubtless the chairman of this Commission is besieged with requests for public appearances in connection with matters concerning the industry. It is well that he exercises as much reserve as he does, but it would be better if he made no speeches at all, particularly when they vary from week to week, depending on specific influences at work.

In Baltimore, on March 23, he told the advertising club that television service as now set up is potentially capable of serving many millions of people; that in most areas technical transmission is satisfactory; that the problem of obsolescence of receiving sets is relatively minor, since the present channels will be used for the indefinite future; that if he lived in Baltimore he would not wait until the FCC had decided what they are going to do about UHF, and that he would not wait until some bureaucratic agency decided whether there was sufficient propagation data available to write new standards. It is obvious that he spoke thus to placate receiver manufacturers and to restore confidence in the minds of the cautious prospective buyers of sets.

But last week, speaking before the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago, he emphasized that the public interest must come first; that the new ultrahigh frequencies will be opened up in a few months; that imaginative leadership, rather than the Maginot-line type, is needed to bring television service to all of America; that costs of equipment must be reduced so that many can enter the field, and that there must be more competition. Praise be to the Lord that he spoke these truths.

However, the people should be informed by official Commission action rather than by public speeches which may tend to commit or embarrass the Commission and confuse Congress and the industry.

When the President recently canceled his numerous speaking engagements in the interests of his job, it was heartening to the country. This quasi-judicial Commission was hired to make tough decisions, not flattering speeches to the industry it regulates. The Commission has a mountain of unfinished business right here in Washington which demands its undivided attention for many months. In this connection, it is reported that James E. Webb, the new Under Secretary of State, has put the State Department to work. According to a recent newspaper article by Richard L. Stokes, one admiring subordinate said, "Boy, has he put this Department to work?" Another added, "Since Mr. Webb came in, all of us even walk faster." A driving spirit such as this in the Federal Communications Commission is a must.

Since the Federal Radio Commission was created in 1927 and the Federal Communications Commission in 1934,

there has grown up over the years a body of communication law, based on those acts, based on the rules and regulations adopted by the Commission itself, and based on its own decisions and on the court decisions affecting it. That is as it should be.

DEVIOUS PROCEDURES EMPLOYED

Under such a system, citizens doing business with the Commission should know their rights and duties. But do they? Ask any broadcaster in America today if he knows how the Commission is likely to act in a given set of circumstances. Ask any member of the communications bar here in Washington if he can advise a client how the Commission may rule under certain conditions. But ask them privately; do not ask them in an open hearing where their testimony will become known. If they criticize the Commission publicly, cases in which they are interested will suddenly begin to run into mysterious and exasperating delays; difficult engineering points requiring clarification will crop up where the technical matters had appeared to be settled; additional information dealing with stock ownership or financial standing suddenly will become necessary; some other station miles away will belatedly file an objection to a grant or change in license; or simplest and yet most devious of all, the case will just not be reached because of the heavy work load piled up on the Commission.

These tantalizing procedures are common practices. It is known as regulation by the lifted eyebrow. If some bright young man on the staff likes the color of your necktie, or the social or political philosophy you express, you have a fair chance for relatively prompt action. Better yet, if you are a former employee with friends on the staff, you might not only get your own cases out quickly, but actually succeed in delaying the cases of your opponents. This explains, in part, why a particular application may get through in 2 weeks while another application might wait 4 years. These time periods are not exaggerated; the record bears them out.

STAFF RUNS COMMISSION

It is the staff, and principally the legal staff, that runs the Commission. It sets the schedules; it assigns cases to orders of priority; it pushes or slows the engineering and accounting bureaus as it deems expedient; it makes up the weekly agenda of cases for the Commission to act upon. If now and then a commissioner, who may have been prodded by a Congressman in behalf of a constituent who has a lagging case, inquires about it, he is glibly told that it has run into engineering problems, or it has been held up in accounting, or there are some legal matters "we are checking on."

A typical case was called to my attention some weeks ago. A man wrote me from Hutchinson, Kans., where he is interested in the local baseball team. He had worked out arrangements to have the games played at night broadcast by the small local station. The station operates daytime only, but, more than a year before, it had applied to the Commission for a change in frequency and power, and for full-time operation. Another station promptly filed a protest, charging interference. The Hutchinson station then sought another frequency, found it, filed a new application, and the station which had filed the protest withdrew it. Apparently, the way was now clear for action. But when I had inquiry made, I was informed that the application stood fifty-second on what they call the second processing line. The second processing line is reserved for cases more involved technically. There is little hope of the Commission reaching final decision on this case for a long, long time, and the Hutchinson people will have been deprived of a fine public service. Yet no other station would have been harmed by approval. Why such simple cases must lie around for from 14 to 18 months without a decision, I cannot understand. But that is the way it is.

Another exasperating example involves allocation of frequencies for dispatching taxicabs. When the Commission announced nearly 2 years ago that frequencies would be assigned for use by taxicabs, applications poured in from all over the country. Then, due to a faulty allocation plan, the Commission ran out of frequencies; furthermore, many frequencies assigned to taxicabs resulted in sharp interference. So further assignments were frozen.

The proposal to allocate new frequencies was made in June of last year, the Commission indicating that a determination would be made by September. However, the hearing went through October. The Commission promised an immediate decision last December, certainly not later than the first of the year. It is now April, and still there is no decision. Meanwhile, throughout the country taxicab companies who purchased expensive and costly equipment are not able to use it, and all the big talk a year ago about providing a new and worth-while service for the people has become monolog.

I recall a case where the original plans and financing for a radio station were premised on an investment of some $60,000 by three war veterans; but when final Commission action was taken 3 years later, the costs had mounted to above $140,000. Meanwhile, legal fees, expenses of numerous trips to Washington, reluctance to move into other fields while their application apparently was still alive, wiped out the veterans' equity. This pathetic story can be duplicated scores of times.

Nor is the Commission's record better in its common carrier regulation. Last year it held a hearing on telegraph service. Now, 6 months later, the employees and the carrier, both vitally interested in Commission policy on the points raised, are still waiting for a decision.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT PROSTITUTED

It should be clear that in most instances, no action or no decision is far worse and far more deadly than an adverse decision. When a citizen finally receives an adverse determination, he can go to the courts for justice, if he thinks he has a good case, or he can drop the matter, and employ his talents and capital elsewhere. But consider his situation when the decision is delayed for years. He and his associates, who have raised capital and made plans for building a station or an improvement, helplessly wait and watch while the economic situation changes for the worse. They cannot let go, and they cannot hang on, without suffering terrific financial loss.

Mr. President, democratic government was created to aid citizens in achieving their legitimate social and economic aims, not to impede and repress them in their aspirations. It is scandalous, shocking, and disgusting when such things happen. Why have they been permitted to continue? No other independent arm of Congress has been under such frequent and constant criticism as has the Federal Communications Commission, and yet most of the criticisms have come to naught. The Commission's staff is too adroit and cunning to permit a real investigation to take place.

When a resolution calling for an investigation goes through Congress, there is an immediate assaying of the members of the investigating committee as to how they may be placated. If an application is pending for a license in Senator X's State, the applicant learns quickly that the Commission was about ready to act on his case, but now, unfortunately, the request for data and appearances before the investigating committee will slow up final action. The applicant thereupon gets in touch with his Congressman and tells him what a great job the Commission is doing, and he suggests caution. Has Representative Y or Z ever called regarding a station? If so, move their matters along, or hold them up, whichever seems better calculated to keep the Congressman from becoming too nosy.

INDUSTRY LOBBYISTS FLY TO RESCUE

And how the staff uses the industry, big and little, when the Commission faces an investigation. The only time I ever remember a powerful segment of the industry openly opposing the Commission during an investigation was in the Fly regime, when he had proposed the adoption of the so-called network rules. But even then, while the radio industry's spokesmen inferred that the Commission was red, socialistic, and destructive of the American free-enterprise system, the smaller broadcasters were more or less quietly supporting the Commission's proposal.

Ordinarily, however, the Commission can rely fully on the industry's willing legmen and well-paid lobbyists to aid them. In the guise of being anti-Commission they counsel with the investigating committee and advise them of leads that turn out to be either blind alleys or of little material consequence.

INDUSTRY SPREADS SUNSHINE

The campaign to prostitute the FCC goes on and on. The technique is old, but surprisingly effective. The inspiration for it is based primarily on the Commission's power to give or take away; to help or hinder; to grant favors or deny them; to make or break a license; to build or destroy. The Commission has the communications industry, large and

small, in mortal fear of what it can do to them. That is why the "big boys" move heaven and earth to get a friendly appointee on the Commission; why they wine and dine the commissioners, and pretend to consult them not only about their aches and pains but about their most informal views on the most casual matters.

A Commission defender may point out that it has revoked only two or three licenses in its whole history. But it is the club behind the door that brings home the bacon. The threat of license revocation; or the threat of a lengthy and expensive hearing; or the desire to have the Commission approve an increase in power or an additional circuit to a foreign country; or a request for purchase of another station; or the planning for or the promulgation of certain engineering standards; these are the compelling considerations which inspire craftiness and intrigue.

COMMISSION VIOLATES OWN RULES

Such an atmosphere exists to some degree because the Commission gives lip service to its own rules, regulations, and previous decisions. It is no secret that in decision after decision the Commission either violates or bypasses its own rules. For instance, a wealthy New Yorker for years has continued to own two stations in violation of the "duopoly" rule.

Unfortunately, some Commissioners have been confused by involved legal arguments made to them by their own staff. Such arguments appear compelling to the Commission when the staff contends it is trying to avert an adverse court decision. All too frequently a decision is written in such a way as to make it difficult, if not impossible, for an applicant or a licensee to get into court. A broadcaster may be granted a temporary renewal license while the Commission reviews his operations. In fact, he may be kept on a temporary basis for 3 or 4 years. All that time his economic neck is in the noose, never knowing when the trap will be sprung. After all, if the Commission revokes his license, his entire investment is gone. Usually, after a lengthy period of consideration, the Commission will renew the license but issue a lengthy opinion whose obiter dicta informs that licensee and all other licensees how on that point to conduct themselves.

That is judicial law making. It is an undemocratic and immoral procedure. It is a corruption of the legislative process without following the prescribed hearing formula. It is bureaucratic tyranny. Even though they never appeared in a hearing and never had an opportunity to state their views, licensees are bound by this strategy. The victim cannot set it aside; he has nothing to go to court about; he did not lose his license, and he had no cause of action. Unfortunately, this practice is indulged in by too many of our regulatory agencies.

Who do you think writes these decisions—the Commission? Oh, no! The legal opinion and drafts of decisions are written by the identical legal staff which prosecuted the case in the first instance. A member of the legal staff represents the Commission in the original hearing, questions and cross-examines litigants; a month later, or 6 months later, or perhaps 2 years later, he prepares the Commission's final decision in the case.

In their last annual report the Commission said:

> Any final order is subject to judicial review in accordance with the appellate provisions of the Communications Act and the Administrative Procedure Act.

Of course, in theory, any order is subject to legal review; but in actual practice, relatively few can get into court. Take, for example, the Commission's Port Huron, Mich., decision last year involving a station's duties in handling political broadcasts. After putting the licensee on a temporary grant and keeping him there for a year, the Commission majority decided that the licensee had done wrong and told him how and what he must do in the future. It did not revoke his license. The licensee was gratified that he could remain in business, and, of course, he had no cause of action, because he had not been deprived of any material thing. Obviously the decision was not subject to court review. The Commission's decision bound him, and by its dicta set a course of action for all other licensees to follow.

The Commission, in its last annual report, boasts that 21 cases went to the courts. This total of 21 cases is not impressive when it is understood that eight cases were on a single issue and were consolidated. Whether 14 litigants getting into court during more than a year is significant must be evaluated in relation both to the total number of cases handled by the Commission, and more important, whether or not the cases went upon substantive grounds or on procedural grounds. The small number that get to court on substantive points bears out the contentions of legal experts that their only hope for the future is broadened use of the Administrative Procedure Act. There is significance in the fact that the Commission's legal staff strongly resisted the efforts of the last two chairmen of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to tighten up the procedural and appellate provisions of the Communications Act.

LICENSE TRAFFICKING PERMITTED

Another grave charge is that the Commission has permitted the operation of a particularly nefarious practice which involves trafficking in Federal licenses and construction permits. It has become a common practice for construction permits to be advertised openly for sale for substantial sums. Engineering and legal fees expended may amount to as little as $2,000 and then be offered for sale for $50,000 or more. Sometimes construction has begun—a building or a part of a building is up, or even a transmitter is built. Sometimes the station may even be running its tests preliminary to actual operation. The authority to build and operate a station in a particular community is what is offered for sale. In my opinion, it was not the intent of the Communications Act that permits should be peddled to a second party.

In Washington liquor licenses are transferred for substantial sums, but broadcast licenses ought not to be sold over the bargain counter like beans in the corner grocery.

With the advent of television there is now opening up a new field for the exploitation of construction permits and station licenses. For example, a motion-picture group has an option to purchase a small local 250-watt station for a substantial sum of money premised on that station's securing a television channel allocation. No television allocation, no sale. Under such a policy, who do you think will finally own and control television in this country? Under the law, the Commission is required to determine the moral fitness of a licensee.

COMMISSION RESPONSIBLE

Mr. President, a few persons—three or four in key positions—control the whole operation; and, Mr. President, they control it. The organization of the Commission and its laxity and reluctance to face realities insure such control. The Commission, as a commission, is just not on the job enough. Weeks may go by without a quorum.

But, in the final analysis, it is the Commission rather than the staff on whom the responsibility for all these acts of omission and commission must fall. Every succeeding Chairman and many of the members have been appointed with the avowed objective of cleaning out the Augean stables. The top staff personnel, who for years have been writing the decisions and guiding the policy, so imperative in effecting a shake-up, cannot easily be set aside. About the time he understands the job the Chairman resigns, selects the crown prince to succeed him, moves on to greener fields, and the Commission is back where it started and doing business in the same slipshod, extralegal, awkward, ponderous way, under the guiding hand of the career men on the staff.

The staff itself, as a whole, perhaps should not be severely criticized. Most of them are civil servants, working their way up and largely content to do their day-by-day tasks to the best of their ability. It is human and entirely commendable that staff members are on the lookout to better themselves. The legal and engineering experts realize that their best opportunities lie on the outside, either with large corporations or with well established legal firms. But the Commission should realize the temptations inherent in such a situation and govern itself accordingly.

It is my opinion, as heretofore stated, that additional personnel would result in greater delays and that increased salaries, justified as they are as a matter of equity, would not improve the service materially. In certain activities the Commission already has too many rather than too few employees. Of a total of 1,400, approximately 900 are in Washington and 500 in the field. Most of the latter are engaged in what is known as field engineering and monitoring work. It would appear that this latter activity could be cut down considerably without any serious consequences. In the early days when radio transmitter equipment was not as well engineered as today, the Commission did have to police the air-

ways and keep stations on assigned frequencies. Today's fine equipment does not need that kind of surveillance.

Big government is dangerous; our's has become alarmingly large and shockingly inefficient, as the Hoover Commission reports clearly show. Changes in organization to make better use, with more direct control, of the staff now employed, rather than to have more people falling over each other, will cure some of the trouble in the Commission.

As a matter of fairness and justice, however, I favor increases in salaries and especially in the Federal Communications Commission where expertness and good judgment are so necessary. But I am not foolish enough to believe that higher salaries will mean different employees. When salaries go up, as I hope most earnestly they will, we shall see the same old faces, the same reactionary attitude toward progress, and the same outside controls operating.

In this intriguing and fascinating industry every staff member and every commissioner faces the greatest challenge imaginable to do a job. If the challenge of pioneering in the most attractive scientific venture of all time is not enough to bring out the best there is, an increase in salary will not do it.

CHAOS PREVAILS

In summary on these points, it would appear to me that an honest and sincere evaluation of all these charges and a frank willingness to meet them squarely would result in a house cleaning and a shuffling of staff personnel; a reorganization of procedures so that the legal staff does not run the Commission; and a firm resolve to keep a quorum of the commissioners around the table until the logjam has been broken and some semblance of order restored where chaos now prevails.

MONSTROUS DECISION IMMINENT

It is charged that the Commission is almost ready to hand down a decision in the clear-channel super-power case favorable to the clear-channel lobby. Mr. President, I most earnestly hope and pray that rumor is wrong. Such a decision would do the gravest violence to some 2,000 small and medium broadcasters throughout this country; would intrench more firmly the power and dominance of perhaps 10 to 15 major broadcast stations; and eventually would result in three or four New York and Chicago corporations controlling the program material pouring in a never-ending stream out of 70,000,000 radios in the United States. Mr. President, such a monstrous decision would over-step the basic authority of the Commission. When such fundamental policy decisions are made Congress must make them.

PEOPLE FACE EXPLOITATION

Finally, it is charged that the television allocation policy adopted several years ago under the Denny regime and being followed today by the Commission will result in the exploitation of the industry and monopoly control of programs. Mr. President, that policy allocation was designed to discourage the overwhelming majority of broadcasters from getting into television; it will prevent the building up of a Nation-wide service in television; it will keep each new development and improvement in television from the public until those in control of patents have had a full opportunity to exploit the present market to the fullest, and then, and then only, will let the people in on the scientific developments which scientifically are ready now. Mr. President, such a policy will maintain and perpetuate a tight monopoly control of what is undoubtedly the most potent and effective propaganda medium yet known to man.

Not only is the development of television vital to the people, but domination of standard AM broadcasting may affect the very future of our kind of government. Involved in both is the specter of rigid monopolistic control of these media. The connivance of the staff of the Federal Communications Commission, wittingly or unwittingly, in these dangerous trends toward private control, is obvious to all who have the facts. Actually, the Commission does have the facts regarding television allocation, but appears unwilling to reverse its earlier decision.

Every radio station in the United States is affected by the clear-channel super-power controversy. Every Member on this floor has received at one time or another communications from radio stations in his State or home town in reference to it. Members of Congress fear they are being led into some technical wilderness, and shy away when the subject is broached. There is nothing at all technical about it. It resolves itself into whether or not the Congress should permit its own creature, the FCC, a free hand to make a basic and fundamental policy decision of vast proportions which directly affects the general public interest and welfare. It is a policy and not an engineering decision.

Is the Congress the law-making body, or is a regulatory agency, pushed on by powerful, concentrated, economic interests and a skillful and highly paid lobby, to be allowed to twist and distort the law against monopoly and hand down a decision which will do violence to every precept of free, competitive American enterprise?

CLEAR-CHANNEL STATIONS HAVE WIDE COVERAGE

Ordinary radio service is known as AM, an abbreviation for amplitude modulation. In the radio spectrum AM is located on the radio dial between 550 and 1600 kilocycles. There are 1060 kilocycles for radio use, which are divided into 106 frequencies, or channels, upon which the signal travels. Each channel or path is 10 kilocycles wide to prevent interference from an adjoining channel. In the United States there are more than 2,000 radio stations occupying these 106 channels, with each station assigned to a specific and fixed channel. Obviously, crowding 2,000 stations on 106 channels requires that each channel must accommodate an average of 20 stations. But the stations themselves vary, depending on their power and coverage. Small local stations, some daytime only, operating with 250 watts, cover a very limited area, and therefore are duplicated scores of times on the same channel throughout the country. The next class of stations, having power of 1,000 up to 10,000 watts, cover a larger area, and thus can be duplicated less frequently on the same channel.

Finally, there are 22 stations operating with power of 50,000 watts, covering a wide area, which during nighttime hours are the sole and only occupants of a channel. In other words, no other station, no matter how remotely located, is permitted to use that channel at night. Thus, the term "clear channel" arises; the channel is clear; no other station occupies it at night. This is true, even though the clear-channel station may be located in New York City and its signal heard only as far away as western Pennsylvania. Nevertheless, the Commission will not assign that New York channel to a station in Pasadena or Seattle or Houston or Birmingham or Cheyenne or Reno.

Even worse, the Commission has adopted rules which will not permit a small local station 1,000 or 2,000 miles away from the clear-channel station to use the same frequency during early morning hours or during early evening hours.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NORTH CAROLINA

The great State of North Carolina, represented in this body in part by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who honors this body by presiding over it at this very moment, is in an important tobacco-growing region.

At Rocky Mount is a small local station which desires to render a service to the local tobacco farmers by broadcasting early morning weather and market information. That Rocky Mount station is permitted daytime use of a channel controlled by station WGY, a clear-channel station in Schenectady, N. Y., owned by the General Electric Co. But the Rocky Mount station cannot begin operation before sunrise each morning and must close down at sunset each day. Many months ago the station applied for permission to start broadcasting 1 hour from 4 to 5 o'clock each morning, so that the farmers would have information before going to the fields or into market. The Schenectady station did not operate at that hour and no one used that frequency, and, therefore, Rocky Mount could not possibly interfere with the Schenectady station or any other station.

What did the Commission tell them? Simply that it had a rule which would not permit the Rocky Mount station to render this public service to the tobacco farmers unless they had the permission of General Electric. Neither General Electric nor any other clear-channel station would grant such permission, since such action would be frowned upon by the clear-channel lobby.

FCC POLICY HITS SMALL STATIONS

There are literally hundreds of such small, local stations, rendering, or attempting to render, a good local public service, which cannot broadcast an evening high-school basketball game, or a debate, or a local public-service feature, or give early-morning weather reports. Please bear in mind that their

broadcasts would not interfere with the clear-channel station. The clear-channel station will not broadcast local crop information, or a local high school basketball game, or local musical programs, or any other local matter. Many of these local stations are operated by cities and towns, and by colleges and educational institutions; many of them are nonprofit stations, rendering a fine public service, and anxious to give even greater public service. But the clear-channel lobby, playing dog in the manger, fortified by a convenient Commission rule, prevents the continuation of the Commission's earlier duplicating policy.

I must interpolate at this point that the Commission at one time did have a policy, and followed it, of breaking down these clear channels so as to give better service to the listening public of the United States, but they have withdrawn or changed that policy.

The law plainly directs the Commission to serve the public interest and not the clear-channel-lobby interest. The clear channels belong to the people, not to General Electric or to anyone else. The clear-channel stations are merely licensed to use them in the public interest.

In my opinion, the rule prohibiting daytime stations from broadcasting at night is wrong. But under the law one might respect it if the Commission treated all comers alike. It does not do so. The right pressure in the right place has influenced the Commission to violate this rule, just as it has conveniently bypassed other rules and precedents. For example, New York City's municipal daytime station, occupying a clear channel, has just been granted a 6-month temporary authorization to broadcast until 10 o'clock at night. This harms no one, and serves a useful purpose, and I rejoice that the action was taken, but why discriminate and play favorites between Senator HOEY's Rocky Mount and New York City? Why deny nonprofit educational stations in Iowa, Illinois, and Oklahoma the same rights?

I repeat, these favored clear-channel stations occupy frequencies reserved exclusively to themselves for night-time broadcasting. With the power they now have, they can cover an area approximately 750 miles in radius, some a little more and some a little less. These 22 stations are located in the large metropolitan cities of this country—New York, Schenectady, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Louisville, Nashville, Chicago, Fort Worth, Dallas, San Antonio, Los Angeles, Salt Lake, and the like. Some of these cities have three clear-channel stations. Theoretically they are supposed to render a service to rural listeners. But the overwhelming majority of them are located east of the Mississippi, in the heavily populated metropolitan areas. Do not overlook that their tremendous income arises from advertising based on the coverage of millions of city people.

Actually clear-channel farm programs reach a small portion of the farm population. Farmers get their local weather information and other programs of particular interest to them from their local stations, which understand their problems and have the available radio time to devote to news and information of special interest to them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am deeply interested in what the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is saying today about these radio matters. How long has this clear channel matter been before the Federal Communications Commission for some sort of decision, on behalf of the small operators who have been applying for some of the frequencies which will not interfere with the large stations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The matter has been before the Commission for a long, long time. The Commission held extensive hearings, as I have pointed out, and yet there is no decision. I do not know exactly how long the matter has been before the Commission in a formal way, but my guess is that it has been before it perhaps for as long as 4 years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does not the Senator feel as I do, that in a matter of this importance, when obviously a great many people have filed applications, an excessively long time has been taken in reaching a decision, and many dilatory tactics have been employed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree, and I thank the Senator for his observation. His conclusions are parallel with my own.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And this delay has occurred despite the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, not the committee itself formally, but the chairman and members of the committee, and many others, have repeatedly asked why a decision could not be rendered in this matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true. The committee chairman and many members of the committee have pressed the matter, as have many Members of the House of Representatives and Senators, without result.

Originally this country had 46 clear channels. But as the need grew for additional local and regional stations, the Commission began to duplicate clear-channel frequencies, placing additional stations on the same channel but sufficiently distant apart so there would be no interference.

CLEAR-CHANNEL LOBBY FORMED

Several years ago 16 clear-channel stations realizing that this sensible and necessary trend would eventually catch up with them, banded together into a lobbying organization. This lobby filed a petition with the Commission demanding that the remaining clear-channel stations be granted 750,000 watts of power, contending the objective to be to give better service to 23,000,000 rural listeners. They made this ridiculous argument with a poker face. That the 23,000,000 farm people could be better served by local stations, the result of a wise use of duplication, is glossed over by the clear channels and the obedient Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might illustrate what the Senator has just said by citing an example. I know the Senator could cite many other examples. For instance, in my home State, in the city of Spokane, Wash., a request has been made to the Commission informally—it was not a formal application—that a certain frequency be given to a station there so that the station might serve a radius of, say, another 25 or 30 miles, and include about 60,000 farmers who are not now served from the Spokane area by this particular station, which is a network station. The frequency available for the area, however, happens to be one of the clear channels that some station back on the east coast has. The Commission has consistently refused to act on this type of application. But here are these rural areas denied the right of local radio service, and the people are obliged to listen, whether they like it or not, to programs which come on a clear channel, which may originate in San Francisco or some other place.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado if he does not know that that situation is duplicated in many, many cases?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; there are literally hundreds of such cases throughout the country. In my opinion there is absolutely no excuse for them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The listener wants to listen to programs coming from his local station, just as we like to read our local newspapers, although we may read some out-of-town newspapers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Washington is correct in his statement. The situation is exactly as he has described. It would not be quite so irritating if the clear-channel station was being injured, if use, such as I have described, was made of it. But the clear-channel station would not be injured in the slightest degree by such use of the channel. For instance, we had a clear-channel station in Denver, Colo., KOA. Finally the Commission broke down that clear channel and located a station on the same channel in Boston, and another station was located on the same channel in, I believe, Ohio. The location of the two stations on the same channel has not harmed KOA in the slightest degree. KOA is continuing to serve the public just as it did before the channel was broken down.

On the clear-channel petition, the Commission held extensive hearings comprising 6,700 pages of testimony, 421 additional exhibits, and voluminous briefs. Furthermore, based on a bill I introduced last year the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held one of the longest and most exhaustive hearings in which I have ever participated. More than 70 witnesses testified in person and some 600 radio stations in this country sent in letters or

statements making a printed record of more than 1,200 pages.

CHICAGO TRIBUNE STATION'S VAST COVERAGE

It is not difficult to understand what is back of the petition to grant these clear-channel stations 750,000 watts of power, and what the effect on other stations and on the country would be. The Chicago Tribune, the spearhead of the lobby seeking superpower, is demanding 750,000 watts. Today, with 50,000 watts, that station covers roughly a semicircle ranging from the Alleghenies on the east to Kansas and Nebraska on the west, and south into Kentucky and Missouri. In that vast area there are scores of other stations, small locals and medium-size regionals, some prosperous and some not so prosperous. They must live on advertising and they must compete with the big clear channels for a fair share of the territory's advertising dollar.

The Chicago Tribune station is supposed to be serving the farmers in all this vast area, despite the fact that 10 different kinds of weather may exist at the same time in various parts of the area and despite the fact that in one section tobacco is the crop, in another corn, and in a third wheat, or dairying, or beef-cattle production. There are not enough hours in the 19-hour broadcast day to put out all the varying information it really takes to give a good service to each of these local sections of that territory, carry the network programs it is obligated to carry, and at the same time serve the Chicago metropolitan area from which it derives most of its revenue.

HIGH POWER MEANS MONOPOLY

That is the picture of a clear-channel station as it operates today, with 50,000 watts of power. Now, what would the situation be with 750,000 watts?

The area to be covered would increase in size materially; the Chicago Tribune's voice then would be heard in the two Dakotas, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, parts of Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana, south to the Mexican border, and eastward beyond the Alleghenies. In the area it previously covered with 50,000 watts, its signal would be so powerful that no station could compete.

How long do Senators think national advertisers are going to pay for 20 stations to cover an area which they can cover with one? One thousand and even 1,500 miles from Chicago the voice of the Tribune would be heard clear and loud and strong, by the rural people and hundreds of cities already being well served by their local stations. Obviously, these smaller stations, now suffering reduction in revenue, would wither on the vine.

Now, multiply the Chicago Tribune case by 10 or 12 750,000-watt stations located so their combined broadcasts completely blanket the entire United States. How many regional radio stations are going to remain in business in this country in competition with that kind of monopolistic operation?

The economic effect of this superpower broadcasting would be appalling. A small group of owners would control radio in this country. That is bad enough, but consider the frightening political and social consequences of such a development.

For example, how would the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] fare if during a political campaign he had to make arrangements with the Chicago Tribune for time for a broadcast to cover his State of Minnesota?

Or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] trying to buy time to speak to his constituents on a matter of great consequence to them?

Or the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], who just came through a successful campaign. How would it have been if he had to do his broadcasting from Chicago to catch the radio ear of the Wyoming people?

Is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] going to have to use the clear channel stations in Louisville and Nashville in order to talk to his people in Alabama? He may have to compete for time with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] who would have to use one of those stations to get his views across to his Florida voters.

How can these clear-channel stations begin to give service to all the people to whom they seek to furnish radio service?

What kind of a country are we going to have when a half dozen corporations control the airways of America? I do not care how pure they are, or how public spirited, or how fair—it is not in the democratic tradition that this potent medium of propaganda be in the hands of three New York corporations and three or four other powerful station owners.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado that I am very happy he has taken note of this evidence of the concentration of control over the instruments of information to the people. The truth of the matter is that such control exists not only with respect to the clear channels, of which he is speaking, but with respect to all forms of radio and television. It has come down to such a position that, if I recall the figures correctly, four or five large advertising firms actually control from 60 to 90 percent of all the programs upon radio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think perhaps the Senator's figures are just a little low.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, those who listen to the radio find that these great concerns doing a national business affecting the lives of most of the people of the United States, because they produce and distribute the commodities upon which the people depend for their economic livelihood, use a considerable portion of this time for propaganda work. I use the word which the Senator from Colorado has himself used. Special pleaders of great ability, with excellent voices, who know how to write their material, get upon these channels and purvey to the people of the United States the views of the special interests which seek to dominate the entire economic scene.

It is a matter of tremendous importance to our people. A handful of program directors in New York practically decide who can go on the radio programs. Entertainers throughout the country who have capacity and talent, if they desire to follow the profession of singing or any other entertainment upon the radio, for the most part get no opportunity unless they can prevail upon a few talent scouts in New York to let them have the opportunity. I am ready to admit that there is no particular plan upon the part of the talent scouts to exclude any competent person. But, as Members of the Senate know, there is not time enough in the day for persons who occupy positions of strategic importance to review all the things that claim our attention. No doubt the Senator agrees with what I say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly I agree.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So it is of the utmost importance, in considering the problem of radio, to make certain that the administration of the law creates opportunities for people everywhere to use this great new avenue of public information.

The problem which the Senator is so admirably discussing now is found in a dozen different lines. Take the case of aviation. The CAB has recently issued an order with respect to independent aviation companies. During the past 15 or 16 years the Public Treasury has contributed about $638,000,000 in subsidies to maintain the so-called scheduled air lines. We hear a great deal of condemnation of subsidies paid out of the Treasury of the United States when they go to the farmer, or when they go for the development of public housing. But when such subsidies go to maintain the great scheduled air lines, or to maintain shipping upon the high seas, we hear nothing about it. A subsidy paid to big business is, of course, acceptable or desirable, but any other subsidy is a step toward socialism.

I am very glad that the Senator is calling attention to the fact that so few companies control the clear channels. Let it not be forgotten that they control them by virtue of the acquiescence of the Congress of the United States, and only so. Therefore I think we have the responsibility for what happens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very grateful to the Senator from Wyoming for his observations, and especially for his eloquent statement with respect to the economic importance of these controls.

These reasons are compelling enough to warrant the closest congressional scrutiny of this monstrous and wicked proposal.

I have never heard a Senator complain that the rural people in his State are not getting radio service from distant cities. What they do tell me is that local stations are deprived of rendering a better service by the rules and the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission which keeps them off the air.

DUPLICATION IMPROVES SERVICE

Many States require additional radio stations which they cannot get now because there are no channels on which to place them. But if the Commission would place additional stations on the remaining 22 clear channels, a substantial number of additional stations would become immediately available. Obviously there is no interference to a New York station if another station is placed on its channel west of the Alleghenies. Cheyenne and Reno need 50,000-watt stations to serve large, thinly populated rural areas. But Cheyenne and Reno cannot provide State-wide radio coverage because no frequencies not controlled by the 22 clear-channel stations remain available.

I emphasize that if and when additional stations were added on these clear channels, nothing would be taken away from today's clear-channel stations. They would continue to cover the area they now cover. They would continue to broadcast with 50,000 watts. They would remain the large and powerful stations they are today. But seemingly there is no limit to their greed and their ambition to dominate America.

I repeat once more that the clear channels themselves do not belong to these stations. These channels belong to the people, but nevertheless the Federal Communications Commission, which was created to protect the people, preserves them for a private monopoly and refuses to break them down.

I have been damned by the clear-channel lobbyists and their powerful friends for resisting their vicious objective of tight control. The objective of the grasping clear-channel lobby is directly contrary to the public interest; it assures monopoly rather than competition, and above all else it is a direct threat to the freedom of broadcasting information.

More than a year ago our committee asked the Commission to withhold any decision in the clear-channel case pending hearings on the bill I introduced to require duplication and limit power to the present 50,000-watt grant. Consistently and continuously the Senate has made it clear to the Commission that it doubts their authority to grant super power to clear channels under the Communications Act, which requires competition in radio, and especially that licenses be granted in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

FCC DECISION EXPECTED

In spite of the clear intent of the law, in recent public speeches, the Chairman of the Commission has hinted that the Commission might make its clear-channel decision around May 1. It would be a fatal step against the people of the United States should the Commission in this decision fail to limit power to 50 kilowatts and not renew its earlier precedents for duplication of clear channels. The 2,000 small stations throughout the United States that would be harmed directly have no effective legal remedy to stay the proceedings and prevent a superpower grant. Even if they could secure an injunction and try the matter in the courts, which among them can afford the lengthy and expensive litigation which would be involved in going to the Supreme Court of the United States against the rich and powerful interests who seek this stranglehold on the public opinion of America?

As I understand, the Chairman's position at the moment is that the anticipated development of the radio art has made the superpower question academic. But I maintain that such an assumption is not the answer. The Commission has the legal duty to foster competition, and it should not rely on hoped-for economic factors to solve this vital issue. Affirmative action in the interest of competition which would effectively halt monopoly is mandatory now if the public interest is to be served.

HEMISPHERE AGREEMENT CITED

One reason assigned for making an early pro-clear-channel decision is that this country's proposals for the North American Regional Broadcasting Conference must be circulated among the signatory countries by May 1. I want to make it plain that I think we should have had a decision in this case years ago, but not in the interest of monopoly and special privilege, and not to get the jump on our neighbors in this hemisphere.

It would be well to bear in mind that six countries in this hemisphere, Canada, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Mexico, and the United States are signatories to what is known as the North American regional broadcasting agreement. It expired in 1946 but was renewed until March 29, 1948. Legally, no agreement exists today. A conference to discuss a new agreement is scheduled to be held in Quebec beginning this September. The usual practice in such conferences is for each of the participating countries to formulate their proposals 6 months in advance and circulate them among the participating countries so that each will be familiar with the other's proposals prior to the conference.

This agreement, commonly known as NARBA, assigns and allocates frequencies—not stations—to be used by each of the signatory countries. Let me emphasize that NARBA allocates frequencies, not stations. This agreement stipulates the rights to use frequencies; it defines the various classes of stations and the service areas; and it defines hemispheric interference. Under that agreement the 106 channels in the standard broadcast band, to which I referred earlier, are broken down into 59 clear channels, 41 regional channels, and 6 local channels. Of the 59 clear channels, the United States was granted 46, with a high degree of protection from interference by any of the other signatories. The other 13 clear channels were assigned among the remaining signatories with the same degree of high protection for use in those countries.

In the United States 24 of our 46 clear channels have been duplicated; that is, more than one station has been placed on each of these frequencies in order that we might accommodate the demand for stations in this country. The remaining 22 clear channels have successfully resisted duplication and have retained for themselves the sole and exclusive nighttime use of their individual channels, as I have pointed out. They are the kingpins of the radio world and are officially designated as class I–A stations.

Despite the fact that nowhere in the agreement is there any mandate that class I–A stations should have power in excess of 50,000 watts, the clear-channel lobby insists that the agreement contemplates that the Federal Communications Commission should grant them operating power of 750,000 watts. This lobby contends that if we do not increase the power, we will lose our exclusive rights to these clear channels. A more distorted interpretation of very clear language cannot be imagined.

I cannot believe that our country, or that any of the other five signatory countries, ever would have signed an agreement which required them to operate their own domestic stations according to a pattern laid down by other countries. To the contrary, the only logical assumption is that each country agreed with the others with respect to the assignment of channels between them and the kinds of stations that would operate on those channels. Obviously, each country should have the right to operate its own domestic radio stations in such manner as is most suitable and desirable for the public welfare of that country, so long as such operation does not interfere with the operation of radio stations in the other signatory countries.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand the lobby's line of reasoning. In the first place, I am opposed to a 750,000-watt operation of radio broadcasting stations in the United States because of the certainty of resulting monopoly control. In the second place, I can see no reason why the formal proposals of the United States should include any reference to the amount of power with which class I–A clear-channel stations should operate, so long as we continue to operate them with the 50,000-watt minimum set forth in the agreement.

I repeat, Mr. President, none of the other participants in the conference should be interested in what amount of power we use in this country, so long as we do not cause interference to their stations; similarly, we should have no concern as to the amount of power they use, so long as they do not cause interference to our stations. On this basis, and on this basis only, the United States should premise its NARBA proposals.

Nevertheless, the clear-channel lobby asserts that this country must go to the Quebec conference with a proposal that class I–A clear-channel stations should operate with 750,000 watts of power. Whether or not the State Department, which is responsible for negotiating international agreements, and the Federal Communications Commission will fall for this poppycock remains in grave doubt. I cannot believe that the State Department will countenance such a selfish American program.

WILL OPPOSE AGREEMENT

Mr. President, Cuba and Canada are not pressing for any change in power. While today Mexico is operating several

stations with power in excess of 50,000 watts, I was informed by high and reliable Government authority there that such operations are uneconomic. I was told that while they would not look with favor upon having some other country tell them what power they should use, they would favor an agreement limiting power for all of the signatories to the North American regional broadcasting agreement. We cannot cure the very unsatisfactory domestic intereference stemming from the present Mexican broadcasting situation by going to superpower ourselves. Such an attempt is certain to lead to a radio power race and a resort to the law of the jungle. That is no way to work out a good-neighbor problem. Obviously, the clear-channel lobby's proposal is directly contrary to the good-neighbor policy.

I repeat again, Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that the Federal Communications Commission would repudiate the clear intent of our Communications Act if it were to render a decision granting authority for the operation of our clear-channel stations with superpower. This act requires that there shall be competition in radio broadcasting and that assignments of frequencies and power shall be made in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. I contend that an allocation of power in excess of 50,000 watts would be detrimental to the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

Let me make it very clear here and now that if the Federal Communications Commission does hand down a decision granting superpower to any radio station in the United States and if the State Department will propose that as a policy at the Quebec Conference, as a Senator of the United States and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I shall go to Quebec on my own and shall make clear to that conference in every way I can that any such agreement will be opposed in the Senate of the United States to the limit of my ability; and, furthermore, that I shall not rest until the present power limitation in the United States is restored by law. I am certain that I shall have plenty of help in the Congress when the 2,000 radio stations in the United States and the listening public discover by bitter experience what has been foisted on them by the FCC, if the FCC makes the rumored decision. A national broadcasting magazine took a poll of the radio industry not long ago and discovered that 85 percent of the radio industry of the United States is opposed to superpower.

TELEVISION MONOPOLY SHAPING UP

The clear channel superpower question does not stand alone as a symbol of monopoly and economic tyranny. The same dangers are present even in a greater degree in television, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out a few moments ago. In television, as in standard AM radio, the Commission seems to be flirting with the idea of going along with the engineering and economic thinking of big private interests who have planned a policy of tight control.

It is time that Members of Congress should know more about television. This highly entertaining visible art brings to the citizens of selected large cities interesting and entertaining programs which are bound to improve in the days ahead. It is a rapidly expanding industry. The people of the United States already have purchased more than 1,300,000 receiver sets. There are now 60 television stations on the air, and applications have been filed for more than 300 new stations. Chairman Coy has predicted that within a decade there may be as many as 800 television stations and possibly 20,000,000 or more receiving sets in use. Leading personalities of the radio industry believe that ordinary aural radio broadcasting is on its way out, with television the coming thing. I do not wholly agree, but certain it is that television in the large cities is crowding AM.

TODAY'S TELEVISION LIMITED

Today television operates on 12 channels in what is known as the very high frequency band. The original assignment was 13 channels, but interference made one channel unusable. Other interference problems have cropped up, all combining to bring into serious question the entire original allocation and the standards then adopted. In any event, it has been obvious for a long time that the 12 channels now being used will not provide a competitive Nation-wide television service, and Commission spokesmen frankly say so.

However, there is ample space in the spectrum to operate television so that the entire Nation may be served. That space is known as the ultra high frequency band. The space occupied by the present television channels ranges from 44 to 88 megacycles and from 174 to 216 megacycles. The ultra high band ranges from 480 to 920 megacycles. Obviously, there is a great deal more space for television in the ultra high than in the very high band.

Today television operates on a channel 6 megacycles wide; that is, the electrical impulse that carries the picture and the voice is 6 units wide. Assuming that the ultra high spectrum was divided into channels 6 megacycles wide, 73 channels would become available, as compared to the 12 channels presently being used in the very high band. Here, then, is the opportunity to really provide a competitive Nation-wide service, when and if every community desiring television can support it economically.

But the Commission stuck to the very high band, assigned 13 channels and adopted standards which limited the operation to black-and-white television. This was done despite the fact that one of the large units in the radio industry testified at length and fought to secure a decision which would permit operation of color television. But an even larger cog in the industry vigorously opposed color standards at that time, and insisted that the industry was not ready for good color television.

Commission adoption of that view, whether or not it was technically correct at the time, further entrenched monopoly control of television. When the decision came down for black-and-white operation, every major unit in the radio broadcasting industry which could afford it filed applications and sought to expedite construction of television stations. In the forefront of this movement was the National Broadcasting Co., a subsidiary of the Radio Corporation of America, which probably has done the major experimental work in television, and which asserts control of the overwhelming majority of basic patents for the manufacture of television transmitters as well as receivers. It is to the credit of the Radio Corp. that it risked its capital, even though that was no eleemosynary act on its part, in view of its dominant position in the industry and its tremendous investment in patents. It is obvious that as the industry prospered, the company prospered. It had opposed color; it had opposed opening up the ultra high band to commercial operation; it had advocated certain engineering standards; and it had won Commission acceptance all down the line.

TELEVISION SERVICE LIMITED

Under the regime of former Commission Chairman Charles Denny, now an executive vice president of the National Broadcasting Co., the 12 channels first assigned would restrict television to 394 stations in 140 metropolitan communities in the United States. Some cities would have as many as 5 stations; some only 2. If Senators thought all the cities in their States were going to have television, they had another "think" coming. There are more than 2,000 cities in this country with a population of 5,000 or over, and obviously some 1,800 cities were not to have television under the original plan.

That allocation could not stand up. When Senators and Members of the House of Representatives would finally realize, a year or two hence, that television had become a caste service and could be made available on a Nation-wide basis only through a scheme that pumped the New York and Hollywood programs through a monopoly-controlled system, all the past criticisms and complaints about the Commission would fade into insignificance when compared to the roar which their constituents would thunder at them.

So the experts were summoned to testify again. The principal difference now was that those who previously had urged that color television be permitted in the present channels were strangely silent. Under the law, the Commission is directed to promote every advance in the art. It dare not sit idly by waiting for the industry to time progressive steps. Memoranda from some of the Commission's own technical people showing that color could be used and that additional frequencies could be employed were not touched upon, and the serious problem of patent controls was hushed up. Everyone in the industry was actively pushing black-and-white television; no one wanted to be left behind in the race for the lucrative profits that were anticipated from advertising.

After this hearing, the Commission proposed a revised allocation of television channels. This time it broadened the base; the total number of cities that might have television was increased to

459, and the total number of stations was boosted to 955. This is still a long way from giving competitive television service to the people of the United States. The theory was fine, as far as it went; but would it work? How much separation was necessary between channels occupied by different stations in the same town? How close or how far away could one town be from another for an acceptable use of the same channel? To what extent will there be blurred reception in an area where two stations in nearby cities are on the same channel? An ad hoc committee was created to find the answers.

But this committee of experts faced an even more embarrassing problem. Several years before, the Commission had removed other services from the very high frequencies, and had granted their channels to television. That was done even though some engineering authorities asserted at the time that it was an unwise allocation and would bring headaches. Now the committee of experts finds itself in a quandary. Their new engineering data appears to be at sharp variance with the data that was used several years before to support the original television allocation.

Now it is discovered that television stations on the same channels must be 225 miles apart to insure no interference. In order to slow up the opening of the ultra-high frequencies, the high and mighty in the industry are attempting to convince the Commission that synchronization solves the interference problem. It did not solve it between Detroit and Cleveland.

Perhaps the committee of experts hesitates to write a report which will make clear that the present television allocation scheme just will not work; that too many stations have been allocated on the same channels in cities too close to each other. Such a finding would buttress with engineering documentation the frequently repeated charge that the original television allocation was and is a monopoly device. Also such a finding would make obvious the need for a quick shift into color and the ultra-high frequencies, so that a nonmonopolistic and truly Nation-wide television service might become available.

Assuming that the expert committee is permitted to make an objective and factual report, the present Commission must either openly disavow the television allocation of a few years ago and start all over again, or else fumble around in an attempt to remedy the basic error that was committed.

Unfortunately, the Commission, under its new Chairman, continues the search for a way to patch up the abortive allocation. Their planning does not contemplate a new and fresh start. Apparently, the pressure is too great and the Commission too timid to take such a constructive step. Last September the Commission proclaimed a freeze on further television applications while it worked out the complicated details. That freeze continues today.

That the Commission recognized fully that the ultra-high frequencies would be necessary eventually, is obvious from the fact that it set aside those frequencies for television. Some day, an alert and progressive Commission is going to open the ultra-high frequencies to commercial television operation. Some day, an alert and progressive Commission is going to allow color television to be operated. Since such steps will prevent monopoly and tight control, powerful industry interests, anxious to tune the time to its own profits, connive for delay. Perhaps it is natural they should do so. But why should the Commission be blind?

A large corporation, holding control of basic patents on transmitting and receiving equipment, collecting royalty tribute from all other manufacturers, and owning five television stations favorably located in the largest cities, has compelling economic reasons for freezing television allocations and standards until the time is ripe for the shift. It needs time and opportunity to build a Nation-wide network; it wants time and opportunity to merchandize millions of receiving sets. Then, when an obliging Commission would agree and announce that television is ready for the new day, the second skimming of the cream could begin. The Commission apparently is naive enough to believe that monopoly is avoided because patents are freely licensed; they do not appear to understand that if the timing of each step can be influenced, the selfish objective of monopoly control has been effectuated.

Under these circumstances, it is obvious why the gentleman from California, Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD, has again proposed legislation which would effectively bar all manufacturing enterprises in the communications field from holding a broadcast license or operating a radio network. Such a prohibition would remove once and for all the constant specter of monopoly, with which no commission seems able or willing to deal.

There are other disturbing facets to this monopoly picture. Broadcasters who have been convicted of antitrust violations are granted increases in power; interests who have accepted consent decrees stand defiantly at the counter demanding the right to get into television; networks "move in" to exert even greater control of their affiliates by becoming brokers for national advertising. The Communications Act itself makes quite clear that convicted monopolists should not hold licenses. But strangely enough, the Commission has never promulgated a rule which would settle directly once and for all its own interpretation of the act on the rights of those who have run afoul of the antitrust laws. It gives lip service to its network rules.

The Communications Act, which the Commissioners have sworn to administer honestly and faithfully, solemnly declares that they shall "generally encourage the larger and more effective use of radio in the public interest," and it makes certain and positive it is their duty to protect the public interest, convenience, and necessity and preserve competition.

In the final analysis the Commission has one overriding duty—to push the development of the art. It has data and skilled engineering advice in its own files which say that color is ready, that the higher frequencies can be used.

TELEVISION FACES CHANGE

Television today is not what this visible art will finally be any more than the Wright Brothers' *Kitty Hawk* can be compared with today's jet-propelled bomber. Already, television in the laboratory surpasses in every material aspect what is on the market. The imposition of arbitrary standards by a Government agency can have no other effect than to freeze the art until such time as powerful interests order the thaw. Standards must be elastic so that American brains and inventive genius will have freedom and the challenge to move forward as fast as science permits.

Let me make it clear that no one realizes more than I what difficult and vexing engineering decisions are involved. Television today is still a rich man's game; pick-up and transmission equipment costs huge sums of money; the existing channels which have the better coverage have been assigned to the large cities; and uncertainty and confusion continue to exist about allocations and standards. The ultra-high frequencies which offer so great an opportunity for expansion and competition are not yet fully explored for the visible art, largely because they have not been allocated for television use.

MAKE TELEVISION COMPETITIVE

All that I am seeking is to make television a wide-open competitive business. Development and improvement will then come along rapidly under our free-enterprise system. There can be no objection to the big networks getting into television; on the contrary, we should be glad that they took the initiative and risked their capital, and I commend them for it. But I do not want the Commission to be their pawns. I do not want the Commission to wait until the last boat in this fascinating field has put to sea with none of the little fellows aboard.

Some way must be found to make it possible for the little fellow to get into the business, and to get in as rapidly as possible. As television pushes forward in the radio field, the source of the present radio stations' advertising revenues will dry up; the average broadcaster cannot stand those losses for 5 or 6 years. He must be given the opportunity now to make constructive adjustments.

If there is to be a preferred class for television licenses, certainly those who pioneered in the radio industry, those who have rendered a magnificent public service in the broadcast field, are entitled to consideration. The grandfather tradition must not be forgotten. The Commission has recognized that its first allocation plan is wrong; it has proposed a second plan which is also wrong; while there is still time to rectify the mistake, it might give consideration to a plan which will allow the average broadcaster in the average-sized city to get into television and promote the same very satisfactory and effective competition we enjoy in radio today. Color television will help the little fellow, because he could sell local advertising which he

cannot sell with black and white. Opening up the ultra highs to commercial operation with color would compel the radio industry, with the laboratories and the large staffs of skilled engineers, to get in and develop the ultra highs, instead of hanging back to exploit first the lower frequencies.

What I am concerned about, and what every Member on this floor and in Congress must be concerned about is, in the future, who will furnish television programs; who will control the media; who will own the stations?

In this magnificent frontier of modern miracles slumbers the opportunity to revitalize and expand freedom of information. It is a job to which every individual commissioner and every Member of Congress should address his undivided attention, remembering first and foremost that the cornerstone of American life is the freedom of the individual—freedom in his economic pursuits and, above all, freedom of thought and ideas. The Congress, working closely with the Federal Communications Commission as a team, fighting to protect the people, can make these freedoms living realities.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	Neely
Bricker	Hoey	O'Conor
Bridges	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Hunt	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Kerr	Taft
Ecton	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Langer	Thye
Flanders	Lodge	Tydings
Frear	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	
Hayden	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). A quorum is present.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, only a few days ago I cast a vote in the Senate to retain the protection the minorities of this country have enjoyed since this free Government of ours was established.

At no time since I have been in the Senate have I intended my vote to be for the benefit of one class of our people to the exclusion of another class. I intend maintaining that consistency. For that reason I want to speak briefly in support of the amendment which is now pending, and which certainly is designed to prohibit the passage of class legislation.

I have reference to the amendment intended to be offered by the able junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and I ask at this time that the amendment be printed in the body of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BRICKER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 28, and after line 11, insert the following:

"(9) In recognition of the fact that public policy requires equality of treatment of all people and prohibits discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry in regard to public housing, every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for any low-rent housing project initiated after March 1, 1949, shall provide that the housing project to which the contract refers shall be operated without discrimination or segregation. Any person who in the management or operation of such housing discriminates or attempts to discriminate against any person, family, or group of people on account of race, creed, or color shall be guilty of a violation of this section and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment. Any citizen or organization may enjoin the violation of this section in any court, State or Federal, of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, if the Congress is to authorize the collection of taxes and the expenditure of those taxes for the purpose of building homes, then we have no right to exclude any class of our people from the right to live in those homes. In fact, I am somewhat disturbed that it is necessary for the Senate to consider an amendment which would make such a bill free of discrimination and free of segregation.

We are not presented with a bill which says that only one class of people shall pay the taxes necessary to build these homes. Why should we be asked to act on a bill which says that only one class of people can live in the homes, or a bill which leaves the decision in the hands of one man or one bureau as to who shall live in them?

Not long ago we were asked to place in the hands of one man the right to determine the fate of minorities. Now we are asked, by the housing bill, to place the rights of minorities in the hands of one man or one bureau. Is that a sample of what some people mean by civil rights, or equal rights?

Verbal and printed charges have been hurled from very peculiar sources, to the effect that this amendment was designed to kill the housing bill. I, for one, am anxious to see who it is who can be blamed for any denial of civil or equal rights in the Senate. Who wants to take the money from all and spend it on houses for only some of the people?

Who is doing the talking for minorities and voting against them?

I think we have taken enough rights away from our people. I think it is time we should recognize that they still have some rights left, and that we should act to protect those rights.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. In a moment. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of my remarks a resolution directed to certain leaders of the Senate by the National Negro Council.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COPY OF RESOLUTION SENT TO SENATOR LUCAS, MAJORITY DEMOCRATIC LEADER, SENATOR MYERS, DEMOCRATIC WHIP, SENATOR TAFT, CHAIRMAN, MINORITY POLICY COMMITTEE, AND SENATOR WHERRY, MINORITY REPUBLICAN LEADER, DEMANDING SUPPORT OF BRICKER ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AND ANTISEGREGATION AMENDMENT IN MULTI-MILLION-DOLLAR NATIONAL HOUSING LEGISLATION BY THE NATIONAL NEGRO COUNCIL

The Civil Rights Conference of the National Negro Council, in a resolution, protested the unanimous action of the Senate Democratic caucus in ordering the defeat of the Bricker antidiscrimination and anti-segregation amendment, proposed for inclusion in the multi-billion-dollar national housing legislation. This apparent public and open conspiracy to sabotage the constitutional guaranties of equal rights to 13,000,000 Negroes, would actually give official sanction for all time to come to such denial of their civil rights in the pending housing bill.

Such Senate action on the heels of the filibuster debacle by the Democratic majority of the Eighty-first Congress would serve notice of the complete repudiation of the President's civil-rights promises and the platform pledges of the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia last summer. * * *

The Civil Rights Conference, therefore, calls upon the Democratic and Republican leadership in the Senate, in keeping with the civil-rights pledges of both parties in their platforms and in this first opportunity for a direct vote on civil rights for Negroes in the Senate, to support the enactment of the Bricker antidiscrimination and anti-segregation amendment as part and parcel of the national housing legislation or stand exposed for political insincerity and co-partners with the Democrats in perpetuating the present Federal housing policies of racial discrimination and segregation.

EDGAR G. BROWN,
Director, National Negro Council.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of Edgar G. Brown, director of the National Negro Council, made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, pages 369 to 384, when the subcommittee was considering general housing legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDGAR G. BROWN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL NEGRO COUNCIL

Mr. BROWN. My name is Edgar G. Brown, director of National Negro Council.

I wish to express my thanks to the chairman and the members of the committee for this opportunity to present our views relative to this important and imperative national housing legislation and the equally vital matter of expediting its consummation. No doubt there is not a single statesman

among the 531 Members of Congress who has not been impressed recently by the tragic and challenging picture carried in the local press; slums and hovels in which thousands of good and patriotic Americans live and call homes right in the shadow of the Capitol of the most powerful and wealthy nation of the world.

No doubt the members of this great committee are among the Senators of clear vision and tender conscience who have looked out on this sad spectacle and resolved to do something to wipe out this blot on the Nation's escutcheon and to set a nobler example of democracy and representative government.

Certainly this is no time to be chided for man's inhumanity to man before the court of world public opinion. Moreover, we might presently find our own people questioning both the moral as well as the economic soundness of yearly expenditures of $6,000,000,000 abroad and only quibbling over civil rights at home, and victorious American veterans of every race, color, and creed, homeless and no better off than the frightened animals now in their former fox holes and as disillusioned as the conquered Germans and Japanese.

If I may be indulged for a few moments, I wish to call the attention of the committee to two recent news stories, pertinent and enlightening, which appeared in the Afro's Washington edition.

Mr. Chairman, knowing that it is nearly noontime, I would like to summarize what is in these two articles, and if you don't mind having them printed completely in the record, I would appreciate it.

Senator SPARKMAN. Let them appear in full in the record, and you summarize, as you wish.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you. This is an article in the Afro-American newspaper, Washington, D. C., January 25, 1949: "Mixed housing project in Manhasset sets pattern for democratic living; 12 people of various races, creeds, put over $1,500,000 program with State's aid."

It outlines how a group, more or less informally, of all races sat down and counseled together as to their community needs. They then advised with the proper authorities, and as a result the project is now consummated, and all races are living in the project. The same thing happened as was testified, and I was glad to hear it this morning, from the treasurer of the State of Georgia. In this case where this project was located in New York, juvenile delinquency and the usual crime incidents, morbidity, and so on were eradicated appreciably. Judges and other public officials so agreed.

The other article is also from the Washington Afro-American of February 8, 1949: "10,384 dwellings needed to ease housing shortage."

Here in the Nation's Capital "War units now 'rapidly going to pieces,' NCHA says; asks for 5,500 low-rent houses."

This is a Government report, Mr. Chairman, outlining the things that you well know already.

Senator SPARKMAN. And you wish to have that article in the record, also?

Mr. BROWN. If you please, sir, and one other from the study on segregation and housing in the Nation's Capital.

Senator SPARKMAN. Let it be inserted.

The articles and study referred to follow:

"MIXED HOUSING PROJECT IN MANHASSET SETS PATTERN FOR DEMOCRATIC LIVING—12 PEOPLE OF VARIOUS RACES, CREEDS PUT OVER $1,500,000 PROGRAM WITH STATE'S AID

"NEW YORK.—The story of Low a 110-unit interracial housing development became a reality in Manhasset, N. Y., following a conference of 12 residents representing various races and creeds 4 years ago in the living room of Mrs. Dorothy Fremont Grant was unfolded here last Thursday to the Catholic Interracial Council.

"Contracts for the projects, which will cost $1,500,000, were signed on January 12. It will replace slum conditions in the area inhabited by the majority of Manhasset's colored residents, estimated at more than 1,000.

"ORIGINAL PLANNERS

"William H. Pusey, who with his wife was among the conferees, told the Catholic Council they were invited by Mrs. Grant to her home to discuss race relations and its bearing on the town of Manhasset.

"The group consisted of George K. Hunton, editor of the Catholic Interracial Review, who served as moderator for the discussion; two representatives of the Jewish population; two colored residents; the Puseys, and others.

"SLUM CONDITIONS TOLD

"The group noted that out of the 191 dwellings, housing about 700 colored people, 81 required major repairs, and 31 were actually unfit for habitation.

"Mr. Pusey said some were nothing more than garages and chicken coops, and one was a store with curtains as partitions, occupied by two families totaling eight people. Ten percent of the dwellings had no electricity and many had no inside toilets or bathing facilities, water, heat, or cooking gas.

"TIMELY WARNING HEEDED

"'All of us agreed that a housing project was called for,' Mr. Pusey said. When this was decided Mr. Hunton warned against two things: He advised the group not to call in any politicians on their problem, and urged them to be on the watch for outside interests which might come in and defeat their purpose of providing good housing for the underprivileged.

"ENDORSED BY COMMUNITY

"The group went to work. Civic associations were contacted and found to be in favor of correcting the existing conditions. A committee was created, a report of the housing situation was prepared and endorsed by prominent residents. A petition was then filed with the State legislature asking it to create a housing authority for Manhasset.

"STATE LENDS SUPPORT

"The bill was passed by the legislature in March 1946 and members of the housing authority were appointed in May of the same year, one of whom was a member of the original sponsors.

"The housing authority then made a survey based on standards established by the State housing commission. This survey was approved in January 1947, and the way cleared to make application for funds.

"FINANCING APPROVED

"In October 1947 the State housing commission gave its approval for issuance of funds to build the project, final details for which were completed on January 12.

"The area will be fully landscaped and will cover 11 acres. Since the original plans were made, the site has been enlarged by an additional 20 acres made available by John Hay Whitney, financial and social leader.

"RENTAL AND SERVICES

"The apartments will have an average of four rooms each and will rent for approximately $8.70 a room per month which will include heat, gas, and electricity.

"This is the first time an unincorporated town in New York has obtained State funds for a housing project.

"EXAMPLE FOR OTHERS

"Mr. Pusey cited the calling of the conference by Mrs. Grant and the development which followed as an example of what any community can do about its housing problem, if it is willing to work cooperatively without regard to race or color. He concluded:

"'I hope as a result of our forum this evening, you will take away with you the satisfying thought that another substandard housing condition for colored people is about to be replaced with decent housing.'

"EVERYBODY'S JOB

"'But beyond all this, I should like you to take away the idea that I have tried to demonstrate that a small representative group, motivated by a worth-while ideal and competently directed, can achieve outstanding results and other communities can obtain the same results with its problems as was achieved in our town.

"'It can be done, but remember you have to do it.'"

"TEN THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FOUR DWELLINGS NEEDED TO EASE HOSUING SHORTAGE—WAR UNITS NOW 'RAPIDLY GOING TO PIECES,' NCHA SAYS; ASKS FOR 5,500 LOW-RENT HOUSES

"Some 5,500 permanent low-rent dwellings and replacements for 4,884 war housing projects, now in a serious state of deterioration, are needed in Washington as soon as possible and should be erected by both public and private concerns, the National Capital Housing Authority advised in its 1948 annual report released last Monday.

"Nearly all of the war-housing units, most of which are temporary, are 'rapidly going to pieces,' the report stated. 'It is estimated that there are in the District of Columbia more than 44,000 substandard dwellings occupied by more than 44,000 low-income families,' it continued.

"BAD PLACE TO LIVE

"NCHA said that Washington is a very bad place to live for many thousands of families who occupy its slums, its cheap rooming houses, and the residue of its old alley dwellings.

"It is clear that sites should be provided for proper dwellings for the estimated 44,000 low-income families. There is need for relief of the intolerable house overcrowding in the older congested and deteriorated areas of the city and the scarcity of sparsely occupied areas available for redevelopment by residential construction, it was pointed out by John Ihlder, executive officer of NCHA.

"ADMITTED ONLY 276 FAMILIES

"The authority admitted a total of 276 low-income families to permanent housing during 1948, it was reported. The heaviest concentration of addresses of new tenants was found in the decayed northwest section which extends from Florida Avenue southward to Massachusetts Avenue, and from North Capitol Street, westward to Fourteenth Street, represented by census tracts 44 to 50.

"This segment is noted for its slums, its high crime rate, juvenile delinquency, disease, and infant mortality. This one slum area in 1940 contained 6,013 unfit dwellings, 19 percent of all slum housing, declared NCHA.

"The authority reports having served 10,988 callers during the fiscal year 1948. It had active applications of 5,272 as of July 1, 1947, representing 3,925 for war housing and 1,347 for low-rent housing. As of June 30, 1948, there were 6,665 applications on file.

"Out of a total of 1,746 applicants assigned to NCHA dwellings during the fiscal year, 432 were colored—199 of these going to war houses and 233 to low-rent housing.

"SYPHAX PRAISED

"The report cited the Syphax housing program, southwest project, as 'a splendid example of what can be done when the right

thinking people in a community join forces in a well-planned program to benefit all.'

"A complete résumé of the work carried on at Syphax, as reported in the Afro several months ago, is contained in the annual report.

"Out of 8,146 dwellings in Washington operated by NCHA a total of 4,137 are occupied by colored persons."

"STUDY OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON SEGREGATION AND HOUSING IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

"SEGREGATION, INC.

"'Race segregation here is a "natural state," and certain groups which agitate against it are "unscrupulous" and "un-American." '—President of Federation of Citizens Association, Washington Post, October 15, 1947.

"Is segregation American?

"It might surprise the people we liberated from Nazi ghettoes to know that race segregation is defended as both 'natural' and 'American' by the business and property interests that dominate the Nation's Capital.

"But the fact is that the leaders who call segregation natural are the ones who enforce it. There is no reason to suppose the practice is American.

"The situation can be expressed most briefly by setting side by side the Federal statute recently cited by the Supreme Court in holding restrictive covenants unenforceable,[1] and the present rules of practice of the Washington Real Estate Board, representing the principal enterprise of the city.

"'ACT OF CONGRESS, APRIL 9, 1866[2]

"'All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey, real and personal property.

"'WASHINGTON REAL ESTATE BOARD CODE OF ETHICS, 1948[3]

"'No property in a white section should ever be sold, rented, advertised, or offered to colored people. In case of doubt, advice from the public affairs committee should be obtained.'[4]

"The real-estate board

"Among the active members of the real-estate board, and subscribing to its code of ethics, are 25 banks, insurance, and title companies, and building and loan associations. Because of the absence of heavy industry, these groups hold a position of unchallenged leadership in the economic life of the community.

"The District's only industry of consequence is the Federal Government and its great expansion, financed by all the taxpayers of the Nation, has supported one of the most profitable real-estate markets in the country. Since 1900, the Nation's Capital has doubled and then doubled again in population.

"Yet the real-estate interests have used their privileged position to bar Negroes from most of the growing city, and to confine them tighter and tighter in racial ghettoes. Under their code of ethics, they have acted jointly to deprive colored citizens of their equal right to purchase, lease, sell, and hold property.

"On what ethical ground have they done this? On the ground that equal rights for colored people would depreciate property values in white neighborhoods.

"Is this good ethics? What is meant by 'depreciating property values'?

"Negroes as home owners

"Real-estate men themselves report that Negroes make good home owners, and that, given a chance, they take care of their property. A few years ago, the National Association of Real Estate Boards published the results of a survey it conducted among the local boards. Here are the answers to some of the questions:[5]

"1. Does the Negro make a good home buyer and carry through his purchase to completion?

"'Yes,' was the almost unanimous reply * * * 'very good.' 'Better than whites of the same economic status,' some cities report. 'Their tenacity and willingness to sacrifice to hold on to their homes far exceed whites.'

* * * * *

"4. Does the Negro abuse property, or does he take as good care of it as other tenants of comparable status?

"He takes good care of it, in many cases better care than other tenants of his economic group, say 11 cities (73 percent of those reporting). * * *

"5. Do you think there is a good opportunity for realtors in the Negro housing field in your city?

"'Yes,' say almost two-thirds of the cities (63 percent). 'Splendid opportunity,' say boards in some of the largest cities * * *.

"Segregation is good business

"The local real-estate board has nothing against Negroes as home owners.[6] But exclusiveness has a market value, and is a substantial factor in determining what many white people will offer for residential property. Thus, segregation is good business.

"By throwing up racial barriers, a realtor can capitalize on the racial feelings of some of his customers without making the property less valuable to others. Once this process starts, racial prejudice becomes an investment, and enters into the resale price of all lots in the area.

"In this way Negroes have been barred from most of the new subdivisions, and they are now being boosted out of many old neighborhoods where they lived undisturbed for generations. A striking example is Georgetown, throughout which colored people formerly lived intermingled with whites.

"How money was made in Georgetown

"Since the 1920's, this old part of Washington has been promoted as a quaint, historic, desirable place for white people to live. The dispossession of the Negro residents is part of the redevelopment project, and is jointly managed by the city's leading realtors and their allied banks and trust companies.

"A few Negro home owners have succumbed to inflated prices, and have sold willingly. Others have been compelled to sell after being refused loans for repairs and improvements. As a matter of policy, the lending institutions of Washington deny credit to colored people in regions being prepared for whites.

"Many Negro tenants have been evicted so that white owners could remodel and rent or sell to whites at substantially increased prices. And as the white developers have moved into Georgetown, they have covenanted it block by block with racial restrictions to keep any Negro from returning.

"Uprooted from Civil War settlements

"In the same way, the old Negro settlements around the Civil War fort sites have been gradually whittled down. The white population, once indifferent to these hilly regions because they were too far out of town, has come to consider them highly desirable residential sections. Few colored families have been able to resist the methodical real-estate purchasing agent, or fight the condemnation or cutting up of their property by new roads and subdivisions.

"Twenty years ago the West End was a good-sized Negro community. But new public buildings and recent additions to George Washington University, forbidden to Negroes, have given real-estate interests a chance to develop much of this area west of the White House into an exclusive district of luxury apartment houses for whites.

"Large areas formerly occupied by Negroes have been condemned for Government buildings, parks, schools, and highway systems. In recent years many Negro families have been dislodged by the new Federal buildings on Constitution Avenue, by war-housing projects for whites in the Garfield section of the southeast, by the expansion of the navy yard, and the superhighway network built to service the Pentagon Building and the National Airport.

"America's displaced persons

"Colored people are displaced by public improvements more often than whites because they are concentrated in the blighted downtown areas that are suitable for public construction. And once unhoused, they are worse off than whites because they cannot move freely in the District.

"Under the code of ethics of the real-estate board, they are crammed tighter and tighter into the already bursting Negro ghettoes. During the war a Washington newspaper reported:

"'The crowding in the slums of the District has also been intensified by the fact that not only housing but the areas formerly occupied by Negroes have decreased. Various developments such as public buildings, war-housing projects for whites, and new roads have swept away many acres of ground heretofore open to Negro occupancy[7] * * *.'

"Negroes pay for exclusion

"Deprived of his equal right as a citizen to participate in the growth of the Capital, uprooted from many old scattered communities because exclusiveness can be sold, the Negro is herded into the inner zones of the city. And here for the second time his segregation is capitalized, and he is made to pay for his own exclusion.

"'Negroes in the same economic groups are better pay because the demand for housing is so much keener.' (Realtor Work for Negro Housing (1944), National Association of Real Estate Boards).

"Because the areas in which Negroes can live are artificially limited, they must pay more for the same housing than white people. Uncontradicted evidence in a recent Supreme Court case showed that property in the 100 block of Bryant Street NW., an area of mixed occupancy, is priced 30 percent higher to Negroes.[8]

"Going and coming

"As a result, the same real-estate interests that make money by excluding colored people from new subdivisions are able to collect inflated rentals from the slums into which they are driven. A profit is made on the Negro going and coming.

"The Negro home owner is forced to assume exorbitant financing costs. Staggering under the burden of his payments, with an income lower than a white man's, he is usually forced to take in roomers and subdivide his property in order to save it.

"What all this means to Negro families and also the community was recently summarized in an opinion rendered by Justice Edgerton of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia:

"'That enforced housing segregation, in such circumstances, increases crowding,

[1] *Hurd et al.* v. *Hodges et al.* (1948, 68 Supreme Court Reporter 847).

[2] 14 Stat. 27, 8 U. S. C. No. 42.

[3] Code of Ethics, sec. 5, art 15.

[4] As a general rule, the board takes the position that any neighborhood is white if 50 percent or more of its inhabitants are white (Doc. No. 109).

[5] Realtor Work for Negro Housing, National Association of Real Estate Boards, October 24, 1944.

[6] In the Capital, restrictive covenants have been directed more and more against persons of Jewish descent.

[7] Washington Post, February 6, 1944.

[8] *Hurd et al.* v. *Hodge et al.* (1948, 68 Supreme Court Reporter 847).

squalor, and prices in the areas where Negroes are compelled to live is obvious. It results in doubling up, scandalous housing conditions for Negroes, destroyed home life, mounting juvenile delinquency, and other indications of social pathology which are bound to have their contagious influence upon adjoining white areas.'[9]

"The citizens associations

"The Negro gets blamed by white people for his own segregation. Compressed, he is held responsible for the pressure. His concentration, which is the white man's profit, is regarded as a mobilization. His painful necessity of paying more becomes a fifth-column threat to the racial integrity of adjacent white areas. The Minutemen who defend these ramparts are gathered into the citizens associations.

" 'It's too bad you can't take a nice healthy club or crow bar and lay them (Negroes) in the gutter where they belong' (speech before Dahlgren Terrace Citizens Association, reported in Washington Post, September 18, 1947).

"Originally the citizens' associations were neighborhood improvement societies, interested in such things as trees and flowers, schools and parks, and improved city services. Not until the 1920's did they become actively concerned in the containment of Negroes, and turn into a front for the real-estate interests.

"Theirs is not to reason why

"These neighborhood groups did not manage the higher strategy by which the Negro was barred from most of the District and piled up in the inner zones. But they were the first to feel the pressure, and the responded in a kind of reflex action. Instead of demanding of civic leaders that colored residents be allowed to thin out in other areas, they built fences of their own and made the pressure worse.

"In the drive to exclude the Negro, the federated citizens' associations have functioned as the front-line shock troops, completing his encirclement by a network of mutual defense pacts, or agreements not to sell, erected all around the inner zones of the city. Their job has been to hold the line and sound the alarm whenever danger threatens.

"Recently the alarm sounded in Congress Heights in Southeast Washington.

"It was reported that two houses in this area had been sold to colored families, and 500 white property owners braved inclement weather to attend a hurriedly called mass meeting. Upon assembling, they were told that a collection had already been taken up and that both houses had been bought back from their Negro owners at premium prices. But a leader warned of a continuing threat:

" 'We called you here to plead with you not to sell to a colored person * * * Colored persons might offer $1,000 or $2,000 more, and that's a temptation.' (Speech before Congress Heights Citizens' Association, reported in Washington Evening Star, September 18, 1947.)

"White victims of segregation

"The white people who belong to these citizens' associations are themselves victims of the over-all segregation policy. The profit is not for them. The fact that the Negro's exclusion can be capitalized is their main worry. What they fear is the high price that colored people are forced to pay, and are willing to offer. They don't want to sell.

"What is important to most whites is the value of property as a place to live, and this value is threatened by the construction of racial barricades. With each Negro segregated, the fear increases in adjacent white communities as if a dam were about to break. When a crack appears, panic may ensue and the white owner may suffer an actual monetary loss.

"But worse than any derangement in property values is what happens to the relations of men. When bigotry is incorporated, normal human values are destroyed and every Negro becomes a menace.

"The whites seemed to get scared

" 'We lived for 16 years in this neighborhood. For 10 of those years we were the only colored family in this block, and we were completely accepted. Then, some time ago, the whites seemed to get scared about an invasion of Negroes, and they started to get up a restrictive agreement. After they had all signed up, they came around to ask us to sign the agreement, too.

" 'We were surprised that they would come around to us with a thing like that, but they just said: "You're different. You know we all like you, and it isn't people like you that we want to keep out." Then my father said: "Do you know what you are asking me to sign? You are asking me to promise not to sell my house to my own brother, and if I sign this thing I can't even deed it to my own son." ' (Statement of Negro Government employee (case C–121).)

"In no-man's land

"As the color lines draw tighter, a kind of no-man's land is growing between the races in the capital. It is becoming more and more rare for white and colored people to live together in the same neighborhoods, or even to have a speaking acquaintance with each other.

"However, fringe areas develop where the races are jammed together in slums, and where it is not practicable to capitalize any kind of 'exclusiveness.' A detailed field study of one of these mixed neighborhoods was undertaken recently to discover how the races got along under such adverse circumstances.

"The neighborhood selected was a 3-block stretch on the southern edge of the main Negro ghetto a few blocks from the downtown business district. Its buildings are old brick structures in varying stages of dilapidation. The tiny yards are mostly uncared for, and are marked off by fences in need of repair. Elaborately wrought ironwork decorations are epitaphs of a better day.

"No trouble reported

"In these three blocks live approximately 600 adults, 60 percent of them white and 40 percent Negro. The Negroes are more crowded than the whites. Whole families live in one room, cooking on hot-plates or small stoves. Stairways, walls, floors, and plumbing are in bad shape. Ordinary locks have become useless and have been replaced by padlocks.

"The great majority of white people in the area are natives of the South. Two-thirds of those interviewed had lived in the neighborhood for more than 1 year, and one-third had lived there for more than 5 years. Negroes first moved into the area about 10 years ago.

"At the end of each interview, the following question was asked, phrased to point up factual personal experiences, as distinguished from attitude, opinion, and hearsay:

"Question. Have you or any members of your family ever had any difficulty or trouble with the colored (white) people on this street?

"Result. Of the 209 adults covered (126 white, 83 Negro), trouble was reported for only one person. He was a white man who said of Negroes: 'They make too much noise at night.'

"People get along

"Opinions and attitudes were not asked for, but one elderly woman who was born in the South and had lived in the neighborhood more than 10 years said:

" 'The Negroes give no trouble. They're good neighbors. I always liked the ones who bought property beside us 6 years ago. The man takes an interest in his place. We say "hello" and chat often. They're noisy, at times, but who isn't? Yes, we get along fine' (Case N–46).

"Careful observations of this area over a period of years support the conclusion that at all ages the people get along with one another, in spite of serious overcrowding, a low educational and income level, and the presence of white southerners in unusual numbers. A matter-of-fact way of life has developed.

"The races trade together in the same drug stores, grocery stores, and neighborhood shops. In the middle block, white and colored children frequently play together. Occasionally, one can see such signs of approval as a white mother turning a jumping rope for a couple of girls of both races, or a father joining in a ball game with a mixed group of boys.

"It is not in the field of spontaneous human relationships that trouble occurs in Washington, but on a high-policy level where the segregation of the Negro is planned as a matter of good business, and investments are made in the denial of his equal right to own property. It is not the poor whites who set the pattern, but men of acknowledged culture and refinement, the leaders of the community.

"Allied against the Negro in this doubtful enterprise, in spite of contrary ideals and professions, is the full majesty of the United States Government.

"NEGROES ARE AMERICANS

" 'It is one thing when private tenants, property owners, and financial institutions maintain and extend patterns of racial segregation in housing. It is quite another matter when a Federal agency chooses to side with the segregationists.'—Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma.

"In a matter involving the rights of citizens in the Capital, it is impossible for the United States Government to be neutral. It must adopt a policy in favor of treating Negroes as Americans or help deprive them of their rights.

"The courts admit error

"For a generation, the Federal courts of the District of Columbia have helped real-estate men enforce agreements not to sell land to colored people. But the Supreme Court has now decided that such action violates the act of Congress,[10] giving all citizens of the United States the same right to purchase, lease, sell, and hold property.

"In an historic decision handed down in the spring of 1948, the high court reversed an order of the District Federal court evicting colored families from homes they had bought and paid for on Bryant Street NW., in Washington. Chief Justice Vinson delivered the opinion of the Court:

" 'OPINION OF SUPREME COURT

" 'Solely because of their race and color they are confronted with orders of court divesting their titles in the properties and ordering that the premises be vacated. * * * We hold that the action of the district court directed against the Negro purchasers and the white sellers denies rights intended by Congress to be protected by the Civil Rights Act, and that, consequently the action cannot stand.

[9] Dissenting opinion, *Hurd et al.* v. *Hodge et al.* (1947), 16 Fed. (2d), 233, 235).

[10] Sec. 1978, Rev. Stat., 8 U. S. C. 42: "All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property."

"'But even in the absence of the statute, there are other considerations which would indicate that enforcement of restrictive covenants in these cases is judicial action contrary to the public policy of the United States.[11] * * *'

"Damage has been done

"Even if all Government agencies were now resolved to protect Negroes in their rights as Americans, it would not be easy to undo the admitted wrong that has been done them. The best areas of the District have already been preempted by whites, and the heart of the Capital will long be scarred with ghettos built in the name of the law.

"But in spite of the Supreme Court reversal, the Government's lending, housing, and planning agencies are still being used by the bankers and realtors of Washington to help deny colored people their equal rights to own property in the District of Columbia.

"Colored families will no longer be thrown out of homes in white sections on orders of the Federal judge. But they are being denied the right of home ownership just as effectively in other ways with the help of the Federal Government.

"FHA insures segregation

"If a colored man wants to build a house, he must usually, like a white man, borrow money to finance it. Here the Government steps in with its FHA mortgage-insurance plan, which is intended to encourage the building of low- and medium-cost homes. The banker lends the money, and collects the interest, and the Government insures him from loss.

"Until 1947, however, the FHA Underwriter's Manual required that deeds in biracial areas include: 'Prohibition of the occupancy of properties except by the race for which they are intended.' In other words, the segregation of the Negro in the Capital was the only condition under which FHA would approve a loan.

"As a result of public criticism, racial conditions have been deleted from the new FHA Manual. But in Washington the bankers themselves insist on segregation. As long as they are permitted to make this condition in issuing Government-insured loans, Government money is being used to insure that Negroes are penned in racial enclosures.

"No place to build

"Often this means that a colored man can't build a home at all in Washington. In the areas now allotted to him by the Real Estate Board, there are not many vacant building sites. During the war agents for the Federal Public Housing Administration surveyed the city in vain search for suitable land.

"Every time an area not encumbered by racial restrictions was found and seriously considered nearby white residents lodged public protests and threatened court action. The American Veterans Committee wanted to build a housing project for veterans of all races in Washington, but was finally compelled to seek land outside the District.

"War veterans, both white and colored, know what the housing shortage means. But the Negro veteran has an additional problem in Washington. He is faced with an artificial land shortage. A census survey taken in 1947 showed that 71 percent of the married Negro veterans in the city were living doubled up in rented rooms or tourist cabins—a figure which was higher than for any city in the South.[12]

"Private enterprise a mockery

"The purpose of the Government to encourage private building for low- and medium-income groups has been frustrated where it is needed most. What a mockery private enterprise has become for the colored people of Washington was shown during the war when the Government issued priorities to private builders for desperately needed homes.

"It was revealed at Senate hearings in 1944 that of 30,700 dwelling units for which priorities had been given to private builders, only about 200, or less than 1 percent, had been completed for Negroes. Of 2,300 priorities allotted specifically for Negro occupancy in August 1943, only 22 were under construction and 8 completed at the end of the year.[13]

"It is obvious that segregation discourages private building for Negroes and increases their need for public housing. Yet the efforts of the Capital's public-housing authority to find building sites for Negro occupancy have aroused bitter controversy.

"Threats to public housing

"In 1943, at the height of a critical shortage of housing for Negro war workers, the National Capital Housing Authority proposed the construction of a project for Negroes in the Congress Heights area. It had to be abandoned, however, because of political pressure brought to bear by organized groups which were 'fencing in' the area for whites.

"The attacks made by these private interests on Government plans for Negro housing culminated in a congressional investigation of the housing agency in 1944. During the hearings the president of the Federation of Citizens Associations warned:

"'Unless it is going to be thoroughly understood that public housing must be continued on a segregated basis, people of Washington are going to, by a very great majority, oppose it.'

"Terms of surrender

"Unable to cope with the power of the real-estate lobby, the Government housing authority has accepted the mass segregation of Negroes as the only basis on which it will be permitted to build any housing for the low-income residents of the Capital. One of its officials explained in 1947: 'Segregation is the accepted pattern of the community.'

"But in accepting segregation, the housing agency has helped defeat its own purpose. While it has cleared the central part of the city of many scattered alley slums, and has built an appreciable number of dwelling units for Negroes on very limited funds, the net result has been to further decrease the land area available for Negro housing.[14]

"The slum areas it has cleared have been opened to white development, and the colored residents have been moved back within shrinking borders. Negroes are always relocated in established Negro neighborhoods, but housing projects for whites are sometimes located in areas of mixed occupancy, and even in predominantly Negro areas.[15] In this way even more land is captured for white use.

"A vicious circle

"The Government is caught in a vicious circle. Partly because segregation discourages private building, public housing for Negroes is necessary at the taxpayer's expense. But this housing is always built in a way to tighten segregation, thereby creating the need for more public housing, and for more money to be spent in aggravation of the original evil.

"The cost of publicly financed segregation can be measured, not only in lost human values and violated constitutional principles, but in defeated purposes and in dollars and cents. It makes wards of the people segregated.

"Things have reached the point in Washington where the Government must soon face the question of whether it is going to protect colored people in their rights as citizens or whether it is going to confirm them in their disinheritance. Great projects are under way.

"A more beautiful Capital

"Elaborate plans are being drawn to make Washington the most beautiful capital in the world. Under the Redevelopment Act passed by Congress in 1946, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has been given authority to plan the rebuilding of all the city's blighted areas. Millions of dollars are to be made available for land purchases.

"In glowing words, the Chairman of the Commission has stated his purpose to plan a capital adequate to the needs of the people and worthy of its great destiny. The city will have new parks and playgrounds, a magnificent new highway system, and fine new public buildings. Unsightly slums will no longer mar the view from the Capital steps.

"The Chairman's words have received much applause. No one wants to see blighted areas in the center of Washington. No one wants to see substandard housing perpetuated, least of all the Negro who must live in it.

"Negroes fear improvements

"Yet a hitch has developed. In January of 1948, the House Appropriations Committee turned down a request by the Planning Commission for $3,400,000 to start operations of the new District Redevelopment Land Agency. Here is part of the news item which appeared in a Washington newspaper:

"'HOUSE COMMITTEE REJECTS REQUEST AFTER OBJECTIONS FROM NEGRO GROUP

"'Slum-clearance funds for Washington were rejected yesterday after Negro objections that the project would establish a "Hitlerlike ghetto" for them. * * *

"'William D. Nixon, chairman of the Committee of the (Negro) Federation of Civic Associations, testified:

"'"In the city of Washington, the cradle of democracy, the colored citizen can no longer select a place of his choice in which to live. General Grant openly states that the colored population, dispossessed by playgrounds, public buildings, parks, and schools, will be housed in the far northeast section in the rear of Anacostia."'[16]

"A gross misunderstanding

"The general referred to by the Negro spokesman is Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant 3d, Chairman of the Planning Commission. In reply, he said that there had been a 'gross misunderstanding.'

"'For many years there has been a misunderstanding.'

"According to the Constitution, Negroes have the same right as white people to move anywhere in the District. According to the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, it is unlawful for the Government to deprive them of this right. But what happens to colored people displaced by public improvements?

"General Grant's Commission

"Uprooted by the Government, they are forced by Government policy behind racial barricades satisfactory to the real-estate board. No private housing will be built for

[11] *Hurd et al.* v. *Hodge et al.* ((1948) 68 Supreme Court Reporter 847).

[12] Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Housing of Negro Veterans, January 1948. (Survey in 24 southern and 8 northern areas conducted by Bureau of Labor Statistics and Bureau of the Census.)

[13] Subcommittee hearings, Senate Committee on District of Columbia, investigation of the National Capital Housing Authority, 1944, p. 1142.

[14] NCHA now operates 3,259 permanent low-rent dwelling units; 2,700 of them occupied by Negroes, 559 by whites. In 1940 there were in the District of Columbia approximately 173,500 occupied dwelling units; 40,000 Negro-occupied, 135,500 white-occupied.

[15] Among the projects for whites built in largely Negro areas are the Lily Pons houses and the Quarles Street houses, off Kenilworth Avenue, in the far northeast, and the Knox Hill dwellings and the Twenty-fifth Street houses, directly south of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

[16] Washington Post, January 3, 1948.

them elsewhere. Nor any public housing. Advice on proper building sites is given by General Grant's Planning Commission. Here are two recent examples of its daily activities:

"1. The Commission advised a Negro builder who wished to develop a 60-acre tract of land in southeast Washington to seek land in the Negro section of the northeast instead.

"2. A Commission spokesman stated that the valley running through Marshall Heights, for which a highway is now being planned, should be the logical dividing line between the white and Negro sections of the far southeast.

"Eighty years after Appomattox

"Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d takes the view that his Planning Commission must observe the segregation principle 'until the community is ready' for mixed neighborhoods. But what is the fact?

"The general's Planning Commission, in the name of public improvements, is driving new highways between the races, and evacuating Negroes from areas where they were free to live in his grandfather's day. Eighty years after Appomattox, the Commission is helping to dig racial trenches in the Capital.

"It is a question for white people whether such improvements are worth the price, or whether an unplanned city wouldn't be better, with a few slums to mar the vistas, than a bright shining capital swept clean of individual rights.

"A desperate beachhead

"To the Negroes of Washington, their old slums are a kind of desperate beachhead on their heritage as Americans. In shacks and huts they once were free to live anywhere in the city. But now they are driven back.

"When discrimination is personal and a matter of each man's private prejudice, Negroes are still freemen. But against planned segregation they are helpless. When their exclusion becomes a good business proposition, when it is capitalized in bonds and banks, when the American Government drives them back, then their last chance is gone.

"In any event, we would expect to find Negroes occupying the worst housing in the worst neighborhoods. They are assigned, as we shall see, to the meanest and lowest paying jobs. And, being rejected by color, they may tend to withdraw by color, and live more or less together.

"I Am an American Day

"This tendency can be noted among newly arrived immigrants, who congregate in the slums of our great cities in different foreign-language groups. But, in their case, even voluntary segregation is recognized as bad, and efforts are made to narrow the gap.

"Before long, these foreign immigrants begin to think of themselves more as Americans than as Italians or Poles or Slovaks, and this process is encouraged. The Nation celebrates I-Am-an-American Day to instill in newly naturalized citizens a sense of belonging. They are welcomed out into the community.

"But, with the Negro, is that what happens? He has been an American longer than most Americans, but in the Nation's Capital efforts are now being made to isolate him as a Negro. At what cost?

"THE HUMAN WRECKAGE

"'Bacteria are broad-minded. * * *'—Anonymous.

"A Negro's disadvantage

"An indication of the disadvantages under which Negroes live in the Nation's Capital is furnished by disease and death rates. There is no reason to suppose that Negroes are born less healthy than white people, and it is well known that some of them live to a ripe old age.

"Yet the life expectancy of a colored resident of Washington is 10 to 12 years less than that of a white resident. In 1944, his chances of dying were 37 percent greater.[17] Elsewhere in the Nation, the colored death rate was only 19 percent higher than the white death rate."

Mr. BROWN. It is our belief that definite language must be included in this over-all coordinated and inclusive Federal housing legislation, once and for all outlawing racial discrimination and segregation in administration, construction, finance, insurance, and occupancy in keeping with the recent decision of the Supreme Court declaring restrictive covenants unlawful.

We wish to strongly urge upon this committee the inclusion of language in the Federal housing legislation (now before you) to prohibit any order, regulation, rule, or other action by the Administrator, Secretary of Agriculture, or any subordinate official having any power directly or indirectly, or any and all authority, committees, such as proposed in the rural-housing county committees, which countenances discrimination and segregation on account of race, color, creed, or national origin.

Further we desire to impress this committee that it include appropriate language in the national housing bill to deny any and all benefits of this housing legislation to a contractor, labor union, or beneficiary of this legislation and prohibit any consideration, employment, funds, or benefits, as long as any claim or evidence of segregation or racial discrimination exists in any degree whatsoever.

Human rights must no longer be left to chance and good intentions in an atomic age. We must guard our most sacred and precious human potential. The spirit and letter of the Constitution and the language of Thomas Jefferson, "that all men are created equal and endowed by God with certain inalienable rights," must be the embodiment of the housing legislation.

Certainly public funds should not be used, Mr. Chairman, to discriminate against American citizens, and I want to emphasize particularly that a million Negroes served with 9,000,000 other Americans to preserve democracy in this world, and among them was my son. I myself am a veteran of World War I, my sister was a first lieutenant in the American Army Nurse Corps in World War II. She volunteered and served 4 years. I am sorry to report to you here today that when she died she was segregated in the basement with men in Jefferson Barracks of the veterans' hospital in St. Louis, Mo. I hope that no other woman of any race will ever be subjected to that kind of indignity in death with nothing done about it by the United States Government, in serving her country.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have a great deal more respect for the people who are frank in their statements of their personal and public views than for many who give abundant lip service to democracy and have a lot of official opportunities to carry it out, but do nothing about it.

I might say that, as you know—and I think I owe this to you and Senator MAYBANK, who has just come in—I have opposed both of you being seated here in the United States Senate, and I am still opposed to your being seated until you are investigated as to whether you did like Senator Bilbo——

Senator MAYBANK. I thought this was a housing investigation.

Mr. BROWN. Senator MAYBANK, I want to pay you a compliment eventually when I get through.

Senator MAYBANK. But you said I ought to be investigated.

[17] Report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the year ended June 30, 1945, p. 119.

Mr. BROWN. We do not think you should for the purposes of this committee, particularly, but I am interested in trying to make the point here, that you, Senator MAYBANK, outlaw any discrimination in this housing bill. The fact that Judge Waring, down in South Carolina, insisted upon putting people in jail for contempt of court because they refused to permit Negroes to register and to vote in the so-called white primary points up the importance, in legislation, of you, Senator MAYBANK, and other men who are beneficiaries of elections under such conditions as I have indicated. We are asking and are hopeful, despite those conditions and that situation, since you have taken an oath to uphold the law and the Constitution, that you will see that in this housing legislation, where the Government and all the taxpayers are contributing, there will be no discrimination and segregation on account of race, color, or creed, and I have confidence enough in you and Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama, despite, as I just said, my personal observations on this matter as to the background of it, that you will live up to your oath of office, despite politics of South Carolina.

I would just as soon sometimes trust those who do not give so much lip service out in the public to civil rights, but maybe when they use their official influence they are equally fair or perhaps more advantageous to the general citizenry, without regard to race, creed, or color.

Senator MAYBANK. I can say this: In Charleston there are some of the best housing developments in this country. Colored people there have good housing. I commend the committee that operates the housing in Charleston now, and if you go down there you will find the colored people in those housing projects very satisfied.

Mr. BROWN. I am glad to hear that. I also heard testimony of the witness from Georgia, where I happen to know the first housing project of this country was built with Federal funds, and he testified in your absence, Senator MAYBANK, that not a single Negro and not a single white person has been found delinquent coming from the vicinity of those housing projects there. This was the testimony of a judge in the city of Atlanta, Ga.

Senator MAYBANK. You need not worry about how I feel about housing, health, and those things for colored people.

Mr. BROWN. Since you raise the question, Senator MAYBANK, I believe I know there are now in many sections of the country white and colored people living in the same housing projects, and nothing has happened. I think we can make a lot of progress by going ahead and serving equally human beings who are created in the image of God, in keeping with the Constitution and the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, who said that all people were created equal.

Senator MAYBANK. You cannot convince me of that. Colored people are perfectly satisfied the way they are.

Mr. BROWN. It may be true in South Carolina, but not in other States, including Illinois, my home State, New York, Pennsylvania, and many others where we are voters and recognized as citizens.

Senator MAYBANK. Look at the trouble you had in Detroit.

Senator SPARKMAN. Is the real trouble not this, that in our area we know what we are doing? In those areas they pretend to do one thing, but do the other.

Mr. BROWN. As to Detroit today, all is well. As I have stated earlier, Senator SPARKMAN, many sincere people see things quite differently. You have repeated practically what I have indicated. I didn't come here, Senator SPARKMAN, to start any controversy on civil rights, and I want Senator MAYBANK to know——

Senator MAYBANK. The only statement I made was that you had reference to elections,

and I did not think that belonged in this committee, where we are dealing with housing. If there is any question of elections, it should not be discussed here, as you know, and I don't think it has any place in here.

Mr. BROWN. I agree with you.

I might conclude by saying that I wish that all I have suggested in these newspaper articles and studies will be placed in the record. I would like to mention, Senator MAYBANK, and Senator SPARKMAN and other Senators, this matter of the building unions.

As a previous witness testified, they got 1,500 bricks laid 16 years ago by a bricklayer, and now they get 600 bricks per day.

Also, I want to bring out that these building unions, bricklayers and others, exclude in most instances Negroes from their membership, and I believe if they were opened to Negroes, more carpenters and bricklayers would be available; we would bring down the cost of building—and I think that is important.

Senator SPARKMAN. Do they do that up North?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir. In all sections of the country, I understand.

Senator SPARKMAN. In my home town one of the best masons I know is a Negro.

Mr. BROWN. That is another anomaly or paradox of the so-called race question, Senator SPARKMAN, and I am glad you brought it out.

Senator MAYBANK. I would like to know about that, too. They are not excluded in certain sections of the South, are they?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; I have no recent report. I do not think in the South they have been.

Senator MAYBANK. Where do they exclude them?

Mr. BROWN. In many sections of the North, to my knowledge.

Senator MAYBANK. Where you get your lip service?

Mr. BROWN. That is right. I wanted to get that in the record, and I am very happy that you emphasized it, Senator MAYBANK.

I think it is a crime for the Federal Government to permit unions to have the benefit of collective bargaining, such as bricklayers and other skilled workers, who exclude people from making a living, earning bread for their families, educating their children, interfering with good Americans being good citizens on account of color. They make it difficult even for citizens of both races to have proper housing because of these costs, resulting in monopoly and limiting their membership and creating a scarcity of labor in setting up a color bar. I think it is just as important as having all these funds expended without discrimination as to finance, insurance, and administration and occupancy that no unions be able to benefit under this legislation, or any other Federal legislation that has racial exclusion written into their constitutions, as 17 A. F. of L. unions have, including some of these bricklayers, carpenters, and other builders, who rig up prices and make these building costs almost prohibitive.

Some language ought to be put in this legislation that such unions be denied any benefits if they deny membership to other American citizens on account of race or color. It is wrong and inhuman, as well as unconstitutional. It certainly isn't Christian. It is an unholy practice.

I think, Senator MAYBANK and Senator SPARKMAN, if you could do that, 13,000,000 Negroes certainly would consider that a very genuine contribution to civil rights, far more timely than meaningless gestures for public consumption and political purposes. I think a lot of talk would then be unnecessary. The need of a filibuster on the floor of the Senate would be precluded.

I wish to thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you for your statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I intend to support the amendment offered by the able Senator from Ohio. I believe it to be fair and equitable.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, the question I should like to propound to the Senator from Indiana is as to where in the bill it specifically refers to who may live in public-housing projects.

Mr. CAPEHART. It does not do so.

Mr. THYE. Then what is the necessity for the amendment? If there is no mention of class, creed, religion or color in the bill then why is an amendment necessary?

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendment is based on the fact that heretofore the administrative agencies have denied members of the Negro race the right to participate, plus the situation which exists in connection with TVA, a project owned and operated by the Government. All one needs do is to visit TVA, and go through the project, and find drinking fountains, one drinking fountain labeled "whites," another drinking fountain labeled "colored," in a 100 percent governmental project, owned and operated by the very people who today are advocating civil rights. If segregation is practiced in TVA, as is being done and has been done for many years, then it will be continued in legislation passed by the Congress, if the pending bill shall not be amended. I know of no way of insuring equal rights to all our people except by writing a provision into the bill to that effect.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, that raises another question. In my State, and I think the same situation prevails in the Senator's State, water fountains are not so labeled, are they?

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, no.

Mr. THYE. Then, I come back to the question, why does the Senator wish to spell out specific provisions in the law, when the bill in itself as it is written would definitely provide that there could be no discrimination? Is not that the truth? If the Administrator were acting in accordance with the act, he would find nothing in the act which would compel him to discriminate or to exclude. Then it is a question of attacking the administrator, in the event the administrator is not functioning in accordance with the law; and it would be useless to write provisions into the bill which no one could understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Unfortunately, the senior Senator from Indiana is not the administrator. Unfortunately he possibly will not be, and unfortunately has not been, and unfortunately, during the past 12, 15, or 18 years, there has been discrimination in the administration of many acts which have been passed by Congress, involving legislation carrying appropriations for Government-operated projects, which the Government is still operating. The same persons who will administer this particular measure have been administering the other acts, and they have been practicing segregation, as I pointed out in the case of TVA.

Mr. THYE. My only fear in connection with the proposal to write specific language into the bill as to what can be done and what cannot be done, is primarily that if the amendment shall prevail, and because of the amendment the entire housing legislation is defeated, we would be endangering the chance of the people or the families who have not places to rent or live in now to obtain suitable living quarters in the near future, or within the next few years. That is the great question in my mind, whether we should support the amendment and lose the housing legislation, or whether we should defeat the amendment and pass the housing legislation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who would vote against the amendment which has been offered by the able Senator from Ohio? Who is against civil rights?

Mr. THYE. I am not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who is against equal treatment for all?

Mr. THYE. I am not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who can possibly be against permitting people of all creeds and colors to live in housing which has been constructed by the American taxpayers' money? Who is going to vote against it? Who is against civil rights?

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The senior Senator from Ohio is going to vote against the amendment, if the Senator from Indiana wants to know who is going to vote against it.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is the privilege of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The situation in Ohio is, roughly speaking, that where a housing project is built in a colored district, it is generally occupied entirely by colored people. Where it is built in a white district, it is as a rule occupied by white people. There are a number of projects where both white and colored people are taken care of in the same project. There has been no discrimination. There has been no charge of unfairness. The law has been administered with absolute equality. In fact, I would say it has been administered, on the whole, with preference to the colored people, because as a rule they have the lower incomes, and they are therefore more eligible to secure accommodations in these projects.

So there has been no criticism whatever of the administration of the system, except in one case, and that really was not because of discrimination, but it was because of very bad judgment, I think, in a case in Detroit, where a race riot developed because those in charge were trying to do something which I do not think should have been done in the beginning. Otherwise, there is no reason that I know of for such a requirement as is proposed. It seems to me the system has worked with entire justice, and there is no charge made of discrimination of any kind. I think a general statement that there should be no discrimination is all right, but circumstances might require a certain amount of segregation, and a preference to one group or another in a particular housing project.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, I wish to make a comment. The senior Senator from Ohio stated the situation very well. The reason I asked the question in the first place was because I had not found

within the language of the bill that discrimination could be practiced.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator know that the TVA, a Government project, owned by the Government, operated by the Government with funds furnished by the taxpayers, practices discrimination in the operation of that project? As I stated a moment ago, we find at one place a drinking fountain labeled "Colored" and at another place a drinking fountain labeled "White." So by reason of that discrimination we have two drinking fountains, thereby costing the American taxpayers twice as much for installation of drinking fountains. Does the Senator from Minnesota know that?

Mr. THYE. I have visited the TVA, but my purpose in visiting TVA was to investigate the general welfare TVA was bringing about not only in respect to flood control but in the development of conservation practices in that area. I regret that I was not looking for what the Senator from Indiana refers to. Had I been looking for it, I possibly would have seen it. At least I did not see what the Senator refers to. I was looking at the physical operation of the dams and the hydroelectric and the service projects rather than what the Senator refers to. So I cannot say whether I saw it or not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator in favor of passing a law which would require that each employer must not discriminate in hiring persons of different nationalities, colors, and creeds?

Mr. THYE. Insofar as the senior Senator from Minnesota is concerned, and so far as his own convictions are concerned, he is against class discrimination or class segregation, and favors provisions and measures establishing civil rights. The Senator from Minnesota, however, believes that the Senator from Indiana, in going from the question of housing and the provisions of the housing bill over into the question of employment, is going beyond the intent of the debate we have had on the subject.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, why should those who are in favor of Congress passing a law providing that an employer may not discriminate in the hiring or employment of persons, yet oppose writing into the pending measure a very simple statement providing that there shall be no discrimination in the operation of any housing project which is built by the money of all the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. LANGER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I call the attention of the Senator from Indiana to the fact that the Democratic Party has charge of the Army. All that would be required of Mr. Truman, the President, who is a friend of the colored people, is that he issue an order which would wipe out the discrimination existing in the Army. I do not know whether or not I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, but I submit that when a certain party says it is the particular friend of civil rights, it is possible that that party can be mistaken.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a press release which is undated, but which is issued by the Washington bureau of the NAACP.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 18, 1949.—In telegrams to the Democratic majority leader, Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, and Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican minority leader, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People urged support not only for the amendment proposed by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, Ohio, to the multimillion dollar public housing bill prohibiting segregation in public housing projects but asked for a broader amendment to cover all federally aided housing, public and private.

The telegrams signed by Leslie S. Perry, Washington representative for the NAACP said:

"When the NAACP representative testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the housing bill, S. 1070, among other amendments advocated was one to prohibit racial segregation in Federal public housing.

"We have studied the antisegregation amendment proposed by Senator BRICKER and believe as framed it would correct part of the serious housing situation confronting racial and other minority groups.

"Federal funds should not be used to aid or subsidize by loans, grants, insurance, or any other means any housing, public or private, which segregates or otherwise discriminates against eligible citizens because of race, color, creed, or national origin.

"We, therefore, urge support not only for the Bricker amendment but a broader one to cover all federally aided housing contemplated by the bill.

"Since various public charges have been made regarding Senator BRICKER'S motives in proposing the amendment, the association desires to point out that it looks to the legal effect of a proposed amendment or law; it does not probe the secret motives of the sponsor."

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, I wish to make a few general observations on Senate bill 1070, commonly known as the Federal housing bill. On the floor of the Senate great stress has been placed on the need for slum elimination. No one disagrees with the motive of those who desire to eliminate the slums in metropolitan areas. Certainly I do not differ with the purpose of the section of the bill which seeks to encourage the elimination of city slums. There has been a great deal of overemphasis placed upon that aspect of the bill heretofore, both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, the hope being that emphasis upon title I of the bill will carry along the other titles with which many of us do not agree.

Pictures have been submitted to the Senate showing the deplorable conditions in the city of Washington and in other great cities of the country. Those deplorable conditions have existed too long, and they are today too prevalent for the public welfare. Likewise pictures might be shown here of some of the Government housing projects which have already become dilapidated and are almost in slum condition in some of the cities. I personally have seen, as no doubt many other Members of the Senate have seen, such housing projects under public management. Yet that situation does not justify opposition to the provision.

I desire to point out to the Senate that if there had been the aggressiveness in the past 10, 15 or 20 years on the part of local governments which we see exhibited here now in order to provide this contribution to local governments, the slum conditions would largely have been eliminated in the metropolitan areas. There is not one slum area that could not have been greatly improved by the enforcement of local sanitation laws, by the enforcement of compliance with the local building codes, and through the exercise of the general police power that resides in the States and in the cities of the country.

What is sought to be done is further evidence of the fact that the city governments of the country have come to have a reliance upon a philosophy of government which argues that, if they can get money from the State Governments or from the Federal Government, they can show great improvement in their communities, take full credit for it, and their people will never have to pay the bill for the improved conditions. So therefore they take the credit without assuming the responsibility.

I for one am not in favor of the Federal Government encouraging such an attitude on the part of local public officials. I think that sooner or later, if the slum condition is ever to be eliminated in the metropolitan areas, it must be because the local authorities assume their full responsibility. For the reason that this bill does put that responsibility upon the local communities to a large degree, even though Federal contributions and grants are made to local area authorities, I shall support title I, if it is possible to do so, separate from some of the other provisions of the bill. It will be an impetus, it will be an encouragement to local governments to do the job which they heretofore should have done on their own responsibility.

In considering the problem I recognize full well that the financial situation of many of the cities is very bad. Likewise in some of the States the financial situation is not good at the present time. But most of the States of the country are solvent. Many of them have no debts at all. And certainly the city governments are in a better financial position today to assume this responsibility than is the Federal Government which we directly represent in the Congress of the United States. They have no debts, either singly or in the over-all collective situation, comparable to the debt owed by the Federal Government. They have the resources from which to draw to eliminate local slum conditions. Many communities have assumed that responsibility. Such communities stand out as exemplifications of good local government, and

should afford encouragement to other communities.

I mentioned the tax situation. I do this in connection with title I, as well as title II of the bill. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that today we have an annual budget of $42,000,000,000 as a burden on the Federal taxpayer. Last year the Federal budget took out of my State $2,700,000,000. This year it will take out of Ohio $2,430,000,000. That means $300 for every man, woman, and child in my State. It means $1,200 for every family in Ohio, and it means 25 percent of the total assessed real, public utility, and personal property values of the whole State of Ohio. So if a farmer owns 100 acres of land in my State, this year his share of the Federal Government operating expenses will amount to one-fourth of the total value of his farm. The same reasoning could be applied to a small business, or to a large business, for that matter, or to the laboring man, because ultimately there is no source of wealth except that which comes from the utilization of our resources and from human labor. This expenditure must come out of the soil, out of the mines, out of the land, or out of the work of the people of the Nation who carry the burden of the cost of the Federal Government.

I emphasize that fact because some day we shall reach the point of diminishing return in taxes. Perhaps we have already reached that point. We cannot increase taxes upon our people for Federal needs at this time without further depressing business, agriculture, and labor. I do not believe that we dare go into another era of deficit financing. This bill would simply add further to the Federal cost of Government, which would increase the $300 burden upon every citizen of my State, the $1,200 burden upon every family, and the burden of 25 percent of the total value of all the property in the State, which must be taken each year to pay the operating expenses of the Federal Government.

In compensation for the cost of the slum-elimination section I believe that it will add greatly to the value of the real estate within the local community, if it can be successfully accomplished and economically administered.

I now pass to title II, which is the important section of the housing bill. It is the provision which calls for the construction by the Federal Government, through local housing agencies, of low-rent housing accommodations. In committee hearings I repeatedly asked representatives of the Federal Government who appeared before us what the total dollar cost of this provision will be. So far I have not had a definite dollar figure placed upon the actual cost. However, in the bill there is an authorization for the Federal Government, through its local agencies—and they are actually agencies of the Federal Government—to allow a cost per room of $1,750. In the discretion of the Administrator that may be increased $750, making the cost per room of these projects $2,500.

That would mean that a five-room house or living unit, either individually or in conjunction with other living units, would cost $12,500. We have had sufficient experience with Federal Government projects to know that the maximum very quickly becomes the minimum cost of Federal projects. The cost of $12,500 for a five-room living unit will be in addition to the cost of the land purchased and the cost of demolition of any buildings already on the land. The average cost might possibly go to $14,000, or even $15,000 per unit for these subsidized low-income-group rental units. That is more than the average cost or present value of the living units of the great majority of the people of the United States.

When we reach the point where we provide better housing for those who are subject to the largess of their Government, those who are in the welfare class, those who have not been able to accumulate or keep or provide their own housing, when we provide them with living units the value of which is greater than the value of the average American home, we then definitely place a penalty upon thrift and a premium upon indolence.

No one will object to giving help to those who are in need. It has been the history of our Government—Federal, local, and State—that we have compassion upon those who are in need. We have helped them. I am justly proud of the fact that we have taken care of those in need. But we have never gone to the extent, and I do not believe we should go to the extent now, of providing for those whom the Government helps, living accommodations greater in value and better than the living accommodations of the average citizen of America, who must ultimately pay the cost of this project.

The cost must be taken out of the labor of the people. It must be taken out of the value of the houses now owned, and out of the income, earnings, and savings of the people of America. As was stated the other day by a distinguished Senator who was speaking in connection with the rent law, the great middle class is becoming further and further suppressed. To a greater and greater extent their property is being taken away from them by the Federal Government as well as by local government, to meet the costs of government. At present that cost amounts to more than one-third of the income of the people of the country. Sooner or later we shall reach the point where they will be unable further to carry the burden.

If the cost of operation of the Federal Government continues to increase as it has been increasing, the money for the operation of the Federal Government will not be forthcoming from the people of the United States. We are reaching the point of diminishing return. So, in my judgment, title II of the bill should not be enacted into law at this time.

Only last week I had the experience, in my home town, of seeing 40 loans made to private builders for $6,100 each. The houses to be built will sell for less than $7,000, on an amortization program in which payments will be equal to the rent in the units to be constructed with Federal Government money. These privately built homes will be occupied by single families in home ownership, which is, after all, the real foundation of our society in the communities of the Nation. In my city, which is a city of 400,000 people, there are today 800 vacant living units. The majority of them are in the lower-income group. Day by day we are catching up with the need for rental units, as well as housing units for sale. As soon as we have enough housing accommodations in the country to take care of the need, the rental rate will fall, and costs will come down to meet the needs of all the segments of our society. Other cities could undoubtedly show the same situation. We are rapidly catching up with the Nation's housing needs.

A year ago we were told by the steel producers, and even by the President in his address to the Congress, that we would have to pour Federal money into the steel business. We were told that there was not enough steel for greater automobile production. There was a 2-year backlog. We are now caught up so far as automobiles are concerned, and this year the production of steel will be 99,000,000 tons, the greatest production in the wartime or peacetime history of the country. The gray market has gone. We are up to the hour in the production of steel, which was the last bottleneck in the reconstruction program.

If we leave this problem where it has always been, in the hands of private industry, with the aid which must be given to the needy through State and local governments, we shall better solve this problem than by entering into a program of extensive and expensive Federal contributions for low-rent housing projects.

A moment ago I mentioned the cost of these units to the taxpayers. Ultimately that cost may be paid back. It has not been paid back very rapidly in the case of the units which have already been constructed. Yet there is to be an annual contribution on the part of the Federal Government for the difference between the amortization costs of the unit and the rents of the low-rent housing projects. That will be a subsidy which, when this construction program is completed, will amount to $308,000,000 a year. If we add to that approximately $5,000,000 more for the rural program under title IV, we have a total of approximately $313,000,000 of annual contributions from the Federal Government. That means that the Federal Government will be contributing, every month, $31 plus for every unit under this construction program of 810,000 units. The cost will not be merely the immediate construction costs; but the cost which will be burdening the people of the United States will include an annual charge of $308,000,000. We are here placing this burden upon the people for the next 40 years; and, if the program of amortization is not properly carried out and if the housing units are permitted to depreciate, as they have in many instances at the present time, the units will not last for the 40 years contemplated for amortization under this plan. They will deteriorate to the point where they will become the slums of the community. There will be no local pride of ownership; there will be no desire on the part of the tenants to keep the property in good condition, in the condition

in which it should be kept; and those properties will be the slums which will have to be eradicated by means of future Federal contributions.

So, Madam President, this program will simply breed another undesirable condition with which future Congresses will have to deal. Unless we recognize certain fundamental principles in connection with the consideration of this program, eventually we must come to the time when all housing will be a Government project, and then we shall have destroyed all pride of individual ownership, which throughout our history has been an important factor in our greatness.

Now I wish to move on to a brief consideration of title III, the research section of this bill. I certainly approve of research by the Government; that is a field in which the Government heretofore has operated, both on the State and on the National level. I believe that considerable research should be conducted before we commence a large-scale housing program. But the research should be completed before such a project is commenced. We should know now what are the very best and cheapest building materials, and the most efficient and economical living unit which can be constructed under this program, before we begin upon it. Certainly the advocacy of preliminary research does not constitute opposition to the meeting of the need.

At this point I wish to pay a little attention to title IV of the bill. In the committee there was very little testimony regarding title IV, but there is a great deal of misunderstanding both as to the purpose and as to the results which will be obtained under it. Title IV of the bill provides for loans and grants to the lower-income group engaged in the business of agriculture. I think the title is limited in its application to farms with an income of $400 as of the year 1944, and the title would leave to the Secretary of Agriculture the determination of their income.

In the first place, Madam President, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot reconstruct in his mind all the crops which were grown on such farms in 1944; and a farmer who lives on a farm with a gross income of $400 a year certainly and undoubtedly would not have kept a very comprehensive set of books which would give to the Secretary of Agriculture any great guidance in his determination of whether that farmer is entitled to either a loan or a grant from his Government.

What are the main provisions of this part of the bill? In the first place, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to loan $500 on a farm building or to grant $500 on a farm building for a roof or for an outhouse, or for anything else the Secretary of Agriculture says the money may be used for. One provision included in this part of the bill is characteristic of some of the legislation the Congress has been enacting in the past few years, namely, that if a loan is made to the owner of a farm who himself does not live on it, but has a tenant on it, the owner cannot then dispossess the tenant until he obtains the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture to do so.

The bill provides for these loans to submarginal farms. If a farm has been submarginal for the last 10 years, it is not very much of a farm and should not be made subject to the loan or grant of Federal money, so as to tie the farmer to that kind of a farm. Such a policy would simply result in perpetuating the submarginal farms, and ultimately would do no real social good. But, further than that, this part of the bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to set up in every county in the United States committees to pass upon those who need Government loans or Government grants. The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may utilize any other committees which are available; but all other Members of the Senate know as well as I do that if we authorize the appointment of new committees, and if there is money to pay for them, there will be a separate and distinct committee in every county and in every parish in the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to pay each member of the committees $5 a day. For a three-member committee, that will amount to $15 a day for the entire committee, which is not an extravagant amount, I grant, but in many of the rural communities it would be a considerable amount of additional income. Such committees are to be authorized to incur expenses, and the expenses are to be paid by the Secretary of Agriculture. The total amount—this would be the maximum, I grant—for those committees, if they were operating in every county in the United States, would be $138,105 a day, to carry on the committees' activities. Under the provisions of this bill, not only are those committees to be authorized to pass upon the need of submarginal farms for aid and Government largess, but they are to be authorized to do other things which the Secretary of Agriculture would authorize them to do in any field, I presume, in which he might be interested.

At the present time there are 16 distinct loaning agencies dealing with farmers and agriculture in the United States, and 6 of them are loaning directly to farmers. So, if there is need for an arrangement of the sort provided by this bill, let us give the existing committees authority to pass upon that matter; let us not set up a political organization of three men, in every county in the United States, to decide on the qualifications of farmers operating on submarginal farms to be loaned or given $2,000, or $500 for each building, which, if four buildings were involved, would make a total of $2,000.

I say to the Senate that this bill should not authorize any such thing. I say that this provision of the bill will serve only to build up in the Government a new political department, and that the Congress of the United States ultimately will regret its action in writing such a provision into this bill, if it does so.

I say further that there is no reason at this time, in view of the agricultural situation, even with farm prices dropping as they are today, for the Government to attempt to tie the farmers of the United States to submarginal lands, and to say to the owner of a little patch of ground, "If we give you the money, you must keep on your land the tenant you have on it now, until such time as the Secretary of Agriculture says you may get rid of the tenant."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amount mentioned by the Senator from Ohio is the limit that can be contributed or loaned by the Federal Government on a farm home or on a farm project, is it not?

Mr. BRICKER. Under the pending bill, on a submarginal farm project, it is $2,000, or a grant of $2,000. Some have said the bill limits it to a $500 grant, but as I read the bill it says $500 per building. There must be four buildings in order to get the full $2,000. That might include an outhouse, a smokehouse, a roof on the home, or the barn.

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator mistakes the provision regarding farms. The Senator is dealing with another provision which simply provides for $2,000, which is for farms which are not now and never can be made self-supporting. The limit is $2,000, or $1,000 per structure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The other provision relates to a farm loan for the construction of a home.

Mr. BRICKER. It says the grant with respect to any one farm or dwelling or building shall not exceed $500.

Mr. TAFT. That, however, deals with section 404. I may say I have a motion pending to strike out section 404 altogether. The other provision contains no definite limitation on the size of the house. My recollection is that, as contemplated, it is about $5,000.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no express limit put upon the Secretary's determination of the amount. It is only limited by the grants of the Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This is what I am trying to determine: As I understand the bill, and as I understood the Senator to say in his remarks, in the case of slum clearance the bill provides for as much as $2,500 per room; is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is for the construction of houses to be used by tenants who now occupy buildings in slum areas; is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. If there is a slum elimination in the area, of course, those who occupy the present buildings have the first preference above any others.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator's comparison of the provision of the bill he is now discussing, have reference to homes on submarginal farms, say, as to how much shall be spent under the bill per room for a farm home?

Mr. BRICKER. There is no limit on that. It is entirely within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is not even on the same basis.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Wait a minute. Let us see. Can the Secretary, under this provision of the bill, spend as much as $2,500 per room on a farm home?

Mr. BRICKER. It could be used in any way, except in the case of submarginal farms it has to be used on four buildings, if there is a $2,000 loan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would have to be used on four buildings. In other words, $4,000 is the ceiling; is it not?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the ceiling that can be spent on any one farm, is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And there would have to be four homes, in order to get that amount, would there not?

Mr. BRICKER. Four buildings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, there is a ceiling of $1,000 per building, on the buildings to be constructed for farmers; is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; whereas, in the same bill, we set a limit of $2,500 per room, in connection with the clearance of slums. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the Senator tell me that there is that great difference in cost between building a farm home and building a structure to replace a slum?

Mr. BRICKER. No; not if the accommodations are the same. Of course, it might cost more in rural communities than in a metropolitan area.

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield further to the Senator from Arkansas, first.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Since we are providing this fund freely from the taxpayers' money, why should not all people living on the farm get equal accommodations with those now living in a slum, if we are going to take care of all of them?

Mr. BRICKER. There is no logical argument against that.

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Ohio yield to the senior Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There is a logical argument, which is that the only possible justification for the high cost permitted—and I think it is too high; I criticized it when the bill was introduced—is that it must be a fireproof building constructed to meet, in effect, the requirements of the fire codes of the various cities. A fireproof building is very much more expensive, particularly an apartment building. Take the State of New York, which is building apartments in the city of New York. They are not peculiarly desirable apartments, but they are very expensive to build in that particular place.

So far as sections 404 and 403 are concerned, there is no limit on the cost per room for a farm home. The only limit, contained in section 404, which I think is a completely unsound economic proposition, deals with a subject which I think should be met in a completely different way, as to which, as I say, I filed an amendment to strike out.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator says there is no limit. Is there not a limit of $4,000 per farm?

Mr. TAFT. There is no limit of $4,000 per farm.

Mr. BRICKER. That is in the submarginal section. The Senator was talking about sections 402 and 403, which are the productive areas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if it would not be well for us to keep in mind the fact that the various loans for farm houses come under three different sections, 402, 403, and 404. The types of loan the Senator from Ohio was talking about are those under section 404, relating to a different subject.

Mr. BRICKER. Those relate to submarginal lands.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those relate to submarginal farms. They do not relate to the building of farm homes at all, but merely to patching up. The Senator from Ohio I think is in error in one respect; that is, that the maximum that could be loaned and granted, by a combination of loans and grants, under section 404, is $2,000 rather than $4,000.

Mr. BRICKER. The amounts granted would be $1,000 and $500. One interpretation of the grant section would bring it up to $2,000 by grant, and $2,000 by loan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it says the aggregate of the combined loan and grant shall not exceed $2,000.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct—on any one farm or dwelling or building.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When it comes to building homes on farms, there is no limit except insofar as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe a limit.

Mr. BRICKER. In that connection, I cited the fact that there are already six agencies loaning directly to the farmers. If this provision is needed, we might well lodge authority in one of the other agencies which are already loaning to farmers all over the United States, and not create another one. Of course, the attempt here is to apply the section to farmers who do not have credit, who cannot get credit, and who are not entitled to credit; and yet it is based upon the finding by the Secretary of Agriculture that there is a reasonable right to expect that the loan can be repaid, while the standards of living are still maintained. If those who obtain the loan cannot repay it, together with any interest on it, the Secretary of Agriculture is given authority to remit the interest and the loan, I think up to 50 percent.

Mr. FLANDERS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like, if I may, to amplify the point which the junior Senator from Ohio just made.

Mr. BRICKER. I may say I have reached an age now where I am glad to have the title "junior" applied in any capacity. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator. I am beyond that age. [Laughter.] I merely want to amplify a point which the senior Senator from Ohio—who, I presume, has reached an age where he does not mind being called the senior Senator from Ohio—made. I noted, as the junior Senator from Ohio was speaking about the possibilities of the public housing becoming a slum, that he apparently did not tie in the higher cost per room of these buildings with the longer term over which the public grants last. In other words, in order to keep the buildings from being slums at the end of the period, it is necessary to build them more substantially than is required for an FHA loan; otherwise they will become slums, exactly as the junior Senator from Ohio fears.

Mr. BRICKER. We both hope they never will be.

Madam President, I have prepared some amendments, along with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. I shall not elaborate on them at this time, but their purpose is to make housing facilities available to the lower-income groups. The first amendment fixes a dollar-income maximum for those persons entitled to occupy the projects and under which they would be entitled to remain. I think the amendment is necessary, because at the present time many families, in some places a great majority of the families, in low-rental projects which were erected prior to the war are in a higher-income group. It was necessary for the Congress to permit the condition to continue. The Eightieth Congress enacted a law to permit the continuance of that situation. But there should be some provision in the law to make such projects peculiarly available to those persons who are entitled to relief and to the welfare grants of the Government, or to those persons who are in the lower-income group.

There is a second amendment, which I shall later discuss more at length, which would prohibit Government employees from living in those projects. With the grant which the Government is giving, it would bring the rent down much lower than Government employees would otherwise find available. I remember that in one project 37 percent of the Government employees of the housing area live in the project. They are the beneficiaries not only of the taxpayers' money, which is paid them in salaries, but also of the grant of lower rent. In one instance the mayor of a community was a tenant in one of the Government projects. I know that is not true of a large percentage, but, nevertheless, a man who is capable of influencing his fellow citizens to elect him mayor, or to the city council, or who is able, because of his political contacts and connections,

to obtain a job with the Government, also has strings he can pull and contacts he can make in order to get one of these $12,000 rental units at a depressed rate. The Government is not only paying his salary but is likewise giving him a further emolument which is reflected in the lower rental he has to pay for the unit.

The third amendment is one which has already been discussed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It is in regard to segregation in the various housing projects. We all know that throughout the country there have been segregated units. There are units for Negroes, units for Spanish-Americans in some of the Southwestern States, and units for white people. It may be that some of them are for a combination of races. But this is the one opportunity which the Members of the Senate will have to vote on the proposition at this session. We have seen a great deal of shadow-boxing with reference to an attempt to put the responsibility for the failure of the civil-rights program on this side or that side or some other place. Here is a chance for us to vote our party platforms. I do not have to read them; we have all read them. One of the emphasized points in both party platforms, and in the campaign, was that we stand for civil rights. If we do, let us be honest about it. If we do not, let us likewise be honest about it, but vote one way or the other. This is one place in which the taxpayers' money is being used for those who are in need. It is not putting the hand of the Federal Government and the control of Federal authority on local communities. It is not saying to employers, "You have to do this, that, or the other thing." It is not saying to the States, "You will be restricted within certain limits." It is simply carrying out the Constitution of the United States.

A moment ago the question was asked whether this bill would pass if it contains this amendment. If it does not pass, there is something wrong with the bill, something wrong with the Constitution of the United States, or something wrong with the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties, both of which parties came out frankly and without any equivocation in favor of civil rights. Here is one chance for the Members to vote their belief and stand for or against it.

I join with the Senator from Washington in presenting the amendment to the Senate so that we may have a record vote upon the issue, which is a direct issue, and we shall have an opportunity to say "yes" or "no" and have our decision recorded. If the bill with this amendment is defeated, well and good. That will mean that there is something wrong with the bill, or something wrong with the party platforms, or with the speeches which have been made in the shadow-boxing which has taken place over this issue up to the present time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the junior Senator from Ohio yield for a question or two?

Mr. BRICKER. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was, unfortunately, not in the Chamber when the Senator began his address, but I heard most of it, and I should like to inquire whether I am correct in my understanding that the junior Senator from Ohio said it was the Federal Government which built these houses and operated them in various cities.

Mr. BRICKER. It is done, of course, as I well know and as the Senator from Illinois well knows, under the management of local authorities; but the Federal Government has a controlling hand in it, because, in my State, when the Supreme Court of the State said the projects could not be exempted from taxation, the Federal Government immediately took back title to them and operated them through its agency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is unique, is it not, that in Ohio local authorities do not have the power to operate these housing projects?

Mr. BRICKER. They have the power to operate them; there is no question about their power. The only question is whether they can levy local taxes on agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in every other State of the Union public housing is constructed by local authorities and operated by them?

Mr. BRICKER. So far as I know, that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are not the contracts let by the local authorities?

Mr. BRICKER. Oh, yes, with a Federal authorization that comes through the law. If it were not given through the law, there would be no authority for the contracts, and, of course, the local agencies would be operating with their local funds, or in a vacuum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will not the construction be under contracts let by local governments, and not under contracts let by Federal authority?

Mr. BRICKER. Of course the loans come from the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is the local authority which lets the contracts, is it not?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; that is correct. But the Federal authority fixes the value of the improvements and the amount of money which can be spent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The junior Senator from Ohio is, I am sure, aware of the fact that these figures are ceilings, not averages.

Mr. BRICKER. As I said a while ago in regard to the expenditures of public funds—and I have had some experience with such matters in the field of local government as well as in the field of the Federal Government—the maximum very quickly becomes the minimum. I am quite sure it will do that in this situation. Every local community wants the very finest it can secure in its public housing projects. It wants them constructed according to the highest standards. It wants to boast of them. I remember full well that in 1940 the President of the United States came to my city. I was holding a local office. The President was on a nonpolitical inspection tour, prior to election. The President asked me to ride with him. It was a high compliment and a great honor that he paid me. He asked me to go along with him, rather than ask the candidate of his own party. It was a situation peculiar to Ohio, in which the Senator from Illinois would not be interested. We rode through Broad Street to a housing project. There was a great celebration at that time. That was the only inspection that was made. We were justly proud of the project, because it was a beautiful development. The cost was above the average.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if he will turn to section 203 (5), page 31, of the bill, beginning on line 2:

> The Authority shall make loans, grants, and annual contributions only for such low-rent housing projects as it finds are to be undertaken in such a manner—

Now I emphasize these words—

> that such projects will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and economy will be promoted both in construction and administration.

So that the injunction of the Federal Government is for simplicity of design and materials in construction and administration, and if that is violated, it will be violated by the action of local governments and not by the direction of the Federal Administration.

Mr. BRICKER. But must be with the approval of the Federal Administration, or money will not be available.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a direct injunction here that there must be simplicity of design and economy in construction and administration.

Mr. BRICKER. Those injunctions have been practically in every building authorization enacted by the Congress, as well as in all other appropriations, and I defy anyone to show where there has yet been any great economy in the administration of Government authority on the Federal level.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio another question.

Mr. BRICKER. I remember that when I was in office in Ohio, every week someone called upon us from the Federal Government. The callers never came singly, they came in pairs, sometimes three at a time, to discuss how the Federal Government could control the manipulation by the State government of the funds in the State of Ohio, which were grants-in-aid for various projects. Then the week after the visit of the first two callers a couple more came in to check up on what they had done, and sometimes "checker uppers" on the "checker uppers." If that indicated economy in government, I am at a loss to understand how it could do so. The same thing applies to the kind of a building program we are now considering. There will be no economy, except in the limits imposed by the Congress on the cost of any kind of building erected by the local housing authority.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if he will now turn to page 17 of the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the housing bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Is that the original report?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, page 17. I should like to call attention to the first sentence, under the heading "Costs under present program." I quote:

> The average over-all cost of the projects developed under the United States Housing Act, most of which were built in the years 1938 to 1942, was only $4,649 per dwelling.

That included land costs and utility costs, as well as construction costs.

I have here a break-down of these figures in the testimony given by Mr. Egan before our committee on the 7th of February, which show acquisition costs of $631, improvements and utility distribution system costs of $459, a total of $1,090, almost $1,100, whereas the actual construction cost was $2,882 per unit. Since the average unit undoubtedly comprised more than three rooms, that meant that we had average construction costs of less than a thousand dollars a room. While costs were much lower then than now, I think it can be said that the construction costs under the Public Housing Administration at that time were not in excess of private construction costs, and may in fact have been below them. So that the experience we have had to date does not, I think, support the Senator's contention that public housing must of necessity be excessively costly and wasteful, although I am sure the Senator made the statement in the utmost good faith.

Mr. BRICKER. I not only made it in good faith, but I made it with an experience back of me upon which to base my judgment.

If the figures given by the Senator were the costs in 1938, there were many hidden costs in the figures, costs of administration and other items, which do not attach themselves to the cost figures which are read here. I certainly know those are not the figures in my community of the per-unit costs of the housing units, even under the earlier bill.

If the figures are accurate, that is certainly a proper index to follow. With prices coming down, and with construction costs lessening day by day—and they will be much less a year from today—let us put a limit below what it is at the present time, which is far above the cost of the average American home, and almost twice as much as the GI loans and the guaranteed loans to the home builders themselves. There certainly can be no justification for the Congress authorizing the construction of housing units for occupancy by people who are entitled to welfare grants from the Government at a higher cost per unit than that which is authorized under GI loans, for those who fought for their country, and who borrow their money and assume the responsibility of building their own houses, or buying them from others who have already built them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me to correct one or two of his statements, on the basis of the figures I have?

Mr. BRICKER. I have those figures in my file.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator quoted high administrative costs. According to the figures submitted by Mr. Egan, the local authority overhead was $84 per unit, or a little less than 2 percent of the total cost per unit. The architectural and superintending charges were $243 a unit, or about 5 percent. Anyone who deals with architects and engineers knows that a 5-percent charge is fairly reasonable. So I submit that on the basis of the some 150,000 units constructed to date, the costs have not been excessive, and we have made every effort in the bill to keep costs down.

Mr. BRICKER. Two thousand five hundred dollars a room, or approximately $15,000 for a dwelling, which the cost might easily reach, does not indicate a serious effort on the part of Congress to hold down costs.

In regard to the engineering and architectural fees, it seems to me that the units should be standardized. There should be consistency in the program, and there should be a minimum in the overhead for engineering and architectural fees, in regard to the construction of this elaborate program of 810,000 units.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like again to point out to the junior Senator from Ohio that in the committee we have constantly emphasized that the figures which I have just quoted are average costs.

Our bill deals with maximum costs, a a normal ceiling of $1,750 per room, which as a matter of fact is probably less than the $1,000 a room ceiling imposed in the thirties, in view of the increase in materials and labor. Then we have a superceiling intended for a city like New York, where costs are excessively high, up to probably $2,500 a room. But there is every intention to keep the costs down below those ceilings.

Mr. BRICKER. That intention might be the most wholesome in the world, yet it is the execution of the law that really will determine whether economy has been effected. If the Senator has had any experience similar to what some of us have had in Government costs, he knows that they are in excess of costs in private construction.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not well when we discuss maximum costs for us to keep in mind the fact that these figures which are given are the absolute maximum, that they are the absolute ceiling? Instead of talking about a house which is going to cost $12,500, is it not well for us to keep in mind that under the provisions of the bill the average public housing unit which is built must cost not more than $8,500? If it costs more than that we simply cannot carry out the program. That is all there is to it.

Mr. BRICKER. That is an over-all limit. Not on any one project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But from hearing some people talk I am afraid the impression will go out that all the units we are going to build will cost $12,500. That is not true. The average over-all cost cannot exceed $8,500.

Mr. BRICKER. That is excluding the land.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Add $2,000 cost of the lot, and the cost of demolishing the property, and the total cost would be brought up to $10,500. That is the average.

Mr. SPARKMAN. $8,500 would be the average.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question or yield the floor.

Mr. CAIN. I should appreciate the Senator yielding for a question. If I understood the Senator from Alabama correctly, his assumption is that the house will cost only $8,500, exclusive of the land and exclusive of demolition, provided 810,000 accommodations are built.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator subscribe to my statement of understanding of the position of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. Furthermore, in response to the question of the Senator from Washington, there is an opportunity for the President to expand or diminish the program within any one year, without regard to the maximum limit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the actual cost figures, I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the rather large-scale projects which were built at the Hanford plant, where 2- and 3-bedroom houses were being constructed for the people at Hanford. There was a considerable unit production there. My recollection is that the cost ran between $12,000 and $14,000 per house, and I do not believe that that cost completely included land acquisition.

Mr. BRICKER. I am not familiar with the figures. We had them before us last year in the joint committee. We also had before us the cost of the Oak Lodge or Log Lodge project in that area. The cost per unit was enormous, clear out of all reason. Of course the figures with respect to that project are not wholly conclusive, because that community was rather far away, and shipping costs might be higher than in other places. That is something I do not know. But the plans for the units certainly are not either elaborate or excessive. They are the type of units which one would expect to be built under a Government housing program. So undoubtedly those cost figures, which may have been a little higher than they are at the present time, would be good evidence of what we might expect for the cost of this kind of program. I am sorry I do not have the actual figures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio whether or not these projects, as the bids are let for them, are on the basis

of competitive bidding for private contract?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct. That is what they are supposed to be under the law, and I am quite sure they are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, neither the Federal Government nor the Corps of Engineers nor any other agency of the Federal Government actually builds the units?

Mr. BRICKER. No; they are built by local contractors under the local agency, which is really in fact, although appointed locally, an arm of the Federal Government. The only controls on costs are the maximum controls prescribed by the pending bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that each public-housing project must be approved by the local governing body?

Mr. BRICKER. It is accepted by the local body.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And must be approved by the local body?

Mr. BRICKER. No; accepted by the local body and approved by the Federal agency.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I mean before a project can be constructed, before a plan of slum clearance or public housing can be inaugurated, it must be approved by the local governing body?

Mr. BRICKER. The local governing authority must adopt a resolution before a slum-clearance project can be initiated. I think a question of that sort should be put up to the referendum of the people themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But is it not true that a public-housing project must have the approval of the local governing body?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; that is provided in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So we have local governing bodies acutally authorizing, actually supervising and approving the construction of a public-housing project in the locality.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true. According to the plans made by the Administrator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Moreover, we have the standard competitive bidding procedures of the municipality or locality applied to the letting of the contract figure for the construction of public housing?

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct. By reason of decreasing costs of materials, and from the experience I have already had personally in letting bids for construction of large projects, I am hopeful there may be economies effected. Until the present time there has not been much opportunity for cutting costs in the competitive-bidding field, because if a bid was received which came within the engineer's estimate it was doing very well. There is some evidence that the situation in that respect, however, is becoming much better. If this title of the bill is passed, I am very hopeful those economies will be put into effect, and that there will be local control, that there will be competitive bidding, and that advantage will result from decreasing costs and greater efficiency of labor production and so forth and so on. All those factors might bring the costs down. I am fearful, however, that unless Congress puts a dollar limit upon the cost it will not be effective.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I gather, I may say, from the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, that he feels there have been some excessive costs.

Mr. BRICKER. I think there have been excessive costs in most all Government projects.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to interpret the Senator's remarks to mean that local governments should have legislation imposed upon them by the Congress telling them what their administrative costs must be?

Mr. BRICKER. So long as the Federal Government is putting up the money and paying the difference in cost of the rental units, and so long as there is a desire on the part of the local governments to get what they feel is something for nothing from the Federal Government, which they do not have to tax their communities to secure, I think some curb must be placed on the dollar expenditure in the law itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio felt that way concerning the righteousness and omnipotence of the Federal Government in the rent-control law which was discussed on the floor of the Senate, or did the Senator at that time base his case on the local governments?

Mr. BRICKER. I have talked against the Federal Government going into the local field, on the ground that both the Federal Government had no business in that field at the present time, and that the local government should assume its own local responsibility, for I believe it can handle the situation better than can someone sitting behind a desk in Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, is it not true that the Senator from Ohio feels that local government is best able to manage local affairs?

Mr. BRICKER. That is true. That is a distinct philosophy of mine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Senate bill 1070 permits local public authorities to make contracts to build public-housing projects, and permits local authorities to supervise and administer the building of the housing projects. Does not the Senator feel it desirable to have less Federal interference in terms of saying what the administrative costs ought to be and what the Federal regulations ought to be?

Mr. BRICKER. It is desirable so long as the responsibility is on the local governments. I mentioned in the beginning, but I assume the Senator from Minnesota was not present in the Chamber at the time, that what is now proposed is based on the philosophy which is prevalent in the country and has been for a long time, and seems to be gaining ground on the part of the local citizen, that if he can get something from his Government which he does not have to pay back, he is better off. We seem to have lost the old philosophy America was builded upon, which was, "What can I do to help my Government?" There seems to be prevalent the philosophy among too many of our people, "What can my Government do for me?" Yet we receive more out of our local tax dollar than we receive out of any other tax dollar at the present time. Certainly I favor local government. But the cities have gotten into the frame of mind—and I saw much of this during the relief era in Ohio—where they want to get as much money as possible out of their State governments or the Federal Government. They want to get money from the State or Federal Government, and not be obliged to tax their own people, and not be obliged to pay back the money, so they can then say to their citizens, "Look at the great job we have done, and it did not cost us a cent."

Last year a Senator showed me a letter which he received from a citizen of his State in regard to the contribution for education in his State. The Senator voted against legislation then pending providing for Federal aid to education. The writer of the letter said to him, "But do you not know that this does not cost the people of your State one red cent? That the money is all to be paid by the Federal Government?" That illustrates the feeling which seems to prevail in so many places in our country and among so many classes of our people.

Further, the States have gotten into the frame of mind that if they can come to Washington and secure contributions, if they can secure grants-in-aid, if they can secure subsidies from the Federal Government, somehow they are going to get the aid in this over-all picture and will never have to pay it back. In other words, they are giving up their local government to the Federal Government until the point was reached a year ago, at the joint meeting of the Representatives of Congress and the Governors' Conference, that the Governors said to the Congress—we have paid no attention to it thus far, and I am sure we shall not, judging by what has happened—"cut down your grants-in-aid to the States and release to us some of the areas of taxation so that we can continue projects on a local level and get the money to carry them on."

It is fundamental in political philosophy that the more we build the power of government the more we take away the rights of the individual citizen. The more powerful the Federal Government becomes the less important the State governments become. The more the State governments reach out into local communities, with money or authority the less authority there is close to the homes of the people. To my mind there is a tendency toward centralization and totalitarianism which I am quite confident the junior Senator from Minnesota joins me in opposing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio was in the Chamber yesterday when I presented for the consideration of the Senate telegrams from the mayors of a number of large cities. They were deeply concerned about the housing program. They were in favor of the general principles of Senate bill 1070. I wonder whether or not the junior Senator from Ohio remembers

that the mayors pointed out that tax revenues of municipalities were being devoured and consumed by the slum areas and the blighted conditions which exist in their cities. It was pointed out that for every dollar of taxes from a slum area the cost of maintaining it averaged $6. In some instances the cost of maintaining a slum area and furnishing services ran between 8 and 15 times the taxes produced by a slum area.

Is it not true that the provisions of this bill—which I trust will be enacted into law—would make possible a reversal of that very difficult situation which faces municipalities? Would not the bill make possible the elimination of slum areas and the demolition of some of the decrepit and blighted hovels, thereby relieving municipalities of the tremendous burden of public-service costs which they now have to pay? Is not that one of the good effects of the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. As I see it, that is the reason for the bill. There is no other justification for the bill. I favor that particular section of the bill, for this reason: The cities have neglected their local responsibilities in cleaning up slum areas. If they had started 20 years ago, when they should have started, to enforce the local laws, to require compliance with their building codes, and to get rid of the crime-infested areas, we would not be faced with this problem today. The mayors who are imploring us to come to their aid have throughout the years—not the same individuals, of course, but the same communities—avoided local responsibility in many respects.

We are facing a condition. We are not facing a theory, or applying a philosophy of government. This condition exists. It is a serious and costly condition. For that reason, if the Federal Government can furnish an impetus, either through grants or loans—although I would not be as much in favor of grants as loans—to the local governments to clean up the situation, it will be a wholesome thing. I hope that can be done without destroying the sense of local responsibility which the people themselves must ultimately assume if the program is to effectuate the purpose which we hope to accomplish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator hear me read telegrams from the mayors of St. Louis, Seattle, and San Francisco?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In those telegrams the respective mayors pointed out that their local public housing authorities had opened up new areas of civic participation for the individuals who lived in the housing projects. Such projects had reduced crime, delinquency, and disease. They had reduced the cost of government. The actual citizen participation on the part of residents in public housing projects was far beyond that in any blighted area. Would the Senator say that was good for democracy, and good for the Nation? Let us not get into the argument about democracy today. Would the Senator say that that is good for the Nation?

Mr. BRICKER. I think it is good for the local community. It is a responsibility which should long ago have been assumed by local authorities. That is one reason why I join with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] in an amendment which would require that wherever there is a housing development, a slum unit shall be destroyed for every unit of new housing, replacing one with the other. I hope that when this project gets under way the cities will be able to eliminate at least a portion of their slums. Slums are not entirely the result of a housing situation. They represent the state of mind and the spirit of the people. Those factors enter into the creation of slums. I do not want to see this program made a program by which the slums can be pushed from one section of the city into another, or scattered into other communities. I want to see some ultimate good effected by this kind of program. The best way to help the cities is to reduce the costs of Federal Government, so that they will have a little more money with which to operate.

I do not know whether the Senator remembers the figures which I gave. The $42,000,000,000 Federal budget this year will take out of my State $2,430,000,000. That is $300 for every citizen of Ohio. It is $1,200 for every family in our State. It is equal each year to one-fourth of the appraised value of all the personal and real property in my State. If the Federal Government could somehow give a little of that back to the communities by way of taxation, so that the responsibility, as well as the opportunity, would be with the local governments, it would not only improve the condition of the municipalities but would strengthen the very foundations of our representative system of government. It would not take away individual opportunity. It would not deprive the people of our country of the very foundation of our government structure, which is local reliance, individual responsibility, and willingness to take care of ourselves in our own homes and our own communities through local government, without seeking the largess of the Federal Government, which reaches down in a sort of omnipotent, papa-knows-all theory of government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that local government has only such authority and such taxing powers as are granted to it by the legislature? Is it not true that the local municipality is literally the child of the State government? Is it not true that there is no inherent taxing power within a local municipality? If that be true—and I think the answer is quite obvious—how can it be said on the floor of the Senate that by reason of the fact that the Federal Government relinquishes taxing powers, the towns and municipalities will be enabled to tax? What tax can the Federal Government relinquish today which a municipality could place upon its ordinance books, and which it does not already have? What taxes could the Federal Government give up today that a municipality could legislate tomorrow without the concurrence of the State legislature?

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, the situation may not be the same in the Senator's State as in my State, but in the State of Ohio the local government has full taxing power. Taxing authority is lodged in the counties and municipalities, and they have unlimited taxing authority. I think that is true in the majority of States, except in the fields into which the State has entered. Under our decisions in Ohio, the State has exclusive authority to tax in a particular field. But if some of the $300 per individual, or some of the $1,200 per family, were left back home, there would be a little more money with which to take care of local needs not only of the individual but of the local government as well.

A moment ago I mentioned the Conference of Governors, which asked the Congress of the United States to cut the appropriations for grants-in-aid to the various States and open up some of the fields of taxation—at least to get out of them, so that they would be available for State and local taxation, thus providing more money with which to carry on the affairs of local government. Last year in my State—and I think the same situation prevails in the Senator's State—the amount of money collected for the annual expenses of the Federal Government, the $42,000,000,000 budget, was thirteen and one-half times the total amount of money collected for local and State governments from all real-estate, public-utility, and personal-property taxes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that such statements, however, are somewhat misleading when they fail to take into consideration the fact that local and State governments do not pay the war debt, do not pay the interest on the public debt, do not pay for veterans' benefits, and do not pay for national defense expenditures or for foreign-policy commitments, such as those under ECA; and is it not also true that a statement about the tremendous amount of tax revenues the Federal Government takes in, as compared to the amount of revenue of the State and local governments, is not particularly helpful, because the situation of the State and local governments is not comparable to that of the Federal Government? Is not that true?

Mr. BRICKER. Let us make it comparable then: The money does not come from the local governments or the State governments, but it comes from the pockets of the taxpayers of the country; and the payment of $300 in taxes is of great concern to the taxpayers, regardless of whether that money goes to the Federal Government or goes to the State or local governments. After all, the burden is on the taxpayers, regardless of whether the taxes obtained from them go to the local government, the State government, or the National Government.

Our country has now reached the point where business is being depressed and individuals are losing their initiative and are fearful of their investment dollars; they are fearful whether they will obtain

a return on their investments, and are particularly fearful as to whether they will ever get back their investments.

Let me point out that last year the Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on a proposal for long-term capital loans; and various witnesses before the committee stated that such loans were necessary. We inquired as to the necessity, and we were told that the supply of investment money is drying up, and money is not going into new investments in the way that it should. We asked why that was, and we were told that in the first place there is a skepticism among investors in regard to making further investments in this country, for they have been educated to distrust investments; and, in the second place, it was pointed out that taxes are so high that people are fearful that they will not get a return on the money they invest, and perhaps never will get back their invested dollars. In fact, they are more afraid of losing their invested dollars than they are of not getting a return on their investments.

After all, Madam President, our tax structure has reached a point where it has a stifling effect on business and on the willingness of the individual to work and to save and to invest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator from Ohio would have us come tc the conclusion that taxes are injurious upon business or are an impediment to the expansion of business; is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. Taxes are too high, and I am fearful that now they have reached the point of diminishing return, so far as the use of tax moneys by our Government is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator from Ohio say that inasmuch as the Federal Government has encroached on the areas of local taxation, at least the fair thing for the Federal Government to do, in view of its omnipotent taxing power, is to give back to the people some of that money, thus returning that much of it to the source whence it was gathered?

Mr. BRICKER. No; not give it back.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or, let us say, make a refund?

Mr. BRICKER. I am in favor of cutting down the cost of government, so that the individual citizen who works may have more of his income left for his family needs and for his community enterprises. The plain fact is that when we get down to the ultimate answer to this problem of the cost of government, we find that all tax revenues must come from one of two sources: One of them is the utilization of natural resources, and the other is the earnings of human labor. So the present tremendous cost of government must come from those two sources, ultimately; both the money we are spending at home and the money we are spending abroad must come from those two sources.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator from Ohio permit me to make a brief observation at this point?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question, and then shall yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well; I shall endeavor to state what I have in mind in the form of a question. I understand that the Senator from Ohio has said he is interested in cutting down the costs of government. I agree with him as to that. I also am interested in cutting down the costs of government, and I am open to any practical suggestions along that line. Therefore, let me inquire how the Senator from Ohio would answer the statement of the mayor of Kansas City, Mo., who said that the slum areas of Kansas City, Mo., yield 6 percent of the tax revenues of that city, but require the expenditure of 45 percent of its revenue. Would not it seem possible that the best way to cut down the cost of government in Kansas City, where several hundred thousand people are living and working—and we are talking about people, not cities or counties—would be to do away with such slum areas which, as I have pointed out in the one instance I have mentioned, require the expenditure of 45 percent of the entire revenue of the city, although the slum area involved yields only 6 percent of the city's revenue? Would not it be desirable to use tax money to produce conditions in which desirable citizens could develop?

Mr. BRICKER. There is no doubt that it would be desirable, and also there is no question that the program or desired result could be effectuated if the mayors of the various cities had assumed their full responsibility, because there are already on the statute books sufficient laws to enable the various cities to take care of that problem. If they wish to do so—and we should remember that such slum areas pay a higher rate of taxation than do many other areas of the cities—they could enforce the laws already on the statute books, including the safety laws and regulations and health regulations, and thus could greatly improve such conditions. So the answer lies in the local governments and in having them assume their responsibilities.

In short, Madam President, the purpose of the present proposal is a good one, and I hope this proposal will accomplish the purpose we seek to have it accomplish; but it cannot be accomplished unless the local authorities assume their rightful responsibilities. Likewise, it never can be carried out from the city of Washington, because administration from the city of Washington is lacking in local interest and in the intimate contacts and the responsibilities at the local level which must exist if this problem is to be solved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a further question?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then would the Senator from Ohio have me assume that every municipal official and every county official in the history of the Nation—because every major city suffers from the blight of slums——

Mr. BRICKER. In varying degrees. We cannot classify all of them as blighted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Although there is variation in respect to the degree, yet there is no city in the United States which does not suffer from some kind of blight because of some type of slum.

So, Madam President, from the statement which has been made by the Senator from Ohio, are we to conclude that this problem could have been handled by the local authorities, and that all they had to do was to have the courage to enforce the existing laws? Then are we to infer that all local and city officials in the United States since the beginning of our history have been lacking in the courage to enforce the authority vested in them by the State and city laws and regulations?

Mr. BRICKER. That may be the Senator's conclusion; but certainly it is not proper for such persons to say that the Federal Government must take care of this matter. Ultimately the responsibility rests on the communities. I, for one, do not attribute to any American city a deliberate lack of responsibility or a deliberate refusal to meet its responsibilities. I do not say that such a situation has brought about this problem; but I say there has been a lack of courage to enforce local laws which, if enforced, would have prevented the occurrence of the situation which we find in so many of our cities today.

So, Madam President, I place the responsibility where it belongs, namely, in the local communities. This bill will not solve the slum problem at all. It will not permanently relieve the problem in the cities of the United States. This bill is a mere palliative. At the very best, it is a mere incentive. It will be a start, but a start only in the right direction. I hope it will not amount—and the Senator from Washington and I are trying to prevent it from doing so—to a dispersal of the slum areas, with the result that they will infest other sections where housing units are built.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a further question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then are we to assume that the mayors of the cities, the city councils, the municipalities and the legislatures of a number of the States which have endorsed the slum-clearance and public-housing program are totally unaware of what is good for them and of their needs, and are totally unaware of the kind of local program, such as the one embodied in this bill, which will fundamentally meet their needs?

Mr. BRICKER. They are aware of it, or else they would not have sent telegrams or letters to the Senator or would not have come before the committee. Certainly they are aware of the situation, as all of us are aware of it. However, I think they sometimes overemphasize the problem. I think we should sometimes look to the fine sections of our cities and to the good jobs which have been done, and should not always emphasize the deplorable side of our society.

Mr. CAIN. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. I inquire what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. CAIN. I ask that the amendment be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 11, following the word "and" at the end therof, it is proposed to insert "(iii) unless the project or projects in the locality, which are to be assisted under this act, shall have been approved by referendum of the voters in the locality at a general or special election; and."

Mr. CAIN. Madam President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes at this time to make his position on the pending legislation, Senate bill 1070, completely clear. The Banking and Currency Committee did not hold hearings on S. 1070 as such, for hearings were held simultaneously on seven pieces of proposed legislation, all related to housing or to certain of its phases. Of those seven bills which were before the Committee on Banking and Currency, two were low-rent housing and slum-clearance bills, broad and very general in nature. They were S. 138, the administration bill, sponsored by eight of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. The other bill was S. 709, quite similar in fact to S. 138, and sponsored by 16 of my Republican colleagues on this side of the aisle.

The committee in due time, after a great deal of thought, reported favorably S. 138. On the final vote concerning S. 138, as I recall, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the junior Senator from Washington voted against the bill. I think some Senators will be interested in knowing why two out of the entire number of Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, thought it wise and necessary to vote against a bill which concerns most of us very deeply. I have a right, and, I think, a need to raise the question as to whether the junior Senator from Washington is opposed to slum clearance. The answer is "No." Is he opposed to redevelopment for the American communities situated throughout the 48 States? The answer is "No." Is he actually opposed to low-rent housing? Again the answer is "No."

The junior Senator from Washington voted against S. 138 in committee, for he was most sincerely convinced that the bill could, should, and must be improved before being passed by the Senate. As I understand the situation, S. 138 is not now, nor has it been, on the Senate Calendar. S. 1070, an improved bill, with bipartisan sponsorship, and combining the best features of S. 138 and S. 709, a clean bill, is now before the Senate for debate and consideration.

I join with all other Senators in hoping and desiring the bill to be the very best possible legislation the collective wisdom and ability of this distinguished body can devise and produce. No other legislation to my mind, be it domestic or foreign, now or hereafter to be considered during this session of the Congress, will eventually prove to be so costly. I think we should attempt, as sincere and conscientious and honest men are doing in the debate, to draw a blueprint, to write most carefully the specifications for this monumental undertaking in the form of a housing bill. Let us hope our work eventually will be well done.

The junior Senator from Washington is privileged, indeed, to have joined with the junior Senator from Ohio in offering for consideration by the Senate a number of amendments. All the amendments which we seek to bring to the favorable attention of the Senate have been offered in a good spirit and with a profound hope that they will improve the basic structure of the pending legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CAIN. I am very happy to yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. After going over S. 1070 in a great deal of detail, there is one thing that disturbs me very much. I wonder whether the Senator has the other bill before him.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator will turn to page 27, line 21, I note, starting with line 16, one very very substantial change from the public-housing bill which was submitted last year, which I think is an excellent change. It is lettered "(i)", and provides that there shall be no discrimination against families who are receiving a widow's pension, relief, and so forth; which I heartily approve.

On line 20, there is another clause which on its face would seem to provide that housing needs shall be the controlling yardstick in selecting tenants. In reviewing that language, I find that just the opposite result will be accomplished. I wonder whether the Senator can tell me what he understands by the term "at specified rents," and just what that means in this particular provision which has been adopted by the committee. Perhaps I could ask the Senator whether he has the same understanding of it as I have. If the three words "as specified rents" were stricken, am I correct that this provision would then mean that actually the family having the greatest housing need—which does not necessarily mean the family with the lowest income, but a family below the maximum scale—would be considered on the basis of the size of the family, the health of the mother and father, the conditions under which they are living, and that then actually the family would have priority? Furthermore, assuming the language were left as it is, is it the Senator's understanding it means that the rents will first be set at a scale ranging perhaps as they do now, from $22.50 to $55 a month, and that then the housing needs will be taken into consideration only if the family in question can pay the rent which has been fixed for a particular unit; so that actually, under the language as now written, we shall not be giving priority to the family with the greatest housing need. Does the Senator so understand the language?

Mr. CAIN. I think the provision, as written into the bill, will make likely the happening of that to which the Senator has referred. As I understand, specified rents will be established which will permit a local body, generally a housing authority having jurisdiction, to select tenants whose ability to pay is either higher or lower than the median rent laid down. If that be so, it would certainly mean that quota X, over the $30 median figure, would have to be established, in order to accommodate an equal number of those who were able to pay as many dollars under the line as the others were able to pay over the line. Do I make myself clear to the Senator?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Alabama to my next question, because I think it is extremely important. I think the language on page 27 will determine whether we shall have a good public-housing bill or a very bad one. I think there can be no doubt about that. Am I correct in understanding that under that language a scale of rents is first established? Let us assume that there is a three-bedroom apartment and that the rent established is $55 a month. Some of the projects run as high as $55, some $45. Let us say this apartment has a rental of $55. In screening the applicants who need a three-bedroom apartment, we find a family with seven children. Let us say they are living in slum conditions at this time. Let us go a step further, and assume that the health of the father is such that he cannot earn a sizable salary. Let us assume that he is earning only $1,300 or $1,400 a year. That situation can be found a hundred thousand times throughout the Nation. Am I correct in understanding that that family would be automatically excluded from the $55 apartment because it was unable to pay $55 a month? If I am correct in that, then the language needs to be changed. In my discussion with the experts and so-called experts of the housing agency, they heartily agreed with me that under this language that would be the situation. I wonder if both the Senator from Washington, who represents one line of thought, and the Senator from Alabama, who represents another line of thought, feel, with me, that if the situation is as I have described it, the language should be changed.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator that I think that is the case, but I am not certain. Because all of us are trying to achieve the best housing legislation result, I should appreciate it if the Senator from Alabama would respond.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington shall not lose the floor by reason of having the question answered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that such an arrangement be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I stated to the Senator from Wisconsin last Thursday, when he propounded a similar question to me, I do not believe his surmise is correct. I think that under the terms of the bill as it has been written, the family the Senator describes would certainly be eligible to get into the apartment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very much concerned about this matter. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] should be even more concerned than I am, in view of the conditions existing in Pittsburgh and some other Pennsylvania cities. Just what is the purpose of putting into the bill the language "at specified rents"? What does it mean? It seems to me to be trick language to defeat what would otherwise be the obvious intent of the committee amendment. Why must we have that language in the bill, on page 27, line 21?

While the Senator is looking it up, let me go further, so that my position will be absolutely clear in his mind. I understand it to mean that, first, the rents are established, instead of first determining how much a family is able to pay. Then no one will be eligible for the particular rental unit unless he can pay the particular amount fixed. If we are to take care of those who have the greatest housing need, keeping in mind, of course, especially, the size of the family, if we mean to take care of the poor man, as we all say we do, it seems to me the language should be changed. If we say we shall take care of him, but not if he is too poor, I think that is a great mistake. It will make the program as unworkable in all the sizable cities as it has proven to be in the past. As the Senator knows, I have probably spent more time investigating housing projects than has any other Member of the Senate. Other Senators were doing work which was equally important. The reason why I found so many objections to public housing was that the Administrator was doing exactly what we are probably telling him to do in this bill, namely, to exclude those who most need housing. What objection would there be to striking out the words "at specified rents", so it will be absolutely clear?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, if I may answer the Senator, I think he has construed the language absolutely in the reverse when he says that because a rental is established at a certain level and a man with a family is not able to pay that particular rental, he may be excluded. I think the opposite is true. When the rental which a certain unit should bring has been established, then if the man whom the Senator uses as an illustration has an income which is too large to entitle him to go into that kind of an apartment, he would not be eligible for admission to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. What if his income is too low?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It cannot be too low. In other words, it does not matter how low it becomes, he is entitled to a unit which will meet the requirements of his family. That is the reason why I say the able Senator has turned it around completely.

Mr. McCARTHY. Last year, when I offered an amendment to provide that the yardstick in selecting tenants for public housing should be the greatest housing need, the argument was made that only the poorest persons would be placed in public housing. For example, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made the statement—and I think I quote him exactly—that if we should adopt the amendment, we would, in effect, be making public housing poorhouses. That idea was abandoned by the administration when it sent its bill to the Congress. I understand the President, with whom I do not always agree, goes along with the idea argued so much on the Senate floor last year, that when we provide public housing and spend approximately $20,000,000,000 for it, we will start out by taking care of those who most need public housing. Yet there has been drafted a piece of legislation which will defeat that very purpose.

If the Senator can tell me any reason at all why the language is included in the bill, I should like to know it. It certainly it not to protect the poor man, because if the Senator will talk to any one of the officials in the Public Housing Administration he will be advised that, under this language, it will be impossible for a man who is unable to pay $55 or $45 a month to get the benefit of the proposed housing. No matter how great may be his housing need, it will be impossible to put that man into the housing unless he can pay the rent. The greater the housing need, the larger the family, the worse the health of the father may be, the less able he is to pay a higher rental.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I have said before, I think the able Senator has concluded just in reverse. As a matter of fact, I have here a memorandum which comes from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and from my reading of the memorandum I get just the opposite impression to that which the Senator from Wisconsin seems to get.

By the way, let me say that what the Senator has said about his own work in connection with housing is absolutely true. I suppose he has done as much as any other Senator, or perhaps more. He worked hard, I know, all during the Eightieth Congress. But I call his attention to the fact that the bill reported by the committee last year and the bill passed by the Senate was in the control of the Republican leadership. The pending bill, the bill before the Senate this year, represents the offering of the Democratic-controlled committee. However, I will say that we had no particular difficulty in the committee in writing in this language. We had cooperation from both sides of the committee. I do not remember that there was any particular difference of opinion on the subject. The print we first considered, in committee by the way, did not contain this particular provision about urgent need. The committee wrote that into the bill, because we felt that families in most urgent need of housing should be admitted to the projects.

Following the questioning by the Senator from Wisconsin last Thursday, I must say that I was very much impressed with the argument he made at that time. I was afraid that there was something in the bill which we had overlooked, and that it might have the effect he suggested. I was concerned about it, so I took the matter up with the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and I have here a lengthy memorandum from them regarding it. I shall not read the memorandum at this time, but, Madam President, without prejudicing the right of the Senator from Washington, who is entitled to the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point this memorandum, dealing with the very subject matter referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR SPARKMAN, APRIL 19, 1949

In the debate on Thursday reference was made to the section in S. 1070 which requires preference in public housing for low-income families on the basis of the urgency of their housing needs. The question was raised as to whether some trick language had been inserted in the bill as reported out by the committee which would have the effect of nullifying the intended preference.

The language to which the reference was made is not trick language at all. It is sensible and well-considered language which is necessary to attain the very objectives which are desired, namely, that preference be given to families having the most urgent housing needs. The suggestion for an additional authorization for contributions without limit as to amount, which would be necessary to accomplish the desired objective, seems not only unbusinesslike but also unnecessary. Both of these suggestions will be dealt with in detail, but first attention should be directed to the purposes of the bill in this respect and how its provisions would actually work in practice.

The primary purpose of public housing is to provide decent housing for families living in the slums. Families having the worst housing should get preference. This does not, however, mean that public housing should be used as a program of monetary relief for families who have no income or incomes that are far below the level of bare subsistence. It is the function of welfare and relief agencies to provide such families with the bare minimum of subsistence. The Federal Government should not provide funds to get rents so low that families with little or no income can be accommodated. To do so is really to put the Federal Government into the business of providing local relief assistance in those communities which do not provide reasonable welfare assistance. Welfare agencies must provide these families with a minimum subsistence income, and public housing can and will then accommodate them under the bill at rents in proper relation to their actual income—regardless of its source. They can and will do this under the present provisions of the bill.

The discussion on Thursday as to whether or not public housing is securing low enough rents overlooked two important points: (1) The lowness of the rents which are necessary and (2) the ability of public housing to reach the required levels under the present provisions of S. 1070. Inquiry was made as to what would happen in the case of John Jones, who was earning $600 a year and has six or seven children. The Senator said that he assumed the Housing Administrator would decide that John Jones could pay no more than $20 a month rent. As a matter of fact, the rent which a local housing authority would set for a family with $600 income would be not $20 but less than $10 per month. But whether the rent be $20 a month, leaving

$360 a year for all the other expenses of John Jones and his six or seven children, or whether the rent were $10 a month, leaving $480 a year for everything except rent—in either case it is abundantly clear that John Jones and his six or seven children would starve.

But in this United States, families are not allowed to starve. Local public assistance, made available through local welfare agencies, provides the means to avoid starvation. Appropriate relief agencies would supplement the income of John Jones and his six or seven children up to the level of bare minimum subsistence. In larger cities he would be given enough relief so that, with his own earnings, he would have $2,000 or $2,500 a year available for himself and his children.

It will also be helpful to know how the local housing authorities set their rents and make sure that they have rents low enough to take care of the families who actually are in the most urgent need of housing. On the best available data, they determine what are the actual incomes of the families actually living in the slums and what rents they can afford to pay. They then set up a schedule of various rents to accommodate the spread of incomes among the families actually living in the slums. These rents under the graded rent system are set, not on the basis of the size of the dwelling but on the basis of the family's actual income. The top rents for admission are, of course, held well below the level at which decent housing can be obtained from private enterprise. S. 1070 requires that this gap be at least 20 percent, and in practice I am informed it is generally much larger. The lowest rent in the scale is set at a level low enough to be within the means of the lowest-income families living in the slums, including, of course, in their income the amount which they receive from relief and welfare agencies.

For each of these rents there is a maximum income limit set pursuant to statute, which cannot be more than five times the rent. The maximum income for the top rent is, of course, the maximum income at which any family can be taken into the project. For the lowest rent, there is also a corresponding maximum income, but there is no minimum income in connection with this rent. It should be made very clear to the Senate that the local housing authorities are not authorized to set any minimum incomes for admission to their projects.

The local authorities also determine how many of the dwelling units ought to be made available at the various rents and corresponding incomes in order to fairly serve all of the families whose need for housing is most urgent. This is important, because the urgency of housing need does not bear any direct and necessary relation to the income. This is recognized in S. 1070, since it provides for a preference, not on the basis of income but, rather, on the basis of urgency of housing need.

The language in question is not trick language. It is very necessary and proper language. It requires that in initially selecting families for admission to dwellings of given size and at specified rents, the public-housing agency shall give preference to families with the most urgent needs. The phrase "of a given size" is necessary in order to assure that families are assigned to units of the proper size. If, for example, a unit large enough to accommodate a family of six persons was available, and if there were two applicant families, one with six persons and one with three persons, both of whom were of low income and both of whom needed rehousing, it would be manifestly wrong to give this large apartment to the small family even though the urgency of the small family's housing need was somewhat greater than that of the large family. In other words, preference on the basis of urgency of need should be related to the size of the unit applied for.

The same is true in relation to the preference for units at a specified rent. This limitation is necessary in order to assure that the families with the very lowest incomes get a fair chance at the dwellings in a public-housing project when it is first tenanted. Experience has shown that as among the families in the low-income group who are in urgent need of housing, the families with the higher rather than the lower incomes tend to apply first. These families are more active and are better informed, while the families of lowest income often do not as quickly appreciate that public housing is actually being made available to them. Time after time, housing authorities have been told by the most underprivileged families that they had not applied earlier because they could not believe "this project was really being built for the likes of us." Local authorities have many times had to enlist the help of welfare agencies and religious organizations in making clear to the families whose housing need is most urgent and whose incomes are lowest, that these projects are actually for them. It is therefore clear that the requirement of S. 1070 that the preference in respect to housing need should be at specified rents is a necessary and proper one in order to make sure that a fair proportion of lowest-income families are properly served.

Apparently there was also some concern whether or not public housing actually does have rents low enough to serve families of very low income and whether enough of the units will be made available at the lowest rent levels.

Doubts on this score would seem to be based on a misapprehension of the actual facts. Such doubts seem to assume that the lowest average rent which can be attained by public housing projects after application of maximum Federal and local contributions is about $32. For example, it was said that if one unit is rented at $22 there must be a corresponding unit rented at $42 in order to break even. The theory is correct, but the figures are wrong. It is true, of course, that the housing authorities provide a range of rents in their projects and that the average of these rents must suffice to pay project costs after Federal and local contributions have been received. As a matter of fact, however, the average rents which local authorities could achieve with their present projects is not $32 but $20.16 a month. This figure is based on the policies proposed in S. 1070 as to the payments in lieu of taxes, and it includes not only shelter, but also the cost of supplying the tenants with heat and other utilities.

Given the actual lowest average rent of $20.16 rather than the erroneous figure of $32, it is obvious that authorities could provide one dwelling at about $10 a month, one at $15, one at $20, one at $25, and one at $30, and still make both ends meet. These are about the rents which a local authority could achieve under S. 1070 if they are needed to house those families who have the most urgent housing needs.

The lowest rents which are set by the local authorities are based on the actual needs in their localities. There is attached a table showing these lowest rents. This table shows that 19 percent of the projects have rents available at $10 or less. Forty-nine percent of them have rents available at $12 or less, while 71 percent have rents available at $14 or less. The average minimum rent for all the projects amounts to only $12.12 per month.

It would also be helpful to know what rents are actually needed to house families coming from the slums today. As heretofore indicated, tenants are selected on the basis of need and without the establishment of any minimum income whatsoever. Indeed, special emphasis has been placed by local authorities on trying to get families with very low incomes. In the first half of 1948 the rents which were necessary for these newly admitted families were as follows:

	Percent
Under $16	7
$16–$20	10
$20–$24	18
$24–$28	24
$28–$32	19
Above $32	22

The average rent, including heat and all other utilities charged the families who are admitted, was $26.56 per month. This is a realistic measure of the rents which are actually needed in public housing to accommodate families who will come from the slums. The families admitted were admitted primarily on the basis of their housing need and none were turned away because their incomes were too low.

As indicated above, the present projects could, if necessary, achieve an average rent of $20.16. This is $6.40 below the average for the families admitted last year. This potential power to reduce rents through increased Federal contributions (within the limits now provided in S. 1070) is always available if it is needed in hard times. This possible reduction in rents below the level of present intake would correspond to a reduction in average income of the families taken in of almost exactly $480—a very sizable reduction.

It is thus apparent that the phrase "at specified rents" would not operate to debar a deserving family with urgent housing needs from admission to low-rent housing except, perhaps, in the most exceptional circumstances. The language, however, is essential to assure that families with the lowest income get a fair chance when projects are first tenanted. Moreover, this phrase which the committee has included in S. 1070 serves a further valuable purpose in preventing any possible exploitation of the Federal contributions by any locality. If it were eliminated, no minimum rent could be set and there would be no limit to how low rents would have to go on a given project in order to serve families with little or no incomes. If the level of relief in any locality was far below the level required for minimum subsistence, excessively low rents would be necessary in public housing. This bill is not an appropriate device for dealing with the problem of making Federal aid available to supplement State and local welfare systems. Other legislation deals specifically with that problem.

If the language should be eliminated, the specific annual contributions now authorized by S. 1070 might not be sufficient in a city where excessively low rents were required and the solvency of its projects might be undermined. For this reason, in addition to the specific authorization of annual contributions in definite amounts, there would have to be included provision for additional authorizations of annual contributions without limitation as to amount. No one could estimate what would be required. We might never have such a situation. But if we did, the funds would have to be available to meet it. An open-ended authorization would therefore appear to be necessary.

To authorize annual contributions without any limitation whatsoever would be a most unbusinesslike procedure. Public housing should be run on a business-like basis, and the Congress should fix a definite limit to the commitments which it is authorizing.

It is believed that the contributions now authorized are sufficient to meet the needs of families now living in the slums, and will permit these families to be admitted to public housing with preference to the families most urgently in need of rehousing. If future experience should prove that larger contributions are necessary in order to meet the most urgent needs, the facts can be presented to Congress for such further action as appears suitable.

Minimum rents available in low-rent projects for average-sized families—Public Law 412 and PWA projects, contract rents, 1948

Minimum contract rent per month:	Percent distribution of projects
Under $10	18.5
$10–$11.99	30.2
$12–$13.99	22.0
$14–$15.99	11.0
$16–$17.99	7.5
$18–$19.99	7.3
Over $20	3.5
Total	100.0
Median minimum rent	12.12

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to one fact. He tells me he has a memorandum from the HHFA which indicates that the language we are discussing, instead of excluding the poor tenants, would be more likely to exclude the wealthy tenants. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. What is the question?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator's statement is that he has a memorandum from the HHFA to the effect that the language to which I have called attention would more likely exclude the wealthy tenant than the poor tenant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that I should put it in that way. I said it would be just the reverse of what the Senator said. Let me read a paragraph.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me call one matter to the Senator's attention, before he does that.

I have drafted an amendment striking out the words "at specified rents." I have been informed by the housing agency that if the Senate adopts that amendment, it may mean cutting the poorer families from the public housing projects; in other words, those lower down in the income scale, and that it will then be necessary to add a further amendment providing that if necessary a subsidy may be required to take care of additional costs, which of course completely negatives what the Senator tells me, that it would have the opposite effect. If the Senator from Alabama is correct, if this language means the agency would be getting wealthier tenants, then certainly the housing agency could not tell me that it would cost more money to operate public housing.

In view of the fact that we are spending, roughly, from 10 to 20 billion dollars, since there is a purpose we desire to accomplish, even if it will cost a little more, we should spend the extra money, and do what the people across the Nation think we are trying to do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I want it understood that I did not say that it would mean we would get wealthier tenants in the projects. What I did say was that so far as the individual case the Senator from Wisconsin used as an illustration was concerned, the thing which would tend to keep a person out would be that his income was greater than would entitle him to get a unit at the rental which had been specified.

Let me read a very brief sentence or two relating to the very question the Senator from Wisconsin asked last Thursday. This is from the memorandum submitted by the HHFA:

> In conclusion, I want again to reaffirm that the language of S. 1070 in this respect is appropriate language which is necessary to achieve the very purposes which the Committee and which Senator McCARTHY have in view.

In other words, the very thing the Senator from Wisconsin wants done will be done under this language.

While I am on my feet I should like to say also that the Senator from Wisconsin contends that if the language which he suggests is stricken from the bill, we would have to provide additional contributions. The bill as it came to us originally, as the Senator from Washington will recall, provided for annual contributions of $445,000,000. The committee worked out a bill which made it possible to cut that down to $308,000,000 a year. We feel that we have done a good job in cutting it down to $308,000,000 a year. I wish to say, in all frankness, that I certainly do not want to be a party to any amendatory language which will give an open end to contributions, or even will increase the ceilings of the contributions we have provided in the bill. I think we have done a good job in working out this bill as we have and in holding down the annual contributions to $308,000,000. I do not care to agree to any language, and I do not want to see the Senate agree to any language which will necessitate increasing the amount of the annual contributions. I want to make myself very clear on that point. If the Senator is correct in saying that it would increase the amount, by all means I think that should be a strong argument against accepting the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator from Alabama feel that by adopting the amendment I have suggested, the poorer people will get the housing, and in the end it will cost more money, requiring a greater subsidy?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know what the Senator's amendment would accomplish. I know that the Senator from Wisconsin said it would do what he has stated.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator said last Thursday that if that language were adopted, it would be necessary to increase the contributions. I wish to make it clear that I am not in favor of increasing the contributions. I want to make it clear also that I believe as strongly as is possible that the language contained in the bill at the present time takes care adequately of the people in the various communities who are most urgently in need of housing. Therefore I wish to stand on the bill as it is written.

Mr. McCARTHY and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator from Virginia will permit, I shall yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin to ask a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I want the record absolutely clear as to what the committee intended to do, and I wish to ask the Senator a further question.

Let us assume there is constructed in the city of Pittsburgh a public-housing project of 500 dwelling units. Let us assume that there are 5,000 applications from tenants who come within the income ceiling; that each of the 5,000 wants one of the 500 units. Let us assume that the Administrator picks out 500 who are in the greatest housing need, applicants having sizable families, living in slum conditions. Let us assume that the Administrator finds that they cannot afford to pay any more than $22.50 a month. In the meantime, of course, the Administrator has set a scale of rent for the apartments. Let us assume that the scale he has set ranges all the way from $25 to $40 a month. Am I correct in assuming that under that set of circumstances the Administrator of that housing project, no matter how sincerely he wanted to accommodate the individuals who needed the apartments most, could not possibly take care of any of them because they could not pay the minimum rent of $25 a month, which he had set, and could only afford to pay $22.50 a month rent? Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin is correct in that assumption. The Senator is using the measure of the amount of rent the person is able to pay for determining whether or not he receives an apartment or receives a place in which to live.

Mr. McCARTHY. It should be, but under the bill it is not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under our bill it is. What the local housing authority does is this: It finds the amount of income the family has, and then determines how much rent the family can pay. That is the rent charged to the family regardless of what the rental may be for the unit the family moves into.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very happy the Senator from Alabama has made that statement. As I understand, when there is a provision so ambiguous as this appears to be, and there are a number of attorneys, all of whom differ as to how it should be construed, the administrative body will be bound by the statements which the sponsor of the bill makes upon the floor. So there can be no doubt upon it, so we will know what will bind the Public Housing Authority, is it the Senator's position that under the bill, as written, the administrator of any public-housing project in any part of the United States will have the absolute authority and the duty to give priority of tenancy to the family with the greatest housing need, regardless of whether the family is financially able to pay the schedule of rents which has been established for the particular housing project? If the Senator answers the question in the affirmative, then I am not disturbed about the bill, because that

will bind the Public Housing Administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I answer in the affirmative.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, I should like to say——

Mr. McCARTHY. Do not qualify; please do not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not going to qualify. But I want to say that the the measuring stick is not the income the family has. It is the urgency of the housing need. In measuring that need income is only one element.

Let me verify that with the statement from the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I can do it in just a few words:

For each of these rents, there is a maximum income limit set pursuant to statute which cannot be more than five times the rent. The maximum income for the top rent is, of course, the maximum income at which any family can be taken into the project. For the lowest rent, there is also a corresponding maximum income, but—

I want the Senator from Wisconsin to get this statement—

but there is no minimum income in connection with this rent. I want to make it very clear to the Senate that the local housing authorities are not authorized to set any minimum incomes for admission to their projects.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield so I may ask a question of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Virginia so he may address a question or several questions to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has just said that the urgency of the housing need will be the test, and that income is only one element. If, however, there is adequate housing available, but above the ability of 20 percent of the families to pay, would not income then be the major test?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator mean 20 percent above what the family is able to pay?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; I did not say that. I said above the ability of 20 percent of the families of the Nation to pay.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If there is housing available and the rent is less than 20 percent of his annual income, then he is not eligible to come into that public housing at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let us start at a given income. Let us take $1,600 as the family income. As a general proposition, would a family of that income be eligible?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Be eligible for a public housing project?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let us see. One-fifth of that income would be $320, which would be a little more than $25 a month. If there were private housing available at $27.50 a month, then that person would not be eligible to admission to the public housing project. Otherwise he would be eligible.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assume the distinguished Senator from Alabama realizes that 20 percent of the families of the Nation have an income of $1,600 a year or less.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that there are more than 7,000,000 families with incomes in those low brackets?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is probably true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator said that the bill was so framed that it would take care of all sections of the Nation. Is there anything in the bill which limits the number of units that can be built in any one State?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is the limit?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not more than 10 percent in any one State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was a committee amendment, was it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; that was in the bill. The Senator from Virginia offered an amendment in the committee relating to slum clearance which brought it in line with the public housing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator said the bill was framed so that we could never be called upon to contribute more than $308,000,000 a year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the Administrator of this program have the power, without coming to Congress, to approve a project that would commit us for 40 years?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is the limitation in the bill that would prevent him from committing us in 1 year to more than $308,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The $308,000,000 is the maximum that can be committed. He has no authority to commit for more than that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let us assume then that he commits us each year to $308,000,000. When he does so he commits us for 40 years at that rate, does he not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, or until the city has amortized the indebtedness.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then if he commits us at that rate for the 810,000 units, he would commit us for the approximate sum, in 40 years, of $15,000,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it is a little less than that; about $13,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There appears to be some difference of opinion as to the over-all amount. I have seen estimates in excess of $16,000,000,000. I am constrained to believe that $15,000,000,000 is a pretty fair and accurate estimate of the over-all cost.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If my arithmetic is correct, 40 times $308,000,000 is $12,320,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does that include all the provisions of the bill, those with respect to slum clearance, as well as others?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; that is housing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what I had in mind. When we include the other provisions of the bill, it is fair to say that this is a $15,000,000,000 project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I think if we include all loans and grants, it will run between $15,000,000,000 and $16,000,000,000. By the way, the figures are set forth on page 29 of the committee report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If we commit ourselves to a $15,000,000,000 project which takes care of only 810,000 families with an income of $1,600 or less, what provision would the Senator recommend for the remainder of more than 6,000,000 similarly situated families? Would the Senator end the program when we shall have taken care of only 810,000 of them, or would he give fair and equal treatment to all the 7,000,000-plus in that same unfortunate income situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to correct one statement which the Senator made, and that is that we are spending $15,000,000,000 on 810,000 families. When the Senator makes that statement, he gets back to public housing. The $15,000,000,000 includes everything—slum clearance, public housing, and research and development, which is for the aid of private housing more than public housing. It includes also farm housing, and everything else in the bill.

I realize the problem we are up against in providing only 810,000 units when there are probably 6,000,000 families who need help. Any one of these problems which we attack presents exactly the same difficulty. Yesterday afternoon on the floor of the Senate there was quite a discussion about the total inadequacy of the farm section of the bill. I know that it is inadequate. It is terribly inadequate.

The able Senator from Virginia was a Member of the House, as I was, when the farm tenant purchase bill was enacted back in 1937. I am sure the Senator from Virginia voted for that bill. The argument was made then as to the inadequacy of the program. Last year we had under consideration a program with reference to a certain power project—it may have been the St. Lawrence seaway. The argument was made that many rivers in this country needed improvement, and therefore we should not spend money improving the St. Lawrence. In connection with almost every problem of any nature we are met with the same difficulty—the inadequacy of what we are able to do. We are unable to do a complete job. I will tell the Senator what I would do——

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator agrees that this start is inadequate. He agrees that the start will cost $15,000,000,000. He agrees that 20 percent of the families have incomes of less than $1,600, and that if we do a fair and just job for the more than seven million families similarly situated with respect to income and a desire for good housing but the inability to obtain it, the cost will be more than $200,000,000,000. Is not this the time to consider what we are starting?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly I think it is the time to consider what we are starting. I do not agree with the premise that

we would have to do this kind of job for every one of those families. I hope that somewhere along the line the construction of housing can become systematized to such an extent that costs can be reduced and private industry can do the job.

I believe that one of the things most to be regretted and the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] did much to bring out this point in the Joint Committee on Housing 2 years ago—is that the vast industry of housing in the United States has never been modernized. It is the only great industry which still produces in single units. It does not use assembly-line techniques. For the first time we are writing into law a provision for research and development. We hope that we can develop housing and home-building techniques which will bring the cost down to the point where private industry can do what we all want it to do, that is, build houses at such cost that the people can afford to rent decent places in which to live.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I fully agree with what the Senator from Alabama says in that connection. I am satisfied that plans for prefabricated houses can be perfected by which satisfactory houses can be provided at substantially less cost than is now the case. But I have been informed—and I believe reliably so—that the average rent paid last year was $31 a month. If we divide 810,000 units into the subsidy provided by the bill, the result is $32 a month, if all the units are built. It seems to me that that is a rather expensive approach to getting people to do something for themselves, if we are to pay a dollar a month more in subsidy than the average rent now being privately paid by the man who has to pay it out of his own pocket.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, we do not anticipate that the full $308,000,000 will be used. Again, that is the maximum. Experience so far has shown that only 58.6 percent of the authorized subsidy has actually been used. We hope that the maximum will amount to $200,000,000, rather than $308,000,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Alabama a question? If I can first obtain unanimous consent that I may do so without jeopardizing the right of the Senator from Washington to the floor, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield under those conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I assume that the Senator from Alabama has before him a copy of the bill. If he will turn to page 47, he will note that it deals with a very important subject, namely, the inauguration of a plan for research. As the Senator knows, last year in the Housing and Home Finance Administration, we established a division whose job it was to attempt to standardize building codes throughout the country and to work toward the standardization of building materials, as well as to conduct any research incident to that task. I note that a great many additional duties have been placed upon this particular division. It has a tremendous job. Nothing is said in regard to the salary of the individual who is to head this great research agency. I wonder if we are not making the mistake, which we often make, of prescribing an important task and then not paying a salary sufficiently high to attract a competent individual who would make that job practically his life work. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama would be averse to an amendment to title III, the housing research section, providing the same salary scale for this agency as is provided at the present time for the FHA or the PHA. I am firmly convinced that it will not be possible to obtain the services of a man competent to do the job at the $10,000-a-year limitation under the terms of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it was our feeling that the research division should be established under the office of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and that so far as the personnel necessary to do the job are concerned, they would be taken care of under the Classification Act. Under the Classification Act, where certain duties are laid down and where there is a description of those duties, it would be relatively simple to get the type of personnel needed for doing the job.

So far as any pay increase is concerned it seems to me it should be handled in a pay bill relating to the entire government, rather than as a separate and distinct matter in connection with creating this job.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CAIN. Let me suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that word has come to me that perhaps all of us, because of the fact that an amendment is pending, are yielding a little too freely, and that such action may result in jeopardizing my position on the floor. Therefore, I wonder whether the junior Senator from Wisconsin would permit me to conclude my remaining brief remarks on the pending amendment, to be followed by further questions from him to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question addressed to him?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. I note that the bill has three sections dealing with farm housing. One section deals with loans to farmers living on farms which are adequate to support the buildings on them and to support the farmers. That is one class. I think the provisions of the amendment as to it are rather good.

In the second place, there is a section dealing with aid to a farmer whose farm presently is not sufficient to support him and his family and to support decent buildings on the farm——

Mr. CAIN. But the assumption is that it will become adequate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; it is assumed that as to that group, the Secretary of Agriculture will find that ultimately they will become self-sustaining. That section is not a bad one, either.

Then there is a third section and I should like to ask the Senator about it. It deals with grants and loans—but principally grants—to farmers living on farms which the Secretary of Agriculture has previously found will never be able to support them.

In other words, in such cases the Secretary of Agriculture would say, "Here is a farm which can never support this farmer."

Certain grants are proposed for such farmers; and among those grants, as the Senator from Washington knows, is one calling for a $500 grant for the building of a toilet. I do not believe there is urgent need on such farms for expenditures in that amount for that purpose. I lived on a farm for a number of years, and that was not the principal need, as I recall.

In short, Mr. President, I think that section is completely ridiculous. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may appoint, in each county, three men, who will work on a per diem basis, plus expenses. With 3,000 counties or parishes in the United States, that could mean 9,000 members of such committees. Of course, that number doubtless will be reduced somewhat, because the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to use existing farm agencies or committees. In any event, those men will be used to aid farmers living on farms which the Secretary of Agriculture thinks never will be able to support them. Does not the Senator from Washington think it would be much better to take the $12,000,000 to be authorized under this section of the bill and use that money to move farmers off submarginal farms, to places where they can make a living? What is the Senator's thought as to that?

Mr. CAIN. In answer, let me say that I happen to be among the Senators who feel that that section of title IV is unwise and certainly should not be incorporated into law at this time, for as I understand that section of the proposed law, it would attempt to extend grants or loans to operations which have been considered or are considered to be certain to continue as inadequate, submarginal operations. To my mind that is not good public policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask a question in regard to the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin that, instead of rehabilitating such farmers on the farms where they are located, they be moved to other places. In such event, would not it be necessary to have the committees which have been referred to, in order to have some group which would be able to say which farmers would qualify for moving to other farms?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if I may reply, let me say I think that is correct. It seems to me that under this provision of the farm section, after the Department of Agriculture has finished paying the approximately 7,000 or 8,000 committeemen their per diem fees and their expenses, there will be precious little money left to pay farmers to build toilets.

I hope the Senator does not mind my referring to this section as the toilet section, because to my mind that is about all it amounts to—in short, a grant of $500 to a farmer to permit him to build a toilet.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, to permit me to ask a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am delighted to know that the Senator from Wisconsin has just finished asking me a question. [Laughter.]

I am pleased to yield now, to permit him to ask any question he has in mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. In regard to the section with reference to housing research, I can inform the Senator from Washington that there is no present classification pay bill or other pay bill which, without amendment, will provide for a salary to the research director under this bill higher than the usual $10,000 or $10,300, the maximum under the present limit. However, in view of the fact that the director will have the job of bringing up to date an industry which spends, I believe, somewhere between $10,000,000,000 and $14,000,000,000 a year, will the Senator from Washington agree with me that we should amend that provision so as to provide that the work will be done by a division placed on the same pay scale as that of the FHA or similar agencies; in other words, a pay scale permitting a salary of $15,000 a year for the head of the agency?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wisconsin is speaking of a subject far broader than the one involved in the particular bill now before us. I take it he feels that a number of the pay scales in the executive branch of the Government should be increased in order to permit the employment of better-qualified personnel.

Mr. McCARTHY. But I call attention to the fact that there is no pay bill, as presently written, which will take care of this situation. If it is to be taken care of, I assume it should be taken care of in the legislation setting up the new agency. I wonder whether the Senator from Washington agrees to that.

Mr. CAIN. From my point of view, I would be inclined to wait until the over-all executive branch salary problem can be considered in one piece of legislation. I think the matter should be handled as a whole, rather than piecemeal, for piecemeal procedures have frequently gotten us into sad difficulties in the past.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder whether the Senator from Washington knows that the minority report on Senate bill 558, signed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and myself, suggests an amendment covering the entire classification pay act which, in the form of the Langer-Johnson pay bill, was introduced in the Eightieth Congress; and I wonder whether the Senator realizes that it provides for increases up to approximately $14,000 a year.

Mr. CAIN. I have known that some thought was being given to the over-all salary problem; and such a procedure would certainly suit my thinking better than would a piecemeal treatment.

Mr. LANGER. Let me point out to the Senator that the minority report has been filed and is available, if the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Wisconsin wish to examine it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think we can conclude our consideration of the pending amendment and can obtain a vote upon it in a short time.

The first amendment, which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Washington, is, in the opinion of its authors, a very small addition to the pending legislation. It is easily understood; it is democracy; it is simply American. It requires no lengthy justification and is subject to no just criticism.

In support of the amendment, Mr. President, I call as my first witnesses language found in the title of the bill, which I should like to read:

To establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

I wish all Senators would note carefully these particular words:

To assist * * * projects * * * initiated by local agencies.

I submit that the American citizen, the American taxpayer in every American locality is in fact and ought to be understood to be the local agency. Let me read now from the bill itself. On page 24, line 7, we find the "local public agency" defined as follows:

(h) "Local public agency" means any State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body which is authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought. "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States.

Note carefully the words "authorized to undertake the project." How better may any public body be authorized to make commitments for its community than, through the local ballot box, to conduct a referendum? I continue to read briefly from the bill, page 24, line 21:

In recognition that there should be local determination of the need for low-rent housing to meet needs not being adequately met by private enterprise.

"Local determination" are the two key words at this point in the bill. Let us turn now to the report on the Housing Act which accompanies the bill (S. 1070). On page 2, from the section entitled "Philosophy of the Bill," I read:

The bill now being favorably reported by your committee is based upon the firm foundation that, although the housing problem is obviously national in scope, it is fundamentally a local problem, and that the first responsibility for its solution therefore rests with the local community. This bill leaves that primary responsibility with the local communities where it belongs. It recognizes that the need for any kind of housing action should be determined locally. It therefore provides that Federal assistance for the clearance of slums and blighted areas shall be available only for projects where there has been a local determination, by the governing body of the community, that the project is needed and where the plans for such project are locally made and locally approved. It therefore provides that Federal assistance for low-rent public housing shall be available only for projects where there has been a local determination, by the governing body of the community, that such housing is required in order to meet needs not being adequately met in that community by private enterprise, and where such projects are locally initiated, locally developed, and locally managed. It therefore provides that, in making Federal assistance available for farm housing, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have full authority to use local committees of farmers in order that there may be local determinations of the need for such assistance. This bill fully incorporates the basic philosophy that, if the people of a local community take no interest in that community's housing problems, it is not for the Federal Government to impose a program upon them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was wondering whether the Senator has any idea as to how long he will speak.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to answer the question, and will do so as best I can, since all Senators are anxious to get on with the amendments. I have remaining four brief pages of explanation of the amendment, following which I should like to ask those who may oppose the amendment to rise and tell me and other Senators why they oppose it; in the hope that both sides of the question can then be within the knowledge of every Senator, and we can promptly vote the amendment up or down.

Mr. MAYBANK. I realize it is a difficult question to ask the Senator, but does the Senator think we shall be able to do that tonight? I refer only to the amendment?

Mr. CAIN. I shall conclude my presentation on the amendment within 6 or 7 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. It will be impossible to finish, because I intend to talk for at least an hour.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from Washington will yield further, I may say I was referring only to the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. That is what I mean.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator expect to speak on this amendment?

Mr. LANGER. I want to talk at least an hour, after the Senator from Washington concludes.

Mr. MAYBANK. On this amendment?

Mr. LANGER. On this amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was asking only with reference to the amendment now under consideration. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the Senator's inquiry. We all want to get through as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I have been reading from the section entitled "Philosophy of the Bill," as outlined and written by some of its sponsors. In this language we find that the philosophy of the bill most

bluntly places responsibility on the people of a local community. If the people themselves manifest no interest, the Government will not impose a program upon them. The junior Senator from Washington and his coauthor have thus justified the amendment. We propose by the very language of the bill itself, in accordance with the report, to do certain things.

Let us now examine briefly but critically the beneficial results to be obtained through adoption of the amendment, as it relates to the operation and administration of the tremendously large program which is contained within the bill before us. Without a referendum one can readily see that in many communities where citizens discern a real need of assistance as offered in the bill, a local public body, either through inertia or as result of prejudice, or by reason of its individual personnel, may take no positive action and may make no recommendation to its local housing authority.

At this point, I desire to call especially to the attention of my very good friend the Senator from Alabama, the statement I have just made. I shall restate it. The amendment which has been offered by the two Senators, one from Washington and one from Ohio, proposes that a referendum be had before a community replies either that it wants to accept housing grants and assistance as offered, or that it does not. I have stated that without a referendum this is one of the several things that will probably happen at some time, to the impairment of what the Congress wishes to have done in America: Without a referendum it will happen in many communities that its citizens, men and women not in public office, and not constituting any public body, will discern and know there is a real need of the assistance offered in the bill, but the local public body may, either through inertia or as the result of prejudice, or by reason of the individual personnel, take no positive action and make no recommendation to the local housing authority. The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and I maintain very seriously that in certain instances it will happen that where a low-cost building or housing program ought to be undertaken in an American community, it will not be undertaken, because the local public body which under the law is required to make the decision will make no decision, possibly as the result of prejudices arising out of the past in connection with actions which may have been taken.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say to the Senator I do not want to interrupt his thought, and unless he feels it is all right for me to do so, I shall not interrupt him at this time.

Mr. CAIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the place where the bill needs strengthening more than any other is with respect to its failure to compel the local communities who are going to ask for money to take preventive steps against the creation of slums. We are treating a disease, rather than trying to stop the spread of the disease. On page 2 the third objective of the bill reads:

> Appropriate local bodies shall be encouraged and assisted to undertake positive programs of encouraging and assisting the development of well-planned, integrated residential neighborhoods.

I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I appreciate the reluctance of the committee members to dictate, perhaps, to the local government of either State, city, or county, but if we are to assume the responsibility of saying what kind of housing there shall be in Kankakee or in Baltimore, it seems to me we have a right to say to those bodies, "We will put up the money, but for the future you must adopt such a code affecting landlords and tenants as will prevent the recurrence of the conditions which we are trying to cure."

I am making this point because I realize the futility of trying to strengthen the bill at this stage of the proceeding by an amendment to accomplish the desired result, but I hope that if we ever have another one of these bills, in the meantime some uniform code of antislum legislation will have been evolved so that none of the money will, in the future, go to any except deserving communities which are endeavoring to help themselves before they come to the Federal Government and ask for assistance.

I apologize for making such a long statement.

Mr. CAIN. I most sincerely thank the Senator from Maryland for the contribution he has made, and I differ from him only in one particular. I am satisfied that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and other members of the Banking and Currency Committee are willing to listen to a suggestion in the form of an amendment which would help to secure at least a part of the improvement which the Senator from Maryland has in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is difficult to evolve what might be called a uniform code for the prevention of slums. It would have to encompass such things as floor space, room space, sanitation, lighting, and many other things. I think we are at a point at which a tenant will have to be punished if he permits, by his own acts, a property to deteriorate so rapidly that it becomes a slum after he has rented it from the landlord. Likewise, we may have to punish landlords who will not properly maintain their property.

What we are doing is attempting to cure a disease after it has taken place; and in connection with this subject, what we need to do is to give more thought to preventing the creation of slums. I understand that in some of the Scandinavian countries tenants band together and themselves punish each other if they pull down the standard of the whole community. I do not know whether that would be feasible in America. I doubt it. I think the Committee on Banking and Currency might appoint a subcommittee which would attempt to evolve a uniform code for the prevention of slums, and, in any future bill, next year or the year after, make it a condition precedent that a community will have to have some antislum measures on its books before it shall be entitled to come to the Federal Government for assistance. In that way, if it be done thoroughly and without too much of the coercive element in it, we would get in the cities legislation and inspections which would deter the creation of slums, we would save many thousands of dollars for the Federal and local treasuries, and save many expenses of municipal governments, because slums are expensive to maintain.

Mr. CAIN. May I point out to the Senator from Maryland that, to my knowledge, probably most of our American cities have codes, regulations, statutes, and ordinances now on their books which, if they had been carefully enforced over the past several decades, would have prevented our being faced with the major portion of this problem?

Mr. TYDINGS. Assuming that is correct—and I think many cities do have such codes—I think in some respects they are defective. But even if they are not defective, and the fault lies with lack of enforcement, we should put such a provision into law. This is probably the third, fourth, or fifth time, maybe the eighth or ninth time, in the past 15 years that we have had this very problem before us. I think we have reached the time when we should serve notice on the municipalities that unless they maintain a certain standard of inspection and control for the prevention of slums, they cannot come to the Federal Government and secure money through various bills which we pass from time to time. It is their dereliction of duty which creates the slums. We seem to be devoting very little thought to that point. We are simply trying to palliate it and not cure the real cause.

Mr. CAIN. There are several members of the committee, and there may be other Senators, who are concerned over the problem which has just been so ably defined by the Senator from Maryland. We have thought that when we begin a larger program than we have ever before thought possible, if we do not insist that for every new house created a bad house shall be either improved or torn down, we shall, over a period of time, make no dent in the slums at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yesterday there was a very interesting discussion on the floor of the Senate. Pictures were shown, and, indeed, in all our local newspapers there were pictures of a number of Senators visiting slums in the neighborhood of the Capitol. I should like to determine whether, in the city of Washington, there are laws on the books to prevent the creation of slums, which are not being enforced, or whether there is a lack of legislation to prevent the creation of slums in the District of Columbia. Could some

member of the committee give me that information?

Mr. CAIN. I happen to be a member of the committee, but I cannot give the Senator the information. I think it can be procured, and I shall be delighted to procure it for the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I am making is that we are about to appropriate money to cure the condition, theoretically, and yet no one is offering any legislation, or, insofar as I know, intends to offer any, which will prevent the creation of slums next year or 3 or 4 years from today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say, first, with reference to District of Columbia laws, that there are laws and sanitary regulations against the maintenance of rental quarters which constitute a hazard to health and safety. As a matter of fact, as the Senator may recall, in connection with some of the slums visited yesterday, it was stated that condemnation signs were found posted.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was due to the fact that they are getting ready to build there, was it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is referring to those which have been condemned in court.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought that was what the Senator meant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I meant, from a sanitary standpoint. One of the buildings had been condemned for 20 years. The real difficulty is that we are so far behind with places for people to live that we can scarcely do away with any habitable place, decent or indecent. That is the tragic circumstance which prevails today. If we ever catch up, by all means we should have some such provisions as that which the Senator from Maryland has suggested. I would not go along to the extent of making it coercive.

Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that in this bill we encourage prevention of slums as much as we can. For the first time we are starting out with a slum-clearance program.

Mr. TYDINGS. For the first time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The first time for a separate slum-clearance program. I was just about to say that the Senator probably recalls when the National Housing Act was passed, some 12 or 15 years ago, we provided for public housing to be used for the elimination of slums, but it was a program with two parts tied together, the elimination of slums and the building of housing. During the war Congress enacted a statute, or part of a statute, in the Lanham Act providing against the erection of public housing units as slum-clearance projects. There were two reasons: First, the old program had not proved successful; and in the second place, we needed the existing places; we could not spare them. That condition prevails today. But in the pending bill we provide a separate slum-clearance program, and I think it is a very liberal program for a starter.

I call the attention of the Senator to some of the provisions set forth on pages 11 and 12 of the bill. I think we do everything we can to make certain that in the redevelopment of these areas the very things the Senator has mentioned are complied with.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator from Alabama has completely gotten my point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, yes; I have, but I have not completed my own statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me to interrupt him——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree that when a place is already in bad repute, in the category the Senator has described, that is one thing, but I wish to approach the problem before it gets in that condition.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to tell the Senator an experience I had. I happen to own one or two small houses. I am sorry to say that I rented one to a certain Army officer. I rented one to six or seven Army officers, who stayed very short periods of time during the war, and most of them were fine tenants, and I tried to have a very nice property for them to occupy.

I had one particular tenant, and before he and his wife took over the property I had the rooms and the stairways and the whole place painted so that it was spotless when they went into it. They went out in 5 months, and I had to take over a year's revenue to put the place back into condition again, and I had no redress at all.

It is not always the landlord who is at fault, and it is not always the tenant who is at fault. But unless we put a responsibility somewhere, unless we have a court where such a situation can be dealt with in the large municipalities, slums will increase at a faster rate than they would if we put restrictions on the use of property, or on the neglect of property on the part of the landlord.

I do not think it is possible to tear down the houses which now exist until we get enough new houses to accommodate the present tenants. I agree with the Senator in his comment about the illustration he has given concerning the house which had been condemned for 20 years, but I think that we are not getting completely at the problem merely by looking at it from a sanitary point of view.

Tenant and landlord courts, in my opinion, should be set up, so that a landlord could come in and complain about the abuse of the property by his tenant, and either force the tenant to evacuate unless he would take better care of the property, or compensate the landlord or make such provision that the landlord could get judgment against the tenant. I think the tenant should be able to make the landlord put in certain sanitary improvements so as to make a house livable. I do not see that that is going to be done under this bill. If we are to raise the standard of living conditions in the poorer sections of our cities, we need more than new houses; we need to create a state of mind on the part of the tenant and on the part of the landlord which will give them a fuller and a deeper comprehension and appreciation of real property. Until the municipalities deal with the subject in that fashion, we are not going to get our money's worth for the money we are appropriating.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Washington will yield to me very briefly, I should like to remind the Senator from Maryland of another fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am most pleased to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In providing also for the first time for housing research, we hope that much of the program the Senator has so well outlined will be worked out.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is fine. Where is that in the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In title III, starting on page 47. It covers many of the things the Senator has been discussing.

With reference to the establishment of landlord and tenant courts, of course the Senator realizes that would have to be done by State legislation, and I think he would be the last one in the world to suggest that Congress require that to be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, of course, I agree to that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Through the housing research and study title, on page 47, we should be able, if it works out as we hope it will, to have municipalities establish some kind of uniform code covering many of the things the Senator has mentioned. I think the bill which we are proposing is very definitely a long step forward in trying to get a decent housing program in this country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Washington yield for one more observation? Then, whether I desire to talk more or not, I shall not impose on the Senator's time and good nature.

Mr. CAIN. I yield for any observation or question the Senator desires to make or propound.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Washington for what I believe is a point of view that is very wholesome in this debate. We are beginning to realize that cure of slums, after they come into existence, is not the answer. The prevention of slums is the best, cheapest, and most wholesome approach to the problem.

My concluding thought is that if the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Alabama, both of whom are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, will follow up this research provision, or, indeed, if they will see fit to appoint a subcommittee to try to evolve what might be called a uniform code of slum prevention, not to be put on the cities by coercion, but to be a sort of

goal, a yardstick, which many of them, I hope, would adopt voluntarily, they will make a tremendous contribution to the living conditions in this country, and in my judgment over the years they will save the Treasury a considerable sum of money, because what we need now is leadership.

The committee is familiar with the conditions which exist in many cities. If during the recess it would evolve a code of slum prevention and suggest it to the cities, and, by a campaign of education rather than coercion, have them adopt it, either in whole or in part, in my judgment, 10 years from now they will have to their credit the saving of many millions of dollars, both by the municipalities and the Federal Government, which I am afraid otherwise will be wasted in trying to cure an evil which we might never have had to deal with at all if we had tried to prevent it.

I thank the Senator from Washington for his indulgence, and I hope that he and the Senator from Alabama may find some merit in my suggestion. If they do, and will work on it, I think they will have made a great contribution to the living conditions in this country for all the people.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Washington will yield one more time, I shall not impose further on him.

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to say there is much merit in the very fine suggestions which have been made by the able Senator from Maryland, and I should like to call his attention to one other provision in the bill. If he will look at page 4, under "Slum clearance," section 101, he will find this language:

In extending financial assistance under this title, the Administrator shall—

(a) Give consideration to the extent to which appropriate local public bodies have undertaken positive programs—

Now turn to subsection (2)—

for preventing the spread or recurrence, in such community, of slums and blighted areas through the adoption, improvement, and modernization of local codes and regulations relating to land use and adequate standards of health, sanitation, and safety for dwelling accommodations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Please understand, I do not suggest that ours is a complete program, but I do say that in various parts of the bill we are tying in the kind of program the Senator has suggested.

Mr. TYDINGS. I had read the provision before, and I was attempting to find it when I originally rose to interrogate the Senator from Washington. I would not take out one statement contained in the paragraph the Senator from Alabama has read. He and I are looking at this matter in exactly the same way.

My point is—and I do not say this with any supercilious idea of criticism—he has a nice New Year's resolution here with which the Administrator will not have to bother very much. While the language is fine, I hope that when there is more time to put the provisions together the able Senator from Alabama and the able Senator from Washington together with their colleagues will find some way of translating the pious hope we find expressed in words there into a form of more vivid reality, if I may use that expression.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very much interested in the viewpoint of the Senator from Maryland. I think he has made some valuable suggestions. I wish to add one to them. Congress has something to say about the great city of Washington, D. C. I wonder whether it is not possible for the committee to prepare a model housing and sanitation code applicable to the city of Washington. Because Washington is under our jurisdiction it is here that we could test such a code and determine whether it would or would not operate properly.

As I view the situation, the slums in Washington have been used on many occasions as an argument for building new public housing, but they have not been used in the same way as a compelling argument for striking at the very heart of the matter, which is clearing out the slums. It could have been done, and it can be done now. I think we can render no greater service to the Nation than to say, "We have demonstrated in Washington, a city over which we have jurisdiction, that this thing can be done."

The District Health Department today gave me the codes which have been adopted by the District government, under acts passed by Congress. Some of the penalties for violation of the codes run from $5 to as high as $45, for allowing unsanitary conditions to continue in the slum areas and in the public housing units in this city.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make an amplification for the RECORD. A reading of my remarks may give an entirely different impression from what I intended. I stated the penalty was from $5 to $45. That may indicate I meant it was a stiff penalty. I was trying to be sarcastic. I should like to have it so appear in the RECORD. I think this is the only way I can have the RECORD show the idea I intended to convey.

Several Senators yesterday looked at some slum areas. I wish to say to the people of America that Congress should provide, in connection with the use of the taxpayers' money to build new housing, for the destruction of the slums. The slums have been here for more than 20 years. I happen to have lived in a city in which judges are elected. Blame has at times been attached to the system of electing judges, and the assertion made that under such a system the laws cannot be enforced. But in Washington the judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Yet we have slum conditions here. Therefore, I do not want to hear it said that it is only in places where judges are elected that laws cannot be enforced. I think the time has come when Congress must demonstrate that we can clear the slums from Washington.

Mr. President, I desire to help carry out what the Senator from Maryland has suggested, but to carry it out in such a way that we can demonstrate to the public that we are providing for more than simply the building of houses. New housing is a part of the problem. The question of education in sanitary matters also is involved. The question of law enforcement is involved. We must determine to make America a better place in which to live. But let us attack the whole problem. Let us use this city as the guinea pig, and demonstrate to the rest of the Nation that we can clear out the slums. Such a demonstration would not be a dictate to the rest of the country, but it would be, I am sure, one of the greatest services that we in Congress could render to the Nation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to associate myself with the remark made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] earlier in the debate today. The creation of slums comes about partly from a state of mind that must be changed before the slums can be gotten rid of.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Some discipline must be exercised in the care of property. Some discipline must be exercised in the use of property, just as discipline is exercised over those who throw papers on the streets, an offense punishable by a fine. If too many violations of the ordinance in respect to throwing papers on the streets take place, the police begin to take notice. We have to translate such discipline in a humane, democratic way, to the conditions which indirectly bring about the creation of slums.

I wish to associate myself with the thought expressed by the Senator from Michigan that we here are in a pretty frail position.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are very vulnerable.

Mr. TYDINGS. We stand on the floor of the Senate and exhibit pictures of slums existing all over the country, whereas Washington is directly under our control.

Mr. President, I believe it would be well if the Committee on Banking and Currency were to evolve a code such as the experience of its members, and the testimony brought before it, would satisfy, it would be a wise measure, and report it, and then let it go to the Committee on the District of Columbia for further consideration and hearings, after which the Congress could adopt it. If such a measure were enacted perhaps the example created in the National Capital would be beneficial to other sections. If such legislation could be adopted in the States and municipalities, for the country as a whole, it would result in our people becoming healthier, in their living conditions being vastly improved, without the expenditure of a single Federal dollar, and we could get rid of a large part of the problem which really has no business here, if we tell the truth, because it is local in its essence and local in its genesis.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The problem of the slums will not be solved merely by build-

ing new housing units. The slums must be destroyed. It is a problem which the people as a whole must solve.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I suggest that in connection with the legislation we make an effort to do something at this time to shock the people of the country into recognizing that in return for receiving new low rent subsidized housing from the Federal Government they themselves must destroy or renovate substandard housing on the local level. An amendment is to be offered and discussed at some length which will provide in very simple language that for every one of subsidized but good substantial clean sanitary houses that are built the American community in which that housing is to be placed must take upon itself as an obligation either to bring substandard housing up to standard condition, or demolish it entirely. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that I am completely satisfied that if we approve such a requirement in connection with the pending bill people all over the country will become interested for the first time in decades in determining what they themselves may accomplish to do away with slums, and to make certain that they will not arise in the future.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Due to the shortage of homes existing throughout the land, are we ready at this particular time to impose such a restriction upon housing construction? The escalator provisions of the bill definitely provide that if a private builder, an individual, desires to build a home, if he does not utilize all available manpower and supplies going into the construction, the Federal Government will step up his building program. If a provision is placed in the bill compelling the destruction of a slum home at the same time a new home is built, it will result in there not being sufficient living quarters. It might be very well to make such provision after we have caught up with the present drastic shortage, a shortage caused first by a depression, when people could not afford to build, and second, caused by the long continuance of the war, during which building materials were not available, and when homes could not be built.

What is now endeavored to be done is to attempt to supplement the contractor's efforts to the maximum in order to provide some homes for people to live in. So I simply caution the Senator that his amendment may be coming 2 years too soon. The amendment might well be submitted 2 years from now, when we have caught up with the great home needs that exist in the land. The amendment is a worthy one, but I believe it would impose a hardship upon those seeking a place to live.

Mr. CAIN. First, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observation. Second, I think I can explode completely the premises the Senator has used. Let us do it through an example. What are we in Congress trying to do? Before every hearing on the question of housing we have had, during the two and a half years I have been in the Senate, we have said, "We are going to get rid of the slums. We are going to provide accommodations for persons of low incomes to live in." Now that is what we are going to do in city X. That city says it wants 500 units of public housing. Who are going to live in those houses? Five hundred families presently living in slums. When the 500 new units are constructed, the 500 families living in slums today will move into the new housing. Unless it is contended that we are going to continue slums in perpetuity we had better make certain to destroy the bad housing from which the families move into the new housing. If we do not destroy the slums, then, when families living in them move into better housing, their places will be taken by other slum dwellers, and we will be faced with the same situation two decades from now.

Mr. THYE. There is a slum-clearance provision in the bill as it is written. The purpose of slum clearance is the eradication of an undesirable area which affects adjacent property. The question is simply this: Are we prepared to move in and eradicate every dwelling which is undesirable, or cause it to be improved by repairs because it happens to fall in the category of the undesirable? Are we going to be able to do that immediately upon the passage of the bill, before additional homes are constructed? I ask that question because of the great scarcity which exists in rental accommodations. That is the only reason for my caution. We may do an injustice by singling out a place within the city and saying, for example, that block X in city G must be removed immediately because it is an undesirable slum area, before we can proceed with another aspect of the program. That is the point which I wish to clear up.

Mr. CAIN. I apologize if I have not made my position clear. I think we are talking about the same thing. I believe that I can allay the Senator's concern.

There are two titles in the bill to be taken into consideration in this connection. One is title II, which is concerned with the construction of subsidized low-rent housing accommodations. Title I is concerned with slum clearance and community redevelopment. Some communities will avail themselves of Federal assistance to redevelop the community and to get rid of certain slum areas. Other communities will not touch title I at all, but they will avail themselves of the opportunities afforded them through title II to get, say, a thousand units of low-rent housing.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to finish this observation. This portion of the problem is disassociated from any concern of the Federal Government.

In answer to the Senator's last question, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and I are going to suggest that no project shall be assisted under this act, with reference to title II, unless there shall be in force and effect an ordinance or other local law prohibiting the use and operation for residential purposes of property which is unfit, insanitary, or otherwise detrimental to the public health. The authority shall determine that question under the provisions of an existing ordinance or other local law. Within one year after the project shall have first been made available for occupancy, dwelling units in number equivalent to the number of dwelling units in the project will be either demolished or rehabilitated.

On the basis of this approach, there will not be a net loss of a single solitary unit of housing in a community. Let us suppose that a project is to have a thousand units. It is constructed and made available for occupancy. A thousand families move in. From the time those thousand families move in, the community has a year in which to fulfill its obligation, either to repair or rehabilitate a thousand substandard houses, or to destroy them. In no American community will the destruction of a thousand houses be required, because of every thousand houses which are substandard, it is estimated that 60 percent of them are susceptible to being made standard by the expenditure of reasonable sums.

Under the terms of this amendment we would be getting rid of the slums. We would be improving private property within the community. With reference to that obligation, it would not cost the Federal Government a dime. Why? Because the American property owner should be required by law to make certain that his facilities do not disintegrate into a slum.

With that observation, I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Let us assume that there is need for the additional housing project consisting of 1,000 units.

Mr. CAIN. I used that merely as an example.

Mr. THYE. Up until such time as agreements had been recorded, construction of the project could not be commenced. Is that the full intent of the Senator's amendment? Suppose that the housing project is accepted and approved. It then becomes a question of procedure. Before we can proceed with the project we must have an agreement with the city authorities and the property owners of 1,000 units that such units must be either repaired or removed entirely before the new project, consisting of a thousand units, can proceed. Is that the intent of the amendment?

Mr. CAIN. It would not work exactly like that.

Mr. THYE. How would it work?

Mr. CAIN. I think I can indicate how a contract would actually work under this law. Community X says to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, "We, as a local community, want a thousand low-cost, low-rent, subsidized, federally constructed homes." The Administrator says, "That is excellent. All you have to do in return for the thousand new homes to be built is to agree that within a year following the time when the thousand homes are available for occupancy you will exercise the authority of your city to guarantee that a thousand presently substandard units in your community are either rehabilitated or demolished."

I happen to be familiar with the business of city administration in a good many cities of this country. I could go into almost any city, take a look at the books, call in the head of the fire department, the head of the health department, and the head of the police department, and say, "With reference to these 1,000 existing substandard accommodations, only enforce the law. Be courteous. Be reasonable. Do not be antagonistic; but say to the owners, 'You have a year within which to rehabilitate this accommodation, or we are going to require you to destroy it.'"

No housing accommodations would be lost. No units of available housing would be lost, but there would be a tremendously fine contribution to the future health of the community.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator anticipate any delay in the negotiation of all the transactions necessary to commit the city administration to the program? There would have to be an obligation under a specific contract with respect to a thousand housing units. Merely a word would not be sufficient. There would have to be a contract or agreement. Does the Senator anticipate any delay on the part of the Housing Administrator in proceeding with the construction of the 1,000 housing units while he is dealing with those who are involved in the housing project, and while compliance is being obtained on the part of property owners with respect to their obligation to repair and improve their property?

Mr. CAIN. Let me respond by describing how such programs have actually worked in the past.

In passing, let me say to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that he has begun a discussion which is of the greatest possible importance to the future of this proposed legislation. I believe that every city administration which knows anything at all about its business knows, in rather accurate fashion, the number of substandard units of housing within the community. The health department is always concerned with that problem. It is constantly investigating and analyzing the situation. The fire department must know where the so-called firetraps are, in order best to protect the community against the hazard of fire.

Take the city of Tacoma, Wash., in which I live. I could go there today and ask the health director how many substandard units there are within the confines of that community. He might reply, "Between 1,200 and 1,500." If I were to ask for the addresses, he could furnish that information from his file. The fire and police departments could do the same thing.

The laws of that community are comparable to the laws of most other American communities. They provide that every property owner shall keep his property in such condition as to comply with the health and sanitation regulations. So far so good. The community wants a thousand houses. It so states to the Federal agent. The Federal agent says, "You will get them provided you will, for the first time in years, do something for yourselves. Will you agree, within a year's time after the houses are available for occupancy, to rehabilitate or destroy a thousand houses? If the mayor and the city council want those 1,000 new houses they can immediately say, "Where do we sign?"

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to get the thought of the two Senators who are engaged in this colloquy. In the time of the Senator from Washington I should like to ask this question: If the 1,000 houses to be built in community X were built to replace a thousand houses in the slums in that community, and if there were no abnormal housing shortage in community X, would the Senator then assume that it would be all right to tear down a thousand slum houses?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. I would say to the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland that my only reason for raising the question——

Mr. TYDINGS. I see the Senator's point——

Mr. THYE. My only reason for raising the question was to make certain that we were not placing a stumbling block before those who would endeavor to improve the situation and to increase the number of living units in the United States, by means of carrying out the legislation we are now discussing. That was the first purpose of the question I asked. The second purpose was that I am as concerned as anyone could be about slum clearance and the eradication of slum areas, which have done more to destroy the opportunities of American youth and have brought about more juvenile problems than has any other thing which may have occurred in our land.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure of that.

Mr. THYE. But in view of the present emergency situation because of the housing shortage, I do not wish to have a stumbling block placed before the Housing Administrator, so as to prevent the achievement of what all of us wish to have achieved.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator from Minnesota understands my point. He would not object to the destruction of slum housing, assuming that other houses had been built and that there was no abnormal shortage of other houses in the community, would he?

Mr. THYE. Absolutely not.

Mr. TYDINGS. His one concern, I am sure, is the destruction of slum houses in locations where there might be such a shortage of houses that the destruction of the slums would almost create the condition which we desire to get rid of. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, would the Senator from Minnesota object to the destruction of the slum housing 1, 2, or 3 years later, let us say, when it would be fair to assume that by that time the housing shortage would have been met?

Mr. THYE. Positively not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the Senator from Minnesota has answered my question.

Mr. THYE. In fact, I qualified myself at the outset by saying that I feared that the amendment compelling the removal of at least as many slum units as the number of units constructed might come into effect 1 or 2 years too soon, and thus might create just an additional vacuum in the housing situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator realizes that the 1937 act provided that one slum unit should be removed for each new housing unit created under the act, but there was a proviso:

> Except that such elimination may, in the discretion of the Authority, be deferred in any locality or metropolitan area where the shortage of decent, safe, or sanitary housing available to families of low income is so acute as to force dangerous overcrowding of such families.

Does that not allay entirely the Senator's fear?

Mr. THYE. That is correct. The reason the problem was involved under the 1937 act was that just after that measure was enacted and just after the construction of houses began, we moved into a war era; and of course during the war it was not possible for private housing to be constructed; in fact, it was not even possible for the normal amount of public buildings to be constructed to facilitate meeting the needs of the institutions in the States. That is why we have this tremendous vacuum in the housing supply, and that is why I was concerned as to whether we would place an obstacle or a stumbling block before the Administrator, so as to prevent him from moving speedily forward in the construction of new homes or living units, of which there is such a shortage in our land today.

Mr. CAIN. If the 1-for-1 amendment were to prevail in the Senate, would the Senator from Minnesota continue to be of the opinion that the provision might be an obstruction to the construction of the new houses or housing units whose construction would be made possible by this proposed legislation?

Mr. THYE. My fear has been eased very considerably, because I think the discussion which has occurred here would leave no doubt in the mind of either the city officials or the Administrator as to what is intended by the legislation and as to what they might expect to be obligated to do under it.

Mr. CAIN. In other words, this bill would make very clear that after new houses have been built, as a part of the obligation in connection with obtaining new houses or new housing units, old houses or old housing units must either be improved or destroyed; is that correct?

Mr. THYE. Within a reasonable time.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; we mention a year.

Mr. THYE. And that if the destruction took place, it would not result in putting families on the street.

Mr. CAIN. The new houses would have been built prior to the time when any of the old houses would be destroyed.

Mr. THYE. Under the congested conditions which we found it highly desir-

able to relieve, many families might be living under the same roof. In such case one of those families might be placed in a new public housing unit, but the other families might be left in the old house for perhaps a year longer, until such time as sufficient private construction adequate to eliminate the housing shortage might be made available. That is what I have in mind. There might be two or three families under one roof, and compelled to live there because of a lack of sufficient housing.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from Pennsylvania to the question I shall ask in connection with the matter of public housing, if the Senator from Washington will yield.

Mr. CAIN. Let me ask whether the Senator from North Dakota is addressing his question to all the Senators to whom he has referred or to me.

Mr. LANGER. I am addressing it to the Senator from Washington, in the hope that all the other Senators will listen.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator from Washington familiar with the preamble to the Democratic Party platform, adopted in 1932?

Mr. CAIN. The answer is "No."

Mr. LANGER. Let me read it to the Senator:

> We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe.

Then let me call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Washington to the platform of the Democratic Party in 1936, at the time when the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention. Here is what the Democratic Party promised for the poor people:

> HOUSING
>
> We believe every encouragement should be given to the building of new homes by private enterprise, and that the Government should steadily extend its housing program toward the goal of adequate housing for those who are forced through economic necessities to live in unhealthy and slum conditions.

Mr. President, that was in 1936, long, long years ago.

I wish to call the attention of the Senators I have mentioned to how far the Democratic Party has progressed toward keeping that platform pledge. I hold in my hand an article appearing in today's New York Times. It says, in part:

> DOUGLAS takes four Senate colleagues on tour of slums near Capitol Hill.

The following appears in the sixth paragraph of the article:

> Senator DOUGLAS said that the alley represented "one of the worst slum conditions I have ever seen and only 100 feet from the Senate Office Building."

So, Mr. President, in 13 years the Democratic Party had progressed 100 feet from the Senate Office Building, in clearing out the slums here in the city of Washington.

I further call attention to the fact that there is one great distinction between the Democrats, in the way they do business, and the Republicans, in the way they proceed when they get into office. Mind you, Mr. President, last year not only myself but also the Senator from Oregon and other Senators made speeches on this very matter of the slum situation. Finally in the Eightieth Congress, which has been denominated as the very worst, the Senate passed a bill sponsored by the senior Senator from Ohio for the purpose of clearing the slums. It was really a very fine bill. There was not very much publicity about it. I picked up this morning's New York Herald Tribune. I walked into another room and I saw a vast number of newspapers there. There is a front-page photograph of a Democratic Senator. The word goes out to all the people, who did not keep track of what the Eightieth Congress did, that he is another Democrat who has gathered up some of his colleagues, and they have gone out to investigate slum clearance. The Democratic Party once more, I assume, is going to claim credit for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland says it will take 2 years more to pass a bill. I call attention to the fact that the Republican Party 2 years ago passed a bill providing for slum clearance. Unfortunately, the measure was not passed by the House. So far as the Senate is concerned, we did a good job.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. CAIN. Before yielding further, I merely wanted to ask the Senator from North Dakota, What was the question he desired to ask?

Mr. LANGER. The question was whether it is not true that the Republican Party, in the Eightieth Congress, so far as the Senate is concerned, did a good job in connection with the subject under discussion?

Mr. CAIN. I may say to my good friend from North Dakota, he has already obviously answered his own question at some length. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from North Dakota said the Republican Party had passed the Taft housing bill through the Senate. That is correct. But the Senator neglected to say the Republican Party would not pass the Taft housing bill through the House. So while it is true that the Democrats only went 100 feet in 13 years, the Republicans actually lost ground. So we are ahead of them, at any rate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have been yielding all afternoon. I think it is perfectly proper, and I shall continue to do so. I should like to say, however, that we are confronted, it seems to me, with a national problem; we are trying to reconcile differences between people of different attitudes of mind, and the less we get into the field of partisan politics, the healthier it will be.

I should like again, if I may, merely to say that the amendment which is presently before the Senate would only require of any American community, before taking advantage of the requirements and provisions of Senate bill 1070, acting through its public body, to refer its desire to take advantage of the legislation to the citizens of the community. We call it a referendum. I said sometime ago we should examine the beneficial results to be obtained from adopting the amendment, which would require a referendum on one of the more important questions of the day. I should like to repeat, because it is a singular fact I think, that without a referendum it will certainly happen in many communities whose citizens want the assistance provided in the pending bill, and think it is needed, that the local public body, either through inertia or prejudice or by reason of the individual personnel, will take no positive action, and make no recommendation to its local housing authority. Much has been said directly or by way of implication to the effect that great industrial groups with sinister purposes are abroad in the land, determined to destroy, to interrupt, to torpedo the objectives of the bill. If that be so, then how much easier is made the accomplishment of their purposes, if the only thing needed is majority control of a local public body. I submit therefore, and call it to the attention of every Senator, that the adoption of the pending amendment is a positive method by which an American community can insure itself of the required local determination and thus negate those influences, no matter what motives might be brought to bear on a small local governing body. Likewise, the amendment in this respect becomes, as it ought to be, a two-way street. It would obviously protect the local governing body from the overzealousness of well-intentioned but oftentimes highly emotional groups who would illogically persuade action not in the local public interest.

Were I, or any other Senator, the person chosen to administer the bill, to translate the intent of Congress into a going, effective instrument, then I think most Senators would welcome and insist upon the pending amendment.

Under the terms of the bill, an American community itself must make substantial contributions to the projects, either by direct cash payments or by waiving taxes. Thus, each and every one of the citizens of a community should be permitted to record his own individual wishes.

The bill embraces a tremendous social program. Certainly I subscribe in full measure to the hope that it will increase the health and the well-being of our citizens generally. This tremendous program will fail only as it fails to receive the sturdy and continuing interest and support of America's communities. As the administrator, were the administration of the legislation to be my own task, I should want that positive assurance from a community.

Again, from the viewpoint of effective administration, the bill before us, as I know we all agree, is fraught with highly controversial items, which ought first to be thought out and submitted to a positive determination by the citizens most directly affected. Who should be admitted to the low-rent housing provided by the Federal Government in any community? Under what conditions are they to be permitted in the first instance to occupy the housing? How long, and under what conditions, are they to be permitted to remain? What should be the cost per unit? What form shall the local assistance take? What areas are to be cleared of its slums or blight? These are but a few of a score of big questions within the confines of the pages of the bill. If they are not first answered by Mr. John Q. Public or John Citizen everywhere, the program will surely fail of its fine objective.

In America's 10 years of experience with public housing, much that is uncomplimentary of its administration has been said, and with very just cause. Fraud and ineptness have been charged on occasions. Uneconomical practices and procedures have grown up, happily in small degree, within the program. It, therefore, happens to be the very positive belief of the junior Senators from Ohio and Washington that in its new and continuing shape the operation is assured of a more successful administration with the adoption of this amendment.

I have not had an opportunity to discuss at any length the substance of the amendment, before this time, with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who was the chairman of the subcommittee, nor have I had an opportunity to discuss its merits with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. I know they will give consideration to the amendment and that they will certainly provide the Senate with substantial reasons, if, in their opinion, the amendment should not be approved by the Senate. My great feeling in support of the amendment is that when an American community embarks upon a course calling for the establishment of projects consisting of subsidized low-rent housing units, that community is not likely, in the field of housing, to cut itself off from assistance from the Federal Government. That may be quite the proper thing to do, but it will be a costly thing to do. I feel that every citizen of an American community should have laid before him clearly all the facts involved in his particular community case, with a majority expression by the community which, if in favor of taking advantage of the possibilities offered by the bill, will be healthy, not only for the future of public housing, but will further be healthy in cementing and creating a greater and a more wholesome relationship between the Federal level of government on the one hand and the community and its citizens on the other.

Mr. President, aside from perhaps having an opportunity tomorrow to summarize in a few sentences the substance of this first of a series of amendments to be offered, I have concluded my presentation of the amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate this afternoon on the housing bill which is now pending, to call the attention of the Senate to the existing low-rental housing projects in Pennsylvania, and also to call the attention of the Senate to the 3-year program for urban low-rental housing submitted by local housing authorities in Pennsylvania, as of 1945. I hoped we might reach a vote on at least some of the amendments, and I therefore refrained from asking for recognition. The hour is late, and I do not intend to make the remarks to which I have referred, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed as my statement at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING

Mr. President, I think most of us in the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress need no more persuasion to agree on the urgent need for an adequate low-cost public-housing bill at this time. This crowning and obvious fact was recognized by the Senate in both the Seventy-ninth and the Eightieth Congresses when a similar bill was passed. I am sure that all of us who supported this measure last year and in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and all of us who support it now, are happy to know the same fate of those previous housing bills does not lie ahead of the bill before us now. This bill will not die before being passed on by the House of Representatives, and it will become part of the law of the land during this session of Congress.

This housing bill tackles head-on one of the most critical domestic problems in America today. The technical name for that problem is "urban redevelopment"—but it is better known to all of us as slum clearance. And this is a critical problem in my own State of Pennsylvania.

To illustrate, the report submitted by Senator WAGNER to the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress quotes Mayor David Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, thus:

"The present deplorable housing situation is having a serious effect upon family life. * * * The city of Pittsburgh and every other city in our country are endangered by the growth of slums and the failure to provide decent homes for our citizens. * * * This deplorable situation cannot go on * * * Congress must pass S. 866 at once."

The Senate will recall that Senate bill 866 is the housing bill which the Eightieth Congress did not pass.

Now it is perfectly understandable why this slum problem should be a pressing one in Pennsylvania. In the first place, as one of the Original Thirteen States, Pennsylvania was among the very first to develop its industrial and mineral resources. The enormous extent to which this development has been carried forward has made Pennsylvania the second most populous State. In addition to a large rural population, great aggregates of people live in densely populated metropolitan areas. Ten metropolitan districts alone have populations greater than 100,000.

These are important facts, because age and concentrations of population are major contributors to the creation of slums. That such slums do exist is painfully clear from such information as was furnished by the 1947 census survey. The Philadelphia area contains almost a million dwellings—and that survey showed 11 percent of them either lacked private baths, or were in need of substantial repair. A third of the more than half million dwellings in the Pittsburgh area are in this condition. In the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area this figure is 25 percent—and in the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton area, 23 percent of the dwellings similarly need either a private bath or major repair. Of the four areas I have used as example here, only Philadelphia—with 11 percent of its dwellings in need of major overhaul—lies below the national average of 19 percent. The other three areas are materially worse off than the Nation as a whole.

Urban slum clearance will not solve all of America's housing problems, however. The present bill also tackles the problem of what we might refer to as rural slums, a problem at least as serious in many of its aspects as that existing in our cities. I do not intend to discuss this at this time, however, because this issue was brought to the attention of the Senate on Monday of this week by the illuminating and thorough remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. He has given us an excellent survey of an urgent problem which exists in America's rural housing.

Reports from Pennsylvania newspapers, letters, and conversations I have had with State and municipal authorities, with Pennsylvanians from one end of the State to the other, overwhelmingly confirm the fact that there is an almost unanimous belief that we must face the problem of slum clearance and public housing. And there is almost unanimous agreement that Federal aid is obligatory if we are to carry out our aim and our duty to see to it that the American people are decently housed.

My own city of Philadelphia refused for some years to set up a local Housing Authority. I am happy to observe, however, that this reluctance is a thing of the past—and once Philadelphia entered the public housing program, it did so wholeheartedly. Today 6 public housing projects provide 3,248 dwelling units in Philadelphia—almost a quarter of the total public housing units in the State.

The report of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] on slum clearance contains a statement which, I believe, illustrates quite well the present attitude in Philadelphia toward public housing, and I should like to read it at this time.

"Mayor Bernard Samuel of Philadelphia expressed the point of view of the majority responding when he said that State enabling legislation in Pennsylvania is not in itself sufficient to carry out a program of clearing and redeveloping slums and blighted areas because it does not provide the necessary financial assistance. 'Only with Federal financial assistance can the city of Philadelphia hope to carry out to a successful completion its contemplated program of urban redevelopment,' he said."

While the city administration at Philadelphia flatly refused at first to accept any sort of Federal support for slum clearance and public housing, Pittsburgh, on the other hand, responded immediately—and I am proud to say that today one of the finest public-housing programs in the country is to be found in Pittsburgh. At present there are 4,463 public-housing units in that city alone—almost 40 percent more than are to be found in Philadelphia. In addition to the six housing projects in Pittsburgh itself, the surrounding communities in Allegheny County of McKeesport, McKees Rocks, Duquesne and Rankin have constructed more than 1,240 housing units, swelling the total for Allegheny County to 5,604 units.

At present, 25 Pennsylvania localities have Housing Authorities. 22 of these authorities have constructed 46 separate projects, housing 13,286 families and 5,262 of these housing units were occupied by Negroes on the last day of 1948.

TABLE 1.—*Low-rent public-housing projects in the State of Pennsylvania*

Location	Number of projects	Total number of units	Total number of units occupied by Negroes as of Dec. 31, 1948
Aliquippa	2	154	50
Allentown	2	426	1
Ambridge	1	72	----------
Beaver Falls	2	192	49
Bethlehem	1	202	----------
Chester	4	1,200	547
Connellsville	1	150	----------
Duquesne	2	265	81
Erie	2	264	40
Farrell	1	150	36
Harrisburg	2	460	224
Johnstown	2	211	50
McKeesport	3	406	50
McKees Rocks	1	288	19
Philadelphia	6	3,248	1,981
Pittsburgh	6	4,463	1,981
Pottstown	1	117	----------
Rankin	1	182	34
Reading	1	400	8
South Union Township	2	240	40
Washington	2	146	46
Wayne	1	50	25
Total	46	13,286	5,262

Cities in Pennsylvania with local housing authorities but without a low-rent program: Elwood City, Housing Authority of the County of Lawrence; Scranton, Scranton Housing Authority; New Kensington, Westmoreland County Housing Authority.

In recent years, the reaction of Pennsylvania localities demonstrates in convincing fashion the awareness of the people in my State of the need for slum clearance and public housing. The local housing authorities of Pennsylvania answered the postwar shelf application questionnaries in 1945 by submitting estimates of 27,300 public-housing units which they were willing to undertake in a 3-year period.

TABLE 2.—*3-year programs for urban low-rent housing submitted by local housing authorities in Pennsylvania—1945*

Allentown	600
Arnold Borough and New Kensington City	225
Braddock Borough	700
Braddock Township	100
Centerville	150
Chester	1,500
Clairton	300
Donora	150
Easton	150
Erie	276
Farrell	330
Fayette County	629
Harrisburg	1,250
Johnstown	1,686
Masontown	46
McKeesport	600
McKees Rocks Borough	400
Monessen	220
Philadelphia	9,750
Pittsburgh	7,000
Rankin Borough	300
Reading	228
Washington	250
Westmoreland County	525

The results of that 1945 survey simply added up to this: Pennsylvania localities were then ready to construct—in the short space of 3 years—more than twice the number of public-housing units as already existed in the State.

Because of inaction by Congress in the past few years, nothing has been done to make it possible to carry out that program. There is a compelling reason to believe that Pennsylvania is ready today to undertake a still larger program. Last year, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], collected a great deal of information from State governors, mayors, and prominent public leaders which he included in his report to the Joint Committee on Housing. And, although Senator WAGNER did not contact all the Pennsylvania areas which had local housing authorities, the reports he received from five of our cities indicate clearly that these cities are ready to accept their responsibilities in developing an even larger public-housing program than they had previously submitted in 1945.

The 1945 postwar shelf program had visualized a 3-year plan for public housing. The Senator from New York had based his survey on a 4-year program. All five of the communities which reported said they were willing to undertake a larger commitment over this longer period than they had previously outlined. Philadelphia volunteered to accept a 6-year program to construct 19,500 housing units—instead of the 9,750 units previously agreed to under the 3-year program. Pittsburgh agreed to undertake 10,000 units in 4 years, instead of 7,000 in 3 years. Similarly, Erie revised its estimate upwards from 276 to 500; Harrisburg, from 1,250 to 1,800; and Reading, from 228 to 500.

These figures show quite clearly the vital awareness to the public-housing problem among the people of Pennsylvania.

These figures prove that up to now we have scarcely made a dent in the over-all problem of supplying decent housing. The bill before us is designed to meet two specific aspect of the much larger question facing us in meeting the housing shortage in America. This bill supplies funds imperatively needed to clear away slums. The very nature of slum clearance is what we might term uneconomic from the standpoint of private investment. Frequently, the cost of acquiring and clearing land costs more than the value which can be received from the land once cleared. This bill provides the money to make up that difference. Should we fail to furnish funds for this purpose, the alternative we face gives rise to a curious contradiction. That contradiction is this:

In city after city, the amount of taxpayers' money which is required to maintain essential services in slum areas—in special fire and police protection, juvenile courts, houses of correction, and health clinics—is considerably more money than is received in revenues by the private owners of those same squalid slum properties.

I have received many letters which point out the costs to America of retaining our slums. One of these letters stresses particularly well an aspect of this problem which we are frequently apt to overlook, and I should like to quote briefly from it:

"In my work as a psychiatrist I am acutely aware of the great emotional damage to individuals and families as the result of terrible housing conditions. Surely the cost of adequate housing legislation now will be far less than the ultimate cost of emotional illness if people's basic needs are not provided for. It is only common sense that the Government take action to meet such a fundamental need for so many people."

In addition to slum clearance, the other major attack planned in the housing bill is to provide a decent place to live for that section of our population least able to provide adequate shelter for themselves. And the bill contains careful guaranties that this publicly supported housing program will in no way duplicate or threaten building programs now being carried out, or contemplated, by private investment on its own initiative. The difference in rent ceilings provided in this bill assure this. What we are undertaking here is to meet a challenge yet unmet by our private building program in America—the kind of challenge which has not been economically practicable for private building to meet—and which is, on the other hand, the kind of problem which has caused the greatest hardships among those least able to remove the burden upon them. I feel it is entirely unnecessary for me to elaborate on the terrible price America pays for the disease, the crime, and the despair which flourish in our slum areas.

Yes, this bill before us takes a long stride in the right direction—but it does not end the housing shortage in America. For one thing, it is a bill intended for a limited, but most urgent purpose. The bill is going to supply some relief where that relief is most needed. I am only sorry that we did not have this measure a year ago, when we had the opportunity to have it. I am even more sorry that we did not have it 2 years ago, or 3 years ago because by this time we would have had some of this job behind us, and the present situation would not be quite so critical.

But we did not get this bill 1, or 2, or 3 years ago. That is history now, and of no present moment. We must look at the present, and to the future. When we look at the present and look at the future, we can see clearly the need for much more housing legislation than this bill alone. The present bill is going to help only those whose incomes are right at the very bottom of the economic heap. What, Mr. President, may I ask, do we see for the countless millions who today are earning incomes just above the level which would entitle them to live in public housing? These people, too, are crowded together—millions of them—and millions of them live in substandard, inadequate housing.

They, too, wish to build their own homes, but they simply cannot afford to do so on the present market with its high building costs and prohibitive financing methods. The Members of this Congress must face this problem, too, as I am confident they will. I look to the day that America shall launch itself on a simply gargantuan home-building program, making use of new building techniques, new materials, and new financing methods. I am confident, too, that this can be done completely in keeping with the spirit of our American free-enterprise system. And I am confident that we shall achieve one of the great American dreams—the dream that every American shall be decently sheltered in a home he is proud of.

The present bill, as I have said, is a big step. But it is only a first step. So I urge every Member of the Eighty-first Congress to support this measure now so we will be able to cut to a minimum any further delay in this essential work which lies before us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Chair please state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask if the pending question is the same at this time as it was last night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is exactly the same.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of

the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA—TREATY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Executive B—Eighty-first Congress, first session—an International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, signed at London on June 10, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 27 other states.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not know that any treaties were to be ratified today.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I myself would insist on a larger attendance of Senators if the treaties to be considered were at all complicated, but they are very simple matters, dealing with weather reports and with safety at sea. They were unanimously reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and inasmuch as they involve little or no cost to the United States and are a great advantage to maritime travel all over the world, I was hopeful that we could dispose of them. I shall be glad to make a fuller explanation if the Senator desires it.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator a question or two?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator says these treaties were reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. One of them deals with weather reports, and provides simply for an exchange of weather information all over the globe, in the interest of safety at sea. The other treaty is designed to cause the nations of the world to equip their ships with safety appliances, such as lifeboats and life preservers, in a voluntary manner, so as to raise the whole standard of safety at sea.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the treaty.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive B (81st Cong., 1st sess.) an International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, signed at London on June 10, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 27 other States, which was read the second time as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA, 1948

The Governments of the Argentine Republic, the Commonwealth of Australia, Belgium, the Republic of the United States of Brazil, Canada, the Republic of Chile, the Republic of China, Denmark, Egypt, the Republic of Finland, the French Republic, Greece, the Republic of Iceland, India, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Republic of Panama, the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Poland, the Portuguese Republic, the Union of South Africa, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia, being desirous of promoting safety of life at sea by establishing in common agreement uniform principles and rules directed thereto:

Considering that this end may best be achieved by the conclusion of a Convention to replace the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1929:

Have appointed their Plenipotentiaries, namely:—

The Argentine Republic:

Captain Don Alberto J. Oddera, Naval Attaché, Argentine Embassy, London.

Commander Don Juan Eugenio Peffabet, Chief of Regime and Safety of Navigation Services Division in the Maritime and River Transit Service—Maritime Prefecture—Navy Department.

Lieutenant Don Jorge R. Martinez-Vivot, Naval Engineer, Navy Department.

The Commonwealth of Australia:

Captain Norman Gerald Roskruge, Acting Director of Navigation, Marine Branch, Department of Shipping and Fuel.

Mr. Sydney Pollock, Engineer and Ship Surveyor-in-Chief, Marine Branch, Department of Shipping and Fuel.

Belgium:

Mr. G. Bertrand, Engineer in Chief, Director of the Marine Administration.

Mr. F. Van Gool, Nautical Adviser, Marine Administration.

The Republic of the United States of Brazil:

Vice-Admiral Gustavo Goulart (Retd.), President, Maritime Tribunal.

Rear-Admiral Antonio Alves Camara, Director-General, Hydrographic and Navigation Department in the Ministry of the Navy.

Captain Paulo Nogueira Penido, Naval Attaché, Brazilian Embassy.

Commander J. C. Rego Monteiro, Naval Constructor, Head of the Technical Division, Rio de Janeiro Naval Yard.

Canada:

Mr. Jules Léger, Officer of the High Commissioner for Canada in London.

Mr. H. V. Anderson, Director of Marine Services.

The Republic of Chile:

Commander Kaare Olsen Naval Attaché, Chilean Embassy, London.

The Republic of China:

His Excellency Dr. Tien-Hsi Cheng, Ambassador.

Denmark:

Mr. Ove Nielsen, Head of Shipping Department, Royal Ministry of Trade, Industry and Shipping.

Mr. Aage H. Larsen, Principal, Technical Section, Royal Ministry of Trade, Industry and Shipping.

Mr. Arnold Poulsen, Civil Engineer, Advisor to the Royal Ministry of Trade, Industry and Shipping on Radio and Electrical Technique.

Mr. A. Bache, Deputy Head of Section, Royal Ministry of Trade, Industry and Shipping. Secretary to the Delegation.

Mr. T. C. Christensen, Shipowner. Member of the Board of Directors of the Danish Steamship Owners' Association.

Captain Th. Petersen, Secretary, Danish Steamship Owners' Association.

Captain J. Kastrup Olsen, Chairman, General Danish Association of Master Mariners.

Mr. H. Rasmussen, Manager of the Firemen's Union of Denmark.

Egypt:

Mr. Choukry Costandi Fanous, Consul-General for Egypt in London.

The Republic of Finland:

Captain William Söderman, Head of Marine Department of the Board of Navigation.

The French Republic:

Mr. G. Anduze-Faris, Secretary-General of the Merchant Marine.

Greece:

Captain Antoine Bachas, R. H. N. F., Greek Ministry of Mercantile Marine, London.

The Republic of Iceland:

His Excellency Mr. Stefan Thorvardsson, Icelandic Minister to Great Britain.

India:

Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom.

Sir Raghavan Pillai, Indian Chargé d'Affaires, Paris.

Mr. M. A. Master, General Manager, Scindia Steam Navigation Co., Ltd., Bombay.

Mr. R. S. Mani, Deputy High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom.

Captain S. A. T. Bullock, Nautical Adviser, Government of India.

Lieutenant Commander T. B. Bose, R. I. N., Principal Engineer and Ship Surveyor, Mercantile Marine Department, Calcutta.

Ireland:

Mr. Denis Devlin, First Counsellor, Office of the High Commissioner for Ireland.

Miss Thekla J. Beere, Principal Officer, Department of Industry and Commerce.

The Italian Republic:

Lieutenant-General of the Captains of the Port Giulio Ingianni, former Director-General of the Mercantile Marine. Chairman of the Italian Safety of Navigation Committee.

The Netherlands:

Mr. P. S. van't Haaff, Inspector-General of Shipping.

Mr. A. J. W. van Anrooy, Chief of the Mobile Telegraphy and Radiotelephony Services.

Captain G. J. Barendse, former Commodore of the Holland-America Line.

Captain J. F. van Muijlwijk, Treasurer of the Merchant Navy Captains' and Officers' Union.

Mr. E. Smit Fzn, Naval Architect, Adviser to the Shipping Inspection Service.

Mr. D. Hudig, former Director of the Royal Netherlands Steam Navigation Co.

Mr. T. M. Pellinkhof, Chief of Labour Section of the Directorate-General of Shipping.

New Zealand:

Engineer Lieutenant-Commander Edward Brown, R. N. Chief Surveyor of Ships, Marine Department.

Mr. Victor G. Boivin, Deputy Chief Surveyor of Ships, Marine Department.

Norway:

Captain E. Bryn, Director of Shipping, Ministry of Industry, Trade and Shipping.

Mr. J. Schönheyder, Engineer-in-Chief, Ministry of Industry, Trade and Shipping.

Commander O. I. Loennechen, Commander, R. N. R., and Vice-President in the Norwegian Shipowners' Association.

Captain Chr. Meyer, R. N. (Retd.), Former Director in the Norwegian Shipowners' Association.

Captain E. Tonnesen, Captain, Merchant Marine, and Chairman in the Norwegian Shipmasters' Association.

Mr. Johs. E. Johansen, Secretary-General of the Norwegian Shipengineers' Union.

Mr. E. H. Ottersen, Radio Operator, Secretary in the Norwegian Seamen's Union.

Pakistan:

Mr. H. I. Rahimtoola, High Commissioner for Pakistan in London.

The Republic of Panama:

Señor Eusebio A. Morales, Counsellor at the Panamanian Legation in London.

The Republic of the Philippines:

The Hon. Ramón J. Fernandez, Minister designate.

The Republic of Poland:

Captain H. Borakowski, Technical Shipping Adviser, Ministry of Shipping, Warszawa.

Captain Czeslaw Antkowiak, Director of London Branch Office, Gdynia-America Lines Limited.

The Portuguese Republic:

Senhor João de Deus Ramos, Counsellor to Embassy in London.

Commander José C. da Rocha, Naval Attaché, Portuguese Embassy in London.

Constructor Commander Raul Alberto Soares da Costa, Portuguese Navy. Division of Merchant Marine, Lisbon.

Lieut.-Commander Alfredo de Oliveira Baptista, Portuguese Navy Division of Communications, Lisbon.

Captain Luiz Armando de Loura, Portuguese Merchant Marine.

Sweden:

Mr. Karl Hjalmar Sjöholm, Chief of Division to the Board of Trade.

The Union of South Africa:

Mr. Reginald Gough Palmer, Senior Clerk of Department of Customs and Excise.

Captain G. A. Chettle, Examiner of Masters and Mates; Surveyor of Ships; Department of Customs and Excise.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

Rt. Hon. Sir John Anderson, Chairman of the Port of London Authority.

Sir Gilmour Jenkins, Permanent Secretary of the British Ministry of Transport.

Mr. N. A. Guttery, Under-Secretary, British Ministry of Transport.

The United States of America:

Admiral Joseph F. Farley, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. Jesse E. Saugstad, Chief of the Shipping Division, Department of State.

The Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

Mr. Luke Dancevic, Director—Directorate of Shipping, Split.

Who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE I

(*a*) The Contracting Governments undertake to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and of the Regulations annexed thereto, which shall be deemed to constitute an integral part of the present Convention. Every reference to the present Convention implies at the same time a reference to these Regulations.

(*b*) The Contracting Governments undertake to promulgate all laws, decrees, orders and regulations and to take all other steps which may be necessary to give the present Convention full and complete effect, so as to ensure that, from the point of view of safety of life, a ship is fit for the service for which it is intended.

ARTICLE II

The ships to which the present Convention applies are ships registered in countries the Governments of which are Contracting Governments, and ships registered in territories to which the present Convention is extended under Article XIII.

ARTICLE III

Laws, regulations, reports

The Contracting Governments undertake to communicate to the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organisation (hereinafter called the Organisation)—

(*a*) the text of laws, decrees, orders and regulations which shall have been promulgated on the various matters within the scope of the present Convention;

(*b*) all available official reports or official summaries of reports insofar as they show the results of the provisions of the present Convention, provided always that such reports or summaries are not of a confidential nature; and

(*c*) a sufficient number of specimens of their Certificates issued under the provisions of the present Convention for circulation to the Contracting Governments for the information of their officers.

ARTICLE IV

Cases of force majeure

(*a*) No ship, which is not subject to the provisions of the present Convention at the time of its departure on any voyage, shall become subject to the provisions of the present Convention on account of any deviation from its intended voyage due to stress of weather or any other cause of *force majeure.*

(*b*) Persons who are on board a ship by reason of *force majeure* or in consequence of the obligation laid upon the master to carry shipwrecked or other persons shall not be taken into account for the purpose of ascertaining the application to a ship of any provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE V

Carriage of persons in emergency

(*a*) For the purpose of moving persons from any territory in order to avoid a threat to the security of their lives a Contracting Government may permit the carriage of a larger number of persons in its ships than is otherwise permissible under the present Convention.

(*b*) Such permission shall not deprive other Contracting Governments of any right of control under the present Convention over such ships which come within their ports.

(*c*) Notice of any such permission, together with a statement of the circumstances, shall be sent to the Organisation by the Contracting Government granting such permission.

ARTICLE VI

Suspension in case of war

(*a*) In case of war, Contracting Governments which consider that they are affected, whether as belligerents or as neutrals, may suspend the whole or any part of the Regulations annexed hereto. The suspending Government shall immediately give notice of such suspension to the Organisation.

(*b*) Such suspension shall not deprive other Contracting Governments of any right of control under the present Convention over the ships of the suspending Government when such ships are within their ports.

(*c*) The suspending Government may at any time terminate such suspension and shall immediately give notice of such termination to the Organisation.

(*d*) The Organization shall notify all Contracting Governments of any suspension or termination of suspension under this Article.

ARTICLE VII

Prior treaties and conventions

(*a*) As between the Contracting Governments the present Convention replaces and abrogates the International Convention for the safety of Life at Sea which was signed in London on the 31st May, 1929.

(*b*) All other treaties, conventions, and arrangements relating to safety of life at sea, or matters appertaining thereto, at present in force between Governments parties to the present Convention, shall continue to have full and complete effect during the terms thereof as regards:—

(i) ships to which the present Convention does not apply;

(ii) ships to which the present Convention applies, in respect of matters for which it has not expressly provided.

(*c*) To the extent, however, that such treaties, conventions or arrangements conflict with the provisions of the present Convention, the provisions of the present Convention shall prevail.

(*d*) All matters which are not expressly provided for in the present Convention remain subject to the legislation of the Contracting Governments.

ARTICLE VIII

Special rules drawn up by agreement

When in accordance with the present Convention special rules are drawn up by agreement between all or some of the Contracting Governments, such rules shall be communicated to the Organisation for circulation to all Contracting Governments.

ARTICLE IX

Amendments

(*a*) (i) The present Convention may be amended by unanimous agreement between the Contracting Governments.

(ii) Upon the request of any Contracting Government a proposed amendment shall be communicated by the Organisation to all Contracting Governments for consideration and acceptance under this paragraph.

(*b*) (i) An amendment to the present Convention may be proposed to the Organisation at any time by any Contracting Government, and such proposal if adopted by a two-thirds majority of the Assembly of the Organisation (hereinafter called the Assembly), upon recommendation adopted by a two-thirds majority of the Maritime Safety Committee of the Organisation (hereinafter called the Maritime Safety Committee), shall be communicated by th Organisation to all Contracting Governments for their acceptance.

(ii) Any such recommendation by the Maritime Safety Committee shall be communicated by the Organisation to all Contracting Governments for their consideration at least six months before it is considered by the Assembly.

(*c*) (i) A conference of Governments to consider amendments to the present Convention proposed by any Contracting Government shall at any time be convened by the Organisation upon the request of one-third of the Contracting Governments.

(ii) Every amendment adopted by such conference by a two-third majority of the Contracting Governments shall be communicated by the Organisation to all Contracting Governments for their acceptance.

(*d*) Any amendment communicated to Contracting Governments for their acceptance under paragraph (*b*) or (*c*) of this article shall come into force for all Contracting Governments, except those which before it comes into force make a declaration that they do not accept the amendment, twelve months after the date on which the amendment is accepted by two-thirds of the Contracting Governments including two-thirds of the Governments represented on the Maritime Safety Committee.

(*e*) The Assembly, by a two-thirds majority vote, including two-thirds of the Governments represented on the Maritime Safety Committee, and subject to the concurrence of two-thirds of the Contracting Governments to the present Convention, or a conference convened under paragraph (*c*) of this Article by a two-thirds majority vote, may determine at the time of its adoption that the amendment is of such an important nature that any Contracting Government which makes a declaration under paragraph (*d*) of this Article and which does not accept the amendment within a period of twelve months after the amendment comes into force, shall, upon the expiry of this period, cease to be a party to the present Convention.

(*f*) Any amendment to the present Convention made under this Article which relates to the structure of a ship shall apply only to ships the keels of which are laid after the date on which the amendment comes into force.

(g) The Organization shall inform all Contracting Governments of any amendments which come into force under this Article, together with the date on which such amendments, shall come into force.

(h) Any acceptance or declaration under this Article shall be made by a notification in writing to the Organisation, which shall notify all Contracting Governments of the receipt of the acceptance or declaration.

ARTICLE X

Signature and acceptance

(a) The present Convention shall remain open for signature for one month from this day's date and shall thereafter remain open for acceptance. Governments of States may become parties to the Convention by:—

(i) signature without reservation as to acceptance;

(ii) signature subject to acceptance followed by acceptance; or

(iii) acceptance.

(b) Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument with the Organisation, which shall inform all Governments that have already accepted the Convention of each acceptance received and of the date of its receipt.

ARTICLE XI

Coming into force

(a) The present Convention shall come into force on the 1st January, 1951, provided that, at least 12 months before that date, not less than 15 acceptances, including 7 by countries each with not less than one million gross tons of shipping, have been deposited in accordance with Articles X and XV.

(b) Should 15 acceptances in accordance with paragraph (a) of this Article not have been deposited 12 months before the 1st January, 1951, the present Convention shall come into force 12 months after the date on which the last of such acceptances is deposited. The Organisation shall inform all Governments which have signed or accepted the present Convention of the date on which it comes into force.

(c) Acceptances deposited after the date on which the present Convention comes into force shall take effect three months after the date of their deposit.

ARTICLE XII

Denunciation

(a) The present Convention may be denounced by any Contracting Government at any time after the expiry of five years from the date on which the Convention comes into force for that Government.

(b) Denunciation shall be effected by a notification in writing addressed to the Organisation which shall notify all the other Contracting Governments of any denunciation received and of the date of its receipt.

(c) A denunciation shall take effect one year, or such longer period as may be specified in the notification, after its receipt by the Organisation.

ARTICLE XIII

Territories

(a) (i) The United Nations in cases where they are the administering authority for a territory, or any Contracting Government responsible for the international relations of a territory, may at any time by notification in writing given to the Organisation declare that the present Convention shall extend to such territory.

(ii) The present Convention shall from the date of the receipt of the notification or from such other date as may be specified in the notification extend to the territory named therein.

(b) (i) The United Nations or any Contracting Government which has made a declaration under paragraph (a) of this Article, at any time after the expiry of a period of five years from the date on which the Convention has been so extended to any territory, may by a notification in writing given to the Organisation declare that the present Convention shall cease to extend to any such territory named in the notification.

(ii) The present Convention shall cease to extend to any territory mentioned in such notification one year, or such longer period as may be specified therein, after the date of receipt of the notification by the Organisation.

(c) The Organisation shall inform all the Contracting Governments of the extension of the present Convention to any territories under paragraph (a) of this Article, and of the termination of any such extension under the provisions of paragraph (b), stating in each case the date from which the present Convention has been or will cease to be so extended.

ARTICLE XIV

Registration

As soon as the present Convention comes into force it shall be registered by the Organisation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XV

Interim arrangements

(a) Unless and until the Organisation, in accordance with the Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organisation signed at Geneva on the 6th March, 1948, takes over the duties assigned to it under the present Convention, the following provisions shall apply:—

(i) All duties which are assigned to the Organisation, other than those set forth in Article IX, shall be carried out by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (hereinafter called the Government of the United Kingdom).

(ii) Amendments to the present Convention may be proposed at any time by any Contracting Government to the Government of the United Kingdom and such proposals shall be communicated by the latter to the other Contracting Governments for their consideration and acceptance. If any such amendment is unanimously accepted by the Contracting Governments, the present Convention shall be amended accordingly.

(iii) A Conference for the purpose of revising the present Convention shall be convened by the Government of the United Kingdom whenever, after the present Convention has been in force for five years, one-third of the Contracting Governments express a desire to that effect.

(iv) The present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom, which shall transmit certified true copies thereof to all Signatory Governments.

(b) When the Organisation takes over the duties assigned to it under the present Convention, the Government of the United Kingdom will transmit to the Organisation any documents which have been deposited with or received by the Government of the United Kingdom under the present Convention.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done in London this tenth day of June, 1948, in a single copy in English and French, each text being equally authoritative.

For the Argentine Republic:
A. J. ODDERA.
JUAN EUGENIO PEFFABET.
J. MARTINEZ-VIVOT.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Commonwealth of Australia:
NORMAN G. ROSKRUGE.
SYDNEY POLLOCK.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Belgium:
G. BERTRAND.
F. VAN GOOL.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of the United States of Brazil:
GUSTAVO GOULART.
ANTONIO ALVES CAMARA.
PAULO NOGUEIRA PENIDO.
J. C. REGO MONTEIRO.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Canada:
J. LEGER.
H. V. ANDERSON.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of Chile:
K. OLSEN.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of China:
T. H. CHENG.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Denmark:
OVE NEILSEN.
AAGE H. LARSEN.
A. POULSEN.
A. BACHE.
T. C. CHRISTENSEN.
TH. PETERSEN.
J. KASTRUP OLSEN.
HARRY EM RASMUSSEN.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Egypt:
C. C. FANOUS.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of Finland:
WILLIAM SODERMAN.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the French Republic:
G. ANDUZE-FARIS.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Greece:
A. BACHAS.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of Iceland:
STEFAN THORVARDSSON.
(Subject to ratification.)

For India:
V. K. KRISHNA MENON.
W. A. MASTER.
T. B. BOSE.
S. A. T. BULLOCK.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Ireland:
DENIS DEVLIN.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Italian Republic:
GIULIO INGIANNI.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Netherlands:
P. S. VAN'T HAAFF.
A. VAN ANROOY.
D. HUDIG.
E. SMIT FZN.
G. J. BARENDSE.
T. M. PELLINKHOF.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For New Zealand:
EDWARD BROWN.
V. G. BOIVIN.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Norway:
E. BYRN.
J. SCHENHEYDER.
CHR. MEYER.
JOHS. E. JOHANSEN.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Pakistan:
HABIB I. RAHIMTOOLA.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of Panamá:
E. A. MORALES.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of the Philippines:
R. J. FERNANDEZ.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Republic of Poland:
H. BORAKOWSKI.
C. ANTKOWIAK.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For the Portuguese Republic:
JOAO DE DEUS RAMOS.
JOSE C. DA ROCHA.
RAUL ALBERTO SOARES DA COSTA.
ALFREDO DE OLIVIERA BAPTISTA.
LUIZ ARMANDO DE LOURA.
(Subject to acceptance.)

For Sweden:
HJALMRA SJÖHOLM.
(Subject to acceptance.)
For the Union of South Africa:
R. GOUGH PALMER.
G. A. CHETTLE.
(Subject to acceptance.)
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
JOHN ANDERSON.
GILMOUR JENKINS.
N. A. GUTTERY.
(Subject to appearance.)
For the United States of America:
JOSEPH F. FARLEY.
JESSE E. SAUGSTAD.
(Subject to acceptance.)
For the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, Eighty-first Congress, first session, an international convention for the safety of life at sea, 1948, signed at London on June 10, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 27 other states.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. (Putting the question.) Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next business on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Executive C (81st Congress, 1st session): a convention of the World Meteorological Organization, which was open for signature at Washington on October 11, 1947, for a period of 120 days, and was signed, during that period, by the representatives of the United States of America and 41 other states, and a protocol relating thereto which was signed at the same time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the same question relative to this convention. Was it reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. TYDINGS. It was. It has to do with the exchange of weather information between nations on a unified basis.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this treaty?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive C (81st Cong., 1st sess.), a convention of the World Meteorological Organization, which was opened for signature at Washington on October 11, 1947, for a period of 120 days, and was signed, during that period, by representatives of the United States of America and of 41 other states, and a certified copy of a protocol relating thereto which was signed at the same time, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION OF THE WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

With a view to coordinating, standardizing, and improving world meteorological activities and to encourage an efficient exchange of meteorological information between countries in the aid of human activities the contracting states agree to the present convention, as follows:

PART I—ESTABLISHMENT

Article 1

The World Meteorological Organization (hereinafter called the Organization) is hereby established.

PART II

Article 2—Purposes

The purposes of the Organization shall be—

(a) To facilitate world-wide cooperation in the establishment of networks of stations for the making of meteorological observations or other geophysical observations related to meteorology and to promote the establishment and maintenance of meteorological centers charged with the provision of meteorological services;

(b) To promote the establishment and maintenance of systems for the rapid exchange of weather information;

(c) To promote standardization of meteorological observations and to insure the uniform publication of observations and statistics;

(d) To further the application of meteorology to aviation, shipping, agriculture, and other human activities; and

(e) To encourage research and training in meteorology and to assist in coordinating the international aspects of such research and training.

PART III—MEMBERSHIP

Article 3—Members

The following may become Members of the Organization by the procedure set forth in the present Convention:

(a) Any State represented at the Conference of Directors of the International Meteorological Organization convened at Washington, D. C., on September 22, 1947, as listed in Annex I attached hereto, and which signs the present Convention and ratifies it in accordance with Article 32, or which accedes thereto in accordance with Article 33;

(b) Any Member of the United Nations having a meteorological service by acceding to the present Convention in accordance with Article 33;

(c) Any State, fully responsible for the conduct of its international relations and having a meteorological service, not listed in Annex I of the present Convention and not a Member of the United Nations, after the submission of a request for membership to the Secretariat of the Organization and after its approval by two-thirds of the Members of the Organization as specified in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of this Article by acceding to the present Convention in accordance with Article 33;

(d) Any territory or group of territories maintaining its own meteorological service and listed in Annex II attached hereto, upon application of the present Convention on its behalf, in accordance with paragraph (a) of Article 34, by the State or States responsible for its international relations and represented at the Conference of Directors of the International Meteorological Organization convened at Washington, D. C., on September 22, 1947, as listed in Annex I of the present Convention.

(e) Any territory or group of territories, not listed in Annex II of the present Convention, maintaining its own meteorological service but not responsible for the conduct of its international relations, on behalf of which the present Convention is applied in accordance with paragraph (b) of Article 34, provided that the request for membership is presented by the Member responsible for its international relations, and secures approval by two-thirds of the Members of the Organization as specified in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of this Article.

(f) Any trust territory or group of trust territories maintaining its own meteorological service and administered by the United Nations to which the United Nations applies the present Convention in accordance with Article 34.

Any request for membership in the Organization shall state in accordance with which paragraph of this Article membership is sought.

PART IV—ORGANIZATION

Article 4

(a) The Organization shall comprise:

(1) The World Meteorological Congress (hereinafter called the Congress);

(2) The Executive Committee;

(3) Regional Meteorological Associations (hereinafter called the Regional Associations);

(4) Technical Commissions;

(5) The Secretariat.

(b) There shall be a President and two Vice-Presidents of the Organization who shall also be President and Vice-Presidents of the Congress and of the Executive Committee.

PART V—ELIGIBILITY

Article 5

(a) Eligibility for election to the offices of President and Vice-President of the Organization, of President and Vice-President of the Regional Associations, and for membership, subject to the provisions of Article 13 (c) of the present Convention, on the Executive Committee should be confined to the Directors of Meteorological Services of Members of the Organization.

(b) In the performance of their duties, the officers of the Organization and the members of the Executive Committee should regard themselves as representatives of the Organization rather than as representatives of particular Members thereof.

PART VI—THE WORLD METEOROLOGICAL CONGRESS

Article 6—Composition

(a) The Congress is the supreme body of the Organization and shall be composed of delegates representing Members. Each Member shall designate one of its delegates, who should be the director of its meteorological service, as its principal delegate.

(b) With a view to securing the widest possible technical representation, any director of a meteorological service or any other individual may be invited by the President to be present at and participate in the discussions of the Congress.

Article 7—Functions

The functions of the Congress shall be:

(a) To determine general regulations, subject to the provisions of the present Convention, prescribing the constitution and the functions of the various bodies of the Organization;

(b) To determine its own rules of procedure;

(c) To elect the President and Vice-Presidents of the Organization, and other Members of the Executive Committee, in accordance with the provisions of Article 10 (a) (4) of the present Convention. Presidents and

Vice-Presidents of Regional Associations and Technical Commissions shall be elected in accordance with the provisions of Articles 18 (e) and 19 (c), respectively, of the present Convention;

(d) To adopt technical regulations covering meteorological practices and procedures;

(e) To determine general policies for the fulfillment of the purposes of the Organization as set forth in Article 2 of the present Convention;

(f) To make recommendations to members on matters within the purposes of the Organization;

(g) To refer to any other body of the Organization any matter within the provisions of the present Convention upon which such body is empowered to act;

(h) To consider the reports and activities of the Executive Committee and to take such action in regard thereto as the Congress may determine;

(i) To establish Regional Associations in accordance with the provisions of Article 18; to determine their geographical limits, coordinate their activities, and consider their recommendations;

(j) To establish Technical Commissions in accordance with the provisions of Article 19; to define their terms of reference, coordinate their activities, and consider their recommendations;

(k) To determine the location of the Secretariat of the Organization;

(l) To take any other appropriate action to further the purposes of the Organization.

Article 8—Execution of Congress decisions

(a) All Members shall do their utmost to implement the decisions of the Congress.

(b) If, however, any Member finds it impracticable to give effect to some requirement in a technical resolution adopted by Congress, such Member shall inform the Secretary General of the Organization whether its inability to give effect to it is provisional or final, and state its reasons therefor.

Article 9—Meetings

Meetings of the Congress shall be convened by decision of the Congress or of the Executive Committee at intervals not exceeding four years.

Article 10—Voting

(a) Each Member shall have one vote in decisions of the Congress, except that only Members of the Organization which are States, as specified in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of Article 3 of the present Convention (hereinafter referred to as "Members which are States"), shall be entitled to vote on any of the following subjects:

(1) Amendment or interpretation of the present Convention or proposals for a new Convention;

(2) Membership of the Organization;

(3) Relations with the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations;

(4) Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the Organization and of the members of the Executive Committee other than the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the Regional Associations.

(b) Decisions of the Congress shall be by two-thirds majority of the votes cast for and against, except that elections of individuals to serve in any capacity in the Organization shall be by simple majority of the votes cast. The provisions of this paragraph, however, shall not apply to decisions taken in accordance with Articles 3, 25, 26, and 28 of the present Convention.

Article 11—Quorum

A majority of the Members shall be required to constitute a quorum for meetings of the Congress. For those meetings of the Congress at which decisions are taken on the subjects enumerated in paragraph (a) of Article 10, a majority of the Members which are States shall be required to constitute a quorum.

Article 12—First meeting of the Congress

The first meeting of the Congress shall be convened by the President of the International Meteorological Committee of the International Meteorological Organization as soon as practicable after the coming into force of the present Convention.

PART VII—THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Article 13—Composition

The Executive Committee shall consist of:

(a) The President and Vice-Presidents of the Organization;

(b) The Presidents of Regional Associations, or in the event that Presidents cannot attend, alternates as provided for in the general regulations;

(c) Directors of Meteorological Services of Members of the Organization or their alternates, equal in number to the number of Regions, provided that not more than one-third of the members of the Executive Committee, including the President and Vice-Presidents of the Organization, shall come from one region.

Article 14—Functions

The Executive Committee is the executive body of the Congress and its functions shall be:

(a) To supervise the execution of the resolutions of the Congress;

(b) To adopt resolutions arising out of recommendations of the Technical Commissions on matters of urgency affecting the technical regulations, provided that all Regional Associations concerned are given an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval before adoption by the Executive Committee;

(c) To provide technical information, counsel, and assistance in the field of meteorology;

(d) To study and make recommendations on any matter affecting international meteorology and the operation of meteorological services;

(e) To prepare the agenda for the Congress and to give guidance to the Regional Associations and Technical Commissions in the preparation of their agenda;

(f) To report on its activities to each session of the Congress;

(g) To administer the finances of the Organization in accordance with the provisions of Part XI of the present Convention;

(h) To perform such other functions as may be conferred on it by the Congress or by the present Convention.

Article 15—Meetings

The Executive Committee shall meet at least once a year. The time and place of the meeting shall be determined by the President of the Organization, taking account of the views of the other members of the Committee.

Article 16—Voting

Decisions of the Executive Committee shall be by two-thirds majority of the votes cast for and against. Each member of the Executive Committee shall have only one vote, notwithstanding that he may be a member in more than one capacity.

Article 17—Quorum

The quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee.

PART VIII—REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Article 18

(a) Regional Associations shall be composed of the Members of the Organization, the networks of which lie in or extend into the Region.

(b) Members of the Organization shall be entitled to attend the meetings of Regional Associations to which they do not belong, take part in the discussions, present their views upon questions affecting their own Meteorological Service, but shall not have the right to vote.

(c) Regional Associations shall meet as often as necessary. The time and place of the meetings shall be determined by the Presidents of the Regional Associations in agreement with the President of the Organization.

(d) The functions of the Regional Association shall be:

(i) To promote the execution of the resolutions of Congress and the Executive Committee in their respective regions;

(ii) To consider matters brought to their attention by the Executive Committee;

(iii) To discuss matters of general meteorological interest and to coordinate meteorological and associated activities in their respective regions.

(iv) To make recommendations to Congress and the Executive Committee on matters within the purposes of the Organization;

(v) To perform such other functions as may be conferred on them by the Congress.

(e) Each Regional Association shall elect its President and Vice-President.

PART IX—TECHNICAL COMMISSIONS

Article 19

(a) Commissions consisting of technical experts may be established by the Congress to study and make recommendations to the Congress and the Executive Committee on any subject within the purposes of the Organization.

(b) Members of the Organization have the right to be represented on the Technical Commissions.

(c) Each Technical Commission shall elect its President and Vice-President.

(d) Presidents of Technical Commissions may participate without vote in the meetings of the Congress and of the Executive Committee.

PART X—THE SECRETARIAT

Article 20

The permanent Secretariat of the Organization shall be composed of a Secretary General and such technical and clerical staff as may be required for the work of the Organization.

Article 21

(a) The Secretary General shall be appointed by the Congress on such terms as the Congress may approve.

(b) The staff of the Secretariat shall be appointed by the Secretary General with the approval of the Executive Committee in accordance with regulations established by the Congress.

Article 22

(a) The Secretary General is responsible to the President of the Organization for the technical and administrative work of the Secretariat.

(b) In the performance of their duties, the Secretary General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officers. Each Member of the Organization on its part shall respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General and the staff and not seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities to the Organization.

PART XI—FINANCES

Article 23

(a) The Congress shall determine the maximum expenditures which may be incurred by the Organization on the basis of estimates submitted by the Secretary General

and recommended by the Executive Committee.

(b) The Congress shall delegate to the Executive Committee such authority as may be required to approve the annual expenditures of the Organization within the limitations determined by the Congress.

Article 24

The expenditures of the Organization shall be apportioned among the Members of the Organization in the proportions determined by the Congress.

PART XII—RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

Article 25

The Organization shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations pursuant to Article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations, subject to the approval of the terms of the agreement by two-thirds of the Members which are States.

PART XII—RELATIONS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Article 26

(a) The Organization shall establish effective relations and cooperate closely with such other inter-governmental organizations as may be desirable. Any formal agreement entered into with such organizations shall be made by the Executive Committee, subject to approval by two-thirds of the Members which are States.

(b) The Organization may on matters within its purposes make suitable arrangements for consultation and cooperation with non-governmental international organizations and, with the consent of the government concerned, with national organizations, governmental or non-governmental.

(c) Subject to approval by two-thirds of the Members which are States, the Organization may take over from any other international organization or agency, the purpose and activities of which lie within the purposes of the Organization, such functions, resources, and obligations as may be transferred to the Organization by international agreement or by mutually acceptable arrangements entered into between the competent authorities of the respective organizations.

PART XIV—LEGAL STATUS, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

Article 27

(a) The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each Member such legal capacity as may be necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes and for the exercise of its functions.

(b) (i) The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each Member to which the present Convention applies such privileges and immunities as may be necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes and for the exercise of its functions.

(b) (ii) Representatives of Members and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization.

(c) Such legal capacity, privileges, and immunities shall be defined in a separate agreement to be prepared by the Organization in consultation with the Secretary General of the United Nations and concluded between the Members which are States.

PART XV—AMENDMENTS

Article 28

(a) The text of any proposed amendment to the present Convention shall be communicated by the Secretary General to Members of the Organization at least six months in advance of its consideration by the Congress.

(b) Amendments to the present Convention involving new obligations for Members shall require approval by the Congress, in accordance with the provisions of Article 10 of the present Convention, by a two-thirds majority vote, and shall come into force on acceptance by two-thirds of the Members which are States for each such Member accepting the amendment and thereafter for each remaining such Member on acceptance by it. Such amendments shall come into force for any Member not responsible for its own international relations upon the acceptance on behalf of such a Member by the Member responsible for the conduct of its international relations.

(c) Other amendments shall come into force upon approval by two-thirds of the Members which are States.

PART XVI—INTERPRETATION AND DISPUTES

Article 29

Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation or by the Congress shall be referred to an independent arbitrator appointed by the President of the International Court of Justice, unless the parties concerned agree on another mode of settlement.

PART XVII—WITHDRAWAL

Article 30

(a) Any Member may withdraw from the Organization on twelve months' notice in writing given by it to the Secretary General of the Organization, who shall at once inform all the Members of the Organization of such notice of withdrawal.

(b) Any Member of the Organization not responsible for its own international relations may be withdrawn from the Organization on twelve months' notice in writing given by the Member or other authority responsible for its international relations to the Secretary General of the Organization, who shall at once inform all the Members of the Organization of such notice of withdrawal.

PART XVIII—SUSPENSION

Article 31

If any Member fails to meet its financial obligations to the Organization or otherwise fails in its obligations under the present Convention, the Congress may by resolution suspend it from exercising its rights and enjoying privileges as a Member of the Organization until it has met such financial or other obligations.

PART XIX—RATIFICATION AND ACCESSION

Article 32

The present Convention shall be ratified by the signatory States and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify each signatory and acceding State of the date of deposit thereof.

Article 33

Subject to the provisions of Article 3 of the present Convention, accession shall be effected by the deposit with the Government of the United States of America of an instrument of accession, which shall take effect on the date of its receipt by the Government of the United States of America, which will notify each signatory and acceding State thereof.

Article 34

Subject to the provisions of Article 3 of the present Convention,

(a) Any contracting State may declare that its ratification of, or accession to, the present Convention includes any territory or group of territories for the international relations of which it is responsible.

(b) The present Convention may at any time thereafter be applied to any such territory or group of territories upon a notification in writing to the Government of the United States of America and the present Convention shall apply to the territory or group of territories on the date of the receipt of the notification by the Government of the United States of America, which will notify each signatory and acceding State thereof.

(c) The United Nations may apply the present Convention to any trust territory or group of trust territories for which it is the administering authority. The Government of the United States of America will notify all signatory and acceding States of any such application.

PART XX—ENTRY INTO FORCE

Article 35

The present Convention shall come into force on the thirtieth day after the date of the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification or accession. The present Convention shall come into force for each State ratifying or acceding after that date on the thirtieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession.

The present Convention shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of 120 days thereafter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorized by their respective Governments, have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Washington this eleventh day of October 1947, in the English and French languages, each equally authentic, the original of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America shall transmit certified copies thereof to all the signatory and acceding States.

For Argentina:
ALFRED G GALMARINI
For Australia:
N. H. WARREN
For Belgium (including the Belgian Congo):
A VAN DEN BROECK
N VANDER ELST POUR LE CONGO BELGE
For Brazil:
FRANCISCO XAVIER RODRIGUES DE SOUZA.
For Burma:
MAUNG PO E
For Canada:
ANDREW THOMSON
PATRICK D. MCTAGGART-COWAN
For Chile:
F. NIETO DEL RÍO
For China:
JOHN LEE [Romanization]
For Colombia:
SANTIAGO GARAVITO
For Cuba:
GMO BELT
For Czechoslovakia:
Dr ALOIS GREGOR
For Denmark:
HENRY KAUFFMAN
For the Dominican Republic:
HANS COHN
For Ecuador:
ad—referendum
C J AROSEMENA
For Egypt:
H. FAHMY.
For Finland:
J. KERÄNEN
For France:
A. VIAUT
For Greece:
E S VOURLAKIS
For Guatemala:
CLAUDIO URRUTIA E
For Hungary:
L. AUJESZKY
For Iceland:
TERESIA GUDMUNDSSON
For India:
S. K. BANERJI
V. V. SOHONI
For Ireland:
A. H. NAGLE
For Italy:
GIUSEPPE BARBA

For Mexico:
F. PEÑA A.
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
W. BLEEKER
For New Zealand:
M. A. F. BARNETT
For Norway:
H T HESSELBERG
For Pakistan:
M. O. A. BAIG
For Paraguay:
T. FARIÑA SANCHEZ
For Poland:
J. WINIEWICZ
For Portugal:
H. AMORIM FERREIRA
For the Republic of the Philippines:
C DEL ROSARIO
For Rumania:

For Siam:
CHAROON V. BUNNAG
For Sweden:
GUSTAF SLETTENMARK
For Switzerland:
JEAN LUGEON
For Turkey:
H. R. BAYDUR
For Union of South Africa:
H. T. ANDREWS
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
NELSON K. JOHNSON.
R. C. CHILVER
For the United States of America:
F. W. REICHELDERFER.
For Uruguay:
CAP. DE FRAGATA AMÉRICO DENTONE
For Venezuela:

For Yugoslavia:
MILAN VEMIC

ANNEX I

States represented at the Conference of Directors of the International Meteorological Organization convened at Washington, D. C., on September 22, 1947

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

ANNEX II

Territories or groups of territories which maintain their own meteorological services and of which the states responsible for their international relations are represented at the conference of directors of the International Meteorological Organization convened at Washington, D. C., September 22, 1947

Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Belgian Congo, Bermuda, British East Africa, British Guiana, British West Africa, Cameroons, Cape Verde Islands, Ceylon, Curacao, French Equatorial Africa, French Oceanic Colonies, French Somaliland, French Togoland, French West Africa, Hong Kong, Indo China, Jamaica, Madagascar, Malaya, Mauritius, Morocco (not including the Spanish Zone), Netherlands Indies, New Caledonia, Palestine, Portuguese East Africa, Portuguese West Africa, Rhodesia, Surinam, Tunisia.

I CERTIFY THAT the foregoing is a true copy of the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, including Annexes I and II attached thereto, opened for signature at Washington on October 11, 1947 in the English and French languages, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I GEORGE C. MARSHALL, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this twelfth day of February, 1948.

[SEAL] GEORGE C. MARSHALL
Secretary of State
By M. P. CHAUVIN
Authentication Officer
Department of State

PROTOCOL CONCERNING SPAIN

At the time of signing the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, the undersigned, being duly authorized by their Governments, have signed the following Protocol:

It is hereby agreed that Spain may, as soon as the Resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated December 12, 1946 shall be abrogated or shall cease to be applicable, accede to the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization by complying with the provisions of Article 33 of the said Convention, without having to comply with the provisions of Article 3 (c) of the said Convention.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the respective representatives have signed the present Protocol.

DONE at Washington this eleventh day of October 1947, in the English and French languages, each equally authentic, the original of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America shall transmit certified copies thereof to all the signatory States.

For Argentina:
ALFREDO G GALMARINI
For Australia:
N. H. WARREN
For Belgium (including the Belgian Congo):
A VAN DEN BROECK
N VANDER ELST POUR LE CONGO BELGE
For Brazil:
FRANCISCO XAVIER RODRIGUES DE SOUZA
For Burma:
MAUNG PO, E.
For Canada:
ANDREW THOMSON
PATRICK D. MCTAGGART-COWAN
For Chile:
F. NIETO DEL RIO
For China:
JOHN LEE [Romanization]
For Colombia:
SANTIAGO GARAVITO
For Cuba:
GMO BELT
For Czechoslovakia:
DR ALOIS GREGOR
For Denmark:
HENRIK KAUFFMANN
For the Dominican Republic:
HANS COHN
For Ecuador:
C J AROSEMENA
For Egypt:
H FAHMY
For Finland:
J. KERÄNEN
For France:
A. VIAUT
For Greece:
E S VOURLAKIS
For Guatemala:
CLAUDIO URRUTIA E.
For Hungary:
L. AUJESZKY
For Iceland:
TERESIA GUDMUNDSSON
For India:
S. K. BANERJI
V. V. SOHONI
For Ireland:

For Italy:
GIUSEPPE BARBA
For Mexico:
F. PEÑA A.
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
W BLEEKER
For New Zealand:
M. A. F. BARNETT.
For Norway:
H T HESSELBERG
For Pakistan:
M. O. A. BAIG.
For Paraguay:
T. FARIÑA SANCHEZ
For Poland:
J. WINIEWICZ
For Portugal:
H. AMORIM FERREIRA
For the Republic of the Philippines:
C DEL ROSARIO
For Rumania:

For Siam:
CHAROON V. BUNNAG.
For Sweden:
GUSTAF SLETTENMARK
For Switzerland:

For Turkey:
H. R. BAYDUR
For the Union of South Africa:
H. T. ANDREWS
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
NELSON K. JOHNSON
R. C. CHILVER
For the United States of America:
F. W. REICHELDERFER
For Uruguay:
CAP. DE FRAGATA AMÉRICO DENTONE
For Venezuela:

For Yugoslavia:
MILAN VEMIC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive C, Eighty-first Congress, first session, a convention of the World Meteorological Organization, which was opened for signature at Washington on October 11, 1947, for a period of 120 days, and was signed, during that period, by representatives of the United States of America and of 41 other states, and a certified copy of a protocol relating thereto which was signed at the same time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. (Putting the question.) Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senate considers nominations, I should like to say to the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators present that if these treaties had involved any controversy, I would not have brought

them up; but, knowing they involved very simple questions, having to do with better safety at sea and better international relations, I took the liberty at this late hour of bringing them up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I reserved the right to object only that it might be shown that the treaties came from the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously. I have the highest respect for the integrity of the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calender.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today. That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if the promotions in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service which were confirmed en bloc are routine promotions.

Mr. MYERS. I understand they are all routine.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how many have been moved up this time?

Mr. MYERS. No. We can count them, so many to a page, and multiply that by the number of pages, and calculate very quickly, I imagine, how many have been moved up.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Admiral Alan G. Kirk, United States Navy, retired, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxemburg, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Scott M. Matheson, of Utah, to be United States attorney for the district of Utah, vice Dan B. Shields, retired.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Russell P. Smith, of Cambridge, Md., to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

De Graff Austin, of San Diego, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 25, with headquarters at San Diego, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. LeRoy P. Hunt to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of 5 August 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

David S. Evans, MC, O313515.
Frank D. McCreary, MC, O237729.
Harlan H. Taylor, MC, O228501.
Joseph A. Zingales, MC, O506287.

TO BE MAJORS

Harry L. Dein, MC, O477015.
John F. Harris, MC, O268508.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Prince D. Beach, MC, O542855.
Allen L. Shackelford, MC, O1746846.
Daniel E. Smith, MC, O1765953.
Wilfred T. Tumbusch, MC, O1764813.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

James A. Ambrose, DC, O961728.
Cyrus L. Beye, MC, O1767381.
Leland L. Butcher, Jr., MC.
Henry B. Cabell, JAGC, O1323804.
Bourbon E. Canfield, MC.
Eston R. Caldwell, MC, O1736369.
Fred A. Chalupsky, JAGC, O1546468.
Manley E. Davis, Jr., JAGC, O1647875.
Norman R. Davis, MC.
John T. Evans, Jr., CHC, O535196.
Jack L. Hartley, DC.
Holland Hope, CHC, O537126.
David I. Hull, MC, O1767509.
Gerhardt W. Hyatt, CHC, O932828.
Donald E. King, MC, O1786871.
Samuel K. Kirk, VC, O1775787.
Duval H. Koonce, MC, O1736132.
Edwin Lindig, Jr., MC.
Samuel S. Lionel, JAGC, O1047207.
William P. Lochte, MC, O1776397.
Norman F. Marshall, MC, O1705398.
Robert L. McDonald, MC, O937012.
Albert G. Miller, MC.
Nathaniel W. Morrisette, Jr., JAGC, O540421.
William D. Nettles, VC, O1735556.
Theodore H. Nicholas, MC.
David H. Nichols, MC.
Timothy J. O'Leary, DC, O1718965.
Philip H. Philbin, MC.
William T. Price, Jr., MC.
William A. Rader, Jr., VC., O941980.
Hugh W. Randel, MC, O1775207.
Wallace J. Redner, MC, O1726877.
Abraham R. Richstein, JAGC, O2025713.
Harold Rosegay, MC, O1717459.
Paul Teplis, MC.
Eugene E. Van Vranken, MC, O1756473.
Emmett L. Walsh, CHC, O929461.
Lowell C. Walton, MC, O1766407.
Glenn A. Washburn, VC, O1744984.
John F. Wolf, JAGC, O373131.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Vivian M. Arnold, ANC, N792070.
William L. Bost, MSC, O1533014.
Donald E. Callaghan, MSC, O1341744.
John A. Deakins, MSC, O1544439.
Phyllis H. Fauble, WMSC, M2089.
Emma A. Galgano, ANC, N754952.
John I. Gibbons, MSC, O942367.
Harriett F. Hansen, ANC, N773829.
Mary E. Mahar, ANC, N792765.
Earle A. Paxson, MSC, O1533109.
Arin F. Robinson, MSC, O1545227.
Frederick B. St. John, MSC, O1691739.
Marion D. Sydenham, ANC, N792106.
Josephine M. Vsetula, ANC, N745431.
Elva M. York, ANC, N792150.
Elta R. York, ANC, N792149.
Claude E. Young, MSC, O2047548.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Eugene L. Adoue, O889655.
David W. Affleck, O1334069.
Thomas C. Aldridge, O548307.
Henry G. Allard, O545428.
William M. Allred, O1179760.
Richard C. Anderson, O525336.
Charles Andres III, O556659.
James L. Andrews, O1321278.
Thomas J. Anthony, O525738.
Robert Apt, O1949456.
Richard D. Arnold, O532742.
Richard J. Arnold, O530652.
Frank E. Atchison, O2019119.
Frank A. Athanason, O1186726.
William H. Avery, Jr., O518815.
Dallas O. Baker, O1642461.
Donald S. Ballard, O1340617.
Harry C. Barnes, O445734.
Robert B. Barnett, O524632.
Ross P. Barrett, O548491.
Albert L. Barringer, O2039432.
Carl F. Baswell, O1054902.
John O. Batiste, O549906.
Leonard Becicka, O1313860.
William J. Beck, O1317475.
Woodson W. Bercaw, Jr., O946650.
Robert J. Bernard, O526935.
Charles E. Best, O2018986.
John J. Betz, O1182515.
Charles P. Bickerdike, O542003.
Emerson T. Biere, O1338551.
Bernard Big, O1324132.
James C. Blackford, O2033310.
Stanley R. Blunck, O1287822.
Jew D. Boney.
Robert J. Bouchard, O945649.
Peter J. Boyle, O1175950.
John L. Briggs, O1174789.
Charles A. Brizius, Sr., O1341849.
George K. Brown, O1651160.
Hugh M. Brown, Jr., O520138.
Mark L. Browne, Jr., O532718.
John T. Bryant, Jr., O480278.
John O. Buchanan, O520856.
William P. Bullard, O1341625.
Billy W. Byrd, O526678.
Daniel K. Byrne, O1947763.
Lloyd R. Cain, O2025602.
Robert F. Callahan, O1826125.
J. Parry Cannon, O1337809.
Joseph Capuano, O1556101.
William C. Carper III, O1340351.
Robert F. Carrell, O1341076.
Edward A. Carrigo, Jr., O1287475.
Cloud G. Carter, O1175067.
Eugene M. Castellow, O1186941.
Rupert W. Catlin, O1295507.
Lorin P. Chapman, O1799829.
Sigmund R. Chester, O527324.
Bruce S. Coleman, O1317886.
James F. Coleman, O480276.
William H. Collier, O439257.
Rodney R. Confer, O1020462.
Donald A. Conner, O1323213.
Charles E. Conrad, O1337142.
John S. Craig, O1179823.
Walter M. Crandall, Jr., O1341405.
Morgan J. Cronin, O1282403.

Robert A. Cronk, O1823268.
James A. Crough, O1316532.
Robert F. Cunningham, O436966.
Thomas W. Dale, O520417.
William B. Daum, O1315668.
Gordon R. Davis, Jr., O1059760.
George R. Deakin, O1340634.
Charles D. Decker, Jr., O1168219.
Raymond C. Denchfield, O1334981.
Paul S. Denison, O549998.
Robert J. Dillard, O1335404.
Richard T. Dille, O552728.
William H. Dillon, O1328977.
Thomas W. Donovan, O1312292.
Leslie M. Douglas, O1175102.
George J. Duggins, O1051939.
Lonzie J. Dukes, O945780.
Richard H. Durr, O1063079.
Paul B. Duruz, O460776.
Carl T. Earles, O2018140.
Frank J. Egan, O1291443.
Uell W. Ellard, Jr., O1946241.
James F. Elliott, O955247.
August V. Ellis, O2029293.
Bryce L. Elmer, O544494.
William H. Embley, O689217.
Herman Ertischweiger, O1651917.
Bryan Evans, Jr., O1186849.
Richard G. Fazakerley, O542004.
William H. Fogel, O549862.
William A. Forbes, O1324156.
James E. Foster, O1120751.
Robert L. Gabardy, O1639056.
George A. Galion, O1341416.
John C. Gambrell, O1057070.
Edward J. Garrett, O1185179.
Daniel J. Garvey, O1341874.
Robert A. Geiger, O1337702.
Donald L. Gellnicht, O512406.
Richard E. Gerrish, Jr., O551022.
John F. Gerrity, O519252.
William E. Gore, O1686205.
Robert P. Graves, O445283.
Harry H. Hall, O1332166.
William R. Hanks, O445643.
Laurence K. Hannon, O520438.
George K. Hansen, O2011147.
Velories M. Harlan, O530006.
Douglas P. Harper, O1080627.
Joseph W. Harper, Jr., O1324602.
Carl W. Harris, O1594619.
Dennis J. Harrison, O1340553.
Herbert W. Hayes, Jr., O522569.
Desmond H. Hempton, O2037983.
Norman T. Herbert, O956647.
Alfred G. Hill, O1030985.
Lucius G. Hill, Jr., O1081607.
Genous S. Hodges, Jr., O2020296.
Crenshaw A. Holt, O512733.
Richard A. Huff, O1335653.
Tom Huff, O1588651.
John C. Hughes, O1061735.
Albert G. Hume, O1315066.
Albert L. Hutson, Jr., O497570.
Robert B. Hutton, O947560.
Thomas R. Isaacs, O1039694.
Richard M. Jennings, O1341669.
Carl A. Johnson, O1317397.
Marshall D. Johnson, O1013274.
James D. Johnstone III, O469335.
Robert V. Jones, O1322232.
Tom Kanelis, O1341791.
Hervey E. Keator, O1800132.
Charles G. Kershaw II, O533857.
Edward F. Kerwin, O538998.
Paul E. Killpack, O1020475.
William P. King, O496313.
John F. Kiser, O1054652.
John S. Komp, O1323715.
Joseph Kormylo, O1823745.
Charles E. Kunkel, O448095.
Henry C. Lamar, Jr., O519978.
Kenneth R. Lamison, O1012380.
James R. Lawrence, O1307835.
William E. Leahey, O1550642.
John H. Le Clair, O1338968.
Roy L. Liles, O1330562.
Otto A. Lockwood, O1800067.
Robert C. Lorch, O1330936.
Theodore R. Lowman, O2018377.
Lorenzo F. Luckie, Jr., O500727.
Warren J. Ludwig, O1182417.
Roman J. Lutz, O1340909.
Alexander G. Makarounis, O1798750.
Michael J. Malone, O1047650.
Herbert E. Marlatt, O438616.
James C. Martin, O1330668.
Jason H. Martin, O550094.
George H. Marx, O1062410.
Leroy B. Mattingly, O1184545.
Stan L. McClellan, O1341684.
Walter S. McCracken, O1289779.
Richard D. McFarland, O1319964.
John R. McGiffert II, O1341892.
James B. McIlwee, O550357.
Joseph V. McKeever, O554901.
Walter S. Medding, O546135.
Ralph T. Mello, O1185687.
Elmer J. Messer, O1301184.
Francis C. Miles, O1341812.
John P. Moffitt, O1330845.
Eugene E. Morath, Jr., O1060218.
Berkley D. More, O536981.
Kenneth C. Morisette, O1288938.
Charles Morrow, Jr., O1186873.
William L. Mundie, O1341029.
Roscius C. Newell, O1796843.
Glen L. Nichols, O1179555.
William L. Nichols, O1118264.
Andrew Nisbet, Jr., O1334613.
Robert J. Noll, O1035950.
Leonard L. Norwood, O1018925.
Dorward W. Ogden, Jr., O1651948.
John M. Parker, O511429.
Robert L. Parker, O1014687.
Robert W. Patterson, O1117931.
William H. Patterson, Jr., O1341286
Robert B. Payne, O2026803.
Robert L. Phillips, Jr., O1333379.
Lloyd J. Picou, O518204.
Leon A. Pierce, O1182227.
James E. Piercy, O2011017.
John F. Plumb, O2018754.
Charles M. Post, O2020672.
George M. Powers, O553037.
William T. Putnam, O551526.
Rene Ramos, O934475.
Mark Raum, O516134.
Edward J. Raven, Jr., O1825056.
Paul F. Reagan, O1335184.
Francis W. Reilly, O1045567.
Richard N. Renfrow, O1342002.
Homer E. Rhoads, O1331987.
Marvin E. Rice, O1120429.
Thomas D. Rice, O1323173.
Walton K. Richardson, Jr., O2029581.
Francis M. Riddlemoser, O1636538.
Eugene Rinaldi, O1001667.
Kenneth G. Ring, O1045573.
Eugene J. Ringel, O1333711.
William G. Roberts, O1338131.
Neil Robinson, O467094.
Benton M. Rogers, O885027.
Fred T. Rogers, O1286365.
William J. Rousseau, Jr., O2017128.
Jack R. Sadler, O956243.
Samuel F. Sampson, O1328297.
Carl T. Schuler, Jr., O1117527.
Chesley K. Seely, O947564.
August G. Seibert, O1335066.
Courtney R. Shirley, O1294243.
James W. Shockley, O1042431.
George M. Shuffer, Jr., O1309957.
Arthur R. Simpson, O530423.
Edgar M. Sinclair, O1168919.
Ira T. Sliger, Jr., O521837.
Joseph H. S. Smith, O1559622.
Kingsley J. Smith, O2026084.
Martin R. Smith, Jr., O513921.
Samuel C. Smith, O1325334.
Sam Spector, O1650752.
Frank J. Spettel, Jr., O1296109.
Richard R. Stevens, O2033262.
Cleveland R. Steward, Jr., O1341834.
John S. Stiles, Jr., O957951.
Louis F. Strawn, O1338656.
Robert W. Street, O1287615.
Emil J. Stryker, Jr., O2020590.
James J. Sullivan, O1115123.
Gordon L. Swangren, O1036050.
Ralph J. Swann, O1314721.
Paul A. Swanson, O1583743.
Harvey E. Sweeney, O1290012.
John F. Taylor, O1822484.
Paul R. Thacker, O566894.
David C. Thatcher, O1588915.
Halbert C. Thaxton, O525467.
John W. Thompson, O1951719.
Benjamin M. Walker, O940752.
John J. Walsh, O1325119.
Allie L. Walters, O1550523.
Sherman Weisinger, O1340964.
Allen J. White, O1282410.
Charles I. White, Jr., O1640119.
Harry R. Whitman, O1320401.
Charles C. Wigner, O544399.
Richard F. Wilkinson, O492792.
Tinker Williams, O1020527.
Virgil H. Williams, O553405.
Leo C. Williamson, O1292436.
Clifford C. Wilson, O1342318.
Robert D. Wilson, O1342025.
Jerome T. Winter, O1336724.
Frederick J. Wittlinger, O1114811.
Richard D. Wolf, Jr., O1336013.
Roy L. Wood, O1046700.
William S. Wood, O1119821.
Reginald W. Woolard, O1340608.
Evert C. Youngs, O1057326.
William D. Ziesel, O959713.
Frank J. Zigmund, O1329661.
Paul S. Zobrist, O1946902.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Theodore C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia.
John W. Bailey, Jr., of Texas.
Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah.
Vinton Chapin, of Massachusetts.
Oliver Edmund Clubb, of Minnesota.
William P. Cochran, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Albert M. Doyle, of Michigan.
Gerald A. Drew, of California.
Homer S. Fox, of Michigan.
Julian C. Greenup, of California.
George J. Haering, of New York.
Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa.
Gerald Keith, of Illinois.
Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
Frederick B. Lyon, of Michigan.
Lester De Witt Mallory, of California.
Hugh Millard, of Nebraska.
Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon.
Harold B. Minor, of Kansas.
Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio.
Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
Robert Lacy Smyth, of California.
Edward J. Sparks, of New York.
Edward T. Wailes, of New York.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520 (a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin.
E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey.
LaVerne Baldwin, of New York.
William H. Beach, of Virginia.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Michigan.
Daniel M. Braddock, of Michigan.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
A. Bland Calder, of New York.
John Willard Carrigan, of California.

Augustus S. Chase, of Connecticut.
Norris B. Chipman, of the District of Columbia.
Montgomery H. Colladay, of Connecticut.
Henry B. Day, of Connecticut.
Edmund J. Dorsz, of Michigan.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
Dorsey Gassaway Fisher, of Maryland.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Randolph Harrison, of Virginia.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
Knowlton V. Hicks, of New York.
Frederick W. Hinke, of New York.
John F. Huddleston, of Ohio.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
George Lewis Jones, Jr., of Maryland.
George D. LaMont, of New York.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of New Jersey.
Raymond P. Ludden, of Masachusetts.
John J. Macdonald, of Missouri.
Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
Edward S. Maney, of Texas.
Paul W. Meyer, of Colorado.
Arthur L. Richards, of California.
Donald W. Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Horace H. Smith, of Ohio.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Francis H. Styles, of Virginia.
Clare H. Timberlake, of Michigan.
Marshall M. Vance, of Ohio.
Joe D. Walstrom, of Missouri.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Barry T. Benson, of Texas.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
Reginald Bragonier, Jr., of Maryland.
Stephen C. Brown, of Virginia.
Thomas S. Campen, of North Carolina.
Carl E. Christopherson, of Iowa.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
Bernard C. Connelly, of Illinois.
Robert T. Cowan, of Texas.
Leon L. Cowan, of Texas.
Earl T. Crain, of Illinois.
Richard H. Davis, of New York.
Andrew E. Donovan 2d, of California.
Edward A. Dow, Jr., of Nebraska.
James Espy, of Ohio.
William E. Flournoy, Jr., of Virginia.
Richard D. Gatewood, of New York.
Jule L. Goetzmann, of Illinois.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.
Landreth M. Harrison, of Minnesota.
Miss Constance R. Harvey, of New York.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Theodore J. Hohenthal, of California.
J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.
Perry Laukhuff, of Ohio.
Andrew G. Lynch, of New York.
Edward P. Maffitt, of Missouri.
Thomas C. Mann, of Texas.
Roy M. Melbourne, of Virginia.
John Frémont Melby, of Illinois.
Miss Kathleen Molesworth, of Texas.
John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.
Elim O'Shaughnessy, of New York.
Maurice Pasquet, of New York.
Paul H. Pearson, of Iowa.
Walter Smith, of Illinois.
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.
Ray L. Thurston, of Wisconsin.
John W. Tuthill, of Massachusetts.
Gerald Warner, of Massachusetts.
T. Eliot Weil, of New York.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.
Kenneth J. Yearns, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas.
William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Boies C. Hart, Jr., of Connecticut.
Roger L. Heacock, of California.
William J. Porter, of Massachusetts.
Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Stewart G. Anderson, of Illinois.
William Barnes, of Massachusetts.
W. Wendell Blancké, of Pennsylvania.
Byron E. Blankinship, of Oregon.
Findley Burns, Jr., of Maryland.
Don V. Catlett, of Missouri.
Ralph N. Clough, of Washington.
Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut.
Thomas J. Cory, of California.
William A. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Eugene Desvernine, of New York.
Thomas P. Dillon, of Missouri.
Clifton P. English, of Tennessee.
Thomas S. Estes, of Massachusetts.
G. McMurtrie Godley, of New York.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
James C. Lobenstine, of Connecticut.
Edwin W. Martin, of Ohio.
Charles Robert Moore, of Washington.
Carl F. Norden, of New York.
Julian L. Nugent, Jr., of New Mexico.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
Richard M. Service, of California.
Harold Shullaw, of Illinois.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Joseph S. Sparks, of California.
Norman C. Stines, Jr., of California.
Wallace W. Stuart, of Tennessee.
Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.
Andrew B. Wardlaw, of South Carolina.
Livingston D. Watrous, of New York.
William A. Wieland, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Frederic S. Armstrong, Jr., of Masachusetts.
Oscar V. Armstrong, of North Carolina.
Taylor G. Belcher, of New York.
Robert O. Blake, of California.
Thomas S. Bloodworth, Jr., of Louisiana.
John W. Bowling, of Oklahoma.
Robert A. Brand, of Connecticut.
Clarence T. Breaux, of Louisiana.
William T. Briggs, of Virginia.
Lewis D. Brown, of New York.
Stanley M. Cleveland, of New York.
Carroll E. Cobb, of Georgia.
William B. Connett, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Edwin D. Crowley, of Virginia.
Richard H. Donald, of Connecticut.
Thomas A. Donovan, of North Dakota.
L. Milner Dunn, of Utah.
Thomas J. Dunnigan, of Ohio.
John I. Fishburne, of South Carolina.
William Dale Fisher, of California.
T. Andrew Galambos, of New York.
Arthur L. Gamson, of Arizona.
Robert B. Hill, of Massachusetts.
Edward W. Holmes, of Massachusetts.
William P. Hudson, of North Carolina.
Elmer C. Hulen, of Kentucky.
Alfred le S. Jenkins, of Georgia.
Curtis F. Jones, of Maine.
Joseph J. Jova, of New York.
John M. Kavanaugh, of Louisiana.
William M. Kerrigan, of Ohio.
Thomas D. Kingsley, of Maryland.
William R. Laidlaw, of California.
William C. Lakeland, of New York.
Edward V. Lindberg, of New York.
David J. S. Manbey, of California.
David E. Mark, of New York.
David K. Marvin, of Nebraska.
Joseph A. Mendenhall, of Maryland.
Daniel W. Montenegro, of New York.
Edward N. McCully, of Texas.
Vincent T. McKenna, of New York.
John A. McKesson 3d, of New York.
E. Jan Nadelman, of New York.
Joseph P. Nagoski, of Tennessee.
James F. O'Connor, Jr., of New York.
David L. Osborn, of Arkansas.
Robert Irving Owen, of New Jersey.
Claiborne Pell, of New York.
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr., of Connecticut.
Harry F. Pfeiffer, Jr., of Maryland.
William Walter Phelps, Jr., of New York.
James W. Pratt, of California.
Norman K. Pratt, of Pennsylvania.
C. Hoyt Price, of Arkansas.
Edward P. Prince, of Illinois.
Edwin C. Rendall, of Illinois.
John F. Root, of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin J. Ruyle, of Texas.
Stephen A. Rynas, of New York.
John Newton Smith, of Kentucky.
Rufus Z. Smith, of Illinois.
Clyde W. Snider, of California.
Wells Stabler, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas B. Stauffer, of Illinois.
Charles G. Stefan, of California.
John L. Stegmaier, of Massachusetts.
Robin E. Steussy, of Wisconsin.
Albert W. Stoffel, of New York.
Robert W. Stookey, of Illinois.
DeWitt L. Stora, of California.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.
William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.
James S. Sutterlin, of Kentucky.
Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas T. Turner, of Oregon.
Norman E. Warner, of Iowa.
Herbert S. Weast, of California.
Jackson W. Wilson, of Texas.
Stanley B. Wolff, of New York.
Sam L. Yates, Jr., of Michigan.
Robert L. Yost, of California.
Harry R. Zerbel, of Colorado.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day. May we rejoice as we contemplate its many opportunities for service.

Make us grateful not only for the joys which cheer us but also for the deserved disciplines of trials and tribulations which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Grant that we may meet our tasks and responsibilities with a calm and courageous spirit, proving ourselves faithful and helpful in every situation.

May there be nothing in our thoughts and deeds of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 20, 1949, was dispensed with.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hunt	O'Conor
Baldwin	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Bridges	Kefauver	Robertson
Butler	Kerr	Russell
Cain	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chapman	Langer	Schoeppel
Chavez	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Connally	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	McClellan	Stennis
Donnell	McFarland	Taft
Ellender	McKellar	Taylor
Ferguson	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	Malone	Thomas, Utah
George	Martin	Thye
Gillette	Maybank	Tydings
Gurney	Miller	Vandenberg
Hayden	Millikin	Watkins
Hendrickson	Mundt	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Murray	Williams
Hoey	Myers	Withers
Holland	Neely	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators be permitted to present petitions, memorials, and other routine matters, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISED ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENTS OF INTERIOR AND ARMY (S. Doc. No. 56)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation involving a decrease of $425,000 for the Department of the Interior and an increase of $3,425,000 for the Department of the Army, fiscal year 1950, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 57)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation amounting to $337,425 for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, UNITED NATIONS (S. Doc. No. 58)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $16,000,000, fiscal year 1949, as a special contribution to the United Nations for relief of Palestine refugees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIC ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to combat the citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 23

"To the honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the United States continues to depend on many foreign sources for its supply of strategic and critical minerals; and

"Whereas attempts to procure minerals and metals from foreign sources in time of war is hazardous and costly in the extreme; and

"Whereas many of these strategic and critical minerals are known to occur in Alaska, but have not been mined owing to various economic factors; and

"Whereas stock piling has been deemed the only satisfactory means of insuring an adequate supply of these strategic and critical minerals for any future emergency; and

"Whereas the time required as well as the critical shortages of manpower and materials, prevents the effective development, mining, and utilization of unworked domestic mineral deposits following the outbreak of war emergencies; and

"Whereas strategic and critical minerals and metals are nonperishable and never become obsolete and when placed in Government stock piles they represent an investment having a completely recoverable market value as an indispensable investment for the security of the people of the United States and Alaska; and

"Whereas there have been introduced into the Congress of the United States two measures, H. R. 976 and H. R. 2031, designed to effectuate the exploration and production of strategic and critical minerals through a program of stock piling:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, urges that H. R. 976 and H. R. 2031 or other suitable legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and Alaska by providing assured markets and adequate prices over a minimum period of time.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 14, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 17, 1949.

"GUNNARD M. ENGEBRETH,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor March 19, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Memorial 19

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior; and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Whereas the difficulties and delays experienced by all nations in their attempts to establish a stable population and a sound economy in Arctic areas can be traced almost entirely to the faulty conditions of health and sanitation which are typical of these areas; and

"Whereas inability to overcome these inadequacies of health and sanitation is, in turn, caused by a lack of specific knowledge concerning man's adjustment to the conditions which exist in Arctic and sub-Arctic areas and little scientific information is available regarding the operation of physical laws and ordinary biological processes under conditions peculiar to Arctic regions; and

"Whereas such information can be gained only through painstaking research and experimentation on a long-term basis and to be of value, such research must be of a scientific caliber, conducted on the spot under existing conditions, by trained specialists from many fields, with the necessary facilities and equipment to do a thorough job; and

"Whereas research in Arctic health has been long delayed by lack of any suitable facilities which would enable qualified scientists to carry on a program of investigation of sufficient length and scientific thoroughness to produce conclusive results; and

"Whereas in all of the Arctic area which lies within the Western Hemisphere, there is no facility or institution capable of meeting the basic needs of such an intensive program and of the four countries which possess

vast holdings in the Arctic, none save Russia has developed research centers in this area; and

"Whereas the obvious need for development of well-equipped Arctic health research institutes in the Western Hemisphere has long been recognized, and has frequently been expressed by leading authorities in government, medicine, biology, and other fields; and

"Whereas in recognition of the long-standing need for the development of research facilities in an Arctic area, the Alaskan Delegate in Congress has introduced into the Eighty-first Congress, a resolution requesting congressional authority and appropriations for the purpose of establishing such a facility (H. J. Res. 7) at the University of Alaska; and

"Whereas the board of regents of the university adopted a resolution donating land, ideally located adjacent to the university campus, as a site for the research center:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully urges enactment of such necessary legislation to bring about the establishment of an Arctic Health Institute in Alaska at an early date.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 18, 1949.

"STANLEY MCCUTCHEON,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 21, 1949.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, signed by Paul H. Anderson, president, relating to insect pest control in Hawaii (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Central Citizens Committee, of Detroit, Mich., relating to social-security legislation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Post No. 47, the American Legion, of Fort Wayne, Ind., relating to the trial of 12 members of the national executive committee of the Communist Party in New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Excerpts of minutes of monthly meeting of the directors of the Lehigh County Taxpayers' League, Allentown, Pa., relating to legislation providing compulsory health insurance, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Tax Justice League of Pennsylvania, Inc., of Allentown, Pa., signed by Mark R. Bittner, president, relating to public housing, Federal aid to education, and compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Tenth District Dental Society of the State of New York, of Jamaica, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Joseph P. Eagan, of Oil City, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Thomas bill authorizing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Margaret E. Gruver, of Arlington, Va., relating to uniform regulations for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Weiser (Idaho) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing a Columbia Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose Federal ownership and control of lands, fish, and other resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States

"Whereas the State of South Carolina owns and possesses more than 1,000 square miles of land beneath navigable waters within its boundaries, subject only to the Federal powers over navigation, commerce, and national defense; and

"Whereas State ownership of this property is a potential source of revenue for our State, the loss of which would be a great injury to the State and our people, for whom it is held in trust; and

"Whereas after over 100 years of recognized State ownership without interference with the delegated Federal powers, certain Federal officials are now suing other States for similar property and advocating Federal seizure of the lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the senate concurring), That the State of South Carolina favors continued State ownership and control, subject only to the delegated Federal powers, of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end.

"That the members of our delegation in Congress are hereby requested to give their active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

"That the members of our delegation in Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property.

"That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each member of our delegation in Congress."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Resolutions adopted by the Medical Societies of Baltimore City, Caroline County, Dorchester County, Howard County, Talbot County, and Worcester County, all of the State of Maryland, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma relating to numerous matters pending before Congress.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution 17

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for carrying out and performing items 1 to 13, both inclusive, of interim survey report for the Arkansas River and tributaries of the lower Arkansas River watershed, made by the Soil Conservation Service in conjunction with the United States Forestry Service, and memorializing Congress not to provide funds for carrying out and performing item 14 of said report

Whereas the interim survey report for the Arkansas River and tributaries of the lower Arkansas River watershed made by the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with the United States Forestry Service, Department of Agriculture, both of which are agencies of the Government of the United States, recommends work to be done under a proposed program for run-off and water retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the lower Arkansas watershed, substantially as follows:

1. Construction of approximately 700 upstream floodwater retarding structures by Federal Government, average size 50 acres surface.

2. Stabilization of approximately 23,000 miles of gullies and channels by Federal Government and landowners.

3. Construction of approximately 5,300 miles of diversion ditches and dikes by Federal Government and landowners.

4. Improvement and proper management on approximately 4,355,000 acres of woodland by Federal Government and landowners.

5. Tree planting on approximately 117,000 acres by Federal Government and landowners.

6. Adequate fire control on approximately 5,089,000 acres by Federal Government and State Government.

7. Construction of approximately 51,000 miles of terraces by landowners.

8. Construction of approximately 5,400 miles of farm waterways primarily by landowners.

9. Construction of approximately 11,600 farm ponds by landowners.

10. Improvement of drainage outlets and construction of farm drainage systems for approximately 520,000 acres by landowners.

11. Improvement and proper management of approximately 1,772,000 acres of grassland by landowners.

12. Establishment of grass on approximately 712,000 acres by Federal Government and landowners.

13. Other soil- and water-conservation practices and measures, applied in proper combination with the measures listed above, to complete a basic system of soil and water conservation in accordance with the needs and capabilities of the land in the water shed by landowners.

14. Federal acquisition of approximately 696,000 acres of land. ——— acres in ——— soil-conservation district.

Whereas it is the sense of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma that items 1 to 13, both inclusive, of the above-proposed program be approved and recommended, and that item 14 thereof be not approved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby memorialized to provide funds for carrying out and performing items 1 to 13, both inclusive, of the program as listed above, and as appearing in said interim survey report; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized not to provide funds for carrying out item 14 as listed above and as appearing in said interim survey report; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the two United States Senators from Oklahoma, to each of the Oklahoma Members of the United States House of Representatives, to the United States Forestry Service, Department of Agriculture, and to the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 4th day of April 1949.

WALTER BILLINGSLY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 11th day of April 1949.

JAMES E. BERRY,
President of the Senate.

RETURN OF FORMER COLONIES TO ITALY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., in support of my arguments urging the return and restoration to Italy of her former colonies, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the UN Assembly, at its present session, will take under consideration the trusteeship of the former Italian colonies; and

Whereas the development of the African Continent will be a great contributing factor toward the social progress and economic rehabilitation of western Europe; and

Whereas Italy, prompted, not by selfish gain, but to relieve the sad state of her overpopulation, made great contributions in the development of her colonies, by the construction of railroads, airports, and seaports, by converting arid lands into rich farms, by transforming unknown places into industrial centers and, through the application of scientific knowledge, methods, and skills, raising the standard of living far above that which had been enjoyed by the natives and hundreds of thousands of Italians who settled there; and

Whereas by virtue of her enormous efforts and sacrifices in their development, and her proximity to her former colonies, and her technique, and her excessive population and manpower, Italy is deserving and qualified to undertake their further development; and

Whereas the awarding to Italy of the trusteeship of her former colonies will be a great step in her economic rehabilitation and will further solidify the western nations against the common enemy; and

Whereas the city of Newark numbers among its population 125,000 loyal American citizens whose sense of fairness, and natural sympathy for Italy, recognizes her pressing need for additional territory and the opportunity for useful and peaceful expansion: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That—

1. Italy has every moral right to the trusteeship of her former colonies.

2. The UN would perform an act of supreme justice by awarding to Italy the trusteeship of her former colonies.

3. Italy's friendship to America and her many contributions toward the culture and way of life now enjoyed by our country has earned for her the sincere support of our delegates to the UN for the trusteeship of her former colonies.

4. Justice also requires that Italy be admitted as a member of the UN, so that her hopes and aspirations for her own future and for the peace of the world may be advocated by her own delegates.

5. A copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States.

6. A copy of this resolution be sent to the elected representatives of our State in Congress.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be a judge of The Tax Court of the United States, for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1662. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the United States of the Confederate Cemetery at Fayetteville, Ark., and providing for its care and maintenance; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1663. A bill for the relief of Lex F. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1664. A bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1665. A bill repealing limitation affecting the amount of combined retired pay and compensation that may be received by certain retired commissioned officers who are drawing compensation from a civilian office or position under the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1666. A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate bill 1667 to permit the District of Columbia to borrow money for capital projects, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1668. A bill to provide for the sale of certain permanent war housing in Lakeland, Fla., to the Baptist Bible Institute; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BORROWING AUTHORITY FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the District of Columbia to borrow money for capital projects, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1667) to permit the District of Columbia to borrow money for capital projects, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON WITH REGARD TO BILL TO PERMIT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO BORROW MONEY FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS

Throughout the Nation there are few cities which have not from time to time borrowed money at low interest rates to make needed improvements. Certainly no city as large as Washington would think of waiting for the needed school building or othe public project until all of the cash was in the bank. Of course municipalities as individuals can do too much borrowing, but in my opinion the city of Washington has suffered from an inability to borrow money when needed for important and necessary capital projects.

Due to the financial condition which the District of Columbia is in at this time and the difficulties encountered in finding necessary revenue for running expenses, it is in my opinion important for the city to be empowered to provide for such projects by authorization to borrow money in the same manner as other cities of comparable size and importance.

For this reason I have introduced a bill which I hope will meet with the approval of the Senate and the House of Representatives and be enacted into law without undue delay.

NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, and ask that it be printed and referred to the Appropriations Committee, as it applies to an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, be printed, and printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I do not ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. I simply ask that it be printed and referred to the Appropriations Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PENNSYLVANIA'S FLOOD-CONTROL AND WATERWAYS PROJECTS—TESTIMONY BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD testimony given by him April 20, 1949, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations considering the civil-functions appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. WILTON B. PERSONS, UNITED STATES ARMY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release of the National Military Establishment, Office Secretary of Defense, under date of April 4, 1949, and a release of the National Military Establishment, Department of the Army, under date of April 5, 1949, with reference to the retirement of Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, United States Army, which appear in the Appendix.]

CITIZEN DIPLOMACY—ARTICLE BY JAMES MARSHALL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "International Affairs—Citizen Diplomacy," written by James Marshall and published in the American Political Science Review for February 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTHERN TEXTILES—EDITORIAL FROM THE ANDERSON (S. C.) DAILY MAIL

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Massachusetts Editor Takes Honest Look at Southern Textiles," published in the Daily Mail of Anderson, S. C., of April 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Baltimore Sun there appears the fifth article in an informative series on the monetary cost of the social welfare legislation President Truman has asked Congress to approve during its present session—a program officially estimated to cost $1,250,000,000,000 over a 50-year period.

Today's article is headed, "Proposals would add 25,000,000 to rolls." I ask unanimous consent that the article may be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—PROPOSALS WOULD ADD 25,000,000 TO ROLLS

(This is the fifth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—President Truman's social-security program holds a promise of something for almost everyone.

Everybody in the country will help to pay for it. Nearly everyone will draw some benefit at some stage of life.

In a four-point program, outlined to Congress in January, the President asked for—

1. More old-age and survivor insurance for more people—higher benefits for all those entitled to benefits.

2. A new system of temporary disability insurance to protect workers from loss of income resulting from illness or injury lasting more than 7 days but not more than 26 weeks.

3. A new system of permanent disability insurance to protect workers who are afflicted with serious disablements which have lasted more than 26 weeks and who are found incapable of engaging in any substantially gainful work.

4. A new comprehensive compulsory national health program.

An administration bill for the first three items in the program is pending before the House of Representatives.

The administration has announced that it will send its health bill to Congress before the Ways and Means Committee completes its work on the old-age, survivor, and disability bill.

Not only does the President propose to insure more people—some 20 to 25 million more—but he proposes also to make it easier for everybody to qualify for benefits.

Under the plan, some 55,000,000 to 60,000,000 workers would be insured against all the major economic hazards of life.

If you are now one of the uninsured—a farmer, a domestic worker, an uninsured Government worker, a farm laborer, a lawyer, doctor, architect, or other self-employed—the bill in hand proposes to insure you.

HEALTH BILL COVERS MANY

The health bill, according to administration sources, will propose to insure most of the costs for you and your family doctors' and dentists' services, hospital bills, nurses' services, prescribed medicines, and special health aids such as eyeglasses, crutches, hearing aids, and false teeth.

Under the pending bill, the administration would make it a lot easier for workers to become fully insured for old age—that is, entitled to retirement benefits.

As it is now, it takes a long time to qualify—and a lot of workers never make it.

There is a minimum requirement in the present law that a worker must have at least "six quarters of coverage" to be insured at all. That is, a worker must have earned the legally required minimum wage in the six periods of 3 months each since January 1, 1937.

In order to be fully insured—entitled to retirement benefits—you have to have "wage credits" of $50 or more in one-half of the quarters elapsed since January 1, 1937.

The term "wage credit" means the amount of earnings which have been credited on the worker's record card in the Records Division of Social Security.

In other words, you must have earned $50 in one-half of the quarters elapsed since 1937—and your record card in the Social Security office must show it.

The administration bill would enable a worker to become "fully insured" as soon as he earned $50 in one quarter of each four quarters which has elapsed since 1937.

If you are an insured worker nearing 65, and counting on retiring any time in 1950, you would need, under present law, to have earned wage credits of at least $50 in each of 26 quarters since January 1, 1937.

NEW PLAN LIBERALIZED

But under the President's plan, you could retire any time in 1950 if you had only 13 quarters of coverage—and became 65 years old.

If you are one of those who would be newly insured under the old-age bill, the new retirement scheme would enable you to qualify quickly.

Under it, a newly insured person with not a cent of prior credit, who goes to work January 1, 1950, would be eligible to retire as soon as he earned $50 in the first quarter of 1953.

The bill also offers workers another break not allowed under present law.

Under existing law, your retirement pay depends upon your average wage taken for the entire period of your work in covered employment.

For example, say since 1937 you worked 3 years at $2,000, 3 years at $2,400, and 7 years at $3,000.

In 156 months you would have earned $34,200, or $219.30 average per month. That would be your average wage for computing your benefit, which we will do below.

But the President's bill proposes to allow you to base your benefits on your best 5 years.

In the best 5 years you averaged $250 a month, and that would be the base under the President's bill.

That is a break for you. But the biggest proposal for improving benefits is the new benefit formula itself.

Here is the old formula: 40 percent of the first $50 of your average wage plus 10 percent of the remainder, plus 1 percent of that total for each year you have been insured. The top wage insured is $250 a month.

The administration formula: 50 percent of the first $75 of your average wage, plus 15 percent of the remainder up to $400 a month, plus 1 percent for each year you have been insured.

Say you are the man, mentioned above, who averaged $219.30 for the 13 years to the end of 1950 when you expect to retire.

Under the old formula 40 percent of $50 equal $20. Ten percent of the remaining $169.30 equals $16.93, making a total of $36.93. You have been insured 13 years, so 13 percent of $36.93 equals $4.80, which added to $36.93 gives you $41.73 a month primary benefit.

Primary benefit means what you are entitled to draw on retirement. If you have a wife, aged 65, she could draw an additional $20.87.

The two of you would receive $62.60 a month.

Now take the proposed new formula: Your average pay is $250 for your best 5 years. Fifty percent of the first $75 is $37.50; 15 percent of the remaining $175 is $26.25, making a total of $63.75. Thirteen percent of $63.75 (1 percent for each of 13 years) is $8.29, giving you $72.04 primary benefit.

If you have a wife 60 years old—not 65 as under existing law—she can draw $36.02, and together you have $108.06.

This is $45.46 a month more—or approximately 72 percent more—than under the formula now in the law.

There is still another benefit expansion in the new bill.

If you are a retired worker, drawing old-age benefits and doing occasional odd jobs in covered employment, you now lose your Government benefit for any month you earn more than $14.99.

The President's bill proposes to raise this earning limit to $50.

HIGHER BENEFITS FOR NEEDY

If you are not an insured worker but are drawing public assistance as a needy aged person, or a needy blind person, or a needy child, the administration also plans higher benefits for you.

A separate administration bill, now before the House, proposes substantial increases in Federal grants to States for public assistance.

If you are insured and should die, the Government would help to pay your funeral expenses.

A lump-sum payment equal to 3 months of benefits would be paid for that purpose regardless of whether you have survivors entitled to other benefits.

The administration also proposes to lift from workers' minds another worry, the fear of complete loss of income while ill or incapacitated.

The new bill proposes to add a 1-percent tax on wages to finance temporary disability insurance for all employed persons.

Under this you would be paid approximately a half of your weekly wage for 26 weeks.

This would cost, the Social Security Commission has estimated, about $1,000,000,000 a year.

The self-employed would not be covered under this plan because the experts know of no way to estimate what such a person's loss of income may be while ill.

For permanent disabilities—illness or other incapacity lasting more than 6 months—there would be disability benefits at about the same rates as old-age benefits.

HEALTH INSURANCE COMPULSORY

The President has also proposed a compulsory system of health insurance for you and your family.

"This is not," he has said "free medicine" but "prepaid medical insurance."

You and your boss pay for it. You will pay out of your pay envelope and be entitled thereby to have your doctor's, dentist's, and hospital bills paid out of the Government health fund. Your employer matches your weekly pay deductions.

You would pick a doctor of your own choosing and the health fund will pay his bill.

Such are the broad promises the administration program holds out for some 120,000,000 to 130,000,000 people—54,000,000 workers and their families.

Benefits under this insurance are not expected to start—if Congress approves the President's request—until July 1, 1951.

CONFIRMATION OF ROUTINE PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY AND NAVY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report from the Committee on the Armed Services certain routine nominations in the Army and the Navy, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations. They were ordered to be reported by the committee unanimously. No objection has been filed against any of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the request just made by the Senator from Maryland is the usual request which is made in such cases, in order to save a substantial amount of money which would otherwise be spent in printing the names.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the nominations or promotions routine in nature?

Mr. TYDINGS. They are.

Mr. WHERRY. And the Armed Services Committee has unanimously approved them?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to state with reasonable brevity the reasons why I favor the bill now before the Senate dealing with the general problem of housing, and particularly that section which has raised the greatest controversy, providing for Federal subsidies for low-rent housing throughout the United States.

I have had an interest in this subject since long before I came to the Senate, because of the conditions which existed in my home town. I was interested then in the efforts being made to meet those conditions.

When I first came to the Senate, in 1939, a housing bill of this character was presented to the Senate calling for the appropriation of $800,000,000 for the construction of low-rent housing. I offered an amendment at that time to reduce the $800,000,000 to $400,000,000, and providing for the creation of a committee to study the entire problem of low-rent housing, and particularly the formula which had been adopted for low-rent housing in 1935 or 1936. That amendment was voted down, and I voted for the larger housing bill, which went to the House but was not passed by the House.

When the Committee on Postwar Planning was created and I was made a member of that committee, I became chairman of a subcommittee which undertook a study of the housing problem. I had urged such an investigation in the interval between 1939 and 1944, and we undertook a complete investigation in 1944. We received evidence from all sections of the country, and from all sides of the problem. We considered many suggestions alternative to that which was finally adopted. The committee completed its work in 1945, and we made a report which I still think is fundamentally sound, although the figures with which we were dealing were different. Costs and incomes at that time were different, but the fundamental problem was the same, and it still remains the same. Nothing substantial has been done to change the situation. The additional houses which have been built since 1940 have been almost but not quite enough to take care of the net number of additional family units which have required additional housing.

In 1945, together with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduced a bill. That bill was considered by the Senate. A similar bill was passed by the Senate in 1947. The bill which is now before us asks the Senate to adopt in general the theory of the bill which we introduced in 1945 and the bill which was passed by the Senate in 1947, but which again was not acted upon by the House of Representatives.

In my opinion the housing situation is one of the most important social and economic problems before the people of the United States. The housing industry is one of the greatest industries in the United States. Last year, without any question of public housing, we spent in private housing approximately $7,000,000,000 for the construction of additional homes, to say nothing of the repairs and various improvements which had to be made on existing housing. The industry is one of tremendous scope. It has a great effect on the economic condition of the country. It is one of those industries which in the past have gone down to nothing—from 900,000 homes a year to 100,000 homes a year—with all the unemployment and the danger of serious depression which such a condition involves. So from an economic standpoint we are interested in maintaining the stability of the industry. From a social standpoint, I think there is no more serious social problem in the United States than the character of some of the housing we have today, which so far as I can see has not improved in the past 10 years. It has probably grown somewhat worse.

With respect to farm housing, there has been no increase in the rural population of the country. The problem there is one of condition. So far as urban and rural non-farm housing is concerned, we have today approximately 36,000,000 homes. If we deduct the number of summer camps and various structures which are not really permanent homes, we have about 35,000,000 homes.

At the same time there are about 35,000,000 married couples in the United States, and a number of other family units. The estimate is that today about 3,000,000 married couples live with their families and friends, and are, in fact, doubled up. The estimate is that about half those couples want to be doubled up. They want to live with their families for various reasons, and there is no hardship to them. Probably the other one and a half million couples would like to get homes if they could.

So we have a slight shortage in the total number of homes, but I believe it has been somewhat alleviated in 1947 and 1948. I do not think it will present a serious problem in the future so far as the total number is concerned.

That condition is not true in some places. In some places there is a considerable shortage. In many places there is a complete sufficiency.

However, the condition of those 35,000,000 houses is an entirely different question. According to the 1940 census, which was brought up to date in 1947, about 2,700,000 of those homes are in need of major repairs. They have not been kept up and are not being kept up. They have so far deteriorated that they practically require rebuilding. There are other homes in good condition, but with no running water. Those number approximately 2,800,000. In addition, there are homes with running water but with outside toilets to the number of about 2,300,000. So there are approximately 7,000,000 homes of substandard character. I think that is somewhat of an exaggeration, because I believe that, so far as homes without toilets and running water are concerned, a great many of them in the rural sections are perfectly satisfactory homes, and very likely they could not be supplied with such facilities except at very great cost.

The general estimate of those who know is that between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 homes, for the most part in the cities, but including those in suburban or rural sections which are in need of major repair, are clearly substandard. I suppose half of those are in slums in the cities. They present the most serious social problem in the entire field.

What is the reason for that condition? This is not an exceptional condition. It has not arisen from the war. It has arisen from a long history of construction. The history is worse in the older cities in the East, and in the older cities in the West, such as Cincinnati and Chi-

cago, than it is in newer cities such as Tulsa, Okla. The situation is spotty. Many people who say there is no need of doing anything are thinking of their own communities and are not thinking of conditions in other communities with which they have not come in direct contact.

I think the reason why our system has not provided decent homes arises out of one basic fact, that the cost of housing is too high for the income of the people. If homes could be purchased for half of what they are now being purchased for, I do not believe we would have any slum problem, or any serious problem of housing—certainly not one which would require the construction of public housing, even though we might have to provide relief to people with very low incomes in order to enable them to buy the shelter which would then be available.

Today in most sections of the United States, including the West, it is very difficult to build a four-room house for less than $7,000. Perhaps in the South, and in the case of houses without basements or houses of a temporary character the construction costs are less. Experiments are being made and it is thought that perhaps the $7,000 figure can be brought down to $6,500 or $6,000. Cheaper houses—those having one or two rooms—are built, but such houses can hardly provide a permanent solution to the family problem.

The market for new houses therefore is very much restricted. A family would have to have an income of approximately $3,000 a year in order to be able to live in a $7,000 house; and some 45 percent of all the families in the United States have incomes of less than $3,000 a year. So those families at least are unable to buy new houses, with some exceptions of course. They may be able, in one way or another, to get a house; they may buy a house in which they cannot afford to live, and which they lose rather soon, when they are unable to make the payments. But, roughly speaking, of the 35,000,000 families in the United States, approximately 20,000,000 of them can buy new houses, and the remaining 15,000,000 families are unable to afford new houses. In short, the market for new houses is restricted to that extent.

That was the trouble in 1926; at that time we reached a figure of 900,000 new homes; and then, long before the depression of 1929 commenced, the construction of houses fell off very rapidly indeed because the market began to disappear. Everyone who had enough money to buy a house had bought one, and there was not the general market which there is for food and various articles of a small type which are available to all families who have any income at all.

The FHA mortgage records show that my figure of $7,000, as a minimum figure for a four-room house, is not entirely correct; approximately 21 percent of new houses, some perhaps smaller houses, or built in certain sections of the country have been sold for less than $7,000. Thirty-seven percent of the old houses sold, sell for less than $7,000. Houses deteriorate and depreciate in value somewhat, so that in one way or another the 15,000,000 families do acquire houses or are able to rent houses. But of those who have been able to buy new houses, only 13 percent have incomes of less than $3,000. As a general proposition, families having under $3,000 incomes—and half of the population have incomes of less than $3,000—are not able to buy new houses. Thirteen percent of them were able to do so. Only 17 percent of those who buy old houses have incomes of less than $3,000.

Of the newly married couples, we find, after allowing for all the figures I have mentioned, that at least 175,000 of them every year are unable to buy either old houses or new houses, and so they are faced with the necessity of living with their families or with making some other arrangement.

The answer, of course, is that those who cannot afford to live in new houses can live in old ones; and there is a kind of hand-me-down process which works to a certain extent. An old house deteriorates a little, and sells or rents for a little less than it formerly did, and gradually such houses come down in value, until they are available to families of lower incomes; and in the last analysis, practically everyone in the United States does have a shelter, a house in which to live; but millions of such houses are a disgrace to America.

Twenty-two percent of all families, or more than 7,000,000 families, have incomes of not more than $2,000 a year. The amount of rent which they can pay is so low that by the time they get houses the rent they are able to pay is hardly sufficient to keep up the houses. There has been some talk about the wickedness of landlords. I do not believe much money is ever made out of slum housing, because such houses are used by people who simply cannot afford to pay even a reasonable rent, and the rent which is paid is so low that no landlord is able to pay the taxes and keep the buildings in reasonably good condition. So they deteriorate, and degenerate into slums.

More than 4,000,000 tenant families pay rent of less than $20 a month, and on $20 a month rent I do not think any landlord can keep a house in even reasonably decent condition, certainly not if it has any plumbing in it.

Roughly speaking, the 4,000,000 lowest-income families have gradually gravitated to the 4,000,000 least desirable, substandard dwellings. It has been suggested that all we have to do is to tell the cities to tear down those buildings. But then we would be faced with the problem of finding houses in which those people would be able to live. In the first place, as of today, there are no houses for them to move into, and no private person can afford to build for them. In the second place, if there were 4,000,000 houses waiting for them to move into, after they continued to pay $20 a month rent for any considerable period of time, those houses also would deteriorate into slums. That has happened for years. The lower-income families gradually move into the poorer dwellings, and pay the lower rents, and those building deteriorate into slums. That is the way the matter has worked out. I see no reason to believe that it will work otherwise unless we can reduce the cost of housing at least one-third or perhaps one-half. In short, the way the situation has worked out has simply been that one slum has been replaced with another, and undoubtedly that will continue to occur unless we are able to do something to meet the problem at the bottom of the income scale.

So, Mr. President, I do think the fundamental cure is to be found in reducing construction costs, and certainly everything that can be done in that respect should be done. That is what the research provisions of this bill are intended for. That is what I think the industry today has worked hard to try to achieve. We passed a special bill giving advances of capital to anyone who would build the cheapest types of houses, as against those who wish to build more expensive houses. The cost of construction can be reduced. I think it is being reduced a little, not at the present moment by a reduction in the cost of materials or labor, but by the fact that materials and labor have become more generally available, and therefor a contractor can organize his work better and can build the house quicker, and thus can reduce the total cost to him of building the house. Many persons are concerned with changing the building-code provisions which have excessive requirements, and many of them have requirements which are out of date.

We still face the problem, in some way or other, of trying to reduce the cost of labor and the cost of materials. Materials usually have been subject, I believe, to a good deal of monopoly control. I think that can and should be broken down. In any event, even if we can reduce the cost, that process will take time.

But I see no reason to believe that the job is not a long-term one. Today, prefabricated housing is just about as expensive as housing built in the ordinary way. In some ways prefabricated housing is better, but it has not succeeded in reducing the cost of housing.

I think we must assume that the present cost condition will continue. I hope we may gradually solve that problem, so that we will not have to go on with public housing; but in the meantime I know of no other method of meeting the problem of low-income families, except by starting at the bottom and replacing existing slums with permanent buildings; and subsidizing the rentals sufficiently so that those buildings will not deteriorate, but will be kept up, and will not themselves become slums.

In 1945 our committee explored other means of subsidy. We explored the method of subsidizing private owners. The difficulty is that if that is attempted, it is necessary to impose so many restrictions—for instance, restrictions as to those to whom the owners can rent, and what they can charge, and so forth—that, so far as I can see, no private owner would go into business on such a basis. Limited-dividend corporations have built medium-rent buildings. But that means an economic rent, without subsidy, and such companies do not find it easy today to get the capital even to go into such rental housing. The lower-income groups, of course, could be taken care of

with rent-relief certificates; but the difficulty is that nobody would build any new houses on the chance that, 5 years from now, somebody would continue to issue a great many rent-relief certificates. It would not be known whether the city would continue that policy or not. There could be no assurance, such as there is in the pending bill, that a subsidy would definitely continue for 40 years, so that the money invested would ultimately be returned.

The general theory of subsidizing low-income groups is not a new theory in Anglo-Saxon political life or Anglo-Saxon economic life. The general theory that the Government has a duty to assist the lowest-income groups has been accepted in England for centuries; it is accepted today. It is accepted in every State of the Union, and it does not involve any departure in principle from that which we have pursued during the 150 years of the life of the Republic. We have tried different methods of accomplishing the result. We have had poorhouses. We have county homes in nearly every county of the United States to look after those who cannot take care of themselves. Every city in the country provides free hospitals and free medical care. Every city and every township recognizes the obligation to provide food-relief and to provide clothing relief for those who have no other means of obtaining the absolute necessities of life. I think all of us acknowledge the duty of the community to take care of those who are unable to take care of themselves. That duty has been taught by every community chest in the United States. The American people are a charitable and humane people, and they do not want to see hardship and poverty in the midst of plenty.

In my opinion, the free-enterprise system, without question, brings about greater production and a higher standard of living, than any other system in the world. Under socialism everybody is supposed to get the same. I do not think anybody ever worked out a socialistic system to do it, but that is the theory—everybody gets the same; and the result is that there is no incentive to people to work, no incentive to people to do better than others, and the dead-level production of socialism is, therefore, very much less than that of the free-enterprise system. But the free-enterprise system is based on incentive. It is based, and must be based, on paying people in full for the services they render, and no more, the value of their services to the community in dollars. There are a certain number of people who cannot work. There are a certain number of people who perhaps are unable to work, and others who cannot get work. There are people who have physical disabilities. There are people who perhaps through their own stupidity or inability or laziness are unable to get enough money to provide a decent living for their families. Perhaps we do not care about them so much; but most of them have families, and we do have an interest, I think, in providing equal opportunity for all the children of the families who are brought into being in the United States.

And so, under our system, inevitably we are bound to have a disparity of income. The system is based on a disparity of rewards and income, and at the bottom of the scale there will always be found a certain number of people who do not earn enough, through their own fault or through their own misfortune, or who perhaps earn nothing, to provide themselves and their families with a reasonably decent economic living, including the absolute necessities of life. Those are primarily, of course, particularly when dealing with the question of equality of opportunity for the children, food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and education. We socialized education 100 years ago in the United States, and we undertake to provide it free for all children. With respect to the other three services, we have strictly maintained the general policy of taking care of those who cannot take care of themselves. The job has not been completely done. There are many gaps in it.

After all, the States, the counties, and the cities have certain things they have to do, which came into Government long before the demand for welfare services. They must have a police force and a fire department. They must maintain courts. They must maintain the streets. The welfare services are rather tacked on the end. Where there is a shortage of money, they do not do that welfare job as completely as they recognize their obligation to do it. Then, there are a good many poor States and a good many poor cities that cannot live up to their welfare obligations, simply because of their financial ability. So I believe that a Federal policy of welfare service is justified to the point of assisting the States to see that that job is well and systematically done, and that the field is properly covered.

I believe the American people are sold on the theory that now for the first time perhaps in history we have sufficient production and a standard of living sufficiently high so that we can practically abolish hardship and poverty in their extreme forms in the United States, as they have never been abolished elsewhere. That is the general purpose of the various welfare programs. Of course, under the Constitution, the obligation is primarily that of the States and local communities. But I believe the Federal Government itself has an interest in making it at least possible that all the States and local governments have the means by which they can do the job, the obligation of which is recognized, and which the American people want to see done. I think the American people have an interest, whether they live in Ohio or somewhere else, in seeing the job done in all the other States of the United States. Their interest is not solely that of taking care of the people in their own community.

Of course, this requires a tax on the other four-fifths of the people—perhaps the other three-fifths of the people—to pay most of the taxes. But I believe those people are willing to pay the tax in order to accomplish the purpose of seeing that we no longer have any serious problem of hardship and poverty in the United States, and that the children of all the families in the United States have an equal opportunity, or a substantially equal opportunity, to get started in life, and, if they have the abilities, to make use of them to the full extent they can, so that the United States may remain a country of free opportunity.

Why is the Federal Government involved? After all, the only departure we are asking in the case of the pending bill, and in the case of certain other legislation, is that of involving the Federal Government in these problems, which, under the Constitution, rest primarily on the States and local governments.

In the first place, the States and local governments have a very restricted power of taxation. I served in the Ohio Legislature for 8 years. It is very difficult for a State to tax the lucrative sources of revenue. The State cannot put a very high tax on personal incomes, or upon incomes from securities, or a tax on securities, which is about the same thing. A tax cannot be levied in one State that is higher than the tax which the State across the river imposes. If a State imposes too high an income tax, many of its citizens can go to Florida or other jurisdictions where no income taxes are imposed. So the State is limited very much in its ability to reach the great source of personal incomes.

The State cannot tax corporations very heavily. We had that problem in Ohio. We had the problem of taxing corporate plants in Ohio—steel plants, perhaps, located in the northwestern section of the State. We also had the problem of how heavily we could tax the machinery in the plant. It happens that Pennsylvania does not tax the personal property of manufacturing companies; consequently, the moment we imposed any considerable tax on the personal property of corporations, such as steel companies, every new steel plant that was built in the Youngstown-Pittsburgh region would be put on the Pennsylvania side of the line. States are necessarily limited in their power to reach the lucrative sources of taxation, and while there are some sources the Federal Government does leave to the States, I do not think they amount to a great deal in dollars.

The result, of course, is shown by the fact that the States and local governments together, exercising all their ingenuity in finding new taxes, have succeeded in raising this year approximately $14,000,000,000, whereas the Federal Government is raising $42,000,000,000, three times the amount raised by the States. Consequently, the question is, Can the States, with the amount of money they have, do this job? If I am correct in thinking the people want health, welfare, and education taken care of, I do not believe it can be done, together with all other necessary State and local services, within $14,000,000,000. I do not agree that our municipalities have any extra money. In fact, in every State of the Union, they are facing a very severe financial problem during the next few years, because their costs have increased.

They have had to double the salary of all their personnel, as we have had to do. They are back where they were; they are back where most of their money has to be used for the absolutely essential things in which they have become involved. So, when it is sought to expand and make more complete welfare services, we find that most of the cities do not have the necessary money.

The average income per person in the State of Mississippi is approximately one-third the average income per person in New York and Connecticut. When we get below the average condition, we find States which are wholly unable to provide the money even for education, which has been a recognized and well-financed State activity for a hundred years. Certainly, when we get into any of the new fields of housing and health, we find their contribution has become very difficult and, in many respects, very limited.

That is the main justification for bringing the Federal Government into the problem. I think it has definitely a secondary responsibility, and I believe it should be performed along the general lines of the program which is now before the Senate.

I quite recognize that there is a serious danger in undertaking such relief. There is the danger, of course, that if we give people something for nothing, they gradually come to think they are entitled to more, and more and more persons want it. I realize the danger of expanding into a general socialistic state in which the Government provides everything for everyone. But I do not believe that danger justifies the Federal Government in saying, "We have no concern with the problem." I do not believe it justifies the Federal Government in saying to the States, "You do it if you can; we do not care what may happen. We are concerned with national matters, and we are afraid that if we get into it we might go too far." I think we should go as far as we properly can go on sound principle, and stand at that point.

I believe the principles on which the program should be adopted are perfectly definite. I think three definite limitations are required if the Federal Government is to assist States to do the job, which is primarily a State job. In the first place, the administration of the program must be not only taken charge of by the States, but the States must be left almost entirely independent in carrying it out, with as wide latitude as is possible to choose one method or another to obtain the ultimate result. I think the danger of centralization of power in the Federal Government is the greatest single danger we face in going into this problem. The constant tendency to centralize things in Washington and to have some Federal officer tell persons in local communities what they must do and how to do it is perhaps the greatest threat to the continuation of a free republic and a free people. If we are to have freedom, I know of nothing more necessary than to have freedom of local communities, so that the people who grow up in those communities may have a voice in deciding how they are to live and what kind of principles shall be adopted.

In the case of the WPA, if the communities in each State had done their job and had had the administration of the program, there would not have been all the leaf-raking projects and other things which aroused the resentment and criticism of the people of the Nation. The communities knew those who needed to have work. Our failure in that particular program was due to the fact that we tried to run the whole show from Washington. The fact that the States did not have the necessary income to take care of the matter was very clearly shown in the relief crisis of the 1930's. It was their function to take care of unemployment, but it was perfectly obvious that they were billions of dollars short, and they could not possibly deal with the problem at that time. But we made the mistake of bringing the Federal Government in to do the job; and all the scandals which arose out of WPA were due to that fact.

So I say the fundamental principle should be that we provide the money according to certain defined principles, and the State should have complete power to carry out the program so long as there is compliance with the statutory principle. No Federal official should have the power to go to a State and direct what it must do, and say, "You have got to do it this way, or you will not get your money next month." Whatever restrictions may be necessary I think should be as simple as possible and should be laid down in the statute enacted by Congress.

Unfortunately, in housing the Federal Government originally imposed its program on the States. It is true that with respect to housing, the States, with the exception of New York and some others, have done very little. But in this bill we provide that no contract shall be made with respect to any low-rent housing project unless the governing body of the locality involved has entered into an agreement with the public-housing agency providing for local cooperation. The city council must approve housing in any city. Furthermore, the contract is with a metropolitan housing authority, which is not a creature of the Federal Government, but is created under the laws of the particular State. If the State does not choose to create any metropolitan housing authority or to provide any other method of taking advantage of Federal assistance, there can be no Federal assistance. This program has been too much regarded as a Federal project, because the Federal Government does put up a greater percentage of the money, but in law and in theory, and in practice if the projects work out properly, there will be local control, the authorities complying with perfectly definite Federal standards, and not subject to Federal direction.

So the first principle, I believe, must be the retention of control by the States and local communities.

In the second place, I believe the programs must be confined to those who cannot pay their own way. I do not think the Federal Government should undertake to give people anything when they are perfectly able to buy it themselves.

On page 25 of the bill it is definitely provided that the public-housing agency must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Authority "that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise unaided by public subsidy is providing—through new construction and available existing structures—a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing."

In other words, if a man is within 20 percent of being able to rent an existing home in reasonably decent condition, he is not eligible for admission into a public-housing project. It has been proposed that we place a definite limitation on income of the persons who may be assisted in public housing. We have considered that for the last 4 or 5 years, and the difficulty has been that it is very hard to get a sliding scale. The incomes in different parts of the country vary so much, from New York to Texas, or to other parts in the South where houses are cheaper, that it is very difficult to set any figure, or even find a population formula on which to figure. I do not see any objection to the formula in the bill. It seems to me it confines the relief to people who cannot possibly get other housing. It may be said that it will not be carried out. If there is evidence of that, I should be willing to make further provision.

I notice that the real-estate board of the city of New York has come out in favor of public housing, as I think all real-estate boards should. I think the real-estate people should realize that there is no competition involved in public housing, that the people who are moving into public housing cannot possibly rent any except the very oldest and cheapest types of houses, and are not prospective tenants for any of the new or higher priced houses. The New York Real Estate Board has recognized that condition in New York. They say they recognize the need for a limited amount of low-rent public housing in New York City, with various provisos. It will be available only for families in the lowest-income group, which in New York will be limited to families whose income will not permit them to pay a rental in excess of $30 a month.

The New York Real Estate Board thus recognizes that in New York it would be perfectly satisfactory to have an $1,800 income limit, above which tenants will not be admitted. The amendment here proposes $1,500. I think the formula in the bill relating to that matter would work out very close, as far as I can get the figures, to $1,800 in the city of New York. I believe the sliding scale in the bill is satisfactory.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not care to interrupt the Senator at this time, but I have to leave the floor shortly, and I should like to get the Senator's thought, not on one question, but on three.

There is a research section in the bill, in which I believe the Senator from Ohio is very much interested, which I believe he fathered in 1945. There is a serious question in my mind whether this will be efficiently operated unless we provide for a sufficiently high salary so that the HHFA Administrator can get a really competent man. I wonder if the Senator would seriously object to an amendment, perhaps not bringing this office up to the same status with the FHA, but at least to some intermediate status, so that if and when the pay bill is passed, this administrator would be receiving in the neighborhood of $14,000 or $15,000. Otherwise, I doubt if we will get a competent man in the position.

Mr. TAFT. I have no very strong views one way or the other on the question the Senator propounds, and I have no responsibility or power to accept amendments. If the Senator asks whether I would vote for such an amendment, I should be very glad to examine the Senator's amendment. I do not care to commit myself at the moment because I have not studied the problem recently.

Mr. McCARTHY. Second, there is one farm provision which disturbs me very much, though not the first or second section. The first deals with farms which are self-supporting, and provides for loans to farmers, which I think is a good provision. The second provides for loans to a farmer who is living on a farm which is not presently self-supporting, but which can be made self-supporting. The third deals with grants to a farmer living on a farm which the Secretary of Agriculture has found will never support the farmer and his family. It provides for grants to keep a farmer on such a submarginal farm. I wonder if the Senator would agree with me that for a number of reasons that is a bad section.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not need to argue with me, because I have prepared an amendment which the Senator will find on his desk, to strike all that out. My feeling is that the provision does not provide a solution of the farm problem, and I think it would in the end result in the creation of more slum houses, rather than in their elimination.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask my third question if the Senator will turn to page 27 of the bill. This is something about which I want the Senator's opinion in view of his legal background. Will the Senator tell me what he understands by the language in line 21 "at specified rents"? I am particularly concerned with this question: Does not that language in effect defeat what otherwise seems to be the obvious purpose of the section, starting in line 20, allegedly the purpose of providing that to persons having the greatest housing need shall be given priority in a public-housing unit. I am concerned with what I think is trick language, because it seems to me it completely defeats what seems to be the obvious purpose of the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. When the Senator brought that matter up yesterday I read the provision, and it seemed to me to be quite ambiguous, and it appears to me the section would be clearer if that language were eliminated.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am submitting an amendment to that effect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate the conditions which I think should attach to this program and attach to other public-welfare programs.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to ask one question about the agricultural section, which was brought up by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TAFT. I was not dealing with the agricultural section. I have an amendment to the agricultural section which I shall offer later. I should rather deal with it at the time it is offered, if I may. I do not think an adequate study has been given to the farm housing problem in general.

Mr. BRICKER. I was going to ask about that section, but I shall bring up the matter later.

Mr. TAFT. First, Mr. President, the administration must remain with the States and local governments. Second, we must confine the aid to those who cannot pay their own way. Third, the cost must not be too great, because it must be paid by the other four-fifths of the population who are earning their own way, and should not be discouraged.

The clear difference between the program proposed and what might be called a welfare-state program is shown by the Truman proposal for national compulsory health insurance—so-called insurance. It is not insurance. It is a proposal that the Federal Government tax all the people to pay all the doctors to give free medical services to every citizen. It would violate the principle of State administration, because the whole program would be administered by a bureau in Washington. It would violate the principle of giving aid only to those who were unable to pay for it, because it would give free medical care to everybody. If we extended the same principle to food and clothing and shelter, we would have a completely socialized state. I think the real distinction between the program that is proposed here and the one proposed in the other measure is shown by contrasting it with the proposal for socializing the medical profession, which violates every one of the principles I have mentioned. The program would cost this Government, on the basis of what it has cost England, closer to seven or eight billion dollars than the two or three billion dollars talked about.

I only mention that at this point to call attention to the fact that if we do not want that kind of program, we must adhere, in the welfare programs, to the principle of State administration and control, as I think we do in the proposal of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and myself and other Senators, of giving subsidies or assistance only to those who cannot themselves pay. Further, we must not put the minimum floor so high that the cost will be burdensome on the other members of the population.

It is said we should not extend Federal expenditures in any way. I am willing to economize, I am willing to cut down the scope of any program, but I do not believe that merely because of the tremendous burden of the foreign program, we should entirely eliminate what should be done in the United States.

The budget contains about $237,000,000 for housing in the fiscal year 1950. In my opinion that is much more than can possibly be spent in the next fiscal year.

I doubt if any more than $100,000,000 will actually be expended during the fiscal year 1950. The total cost of this program, over 5 or 6 years, is estimated to be about $500,000,000 for redevelopment, and about $750,000,000 for subsidies, recognizing the fact that the program will increase gradually, and that probably 2 years will be required even to complete the first of the public housing projects. So there would be an average of about $250,000,000 net a year for the cost of the entire bill during the 5 or 6 years. I would estimate the cost to be about $100,000,000 during the first year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have listened with great interest to the discussion of this measure by the Senator from Ohio. I have been waiting for an appropriate time to arrive to inquire of the Senator the full extent of obligations the measure incurs. Since he has reached the point now where he is discussing the anticipated expenditures to be made under the bill for the next 4 or 5 years, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio, whose judgment I respect very highly, and who I know has given a considerable amount of thought to the proposed program: What is the total maximum obligation we are incurring—not what may be spent or may not be spent—but what is the total obligation we are incurring on the part of the Federal Government by title I of the bill for the next 4 years, or through July 1, 1953?

Mr. TAFT. Title I, dealing with urban redevelopment, as I read it, authorizes $1,000,000,000 in loans and $500,000,000 in grants. The $1,000,000,000 should be paid back, I should think, in all cases, within 5 years from the time it is loaned. So I should say that the net cost to the Government would be $500,000,000, so far as the program goes. As a matter of fact, I think it should be recognized that if the program is a success—and it is an experiment; I do not know how this plan of cities buying up property and redeveloping will work—the $500,000,000 will not go very far, but we can see, after we get through, whether it has apparently been worth while or not. That ends that obligation so far as title I is concerned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask the Senator a further question. As I understand, the Senator concedes that title I authorizes the issuance of indebtedness to the amount of $1,000,000,000 during that period, through July 1, 1953. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, in addition to that, does it not authorize as a maximum $1,000,000,000 in contributions or grants during the same period?

Mr. TAFT. Five hundred million dollars, as I have arrived at the figure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Five hundred million dollars; but the bill provides, on page 10, that the President may increase that sum another $500,000,000 in making certain determinations?

Mr. TAFT. No. I thought the President's determinations related only to 1 year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I read from lines 14, 15, and 16 on page 10:

> And any such authorized increase therein may be increased, at any time or times, by not to exceed in any fiscal year an additional $100,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but subject to the total authorization of not to exceed $500,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator thinks it is made subject to that?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is my understanding of it, certainly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am trying to clarify the situation. That would make then the total authorization under title I at present, as we begin the program, of $1,500,000,000? Is that correct? That is the initial obligation the Federal Government is assuming, of course, with the anticipation that the money loaned would ultimately be repaid?

Mr. TAFT. The Government is bound to get back $500,000,000, because it gives it to the cities to enable them to give it back to the Government. I mean that in effect the bill says the Government loans $1,000,000,000 to the cities and they can keep $500,000,000 of it. That is what it amounts to. So the net cost is $500,000,000. I doubt if the Government will ever have outstanding more than that amount.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not follow the Senator. If we give it to them to give it back to us, what is the sense in the first place?

Mr. TAFT. Let us say a city buys a considerable amount of property. The Government gives it the money with which to buy that property. Then the city turns around and sells that property. The city may sell the property to itself, or it may sell the property to the county or the school district or to private parties. Then the city pays the proceeds back to the Government. But the Government, in this total program, permits the retention of $500,000,000 of what has been paid out by the Government. The municipalities which have purchased such properties will probably not sell the properties for more than $500,000,000. They pay the Government back what they get out of it. The Government is financing a turn-over operation, and the Government says it will pay two-thirds of the net cost of that operation, not to exceed altogether $500,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let us turn to title II. I ask the Senator, What is the total obligation the Federal Government is incurring under title II of the bill during the same period of time?

Mr. TAFT. The same power is also contained in title II to loan money, although I do not believe it is spelled out, but I think the power is carried over from the previous act. The lending feature is not very important. All such money loaned in the past has been paid back. The metropolitan housing authorities can borrow money from the public, and are not likely to borrow it from the United States. So far as the bill is concerned, it authorizes a total subsidy of not to exceed $308,000,000 a year for 40 years.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In grants?

Mr. TAFT. In grants, in subsidies, for low-income families.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But title II does authorize the incurrence of an indebtedness through the issuance of bonds, to the amount of one and a half billion dollars, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. I did not see any figure. I read the language rather hastily. Under title II, there is certainly authority to lend money, though the housing authorities are not likely to request the exercise of that authority, because, as I have said, the history of such matters has been that the metropolitan housing authorities can borrow the money cheaper in the markets than they can secure it from the Federal Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We are providing in the bill that they are to get it from the Federal Government at the current rates.

Mr. TAFT. Where is that language, I ask the Senator?

Mr. McCLELLAN. On page 37.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I am trying to ascertain, I may say to the Senator from Ohio, is the maximum obligation the Federal Government is incurring initially by the enactment of this legislation, over the 4-year period which is specifically specified in the bill with reference to the amounts that are authorized during that period. That is what I am trying to determine.

Mr. TAFT. The loans, in the first place, are perfectly good. Heretofore such loans have all been paid. There has never been any trouble respecting such loans. The housing authorities can obtain loans on the market at a cheaper rate than they can obtain them from the Federal Government. So I tried to persuade the sponsors of the bill to leave out the loan provision altogether, because I do not think there is any chance in the world that it will be used.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means we will not have to lend any money for the construction of the projects?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think we will have to lend the housing authorities a dollar. I do not want to avoid the issue. In effect we finance the bonds they issue through the agreement to give them $308,000,000, or some lesser sum, a year, for some 40 years. These bonds are sold, in effect, on the guaranty of the Federal Government to pay this subsidy during those years. That is the basis for the construction.

The total the metropolitan housing authorities may have to borrow is somewhat difficult to estimate, but I think it might amount to as much as $8,000,000,000. Assuming that the cost is $10,000 per family unit, and about 800,000 units are constructed, the total cost would be about $8,000,000,000. The housing authorities themselves are obliged to put up some of the money—10 percent. So something like $7,000,000,000 would be borrowed. The money is borrowed very largely on a contract with the Federal Government that it will subsidize the rents of the particular housing projects for 40 years. The total involved is not to exceed $308,000,000 a year. That, roughly speaking, is the difference between what the authorities can get from the low rent and the actual cost of paying interest, sinking fund, and operation of the buildings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask the Senator another question. Does not the bill authorize the Authority, which is the Federal Housing Authority, as I interpret it, to issue obligations which the Treasury must purchase, in the amount of $1,500,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. It is not required to purchase them. The Treasury may make contracts to lend up to some figure. I do not see any figure of one and a half billion mentioned here, but I am willing to take the Senator's word for that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In return for that lending, the Authority issues bonds to the Treasury Department.

Mr. TAFT. They have not done it, and I do not think they will ever do it. However the authority is there.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I mean. The authority is in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. The practical method is that they sell their bonds to the public, and they sell them as municipal, tax-free bonds. They can sell them at less than 2 percent. All the recent public housing buildings have been financed in that way, not by money of the Federal Government. Today I do not believe the Federal Government holds, under the previous law, any bonds whatever of the metropolitan housing authorities. They have all been refinanced and sold to the public. I do not regard that feature as important. It may amount to $1,500,000,000, but if so, it is a perfectly sound loan which will be paid off shortly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the authority is there.

Mr. TAFT. The authority is there for some figure. I do not know where the figure of $1,500,000,000 appears.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is on page 37.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am trying to get information on this subject. The Senator states that the grants authorized under title II cannot exceed $308,000,000 per annum.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I might add at this point that that is the total authorization. A contract is made on a particular public housing project for a grant which, we will say, shall not exceed $1,000,000 a

year for subsidies. Up to date the history has been—I doubt whether it will be quite so favorable in the future—that only a proportion of that subsidy has been called for. However, I think we must contemplate the possibility of having to pay it all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I correctly interpret the provisions of the bill, title IV authorizes $250,000,000 for loans, and only $12,500,000 for grants during the 4-year period. That is in connection with the farm housing program. Is that the Senator's understanding of the obligation which would be incurred under title IV?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. In connection with section 403, which provides loans for housing and buildings on potentially adequate farms, a subsidy is authorized for 10 years, until they are made self-supporting. There is a total possibility of $5,000,000. Under section 404, which is the section with respect to which I have an amendment to strike out, the grants may amount to $12,500,000. Those commitments are not beyond 10 years, as contrasted with the 40 years with respect to city housing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I have been trying to understand how much in the way of additional obligations we are placing upon the Federal Government by the enactment of this bill, to be met in the next few years. The Senator says the money will not be used, that it will not be necessary; but I am talking about the authorization. According to my interpretation of the figures in this bill under the titles to which I have referred, the total obligation could reach $5,000,000,000 plus over a period of 4 years.

Mr. TAFT. I do not admit the strength of the Senator's argument. So far as the loans are concerned, they are loans that are to be repaid. There is no question about their being repaid, and I do not recognize that as any serious problem to the Federal Government.

In my opinion, the cost of the program which we must contemplate is approximately $325,000,000 a year added to the budget, as a maximum, at the end of 5 years. I think we must contemplate that as the possible cost of this program.

Of course, I feel that today the United States is spending too much money. We are spending $42,000,000,000. We are spending $5,580,000,000 in the ECA appropriation. Altogether, we are spending about $7,000,000,000 abroad. The ECA appropriation is, in effect, in part to conduct a housing program in Great Britain. Without any question they are building public housing. It is a part of their program. Of course, as part of their whole capital construction program it is financed by the money which we advance the British. I do not believe we should say that we are to do that to the exclusion of what we ought to do in this country.

Suppose this program costs $325,000,000 a year for 5 years. It will not cost that much. Suppose aid to education costs $300,000,000 a year. Suppose the health program costs three or four hundred million a year. If we thus spend $1,000,000,000 for public welfare, I should say that in any reasonable comparison of the importance of the subject, and in any reasonable comparison of what we ought to spend, that is a very small contribution to make to a program in which I believe we should be vitally interested. I think it is more important than public works. The budget calls for more than $3,000,000,000 this year alone, for public works. If we are to contrast this program with the general public-works program, I should say that during the 5 or 6 years while this program is in progress we would spend between $25,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000 on public works in the United States.

I say that the provision of welfare aid for people whose living conditions are below standard, and to afford equal opportunity to children, is infinitely more important than would be indicated by the comparison of $5,000,000,000 for 5 years and $25,000,000,000 for public works for 5 years, to say nothing of what we are spending abroad.

I believe that we must economize. However, I believe that we must consider the entire program. I do not believe that we can cut out one thing entirely and say that we are not concerned with it, that we recognize its importance, but because it happens to be new we will not enter into it. It seems to me that we ought to consider all the things we ought to do, and scale them all down. I am trying to scale down the number of houses which can be built in a single year under this program. One of my amendments would reduce the 250,000 units a year which the President might authorize under the bill as it is, to 175,000. I think it is fair to say that we must do each of these things on a reasonable economic basis. We cannot go beyond a certain total. However, it seems to me that there is no argument for entirely eliminating the programs for housing, health, and education simply because we are foolish enough to spend as much as $7,000,000,000 to help foreign countries and are refusing for the moment to reduce it. I hope we may reduce the amount before we are through.

Public works are more popular than this type of program. We are afraid to cut the appropriations for public works. This program deals in intangibles—assistance to people who are so poor that they cannot provide for themselves. So while the program has a certain popularity, it has not the local appeal or the force behind it which a public-works program has. Yet I think it is infinitely the more important.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make this comment: I think the Senator knows that I share his views regarding foreign spending. I voted for the Senator's amendment to reduce the authorization for that purpose. My only objection to the Senator's amendment was that it did not propose a sufficient reduction.

I am not saying that that program is not needed abroad, or that the objectives are not worth while, or that they do not merit our support and our effort to try to rehabilitate countries abroad. But at that time I was doing just what the Senator from Ohio says he is doing now, namely, trying to measure our ability to carry on these programs and finance them and meet the obligations we incur and provide an equitable distribution of our financial means to our various needs—this program and others which are vitally needed—and not exclude one or discriminate against one to the advantage of another.

Mr. President, I think there is great danger that the Federal Government may continue to incur or accept obligations which will be continuous, going on year after year, so that we shall have to appropriate for them indefinitely; and by that means, as we take on new obligations, we shall continuously raise the cost of government, so that ultimately the cost, under our various obligations, will become so great that we shall not have sufficient productive capacity to maintain it. Then, when a crash comes, in my opinion, Mr. President, instead of having a few slum areas, as we may have now in the United States, and instead of being able to eliminate slum areas, we shall simply be creating more slum areas, rather than less. Certainly that is what will happen if we do not guard the financial ability of the country to meet the financial obligations we incur, with the result that we incur greater obligations than the Government can meet and the taxpayers can support.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me restate my position on this matter: Let us determine what we can afford to pay in taxes. Perhaps it is $36,000,000,000. If that is the total, I am quite willing to advance housing as a reasonable claimant to $300,000,000 out of the $36,000,000,000. I do not see why it should be entirely eliminated, why we should hesitate to undertake anything in respect to housing, simply because we are spending too much on a number of other things. I think the matter is relative.

I maintain very strongly that the figure carried in this bill is not excessive, when dealing with one of the greatest problems the Nation has.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I have been examining the definitions contained in the bill. Incidentally, let me say that I have not had opportunity to study the bill as carefully as I should like to, for I am a member of various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and several of them are meeting at almost every hour of the day. But from my limited examination of the bill, I have not been able to find in it a definition of the term "low-income person" or "low-income group"; I have not been able to find in the bill any yardstick with which to measure them. Is there such in the bill?

Mr. TAFT. The yardstick is to be found on page 25:

The Authority shall not make any contract for loans—

And so forth, going down to line 19, as follows—

unless the public housing agency—

That is the local public housing authority—

has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Authority that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits

for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise unaided by public subsidy is providing (through new construction and available existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof.

What it would come to is this: Suppose old-style private housing in a city is available at, let us say, $30 a month rent. The Authority would take off 20 percent, which would bring the figure down to $24 a month. In other parts of the bill, as I recall, it is stated that the person who receives such assistance is assumed to be able to pay not more than 20 percent of his income for rent. Consequently, if he has to pay $24 a month as rent, his monthly income could not be over $120, which would make his yearly income $1,440.

Mr. CORDON. Where is that found in the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the Senator from Washington can help us determine the correct page.

Mr. CAIN. It is on page 44.

Mr. TAFT. The method of calculation which ordinarily is used is stated on page 44 with additional allowances if there are additional children in the family—in short, that the income of the family does not exceed five times the annual rental. Therefore, it all goes back to what the rental rate is for old housing in the particular community. As I have said, if it is $30 a month, then $24 is the highest rent which can be charged in the project; and those who are admitted to the project cannot have incomes in excess of five times the amount of that rent, or $120 a month, with, of course, additional allowances if there are more children in the family.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator explain the phrase, in line 9, on page 44, "net annual income"? As I understand the bill, each family is to be granted a $100 exemption for each minor child; and after the net annual income is determined, not more than 20 percent of it may be paid for rent.

Mr. TAFT. That is a new one to me. I do not know about the use of the word "net" in that connection. From my point of view, certainly it should be clarified by law or regulation. I have not read the report on that point. I suppose it must mean after taxes. I do not know what else it could mean.

Mr. CAIN. It could mean almost anything, I observe, and could be as loose in construction as the term "specified rents," to which the Senator recently took exception.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think the Senator from Washington is justified in his criticism.

Mr. President, I have tried to set forth the reasons why I think the general welfare program should be adopted and why I believe we should undertake this program, in spite of the budget situation.

We also have a program for education, a program for health, and a program for welfare. I think the attack on the housing program has been very largely unjustified, in view of the merits of the program. The attack has been centered on the manner in which a good deal of the public housing was administered during the war, when it was not administered well. It was administered then under great handicaps, because war workers were required to be admitted into such housing, and many of them had incomes in excess of the maximum allowed for persons who were to be admitted to those projects. But most of those difficulties are chargeable to the confusion incident to the war, and the projects themselves were not properly subject to such criticism in normal times.

Another basis of criticism was that some persons thought the Government was going into the housing business. Mr. President, this bill does not admit of such criticisms. Personally, I am willing to say that sufficient safeguards should be adopted so as to insure the carrying out of the purpose, which is to make minimum-living-standard housing available to all families in the United States, so that children may have an equal opportunity to grow up and to become self-respecting citizens, and an equal opportunity for education and for acquiring reasonably decent habits and reasonably decent standards by which the rest of their lives may be guided.

I believe we should adopt this 6-year program, in spite of its cost of $300,000,000 a year for the next 40 years.

I myself have visited many of the public-housing projects, and they have accomplished good. I have gone through the city of Cleveland, where such projects have been built in some places in what formerly were slum areas. The public-housing projects have not only improved the condition of the people who live in them, but they have raised the standard of the entire neighborhood. They have raised the general character and the morale of the people in those communities. I do not believe that anybody who has studied the question is opposed to public housing, if properly limited as it should be, and as I believe it is limited in the pending bill, and in the present Housing Administration. I do not think there is any real opposition or any substantial alternative presented by which the problem can be dealt with. So I think the Senate should adopt the program substantially as presented in the bill, with such amendments as the Senate may see fit to adopt. I shall offer one or two myself. I believe the Congress ought to adopt the program and start the United States toward the elimination of what I think is the greatest social evil in the United States today.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one or two very brief questions?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. During the early part of the Senator's presentation, I remember he referred to the number of American families which, in his opinion, were currently receiving less than $2,000 a year in the way of family income. I have forgotten the figure used by the Senator. I should like to consider it for a moment, if I may.

Mr. TAFT. I have a table from the Bureau of the Census. I may say to the Senator that I have not personally a great deal of confidence in the figures on family income. I do not think the statistical methods have been sufficiently developed, and yet they may be accurate enough. I do not think it is necessary that the exact character of those figures be maintained in order to make the argument. But the figures—and I should be be very glad at this point to place the table in the RECORD—show that 21.8 percent of all the nonfarm primary families have less than $2,000 a year; between $2,000 and $2,500, 11.4 percent; between $2,500 and $3,000, 11.4 percent; making a total of 44.6 percent, which is the figure I used—44.6 percent of all the families with an income under $3,000 a year.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask to what year the Senator refers?

Mr. TAFT. The year 1947, the last year for which I could find any figures.

Mr. CAIN. I am greatly interested in these figures or any others that may be available, to see whether they compare with other so-called reliable figures. I hold in my hand the Economic Report, which includes the message of the President, which was referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, January 7, and which, on page 14, contains certain statistics on the subject which appear to be very greatly different from those used by the Senator from Ohio. Those figures show that for 1947, of our American families, which in that year totaled 36,240,000, 20 percent, or roughly 7,000,000, were receiving less than $800 a year, and that the second fifth of our population, which would therefore encompass a total of 40 percent of our people, were receiving less than $2,000 a year. If there is any validity in one set of these figures, there can be no validity of any kind or character in the others. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks table 2 of the Economic Report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Average money income, after taxes, received by each fifth of the Nation's families ranked by size of income*

[Dollars of 1947 purchasing power]

Family units ranked from lowest to highest income [1]	Money income after tax [2] (1947 dollars)	
	1941	1947
Lowest fifth	$562	$796
Second fifth	1,444	1,933
Third fifth	2,421	2,992
Fourth fifth	3,523	4,226
Highest fifth	7,245	8,574

[1] Includes single-person families.
[2] Liability for Federal personal income tax.

Mr. TAFT. Of course there is one fundamental difference which must be recognized, and that is that there are included in the figures given by the Senator between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 farm families.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Also, that the general level of income of the farm families is lower than the others. So that that again raises a question. I think, though,

that even after making that allowance, it represents a much lower estimate of income than the table I am placing in the RECORD.

Mr. CAIN. That appears to be so.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distribution of nonfarm primary families by total money income and wage-and-salary income in 1947

Income level	Total money income	Wage and salary income
	Percent	*Percent*
Under $500	2.7	3.1
$500 to $999	4.7	4.6
$1,000 to $1,499	6.5	6.4
$1,500 to $1,999	7.9	8.7
Under $2,000	21.8	22.8
$2,000 to $2,499	11.4	12.2
$2,500 to $2,999	11.4	11.7
$3,000 to $3,499	12.3	35.9
$3,500 to $3,999	9.5	
$4,000 to $4,499	7.7	
$4,500 to $4,999	5.4	
$5,000 to $5,999	8.3	17.4
$6,000 to $9,999	9.6	
$10,000 and over	2.7	
Total	100.0	100.0
Median	$3,224	$3,184

NOTE.—According to the Census Bureau, no further break-down is available on nonfarm families by smaller income class intervals than is shown in the above table.

Source: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the Senator from Washington can very well question this: The median is $3,224, whereas I think the average income there referred to is about $2,500.

Mr. CAIN. I have no desire to question the figures as such. I am in hope, along with other Senators, that we may get some figures on which we can rely.

Mr. TAFT. These are the highest figures I have seen from any source, and I am perfectly willing to accept them, because I think they make the case for public housing practically as well as the other figures.

Mr. CAIN. My interest in the figures is, I think, shared by the Senator from Ohio, because from those figures we can more nearly determine where we are headed with reference to the field of enterprise we are discussing, and where we are actually to begin with reference to this particular piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. In fact, I am rather glad to find the higher figures, because it indicates we may not have to go so far.

Mr. CAIN. The program may not be so pressing as might appear from the figures.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, at the end of 5 or 6 years it may be found that the cost of housing has been sufficiently reduced so that private housing will be within the reach of a larger number of families. I should hope that other answers may also be found to the problems of housing, so we will not have to continue public housing, or at least not have to continue it at the rate proposed in the pending bill, after the 6 years. But I perfectly recognize we may find it necessary to have another 5- or 6-year program before that could be accomplished. I do not know.

Mr. CAIN. I have endeavored to caution some of our colleagues to recognize that when we begin with a program of 810,000 homes to take care of the admitted needs of certain families of low income, it seems to me that necessarily we are committing ourselves to take care of similar situations in the years that lie ahead. From such figures as the Senator from Ohio and I have cited we can begin to think of a long-range future program and commitment for the purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington withhold the suggestion?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hunt	O'Conor
Baldwin	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cain	Kefauver	Russell
Capehart	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Connally	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Lodge	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Ellender	McClellan	Taft
Ferguson	McFarland	Taylor
Flanders	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thye
George	Malone	Tobey
Gillette	Martin	Tydings
Gurney	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hayden	Miller	Wherry
Hendrickson	Millikin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Morse	Withers
Hill	Mundt	Young
Hoey	Myers	
Holland	Neely	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the pending amendment, which is the referendum amendment, was discussed yesterday at some length, and I can only hope that most Senators have had an opportunity to consider and study the reasons of justification which were given. I am completely satisfied that the adoption of no other amendment will be so important to the long-range success of the slum-clearance, redevelopment, and low-rental proposals which are now before the Senate. The amendment simply provides that no project or projects in a locality or community which can be assisted under the provisions of Senate bill 1070 will be approved or undertaken until they have been approved by a referendum of the voters at any general or special election.

If the amendment shall be adopted by the Senate I have reason to believe that the following three things will be made reasonably certain:

No governing body of any locality, which, in most cases, is the city council, will undertake a project in opposition to a majority wish of its people. I think the Senate would not like to think that any city council would undertake a redevelopment, slum-clearance, or publicly subsidized low-rental housing project against the opposition of the citizens of the community.

The second objective to be achieved is likewise, I think, a very important one. No governing body of any locality will be able successfully to refuse to undertake a project which is desired by a majority of its people.

The third, and, I think, the most important, is that the Congress will know that every project which is undertaken is supported by a majority of the citizens of the locality in which the project is to be situated.

I believe that the results to be achieved from the adoption of the amendment are imperative to the success and health of the slum clearance, redevelopment, and Federally subsidized housing programs which are soon to be approved by the Congress.

If the Banking and Currency Committee and the Senate really mean to respect and be guided by the wishes of a given locality, the amendment ought to be accepted by the committee and adopted by the Senate.

When the proposed legislation is enacted into law it will be fatal to its success if projects are undertaken where they are not desired or are prevented from being constructed where they are needed. Only through a community's majority vote can these determinations be logically and intelligently made.

Every Senator ought to be keenly and fully conscious of this one fact, that the bill before us contains provision for a total and eventual cost in excess of $15,000,000. But, looking at the proposal in any way we like, it represents a mere beginning. Eight hundred and ten thousand subsidized low rent houses will be made possible by the proposed legislation. These are to be lived in by families receiving low incomes. When the legislation is passed we have, I think, committed ourselves to providing comparable homes for comparable families of low income in the many years which lie ahead. Unless we wish to bankrupt our Nation, and eventually destroy the construction industry of this country, we ought to make absolutely certain that no Federal project is ever undertaken in any community when a majority of the citizens in that locality are willing or determined to solve their housing and redevelopment problems without seeking assistance from the Federal Government.

America has approximately 14,000,000 families whose annual incomes, after taxes, are less than $2,000. This distressing knowledge must convince every Senator and citizen who thinks that the proposed legislation is but a small step, if our intention is to provide eventually a federally subsidized home for every family of low income.

Should the amendment be approved, it would mean that the American community will exercise a far greater degree of caution and thought before it embarks

on a course from which there will be no turning back. The amendment will not weaken the proposals which are before us. It will strengthen them, and make them much more reasonable. It will encourage Americans to think before they act. If they are permitted to do anything less, our Government will have been negligent, extravagant, and unnecessarily unwise. As one who shares a national aspiration for ever greater health, happiness, and a higher standard of living for all our citizens, I hope deeply that the amendment prevails.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Knowland	Robertson
Cain	Langer	Schoeppel
Ferguson	McFarland	Smith, Maine
George	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Williams

NAYS—55

Anderson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chapman	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Lodge	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Ellender	McClellan	Taylor
Flanders	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thye
Gillette	Maybank	Tobey
Hayden	Miller	Tydings
Hendrickson	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hill	Morse	Withers
Hoey	Myers	Young
Holland	Neely	
Hunt	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Graham	McCarthy
Brewster	Green	McGrath
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Chavez	Jenner	Wagner
Downey	Kem	Watkins
Eastland	Lucas	Wiley
Ecton	McCarran	

So the amendment offered by Mr. CAIN on behalf of himself and Mr. BRICKER was rejected.

Mr. BRICKER. I call up my amendment lettered "D," in which the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] joins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, or does he wish to have it stated at the desk?

Mr. BRICKER. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I shall proceed to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 28, after line 11, insert the following:

"GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE AMENDMENT

"(10) (a) No housing owned and operated by the United States or by a local public housing authority which is assisted by annual or other contributions from the United States (except housing specifically provided for military, naval, air force, or other Government personnel) and no such housing the rental of which is subsidized or assisted by the United States shall be occupied by any person employed by any branch, department, or agency of the Federal Government, local State government, or local county, parish, or municipal government.

"(b) All annual grant contracts hereafter made for assistance and subsidies to housing of the character described in subsection (a) shall provide that such housing shall not be occupied by persons employed by any branch, department, or agency of the Federal Government, local State government, or local county, parish, or municipal government. In the case of any existing annual grant or other contract for aid to such housing no change shall be made therein unless the provisions of this subsection are complied with.

"(c) No money shall be paid by the United States or any agency of the United States after the enactment of this act for or toward the operation of any housing of the character described in subsection (a) of this section, or to any housing authority to aid any such housing for any period during which the same or any unit thereof is occupied by persons employed by any branch, department, or agency of the Federal Government, local State government, or local county, parish, or municipal government.

"(d) No person shall misrepresent his employment status in connection with the occupancy of any housing of the character described in subsection (a) or to which the United States contributes any aid or assistance. No person shall lease or occupy any such housing or knowingly permit the occupancy thereof in violation of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. It shall be a violation of this section by the person or persons acting for the lessor knowingly to lease such housing in violation of subsection (a) and it shall be a violation of the section by the person or persons occupying such housing in violation of subsection (a) at the time the same is occupied and a new violation of this section each month such person or persons continue to occupy such housing in violation of this section. Any violation of this section shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 1 year, or both.

"(e) Any citizen, association, firm, or corporation in the United States shall have the right to sue to enjoin any violation of this section, to initiate criminal prosecution under this section or to sue for the recovery of any money paid out by the United States or any agency thereof in violation of this section and in such suit recovery may be had for a penalty in an amount equal to the amount paid out by the United States. The amount recovered for the United States for money improperly paid out shall be paid to the Treasury of the United States and the amount of the penalty shall be paid to the person bringing the action. The district courts of the United States and State courts of general jurisdiction are hereby authorized to hear and adjudicate suits authorized by this section."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the amendment prohibits Government employees of the Federal, State, or local governments from being housed in the subsidized housing units. That provision of the amendment is as follows:

(10) (a) No housing owned and operated by the United States or by a local public housing authority which is assisted by annual or other contributions from the United States (except housing specifically provided for military, naval, Air Force, or other Government personnel) and no such housing the rental of which is subsidized or assisted by the United States shall be occupied by any person employed by any branch, department, or agency of the Federal Government, local State government, or local county, parish, or municipal government.

Mr. President, the only justification for Federal subsidies to housing is in order to give shelter, housing accommodations, to the lower-income groups. I do not think we can classify employees of the Federal, State, or local governments in the lower-income groups. If it is true that they could be so classified, their salaries ought to be raised commensurate with their responsibilities. Under the civil laws of the States, and of the Nation, and even of the local communities, I believe the salary standards are such that there is no need for Federal subsidy for housing facilities for them.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator's amendment cover teachers, thereby prohibiting teachers in the public schools from taking advantage of this kind of housing?

Mr. BRICKER. I think the amendment would prevent teachers from taking advantage of subsidized housing.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly the teachers should be paid salaries adequate to take care of their needs. Their salaries should certainly be commensurate with their responsibilities, which are very real and very great. If the local communities do not pay sufficient salaries to their teachers now, they should increase those salaries in sufficient amounts.

I now wish to read from the report of the Investigation of the Public Housing Authority in the San Diego and Los Angeles areas, by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of the Eightieth Congress. I read merely two or three paragraphs appearing on pages 6 and 7 of the report. What is set forth here may not be typical, but it certainly is an accurate report of what happened in the area in question. The situation is similar in other areas of the United States, and the report bears that out.

I know of one instance in, I believe it is Massachusetts, where the mayor of a city is living in one of the subsidized units. If a mayor has sufficient influence with his fellow citizens to have them elect him as mayor of his community, he has rather close contacts with public authorities no doubt which would give him a priority for housing in one of these units. It is to get away from such special priority which is given to those who do not need it, that I have proposed the amendment. I read from page 6 of the report I mentioned, as follows:

Some of the Housing officials, who draw annual salaries as high as $8,700 a year, are living in Government housing projects which cost $34 per month for three-room apartments.

Men with incomes of $8,700 are living in a $34-a-month apartment subsidized by the Federal Government.

The highest rent paid by any employee of PHA in any of these projects is $54 a month for a three-room house, furnished. Other Federal employees housed in the Government projects in this area are from Bureau of Internal Revenue, Justice Department, and Immigration Service. Most of the Government workers are not war veterans, but those who are veterans are entitled to priority in the Government projects.

Of course, that would be true under the pending bill.

One Federal official in the San Diego area occupies two houses in the Government project. The first rents for $32 a month, and he gets the second for an additional $7 per month, or a total of $39 a month for the two houses. This situation was justified (hearings, p. 10) by the fact that this official has six children and needs two houses. He is not a veteran. This official's salary is $8,179 a year. Some time after 1945 several of his children married and moved out. He no longer needed two houses, but nothing has been done to move him out of the two houses and into one. The normal rent should be $64, and he pays $39.

Another Federal employee lives with his family in a private dwelling in a nearby town, but maintains a house in the Government project for week-end use. He is not a veteran. He has been occupying this house on week ends since 1942. A memorandum in the PHA files as of January 13, 1947, described this employee as "overhoused."

And yet he is given a federally subsidized apartment to use on week ends.

Another tenant was Enos Baker, who is identified in the FBI records as a Negro Communist leader. He is not a war veteran.

* * * * *

Another tenant, A. C. Rogers, was identified as an active Communist and one of the principal Communist organizers in California. He occupies a four-bedroom house at $34 a month. He is not a veteran. Another house has remained unoccupied from December 1946 to February 1948. Inquiry disclosed that the tenant was using the house merely as a storage room for his furniture while he was building a new house in another part of the city. During this interval the PHA had a waiting list of 3,000 applicants for housing, most of them war veterans (hearings, p. 14).

Another tenant (Warren E. Bliss), employed as a deputy zone collector by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, applied for housing on March 19, 1947. Although he is not a war veteran, he was assigned an apartment on March 21.

Another nonveteran, Richard G. Griffith, applied on March 6, and obtained quarters on March 12. This tenant is not a Government employee.

The records of the subcommittee's investigating staff carry the details of about 40 nonveteran occupancies, in which Government officials and well-to-do citizens are occupying three-bedroom apartments at $32 and $35 per month, while more than 2,500 bona fide veterans are on the waiting list in that area.

Collections for water rents, trash removal, and parking-space upkeep are several years in arrears. That condition has resulted from lack of aggressive action on the part of the Accounts and Project Services Sections.

Leasing and occupancy suffers from many glaring defects in illegal certifications to nonveterans and to Federal and local government employees. Notorious Communists are housed. Few quit agreements are exacted from tenants. Week-end tenants were not evicted, and 186 PHA employees, or 37 percent of area employees, were housed on PHA projects.

It is to prevent that kind of situation from prevailing in the new projects that this amendment has been offered. Anyone who is influential enough in his community, who has the political contacts or the influence to get a job either in the local or Federal Government, certainly would also have contacts to get a prior allocation of one of these units in a housing project, as has been proved by the record from the subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the last session.

I personally know that this situation prevails in many communities where Federal employees are housed in the community. Most of the employees in some sections of the PHA are housed in units subsidized by the taxpayers, at the same time depriving those who are in actual need of the housing which was built for them, for which the taxpayers had to put up the money, and for which we are here attempting to authorize $308,000,000 a year for a 40-year subsidy.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator read only the first 10 lines of his amendment. Will he indicate what the remainder of the amendment relates to?

Mr. BRICKER. The remainder of the amendment contains the enforcement provisions. It provides a penalty for any one who misstates his position, or who obtains an apartment or rental unit without revealing the fact that he is a public employee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The remainder of the text simply implements the portion read by the Senator?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. The important part is what I read at the beginning.

Mr. CAPEHART obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] asked for the yeas and nays on his amendment. I do not know whether or not the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. The question was not put.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to hear someone discuss this amendment who feels that it is not fair and equitable. I cannot possibly conceive of any argument against the amendment. It seems to me that anyone who is working for the Federal or State government is certainly receiving sufficient compensation to enable him to pay rent or own his own home, as do millions of other taxpayers. In my own mind I cannot find any argument or excuse for not voting for this amendment.

It is a known fact that those working for the Federal and State governments have permanent employment. They are paid regularly. They are never laid off. They may be eliminated from the pay roll, and when they are eliminated from the pay roll they assume the same status as that of any other citizen. They are entitled to live in one of these projects if their income is so low that they can qualify. However, as I have stated, Government employees have permanent employment. They must be receiving sufficient compensation to pay their rent. If they are not, either the Federal Government, the State government, or the city government is to blame.

I challenge anyone to give me an argument or to cite facts or reasons to show why this is not a good amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Some of the points brought out in the discussion of this subject in the Committee on Banking and Currency are still fairly fresh in my mind.

One question which was raised was whether charwomen who are engaged in cleaning post offices, and so are Government employees, should be barred. Another question which was raised was whether a resident janitor for a group of buildings should be barred.

Still another question which arose was this: Should the country fall on evil days and should WPA—God bless its soul—be aroused from the dead, would the fact that a man was so fortunate—or unfortunate—as to be engaged in WPA work justify throwing him out on his neck from Government housing?

Mr. CAPEHART. Why does the Senator say "throwing him out on his neck?"

Mr. FLANDERS. That is what this amendment would do.

Mr. CAPEHART. He is not in yet. How could he be thrown out if he were denied the right to move in?

Mr. FLANDERS. They come in under the conditions provided in the bill. Suppose they should fall on evil days. If they work for a WPA, they thereupon become ineligible. That is the way I read the amendment. I may be mistaken.

Mr. CAPEHART. If we have a return of WPA and PWA, and have, as we did a number of years ago, ten or fifteen million unemployed, and two or three or four million working for WPA, we certainly cannot supply sufficient rental apartments for all of them.

Mr. FLANDERS. The only question I raise is whether that justifies throwing them out on their necks.

Mr. CAPEHART. I still do not know what the junior Senator from New Hampshire means by throwing them out on their necks.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The junior Senator from New Hampshire has not spoken at all. If he were speaking, he would point out that they would not necessarily land on their necks.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is my understanding of the amendment that it simply would make it impossible for anyone working for the Federal Government, the State government, or the city government to move into a low-rental-housing project.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. As I read the amendment, it would bar the charwomen of the Government who work in Government buildings and who clean our offices, the elevator operators, and other low-salaried Government employees from having the benefit of low-priced housing units supported by the Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why do we pay those people such low wages?

Mr. TOBEY. That is not the question. The objective is to bar them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that anyone working for the Federal Government is receiving $1,600 a year or more?

Mr. TOBEY. It may well be so; but should that bar them from Federal housing projects? Should they be barred from such projects because they earn $1,600? Is that the criterion?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; but I understand that in the bill there is a limit with respect to income. What is the limit in the bill?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is a member of the committee. Does he not know?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am asking the Senator from New Hampshire. Does he know?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I do know. The Senator from Indiana is speaking in behalf of the amendment. I wonder if he knows about it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from New Hampshire does not have the floor. I appreciate the fact that he would like to manage things, but he does not happen to have the floor at the moment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to ask not for the floor but to have the Senator from Indiana yield to me very briefly.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to give to the Senator from Indiana what I conceive to be a hypothetical case which is well within the range of probabilities: An elevator boy working, let us say, in a Federal building, who is the son of a widowed mother and has two minor brothers and sisters, and is himself just a young fellow. That is well within the range of possibilities or even probabilities. I suggest that this amendment would not allow that boy's mother and that little family to go into public housing; but I think they should be allowed to go into it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the distinguished Senator from Vermont be willing to amend the amendment so as to have it provide that any Federal, State, or city employees making more than $1,500 a year, let us say, would be ineligible?

Mr. FLANDERS. I say to the Senator from Indiana that, to my mind, the standards set forth in the bill will prevent abuse.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. I do not know that I speak for the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who was the original author of this amendment; but as one who gladly joined him in offering the amendment, I would recommend that it be amended so as to make it possible for employees at the various levels in the Government service to live in these projects, provided their salaries or incomes in no case exceed the annual income permitted any other American citizen living in such projects. By the adoption of such an amendment to this amendment, we would make certain that the managerial personnel, who on occasion have abused these privileges, shall not do so in the future; we would make certain that various other governmental employees whose salaries considerably exceed the maximum permitted for admission into such federally subsidized low-rent housing projects, which substantially have been constructed to get rid of slums in America, are precluded forever from living in such establishments.

With any encouragement from the author of the amendment, I should like to see such an amendment offered to it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Indiana that he might suggest to the junior Senator from Washington that he would add nothing whatever to the amendment by making such an amendment to it, because those terms are already in the bill, and they apply just as much to Government officials or employees as they do to anyone else.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. I think it is very clear to the Senator from Vermont, as it is to me and to other Members of the Senate, that federally supported accommodations throughout the United States have been occupied in part by large numbers of persons whose incomes have been far in excess of the maximum permitted under the law for the occupancy of those places. If we place in this law a prohibition against permitting the occupancy of such accommodations by any governmental employee whose annual income is in excess of the amount stated in this bill, we shall have grounds for preferring specific charges against whoever might permit such an abuse to occur.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Federal Government is paying anyone, at the moment, such a small salary for doing janitorial work or for sweeping floors or for doing other work that he is unable to rent a house or an apartment for himself and his family, then certainly we should raise such person's compensation sufficiently to enable him to maintain a home, just as any other citizen does.

I still maintain that it is sound to provide that Federal, State, and city employees should not be permitted to live in projects of this sort.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Indiana that if he listened to the suggestions of the Senator from Washington and if he were minded to reply to them, he might suggest that persons with large incomes who continued to live in public housing, did so because Congress passed a law freezing them in possession of such accomodations, but that law was repealed at the special session of Congress last summer, so that point is not at all pertinent to the present discussion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am not the author of the amendment.

I congratulate the able junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for submitting it. If he wishes to change it, I shall be happy to support it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to state, for whatever consideration Senators may see fit to give to my statement, that if the amendment in the form in which it was submitted by the Senator from Ohio were to be adopted in the amended form suggested by the junior Senator from Washington, there would be a real feeling of gladness on the part of most American citizens, because there are tens of thousands of them who are convinced that many of the accommodations in these projects are occupied by persons who have no right to be there; and the unsubsidized American citizen takes violent exception to providing a part of his hard-earned income to support governmental employees, many of whom earn more than he does, in these federally subsidized projects.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I say again that if any government—Federal, State, or city—is paying its employees so little that they cannot afford to rent a home or an apartment, then something is wrong with that government, and that condition should be corrected.

Again I say that I believe we should adopt this amendment prohibiting Federal, State, or city employees from living in these projects; and I shall support the amendment of the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. LANGER. Do I now have the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I rise to speak against this amendment.

At the present time we have approximately 8,000 mail handlers. Approximately two-thirds of them are veterans who have families to support. Up to the time when we passed the last pay-increase bill, they were being paid $1,950 a year. With the $450 increase subsequently provided, they now are receiving $2,400 a year. Federal employees already are being discriminated against: They cannot take any part in politics; they cannot even express their opposition to those who oppose their interests.

I remember very well that less than a year ago, when we tried to obtain even a small pay increase for such employees, at the time when that move was blocked because we could not obtain unanimous consent to have that measure considered, the distinguished Senator from Indiana invited the Senator from North Dakota to go over to the other side of the aisle, suggesting that he was more of a Democrat than a Republican.

Mr. President, I, for one, want to protest against this discrimination against Federal Government employees. I have heard Senators say that there are too many Government employees; but when we ask such Senators to state in which department of the Government the number of employees should be reduced, their silence is eloquent.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the Federal employees as a whole have done a very fine job, and did an exceptionally fine job during the war. It happened that while I was chairman of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate, charges were made in the House of Representatives that some of the women employed by the Federal Government were not working as they should, that there was malingering and loafing on the job. Our committee then employed two experts to look into that matter, and they went from place to place to find out whether that charge was true. With one exception they did not find a single place where Federal employees were loafing on the job, where men were sitting with their feet upon the desk reading newspapers, or where the ladies were taking their knitting along with them. So, Mr. President, in behalf of the Federal employees, whom I know so well, I want to protest against any kind of amendment being adopted which will discriminate against them any more than they are being discriminated against at the present time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator was directing his remarks to the Federal employees. But is the Senator not familiar with the fact that there are many State and county employees—for example, in my State, game wardens and fire wardens—who receive as little as $60 a month? Does the Senator not also recognize the fact that there are other people who because of old age get jobs escorting children back and forth across the streets, who receive not more than $50 a month? Does the Senator believe there is any reason why such persons should be excluded from low-cost housing?

Mr. LANGER. I believe the pending bill, without the proposed amendment, is the very kind of law the people to whom the distinguished Senator from Louisiana refers should have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bridges	Kerr	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cain	Knowland	Schoeppel
Capehart	Langer	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Long	Sparkman
Connally	McCarthy	Stennis
Cordon	McClellan	Taft
Donnell	McFarland	Taylor
Douglas	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Magnuson	Thye
Flanders	Malone	Tobey
Frear	Martin	Tydings
George	Maybank	Vandenberg
Gillette	Millikin	Watkins
Gurney	Morse	Wherry
Hayden	Mundt	Williams
Hendrickson	Murray	Withers
Hill	Myers	Young
Holland	Neely	
Humphrey	O'Conor	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is now meeting by leave of the Senate. The chairman of the subcommittee is the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and he has asked me to announce that the following Members have been in the meeting and, for that reason, did not respond to the quorum call: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HILL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. MCKELLAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "D," offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for himself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—27

Bricker	Gurney	Reed
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cain	McCarthy	Taft
Capehart	Malone	Tydings
Cordon	Martin	Vandenberg
Ecton	Millikin	Watkins
Ferguson	Mundt	Williams
Fulbright	O'Conor	Young

NAYS—53

Anderson	Hendrickson	Knowland
Baldwin	Hill	Langer
Chapman	Hoey	Lodge
Connally	Holland	Long
Donnell	Humphrey	McClellan
Douglas	Hunt	McFarland
Ellender	Ives	McKellar
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	McMahon
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	Magnuson
George	Kefauver	Maybank
Gillette	Kerr	Morse
Hayden	Kilgore	Murray

Myers	Smith, Maine	Thomas, Utah
Neely	Smith, N. J.	Thye
O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Tobey
Pepper	Stennis	Wherry
Russell	Taylor	Withers
Saltonstall	Thomas, Okla.	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Graham	McGrath
Brewster	Green	Miller
Byrd	Jenner	Wagner
Chavez	Kem	Wiley
Downey	Lucas	
Eastland	McCarran	

So the amendment lettered "D," offered by Mr. BRICKER for himself and Mr. CAIN, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "A," in which the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] joins.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

(9) In recognition of the fact that public policy requires equality of treatment of all people and prohibits discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry in regard to public housing, every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for any low-rent housing project initiated after March 1, 1949, shall provide that the housing project to which the contract refers shall be operated without discrimination or segregation. Any person who in the management or operation of such housing discriminates or attempts to discriminate against any person, family, or group of people on account of race, creed, or color shall be guilty of a violation of this section and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment. Any citizen or organization may enjoin the violation of this section in any court, State or Federal, of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am confident the amendment speaks for itself. I said yesterday that there had been a great deal of shadow boxing in the Congress in the attempt to place responsibility for the failure of the civil-rights program. This is the one chance we will likely have to vote on this question during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. President, this amendment does not represent an attempt on the part of the Congress to impose its will upon any State, upon any community, upon any organization, upon any employer or employee. The amendment merely says in effect that the Federal Government subsidy shall be used without discrimination among the citizens of the country since all taxpayers must pay the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to an imposing pamphlet called the Democratic Platform of 1948. On page 13 occurs this very significant statement:

The Democratic Party is responsible for the great civil-rights gains made in recent years in eliminating unfair and illegal discrimination based upon race, creed, or color.

The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination.

We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the full and equal protection of the laws, on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Not to be partisan in any respect, Mr. President, the Republican platform was just as laudatory of its efforts along this line and pledged its support, with the Democratic Party, to the same common end. So we are merely living up to the spirit and the intent of the platforms of the two major political parties in the last campaign, and of the Constitution of the United States, which requires that all citizens be treated equally, justly, and fairly.

Mr. President, since this is likely the only opportunity this body will have to pass upon any segment of the civil-rights program during this session of the Congress, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION OFTEN AGGRAVATES HOUSING AND FOOD PROBLEMS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this body will very soon resume its consideration of the administration's three-part free-trade program, a program which will add to the low-income groups and unemployment in this country and add to the problem the current housing bill is designed to cure.

The second part—the first is making up the trade balance deficits of the 16 European nations in cash each year through the ECA—is the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years.

The State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy based upon the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—upon the theory that the more they divide our markets with the nations of the world the less their annual trade balance deficits will be.

The third part of the three-part free-trade program is the International Trade Organization treaty which would be the last rivet in the permanent free-trade program for this Nation. This organization consists of 58 nations, each with 1 vote, that will meet at least once each year and add up the remaining production and markets of the world, and divide them among the nations of the world ultimately on the basis of population.

Under the ITO this Nation relinquishes all authority over the adjustment of our tariffs and import fees, the system used for many decades to advance our standard of living in accordance with the energy and intelligence which our people apply to their work.

PRODUCTS OF LOW-WAGE EUROPEAN AND ASIATIC LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Free trade means putting the American working man in direct competition with the low-wage living standard labor of Europe and Asia. The products of such labor, through the use of our machinery and know-how, will displace the production of the higher living standard working men in this country.

The choice here then is a very much lower standard of living for our workers in this country, or wholesale unemployment.

Mr. President, in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an article under the heading News and Views by Alexander S. Lipsett, published in the Potters Herald, of East Liverpool, Ohio, a weekly labor newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS AND VIEWS

(By Alexander S. Lipsett)

Serious questions are again raised in connection with the pending authorization of the second installment of the 4-year Marshall plan. Government estimates call for expenditures of $5,580,000,000; the Republican opposition has unsuccessfully demanded cuts ranging from 10 percent of the above total to $1,000,000,000.

During the debate Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, discussed certain aspects of the European recovery program which are of particular concern to the wage earners of America. He alternately denounced the ERP-ECA "through which we are arming Russia for the third world war" and the free-trade program of the Truman administration as "pulling jobs out from under the feet of the American workers," adding:

"American companies are now moving into European countries to utilize European cheap labor and furnish the foreign market—including the American market—with commodities which will displace American workers at home. The President of the United States has gone so far as to propose that such foreign investments by American companies be guaranteed by the United States with the inevitable result that their product will flood American markets and throw millions of workers out of employment. He is doing this at a time when already we have 4,000,000 unemployed and 9,500,000 workers on part time.

"All this is being done under the spacious plea of stopping or containing communism. Actually, Mr. Truman is waging a phony cold war against Soviet Russia on the economic front. If the Truman program is approved by Congress, American labor will be sold down the river like Czechoslovakia at Munich. Our factories will stand idle and Stalin will have won the cold war without firing a shot."

Allowing for exaggeration and oratorical fireworks, the loss of jobs resulting from the move of large American concerns to Europe is serious indeed. Our trade-union movement, wholeheartedly in favor of the Marshall plan and its humanitarian purposes, has apparently paid little attention to the use to which billions of American tax dollars are put abroad. Nor is this an attempt to drag a red herring across the ERP trail. Victor Riesel, in his column "Inside Labor," furnishes interesting details:

"What's worrying the labor people most is the shift of whole factories from the United States to Europe, Scotland in particular. More than a dozen United States firms have set up Scottish shops in the past few years. Largest of these moving closer to the European market is the Remington Rand Co., makers of typewriters and office equipment. Some 12,000 mechanics throughout New England and New York lost their jobs when Rand shifted to Scotland and Canada."

Trade-unionists are bound to ask under these circumstances whether the Marshall plan is really the blessing described by inspired editorials and a well-oiled Government propaganda machine. American labor is willing to do its share for the impoverished people abroad. However, our readiness to help others does not imply that we should lose our shirts and jobs in the process. It might be well for the national spokesmen of labor to take a second look at

what is happening to the livelihood of millions of Americans under the roseate disguise of international cooperation and plenty for all.

Ever since the end of the Second World War the American people have been promised relief from the burden of extravagant bureaucracy. What is the truth? According to the United States Civil Service Commission, 109,000 new Federal pay rollers were added in 1948. American taxpayers now carry more than 2,200,000 Federal civilian employees on their shoulders—more than twice as many as in 1940—almost four times as many as in 1933.

What about the employment of Government employees abroad? At the end of 1948, no less than 193,767 civilians were working for the United States Government in 96 different countries overseas, not including the military personnel in the occupation forces of Germany, Japan, and Korea. An examination of our overseas bureaucracy shows 582 Federal employees in Brazil, 525 in British Guiana, 3,185 in Cuba, 5,886 in Puerto Rico, 27,488 in the Philippine Islands, and so on.

Senator MALONE in his fiery exhortation said that when labor becomes aware of the results of the administration's program "there will be repercussions of a major character." Perhaps there will be.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ENLARGES LOW-INCOME GROUPS

Mr. MALONE. The resulting unemployment or reduced standards then leads to the necessity for additional public housing, food subsidies, and other relief problems, since through the three part free-trade program, now being urged upon Congress, the low-income groups will substantially and continually increase.

Much of the time of Congress is being utilized in meeting relief housing and food problems created by their own actions.

MANY OF OUR OWN PEOPLE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

Mr. President, I have many times, before this body, said that many of our people are not living well; that at least 40 percent of the population of the Nation is at this time having a hard time paying the taxes and keeping the children in school. I am gratified that several Members of the Senate have recently had an opportunity to become familiar with such conditions in this city. If time permitted for a full examination they would probably find similar conditions in 75 percent of the cities of this Nation. Mr. President, the people have an acute dollar shortage at this time.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article by William J. Brady and Bert Wissman, published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS FIND, AT LAST, D. C. SLUM SQUALOR—SIGHTS NEAR CAPITOL STUN INVESTIGATORS

(By William J. Brady and Bert Wissman)

Shocked Senators yesterday finally learned the disgusting truth about the slum areas festering within a few hundred feet of the Capitol, their revealing on-the-spot investigations coming after civic leaders and welfare organizations had pleaded in vain for years for corrective legislation.

Their dramatic "discovery" of the facts about the city's "blighted areas" came after five legislators had made an impromptu tour of filthy, evil-smelling and crowded shacks within a 6-block radius of the Senate Chamber.

* * * * *

Despite the lengthy discussion of slum conditions that preceded the tour, the Senators were ill-prepared for what they saw. All were visibly shocked. Some said they were "incensed" that such conditions exist.

Civic and welfare officials, who have been shocked and incensed for many years at the horror of the slums, last night were hopeful the Senators' investigation would lead to prompt corrective legislation—legislation which they and the Times-Herald have been advocating for two decades.

After the tour, MORSE stood in the Senate Chamber and described to his colleagues the blighted areas. He said he saw scores of homes in which there were no running water or heating facilities. One place—"a shambles of a 4-room house"—sheltered 16 people, he declared.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from an address which I made in the Senate on March 5, 1948.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am only a humble Member of this august body, and I have been here only a year. I wish to make it plain that I do not have all of the answers, but I wish to say that when I came to the Senate I took an oath—and that occurred recently enough that I remember it—to protect the Constitution of the United States, and I construe that also to mean the property of the United States. Certainly we do not protect our money and our property by scattering it throughout the world in an attempt to reach a balance of trade for all of the countries of Europe, many of which already have recovered, as shown by the industrial index, beyond their 1937 positions, but which still want to buy in 1948 goods valued at $5,300,000,000 more than they are able to produce. In other words, these countries want to buy more than they sell, or to spend more than they earn, just as many families in the United States are inclined to do. Today most families in the United States are out of the dollar balance. But our families have to pay their own way. That is what all our people have to do. Similarly I point out that at some time in our national affairs we must come face to face with realities and must pay the piper.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Congress does not have money. The only source of funds for the appropriations we make is the taxpayer, and, Mr. President, every man and woman in this country pays his share of the taxes, either directly, or indirectly, through the bread they eat and the clothes they wear.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD another excerpt from the address which I delivered on the floor of the Senate on March 5, 1948.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Secretary (Secretary of the Interior) seems to have given little consideration to the fact that $17,000,000,000 (Marshall plan) added to the $24,000,000,000 which the Congress of the United States has appropriated since World War II and passed out as gifts to the nations throughout the world is more money than the entire taxable value of the 11 Western States added to that of the 14 Southern States, which together make 64 percent of the area of the United States.

That is what we are giving away, and we are foolish to do so. It is proposed that we accomplish it in 2 weeks. At least, that was the time set. At that rate we would finish the job of giving the entire country away in a very short time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is time that we examine the fundamentals underlying our economic structures and reestablish a firm national policy under which we can maintain our wage-living standard, and which will tend to eliminate the conditions to which much of our special legislation is directed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment lettered "A," offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the roll is called I should like to answer the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] with respect to the amendment now pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator has as yet voted. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think we should be very careful to see what the exact effects will be of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Ohio. It necessarily creates a sharp conflict within the hearts of all of us who want, on the one hand, to clear the slums and to provide decent housing for the slum dwellers and who, at the same time, feel very keenly that we should not treat any race as second-class citizens. We believe that all human beings are indeed children of God and that in our democracy they should be granted equal rights and opportunities. There are differences between individuals, but we want to see men judged and treated according to their individual merits and neither exalted nor depressed because of the accident of their birth.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will in any event probably be supported by the hard core of some 25 to 30 Senators on the other side of the aisle who agree with his thinking in virtually all matters. It will, of course, be opposed by the approximately 30 Senators from the Southern and border States.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator does not imply in that statement, does he, that all who support or may support this particular amendment, in doing so are opposed to the whole idea of public housing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In no sense.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York expects to support the amendment, because he believes in the principle involved in it. The Senator from New York also wants to make it clear that he

is also going to support the public-housing bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to say that no one could question the good motives of the junior Senator from New York. I certainly do not. I know that he has been a stalwart friend of slum clearance and public housing throughout his public career.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York thanks the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not clear to me what the Senator from Illinois means when he says that 25 Senators on the Republican side of the aisle will vote with the able Senator from Ohio because they think as he does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I simply mean that if we take the roll calls during this session we will find that there is a group of from 25 to 30 Senators who generally agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CAPEHART. Could it be possible that the Senator from Ohio might agree with the other 24 Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Let us say there is a community of feeling or a community of thought among them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Presiding Officer: What is the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "A" offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. WHERRY. Was there a vote on the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the clerk began to call the roll, but no Senator voted before the Senator from Illinois obtained the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the issue will turn on what we Democrats of the North and West, some 25 in number, who regard ourselves as liberals do on this matter together with what the small but gallant group of liberal Republicans on the other side of the aisle decide to do.

Now what would happen if we voted for and hence adopted the Bricker amendment? The answer is very simple.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Illinois mean that this small and gallant group of liberals is going to vote for the amendment or does he mean it is going to vote against it? Being liberals, of course, they would vote to support an amendment which provides that there shall be no discrimination. Which is the gallant group?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois yielded for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to say is that the amendment creates quite a storm in the hearts of 25 northern and western Democrats, and, I think, in the hearts of the small but gallant group of Republican liberals on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means the gallant group which is going to vote for the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall make my position clear very shortly, I will say to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have a chance to finish my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator need not yield to any Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There has been one sentence of discussion on my part and 10 sentences of query.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Illinois need not yield to anyone for any purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What would happen if we voted for and hence adopted the Bricker amendment? The answer is very simple. It would inevitably defeat the whole housing bill itself. I think every Member present in this Chamber knows that to be a fact, and knows why it is so. But it needs to be made plain to the people of the country.

In the first place, it would compel virtually all of the some thirty southern and border State Senators to vote against the housing bill as a whole, once this amendment were included in it. Many of them would do this with a heavy heart, for they believe in this bill and want to see it passed. But their sentiments and those of the people whom they represent are so intense on this question that if the choice is presented between added housing with the abolition of segregation in the housing projects of the South and no housing at all, they will choose no housing. We may deplore their feelings, as I personally do, but let us judge not, lest we ourselves be judged.

Let me emphasize the fact that from all I can learn a large majority of the southern Senators are in favor of the bill in its present form without the Bricker amendment. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has for years been one of the leading sponsors of this bill. In the present session, perhaps its two most vigorous and intelligent champions have been the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. As a humble member of the Banking and Currency Committee with those Senators, I want to pay tribute to the devotion and public spirit with which they have fought for this measure. If the Bricker amendment is not included, they and a large majority of their southern and border colleagues will vote for the measure, and enable it with northern and western help to pass. But if the Bricker amendment is adopted, then all of them will move into opposition.

What then will the junior Senator from Ohio and those on the other side of the aisle who stand with him do? Here I want to speak with accuracy and clarity. First, let me say how grateful we are to such splendid Senators on our committee as the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. It so happens that I am the junior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator from Illinois mean the senior Senator from New Hampshire or the junior Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I meant the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. WHERRY. I thought the Senator was speaking of the other liberals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, with no disrespect to the other Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] I can say that wherever Senator TOBEY sits, there is the head of the table.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Illinois has spoken about the probable opposition to this measure on the final vote if this amendment were incorporated in it. Is the Senator sanguine enough to believe that there would be a vote at any time soon if the amendment were incorporated in the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am afraid not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think there would be a vote on anything involving civil rights if it were taken up for debate on the floor of the Senate—even including the cloture rule?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should not like to enter into a discussion of the Wherry amendment to the rules of the Senate. I have already expressed my views in that connection. However, on the whole, I believe that makes it very difficult to bring these measures to a vote. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I did not raise this question. He himself raised it.

Mr. WHERRY. Why do we not put the cloture rule to a test and see whether or not we can end debate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the moment I am discussing the pending amendment.

I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]

that by their constructive criticism of the original measure they have greatly improved it, and in a very real sense they are coauthors of the bill. I for one cannot be too grateful to these men and to the group for whom they speak, and I am sure that the millions of people huddled together in body-weakening and soul-depleting slums, out of their darkness and their misery nevertheless recognize these men as their true defenders and champions. All honor to them. And all honor, too, to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for the way he has championed the cause of decent housing during the yast 4 years.

But the real question is what the 25 or 30 Senators on the other side of the aisle who join with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] will do. Here again I want to be both charitable and just. Unfortunately I have not had the opportunity to become well acquainted with the junior Senator from Ohio, but from what I have seen of him, I like him. He is friendly in manner, direct in speech, and has a saving sense of humor. He has been justly honored by his State and his party. I hope that what I have to say will not cause him a momen'ts pain, for that is the last thing on earth I wish to do.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for a suggestion. He can yield only for a question.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. TOBEY. In justice to the visible evidence and the physical facts, would not the Senator from Illinois add to the statement with respect to the junior Senator from Ohio and the handsomest Member of this body on either side of the aisle?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is probably correct. I hope that what I have to say will not cause him a moment's pain. That is the last thing on earth I wish to do. But surely it is permissible to point out that the Senator from Ohio has made no secret of his attitude toward the bill. He is opposed to it. He would be opposed to it without his amendment, but he would also be opposed to it if it were to include his amendment. I think he is opposed to the bill on conscientious grounds. He does not believe that the Government should go into the business of clearing the slums and providing decent housing for low-income families living in the slums.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. My position was made clear yesterday. I am in favor of the slum elimination section. I am opposed to the public housing section. I favor the research section, and I am opposed to the farm housing section.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I respect the sincerity of the junior Senator from Ohio, although I disagree with his conclusions. I think the evil is so great that the Government should act. It is no idle mind-reading, therefore, when I say that the adoption of his amendment would not win over the junior Senator from Ohio to the support of the bill which he so sincerely dislikes. Nor, I am sure, would it win over the support of the large group of Republican Senators who feel as he does on this subject. Their group, when joined with the southern and border Senators, would then be sufficient to defeat the bill as a whole.

We therefore have the choice of voting for the Bricker amendment prohibiting segregation in public housing everywhere and thereby killing the whole program, or voting it down, enabling the act to be passed, the slums to be cleared, and the 810,000 dwellings to be constructed, and then let the localities themselves decide this question of segregation in public housing.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator be in favor of the amendment if he were certain that the bill would pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am pretty certain that the bill would not pass.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator please answer my question? Would the Senator be in favor of the amendment if he were certain that the bill would pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Personally I do not believe in segregation; but I also know that the Southern States are firmly committed to that principle, and I do not want at this time to disrupt the United States of America during a period of grave national crisis when we are being threatened by the police state in order to force upon them what I believe to be correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator from Indiana could guarantee the passage of the bill with the amendment. Would he go so far as to say——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana may be permitted to answer the question of the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CAPEHART. I intend to vote for the bill, and I intend to vote for the amendment. That is more than the able Senator from Illinois intends to do. He is going to vote against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator yielded only for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As for me, the choice is clear. I want slum clearance and housing for 4,000,000 people. I want it for all groups, regardless of race, creed, or color. I should like to point out to my Negro friends what a large amount of housing they will get from this act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator going to vote for the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I am not going to vote for the amendment.

I should like to point out to my Negro friends what a large amount of housing they will get under this act. At present Negroes occupy approximately 46,000 dwelling units in Federal Housing projects, or about one-third of the total. This does not mean that the Negroes, who form only one-tenth of the total population, have been unduly favored. Because of their poverty and the bad quarters in which many of them live, they need a third of the units. It does show, however, that the American cities as a whole have not discriminated against the Negroes in providing quarters for them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield. I feel as though this afternoon I were the bull in a Spanish bull ring, with the banderilleros opposite throwing in the darts. But I have learned to develop a thick hide; and the toreador, the matador, the bandellero, or what have you, can now cast his darts.

(Manifestations of applause in the galleries.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries are not permitted to engage in demonstrations of any sort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question; the Senator can call it a question from a banderillero or anything he wishes to call it; but I still am a Member of the Senate of the United States, and when the Senator from Illinois states that he is in favor of all these things, but then says he will not vote for them, I think I have a right to question him so that I can learn where he stands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask this question of the Senator——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the junior Senator from Illinois think that if this bill passes without this amendment, one Negro family will have an opportunity to obtain quarters in any of the units which are to be built under this bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly do.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why is the Senator from Illinois afraid to put it into the law?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me point out that of the approximately 140,000 units constructed by the Federal Housing Authority, I believe, exclusive of those originally built by the Public Works, 46,000 are now occupied by Negroes, or one-third of the total, despite the fact that Negroes form one-tenth of the population; and in virtually every southern city that I know of, dwellings have been constructed for Negroes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. But in those units, Negroes are segregated; are they not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I renew the question. Here is a question for the local community to decide, through the Housing Authority. I ask this question of the Senator, most respectfully: Does he feel that these units can be built and handled in such a way that a Negro family can have an opportunity to move into

quarters in them, and, if so, why is not the Senator from Illinois in favor of writing such a provision into the law? What objection is there to doing so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Because the South believes, I hope, in the principle of equal treatment for the races, but does not believe in intermingling the races. As I said to the Senator from Georgia during the debate a month ago, I think they see things from the wrong perspective, but it is their choice.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. TOBEY. A moment ago the distinguished Senator from Illinois spoke of the bull fight and the toreadors and the gay banderilleros, and so forth. Is it not true that what was really in the heart of the Senator from Illinois was that he wanted to shy away from those who were trying to throw the bull? [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I welcome the wit of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois not only shied away, but he has not even answered my question as yet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I have.

Mr. WHERRY. Then does the Senator from Illinois feel that if there is to be equal opportunity in the case of the units to be authorized under this bill, even though such a provision is not contained in the statute, Negro families will have the same right that white families will have to occupy these units? Is that the Senator's statement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Negroes should have the same right that whites have for decent housing, according to their need.

Mr. WHERRY. Will they get it under this bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They will.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Did he notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement that when the hearings on housing were commenced before the Banking and Currency Committee, at the meeting of the full committee the chairman placed in the RECORD a statement showing the number of Negro units in Columbia, S. C., and in Charleston, S. C., and showing that there were more Negro units in Columbia than units for whites, and that in Charleston the number for Negroes was equal to the number for whites, although the populations of both of those cities are predominantly white?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; and when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina was mayor of Charleston, as I recall, he constructed in that city two of the earliest public-housing units. One was for Negroes and one was for whites; and he gave equal treatment to the Negroes in that respect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, that was under an authorization where provisions were made for segregation. However, I am speaking of the pending bill. Does the Senator from Illinois feel that under this bill the decision as to whether any units will be built for Negroes is to be left with the local housing authority, to be reaffirmed by the Housing Authority in Washington?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. But the Federal Housing Administrator could refuse to authorize the construction of projects which were unduly weighted in favor of one group.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he is familiar with a statement by the National Council of Negro Women, with offices at 1318 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a copy of the statement, but I shall be glad to have the Senator from Minnesota explain to the Senate what it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota cannot do so in the time of the Senator from Illinois, under the guise of a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, Mr. President, I would reply to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I do know of that statement, which has been issued by the National Council of Negro Women, under date of April 12. The president of that organization is Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, certainly one of the leading Negro women of the country. Mrs. Bethune says their organization is opposed to the so-called Bricker amendment because they believe it would kill the housing program.

I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio will excuse me if I read some of the statements contained in this letter. The words used in it are not my words, but are Mrs. Bethune's words; I wish to make that point clear.

It says:

> Can we put our trust in the Cain-Bricker move—clearly calculated as it is to kill public housing? * * * Or do we work with our proven friends?

The answer they give is that they should oppose this amendment, as proposed, and should favor the passage of the bill without it.

I also have on my desk an article from the Chicago Defender, one of the largest Negro newspapers in the country, under date of April 9, opposing this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In reference to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], as to the number of houses or housing units which would be available to Negroes under Senate bill 1070, is not it true that according to the estimates made by the National Council of Negro Women, an organization which of course is fundamentally interested in the housing of more Negroes, under this bill, if housing for them is constructed in the same proportion as under the United States Housing Act of 1937, the American Negroes would receive 279,000 of the new homes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and those 279,000 houses would house approximately one and one-third million Negroes, or nearly 10 percent of the Negro population of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me make this comment in prefacing my question: One of the distinguished leaders in the field of housing, a fighting lawyer in New York City, is Charles Abrams. He has had a great deal to do with the construction of Stuyvesant Town. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether, as he has looked over the statement of the Council of Negro Women, he is familiar with what Charles Abrams had to say, and whether for the purposes of the Senate he would read what Charles Abrams had to say in reference to the pending amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall omit the personal references in the statement by Mr. Abrams.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is desirable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall say that Charles Abrams, writing in the New York Post, declared:

> If the device—

In other words, the Cain-Bricker amendment—

> succeeds, it will become the forerunner of a whole series of efforts to use the civil-rights issue as an instrument for killing off civil reform.

He goes on to say that the civil-rights fight—

> must be made on many fronts, but in choosing the front there is no compulsion to accept the one the enemy designates.

I want to say immediately that I do not regard the Senator from Ohio, of course, as being in any sense such an enemy. I am simply quoting Mr. Abrams. I want to make that very clear.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to yield to the Senator from Minnesota first.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the junior Senator from Illinois has this statement by Charles Abrams, referring to the amendment:

> The Cain-Bricker maneuver is made not to advance equality but to destroy public housing. If it succeeds, it will have killed the program which has done more to point the way to real nonsegregation than any other measure in our time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a continuation of the statement which I have read thus far.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I merely ask one clarifying question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that under the statutes of our Nation, under the United States Code, we have basic civil-rights protections which can be applied, and are being applied, by the courts of the United States and by the executive departments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there was a civil-rights law in 1866 on this issue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I should yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of all the observations made by the junior Senator from Minnesota and the statements made by the junior Senator from Illinois, I ask the Senator once again, if all those rights are guaranteed, if all this building were done under the Housing Act passed by the former Congress, which I helped pass, and which has worked satisfactorily, why cannot this matter be worked out in the pending bill? And if it can be, what is wrong about adopting the proposed amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will tell the Senator what is wrong with it. It would throw away 30 votes, or at least 25 southern votes, without any commensurate gain in support from across the aisle.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. But the local housing authority has the right to build the units. The local authority has the determination. The corporation or the local individual makes the application. It does not mean that all the units will be taken over by the people of any particular race or color.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. But the right is vested in the local authority. All that is proposed by the amendment is that there shall not be segregation. What is wrong with that? Addressing myself to Senators who have been in favor of the civil-rights bills, I inquire, what is wrong with that? It is up to the local authority to make the determination. Why not write it into the bill, if Senators mean what they say?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it related only to the city of Chicago, I should vote for the Bricker amendment, to be applied to local housing projects in the city of Chicago.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what is provided. We provide the authority. The application to the Federal Government must originate with the local authority. That is the great burden of the pending legislation. According to the preamble, when private enterprise fails, and when the local community needs housing projects, the local community must originate the application, for it is wholly within its power, we were told the other day. I ask the Senator whether he was on the floor when I addressed certain questions to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]? He said, "The Federal Government has nothing to do with it. It originates with the local community." The local community makes the application and it issues the bonds. The local community decides who may live in the houses. The local community decides for whom the Government is going to build the houses. I ask the Senator, if that be true, and amendments are being written into the bill, why not write into it that there shall be no discrimination? It is solely within the power of the local community, through its local authorities, to do as it chooses about building units for people of all classes. If the Senator is not for that, he is not for the purpose of the bill, he is not for the people in the slums, he is not for those he is trying to help.

Mr. LONG and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should first like to reply to the Senator from Nebraska. While I am a new Member of this body, I have certainly had sufficient experience to enable me to know the meaning of language. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that on page 2 of the amendment it is stated that every housing project must be operated "without discrimination or segregation." This would mean that in every single housing project of the South there would be a necessary intermingling of the races. And consequently, southern Senators would vote against the bill, and we would have no slum clearance or public housing. I should like to say——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish, please?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. It is up to the local housing authority, is it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the amendment a community cannot get any housing unless in each housing unit asked for there is to be no segregation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator from Illinois know that the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, headed by Mr. White, is for the Bricker amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is perhaps true. I have great respect for Mr. White, myself.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator read what they say, if I should hand the copy to him?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should be very glad to have the Senator from Indiana read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana cannot read it under the guise of a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should be very glad to read it for him. The Senator from Indiana has just handed me page 4886 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 20, containing a release which the Senator from Indiana put into the RECORD, quoting, "A press release which is undated, but which is issued by the Washington Bureau of the NAACP," under date of April 18. Would the Senator from Indiana like to have me read it verbatim?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall leave that to the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to do so. I want to see that the Senator from Indiana gets full justice.

It reads as follows:

> In telegrams to the Democratic majority leader, Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, and Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican minority leader, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People urged support not only for the amendment proposed by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, Ohio, to the multi-million-dollar public housing bill prohibiting segregation in public housing projects but asked for a broader amendment to cover all federally aided housing, public and private.
>
> The telegrams, signed by Leslie S. Perry, Washington representative for the NAACP, said—

That apparently is not Mr. White, but it is Mr. Perry. It continues:

> When the NAACP representative testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the housing bill, S. 1070, among other amendments advocated was one to prohibit racial segregation in Federal public housing.
>
> We have studied the antisegregation amendment proposed by Senator BRICKER and believe as framed it would correct part of the serious housing situation confronting racial and other minority groups.
>
> Federal funds should not be used to aid or subsidize by loans, grants, insurance, or any other means any housing, public or private, which segregates or otherwise discriminates against eligible citizens because of race, color, creed, or national origin.
>
> We, therefore, urge support not only for the Bricker amendment but a broader one to cover all federally aided housing contemplated by the bill.
>
> Since various public charges have been made regarding Senator BRICKER'S motives in proposing the amendment—

I desire to say that I have not only never made such charge publicly or privately, but I have never questioned his sincerity, either publicly or in private, either orally or in a writing of any kind. The telegram goes on to say—

> the association desires to point out that it looks to the legal effect of a proposed amendment or law; it does not probe the secret motives of the sponsor.

I shall go even further and say that I feel certain the motives of the junior Senator from Ohio are worthy in this respect.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator not know that the National Negro Council likewise is supporting the Bricker amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator likewise, for the benefit of Senators, read a statement addressed to them in that respect?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be delighted to do so. This seems to be a process in which I do the reading lessons for the Senator from Indiana, on this issue.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should be happy to read it, but I am not permitted to do so under the rules.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be delighted to do so. I cannot read it as well as could the Senator, but I shall try to read it as loudly. It reads as follows:

COPY OF RESOLUTION SENT TO SENATOR LUCAS, MAJORITY DEMOCRATIC LEADER, SENATOR MYERS, DEMOCRATIC WHIP, SENATOR TAFT, CHAIRMAN, MINORITY POLICY COMMITTEE, AND SENATOR WHERRY, MINORITY REPUBLICAN LEADER, DEMANDING SUPPORT OF BRICKER ANTIDISCRIMINATION AND ANTISEGREGATION AMENDMENT IN MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR NATIONAL HOUSING LEGISLATION BY THE NATIONAL NEGRO COUNCIL

The civil-rights conference of the National Negro Council, in a resolution, protested the unanimous action of the Senate Democratic caucus in ordering the defeat of the Bricker antidiscrimination and antisegregation amendment, proposed for inclusion in the multi-billion-dollar national housing legislation. This apparent public and open conspiracy to sabotage the constitutional guaranties of equal rights to 13,000,000 Negroes, would actually give official sanction for all time to come to such denial of their civil rights in the pending housing bill.

Such Senate action on the heels of the filibuster debacle by the Democratic majority of the Eighty-first Congress would serve notice of the complete repudiation of the President's civil-rights promises and the platform pledges of the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia last summer. * * *

The civil-rights conference, therefore, calls upon the Democratic and Republican leadership in the Senate, in keeping with the civil-rights pledges of both parties in their platforms and in this first opportunity for a direct vote on civil rights for Negroes in the Senate, to support the enactment of the Bricker antidiscrimination and antisegregation amendment as part and parcel of the national housing legislation or stand exposed for political insincerity and copartners with the Democrats in perpetuating the present Federal housing policies of racial discrimination and segregation.

EDGAR G. BROWN,
Director, National Negro Council.

I should like to say in reply to these statements that I think both gentlemen are mistaken. I am ready to appeal to history and to time that it is in the best interest of the Negro race that we carry through this housing program as planned, rather than to put in the bill an amendment which will inevitably defeat it and defeat all hope for rehousing 4,000,000 persons.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator realize that a large number of very excellent housing facilities have been constructed in the South exclusively for Negroes, and that many of the Negroes are very well pleased that the facilities have been built for Negroes and that the Negroes do not have to mix with the white people?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall not go into the question of segregation. My views on that question differ from those of southern Senators. I may say that we of the North should not try to sabotage housing in order to adopt an amendment the effect of which would be to defeat housing.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me finish first. As a boy I used to read Alice in Wonderland. It is a good book for everyone, including United States Senators, to read. The Senators will probably remember the passage in Alice in Wonderland describing the smile of the Cheshire cat, which continued after the cat itself had faded from sight. That smile was not very substantial. There cannot be a smile without a Cheshire cat. On the question of housing, let me say that nonsegregated housing without a housing bill does not amount to anything—and I follow the example of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] by pounding the desk to emphasize that point.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who will vote against the housing bill if this amendment should be adopted? Why is the Senator so certain that the bill will be killed? Who is helping to kill it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am a proud resident of the Middle West, but I happened to grow up in Yankeeland, in the State of Maine. A Yankee proceeds to answer one question by asking another, and I should like to answer the Senator's question by asking, Would the Senator vote, and would all the Senators around him vote, for this bill even if it included the Bricker amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that I would vote for it. I shall vote for it with or without the Bricker amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The question has been repeatedly put to the Senator from Illinois with reference to the defeat of housing if the Bricker amendment should be adopted, and reference has been made, apparently, to the question of defeating the bill. What I want to ask the Senator from Illinois is this: It is true is it not that no housing project is to be imposed upon any city or any local housing authority, but it is to be placed there only upon application of the local authority?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not merely good, practical sense, which we might as well recognize right here, that if the bill should pass and become law with an antisegregation amendment in it, no city or town in Southern States, where segregation is a custom and tradition, and, in most of those States, a part of the law, would have any housing project applied for; and is it not also a fact that the South is the place in which the Negroes most need housing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Alabama, as always, states the case accurately and with precision.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true, then, that for all practical purposes, public housing, certainly so far as the Negro is concerned, would be defeated, bill or no bill, law or no law?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York does not want to enter into any debate that would in any way do damage to the bill itself, because the Senator from New York favors the bill, but the Senator from New York would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois a question which, I think, is rather far reaching. Assuming the pending amendment comes to a vote and is rejected, will not its rejection be at least an implication, if not a direct indication, that the Senate of the United States condones and approves segregation and discrimination in public housing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe that any such implication or inference can be drawn. I do not believe in segregation in public housing. We are moving away from it in the North, and we shall continue to move away from it if this bill is passed. It is simply that we who oppose this amendment place the cause of existent housing as the most important thing, and we do not want to endanger it by adopting a provision which will throw the whole South into opposition to the measure. I think, as a northerner, I perhaps can speak on this subject, because, without indulging in mock heroics in the slightest, I know that I am taking a political hazard in making this speech.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Referring to the remarks of our distinguished friend from New York, I ask this question: In view of the fact that the court always looks at the committee hearings and the record of debate on the floor in considering legislation, will not any fair-minded person examine the record and see the motivating purpose behind the legislation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the reason I rose today to speak. Some persons have been telephoning me all day long, saying, "Do not speak on this issue, because whatever you say will be misunderstood and used against you." But I felt it was important to make the issue clear. Every Senator knows what the issue is, but the public does not know, and the

courts may not know what the issue is. That is why I rose and, in my humble and incomplete way, tried to make clear what is the real issue.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that insofar as public housing is concerned, segregation would not at all amount to discrimination, for the reason that the housing facilities would be the same, whether they were constructed for white persons or colored persons?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to say to my good friend from Louisiana that I think white men should realize the feelings black men inevitably have when they are told that because of the fact of color they are marked off, isolated, and cannot associate with white persons. I think the pain of being a black man in the United States of America is very great. So I do not think the Senator from Louisiana should excuse the southern position on that point by saying that Negroes want to be segregated. Perhaps some of them do; but, certainly, every man has the desire to be treated as a human being and accepted on his individual merits. As I say, I am between Scylla and Charybdis. I hope the classical Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] will correct me if I am wrong. I have been between Scylla on that side, and Charybdis on the other side, and it is quite possible that my ship will strike a rock somewhere between.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the group from Scylla.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if I correctly understood him to say that the amendment would endanger the legislation for the simple reason, as was pointed out by the Senator from Alabama, that the States where the need is great would take advantage of the situation. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is only a part of the story. It would prevent any public housing in the South. In my judgment, it would also probably defeat the purpose of the bill in the North itself and would result in no housing for the North, because, while I very much appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Indiana, my neighbor, I cannot believe that he speaks for any considerable number of the 25 or 30 Senators on the other side of the aisle who generally have an affinity for each others views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Illinois a question. In view of the statement he previously made that had this been Chicago he would have felt differently about the question we are discussing, and since the Senator from Illinois is on the floor of the United States Senate in a dual capacity, first as a Senator of the United States legislating for the entire country, and secondly as, in effect, a member of the municipal governing body of the city of Washington, I ask him whether he would feel that there was a different situation presented if an amendment were offered which would provide that in the Nation's Capital, the Capital of the United States of America, no public housing should be built under segregated conditions. A few days ago the able Senator from Maryland and the able Senator from Michigan were talking about making the United States Capital a kind of an example to the country. Would the able Senator from Illinois support an amendment providing that no public housing built within the District of Columbia should be segregated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, with full sense of the solemnity of my words, not as having any importance as coming from myself, I can say that I would support such an amendment. I think we have an obligation to realize that Washington is not merely a southern city, or a border city, but that it is the National Capital, and I think such a provision as that indicated by the Senator would be proper as coming from the Congress in the capacity of a municipal body, and I would vote for it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out, if I may, that I have tried to be extremely generous to those who have asked questions. I had a prepared statement which I had hoped I could finish in 15 minutes. I recognize that as a freshman Senator, I should not take too much of the Senate's time, and I had hoped to conclude very shortly. I have been on my feet almost an hour and nearly all the time has been taken up in discussion with other Senators. I think I have shown that I am ready to answer questions, but in simple justice and kindness I should like to ask that I be permitted to complete my address, and then if my unworthy remarks justify any questions, I shall endeavor to reply.

Oliver Wendell Holmes began the Autocrat of the Breakfast Table by saying, "As I was saying when I was interrupted." As I was saying when I was interrupted some half hour ago, to me the choice is clear. I want slum clearance, and housing for 4,000,000 people. I want it for all groups, regardless of race, creed, and color.

I should like to point out to my Negro friends what a large amount of housing they will get out of this act. At present, Negroes occupy approximately 46,000 dwelling units in Federal housing projects, or about one-third of the total. This does not mean that the Negroes, who form only one-tenth of the total population, have been unduly favored. Because of their poverty, and the bad quarters in which many of them live, they needed a third of the units. It does show, however, that the American cities as a whole have not discriminated against the Negroes in providing quarters for them.

I would expect that this approximate ratio will continue in the future, so that the Negroes stand to get under the proposed act about 270,000 dwelling units, or enough to house about one and one-third million people. This is nearly one-tenth of the Negro population of the country. I should like to ask those who are opposing my stand if this is something which should be lightly turned down. We have the chance to build a happier home life and to reduce the sickness and deaths amongst the Negro community by passing this bill and by providing for 1 out of every 10 Negroes. Is this not more important than asserting the right to nonsegregation in houses which will not be built? I prefer the substantial benefits which the act will bring. As we raise the level of housing, health, and education for Negroes and whites alike, and open up job opportunities more broadly, the severity of many of our race problems will be lessened, and we will find that the groups will be able to live in the same communities on better terms.

It should also be noted that the increase in public housing in the North will decrease the total amount of segregation which now exists. We northerners should be frank to admit that most of our communities do practice many forms of segregation. It is not done as openly or as sharply as in the South, but it is practiced. But the point is, and it is an important one, that we are ashamed of it in our hearts, and that we are seeking to reduce it. The trend in the North is away from segregation, and while we have all varieties of practices in the housing authorities, we are moving away from it there. Some cities like Detroit, I believe, do practice segregation, but others like New York, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Los Angeles do not. And it may be interesting to know that after the initial shock is over, no alarming consequences result.

I should like to call the attention of my southern friends to this statement, which I repeat, that after the initial shock is over, no alarming consequences result. Both sides settle down and discover that those in the other group are not bad fellows after all. To defeat more housing by adopting the Bricker amendment would, therefore, actually prevent the development of this tendency toward better understanding between the races in the North and West.

It seems to me that we shall make more progress if we build up, as I have said, the general level of housing, education, health, and job opportunities. I cannot believe that those groups are wise who in trying to get everything at once defeat the possibility of getting something substantial now. We should not try to legislate on everything at once. There are some problems which we can leave to the future.

I have quoted the attitude of the National Council of Negro Women, the Chicago Defender, and the material from the NAACP and the National Negro Council.

There is one final note on which I should like to conclude. I think we northern Democrats have shown that we are not demagogues trying to get votes at any price.

We could take a demagogic position on this bill, go with a whoop hurrah for the pending amendment, and pretend to be for both public housing and against segregation. That would be vote-getting tactics to adopt, so far as the North was concerned. It would certainly be vote-getting tactics so far as my own State of Illinois was concerned. I do not want to

pin too many roses on us, but I want to say that we have not acted that way.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Would the Senator be so generous as to include a few of the northern Republicans in the very generous statement he made concerning the northern Democrats?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would most certainly do so. And I do not want the Senator from Ohio to think that I am saying that those who favor the amendment are demagogs. I do not mean that at all, and I hope he will not think so, because that is not in my thought. But I do want to say that those of us who are opposing the amendment, at political risk, cannot be accused of being demagogs.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the Senator does not pose as an expert on who is and who is not a demagog, does he?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly not, and I did not want to indulge in too much self-laudation. What I am going to say is primarily for my southern brethren, because I am coming to them in a moment. What I say is that we northerners, Republicans and Democrats alike, who vote against the amendment, are not demagogs.

All we are seeking is the welfare of our country as we see it, but as we decline to make political capital out of this issue, and have exposed ourselves to attacks and misunderstandings amongst our constituents, we must assume a still greater moral responsibility for supporting the civil-rights program which we Democrats adopted at Philadelphia, and which the Republicans, perhaps in a little bit less definite language, but certainly, I would like to believe, with equal ardor in their hearts, adopted.

Mr. President, I should like to say to my southern friends that just as we have refused to make political capital out of this issue, they, too, should give a little. I do not know that I can thump the desk as vigorously as does my friend the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], but I will do the best I can to emphasize my admonition. I want to say to my southern friends that if we decline to make political capital of this issue, they should not be so unyielding on civil rights. Give a little on your side.

Thus, having made everyone angry [laughter], and probably having cut my political throat from ear to ear, but having tried to speak the truth as I see it, at long last I sit down.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for himself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The Chair would like to explain to the Members of the Senate that the yeas and nays were ordered on the amendment; the roll call was in progress, but no Senator had voted, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who rose to address the Senate, was thus entitled to the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a minute or two to commend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for what I think has been a very magnificent and courageous speech on a very difficult political issue. I wish to associate myself with him in his analysis of the Bricker amendment. It is my view that irrespective of whatever motivation there may be behind this amendment—and I am not one who attributes motives to people—the amendment is, in effect, one of political strategy, as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out. I think the adoption of the amendment would make perfectly certain the defeat of public housing in this session of Congress. The wording of the bill itself places the primary responsibility in the local municipalities to proceed with applications for funds under the bill. As has been brought out by the Senator from Alabama, the adoption of the amendment will result in no applications for housing projects being filed in the Southern States.

I am concerned also, Mr. President, with this sort of parliamentary strategy as represented by the Bricker amendment in connection with other great pieces of social legislation to be voted upon during this session of Congress. I mention one for illustration purposes. I say that if it is proper to attach this type of amendment to the particular bill now pending before the Senate, the same parliamentary strategy can and probably would be used in connection with Federal-aid-to-education legislation. By such a parliamentary device an attempt could be made to defeat a bill for Federal aid to education. The use of such civil-rights amendments to various pieces of social legislation would not solve the great civil-rights issue which confronts this Congress but would succeed in defeating needed social legislation so that we can get ourselves into a better position to win the civil-rights fight.

As a member of the board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People I wish to say here this afternoon, Mr. President, that I completely disagree with the officers of that association in respect to their request that we vote for the Bricker amendment. I am satisfied that a vote for the Bricker amendment is not in the interest of the colored people or in the interest of advancing civil-rights legislation through the Senate of the United States.

I stand ready, as I always have stood ready, to meet the issue of an over-all civil-rights program whenever a majority of the Members of the Senate are willing to go forward with an all-out fight for a civil-rights program. But as a civil-righter in the Senate of the United States I am not going to be a party to or give support to an amendment which amounts to a bit of embarassing political strategy, and which in my judgment will have the effect, not of advancing civil-rights bills, but of retarding them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, after having been in the United States Senate for something over 4 years, and having observed the actions of the Senate, having seen what can happen here and what does happen here from time to time, I am afraid I cannot agree with the junior Senator from Illinois when he says that Senators might profitably read Alice in Wonderland. Witness what is happening here today. A number of Senators, all of whom I believe are absolutely sincere in their support of civil-rights measures, yet find themselves—I might say we find ourselves, because I am one of them—in the position of voting against a measure put forward as a proposal to further equal rights and prevent segregation. However, Mr. President, I must agree with the statements which have been made on the floor in the past few minutes that the amendment would accomplish nothing and possibly would destroy the housing bill.

I do not believe anyone can seriously question my devotion to the proposition that all men are equal; but I shall have to vote against the amendment. I do not believe this is the proper place to fight out this question. I am willing at any time, as the Senator from Oregon has just said, to fight out the issue of civil rights on its merits. If anybody can figure out a scheme whereby we can fight a filibuster with a counterfilibuster, I would be party to joining in the counterfilibuster if we could discover any way to make it effective. But to attach to the bill an amendment providing that there could be no segregated housing projects would result in killing the bill.

I have been approached by Negroes who said, "We would rather go down fighting here and now and not have any housing, than to compromise in this fashion." However, Mr. President, I must say that I believe those Negroes who spoke to me have houses, probably adequate houses, to live in. While I might feel that it would be better to go down fighting here, and now, and be for the amendment, and let the housing bill go out the door, I should remember that I also have a house to live in. A fairly decent house. I only have the house to live in. I have not paid for it. [Laughter.] So we cannot be too self-righteous and be ready to let other people go without housing in order that we may stand by our principles.

Mr. President, I believe Senators find out, before they are here very long, that they cannot take a stand and say, "Here I stand, and I will not move, and I will not compromise." Years ago in the West, when I had my show company, we were motorized, and in those days there were very few paved roads. I found out that when my car or my truck got in heavy mud, if I put it in low gear and tried to go ahead in spite of everything I did not get very far. I just bogged down and would stay there in the mud until pavements could be built on which I could drive away. If I compromised enough, and rocked the car a little, and put it in second gear or high gear, I could generally get out of the mud and eventually reach the place where I wanted to go. The same principle applies here in the United States Senate.

So, Mr. President, reaffirming my firm belief that all men are equal, reaffirming my determination to fight to accomplish the goal of acceptance of that principle in this country, nevertheless at this moment I believe it is important that we secure housing for underprivileged

families, black and white. I believe that is more important than to go down fighting and have no housing bill at all. But I want no housing administrator to construe my vote at any time as meaning that I am not in favor of civil rights, equal rights, and that possibly this vote in the United States Senate might be a mandate or even be construed as an acquiescence in segregation. We simply want a housing bill. We hope the administrators will prevent segregation wherever possible, wherever practical, and that we can proceed on the road toward a really free America, which I believe was envisaged by the founders of the Republic.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my good friend the very able Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. What makes the able Senator from Idaho so certain that there will be no housing legislation if this amendment is adopted?

Mr. TAYLOR. I went to school for 5 years, and I can add. That is what makes me fairly certain that there will be no housing bill if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the able Senator were certain that the bill would pass, would he then support the amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR. If I were certain that the bill would pass with this amendment in it, I would certainly vote for the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the able Senator from Idaho, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators who are for civil rights were to speak in behalf of the amendment, if they were to make an effort to have it adopted, if they should try to influence other Senators, and become as crusading in this respect as they seem to be in other respects, might not the housing bill pass with this amendment in it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry to have to say to the able Senator from Indiana what I am about to say. I do not want any Senator to feel that I am questioning his motives, because I think that is against the rules of the Senate, but I am quite sure that those who are opposed to the amendment are not open to reason or to being convinced, no matter how eloquently I and other Senators might debate the issue. Therefore, I feel that it would be useless for me to make a speech in favor of this amendment. I do not think it would do any good.

While I am on my feet, I should like to say that I heard the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] say that a great many Negroes were very happy that the housing projects in the South had been established as segregated projects, and therefore the Negroes did not have to associate with white people. He stated that they would rather be left alone in their segregated housing projects. I cannot agree with the junior Senator from Louisiana. I believe that probably Negroes would be just as happy in their segregated projects. That is not the point. They do not want to have it said to them, "You must stay in a segregated project because your skin is black." Negroes are human beings, I believe. They have feelings, the same as we have, and they do not like to be discriminated against. I cannot accept the argument sometimes advanced by southern Senators.

When I was in Alabama recently, everywhere I went the colored people whom I saw were very happy to see me. They wanted to shake my hand. They wanted my autograph. They did not do that because I was down there fighting for segregation in their housing projects. They wanted to shake my hand, and they were glad to see me, because they thought I was one man who was trying to see that they had the full rights of citizenship in this country and were accorded the dignity which they deserve as human beings and as American citizens.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I intend to vote for this amendment. As I view it, a thing is either right or wrong. I have listened to the speeches of the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Idaho, and the questions from the Senator from Minnesota. When we reach one of the first major tests, these northern Democrats who were going to do so much for civil rights run like scared rabbits. They do not dare to stand up and fight for the things which they themselves said a short time ago were right.

I hold in my hand the Democratic platform for 1940, the substance of which is the same as in 1948, which those Senators supported. What does that platform say?

> We have launched a soundly conceived plan of loans and contributions to rid America of overcrowded slum dwellings that breed disease and crime, and to replace them by low-cost housing projects within the means of low-income families.
>
> • • • • •
>
> Our Negro citizens have participated actively in the economic and social advances launched by this Administration, including fair labor standards, social-security benefits, health protection, work-relief projects, decent housing, aid to education, and the rehabilitation of low-income farm families. We have aided more than half a million Negro youths in vocational training, education and employment.
>
> We shall continue to strive for complete legislative safeguards against discrimination in Government service and benefits, and in the national defense forces. We pledge to uphold due process and the equal protection of the laws for every citizen, regardless of race, creed or color.

That is what the Democratic Party said, Mr. President, when they wanted votes, when they wanted the Negroes in Chicago to vote for them. That is the pledge they made then. But at one of the very first opportunities to carry out this pledge, I repeat, they run like scared rabbits. They could not run fast enough.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

We come now to the United Nations Charter. I see sitting across the aisle from me Democrats who voted for the United Nations Charter. I was one of two Senators who voted against it. Yet after it was passed I said I would help to carry it out.

What does the United Nations Charter say about this kind of situation? I quote from the United Nations Charter, chapter I. Although Democratic Senators may not have read all of the United Nations Charter, it is a fair assumption that they have read chapter I, paragraph 3, which is on the very first page. When they voted for it they voted for this as one of the purposes:

> To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character—

Mark the word "social," Mr. President. Today it is interpreted by one Negro group after another as meaning even intermarriage. That is what the Senate voted for.

> To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

The purpose is to promote and encourage respect for human rights all over the world, which certainly includes the United States. That is the United Nations Charter. Although I voted against it I assumed that after it was adopted I would see Senators who voted for it carrying it out in a practical manner by walking on the streets of Washington with some of their Negro friends. Instead of that, 2 weeks later one of the very men who signed it voted against the abolition of the poll tax. How much confidence can the people of Asia have in this kind of document, for which we vote, and which we afterward flout?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

One of the main arguments is that we cannot have everything at once. I listened with surprise to the distinguished Senator from Illinois say "that everything cannot be obtained at once." I well remember, Mr. President, 3 years ago answering an argument along that line. Three years ago a Negro child in Louisiana was allowed $5.12 for education for 1 year—Mr. President, may we have order? If certain gentlemen wish to engage in conversation, I have no objection, but I shall desist until they conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order, and Senators will cease conversations. The occupants of the galleries will maintain order and will cease moving around.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. President, as I was saying, I remember very well, 3 years ago, answering the argument about not being able to obtain everything at one time. Three years ago a Negro child in Louisiana was allowed $5.12 a year for education, and at that time a white child in Louisiana was allowed approximately $57 a year for education, as I recall. The distin-

guished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] introduced an education bill. How well I remember that when I offered to it an amendment providing that colored children and white children should be allowed equal amounts of money for their education, some of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle rose to——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. President, as I was saying, at that time some of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle rose to object to the amendment I offered. They said, "We will vote to allow a Negro child $12, or perhaps more for education; but we will not vote to place him upon a basis of equality with white children."

The same argument is made to us today, Mr. President. At that time some of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle were willing to raise the amount allowed for the education of colored children to an amount somewhat higher than $12 a year; but——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

As I was saying, Mr. President, at that time some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle were willing to increase to some extent the amount allowed for the education of colored children, but they did not wish to have the Congress appropriate enough money to permit a colored child to receive an education equal to that received by a white child.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

I think I can give the speech the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has in mind, Mr. President. He wishes to tell the Senate that today in Louisiana equal amounts are allowed for the education of white children and the education of colored children.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think it is true that today in Louisiana equal amounts are allowed for the education of white children and the education of colored children. It took the Senator from Ohio a long time to educate the people of Louisiana to that view, but, thank Heaven, they finally became educated in that way.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose.

Mr. President, who knows more about that situation? Do the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and my distinguished friend, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], know more about that situation, or do Walter White, who for more than 25 years has headed the organization known as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and others like him who have made a study of this Negro question? Do the Senators whom I have mentioned know more about the situation than does Hon. Edgar G. Brown, whose statement has been placed in the RECORD, and who for years has led a long, hard, courageous fight for the Negro people? Incidentally, Mr. President, he is the director of the National Negro Council, an organization with 2,000,000 members. So I ask, Who knows more about this subject? Is the matter best known by the several men I have just mentioned, who have made it almost their life work? They say, "We favor this amendment, and it is the first real vote on civil rights which has been presented to the Eighty-first Congress." But then we find the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] saying that he would vote for it for application to the city of Washington, but not for application in the Nation. Mr. President, if it is good for the city of Washington, why is it not good for the entire United States of America? If it is right for application in the city of Washington, why is it not right for application in every one of the States of the United States of America?

Mr. President, in closing I simply wish to say that I am dismayed at the compromise on the part of these northern Democrats. I remember that at the last Democratic National Convention, the delegates pulled off their coats, rolled up their sleeves, opened their shirt collars, bared their breasts, and shouted at the top of their lungs that they would face the enemy in the battle for civil rights. They promised the Negroes in the 1948 campaign that they were going to change things in the United States for civil rights completely. However, at this time at one of the very first opportunities they have to make that fight, what position do they take? Mr. President, General RUSSELL and two or three or four of his southern Senator friends have started them to retreat, and they are running like scared rabbits, dodging hither and thither.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

So, Mr. President, I simply submit that men like Edgar G. Brown, Walter White, and others who have had years and years of experience with these matters, know what the colored people want and what they need and should have and someday God helping us, will get.

I have before me a picture showing the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] with other Senators on a visit to the slums the other day. Of course they took a photographer along; the photographer was certainly the most essential person to make the entire trip. [Laughter.] I wonder what the people of Illinois will think when they see that picture of the distinguished Senator from Illinois and three or four other Senators in the backyard of a house occupied by a Negro family in Washington. I wonder what the people of Chicago will think when they learn that at one of the very first opportunities the Senator from Illinois and his associates among the northern Democrats had to fight in that cause and to vote for civil rights they fled in disorder, even before the attack on the part of some other Democratic southern Senators was launched.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question. Suppose he had two sons; and suppose one of them had died, for some reason or other; suppose the doctors told the Senator that they had a new serum that could very easily bring the dead son to life; and suppose they gave the Senator his choice, and said, "We can inoculate your dead son and bring him to life; or, if you wish us to do so, we shall shoot your live son, and then see what happens to him when we inoculate him with this serum."

Would the Senator say to them, "Just try out the serum on the dead boy," or would he have the doctors try it on both of them, and see what happened.

Mr. LANGER. I would have them try it on both of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for yielding.

Mr. President, attention has already been called to a photograph appearing yesterday on the front page of the New York Herald Tribune. That photograph and the article accompanying it call attention to the visit which certain Senators made to a Negro slum near the Capitol. The statement has been made that the picture shows certain northern Democrats looking at the Negro slums. However, Mr. President, common justice requires that I call attention to the fact that of the five Senators shown in that photograph, three of them are northern Republicans.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I did not say all of them were Democrats. I said the Senator from Illinois, accompanied by some of his colleagues, went there. However, we may note that the article describing the visit states that—

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois—

And so forth. I may add that, in my judgment, if the Republican Party had fought in the Eightieth Congress for the principles of their platform, by which they were pledged to carry on the fight for the passage of an anti-poll-tax bill and the passage of an antilynching bill and the passage of an FEPC bill, today the President of the United States would be not Harry Truman but the distinguished Governor of the State of New York.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of yesterday entitled "The Bricker Amendment."

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, is numbered among those stalwart Republicans who have consistently opposed Federal subsidies to provide housing for the low-income groups. With the prospect that many of his GOP colleagues will vote for the measure now before the Senate, the Ohio Senator tries to put the South against the bill by proposing an anti-discrimination amendment.

The intention is to put liberal Democrats and many Republicans on the spot. They do not want to be recorded as being in favor of racial discrimination, but they know the housing bill cannot pass if the South opposes it, as it will with the Bricker amendment.

There is no inconsistency in liberals of both parties voting down the amendment. They are on record as opposed to segregation. Liberals would show themselves to be impractical theorists if they allowed a maneuver such as BRICKER'S to defeat an important liberal reform.

Actually Negroes would be far more benefited by the passing of a public housing measure than by a reaffirmation of the principle of nonsegregation. Large numbers of Negroes are among those who need a Federal subsidy to provide decent homes for them. The fight against racial discrimination will go on even if a political trick such as BRICKER'S is defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], for himself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], which will be stated.

The amendment was, on page 28, and after line 11, insert the following:

(9) In recognition of the fact that public policy requires equality of treatment of all people and prohibits discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry in regard to public housing, every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for any low-rent housing project initiated after March 1, 1949, shall provide that the housing project to which the contract refers shall be operated without discrimination or segregation. Any person who in the management or operation of such housing discriminates or attempts to discriminate against any person, family, or group of people on account of race, creed, or color shall be guilty of a violation of this section and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment. Any citizen or organization may enjoin the violation of this section in any court, State or Federal, of competent jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—31

Baldwin	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cain	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Vandenberg
Ecton	McCarthy	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	
Gurney	Martin	

NAYS—49

Anderson	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Tex	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Sparkman
Donnell	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Ellender	McClellan	Taylor
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McMahon	Tobey
George	Maybank	Tydings
Hayden	Millikin	Williams
Hill	Morse	Withers
Hoey	Murray	Young
Holland	Myers	
Humphrey	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Jenner	Neely
Brewster	Kem	Smith, Maine
Downey	Lucas	Wagner
Eastland	McCarran	Wiley
Graham	McGrath	
Green	Miller	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRICKER for himself and Mr. CAIN was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PROGRAM

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, many Senators have inquired as to what the program will be for the remainder of this afternoon and whether there is a possibility of finishing debate on the bill this evening. I have conferred with the proponents of the pending amendments and with the minority leader, and most of them believe that if we will remain here for a few hours we can finish the bill this evening. So I say to Senators who may have plans for the evening, that it is our intention to have the Senate remain in session. We are all very hopeful that we may be able to reach a final vote on the bill at a reasonable hour this evening.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, when the acting majority leader says the Senate will remain in session for several hours, I should like to ask him whether he means approximately 8 or 9 o'clock?

Mr. MYERS. I do not think it should take that much time. If there is not too much debate on the amendments, I think we should finish by 7:30 or 8 o'clock. There may be some delay because of colloquies and running debate. No one can predict the exact hour; but I hope we may get a vote on the final passage of the bill by 7:30 or 8 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I had purposely refrained from making any engagements this evening. I have a few remarks to make which are not on the subject of the pending amendment or on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The Senator is recognized for that purpose.

RESIGNATION OF HON. KENNETH C. ROYALL AS SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it was with a feeling of personal regret that I learned of the resignation of the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall as Secretary of the Army.

I have known the Secretary and his family for a number of years. As private citizens of the Carolinas, the members of his family and the members of my family have been friends for years.

Kenneth Royall has served his country well during periods of both war and peace since the date of his birth, back in 1894, in Goldsboro, N. C. He received his A. B. from the University of North Carolina and his bachelor of laws from Harvard University law school. While at Harvard he became a Phi Beta Kappa and an editor of the Harvard Law Review.

Kenneth Royall served his country in uniform during the First World War with the Three Hundred and Seventeenth Field Artillery in France until his honorable discharge in 1919.

Having been admitted to the North Carolina bar in 1916, he returned to law practice and was later elected to the North Carolina State Senate where he served with distinction as chairman of the banking committee. It was during this time that he authored the North Carolina bank-liquidation statute.

In 1942 he was commissioned a colonel in the Army of the United States and named Chief of the Legal Section, Fiscal

Division, Army Service Forces. He was lated appointed by the President to defend German saboteurs captured and tried in this country. After serving overseas as a brigadier general, he became Special Assistant to the Secretary of War in April 1945, and Under Secretary of War 7 months later. For exceptionally meritorious services from May 1943 to November 1945, General Royall was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

He was appointed Secretary of War by President Truman on July 18, 1947, and exactly 2 months later under the operation of the National Security Act of 1947, he became Secretary of the Army.

For almost 2 years now Kenneth Royall has served his country and the National Military Establishment at Cabinet level. He has served with distinction and I, for one, shall be sorry to see him retire from the duties of this most important office.

In the best traditions of the service in which he served, Kenneth Royall has earned the right to a resounding "Well done."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I simply want to take a moment's time to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from South Carolina regarding Secretary Royall. I feel that his retirement and resignation are a distinct loss to the armed services of the Nation. I believe he has served ably, and has certainly given a competent administration, and, in my judgment, national defense in America today is greatly strengthened by reason of the able services which he has given to his country.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to offer another amendment at this time. It seems that the objection to the previous amendment was based on the word "segregation." I desire now to offer the following amendment to be inserted on page 28, after line 11:

(9) In recognition of the fact that public policy requires equality of treatment of all people and prohibits discrimination on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry in regard to public housing, every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for any low-rent housing project initiated after March 1, 1949, shall provide that the housing project to which the contract refers shall be operated without discrimination. Any person who in the management or operation of such housing discriminates or attempts to discriminate against any person, family, or group of people on account of race, creed, or color shall be guilty of a violation of this section and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment. Any citizen or organization may enjoin the violation of this section in any court, State or Federal, of competent jurisdiction.

This amendment simply strikes out the word "segregation," which seems to have been the basis of the objection to the previous amendment, and puts in the word "discrimination." Certainly that brings it within not only the spirit but the actual letter of both platforms of the major parties and within the spirit of the campaign of last fall. There has been one vote taken which clearly shows that the fight a few weeks ago on the Senate floor regarding civil rights was, as I said yesterday, shadow-boxing.

Here is an opportunity to put our votes on record for or against discrimination in connection with this one program in which the Federal Government is using the taxpayers' money without imposing its authority upon any State or local government or upon any employer or employee in the Nation. So, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, proposed by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which will be stated.

The amendment was as follows:

On page 28, and after line 11, insert the following:

"(9) In recognition of the fact that public policy requires equality of treatment of all people and prohibits discrimination on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry in regard to public housing, every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for any low-rent housing project initiated after March 1, 1949, shall provide that the housing project to which the contract refers shall be operated without discrimination. Any person who in the management or operation of such housing discriminates or attempts to discriminate against any person, family, or group of people on account of race, creed, or color shall be guilty of a violation of this section and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment. Any citizen or organization may enjoin the violation of this section in any court, State or Federal, of competent jurisdiction."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—32

Baldwin	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Reed
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Schoeppel
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Langer	Vandenberg
Donnell	Lodge	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	

NAYS—46

Anderson	Johnson, Tex	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chapman	Kefauver	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Ellender	McClellan	Taft
Flanders	McFarland	Taylor
Fulbright	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
George	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Maybank	Tobey
Hill	Millikin	Tydings
Hoey	Morse	Withers
Holland	Myers	Young
Humphrey	Neely	
Hunt	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Green	McGrath
Brewster	Jenner	Miller
Downey	Kem	Murray
Eastland	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Frear	Martin	Wagner
Graham	McCarran	Wiley

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to offer one more amendment. The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has a companion amendment. His amendment applies to title I. My

amendment applies to title II. They are in substance, however, the same, and call for the same action on the part of the Congress. My amendment is lettered "C." I call it up at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42, line 2, in section 205 of the bill, immediately preceding the quotation marks, it is proposed to insert the following sentence:

No contract for contributions under this act shall be entered into by the Authority except following specific appropriation by the Congress of funds for the first annual contribution called for by such contract.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to assure continuing control on the part of the Congress over the carrying out of the provisions of the act. If the bill is enacted into law, authorization will be made for the construction of so many housing units. The Housing Authority will have the power to enter into those contracts with the local agencies or the local authorities for the construction of a definite number of units each year, which may be increased or decreased by the President according to the circumstances at the time, the total being 810,000 units. My amendment would simply require that prior to the entering into of a contract for the construction of these housing units the first annual appropriation must have been made for the subsidy by the Federal Government.

The amendment would simply give continuing control by Congress over the spending of the funds, and would prohibit—or at least would not permit—the letting of so great a number of contracts to carry out which the agency would have to come before the Congress for a deficiency appropriation. The agency would be given a sufficient fund to enter into the contracts, and when they became firm, the money would be appropriated for the first year's subsidy to carry out the contracts.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington is very hopeful that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has done such excellent work as chairman of the subcommittee which wrote and reported the bill, will, if he is opposed to it, give to the Senate his opinion as to why the amendment should not prevail. The amendment merely provides that the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress shall make certain that the first year's contract with reference to any given project is properly, logically, intelligently and wisely designed before it is entered into.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say that while I had not intended to speak on the amendment, I shall be glad to do so when the Senator from Ohio has concluded his presentation with respect to it.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I had finished my presentation, and was wondering whether the chairman of the subcommittee might approve the amendment, which presents a businesslike way of carrying out the program, so as to make sure that there is an appropriation for implementing the contracts before they are actually entered into.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I take very sharp issue with the last statement made by the able Senator from Ohio that the amendment presents a businesslike way of doing the thing. Just the opposite is true. I cannot conceive of anything which would be further from good business practice. In effect, what the amendment proposes to do is to provide that no project shall be started until the appropriation has been made by Congress.

How can a firm contract be made until the local housing authority knows that the Congress is going to support the project? Furthermore, we provide in the bill that there shall be built an average of 135,000 units a year. Let us assume that they are divided up into projects of 300 units each. That would be 450 different and separate contracts coming all through the year. If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Ohio it would mean that Congress would have to stop and approve each one of the 450 separate contracts, and make money available for each one of the 450 separate contracts. The amendment would simply not be workable.

Furthermore, it requires a little time to plan the projects and to get them ready to go under contract. A contract simply cannot be started overnight. The local housing authority is not going to commit itself to the issuance of bonds and the pledging of its credit in order to embark upon one of these projects, if it must depend upon subsequent action by Congress before the undertaking becomes valid.

Mr. President, it seems to me the plan is completely unworkable, and is anything but good business.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there is no reason why the Housing Authority and the local agencies could not negotiate contracts, and why the amounts could not be calculated, and why the results of the calculations could not be brought to the Congress of the United States for annual appropriation. Such action would not hold up the construction at all, but would give assurance to the local agency that when the contract is entered into the amount of money has already been appropriated for the first annual contribution, to carry out the Federal Government's end of the obligation. It would strengthen the contracts rather than weaken them. It would make the program a consistent program, continually under the authority of Congress. It would mean that we are not giving a blank check to the Housing Authority for the purpose of entering into unlimited contracts which may involve the Congress in obligations which it otherwise would not desire to enter into.

INVESTIGATION OF FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution providing for an investigation of our foreign policy in the Far East.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res 30) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution provides as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring, That there is hereby established a joint committee on the investigation of United States foreign policy in the Far East (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of 5 Members of the Senate (not more than 3 of whom shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 Members of the House of Representatives (not more than 3 of whom shall be members of the majority party), to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete investigation of United States foreign policy in the Far East in order to ascertain our present policy and what policies heretofore have been followed by the United States in regard to Far Eastern affairs and to evaluate and determine the effect of such policies. The committee shall make a final report to the Senate and House of Representatives, not later than March 3, 1950, on the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations of the policy to be followed in the future by the United States in the Far East and of such legislation as may be necessary to implement that policy.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress (prior to March 3, 1950), to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

Mr. President, shortly after I first came to the Senate 3 years ago, the Joint Committee To Investigate Pearl Harbor was appointed. That was done 4 years after the event. The Congress of the United States felt that it was important that the American people should be fully informed regarding that event. But the possibilities of getting information related to past history. This resolution is an attempt to inform the American public and the Senate. If possible, we should rectify our mistakes in foreign policy while there is yet time to do something constructive.

The United States has been vitally interested in a free and independent China since long before the open-door policy was enunciated in 1900. Perhaps second

only to the Monroe Doctrine, the United States has been very vitally interested in maintaining a free, independent, and sovereign China. Even as we are meeting in the Senate the Communist forces of China are crossing the Yangtze River. They are moving into the non-Communist areas of China. It is the judgment of the junior Senator from California that if all of China goes behind the iron curtain it is possible that Burma, French Indochina, and ultimately India may go behind the iron curtain. It is further the judgment of the junior Senator from California, and I believe of a number of other Members of this body, and others throughout the country, that if all of continental Asia were to go behind the iron curtain it would be very difficult to maintain a free and independent Japan. The normal economic relationships of Japan in buying and selling are with the continent of Asia. We would then be faced with the alternative of either abandoning Japan to also go behind the iron curtain, or making Japan permanently dependent upon the United States for its economic and military support.

Mr. President, the Government of China and the people of China have been our historic friends. They were victims of aggression before we were at Pearl Harbor. I think that we in America have some responsibility for what has happened in China.

Some of us on the Pacific coast of the United States—I was not a Member of the Senate at the time, but I happened to be a newspaperman—pointed out that this Government was permitting the shipment of scrap iron and oil to Japan, which were being used against the free government of China. It was one of the policies of the State Department to permit that to be done. I think history has recorded that that was a very unwise policy.

Mr. President, the State Department is not infallible in its dealings with foreign problems. The Congress of the United States has a terrific responsibility. I am quite willing to admit that the situation looks very dark in China, but it does not look a bit darker than the situation looked in western Europe after Dunquerque. Had the people of the United States and the Government of the United States taken a defeatist attitude, had we said, "The situation of Britain is hopeless," and had we refused to give them either moral encouragement or other types of assistance, it is quite likely that the British Government would not have been able to stand. It is quite possible that today Europe might be under Nazi domination.

I have no doubt whatever that some of the practical men who lived in other countries at the time of our own war of independence, as they looked at Valley Forge and the condition of General Washington and his troops in that very dark winter in American history, might have written off our cause as hopeless. But men of courage and determination can sometimes turn the scales even though the situation may look dark and hopeless

I do not know just what the answer to this situation should be, but I do say that the American people and the United States Senate have an obligation to get at the facts. We should find out why it is that the country with which we were allied during the war, the country which conducted a long and vigorous campaign, the country which is one of the charter members of the United Nations, one of the big five, the country which is our historic friend, has been sold down the river. If ever a government has had the rug pulled out from under it, if ever a non-Communist government in the world has reason to feel betrayed, that government is the Republic of China. It was done again by the recent statement of the Secretary of State, in which he, on March 14, 1949, practically wrote off any possibility of saving even a part of non-Communist China.

It may be that some people are willing to follow the advice of the State Department and wait until the dust settles and the smoke clears away; but that is a heavy responsibility for us to take, for the American people to take, and for our children to take. If we wait until the smoke of battle has cleared away, if we wait until the dust has settled, we may find that 450,000,000 Chinese are behind the iron curtain, and that approximately 600,000,000 other people on the Continent of Asia are placed in a position where they cannot survive as free and independent nations. Someday in this age of the airplane and the atom, a twentieth-century Genghis Khan may come forth to jeopardize the liberty of western Europe and the security of this Nation.

For that reason I hope that this resolution may be promptly acted upon. I shall certainly do everything possible to bring it to the floor of the Senate for early attention and full debate.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "C" offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bricker	Ecton	Martin
Bridges	Ferguson	Millikin
Butler	Gurney	Mundt
Cain	Hendrickson	Reed
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chapman	McClellan	Russell
Cordon	McFarland	Schoeppel
Donnell	Malone	Williams

NAYS—55

Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ellender	Knowland	Stennis
Flanders	Langer	Taft
Frear	Lodge	Taylor
Fulbright	Long	Thomas, Okla.
George	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McKellar	Thye
Hayden	McMahon	Tobey
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hoey	Morse	Watkins
Holland	Murray	Wherry
Humphrey	Myers	Withers
Hunt	Neely	
Ives	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken	Green	Miller
Brewster	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Kem	Wagner
Downey	Lucas	Wiley
Eastland	McCarran	Young
Graham	McGrath	

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment designated "4-14-49-A," offered by me on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, beginning with line 18, it is proposed to strike out through line 9 on page 9, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) To provide funds for loans under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and additional sums not to exceed

$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and not to exceed $250,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1952, 1953, and 1954."

On page 9, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to require that all funds needed for loans under title I shall be subject to the normal procedures of the Appropriations Committees. Senate bill 1070 as drawn makes no such requirement. As I have read and interpreted the language of the bill it merely states that the Administrator, with the approval of the President, may issue notes, and that the Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase notes up to certain maximum amounts in each of the next five fiscal years. I respectfully submit for the consideration of all Senators that the Congress, through its appropriate committees ought to review annually and pass upon the very substantial amounts of funds—in the case before us, $1,000,000,000—which can be obligated as loans under title I of the bill.

The amendment seeks to accomplish under title I what the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] sought to accomplish under title II. I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama sees any virtue in this amendment relating to title I, as opposed to the opposition he voiced to the recent amendment, which concerned itself with title II?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say only this very brief word: The difference is that in the bill as reported from the committee it is provided that the money shall be obtained through loans. Under the amendment suggested by the Senator from Washington there would be a provision that it shall be obtained by direct appropriations. So far as I know, every type of business which the Government takes part in today, of a nature similar to this, is handled through the method of loans, not by direct appropriations. We began a good many years ago with REA, providing for appropriations. That was carried for but a few years, when it was found much better from a fiscal standpoint to provide for loans. We have been handling it as a loan ever since. The same thing is true of the farm-tenant program. I think I am safe in saying that is the method followed in every single activity of this nature carried on by the Government. I certainly think it would be unwise to depart from it at this time, particularly since we changed from this method back over the years, and now we have I think a fairly uniform system of operating. I believe we should adhere to that system in connection with the pending measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, for himself and for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like now to call up the amendment which I submitted, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, on April 18, 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) No land for any project to be assisted under this title shall be acquired by the local public agency except after public hearing following notice of the date, time, place, and purpose of such hearing published not less than 10 nor more than 20 days prior to the date of such hearing.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to apply what some of us think is a very normal, healthy, completely American custom to the procedure to be followed in arriving at a local determination of any redevelopment or slum-clearance project. Under the amendment, before any authorized public agency could enter into a contract for financial aid, it must first have held public hearings on the proposed project, Mr. President, were you and I members of such an agency I believe we would thoroughly welcome this procedure.

Public hearings on any community project are as American as they can be. I like to think that we would make more certain the public acceptance of the proposed legislation by writing into it the time-proven constructive American custom of a public hearing on a public question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], for himself and for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. CAIN. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A division is requested. Those in favor of the amendment will rise.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if I may, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—43

Baldwin	Holland	Russell
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bridges	Knowland	Schoeppel
Butler	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Lodge	Stennis
Capehart	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	Malone	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
George	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Mundt	Williams
Hendrickson	O'Conor	Young
Hickenlooper	Reed	
Hoey	Robertson	

NAYS—35

Anderson	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kerr	Pepper
Flanders	Kilgore	Sparkman
Frear	Long	Taylor
Fulbright	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Magnuson	Tobey
Humphrey	Maybank	Withers
Hunt	Morse	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Graham	McCarran
Brewster	Green	McGrath
Byrd	Hayden	Miller
Chavez	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Downey	Kem	Wagner
Eastland	Lucas	Wiley

So the amendment offered by Mr. CAIN for himself and Mr. BRICKER was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, many Senators are not yet convinced that this country should enter into an extensive public-housing program without further study. There are likewise many Senators who are not satisfied with title IV, which is the farm-loan section of the bill. We have debated the subject extensively; every Senator knows the issues involved. I therefore move, Mr. President, that title II and title IV be stricken from the bill. That would leave the slum-clearance section and all the provisions for loans and grants, together with the provision for research on the part of the Federal Government. As a result of such research Congress would be in a better position to approach the problem of a great housing program as well as an extensive farm program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If this motion should not be agreed to, would title IV be open to further amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are detained in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate, on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—19

Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Butler	Hoey	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Capehart	Knowland	Tydings
Cordon	McFarland	Williams
Ecton	Martin	
Hendrickson	Millikin	

NAYS—58

Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Baldwin	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bridges	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Donnell	Lodge	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Taylor
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Magnuson	Thye
George	Malone	Tobey
Gillette	Maybank	Vandenberg
Gurney	Morse	Watkins
Hill	Mundt	Wherry
Holland	Murray	Withers
Humphrey	Myers	Young
Hunt	Neely	
Ives	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Downey	Graham
Brewster	Eastland	Green
Byrd	Fulbright	Hayden
Jenner	McGrath	Wagner
Kem	McMahon	Wiley
Lucas	Miller	
McCarran	Smith, Maine	

So Mr. BRICKER's motion was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that just before the votes on the two amendments offered by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], one on nonsegregation and the other on nondiscrimination, the texts of the two amendments be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to call up amendment B.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31 it is proposed to strike out on line 6 and 7 the words "economy will be promoted both in construction and administration" and insert in lieu thereof the words "as will not exceed in cost (excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities) the costs (as estimated by the Federal Housing Administration) of new privately built dwelling accommodations (excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities) then currently being insured in the area by the Federal Housing Administration)."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to provide a reasonable measure, a more accurate yardstick, by which the costs of the projects to be aided under the bill may be controlled by the Public Housing Authority or Administrator.

The ceiling limits of costs found in the bill—and apparently a good many Senators are not aware of this fact—far exceed the costs at which private builders are presently producing desirable dwelling accommodations in almost every area of the continental United States.

The language of the bill has prescribed in dollars, the maximum costs per room, namely, $2,500, then admonishes the Authority, and only in general terms, to exercise economy before entering into contracts of assistance with the local agency.

Let me read, Mr. President, the exact language as found on page 31, lines 2 to 15:

> The Authority shall make loans, grants, and annual contributions only for such low-rent housing projects as it finds are to be undertaken in such a manner that such projects will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and economy will be promoted both in construction and administration. In order to attain the foregoing objective, every contract for financial assistance entered into with respect to any low-rent housing project initiated after March 1, 1949, shall provide that no award of the main construction for such project shall be made unless the Authority, taking into account the level of construction costs prevailing in the locality where such project is to be located, shall have specifically approved the amount of such main construction contract.

The words to be replaced by my amendment are in lines 6 and 7, namely, "and economy will be promoted both in construction and administration."

I know of no better barometer for "economy in construction" in every section and area of our country than the Federal Housing Administration. Its activities in the field of mortgage-loan insurance have made it imperatively necessary that the Federal Housing Administration know the prevailing construction costs of every kind and type of housing facilities built, be they for single families, four families, or multi-floor, multiple-unit apartment houses. It is that experience, that intimate knowledge of costs that the amendment brings to bear on this very important item of economy in the capital outlay for the facilities to be built and the corresponding aid to be granted under the terms of this act.

I should like to make perfectly clear that the amendment which is pending does not hold the construction of a project to the unit cost as determined by the maximum amount of a mortgage which FHA would insure in its normal insuring practice. FHA is held to certain statutory limits for its mortgage insurance. These limits are not brought to bear under this amendment.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and I are attempting, through this amendment, only to make every use of the favorable knowledge and experience of economical construction costs within many given areas of the country, as found today by FHA.

I believe that if the amendment is adopted and becomes part of the law it will result in materially decreasing the cost which otherwise will be imposed upon the Government by the passage of the legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment lettered "B" offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was as follows:

> Page 31, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "economy will be promoted both in construction and administration" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as will not exceed in cost (excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities) the costs (as estimated by the Federal Housing Administration) of new privately built dwelling accommodations (excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities) then currently being insured in the area by the Federal Housing Administration)."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—28

Bricker	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	McClellan	Schoeppel
Cain	McFarland	Tydings
Capehart	Malone	Watkins
Cordon	Martin	Wherry
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Mundt	Young
Hendrickson	O'Conor	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NAYS—46

Anderson	Ives	Murray
Baldwin	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Donnell	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Ferguson	Knowland	Sparkman
Flanders	Langer	Stennis
Frear	Lodge	Taft
George	Long	Taylor
Gillette	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McKellar	Thye
Hill	McMahon	Tobey
Holland	Magnuson	Withers
Humphrey	Maybank	
Hunt	Morse	

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Graham	Smith, Maine
Brewster	Green	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Jenner	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Kem	Vandenberg
Connally	Lucas	Wagner
Downey	McCarran	Wiley
Eastland	McGrath	
Fulbright	Miller	

So the amendment offered by Mr. CAIN, for himself and Mr. BRICKER, was rejected.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 304. The Administrator shall appoint a director to administer the provisions of this title under the direction and supervision of the Administrator, and the basic rate of compensation of such position shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We have no objection to the amendment. We are glad to accept it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a number of Senators have requested some information relative to a housing proposal which was on the ballot in California last November. It was an initiative constitutional amendment which would create a State housing agency, authorize the State to guarantee obligations of, and furnish operating subsidies to, public housing authorities, expenditures for such purposes not to exceed $25,000,000 annually. It would authorize State bonds up to $100,000,000 to finance State loans to public housing authorities and private nonprofit housing associations; bond principal and interest to be paid from State tax revenues. It prescribed State and local government powers, eminent domain, and other powers of housing authorities. It regulated taxation of housing authority property, and exempted local housing authority bonds from taxation.

While it is not exactly comparable to the legislation before us, it was a matter, on a State level, which was submitted to the people of California. I ask that the table of the vote, taken from the official vote furnished by the secretary of state for the general election on November 2, 1948, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Counties	Housing: Initiative constitutional amendment. Adds art. XXVII to constitution. Creates State housing agency. Authorizes State to guarantee obligations of, and furnish operating subsidies to, public housing authorities, expenditures for such purposes not to exceed $25,000,000 annually. Authorizes State bonds up to $100,000,000 to finance State loans to public housing authorities and private nonprofit housing associations; bond principal and interest to be paid from State tax revenues. Prescribes State and local government powers, eminent domain, and other powers of housing authorities. Regulates taxation of housing authority property. Exempts local housing authority bonds from taxation.	
	Yes	No
Alameda	96,068	176,265
Alpine	20	76
Amador	608	2,303
Butte	3,987	14,304
Calaveras	550	2,523
Colusa	502	2,557
Contra Costa	29,002	48,906
Del Norte	396	1,813
El Dorado	1,134	4,072
Fresno	18,783	47,306
Glenn	621	3,759
Humboldt	6,386	12,040
Imperial	1,952	6,997
Inyo	653	2,333
Kern	13,891	33,814
Kings	1,889	7,159
Lake	797	3,465
Lassen	1,240	3,097
Los Angeles	474,561	1,021,221
Madera	1,483	4,853
Marin	7,693	21,160
Mariposa	422	1,301
Mendocino	2,500	6,872
Merced	3,036	10,188
Modoc	468	1,867
Mono	100	487
Monterey	7,710	20,826
Napa	2,839	10,765
Nevada	1,342	5,233
Orange	10,095	61,069
Placer	2,577	9,856
Plumas	1,276	2,608
Riverside	10,306	38,657
Sacramento	17,950	62,780
San Benito	740	2,982
San Bernardino	20,189	62,873
San Diego	55,048	127,697
San Francisco	121,172	165,901
San Joaquin	10,194	38,644
San Luis Obispo	5,019	10,881
San Mateo	21,258	53,750
Santa Barbara	9,077	21,973
Santa Clara	20,946	63,780
Santa Cruz	4,721	17,108
Shasta	2,356	7,767
Sierra	280	640
Siskiyou	2,619	6,978
Solano	12,297	17,771
Sonoma	7,210	24,976
Stanislaus	5,488	25,640
Sutter	969	4,962
Tehama	860	4,289
Trinity	377	1,201
Tulare	6,317	23,927
Tuolumne	827	3,226
Ventura	7,902	20,637
Yolo	2,195	8,225
Yuba	1,191	4,286
Total	1,042,089	2,372,646

Mr. KNOWLAND. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that on this issue the "yes" vote was 1,042,089; the "no" vote was 2,372,646. There are 58 counties in California. The issue lost in all 58 counties, including the four metropolitan counties of the State.

For the information of the Senate, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the constitutional amendment.

There being no objection, the copy of the constitutional amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE XXVII—HOUSING AMENDMENT OF 1948

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. Preamble:

The people of the State of California hereby express their common interest in housing. Sound homes foster sound citizenship.

Good housing will preserve and enhance human values—our greatest asset.

We take cognizance that large numbers of families and persons lack the means to obtain shelter of even minimum decency and safety. Many young persons, including veterans of the recent war, cannot obtain adequate housing in which to establish desirable family life. They are forced to occupy congested, unhealthy, and unsafe quarters in slums and blighted areas in cities and rural areas. The children who grow in such conditions suffer an impairment of opportunity to contribute fully to the production and progress of the State and the Nation.

Inadequate housing and blighted neighborhoods represent impaired human, economic, and civic values which affect the welfare of all. To the extent that private endeavor is unable to provide healthy and decent environment, it is a matter of public interest and concern.

Advancement of the moral, physical, and economic health and welfare of the people is a proper and necessary function of their government. The undertaking of such measures as may be effective to further these ends through better housing is hereby declared a public purpose and the policy of this State.

To assist public bodies and nonprofit housing associations to provide decent housing for persons who lack the means to obtain adequate housing through private endeavor is the objective of this article.

SEC. 2. Short title:

This article may be referred to as the "housing amendment of 1948."

SEC. 3. Definitions:

A. "Agency" shall mean the agency established by title II, section I, of this article.

B. "Bond" shall mean any bond, note, interim certificate, debenture, or any other obligation of a housing authority.

C. "Development" shall mean any or all of the planning, designing, acquisition, improvement, construction, financing, or refinancing of housing developments or housing properties.

D. "Eligible person" shall mean an individual who lacks sufficient income to secure decent, safe, and sanitary housing for himself or his family at rentals or prices currently available in substantial supply through private endeavor.

E. "Going rate of interest" shall approximate the current annual yield rate upon outstanding general obligation bonds of the State having a maturity of 10 years or longer, as determined by the agency at the time of making a particular loan.

F. "Governing body" shall mean any legislative body, council, board, or commission having power of legislation or control over the affairs of a public body pursuant to its charter or the laws of the State.

G. "Guaranty" or "guarantee" shall mean the obligation of the State to pay the principal of and interest on bonds of a housing authority as provided in title III of this article.

H. "Housing authority" or "authority" shall mean any public body created pursuant to the housing authorities law of 1938, as amended, or its successor or any other public body authorized by law to undertake the development or operation of housing developments.

I. "Housing bonds" shall mean the State bonds authorized by title V of this article.

J. "Housing development" shall mean a specific undertaking, work, or improvement by a housing authority to provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for eligible persons and may include such appurtenances and facilities as will promote a desirable environment. The term may also include the acquisition of land for future development.

K. "Housing fund" shall include housing loan fund, housing assistance fund, and housing administration fund established by title IV of this article.

L. "Housing property" shall mean a specific undertaking, work, or improvement by a nonprofit housing association to provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for its members.

M. "Non-profit housing association" shall mean any corporation organized under the laws of the State and empowered to develop and operate housing for its members in accordance with the provisions of this article, provided its articles of incorporation and bylaws prohibit operation for profit.

N. "Operation" shall include all actions and costs related to management, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, insurance, reserves, taxes, and payments in lieu thereof, service charges, assessments, amortization, interest, financing and refunding, and other related actions and costs.

O. "Public body" or "political subdivision" shall mean any city, city and county, county, municipal corporation, commission, district, authority, or other subdivision or public body of the State.

P. "State" shall mean the State of California and any agency or instrumentality thereof.

Q. "Subvention" shall mean the periodic payment authorized to be made to a housing authority in aid of a housing development as provided in title III, section 2, of this article.

R. "Veteran of World War II" shall include the unmarried widow of a deceased veteran.

TITLE II—STATE HOUSING AGENCY

SECTION 1. Establishment, membership, and organization:

A. There is hereby established an executive agency of the State to be known as the State Housing Agency. Except as otherwise provided herein, all powers of the agency shall be vested in five commissioners, who shall be appointed by the Governor. Three of the commissioners who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of 1, 2, and 3 years, respectively, from the date of their appointment, and two shall be designated to serve for terms of 4 years from the date of their appointment. Thereafter commissioners shall be appointed as aforesaid for terms of 4 years, except that all vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired terms. A commissioner shall hold office until his successor has been appointed and qualified. A commissioner shall receive no compensation for his services, but he shall be entitled to reasonable expenses, including travel expenses incurred in the discharge of his duties. The agency annually shall select its own chairman from among the commissioners. Three commissioners shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting its business, exercising its powers, and for all other purposes. Action may be taken by the agency only upon a vote of a majority of all commissioners unless in any case the rules or regulations of the agency shall require a larger number. The commissioners may delegate powers to such officers and employees as they may designate by resolution.

B. The agency shall appoint a State director of housing, without regard to civil service laws, to be its chief executive officer and shall fix his compensation. The director may appoint three deputies and the general counsel and his professional staff without regard to civil service laws after the agency shall have determined the required qualifications and fixed the duties and compensation of office. The agency or its director may call upon the attorney general for any opinions or legal assistance. The director may appoint additional employees, subject to civil service laws, and determine the qualifications and duties of each position, all in accordance with an organization plan approved by the agency.

C. No commissioner or employee of the agency shall acquire any interest, direct or indirect, in any housing development or housing property or in any property or contract related thereto. Where any such interest was acquired prior to his employment or appointment he shall disclose the same in writing, which disclosure shall be entered in a special record of the agency kept for such purpose. Any such contract or claim for compensation for work done or supplies or materials furnished, in which any commissioner or employee acquired an interest during his term of office or employment, shall be void.

D. For inefficiency, neglect of duty, or misconduct in office, a commissioner may be removed by the Governor, but a commissioner shall be removed only after he shall have been given a copy of the charges at least 10 days prior to the hearing thereon and have had an opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel. In the event of the removal of any commissioner, a record of the proceedings, together with the charges and findings thereon, shall be filed with the Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. Powers and functions:

A. The agency may exercise its powers at any place, and rent or use office space and establish its offices at such locations in the State as it may deem necessary or convenient. The agency shall be entitled to office space in State office buildings and other services and facilities on the same basis as other executive departments of the State.

B. The agency may employ such personnel as it may deem necessary or convenient to carry out the purposes of this article.

C. The agency may sue in the name of the State whenever it is deemed necessary or advisable to enforce any of its rights conferred by this article or by any law, mortgage, lien, bond, contract, or agreement and may be sued in the same manner as a private person in any matter arising as a direct result of, and in relation to, the exercise by the agency of any of its powers and functions authorized by this article. The agency shall be represented in all litigated matters by the Attorney General in association with its general counsel and staff.

D. The agency may execute in the name of the State such contracts and documents as it deems necessary or convenient to the exercise of the powers and functions authorized by this article.

E. The agency may acquire in the name of the State by gift, grant, bequest, devise, foreclosure, or otherwise, any real or personal property or any interest therein and assign, invest, sell, lease, exchange, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise dispose of such property.

F. The agency may make loans, subventions and guaranties in aid of housing developments and may make loans to nonprofit housing associations in aid of housing properties of such organizations.

G. The agency may include in any contract for loan, subvention or guaranty, a provision requiring conveyance or transfer of possession of the housing development to the agency in the event of breach of any covenant or condition thereof, and in such event, the agency may complete the development and undertake the operation of such housing development, continuing to make subventions and guaranty payments in aid thereof during the continuance of the breach. At such time as the agency is satisfied that breach has been cured, the agency shall reconvey or retransfer possession of the housing development to the housing authority and resume contract benefits.

H. The agency may furnish assistance to public bodies and officials in determining the characteristics of the housing problems within their jurisdiction, in analyzing such problems, and in effecting solutions thereof.

I. The agency may make surveys and studies, publish reports and disseminate information on local and general housing conditions and needs in the State.

J. The agency may cooperate with and accept assistance from any persons, organizations, or agencies of government or other

sources of aid, financial or otherwise, to achieve the purposes of this article.

K. The agency shall make a comprehensive annual report to the governor on its activities and operations and shall include therein such recommendations for executive and legislative action as it may deem advisable.

L. The agency may in its discretion include in any contract to assist a housing development or housing property provision for the repayment of all loans outstanding and the sale of the housing development or housing property if at any time it is determined by the owner thereof and the agency that there is no longer any need in the locality for the operation of such housing development or housing property.

M. The agency shall have power to create and appoint councils or committees to meet with the agency in an advisory capacity to discuss the objectives and execution of the program provided for by this article and to make recommendations in connection therewith, and may pay reasonable expenses of persons so serving.

N. The agency may contract, without regard to civil service laws, for the services of technicians, experts, professionals, etc., on a per diem basis or otherwise to secure reports, information, advice, or assistance necessary or convenient to carry out the purposes of this article, including the development or operation of a housing development pursuant to paragraph G of this section.

O. The agency may issue, and from time to time amend, such rules and regulations as it deems necessary or convenient to carry into effect the powers and purposes of this article.

P. The agency may study the problems and effects of monopolies, extortionate, illegal, or unfair practices, or practices affecting the cost of construction or production of buildings and cooperate with Federal and State investigating officials to end such abuses.

Q. The agency may modify, consolidate, supersede, or supplement contracts which it has executed pursuant to the provisions of this article, with or without consideration: To permit consolidation or separation of housing developments or portions thereof; to permit adjustment of interest charges contained in such contracts when determined advisable by the agency to assist in financing housing developments; and to permit adjustment of the fixed amounts of subventions.

R. The agency may generally exercise any and all additional powers which it deems necessary or convenient to the execution of the powers and functions authorized by this article.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SECTION 1. Loans in aid of housing developments:

The agency may make loans to, including purchase of bonds issued by, housing authorities to assist in the development or operation of housing developments. Loans shall bear interest at the going rate of interest plus one-half of 1 percent, shall be secured in such manner and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding 50 years, as the agency may determine. The total of any outstanding loans to assist a housing development shall not exceed the estimated cost of such housing development as determined by the agency from time to time.

SEC. 2. Subventions to housing authorities:

The agency may make periodic subventions to housing authorities to aid the operation of housing developments at rentals within the financial reach of eligible persons. Subventions shall be paid from the housing assistance fund and the aggregate amount of payments contracted by the agency shall not exceed the amount authorized therefor. The subvention paid in aid of a housing development during any year shall not exceed an amount equal to the difference between the costs of operation and the income received from rentals and other charges approved by the agency in accordance with the provisions of this article. The agency shall be empowered to create a debt or liability of the State by embodying the provisions for subventions in a contract guaranteeing their payment over a fixed period not exceeding 50 years. Payments under any such contract may be pledged as security for any loan or credit obtained by a housing authority to assist the housing development to which such payments relate.

SEC. 3. Agreements of guaranty with housing authorities:

The agency is empowered to create a debt or liability of the State by making contracts with housing authorities guaranteeing the payments of interest and principal, as they become due, upon bonds to be issued by them for the purpose of financing the development of housing developments at rentals within the financial reach of eligible persons:

A. Provisions:

Such contracts shall provide: (1) That any bonds guaranteed shall be sold at not less than par and the total principal amount thereof shall not exceed the estimated cost of development as determined by the agency; (2) that the agency shall approve as to form, substance, amount, security, purpose, maturity, and manner of issuance all bonds subject to guaranty and shall evidence such approval and guaranty by appropriate endorsement upon each bond, provided that such endorsement upon the interest coupons attached to such bonds may be made by the facsimile signature of the officer designated by resolution of the agency to endorse the bonds; (3) that the agency will make payments of interest or principal upon guaranteed bonds after default by the issuer.

B. Payments:

Guaranty payments of interest and principal shall be made from the housing assistance fund and the payment made in any year, together with any subventions made pursuant to section 2 hereof, shall not exceed, in the aggregate, the amount authorized for such fund.

C. Negotiability and legal investment:

Bonds and interest coupons guaranteed pursuant to this section shall be negotiable instruments; they shall be legal investments for all purposes.

SEC. 4. Conditions of aid to housing authorities:

A. Determinations:

Before making any contract for loan, subvention, or guaranty with a housing authority, the agency shall determine that—

1. There is a need in the locality for decent housing at rentals below those currently available in substantial supply through private endeavor and that the assistance requested will aid in meeting such need;

2. The estimated revenues of operation, including subventions, contributions, or assistance from any source, will be sufficient to meet the estimated costs of operation;

3. The governing body of the city, city and county, or county in which the proposed housing development is to be located has adopted a resolution approving the filing of an application with the agency;

B. Contract provisions:

Any contract for loan, subvention, or guaranty with a housing authority shall contain appropriate provision to require that:

1. Decent accommodations are or will be made available at reasonable cost to eligible persons who will be displaced by development of the dwellings to be provided;

2. Wages or fees not less than those prevailing in the locality will be paid to all workers employed in development and operation; and, that there will be no discrimination in employment on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

3. The average net construction cost of the dwelling units (excluding land, site improvement, nondwelling facilities, and overhead) will not be greater than the average net construction cost of dwelling units currently produced in the locality or metropolitan area under the legal building requirements applicable to the site and under labor standards not lower than these prescribed in this article;

4. Construction shall be contracts awarded after competitive bidding;

5. Development will not conflict with provisions of any official master plan duly adopted for the area;

6. Rentals shall be fixed within the financial reach of eligible persons; provided that the housing development shall not be operated for profit but the rental revenues (together with all other available monies, revenues, income, and receipts from whatever sources derived) shall in any event be sufficient to pay costs of operation;

7. Dwellings shall be let to eligible persons on the basis of need, without discrimination or segregation as to race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry;

8. In selecting eligible persons for occupancy, preference shall be given, as between cases of like need, to veterans of World War II and families displaced by freeway construction, community redevelopment activities, or other public improvements, including families displaced by the housing development; provided that the veterans preference shall not continue beyond 5 years after the effective date of this article, and the preference to displaced families shall be limited to initial occupancy in the housing development. The housing authority may determine the order in which the foregoing preferences shall be applied in relation to local conditions;

9. Dwellings shall be let only to eligible persons who have resided in the State for a period of not less than 1 year; provided, that the agency, may, upon application of the housing authority, waive such requirement during periods of emergency or when in the public interest;

10. In development and operation, consideration shall be given to needs and family characteristics of all eligible persons, including single persons and large families.

11. The housing development and all its accounts and records shall be open to inspection or audit by representatives of the agency at all reasonable times.

12. Operation of the housing development will be in accordance with schedules of income, rents, and expenses approved by the agency.

13. The housing authority will submit such reports as the agency may require.

14. The housing authority will not, without consent of the agency, commit any act, or give consent, to transfer possession of or convey title to the housing development.

C. Other provisions:

The agency may include in its contracts other provisions to effectuate the purposes of this article or to facilitate the sale of bonds.

SEC. 5. Allocation of benefits:

During the first year after appointment of the first commissioners of the agency, contracts creating obligations against the housing assistance fund shall not exceed for housing developments with a particular county the proportion which the amount so obligated bears to the housing assistance fund as to the population of such county bears to the population of the State, as determined by the agency. After 10 years from the effective date of this article, unless such period shall be extended by law, no new contract for loan, subvention, or guaranty shall

be made by the agency in aid of any additional housing development or housing property.

SEC. 6. Loans to nonprofit housing associations:

A. Purpose:

The purpose of this section is to provide a source of useful credit for those veterans of World War II and other persons, and their families, of moderate income who, in the determination of the agency, lack sufficient income or available credit to buy or rent standard quality housing currently being produced in substantial supply by private endeavor, but who can obtain adequate housing through mutual organization with the assistance of a loan by the agency as hereinafter provided.

B. Loans authorized:

The agency may make loans to nonprofit housing associations for development of housing properties; provided that the total loans outstanding upon a housing property shall not exceed the cost of the development and in no event shall loans by the agency on any housing property exceed 95 percent of such cost as determined by the agency. Loans shall bear interest at the going rate of interest plus one-half of 1 percent, shall be secured in such manner and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding 50 years, as the agency may determine.

SEC. 7. Conditions of aid to nonprofit housing associations:

A. Agency determinations:

Before making any loan to a nonprofit housing association, the agency shall determine that: (1) the housing property is proposed for the purpose of providing adequate housing for veterans of World War II and other persons, and their families, of moderate income who lack sufficient income or available credit to buy or rent standard-quality housing currently being produced in substantial supply by private endeavor; (2) making the loan will effect the purposes of section 6 hereof; and (3) the estimated rents, revenues, receipts, or income of the non-profit-housing association, from whatever source derived, will be sufficient to pay the estimated costs of development and operation.

B. Contract provisions:

The amount and terms of any loan with a nonprofit housing association shall be set forth in a contract with the agency which shall contain appropriate provision to require that:

(1) Development and operation of the housing property shall be for the exclusive use and benefit of members in the non-profit-housing association and not for profit; provided, that the agency may agree to such qualifications in the foregoing as, in its determination, will be necessary to protect its security for or interest in the loan;

(2) Wages or fees not less than those prevailing in the locality will be paid to all workers employed in development; and that there will be no discrimination in employment on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(3) The average net construction cost of the dwelling units (excluding land, site improvement, nondwelling facilities, and overhead) will not be greater than the average net construction cost of dwelling units currently produced in the locality or metropolitan area under the legal building requirements applicable to the site and under labor standards not lower than those prescribed in this article;

(4) Construction will be by contracts awarded after competitive bidding;

(5) Development will not conflict with provisions of any official master plan duly adopted for the area;

(6) Sales prices or rentals in the housing property shall be subject to approval by the agency;

(7) Occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the housing property shall not be restricted or segregated on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(8) The housing property and all its accounts and records shall be open to inspection or audit by representatives of the agency at all reasonable times;

(9) The nonprofit housing association will submit such reports as the agency may require; and

(10) Any conveyance or transfer of possession of the housing property shall be subject to approval by the agency.

TITLE IV—STATE HOUSING FUND

SECTION 1. Fund established:

There is hereby established in the State treasury a fund, to be designated, State housing fund. The State housing fund shall be maintained and used solely for the purposes of, and pursuant to the provisions of, this article.

SEC. 2. Fund composition:

The State housing fund shall include the following component funds, together with any additional funds which may be provided by law.

A. Housing loan fund:

A fund to be designated housing loan fund, is hereby established for the purpose of making loans by the agency authorized by title III of this article.

(1) Deposits:

There shall be deposited in the housing loan fund: (a) all proceeds from the sale of the housing bonds; (b) all payments of principal and interest by borrowers from this fund; (c) all net proceeds received by the agency in realizing upon any property pledged as security for a loan made from the housing loan fund; and (d) any moneys provided by law for such purpose. There shall also be deposited in the housing loan fund, and be available for expenditure by the agency therefrom, any gift, grant, bequest, devise, or the income therefrom, when so provided, for the purposes of such fund.

(2) Payments:

Payment from the housing loan fund shall be made to borrowers, or their agents or designees, at such times, upon such showings and in such manner as the contracts or regulations of the agency shall provide. The State controller shall issue warrants for payments from the housing loan fund upon certification by the officer of the agency designated by its resolution. The State treasurer shall make payments from the housing loan fund in accordance with the warrants issued by the State controller.

(3) Surplus:

Unless otherwise provided by law, any monies in the housing loan fund in excess of $100,000,000 shall be transferred by the State treasurer to the State general fund; provided that in computing such amount there shall be excluded: (1) any property held by it as security for loans made by the agency; and (2) any moneys deposited by virtue of any gift, grant, bequest, devise, or income therefrom.

B. Housing assistance fund:

A fund, to be designated housing assistance fund, is hereby established for the purpose of making subventions and guaranty payments by the agency pursuant to contracts authorized by title III of this article.

(1) Deposits:

There is hereby appropriated from any moneys in the general fund or surplus in the State treasury the sum of $25,000,000, plus any additional amount provided by law, for the purpose of making any payments authorized by sections 2 and 3 of title III of this article. The funds so appropriated shall be transferred by the State treasurer to the housing assistance fund upon presentation of a resolution by the agency directing such action and shall remain available until expended. There is also hereby appropriated annually from any moneys in the general fund or surplus in the State treasury a supplementary amount which, together with the balance in the housing assistance fund as of the beginning of the fiscal year, will equal the amount appropriated in the first sentence of this section, plus any additional amount provided by law. The funds so appropriated shall be transferred by the State treasurer to the housing assistance fund upon presentation of resolutions by the agency specifying the amount, and directing such action. All funds appropriated shall remain available until expended. There shall also be deposited in the housing assistance fund, and be available for expenditure by the agency therefrom, any gift, grant, bequest, devise, or the income therefrom, when so provided, for the purposes of such fund.

(2) Payments:

Payments from the housing assistance fund shall be made, pursuant to the contracts of the agency authorized by title III of this article, in such manner, upon such showings and at such times and places as the contracts or regulations of the agency shall provide. The State controller shall issue warrants for payments from the housing assistance fund upon a certification by the officer of the agency designated by its resolution. The State treasurer shall make payments from the housing assistance fund in accordance with the warrants issued by the State controller.

C. Housing administration fund:

A fund, to be designated housing administration fund, is hereby established for the purpose of paying the costs of administering the agency.

(1) Deposits:

There is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the general fund or surplus in the State treasury a sum to be available during each fiscal year equal to 3 percent of the maximum authorized amount of the housing assistance fund or such higher amount as may be provided by law. The moneys so appropriated shall be transferred by the State treasurer to the administration fund upon certification by the agency that all, or any part, of said appropriation is needed during the fiscal year. There shall also be deposited in the housing administration fund any moneys appropriated by law, and any gift, grant, bequest, devise, or the income therefrom, when so provided for the purposes of such fund.

(2) Payments:

The State controller shall issue warrants for payment from the housing administration fund upon presentation of statements certified by the officer of the agency designated by its resolution. The State treasurer shall make payments from the housing administration fund in accordance with the warrants issued by the State controller.

SEC. 3. Investment of surplus funds:

The agency may authorize or direct the investment or deposit of moneys in any of the funds subject to its control, or appropriated for its use, in the manner and to the extent authorized by law for investment or deposit of other State funds.

SEC. 4. Liquidation of fund:

Unless otherwise provided by law, when all obligations of the agency, pursuant to contracts authorized by this article or by any law, have been discharged in full, the appropriations made in section 2 hereof shall terminate, and any moneys remaining in the State housing fund shall be transferred into the general fund of the State; provided that any moneys or property in such fund which is the res or income of any gift, grant, bequest, or devise shall not be so transferred in violation of its terms.

TITLE V—HOUSING BOND ISSUE

SECTION 1. Creation of State debt authorized:

For the purpose of providing funds for the housing loan fund created by this article, the agency shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered to create a debt or debts, liability or liabilities, of the State, in the manner and to the extent hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. Preparation of housing bonds:

A. Amount and rate of interest:

For the purpose of this article, immediately after the adoption of any resolution by the agency provided for in section 8 of this title, the State treasurer shall prepare the requisite number of suitable bonds of denomination of not less than $50, in accordance with the specifications contained in such resolution. The aggregate par value of all housing bonds issued under this title shall not exceed the sum of $100,000,000; provided that the aggregate par value of all housing bonds issued during the first year after the adoption of this article shall not exceed $25,000,000; and the aggregate par value of all housing bonds issued during the first and second years after the adoption of this article shall not exceed $60,000,000; and thereafter the par value of all housing bonds issued shall not exceed $100,000,000. The housing bonds issued under any such resolution shall bear interest from the date of issuance of said housing bonds to the date of maturity thereof, at a rate to be determined by the agency, in consultation with the State treasurer, and specified in such resolution, but in no case exceeding 5 percent per annum; such resolution may provide for redemption with or without the payment of a premium. Both principal and interest shall be payable in lawful money of the United States at the office of the State treasurer, or at the office of any duly authorized agent of the State treasurer, and shall be so payable at the times specified in said resolution or resolutions.

B. Signature:

All housing bonds issued under this article shall bear the facsimile signature of the Governor and the facsimile signature of the State controller and shall be endorsed by the State treasurer either by original signature or by a signature stamp adopted for each particular housing bond issued under this article. Said housing bonds shall be signed, countersigned, and endorsed by the officers who shall be in office on the date of issuance thereof, and each shall bear an impress of the great seal of the State. Housing bonds so signed, countersigned, endorsed, and sealed, when sold, shall be and constitute a valid and binding obligation upon the State, although the sale thereof be made at a date or dates upon which the officers having signed, countersigned, and endorsed said housing bonds, or any or either of said officers, shall have ceased to be the incumbents of the offices held by them at the time of signing, countersigning, or endorsing said housing bonds.

C. Interest after maturity:

Each housing bond issued under this article shall contain a clause or clauses stating that interest shall cease to accrue thereon from and after the date of maturity thereof and referring to this article and to the resolution of the agency hereunder by virtue of which said housing bond is issued.

D. Interest coupons:

The requisite number of suitable interest coupons, appropriately numbered, shall be attached to each housing bond issued under this article. Said interest coupons shall bear the facsimile signature of the State treasurer who shall be in office on the date of issuance of the housing bonds to which said coupons pertain.

SEC. 3. Retirement of housing bonds.

All housing bonds issued under this article and sold shall be deemed to have been called in at their respective dates of maturity and the State treasurer, at the specified date of redemption thereof, or on the respective dates of maturity thereof, or as soon thereafter as said matured housing bonds are surrendered to him, shall pay the same out of the proceeds of the State controller's warrants issued in favor of the State treasurer as provided in section 4, of this title, and shall perforate the housing bonds so paid with a suitable device in a manner to indicate such payment and the date thereof. He shall also, on the said respective dates of maturity, cancel all housing bonds bearing said dates of maturity and remaining unsold, by perforation with a suitable device in a manner to indicate such cancellation and the date thereof. The provisions of this section shall be applicable also to the interest coupons pertaining to the housing bonds authorized by this article to be issued, and shall be applicable, as far as practicable, to any authorized agent of the State treasurer.

SEC. 4. State appropriation:

A. Amount:

There is hereby appropriated from the general fund in the State treasury such sum annually as will be necessary to pay the principal of and the interest on the housing bonds issued and sold pursuant to the provisions of this article, as said principal and interest becomes due and payable.

B. Tax levy:

There shall be levied and collected annually and at the time other State revenue is collected, such sum, in addition to the ordinary revenues of the State, as shall be required to pay the principal of and interest on housing bonds as herein provided, and it is hereby made the duty of all officers charged by law with any duty in regard to the collections of said revenue, to do and perform each and every act which shall be necessary to collect such additional sums.

C. Method of payment:

Both principal of and interest on housing bonds when due shall be paid by the State treasurer from the proceeds of warrants issued against said appropriation from the general fund by the State controller in favor of the State treasurer, or in favor of any authorized agent of the State treasurer, upon demands which shall be subject to audit in any manner provided by law.

SEC. 5. Appropriation for expense:

The sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the general fund in the State treasury to pay the expenses that may be incurred by the State treasurer in having housing bonds prepared and in advertising their sale. Said amount shall be refunded to the general fund in the State treasury, pursuant to warrants issued by the State controller for that purpose, out of the specific funds into which the proceeds from the sale of housing bonds shall be covered in accordance with the provisions of this article.

SEC. 6. Sale of housing bonds:

When the housing bonds have been executed they shall be sold by the State treasurer at public auction to the highest bidder for cash, in such parcels and numbers as the said treasurer shall be directed by the governor of the State, under seal thereof, after a resolution requesting such sale shall have been adopted by the agency, but said treasurer must reject any and all bids for housing bonds, or for any of them, which shall be below the par value thereof plus the interest which has accrued thereon between the date of sale and the last preceding interest maturity date; and with the approval of the governor, he may from time to time, by public announcement at the place and time fixed for the sale, continue such sale, as to the whole of the housing bonds offered, or any part thereof offered, to such time and place as he may select. Before offering any housing bonds for sale, the State treasurer shall detach therefrom all coupons which have matured or will mature before the day fixed for such sale.

SEC. 7. Notice of sale, proceeds of sale:

Due notice of the time and place of sale of all housing bonds must be given by the State treasurer by publication in one newspaper published in the city and county of San Francisco and also by publication in one newspaper published in the city of Oakland and by publication in one newspaper published in the city of Los Angeles once a week during 4 weeks prior to such sale. In addition, the State treasurer may give such further notice as he may deem advisable, but the expense and cost of such additional notice shall not exceed the sum of $500 for each sale so advertised. The proceeds of the sale of housing bonds shall be forthwith deposited by the State treasurer in the housing-loan fund created by this article; provided, however, that any proceeds of the sale, paid as accrued interest or by way of premium shall be paid over by the State treasurer into the general fund of the State.

SEC. 8. Resolutions for issuance of housing bonds:

Whenever the agency shall have determined that the issuance of housing bonds under this article is necessary or desirable, it shall adopt a resolution to this effect. Said resolution shall authorize and direct the State treasurer to prepare the requisite number of suitable bonds and shall specify the aggregate number, aggregate par value, and the date of issuance of the housing bonds to be issued, the date or dates of maturity of the housing bonds to be issued and the number and numerical sequence of the housing bonds maturing at each date of maturity, the annual rate of interest which the housing bonds to be issued shall bear, the number, numerical sequence, amount or amounts and the dates of maturity of the interest coupons to be attached to the housing bonds, the technical form and language of the housing bonds to be issued and of the interest coupons to be attached thereto, and such redemption provisions, with or without payment of premiums as may be specified.

SEC. 9. Interest:

The rate of interest to be borne by the housing bonds shall be uniform for all of the same issue and shall be determined and fixed by the agency in consultation with the State treasurer, according to the then prevailing market conditions, but shall in no case exceed 5 percent per annum, and the determination of the agency as to the rate of interest shall be conclusive as to the then prevailing market conditions. The interest coupons to be attached to the housing bonds shall be payable at semiannual intervals from the date of the issuance thereof; provided, that the interest coupon first payable may, if the agency shall so determine and specify, be payable 1 year after the date of issuance thereof.

TITLE VI—TAXES

SECTION 1. No property shall be exempt from taxes as a result of financial assistance provided in this article; provided, that any public body shall have power, by resolution of its governing body, to waive, or agree to waive, any taxes, liens, assessments, fees, or charges which may be levied against a housing authority and its property or its operations for such periods and in such manner as such governing body may determine.

SEC. 2. In any year during which the agency shall make payment from the housing assistance fund pursuant to a contract of subvention or guaranty, the total of any tax payments by the housing authority upon the housing agreement so assisted for such year shall be reduced by an aggregate amount equal to such subvention or guaranty payment; provided, that the taxes paid shall not

be less than the taxes which would be paid on the assessed value of the property comprising the site at the time of its acquisition by the housing authority.

SEC. 3. The bonds of a housing authority, together with the interest thereon and income therefrom, shall be exempt from all taxes and special assessments of the State or any political subdivision thereof.

TITLE VII—SUPPLEMENTAL POWERS

SECTION 1. Housing authority:

A. Powers:

Any housing authority shall have power: to engage in the development and operation of housing developments and undertakings; to borrow money, or obtain financial and other aid from any source and comply with any conditions thereto; in furtherance of the provisions of this article, to exercise its powers now granted or hereafter extended under any law as if set forth herein; to make contracts with the agency for any assistance provided by, or pursuant to, this article and execute its responsibilities thereunder.

B. Area of operation:

Two or more housing authorities may, by resolution, join in the exercise of their powers and may designate one to act on behalf of all. A housing authority may operate within the territorial limits of another political subdivision with consent by resolution of the government body thereof and the housing authority, if any.

C. Federal aid:

In exercising its powers pursuant to this article or any law, a housing authority shall not be required to obtain assistance from the United States of America or any instrumentality thereof, but a housing authority may agree to receive such assistance and comply with any conditions thereto.

SEC. 2. Public body:

Any public body may exercise, and agree to exercise, its powers to assist and cooperate with any housing authority in the development or operation of housing developments or undertakings pursuant to this article or any law. In exercising its powers, the governing body of a public body may: act by resolution which shall take immediate effect; transfer or convey property or provide public works and financial and other assistance with or without consideration; waive requirements, fees, or other charges; and enter into agreements which may extend over any period. A public body may extend its facilities or services outside its jurisdictional limits to assist a housing development with consent by the governing body of the city, city and county, or county in which such housing development is located.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. Eminent domain:

Anything in this constitution or the laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding, housing or redevelopment authorities, agencies, or commissions, or political subdivisions of the State engaged by law in the clearing of slums or blighted areas, redeveloping communities or developing housing, may acquire real property which it may deem necessary for its purposes by the exercise of eminent domain in the manner established by law; provided, that in taking such real property no award of compensation shall be made by reason of any increased value due to the use of real property contrary to law; provided further, that the petition by any such authority, agency, commission, or political subdivision for condemnation of real property for such purposes may request and the court shall order immediate possession of said real property upon payment unto court of the estimated value of the said property. The amount to be deposited shall be determined by the court after appraisal by two appraisers appointed by the court for such purposes.

SEC. 2. Powers of the State legislature:

(a) Affecting this article:

The legislature shall have power to enact laws providing for financial and other assistance for housing in furtherance of the intent and purpose of this article; provided, that during a period of 10 years from and after the effective date of this article no law shall be enacted which will diminish or lessen the appropriations or powers created or established by this article.

(b) Affecting housing authorities:

The State legislature shall pass no act or amendment to the housing-authorities law, as amended (Stat. of 1938, ch. 4, as amended), which shall in any way lessen or diminish the powers of housing authorities.

(c) Consolidation of other housing functions:

The legislature may consolidate into the agency such other housing functions as are being performed or which hereafter may be performed by the State.

SEC. 3. Article controlling; self-executing; and severability:

(a) Article controlling:

Insofar as other provisions of this constitution or the provisions of any law may be in conflict or inconsistent with the provisions of this article the provisions of this article shall control.

(b) Self-executing:

The provisions of this article shall be self-executing and shall not require legislative action.

(c) Severability:

Notwithstanding any other evidence of legislative intent it is hereby declared to be the controlling legislative intent that if any provision of this article, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the article and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to strike out the words "and at specified rents."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment, and I think it is absolutely necessary. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] if he will remain in the Chamber and give this matter his attention. I have unlimited respect for the Senator from Ohio as a lawyer, and for various other reasons.

Mr. President, I feel that this amendment is absolutely necessary if we are to clear up an uncalled-for and unnecessary ambiguity in the bill. I am referring to page 27, in line 21.

Originally the administration presented a bill and a group of Republican Senators also presented a public housing bill. That bill differed somewhat from the language we now have before us, in that, instead of the words "at specified rents" the language "at the rent involved" was used.

I understand that the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency could not understand what that language meant; nor can I. If I am mistaken in this statement, I hope I may be corrected. I understand that none of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency could understand what the language "at the rent involved" meant. So there was substituted the language "at specified rents."

I do not believe the provision has been clarified at all by this change in language. I believe that the language "at specified rents" makes it even more ambiguous than "at the rent involved." I certainly would not want to attempt to administer this section with this language in it. I can see no reason for having the language in the section, so I move that the words "and at specified rents" be stricken so that the Public Housing Administrator and the Congress may know what we are voting on. If those words are stricken from the bill, we shall then have a very clear provision which will accomplish what I am sure the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] wants to accomplish by this legislation. He has so stated on the floor of the Senate. It will provide what I believe all members of the Committee on Banking and Currency want to provide, and that is public housing units for families which need housing units the worst.

With that explanation, I ask that the Senate now act on this amendment. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would tell us what he thinks about this language, whether he thinks it is as vague, indefinite, and ambiguous as I think it is; and if not, I hope some Senator can tell us just what the language means.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I stated to the Senator from Wisconsin earlier this afternoon, it seems to me that the words "and at specified rents" add nothing to the meaning. They do add ambiguity. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have the words stricken out, and I would recommend to those in charge of the bill that they be eliminated. I do not see any purpose in those words.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is the same question which the Senator from Wisconsin discussed yesterday and last Thursday. Yesterday I submitted for the RECORD—and it is to be found on page 4808—a statement which I think explains very clearly the purpose of this language.

The Senator from Wisconsin and I are in complete agreement as to what we want to accomplish. I am definitely of the opinion that the language in the bill does accomplish it in an orderly manner.

In the orderly management of public housing projects the various apartments are arranged according to a certain rent level. Those become the "specified rents." Suppose, for example, there is one level which ought to rent, we will say, for $30 a month. If the income of a person applying for an apartment were more than $150 a month, he would not be eligible for that apartment. It seems to me that we must have some arrangement under which the apartments are lined off according to the rents they should bring. That is exactly what is meant by the language "at specified rents."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin has expressed the fear that by the use of this term a person with a limited income might be prevented from getting into a housing unit. That is not the purpose at all, and the language would not accomplish that purpose. I assured him of it yesterday, in answer to the question which he asked. I thought he was satisfied with the answer I gave, an unequivocal affirmative answer to the effect that the lowness of income would never bar a person or a family from a unit. It is the bigness of the income that bars the family from admission to the project, and not the smallness of the income. I believe that the language "at specified rents" should be kept in the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The original language was "at the rent involved." At that time I invited the attention of the staff of the committee to the fact that, in my opinion, that language would defeat the purpose which I think we are trying to accomplish. Then the language was changed from "at the rent involved" to "at specified rents." I cannot see in what way this change of language cures the defect which the Senator apparently felt was in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall try to give the history of the change as it was made. As I stated the other day, in the original bill there was no requirement that those most urgently in need of housing should be given an absolute preference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to call attention to this point: The administration bill, the Republican bill, and the bill now pending are identical with the exception of the words I have just recited to the Senator from Alabama. All of them provide for a preference, allegedly. The only change has been to strike out the words "at the rent involved"—apparently because Senators thought, as I did, that the bill with those words was defective—and to substitute the words "at specified rents," which I believe make the bill equally defective.

I wonder why the change was made and why the Senator thinks they cure the defect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me correct the statement I made a moment ago when I said, in effect, that in the original bill the words "of most urgent housing need" were not used. Those words were included in the original bill; but in the subcommittee we rewrote the section relating to housing needs and veterans' preference and specified rents; and in the committee print, as it went to the full committee, the words "most urgent housing need" were eliminated. However, in the full committee we rewrote it. There is no particular significance in the change of the language from that contained in the original bill to that included in the bill as it came from the full committee. The change was made, so far as we were concerned, from the subcommittee version to the version as it came from the full committee.

As I have tried to state, it was the feeling in the full committee that the persons most urgently in need of housing should be given a preference in being admitted to these properties.

Question arose as to the various classifications of apartments and the rents they should bring. So we wrote in the words "at specified rents."

I can assure the Senator from Wisconsin that it was the intent of the committee that the persons most in need of housing should be given an absolute preference in being admitted to such housing, provided they otherwise could meet the requirements; and the words "at specified rents" were included in order to prevent the admission into such housing units of persons whose incomes were too great to entitle them to admission. Those words were not included for the purpose of keeping out the low-income families.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very much impressed by the Senator's statement of his intention; but I hope he will remember that the road to some place or other is said to be paved with good intentions.

The Senator has stated that his intention is to take care of those having the greatest housing need. Let me ask this question: Let us assume that the specified rent in one of the projects is $55 a month. Let us further assume that a certain family is very much in need of one of the three-bedroom apartments in the project, and assume that their housing need is greater than that of any other prospective tenant, even one who could pay $55 a month; but also assume that the income of the particular family with the greater need is so low that it could not pay more than $22 a month, the minimum rent. Am I correct in stating that that language would absolutely and definitely bar that family, the family with the greatest housing need; and under those circumstances would not the Administrator have to say, "I shall select a family that is able to pay $55 a month," and then would not he select one of the families in that income category having the greater housing need?

I may say to the Senator that that is the opinion of a great number of persons in the Public Housing Administration, who very truthfully have told me that that is the effect of this language, and that it was intentionally placed in the bill in order to accomplish that purpose.

So, in view of the fact that the Senator from Alabama has stated to me that he has no intention whatsoever of barring, merely because their income is low, families who need such housing the worst, I ask him whether he can have any conceivable objection to striking out those words.

Certainly the high-income families will be barred because of the language of the bill itself. The public housing section itself makes it incumbent upon the local authority to determine a maximum salary range, beyond which tenants will not be accepted. With that protection, can the Senator think of any conceivable reason why we should not strike from the bill that trick language—and I use that phrase advisedly—which I say to the Senator, and I have no doubt about it, will completely defeat the purpose of both the subcommittee and the full committee? If there were any valid reason which the Senator could point out as to why or how the striking out of that language would make the bill a poor public housing measure, then most likely I would go along with the Senator; but certainly no damage whatsoever will be done by striking out that language, for to strike it out will simply serve to accomplish what all of us have said on the floor of the Senate we wish to have accomplished.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wisconsin is as wrong as he can be in the conclusion he reaches. If we strike that language from the bill, I think the result will be that the low-income families, rather than the others, will be hurt, because then the others will be allowed to enter such housing units. Under such circumstances they might be able to break through and obtain apartments which otherwise the low-income families would obtain.

So I think the Senator from Wisconsin is incorrect in the conclusion at which he has arrived, and I believe that a careful study of the memorandum I placed in the RECORD yesterday afternoon should convince him of what I say.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Alabama has not answered my question. I refer to a situation in which the specified rent might be $55. The bill as presently written provides that the families selected for admission into such housing units will be selected on the basis of the greatest need at the specified rent. Does not that mean that this language would automatically bar any family unable to pay the $55 rent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the clear language of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I shall answer that categorically: No; it does not.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then what do the words "at specified rents" mean? Can the Senator tell me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not know how I could explain it more fully than I did yesterday in answer to the various questions asked by the Senator from Wisconsin, and also by the memorandum I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays; and I wish to be heard further in regard to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire whether the President pro tempore stated there was not a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Baldwin	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Gurney	Magnuson	Wherry
Hayden	Malone	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	Withers
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Young
Hill	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the acting majority leader?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Once again the question has come up as to whether the Senate may be able to finish action on the pending bill tonight. I should like to inquire of the acting majority leader whether he has any further information to give Members of the Senate at this time?

Mr. MYERS. I have consulted with the sponsors of the pending amendments. I have also consulted with the minority leader, with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and with the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the pending bill. The general consensus is that we can finish action on the bill tonight. We should not take too long on the pending amendments. I think the Senate should remain in session. I feel that we can finish at a reasonable hour—I have said 7:30, or we might possibly run a little longer; perhaps until 8 o'clock, or a little longer. But I think we should remain in session to conclude action on the pending bill, since we have now remained in session until 10 minutes before 7. I therefore ask Senators to bear with us. If we all do our best, I am sure we can complete action upon the pending bill at a very reasonable hour this evening.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should first like to ask again for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should now like to address myself to this particular amendment for a few minutes, especially for the benefit of Senators who may not have been on the floor when the amendment was first called up.

I should like to have the clerk to reread the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out, in lines 21 and 22, on page 27 of the bill, the words "and at specified rents."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this amendment should clear up a very unnecessary and very patent ambiguity in the language of the bill which concerns the public-housing section. Originally, both the administration bill and the so-called Republican bill contained the language "at the rent involved."

This concerns public housing units and the yardstick to be used for the admission of tenants. I called the attention of the staff of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to this confusing language. At a subsequent date the subcommittee substituted the language "and at specified rents." I have asked any number of Senators if they could read the language and tell me what it meant. Up until this time I have not found a single Senator who could answer the question, except that I received an answer from the Senator from Alabama and a much more ambiguous communication from the Public Housing Administration. I have read the explanation of the Public Housing Administration which the Senator from Alabama put into the RECORD, but, after reading it, I am, frankly, much more confused than I was before I started.

The removal of these words from the public-housing section of the bill can in no conceivable way weaken or damage that section.

Some Senators were not on the floor at the time the Senator from Ohio addressed himself to this particular amendment. As Senators know, the Senator has long been a champion of public housing. He very freely admits that the language is unclear and should be removed from the bill. I say, in all frankness and all seriousness, that unless the language is removed it will be impossible to administer the act, and I urge that the Senate very seriously consider it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. McGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—30

Baldwin	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Cain	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Ecton	McCarthy	Watkins
Ferguson	McClellan	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Young

NAYS—46

Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Lodge	Sparkman
Frear	McFarland	Stennis
Fulbright	McKellar	Taylor
George	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Maybank	Tobey
Hoey	Morse	Vandenberg
Holland	Murray	Withers
Humphrey	Myers	
Hunt	Neely	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Graham	Miller
Brewster	Green	O'Conor
Butler	Kem	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Long	Tydings
Chavez	Lucas	Wagner
Downey	McCarran	Wiley
Eastland	McGrath	

So Mr. McCARTHY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I desire to call up amendment "C."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, beginning with line 16, it is proposed to strike out through line 2 on page 28, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "(c) except in the case of the family of any veteran or serviceman (or of any deceased veteran or serviceman), which family shall have the preference prescribed in subsection 10 (g) of this act, no family shall be eligible for admission to any low-rent project assisted under this act unless such family is certified, by

the local government agency administering public welfare in the locality, as in need of public contribution toward the payment of its rental; and."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, under the bill as drawn, as I understand it, a local housing authority is charged with the responsibility for selecting the tenants who are to live in the federally subsidized low-rent housing projects. The pending amendment would provide that the selection of tenants would be taken from any local housing authority and placed in the hands of the public-welfare agency of the community in which a particular subsidized low-rent housing project was situated.

Mr. President, I think there is a very good and sound reason for the adoption of this amendment. I wonder how many Senators know what a local housing authority actually is, what it consists of.

In every community with whose conditions I am familiar a local housing authority consists of a group of voluntary workers. So far as I know, they are almost invariably fine, busy American citizens who have accepted appointment, generally from the mayor of the community, and willingly volunteer their time and effort in the local public interest, as they relate to housing, without compensation for their services.

The men and women of these many local housing authorities throughout America are, and have been for a long time, doing a fine and richly appreciated service in the general supervision of the public and war-built housing within their respective communities. But the fact remains that because of the very nature of the local housing authorities, all too few of the membership have any concrete knowledge concerning the families who are most in need of Federal housing within their communities.

It seems therefore extremely logical to the sponsors of this amendment that the agency within the community be selected which is best qualified by experience and training and knowledge to make selection of the families who are most in need of Federal housing within any given American community.

A very few minutes ago the very distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in speaking in opposition to the amendment which was recently offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and defeated, referred to a statement which he had received a few days ago from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

I wish to refer to the very same statement in support of the amendment which is pending. I refer to the statement, because in the words of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, located here in Washington, we find that in his opinion, on the basis of the record, there are large numbers of families badly in need of Federal housing who are not being accommodated for two reasons: First, the families in need of housing did not know that housing was available, and the local housing authority charged with the responsibility of selecting the tenants did not know that such families in large numbers actually existed within the confines of their jurisdiction.

I presume that if Mr. Foley, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, did not write the paragraph to which I now refer, he certainly authorized and approved it, because it came in an official document to the Senator from Alabama. The paragraph in part reads as follows:

> Time after time, housing authorities have been told by the most underprivileged families that they had not applied earlier because they could not believe "this project was really being built for the likes of us." Local authorities have many times had to enlist the help of welfare agencies and religious organizations in making clear to the families whose housing need is most urgent and whose incomes are lowest, that these projects are actually for them.

In the light of that experience, as it comes from the official spokesman for the subsidized housing which we have been discussing for some time, I think it would serve a concrete and good purpose to have the selection of tenants placed in the hands of the official welfare agency of every American community.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will permit me just one observation. I am satisfied that the Members of this body are willing to appropriate or authorize the expenditure of many billions of our taxpayers' money for one reason, and one alone; they expect that it will result in public housing to be lived in by the families in American communities who are most in need of housing. If we can make more certain of that by utilizing the experience and the professional training of an official welfare agency and attain a better result than has been achieved by utilizing the local housing authorities, consisting, as they do, mostly of volunteer workers, the Senate would be well advised to adopt an amendment designed only to make more certain the attainment of the objective which all of us seek.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure I understand the pending amendment. Am I correct in believing that it would not mean that only welfare clients would be accommodated in public housing? Am I correct in my assumption that the amendment means that the welfare agency would have the job of selecting as tenants those who were in need of some public assistance insofar as housing is concerned?

Mr. CAIN. The public welfare agency, under the terms of the amendment, would be charged only with determining the families within its jurisdiction who were most in need of housing.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendment does not mean that the public housing project would be solely for welfare cases?

Mr. CAIN. The adoption of the amendment would not mean that public housing projects would be lived in only by relief and welfare cases.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to utter only a couple of sentences in opposition to the amendment. I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that 41 State legislatures have set up laws whereby local housing authorities may be established, and providing that the discretion of selecting those who should go into these housing projects would vest in the local housing authorities. Adoption of the amendment would completely upset that machinery which has been established by the 41 States which have provided local housing authorities.

As a matter of fact a great many of the cases in housing projects are welfare cases. I call attention to the fact that in Seattle, Wash., in April 1948, 39 percent of those occupying the low-rent homes were welfare cases. In March, 1949, 43 percent were welfare cases. In the city of Tacoma, Wash., in March, 1941, 20 percent were welfare cases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of various cities throughout the United States which have low-rental housing projects, showing the percentage of welfare clients living in the low-rent housing projects compared with all tenants.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Welfare clients living in low-rent housing projects as percentage of all tenants

	April 1948	March 1949
	Percent	*Percent*
Anaconda, Mont.	17	
Baltimore, Md.		11
Boston, Mass.	6	10
Chester, Pa.	9	
Chicago, Ill.	23	20
Cleveland, Ohio (PWA and PL-412 projects)	24	
Gary, Ind.	34	
Hammond, Ind.	24	
Hartford, Conn.	8	
Los Angeles, Calif. (PL-412 projects)	23	15
Louisville, Ky.[1]	10	10
New Orleans, La.		23
New York, N. Y.	8	12
Peoria, Ill.		24
Philadelphia, Pa.	15	14
Phoenix, Ariz.	10	
Pittsburgh, Pa.	20	20
Quincy, Ill.	24	
San Bernardino, Calif.		16
San Francisco, Calif. (admissions in last 6 months)	33	
Seattle, Wash.	39	43
Tacoma, Wash.		20
Washington, D. C.		9

[1] An additional 20 percent of tenants have incomes as low or lower than the welfare clients, but are living on their own resources without public assistance.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the amendment does not require that public-housing projects shall be lived in by only welfare and relief tenants. The amendment simply provides that the selection of tenants shall be placed in the hands of a qualified welfare agency.

I have indeed high admiration and respect for the Senator from Alabama. I think he has done an exceedingly fine and conscientious job with the pending legislation. But I think his thinking on occasion is subject to being questioned in a modest sort of way. Those who framed the amendment have had an exceedingly broad experience on the local level of government throughout the country. Because of that experience we are suggesting that if it is the intention of the Senate to see to it that those who are most in need of housing are accommodated, we can best attain that end by selecting the best qualified personnel to

make the initial tenant selection, and that would be accomplished through the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, on the amendment lettered "C," offered by me and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that on this vote the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] have a pair.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—10

Brewster	Ecton	Wherry
Bricker	Jenner	Williams
Cain	McCarthy	
Capehart	Malone	

NAYS—65

Anderson	Hoey	McMahon
Baldwin	Holland	Magnuson
Bridges	Humphrey	Martin
Chapman	Hunt	Maybank
Cordon	Ives	Millikin
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Douglas	Johnson, Tex	Mundt
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ferguson	Kefauver	Myers
Flanders	Kerr	Neely
Frear	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Knowland	Pepper
Gillette	Langer	Robertson
Gurney	Lodge	Russell
Hayden	Long	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	McClellan	Schoeppel
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Hill	McKellar	Sparkman
Stennis	Thomas, Utah	Watkins
Taft	Thye	Withers
Taylor	Tobey	Young
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	George	Miller
Butler	Graham	O'Conor
Byrd	Green	Reed
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Lucas	Tydings
Downey	McCarran	Wagner
Eastland	McGrath	Wiley

So Mr. CAIN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46 it is proposed to strike out lines 6 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) By adding at the end of the proviso in subsection 10 (a) and the proviso in subsection 11 (a) in each case a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no project shall be assisted under this act unless there shall be in force and effect an ordinance or other local law prohibiting the use and operation for residential purposes of property which is unfit, unsanitary, or otherwise detrimental to the public health and the Authority shall determine that, under the provisions of such ordinance or other local law, and within 1 year after the project shall be first available for occupancy, dwelling units substantially equal in number to the number of dwelling units in the project will be demolished or rehabilitated."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington is very conscious of the lateness of the hour, but he hopes that Senators will find it possible to consider the substance of this amendment. I think that most Senators probably know that there are a large number of slum units of housing in this country. I wonder if they know how many it is reliably estimated that there are? The best figure we can find is that we have today in the urban communities of America more than 4,000,000 units of slum housing or substandard housing, whichever one may choose to call it. This amendment merely provides that for the 810,000 low-rent houses to be constructed there shall either be torn down and removed from the premises or repaired a number substantially the same as the number of new houses to be constructed.

I have bothered, as some Senators have, to go back and read what was in the minds of Members of Congress in 1937 when the United States Public Housing Act was first passed. I have found to my complete satisfaction that both Democrats and Republicans, led in that era by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], wanted above all else, as a result of the construction of low-rent accommodations, to begin to make serious inroads on the existing slum dwellings.

The other day this question was raised by me to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The Senator from Illinois was sympathetic to the intention of my amendment, but he and several other Senators who were likewise very sympathetic thought it was not reasonable to consider it in this legislation, because in their opinion its adoption would be too costly.

I wish to suggest now to the Senator from Illinois and to any other Senator who is interested that I do not think their fears are justified. In my considered opinion it is conveniently, possibly, and completely practicable in every American city about which I know anything to say to the owners of the slum dwellings, "We will give you 1 year from the time the new homes are ready for occupancy to do one of two things—either reestablish or rehabilitate your substandard units of housing so that it can be considered to be standard, or tear it down."

If this amendment is adopted it will not impose a further penny of cost, so far as I know, on the Federal Government. It would result, by the time we should have built 810,000 fine new homes, in the reestablishment or destruction and demolition of 810,000 present homes which are considered to be of slum quality. I take it to be a fact that if the amendment is rejected, the Congress will be faced with this situation in the future: As we build our 810,000 units, we shall reach into the American slums and shall take out 810,000 American families and place them in this decent housing; but then another 810,000 American families will immediately go into the slums from which we have just taken the first 810,000 families. I know of no other practical approach to the elimination of the American slums than the adoption of the pending amendment which will only carry out precisely the intent and purpose and principles of the designers and authors of the first major law on this subject as approved by the Congress in 1937. If there is no cost to be imposed upon the Government by the amendment, then I know of no valid reason why the amendment should be rejected. Out of my own experience, I know that in most American communities there are prevailing codes and regulations which, if enforced, would, as of the present time, require that substandard slum housing be abolished from those communities or brought up to standard.

This amendment would be very helpful in that respect, because it would say to the average American community, "As your Federal Government seeks to help you in providing sanitary, decent homes for your families of low income, your Federal Government thinks it has a legitimate right to require your community to start to clean up your house, so as to get rid of your own slums."

Mr. President, I take it to be a certain fact that no Senator will vote against this amendment because he does not approve of its purpose. Should Senators vote against the amendment, they will do so because somehow or other they think it is not practical or would be too costly.

So, Mr. President, as against my considered opinion and contention that, under this amendment, there is no obvious or apparent cost to the Federal Government, I would deeply appreciate hearing at this time from those who up to this moment have opposed the amendment because they did not think it practical. I

should be most appreciative if they would respond to the observations I have just made, and particularly would the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] please me by making any comments he may care to make.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on what is to me the second most important amendment of all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington requests the yeas and nays on this amendment. Is there a sufficient second? The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum until the number of Senators seconding the request for the yeas and nays can be counted again?

Mr. LANGER. I understood the President pro tempore to announce that there was not a sufficient second.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct; but will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum until the count can be taken again, so that some of us who were discussing the amendment among ourselves may respond to the call?

Mr. LANGER. Very well, Mr. President; I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

On this amendment the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

Evidently there is a sufficient second, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—22

Brewster	Gurney	Taft
Bricker	Jenner	Vandenberg
Bridges	Knowland	Watkins
Cain	Malone	Wherry
Capehart	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Mundt	Young
Ecton	Saltonstall	
Ferguson	Schoeppel	

NAYS—50

Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Douglas	Kefauver	Neely
Ellender	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kilgore	Pepper
Fulbright	Langer	Robertson
Gillette	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	Long	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Taylor
Hill	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Holland	McMahon	Thye
Humphrey	Magnuson	Tobey
Hunt	Maybank	Withers
Ives	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Flanders	Miller
Baldwin	George	O'Conor
Butler	Graham	Reed
Byrd	Green	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Lucas	Tydings
Downey	McCarran	Wagner
Eastland	McGrath	Wiley

So Mr. CAIN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the sake of completeness of the legislative record, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I addressed yesterday to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, together with his reply, directed to the point covered by the Senator from Washington in his amendment. I should like to make merely a very brief statement of the contents of my letter and the contents of his reply.

I joined with the junior Senator from Washington in the hope and belief that the preponderant proportion of the funds under title I would be used for slum clearance and would not be used to bypass slum clearance in order to acquire an undue number of sites on the outskirts of cities. I recognized, of course, that there must be some such, in order to take care of the displaced families and the spillover of population, but I thought it was the intent of the Senate that the major portion of the $1,000,000,000 should be used for slum clearance. I therefore addressed a letter to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator yesterday, pointing out what I had said on the floor of the Senate, expressing my hope that this was the intention of the Administration, and requesting a reply from him.

Today I have received the reply. I shall read only the last paragraph:

> I can assure you that if title I is enacted, it will be my firm policy to administer that program in such manner as to concentrate its benefits on local programs that will place maximum emphasis on the actual clearance of slums.

In conclusion I should like to say, woe betide any Administrator who bypasses the clearing of slums and who devotes the preponderant proportion of the funds merely to acquiring sites on the outskirts of cities.

There being no objection, the two letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 20, 1949.

DEAR MR. FOLEY: I would like to direct your attention to statements which I made on the floor of the Senate on April 19 during the course of my discussion of the slum clearance program proposed under title I of S. 1070.

During a colloquy with Senator CAIN, of Washington, I made the following remarks, as quoted on page 4738 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"That is something devoutly to be wished, and I hope that in the administration of this act the Housing Administrator will not primarily bypass slum clearance for development on the outskirts. I hope we can make on the floor of the Senate a record sufficiently strong as to make plain that his primary obligation is to clear the slums under title I. Anything the Senator can say, or anything I can say in that direction will be in the right direction. There will, of course, have to be areas developed on the outskirts to provide new housing for displaced families."

I should like to take this occasion to reemphasize my very strong conviction that the actual clearance of slums is the primary purpose and primary justification for the substantial Federal financial assistance which will be made available when title I of S. 1070 is enacted into law, as I am confident it will be.

In stressing this purpose and justification, I am in no way denying the necessity for including in the authority under Title I the right to assist local public agencies in also acquiring open sites as an adjunct to overall slum clearance programs in communities. During the course of my remarks on title I, I called attention to the importance of such authority as an adjunct to slum clearance operations and in order to make possible the dispersion of slum population and the elimination of the overcrowding and overbuilding which are among the worst aspects of slum conditions.

However, I have the profound belief that the acquisition of open sites for development purpose should at all times be subordinate to the basic purpose of the actual clearance of slums and that the primary emphasis in the execution of that program will be placed on that basic purpose.

I sincerely trust that this will be the guiding principle in the administration of this program after the enactment of title I.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senator.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1949.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: In reply to your letter of April 20, I can state unequivocally, as I have in my testimony before the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that I have understood and believed the primary purpose of title I of S. 1070 to be the clearance of slum areas. I have also made clear my understanding and belief that the authority contained in that title for the acquisition of open sites, while essential to the effective execution of slum-clearance programs, is subordinate and supplementary to the basic purpose of slum clearance.

Actually, I have always considered that the various authorities contained in title I would serve a single purpose since the clearance of slums cannot be accomplished by demolition alone. Families displaced from these overcrowded slum areas must have an opportunity to move to better houses either in the reconstructed slum areas or elsewhere. It is apparent that a large number of these families cannot be housed on the redeveloped central sites. In eliminating overcrowding, which is a characteristic of slum areas generally, the population of central areas will be reduced, and some displaced families must be provided with housing in other and more open areas in our cities, even if the slum site is entirely redeveloped for housing. Many slum areas, however, are not suitable housing sites at all, and, in accordance with sound city-planning principles, will be redeveloped for commercial or industrial purposes. Title I offers financial assistance to communities to assemble open land for housing sites and thus would eliminate an important obstacle to the rehousing operation.

Actually, the open land phases of the title I program, even if used as extensively as possible in support of the clearance of central slums, will require a very small part of the financial authorization.

Even if all families displaced from slum-clearance projects assisted under title I were to be rehoused in new accommodations on open sites, it is reasonable to estimate that only a very small percentage of the loan and grant authority contained in title I would be utilized for the acquisition and preparation of such open sites and that the great bulk of that loan and grant authority would be available for the acquisition and clearance of built-up slum areas.

I have read with great interest your able discussion of title I of S. 1070 during the debates on April 19, and I find myself in full accord with your position that the actual clearance of slums and the lifting of slum conditions from the families now living in them constitute the basic purpose and justification for the Federal financial assistance which would be authorized by that title.

I can assure you that, if title I is enacted, it will be my firm policy to administer that program in such manner as to concentrate its benefits on local programs that will place maximum emphasis on the actual clearance of slums.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out "115,000" and insert "40,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the pending bill authorizes a total of 810,000 dwellings in 6 years, or 135,000 a year. It, however, contains a discretionary provision by which the President, if he finds or thinks more construction is needed or the economic conditions of the country justify it, may add 115,000 in every year, so that it would bring it to a total each year of 250,000, and he might thereby accelerate the program so that it would be completed in slightly more than 3 years. That would be a very easy thing for him to do, and I am very much afraid he might do it. The amendment proposes to leave the 810,000 and the 135,000, but to reduce the discretionary power to add 115,000 in any one year to 40,000, or a total of 175,000 dwellings in a year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was under the impression that the able Senator from Ohio was agreeable to a compromise figure, setting the maximum at 200,000, which would involve a change in his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. It would change it from "40,000" to "65,000."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator be willing to accept the amendment, if I meet that modification?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I was under the impression that that suggestion had been made to the Senator and that he was agreeable to it.

Mr. TAFT. I should be willing to modify the amendment. I should like to say that our total construction in 1948 was about 900,000, and it seems to me that 250,000 public units in a single year is out of proportion to the total program and should not be permitted; that it would take materials and supplies away from the private builders, who would then have a legitimate objection, and furthermore, the program would be too large. I think 200,000 a year is still a little large, but if the Senator is willing to accept that figure I am willing to compromise. I hereby modify my amendment by striking out "40,000" and inserting "65,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment, as modified, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to strike out "115,000," and insert "65,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 56, it is proposed to strike out sections 404 and 405; on page 58, line 7, to strike out "404" and insert "403"; on page 58, line 15, to strike out "404" and insert "403"; on pages 60 and 61, to strike out section 408; and on page 67, after the word "Secretary" and the semicolon in line 10, to strike out the remainder of line 10 and all of lines 11 to 14, inclusive, and line 15 through the letter "(c)," and insert "(b)."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to strike out the third section of the farm-housing program. The problem of farm housing is somewhat different from the problem of city housing. It has never been satisfactorily studied. Our commitees over and over again tried to get the Department of Agriculture to make a complete study and to present some intelligent discussion and an intelligent solution of the problem of farm housing. Finally, approximately 2 years ago, they came up with this particular program. I do not think they themselves claim they have made a complete study of the subject. There is this problem in farm housing, that if there is a mortgage on the farm it is very difficult to procure money to build a farm house, because it is difficult to get a first mortgage on the house.

Sections 1 and 2 are devoted to trying to solve that problem and to permit the Government to give a second mortgage to enable a farmer to improve his house to the extent of the income from the farm, which will take care of the interest and sinking fund on such mortgage.

The third section, however, is one which seems to me to have no constructive purpose and which will have no constructive result. It is found on page 56 of the bill. It provides:

> In the event the Secretary determines that an eligible applicant cannot qualify for a loan under the provisions of sections 402 and 403—

That means that a farm which cannot earn its own way is certainly a completely submarginal farm, which the Secretary says cannot possibly be made anything other than a submarginal farm. Under those conditions—

> the Secretary may make a grant or a combined loan and grant to the applicant to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a convenient and sanitary water supply, supplying screens, repairing or providing structural supports, or making other similar repairs or improvements.

It is further provided that no assistance shall be extended to any one individual in excess of $1,000.

I think if $1,000 is spent to improve a submarginal farm, it will be only a few years until there is another slum dwelling. It is in no way comparable to what is done in cities. It is not a satisfactory solution. If someone can come up with a satisfactory solution along the line of what we have done in the provisions regarding cities, I shall be very glad. The ordinary public-housing provision can be applied to rural housing if there is sufficient initiative to build up a local housing authority. It has been done in certain districts in Georgia. But to provide $1,000 per farm to enable a farmhouse to be fixed up and have screens put on it, or some such slight improvements made, is, it seems to me, simply in the nature of a hand-out. It does not solve the problem. It does not make that particular

house a decent house if it was not decent before. If it was not a decent house before, I think it is very unlikely that it will be a decent house by reason of the expenditure of that amount of money. A farmer can borrow money for repairs, under FHA, if he has any credit.

I think this particular provision is an unfortunate one. It seems to be thrown in by way of doing something for the farmers in order to balance what we are doing for the city people. When we help the farmer we must do it in a different way. We have a number of different provisions regarding submarginal farms to help the farmers on a comprehensive scale to build up their own farms, under the various Bankhead laws, and other provisions for loans, such as those covering seed and the planting of crops. In addition to that, we are maintaining price supports for farmers so that they will receive a reasonably ample return in proportion to the income of other segments of the community. According to present indications, the Commodity Credit Corporation may have to use, by the end of this year, as much as $4,000,000,000 to buy up crops in order to maintain that guaranty.

So, Mr. President, I feel that the language should be stricken from the bill. The local committees provided for are not necessary for programs 1 and 2. They are only included because, under the third program, there was no way to handle it without some kind of local "hand-out" committee to decide who is and who is not deserving.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator from Ohio think it might be possible with $1,000 to build a bathroom in a farm home and, in addition to that, probably put screens on the doors and windows; and would not those two additions probably entirely change the character of the farm home to one which might be habitable but which otherwise would not be habitable?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think it would change the character of the home. I think it would be very much the same kind of home afterwards as it was before the money was expended. I do not believe it would in any way provide a reasonably permanent home to which the farmer could look forward for any considerable number of years.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Suppose the farmer has already shown some initiative by repairing his own home, but is unable to build an ideal type home. The question is whether he is to have an outhouse, running water, or bath facilities in his house, and whether flies come into his open windows and doors, or whether he shall have screens on his doors and windows. I think that might make a great deal of difference.

Mr. TAFT. If we were doing this in a city, I should be just as strongly opposed to saying, "Here is $1,000 if you want to fix up your house." I think the thousand dollars would be thrown away, in 9 cases out of 10. It would simply be another form of relief. We might as well put the whole thing on a relief basis. The program is in no way constructive.

The bill which we introduced did not contain this provision, and when I joined in the general bill I expressly reserved the privilege of offering this particular amendment. I wanted to make that clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator aware that the purpose for which these loans and grants can be made to submarginal farmers includes not merely screens, but toilet facilities, and provision for a convenient and sanitary water supply; and is not the primary purpose to eliminate typhoid fever from these farms by seeing to it that there is a sanitary water supply, that the toilet facilities are sanitary, so that there is no contamination of the water supply? Is not that a tremendously important purpose?

Mr. TAFT. I think one would have a very difficult time, with $1,000, to install a Delco system to provide running water in any house in the United States. It is very difficult to do any such comprehensive repairs for $1,000.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can assure the Senate that I shall not detain it for any great length of time or postpone the vote. I wish to express my regret that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has seen fit to level his fire on the smallest, though one of the most important items, in the bill. To level his fire at this item, which involves the expenditure of only $1,000,000 for the first year, and a total of $12,500,000 for the 5-year period, is almost like pointing a 16-inch naval gun at a canary.

Mr. President, anyone who is at all familiar with housing conditions on the farms of the United States knows that the most deplorable slums of the Nation are not found in the great cities, but on the farms. Oftentimes, particularly in the section of the country from which I come, one may see a little house with holes in the floors, and holes in the walls through which one could throw a cat, with rain coming through the roof, but perhaps with a little vine growing up the side of the house. Passersby, riding along the road, may say, "Oh, how picturesque. Look at that unusual farm home." They know nothing of real living conditions on the farm, but they may be greatly concerned about the elimination of slums in the cities. To appropriate money to eradicate the slums in the city, and pay no attention to the slum homes on the farms would be unfair and un-American.

The amount of money involved in this provision of the bill this amendment would eliminate is almost pitiful, it is so inadequate. Only $1,000,000 is provided for grants for the first year, and the total amount involved for 5 years is $12,500,000.

I do not complain about the grant of one-half billion dollars for slum clearance. I think that appropriation is necessary, and will contribute to a better life in the United States. We know that this program as applied to the cities will finally reach a figure of $308,000,000 a year in annual subsidies. Yet, though 20 percent of our people live on the farms, the maximum which can be reached under the farm housing program is $5,000,000 a year.

In view of this great disparity in the sums involved, I submit, when we consider the number of people who are affected, that if any action whatever were taken regarding this provision in the bill, the amount provided should be increased rather than reduced.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Georgia had an amendment inserted in the housing bill last year to care for the farms. He heard the testimony today as to the income of the farmers. He states that some 20 percent of the people in this country live on the farms. What about their income?

Mr. RUSSELL. They receive 9.3 percent of the total national income.

Mr. MAYBANK. So that one-fifth of the people live on the farms, and they receive less than 10 percent of the national income.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. Yet, if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio should be agreed to, it would deny them even this pittance, in a program in which we are supposed to be acting to improve the living conditions of the American people.

Mr. President, there are many marginal and submarginal farm homes in this country. The Senator from Ohio says that if we spend $500 on these homes it is thrown away. I submit that $500 spent on submarginal farm homes will contribute to improving the health and the welfare and the living standards of the American people.

Now to get down to a practical aspect of the problem. If we continue to neglect these woefully inadequate homes, some of which are scarcely fit to be used to house animals, much less people, those who live in them now will not continue to endure such conditions. When the city housing program is started, they will move to the cities, and endeavor to secure the benefit of the better houses provided in the bill for the cities. This will only accentuate the housing problem in the cities instead of relieving present conditions. It would be one of the most economical measures we could adopt if we should authorize the use of $500 or $1,000 to make these houses habitable, so that people would be content to stay in them, rather than have them all trooping into the cities. This has been the trend in recent years.

Mr. President, I am amazed at this criticism of the committee system involved in the amendment. This committee system has been in operation since the inception of the farm security program. Three outstanding farmers are selected in an agricultural county, and they pass on the applications for loans made by those who cannot obtain loans elsewhere than with the Farmers Home Administration. It has saved the Government millions of dollars. It has given the administration of the Farmers

Home Administration a tower of strength in every county, because they had three outstanding farmers who were interested in the program.

Here we find an effort made to cut out this pittance of $12,500,000, which means so much to people who live in slums, even though they are not located in cities, by one who is supporting a bill which will cost, over the period of time contemplated, $14,000,000,000.

Any American program to help solve the housing problem must carry some measure of assistance to the farms of the Nation, and go hand in hand with efforts to better the living conditions of those who dwell in the cities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the committees, is it not true that the bill proposes to use the same committees which are already being used?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator called that to my attention, because I did not know that was a fact. Those committees have been in operation for a number of years, and have proved to be one of the most stabilizing factors in all the activities of the Farmers Home Administration, which, as I understand, will administer the provisions of the bill we are discussing.

Now I wish further to point out that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would strike out section 405 of the bill in its entirety. Section 405 does not relate solely to the loans and grants made to those living under submarginal conditions. It relates to all the loans made under the provisions of the bill for farm housing everywhere throughout our land. Section 405 takes note of the fact that the farmer is constantly dealing with hazards that are beyond his control. The grasshoppers eat up his wheat or corn, the boll weevil may destroy his cotton.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My impression was that section 405 applied only to section 404. Does the Senator think it applies to sections 402 and 403?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the English language means anything it applies to all of the provisions of the bill, and would eliminate the moratorium which might be granted in case of drought or other misfortune to the farm population.

Mr. TAFT. I am not certain about it, but I ask leave to modify my amendment so that it will not strike out section 405.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am afraid the Senator's information in regard to the provisions of section 404 is just as nebulous as his information as to section 405, which applies to all the loans made under the terms of the bill.

The Senator says that no study has been made. Hearings have been held on this question of farm housing every time there has been a housing bill before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I never heard any farm organization testify in favor of this provision. I believe that once the Farm Bureau Federation appeared to oppose the provision, indeed, wanted all the farm sections taken out, because they thought the subject had not been properly covered. My understanding is that this year there was no evidence before the committee in favor of this provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not be critical of the Farm Bureau Federation or any other farm organization, but I will say that most of the farm organizations are controlled by men who own their farms and who have adequate housing facilities. However, I may say that the National Farmers Union has today taken action strongly urging the defeat of the Senator's amendment. So that there is at least one farm organization which is strongly opposed to the Senator's amendment, and which is urging the Senate to adopt the provision reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. In accordance with what the senior Senator from Ohio has said about modifying his amendment, he will confine it entirely to section 405, will he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Section 404.

Mr. THYE. Am I right?

Mr. TAFT. My amendment originally took out section 405. But the amendment as modified leaves section 405 as it is. My interpretation was that the language "any such loan" referred to the loans referred to just ahead of that language in section 404. The Senator from Georgia feels it applies also to section 402 and section 403, and I am perfectly willing to have it apply to 402 and 403. I therefore modify the amendment so that section 405 will remain in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that those who live in these pathetic farm dwellings, these poor, tumble-down shacks, which we see in the coves and on the side roads—we do not see them on the main highways—are not able to be associated with one of the big farm organizations. They are unable to make their voices heard. They are unlike those in the cities, whose representatives here, mayors, labor unions which are interested, many great charitable organizations which are interested, appear in their behalf. They live back almost out of contact with the world, and it would be a great tragedy if the Senate of the United States, in passing this comprehensive piece of legislation, were to strike out this one small item of $12,500,000, which offers a ray of hope to those who live back on the forks of the creek, back in the woods, and whose voices are all too seldom heard in this Capitol.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much money would be appropriated the first year?

Mr. RUSSELL. One million dollars.

Mr. CAPEHART. And we are going to loan $1,000 to each needy farmer?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; make loans of $500, and make grants up to $500.

Mr. CAPEHART. A thousand dollars in all?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. One million dollars is all that is involved. It certainly is a very, very small sum to give to the American farmers, when we consider that Congress voted a few days ago to authorize $5,580,000,000 to go to the people in foreign countries. The amount provided in the bill for the farmers is really so very little, and because of the very fact that it is so little I am wondering whether we should give them anything. I simply cannot conceive of this body only appropriating $1,000,000 for the farmers. If $1,000 were provided for a farmer, the total amount would provide for only 1,000 farmers. In other words, that is what we would do by this bill—provide for only 1,000 farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is assuming that each farmer will receive the maximum amount of $1,000. In my opinion a number of farmers will be benefited by loans as low as $50. The living conditions of many farmers will be greatly enhanced by loans of $50. Of course, I think the total amount is woefully inadequate. The Senator from North Dakota has an amendment which would increase that amount. If the Senator from North Dakota presses his amendment in its present form it may jeopardize the entire bill, but we certainly would be justified in increasing the amount substantially. We certainly should not support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which would strike this entire provision from the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. It seems to me we are not living up to our record, when we appropriate only $1,000,000 for the farmers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to protest against taking up the question of farm housing at this hour of the night. We spent all day Monday discussing funds for the city people, and all day Tuesday and all day Wednesday. Now at this hour, at a quarter after 8, we are going to take up the question of helping the farmers of the United States of America. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose that the Senate shall come to a vote on this question tonight, if I can help it, even though I am obliged to stand here and read the entire bill.

I want to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. In almost every State, indeed in every State, poor, tumble-down farm shacks can be found. The farther we go out into the country, the farther away from town we get, the poorer we find the farm homes to be. There is no State in the Union where some submarginal land and farms thereon does not exist. There is no question that the Senate can do a tremendous amount of good in lending to farmers even the small sum of $1,000, which I think is woefully inadequate to

relieve conditions existing in some of the submarginal regions.

The first part of the bill contains the provision that a man who builds a house in the city can borrow $750 for the construction of each room. Then it is further provided that under certain conditions in the city a man can borrow $1,750 for the construction of each room. And further, that under certain other contions a man can build a house in town at the cost of $2,500 per room. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia said, the sum of $12,000,000,000 is provided for the city people, and then the bill provides a measly $1,000,000 for the farmers.

That is not all, Mr. President. There are certain parts of the housing bill which should not be included in it. The Senate should take this matter up very carefully.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the farmers of the United States, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, when we can give this matter sufficient time thoroughly to take care of the needs of the farmers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is in order, but is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota. [Putting the question.]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order that the——

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the result of the vote?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The result has not been announced.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, excuse me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The "noes" appear to have it. The "noes" have it, and the motion is lost.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I will take the rest of the evening in speaking, so that is all right with me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I want to take up in detail the matter of housing for the farmers of the United States of America.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator intend to offer an amendment?

Mr. LANGER. I intend to offer three amendments before I am through.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator is out of order, and I ask for order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call attention first of all to the fact that the bill would set aside $12,000,000,000 for city housing, but yet when it comes to the farmer the bill starts off with a measly $1,000,000. I want to say that if Senators think that some of us from farm States are going to stand idly by and tolerate that kind of action without a fight they are mistaken.

Mr. President, a part of this measure should be eliminated. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that a part should be taken out of the bill. For example, section 405, paragraph (a) should be eliminated in its entirety. I will read it:

In connection with financial assistance authorized in sections 401 to 404, inclusive——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator not yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield, even for a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am reading from section 406 (a), which I believe should be eliminated entirely. I read:

In connection with financial assistance authorized in sections 401 to 404, inclusive, the Secretary shall require that all new buildings and repairs—

Repairs which may cost $25, which may cost $50, which may cost $100 to $500—

financed under this title shall be substantially constructed and in accordance with such building plans and specifications as may be required by the Secretary.

So we have a man located here in Washington who will have under him a great many agents, who will tell the farmers what kind of buildings to build. I continue to read:

Buildings and repairs constructed with funds advanced pursuant to this title shall be supervised and inspected, as may be required by the Secretary, by competent employees of the Secretary.

Now listen to this:

In addition to the financial assistance authorized in sections 401 to 404, inclusive, the Secretary is authorized to furnish, through such agencies as he may determine, to any person, including a person eligible for financial assistance under this title—

So a poor farmer in Oklahoma who is broke will receive a miserable $500; he cannot receive more than that, and he may receive only $250—

the Secretary is authorized to furnish, through such agencies as he may determine, to any person, including a person eligible for financial assistance under this title, without charge or at such charges as the Secretary may determine, technical services such as building plans—

They are going to have building plans for this farmer in Oklahoma, I want the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to know. In connection with a loan of $400, $300, or $250, the Secretary can make him take building plans, and charge him for them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. President, in addition to giving him building plans, he must have, if the Secretary so directs, technical services—

technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision, and inspection, and advice—

I do not know what the advice is, unless it is advice as to whether he should build a toilet with one hole, or three or four—

advice and information regarding farm dwellings and other buildings.

This man goes out there, with the result that a charge is made in the amount which may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. On a $250 loan the charges may be $100. The farther a man lives from town the more the charge will be. In the West many farmers live 30, 35, or even from 50 to 75 miles away from the county seat. They are going to send men out there, first of all, to supervise. Then they are going to send men out to inspect.

I certainly agree with the Senator from Ohio that if we are to take anything out of the bill, paragraph (a) of section 406 should be taken out.

In addition—

The Secretary is further authorized to conduct research and technical studies,

This is after he was supervised and inspected the farmer.

A man may be getting a loan of $400 or $500. There is a provision that the Secretary is authorized to conduct "research and technical studies, including the development, demonstration, and promotion of construction of adequate farm buildings and other buildings for the purposes of stimulating construction, improving the architectural design and utility of such dwellings and buildings, utilizing new and native materials."

They could go out to the western part of the United States and experiment with a mixture of peat and lignite coal from North Dakota, to find out whether they could construct a building from such a mixture, and charge it all to the farmer.

In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to study "economies in materials and construction methods."

That is to find out just how they are going to construct these buildings. He is further authorized to study "new methods of production, distribution, assembly, and construction, with a view to reducing the cost of farm dwellings and buildings and adapting and developing fixtures and appurtenances for more efficient and economical farm use."

I believe that the entire subsection (a) should be stricken out. I move that it be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair advises the distinguished Senator that there is already an amendment pending, so the motion is out of order.

Mr. LANGER. At the appropriate time I shall so move.

Now we come back to title IV, Farm Housing. I wish to demonstrate how little is being done for the farmers of the United States, in comparison with people in the cities. As I previously stated—and it cannot be denied, because here it is in black and white—a man in the city who is going to get some help can borrow $750 for one room. I want to repeat it so that there will be no doubt about it. He can borrow up to $1,750 more under certain conditions, and under other conditions he can add those

amounts together, making $2,500 a room, without the lot. So if he has a four-room house, that is $10,000. If it is a five-room house, it is a $12,500 house. But the farmer is limited to $1,000.

Because of the fact that I believe many Senators have not read title IV, I am going to read it in full:

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, subject to the terms and conditions of this title, to extend financial assistance, through the Farmers Home Administration, to owners of farms in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and other farm buildings on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions and adequate farm buildings as specified in this title.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished son of Georgia, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has done so much for agriculture in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I well remember the enormous amount of work the Senator from Georgia did for REA.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that no Senator has been more active in promoting the cause of REA, or more vigorous in supporting farm amendments than has the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator, but the Senator from North Dakota did not come here until long after the able Senator from Georgia had been one of the leaders in this fight. It is true that in the past few years I have done all I possibly could for the farmers of the Great Plains area; but compared with what the distinguished Senator from Georgia has done, it is very insignificant indeed.

I might tell my distinguished friend from Georgia that in the Great Plains area we have done considerable for REA during the past year—for South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Montana. North Dakota was at the very bottom of REA a year and a half ago. The State of South Dakota was the forty-seventh State. It had just a few more farmers receiving the benefits of REA than did the State of North Dakota.

So we went to the Department of Agriculture and to the REA. First of all, we found that owing to the war there was a shortage of material. It was impossible at first to get poles for the Great Plains area. We subpenaed Mr. Wickard before the Committee on Civil Service, investigating personnel. Mr. Wickard came before us and testified for more than a week. He brought in charts showing, for example, that in the State of Rhode Island 95 out of every 100 farmers had REA. He submitted charts showing that in the State of Washington 81 farmers out of every 100 had REA, but in the State of North Dakota less than 7 farmers out of every 100, and in South Dakota less than 9 farmers out of every 100, had those benefits. Mr. Wickard stated that he would do all he possibly could to help the Great Plains area.

Last year I discovered, for example, that Wyoming jumped from nearly the bottom of the list to twenty-sixth. In the Great Plains area, aside from Wyoming, Nebraska had actually decreased. We found, that in the State of Minnesota, roughly 5 years ago, 40 out of every 100 farmers had REA. In Montana 25 out of every 100 had it.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] will remember that we asked him to appear before the committee. He came in and interrogated Mr. Wickard, the head of the REA. The excuse which Mr. Wickard gave for Nebraska having a smaller percentage as it went along, and losing its position, while Wyoming went up and up, was the fact, as he stated it, that in the Wyoming valleys there was a larger population, and that therefore REA had, of course, made much greater progress in those areas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota wants considerably more time to finish the speech he is making which is very informative. If he does, I wonder if it would be agreeable for him to continue tomorrow, if it may be understood that he may retain the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have a vote taken on the Taft amendment before we take a recess tonight; but after the vote is had on that amendment, I wish to have time given to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself to prepare amendments which will give the farmers more money and will put them a little bit more on a basis of equality with the city people than they are at the present time.

I discussed this matter with my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Senators, and I rather think we shall get other Senators to join with us in the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota a question. I am not sure that unanimous consent will be needed for the purpose I have in mind, because I am not sure how long the debate tomorrow may continue. But I ask the Senator this question: If a vote is had this evening on the Taft amendment, is it the intention of the Senator from North Dakota then to take the floor and be heard at length on an amendment or amendments for an increase in the appropriation for farm housing?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of that situation, I think the acting majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] should take into consideration the statement just made by the Senator from North Dakota; for under those circumstances, after the vote is had on the Taft amendment, I feel that the only wise thing to do will be to have the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. MYERS. Then, Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to permit us to vote on the Taft amendment, and then to move a recess.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; and incidentally I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that in Pennsylvania the farmers are in much better condition in regard to the REA and similar matters, than are some of the farmers in other sections of the United States.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to say that in Pennsylvania we are in need of much more REA assistance, and we could use many more REA cooperatives in our State.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, or I shall yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it the purpose of the Senator from North Dakota to try, tomorrow, to increase the amount?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; we expect to offer amendments, tomorrow, to increase the amount.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In looking into this matter, has the Senator determined how many farms would be included under the million dollars?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; all those points have been checked. Not quite 2,000,000 farms would be included in this farm program. There are not quite 6,000,000 farmers, altogether—5,859,781, actually; but there are about 2,000,000 farms for which advantage of this provision should be taken.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the pending bill, with $1,000,000, how many farmers would be cared for?

Mr. LANGER. As I said the other day, if all 2,000,000 applied, $1,000,000 would give each farmer 50 cents.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And if a thousand farmers applied, there would be $1,000 for each of them, would there not?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In other words, in the State of North Dakota, on the basis of its population, about six farmers in the entire State would benefit.

Mr. LANGER. That is right. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator if it is not correct that this afternoon we agreed to accept an amendment to increase this amount, and I may say, Mr. President, I have been on the same side with the Senator from North Dakota in regard to this matter.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is why I have asked the question—to show that we would accept the amendment, but now I understand that the Senator from North

Dakota would prefer to prepare a new amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; an amendment which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and perhaps other Senators can agree upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me ask the acting majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, whether he feels that a quorum call should be had before the vote is taken on this amendment—although I do not ask for it.

Mr. MYERS. No, Mr. President; I believe all Senators are either in or near the Chamber, and therefore I think we do not need to have a quorum call.

Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before that matter is determined, let me say that I regret very much to feel compelled to state that I believe a quorum call should be had before the vote is taken on the Taft amendment. If the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will suggest the absence of a quorum, I shall be very glad to have that done. Otherwise, I myself shall feel compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MYERS. Very well, Mr. President; I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Baldwin	Hunt	Myers
Brewster	Ives	Neely
Bricker	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Taylor
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McKellar	Thye
Fulbright	McMahon	Tobey
Gurney	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Hayden	Malone	Watkins
Hendrickson	Martin	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Williams
Hill	Millikin	Withers
Hoey	Morse	Young
Holland	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

If present and voting, the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—30

Baldwin	Flanders	Saltonstall
Brewster	Gurney	Schoeppel
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Taft
Cain	Ives	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Tobey
Cordon	Lodge	Vandenberg
Donnell	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Withers

NAYS—41

Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Chapman	Kefauver	Myers
Douglas	Kilgore	Neely
Ellender	Langer	O'Mahoney
Frear	Long	Pepper
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hill	McKellar	Stennis
Hoey	McMahon	Taylor
Holland	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Humphrey	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Hunt	Maybank	Wherry
Jenner	Morse	Young
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Graham	O'Conor
Butler	Green	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Tydings
Downey	Lucas	Wagner
Eastland	McCarran	Wiley
George	McGrath	
Gillette	Miller	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment:

On page 67, line 11, change the figure "1" to "2", making it read "$2,000,000" instead of "$1,000,000."

In line 13, change the figure "2" to "5", making it read "$5,000,000" instead of "$2,500,000"; change the figure "4" to "8", making it read "$8,000,000" instead of "$4,000,000"; change the figure "5" to "10", making it read "$10,000,000" instead of "$5,000,000."

This raises the amount of grants from $12,500,000 to $25,000,000 over a period of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish his amendments to be considered as one amendment?

Mr. LANGER. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the Senator is increasing the grants to $25,000,000. I should like to say, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that I shall be glad to accept his amendment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator, by his amendment, wishes to increase the appropriations to $25,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator think the farmers want it?

Mr. LANGER. They do; they need it very badly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], which will be considered en bloc. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

If present and voting the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—41

Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Donnell	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Langer	Pepper
Ellender	Long	Russell
Frear	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Stennis
Hayden	McKellar	Taylor
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Malone	Thye
Humphrey	Maybank	Wherry
Hunt	Morse	Young
Jenner	Mundt	

NAYS—28

Baldwin	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Ives	Taft
Cain	Kilgore	Tobey
Capehart	Knowland	Vandenberg
Cordon	Lodge	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Withers
Flanders	Millikin	
Gurney	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—27

Aiken	Gillette	Miller
Bricker	Graham	Murray
Butler	Green	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Chavez	Kem	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Downey	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	McCarran	Wagner
George	McGrath	Wiley

So Mr. LANGER'S amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have three technical amendments, or curative amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and I hope they may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 1, after the word project and preceding the comma, insert the words "initiated after the date of the approval of the Housing Act of 1949."

On page 29, in lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "where an application for admission is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

On page 29, in lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "where an application for admission is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, since we have seen some rather strange manipulating around here lately, I think those amendments should be adopted individually, and that we should have yea-and-nay votes on them, and an explanation in full from the sponsors. Having seen some of the manipulation which has gone on in this Chamber this evening, I think the sponsors of the bill should present to the Senate the reasons for these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the first of the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 1, after the word "project" and preceding the comma, it is proposed to insert the words "initiated after the date of the approval of the Housing Act of 1949."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I may say I did not refer to what is on the particular paper from which the clerk has read as being the three amendments. I referred to this as one amendment, because the three different changes really constitute one change. The change must be made in three different places.

All the amendment seeks to do is to remove the provision which limited veterans' preference in low-rent public housing to 5 years. In other words, in the language of the bill as it was presented to us it was provided that a veteran, in order to have preference——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that it is to eliminate veterans' preferences in the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it is to eliminate the provision which limited veterans' preferences to 5 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is a bill which has been considerably mixed up, and I think we should have it very clear what the Senator is intending by the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be very glad to make it very clear.

The bill as it was originally introduced provided that a veteran, in order to get a preference in one of these projects, would have to file an application within 5 years. In other words, 5 years later there would be no veterans' preference whatsoever.

The very first witness before our committee was interrogated regarding that, namely, Mr. Egan, and I think Mr. Foley also said there was no real purpose in it, and they did not mind having it eliminated. The veterans' organizations asked to have it eliminated, and we assured them it would be eliminated in the course of the hearings, but through an oversight, when the bill was finally drafted it was included.

Mr. BRIDGES. On what page of the hearings does that testimony appear?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will give me time to find it, I think I can.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from New Hampshire wants to wait until we find that particular testimony——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that this amendment is urged by the American Legion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is urged by all the veterans' organizations who appeared before us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By the Veterans of Foreign Wars?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And by the AMVETS?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have the page of the testimony. The contribution of the Senator from Illinois is entirely beside the question. What I want is the record. The Senator from Illinois has made many comments here today, and I think that when the RECORD is made, we will let it answer, so that in the months and years ahead we can refer to the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the able Senator from New Hampshire will follow me——

Mr. BRIDGES. On what page?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If he will take up a copy of the general housing legislation hearings on various bills which were pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and look at page 180 of the hearings, down about the middle of the page, he will find that I asked Mr. Egan the question I shall read. I shall wait until the Senator finds the page.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I read:

Senator SPARKMAN. * * * Now, Mr. Egan, I want to ask one question while I have it in mind.

Referring to page 24 of S. 138—

In order to make it perfectly clear to the Senator from New Hampshire, that is the bill that was before us, although when we reported a bill we reported a clean bill. The bill before us now is S. 1070. I read further:

Referring to page 24 of S. 138, lines 15 to 17, there is a limitation placed there on veterans' preference, to those applying within 5 years. My attention has been called to this by representatives of veterans' organizations. They state to me that in no other law dealing with veterans' preference are such words of limitation included, and they have suggested that there be eliminated from that sentence the words "where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

Mr. EGAN. We have no objection to that elimination. The only reason it was put in was because the previous program had no requirements. We thought after 5 years we would get the whole program on one basis. We certainly have no objection to that elimination.

Mr. BRIDGES. Now, I should like to ask the Senator where the representatives of the veterans' organizations themselves asked in the hearings for the elimination of this provision.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will bear with me for a few minutes, I shall do my best to find where the various representatives testified. I notice that John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, testified at page 661. I am not

sure that he asked for the elimination, but it may be that the witness whom he presented did.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator read Mr. Taylor's testimony, and see if it is in it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am just looking over it to see if it is in it.

Perhaps it would suffice for the Senator from New Hampshire for me, instead of reading the testimony, to read a letter from the American Legion.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should be glad to hear the letter, but I should like to be referred to the testimony.

Mr. SPARKMAN. After we had reported the bill with this provision in it, although we had told them in the course of the hearings that it would be omitted, the American Legion wrote me a letter, as chairman of the subcommittee, calling my attention to the fact that we had not eliminated that language.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to hear the letter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from New Hampshire would like to hear the letter, I shall be very glad to read it, or place it in the RECORD.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to hear it read.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The letter is from the American Legion, national legislative commission, 1608 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. It is dated April 11, 1949, and is addressed to me. I read as follows:

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: As one of the sponsors of S. 1070, you will be interested in knowing the American Legion most heartily endorses this legislation and urges the Senate to pass this bill when it is considered.

As a veterans' organization, we are of course interested in the benefits the bill will accord veterans. In our judgment, section 202 requires amendments in order that veterans of this country will receive adequate preference to the low-rent housing contemplated by the bill.

The American Legion does not quarrel with the principle that families displaced through slum clearance be given priority for rental opportunity in any low-rent housing developed in the particular locale in which the displacement occurs. It is opposed, however, to extending this priority to the degree contemplated by the present wording of section 202 of the bill.

If I may interpolate there I will say that he was wrong in his interpretation with reference to section 202, and I think we succeeded in convincing him of that fact.

But now here is the part that has to do with the veterans' preference:

This section also contains a proviso that a veteran's application must be made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949. You will be the first to recognize that the veterans' housing problems will not be solved in the next 5 years. You will recognize that in this bill, as now written, an altogether new theory of veteran preference is being introduced. Never before, to our knowledge, has the Congress attempted to place a time limitation on the preference afforded veterans.

The American Legion most respectfully submits for your consideration corrective amendments which will, in our judgment, give the veteran a fair preference and one which we know you wish to give him. Your earnest consideration of these amendments would be most appreciated, and if you agree with them, urge their adoption when S. 1070 is considered by the Senate.

We are calling this matter to the attention of the other sponsors of the bill in order that all may be acquainted with the position of the American Legion.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT R. POSTON,
Associate Director,
National Legislative Commission.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. As a dues-paying member of the American Legion, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the Senator from Alabama is the chairman, I will say that I do not recall that any promise was ever made by the subcommittee to any group of veterans during any hearings, that the restriction to which the Senator from Alabama has referred would be eliminated from the bill. I realize that my memory may be faulty, but I should like to have the Senator from Alabama refer us to the pages of the hearings where any such agreement was made with the American Legion or any other veterans' group.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to continue to look for that particular matter. However, as I do, I wish to say most positively that I myself in open meeting of the subcommittee did make such a statement to the representatives who appeared before us representing some of the veterans' organizations. I am sure I shall be able to find it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator is not able to find it, and we are legislating in the dark, as we apparently have been recently, perhaps the Senator would prefer that we recess so we can have time to study the matter tomorrow.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me refer both the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire to page 327 of the hearings, where Mr. Charles Foster, testifying for the Disabled American Veterans, raised the same question, and where I made this statement——

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Alabama read what Mr. Foster had to say?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I shall be glad to read it:

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to comment briefly on several provisions of S. 138 which have a direct bearing on veterans' rights. These provisions are more or less similar to corresponding provisions in the other housing bills before this committee. Therefore, what is said with respect to S. 138 is meant to apply equally to the others.

Section 202 of title II of S. 138, beginning on page 24, provides for a veterans' preference. We feel that this preference should be strengthened by eliminating the phrase beginning on line 15 which reads: "where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

The theory of a veterans' preference in determining tenant eligibility is recognized by Congress as just and equitable in view of the service these men and women rendered their country.

Inasmuch as this theory of veterans' preference has been established in other acts of Congress, we see no valid reason to limit the preference to a period of 5 years after March 1949. At this time no one knows what conditions will prevail with respect to housing in 1954 and in the following years. The situation at that time may be as acute as it is today. We therefore recommend that this time limitation on veterans' preference be eliminated.

This is my reply, Mr. President:

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Foster, if I may break in there, you may be interested to know we have already raised that question with the housing officials, and have been assured by them they have no objection to the elimination of that time limitation.

Then Mr. Foster said——

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator explain to the Senate why the subcommittee did not do so then? The chairman of the subcommittee had assured the veterans that it would be done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that when the bill was drafted by the subcommittee, through a typographical error the words were omitted.

Mr. President, I now decline to yield further. I submit the amendment, and let whoever pleases to do so, oppose it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, who has the floor? Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire now has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is what I thought. I should like a further explanation from the Senator from Alabama if he will give it. I should like to hear him read from the statements of other veterans' organizations. The American Legion apparently made no statement in the record at all. The Senator brought out the position of the Legion in an individual letter. The Senator has referred to one veterans' organization. What about the other veterans' organizations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, which I really have no right to answer under the parliamentary rules of the Senate, since the Senator from New Hampshire has no right to ask me a question, he having the floor—I wish to say this: I have cited at least two instances in the printed record where we have stated that the language would be eliminated. I have stated that it was inadvertently included in the bill when the final draft was made, but that we agreed to eliminate the language on the Senate floor. I have offered the amendment, Mr. President, to bring that about. We are keeping faith with the veterans' organizations which appeared before our committee. I do not care to debate the question further, but I should like to see it submitted for a vote. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I shall be very glad to have a yea and nay vote on the question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my only reason for raising this point is that so many things have happened here in recent moments in the discussion of the housing legislation that I think it is well from now on, if amendments are offered, that we go into them and find out all the facts concerning them. The Sena-

tor from Alabama may very well be correct, or may very well be wrong in respect to this matter. I think Senators should no longer continue to legislate in the dark. I believe we should have all the facts at hand before taking action. We have decided to spend the evening here, and we might as well go into these amendments. If there are going to be any more deals made or any more things arranged here, we might as well have a full explanation of the amendments.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for his explanation. I think so far as he has gone the explanation has been rather clear. But I think that with respect to the various amendments it is well that we look into them before acting upon them. I am perfectly willing to let the question on the pending amendment go to a vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator whether he finds anything wrong with the amendment? I certainly see nothing the matter with it. I do not believe the Senator from New Hampshire himself will find anything the matter with it. In view of the fact that there is nothing the matter with this amendment, but if something wrong has been done here tonight, why does not the Senator address himself to that which is wrong, rather than to something which is obviously all right?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in view of what has gone on here tonight, I shall ask for an explanation of everything that is proposed by way of amendment. The Senator from Alabama, who has handled the bill in a very able manner, has endeavored to explain the amendment. I want him, however, to be given the opportunity to explain the amendment in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on this amendment. I wish to speak as a veteran and as a member of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Alabama was the chairman. Though the Senator from Alabama may be correct in his recollection of an understanding which was reached between the subcommittee and various veterans' organizations, I have no such recollection. I should like to indicate that from my point of view as a veteran I am opposed to this amendment, which seeks to guarantee preferential rights to the American veteran 10 years after the last war was concluded. As I understand the provision now in the bill, it is that any American veteran of World War II shall have a priority right to occupancy in a federally subsidized housing unit if he applies for admission within 5 years from 1949. I think that is long enough for the average American veteran. I am simply one of that class. I feel that if after 1954 the individual who has been a veteran of the last war is possessed of a low annual income he ought to have his right to seek admission into one of these Federal projects, just as any other American citizen. But I deny the validity of any contention that the American veteran wants to have preferential rights for housing 10 years after the war, in which he only did his duty, is over and done with.

Though I may find myself in opposition to some of the leaders of veterans' organizations throughout the country, I am completely satisfied that the average American veteran is not going to ask his Government to protect him in a Federal housing project 10 years after the war is over. I think that expression will be subscribed to by the rank and file of veterans, by the hundreds of thousands throughout this land, who ask not for a preferential right in a Federal housing project, but only for the right to make a living for themselves and their families.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Alabama if I am correct in understanding that this amendment would give preference in perpetuity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it would. At least it would lift the restriction.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like further to ask why, if the principle is established of giving this right in perpetuity, the veterans of World War I are discriminated against. The same principle which gives this right in perpetuity to the veterans of World War II should establish the same right in perpetuity for the veterans of World War I.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the reason for giving the preference to veterans of World War II rather than veterans of World War I is that there are hundreds of thousands of veterans of World War II who have not yet been able to find a place to live. There is much more maladjustment among veterans of World War II than among veterans of World War I. It is characteristic of all our legislation of the past several years that it contains such a preferential provision. In practically every bill which is passed the same kind of priority is established. Practically every one of those measures has carried similar veterans' preference, limited in recent years in almost every case to the veterans of World War II. So far as I now recall, every such piece of legislation has been without limitation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] say that this right would be granted in perpetuity. I am sure that the Senator from Alabama recognizes that the present Congress or any succeeding Congress could change the statute whenever it saw fit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true. I think a better way of stating it would be to say that it is without limitation. We simply eliminate the limitation in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have attempted to cooperate in every way to get this bill through to final passage tonight. I believe the Senator knows that, and I am satisfied that the acting majority leader knows it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true; and I appreciate the attitude of the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. A question has arisen which should be completely clarified before the bill is passed. While I am willing to stay here as long as necessary, I think the only sensible thing to do is to take a recess until tomorrow and give the subcommittee time to iron out the difficulty and clarify this question, so that there will be no trouble about it. I offer that as a constructive suggestion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am willing to assume responsibility for the amendment myself, without having to iron it out among members of the subcommittee. Any Member of the Senate may offer an amendment any time he so desires.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have sent the amendment to the desk under my own name. However, I did make the statement that in the course of the hearings we stated repeatedly that the limitation would be lifted. We told the veterans' representatives that it would be lifted. Mr. Egan, the Commissioner of Public Housing, said that there was no objection to it. We never assumed that we would run into this opposition. I never dreamed that a single Member of this body would oppose giving preference to the veterans of World War II, just as we have done in every other measure we have passed, including the rent-control measure. There is a veterans' housing provision in the rent-control measure. There is a similar provision in the legislation relating to jobs in the Government. Such a provision appears in almost every type of legislation we have passed. We have written into it the same kind of veterans' preference. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. President, I assume full responsibility for the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observations. No doubt this amendment would accomplish what he is attempting to do, that is, fulfill the promises which were made to whomever they were made. But I submit to the distinguished Senator that an important question has been raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] with respect to discrimination against veterans of World War I. It seems to me that two or three suggestions have been made which ought to receive consideration. If we want to legislate on the floor of the Senate, of course we have the right to do so. I simply offer my suggestion as a constructive way to iron out this amendment so that there will be no mistake.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate that; but I should like to make this suggestion

to Members of the Senate: I suggest that they turn to pages 28 and 29 of the bill and read the section headed "Veterans' preferences."

In the first place, the first preference given in one of these public projects is to families who have been displaced. The veterans' preference is a secondary preference. They do not have the first priority. We have not given the veterans first place. I will say in all fairness to them that they did not ask for it. They felt that displaced families ought to have first priority, and we gave it to them.

Mr. President, I submit that the amendment is perfectly good, and I am ready to vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say first that I have been previously committed to vote for the amendment which the Senator has offered, upon the request of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin. I think it is a proper amendment.

However, in view of the fact that it extends the preference for 45 years, that means until the veteran of today is 85 or 90 years of age. World War I veterans are now approximately 55 or 60 years of age, within the ages within which we are giving preference to World War II veterans. Would the Senator from Alabama consider a change in his amendment to include veterans of World War I as well as veterans of World War II? Otherwise, it seems to me that this is very unfair discrimination against the veterans of World War I. If this amendment provided only a 5-year preference——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order; there is too much confusion on the floor of the Senate. Senators will take their seats. The Senator from Wisconsin will not proceed until the Senate is in order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will be very happy to correct the statement he just made about World War I veterans being 55 or 60 years of age. I happen to be a veteran of World War I, and I am only 51. I do not wish to be considered any older than I am, let me say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will not proceed until the Senate is in order and Senators take their seats. [A pause.] The Senator may proceed now.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Indiana, let me say that what I meant was that some of the more elderly veterans of World War I are now 55 or 60 years of age; and I am very much concerned about this matter, in view of their situation. If we were proposing to grant only a 5-year preference to the veterans of World War II, that would not be an unfair discrimination against the veterans of World War I. But now that we have adopted a policy of giving a 45-year preference to World War II veterans—I believe that is what we have decided upon—it seems to me we should include the veterans of World War I, in view of the fact that much less than 45 years have elapsed since the end of World War I.

So I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama will consent to modify his amendment so as to include the veterans of World War I, as well as the veterans of World War II.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that as I understand the opposition which has arisen to the amendment, it has not developed because the veterans of World War I are not included under it, but because of our attempt to give a preference to any veterans.

I say to my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that I am not willing to do anything on this matter until we obtain some kind of acceptance of a veterans' preference. What I am fighting for is a veterans' preference. After we have disposed of the opposition to giving some kind of preference in this bill to veterans, then I think we can well take up the question of including the veterans of World War I.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that when he refers to opposition to giving a preference to veterans, I do not oppose giving them a preference. I have just stated to the Senator that I will vote for his amendment. I do not care whether he wishes to have it provide for a 45-year preference or a 60-year preference or an 80-year preference; I will still vote for it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make clear to the Senator, if he will yield further, that I understood he would vote for the amendment; but certainly he is not blind and he is not deaf. He has seen the opposition we have encountered in trying to provide some kind of preference for veterans, and he has heard the captious criticism which has been directed to the simple amendment which seeks to do only simple, fundamental justice to the veterans of the recent war. I say that opposition must be disposed of before we can handle the request the Senator from Wisconsin has made.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Alabama to consent to modify his amendment in the way I have suggested. Of course, I cannot dispose of opposition to the veterans' preference provision, and neither can he. We shall dispose of such opposition by bringing the amendment to a vote. Practically every matter which comes before the Senate encounters opposition of some sort. The Senator from Alabama is offering an amendment which I favor. It provides for a 45-year veterans' preference. If the Senator wishes to change the amendment so as to have it provide for a 60-year or 75-year veterans' preference, I shall still favor it. However, inasmuch as the amendment now provides for a 45-year preference for veterans of World War II, it obviously is only honest and fair to change it so as to provide the same preference for veterans of World War I.

I assume that after the amendment is changed in that way, there still will be opposition to it. I shall be surprised if the Senator from Alabama or myself ever propose anything on the floor of the Senate which does not encounter some honest, sincere, and intelligent opposition.

So I ask the Senator very sincerely to extend to the veterans of World War I the same right which he and I think should be extended to the veterans of World War II.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further, let me say in answer to his question that I appreciate his sincerity and his offer to help; but, Mr. President, goodness knows, if Senators are going to oppose a preference for World War II veterans, when the boys are still coming out of the armed services, and many of them are getting married, and many of them are trying to find places in which they and their families can live, but are having extreme difficulty because of the crowded conditions and the lack of adequate housing, then I am afraid that if we amend the amendment so as to include World War I veterans, we shall invite still greater opposition.

So I think we should dispose of this amendment as it is, before we seek to add to it other veterans—not only the veterans of the First World War, but perhaps the veterans of all wars.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Alabama will not consent to change or modify his amendment so as to have it include the veterans of World War I. Of course, I shall not ask him to broaden the amendment still further and have it include the Spanish-American War veterans, but I simply ask him to have the amendment include the veterans of World War I, in view of the length of the proposed preference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the amendment suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin in order to the amendment sent to the desk by the Senator from Alabama?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama is open to amendment, and is subject to the amendment proposed to it by the Senator from Wisconsin or to any other amendment which may be proposed to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama be so amended.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I be heard on that matter?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question; or, if he does not wish to ask a question, then I shall be glad to yield, upon condition that unanimous consent is given that the Senator from Alabama may make a statement at this time without causing me to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact

that if the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to submit his amendment, it would properly be submitted to subsection (b) in line 21 on page 29, and not to the amendment I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules, upon the advice of the Parliamentarian, that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama is open to amendment, and therefore is subject to amendment if any be offered to it by any Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I now move that the following language be inserted on page 29 in line——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must rule that the amendment the Senator from Wisconsin is proposing would not be in order at this time, because it seeks to amend a different portion of the bill from that proposed to be amended by the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, Mr. President, I wonder whether I may have the indulgence of the Chair until I can read the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I do not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well; I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is not the Senator from Wisconsin of the opinion that his amendment would properly be offered in line 21 on page 29, where the term "veteran" is defined?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am inclined to think the Senator from Alabama is correct, Mr. President. I think the proper method for me to adopt is, not to attempt to amend the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, but, rather, to make the necessary amendments on pages 29 and 30.

For that reason, Mr. President, I shall offer such an amendment now, in view of the fact that it is along identical lines with the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must rule as to that——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to permit me to complete the statement of my request: At this time I should like to offer the amendment; and I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be considered en bloc with the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, in view of the fact that both the amendments concern the identical subject. I certainly hope the Senator from Alabama will not oppose this move to give the veterans of World War I such a preference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator be pleased to know that I certainly shall not oppose it? I believe, however, the other amendment should be disposed of first.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like the Senator to point out the language which he claims limits the application of the bill to World War II veterans.

Mr. McCARTHY. I call the Senator's attention to the language at the bottom of page 29.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is that under "Definitions"?

Mr. McCARTHY. I refer to lines 23 and 24, the dates of service, which I believe contain the limitation; and again, on page 30. The amendment which I would offer would add two additional dates, on pages 29 and 30. With the indulgence of the Chair, I should like to offer that amendment and renew my request for unanimous consent to have the amendments considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to rule that the amendment is out of order. But the Chair is willing to put a unanimous-consent request as to whether the Senator from Wisconsin shall be permitted to offer his amendment and to attach it to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, so that the two may be jointly considered. Is that the request?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Wisconsin will state the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose that the following language be inserted on page 29, line 24, after "1947", namely, "and from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918", and that the same language be inserted on page 30, in line 4, after "1947."

Mr. BRIDGES rose.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama made the statement that there was opposition on the part of Senators to veterans' preferences. Of course, he knows that is not correct. He has stated that this preference was granted in perpetuity, but he admitted there was no danger in that, because succeeding Congresses could change what a previous Congress had done, so that if the 5-year limitation is included, the Congress, 2 years from today, or 4 years from today, could increase it 5 years or 10 years. There has been no opposition to granting veterans' preferences here.

I believe the Senator from Wisconsin has really suggested an equitable thing when he proposes that all veterans be treated alike. I think this discussion has borne some fruit, if the result shall be that one great body of veterans shall not have to bear a cross. I think it is wise that we discuss these amendments rather than allow them to slide through in the dark as some of them have done in the past. I am very happy to see the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that one great body of veterans was about to be discriminated against. In the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama he entirely lost sight of millions of veterans in this country. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is to be congratulated for the very able stand he has taken.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say, if the Senator continues in the same vein, I perhaps shall add another amendment, to include the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. President, I fear I am forced to restate the amendment. I believe it is not technically correct. It provides, instead of the language I mentioned, in line 24, on page 29, after "1947," the insertion of the words "at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918," and to strike the suggested change on page 30, which will be unnecessary in order to accomplish the purpose which the Senator from Alabama and I have in mind. With that, I yield the floor.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate will permit the Chair to state the parliamentary situation as he understands it, the Senator from Alabama offered what amounted to one amendment, though it was in three parts. Objection was made to the consideration of it as a single amendment. Is that objection now withdrawn?

Mr. BRIDGES. I withdraw it. It is my understanding that the McCarthy amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama is now under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands then that the three amendments, which really constitute a single amendment, as offered by the Senator from Alabama, is now under consideration jointly with several individual amendments which constitute a single amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. The question is now upon agreeing to the joint amendments as offered, and as consented to be offered, by unanimous consent, jointly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendments on which we are about to vote? We do not want anything else to take place here that we do not all understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was going to suggest that the clerk read first the three separate amendments, which consitute a single amendment, as offered by the Senator from Alabama, and then read the similar several suggestions, which constitute a single additional amendment, as offered by the Senator from Wisconsin; and then the Senate will know what it is considering jointly, under the unanimous-consent agreement already made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I thought it was very clear that the unanimous consent was to the offering of an amendment to the first Sparkman amendment. That was the only unanimous-consent request I heard. The pending question, as I understood, was on the McCarthy amendment to the Sparkman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will allow the Chair to make clear the situation, there are other

Sparkman amendments as the Chair understands, which are to come later. But there were three separate segments of the first Sparkman amendment, and they are now being considered together as one amendment, and they necessarily constitute a single amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thought that was the point to which objection was originally made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from New Hampshire, who had first raised the objection, to have withdrawn the objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I withdraw the objection to the consideration of the first amendment, as modified by the McCarthy amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair. The Chair now asks the clerk to state the first Sparkman amendment, in three parts.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, in line 1, after the word "project" and preceding the comma, it is proposed to insert the words "initiated after the date of the approval of the Housing Act of 1949"——

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, Republican opposition will apparently prevent the final vote on the bill tonight. Therefore, I venture to improve a moment that otherwise would be utilized for no good purpose. I invite attention to the extraordinary spectacle we have just beheld.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator desist a moment, until the clerk can complete the reading of the amendment; after which the Chair will immediately recognize the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. With pleasure I comply with the wish of the Chair and temporarily "desist."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the reading of the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, in lines 4, 5, and 6, it is proposed to strike out the words "where an application for admission is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

On page 29, in lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to strike out the words "where an application for admission is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

On page 29, line 24, after "1947", it is proposed to insert the words "and at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Republican members of the Senate have just demonstrated the fact that they can change their leadership as quickly as a chameleon can change its color, or a cat can wink its eye. Only an hour ago the eminent Senator from Ohio (Mr. Taft), was the dominant Republican of the Senate. Only a week ago the Christian Science Monitor, in a front page article, informed the world that the influence of this Ohio statesman was greater than that of any other member of the Congress. But a new leader of the minority has, with little ceremony and no pomp, just ascended the throne. Tonight the Republican membership can sing, subject to slight amendments, those well-known lines from Casey Jones—

Go to bed children, and hush your cryin',
For you've got another papa on the Salt Lake Line.

The name of the new papa is Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, who, in the Senate, is known only to be loved and named only to be praised.

Mr. President, I invite the Democrats of the Senate to join me in rejoicing over the defeat of the Taft amendment, designed to deprive the farmers of the Nation of $12,500,000, more or less, which the bill proposes for the benefit of those engaged in agriculture. Let it be recorded and remembered that Democratic Senators, with their never-failing sympathy for those who till the soil and feed the world, properly voted almost unanimously against the amendment.

The farmers, who are the salt of the earth, deserve all and more than they are promised by the bill. They also deserve much from the Democratic Party because they generously helped to elect Harry Truman President of the United States and greatly contributed to the making of both the Senate and the House of Representatives Democratic. Democrats owed it to themselves to defeat the antifarmer amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If it had been adopted, the Senator undoubtedly could not have been nominated for President by the Republicans in 1952. He once deprived himself of the presidential nomination by sponsoring the Senate version of the Taft-Hartley law. If he had attached his name to the pending bill as a result of the adoption of his amendment, the farmers would unanimously refuse to support his candidacy for office in the future. Without farmer votes, manifestly he could not be nominated for the Senate in 1950 or for the presidency in 1952. It would be truly unfortunate for the Democratic Party for the able statesman from Ohio to fail to obtain either of these nominations!

Mr. President, for still another reason I am glad that the Taft amendment was defeated. If it had prevailed, every agricultural State in the Union would go Democratic in the next election. If that should happen, the Republican Party would die, and in the present unsettled condition of the world, the American people would not have time to bury all the politically dead.

So I rejoice that the Democratic Members of the Senate have here tonight saved the farmers from injury, the Republican Party from annihilation and incidentally honored themselves. I congratulate the new Republican leader [Mr. LANGER], who is always on the side of the people, for having helped to save the Republican Party from the death wound which it would have suffered if the Taft amendment had been adopted.

We need two political parties in the United States. The Democrats and a few Republican liberals have just saved one of them from oblivion. The rescued party will provide sufficient opposition to impel every Democratic Member of the Congress to continue to render the best possible service to the American people.

The Republican Members under their new captain are cordially invited to march with us to new heights and to a new and better day.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I want to make an observation in answer to the able Senator from West Virginia. He made quite a speech, and of course we appreciate his interest in the Republican Party. But if I remember correctly, the bill was intended to give the farmers only $1,000,000. The able Senator from West Virginia thinks the Democratic Party can buy the American farmers for $1,000,000. There are approximately 13,000,000 farmers in the United States, and the great and able Senator from West Virginia rises and damns the Republican Party and says it is going to be buried and that it will lose all the votes of the farmers of America.

The Democratic Party offers the farmers $1,000,000. Think of that, Mr. President. They offer $1,000,000 to 13,000,000 farmers. That is 6 cents apiece. That is the record of the Democratic Party about which the able Senator from West Virginia has spoken. Six cents for each American farmer provoked the great speech which the Senator made a moment ago, in which he told us how the Democrats will save the American farmers by giving them 6 cents apiece, and that the Republican Party will be buried. That comes right after the Senate, a few days ago, voted $5,580,000,000 for the people of Europe. The same party to which the able Senator from West Virginia belongs offers the American farmers 6 cents apiece. I do not know how much they gave the farmers of France and England and of the other 16 ECA nations. I suspect, if the figures were broken down, the amount would run into a billion dollars.

Mr. President, it just does not make sense. It is politics. That is all it is; pure politics. If the party of the able Senator from West Virginia were sincere about helping the American farmers, they certainly would not have attempted to do it with a million dollars.

Let me tell the Senate what they are interested in. They are interested in the committee of three in each of the counties, at $5 a day. They are interested in permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe the rules and regulations governing the architecture of the farm buildings, plus traveling expenses, and plus all sorts of other expenses. That is the thing in which the able Senator from West Virginia is interested. He is not interested in the farmers, because had he been interested in the farmers, he would have offered them more than 6 cents each. It is my personal opinion that under the bill as it is written, if the Secretary of Agriculture follows all the commands which are written into the bill—that is, to study economy on the farm, to study the architecture on the farm, to do all the things the bill calls for—he will be spending more than a million dollars for that purpose alone.

Think of that, three people in every county, at $5 a day, plus all the other people. They are going to make plans for these farm buildings, at $5 a day, plus expenses. The cost will run consid-

erably over a million dollars. They are going to give the farmers a million dollars; they are going to spend another million or two or three or four or five million to work out plans for the farms. That is the thing which interests the able Senator from West Virginia. That is the thing which has always interested the able Senator from West Virginia—the political aspect of this matter.

I am ashamed of the United States Senate, that they would offer the American farmer only a million dollars. It is a disgrace. I should think the American farmer would resent it. I am a farmer. I feel bad; honestly I do. You are just not treating us right when you give us only a million, and give foreigners $5,580,000,000.

In the rest of the housing bill there are other provisions, and I should like to say something on that subject. The bill I hold in my hand will cost the American taxpayer $22,000,000,000. Out of the $22,000,000,000, over a period of 5 years, you are going to give the American farmer $12,500,000; or you were until the able Senator from North Dakota rose here tonight and said that if you did not do something he was going to talk all night and keep the Senate in session. Then everybody rushed over here and made a deal with him, and you spent $12,500,000 of the American taxpayers' money in order that the able Senator from North Dakota would not talk all night. [Laughter.] That is what has happened.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing the able Senator from North Dakota. He got what he wanted, and he got it by threatening to make the Senate stay in session all night, or refusing to permit a recess, so that this bill could not be passed tonight. It cost $12,500,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I spoke to the senior Senator from North Dakota long before he threatened to talk all night, and long before he even offered his amendment, believing, as he did, that it was correct. Two nights ago I told him, as the RECORD will show, that he was correct. So I think the Senator from Indiana is manifestly unfair in making this wild charge in the United States Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we all saw the deal made here on the Senate floor. There is no question that the committee bought off the filibuster of the senior Senator from North Dakota by agreeing to increase the appropriation $12,500,000. There is no doubt about it. We saw the thing done on the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have the floor. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor. The Chair will not permit the Senator from Indiana to yield further except for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a point of order. One of the distinguished Republicans——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield for a point of order. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am not certain what happened. I saw them writing it out. I think Senators can read the record of what was said. If I remember correctly, the able Senator from South Carolina, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, said he would accept the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. I do not know what happened, but I do know, Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator be good enough to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of two evenings ago, and read the discussion with the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to read it tonight or tomorrow morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator has not read it, he should read it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not intend to speak or delay the Senate, but I felt that someone should answer the able Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator include the distinguished minority leader, Mr. WHERRY, of Nebraska, with those who helped to "buy off" the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, no one said that anybody bought off anybody at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say that, and nobody else said it. What I said was, and I shall repeat it, and I think it was perfectly clear to everybody in the gallery, to everyone on the floor, that the United States Senate here tonight, under some sort of condition or situation, when there was a lot of buzzing going on, voted $12,500,000 of the American taxpayers' money—that is all, $12,500,000—without any consideration, without any debate. Then the able Senator from West Virginia got the floor and proceeded to condemn the Republican Party to the grave, and claimed that the Democratic Party would get the farmers' votes because they were going to give them a million dollars, about 6 cents apiece.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the able Senator for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the Senator on the floor——

Mr. NEELY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact——

Mr. CAPEHART. I first yield to the able Senator from Nebraska. Then I shall yield to the able Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the able Senator from Indiana answer me whether he did not hear the remarks made by the minority leader asking the distinguished acting majority leader, in view of the fact that the Senator from North Dakota had made the statement that he expected to talk at length on his amendment, if he would permit a vote on the Taft amendment, and the Senate would then recess until tomorrow for further consideration and deliberation? Did he hear that on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that that should be carried out. I do not care to assume the leadership of the United States Senate, but if the Senator will yield, I now make a motion that the Senate recess until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator for the purpose of making a motion to recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose. The motion is for a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock? The Chair was advised that the distinguished acting majority leader had a sad announcement to make.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to withhold the motion for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Since the Senator has withheld the motion, do I have the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. I understand there are no further amendments pending, with the exception of one noncontroversial amendment which has been offered by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a point of order. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Nebraska withheld his motion, and I have the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To make a sad announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate indulge the Chair a moment? The point of order is not correctly made. The Senator from Nebraska withheld his motion that the Senate recess, until an announcement could be made by the acting majority leader.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the statement was made that the acting majority leader was about to make a sad announcement. Thereafter he indulged in an argument on the motion to recess. I made the point of order that the motion to recess was not debatable.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MYERS. I inquire who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] had the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania for the purpose of making an announcement. I want to

be absolutely fair about this matter. I think we should cooperate. Three times on the floor tonight I have asked that the Senate carry out the suggestion which was made prior to this motion. I believe the announcement should be made at this time, and that the Senate should then recess until tomorrow. I hope the motion to recess will prevail.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Nebraska has withheld his motion so the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] can make an announcement.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized to make an announcement.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT LEWIS COFFEY, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I had proposed earlier to rise on the floor of the Senate with the sad responsibility of informing the Senate officially of the death yesterday of Representative ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR., of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, a fighter-pilot hero of the last war, who was killed in the crash of the jet Shooting Star, in which he was making a so-called routine practice flight. His death ended at the age of 30 years what had promised to be an outstanding career in the Congress.

Just as he faced death so fearlessly so many times in the last war, he died yesterday in the active military defense of America, as if he had been engaged in actual war activity, for he died while seeking to retain and improve his skill as a fighter pilot in case national emergency should ever call him back into the active Military Establishment.

He maintained his Reserve status and flew regularly in his jet plane, even though heavily burdened as a Member of Congress with the great multitude of duties which fall on all conscientious Members of Congress—duties which a new Member finds suddenly and overwhelmingly thrust upon him.

His constituents, I know, were proud of the fact that he was the only Member of Congress who piloted jet planes. But they were much prouder of him for being what they considered a good Congressman.

In his short tenure in Congress, since the first of this year, he demonstrated tremendous leadership potential. Had he lived, he would, I am sure, have developed into one of the outstanding Members of Congress. As it was, he brought dignity, veracity, and deep patriotism to his work in Congress.

His tragic death, climaxing a hero's career, constitutes a sorrowful blow to the people of the Twenty-sixth District of Pennsylvania, to the Democratic Party of Pennsylvania which had proudly put him forward for election to Congress, and to the Congress itself, which will certainly miss his deep understanding of military issues and his humane approach to all issues, foreign and domestic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Representative COFFEY's biography, as it appears in the Congressional Directory, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The biography of Representative COFFEY is as follows:

ROBERT LEWIS COFFEY, JR., Democrat, of Johnstown, Cambria County, Pa.; born October 21, 1918, in Chattanooga, Tenn.; son of Robert Lewis Coffey and Curry Ethel Brindley; education, Ferndale High School 1935, University of Pittsburgh, and Penn State College 1939; air inspector and senior officer's course, Orlando, Fla.; Command and General Staff School, Leavenworth, Kans., 1945; profession, air force officer; received appointment as a flying cadet September 23, 1939; commissioned second lieutenant June 1940, and assigned to Langley Field, Va., as a fighter pilot; in January 1941 transferred to Puerto Rico as flight commander in the Thirty-sixth Fighter Group; promoted to first lieutenant November 1, 1941; transferred to Panama December 10, 1941, on antisubmarine patrol; March 1942, promoted to captain and made squadron commander of the Fifty-second Fighter Squadron; assigned to the Third Fighter Command in August 1942 as aide-de-camp to the commanding general; promoted to major in January 1943; overseas, European theater of operations, Ninth Air Force, December 1943; promoted to lieutenant colonel March 12, 1944; flew 97 combat missions over Italy, Yugoslavia, France, and Germany; shot down on German airfield July 11, 1944; evaded capture and operated with the French Forces of Resistance (the Maquis); returned through the German lines 1 month later; assigned as Military Air Attaché, United States Embassy, Santiago, Chile, in October, 1945; departed April 1948; jet training with the Fourth Fighter Group, Washington, D. C.; resigned regular Air Force commission September 1, 1948, to pursue political candidacy; commissioned colonel, Air Force Reserve, September 2, 1948; decorations: Distinguished Flying Cross, 3 times; the Air Medal, 27 times; Purple Heart; Bronze Star, for activities behind German lines; Orden al Mérito, Chile, for diplomatic service; European Theater of Operations Campaign Ribbon, 5 battle stars; Service Ribbon and American Theater Ribbon, from 1935 to 1939; belonged to the United Mine Workers of America and was employed in all positions from coal loader to engineer; married the former Eileen Mercado-Parra, of Ponce, Puerto Rico, October 15, 1942; two children: Robert Lewis 3d, age 4½; Eileen Maria, age 1; member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Veterans, the Elks, the Northfork Country Club, Army-Navy Club; elected to the Eighty-first Congress on November 2, 1948.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, at this point I offer, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], a privileged resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 111) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR., late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee to be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives, when it reconvenes on the twenty-fifth inst., and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will defer the appointment of the committee called for by the resolution, so that tomorrow morning the Vice President may appoint the committee.

The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. I now renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Are we not in the process of a roll call, and is not an unreasonable delay a proper point of inquiry and objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue to call the roll, without delay.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the

Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], is detained on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—32

Baldwin	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Jenner	Taft
Cain	Knowland	Thye
Capehart	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cordon	McCarthy	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Mundt	

NAYS—39

Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Chapman	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Pepper
Ecton	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Langer	Russell
Frear	Long	Sparkman
Fulbright	McClellan	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Taylor
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Maybank	Tobey
Ives	Morse	Withers

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Green	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Connally	Kem	Smith, Maine
Downey	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	McCarran	Wagner
George	McGrath	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	
Graham	Miller	

So the Senate refused to take a recess.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, since the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has accepted the suggestions of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], it seems to me that there is certainly no controversy as to the pending amendments. I am very hopeful that we can reach a vote on those amendments. There is only one other amendment of which I have any knowledge. That is the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, to which I believe the committee has agreed, and upon which there is no controversy. Therefore, I see no reason why we could not dispose of those amendments after the long days of debate on the bill, and then have a vote on final passage. I realize that the hour is growing late and that tempers are a bit ruffled. If we could only put our feelings aside and get a vote on this important legislation, so that tomorrow we might turn our attention to the Commodity Credit bill, I feel that the Senate would be performing a real service for the people of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in conjunction with the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have had a very interesting discussion this evening by the very distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who looked into the crystal ball of the future relative to political parties. He analyzed the campaigns of the past. He even went so far as to predict the future nominees of the parties.

I have heard a great deal about the outcome of the last election. I have heard many persons tell the story, and I have heard it heralded over the radio and the press, that a great mandate was received by Mr. Truman and the administration in the last election.

I wonder if Members of this body realize that Mr. Truman is the first minority President since Woodrow Wilson. Since Woodrow Wilson was elected President of the United States no other President, until his time, has ever sat in the White House by reason of the vote of a minority of the voters of the United States. Sometimes when I hear from the eloquent throats of some gentlemen—particularly some of the newcomers to the Senate on the other side of the aisle—about the great mandate which swept across the country, I wonder how we are to interpret that mandate. For the first time since Woodrow Wilson we have a minority President in the White House.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the distinguished Senator realizes that in the election of 1864 there was another minority President elected, named Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am aware of that; but I am talking about the current century.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to draw a fair comparison between two Presidents, which I think the distinguished Senator will admit is only a fair comparison.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that in making my remarks about a minority President I mean no disrespect to the present occupant of the White House, whom I like personally. I merely wish to point out that there was no great mandate on the part of the voters of the country. Less than a majority of the voters who went to the polls voted for the head of the Democratic ticket.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I want the distinguished Senator to make it plain that the statements made by him are not intended as a reflection upon the choice of the American people for the Presidency.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not get the Senator's point. Is the Senator reflecting on him, or am I?

Mr. KILGORE. I interpreted the remarks of the Senator as a reflection upon the President.

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to be sure that the distinguished Senator is aware of the fact that other Presidents have been elected by minorities, including the founder of the party of which the distinguished Senator is a very able member. The last election is not the only election in which a minority of the popular vote controlled an election. That is no reflection upon the man selected in such a situation, by reason of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator that there is no reflection upon the present occupant of the White House, whom I hold in high personal esteem.

As a matter of fact, when Abraham Lincoln was elected by a minority of the voters, so far as I know from my reading of American history there was no contention about a great mandate of the people. Since November I have been hearing from certain Members on the other side about the great mandate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly the Senator from New Hampshire will realize that in the election of 1864, the primary issue was the question of having the people give a mandate to Abraham Lincoln. The election of 1860 was the one to which I referred originally, but the election of 1864 also has a primary bearing. That question was raised in that election. Incidentally, the Congress later upset the decision of the voters; and as a result there was the terrible reconstruction period, following the Civil War, which probably caused most of the troubles in the South, particularly in the Southeast.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not wish to go into a discussion of the Civil War at this time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JENNER. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken, and the Senate will be in order. [A pause.] The Senator from New Hampshire may now proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on November 2, 1948, Mr. Truman received 24,104,836 votes.

Mr. Dewey received 21,969,500 votes.

Mr. Thurmond received 1,169,312 votes.

Mr. Wallace received 1,157,100 votes.

Mr. Norman Thomas received 132,138 votes.

Mr. Claude A. Watson, the Prohibition candidate, received 103,343 votes.

Mr. Edward A. Teichert, the Socialist-Labor candidate, received 27,921 votes.

Mr. Farrell Dobbs, the Socialist Workers candidate, received 13,007 votes.

And there were other scattered votes.

As I have said, Mr. President, the standard-bearer of the Democratic Party, who received the "great mandate," as stated by some Senators on the other side of the aisle, received exactly 49.5 percent of the total vote. Certainly that is no great mandate on the part of the voters of the United States.

We have heard a great deal of discussion about the Eightieth Congress, which has been termed by some a "do-nothing" Congress. I thought the very able leader presented a most excellent summary of the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress, and I think it would be well for us to consider it further at this time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire whether the Senator from New Hampshire, in stating the vote, would also include reference to the 44,870,320 American citizens who did not vote in that election, and whether he would comment as to whether it is the idea of some persons that those potential voters by staying at home indicated that they were giving a mandate to any particular party or any particular person or any particular policy. That, to my mind, is the most significant aspect of that election.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say in reply to the Senator from Maine that I think he has brought out a most interesting and striking point, namely, that millions and millions and millions of United States citizens stayed at home and did not vote in that election. In other words, they did not give Mr. Truman and the Fair Deal or the New Deal any great mandate, but they stayed home. Probably they were attending to their own duties at home and did not feel it worth while to give a mandate to the administration then in Washington.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would it be significant to point out that in the great State of West Virginia, from which comes the Senator who has recently commented on this matter, although there were 750,000 citizens of West Virginia who voted on one side or the other of that great issue, there were 345,250 who did not record their votes on either side of that issue—in other words, the number of persons who did not vote in West Virginia in that election equals approximately 50 percent of the number who did vote in West Virginia.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, is it possible that in the great State of West Virginia such a vast number of people failed to vote? Will the Senator state the figures again?

Mr. BREWSTER. There were 354,250 citizens of West Virginia who, although eligible to vote, did not record their opinions in the recent election. That number is almost equal, I believe, to the total Democratic vote or to the total Republican vote in West Virginia in that election.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very much surprised to hear that. Of course, I have a very high opinion of the Senator from West Virginia, but I am amazed to learn from the Senator from Maine that such a vast number of voters in West Virginia failed to register their votes either for or against the Senator from West Virginia or either for or against any of the candidates for President of the United States in that election. That information is very interesting, and is a very real contribution to the "mandate" suggestion, of course.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he would observe, however, that those in West Virginia who did speak, spoke wisely and well. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to be very frank with you and the other Members of the Senate, I would not like to see some things rushed through here tonight. I have no intention of prolonging the Senate's discussion of these matters. However, I can talk for 2 or 3 hours longer, and I have some very pertinent remarks to make.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In reference to the Senator's suggestion that he might talk for 2 or 3 hours, let me ask whether he has any hope that he might obtain agreement to have an extra $12,500,000 added to an appropriation, if he prolongs his remarks now. Is that included in his thinking?

Mr. BRIDGES. I must say I have nothing of that kind in mind at the moment. Of course, I do not know exactly what may be proposed to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Would the Senator desire that I circulate around on the floor of the Senate and see what kind of an arrangement along that line could be made, if the Senator from New Hampshire is adamant in his determination to speak for 2 or 3 hours longer? I do not necessarily offer myself in that connection; but I should like to have the Senator state his thinking along that line, if he cares to do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall give consideration to the suggestion the Senator from Iowa has made, but at the moment I have nothing of that sort in mind.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a further question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator from New Hampshire aware that a precedent for such action is already in existence, in view of the proceedings tonight on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; and we did not in any way interpose objections, so as to prevent the Senator from North Dakota from obtaining it. He was fighting for what he believed in, and he was able to obtain it.

But the question here is whether anything of that sort is to be done in regard to other amendments to this measure. If that is the case, then I think we must discuss all the amendments, and of course there are other subjects which we might look into at a time such as this.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I ask the able Senator from New Hampshire, for whom I have a very high regard, whether in his investigation of the votes cast in West Virginia he discovered that, although Senator Revercomb defeated me in 1942 by a majority of fewer than fifty thousand votes, I, in turn, defeated him last year—1948—by a majority of more than 105,000 votes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was not aware of that; but I am glad to have the Senator from West Virginia put in a good plug here for the record he made. I think it is always worth while for Senators to do so; and if the Senator from West Virginia made an excellent record or run in that election, I am glad to have all Senators know that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am interested to have the figures on the West Virginia vote, because I did not have them in the tabulation which I have been happy to call to the attention of the Senate, and which is to be found in the Appendix of the RECORD, at page A2104, under date of April 8, 1949. That tabulation gives a record of the total vote by States, showing the vote in every State of the Union in the 1948 election and in the 1944 election, together with the nonvoters.

The interesting point in connection with the statement made by the Senator from West Virginia is that although his apparent vote would be approximately 427,000, I gather that the number of those who failed to vote in that election, the number of nonvoters in his State in that election, almost equaled the number of votes he received. In other words, there were 354,000 eligible voters in West Virginia who failed to vote in that election. Of course, that is no great credit either to the Republicans or to the Democrats. I think it is a reflection on both political parties and both political organizations when almost 50 percent of the voters of the country, for one reason or another, do not think it worth while to go to the polls.

The figures as to voting in the State of the Senator from Florida, whom we have heard this evening, are even more interesting and impressive, since, while 577,000 people voted, there were 887,000 who did not vote on either side; so something less than 40 percent of the eligible vote turned out, and 60 percent of the eligible voters did not vote at all.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator were familiar with the situation, I am sure he would observe that with the rather slight Republican threat we have in Florida, all the Democrats do not feel it necessary to vote there.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator ascertain from the Senator from Maine what proportion of the vote was cast both in New Hampshire and Maine in the last campaign?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have it right here.

Mr. NEELY. And also 4 years ago, in the Presidential election preceding the last one.

Mr. BRIDGES. While the Senator is looking that up, I merely want to say, because the Senator bragged about his record, that the Senator from New Hampshire was elected last fall in New Hampshire by the largest majority ever given to a United States Senator in the history of the State. I had not intended to mention that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Apropos of the statement made by the Senator from West Virginia a moment ago, quoting his record of 6 years ago and his record of this fall, I noticed that his majority this past fall was much greater than it was 6 years ago. Does the Senator believe that the absence from office of the Senator from West Virginia enhanced his majority in the election, that the vacation he took added to the majority he later got last fall? I am asking the Senator from New Hampshire what his opinion is on that subject. I simply do not know.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not sufficiently familiar with the record in West Virginia, but perhaps the Senator from West Virginia could give the answer.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me so that I may answer the question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. The answer is that the Senator from Indiana evidently has not kept up with my history, or he would know that during my absence from the Senate I was Governor of West Virginia for 4 years and that for 2 years I was a Member of the House of Representatives. It is true that I was absent from the Senate, but I was not, for 6 years, absent from official life.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question is, Will the Senator from New Hampshire please advise the Senator from West Virginia that the questioning Senator is not from Indiana, great State that it is?

Mr. NEELY. I beg the Senator's pardon for having inadvertently miscalled his State.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But will the Senator advise the Senator from West Virginia, merely to keep the record straight, that the questioning Senator is from the State of Iowa?

Mr. NEELY. I know the Senator is from Iowa.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator from Iowa made the correction, because he comes from a great State, and I think he is entitled to be listed in the Senate as coming from that State.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Indiana is a great State.

Mr. BRIDGES. Indeed it is.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I want to give the figures which were requested. Would the Senator from New Hampshire be interested to know that in New Hampshire, in the last election, 63 percent of the eligible electorate participated in his overwhelming victory, that there were 231,440 citizens of New Hampshire who voted, giving him a majority, I believe, of some 15,000 or 20,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. It was a little more than that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Whatever it was; I do not have the figures on that. There were 133,560 who did not vote. Under the theory of the Senator from Florida, I think we may be entitled to assume those were all Republicans.

Mr. BRIDGES. I hope so.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the State of Maine the figures do not appear for the regular State election, which is held in September, at the time my junior colleague [Mrs. SMITH] was elected by the greatest majority in the entire history of the State of Maine ever given for any candidate, approximately 100,000. I do not have the total vote nor the number of Republicans who remained home on that day under the Florida theory. But in the Presidential election there were 264,787 who voted, 303,000 who remained at home; in spite of which Maine went very decidedly Republican. Those are the figures which were requested.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Let me inquire again what the majority was of the Senator from New Hampshire in the last election.

Mr. BRIDGES. It was about 38,000.

Mr. NEELY. Thirty-eight thousand, and my majority was 105,000. So why should I worry about comparisons in this matter. [Laugher.]

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from West Virginia, of course, does not need to worry about any comparison. He has a few more voters in his State than we have in New Hampshire. Our ratio perhaps is a little different.

Mr. BREWSTER. He has four times as many voters, and he had twice the majority. So he seems to lag a little.

Mr. NEELY. No; if the Senator from New Hampshire had 38,000 and I had 105,000, the Senator from Maine ought to know more about arithmetic than to say that.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is two and one-half times.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. There were a few other things about the last national election I think we should consider. There was a total of 49,363,798 ballots cast. There were only 48,680,416 marked for President. That is a very interesting coincidence. Out of 49,363,798 ballots which were cast, a large number of the people did not vote for President. I think that is very significant. It means that 683,382 voters balloted for State, county, and local candidates, but skipped making a choice for the highest office in the land. Forty-eight million, six hundred and eighty thousand four hundred and sixteen total votes for President is the second highest in history. In 1940, the record year, it was 49,820,312. In 1944 it was 47,976,263. That affords a rather complete picture of the presidential vote.

I think that at this time, Mr. President, I should like to review some of the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress, the so-called "do nothing" Congress, so labeled all over the country by the Democratic candidate for President and by many of the Members on the other side. This is a very interesting statement in summary, prepared by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who I think made a great contribution in summarizing the situation. I know the Senator will be interested in having the Senate and the country as a whole know this.

I now read from the compilation to which I just referred:

> By an overwhelming vote of the people in the 1946 election, Republicans were placed in control of the Eightieth Congress. In the following 2 years under Republican leadership, controlling only the legislative branch of the Government, Congress achieved a remarkable record of outstanding accomplishments. These accomplishments are all the more impressive when viewed against the difficulties faced by the Republican leadership.
>
> For 14 years the New Deal-Democrat Party had been in control of all branches of the Federal Government. This is not in fact a party in the traditional sense, but a coalition of splinter factions and pressure groups drawn from the Democratic South, from corrupt city political machines, from narrowly interested minorities, and from the radical left-wing fringe in our country. Its leaders ruled by doctrines and tactics which were radical departures from the liberal tradition in America. Much of their claims to liberalism rested on nothing more than liberality with taxpayers' money through lavish Government spending schemes unrestrained by care for the soundness of the public finances.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When was that published, and when were the facts made known to the Nation?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is no publication date on it, but it must have been published sometime after the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress and

prior to the convening of the Eighty-first Congress. Whether there was time enough for the public fully to comprehend it I do not know. Apparently the public did not.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Was it not published immediately after the adjournment of the Senate in 1948?

Mr. BRIDGES. I could not tell the Senator that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Was it not published in order to try to get the voters to study it, in order to induce them to vote for Republican candidates? Is not that a fact?

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume it was put out for a similar purpose, but I am not familiar with that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it was put out only 2 weeks after a similar statement was issued by the then minority leader. This statement set forth what the Eightieth Congress did, and the statement issued by the minority leader set forth what the Eightieth Congress did not do. If the people had known the facts, I think there would have been a different result.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So it was made public in order that the voters would know about what had occurred in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. Such documents are published at every session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not criticizing it. I was wondering whether the people knew about it when they had an opportunity to vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. Some of them must have voted without knowing many facts about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that those who did find out the facts did not elect the present occupant of the White House? Is he not in the White House by minority vote?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The persons who were familiar with the document may have voted Republican or for the distinguished Governor of the State of the Senator from South Carolina. There were many fine people in the Dixiecrat Party. I know they did a great job for Mr. Thurmond, and they were not in the Democratic parade. When I heard about Governor Thurmond going by in the inaugural parade and his failure to get recognition, it bothered me, because I like to have all 48 governors treated alike. It bothered me to think that Governor Thurmond should receive any slight in that respect.

Mr. President, I should like to continue for a little while.

I read further:

> They padded the public pay rolls with officeholders and then impaired the value of publis services by using them for propaganda and chicanery. Persons equipped with alien doctrines were permitted in the Government service while they used their positions to undermine the national interest.
>
> They governed by emergencies and crises, by misleading and by suppressing information, by circumventing Congress, by controls and coercive Executive orders, by multiplying bureaus and agencies, by cheapening the value of money, by aggravating class and racial differences for political gain, and by assuming in the Federal Government powers which constitutionally are reserved to the States and to the people. The Government took almost a quarter of the people's income to maintain this outrageous system.
>
> We had fought the war at great cost and human sacrifice to end the threat of totalitarian dictators and to establish peace with justice on the high principles of the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter. Yet the administration forgot these principles when the time came to negotiate settlements for the peace and reconstruction of the world. It retarded European recovery by the crippling operations advanced in the Morgenthau plan. It invited the Russians to move into Europe and Asia by concessions at Yalta and Potsdam. Then the administration used billions of the American taxpayers' money to pay for its mistakes while it played the dangerous game of power politics all over the world.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to know whether the Senator will yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire to yield in order that I might make a motion to take a recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot yield except for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I will yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recess until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Morse
Baldwin	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kem	Russell
Chapman	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Flanders	McFarland	Vandenberg
Frear	McMahon	Wherry
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Withers
Hayden	Martin	Young
Hendrickson	Maybank	
Hill	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. WHERRY. No action has been taken on the motion, of course. Therefore I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws the motion.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I continue to read:

> The New Deal-Democratic administration desperately sought to carry over into peacetime the powers, functions, and controls it exercised in war, although these controls handicapped the productive energies of industry, labor, agriculture, and business. The low prices set by administration price controls proved fictitious because store shelves were bare, black markets flourished, and subsidies of taxpayers' money were required to provide the incentive to produce.

Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is out of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, now that the hour is 11:05 o'clock, does not feel that there is some way by which we can induce him to indicate whether or not he would be agreeable to having a vote on the amendment which is now before the Senate with the idea that there might be some disposition to get a final vote on the bill so that we might recess. I appeal to the Senator to see if he might not permit the Senate to do that at this time. I do not wish in any way to detract from the statement from which he is reading, because I had something to do with compiling it, and I should like to see it all in the RECORD, but I would appeal to the Senator, if he would listen to me—and I have a great affection for him—to indicate if there is not some way by which we could get to a vote on the amendment and on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire has no desire unduly to prolong the debate, but we arrived at a situation earlier in the evening where amendments were floating around too rapidly, and for reasons which certainly were not understood generally by the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire took the floor so that we might have an explanation of the amendments as they came forth. Then Senators made sundry reflections, a Senator reflected on the Republican Party, and the Senator from New Hampshire felt it his duty to discuss some of the points which the Republican Party richly deserved having discussed.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the service rendered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and I am satisfied that it has been a great service to bring this matter to the attention not only of the Senate, but of the country generally. I should like once more to appeal to the Senator to insert the remainder of the article in the RECORD, and permit us, if he sees fit, to take

action on the amendment pending, and see if there is a chance to pass the bill tonight.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if there is a desire on the part of the Members of the Senate to complete the legislation tonight, and it is causing inconvenience to various Members of the Senate to be kept here at this late hour and we can have a vote and understand what we are voting on, and then an explanation of any further amendments which may be offered, the Senator from New Hampshire certainly will acquiesce in that program.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, and I appreciate his attitude very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if we are to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, I wish to ask him some questions, because I state most sincerely, and without any idea of delaying action, that the amendment in its present shape is not in good form, and presents a question which, 25 years from now, may arise in respect to two adjoining housing projects.

In Boston today there are some low-rent housing projects which were built before March 1, 1949. As the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is drawn, any housing projects built after March 1, 1949, must give first preference to veterans for an indefinite period of time. If that preference is limited to 5 years, there is no objection to the amendment in its present form, but if the date is stricken out so that veterans will have preference indefinitely, a situation will arise to which I wish to invite attention.

A low-cost housing project built before March 1, 1949, stands beside one built after March 1, 1949. A veteran has a preference in the latter, he has no preference in the former. So that 25 years from now, let us say, there will have to be signs on the front of one house, "This was built before March 1, 1949," and on another, "This was built after March 1, 1949." In one a veteran would have to compete with another citizen. In the other he would have preference.

As the bill was originally drawn, as I have been reading it, it is perfectly satisfactory, because the preference lasts only 5 years, but if it is going to last for an indefinite period of time there should be further amendments to make the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama really effective. The way to make it effective would be to strike out, in line 19, page 28, the words "initiated after March 1, 1949." If those four words were stricken out, then a veteran would have a preference in any housing development whether built before March 1, 1949, or after March 1, 1949.

So, Mr. President, I submit most respectfully, and without any idea of delay, that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama should be further amended, if it is going to be made really effective and be efficient in the years to come.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Massachusetts offers that as a modification to my amendment? I will say to the Senator that I certainly have no objection to his proposal. I believe that if the Senator seeks to amend in that respect, he ought to amend also by striking out the first part of my amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. That also should be stricken out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Which would have made an addition on line 1 on page 29.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator from Alabama agree that the changes I have suggested would give veterans a preference regardless of the date of the project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is much merit in the contention the Senator from Massachusetts makes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the effect of the Senator's suggestion to make the amendment retroactive to March 1, 1949, with respect to projects already built, and if so, is that possible?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My purpose would not be to make it retroactive, but simply to say that from this date onward, veterans will have preference as to all low-rent housing regardless of when the housing was built.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought the Senator was speaking a moment ago about the date of the construction of the houses, because the Senator said that on one project there would be a certain date and on another project another date. I have not made any study of the subject. I do not know whether we could make the provision retroactive and applicable to projects already constructed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My purpose is not to make it retroactive. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama provides that veterans shall have certain preferences on housing built after March 1, 1949. If that were only for 5 years, it would be perfectly proper, because it would identify the housing very easily, but if it is to go on indefinitely for 25 years, or up to 45 years, I think then in fairness to the next generation there should not be any distinction between housing built in 1937 and in 1949.

Mr. PEPPER. That was the question I was asking, and no doubt the Senator has examined the subject. If we are at liberty to do so I should like very much to have it retroactive to all the Federal housing projects. But I simply do not know that we could make it retroactive to the first Federally aided housing projects. If the Senator thinks that can be done, well and good.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My hope is simply to put all the housing projects on the same basis.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator's proposal would bring about just what he expresses the desire to have brought about with respect to all buildings built under the United States Housing Act of 1937. On page 28 of the bill, line 13, this language appears:

SEC. 202. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows.

The Senator's proposal would apply to the act of 1937. Therefore the houses built under that act would be subject to the preference, and I understand that is exactly what the Senator wants to do, and I think that is what ought to be done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe it should be done if we are to have veterans' preference last for an indefinite period of time, because houses will grow old, and we will not know which house was built before March 1, 1949, and which was built after that date.

Do I understand that the Senator from Alabama would accept an amendment, to strike out the words on page 28, line 19, "initiated after March 1," and withdraw the first of his three amendments, as typed, at the desk?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is thoroughly acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The Senator from Alabama has further modified his amendment, in line with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The question therefore is on the amendment, as modified.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, is the question on the amendment as modified by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and as further modified by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the words "initiated after March 1, 1949."

On page 29, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the words "where an application for admission is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

On page 29, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the words "where an application for admission is made not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949."

On page 29, line 24, after the figures "1949," it is proposed to insert the words "and at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I call up my next amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 73, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following new section and renumber appropriately the succeeding two sections:

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

SEC. 508. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the National Capital Housing Authority is hereby authorized to acquire sites for low-rent public-housing projects assisted under the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the adoption of the Senator's amendment make Senate bill 1070 apply to the District of Columbia?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The purpose of the amendment is to give to the National Capital Housing Authority the right to purchase sites for slum clearance and public housing and to participate in the benefits of the act.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would make the act apply to the District of Columbia, except as to rural districts?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. As Senate bill 1070 was drawn, it did not apply to the District of Columbia. Why had the District been left out originally?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill as drawn, at least in part, is an amendment to the Housing Act of 1937. It does apply to the District of Columbia. But under a bill that was passed in 1946, there was created the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. That bill, as it passed the Senate, contained several amendments. The amendments were not germane to the bill, but were crippling to public housing. One of the amendments transferred to the new agency all the National Capital Housing Authority's power to acquire sites.

Representatives of public housing protested the amendments, especially that transferring power to acquire sites, because it would prevent more than a fragment of a public-housing program in the District of Columbia. Experience has borne out the forecast which those representatives then made. The only redevelopment project yet planned—none has been undertaken—provides for only 350 low-income families. At this time the National Capital Housing Authority has 18,000 low-income families on its waiting list, more than 5,000 of them families of low-income veterans. Even if the redevelopment agency were fully implemented, a large part of the redeveloped areas would be redeveloped for uses other than public housing though they will necessarily displace a low-income population.

But because Congress had to adjourn within a few days, the chairman of the Senate conferees said that referring the bill to conference meant its death. Proponents of public housing therefore acquiesced in accepting the amendments in the hope that Congress would later repeal them. Since then Congress has neither repealed the amendments nor has it implemented the Redevelopment Act.

Consequently, if the National Housing Act of 1949 is passed, the National Capital Housing Authority will be the only public housing agency in the country which cannot take advantage of its provisions. In order to remove this restriction the amendment is offered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In August 1945, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act was passed. That carried an authorization of $20,000,000. Since that time I think about $50,000 to $70,000 has been appropriated for plans. Will the fact that we include it in the pending bill in any way repeal the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, or will that act stand, and will the new act, Senate bill 1070, merely mean that we are providing further housing for the District of Columbia?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, under the act to which the able Senator has referred, it is my understanding that no money was ever appropriated, and therefore nothing was ever done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Some money was appropriated for plans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A mere pittance, not even enough to complete a plan, if I correctly understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will this amendment in any way repeal what Congress did in the Redevelopment Act, or will it merely mean that we are authorizing the District of Columbia agency to come under the provisions of the proposed act? Will it also come under the other act, so that more housing will be provided for the District of Columbia?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The first statement of the Senator is correct, according to my understanding. In other words, by this amendment we place the same power in the local housing agency, whatever its name may be, that we place in every other local housing authority throughout the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is more familiar with the bill in relation to its repealing clauses than I am. Will there be anything in it that may repeal the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not in Senate bill 1070, the bill before us, and not in the amendment I have offered.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I want to make sure of.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain technical amendments which I offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

1. On page 8, lines 4 and 5, delete the words "not to exceed in any fiscal year an additional" and insert the words "additional amounts aggregating not more than."

2. On page 10, line 16, delete the words "not to exceed in any fiscal year an additional" and insert the words "additional amounts aggregating not more than."

3. On page 17, line 12, strike out "section 3709" and insert in lieu thereof "section 3709, as amended."

4. On page 19, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike "sections 1 and 2 of the act of June 13, 1934 (U. S. C., title 40, secs. 276b and 276c)," and insert in lieu thereof the words "title 18, U. S. C., section 874 and of title 40, U. S. C., section 276c."

5. On page 27, line 25, make the word "need" read "needs."

6. On page 34, line 6, after the word "act" and before the close parenthesis insert the words "and notwithstanding any other provisions of law."

7. On page 34, line 17, delete the words "provisions of this act" preceding the semicolon and insert the following: "first proviso of subsection 10 (b), or, where applicable, the second proviso of subsection 10 (c)."

8. On page 40, lines 17 and 18, delete the words "not to exceed in any fiscal year an additional amount of" and insert in place thereof the words "additional amounts aggregating not more than."

9. On page 41, lines 14 and 15, delete the words "not to exceed in any fiscal year an additional" and insert the words "additional amounts aggregating not more than."

10. On page 41, line 17, delete the words "not to exceed in any fiscal year" and insert the words "amounts aggregating not more than."

11. On page 41, line 25, delete the word "development" and insert the words "commencement of construction."

12. On page 42, line 20, insert after the word "exemption" and before the comma, the words "and the authorization of payments in lieu of taxes."

13. On page 43, line 5, delete the words "were payable" and insert the words "dates occurred."

14. On page 43, line 17, delete the words "are payable" and insert the words "dates occur."

15. On page 49, line 6, strike out "321b," and insert in lieu thereof "321n,".

16. On page 72, lines 16 and 17, delete the words "the State or."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama explain these amendments? I am not asking for a lengthy explanation, but the Senator stated that the amendments read by the clerk were technical amendments. They certainly are technical, and many in number. The point I wish to make clear is whether or not they change the meaning of the bill in any material way. What is the general purpose of the amendments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have prepared a memorandum which explains the amendments. It is not very long. I shall read it. I think it will conform to the wishes of the Senator from New Hampshire.

EXPLANATION OF TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO S. 1070

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 8, 9, and 10: These amendments are to clarify the escalator clauses relating to the amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for, or dwelling units which may be constructed, in any one year, so as to make it clear that the aggregate increases or decreases in such amounts for any one year will not exceed the amounts specified in the act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does that mean that if they build less the first year, they may carry them over and build them in the second year? Is that what the Senator is doing by these amendments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. These amendments relate to the escalator clause. The average number over the 6 years is 135,000 a year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose they build only 50,000 the first year, can they build the next year those that were left out the first year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The next year they could build 135,000 plus whatever number the President decided could be constructed under the formula prescribed in the bill, not to exceed 200,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. But under no circumstances could they build the second year more than 200,000, even though they built only 25,000 the first year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is my understanding. I think the sense of the amendment is to make that very clear. The Senator will notice that we use the words "not more than."

Continuing with the explanation of the amendments:

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 15: These amendments are to insert the correct statutory citations.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment is necessary because housing needs may be of several kinds and because the plural instead of the singular is used elsewhere in the act when referring to such housing needs.

Amendment No. 6: This amendment is necessary in order to make it clear that the covenant permitted by section 22 may be made (in lieu of the provision required by the first sentence of subsection 15 (3) as now specified in S. 1070) notwithstanding any other provision of law which might be construed as inconsistent therewith. While it may be that the provisions of section 508, which provide that the provisions of S. 1070 are controlling in the event of inconsistency, would overcome any resulting difficulties, it is desirable to eliminate any possible ambiguity—particularly in connection with financing provisions.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment is necessary in order to make more specific the references to the provisions in the act which are involved.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment conforms the language of the second proviso of the second sentence to the language of the second proviso of the first sentence which correctly employs the term "commencement of construction" rather than the term "development."

Amendment No. 12: This is to make it clear that, in the case where State law prohibits tax exemption of the project, and the locality provides a cash contribution in lieu therefor, such cash contribution will not be reduced by any payments in lieu of taxes.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14: These amendments are to cover the situations where, although an annual contribution date occurred, no contributions actually were paid because in those years the project revenues were sufficient, without such contribution, to meet debt service.

Amendment No. 16: This amendment makes clear the intent of the section that the State can apply if it is operating the project since, in such case, the State is a "public housing agency" under the definition in section 2 (11) of the United States Housing Act, but cannot apply where it is not operating the project since, in such case, the local public agency operating the project must apply.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have the RECORD clear on the question of the sums of money in lieu of taxes. There was a grave doubt that the housing authorities were authorized to enter into contracts with the Federal Government for the payment of money in lieu of taxes. What does the Senator propose to do under the amendments which he offers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are making the provision uniform. We are doing the same thing which the Committee on Appropriations did this year in the deficiency appropriation bill. I am not sure, but I believe that we use exactly the same language.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator making the amount 10 percent of the shelter rent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not to exceed 10 percent of the shelter rent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will that cause the Federal Government to make further contributions to the cities, to make up the 10 percent of the shelter rent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It simply provides that there shall be paid to the city, in lieu of taxes, an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the shelter rent. It is the same provision, as I understand, as the one which went into the appropriation bill this year. The reason that provision is inserted in the amendment is to take care of the situation in the State of Ohio, where it has been held, as I understand, that payments cannot be made in lieu of taxes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that the argument is the same as the one we have heard in the Appropriations Committee for a period of years; and this amendment is exactly the same as the one we placed in the appropriation bill 2 years ago, to limit the payments and to have them made in the way that the Senator and I discussed in the committee; and in connection with that matter the Senator from Georgia introduced a measure to repeal such a provision in connection with the appropriation bill which was reported last year. So it is exactly the same, and the question is one in regard to payments made in lieu of taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Alabama. [Putting the question.]

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of today; a telegram from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union; a telegram from Walter P. Reuther, chairman, CIO National Housing Committee; and a short newspaper item from the New York Times of April 11, 1949; a telegram from Mr. John C. Persons, president of the First National Bank of Birmingham; a telegram from the First National Bank of Mobile; and an article published in the New York Post Home News of this date, by Charles Abrams.

There being no objection, the editorial, telegrams, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 21, 1949]

THE SENATE HOUSING BILL

The Senators' tour of the Washington slums says about all there is to say on the need for the long-delayed national housing program. When Members of Congress may walk only a hundred yards from their offices to find family after family crowded into unsanitary and condemned buildings because there is no other place for them to live, the why of aid to housing is plain beyond argument.

The Senate, recognizing that conditions such as this will be remedied only by a national policy and program of action, has twice before passed a comprehensive housing bill. Through two shifts of party leadership it has put aside politics to respond to the overweening public need. The foundation provisions of the bill now under debate are those worked and reworked over a period of years by some of the most capable men on both sides of the Senate. These same men have again hammered out agreement, compromising the views of the two parties, enlisting the sponsorship of 11 Democrats, 11 Republicans.

Thus the goal of the bill's public housing provisions—1,050,000 units in 7 years on the administration side, 600,000 in 6 years on the Republican side—now becomes 810,000 units over 6 years. This is a fair compromise and a realistic goal. The main reliance on private enterprise to meet the bulk of housing needs is still there, with ample safeguards against putting public housing into destructive competition with private. Urban redevelopment sections of the old bill have been changed to meet a concrete situation in most cities, where the housing shortage itself makes slum clearance and orderly city planning impossible if rebuilding must be limited to slum-cleared land. The measure rests responsibility in the local authorities for initiating and developing the local programs. It retains grants for research essential to a long-range attack on building costs, outmoded codes, and instability in the housing industry.

In sum, this is as good a bill as the most earnest men in Congress, concentrating on housing needs and seeking the most hopeful means for meeting them, could devise. What we hope and urge is that the Senate will pass this good bill with such a strong demonstration of unanimity that opposition in the House, twice successful in obstruction, must this year crumble away.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 20, 1949.*

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building:

The National Farmers Union strongly urges the defeat of Senator TAFT'S amendment to the housing bill which would eliminate sections 404, 405, and 408 from the bill. Without these sections the farm housing program included in the bill will be of little or no avail in attacking the worst of the rural slum conditions with which it should deal. We believe that rural people are as much entitled as urban people to an adequate program for slum clearance in agriculture.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 19, 1949.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Your support of comprehensive housing legislation most encouraging to millions of families living in unhealthful conditions. Passage of adequate housing legislation by this Congress including a program for the middle-income group will be long step toward the solution of the housing tragedy which exists in this country today. Millions of organized workers who are watching this bill closely will especially remember your support of this legislation.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
Chairman, CIO National Housing Commitee.

[From the New York Times of April 11, 1949]

WORKERS' HOMES PLANNED—ITALIAN DEPUTIES VOTE 7-YEAR PROJECT OF 1,700,000 ROOMS

ROME, April 10.—The Italian Chamber of Deputies approved last night a 7-year Government housing program intended to build about 1,700,000 rooms for workers.

The vote was 244 to 85, with only Communists and pro-Communist Socialists voting against it.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *April 20, 1949.*

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building:

I would like for you to know that we are in favor of the retention of section 502 of the 1949 housing bill. We believe that banks can be of service in handling the securities that may develop under this section.

JOHN C. PERSONS,
President, First National Bank of Birmingham.

MOBILE, ALA., *April 20, 1949.*

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building:

We very much favor retention section 502, Housing Act, 1949.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF MOBILE.

[From the New York Post Home News of April 21, 1949]

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 21, 1949.—While the United States Senate was debating the housing and slum-clearance bill yesterday, the Negro tenants of 30 alley dwellings across the street which had been visited by a group of Senators the day before and called a national disgrace, were being served with notices to get out, so the United States Senate could have a new office building.

"A man came and just tacked it up on the door," said Mrs. Mary Deville, showing me an eviction notice by the Government directing her and all the other tenants in Schott's Alley to leave within 30 days.

Mrs. Deville, mother of 10 children, whose husband, Ralph, earns about a hundred dollars a month and pays $10 a month for rent said to me yesterday:

"I've been everywhere; I've been to the housing authority and they said they have no apartments big enough * * * too many children they told me. The best I could get, the landlord wants a hundred dollars a month for, and you know we have to have something left for food."

John Ihlder, executive officer of the National Capital Housing Authority, told me yesterday that he has 18,000 families on the waiting list and no apartments big enough for the Devilles. "We are simply not able to accommodate the families in Schott's Alley," said Ihlder. He said there are thousands of preferred cases on the waiting list ahead of them, veterans and tenants who have been cleared from other sites to make room for other public buildings.

"Look at them kids," said Mrs. Deville, ruefully, as she watched her 8-year-old running down the alley * * * "the way they wear out them shoes."

Schott's Alley looks right up into Senator FULBRIGHT'S office across the street. The dwellings consist of little two-story brick buildings with two rooms on a floor, each just about big enough for a bed. They were built before the Civil War; some of them are old stables. The rooms haven't been painted in decades and big gaping holes in the ceilings reveal the decaying wooden lath. There is neither gas nor electricity nor plumbing. Lighting is by candle. Back of each house is an outhouse which in the summer sends forth an odor to the surrounding neighborhood and the tenants in an apartment house nearby, inhabited largely by Senators' secretaries, have repeatedly complained.

Last Tuesday the Senate interrupted debate on the housing bill to allow a group led by Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois to inspect some of the slum alleys nearby. Schott's Alley was the first they visited. "I had to scrub myself afterward," said one of the Senators. After the tour, the pictures of the slums were plastered over the front pages of the Washington newspapers. But few people here knew that the very slum the Senators saw had been ordered torn down to make way for the new Senate office building extension.

"How can you possibly sleep ten children here?" I asked Mrs. Deville, looking at the tiny bedrooms. "The children are small, you know, and it's gonna be hard as they grow up, but we got a roof now anyway. I don't know where we'll go now, though. The rents are so high." Inside on the bed were her 2-year old twins.

In another house was Mrs. Mary Bennett, a widow with seven children, the youngest 2 years, the oldest 15. Mrs. Bennett is on relief. The 6-year-old girl was lying on the bed in the stuffy, stinking little room with a fever. She had just gotten her notice too, Mrs. Bennett told me, and she had gone down to ask the relief agency whether they could get a house for her. They told her they would pay her rent but getting her a house was impossible.

"You'll just have to find a house for yourself some way," they said. "I don't want to go out on the street," she said.

In another of the little houses was Mrs. Mary Johnson whose husband gets $20 a week as workman's compensation. One of his eyes was taken out by a piece of steel a little while ago. They have 6 children, the youngest a 10-month old boy, the oldest 12. As I entered, the children were all crowded around a kitchen table eating by candlelight. There was a stale, stuffy odor coming out of the hot room. "I have looked and looked for a house," she said bitterly, "but when they hear I've got 6 children they just walk away."

"I've just been walking myself to death looking," said Rosalie Johnson, another tenant, "but everything's for sale and nothing's for rent."

Ihlder told me yesterday there are simply no places for these people at the rents they can afford, particularly for the larger families. There are more than 40,000 substandard houses in the Nation's Capital, of which 1,300 are alley-slum dwellings, he said.

At one of the recent sessions, Congress put a limit on the amount the National Capital Housing Authority could spend for new housing—no more than $5,000 per unit, so Ihlder built few large apartments. Though the Government has asked for immediate possession of Schott's Alley to make way for the Senate Office Building, none of the families is being helped to find a house. Senator SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, who is leading the fight for the housing bill told me yesterday that he thought extensions of time could be arranged for the tenants.

Curiously the debate most of the day yesterday centered around Senator CAIN'S proposal to tear down slums as the only way of getting rid of them. CAIN who opposes the housing measure wants one house torn down for every new house built. With 18,000 families in the District ahead of them, the tenants in Schott's Alley may have a long time to wait if CAIN'S amendment is adopted.

Yesterday, during the course of the debate, Senator BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, said that slums are "a state of mind." But the tenants of Schott's Alley all think that though their slum is pretty bad, it's better than being on the street.

CHARLES ABRAMS.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a large number of telegrams which have been sent to me by bankers located in many of the States of the Union.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing larger program projected and will lower costs to the Federal Government.

DEWAR, ROBERTSON & PANCOAST.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers, we strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act, for the authorizing of banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds distribution as broad as possible is absolutely essential for financing the large program projected and should very definitely lower costs to Federal Government.

BREED & HARRISON, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers we favor retention of section 502 in Housing Act of 1949 which authorizes banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Because of large financing projected broadest distribution of the issues is vital and should result in lower cost- to the Federal Government.

EDWARD F. WRIGHTSMAN,
Manager, Municipal Bond Department, Fitzgerald & Co., Inc.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers we advocate retention of section 502 of Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is essential for successful financing of this large program and will reduce costs to the Federal Government.

OTIS & CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers we favor retention of section 502 in Housing Act of 1949 which authorizes banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Because of large financing projected broadest distribution of the issues is vital and should result in lower costs to the Federal Government.

CHAS. E. QUINCY & CO.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 8, 1949.*
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large programs projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
RUSS & Co.

DENVER, COLO., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As a private investment dealer, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds; broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
J. A. HOGLE & Co.,
KARL L. MAYER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
W. C. LANGLEY & Co.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
Understand Federal Housing Act comes up for consideration shortly; in order to provide widest possible market for the bonds to be issued under the act we favor strongly retention of section No. 502 permitting commercial banks to underwrite and deal in these bonds.
REINHOLDT & GARDNER,
Members New York Stock Exchange.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
BARTOW LEEDS Co.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
ADAMS MCENTEE & Co., INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
HARVEY FISK & SONS, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of section 502 of Housing Act of 1949, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is essential for successful financing of this large program, and will reduce costs to the Federal Government.
SWISS AMERICAN CORP.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers in United States Government, State, and municipal securities, we feel in order to lower the subsidy cost to the Federal Government that the broadest market possible should be made available for the proposed housing bonds.
C. J. DEVINE & Co., INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected, and will lower cost to Federal Government.
CENTRAL REPUBLIC Co., INC.

RENO, NEV., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Bank and Currency Committee, United States Senate Office Building:
As a private investment dealer we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
J. A. HOGLE & Co.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealer we urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds broadest possible market is absolutely necessary for financing the large program projected and should very definitely lower cost to Federal Government.
A. WEBSTER DOUGHERTY & Co.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act for the authorizing of banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Distribution as broad as possible is absolutely essential to financing the large program projected and should very definitely lower cost to Federal Government.
DOLL & ISPHORDING, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of section 502 of Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is essential for successful financing of this large program and will reduce costs to the Federal Government.
WOOD GUNDY & Co., INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
RHOADES & Co.
CARL M. LOEB,

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
JAMES S. BAKER & Co.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 8, 1949.*
The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building.
As private investment dealers we strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is absolutely essential for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
SCHMIDT POOLE & Co.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Building.
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of bank amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
NEW YORK HANSEATIC CORP.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building.
We favor continuation of proposal in new Housing Act permitting commercial banks to underwrite and deal in housing bonds so that financing the housing program will be facilitated at lowest cost to Treasury and effect the widest market distribution.
BRIGGS SCHAEDLE & Co., INC.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman of Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:
As private individuals and dealer we advocate retention of bank amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market necessary for financing this large program and to obtain lowest interest costs to Federal Government.
PALMER JAFFREY,
Piper, Jaffray & Hopwood.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Banking and Currency Committee:
As a private investment dealer, we advocate retention of banking amendment in

Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

J. A. HOGLE & Co.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 8, 1949.*

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:

We favor section 502 of Federal Housing Act permitting banks to deal in Federal housing bonds.

A. G. EDWARDS & SONS.

RICHMOND, VA., *April 9, 1949.*

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Washington, D. C.:

We urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. As broad a market as possible necessary for financing the large program projected and should lower cost to Federal Government. We are private investment dealers.

F. W. CRAIGIE & Co.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building:

As a private investment dealer, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

J. A. HOGLE & Co.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *April 11, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:

As investment dealers we urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in proposed new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is essential in view of magnitude of program projected.

SAGE, RUTTY & Co., INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 11, 1949.*

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:

As private bankers and municipal-bond dealers we advocate retention of banking amendments in Housing Act of 1949 allowing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing obligations. Broadest possible market is necessary to the Housing Authority and Federal Government for financing this large program at lowest interest cost.

LAIDLAW & Co.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 11, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senator, Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

GARRETT & Co.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We as private investment dealers strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is not only desirable but absolutely essential for financing the large program projected and should lower interest cost to Federal Government.

RYAN, SUTHERLAND & Co.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 8, 1949.*

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers we believe banks should be permitted to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds as provided in banking amendment to Housing Act of 1949 to insure broadest possible market and lower costs to Government.

E. W. CLARK & Co.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 8, 1949.*

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers we strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is absolutely essential for financing the large program projected and should definitely lower cost to Federal Government.

BRITTAIN KENNEDY & Co.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers we strongly urge retention of banking arm in Housing Act for the authorization of banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broad distribution is necessary to insure proper financing of the large program projected and wide distribution should definitely lower cost to Federal Government.

DRYDEN & Co., INC.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *April 8, 1949.*

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new-housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

DITTMAR & Co.
ELMER A. DITTMAR.

CLEVELAND, OHIO., *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman of Banking and Currency Committee:

As private investment dealers, we strongly urge retention of the banking amendments re the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in proposed bonds because as broad a market as possible is essential for financing the projected program and provide a lower interest cost to the Federal Government, and ultimately the taxpayer.

THE FIRST CLEVELAND CORP.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, as private investment dealers, strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is not only desirable but absolutely essential for financing the large program projected and should lower interest cost to Federal Government.

RYAN, SUTHERLAND & Co.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:

As investment dealers intending to bid on housing bonds we strongly urge retention of banking amendment which authorizes banks to underwrite and deal in such bonds. It is essential that as broad a market as possible for the large program projected be developed to further the lowest cost to the Federal Government.

CURTISS HOUSE & Co.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:

As investment dealers we favor retention of section 502 in Housing Act of 1949 which authorizes banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Because of large financing project a broad distribution of the issue is vital and should result in lower costs to the Federal Government.

LADENBURG, THALMANN & Co.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers we advocate retention of bank amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

NEW YORK HANSEATIC CORP.

DALLAS, TEX., *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senator, Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

DALLAS UNION TRUST Co.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Commerce Committee,
Senate Office Building:

As Government and municipal bond dealers we urge retaining banking amendment in Federal Housing Act authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Nation-wide distribution is needed for this large-scale financing and should result in substantially lower interest costs to the Federal Government.

ASSEL KREIMER & Co.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers, we strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broad as possible market is essential for financing the large program projected and should definitely lower cost of Federal Government.

BALL, BURGE & KRAUS.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in the new housing bonds. We feel that broadest possible market is necessary for financing this large program and for lowest cost to the Government.
CHARLES W. SCRANTON & CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman of Senate Banking Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing bank to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower cost to the Federal Government.
WAGENSELLER & DURST, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is essential for successful financing of this large program and will reduce costs to the Federal Government.
SHEARSON HAMMILL & CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower costs to the Federal Government.
PACIFIC CO. OF CALIFORNIA,
ROBERT H. PARSONS, *President.*

DALLAS, TEX., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senator, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.
FIRST SOUTHWEST CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower costs to the Federal Government.
STERN, FRANK & MEYER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act for authorizing of banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Distribution as broad as possible is absolutely essential for financing large program projected and should very definitely lower cost to Federal Government.
WALTER, WOODY & HEIMERDINGER.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealer we advocate retention of bank amendment in Housing Act, 1949, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest market possible necessary for financing this large program and to obtain lowest interest cost to Federal Government.
KALMAN & CO., INC.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *April 8, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. The broadest possible market is absolutely necessary for financing the large program projected and should lower cost to Federal Government.
J. C. BRADFORD & CO.
By Q. R. LEDYARD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee:
In re Housing Act of 1949, S. 1070, strongly urge authorization underwriting and dealing by banks in new housing bonds. Broad distribution and active secondary markets essential to success of financing reducing rental costs to tenants and service charges to United States Treasury.
D. W. RICH & CO., INC.,
Dealer in United States Government Securities.

DENVER, COLO., *April 7, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of amendment to Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary in financing large program of this type and will lower cost to Federal Government.
BOETTCHER & CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 7, 1949.*
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is essential to successfully finance large program projected and will definitely lower cost to Federal Government.
J. B. ROLL & CO., INC.
JOHN B. ROLL, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 7, 1949.*
Senator BURNET MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower cost to the Federal Government.
WEEDEN & CO.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *April 7, 1949.*
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Recommend retention section 502 Housing Act, 1949, authorizing banks to participate as underwriters.
WHEELOCK & CUMMINS, INC.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
As private investment dealer we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost of Federal Government.
W. R. STEPHENS INVESTMENT CO., INC.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
As investment dealers, we are in favor of retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Because of the large amount of this financing in the future, broad distribution of the several issues is vital.
WHITING, WEEKS & STUBBS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 7, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Favor passage of section 502, permitting banks to deal in housing bonds, as feel it will give a broader market, resulting in better prices to seller of bonds.
DEMPSEY, TEGELER & CO.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *April 7, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
As a private investment dealer, we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected, and will lower cost to Federal Government.
J. A. HOGLE & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 7, 1949.*
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower cost to the Federal Government.
CONRAD BRUCE & CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 7, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing

large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

J. A. HOGLE & Co.,
SIDNEY B. HOOK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 7, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower cost to the Federal Government.

R. H. MOULTON & Co.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealer we advocate retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large program projected and will lower cost of Federal Government.

WOMELDORFF & LINDSEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower the cost to the Federal Government.

J. BARTH & Co.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing the large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

BRUSH, SLOCUMB & Co.,
SPENCER BRUSH,
President.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 7, 1949.*
Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealer we advocate retention section 502 of Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible distribution is essential for financing a large program projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

KAISER & Co.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 8, 1949*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers, we strongly urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broad as possible market is essential for financing the large program projected and should definitely lower cost of Federal Government.

FIELD, RICHARDS & Co.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe broadest possible market essential for financing large Federal housing program and as private investment dealers we strongly urge retention of banking amendment enabling banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds.

MERRILL, TURBEN & Co.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers, we advocate retention of banking amendment of housing act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large programs projected and will lower costs to Federal Government.

MARX & Co.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 7, 1949.*
Senator B. R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment bankers, we recommend banking amendment to the public housing bill, allowing banks to buy and sell proposed housing bonds. This will give issue widest possible distribution and should lower financing cost for Federal Government.

STIFEL, NICOLAUS & Co.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As private investment dealers we advocate retention of banking amendment of housing act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is necessary for financing large programs projected and will lower cost to Federal Government.

WATKINS, MORROW & Co.

SAN FRANCISCO, *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We plan to participate in distributing the housing bonds to be authorized by the Housing Act of 1949. In that authorization we believe that section 502 should be retained. We believe that distribution will be strengthened if the banks are included as authorized underwriters and dealers. Their distribution could lower the underwriting costs to the issuing agency.

MITCHEM TULLY & Co.,
Investment bankers.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As a small investment dealer, we hope that the banking amendment in the Housing Act of 1949, authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds will be retained. The banks will treat us better than the big investment dealers, and the Government will get their money at a lower cost.

KETCHAM & NONGARD,
ROY D. O'BRIEN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 7, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are small private investment dealers in municipal bonds. Have been in business since 1932. Are anxious to assist the United States Government in financing large Federal housing program at the lowest possible cost. It is our firm belief this can best be done by the retention of the banking amendment in the Housing Act of 1949, which will authorize banks to underwrite and deal in the new housing bonds.

JOHN W. CLARKE, INC.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 9, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As investment dealers, we urge retention of banking amendment in Housing Act of 1949 authorizing banks to underwrite and deal in proposed new housing bonds. Broadest possible market is essential in view of magnitude of program projected.

Bank experience and familiarity with distribution of other tax-exempt securities should contribute to securing greatest possible breadth and strength for market for new tax-exempt housing bonds and should aid in securing lowest cost of program to Federal Government.

MAYNARD H. MURCH & Co.,
R. C. CHAPMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1949.*
Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building:

As private investment dealers, it is our judgment that section 502 in the Housing Act of 1949, which authorizes banks to underwrite and deal in new housing bonds should be retained. With the large volume of financing for this proposed purpose, we believe it wil be essential to include the banks as dealers to obtain broad and satisfactory distribution. We believe this section is vital to the Federal Government.

HANNAHS, BALLIN & LEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent on official business, and is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate, on official business, and is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea", and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business, and is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—57

Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Baldwin	Ives	Myers
Brewster	Jenner	Neely
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Donnell	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Schoeppel
Ellender	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ferguson	Langer	Stennis
Flanders	Lodge	Taft
Frear	Long	Taylor
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	McMahon	Thye
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Tobey
Hill	Malone	Vandenberg
Hoey	Martin	Withers
Holland	Maybank	Young

NAYS—13

Bricker	Gurney	Robertson
Butler	Knowland	Wherry
Cain	McClellan	Williams
Cordon	Millikin	
Ecton	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	Downey	Graham
Byrd	Eastland	Green
Chavez	George	Hunt
Connally	Gillette	Kem
Lucas	Murray	Tydings
McCarran	O'Conor	Wagner
McGrath	Reed	Watkins
McKellar	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Miller	Smith, N. J.	

So the bill S. 1070 was passed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND STRATEGIC STOCK PILING ACTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 108, Senate bill 900, known as the Commodity Credit Corporation amendment bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 900.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

COMPARISON OF APPROPRIATION BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH CORRESPONDING BILLS PASSED AT THE LAST SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a table showing the amounts carried by the appropriation bills which already have been acted upon by the House of Representatives. I think all Members of the Senate will find the comparison of interest. Let me point out that in respect to the major supply bills which thus far have been acted upon by the House of Representatives, the comparison shows an increase of $4,216,000,000 over the amounts carried by the same bills in the prior fiscal year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriation comparisons, exclusive of foreign aid, legislative, permanent, and contingent appropriations

	1949 approved [1]	1950 request [2]	House action [2]	House action versus 1950 request		House action versus 1949 approved	
				Increase	Decrease	Increase	Decrease
Independent offices	$6,787,102,402	$7,775,566,830	$7,104,571,603		$670,995,227	$317,469,201	
Civil functions	641,575,666	767,733,220	593,292,270		174,440,950		$48,283,396
State, Justice, Commerce	511,129,662	740,023,456	684,616,102		55,407,354	173,486,440	
Labor, Federal Security	1,866,053,700	2,235,065,685	2,211,794,085		23,271,600	345,740,385	
Treasury, Post Office	2,244,727,680	3,172,666,750	3,072,817,903		99,848,847	828,090,223	
Agriculture	577,546,953	726,879,908	943,117,979	$216,238,071		359,332,955	
District of Columbia	99,729,483	103,321,427	98,923,621		4,397,806		805,862
Government corporations	38,479,061						38,479,061
Interior	407,836,974	616,805,020	536,461,908		80,343,112	128,624,934	
Armed services	11,403,477,413	13,219,835,700	13,849,361,800	629,526,100		2,445,884,387	
Deficiencies	2,034,554,306	1,776,302,974	1,739,854,849		36,448,125		294,699,457
Total	26,612,213,300	31,134,200,970	30,834,812,120	845,764,171	[3] 1,145,153,021	[4] 4,598,628,525	382,267,776

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 17, 1948.
[2] House reports.
[3] Net decrease of $299,388,850, or 0.9 percent.
[4] Net increase of $4,216,360,749, or 15 percent.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LODGE asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate a part of Friday and Saturday.

Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative from Pennsylvania, ROBERT LEWIS COFFEY, JR., I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 22, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of title I, section 107 (b), Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress:

To be lieutenant colonels

Charles E. Dunham, O16801.
Michael C. Grenata, O9304.
Franklin L. Litchtenfels, O16355.
Alden H. Seabury, O7431.
James C. White, O11666.

To be first lieutenant

Harry Mazur, O26137.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be colonels

Earl William Aldrup, O15972.
Miles Jason Baze, O41378.
Conrad Lewis Boyle, O15951.
William Joseph Bradley, O15967.
Harold Francis Chrisman, O15961.
Philip Feinberg, O38591.
Emroy Elmer Feind, O28787.
Conrad Gordon Follansbee, O15973.
Wayne Bailey Gardner, O41366.
Alexander Grendon, O39506.
Valerius Hakanson, O41371.
George Laurence Holsinger, O15989.
Carroll Delmar Hudson, O28785.
George Edward Isaacs, O15959.
John Gardner Ladd, O39509.
Frank Riley Loyd, O16004.
Harold Mills Manderbach, O15984.
Robert Reinhold Martin, O15953.
Murray Eberhart McGowan, O15943.
Edward Charles Miller, Jr., O38590.
Harry William Miller, O16005.
William Merritt Preston Northcross, O28793.
Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952.
Harry Edward Owens, O28786.
Raymond Dishman Palmer, O15942.
Lewis Ebenezer Perry, O28781.
George Cooper Reinhardt, O15963.
Coleman Romain, O28783.
Abraham Julius Rosenblum, O28788.
John Douglas Salmon, O15937.
John Henry Sampson, Jr., O15974.
August Edward Schanze, O15976.
William Frederick Schweikert, O28778.
Charles Stowe Stodter, O16013.
Esthel Oliver Stroube, O41368.
William Carl Thompson, O41374.
John Vogler Tower, O15956.
Herbert Ryan Tumin, O41367.
Harold Witte Uhrbrock, O15990.
Curtis Leigh Varner, O28779.
Thomas Clagett Wood, Jr., O15946.
Clyde George Young, O28790.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Lyman A. Thackrey
Carl F. Espe
Herbert S. Duckworth
Frank Akers

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Samuel E. McCarty
George W. Bauernschmidt

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Carlton R. Adams and other officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 7, 1949, and appear in full in Senate proceedings of the Senate for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Carlton R. Adams, which is shown on page 4071, and ending with the name of Frederick R. L. Tuthill, which appears on page 4072.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Robert J. Artz et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 12, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert J. Artz, which appears on page 4388, and ending with the name of Robert N. McKinney, which appears on page 4389.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Edward B. Willingham, D. D., pastor, National Baptist Memorial Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all mankind, in the stillness of this moment, make us sensitive to Thy spiritual presence. Great Thou art, and greatly to be praised. We worship Thee.

With thanksgiving we acknowledge Thy blessings to us. Make us mindful that unto whom much is given of Him, shall be much required. Direct our stewardship of the abundant mercies from Thy hand.

Look with favor upon these who represent the people of our Nation. May they faithfully represent Thee. Thou hast promised wisdom to those who seek Thy truth. May our knowledge of the way of truth be fortified by character, and may strength be given to deal righteously.

Bless the President of our land and all who have a part in directing the destiny of the human race. May Thy peace be upon our Nation and upon all people of the earth. This, our prayer, is in the spirit of the Prince of Peace, Thy Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 21, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE COFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to appoint a committee of Senators to attend the funeral of Representative ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR., of Pennsylvania. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 111, agreed to yesterday, the Chair appoints the two Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS and Mr. MARTIN] the committee on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Holland	Neely
Baldwin	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hunt	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chapman	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Long	Sparkman
Donnell	McCarthy	Stennis
Douglas	McClellan	Taylor
Ferguson	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thye
George	Malone	Vandenberg
Gillette	Martin	Watkins
Green	Maybank	Wherry
Hayden	Miller	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Withers
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Young
Hill	Murray	
Hoey	Myers	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions, memorials, and other routine matters, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, at Washington, D. C., March 24 and 25, 1949, which with the accompanying report was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRIBUTES TO KENNETH C. ROYALL, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to comment just briefly——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot do so at this time under the unanimous-consent agreement just entered into.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to say a few words concerning the resignation of Kenneth C. Royall, as Secretary of the Army. I shall use less than 5 minutes of the Senate's time in doing so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator would be obliged to receive unanimous consent in order to do so.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement on the subject of the resignation of Secretary Royall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I was very sorry to learn yesterday that Kenneth C. Royall had resigned as Secretary of the Army. He has been an able, energetic Secretary of the Army and has given outstanding public service in the exacting years of the war and since. This service I know has been rendered at a sacrifice to his own personal affairs and to his health. As one fellow American I am very grateful to him for his fine contribution to the United States and to public service generally.

I may say further, Mr. President, that as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have had frequent occasion to hear him testify before our committee. On every occasion when he testified he appeared to know his job thoroughly, to be intensely interested in it, to be a forthright, loyal American.

I cannot see him leave the public service without expressing my own personal regret and my gratitude for his fine efforts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement on the resignation of Kenneth C. Royall as Secretary of War, the same subject on which the Senator from Connecticut has just spoken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the Senator from Connecticut, who has just spoken, regarding the resignation of Kenneth C. Royall as Secretary of War. As a law-school classmate of his and as one who has followed his career through the years since that time, I was happy to see him become associated with the war effort as Under Secretary of War. I pay high tribute to the able work he has performed as Secretary of the Army. He has earned his retirement. He has earned the right to go back to the private practice of law. A brilliant student, he became a good lawyer, and a fine public servant, and I am sorry to see him leave the public service.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement on the resignation of Secretary Royall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I had intended to make this statement on the floor yesterday, but because of the bill which was before the Senate and the lateness of the hour, I reserved it until today.

In the resignation of Kenneth C. Royall as Secretary of the Army our Government is losing a fine public servant. My high opinion of Secretary Royall is based not only upon his outstanding record of public service, but upon my many contacts with him as a member of the Senate.

During 1945 Mr. Royall, who was then a brigadier general, acted as Army liason officer with the Senate War Investigating Committee on which I then served as a minority member. Later as Secretary of War and as Secretary of the Army Mr. Royall on many occasions came before the Investigating Committee of which I was chairman on matters involving the Military Establishment.

Mr. Royall was always most cooperative with these investigating committees of Congress. In our efforts to uncover and correct inefficiency, mismanagement, and fraud in the armed services he made a substantial contribution. The May-Garsson case, the General Meyer case, and the recent case of the German war criminal Ilse Koch are but a few of the many instances in which Secretary Royall left no stone unturned to assist the Congress in obtaining the complete and true facts. Likewise, in my other official contacts with Secretary Royall I found him to be extremely well informed and straightforward in all his dealings with Congress.

I am firmly convinced that if all officials in the executive departments were to display the same candor and the same sincere attitude of cooperation with Congress which has been demonstrated by Mr. Royall our Government would be a better Government. Mr. Royall has served his country faithfully and with high distinction, and I am honored to have this opportunity to pay him tribute.

At this time I wish to pay the same tribute to Secretary of Defense Forrestal on his retirement. He was a great public servant. We shall miss both Secretaries from the Military Establishment. This does not detract from those who are entering the service, Mr. Louis Johnson and Mr. Stephen Early. We know that we shall receive fine public service from them also.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of Toledo, Ohio, relating to the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 21

"Whereas Iowa produces, both as to value and numbers, more eggs than any other State in the Union; and

"Whereas the farm income of Iowa from eggs alone in 1948 was approximately $150,000,000; and

"Whereas the people of Iowa are strongly in favor of a fair and adequate price support program for eggs; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture and all State extension departments have approved and promoted a program whereby eggs would be sold strictly on a quality basis, which program resulted in 80 percent of all eggs sold in Iowa being evaluated on standards of quality and grade; and

"Whereas in the administration of the support program by the Federal Government only the price of dry eggs has been supported, while the price of frozen and shell eggs has not been supported, with the result that undergrade eggs in the present market command almost the same price as the top consumer grade AA eggs; and

"Whereas this policy has destroyed the producer's ability to market eggs on a quality basis according to grade and has undermined the grading program, which formerly encouraged production of a quality produce: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to require price support of eggs at the top grade, including frozen and shell eggs, with deductions for undergrade eggs, and to eliminate the present practice of supporting only the price of dry eggs; be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the United States Senators from Iowa and to the Representatives in Congress from

Iowa and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States."

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give close attention to and work for the passage of Senate Act No. 67, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico

"Whereas United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has presented an act in the Senate of the United States amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 19 8 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island carry out the will of the Rhode Island Legislature by giving close attention to Senate Act 67, introduced by United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, and working for the enactment of the measure in order that the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 may be amended in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. BREWSTER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-fourth legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Secretary of Defense and the Committee on Civilian Components, commonly known as the Gray board, have recommended the federalization of the National Guard by the organization of a single Federal Reserve force under the Army clause of the Constitution, instead of under the militia clauses of the Constitution as the National Guard is now organized and under which the sovereign States retain the authority for the appointment of the officers of the National Guard and the training of the National Guard in time of peace in accordance with the discipline prescribed by the Congress; and

"Whereas federalization of the National Guard would destroy the National Guard as it now exists and which has rendered exceptional and valiant service to the Nation in two World Wars, and in time of peace would impose extraordinary costs beyond the ability of the Nation to meet, and would result in the centralization of all military power in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the States would be left without an internal security force and would be compelled to organize and maintain State troops at great cost to the States, with the result that there would thus be maintained a Federal Reserve and State military force, creating a duplication of effort and expense while the National Guard, as it is now constituted and controlled, not only furnishes the necessary internal security for the States but, in addition, serves as a component of the Army of the United States and a first line of defense thereof as provided by the National Defense Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to oppose all legislation designed to establish a single Federal Reserve force and to retain intact the National Guard as it is now organized, thus reserving to the States the controls provided by the Constitution and insuring that the National Guard will be at the disposal of the State in time of peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the chairman of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the Congress."

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to take the necessary steps to prevent eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest in the town of Ayer

"Whereas 200 families of GI's have been served with notice from the United States military authorities to vacate within a period of 30 days the living quarters that they are now occupying in Devencrest at Camp Devens in the town of Ayer; and

"Whereas the acute housing shortage is such that these families are unable to find other suitable living quarters: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps may be necessary to prevent the military authorities from proceeding with the eviction of these families; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, April 11, 1949.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 14, 1949.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts for certain services rendered by them to the Federal Government

"Whereas the employees of the Division of Employment Security of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts rendered valuable services to the people of this Commonwealth and to the United States during certain periods when said employees were loaned to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas said services have never been paid for or in any way compensated for by the Federal Government: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Members of Congress from Massachusetts to secure the enactment of appropriate legislation to the end that the employees of the Division of Employment Security of this Commonwealth be adequately compensated for certain uncompensated overtime work done by them from January 1, 1939, through December 31, 1941, and for the difference between the 37½ hours' work for which they were paid and the 40 hours' work which they actually did each week from January 1, 1942, through November 15, 1946, said difference being unpaid, while they were loaned to the Federal Government and served as employees thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, April 11, 1949.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 14, 1949.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk."*

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Pulaski, Tenn., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF NORTH PLATTE VALLEY IRRIGATORS PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter and a resolution from the board of directors of the North Platte Valley Irrigators Protective Association, of Scottsbluff, Nebr., relating to the Missouri Valley Authority, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTH PLATTE VALLEY
IRRIGATORS PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Scottsbluff, Nebr., April 18, 1949.

To Association Members:

The accompanying resolution, prepared by Mr. Harry A. Bashore (former United States Reclamation Commissioner), Mr. A. H. Atkins and Mr. C. G. Klingman (directors), appointed by your president for that purpose, is intentionally brief. It is generally conceded that for all practical intents and purposes there is little difference between the present Missouri Valley Authority bill, S. 1160, and the bill of the same name introduced in 1945, S. 555.

It is, therefore, the belief of your board of directors that it might be well to review some of the objections voiced in 1945 in opposition to S. 555 on the ground that they are equally valid in connection with S. 1160. Below we quote a portion of the conclusions contained in the adverse report from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation under date of October 18, 1945. We earnestly urge not only your own careful consideration of these conclusions but also that of your entire board of directors and of the people of your community. For our part, we pledge further careful study. We also purpose to furnish you with additional facts and conclusions from time to time for your consideration. This bill is important from two standpoints—first, our water rights, and, second, our form of government.

CONCLUSIONS

(a) A comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of the Missouri River Basin has, after thorough consideration by the Congress, been adopted, and the initial stages thereof have been authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. This plan provided a program of unified water and land resources development and control for the Missouri River Basin.

(b) Execution of the plan already approved by the Congress through existing Federal agencies, in cooperation with the States, assures proper emphasis on the primary needs of flood control and irrigation and resolves conflicts between the users of water. It assures, furthermore, that the

plan will be carried out by experienced agencies.

(c) The existing laws and procedures provide full integration of the activities of the established Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the several phases of water- and land-resource development. These policies and procedures protect States' rights and interests, State water laws, and provide full cooperation between the local State and Federal interests.

(d) The present organization of the Bureau of Reclamation affords the benefits of resource development on a regional basis without the objectionable features contained in S. 555.

(e) Under S. 555, policies and laws respecting the use and control of water, heretofore established by the Congress are in a large measure destroyed, and the State water laws and States' rights and interests in water and its utilization and control are not adequately preserved and protected.

(f) The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Bureau of Reclamation would either be eliminated entirely from the Missouri Basin, or their activity curtailed at the will of the authority. Other Federal land and water agencies operating in that basin would find it necessary in a large measure to conform with the policies of the authority. The laws under which these agencies now operate and basic provisions of the present reclamation law, would, so far as the Missouri Basin is concerned, be drastically changed.

Yours very truly,

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

RESOLUTION

Whereas various bills have been introduced in the Federal Congress for the establishment of Federal cooperations allegedly for the better coordination of the development of the Government in the various river basins; and

Whereas S. 1160 has been introduced for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority and the latter has received the particular consideration of this organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Platte Valley Irrigators Association, That we have the same fundamental objection to any authority bill and particularly to S. 1160 that we had to S. 555 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, for the following reasons:

First. The bills propose a major step in the destruction of the basic organization of the Government of the United States as we have known it for the last 150 years.

Second. The setting up of a Federal corporation under the control of a board of five members cuts across the existing lines of Federal bureaus and departments. While lip service is given to State laws and vested rights, it is evident that the corporation may completely ignore them. The authority idea fits into the pattern established in Nazi Germany under the Hitler regime and will make the people of the United States subjects of the State and not citizens of the Republic.

Third. The policies and laws respecting the use and control of water, heretofore established by the Congress which preserved States' rights, and as practiced in this valley, are in a large measure destroyed, and the State water laws and States' rights and individuals' interests in water and its use and control are not preserved or protected. Furthermore, the basic provisions of the present reclamation law, would, so far as the Missouri Basin is concerned, be subject to dictatorial interpretations.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTIONS OF COUNCILS OF BETHLEHEM AND AMBRIDGE, PA.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two resolutions from Pennsylvania communities urging the designation by Congress of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day. One of these resolutions is from the common council of the city of Bethlehem, approved by Mayor Robert Pfeifle, and the other is from the town council of the borough of Ambridge, approved by Burgess P. J. Caul.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929 to October 11 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Bethlehem and State of Pennsylvania:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania.

Adopted by council this 1st day of February 1949.

ROBERT PFEIFLE,
Mayor.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Town Council of the Borough of Ambridge and State of Pennsylvania:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania.

Resolved and enacted this 14th day of April 1949.

DAVID R. MORRIS,
President of Council.

Approved this 18th day of April 1949.

P. J. CAUL,
Burgess.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 34. Resolution to investigate contracts with railroads for carrying United States mails; with amendments (Rept. No. 285).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of David K. E. Bruce, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Mayhew Derryberry, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Katherine M. Herrold, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Carl L. Anderson, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Winfield K. Sharp, Jr., and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

James A. Shannon, and several other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1669. A bill authorizing the institution and maintenance of an action against the Tennessee Valley Authority to enjoin the expenditure of any funds appropriated for the construction of any steam electric generating plant by such authority and to enjoin the construction of said plant or plants as being contrary to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HUMPHREY introduced Senate bill 1670, to authorize Federal assistance for the construction of elementary and secondary public schools, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate bill 1671, to continue price support for agricultural commodities at current levels for 2 years, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Efrosini Abad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. T. A. Robertson; and

S. 1674. A bill for the relief of J. L. Hitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1675. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp commemorative of the Eleventh Tennessee Walking Horse Celebration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1676. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ebba Dalin; and

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Erik H. Lindman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1678. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize Federal assistance for the construction of elementary and secondary public schools, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me, together with a digest of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and digest by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1670) to authorize Federal assistance for the construction of elementary and secondary public schools, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement and digest are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY UPON INTRODUCTION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ACT

I am pleased to introduce today the Public School Construction Act, legislation which I am proposing which would authorize an appropriation of Federal funds to the States to construct elementary and public schools for the Nation's children between the ages of 5 and 17 years.

At present, there are more than 4,000,000 children throughout the country who are not attending school. In many instances this is due to lack of adequate buildings. The increased birth rate during and after the war has crowded school buildings to the point where in some States children are being turned away from enrollment.

According to a study made by the United States Census Bureau of Statistics, under a special grant by the American Parents Committee, school enrollments in 1951 will be 2,400,000 more than they were in 1948. And in 8 years 8,000,000 more children will be seeking enrollment than in 1948 in buildings which are now inadequate.

School buildings must be provided for our current generation of children or they will grow up as illiterates.

In asking for an appropriation of $500,000,000 for the first year and five succeeding years I would like to point out that construction costs are high. Many States cannot meet these costs. Education of children is a national responsibility, and there must be cooperation between the Federal Government and the States.

A recent study made by the National Education Association shows that in communities checked one out of every five schools now in use was built prior to 1900. Two percent of these, and still in use, were built in 1870. Many of these old buildings are firetraps, and should be condemned.

In 1947 more than half of the communities surveyed by the National Education Association reported overcrowding in schools. Attendance in these schools is now 30 percent higher than in 1947. One out of four cities surveyed is using one or more school buildings which have been officially condemned. Over 1,000 schools in the State of Virginia have been listed as unfit for use. These are figures compiled in 1947. During the war and immediately after there was a marked increase in the annual birth rate—between a million and a million and a half more children were born each year. Many of these are ready for school. Others are coming of school age soon. There is an urgent need for immediate action to provide the buildings for their education.

Overcrowded conditions and condemned schools invite disaster. The fire-insurance underwriters point out that in 1946, when the last figures are available, there were seven fires every day in schools and colleges in the United States and Canada. We are being unfair to America's children when we expose them to these hazards.

In no way does this measure affect or compete with the Federal aid-to-education bill. Rather, it is a companion bill designed to meet the need throughout the country of adequate elementary and secondary school buildings.

Every provision is made in this bill to preserve the right of State control of education. The United States Commissioner of Education, acting under the Federal Security Administrator, will issue the regulations to administer the act, calling on the Federal Works Agency to supervise construction and proper fulfillment of contracts.

The formula for distribution of funds would be based on the ratio the State per capita income bears to the national per capita income, with no State receiving more than 75 percent Federal funds nor less than 33⅓ percent.

DIGEST OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ACT

Purpose: To authorize funds to help the States construct elementary and secondary public schools.

Appropriations: $500,000,000 authorized for the first year and for each five succeeding years. Unexpended funds each year to be appropriated for the next year in addition to the authorized amount. Payments to be made to the States after State plans are submitted and approved by the United States Commissioner of Education.

Administration: To be administered under the Federal Security Administrator. The Commissioner of Education, acting under the Federal Security Administrator, to issue regulations necessary to administer the act. The Federal Works Agency, on behalf of the Commissioner of Education, to supervise the actual construction of the schools.

State plans: The State must name a State agency to administer the plan and determine priority of school-construction projects on the basis of needs, with special consideration to rural communities and those with limited financial resources.

Allotments to States: To be made on the basis of the population of children (5 to 17 years) in that State in proportion to the total United States population of children. In States where schools are maintained for separate racial groups such schools shall receive Federal funds in the same proportion as the minority racial groups is to the total children population of the State. Satisfactory completion of the project and supervision of proper fulfillment of contract shall be done by the Federal Works Agency. Contracts must provide rates of pay for labor not less than prevailing local rates for similar work.

Emergency construction: Immediate school construction in districts found by the commissioner of education to be suffering from acute shortages of schools is authorized waiving certain features of the State plans but not to exceed 50 percent of the State's allotment for the first fiscal year.

Administrative expense: The commissioner of education on the basis of plans submitted by the State to set the percent of funds necessary for efficient administration. The Federal Security Agency shall receive an additional appropriation to carry out its functions of administration.

Grants-in-aid: Federal aid to match State aid on a basis proportionate to the ratio that the State per capita income bears to the national per capita income. No State, however, to be allotted more than 75 percent Federal funds or less than 33⅓ percent.

The act preserves the right of State control of education.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue price support for agricultural commodities at current levels for 2 years, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1671) to continue price support for agricultural commodities at current levels for 2 years, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The purpose of this bill is to continue price support for agricultural commodities at current levels for 2 years.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948, price support is provided for the 1949 crops of the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity; price support for wool is provided at levels prevailing in 1948; price support is provided throughout 1949 for milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price, and price support is provided throughout 1949 for other "Steagall" commodities at prices between 60 percent of the parity or comparable price and the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948, except that the remainder of the 1948 crop of potatoes required to be supported in 1949 at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price. If no change is made in existing legislation, subsequent production of these commodities would be covered by the provisions of title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which is better known as the Aiken farm bill. Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 (Aiken bill) provides flexible levels of price support varying from 60 to 90 percent of parity. In addition, title II provides for a substantial change in the method of computing parity prices.

It is the purpose of the present bill to extend for two crops, or for two calendar years, the levels of price support which the statutes now require with respect to the 1949 crops, or the 1949 marketings, of these agricultural commodities. In essence, the bill would delay for 2 years operations under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948, thus giving additional time for study of the effects of the revised parity formula and the flexible price-support provisions.

THE COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION—WITHDRAWAL OF COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Last Tuesday I introduced, along with several other Senators, Senate bill 1645, to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands. By inadvertence, the name of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was placed on the bill as a cosponsor. He is not a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent to have his name removed from the bill, and that the RECORD may so show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say to the Senator, while I think I have some knowledge of the Missouri Valley Authority, of which I am a sponsor, I have but very little knowledge of the problem with respect to the Columbia Basin area and the Columbia Valley Authority. I have not even read the bill. For that reason I, of course, consent to the removal of my name from the bill as a cosponsor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator I appreciate his position. I apologize for having put his name on the bill as a cosponsor.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. HENDRICKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3838) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LODGE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RECLAMATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KERR

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on reclamation delivered by Senator KERR before the seventeenth annual convention banquet of the National Reclamation Association, on November 18, 1948, in Oklahoma City, Okla., which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT ARE WE BEING SPENT INTO?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR ROBERTSON—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What Are We Being Spent Into?" written by Senator ROBERTSON and published in the Reader's Digest for May 1949, together with an editorial entitled "One Brave Man," published in the Omaha World-Herald for April 20, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Appropriations Committee, on April 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FINANCING GEORGIA SCHOOLS—LETTER BY WILLIAM F. OGBURN

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of financing Georgia schools, written by William F. Ogburn, and published in the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHIEVEMENT OF HOME DEMONSTRATION AGENTS IN THE SOUTH—ARTICLE BY MISS SALLIE HILL

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with achievement of home demonstration agents in the South, written by Miss Sallie Hill, home department editor of the Progressive Farmer, printed in the March 1949 issue of that publication, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE FROM CHEYENNE (WYO.) EAGLE

[Mr. HUNT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Crane and Bishop Lash Proposed Authority as Invasion of State Rights," published in the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle of April 18, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC SITUATION IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MARSHALL PLAN

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Marshall-Plan Letter," written by Harold G. Stagg, and published on March 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT—ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to state that the hearings on the North Atlantic Pact were set by the committee to begin on April 28. The committee has changed that date, and the hearings will now begin on April 27. My purpose in rising is to give notice that the hearings on the North Atlantic Pact will begin on April 27 in the Caucus Room in the Senate Office Building.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance at the session of the Senate on Monday next.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate until Tuesday next.

Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate today and tomorrow, beginning at 4 p. m. this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on Monday, April 25, 1949.

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on Monday, April 25, 1949.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee hearing the Malmedy matter, be permitted to sit this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in today's Baltimore Sun there appears the

sixth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what they would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals, which are officially estimated to cost $1,250,000,000,000 over a period of 50 years.

This article is entitled "Who Can Qualify for Retirement Pay." I ask unanimous consent for insertion of the article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—WHO CAN QUALIFY FOR RETIREMENT PAY

(This is the sixth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—This series of articles has as its purpose to show what the President's expanded social-security program promises to individuals, and what the program would cost the country now and in the future.

It particularly is concerned to help workers find out just how much benefits they stand to gain for how much in the way of taxes.

It becomes necessary to state, therefore—in the interest of strict accuracy—that millions of people who now think they have social security have no such security at all.

Millions of people—so Members of Congress have learned—apparently believe that because they have made some small payment toward social security they automatically are entitled to retire at the age of 65.

To gain benefits is not so easy as all that.

And many who may have the right to benefits today may lose the right tomorrow.

In social insurance—quite unlike private insurance—a payment, or many payments, does not give a worker a vested right to the contributions he has made.

It is conceivable that you may pay social-security contributions—or taxes, as the law calls them—and yet lose every cent you paid in.

Mere membership in the system is no guarantee of a benefit.

To get a benefit you have to qualify, and a great many things you do, or neglect to do, may prevent you from qualifying.

TO BE ENTITLED TO RETIRE

To become fully insured—that is, to be entitled to retire—a worker must have been in the system a prescribed time and have certain wage credits.

The administration has recommended that it be made much easier to qualify, but for the present the law is—

To be entitled to retire a worker must have wage credits of at least $50 a quarter in one-half of the quarters which have elapsed since January 1, 1937.

But he can lose this protection.

For example: Since the start of the system 49 quarters have now elapsed. A worker with wage credits in 25 quarters (more than half of 49) is fully insured today.

If he does not work any more for the next three quarters—to the end of 52 elapsed quarters—he will need 26 quarters to qualify for retirement.

But he has only 25 quarters with wage credits. He would lose his fully insured status and would have to work again until he accumulated credits in half the elapsed quarters before he could retire.

Such a worker might have, however, what is known as a currently insured status.

If a worker who is in covered employment dies after working roughly one-half of the last 3 years of his life, he is called currently insured.

In that event children under 18 and widows with such children in their care draw monthly benefits.

But a widow without such small children draws nothing.

Once a worker has had 40 quarters of coverage—10 full years—he is called permanently insured.

AVERAGE WAGE CREDIT DECLINES

Then he can quit work for good and not lose his insured status—although the longer he doesn't work before he retires the more his average wage credit declines—and hence the size of his retirement benefit is automatically reduced.

At the end of 1948, according to social-security records, there were about 13,200,000 permanently insured.

At the moment there are about 38,200,000 fully insured—that is, entitled to retire when they reach age 65.

But millions of people who have paid money into social security have no current protection—and little hope of it under the existing law.

Altogether there are more than 87,000,000 people in the country with some amount of wage credits—but more than half of these actually have no protection at all.

Many people pass back and forth between covered employment and uncovered employment.

Millions of these have paid substantial sums but can collect no benefits.

Something over 36,000,000 people have paid in contributions who have never acquired any wage status or benefit status at all.

Many of these were women who worked for a few years during the war.

These have shifted to some line of work not covered by social security and unless they go back to covered employment and stay long enough to qualify, their contributions are lost to them.

That's one reason why the administration says it is anxious to broaden the coverage to take in the self-employed, farm labor, farmers, domestics, and others.

By broadening the coverage to some 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 more persons, millions of wage credits now lost would be recaptured and made the basis for future benefits.

But many people would also be saved by the proposed shorter period for qualifying.

By cutting the qualification period to one covered quarter out of every four quarters which have elapsed since January 1, 1937, a good many of the millions who now just miss qualifying would be covered.

WORKER MAY LOSE PROTECTION

But the way the law stands now, a worker may contribute for years and then lose all.

For example, he might be a $300-a-month worker who was in a covered job continuously for 9 years and 9 months and then suddenly decided to go into some uncovered employment—farming, preaching, self-employment, anything uncovered.

If he stayed out 9¾ years, he would lose his status because he could not show wage credits for more than half of the elapsed quarters since 1937.

On the other hand, a man or woman who is qualified for retirement stands to gain many times the amount paid in as contributions.

At the end of this year, 13 years will have elapsed since old-age insurance started.

Assuming a man or woman, with full coverage, is 65 and entitled to retire at the end of the year:

The maximum amount such a person can have paid in is $390—$30 a year for 13 years.

His employer will have paid in the same amount—making the total payment into the fund $780.

At present rates, that man can retire January 1 at age 65 with $45.20 a month benefits for the rest of his life. That is $540.40 a year.

If he lives to age 85 he will have collected for 20 years a total of $10,848.

That's why they call it social insurance. The difference between what the insured and his employer have paid in and what the insured person draws out is made up by other people's contributions plus whatever interest the contributions have accumulated.

The above example shows one reason why officials insist that the taxes for support of the system must quickly rise—or else, in a not-far-distant day, they will have to tap the Treasury to make up a big deficit.

RETIREMENTS WILL INCREASE

In a few years people will be retiring at an accelerating pace. The percentage of aged in the population is rising rapidly.

Soon the $10,700,000,000 backlog in the trust fund will begin to look small.

But to return to the ways in which a worker can reach retirement age and still get no benefit:

You do not get benefits automatically when you reach 65. You must retire, you must notify the nearest office of social security, and you must file a claim for retirement benefit.

Also—and this is important—you must prove your age.

If a worker who could retire desires to go on working and not retire, he draws no benefit. Old-age insurance is not an annuity system.

Incidentally, if you have been paying on private annuities to come due at age 55, or age 60, with a thought of retiring, living on the annuities for 10 years and then applying for old-age benefits to support you the rest of your life—you may have a sad awakening. Every year you don't work pulls down your average wage credit under the present law—and you might apply for retirement under such a scheme to discover that your benefit would be pitifully small.

There are other ways in which a worker may lose part of his benefits. By working in some covered employment 1 month and earning more than $14.99 he loses his benefit for that month.

SHOULD FILE PROMPTLY

But you can work in an uncovered job all you want—and not lose your benefit after 65. And no matter how big your income from stocks and bonds may be—there is no means test for old-age benefits—you can still draw your retirement benefit.

You could lose part of your benefit by not filing for it promptly. Benefits are payable retroactively for only 3 months prior to month of filing.

If you do not file until the fourth month—you lose 1 month's benefit.

If you are the young widow of a retired worker and have no children, or your children are all over 18, you get no benefit at all until you become 65—no matter how much your husband paid into the fund. The pending bill would lower this waiting period to age 60.

Until now it has been possible for a worker to retire and run a small business of his own without disturbing his benefit.

But the pending bill would change that. It proposes to put the self-employed under social security.

Lastly, a widow drawing a benefit may lose it—by remarrying.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS SERVICE ARTICLES ON GOVERNMENT MEDICAL INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the International News Service has published a series of articles describing the relationship between government and medicine in various parts of the world.

Although only two articles of the entire series represent the viewpoint of those who advocate national health insurance, I am sure that all of the articles will prove of interest to the Members of Congress. I should like to call particular attention to the distinction between the articles describing the program in western European countries and that describing the program in Soviet Russia. Those in western Europe are based upon an insurance system to which the recipient of care contributes and under which that care is furnished by doctors not employed by the state. The system in Soviet Russia is based on free tax-paid care given by doctors employed on salary by the state. The national health insurance program recommended by the President calls for the first type of system—that of western Europe. The Republican health bill recently introduced in opposition to the Democratic national health-insurance measure would provide free tax-paid medical care to 20 percent of the population. It would seem obvious that such a program would quickly lead to a completely sovietized system of medicine in the United States.

In view of the great public interest in this matter, I ask that the International News Service series on Government medical insurance programs be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS SERVICE SERIES ON GOVERNMENT MEDICAL INSURANCE PROGRAM

(By Robert G. Nixon)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—President Truman will soon ask the Congress to approve a system of national health insurance to bring medical, dental, and hospital care to all the Nation's citizens.

The Presidential proposal embraces a plan for prepayment of medical services on a Nation-wide scale through a 3-percent levy on the first $4,800 of all individual annual income.

Under the compulsory insurance program, all persons who work for a living, and their dependents, would be covered.

Needy persons would be covered under premiums paid by public agencies.

In addition, Mr. Truman's program calls for Federal aid to broaden the public health services, for expansion of hospital facilities, for additional medical research and medical education, and to provide compensation to individuals for lost income due to illness.

The President's medical plan will be submitted to the Congress during the present session. In envisages a 10-year plan to improve the Nation's health, based on a recent governmental study made by Federal Security Administrator Oscar E. Ewing.

The President's five-point proposal follows:

1. Federal assistance for the construction of hospitals, health centers, and other medical, health, and rehabilitation facilities, the cost to be shared by States and localities.

2. Expansion of present Federal-State and local public health service, through Federal grants.

3. A broad program of Federal aid to increase medical education and medical research.

4. Prepayment of medical costs to provide care for all—whether poor, or rich, or of moderate income—through a system of compulsory national health insurance based on a 3-percent levy against the first $4,800 of individual incomes annually.

5. Protection of loss of wages from sickness and disability under an expanded Social Security System.

The President has submitted his plan for Nation-wide health insurance to earlier Congresses.

The proposal thus far has not met with much acceptance in the Congress.

The plan, however, was one of the planks in the platform on which he campaigned, and won, last November.

With a Democratic majority in both Senate and House, Mr. Truman now hopes to attain congressional approval.

The plan has been attacked by opponents as socialized medicine.

The President's answer is:

"What I am recommending is not socialized medicine.

"Socialized medicine means that all doctors work as employees of the Government. The American people want no such system. No such system is proposed.

"Under the plan I suggest, our people would continue to get medical and hospital services just as they do now—on the basis of their own voluntary decisions and choices.

"Our doctors and hospitals would continue to deal with disease with the same professional freedom as now.

"There would, however, be this all-important difference; whether or not patients get the services they need would not depend on how much they can afford to pay at the time.

"I am in favor of the broadest possible coverage for this insurance system. I believe that all persons who work for a living and their dependents should be covered under such an insurance plan.

"This would include wage and salary earners, those in business for themselves, professional persons, farmers, agricultural labor, domestic employees, Government employees, and employees of nonprofit institutions and their families.

"In addition, needy persons and other groups should be covered through appropriate premiums paid for them by public agencies."

A rival plan to the President's has been introduced by five Senators who term it a "voluntary health insurance measure."

The Senators are HILL (Democrat), Alabama; O'CONOR (Democrat), Maryland; AIKEN (Republican), Vermont; WITHERS (Democrat), Kentucky; and MORSE (Republican), Oregon.

Under their plan, all persons able to pay subscription charges, particularly those in rural areas, would be encouraged to enroll in voluntary prepayment health insurance programs.

Medical and hospital care would be made available to persons unable to pay the costs, through Government-supported membership in nonprofit prepayment plans.

These persons would be issued service cards entitling them to the same type and quality of services provided regular subscribers.

The State health insurance agency would reimburse the health insurance plan for the full cost of care, plus a reasonable administrative expense. The State could collect partial payment based on ability to pay from persons unable to meet full subscription charges.

When any person in a prepayment plan became unemployed, his health insurance subscription charges would be paid by the State agency for the same period that unemployment compensation is paid.

(By Fred Doerflinger)

LONDON, March 26.—Growing pains, abuses, and criticisms have characterized the first 8 months of Britain's comprehensive national health service.

But its proponents declare that once the difficulties have been overcome it will prove to be a great social advance for Britain.

Although a barrage of complaints continues to fall round the broad Welsh shoulders of Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, few Britons are opposed to the plan in itself.

Criticism is directed at the manner in which the scheme is being operated, the grave underestimate of its cost, the painfully long wait for attention, the serious and overwhelming pressure on doctors, dentists, and hospitals, and numerous specific alleged injustices to patients and practitioners under the plan.

The new so-called free shoe of the national health service has undoubtedly pinched painfully in many places and continues to be uncomfortable. But Britons generally believe that with certain minor repairs and adjustments the shoe eventually will fit fairly well and give satisfaction.

A national health service is not a new idea in Britain.

It was actually begun in a modest way back in 1912 when the late David Lloyd George introduced a national health insurance scheme. Eventually the scheme gave benefits to some 20,000,000 employed persons in the lower income groups.

Gradually a cradle-to-the-grave security plan for everyone evolved, and as part of this idea Winston Churchill's wartime coalition government drew up detailed blueprints for an over-all health plan for the nation.

Prime Minister Attlee's Labor government introduced the present comprehensive all-in health service on July 5, 1948.

From the earliest days, Britain's medical profession consistently argued that it was unwise to inaugurate a complete service in one fell swoop. The doctors have always wanted it to be taken in stages.

Bevan, backed by a Labor majority, resisted this view, and the measure was passed through Parliament, over the protests of the medical profession and some dissident M. P.'s.

Today the nation's doctors, though cooperating nearly 100 percent, point out that experience has proved medical opinion correct.

There are no more doctors, dentists, and nurses available and, more important, no additional hospital beds or hospitalization and dispensing facilities than before the scheme.

The public response to the scheme has been overwhelming. The existing facilities have been unable to cope with such an avalanche.

The new service suddenly offered, immediately, to everyone in the country in exchange for a weekly contribution, a complete medical service, dental benefit with new dentures, ophthalmic benefit with spectacles, free prescriptions, from aspirin to the most expensive compounds, and even free wigs, hearing aids, and corsets. It was hardly remarkable that the British public grabbed with both hands.

Most of the doctors, nearly all the dentists, the great majority of the specialists and practically all of the pharmacists came into the scheme, as did some 95 percent of Britain's 50,000,000 population.

A great increase in demand was expected, but the phenomenal size of that increase had clearly not been anticipated.

So great was the rush for free attention and remedies of all kinds that before long Bevan had to call for restraint and a little common sense. He frankly admitted in typically British official language:

"There is evidence of a tendency to abuse the service."

Doctors, dentists, opticians, druggists, and hospitals put it another way. They said simply: "We are swamped and overworked," and complaints of all kinds poured into the offices of the Ministry of Health throughout the country.

Freed from medical bills Britons everywhere had decided that they were ailing. Some saw rather remarkable openings, and an anxious Minister of Health had to lay down the law and point out that such things as whisky, champagne, and beer were not to be doled out indiscriminately as prescriptions under the Health Service.

National health bills skyrocketed and Bevan was forced to ask the House of Commons for an extra $233,820,000 over and above the original $620,000,000 estimate of the first 9 months' cost of the service.

While the Conservative opposition scathingly criticized, Bevan pointed out that the service was costing more money than anticipated because so many more people than expected were taking advantage of it.

Bevan himself admits that some things are wrong and must be put right. The public itself has to learn how to use the service wisely and properly, he told the House of Commons, and added:

"We must bear in mind the objective—in the midst of all the delays, miscalculations and irritations with which the people operating the service will inevitably have to struggle in the next few years—that we are out to build a healthier Britain and to cut down the waste of vital energy which the gaps in our social and medical services have caused in the past.

"The cost in money and effort will be high. The country must be prepared to face that fact. * * *. We simply cannot afford to have an unhealthy nation."

(By Axel Wennerling)

STOCKHOLM, March 30.—Sweden, which took its first steps toward socialized medicine while the Pilgrims still clustered near Plymouth Rock, has spread a far-reaching network of health programs in which free enterprise and government live side by side.

The Government has preempted a large area of medical services. It is scheduled to veer further from its proclaimed middle way. But the word "voluntary" is still an important one in the vocabulary of Swedish medicine.

Despite its long history, Sweden's national health program still gets its share of biting criticism—as in Britain, the doctors are overworked; patients may have to wait long periods for treatment.

Doctors fear that under pending legislation they will become mere civil servants. There are, on the other hand, demands that the bureaucracy be widened and strengthened.

But the theory and practice of Government participation in the minute detail of the nation's health are generally accepted. Only the matter of degree is argued.

The main bases of Sweden's health organization are its 500 civil-servant doctors—the first such appointed at the end of the seventeenth century—comprehensive public health activity; Government-owned hospitals and clinics, and Government-approved voluntary sickness and accident insurance societies.

The insurance societies, first sponsored by the Government in 1891, now claim an aggregate membership of about 4,700,000, more than half the population. The premiums vary and the Government subsidizes about 55 percent of the societies' outlay. Most of the country's approximately 4,250 doctors take part.

Throughout the rural reaches of Sweden, the 500 provincial, Government-employed doctors are as familiar as the R. F. D. postmen in rural America. They are responsible for practically all rural medical care outside special treatment.

They receive a salary and maintain a low scale of fees for general practice—a routine consultation costs less than a dollar—but they also give free consultations to mothers-to-be, new mothers, and small children, and act as school doctors.

The provincial doctors are backed up by a corps of 1,100 district nurses, employed by county councils and entrusted with considerable responsibility.

In urban areas, the municipalities employ doctors with duties roughly similar to those of the provincial physicians. Results have not been entirely satisfactory, however, and there are plans to set up a system more closely resembling the rural one.

While the private physician has thus far been left comparatively unaffected by the Government, and private practice still predominates, the Government has taken over a major share of hospital work.

The first public hospitals appeared in Sweden in the latter half of the eighteenth century.

At first they treated poor patients free and charged others half or full rates, according to the patient's means. But later the indigents were charged a small fee. A number of private hospitals were founded by endowment or donation through the years, but most of them since have been taken over by the Government or municipalities.

The general rule-of-thumb for public hospitals in Sweden is that councils set up in each of the counties care for the physically ill and for maternity cases, while the National Government takes care of the mentally ill.

The hospital facilities available in the average county include:

1. One central hospital, a large institution which offers a variety of specialized services and types of care.

2. One or more smaller hospitals, with only two or three specialized departments.

3. Several small general hospitals.

The National Government operates a few big hospitals in connection with medical colleges, the largest being Karolinska Sjukhuset at the University of Stockholm.

Swedish hospital practice differs in one important respect from that in the United States. When a private doctor refers a patient to a hospital, the resident hospital physician takes over the care and treatment. The patient returns to his own doctor when he leaves the hospital.

Public hospitals maintain high standards and attract top medical specialists with high pay scales.

All this can be had by a patient for a fraction of the cost in the United States. Full care in a ward comes as low as $1 a day. In an appendectomy, for example, if the patient can leave the hospital in 6 days, his bill would be five or six dollars.

And if the patient is covered by a voluntary insurance plan, even this will be paid.

Public dental clinics have sprung up on a local basis, but the Government recently decided to establish a regular public dental service for the entire country. The clinics, which will operate under the county councils with the help or Government funds, will furnish low-cost dental care to everyone.

The nation's public-health service program looks somewhat like that in the United States—offering preventive-medicine services like immunization—but it also takes a special interest in mothers and children.

An estimated 60 to 70 percent of all expectant mothers now avail themselves of free prenatal care provided by health officers in the rural districts and public clinics with specialists in the cities.

More than 80 percent of new-born babies are registered at the special child-health centers, where they receive periodic examinations. District nurses also visit homes to supervise feeding and help in the early months of infancy.

The Government places such emphasis on care of mothers and children that it will even pay transportation costs for those who live far from a medical station.

All of this adds up, the Swedish Royal Medical Board points out, to an exceptionally high standard of health and medical services.

(By Verner Forchhammer)

COPENHAGEN, April 1.—Denmark has wrapped private medical practice, health-insurance societies, and state-owned hospitals into one big medical package that satisfies just about everybody.

Doctors, usually the core of opposition to Government medicine plans, are doing fine under the present system.

Hospitalization can be had for 1 kroner 20 oere a day—24 cents—and that includes the doctor's fees.

And even that is paid if the patient is a protected member of one of the state-supported health-insurance societies.

Denmark achieved this state of things with a system that includes the following components:

1. State-supported insurance societies. Membership in the societies is compulsory, but the protection varies. If the member's taxable income is above a set figure—in Copenhagen it's $1,600 a year—he pays a nominal fee but gets nothing directly in return.

If his income is below the figure, he pays from $1 to $1.60 a month and gets just about everything, medicalwise, in return—doctors' and dentists' care, free or partly free medicine, eye glasses, and, for a small additional fee, reimbursement for income lost through sickness.

2. Private insurance programs: To protect those above the maximum-income level, private insurance companies have a broad program of sickness insurance—most of them covering two-thirds to three-fourths of a family health bill. Fees are considerably higher than those of the state-supported societies.

3. Government-owned hospitals: Both the state and local communities own hospitals, with the low charges mentioned and provision for completely free treatment of those without means.

4. Free and compulsory treatment for some diseases: A special private (but state-supported) organization cares for all tuberculosis cases, from examination through recuperation in big private sanatoria.

In this same program, vaccinations against various types of disease—like smallpox and diphtheria—are free. The state supplies the vaccine; the doctors volunteer their efforts.

Since a physical examination is necessary before a person is accepted in one of the health-insurance societies, and some are denied membership for health reasons, the public hospitals care for those nonmembers.

Seen from the all-important viewpoint of the doctor, here is the way Denmark's program works:

The doctors' union (one of the most tightly knit in the country) has collective contracts with the health-insurance societies, fixing an annual sum for each society patient on each doctor's panel.

There is a stringent limit to the number of patients per panel, to insure adequate treatment. (This eliminates one of the main complaints against the British system,

that doctors are overworked and patients have to wait in line.)

Hospital doctors are paid by the state or community owning the institution but are free to practice privately outside.

The central unions of the societies in the larger areas like Copenhagen and Jutland also have set up their own optical shops, medical laboratories, and clinics for special treatment.

All of this adds up to the following reaction:

Practically no one in Denmark, including the doctors, wants the system of Government medicine abolished or weakened.

(By O. S. Hintz)

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND, April 2.—Ten years of Government medicine in New Zealand has produced overwhelming public support for the plan. It also has produced some abuses.

In fact, critics of the plan and some of its supporters agree that there's a strong cause-and-effect relationship between the public support and abuses.

Dr. T. R. Ritchie, the Dominion's director general of health, summed it up this way:

"All too frequently one hears the statement that so much tax is being paid that it behooves everyone to get as much in return as possible.

"This attitude undoubtedly accounts for many trivial and unnecessary calls on medical men and for much unnecessary prescribing and wastage of medicine. No social measure can succeed where there is a lack of social conscience."

For health insurance, and for various pension benefits under social security, the Government takes 30 cents of each $4 of income, including company income. In addition, some $64,000,000 is transferred annually from general tax funds to the social-security fund, making the total levy about $168,000,000—12½ percent of earned income.

The cost of the medical plan itself—which does not include all medical services—about $30,000,000 a year, roughly $20 per capita for the country's 1,600,000 population.

Here's how the New Zealand plan works:

Every woman is entitled to free prenatal advice, hospital confinement, and postnatal care in either a public or private-licensed maternity hospital.

The Government pays the doctor and gives the hospital $9 for the day of labor and $2.50 daily for up to 14 additional days. Maternity services cost the Government about $2,200,000 a year.

The general practice of medicine has developed differently, and less satisfactorily.

At first persons were invited to enroll with a doctor of their choice. The doctor would get $3 a year per patient from the Government and would provide all general-practice services free. Only a few medical men accepted this, so the Government set up an alternate system in 1941.

The doctor now can work on the per capita program. He can claim $1.50 from the Government for each consultation; or he can collect directly from the patient, perhaps at a higher rate, and the patient can get $1.50 per visit from the Government.

Dissatisfaction with this program was expressed by a committee made up of six doctors, a senior administrator of the Dominion health department, and a lawyer, T. P. Cleary, chairman. The committee suggested the refunds-to-patients plan be eliminated and doctors get up to $2 per visit from the Government.

Specialists services aren't covered directly by social security.

The patient pays the regular specialist's fee—usually $8.40 for the first visit and $4.20 for each additional one—and collects from the Government at the standard $1.50 per visit.

Even before social security, all large hospitals were state-owned, deriving revenues from $2.50 a day paid by patients, plus Government subsidies. Now all hospital treatment is free. Government subsidies and local property taxes foot the bill.

For the last few years there have been long waiting lists at all the better hospitals, just as there have been queues for doctors. The hospitals haven't been able to handle the increased demand under social security.

The part of the plan that has produced the most numerous charges of abuse is the pharmaceutical phase—introduced in May 1941.

Practically all medicine, drugs, approved medical appliances and materials prescribed by doctors are free to patients. The druggist sends his bill, signed by the doctor, to the social-security fund. The cost adds up to $6,400,000 a year—about $4 per person.

Members of Parliament and distinguished overseas critics protest that New Zealand is being turned into a country of medicine topers.

The Cleary committee has suggested that one way to reduce this abuse is to stipulate that part of the pharmaceutical costs be paid by the patient.

(By Natalia Rene)

Moscow, April 3.—Socialized medicine in the Soviet state is an all-encompassing program that starts with prenatal care and includes such novelties as vacations for mothers.

All regular medical care, except for drugs and medicines, is free. And the drugs and medicines come cheap at the nearest state-owned drug store.

Along with complete free medical care, the Soviet program includes pay for time lost through sickness—and those vacations for mothers.

For 35 days before the expected date of delivery expectant mothers get a paid vacation. They get 42 days more after the child is born. Besides this special allowance, mothers also get their regular 2- to 4-week vacation.

Following is an outline of the Soviet medical program:

Each large city is divided into districts and in each of the districts there are regional ambulances or clinics which provide the broad base of Soviet medicine. Each district also has at least one special clinic for children.

On the regional levels there are "policlinics," with trained physicians in every branch of medicine and equipped to provide physiotherapy and simple surgical help.

Many of the patients who come to the policlinics are ambulatory cases—persons in need of some simple "repair" who can continue their work.

But if a patient is unable to come to the policlinic, the institution will send a doctor to his house.

A trained nurse also is sent if needed, and the best surgical help is available free.

The sickness-insurance program starts with a bulletin the doctor gives the patient. The patient presents it to his work superior and gets paid for the time lost.

But the doctor can't prolong the bulletin longer than 10 days. After that the doctor has to check with a commission of doctors at the clinic.

Expectant mothers are treated at special mother-and-child centers in their district.

Besides the regular free medical treatment, resorts to provide special treatment have been set up in the Crimea, the Caucasus, and in other sections of the country for which fees are charged.

But if the illness is serious and the patient is unable to pay for a reservation, a special resort commission at his clinic has the power to give him a reservation free or the trade-union committee at his place of work may foot all or part of the bill.

(By Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, chairman of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association)

CHICAGO, April 5.—American leaders who accepted in good faith the data submitted in Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing's report to the President, allegedly based on a meeting of the National Health Assembly, and resulting in President Truman's plan for Federal compulsory health insurance, now find they were victims of a cruel political hoax.

Even though the whole world recognizes that American medical care, medical institutions, and medical advances make the United States foremost among nations, the Federal Security Administration and other agencies and leaders in the Federal Government belittle the American medical profession and hold it up to scorn.

One of the most brilliant chapters in world medical history has been the continual progress of American doctors in reducing the death rates from communicable diseases. Medical progress has increased our average life expectancy, during my own lifetime and Mr. Ewing's, from 34 years to 67 years.

Despite the preeminence of American health standards, of American medicine on every front in the fight against disease, President Truman now advocates an alien plan based on the compulsory political program of various foreign countries, notably Britain, Russia, and Germany.

In those nations socialized medicine has failed to improve health standards, and their standards of medical care do not even approach those of the United States. Under the circumstances, it is shocking that Mr. Ewing should consider such a discredited system of political medicine here.

The proposal for Federal compulsory health insurance is not based on the findings and recommendations of the National Health Assembly. The National Health Assembly refused to endorse or in any way sanction a program of compulsory health insurance.

Mr. Ewing, in his report, repeats for his own purposes the completely unqualified claim that "325,000 people die needlessly every year."

His figures include 40,000 deaths from accidents, 115,000 from cancer and heart disease, 120,000 from communicable diseases, 30,000 infants and maternal deaths, and 20,000 from other causes.

How can any system of compulsory health insurance prevent motor-vehicle accidents, falls from ladders, and slips in the bath tub? If Mr. Ewing knows, he should immediately advise the National Safety Council.

Heart disease and cancer are mainly afflictions of old age. Our average life expectancy has been increased by medical progress, year by year, until today it has reached an average of 67 years. It follows reasonably enough that the natural afflictions of old age, including heart disease and cancer, are responsible for more deaths.

The President's plan would not solve any existing problems, but would create vast new ones, including the following:

1. It has been proved in other countries that political control of medicine brings steady deterioration of medical standards, inferior medical care, impairment and eventual abolition of research, and a dangerous decline in the people's health.

2. Doctors would be responsible to bureaucrats, as well as to patients. Under socialized medicine in Germany there was 1 nonmedical employee for every 100 persons insured. This is a ratio which, in America,

would call for some million and a half nonmedical employees on the Government pay roll.

3. Doctors would be overwhelmed with paper work and red tape. The present British experiment is proof of that.

4. Doctors would be swamped with patients who do not need any medical care, as well as with patients who do, and the sacrifice would be on the part of those who really needed care and attention.

5. Government-controlled medicine means the invasion of personal privacy. Intimate health records become a matter of Government record, available to nonmedical employees. In England this situation has resulted in gossip which is bitterly resented by patients and which recently was protested by the British Housewives League.

6. Compulsory health insurance inevitably leads to the panel-practice system, under which each doctor serves a certain list of patients and each patient is enrolled on the list of some Government-approved doctor. Under this system there can be no guaranty that a patient will be able to select the doctor of his own free choice.

7. Compulsory health insurance would be the entering wedge for the ultimate regimentation of all phases of American economy and national life. That has happened in Germany and Russia and the process is well under way in England. The fight against political medicine is not simply a medical fight; it is a fight for all Americans against a foreign ideology that is wholly contrary to American concepts and principles.

If this Old World contagion of compulsory health insurance is allowed to spread to our New World, it will mark the beginning of the end of free institutions in America. We will have taken one of the final, irreparable steps toward state socialism—and it will only be a question of time until the railroads, the steel mills, the power industry, the banks, and the farming industry are nationalized.

While the Social Security Administrator has been talking about compulsory health insurance that would cost unknown billions in taxes, doctors, insurance men, and the American people have been acting.

One of the most remarkable developments in our economic history has been the rapid growth of voluntary medical and hospital insurance during the past 25 years, and especially in the past 5 years.

Fifty-two million people are paying premiums on some 80,000,000 insurance policies. Solving their problems in the free, American way, they are budgeting the costs of illness according to their individual needs and their own judgment of how much they want to pay.

The spectacular growth of voluntary health and hospital insurance proves that the American people like this way of doing things.

It shows that we have right now a popular method of cushioning the economic burden of sickness without resorting to force, compulsion, and regimentation.

(By Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana)

WASHINGTON, April 6.—There is scarcely an individual or a family in this country so well off that it need not fear the costs of unexpected illness.

Millions of otherwise self-supporting and self-respecting Americans know that should illness strike, medical and hospital bills could run into thousands of dollars and their only recourse would be the loan shark or public charity.

Even worse than this, perhaps, is the fact that through fear of the costs of modern medical care, our people do not take advantage of preventive medicine; instead of calling on the doctor early enough for him to keep us well we are forced to put it off until the ailment is serious and its treatment expensive.

To put it briefly, modern American medical care is among the best in the world but most Americans can't afford it.

Yet this need not be. Long ago we Americans discovered that problems which no family could solve independently could easily be solved when we acted together. We can make the best of medical care available to all our people, in a self-respecting way and at a price we can afford. We can do it through national health insurance.

We have done it already for three of the four big worries that used to afflict our families. The fear of what would happen if the breadwinner were injured at work is no longer with us, nor is the abject fear of unemployment or penniless old age.

We got together and passed workmen's compensation laws, unemployment insurance laws, and old-age insurance laws. Each time we were told it couldn't or shouldn't be done. We were told it was un-American, foreign, ruinous. But we weren't frightened by these labels hurled about by selfish, self-seeking individuals. We went ahead and together insured ourselves against three of the great threats to American family life, and in each case, it worked.

Now we can and must remove the fourth threat, the threat of the costs of illness. National health insurance can do the job.

What is national health insurance? A simple plan whereby everyone would contribute a small amount each week, in proportion to his income, into a national health insurance fund. In return he would know that his doctor and hospital bills would be paid from that fund. Instead of being called on for large amounts when ill, we would pay small amounts regularly when well.

How would it work? Under my (the administration) bill, the employed person would pay 1½ percent of his salary—$30 a year if he earned $2,000; $45 a year if he earned $3,000, never more than $54 no matter what his income. His employer would add a similar amount. These payments would cover the worker and his family. The Federal Government would add to this the difference between what our people can afford to pay and what it costs to give them necessary care. The doctors decide the latter. We would then set up a health insurance fund for each local community in the land. The funds would be run and managed by your own local people.

Under our plan, you would go to your own doctor just as you do now. The bill guarantees your freedom to choose and change your doctor. Your doctor would treat you just as he thinks best. The bill guarantees him the right to join or not to join the program. It guarantees him political, economic, and professional freedom.

The main differences would be (1) that the bills would be sent to the insurance fund and not to you, and (2) that the doctor would be free to give you the best care you needed without having to ask whether or not you could afford it.

My bill does not change the practice of medicine, it merely changes the way we pay for it. In place of our present haphazard, unpredictable, and burdensome method, we would substitute the American way of insurance.

THE SITUATION IN CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written on March 14, 1949, by Secretary Acheson to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] relative to a bill introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 14, 1949.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: The following comments on S. 1063 are offered in response to your request as conveyed by Mr. O'Day, clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in his letter of February 28, 1949. It is the Department's view that the bill proposes aid of a magnitude and character unwarranted by present circumstances in China.

Despite the present aid program authorized by the last Congress, together with the very substantial other aid extended by the United States to China since VJ-day, aggregating over $2,000,000,000, the economic and military position of the Chinese Government has deteriorated to the point where the Chinese Communists hold almost all important areas of China from Manchuria to the Yangtze River and have the military capability of expanding their control to the populous areas of the Yangtze Valley and of eventually dominating south China. The national government does not have the military capability of maintaining a foothold in south China against a determined Communist advance. The Chinese Government forces have lost no battles during the past year because of lack of ammunition and equipment, while the Chinese Communists have captured the major portion of military supplies, exclusive of ammunition, furnished the Chinese Government by the United States since VJ-day. There is no evidence that the furnishing of additional military matériel would alter the pattern of current developments in China. There is, however, ample evidence that the Chinese people are weary of hostilities and that there is an overwhelming desire for peace at any price. To furnish solely military matériel and advice would only prolong hostilities and the suffering of the Chinese people and would arouse in them deep resentment against the United States. Yet, to furnish the military means for bringing about a reversal of the present deterioration and for providing some prospect of successful military resistance would require the use of an unpredictably large American armed force in actual combat, a course of action which would represent direct United States involvement in China's fratricidal warfare and would be contrary to our traditional policy toward China and the interests of this country.

In these circumstances, the extension of as much as $1,500,000,000 of credits to the Chinese Government, as proposed by the bill, would embark this Government on an undertaking the eventual cost of which would be unpredictable but of great magnitude, and the outcome of which would almost surely be catastrophic. The field supervision of United States military aid, the pledging of revenue of major Chinese ports in payment of United States aid, United States administration and collection of Chinese customs in such ports, and United States participation in Chinese tax administration, all of which are called for by the bill, would without question be deeply resented by the Chinese people as an extreme infringement of China's sovereignty and would arouse distrust in the minds of the Chinese people with respect to the motives of the United States in extending aid. While the use of up to $500,000,000 in support of the Chinese currency, as proposed in the bill, would undoubtedly ease temporarily the fiscal problem of the Chinese Government, stabilization of the Chinese currency cannot be considered feasible so long as the government's monetary outlays exceed its income by a large margin. After the first $500,000,000 had been expended the United States would find it necessary to continue provision of funds to cover the Chinese Government's budgetary deficit if the

inflationary spiral were not to be resumed. That China could be expected to repay United States financial, economic, and military aid of the magnitude proposed, which the bill indicates should all be on a credit basis, cannot be supported by realistic estimates of China's future ability to service foreign debts even under conditions of peace and economic stability.

The United States has in the past sought to encourage the Chinese Government to initiate those vital measures necessary to provide a basis for economic improvement and political stability. It has recognized that in the absence of a Chinese Government capable of initiating such measures and winning popular support, United States aid of great magnitude would be dissipated and United States attempts to guide the operations of the Chinese Government would be ineffective and probably lead to direct involvment in China's fratricidal warfare. General Marshall reflected these considerations when he stated in February 1948 that an attempt to underwrite the Chinese economy and the Chinese Government's military effort represented a burden on the United States economy and a military responsibility which he could not recommend as a course of action for this Government.

Despite the above observations, it would be undesirable for the United States precipitously to cease aid to areas under the control of the Chinese Government which it continues to recognize. Future developments in China, including the outcome of political negotiations now being undertaken, are uncertain. Consideration is being given, therefore, to a request for congressional action to extend the authority of the China Aid Act of 1948 to permit commitment of unobligated appropriations for a limited period beyond April 2, 1949, the present expiration date of the act. If during such a period, the situation in China clarifies itself sufficiently, further recommendations might be made.

Because of the urgency of the matter this letter has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, to which copies are being sent.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed a press dispatch out of Tokyo today, by the United Press, which reads as follows:

TOKYO.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur is watching developments in China closely and feels the ultimate outcome of renewed fighting there will be of great importance to the United States, the United Press learned today.

Sources close to MacArthur said the supreme commander feels the China problem is one of such magnitude that it merits consideration by American officials in the formulation of a basic global policy. He also feels some American quarters have tended to underrate China's needs and her importance.

MacArthur has come to believe that a break in the frontiers of freedom here could result in a flood that might engulf other areas before it is finally halted.

MacArthur also believes too much emphasis has been placed on Europe, while an equally explosive situation exists in this part of the world.

According to a reliable source, MacArthur holds the following convictions about China:

1. China is of strategic importance to the United States.

2. When properly considered, China can be seen as holding a potential benefit to the United States by contributing to the stability and advancement of a future American standard of life.

3. The United States should not fail to recognize the long and friendly relationship it has enjoyed with China.

Following that I should like to have printed an article entitled "Thunder in the East," by the well-known foreign correspondent William Philip Simms, regarding the present situation in China and the Far East, together with an editorial entitled "We Need Light on China," from the Washington News.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THUNDER IN THE EAST

(By William Philip Simms)

The extreme gravity of the far eastern situation is beginning to percolate through officialdom here.

The first phase of the Red conquest of Asia is now over. Manchuria, the north half of Korea and all China down to the Yangtze are in Communist hands.

The next will be the advance on South China, Indo-China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Siam, Malaya, and Burma. Then the squeeze will be put on India. Somewhere along the line, Iran and the Near East may get another dose of Red pressure.

But the United States State Department is between the devil and the deep sea. Three years ago it allowed some of its leftists to get away with the fairy story that there were no Communists in China. The armies fighting against the central government were only farmers fighting for agrarian reform. The fact that their top leaders had been trained and indoctrinated in Moscow was dismissed as meaningless.

Nor did it seem to make any impression when, in 1945, the Russians turned over vast quantities of Jap munitions to the Chinese Reds.

Two months ago, I quoted the prediction of one of the best-posted Europeans in Washington—just back from China—that the Communist peace move would fail. He said it was merely a stall to gain time to consolidate on the north bank of the Yangtze. When the Communists were ready, he said, peace negotiations would collapse and they would cross the river both east and west of Nanking.

Even then, Washington officially pretended to take the peace negotiations seriously. Now what the European predicted has happened.

It is never easy for a government to admit it has blundered. But the longer Washington neglects to change its do-nothing policy the more difficult the move will be and the more dangerous the situations will have become.

The significance of the Communist push is not altogether lost here. The West's line of defense fronting on Asia runs from the Aleutians through Japan, south Korea, Shanghai, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Indo-China, the British and Dutch Indies, Singapore, Malaya, Siam, and Burma.

A breach anywhere in the line would be serious. Already it is gravely menaced in several places. Indochina is almost hopelessly undermined. Indonesia is undermined. If the Dutch—who wish to set up a self-governing commonwealth there—are prevented from doing so, the Communists will take over. Malaya, Burma, and Siam are all under Communist fire.

Prime Minister Nehru of India says that every mile the Reds advance south of the Yangtze increases his country's peril. India is also threatened from the direction of Afghanistan and Iran, and under the surface Egypt is seething with unrest. This vast area, holding more than half the population of the globe, is affected by events on the Yangtze.

One of Washington's blunders is its failure to recognize the global nature of the Russian front. Europe is the Red front's right, the Far East is its left and India its center. North America is on both flanks.

Former Ambassador Bedell Smith, since his return from Moscow, has recalled Soviet policy to otherwise forgetful minds. Both Lenin and Stalin have preached elasticity. Soviet communism must advance as far and as fast as circumstances will permit, but be ready to halt, or even retreat temporarily, when it finds the going tough.

Diplomats believe, therefore, that there might be a lull on Russia's western front as the battle in the Far East grows more intense. When its objectives out there are reached, or the Atlantic Pact powers go back to sleep, the attack in the west can be resumed.

WE NEED LIGHT ON CHINA

If the Truman administration has nothing to conceal about its part in the Chinese situation, it can prove good faith by agreeing to Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND'S resolution asking for a full-dress congressional review of our China policy.

The United States has a vital interest in a free and independent China. If China goes behind the iron curtain, communism will stand on the borders of India, Burma, and Indochina. Japan will be cut off from the Asiatic mainland. Anything we can do to save this situation should be done.

The State Department's policy has been a dismal failure. It should welcome a congressional review that might point the way out of our present dilemma. A bipartisan foreign policy must be that in fact as well as in name. But, where we have had an open, bipartisan policy for Europe, Asiatic decisions have been made behind closed doors, and carefully concealed from Congress and the people. That is the totalitarian, not the American, way.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND STRATEGIC STOCK PILING ACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are certain committee amendments to the pending bill, which will be considered first.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I correct in understanding that amendments to the committee amendments will be taken up as the committee amendments are considered in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments will be taken up first and disposed of. Amendments to the committee amendments are in order. When they are disposed of, other amendments to the bill will be in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate for consideration, Senate bill 900, is entitled "A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes." A portion of the title has been stricken out by a committee amendment. I am sure that there will be no objection to the amendment of the title.

Hearings were held on the bill, and the committee reported the bill unanimously.

It is very simple, embracing but two general provisions.

The first provision of the bill proposes to change the personnel of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the present law the Board consists of five members, the Secretary of Agriculture being ex officio a member of the Board. The other members are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The present personnel includes two gentlemen who do not live in Washington. One of them resides in California and the other in Tennessee. So, when a Board meeting is called these members must come from their homes and serve on the Board, and then return to their homes, because there is not work enough for a full-time permanent job.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I to understand the Senator to say that two members of the Board do not live in Washington, one residing in California and the other in Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And they have to come here each month for the Board of Directors meeting?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They come whenever any business is to be transacted which requires their presence.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that the two gentlemen to whom the Senator refers, one of whom lives in California and the other in Tennessee, are now drawing $10,333 a year from the Government? The question is, Why are they not on the job all the time? Why is it that they come here only once a month?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I cannot answer that question. I am sure that they are not connected with the Department of Agriculture, except in one particular, namely, that they are members of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is not that a $5,000,000,000 corporation?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Not quite.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Four and three-quarters billions, to be exact.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The capital stock is $100,000,000, and it has a borrowing capacity of $4,750,000,000, making it almost a $5,000,000,000 corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is not the administration of a $5,000,000,000 corporation almost a full-time job for five men?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that is a matter of opinion. It would seem that an organization so gigantic as this one should require the full-time services of the men to whom the Senator has referred, but this is a very peculiar organization. It was created by the Congress for one specific purpose, namely, to support the prices of farm commodities.

So the first part of the bill has to do with a proposed change of the personnel of the Board of Directors. Because the Secretary of Agriculture is the responsible head of that Department, and because he is charged with certain responsibilities, the Congress having authorized and directed him to do certain things, he is the one person upon whom we must depend to do the job as ordered by Congress.

For example, in the bill which was passed last year, on the last day of the first session of the Congress, we find the first two or three lines in the first section reading as follows:

SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed—

And here follows what he is directed to do—

through any instrumentality or agency within or under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, by loans, purchases, or other operations—

To do certain things; and the main thing, of course, is to support prices.

Inasmuch as the Secretary of Agriculture is the one person upon whom the Congress, and the country, for that matter, depend for carrying out the directives of the Congress, it seems to me to be entirely proper that he be given power commensurate with his responsibility in that connection, which is to handle in toto the supervision and management of the Department of Agriculture.

In order to carry out that responsibility in what seems to be a proper way, the committee has made some recommendations for changes. The first change is that the new board is to consist of 6 persons to be appointed by the Secretary. Of course, he himself, being the Secretary, will be ex officio chairman of the board.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is also provided that the board of 6 members shall be appointed by and shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, he will be able to remove them daily, if he sees fit to do so. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I assume that is a proper conclusion. If the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed by the Congress to do certain things, then if he should make a mistake and should find on the board members who refused and failed to go along with his recommendations and directives, of course he should, or he must, see to it that the board was changed, or else the proper carrying out of his responsibilities would be interfered with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Assuming that the Secretary of Agriculture—who, after all, is only a human being—should make a mistake in one of his decisions, and assuming that the Board of Directors would be correct in the position taken by them, does not the Senator think it would be a somewhat unhealthy situation for the Secretary of Agriculture then to be able to dismiss that Board of Directors and install a new Board of Directors?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Of course, Mr. President, this matter involves a question of policy. If the viewpoint of some persons should be enacted into law—in short, the viewpoint that the Board should be independent—then the Board might not be in harmony with the Secretary, in which event his performance of his responsibilities would be interfered with; and in that case if he did not perform the duties imposed upon him by the Congress, he would be sadly lacking in efficiency.

The first section of the bill simply makes clear that the Secretary, whoever he may be, is to be held responsible. Today he is one person; tomorrow the Secretary may be some other person. Today the Secretary is of one political party; tomorrow another political party may have one of its members in this position. So in considering this matter, we must consider it without respect to personnel or without respect to party.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the pending bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be solely responsible for the activities of the Corporation; would he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under the law he is given that responsibility; and of course the Congress will hold him to it. That being true, he should have the power to carry out the directives of the Congress and otherwise to assume and fulfill the responsibilities imposed upon him by the Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the same provision, is it not, as the one under which the agency operated prior to the passage of the last Commodity Credit Corporation Act by the last Congress?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct; and, so far as I know, there has been no complaint about the management of the Corporation prior to the past 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a further question, the one to which I have been leading up, it is this: If the Secretary of Agriculture under the pending bill is to be solely responsible for the financial transactions of the Corporation, if a provision to that effect will constitute a reinstatement of the provision under which the Corporation operated prior to 1948, then does the Senator from Oklahoma mean to say that the Secretary of Agriculture who was in power during the period 1943–1945 is responsible for the $366,000,000 which is unaccountable for in that Corporation? Is that the man whom Congress should hold responsible?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, we have heard much on the floor of the Senate with respect to considerable criticism of the Secretary for the management of the Corporation. At this point, and in answer to those criticisms, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated April 5, 1949, addressed to the

Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, and signed by the Secretary, Charles F. Brannan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this letter gives all the information that is available with respect to the charge which has been made in the public press and upon the floor of the Senate with respect to some alleged shortage or discrepancy in the funds or figures of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object in regard to that request, I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma has an additional copy of the letter which I may see.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I do not have an additional copy; but I shall be glad to have the copy I have just sent to the desk delivered to the Senator from Delaware, so as to let him consider it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1949.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: This refers to the $366,000,000 of receivables on the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1945, discussed in the General Accounting Office audit report on the CCC recently submitted to the Congress and to which attention has been again recently directed by Senator Williams of Delaware.

These wartime operations were the subject of an extensive investigation by a House committee under the leadership of Judge Tarver. The then War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, laid all pertinent facts concerning these transactions before the committee. All questions of fraud or loss to the Government were fully explored and the committee fully satisfied that there was no evidence of either.

The liquidation of accounts to cover the $366,000,000 of receivables has also been the subject of extended discussions and correspondence between the GAO and the CCC. These discussions culminated in a plan proposed by CCC to investigate in detail the transactions representing commercial sales to other than Lend-Lease or other Government agencies. It was determined that it would not be practical for the Corporation to expend the tremendous amount of effort and funds which would have been required to investigate purely Government transactions. These plans were formally presented to the GAO and the CCC received a letter dated April 10, 1947, which is stated in part as follows:

"As requested in your letter, we have reviewed the plan proposed by you with respect to your review of questionable items. It is noted that you propose to make no attempt to investigate transactions recorded in lend-lease receivable accounts prior to September 2, 1945 (VJ-day), and in receivable accounts with other agencies of the United States Government. In view of the very large volume of work and the administrative costs involved in such a review, we concur with the plan proposed by you to the extent that it can be demonstrated that there will be no over-all loss to the United States Government."

The criticism of the auditors stems from the Corporation having failed to furnish a detailed listing by individual debtors of the amounts due as of June 30, 1945, to the extent of $366,000,000 of receivables. These receivables result from transactions in connection with the wartime supply program which in total amounted to approximately $8,000,000,000, of which approximately $6,800,000,000 was represented by lend-lease transactions.

We proceeded on the assumption that concurrence had been received in our plan of operations several years back and have made no further effort to reconcile these accounts. The basic documents are still available for such reconciliation if it is now determined that this should be accomplished. However, we fail to appreciate in what way the public interest would be served in a manner commensurate with the expenditure of effort and funds that would be involved.

On December 26, 1947, the CCC submitted to the GAO a final report on the liquidation of the program as of June 30, 1947, and full detail in support of the balance in the receivable account as of June 30, 1947, was made available to the auditors. The GCP program was liquidated at a net gain to the Corporation.

As you will observe from the attached letter of even date to Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, we are again offering to reconcile these accounts although I say to you frankly that I can think of no public objective or interest to be served by so doing which would remotely warrant the expenditure of such a large sum of money.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the change in the personnel of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation is the first change proposed by this bill.

At the present time, the directors are required to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Under the change proposed in this bill, the Secretary will make the appointments, and the directors thus appointed will serve no doubt at his pleasure and at his will, for the reason that he is the one who is charged with the responsibility, but, of course, he cannot do all the work himself, and must have assistants and associates, who should be of his choosing, because he is the one who, in the final analysis, acts. When the Board acts, he acts; and he should have a Board that will carry out his will.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Oklahoma to say that the Secretary is charged solely with the administration of this act? If that is so, then why is it necessary to have a board of directors?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma Mr. President, carrying out the directives of Congress in respect to 40 classes of agricultural commodities is a gigantic task. It is one which could not properly be performed by one or two persons. In the Department of Agriculture there are thousands of employees who are needed to carry on the work as directed by the Congress.

So, as this corporation furnishes the money with which to support commodity prices, there must be a competent organization, first to get the money from whatever source it can be secured, and then to make it available upon the orders of the Secretary, who, after all, must pass upon every move of his Department. So it is necessary to have efficient and competent men in the various positions, serving in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I believe I understand that part of the Senator's statement; but if the Secretary is directly responsible for the administration of this act, then I fail to see where the Board of Directors have any direct bearing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Of course, Mr. President, the Board of Directors must perform the services and duties as directed by the Secretary. There must be a head of every organization, and the Secretary is the head. He is the one whom Congress directs. Let us take any compilation of laws authorized by the Congress. Here is a publication entitled "Farm Relief and Agricultural Adjustment Act." Turning through the book, on almost every page there will be found some law enacted by the Congress, and invariably the law authorizes and directs the Secretary to do certain things. It does not direct a person under him to do certain things, but he is authorized and directed to do it himself. That being true, he must have facilities for carrying out the directives. The directives are so numerous and involve so many activities that, of course, it requires a large personnel to enable the Secretary to function as the Congress may from time to time direct.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I think I understand what the Senator said, but I still fail to realize why it is necessary to have a board of directors, if the Secretary of Agriculture is duty bound as a responsible agent to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am sure the Senator would not expect the Secretary to do all the work of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. FREAR. No, I do not. But what good is a board of directors, unless they have some responsibility and can give the Secretary advice? The Senator has just stated the Secretary probably needs assistance and advice.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They can give the Secretary advice. When the advice is given the Secretary passes on it and comes to a conclusion. He then issues a directive. I should be very glad to yield at this time to the former Secretary of Agriculture, who is the one person who has developed this organization

and made it what it is today. If I may, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, may I inquire whether it is for the purpose of replying to my question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope it may be.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should be very glad to have the Senator from New Mexico answer the Senator's question, because he is much more competent to do it than anyone else that I know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from New Mexico to answer the question. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Chair. I should like to say that any board of directors selected carefully from the 68,000 to 80,000 employees of the Department of Agriculture cannot help but be useful to the Secretary of Agriculture in administering the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. There was recently published a statement to the effect that no one Secretary of Agriculture could possibly keep in his mind the various ramifications of the Department. Therefore, when the Secretary selects a board of directors from within the organization, he brings in one expert on tobacco, he brings in one expert on the handling of grain, he brings in one transportation expert, he brings in his counsel, he brings in generally persons who are familiar with the handling and storage of cotton. When a problem is presented to the Board, the Secretary has the assistance of those persons, who are career employees today, and who have a background of long experience with the Department in handling such problems. This action is taken upon the suggestions which are before the Board.

If I may cite an experience, we struggled for a long time with a tobacco program, trying to export tobacco to Spain. We had to bring in, very naturally, "Charlie" Gage, who was head of the Tobacco Branch, and who was on the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, one of the wisest and most efficient men I have ever known. His advice was invaluable. No single Secretary of Agriculture could possibly have had the experience in tobacco which that man possesses. But along with him we had to have a transportation expert. Therefore, there sat on the Board persons who were familiar with all types of agricultural commodities.

The provision in the bill merely means that the Secretary can group together in the shortest possible time the men who are familiar with the programs, who have been handling these matters, who are career employees of the Department, who are there year after year, through one administration and the next, and who know how to handle the various programs the Secretary is charged with the responsibility of administering.

I recognize that the responsibility must be lodged in some one man, and therefore whenever the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation has finished with a docket, the docket goes back to the Secretary, and he must again approve it before it becomes effective. That places final responsibility upon him. Perhaps we could cite the case of the Ford Motor Co., which was individually owned. Certainly Henry Ford and his family could have run it as they wished, but they still used a board of directors, in order to have the advice of good business brains. That is done in the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it is very essential that it be done that way.

I may say further that the Board of Directors was not subservient to the Secretary during the time that I was administering programs there. Several times the Board of Directors outvoted me, and I was happy to think that they were vigorous and open in their opposition to something that they thought was wrong, based upon long experience in the Department, which I had not had.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, to whom may I address a question pertaining to this subject, the Senator from Oklahoma or the Senator from New Mexico?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may have a choice.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to yield for the Senator from Delaware to interrogate the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Delaware may interrogate the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Chair. Addressing my question to the Senator from New Mexico, I should like to inquire as to line 18, on page 2, which reads as follows:

> SEC. 9. Directors, Advisory Board: (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors * * * subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary.

How does the Senator interpret that provision?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it means that in the handling of the routine affairs of the Corporation, the implementation of the program shall be in the Board of Directors. But I have said to the Senator that because of the character of the law which places responsibility finally upon the Secretary, he cannot avoid eventually passing upon everything the Board of Directors does.

Mr. FREAR. But does it give power to the Board of Directors to disagree with the Secretary? If so, what would happen?

Mr. ANDERSON. It not only gives the Board power to disagree, but it imposes on them the obligation to express their opinions. I can only cite an example as to what happened. The Board of Directors of the Corporation decided at one time to continue carrying war-risk insurance on sugar being brought from Cuba to the United States. That was in 1946 or 1947. The then Secretary of Agriculture was in the insurance business. I thought it a very poor policy to carry, and I overrode the action of the Board of Directors and decided that we would get along without that insurance, and thereby save $150,000 or $200,000. As members of the Board, they thought the prudent thing to do was to carry insurance, because a bomb or a mine might destroy a cargo of sugar. They thought their responsibility, probably to save criticism, was to make sure the shipments were amply covered. I felt it was unwise to do so. They disagreed. As was to be expected, when the final responsibility is on one person, he must assume the responsibility. If I had been wrong, I would have had to pay for it.

Mr. FREAR. Am I to understand from the statement of the Senator from New Mexico that the Secretary's position now is the same under the proposed legislation as it was when the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. But I may say to the distinguished Senator that if I had had my way about it, the Congress would not have made the change. I think it is necessary to change it back now. I think it is extremely unfortunate, if there is an individual charged with the responsibility, open to criticism if he fails to carry things out, to have it then said to him, "But we will take away your authority to carry out the program."

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from New Mexico to make the statement to my colleague from Delaware that the Advisory Board and the Board of Directors have some power. I should like to have the Senator from Oklahoma or some other Senator point out to me where, in the pending bill, either the Advisory Board or the Board of Directors has any power whatever to carry out a policy, when in so doing it overrides the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture. I wish some Senator would point out to me where, in the bill, there is any such provision.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I can give my viewpoint on the matter. The law provides that the Secretary shall have the responsibility, that his word is the last word; and the law further provides, as I interpret it, that when the Secretary comes to a conclusion, if the Board should be in disagreement, his conclusion is announced as the action of the Board. In other words, he is the Board, and he uses the personnel of the Board to give him advice, exactly as the President uses his Cabinet. The President of the United States cannot do all the work imposed on him by the Congress, so Congress has provided for an elaborate system of assistants in the form of Cabinet members and their bureaus. The President is charged with certain responsibilities, and he has a great number of persons to advise him, so that when he acts he can have the best advice that can be procured. But, after all, he is the one who does the acting, and the act of anyone in his department is the act of the President, because he is responsible as the Chief Executive. I contend that on a smaller scale the Secretary of Agriculture is the chief executive of the Department of Agriculture, and, in the last analysis, his word is the law until overturned by the courts or by the Congress.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two along this line. I observe that in Public Law 806, which is the existing law, the Corporation is to be within the Department of Agriculture, but subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors. The amendment proposes to strike out "direction and control of its Board of Directors" and make it subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. I should like to ask the Senator, first, if there is any other Government corporation of which he knows in which there is a board of directors, but in which the general supervision and direction is vested in one individual who is superior to and has power greater than that of the board of directors?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is my interpretation that the heads of the different boards, in practice, control the boards. That may not be the case in every instance, but in this particular case, under present law, while the Board of Directors, as mentioned in the law, is under the supervision and direction of the Secretary, its members are, no doubt, recommended by the Secretary, in the first instance. So it is presumed that the members will help the Secretary. But when it comes to action, he will make the decision, and the members of the Board will assist in carrying out his decisions, so that the Secretary, under the present law, is, in fact, the Board.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. It struck me as a very curious arrangement under which the Corporation is a board, which board, with all its powers of general direction and control, shall now suddenly change its whole scheme, so that it no longer is a board, but one individual has control over it, thus making it, as I see it, a mere figurehead. Indeed, to adopt the thought of the Senator from Delaware, if the board should decide on a particular course of conduct and the Secretary of Agriculture should decide against it, all he would have to do would be to discharge the board from its official connection with the Government, and out it would go, because, under the terms of the bill, the members are appointed by the Secretary and hold office at his pleasure.

There may be some reason for that; but is there any other Government corporation, of which the Senator knows, in which, with an existing board of directors, there is one superior individual who has power over and above the board of directors of the corporation? I should like to know whether there is any such corporation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not want to interpret the powers, the duties, and the responsibilities of all governmental boards, but from my viewpoint, where boards have the same power as is given to this board, the chairman is, in effect the board. That is about the result, especially in this particular case. I do not care what kind of board is appointed, or who appoints the members, it must do what the Secretary asks it to do, or else his responsibility is interfered with. He is the one to whom Congress has given the directive and authority.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico in order that he may answer the Senator's question.

Mr. DONNELL. I should be very glad to have the Senator from New Mexico answer, but I should like to ask the Senator this question: As I see it, in Public Law 806—the existing law—it is distinctly stated that the management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors, that the Secretary of Agriculture is a member of the Board, and that the remaining members are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Then along comes this bill, and, while it preserves the corporate organization, to my mind it is pure fiction, because under the bill, while there is an ostensible board of directors, the Board has no ultimate power. The direction and control of the Corporation are taken out of its hands and vested in one person. The Board sits there as a mere tool, and if it does not operate in the way in which the Secretary thinks it should, it can be discharged at his pleasure.

The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Recognizing that there is an entire reversal of the process under existing law and under the amendment as proposed by the bill, does the Senator think it is advisable that there should be vested in one person the power over a nominal, fictional Board of Directors with more ostensible power, or would it be better, in so many words, to cast aside this fictional corporate existence and make the Secretary of Agriculture the man who has power, direction, and control in carrying on the activities otherwise to be carried on by the Corporation?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the correct interpretation is not given to the act, then Congress is at fault. The Commodity Credit Corporation has for its purpose the support of prices. The Congress has directed the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices. Suppose the Board should refuse to go along with supporting prices. Then there would be a conflict between the Board and the Secretary, and conflict between the Secretary and the Congress. That is only one power. The second power is to provide facilities for supporting prices. Then there is a third power, to procure agricultural commodities for other agencies. The Commodity Credit Corporation, under the supervision of the Secretary, is the agency which oftentimes buys for the Army, Navy, Air Corps, in times past for UNRRA, and now for ECA. Suppose the Board should say, "We do not agree with this policy." The Secretary is authorized and directed to do it, so he must have the power to do it, or else our theory is wrong.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In a moment. The Board has the power to take care of surpluses. Suppose the Board should say, "We do not agree with Congress or with the Secretary. We refuse to take care of surpluses." It is the theory of the bill, as I understand, and of the whole scheme of the Department of Agriculture, for Congress to make the broad policy, to authorize and direct the Secretary to carry out that policy, and then he must carry it out through such agencies as he may select. In this particular case, because of the vast expense of financial transactions, approximating $5,000,000,000, it was thought proper, and I myself think it is proper, for him to create a Board. He has recommended that the Commodity Credit Corporation be used in carrying out the law.

Another policy which we have directed the Secretary to carry out through this Board is with respect to exports and imports of certain commodities. He has many other duties to perform through the agency of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I contend that the Commodity Credit Corporation is nothing more nor less, in effect, than a group of his selected officers to do the thing which he directs them to do. That is my impression.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I can well understand the philosophy of the Senator, and he may be entirely correct, namely, that the responsibility is on the shoulders of the Secretary. Perhaps he should have these powers. I am not certain about that, but I can see the point of the argument. But the question I wish to address to the Senator is this: Is it desirable to adopt a pure fiction in which a board of directors sits without any power whatsoever, subject to directions from the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to carry out the plan? Would it not be much more frank, honest, exact, and actual if the statute should be so amended that the Secretary of Agriculture, on the one hand, would have the responsibility, and, on the other hand, would have the power, rather than to have some fiction interposed between them, resulting, perhaps, in a separation of responsibility, so that the Secretary of Agriculture, if he deemed it advisable, might say, "I acted on the advice of the board of directors"? On the other hand, the board of directors might say, "We are mere figureheads and we had to do what the Secretary of Agriculture said."

Let me say one thing more as a further portion of the question. I appreciate it is a lengthy question, but I think the Senator sees the point at which I am driving.

I observe in section 9 of the act as it now stands that not only is the Board appointed by the President—not by the Secretary of Agriculture, as is provided in the amendment to the law—but, in addition to that, the power of removal, under the existing law, is vested in the President of the United States, and not in the Secretary of Agriculture.

It seems to me—and I ask the Senator if he does not think so—that the existing law is much more frank and honest to the public, and much more likely to result in better management, even

though there has been mismanagement in the past, than is the fiction of a corporation set-up which ostensibly has powers which it does not have at all? Is it not dishonest, is it not untrue, and is it not fictional to create such an agency as the Commodity Credit Corporation as a pretended corporation, whereas the ultimate power is actually in the hands of one man?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me give my interpretation, then I shall yield, if I may, to the former Secretary of Agriculture, now our distinguished colleague from New Mexico.

I contend that there may be a difference between the present law and the proposed amendment, but there is no difference in the facts. It is my belief that no man has been appointed on this Board except upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not care who makes the appointment, whether the President or the Secretary; the men are selected by the Secretary. Then, if they be appointed by the President, it is only at the recommendation of the Secretary. So in fact a member of the Board is appointed by the Secretary, using the President as an agency to announce his appointment.

Mr. DONNELL. It does not so state in the statute, does it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am giving the Senator my interpretation of the statute.

Mr. DONNELL. The statute says the "remaining members" of the Board, that is, in addition to the Secretary of Agriculture, who of course is appointed by the President, "shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." That is all it says.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me give the Senator my interpretation. If the Secretary recommends that the President appoint A on the Board, and A for some reason may not function properly—he may not develop as the Secretary perhaps hoped he would develop—instead of going along with what the Secretary wants to do, he has an idea of his own, and he wants to go along on his own idea, so he cannot cooperate with the Secretary, and refuses to cooperate with him—the fact that the President has appointed him would only make it necessary for the Secretary to go to the President and say, "Mr. President, Mr. A, whom we thought was all right and would go along with our program, is not doing it. I cannot get along with him. We must get someone to take his place." The President, having made the appointment in the first instance, on the recommendation of the Secretary, I feel certain would find means of replacing the appointee, or the member of the Board, by someone more cooperative. In the last analysis the result is exactly the same.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I can fully appreciate the point the Senator makes, that if the responsibility is on the shoulders of the Secretary he should have the power. I can see that point, and it may be entirely well taken. But the point to which I have called the Senator's attention, and as to which I ask him again, is this: Does not the Senator think that if that is to be the philosophy of the law, namely, that the responsibility being on the shoulders of the Secretary he should have the power, it would be much more frank and honest, and more conducive to good management, if the law were to say that, since the Secretary has the responsibility, he has the power? Give him an advisory board, if that is desired, but do not create this fiction of a corporation, with a series of directors who are nothing more nor less than dummies of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to immediate discharge the moment they do not agree with his position.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I agree with the Senator exactly, and that is the exact thing the bill proposes to do. It proposes to simplify this matter by giving the Secretary the power to name his own board, and so long as they work with him as he thinks they should, they will remain on the board, but any time they refuse to cooperate he has the power, under the bill, to get rid of them. So the bill is doing the exact thing the Senator says should be done.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not seem to have made my point at all clear. My point is that the bill does not accomplish the result to which the Senator refers. It may give the power to the Secretary, and I have no particular quarrel with that, but I say that the bill by the amendment creates this condition, namely, that there is an ostensible corporation, with an ostensible and fictional board of directors, which has some power, ostensibly, but not actually, and the members of which are subject to immediate discharge by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The question I again ask the Senator is, Does he not think it would be more frank, more honest, and more conducive to good business practice to abolish this corporation and to place the power, on the one hand, on the shoulders of the Secretary, and, on the other hand, to repose in him the power of carrying out the policies which the responsibility entails?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico in a moment. It is my contention that the bill if enacted into law will do the exact thing for which the Senator from Missouri is arguing.

I am glad now to yield, if I may, to my colleague, the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Missouri has not read recently the section creating the board of directors, or he would have discovered that three of the five are from the Department of Agriculture, whom he chooses to characterize as dummies. I say to him they are not dummies, but they are representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will pardon me, I am not clear as to whether he is talking about the existing law or the proposed amendment to the law.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am talking about the existing law. If the Senator will read down the page, he will see that Federal Government employees "shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board." At the present time three of the five members of the Board are employees of the Department of Agriculture, and the only thing the pending proposal does is to make all the members of the Board employees of the Department of Agriculture. A majority now are drawn from the Department of Agriculture.

I remind the distinguished Senator that the very thing he has been discussing was the principle under which the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized, and under which it operated for many years. Certainly there has not been protest over the fact that it was so organized.

The very first act creating the Commodity Credit Corporation, on which Members of the Senate and of the House agreed, was that it should be under the full jurisdiction and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. He is charged with the support of prices. If divided responsibility is desired, Congress could set up a separate organization charged with the support of prices.

I should like to call attention to the fact that in the debate last year, about June 18—and I could give the exact page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, one of the finest men who has ever served in the Congress, in my opinion, and one of the greatest authorities on agriculture, the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, went to the well of the House and said that he was opposed to the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation as it was reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency because it did set up a board which he thought was not subject to the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. He said we would have divided authority when we needed unification. So strongly did the then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture press his point that when the bill went to conference there was a compromise on the subject, and three of the members were to be allowed to come from the Department of Agriculture, in order that the Secretary could control the Board. It was done precisely for that purpose, and I do not think it is dishonest to do it that way.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I address a question to the Senator from New Mexico, since he is answering the questions?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not questioning at all the advisability of the man who has the responsibility also having the power. The point to which I have addressed myself—and I have tried to make it clear, and if I have not done so it is my own fault, doubtless—is that here we have a situation in which Senators contend, and perhaps rightfully, that the

responsibility is on the shoulders of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that therefore he should have the power. I am not questioning that. But now we have before us a bill, and instead of saying so in so many words, it yet continues in existence a corporation which, instead of having a board of directors with some power, as it has under the presently existing law, will no longer have any power.

The question to which I have addressed myself and to which I now invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico is: Does he not think that it will be far more frank, far more honest, and far more conducive to good business, to good management, if the statute, instead of creating a figurehead corporation with directors who have no real power, who are subject to immediate discharge by the Secretary of Agriculture, simply states in so may words, "the powers as well as the responsibility are vested in the Secretary of Agriculture," and leave out all this fiction of a corporation which actually does not have any corporate powers, or at any rate the board of directors does not have any powers?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope I can reassure the Senator on that point very shortly. The Commodity Credit Corporation buys tremendous amounts of grain, cotton, and various other commodities. It is a difficult thing to go into court and sue the Secretary of Agriculture and the United States Government. Therefore a corporation is established which can sue and be sued. It is now conducting itself as a business agency with the corporate form so used. I say the United States Congress was very wise in creating it on that basis.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. It is fully within the power of the Congress, is it not, to prescribe a procedure by which the Secretary of Agriculture, without any liability on himself as such, could sue and be sued, as well as the Government itself, instead of exhibiting to the public an ostensible corporation the directors of which have no real power? Would it not be more frank and more honest by statute to say, "We are giving the responsibility to the Secretary, we are giving him the power, and any person who is aggrieved by his action under that power may sue?" Congress has that right, has it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that he well knows I am not a lawyer. He is. He would know whether that can be done, and I would not. But I would say to him—and the same thing can be said in behalf of private management of a business—that we have found out after many long years of experience that there are decided advantages to the corporate form of operation of business, by reason of its ability to have agents scattered all over the country who can represent and handle affairs for the corporation. I can assure the Senator that this corporation, which was in existence in that sort of fashion for more than a dozen years, worked very satisfactorily with that type of power. It was only changed a year ago, and that change has not been good. We are asking to put it back as the Congress had created it previously.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I might make the suggestion that in connection with the formation of our Government we do not find in the Constitution any direct authority for the creation of a Cabinet to assist the President. The Cabinet positions have been created by law. Cabinet officers are assistants to the President. Under the Constitution he is the Chief Executive. Under the Constitution he is Commander in Chief of the Army. But the Congress has set up a comprehensive and extensive group of organizations, an impressive group, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The President depends on the heads of these organizations for advice, but he does not have to take the advice furnished him if he does not see fit to do so. He has the power to countermand or revoke any order made by the head of any department, or to issue new orders.

I hold that situation to be similar to the power conferred by the Congress on the Secretary of Agriculture in respect to supporting prices. He can do so through any agency now existing in his Department, or through any agency created by the Congress for that purpose. In this case the Congress has established the Commodity Credit Corporation to do the thing Congress has said should be done. That is my interpretation of the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to make a correction for the RECORD. The Senator from New Mexico, in answer to a question asked him a few minutes ago, said that under the legislation now being considered no change was made in the set-up of the Directors; that the set-up would be the same.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I made no such statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from New Mexico to say that the Board of Directors are, under the legislation before us, continued exactly as under the present law; that what would be done under the new legislation is the same as what would be done under the present law. There is this distinct difference, however, between the Board of Directors as it now exists and as it would be under the pending bill, if enacted. The Board of Directors now cannot be removed at the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture, whereas under the proposed law they would be figureheads, and they could be removed by the Secretary on 10 minutes' notice.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say I think that is true, but I also say that I am sure the Senator from Delaware recognizes the fact that in the Cabinet there is a close working relationship between the President and the members of his Cabinet. I cannot imagine the situation arising where the Secretary of Agriculture wanted to remove a member from the Board, and the President would not remove him from the Board. The President usually appoints members on the advice and suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Assuming that to be true, and I recognize it to be true, then what is wrong with the existing law? If the bill makes no change in the existing law, why not leave the situation as it is?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me so I may answer the question of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The proposal now made is this: Members of the Department of Agriculture would be available for advice and council to the Secretary in the meetings of the Board, in acting as his counsel. The Board consists of five members, the Secretary, and two other employees of the Department of Agriculture, and two other Directors, one from Tennessee and one from California at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I might say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have no objections to all members being appointed as former employees of the Department of Agriculture, or from whatever place they are appointed. I am glad he has confidence in the President's ability to choose capable men. I hope there is no reflection on the other side of the aisle upon his ability in that respect. I am perfectly willing to put into the hands of the President the power to select the Board of Directors from any source from which he wants to select the members. He can accept the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture. Surely, he is supposed to do so. The Senate confirms the Board of Directors. I have no objection to enlarging it to six, if the only objection the Senator from New Mexico has to my amendment is that the Board of Directors should be composed of six members instead of five. All I insist on is that they be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Once they are confirmed they are subject to removal either through impeachment or by removal by the President himself.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let us assume that this condition should arise; that the Board should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and that thereafter Congress should give a directive to the Secretary to do certain things which he was obliged to do through the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order to carry out the directions given by Congress, and that the Board refused to go along.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That situation could be handled in the same manner in which it is now handled with respect to every other Government corporation I know of, the boards of directors of which are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. For instance, Congress directs the RFC to make loans under certain circumstances. It is inconceivable that the RFC would say, "We will not make the loans directed by the Congress to be made." If the Corporation refused, its members could be impeached. I cannot picture by any stretch of the imagination that the directors of the TVA, or of any one of the other Government corporations, would say, "We are going to strike against the Government. We are not going to carry out the instructions of the Congress." Congress can certainly take care of such a situation if it develops. I have sufficient confidence in the President to believe that he would never appoint a man who would not carry out the instructions of Congress, and I believe Congress would not confirm a man who would not carry out its instructions.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I began to explain the bill, but I am still explaining the first section.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I am still at a loss to know to whom to address my question—whether to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. However, this is the question, and I shall let either Senator give the answer——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor, and the question should properly be addressed to him.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to address this question to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Just now the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] made the statement that it was to the advantage of the Secretary of Agriculture, in fulfilling the obligations and duties imposed upon him by Congress, to have the advice of members of the Department of Agriculture. I should like to ask if the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have the authority to ask any of the 80,000 or more persons employed in the Department of Agriculture for advice and assistance?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The answer must be yes.

Mr. FREAR. Then why not eliminate this board? If we are to give to the Secretary of Agriculture full responsibility and authority, and he can seek advice from any of the 80,000 employees of the Department of Agriculture, why do we say that he must have a board of 3, 5, 7, or any other number of members?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Congress has heretofore passed upon that question. It created the Board in the first instance. Last year it proceeded to change the Board somewhat. The Board was not functioning as well as was hoped. One member being from California, it requires 2 or 3 days to travel across the country. When he is through it requires 2 or 3 days for him to get back home. That is not a very satisfactory organization so far as that member is concerned. For that reason the committee recommends that a change be made.

Mr. FREAR. Does not the Secretary of Agriculture now have the privilege of calling upon any member of his organization? There are three members of the Board from the Department of Agriculture, two besides the Secretary. As I understand the Senator, the Secretary still has the privilege of calling upon any member of the Department of Agriculture for advice and assistance. Certainly he has among his employees many persons in whom he has the greatest confidence, who could give him advice. As the distinguished Senator from New Mexico said a while ago, when he was Secretary of Agriculture there were men in the Department who gave him unlimited counsel, for which he was very thankful and appreciative. I understand that the present Secretary of Agriculture has under him many employees who are well versed in the fields in which he may seek information.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that the Commodity Credit Corporation is a Delaware corporation, and that as a corporation chartered under the laws of his State it had to have a board of directors. We cannot wipe them out.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to comment that I know of no better State in which it could have been incorporated.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has considered this question very thoroughly. It has been considered and discussed on a nonpolitical basis by both Republicans and Democrats.

There was a time when I thought of the possibility of having a board entirely from the outside. However, the more I study the question the more firmly convinced I become that this would be an unwise policy. The Secretary of Agriculture has the responsibility of supporting farm prices. If we believe in the price-support program, eventually we must reach the conclusion that the Secretary of Agriculture must be given full power to carry out the provisions of the law.

The Board of Directors has been referred to as a fictional board. To me that is immaterial. There are valuable advisers in the Department. Many of them come up from the grass roots—from the AAA organizations and other organizations. They have independent minds. They are specialists in certain fields, and they make valuable members of this Board.

One further important question which arises in my mind is this: If a majority of the membership of the Board were from the outside, there might be times when the Secretary of Agriculture could not operate effectively in supporting prices.

An even more dangerous situation might arise. Suppose that next month the Secretary of Agriculture should have orders to buy for ECA 50,000,000 or 100,000,000 bushels of wheat. If the outside Board members were not friendly, and the information leaked to the public or to the grain trade that this large amount of wheat was to be purchased, immediately the price might jump 50 or 75 cents a bushel, and speculators would make millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator from North Dakota referring to any past leaks which have developed under the previous organization?

Mr. YOUNG. I believe there may have been some leaks. People are only human. However, I believe that there are fewer leaks in the Department under the present system than there would be under the system of an outside board.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I should be allowed to get into the discussion. I recognize that there were stories of leaks from the Department of Agriculture. But when the stories were traced down, the leak was definitely pinned on another department. It did not come from the Department of Agriculture. I am always happy to defend those in the Department of Agriculture with whom I was associated. I never saw a more honorable group of people in my life.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from New Mexico tell us from what department the leak came?

Mr. ANDERSON. The finding of the House Committee was that a girl in the Department of Commerce had inadvertently made public the information.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was done about it?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator will have to ask the Department of Commerce. However, I understand that her authority was taken away from her.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from New Mexico pointed out the fact that the leak came from a girl in the Department of Commerce. What reflection would that be upon the prospective Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation? Does the Senator think that a girl in the Department of Commerce would lead the whole Board of Directors astray to a greater extent than would the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at all. However, the question arose with respect to leaks from the Department of Agriculture in connection with grain purchases. I wanted to make it perfectly clear that the leaks did not come from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may I shall run through the bill hurriedly. It contains only six sections.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand the position of the Senator from Oklahoma, he

considers the Commodity Credit Corporation as a bureau, so to speak, of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I differ with the Senator on that point. This is a banking institution. There is no department of the Government that I know of which has its own private bank. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a banking institution. It has the authority to borrow $4,750,000,000 with the guaranty of the Federal Government. It seems to me that the Directors of such an institution should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that the Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation are now appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Directors of the Export-Import Bank are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The same statement applies to the Directors of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Tennessee Valley. Their Directors are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

This is the second largest banking corporation in the Government. The first is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. If I were the Secretary of Agriculture I would want the responsibility divided. I would want the President to appoint the Directors and have them confirmed by the Senate.

It is inconceivable to me that it can be argued that a banking institution such as this can be compared with a mere bureau in one of the departments. It is entirely different. It is chartered by an act of Congress. As the Senator knows, under the so-called Byrd-Butler bill these 48 corporations when first established had congressional control over them. They were chartered after a 10-year effort. They were required to obtain charters and to operate as corporations should be operated. I cannot agree with anyone who says that a banking institution such as this can be compared to a bureau of the Department, and that therefore the head of the Department should have complete control of the banking corporation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at one time I entertained the same viewpoint; but when the matter was presented last year and we went into it rather thoroughly, and when it was presented again this year and we again went into the subject thoroughly, I was forced to change my mind, for this reason: If the Congress should direct the Secretary to support the price of peanuts, cotton, apples, or anything else, and if the Secretary should call upon the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide him with the money to support the price of peanuts or cotton, and the Corporation, being independent, were to say, "We do not think that is a good policy; we cannot go along with you," having the responsibility under the law, what could the Secretary do under such circumstances except go to the country and say, "I have a Board which will not go along with me, although I have the responsibility and a directive from Congress to do certain things. I cannot get the money. The Board will not let me have it."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. What about the Federal Reserve Board? It is subject to the control of Congress. Congress passes laws saying how the Federal Reserve Board shall be operated. I cannot believe that the Directors of this Corporation would deliberately disobey and disregard laws passed by Congress. The same argument could be made with respect to all other Government corporations. They are all in the same category.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This is wholly a matter of policy. I realize that every Member of the Senate is entitled to his viewpoint. But after the hearings we held, and the experience the Department went through, it is now the considered judgment of the Department and of the committee that this is a more efficient way to get the job done than the other way.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question, if he will yield further.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Has there been any difficulty in the operation of this Corporation since it was chartered? Have the Board of Directors refused to obey the direction given by the laws passed by Congress?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Of course, I cannot answer that question. No one would admit that there has been an open break or a breach.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator's argument has been that the Directors, not being under appointment by the Secretary of Agriculture, would not obey the directions given by the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They might not obey.

Mr. BYRD. Has that occurred?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I cannot answer that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would remind the Senator from Virginia that the law under which the Commodity Credit Corporation has operated all these years is precisely the law behind this charter.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator whether in the last year there has been any difficulty.

Mr. ANDERSON. Only last week the Secretary of Agriculture wanted to have a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation to pass upon the support price for pork, but he could not do so because the members of the Board of Directors were out of town.

Mr. BYRD. That does not answer the question. Has the Board of Directors refused to obey the requests of the Secretary of Agriculture in the last year?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think so.

Mr. BYRD. Then that answers the question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. But they could abuse their power.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, here is a Corporation, very much like a bank, with a large borrowing power, and handling very great sums of money. The Senator knows that. Once this Corporation begins operations it cannot be controlled in the way that an appropriation can be controlled by law. I am told that even the accounting of the Commodity Credit Corporation has not been kept up-to-date.

But, be that as it may, if there is a desire to make this Corporation a part of the Department of Agriculture, then it seems to me we should disband the Corporation. However, how the Corporation could be disbanded, and still could be given this borrowing power, I do not know.

This and other Government corporations have been in existence for approximately 15 years. They have not been under the control of Congress until the so-called Byrd-Butler bill was passed.

But the Senator knows that the Department of Agriculture cannot borrow money as a department. A corporation must be formed in order to be given the power to borrow the money, collect the money, and make the loans.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am almost in full accord with what the Senator from Virginia is saying about the fact that this Corporation acts generally in accordance with the dictates of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the matter must be handled in that way. We could tell the Secretary of Agriculture that he must do certain things; but I believe the Senator is entirely wrong when he calls the Corporation a banking corporation. Under the law under which this Corporation operates, when the price of wheat drops below a certain level the Commodity Credit Corporation begins to buy wheat, not of its own volition, but under the orders of the Secretary of Agriculture, who has been directed by Congress to support the price of wheat.

Mr. BYRD. The Corporation buys because it has the authority to borrow money as a banking institution. When the Corporation sells such products, the money goes back into the treasury of the Corporation, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I ask the Senator how in the world he would have the Secretary of Agriculture carry out the price-support programs if he did not have this sort of agency to look to.

Mr. BYRD. I do not say he should not have this sort of agency; but I say the Secretary of Agriculture should not be in sole and complete control of this great banking corporation. Various parts of the United States have representation on the Board of Directors, as

the Senator from New Mexico pointed out a while ago in the case of two directors, I believe.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. What is the objection to having the directors approved or confirmed by the Senate of the United States, inasmuch as they will be handling billions and billions of dollars of the people's money every year, in a revolving fund, as they have been doing. Has there been any abuse of that power? Is the Senator from New Mexico—who knows so much about these matters—aware of any abuse?

Why is this change desired? Why do Senators wish to take away from the Senate the right to confirm these directors?

In the case of this tremendous power, with this great revolving fund, amounting to I do not know how many billion dollars a year—because the money goes in and goes out—why should not the Senate have the right to pass on the directors who control that money?

Mr. ANDERSON. Very little of it is discretionary. When cotton reaches a certain price, the Corporation must step in and buy. That is not a matter of judgment; it is practically a mere mechanical operation.

Mr. BYRD. But what is the objection to having the men who handle this large amount of money confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator, if I may be permited to do so, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield further——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator that I have never objected to having the names submitted to the Senate for confirmation, except, in view of the problems with which the Department has to wrestle, I would rather depend upon career employees in the Department of Agriculture, those long skilled in the operation of these programs, than to try to bring in someone else from the outside.

I wish to say that while I was Secretary of Agriculture, I tried to bring in as head of the Commodity Credit Corporation some outstanding businessman to help in its direction. I approached man after man. I went to two very large New York financial establishments, and they supplied me with a list of public-spirited and outstanding citizens whom they thought might be willing to come to Washington. One by one, I approached those men; but not one of them would undertake the task.

It is a task which requires long experience with agricultural production and long familiarity with agricultural programs. Those men felt they did not want to do the work.

I pointed out at the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that we approached a gentleman in Florida, a Mr. Love, one of the finest bankers and farmers in Florida, and tried to bring him to Washington, to be head of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I told him he could write his own ticket so far as I was concerned, but that we needed him a few days a week, to be head of that Corporation.

He came to Washington and talked with us, but then returned to Florida. He did not feel he could put in his time on that work, after watching one meeting of the Commodity Credit Corporation's Board.

I say to the Senator from Virginia as earnestly as I know how, that it is very difficult to bring in from the outside persons to administer these programs. In my own experience I have found that it is much better to use career employees of the Department to help carry out the directives of the Secretary.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator see any objection to having them confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not quarrel with that; but I think it is easier not to have that done.

Mr. BYRD. Certainly it is not a question of whether it is easier. It is the duty of the Congress to protect the people's money.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say that they operated 14 years under the other program.

Mr. BYRD. They operated 1 year—last year—under the present program, and the Senator is unable to point to a single instance in which the Board abused its power; is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the law passed by the Congress at the last session, and approved July 3, 1948. On page 6, I wish to read from section 202:

> The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation (except as provided in subsection (c)) and other means available to him—

Here is the point—

> is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers, through loans, purchases, payments—

And so forth. That is a directive to the Secretary. He is directed to do this job through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If we could obtain better men to serve on the Commodity Credit Corporation's Board by going into the States and selecting men who have had no experience except in their particular line, but no experience in carrying out the directives or directions of Congress, if we could thus get better men, more experienced men, more efficient men, to handle the Commodity Credit Corporation's business than can be obtained by selecting those who have been trained in the Department, those who know the work of the Department and know the enactments of the Congress and the precedents which have been established, then of course I think the argument would be made out. But I contend that that cannot be done. It is impossible to go out into the States and get men with the necessary experience and with particular qualifications, especially for the salaries we provide, to come here and do this class of work. It would take them years to become familiar with the work. It is my contention that the Secretary, having the responsibility, must fulfill it or fail. He must, then, have men of his own choosing, the best men he can secure. The best men he can secure are no doubt those who have spent years in the Department, who have been educated along particular lines, and brought up to know the things that ought to be done and that are being done by the Department. That is my interpretation of the law.

Mr. BYRD. I think that interpretation is a very good one with respect to ordinary matters. But this is not an ordinary matter. This is a question of a banking institution. Even though the Senator from New Mexico may not have regarded it as such, it is a banking institution, because it has authority to borrow money upon the credit of the United States Government. No department of the Government has such power. Ours is a Government of checks and balances. Checks and balances may at times be cumbersome; but I am proposing in connection with the pending bill that the check should be that the President appoint the directors, and that they be confirmed by the Senate. If the Senator knows of any instance in the past year when that plan has not worked to carry out the intent of Congress I should like him to state it, because I understand from him and from the Senator from New Mexico that while the law has been in force for more than a year there has been no objection to the manner in which the Board has functioned. I am speaking of checks and balances. I am speaking of the duty resting upon the Senate and the Congress to protect these great funds as best we can. It may be it would take a little longer; it may be that it would be desirable to have on the Board men who know thoroughly about these questions, such as the career men, but at least there are two such members on the Board now. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. And, as I understand, two of the members are from the Department of Agriculture. I think, Mr. President, if I were the Secretary of Agriculture, handling billions of dollars every year, as he does, I should want the protection of having the Board of Directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The committee recommends the adoption of subsection (b), section 3, which provides for the creation of an advisory board, to be appointed by the President. The board is to be selected from the personnel of the general public, brought in from the States. The advisory board is created for the special purpose of advising the Secretary with respect to matters upon which he requests advice. If it should be adopted and written into the law, there would be an advisory board at all times available to give the Secretary advice upon any matter on which he might request advice.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Perhaps no other Member of this body has had greater personal experience and closer contact with the Commodity Credit Corporation than has the Senator from Nebraska. I want to speak in a friendly and constructive way with respect to the program which has heretofore been carried out.

I think there has been a failure to get practical, experienced men in handling some of the problems. To illustrate what I mean, I think if there had been properly qualified men on the Board, men of proper experience, they would have avoided the situation which we face at the moment. A little more than 2 weeks from now, the wheat harvest starts in the southern area, particularly Texas. It then moves gradually north through Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and the Northwest. On April 30, just a few days hence, the Commodity Credit Corporation will come into possession of several hundred millions of bushels of grain, particularly wheat, on which they have had a loan, all of it ready to move at once. Had there been experienced men in charge of the program, I think they would have staggered the loans so that they would have taken possession of the wheat that was available on loans in the southern district a month or two in advance of the crop movement, and they would have had an opportunity of moving out of storage in Oklahoma anything that was in storage there. They could have moved grain from storage in Kansas, Nebraska, and from States farther north, as the season advanced. As it is, we are faced with an embargo in the New Orleans market, because of the rush of Commodity Credit wheat for export. It is an illustration which I think very definitely shows the weakness of the system, in having inexperienced men handling great quantities of commodities.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I want to answer the implied question of the Senator. I think it is strictly in point. Yesterday I was looking over the news reports which come to us by means of the ticker in the corridor. The ticker, as I think it is called, automatically prints alleged news items. As a rule, I think the news items are correct. I saw an item, respecting wheat, that I thought might be in point, taken from the news sheets of yesterday, April 21, 1949. The item comes from Hutchinson, Kans., and it reads as follows:

> Experts said today that despite all transportation and storage arrangements, part of the Kansas wheat harvest this year will be "stored" on the open ground. The grain men attended a State-wide conference called by Gov. Frank Carlson. Emmett Wolmer, Smith Center, Production and Marketing Administration official, estimated that 80 percent of the State's storage facilities are filled.

Mr. President, that shows that obviously there is need of storage facilities.

I also have before me a folder, which contains a picture of a vast amount of wheat stored on the ground in Texas. I should like to pass this around, because I imagine some Senators do not believe there is any necessity for additional storage. Yet, here is a picture showing a vast amount of wheat stored on the ground. It shows a truck with a device for either loading or unloading the wheat; I cannot tell which. If Senators wish to see this publication, they will observe a photograph of wheat stored on the ground.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. In connection with what I term mismanagement in the handling of the crop of last year, I may say we are approaching a situation where storage is going to be a little scarce. But it is nothing unusual. The storage, I think, should be constructed by the man who raises the grain. He may need Federal assistance in providing storage on the farm for his own wheat or other grain. That is where I think it should be stored, though, of course, it is necessary to have terminal storage also. But if we have men who are looking after the best interests of the American farmer all the time, why do we permit Canadian rye, to the extent of 15,000,000 bushels, to move into this market just at a moment when we desperately need storage space for our own crop that is coming on?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think the question answers itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to return to the question asked by the senior Senator from Virginia of the junior Senator from New Mexico. I may preface my question with the observation that, as I understand, Senate bill 900, section 3, amends the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, Public Law 806, section 9, relative to appointment of the board of directors. Am I not correct in interpreting the proposed new section to mean that the power to appoint the board of directors will be vested in the Secretary, or that the appointments will be made under his supervision and direction? That is different from the present law, wherein it is provided that they shall be appointed by the President, to be confirmed by the Senate? There is, of course, the question of confirmation. As a further observation, before asking my question, I may say it seems to me that is where the point at issue really lies.

Would it not be just as practical for the Secretary to suggest to the President the names of those he wants as members of the Board of Directors as for the President himself to appoint them? In the final analysis, would it not simply come down to the confirmation by the Senate of the nomination of whoever was appointed a director, and who, no doubt, would be suggested to the President by the Secretary, if this bill shall pass?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It makes no difference; it is simply a means to an end. I contend that it is more effective and efficient for the Secretary to pick the men from his own Department, rather than to bring men in from the outside, train them, designate them to do this work, and then have them go out into the country and carry on the work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary could do that under the new law, just as he is doing under the present law; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. He is doing it under the present law.

Mr. WHERRY. I renew the question which was asked by the Senator from Virginia: Why is it not practicable for the Senate to confirm the nominations of members of the Board, as is done under the present law?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The present law provides for that.

Mr. WHERRY. It will be changed, will it not, if this bill is passed?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. At present when the Secretary wants the Board to meet he must either telephone, telegraph, or send a letter to a gentleman in California, and that gentleman must leave his work and come across the country and serve here in his capacity as a member of the Board. When his duties are completed here, he goes back to his business in California. It is my contention that that cannot result in the best kind of service.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Here is a director of a corporation which handles billions of dollars. I ask the Senator if that director should not be available every hour of the day for his official duties as director of the Corporation, and cannot the ability required for the position be obtained among the career men; just as well as from outside the Government service?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is exactly what this bill would mean if and when it is enacted into law.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why does it not provide that whether the men are appointed by the Secretary or by the President, in the final analysis the Senate shall confirm their nominations? A man living in California ought to be paid a sufficient salary if he is to be a director of the Corporation. I submit to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, for whom I have the highest regard, that if the Senate is to assume its responsibility it should at least confirm the nominations of those directors. Otherwise complete responsibility is placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and we are removing completely the responsibility of the Senate in the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. My answer to the question is that the Secretary is the one to whom we have given the authority and responsibility. He is the one upon whom the administration, whichever party is in power, must depend. He should have men of his own choosing, who are wholly loyal to him, and efficient and competent to do the work. When they have advised him and have done what they should do, he makes the decision, because he has the last word.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to detain the Senator, but I think it is a very vital point. I understood the Senator to say that it is being done under the present law. No doubt the Secretary would suggest appointments to the President, and the President would make the appointments. The Senate would then confirm the nominations.

If this bill should be enacted into law, the Senate will abdicate its responsibility if it does not see to it that directors who

are appointed are confirmed by the Senate. I agree with the Senator that the Secretary should have the right to designate whom he pleases and to suggest appointments to the President, but, inasmuch as we are dealing with a large corporation doing billions of dollars worth of business, does not the Senator feel that the Senate should have the responsibility of confirming nominations in connection with directorships?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In answer to that question, if I could see any good to come from confirmation by the Senate, I certainly would join in the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Nebraska with reference to the Board of Directors appointed by the President, the Advisory Board of five.

Mr. WHERRY. That is an added provision. As I understand, that will be subsection (b) of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield further——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to state what my observation has been in serving as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I was present when the Commodity Credit Corporation articles of incorporation were redrafted, and was also in the conference committee when certain provisions were drafted and concurred in by the conference committee. Last year I was just as insistent as is the Senator today that there should be some outstanding individuals brought in to supplement and to assist the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the responsibilities of this huge corporation. We provided that two members of the Board of five should be chosen from outside the service. That was done. One was appointed from Memphis, Tenn., and the other one from California. The Board would meet approximately once a week for the general transaction of the business of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In order for those two Board members to attend, one would have to fly or come by train from California, and other other from Memphis. There would possibly be 1 day of conference. Then they would return, or wait here until the next Board meeting.

When Congress reconvened in January it was brought to our attention—and I will say that the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], was the one who brought it most conclusively to our attention—that it was rather ridiculous for the Board to meet once a week when an outside member would have to come from Tennessee or from California. So the question was reexamined to determine what the next course of action should be. I think I can accurately quote what I said at one session. I said:

> Gentlemen, it seems to me that if I, or any one of us, were placed under the responsibilities of a corporation as large as is this one, we would like to have the assistance, at least once a month or quarterly, of the best business minds which this Nation has to offer, to have them as members of the Board or as employees within the Department of Agriculture. They might serve as Board members comparable, somewhat, to the members of the board of directors of a bank or of some other corporation. They would sit down once a month with the Secretary of Agriculture and determine the policy and the course of action in connection with what we are to do with surpluses if they should accumulate. We can expect them to accumulate in this postwar era. They should also determine with regard to disposing of the powdered milk and the butterfat which have been acquired, and the citrus crops which we are compelled to acquire.

I thought it was desirable that we should get one of the best bankers, one of the best men trained in the export field, and one of the best men trained in the grain business to serve on this Board. If they could sit down once a month with the Secretary and the administrative staff within the Corporation they might be able to lay down a course of action or a policy which would chart us through the highly complex problems in connection with the surpluses we have and may expect to have in the future.

It was for that reason that we finally conceive the idea of this five-man Board, and concluded that if the five-man Board were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, we certainly would have men with prestige, and certainly have men who would not hesitate in talking back to the Secretary of Agriculture if they differed with the Secretary's general policy in the over-all administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation functions. It was that we had in mind when we finally, as a committee, consented to the specific committee amendments which were drafted into the advisory five-man Board provision. That is the explanation of what took place in the committee.

As I said at the outset, I was probably as instrumental as anyone else in providing for the appointment from the outside of two men to be members of the Commodity Credit Corporation Board, rather than to have them appointed from within the group of career people who have served in the Department for perhaps 5, 10, 15, or 20 years, and have come up from clerical positions to the executive positions they now hold. I will say definitely that while it may not meet with my specific approval, it was the basis we finally agreed upon in committee, and permitted to come out as a committee amendment.

I come back again to the thought I heard the former Secretary of Agriculture, the Senator from New Mexiço [Mr. ANDERSON], state before the committee, that when he took office as Secretary of Agriculture, he recognized the tremendous responsibility of assuming all the obligations and the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and sought advice and assistance from some able businessmen to help him labor through the mass of problems confronting him. Because he made that statement, I thought how wise it would be to provide for the appointment of businessmen, to serve perhaps once a month in relationship to the general over-all functioning of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and provide by law how the Secretary and the President of the United States could appoint such men, with the Senate having the opportunity to examine into their qualifications as a basis of confirmation.

However, that is not stipulated in the bill, and that is why I raised the point to the Senator from Nebraska. I felt that if we provided for the confirmation and approval by the Senate, certainly the men would have prestige and a certain amount of authority to exercise in demanding that the Secretary of Agriculture carry out certain functions. But if we were to put the responsibility of the Commodity Credit Corporation wholly outside the Department of Agriculture, then we might find ourselves placing the entire farm-support program, and all the mechanics of parity, in complete jeopardy by a division of opinion, or an argument existing between the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department, and the Board which would administer the Commodity Credit Corporation, and by that division of opinion and division of responsibility bring about an absolute disagreement over what should be done in the support-price program, so that we might find ourselves jeopardizing the entire farm program to such a point that the economy of this great Nation would suffer very drastically.

We took that all into consideration in the 2 years' debate in which I was privileged to participate as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I finally arrived at the conclusion that perhaps we did not help specifically by insisting on these two outside members, because of the complication of their coming in from a distant point in the Nation to meet once a week in the general administrative functioning of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In the event there were an administrative body within the Corporation, and an over-all policy-making Board of Directors appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, which determined what the policy of the Department of Agriculture should be in the administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation's business activities in supporting prices, and all the mechanics we give them legislatively to support prices, I would feel we were going forward. That is why, as a member of the committee, I finally consented to the language just written in the bill, and I sincerely and honestly feel that we are going forward.

At the outset I personally felt that we should have the members appointed by the President and then confirmed by the Senate. I shall call attention to the reason why some might think that desirable, first, that greater prestige would be conferred on the Board by such action, similar to that conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture, and therefore that we might give to the Board members such strength of mind as actually to enable them to deadlock the action of the Secretary. That was finally the reason why the language was not written into the

amendment to have them appointed and confirmed by action of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota for his statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself completely with the statement just made by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. Unfortunately I have not had the length of experience on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which the Senator from Minnesota has had, but in the sessions of the committee this year, during the consideration of the particular bill now before the Senate, Senate bill 900, I found that the approach of the Senator from Minnesota and the approach which seemed reasonable to me were quite similar.

I have some sympathy with the position taken by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], because in the beginning I found it rather hard to differentiate between the Commodity Credit Corporation and other Government corporations dealing in heavy financial transactions, such, for instance, as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

After having made as full and careful a study of the situation as it was possible for me to make, I came to a conclusion which I think is inescapable, that the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation are completely and entirely different from the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is set up as a financial agency, with only a general framework prescribed by law, not within any of the executive departments of the Government, but independently, to seek out those places in the Nation where, in the judgment of the directors, extension of credit which the RFC is authorized to make can be granted in the interest of the general welfare, and particularly in the interest of the communities and the industries to which credit is extended.

In the case, however, of the Commodity Credit Corporation I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Virginia to the fact that here is an organization which, in the first instance—and I quote again from section 2 of Public Law 802, of the Eightieth Congress, under which the Commodity Credit Corporation now exists—was set up as an instrumentality of the United States "within the Department of Agriculture," because in the very beginning it appears that the Congress in creating this agency regarded it as a necessary and integral part of the Department of Agriculture, necessary to the carrying out of some of its important functions.

I again call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Virginia the fact that, in the case of this organization, the determination of the questions as to whether and when credit shall be extended or purchases shall be made, is imposed by act of Congress, not upon this particular corporation, but upon the Department of Agriculture.

The question as to whether or not the facts prevailing in a particular producing agricultural industry at a given time are such as to require or justify the functioning of the Commodity Credit Corporation is a determination which is placed by the law within the discretion of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to yield in a moment, if I may first complete my statement.

It seems to me, after giving considerable study to this matter, that the point of difference which I have just mentioned, completely differentiates this organization and its functionings from any other of the Government corporations with which the Senator from Florida is familiar—and he has been familiar from time to time with various such agencies, particularly the RFC, and the Agricultural Credit Administration, and its various regional institutions.

Now here we have a corporation set up to serve as a tool within the Department of Agriculture, to serve as a conduit merely and simply between that Department and the Treasury, from which the borrowing is done, under the terms of the act of 1938—I believe the act is that of March 8, 1938—to carry out technical decisions reached by the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff.

The Senator from Florida was concerned, and still is concerned, about one aspect of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have not the slightest doubt of the ability, honesty, and integrity of the present Secretary of Agriculture, or of any citizen who may be named to that high post and confirmed by the Senate—and I call to the attention of the Senator from Virginia the fact that after all the Senate does have the veto power in that connection—and I also have complete confidence in the head men in the various divisions of the Department who are career men, and who, in my experience, have almost without exception proved to be men of the very highest caliber and quality. But the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and perhaps other members of the committee, are disturbed to find that under the law as it now exists, there was not provided, as we saw it, a sufficiently technically trained administrative group, qualified by technical experience in the field of handling finance. We set out to find how we could improve that situation.

I may say to the Senator from Virginia and to all Senators upon the floor that, in the humble opinion of the junior Senator from Florida, the act passed last year, with all the good motive behind it, did not accomplish by any means the desired objective, which was the bringing in from the outside men of independent thought who were well versed in financial affairs to assist in the work of the directorate of this Corporation. To the contrary, such a result is prevented by two things. First the act of the Congress itself, which fixed the maximum salary limit at $10,000. I think all Senators know that any person with the experience which would qualify him to serve as an executive in the largest Corporation we have—authorized to handle $4,750,000,000 in any year, and which has actually handled more than $2,000,000,000 in the last year—would command in private industry more than any such salary as $10,000 a year. That was the first thing that stood in the way, Mr. President.

When the Corporation came to look for men to accept that responsibility they found it impossible to find two men who in a true sense were independent in their attitude. I have no doubt that they are excellent citizens, that they are fine men. One was in the State of Tennessee, I believe, a citizen who had served, and may have been serving at the time—I do not recall—as Chairman of the PMA Committee for that State. In other words, to all intents and purposes he was a member of the staff of the United States Department of Agriculture. I am making no criticism at all of his appointment. He was appointed and confirmed. Undoubtedly he is a fine citizen. But so far as bringing in an independent viewpoint is concerned, so far as bringing in the viewpoint of one versed and trained in high finance is concerned, that result was not accomplished.

Similarly, the other outsider who was brought in to the present Board, occupied a similar position, as the Senator from Florida understands, in the great State of California.

So, instead of bringing in independent judgment and skill in the field of finance, nothing along that line was accomplished. So the committee decided that nothing could be accomplished along that line under the present act, because the position does not pay enough, and it does not appeal to men who have the requisite training to give highly skilled handling to great financial matters such as those the Corporation handles.

There were various suggestions as to how that problem should be dealt with. I shall not go into all of them. Some of us felt that a portion of the Board at least should be paid a considerably higher salary, should be attracted from private financial industry, and should be required to serve on a full-time basis, not simply to attend the meetings, as is being done now in the case of the two outside members, but to give all their time to the handling of the fiscal set-up of this far-flung instrumentality.

But that view had to yield to the majority view, and in working the whole thing out the committee decided to adopt, and did adopt, and recommended, and still, I believe, recommends—I know of no departure from that—to the Senate and to the Congress this set-up under which the responsibility, insofar as the actual choosing of the members of the board is concerned, is placed in the agency and upon the person who actually formulates the policies which must be formulated before the Commodity Credit Corporation can begin to function. But we recommended the setting up of this bipartisan advisory group of entire outsiders, who would have no connection at all with the United States Department of Agriculture—not in any sense

that that is an invidious thing; quite to the contrary—but in order to accomplish the purpose which we had in mind, that is, to have an independent outside skilled viewpoint and perspective which, looking into the operation of this huge organization could furnish valuable and needed advice and administrative skill.

So, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the committee, has reported in his address, the recommendation was that that particular viewpoint could, in the judgment of the committee, be better followed and subserved by the creation of this new advisory board which should be appointed from outstanding citizens, and should not be expected to serve on a full-time basis, but should, as described in the amendment, reflect a broad agricultural and business experience, and should meet not less often than each 90 days—we considered it would be considerably more often than that, particularly in the beginning—to advise and to consult and to suggest a better set-up, and to suggest those things which the committee believed need to be done in order to make a more efficient set-up to replace the one that now functions.

Not that we charge any impropriety or know of any impropriety in connection with the present organization; but I think the committee realized that to leave a loose situation would not only reflect upon the Congress and upon all concerned, but, what was more vital, would harm agriculture if something untoward happened. If some grave scandal or misconduct of some sort should by chance—we think there is only the merest chance—creep into the administration of this great organization, it would be agriculture which would suffer. Therefore the amendment was suggested which has already been discussed by the distinguished chairman.

Before I take my seat, let me say a word in reply to the comment, with which I sympathize, which has been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. In a sense the Corporation is a fictional organization. In a sense it is nothing but the United States Government. It is more fictional than most of the other Government corporations. It is established, by the very first section of the act, as a part of an executive department, the Department of Agriculture. As was stated by the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture [Mr. ANDERSON], it was established to meet a need determined by Congress years ago, for a body which could sue and be sued, which could perform corporate acts, and quickly create effective local agents and agencies. We must have agents in all parts of the country, not only to handle the disbursement and collection of money, but to make adjustments of claims and to handle all conceivable kinds of business.

So the Board of Directors, whether named by the Secretary of Agriculture or whether named by the President—and if named by the President, whether or not they are confirmed by the United States Senate—must perform, as a Board of Directors, certain organizational activities which are required of a director-ate in the administration of any corporation.

I hold in my hand the bylaws of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I was interested to see what a far-flung organization is provided for under those bylaws. Without attempting to comment on them in any detail, I invite attention to the fact that it is necessary to have about 200 field agents in all parts of the United States, with authority to buy effectively for the Commodity Credit Corporation, with authority to make advances in its name and accept securities in its name; with authority to accept the delivery of goods in its name, and to provide for the warehousing of the goods. When claims arise, they must have authority to make adjustments of the claims. That is all provided for in the bylaws. The bylaws also provide for all the other meticulous details of operation—how contracts shall be made, and how the Corporation may function. All those things, of course, must be determined by the Board of Directors.

So I find no fault whatever with the fact that the members of the board of directors are, after all, nothing but servants of the United States Government, career employees of the Department of Agriculture in large part. We know that. I invite attention to the fact that the Congress created this Corporation as a part of the Department of Agriculture, realizing that it differed from any of the other Federal corporations which are required to function in the public interest.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand the position of the Senator from Florida, one reason why he wants to change the law is that we cannot get the proper type of men at $10,000 a year. I am speaking of the two outside directors. Yet he undertakes to employ within the Department men who are not getting more than $10,000. I cannot see the distinction.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator that it was thought that bringing in the five advisory committee members, chosen from outstanding groups in the Nation, men who have the finest knowledge of both agriculture and business matters, would, as nearly as possible without completely changing the organization, meet the situation.

Mr. BYRD. I am speaking of the Board, not the advisers.

Mr. HOLLAND. The advisory board is created to advise the directors.

Mr. BYRD. I am speaking of the change in the Board. The present Board consists of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, is a member of the Board. Then, as I understand, in addition to the Secretary of Agriculture, there are two employees or officials of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not more than two additional.

Mr. BYRD. Not more than two additional. That gives the Secretary of Agriculture and those in the Department the majority of the Board.

Mr. HOLLAND. Exactly.

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides that three out of five shall constitute a quorum to enable the Board to function.

The Senator has been contending that we could not get good men for $10,000 a year to serve as outside directors. The two employees of the Department of Agriculture, aside from the Secretary of Agriculture, cannot receive more than about $10,000, under the law. The classification limit is $10,330. Even the highest paid employee of the Department, unless he is an Under Secretary, cannot possibly receive more than $10,330 a year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to comment, for the benefit of the senior Senator from Virginia, on the question of the Board. From the standpoint of the administrative staff within the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture would appoint members of the Board of Directors who would administer all the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That, of course, is what is first planned for within the Department of Agriculture. I assume he might appoint the head of the PMA, or the Under Secretary, or anyone else. They would be the administrators of the entire function of the Department of Agriculture.

For purposes of illustration, let us use a name. Assume that Mr. Smith is highly qualified in the export field. Possibly he could not be hired as a direct employee of the Department of Agriculture to enable him to qualify to serve as a member of the Board, because his income and responsibilities are far in excess of anything he could hope to get within the Department. Therefore he could not be employed by the Department, but it might be possible to obtain Mr. Smith as a Board member to sit quarterly, or once a month, or whenever a special meeting was called. He could come in and sit with the other Board members, who might be businessmen with qualifications comparable to his own.

If the able Senator from Virginia were not a member of the National Legislature, I should say that he would be one of the best qualified men to serve as a member of that Board. But I am willing to wager that his services could never be obtained as an employee of the Department of Agriculture. Yet it might be possible that he would accept an appointment from the President, and that the Senate would immediately confirm his nomination, and he would become a member of the advisory board, which would meet once a month, or upon call for a special meeting.

The Senator from Virginia might sit down with the Board and say, "My anticipation is that we are going to have many million bushels of apples for which we cannot find a ready market. I believe that the best plan the Department of Agriculture could possibly follow would be to prepare to carry this huge volume of apples under the price-support program." Immediately the Senator from Virginia would set to work to help implement the program of preparing to take care of the surplus apples. Generally speaking, that would be the function of the advisory board.

Mr. BYRD. I do not want the Senator to create the erroneous impression that

apples are under the support plan. They are not, and I hope they will never be under it.

Mr. THYE. All perishable commodities will be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, either under the Aiken Act or under the proposed plan as blueprinted for us on April 7 by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. The proposed plan has not yet been enacted into law.

Mr. THYE. I believe that under the Steagall amendments the Secretary has some discretionary power.

Mr. BYRD. He has never exercised it with respect to apples, and I hope he never will.

Mr. THYE. I hope so, too, because I also have an apple orchard.

Mr. BYRD. In regard to the Board, if I am correct the present law provides that the Board shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The proposed law provides that the Board shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, without confirmation by the Senate.

The Senator speaks of an advisory board. I assume that such a Board would have no power to act. Its only function would be to give advice. That means nothing.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma further yield so that I may supplement what I have already said?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In my first statement I referred to all that took place in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry relative to the amendment of the act. At that time I stated that I probably could be charged with some responsibility for the provision which went into the Commodity Credit Corporation Act relative to the two outside Board members who served on that Board a year ago. I do not know whether the senior Senator from Virginia was in the Chamber at the time I made that statement. If he was not, then I would impose upon other Senators long enough to reiterate what I said at that time. I stated then that upon the reconvening of Congress, at one of the early meetings of the committee, we discussed the functions of this Board. It was then the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the able and honorable Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who made reference to the impossible provision which was in the act, insofar as the two outside Board members are concerned.

Mr. BYRD. Let me argue that point, please.

Mr. THYE. If I may, I should like to complete stating the point, Mr. President. Let me say that I am making reference to a statement made by the able majority leader; and in all fairness to him, I should like to complete stating why he made that statement.

He then said: "There is one man, appointed to the Board, who resides in Memphis, Tenn.; and the other one resides in California. The Board meets every week, and sometimes it is necessary for it to meet more often, if emergency arises. It is utterly out of the question to have the members come from Tennessee or from California merely to hold a conference as a Board."

Senators might immediately say that the directors are paid $10,000-plus a year, and should be in Washington every day.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there are many other Government officials who are in Washington every day, and who receive $10,300 a year. So why should not these directors be here every day?

Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield, I wish to make one point——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as all these matters will have to be gone over when individual amendments are before the Senate, it occurs to me that no good purpose will be served by having me hold the floor very much longer. If I may make one or two brief statements, I shall yield the floor.

I was trying to present a brief explanation of the provisions of the bill, and I think I had concluded discussing the first three sections.

The fourth section of the bill, if and when the bill is enacted into law, will give the Secretary the power to appoint the various officials and clerical assistants of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in regard to section 4?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator, as a businessman, whether he agrees that the provision of section 4 to which he has referred is a sound and proper one. He has stated that section 4 amends section 10 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and that section 4 in substance states that the Secretary shall appoint such officials and employees as may be necessary in conducting the business of the Corporation. Then I call the Senator's attention to this language: "delegate to them"—that is to say, to the officers and employees—"such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine."

I call attention to the fact that nothing is there stated to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture is to remain responsible in any sense with respect to the duties that are delegated. In that connection let me call attention to the fact that among the powers vested in the Corporation is the power to borrow money up to $4,750,000,000.

So I ask the Senator this question: Does he think it is good business and good public policy to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to delegate to some unknown person, some person of whom the Senate may never have heard, and whose appointment the Senate may never have confirmed, and with whose selection or appointment the Senate may have had nothing to do, the power to borrow $4,750,000,000? Does the Senator think that would be a good provision of law?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the present law provides for that, anyway, in substance. It may not do it in the words the distinguished Senator from Missouri has used, but the end result is the same.

If I may continue for a few moments further, then I shall surrender the floor; and then any Senator may bring up any matter which he wishes to discuss.

Section 4 gives the Secretary the power to make the appointments. Under existing law, the Board has that power, but of course the Board is under the Secretary. However, under the law the Board now makes the appointments. This provision of the bill would have the appointments handled more directly, for it provides that the Secretary shall make the appointments. That is actually what is done now, under the present law; but in the bill this change is proposed in order to have the provisions conform with the substance of the present general situation.

Section 5 of the bill would amend section 4 (c) of the act of June 29, 1948, so as to enable the Corporation and persons having claims against the Corporation to plead set-offs and counterclaims which now are barred by the statute of limitations, if, at the time when the plaintiff's cause of action arose, the defendant's cause of action on which the set-off or counterclaim was based had not been barred by the statute of limitations. In other words, the amendment would afford protection to either the Corporation or its claimants in cases in which amounts owing were applied against amounts due.

Section 6 provides for penalties as against any person—or any corporation for that matter—who might see fit to infringe upon the name of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is simply a protection to the good name of this organization, and I sincerely trust that its name always will be good.

Mr. President, I have gone through the bill and have pointed out the major features. I think I omitted saying very much about section 2, which really is the primary reason for the existence of this bill. Section 2 would amend the present charter so as to give the Commodity Credit Corporation's Board the power to acquire real property by lease, purchase, or otherwise—which might mean by condemnation, or by gift—for the purpose of providing storage facilities.

If the Government sees fit to provide storage in warehouses, it must have ground upon which to build such storage facilities; and this amendment is necessary in order to carry out the intent of the law.

So, Mr. President, with those interpretations of the provisions of the bill, as I understand them, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he yields the floor?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Senator's last statement, do I correctly understand him to say that, by this bill it is proposed to give the Corporation the power to purchase or lease or otherwise acquire real property; and did he state that "otherwise" would include the condemnation of existing facilities; in other words, that the Government could condemn existing private facilities, and could put them under Government control?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The language of the bill reads as follows, at that point:

Acquire by lease, purchase, or otherwise real property or any interest therein for the purpose of providing storage—

And so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; but the word "otherwise" is what I am speaking to. I understand from the Senator from Oklahoma that the word "otherwise" means that the bill is proposing to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to condemn and take over, in the name of the Government, any existing storage facilities which now are being operated in private ownership.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the word "otherwise" is all-embracing. It might mean that; it might mean many other things.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that is the Senator's interpretation; is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It could be, and it could be otherwise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But that was the intention; was it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; the intention was to give the Government the power, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to acquire property, by lease or purchase or by receiving it as a gift, or, if necessary, if conditions justified it, by taking it over under the power of condemnation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma what kind of conditions he could picture which would justify the Government's taking over existing private storage facilities, if they already were adequate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under the law, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have the power to make loans. Under this bill, if it becomes law, if the Commodity Credit Corporation made a loan on real property and later found that it had to foreclose on the loan, that would not be taking the property by way of lease or by way of purchase, but it would be taking the property by means which could properly be labeled "otherwise," in my opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I am discussing the word "condemnation," which the Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned. I am talking about a case in which the Government has a loan and must take over the property as security. But as I understand the Senator from Oklahoma, he is asking for certain additional power for the Corporation, namely, that if the Government goes into a certain area and if there are in that area existing storage facilities owned and operated by private business or private enterprises, then the Senator from Oklahoma proposes to give the Government power to condemn that property and take it over and operate it as a Government institution, without any condition that it must be mortgaged or handled in some other manner. Is that the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I would not answer that categorically, but there might be cases where storage could not be made available and could not be used, although it existed. It would either be the duty of the Government to step in and build other storage facilities, or to try to negotiate and to take over existing storage facilities. I cannot portray an exact condition which might satisfy the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Those words were intended to cover any form of acquisition of property, in addition to lease and purchase.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I understand correctly, what is proposed by the bill is to confer upon the Secretary of Agriculture the power, if he desires it, of taking over any and all existing storage facilities throughout the country.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I would not make that admission in any degree. I do not think the Secretary, whoever he may be, and of whatever party he may be, would contemplate for a moment spending a single dollar of Federal money to build competitive storage or storage that is not needed. The only purpose of the law is to secure storage to accommodate farmers. Farmers cannot obtain loans on grain or cotton unless it is properly warehoused. A few moments ago I exhibited a picture showing a great pile of wheat stored on the ground. Farmers cannot pile their wheat on the ground and then go to the Government to ask for a loan on the wheat. They must have the wheat in acceptable storage. The Government has that responsibility. I do not think it will be necessary to provide very extensive additional storage. But in areas where storage is not available, in order that the farmers may get loans on their commodities, the storage must be provided either by themselves or by private parties, or directly by the Government; otherwise the law which gives the farmer the opportunity to obtain loans cannot be effective.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not suggesting that the Secretary of Agriculture has done this in the past. I am not suggesting that he may do it in the future. What I am pointing out is that under the bill which the Senator is advocating it is possible, as I understand, so to interpret the word "otherwise" as to confer upon the Secretary power, if the Secretary of Agriculture at any time desires to exercise it, whereby he can condemn existing storage facilities in any area, in any amount; or, in fact, he may condemn all existing storage facilities. Is there anything in the bill which says he cannot do that?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The pending bill, if enacted, would give the Secretary the power to acquire storage in all practicable ways.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, the power is wide open.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate I am exceedingly concerned and somewhat taken by surprise by the insinuation even that this bill pretends to give the Commodity Credit Corporation power to condemn existing privately owned storage facilities. I am utterly astounded at that assumption. I say to the Senator that it has in no way come into my understanding of the bill, and I cannot let the RECORD stand otherwise, that the Secretary of Agriculture can come into my town or any other town and, merely because he happens to think it will help him somewhat, condemn privately owned and operated storage facilities. That is a new angle of the bill so far as I am concerned. I certainly hope that will be cleared up, because I believe it probably would give one of the most ominous powers for Government to invade existing activities and prerogatives of private business that I have seen suggested. I am very much for the Commodity Credit Corporation and its activities, for giving great latitude to it, and for giving it tremendous responsibilities with respect to surplus storage; but this is certainly a new angle to me.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have given my interpretation of the sections. I am sure my interpretations are not all-embracing, and in some particulars they may be erroneous; they may be too wide and too embracing. But the amendments will be taken up from time to time, and we shall discuss them upon their merits when they are considered by the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Iowa and to the Senator from Oklahoma both that I am not an attorney, but from what advice I have had, the interpretation that could be given to the word "otherwise" would make it all-inclusive unless it is redefined.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there are merely two points to which I want to address myself briefly. The first relates to the point that has just been raised in the colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the committee and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Florida that the provisions of the pending measure do not extend nearly so far as he understood was indicated by the chairman of the committee. I recall clearly that in the discussion of the bill in committee, on several occasions, the committee had its attention directed to the fact that there was one very vital paragraph in the law which created the Commodity Credit Corporation, namely, Public Law 806, of the Eightieth Congress, which would remain in force, and which, as the committee understood, made it imperative that the Commodity Credit Corporation should utilize to the maximum extent possible the privately owned facilities which were available in the various communities.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in thorough agreement with the Senator from Florida on that point. Running all through the hearings I think it was the complete understanding of the committee that while the Commodity Credit Corporation should have great power and authority, even to the extent of constructing facilities in those areas where facilities did not exist, yet I agree with the Senator from Florida that the interpretation or the suggestion went much

further, with special emphasis on the suggestion of condemnation of existing and operating privately owned facilities. I simply could not subscribe to the extension of such power, because it would violate the whole spirit of the act that has been written, which says that, where they can be used, the Corporation shall use existing normal private facilities to the maximum, in keeping with carrying out the business of the Corporation, and shall not, in effect, destroy or cut down existing private facilities in performing its functions, where it can avoid doing so. I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Florida generally in his position.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Iowa. In order to make the position which I have taken quite clear, I should like at this time to read into the RECORD the provisions of a certain paragraph of section 5 of Public Law 806, of the Eightieth Congress, which is the existing law establishing the Commodity Credit Corporation. The particular paragraph that I quote reads as follows:

> In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that I agree with him as to the meaning of the law which was passed. I agree with both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Iowa with reference to what we are intending to do. I was wondering about the word "otherwise," and, frankly, in reply to my question I was surprised to see that it was interpreted so broadly. I was also wondering how far we could go with the word "otherwise" included and interpreted as the chairman of the committee has said. Conceivably, the Secretary of Agriculture could say he would take over all existing storage facilities. I do not think it is the intention of the committee that that be done, and I do not think that is the intention of the Congress. I think we should and shall correct that situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Delaware. It seems to the Senator from Florida that the paragraph quoted from the fundamental law creating the Commodity Credit Corporation, and which will still be in existence when and after the pending amendments shall be adopted, should be interpreted in the manner suggested by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Florida. It is the Corporation's first duty to utilize to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will turn to page 3 of the report accompanying the bill, he will find that at the top of that page the first sentence reads as follows:

> There would remain the general prohibition upon the acquisition of real property, and there would also remain in effect the provision in section 5 that the Corporation should, to the maximum extent practicable, utilize the normal channels of trade and commerce.

Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Florida that it is my understanding that that was the general spirit of the act. The act conveyed upon the Corporation the obligation to take care of surplus storage, to take care of certain supports and price adjustments, and that it should not, unless absolutely necessary in the carrying out of the basic business of the Corporation, invade the field of the normal channels of trade or the normal private storage facilities where they are in existence. I again say that I believe, under this act, that where normal and adequate storage facilities are not in existence, the Corporation has the duty to provide storage facilities, but not to do so on a condemnation basis, and take over operating private facilities. I repeat that, because I think it is very important that the point be made abundantly clear, in order that the basic intention of the act may be clarified, and that the duties and limitations upon the Secretary of Agriculture under the act may be well understood.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Iowa. I think he has clarified the position greatly. I believe there is no question whatever that it is the intention of the bill to do as is stated in the report to which the Senator has called attention, and as was stated a few minutes ago by the Senator from Florida, namely, to afford power to round out a program where necessary, but always that the first duty is to utilize to the maximum extent existing facilities.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have had a large number of letters from firms, companies, and individuals operating cold-storage plants across the Nation, as well as from those operating them within my own State. It is for that reason that I am exceedingly concerned about the entire question. I think the Senator from Iowa stated very clearly what his concern is, and the Senator from Florida has assured us of his convictions.

I should like to address a question to the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Does he understand the provision and the intent of the bill in the same manner as has been stated by the Senator from Florida and by the Senator from Iowa? We cannot leave any doubt in the minds of those who operate cold-storage plants across the Nation that they have anything to fear from an aggressive action on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to the effect that it will construct cold-storage plants which will absolutely ruin the businesses now located throughout the United States, operating and offering cold-storage facilities to those who need that type of storage.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Answering the inquiry, there was no evidence presented to the committee that cold storage of that character was necessary. The only intimation with respect to cold storage was with respect to a certain cave in Kansas. I think the Government has taken over a cave there and has used it and is now using it for the storage of farm commodities. So far as evidence is concerned, there is nothing in the record to show any need for additional cold-storage facilities. So far as I am concerned, it would be perfectly all right to provide that it shall not apply to refrigerated warehouse facilities.

With respect to the word "otherwise," suppose that in some section of the country there are no elevators and that all the farmers can do with their wheat is to take it somewhere and pour it on the ground. I showed a picture of wheat being poured on the ground in Texas. In order to get loans upon wheat, farmers must in some way provide approved warehouse space. If there be none at hand, the Government tries to get private parties to provide warehouse space. Suppose no one will provide it. Then the Government must step in and provide it. It first tries to lease some land next to the railroad tracks, but the owners of the land will not lease it. Then the Government tries to buy the land on which to build some kind of a warehouse for wheat, or corn, or some other commodity. Still, the owners of the land will neither lease nor sell it. How is the Government to provide storage space to take care of the farmers who have wheat upon which they desire to secure loans, except to exercise the power of eminent domain and take the necessary land and provide its own storage facilities?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Iowa for the purpose of his asking a further question of the Senator from Oklahoma, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With respect to the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma, I find myself in no disagreement with the particular illustration which he has given. The point of my remarks was directed at what I understood to be the suggestion that existing and operating privately owned storage facilities would be the subject of condemnation proceedings under this bill, if the Secretary should so desire.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It never occurred to me to make such an admission. I would not now make such an admission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am happy to hear the Senator say that, because I was certain I had misunderstood his suggestion along that line. I thought it was sufficiently important so that we should make the record very clear that we should avoid invading private enterprise as much as is humanly possible in carrying on the business of the Corporation. I did not want the record to stand that there was any intention on the part of the committee, so far as I could understand, to confer power of condemnation on the Secretary of Agriculture over existing and operating private facilities.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I made no such admission, and intended to make no such admission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for that statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I did state that the Government had the power to accept property by devise, gift, or bequest.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree with that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If it could not get it by gift, devise, or bequest, in order to obtain a facility which it must acquire, not being able to get it except by condemnation, the Government should have the power to obtain the property necessary to provide the kind of storage required at a particular point to enable farmers to procure loans on their crops.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say at this time that I fully and completely agree with the statement just made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think that it is now clearly apparent that every Senator who has made comment on the floor of the Senate is correct, that there is in Senate bill 900 power of condemnation, in the event, for instance, a site adjoining a railroad track is needed, or a site adjoining present facilities is needed and cannot be procured otherwise, that it may be procured by condemnation as the basis of construction.

The statement of the Senator from Oklahoma, at least as I understand it, is now completely in accord with my own view, that that power of condemnation may not be utilized except subject to the fundamental duty devolved upon the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the act creating it, to utilize to the maximum extent existing facilities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say that I, too, am in accord with the Senator from Florida in having no disagreement with the interpretation of the Senator from Oklahoma, as I just understood it. However, the interpretation as I understood it prior to this I did have disagreement with, and I was surprised at the statement just made. I am glad to know that either I misunderstood the chairman, or he had no intention of embracing the condemnation of existing facilities under the Secretary of Agriculture. That was the point I was surprised at. I do not think Congress could afford to adopt any such policy.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that, in addition to providing that no injury should be done to existing storage facilities, we went a step further? We proposed that any future storage should be provided by private enterprise, cooperatives, and so on, and that every assistance should be given them to establish that type of facility.

Mr, HOLLAND. That was certainly covered in the hearings. I do not know whether it is provided for in the bill as drafted, but that was certainly implicit to the whole understanding.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to point out that in the desire to make sure that there would not be an invasion of the private field, I have prepared to offer an amendment similar to the amendment prepared and offered in the House of Representatives, which would provide that the power to acquire by lease or otherwise should not be utilized unless there was a finding that existing facilities were not adequate. Certainly that would indicate that we intended in every way to make sure that, first, there was an examination of existing facilities. I understand the Senator from Delaware, perhaps joined by one of the Senators from Massachusetts, has offered the identical wording carried in the bill as it passed the House. I merely mention that to show that there was general agreement among us that instead of trying to invade this field, we intended to protect existing facilities.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have examined carefully the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, and I believe it tends to clarify the understanding, and make completely clear the authority of the Corporation, and yet that it is not intended to put the Government into the business of competing with private enterprise as a deliberate purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. One more point, and I shall relinquish the floor. The senior Senator from Virginia in his remarks some minutes ago mentioned the wisdom of the present act, which failed, as has been stated on the floor of the Senate, because of the fact that it had not been found possible to accomplish the objective which Congress had last year in passing the present act, that is, the objective of bringing in independent, experienced, highly trained and highly qualified personnel, whose ability would be merged with that already available, to bring about a finer performance of the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is the position of the junior Senator from Florida, as stated already in the preceding argument, that the act of last year has failed to bring in talent of the kind which was desired at the time the act was passed. The Senator from Florida mentioned the fact that the two exceedingly fine gentlemen who were brought in were simply part of the personnel of the United States Department of Agriculture, chairmen of State committees, one in Tennessee and one in California, and that it was not at all possible, with the $10,000 maximum salary limit, to provide personnel of the type that was sought.

The reason why that set-up in the committee report is being replaced, and the set-up recommended is being substituted for it, is that the committee felt that it would be much more possible to get talent of the kind which we desired so greatly under the advisory-committee amendment than has proved possible under the existing law. Not only would it be possible to get outstandingly qualified persons, but the set-up of the advisory committee provides for five such persons, which gives broader distribution, both geographically and by way of agricultural interests, and by way of general financial expertness and experience.

While the committee was not at all prepared to say that this was the ultimate, last word of wisdom and experience in this matter, I think every member of the committee felt that this set-up as proposed in the amendment now being considered, Senate bill 900, would bring about vastly better results from the standpoint just mentioned than does the present law.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it was felt that the change of the law as suggested would allow the Secretary himself to bring in a larger number of his own trained technical people to advise him directly in the Board of Directors than is possible under the present law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems that this discussion is developing on a little different angle. The only difference between the law we passed last year and the law which existed prior thereto, or the measure we are considering today, is that last year we provided that the President should appoint the Board of Directors and that they should be confirmed by the Senate. Prior to that the Secretary appointed them, as he will under the pending proposal.

The criticism seems to be aimed at the existing law, based upon the fact that two men have been appointed who are incompetent. That is a reflection, in my interpretation, upon the President of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In a moment. I feel that the President is just as competent to appoint these five men as anyone else, and can make the selections as well. There is nothing in the law which provided that he had to pick a man from California. He could have picked a man from the East, he could have picked a man who lived closer to this city if he so desired. There was nothing in the law which provided where an appointee should live. I feel that the President is fully as competent as is the Secretary to

appoint five men who are capable of administering the Corporation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, the suggestion of incompetence, which was brought into the discussion by the distinguished Senator from Delaware, has now first appeared in the debate. Certainly there was no thought in the mind of any member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so far as is known to the Senator from Florida, that either of the two gentlemen who had been brought in as outside members were incompetent. Quite the contrary. But it was the decision of the committee, at least as the Senator from Florida understood it, that these two members who had been brought in and who have rendered service, did not bring in either the independence of thought or the broad financial experience which had been desired, and it was, I think, the unanimous judgment of the committee that such individuals could not be brought in under the provisions of the present law. Whereas it was thought possible to bring in such individuals in larger numbers, five of them, under this advisory committee set-up which was recommended. I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator that the members of this five-man advisory committee would be chosen and selected by the President of the United States.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when the word "incompetent" was brought into the discussion I was compelled immediately to ask that I be recognized, because I do not believe that at any time any committee member ever recognized or ever heard a reference to inability or disqualification of those gentlemen. There was no mention made in committee of any such thing. The only question that was ever raised came up by reason of the fact that the function of the supervising board of the Commodity Credit Corporation is such that the members must oftentimes meet daily. There are times when it is absolutely necessary that the Board meet for several days at a time. If I am incorrect in that statement I know the junior Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, can definitely correct me.

Knowing that the members of the Board, in order to function properly, often had to meet for several days at a time, or several times a week, the question then arose not only in my mind but in the minds of all the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to how we could develop a plan of mechanics under which the Board can function in a supplementary and supervisory capacity to assist the Secretary of Agriculture and his administrative Board within the Department of Agriculture. The question came up as to how we could give to the Secretary and his administrative Board, who are responsible for the many operations in the Department of Agriculture, the benefit of the experience and knowledge of highly qualified men from various fields of business and enterprise, whether those fields be agricultural or agricultural processing or industrial or business management. We felt that if such men could be found, and appointed, they could be of great help in advising the Secretary. It would relieve the Board from meeting weekly, or every time there was a need for the performance of a duty such as the Board is compelled to perform.

There was a difficulty with respect to the two outside members, who have been spoken of, if they were obliged to meet every time a decision had to be made, or to perform the administrative functions required by the Commodity Credit Corporation's daily routine operations. It was for that reason that we recognized we had better examine the question again as we had examined it last year, and if we found some other means of establishing the mechanics of a board of supervisors to assist the Secretary in the administrative duties, we should try to do so. So we conceived the thought that a board composed of men from outside the Department could be appointed. That would result in bringing in men who could not ordinarily be employed as regular routine employees of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota and to the Senator from Florida, that, so far as I am personally concerned, I am not suggesting that these men are incompetent. I have already stated to both Senators publicly that I think the Board is functioning well under its present set-up. What I am asking is that the law stand as it is. Let the President send a list of names to the Senate, and I am ready to vote for confirmation of the men he names. I think such men can do a better job with authority to back up their decisions than can men who are simply figureheads, who are called in to advise.

Picture the type of men who will be drawn from private industry to act in an advisory capacity with this great Corporation, who will sit once a month to do so. Sooner or later their decisions will be overriden. Men of such caliber will not stand for that. They will go back home. I say if an outside board is going to be brought in, or, for that matter, an inside board, let us give them the power to back up their decisions. They may meet once a week or once a month and formulate policy. If there is something wrong in the Corporation give them the power to clean it up. If confidence is not felt in the Board, then let a new board be appointed in which there is confidence. The President can appoint five men to the board. He can select them from whatever fields he pleases. There is nothing in the law which provides from what political party he must select them. Let the President select them, and I will vote for the confirmation of any capable men he selects. I have voted only once or twice against appointments made by him.

Mr. President, I have nothing against the men involved. I am waiting for the privilege of voting for men whom the President appoints. But let us give them power to back up their decisions. Do not ask men to come in from the outside to act as mere figureheads.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in conclusion I simply wish to say that it was the judgment of the committee that the present set-up was not an efficient one. When either the Secretary of Agriculture himself was away, or one of his new key men who comprise the other two members of the Board that are chosen from his own personnel, it is impossible for him to have a quick meeting of the Board. To the contrary, he has to bring someone in from California or Tennessee, regardless of the difficulty of the situation or its urgency, before he can have a meeting.

It was the further feeling of the committee that to have five highly qualified gentlemen chosen to serve as advisers would bring much more fully into play the outside skill, experience, advice, and assistance which the committee felt the Congress had in mind in passing the amendments last year.

The committee also felt that men of that type should be brought forward. They felt there was a loose handling that should not be approved. They would be much more apt to make it their duty to report to the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture would, of course, always be available to the Congress, if the Congress wished to contact him. It would give a greater assurance of efficiency of operation by this great Corporation, which handles so much money, but which above everything is such a vital link in the giving of immediate service to agriculture in the Nation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to have the Senator refer, if he will, to the provision in the bill for an amendment of section 10, relating to the personnel of the Corporation. I should like to ask him the reason for this particular amendment. Section 10 of the existing law provides as follows:

> Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor.

The Senator will observe that the Board defines the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff of executive officers, and it is to those officers, and no one else, that the Board is authorized to delegate any of the powers vested in the Corporation.

I want to ask the Senator why it is that section 10 of the bill, while recognizing that there will still be officers and employees, provides that—

> The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation,

define their authority and duties, delegate to them—

That is, I take it, to any officers or employees—

such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor.

My question is this: Here we have a corporation with extremely important powers, one of them being the power to borrow money to the extent of $4,750,000,000. The existing law recognizes that the Board cannot delegate any such power as that to any one except an officer—indeed, an executive officer, as provided in section 10. Yet the proposed amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to bypass entirely his Board of Directors, and not merely to delegate to officers the power to borrow $4,750,000,000, but to delegate to any employees whom he may select such of these powers as he may determine, including the one to which I have referred. What is the reason for the change, and why was it regarded as important so vastly to enlarge the power of the Secretary of Agriculture as to enable him not merely to vest these powers in the officers, but in any employees whom he might select?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer to the excellent question of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I can simply state my own view and understanding.

It is my understanding that the change suggested in section 10, to which the question of the distinguished Senator refers, is a necessary change in view of the amendments accomplished in section 1, under which the words of the old act "direction and control of its Board of Directors" are changed to the words "supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture (herein referred to as the 'Secretary')".

It is my understanding that if the first amendment which I have just read were made, and if section 10 as it appears in the present law were left undisturbed, we would have an entirely inconsistent situation, in which mere words in the first section would provide that the Secretary should have full supervision and direction of the affairs of the Corporation, but in which, in section 10, the Directors would still be left the vital business of selecting and designating the officers and giving and limiting their powers. So my answer is that the matter brought up by the questions of the Senator is simply a part of the change in the present law begun in section 1 of Senate bill 900, and that without its accomplishment section 1 would be completely inconsistent with the provisions of section 10 of the present law.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that I appreciate his answer, but I do not think I have made my question clear, because I do not think the answer in any sense answers my inquiry.

In my question I am not referring to any change in the ultimate authority as between the board of directors and the Secretary of Agriculture. What I am addressing myself to is this: In section 10 of the existing law the persons to whom these powers of the Corporation may be delegated are no one other than executive officers. That is what section 10 of the present law provides. But in the amendment, on page 4, lines 11 and following, and particularly lines 14 and 15, the delegation of these very important powers of the Corporation, including that of borrowing nearly $5,000,000,000, is not restricted to a delegation of officers of any kind. It may go as well to any employee whom the Secretary of Agriculture may select, whether he be an officer or not.

There may be some reason for this, but my question is, Why is it that the amendment permits him to delegate the power of the Corporation to someone other than an officer of the Corporation? Yet the very same section, section 10, recognizes that there will still be officers, because it says:

The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation.

Do I make my question clear?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think so. My answer is the same as heretofore, except that I shall elaborate it.

I hold in my hand the bylaws of the present Corporation. A large part of those bylaws have to do with a heading called "The executive staff." Under that section, which I shall be glad to hand to the Senator if he cares to have it, he will note that the directors in that instance—and that is proper under existing law—name the various officers. Since the Senator has the list, I shall not attempt to give them except from memory—the Comptroller, the Treasurer, the Secretary, and various other fiscal and administrative officers. It then proceeds to fix their powers and duties.

It is the understanding of the junior Senator from Florida that section 10 simply accomplishes the transfer of the power to make that class of appointments—that is, the executive staff, the officers, and employees—from the Board of Directors, where it reposes under present law, to the Secretary of Agriculture, who under the proposed law would be given, in section 1, much broader powers, namely, powers which are described as "supervision and direction," which greatly transcend the former powers which he held.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding, first, that the bill creates in the Secretary of Agriculture the supervision and direction of the Corporation, over and above the Board of Directors, so that section 2, at the conclusion, will say that this Corporation "shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture"?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. That is point No. 1.

In the second place, the Board of Directors, so-called—and I assume that the Senator from Florida will agree with me that the Board has very little power of direction under this amendment. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree.

Mr. DONNELL. So the Board of Directors is itself subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary.

In the third place, the Secretary not only has supervision to direct the Board of Directors as to what it shall do, but can delegate not only all his powers, but the powers of the Corporation itself, under the terms of section 10—"such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine"—to any employee, whether an officer, or whatever the employment of the individual may be. Am I correct in my understanding of the bill in the respects indicated?

Mr. HOLLAND. The understanding stated by the Senator is almost precisely the understanding of the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question; and I begin by stating that I can appreciate the point made today by the former Secretary of Agriculture, our distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I can appreciate the point that it may be necessary to have a corporate entity in order to sue and be sued and carry on various transactions. However, would it not be much more frank and honest with the people not to provide by this bill for an ostensible board of directors, who, however, would have no actual power of ultimate management, but would be subject to instantaneous discharge by the Secretary? Would not it be more frank for the Government to create, if necessary, a corporation sole, consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture, under the corporate name, if you please, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, rather than to build up a fictitious board of directors which would have no actual power, but would be appointed solely by the Secretary of Agricuture, would be subject to instantaneous dismissal by him, and with respect to which he would have power so great that he could even transfer all the powers of the Corporation to the least important subordinate within his jurisdiction, and might do so at his own desire? Would not it be much more frank simply to create the Secretary of Agriculture under a corporate name, if you please, as a corporation sole, rather than to build up this fiction of an alleged board of directors who actually would have no power whatsoever?

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer, and speaking only for myself, I would say that in my judgment the proposal now before the Senate constitutes a much franker approach to the problem than does the old law.

Mr. DONNELL. But does it as compared to the approach I have just suggested?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me complete my reply, and then the Senator from Missouri may question me further if he wishes to do so. It was my observation and my distinct conclusion, based upon what I heard during rather exhaustive committee hearings, that precisely what

is prescribed under the proposal now being considered by the Senate with reference to control by the Secretary of Agriculture, is presently being accomplished under the existing law, because under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture himself is a member of the Board; and two of his key men, who are in his employ and are subject to his direction, are two of the other members of the Board; and the remaining two members of the Board are the chairmen of State PMA boards, one from Tennessee and one from California.

It was my judgment, and still is, that under the proposed law we would accomplish on this point precisely what now is being accomplished under the present law.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point? If what the Senator has stated is a fact, why is it that the Senator wants any change made in the law—if the same thing that the proposed new law would accomplish is accomplished now?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Missouri did not permit me to conclude my answer.

Mr. DONNELL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Except for the fact that the advisory committee, which would be added under the proposed change in the law would—at least, in my judgment, and I think in the judgment of all other members of the committee—permit to be carried out much more fully than has been possible or than has actually occurred under the present law, the intention of the last Congress, which was that outside ability and outside skill and genius and experience should be made available to this important governmental agency. At least, it was my opinion that that result had absolutely not been accomplished under the present law, and that there was much greater assurance of accomplishing it under the proposed law.

Again let me say to the distinguished Senator that I was one who would have gone further than this proposal in endeavoring to accomplish that result; but, as the Senator from Missouri knows, in committee, as upon the floor of the Senate, we try to work out the best arrangement that can be obtained by joint agreement of those who are involved. So, after long discussion and after having had available the distinguished and well-informed former Secretary of Agriculture, the junior Senator from New Mexico, who had had much experience not only under this set-up but also under the preceding set-up, all of us were of the opinion that a better job would be done by bringing to bear outside skill, outside experience, outside assurances that the conduct of this activity would be to the best advantage of agriculture and of the entire Nation, by means of the change proposed by the measure now before us, and particularly by means of that part of it which would create the proposed bipartisan advisory committee, rather than under the existing law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Missouri will permit, I shall yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, who must leave the Chamber in a few minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator—and I say this somewhat in reply to the observations which have been made by our distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri—that there is a reason for proposing to make this transfer, ostensibly from members of the staff of the Corporation to employees of the Secretary of Agriculture. The answer is this: The provision written into the act last year setting up an executive staff which should be steadily engaged only in the work of the Corporation itself, tends to develop specialists in various commodities, such as a specialist in cotton, a specialist in wheat, a specialist in the export and shipment of corn, and so forth, whereas at the head of the commodity branches at the present time there are men who are specialists in those fields, and who have been long years in the service of the Department. So, instead of setting up a new staff and delegating the work to that staff, it is proposed now to do as was previously done, namely, let the men in those branches of the Department who have long been familiar with the handling of those products and commodities do the work themselves.

After all, if we want experience, the greatest experience of all in the handling of these commodities is to be found among those who have served for years in the Department of Agriculture. There was one day when, as Secretary of Agriculture, I bought more sugar than any other person in the history of this country had bought in a lifetime.

We are steadily faced with such problems. The men serving in the Department of Agriculture have had a tremendous amount of experience in that work, because of their long service in the Department. The man to whom I previously referred today, when discussing tobacco—Charley Gage—knows more about tobacco than does any other person in the United States, because of the vast experience he has had in that field; and the Department is using his experience today, even though he has retired from the active service of the Government. Throughout the Government service there are men who are happy to be there, even though the salaries paid them may be low, and considerably lower than the salaries which such persons receive when they leave the Government service and move into more attractive positions, financially speaking.

I wish to explain that the man who long was the head of the dairy branch in the Department of Agriculture, finally left the Department, where he was being paid $8,000 a year, to go to Boston to a job which paid him $28,000 a year. The man who was head of the sugar branch, who had been receiving a salary of $9,000, when he left that branch and went to California to be the head of a sugar company, received from that company a salary of $60,000 a year. Similarly, I can present a whole list of names of persons who are specialists, and who, as I have previously stated, are willing to work for the Government for $8,000, or $9,000, or $10,000 a year. But when we find a man who is on the outside, it is rather difficult to drag him into the Government service at a salary of $8,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I be permitted to ask a further question of the Senator from New Mexico, by unanimous consent?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. Gage and the gentleman who went to California, where he received a salary of $60,000, or thereabouts, would be amply qualified to act as the officers under the terms of section 10, would they not? They would be men whom the Senator from New Mexico would be perfectly willing to appoint as executive officers; would they not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; because as executive officers of the Corporation, they would have to spend their entire time handling the operations of the Corporation; and men coming from the outside would not have had experience along those lines.

Mr. DONNELL. That difficulty could easily be removed, could it not, by simply striking out one sentence of the act requiring the members of the staff to devote their full time to the work?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I may say that in part what is required of a member of the Cabinet who is confirmed for that position by the Senate is that he use good judgment in the exercise of his powers, and that he shall not confer upon some office boy the right to borrow $5,000,000,000. Of course, that could not actually be done in the case of the Corporation, except by resolution of the Corporation, which of course would not be done in such a case. But no one delegates responsibility in excess of what he feels the administrative officer concerned is capable of exercising.

I do not believe this responsibility would be delegated to members of the executive staff if they were not at the same time handling the affairs of the Corporation.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a further question at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. As I understood, the Senator from Florida indicated that, in effect, the existing law brings about the same results as the proposed amendment, except insofar as the advisory board is concerned, and that the advisory board provision is the major thing or the predominant thing and substantially all that is added in the new amendment, which is not already effective in practice under the existing law. Am I correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that that is all that is added insofar as the character of the membership of the Board is concerned. There is an additional factor, however,

which the Senator will remember I mentioned in my remarks a few minutes ago, to the effect that the proposed change would name more of the top staff men in the Department of Agriculture to the Directorate and make it possible not only for the Secretary always to have them sitting right there at the Board, if they are present, but, what is particularly important, make it much easier to secure a quorum, which has been found difficult under the present set-up. I repeat to the Senator that under the present set-up, other than the Secretary himself, who in the very nature of things is required to be away from Washington frequently, there are two of his heads of staff, heads of his departments, and then there are these two outlying members, and it is frequently the case, as the Senator will easily see, that it is impossible to hold a quick meeting, no matter how badly the Board meeting may be needed, by reason of the very facts which I have set forth, whereas if there were six department heads sitting on the Board, as is provided under Senate bill 900, and the Secretary of Agriculture himself, then when any four of those seven were here available, whether the Secretary was one of the four or not, it would be possible to transact business, and, in the judgment of all who are familiar with the affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation, that will expedite greatly the proper functioning of the necessary business of the Corporation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I return to the question which I asked the Senator a little while ago. That question is: Does he not think it would be far more frank with the public and with all parties concerned if the Secretary of Agriculture were constituted under a corporate name as a corporation sole, with authority to sue and be sued, rather than to set up in the pending bill what purports to be, and which at first glance looks like, a board of directors, which really has no power of direction and is subject to immediate dismissal by the Secretary?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer is that I do not think that. I think either the proposed act or the setting up of a corporation sole would be considerably franker than the present set-up, in which what amounts to sole control is in existence, as the act appears to create a different situation. I have stated to the Senator several times that in my humble judgment after sitting at some length in the hearings, I am convinced that that is exactly what we have now, and we say frankly that we want such sole control in so many words in the proposed amendment. As the Senator has seen from just a few minutes' analysis of the bill, there is in S. 900 no effort at all to hide the fact, because it is stated within the first few lines of the bill itself that it is now proposed to give "supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture," that is, above the functioning of the Board of Directors.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I shall not bother the Senator with but one further question, I trust.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I note the Senator returns to the comparison between the existing law and either the corporation sole or the proposed amendment. That was not my question. My question was as between the plan which I suggest, namely, the creation of the Secretary as a corporation, himself, under the name of Commodity Credit Corporation, perhaps, with power to sue. Would not that be a more frank and open method of drawing this statute than to create, as the amendment proposes, a board of directors with no actual power of direction whatever?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer to the distinguished Senator is that it is not a whit more frank, because no student of the law and no layman can read the proposal without coming to the conclusion that the Board of Directors will be under the supervision and control of the Secretary of Agriculture. To complete my answer, I may say to the Senator that a sole corporation would be even more burdened with inefficiency than the present set-up, because the Secretary of Agriculture cannot in the very nature of things remain in Washington except for occasional periods of time. So that I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator that a sole corporation would be defeated as to its effectiveness before it was started.

Mr. DONNELL. One final question. I take it the Senator realizes that a sole corporation as well as the one proposed in the amendment can act not only by its head but by its agents, likewise, it if is authorized so to do, in the charter. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree.

Mr. DONNELL. It would make it unnecessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to remain in Washington, D. C., every day in the year, would it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am simply making the point that the decisions which would devolve solely upon the Secretary of Agriculture, and would have to be made by him, could not be made except when he was here, whereas as the situation now is under S. 900, in his absence the Board can function, provided there is a majority of the Board here.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if I may interrogate the Senator further—provided their action shall agree with the general supervision and direction of the Secretary; is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I will not make that exception—provided that their functioning may be superseded by him when he returns, but that so long as he is away, the Board is charged with the responsibility of operation of the Corporation, and if it were a sole corporation, the corporation would be without a head and without any policy-making power whatever in his absence. As the Senator, a distinguished attorney, knows, no agent could perform beyond the express power of his agency. There would be no policy-forming head available in Washington. I shall be interested to hear the observations of the Senator upon that point.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator it is inconceivable to me that a corporation could not be created which could authorize its agents to act in the absence of the Secretary. Furthermore, I know of nothing that would require his physical attendance in Washington in order to formulate general policies of the Department. I thank the Senator, though, for his answers to my questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I suggest that the first committee amendment be stated and considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the first committee amendment, is it not, that is to be taken up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the suggestion of the chairman of the committee that we start with the committee amendments and adopt them?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma, does he not think we should have a quorum call, inasmuch as Senators may desire to propose amendments to the committee amendments as we go along?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. I have no objection to a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma wish to suggest it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Butler	Ives	Myers
Byrd	Jenner	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Ecton	Kerr	Russell
Ferguson	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Flanders	Knowland	Schoeppel
Frear	Long	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
George	McFarland	Sparkman
Gillette	McKellar	Stennis
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Malone	Thye
Hendrickson	Martin	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Williams
Hill	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 59)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was subsequently read, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed as a Senate document:

To the Congress of the United States:

In a special message to the Congress on November 19, 1945, and in a number of messages since that date, I have recommended the enactment of comprehensive

legislation to improve the health of our people.

The issues involved in these recommendations have been debated all over the country—in Congressional hearings, in medical societies, and in public forums. Out of all this discussion has come a large measure of agreement. There has been increasing recognition of the need for positive, planned action to bring adequate health services within the reach of all our people. With respect to most of my recommendations, there is no longer any substantial difference of opinion.

Legislation has already been enacted which is helping substantially to provide better health services and medical care. For example, Federal funds are now being made available to help in building badly needed hospitals. The Federal Government's programs of medical research have been expanded. Additional grants have been made available to the States to aid in establishing and maintaining public-health services.

However, the action thus far taken falls far short of our goal of adequate medical care for all our citizens. If we are to deal with the problem realistically and in its true dimensions, action is required on a broader scale.

We are in an era of startling medical progress. The technical resources available to the physician are tremendously greater than a generation ago. But to make these resources effective, he must use much more complicated, more exact equipment. He must turn to specialized laboratories and technicians for help. He must apply new techniques and must secure more effective drugs and appliances.

As a Nation we have not yet succeeded in making the benefits of these scientific advances available to all those who need them. The best hospitals, the finest research laboratories, and the most skillful physicians are of no value to those who cannot obtain their services.

Now that we have the medical knowledge that can bring good health within our reach to a degree heretofore undreamed of, we must improve the means for putting that knowledge to practical use. Good health is the foundation of a Nation's strength. It is also the foundation upon which a better standard of living can be built for individuals. To see that our people actually enjoy the good health that medical science knows how to provide is one of the great challenges to our democracy.

Our objective must be twofold: To make available enough medical services to go around, and to see that everybody has a chance to obtain those services. We cannot attain one part of that objective unless we attain the other as well.

Our needs are plain. We are, and shall be for some time, short of physicians, dentists, nurses, medical technicians, and public health workers. We need more hospitals and clinics. Medical personnel and facilities are unevenly located in relation to the need in different parts of the country—and are particularly deficient in rural areas. We need broader, better supported medical research. We need much more attention to preventive health care and more adequate public health service. Most of all, we need more widespread use of the modern method of paying for medical care through prepaid insurance.

There is, so far as I am aware, no longer any significant disagreement on these basic objectives. And there is general agreement that the financial problem is at the base of our difficulties.

My first recommendation is that the Congress enact legislation providing for a Nation-wide system of health insurance.

The traditional method of paying for medical care cannot meet the health needs of today. As medical education and practice have become better, they have become more specialized and at the same time more expensive. As treatment has become more expensive, families have found it more and more difficult to meet the extraordinary costs of accidents, serious illness, or major surgery. Thus, at the same time that our knowledge of how to provide medical care is at its highest point, more and more people are unable to afford it. It is no longer just the poor who are unable to pay for all the medical care they need—such care is now beyond the means of all but the upper income groups.

This is an anomalous situation. It can and should be met through social insurance. Under such a system, regular contributions to the insurance fund will replace irregular, often overwhelming, family outlays for medical care.

Insurance against the costs of medical care has been growing rapidly in this country in recent years. This growth is proof that our people understand the advantages of health insurance and desire its extension.

Unfortunately, however, voluntary plans have proved inadequate to meet the need. Most voluntary plans give only very limited protection. While some 50,000,000 people now have some form of health insurance, this insurance usually provides only limited protection so far as hospitalization is concerned, and in most cases makes no provision at all for other medical services. Only three and one-half million of our people have insurance which provides anything approaching adequate health protection. Most serious of all, since rates in these voluntary plans are not adjusted to incomes, those who need protection most cannot afford to join.

The only fair and effective means to assure adequate medical care through insurance is to build on the pattern of our existing social-insurance plans. As in the case of those plans, we should seek to include as many persons as possible within the health-insurance system, so that more may benefit and costs can be more widely shared.

Health insurance is a method of paying for medical care. It will not require doctors to become employees of the Government. It will not disturb the freedom of doctors and hospitals to determine the nature and extent of treatment to be given. It will not interfere with the personal relationship between doctor and patient. Under such a plan, patients will remain free to choose their own doctors, and doctors will remain free to accept or reject patients. Moreover, patients, doctors, and hospitals will remain free to make their own arrangements for care outside the insurance system if they so choose.

The administration of the program should, of course, be decentralized to the greatest possible extent. It is also of the utmost importance that the quality of medical care be adequately safeguarded. Both these objectives can be accomplished in large measure by having the administration of the program in each locality guided by a local group in which the skills and judgment of local medical personnel are fully represented. Furthermore, the fullest possible use should be made of the medical schools and their faculties.

Health insurance will mean that proper medical care will be economically accessible to everyone covered by it, in the country as well as in the city, as a right and not as a medical dole.

It will mean that more people will obtain the preventive care which is so important, and that more people will be able to have better medical care. Thus, health insurance will provide an effective demand for the additional doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel we need to improve our health. The provision of more doctors and medical personnel goes hand in hand with better arrangements for paying for their services.

My second recommendation, therefore, is that the Congress enact legislation to help medical schools expand. Special financial aid should be provided for the construction of teaching hospitals and other facilities and to help the schools cover the cost of larger enrollments. At the same time, scholarship aid should be provided for good students who might otherwise lack the means to undertake the long period of professional training.

Today we have about 190,000 active physicians, of whom 145,000 are in private practice. This is not enough. It represents only about 80 percent of the physicians we require. Unless we take prompt action to expand the medical schools, we shall be no better off 10 years from now. We face similar shortages with respect to dentists, nurses, and other professional medical personnel. Obviously, the facilities for professional education will have to be expanded if we are to provide adequate care for our growing population.

Health insurance will have another extremely important result so far as medical personnel are concerned. Since payment of doctors' and other fees will be assured by the insurance system, doctors will be able to practice where they are needed most, without sacrificing income—as too many doctors must now do in rural and low-income areas. Comprehensive health insurance will thus lead to a more equitable distribution of doctors over the country, and we will no longer have the situation where some counties have only 1 active physician for every 3,000 persons, while other counties have 5 or 6.

My third recommendation is that the Federal Government provide increased aid for the construction of hospitals and other medical facilities in communities where they are needed.

In many cases adequate medical treatment can be provided only in hospitals. Under present circumstances, hospitalization is often impossible, both because of the shortage of hospitals and because of inability of the patient to pay the costs of hospital care.

The enactment of health insurance will, of course, permit more of our people to obtain the hospital care they need. Thus health insurance will make it possible to support hospitals in communities where they could not now be supported. At the same time, it will make the present need for hospital construction even more urgent.

The present Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act, enacted in 1946, represents an important step in a national program to provide more hospitals. Under this act, expiring in 1951, some funds are provided for the Government to contribute one-third of the construction costs of public and other nonprofit hospitals.

I recommend that the Congress extend the duration of this program, increase the funds to be made available, and modify the program so that the Government's share will take account of the varying financial resources of different States.

Furthermore, the program should be broadened to include aid for the establishment of community health centers, diagnostic clinics, and group-practice clinics, all of which have proved in recent years to be very effective means of providing better medical care. This aid should be provided in the form of grants to help finance the construction and equipping of public and other nonprofit health centers and clinics, and in the form of Government guaranties of loans for the establishment of private facilities, similar to the mortgage guaranties the Government provides for private housing.

Closely related to these measures to increase the availability of private medical care are certain actions we should take to improve the public-health preventive and disease-control services, which are now inadequate in most areas and totally lacking in many.

At present the Government provides grants to assist State and local governments in preventing and controlling certain diseases, and to promote maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and general public-health activities.

My fourth recommendation is that the Congress increase the amount of the Federal grants for these activities, consolidate the existing separate grants insofar as possible, and provide for matching by the States adjusted to their differing financial resources.

Another essential step, if we are to continue to improve our medical-care system, is to continue to improve our medical research as more facilities and scientific personnel become available. The Government is already contributing substantially to the advance of medical knowledge by conferring fellowships for research in many specialized fields, by providing grants for research by public and nonprofit agencies, and through its own research activities. We must keep alert to every opportunity to add to the program of medical research through new scientific techniques, such as the use of the products of atomic energy, and through the wise and balanced expansion of research into diseases which have not so far been conquered.

These recommendations are interrelated parts of a comprehensive plan for improving the quality of medical care and making such care more completely available to our people. They present a sensible and realistic program of action, which complements my recommendations for extending and improving the Social Security System, including the provision of insurance against loss of workers' incomes during periods of sickness or disability.

We should lose no time in making a full-scale beginning on all parts of our health program. At the same time that we are putting health insurance into operation, we should be establishing the hospitals and clinics, and training the medical personnel, that the insurance system will enable us to afford. We cannot, of course, achieve our goals fully until the system has been in operation for some time. That fact emphasizes the need for early legislative action.

Many people are concerned about the cost of a national health program. The truth is that it will save a great deal more than it costs. We are already paying about 4 percent of our national income for health care. More and better care can be obtained for this same amount of money under the program I am recommending. Furthermore we can and should invest additional amounts in an adequate health program—for the additional investment will more than pay for itself.

The real cost of our present inadequate medical care is not measured merely by doctors' bills and hospital bills. The real cost to society is in unnecessary human suffering and the yearly loss of hundreds of millions of productive working days. To the individual the real costs are the shattering of family budgets, the disruption of family life, the suffering and disabilities, the permanent physical impairments left by crippling diseases, and the deaths each year of tens of thousands of persons who might have lived. This is the price we are now paying for inadequate medical care.

It is plain common sense that we should not permit these needless costs to continue when we have it within our power to reduce them with a practical health program. Where there are differences remaining as to the details of the program we should not permit these differences to stand in the way of our going forward. They should be threshed out with honesty and tolerance, as is our democratic fashion. We should enact the best possible program and then all of us should get behind it to make it work.

We are striving in this country to see that the strength and flexibility of our political and economic institutions are used to bring the greatest possible good to our people. I consider this health program as part of that endeavor—to adjust to modern conditions without losing traditional values, to bring to the people of this country the full enjoyment of the benefits which our freedom makes possible.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1949.*

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND STRATEGIC STOCK PILING ACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the words "Sec. 2", it is proposed to strike out "Section 4 (b)" and insert "Section 4 (h)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what was the announcement relative to the first amendment of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the clerk should state the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean what the Presiding Officer said as to the amendment being agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair said "Without objection, the amendment is agreed to," but the Senator from Delaware was on his feet, and then the Chair recognized the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not a fact that when the Chair announces that without objection an amendment is agreed to, that amendment is agreed to? Did the Chair not make that statement as to the first amendment of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumed that there was no objection, but the Senator from Delaware was on his feet, and the Chair does not know whether the purpose of the Senator from Delaware was to object or not. May the Chair ask the Senator from Delaware if he objects to agreeing to the first amendment of the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the amendment is not agreed to. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I had thought at first that the Senate could proceed and adopt the committee amendments, but I was advised by the Parliamentarian that my amendment pertained to the first amendment of the committee, so I thought it might be better to submit what few remarks I have to make before we voted on any committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator say that he expected to offer an amendment for the committee amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment which I propose to offer strikes out all that portion of the bill which would repeal the existing law pertaining to the board of directors, and the first committee amendment relates to that question. Therefore I would be in the position of opposing the first committee amendment. The second committee amendment I would favor, but the Parliamentarian thought it might be better if I would make my remarks before action on the committee amendments.

Mr. President, before proceeding with my remarks on the amendment, I should like to refer to a brief statement made in the previous discussion. The Senator from Oklahoma handed me the bulletin I have in my hand, which shows a pile of wheat out in the open air for which there was not sufficient storage space. We have heard much discussion about the lack of adequate storage facilities in this country. We have heard much as to who was responsible, but a great deal of the responsibility has been placed against certain provisions in the law enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

I should like to point out to the Senate at this time that this condition is not altogether the responsibility, and could not be interpreted as being the responsibility of the Eightieth Congress. This bulletin is dated February 1 of this year, and this wheat is shown to be still out of storage.

Following the discussion in the recent political campaign, in which it was pointed out that the lack of adequate storage facilities was the responsibility of the Eightieth Congress, and was caused by our failure to adopt certain provisions, I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture on the 12th day of January as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There has been considerable discussion in regard to the need for additional storage capacity for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that this storage shortage was the result of a defect in the recent charter which was extended by the Eightieth Congress for the Corporation.

Proceeding, I said:

Will you please, therefore, advise me what section of the Commodity Credit Corporation's Charter prohibits the Corporation from providing additional storage facilities as required? If the present Commodity Credit Corporation Charter is defective in this respect, what recommendations would you consider adequate to correct the situation?

I was sure, after as much discussion as we heard during the political campaign, that the Secretary of Agriculture, who was leading the discussion, had all the answers, and as one of those who supported the bill at the last session of Congress with the understanding we were taking care of the needs of the Department of Agriculture I wanted to know what corrective legislation was necessary.

I might also mention the fact that every Democrat on the other side of the aisle voted with me for the extension of the Corporation Charter Act, so they, too, thought that we were giving the Corporation broad powers. The President of the United States signed the act and he did not say anything against it. It was only in the midst of the political campaign that they found the alleged defect in the act, and, lo and behold, it was the fault of the Republicans that such a defect existed in the act.

But on the 12th of January, 6 months after the act was passed, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking him what his proposed solution was, and I received a reply from him dated the 18th of January as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter of January 12, 1949, in which you ask what section in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act prohibits Commodity Credit Corporation from providing additional storage facilities to meet the requirements of its program. The provisions of section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (Public Law 806, 80th Cong.), quoted below, prevent the Corporation from effectively furnishing additional storage facilities for agricultural commodities under the Corporation's control. That section reads as follows:

"(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases by entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this act."

This Department has prepared a proposed amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act which is designed to correct the storage situation as well as correcting other difficulties experienced in connection with operations under Commodity Credit Corporation's new Federal charter. This suggested legislation is presently under discussion with the Bureau of the Budget.

I call attention to that. This is the 12th day of January, 6 months after they had made a great campaign issue out of this question. The Secretary of Agriculture was still holding discussions respecting this matter, and did not know what he wanted to do.

I continue to read:

We shall be glad to send you copies of the recommended legislation when these discussions have been concluded.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

As I said, Mr. President, this picture, which was presented to the Senate, of the need for additional storage facilities—a situation which I recognize, and in respect to which I believe perhaps they are correct, although I disagree with them as to who is responsible for the situation—was still in existence on February 1. But it was only on the 23d day of February of this year—that is 4 months after the election and over 8 months after the act had been passed—that the Secretary of Agriculture, who had been loud in his condemnation of the Eightieth Congress for what we had done, finally arrived at a decision as to what he thought would correct the situation.

That was in answer to my previous letter stating that he was sending to the committee at that time S. 900, which he felt would correct the situation, and which he was endorsing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture addressed to me on the 23d day of February may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 23, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to your letter of January 12, 1949, and my reply of January 18, 1949. In your letter you asked what recommendations I would make as to changes in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act. At that time the proposed changes were under discussion with the Bureau of the Budget. These discussions have now been terminated, and my recommendations for amendments to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act are embodied in the bill introduced in the Senate as S. 900. It is my belief that the adoption of these amendments will adequately remove the difficulties discussed in our exchange of correspondence. Section 2 of the bill, amending section 4 (h) of the Charter Act, is directly concerned with the storage problem.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to point out the fact that it was only on the 23d day of February of this year that the Secretary of Agriculture eventually decided what was wrong with the Commodity Credit Corporation Act. He was just as much in the dark as was every Member of the Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, all of whom unanimously supported the bill which was passed by the Eightieth Congress. They supported the conference report which included the provisions in question. I have no recollection that the present chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry opposed those provisions. I know I did not. I did not know that there was anything in the bill which made for any such situation as has been referred to, and frankly I do not think it did. If there was anyone who knew that there was anything wrong in the measure that was passed, and if any Member on either side of the aisle recognized defects in that act, I wish he would rise and make that statement now, because I wish the RECORD to be straight. I have no recollection of any Member of the Senate on either side of the aisle finding fault with the measure at the time of its passage. But in the midst of the campaign an excuse was needed to explain why sufficient storage facilities did not exist, and why the price of corn declined below the support level and not willing to assume responsibility for their own mistakes and seeking to gain political advantage they placed all the blame on the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I do not believe anyone, either the Secretary or any of the men within the Department of Agriculture, had given a great deal of thought to the storage provisions, or to the storage situation throughout the land, until such

time as the price of wheat on the cash or current daily wheat market dropped below the storage or the commodity loan price for that wheat. That took place in August. When it took place, it provided an opportunity for the charge to be made with respect to the act dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation. The cash price of corn did not drop below the seal-up value or the commodity-loan value until during the month of October. When the price dropped below that point, it was then that it was possible to make the charge which was made, and it was then that the farmer, the producer, actually commenced to look for storage facilities in which to store his own. But insofar as wheat was concerned, the harvest had taken place, particularly in the Southwest, in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and Nebraska. Most of the wheat had gone through the regular channels of sales, and there had not been raised the question of storage, because the wheat was worth more on the cash daily market than a commodity loan would have brought the producer.

Those, Mr. President, are the facts that entered into the question of why there had not been any criticism made concerning a restrictive measure that had been imposed by the agreement reached in the conference committee respecting what authority the Commodity Credit Corporation would have in obtaining storage facilities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota has stated the situation correctly. And as I intend to point out in my speech, that is exactly the position which I am taking. No one in Congress, no one in the Department of Agriculture, or no one anywhere found fault with the act until suddenly, when we had the largest corn and wheat crop we have ever had, the Department of Agriculture found itself in the midst of that crop completely unprepared to meet the situation and not knowing what to do with it, they were ready to put the blame on the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The only reason I made the statement I did, was to concur with the Senator from Delaware. I do not have a different opinion from his. I simply wish to place the facts in the RECORD. I heard absolutely nothing about storage of wheat until the price of wheat dropped below what the farmer could actually get for that commodity provided he made application for a commodity loan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I recognized what he was trying to bring out. My point is, Why was the blame laid on the Eightieth Congress? Why was it said that the responsibility rested upon us, because we did not look into the future and see what the needs of the Department of Agriculture were? The Department itself did not see those needs until it got in the midst of the harvest period and prices begin to decline.

Mr. President, I shall quote from some speeches which were made during the campaign in which it was pointed out that during July and August wheat was being sold below the support price because of the lack of adequate facilities to store it. I ask this question. If that is true, if the Department of Agriculture knew it at the time Congress met in special session last summer, after Congress had been called back into session by the President, why did not the Secretary of Agriculture ask for corrective legislation? Why did he not ask us to correct the bill we had adopted, which all of us had passed in the best of faith, and which even the Department itself thought was adequate? The claim was made that in August farmers were selling wheat below the support price by reason of lack of storage facilities. Yet no mention was made of that lack of facilities while Congress was in special session. It was only after they decided to make it a political issue that the charge was made. I shall point out some facts in connection with the Department's buying program to show that the Department exaggerated the situation.

During the recent months, particularly during the preelection period, the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, and other prominent officials identified with the administration have been rather loose with their charges against the Eightieth Congress and the Republican Party. They told the western farmers that their entire grain price-support program was jeopardized through lack of storage facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and that this shortage in storage facilities was the result of provisions incorporated in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as passed by the Eightieth Congress.

Speaking before the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association at their annual convention in Chicago on October 2, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture, who should have known what he was talking about, accused the Eightieth Congress of being responsible for the situation in which the Commodity Credit Corporation found itself, namely, a shortage of adequate grain storage facilities. He appealed to the grain trade for its help in providing storage space because the Government cannot step in. Mr. Brannan also said:

> In the thirties, you will recall, the Government helped out through the construction of grain bins on the farms. But the last Congress put a crimp in that program.

Pointing to the need for additional grain storage space, Secretary Brannan said that even a "moment's reflection shows that terminal storage will soon fill up." Yet at the time we were in special session last summer the Secretary of Agriculture himself did not know anything about it.

President Truman himself made an issue of this question during the recent political campaign. The subject was discussed by him a number of times. First, at Dexter, Iowa, on September 18, 1948, in outlining his agricultural program, he said:

> This Republican Congress has already stuck a pitchfork in the farmer's back.
>
> They have already done their best to keep price supports from working.
>
> Many growers have sold wheat this summer at less than the support price, because they could not find proper storage.
>
> When the Democratic administration had to face this problem in the past, the Government set up grain bins all over the wheat and corn belts to provide storage.
>
> Now the farmers need such grain bins again. But when the Republican Congress rewrote the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation this year, there were certain lobbyists in Washington representing the speculative grain trade.

He did not include this in his speech, but I presume that when he spoke of the speculative grain trade he was referring to his pals Ed Pauley and Dr. Graham, both of whom admitted speculations. I do not know. They are the only prominent ones I can remember.

I continue to quote President Truman:

> These big-business lobbyists and speculators persuaded the Congress not to provide storage bins for the farmers. They tied the hands of the administration. They are preventing us from setting up the storage bins that you will need in order to get the support price for your grain. When farmers have to sell their wheat below the support price because they have no place to store it, they can thank this same Republican Congress—the Congress that gave the speculative grain trade a rake-off at your expense.

Again at Danville, Ill., on October 12, 1948, the President devoted his entire speech to this subject. For the information of the Senate I quote from that speech:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation under the Democratic Administration, developed a program to store grain when there were bumper crops, so that grain could be marketed over a longer period of time. This helped the farmer to get good, steady prices for his crops, and gave him encouragement to reap big crops. If it hadn't been for that encouragement, millions of people in the world would have starved to death.
>
> Well, the grain speculators don't like this because they make their killings when the farm prices go up and down in a hurry.

Again I think he is referring to his pals Ed Pauley and Dr. Graham:

> They don't care what happens to the farmers. The speculators have always exploited the farmer until the New Deal put an end to that speculation and exploitation.

He forgot to point out that some of the speculators were New Deal officials, but I think that might have been an oversight. Continuing, I quote the President:

> So, the grain lobbies got Republican JESSE WOLCOTT of Michigan, and Republican LEO ALLEN right up here in Chicago, Ill., to lead the fight in the Eightieth Congress to change the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation so that it could no longer secure storage space for bumper crops.
>
> That was a plain sell-out to the lobbies by the Republican Eightieth Congress.
>
> Well now, what happened? This year we had a bumper crop, and we have no place to put it. I was down in southern Illinois the other day, and corn down there in southern Illinois was selling for $1 a bushel, and the support price of corn is $1.47 a bushel. Now, who is getting that 47 cents? Not the farmer—not the farmer. The speculators are getting it because they prevented the ability to store that grain and give the farmers the benefit of the support price.

Farmers all over the country are being forced to dump their grain as distress grain, or let it rot on the ground, because the Commodity Credit Corporation no longer has the power to provide emergency storage space for bumper crops. That is the Republicans' program, pure and simple. The farmers cannot get the Government support price, because their crops are not in storage.

Not only was an issue made of this question during the recent political campaign, but the President of the United States deemed it of such vital importance that in his state of the Union message delivered before the joint session of Congress on January 5, 1949, he reemphasized this situation when he said:

The authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate storage space for crops should be restored.

That was on January 5, 1949; and I point out that it was not until February 23 that they finally arrived at what they think is a solution of the problem and today is April 22, 1949, and the bill has just been presented to the Senate for the first time.

In all of these statements made by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other New Deal campaign orators the impression was given that the Eightieth Congress was responsible for the situation under which the Commodity Credit Corporation found itself short of adequate grain storage facilities to take care of the bumper corn crop of 1948, and that this shortage in storage facilities was also responsible for the fact that corn was selling well below the support price during this pre-election period.

Let us get the record straight this afternoon, even if it is a little late. First, I want to say that this accusation against the Republican Eightieth Congress, charging the Eightieth Congress with responsibility for the situation last fall in which the Government found itself with inadequate grain-storage facilities, was a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts and wholly without foundation. I challenge any Member on the Democratic side of the aisle to produce evidence otherwise. I shall be glad to have it included in the RECORD, and will now yield to any Member who wishes to take exception.

At the same time I challenge the Department of Agriculture to make public the contents of a so-called highly confidential report, dated October 30, 1947, entitled "Grain Bins and Equipment Report" compiled by their own agents, which outlines the history of the entire grain-storage bin program. This report includes a complete record of the bungling and irresponsible manner under which the once adequate storage facilities of the Government have been declared surplus and sold for a small fraction of their replacement cost. Many of those bins were sold for purposes other than to supply grain-storage facilities for the farmers. The Secretary now claims that such facilities are essential, and asks us to restore them under this bill.

This report shows that at one time the Government owned over 292,000,000 bushels of storage capacity, or nearly double the amount of storage facilities they now claim is essential. This report, compiled by the agents of the Department of Agriculture, they have refused to make public, notwithstanding the fact that they are now asking us to pass on legislation regarding this subject. This report places the responsibility for the present inadequate grain-storage facilities exactly where it belongs—directly upon the Department of Agriculture. To cover up the record of their own stupid operations, this report of October 30, 1947, entitled "Grain Bins and Equipment Report" has been withheld from both the Members of Congress and the American people and is still classed by the Department as highly confidential.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the most recent letter, dated March 1, 1949, which I have received from Mr. Ralph Trigg, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, denying my request for a copy of this report.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Reference is made to your letter of January 26 to Mr. John E. Tripp requesting information concerning grain bins, as well as a copy of a statement submitted with a docket to the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The information requested by you was submitted in my letter of January 31, 1949. In view of the fact that the statement you requested was a part of an official docket of the Board, I was not at liberty to release this statement, but I assured you that I would discuss your request with the Board, and if approved, the statement would be forwarded to you.

The Board feels it advisable to continue the policy of considering docket material of a confidential nature. However, let us assure you that if you have any further questions that you would like to ask concerning grain bins or grain storage, please feel free to do so, and we will do our best to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does he say in the letter why he refuses to make the report public?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I quote a portion of the letter:

The Board feels it advisable to continue the policy of considering docket material of a confidential nature.

In other words, I suppose it must be a little damaging. We hear a great deal about reports being concealed in the interest of national defense. Perhaps this could be classed as political defense. I do not know any other reason for the refusal to reveal it or consider it so highly confidential that its contents cannot be made available even to Members of Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would not like to get into a political discussion of any kind with the distinguished Senator from Delaware, but he would like to ask a question based upon the provision for a five-man advisory board which is contained in Senate bill 900.

Has the Senator noted that the five-man advisory board is to consist of outstanding citizens reflecting broad agricultural and business experience, to be appointed by the President of the United States, not more than three of whom shall belong to the same political party, so as to assure completely bipartisan—and even nonpartisan—supervision of the operations of this important Government agency at all times, in the event the proposed amendment should be enacted?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I intended to discuss that subject a little later. I would prefer to wait until I reach that point, to save repetition and the time of the Senate. However, let me say that I am not trying to make a political issue of this question. As to the political aspect, I have read two of the President's campaign speeches in which he discussed this situation. I read them word for word. If this is being made a political issue, it was made a political issue by the President of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to make a brief statement? I must leave the Chamber soon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to accommodate the Senator from Florida, but I promised to try to complete my statement by a certain time, and I should prefer to do so.

The Department's withholding of the information contained in this report has proven to be a considerable handicap in my obtaining all the facts regarding its operations; but even without its assistance I have finally compiled a rather complete history of its operations, which I shall now present to the Senate.

The Commodity Credit Corporation claims today that it needs a minimum of 150,000,000 bushels of storage capacity to adequately take care of its support operations. It reports its present capacity as only 41,064,200 bushels, thus indicating a deficiency of 110,000,000 bushels. In reviewing its records, I find that at one time during recent years the Commodity Credit Corporation owned grain-storage facilities of double the amount which it now claims as essential, or to be exact, a total of 292,669,301 bushels, broken down as follows:

	Bushels
62,929 steel bins with a capacity of	136,410,000
78,437 wooden bins with a capacity of	156,259,301
Total storage capacity	292,669,301

After having obtained this record storage capacity of over 292,000,000 bushels, or double the amount which now is claimed to be essential, the Secretary of Agriculture decided to dispose of that storage capacity. New grain-storage bins, several million bushels in capacity, were declared surplus and were

sold for a fraction of their replacement cost. Many were sold as surplus without even being removed from their original crates.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert a chart showing a break-down of those sales.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Period sold	Number sold	Capacity sold
WOODEN BINS		
Miscellaneous sales for which actual dates can be obtained from Grain Bin and Equipment Report, dated Oct. 30, 1947	39,789	78,957,301
July 1, 1943 to July 1, 1944	8,541	17,082,000
July 1, 1944 to July 1, 1945	8,440	16,880,000
July 1, 1945 to July 1, 1946	18,424	36,848,000
July 1, 1946 to July 1, 1947	3,028	6,056,000
July 1, 1947 to July 1, 1948	209	418,000
STEEL BINS		
Miscellaneous sales for which actual dates can be obtained from Grain Bin and Equipment Report, dated Oct. 30, 1947	27,594	57,947,400
July 1, 1946 to July 1, 1947	9,443	19,830,300
July 1, 1947 to May 31, 1948	5,150	10,925,700
May 31 to July 31, 1948	1,224	2,581,000
July 31 to Sept. 30, 1948	932	1,957,200
Sept. 30 to Nov. 30, 1948	719	1,509,900
Nov. 30 to Dec. 31, 1948	283	594,300
Total capacity grain bins sold		251,587,101

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this report shows that out of a total of 78,437 wooden grain bins, all but 6 were disposed of prior to June 30, 1948—the date of the passage of the new and much-criticized Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act—and that during that period, the original holdings of 62,929 steel grain bins were reduced to a total of 17,584, leaving a remaining capacity of only 41,064,200 bushels.

I should also like to point out the fact that even during the time when the President in his campaign speeches in the Midwest was bewailing the fact that there were not adequate storage facilities, here in Washington the Corporation was still in the process of further liquidating their existing grain-storage facilities, and actually was reducing the grain-storage facilities as late as December 1948. The Corporation was selling them, on the one hand; and the President was bewailing the alleged fact that we did not have them, on the other hand.

It is reported that grain bins representing a total capacity of over 50,000,000 bushels were actually declared surplus and were sold for a fraction of the replacement cost, without even having been removed from their original crates. Many of these bins were sold for purposes other than to provide grain storage for the farmers.

If we examine that record, we see that over 250,000,000 bushels of grain-storage capacity were disposed of, and that over 98 percent of that liquidation took place prior to June 30, 1948, the date of the passage of the much criticized Public Law 806, known as the Commodity Credit Corporation Act of 1948. The record is thus clear that the Eightieth Congress could not possibly be held responsible for the alleged shortage of grain storage facilities last year, since, as I have pointed out from records obtained from the Department of Agriculture, over 98 percent of the capacity disposed of was disposed of prior to the passage of the new act by the Eightieth Congress, and that liquidation process was never canceled until the beginning of this year, 1949. As near as I can tell, it was not canceled until inquiry was made in an effort to ascertain what the Corporation had been doing and until an accounting of the handling of the grain bins was requested.

Furthermore, there is no record anywhere to show that the Department of Agriculture had made any effort to buy or that it had even considered repurchasing any additional grain bins under its ample authority as contained in the old law which existed up to June 30, 1948. Any grain bins intended to be used during the year 1948 would of necessity have been purchased long before June 30, 1948, the date of the new act, in order to be delivered in time for use last fall.

As the Senator from Minnesota pointed out a while ago, the question had never been raised. No one in Congress had been made aware of the fact that additional storage facilities were needed. We were not supposed to know how much they had. The Department of Agriculture had never recognized the need, and, prior to the passage of the old act, was not even contemplating the purchase of storage bins, even though up to June 30, 1948, it actually had authority to buy all the bins it wanted to buy.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Of course we were in special session; and if the Corporation was aware of any need for further storage facilities, that matter could have been called to the attention of Congress during the special session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; and I think it is inexcusable that the Department of Agriculture did not direct attention to that situation if it did actually exist. I am not saying that the Corporation does not need additional storage facilities, and I am not opposing this bill today in respect to that power. I thought the Corporation had the power to do all that it wished to do, and that it had sufficient storage facilities, but that for some unexplained reason it had decided to get out of the storage business and to sell or otherwise dispose of the storage bins; and I do not know why it would suddenly change its mind during the election last fall.

Actually, during the midst of the political campaign last fall, at the same time when the Corporation was charging the Eightieth Congress with responsibility for its inadequate storage facilities, we find that the Department of Agriculture was still further reducing its existing capacity. Storage bins of over 4,000,000-bushel capacity were declared surplus, and were sold after June 30, 1948. There is not one clause in the 1948 act which required that further liquidation.

As further evidence that all the loose talk about inadequate storage facilities was merely a part of a planned political strategy, I call attention to section 5 (b) of the present act, as passed by the Eightieth Congress, which reads, as follows:

> The Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—
>
> * * * * *
>
> (b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

During all the period in which the Commodity Credit Corporation has been lamenting its lack of authority to provide adequate grain-storage facilities to the farmers, we find that actually under section 5 (b) of the present act, it already holds ample authority to provide any number of storage bins for the farmers. The Corporation has authority, if it wishes to use its powers under the present law, to provide every farmer in America who will accept its assistance with enough grain-storage capacity to hold every bushel of grain produced last year.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Did the Senator's investigation disclose that the Department did that at all?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no evidence of it, although I have not looked into that matter to any great extent.

There was nothing in the law as passed by the Eightieth Congress last year, and there is nothing in the law today, which would prevent this. The only restriction placed upon the Commodity Credit Corporation last year was that any additional grain storage bins must be delivered direct from the manufacturer to the farmer.

The Commodity Credit Corporation could have financed the entire transaction if they wished, or they could have subsidized any part of the cost, even to the extent of paying for the bins in their entirety and giving them outright to the farmers, if it had been their desire to do it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that on June 30 the Commodity Credit Corporation had certain storage bins in its possession. Is it the Senator's contention that under the wording of the act they were authorized to use those, and that, if more bins were needed, they could even have purchased more bins?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. Under the old act they could have purchased additional storage facilities under their own name. Under the act as passed by Congress, they were restricted to a certain extent. As I say, perhaps that was unwise. That was a point that was not raised at the time. No objection was made to it. The restriction was that the Commodity Credit Corporation could not acquire ad-

ditional storage facilities in its own name. The reason for that being adopted, and I think the real reason of its being adopted and approved by the Department of Agriculture at that time was, that at that time they were in the midst of a program under which they were going to liquidate their existing facilities. I frankly think they were in the process of liquidating their existing facilities, getting rid of them, but they suddenly decided it was unwise, that they had made a mistake. They were caught in a position where the farmers were forced to sell much of their grain under the support price, because of what was purely a mistake on the part of the Department of Agriculture and they were not willing to accept responsibility. As a result we were attacked politically. The blame was laid on the Eightieth Congress. They could have assisted the farmers in acquiring grain-storage facilities under the existing law, by financing a farmer and having the bins delivered directly from the manufacturer to the farmer.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill would have authorized the storing of the same amount of grain whether the money were used to finance the purchase by the farmer, or whether it was purchased by the Corporation itself, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly the result would have been the storage of the same amount of grain. It would have answered the purpose of the farmer, and that point would have become immaterial, although as I said I have no objection as to how they want to operate. I can see the necessity of additional grain storage, if we are to have the support program, and I frankly think the Corporation needs some additional storage facilities.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a moment. But the thing I am criticizing is that the disposal of the once adequate facilities which they had was just plain dumb management. They should have kept those existing facilities as a reserve.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did they dispose of all of them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. All but a capacity of 41,000,000 bushels plus.

Mr. FERGUSON. What were they doing, and what are they doing with the facilities they now have?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to repeat, the nearest I can find out is the statement that 41,064,200 bushels represents the existing capacity, which they report. But before yielding further, I should like to read into the RECORD a statement which the General Accounting Office made relative to their grain storage-bin program, which is very appropriate at this time. I will read that later.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. One reason why no specific thought was given to the storage facilities that would be necessary in the late summer or fall of 1948 was primarily of course that there was so much talk about inflation, and there was likewise an inflationary situation that was upon us and has been for quite a number of years. For that reason, the current grain market was way above any parity or support price, and there was absolutely no movement of grain toward a commodity loan, or to storage. For that reason, of course, the grain bins had been empty. They had been empty ever since the war demands had taken all the grain out of the temporary storage facilities that had been in existence and had been created during the surplus era which existed in the thirties, prior to World War II. The question was simply this: I have definitely said it previously, so it is not a mere political thought. The purchases by ERP or ECA offshore amounted to 129,000,000 bushels of wheat, and the equivalent of 22,000,000 bushels of ground wheat or flour, making a total of 151,000,000 bushels of wheat. When that was purchased offshore, it lent itself to a softening of our grain markets. When the wheat market was softened by reason of the increased surpluses that were added to the high production of wheat for that particular year, it had its effect upon the corn market, upon oats, barley, and all other grains. That lent itself to a condition which softened the market so rapidly in those few weeks in the fall, that the first we knew, we came right out of what was considered an inflationary price situation, to a period when our grain prices dropped below parity, or below the support price, or the commodity loans. The then question was, Why had they restricted us in providing storage facilities? The Administrator of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture found it necessary, because they had not foreseen that we were going to come out of an inflationary situation into a low commodity price or grain price, to charge it to the amendments in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act itself, rather than to their inability to foresee what was going to occur in respect to grain prices in the fall of 1948.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Minnesota is correct in that analysis. Another contributing factor was that the year prior, as the Senator will remember, we had a very poor corn crop, one of the smallest, almost a crop failure. The grain bins were not needed, and evidently the Department of Agriculture was so short-sighted that, having a crop failure in 1947, they figured the country would never produce another bumper crop, so they dismantled and sold their existing surplus storage facilities. When they woke up, in the middle of the next crop year, right in the harvest period, to find they did not have adequate storage facilities, they scrambled around to find somebody to blame for it. They found this little clause of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act. I want to point out that had that clause not been in the act there would not possibly have been one additional storage bin on the farms of America last year. There is no one who can contradict that, for the reason that the Corporation did not discover the need of them until early in the fall. In order to get a storage bin, a steel bin, it is necessary to buy the steel, which must be shipped to the manufacturer. It takes a minimum of from 8 to 12 months to obtain delivery. Delivery of bins could not possibly have been obtained in time for use. Any storage bins that were to be used last fall would have necessitated the placing of an order in the early spring of last year, in order for them to have been delivered on time. They would have been ordered under the provisions of the old act, under which there was ample authority. That is proven by the Department. They admit that fact here today, and have admitted it for weeks, because they have been pointing it out repeatedly on the other side of the aisle. The Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly pointed out the necessity for hasty action on the pending bill in order that he might have the bill enacted and obtain the desired authority to buy the bins and to obtain delivery in time for use this fall. He is correct.

By that same token, it is an admission that he was wrong last year in not ordering them in the spring of 1948 and at which time he had ample authority.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In just a moment. I want to read into the RECORD a statement which the Honorable Lindsay Warren the Comptroller General included in his report—the report which we had so much difficulty in getting, but which we finally got. Here is what he has to say regarding grain storage bins:

> The Corporation did not exercise satisfactory control over its investments in fixed assets particularly grain bins and related equipment. Records were not maintained in such a way as enabled the Corporation (or us) to know the location or condition of such assets, whether, in fact, they were still owned by the Corporation, or whether all income resulting from rental or sales had been received.

In other words, according to the General Accounting Office, the Commodity Credit Corporation did not know how many grain bins it owned, or where they were located, and did not know whether it was collecting rent for them. It does not know where it is going. It is trying to lay the blame on us, and I think it is the responsibility of some of us to tell the Corporation what to do. That is the reason I am offering my amendment and opposing turning over the control of the Corporation to a man who sees nothing wrong with the situation who does not have the vision to foresee the need of American farmers, who sees nothing wrong with the Corporation's being out of balance approximately $366,000,000, but who tries to pass it off by saying it is only a little over $350,000,000.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a memorandum which I received from Mr. Harker T. Stanton, assistant counsel of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate. He confirms the statement which I have just made, namely, that under section 5, the Corporation has power to assist farmers, through loans, subsidies, or other

methods not involving the acquisition or lease of the bins in its own name.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This response to your inquiry with respect to the power of Commodity Credit Corporation to assist farmers in obtaining grain bins.

The Corporation is fully authorized by its charter to render such assistance through loans, subsidies, or other methods not involving the acquisition or lease of the bins by it. It is authorized by section 5 (b) of its charter to make available facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities, which would include grain bins. It is prohibited by section 4 (h) of its charter from acquiring or leasing storage facilities. It therefore can make grain bins available to farmers so long as it does not itself acquire or lease the bins.

In addition, there is no restriction upon the sale by it of bins acquired from its predecessor, the Delaware corporation, under section 16 of its charter act.

Respectfully,

HARKER T. STANTON,
Assistant Counsel.

MARCH 16, 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after listening to the observations of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, am I to understand that one of the reasons why grain was not stored last year was because the Corporation felt that it did not have the broad authority to acquire bins?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I gathered from the political speeches which were made. It is true, as I said before, that under the act we did restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire, in its own name, additional grain bins. The reason was plain. They were in the midst of a program under which they had operated for 3 years previously, of liquidating their existing facilities, had liquidated more than 90 percent, and were still liquidating. They did not abandon the program until December of last year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Delaware this question: In view of the statement just made, does the Senator remember the conference report which was adopted last July? Does the Senator remember the conference report itself, and has the Senator seen or heard of the report brought back by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I remember when it was brought back. I have no recollection of any Senator on either side of the aisle opposing or pointing out any features of the bill which were obnoxious to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there any question at all regarding the power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire property and to provide for storage? I should like to point out the analysis made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and ask the Senator from Delaware if he interprets it as I do. The Senator from Vermont stated that the act conferred powers on the Corporation to acquire property in any manner, and to hold or dispose of personal property as the Corporation deemed necessary in the conduct of its business.

If that analysis by the Senator from Vermont is correct, would not the act give the broad powers which the Corporation apparently stated were denied last fall, to have provided bins in which to store the grain of the farmers on which they could have borrowed money and not have sustained a loss?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the interpretation I put upon the report at the time. It is also the interpretation put upon it by, I think, every Member of the Senate. To my knowledge, not a single Senator had any idea of restricting the storage facilities of the Corporation. We thought we were giving the Corporation what it wanted.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware, or the chairman of the committee, or any Senator who was a member of the committee if it is known who it was who helped to write that analysis. Was it a representative of the Department of Agriculture, or was it someone representing the Commodity Credit Corporation? Certainly it had to come from an attorney or someone else representing either the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture. Does the Senator from Delaware know whether such a representative helped to prepare that report, or where the Senator from Vermont got the report?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know. I do not recall any objections being made to the report. On the conference committee were members of both political parties. It was the duty of the conferees, of whom I was not one, and neither was the Senator from Nebraska, if there was anything important in the report which was far different from the bill as passed by the Senate, to bring it to our attention, because we passed the bill with the the best intentions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Delaware remember that the Senator from Vermont made the statement that the Commodity Credit Corporation might purchase as many bins as it needed for sale or lease to farmers lacking storage capacity?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not remember the statement, but——

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether such a statement was made?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am sure the Senator has checked the record, and that the statement was made.

Mr. WHERRY. The statement was made. We were given to understand, when the bill was passed, that the Commodity Credit Corporation did have the broad authority to acquire personal property, to buy bins, and to permit grain to be stored upon the farms or wherever they chose. I am sorry the Senator from Vermont is not present. I should like to have him give a further explanation and a detailed report with reference to what the understanding was on the part of the conference committee and what we were led to believe would be accomplished.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the understanding of the Senator from Vermont is exactly as the Senator from Nebraska has stated it. I discussed it with him several times. He felt we were giving the Corporation ample authority. The legislative counsel even today says the Corporation has ample authority under the bill to provide storage facilities for farmers. The only difficulty is that they have now changed their minds and do not want to furnish the bins in the name of the farmers, but in the name of the Government. In other words, the Government wants to go into the storage business. I hate to see the Government do it, but, on the other hand, I recognize the necessity for adequate storage facilities. I recognized it at that time and voted for the bill with the understanding from the Department that there were adequate storage facilities, and that no additional facilities were needed, and that those they would purchase from that time on they would purchase in the names of the farmers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the distinguished Senator from Delaware is not opposed to storage facilities on farms or wherever the Commodity Credit Corporation feels they should be located in order to carry out the provisions of the act; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct and I shall support this provision, to restore their power to buy additional bins, but I want to point out in so doing the fact that we are rebuilding once adequate storage facilities it is going to cost several million dollars extra to the taxpayers, because in the program which was carried out they lost several million dollars in the disposal of the bins, and now we have to buy them all back. I want to be sure they will take care of them the next time we buy them. After we run into crop failure I do not want some bureaucrat here to decide we might never grow any more corn, and proceed to dispose of their bins.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think this is very important, and I should like to ask one more question. Does the Senator from Delaware agree with the senior Senator from Nebraska in the statement he made this morning, that it is highly important that the farmers have these bins on the farms, so that they can borrow money on the corn, and then, if they choose to feed the corn or grain, do that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is a good solution.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it practical?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is practical, and I think it is a good program, and I think it is the best answer to the problem.

I do not think we can place too much emphasis on the report, not my statement, but Lindsay Warren's statement, in which he called attention to the fact

that the affairs of this Corporation are in such a condition today that they themselves do not know what they own, they do not know what condition it is in, they do not know the location of their grain storage bins, in fact, do not know what they are doing.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. I understood the Senator to say that the report by the Comptroller General indicated that this Corporation was short around $366,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They indicate they are out of balance. When the Senator says "short," that is not exactly an accurate statement. I never accused them of being short. When the accounting investigation which I hope the Senate will conduct has been completed, and all the answers are in, the Senator can stretch his imagination and say all the money will be there. He can stretch his imagination the other way and say it will all be short. But I am not trying to draw conclusions. All I say is that we have a corporation handling the taxpayers' money, which had $366,000,000 of funds which they have spent and for which they cannot account. I say we want an accounting.

The Secretary of Agriculture says that he has handled several billion and has accounted for all but $366,000,000, and seems to resent the fact that we want an accounting for the remainder. That is a little too farfetched for the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator think $366,000,000 is quite a sum for a corporation of any size to be unable to account for? I was also going to ask whether in his investigation the Senator may have formed an opinion that the shortage might have occurred on the assumption that the grain was worth a dollar a bushel, that they have lost 366,000,000 bushels of grain and could not find it. The grain is really worth about $2 a bushel. They might not have lost 366,000,000 bushels of grain, but that is a pretty big item to lose track of. I was also going to ask the Senator if they might have lost track of some of the grain bins they owned before, and perhaps that is where some of the unaccounted-for funds disappeared.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad of the Senator from Nebraska has raised that question, because it is often raised. In my opinion, from my study of the Corporation, not one cent of this money can be accounted for in the manner the Senator has mentioned. That is a loss which can be determined. I am not speaking now of money they lost on grain bins or any other particular; I have in my files, which the Senator can see, the statement of the exact losses they sustained on the grain-bin program. I am not discussing that loss. I am discussing $366,000,000 for which they cannot account. The Senator from Illinois suggested it might have been shipments which went across seas, but it could not have been that because when a ship is loaded with grain, if that ship is sunk, the manifest is on this side, and the records of the shipping company, if the Corporation's records do not show the facts, would show what was loaded, because they have to collect their insurance, and the records are all available.

I should like to read a statement from the General Accounting Office describing their policies in general. I quote a part of the conclusions of the General Accounting Office as contained in the report:

> The accounting deficiencies encountered were so substantial and the inaccuracies cited in this report so material that we cannot express any opinion that the financial statements prepared by the Corporation present fairly the financial position of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its affiliates, War Hemp Industries, Inc., at June 30, 1945, or the results of their operations for the period ending on that date.

I would also like at this time to point out that this loss in the program is not the $366,000,000 which we are discussing. Since the Senator has brought the subject up, we will discuss it. The Secretary of Agriculture has been claiming around the country that he has been making a little money on the program—that is, he has been giving that impression without exactly saying it in plain words. I shall read from his statement.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Apparently, according to the Comptroller General, there is a shortage of around $366,000,000. Is there anything in the reports the Senator has seen from the Comptroller General or from the Commodity Credit Corporation which indicates whether this shortage was of actual money, a loss in a money transaction, or was it a loss in inventory? Did they keep an accurate inventory and and lose track of it to the extent of $366,000,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The report is very clear that they did not keep an accurate inventory. They did not themselves know what they owned. It took the General Accounting Office 4 years to make this report, and I am not criticizing them, because they did the best they could. They found the books in such a demoralized condition that it was impossible to reconcile their accounts.

Another interesting statement the GAO made which was rather significant was that they were handicapped in two particulars in making the report. The first was the lack of sufficient records, and they said they were also handicapped by the apparent lack of appreciation on the part of the management of their responsibility even to render an accounting to the American people. That to me is rather a damaging statement, for a Government corporation to feel that they are above rendering an accounting of the funds they expend.

I wish to continue regarding the cost of the operation, first, a statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, in a speech made on October 1, 1948, in Chicago. I had the privilege of listening to that speech and was so interested I got a copy of it. He said:

> The Government has not only lost nothing on the total of price supports during the past 15 years but has shown a net gain of $250,000,000 on wheat, cotton, and corn.

In addition to that, the Department of Agriculture circulated bulletins throughout the country giving the impression that the Commodity Credit Corporation was making a profit on its operations. I shall read to the Senate a sample of some of the propaganda, taken from a bulletin widely circulated. This is a Department bulletin dated September 1948, which says:

> Recent Government losses and expenditures that have the effect of supporting prices are extremely small in relation to cash farm income—too small to have any appreciable effect on the inflation problem. Incidentlly, Commodity Credit Corporation shows a lifetime profit rather than a loss.

I read another statement from the bulletin:

> Support prices do cost some money sometimes, even though it is true that CCC at present has a lifetime profit rather than loss on this type of operation.

I read another statement from the same bulletin:

> So far this discussion has centered chiefly on support prices of food commodities. Cotton and tobacco are basic agricultural commodities and the Department is also directed to support the price of wool. Support-price activities on recent crops of cotton have been minor and the net result of Commodity Credit Corporation price support and export operations from 1933 through June 30, 1948, has been a gain of about $183,000,000.

The claim was made of a gain of a little over $57,000,000 at the end of 1948, on the same basis.

From these quotations it is clear that it was the intention of the administration to give the American people the impression that in administering its agricultural programs through the CCC, it was actually making a profit for the taxpayers.

Knowing that these statements were false, I directed an inquiry to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as follows:

> Would you please furnish me the net results from a taxpayer's standpoint of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception in 1933 to the latest date you have available. It is not necessary that this information be broken down in any manner, since the only answer I am interested in at this time is the net profit or loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation during its lifetime.

This is his reply:

> In answer to your letter of February 1, 1949, the net loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from its organization on October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1948, was $2,146,930,367.

In this same letter Mr. F. J. Lawton, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, pointed out that the above amount did not include $1,743,960,803 which has been paid to the Commodity Credit Corporation since 1935 under section 32.

Thus instead of this Corporation operating at a profit as has been reported by the administration, we find that it has actually sustained a loss to the American taxpayers of $3,890,891,170.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. F. J. Lawton, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, confirming the above figures.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C. February 16, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In confirmation of the telephone conversation with your office relating to your letter of February 9, you are correct in your understanding that the $2,146,930,367 designated as the loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from the date of its organization through December 31, 1948, does not include the $1,743,960,803 mentioned in the second paragraph of our letter as expenditures under section 32.

Yours sincerely,

F. J. LAWTON,
Assistant Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The only way in which the Department of Agriculture can justify its statement that the Commodity Credit Corporation has, during its lifetime, operated at a profit is on the basis that it has counted as income the billions which have accrued to the Corporation either as direct appropriations or cancellation of notes. As proof of this statement I quote from the letter of explanation which I received from the Bureau of the Budget:

> Because corporate funds have been replenished by congressional appropriations, the records of the Corporation show a surplus of $52,544,719 on December 31, 1948.

I call the discrepancies, relating to grain-storage facilities and the over-all costs of the agricultural program, to the attention of the Senate and the American people in order that when we consider the enactment of any new legislation we might have the true facts before us.

I think it is well for us to know these facts where the proponents of the measure before us today are proposing today to place in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture such unlimited names. And a man who has given out such misleading information not only respecting the financial affairs of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but also their other operations. It is true the Corporation's activities were carried out in compliance with the acts of Congress, so I am not placing the entire blame for the loss of the Corporation upon them. But I insist those in charge are wrong in giving the American taxpayers the impression that they are making money on a program which is actually costing them millions of dollars. I say, let them tell the American taxpayers what their operations are costing and if they are worth while, we will continue them. If they are not worth while, we end them.

Mr. President, there are other reasons why corn prices sagged to a dollar a bushel in the pre-election period other than those of inadequate storage facilities.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject of inadequate storage facilities, will he yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in my recollection that earlier this afternoon the Senator from Delaware said that the President had said that there were lobbyists down here, grain speculators, who were working on the committee or on the Senate, and produced this iniquitous result of which he was complaining?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. The President also charged the Members of the Eightieth Congress with selling out to these lobbyists, which is a rather serious charge for the President of the United States to make. It is a serious thing for him to charge that the Members of the Congress have sold out to the lobbyists.

I should like to emphasize the fact that the President was not only speaking of the Republicans as being those who sold out, but the Democrats as well; that all of us sold out to the grain lobbyists, according to the President.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Delaware have the slightest knowledge of anything that even remotely approaches a sell-out or any suspicious circumstances which would lead him to think that any Member of the Congress sold out to any of these speculators or lobbyists, to which reference was made in the President's observations?

Mr. WILLIAMS. None whatever. I might say that I have been in the grain business for 25 years, and if the lobbyists were going to approach any Member of the Senate, not to sell out to him, but to influence him, I think they would have come to me. I do not remember any agitation on the part of anybody or any concern expressed on the part of the grain industry as to the provisions in the law. We passed the law as it was approved by the committee. We passed it on the floor of the Senate unanimously. The conference report was agreed to. If any objections were raised to the conference report I did not hear any of them. The conferees on the part of the Senate brought back the report and said that the bill would take care of the situation, and every Member of the Senate present voted for it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In order to keep the record straight I think it should be said that the Commodity Credit Corporation bill passed the Senate 2 months before the end of the session. It passed the House 2 or 3 weeks before the end of the session. The House did not ask us for a conference until about midnight of the last night of the session. We had to do a lot of compromising. We would not have been able to pass the law otherwise. But I believe the grain-storage problem could have been taken care of under the provisions of the act as we passed it. Much of the political argument that was raised afterwards was unfounded. In fact I know of no wheat producer who did not receive price support for his grain. I do not know of a single instance where a wheat producer did not receive support for his wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is correct. I think the reason the prices sagged so lo win the pre-election period was the result of these speeches and false charges. It is not that they necessarily hurt the political future of some Members of Congress. That is a matter which is not too serious. Perhaps it would be better if a good many of us would never return. But I think it is serious to this extent, that the farmers have been taught to believe that when the administration speaks it has the right to expect it to speak with some degree of truth. The President of the United States said there were inadequate storage facilities. He held out no encouragement for any improvement in the situation. The farmers became panicky and rushed in, sold their grain, and forced the market down and thereby took unnecessary losses. What I am going to point out now is that on the other side of the fence the support operations were not properly functioning, that the Government had pulled the plug from under the grain market. I shall place in the RECORD figures to show how they pulled from under the grain market week by week during the weeks preceding the election, and how they stayed out of the market until it was too late to affect it before the election.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that $350,000,000 worth of wheat was purchased in Canada alone by ECA? If that had been purchased in the United States we would not have any problem of price support today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would have helped a great deal. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] raised the same question. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota could supply the approximate dates of the period during which the purchases were going on. I am familiar with the transaction, but not with the dates.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator may be just a little severe on Secretary Brannan for his activities during the campaign period, and the fact that he was not attending to the grain support prices as much as he should have been. I believe the Secretary made approximately 80 political speeches during that period. I think the Senator should concede that any public official who is supposed to operate a Department on a nonpartisan basis in the interests of the economy of the country could hardly make 80 speeches in the short space of 6 weeks and attend to his business, which was to take care of the price supports for the American farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is exactly correct and let us make sure that it cannot happen again.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that during that period the Secretary of Agriculture, or at least those for whose actions he was responsible in the Department, was selling almost daily as surplus property grain storage bins, and then complaining about the Eightieth Congress not providing storage facilities? They were being sold as surplus property at a small fraction of what the Government paid for them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were being sold as surplus property; and according to the Comptroller General they do not know today what they have left, or where the facilities are.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator from Delaware hear the radio program a few nights ago in which the Secretary of Agriculture, on the one hand, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] on the other, were debating certain farm matters?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not.

Mr. DONNELL. Then the Senator did not hear the statement by Secretary Brannan on that program?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator believe that in the investigation which is called for in the resolution which the Senator from Delaware and other Senators have presented to the Senate, it would be appropriate to bring the Secretary of Agriculture down here and ask him two things: First, the basis for telling the public that we were making money in the Commodity Credit Corporation when the facts show a loss of billions of dollars, and secondly, whether or not the remarks made in the radio program the other night, to the effect that during campaigns the remarks which are made are excusable—have any basis in truth and fact. Does the Senator think it would be appropriate in the investigation to ask the Secretary of Agriculture questions along those two lines?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not only would it be appropriate, but I see no way to escape calling the Secretary of Agriculture before a Senate committee, because the Secretary of Agriculture has publicly stated that he can account for every dollar of the $350,000,000. It is unfortunate that he did not tell the General Accounting Office that, so that it could clear the records and save us a great deal of work. The General Accounting Office says that he has not done it and cannot do it. But those accounts must be reconciled. If the Secretary of Agriculture can do it, let us give him an opportunity to do so. Let us call him down here and take up the items one by one. For example, I want to know why, in one regional office, $18,500,000 was disbursed without recording it on the books. It is carried as "cash disbursements." I want to know who was in control of that regional office, who authorized payment of the money, and whether or not that man still holds a position of responsibility.

The significant part of this is that the Secretary of Agriculture says that the books balance, which is true. They balance by giving credit to these inaccuracies. But the General Accounting Office pointed out two rather significant items. One was a duplication of $4,000,000, an overstatement. Another was a duplication in charges of over $2,000,000. I can understand some errors in bookkeeping, human nature being what it is. But the most significant thing to me is that in spite of the errors the books still balance. In my opinion, those things do not just happen.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Before making the inquiry, I asked the Senator whether or not he had heard the radio program to which I referred. The Senator said he had not. In view of that fact, perhaps I should not have asked the question. But assuming the fact that a radio program participated in a few nights ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Secretary of Agriculture disclosed, in substance, that the Secretary of Agriculture suggested that campaign remarks are to be taken lightly, does the Senator think it would be advisable to have the Secretary questioned along the line of his general views as to what are proper financial transactions and what are improper financial transactions in the conduct of his office?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do. I also feel that the Government of the United States has a responsibility. I do not know how it can take care of it, but the Government of the United States is responsible for the loss which every farmer sustained in selling dollar corn during the preelection period, as a result of the inaccurate statements which were made. I think the farmers have a right to blame the Government for the money they lost. They have a right to hold the administration responsible for the losses they sustained in selling corn below the support price last fall, when it was the fault of the Secretary of Agriculture and the false information which he gave out. He should have been in a position to know better. I think that the farmers can hold the Department responsible. I am not so sure that they could not even sue the Department. I am not an attorney. I know that morally the Government is responsible.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask whether or not the Senator has had the privilege of reading the remarks of Secretary Brannan on the American Forum of the Air program on April 19, 1949.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt, I may say that that is the program to which I referred.

Mr. BREWSTER. The date was April 19, 1949. The subject of the program was a discussion of the new farm program by Secretary Brannan and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. DONNELL. That is the program to which I referred.

Mr. BREWSTER. I hold in my hand a transcript of the program, as taken by an official reporter. I think it is extremely interesting and important, and should be part of the RECORD.

I read from the statement of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] on page 11. In an interchange of courteous remarks with the Secretary he said:

> We cannot become partisan. We never have been in the Senate committee, and we shall not be from here on out. But when the thing has been done—

Referring to the action of the Senate last year—

> I do not want to be hit below the belt. There were a couple of times last fall when I was ready to say, "Well, you hit pretty low, Mr. Secretary."
>
> Secretary BRANNAN. If I did, I apologize to you. I did not intend to. That was a campaign [laughter]. I think there were some blows hit wherever they would land at that time.
>
> Senator THYE. I usually try to keep above the belt in all my political blows as well as physical blows.

I take it that is the reference which the Senator from Missouri had in mind in his remarks.

Mr. DONNELL. Precisely. That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is a most significant reminder of a certain famous remark once made by a candidate, who spoke of campaign oratory. The phrase "campaign oratory" was never permitted to die as long as he lived. It is a reminder that the remarks of public figures in a campaign are as fully subject to accountability as remarks as any other time. I could hardly credit my ears when Secretary Brannan passed off so easily some of the extreme comments which he made in the last campaign as simply "campaign"—meaning, I assume, that it was campaign oratory, which was not to be taken too seriously except by the American people, who apparently were influenced by what they thought was the sincerity of his remarks, which he now apparently treats rather lightly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Maine for that contribution.

As I stated, Mr. President, inadequate storage facilities were not necessarily all the reason for the price drop. There was another angle to the price drop during the preelection period, and I wish to point it out.

During the heat of the recent political campaign, while the President of the United States and officials of the Department of Agriculture were telling the farmers that their support program was wrecked, it was only natural for the farmers to become panicky and start dumping their grain on the markets, with the inevitable result that the price of corn sagged far below the support level. As the President himself pointed out on October 12, 1948, in his speech at Danville, Ill., at that time corn was selling as

low as $1 a bushel, or 47 cents below the support level; and at the same time, in the same speech, the President offered no encouragement to the American farmers that the price of corn ever would improve, but he said the low price was due to a law the Congress had passed; and he also said that since there was a shortage of adequate storage facilities, the farmers could not expect any correction of that situation by a change of that law until after January 1 of the next year; or that was the impression which was left with the farmers at that time.

In view of the fact that the Government was committed to a program to support the price of corn, the farmers of the Midwest might be interested in knowing just why during that preelection period the prices fell so far below the support level. I am sure they will be interested in knowing that the reason for that low price was, not inadequate storage facilities, as claimed by the administration, but, rather, the fact that the Government itself—intentionally or otherwise—was negligent in taking the proper steps to support the market.

For instance, a review of the Government's operations in corn during the preelection period between the time of the President's speech which launched his Midwest campaign at Dexter, Iowa, on September 18, 1948, and election day, shows the following:

Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of corn for foreign supply program by weeks

Week ending—	Quantity (bushels)
Sept. 17, 1948	0
Sept. 24, 1948	0
Oct. 1, 1948	0
Oct. 7, 1948	0
Oct. 15, 1948	0
Oct. 22, 1948	0
Oct. 29, 1948	3,850,000

Notice of this latter purchase was not released until November 1, 1948.

Mr. President, I recognize that the foreign purchase program, the program for European aid, is not a relief program. Nevertheless, it should be carried out in a systematic manner.

We also find that the Commodity Credit Corporation's application of support operations were withheld, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support operations in corn

	Under loan		Purchase agreements	
	Monthly	Cumulative	Monthly	Cumulative
As of—	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
Aug. 31, 1948	0	0	0	0
Sept. 30, 1948	0	0	0	0
Oct. 31, 1948	997,604	997,604	353,233	353,233
Nov. 30, 1948	26,162,652	27,140,256	4,068,199	4,421,432
Dec. 31, 1948	57,800,931	84,941,187	5,660,526	10,081,958

I point out that the Corporation has two methods which it may use. In one case, the Corporation puts the corn under loan. In the other, it proceeds by way of making purchase agreements.

In connection with the table of figures which I have just presented, I call attention to the fact that under its purchase agreements the Commodity Credit Corporation had procured before the election approximately a million and a quarter bushels of corn.

At that time the farmers were being told that the reason why no more corn could be put under loan or under purchase agreements was the claimed lack of adequate storage facilities, and that lack of adequate storage facilities was said to be the fault of the Eightieth Congress. However, it is interesting to note that in the month of November, following the election, the Corporation put under loan 26,162,652 bushels of corn, and put under purchase agreements 4,068,199 bushels of corn, or put a total of over 30,000,000 bushels of corn either under loan or under purchase agreements.

In December 1948 the Corporation put under loan 57,800,931 bushels of corn, and put under purchase agreements 5,660,526 bushels of corn—which made a total placed under the support program up to the end of the year of over 94,000,000 bushels of corn, of which only approximately one and one-quarter million bushels were placed under the support program before the election. I simply wish to point that out, not only to the Senate, but to the farmers who sold corn at below the support price.

From this chart it can readily be seen that the support program was not placed into full operation until after the election period. The argument that that was due to inadequate storage facilities, as claimed in the campaign, cannot be supported, in view of the fact that after the election was over the support program was placed into full operation without the addition of a single grain bin. The Corporation did not put the support program into effect until after it was too late to influence the market before the election.

Mr. President, as a grain dealer, I know that one of the arguments which can be made in support of that action was, that the corn carried too high a moisture content before the 1st of November to justify placing very much of it in storage. That is a reasonable argument; and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who also is familiar with the grain business, will agree with me as to that, I am sure.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Delaware mean to infer that the results on November 2 dried out the corn? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. They dried out something, certainly.

So, Mr. President, I am willing to admit that the delay in the application of the price-support program for corn could be attributed to a certain extent to the moisture in the corn. But I emphasize that if the moisture in the corn was the reason for that delay, then the persons who told the American farmers that the failure of the Corporation to engage in larger price-support operations in corn at that time was due to a lack of adequate storage facilities lied to the American farmers; because after the corn dried out, the Corporation put great quantities of corn under loan in November and in December, without the addition of a single storage bin, and that was done under the same law, without any change in it. Mr. President, I am willing to accept either of the explanations; but, one way or the other, someone lied to the American farmers.

As I have said, from the chart I have already presented, it can readily be seen that the support program was not placed into full operation until after the election period. I have already called attention to other instances in which the operations of this Corporation have been conducted in such a manner as to deliberately influence the markets. During the commodity slump of last month, I pointed out to the Senate how during the week of February 4, 1949, the week of the big break in commodity prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation was found, according to its own books, to have actually reduced its corn purchases that week by a total of 93 percent below its purchases for the preceding week. But the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, again came before the Committee on Agriculture, and said that the Commodity Credit Corporation had made no material change in its purchases under the program. However, he did not mention corn in that connection, and did not say that the Corporation had pulled the floor out from under the corn market. Although I would not say he made a definite statement to this effect, yet he left the impression that the Corporation had been conducting its operations on an even keel, whereas in reality the Corporation had cut its corn-program activities that week by 93 percent.

Mr. President, last Monday, March 14, 1949, an article entitled "Commodity Prices Stage Come-back," written by John W. Ball, appeared in the Washington Post. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of Mr. Ball's article inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMODITY PRICES STAGE COME-BACK

(By John W. Ball)

About a month ago the Nation was stirred by a break in commodity markets—grains going down on February 8 the full limit allowed in one day of trading, and livestock crashing into new recent lows.

Economists went into huddles, some of them wearing such dark glasses that all they could say was to repeat over and over: "This is it."

But gradually since February 8 prices have moved back to where they were. Some commodities have remained about the same.

Here in general are the recoveries made:

	Prices are for May futures unless noted	
	Feb. 8	Now
Wheat	$2.06⅛	$2.15⅞
Corn	1.16⅝	1.31⅞
Oats	.60¾	.67¼
Soybeans	2.11½	2.32¾
Cotton, pound	.31¼	.32½
Cottonseed oil, pound	.1408	.1458
Lard, 100 pounds	11.00	12.45
Butter, pound (March)	.5905	.595
Eggs, dozen (October)	.4565	.4725
Grease wool, pound	1.41½	1.34½
Wool tops	1.67	1.58
Choice steers, 100 pounds, Chicago	24.75	27.30
Hogs, choice, Chicago	20.00	22.25
Lambs, Chicago	24.60	[1] 28.75

[1] The highest price for choice lambs in March in history.

Of course these prices, in spite of the recovery, are far below recent tops; such as wheat at $3.06¾ on November 28, 1947; corn at $2.70¾ on January 16, 1948; cotton at 39 cents a pound; cattle at $40 a hundred, and hogs at $34.

A month ago the corridors of the Capitol were ringing with demands by farm bloc Congressmen that an investigation be made to discover speculators who, by selling short, had cleaned up in the breaking market.

Such an investigation was launched by the Commodity Exchange Authority. CEA discovered at once, that transactions had increased greatly in the week of the big break. But further probing has failed to unearth any spectacular maneuvering by short sellers. No speculator made the high profits on the short side this year such as were uncovered a year ago in the first big market break. Transactions increased because the longs were caught and had to sell.

Rumors are that a lot of small operators—many country elevator managers, etc., who ordinarily hedge their operations, took a whipping. In recent years failure to hedge by such dealers meant more profits for them, although it always is a dangerous operation for a grain dealer. Losses this year among such operators are reported to have been extremely widespread and extraordinarily heavy.

The extent of the beak in livestock prices was shown in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics livestock and meat situation report issued last night.

"In mid-February," it states, "prices of good grade steers at Chicago were about 40 percent lower than their record of last summer and the lowest in around 2 years.

"Prices of barrows and gilts were down about 35 percent and were nearly as low as at any time since price controls were removed. Prices of most other classes of livestock have declined less. Cows, bulls, and lower grades of steers have held up better in price than have better grade steers.

"Veal calves set a new record price in January."

As pointed out above, lamb prices are the highest in history for this time of year. The outlook is even more dismal. The Agriculture Department predicts the early lamb crop will be 6 percent below last year—the smallest on record. In addition, the sheep and lamb numbers in the country are at the lowest since the Civil War.

The meat supply will begin to better itself when hogs will first be marketed from last fall's larger pig crop. In addition, BAE states:

"This year there will be more beef of the better grades that come from grain-fed cattle, and more pork, but less of other kinds of meat."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this article points out how the prices of wheat and corn, along with the prices of other agricultural commodities, have increased substantially over the February 8, 1949, prices. What the writer of that article apparently did not know was that the comeback could be attributed to the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation's purchases of wheat and corn for the week ending March 4, 1949—the week when the market came back—showed a 1,000 percent increase over its purchases for the week ending February 4, 1949. It is little wonder that in view of such haphazard buying practices, our commodity markets remain unsettled—when the Commodity Credit Corporation reduced its purchases one week by 93 percent, and then increased them by 1,000 percent a few weeks later.

Such actions presented a golden opportunity for someone on the inside to know when the Corporation was going to "pull the plugs" from under those markets and to know when the Corporation would put them back; and with that information, such persons could make a great deal of money. I do not say that has occurred; but that inference is left by the report of the General Accounting Office, which suggests that such has happened, and that it is deserving of investigation by the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we should insist that the purchasing program of the Commodity Credit Corporation be conducted so as to have the least possible effect on the markets, except of course the Corporation's support programs should be conducted in the normal fashion.

Certainly the time is long past when the control and operations of this giant corporation should be removed from the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and should be placed in the hands of a capable board of directors, to whom Congress can look, and whom it can hold responsible for the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mr. President, it seems to me that we should at least have a board which will appreciate its responsibilities and will render an accounting to the American taxpayers. I shall oppose any move to place control of the board in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, who, as he has stated in his letter—which I shall discuss at a later time, in view of the lateness of the present hour—believes we should not get too much concerned about this matter when, as he has said, he has accounted for everything but a "mere" $366,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado obtained the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to speak very briefly, if the Senator from Colorado will indulge me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S NEW YORK SPEECH

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it seems to me we should not ignore certain utterances of recent days regarding the political aspects of a current campaign which seems to be in progress. The distinguished Vice President attended a Belshazzar feast in New York last night, one of the $100 dinners. That is not the privilege of Republicans, apparently. The menu was not quite so elaborate as that of the recent feast in Washington. At least it was not given out, except that among the viands was filet of mignon with appropriate wines and liqueurs. It was spelled "liquers." I do not take it that is Kentucky liquor, but some other kind of product. But, under the inspiration of that, the Vice President apparently saw handwriting on the wall which indicated that his party received a majority vote of the people in the last election; which, of course, was not in accordance with the facts as was pointed out last evening, while he was speaking. It was but a minority, and there were practically 50 percent of the people who did not vote at all; which I think is, as I have frequently said, a reflection on us all.

But what interested me in his address, in the excerpt which I saw, was the suggestion that the Republican Party was still responsible for all the troubles of the Democrats. It appeared to me that the Democratic Party won the last election. I thought that was shown by the election returns, both as to the President and the Congress; and I supposed that was going to be the end of all our troubles. But, according to our distinguished Vice President, the Republicans are still in control, as he was not even sure that the program which had been presented and had received the mandate of the electorate, as he indicated, would be adopted, or when it would be adopted, if at all. It reminded me, in view of the attitude which is frequently taken on the other side toward the Republican minority of the Senate, of the story by Mark Twain of the prince and the pauper, which Senators may remember from their youth. When the young prince was able to find a playboy from the streets of London, they had a royal good time together; but whenever the prince violated the rules and regulations, the pauper was the one who got the spanking; from which developed the expression "spanking child." So the Republican Party seems to be the spanking child for all the difficulties of the Democratic Party.

If anything goes wrong in Washington, the Republicans are to blame. Certainly when we controlled the Congress there might have been some basis for an allegation that we had at least something to do with it, although we had a presidential veto to overcome in any action we took. But when we are in the minority, when the Democratic Party won the last election, with its overwhelming mandate as they say, we behold the spectacle of our distinguished Vice President going to New York. Evidently he

felt it necessary to explain why nothing had been done, otherwise, I am sure he would have boasted of the Democratic achievements. But rather than that, he explained why nothing had been done, why he was even doubtful that anything would be done at this session. He was still hopeful that at least at some time later in the session, or at some session in the future still more remote, something would be done. Evidently it appeared that the public was beginning to ask questions.

We had 2 months of inaction at the beginning of the session, followed by 1 month of filibustering; for which I am sure they would not attribute responsibility to this side of the aisle. In recent episodes, by much labor, we finally brought forth a little legislation. All the difficulties and all the anguish is attributable to this little Republican minority, which apparently is to serve as a spanking child for all the sins and lack of rectitude of the prince of privilege who is now able to explain all his difficulties away with this very convenient alibi.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the great authority on agriculture from Rhode Island, who is the only Member of the Senate so far apparently supporting the administration's agricultural program, is in the State of New Mexico tonight, where he is addressing the faithful, in an effort apparently to induce them to persuade the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture that he ought to support this program, I take it. I can hardly understand otherwise why the chairman of the Democratic National Committee at this crucial stage of our affairs has to travel away out to New Mexico, to tell citizens of that State about the glories of the very great farm program, conceived apparently in the great agricultural State of Rhode Island, where the principal products of an agricultural nature are clams, with possibly a few lobsters thrown in for good measure. Apparently the electorate in New Mexico are not entirely clear yet as to the virtues of the new farm program which has been so recently disclosed, and I hope the chairman of the Democratic National Committee will plow the soil to good effect in New Mexico, and that it may be reflected in the attitude of the great Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, who thus will be inspired enthusiastically to support the farm program with which we have been so recently regaled.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Surely, in speaking about the products of the great State of Rhode Island, the Senator is not ignoring, is he, the jewelry and Democrats and other precious products which are produced in that State?

Mr. BREWSTER. They have certainly been most prolific in that particular field. Whether it will serve to qualify them as authorities in the agriculture field and as a breeding ground for other Democrats, the future must disclose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It occurs to me that the vast volume of jewelry which the State of Rhode Island produces is in the nature of a substitute for the real thing; in other words, it is costume jewelry. I trust and hope and believe that the genuineness of the Democrats the State produces is much more nearly the real thing than the jewelry to which the Senator from Florida referred.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think any question has ever been raised as to the spurious quality of the Democrats of Rhode Island. We have real reason to respect their qualities and abilities.

The final point which the distinguished Vice President made was that the Democratic Party has the greatest peace record of any party in the entire history of the country. Of course, that is taking in a good deal of territory, "the greatest record as a peace party." That always arouses a little concern with me. I do not like to go through my regular routine, as to the experience which many of us have personally had under Democratic administrations. But when he throws out his chest and claims that the Democratic Party of recent years has had the greatest record in the preservation of peace of any party in our history, I think of the shades of the great men who have preceded us. As I pointed out here a short time ago, and now repeat, in my own lifetime and in the lifetime of everybody here we have had two Democratic administrations and we have had two world-wide wars. One was after they had been in power 5 years, and the other after they had been in power 9 years. So I do not think they can attribute responsibility to the Republicans. I always hasten to add that I do not claim the Republicans could have done any better; I simply say the Republicans could not have done any worse. How a man can acclaim the great Democartic Party as a peace party in the face of that record, and in the face of a cold war in which we are still engaged, as a result in no small measure of the unfortunate and fateful decisions of Yalta and Potsdam and elsewhere, which have involved us in the tremendous tragedy of the Orient, is beyond my power to understand. It seems to me it would be well for the distinguished opposition to take a somewhat more modest point of view.

REPLY TO SENATOR BREWSTER AND COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH MESSAGE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I rose primarily to ask to be excused from the Senate on Monday next while absent in Florida upon public business and to make a few comments about the President's health message which has today come to the Senate. I cannot, however, ignore the references which have just been made by the senior Senator from Maine to the remarks of the distinguished Vice President of the United States and the record of the Democratic Party. I think the Democratic Party does not need my testimony as to the affection that is held for it in the hearts of millions of Americans. The manner in which they have periodically exhibited their affection, practically every time they have had a chance to go to the polls, manifestly most eloquently and wisely, is tribute enough to the character of Democratic objective and the quality of Democratic performance. I think the history of the country, Mr. President, is very clear, that since its inception the Democratic Party has been primarily the people's party. It seems that, somehow or other, the heart of democracy is a little bit more in tune with the heart of the people of the country. It seems that the people recognize that, and they have continued to support the Democratic Party because they feel that although it falters and often fails, nevertheless, it is fighting the battle of the people of the Nation—the whole people, the rich, the poor, and the middle classes.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party has tried to make it possible for the people to live better, and it has ever shown that it acts for the best interests of the well-to-do as well as of the poor. Benjamin Franklin said, "Honesty is the best policy." So is democracy the best policy for the people of the Nation.

I am sure the Senator from Maine did not intend to imply that the Republican Party, or its membership in the Senate and the House, did not vote for the declarations of war for which the Democrats voted, because they were declarations of the Nation, and not of any particular party.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am afraid the Senator from Florida misunderstood me. The conduct of our foreign policy is primarily designed to preserve the peace. That is what I understood was the implication of the Vice President's remarks. I simply pointed out that twice, under Democratic administrations, the Nation has been compelled to go to war. Of course, all of us joined. The point was simply that the Democratic administrations had not been able to avoid war. I do not know that we could have done any better.

Mr. PEPPER. I heard the Senator the first time, and I thank him for amplifying and clarifying his statement. But I have heard the able Senator say that twice, within his memory, this Nation had gone to war, and that it was under the leadership of Democratic administrations. I was merely saying what was unnecessary to say, of course, that the record will show that those wars were forced upon America by dictators from abroad, and that when the Nation acted it was a national and not a party declaration of war.

Mr. President, I also think the history of our country is replete with eloquent evidence that no two Presidents ever tried harder to keep the peace and to

avoid war than did Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. If they were not successful, I am not sanguine enough to believe that anyone else in their place would have succeeded. I think it will be the judgment of history, Mr. President, that there were never two Presidents who were more reluctant to embrace the painful necessity of war than were those two great Presidents of the United States.

I am sure that what the Vice President had in mind was the efforts which have been made by Democratic Presidents for peace after our wars as well as before them. Again, I put no President above Woodrow Wilson, who gave his own life to the objective of peace, and when he fell a victim to overexertion it was when he was laboring in the cause of peace. I must not, Mr. President, force myself to say, contrary to the facts of history, that all Republicans in that period were supporting President Woodrow Wilson when he was trying to establish the instrument which might preserve the peace. I think no Presidents have been more diligent in trying to establish the machinery of peace than has President Harry S. Truman. Surely he has tried very hard to provide the means by which the world might come again to its senses and work cooperatively rather than one part working against another. The epic programs he has inaugurated have stood out and will stand out as magnificent contributions to the return of peace and prosperity to the world.

Mr. President, what I rose to say is that today the President of the United States has sent a message to the Congress, which I think is one of the most significant and far-reaching contributions to peace which any President has ever made. It is with regard to health care for the people of America. Anyone who believes that the body is the temple of the soul, who believes that man is made in the image of God, who believes that the human spirit is divine, must surely believe, Mr. President, in the preservation of life and in the protection of the health of the people of our country.

The President of the United States today has sent to the Congress the most comprehensive, far reaching and, if enacted into law, the most effective program for the preservation of the lives and the protection of the health of our people that any President has ever proposed. I venture to believe that the scrutiny of Congress, inquiry, and the experience we shall have will disclose that this is the only effective program for the health care which is needed by the American people.

It has become apparent, Mr. President, that the insurance program, compulsorily imposed upon all the people, by which they receive the medical care they need, the hospital facilities they require, and, at the same time, having the Federal Government provide the funds by which these services may be made available, is the only way we can effectively and in the American way, without socialized medicine, without imposing upon the Nation an alien system, have such protection. It means much to the lives and to the health of our people. I am hopeful, Mr. President, indeed I anticipate, that this Congress will enact the most far reaching health program which has ever been enacted. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over this subject, I certainly expect to do my utmost in seeing to it that there is brought to the floor of the Senate at this session the best health bill we can devise, after appropriate inquiry and after the deliberations which are fitting for a subject of such gravity.

Mr. President, as one citizen and one Senator I wanted to express my tribute of gratitude to the President who has today held up the light of hope to millions of our people that they will have in the future the health care which it has been impossible for them to obtain in the past.

RECESS TO MONDAY

And now, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 25, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 22 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

David K. E. Bruce, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are thanking Thee in simplicity and sincerity for the privilege of entering upon a new week. Our finite minds do not know what the days may have in store for us but we will trust Thee and not be afraid.

Thou hast made us the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence and hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace. All our yesterdays are a glorious testimony that no good thing wilt Thou withhold from us if we walk uprightly and if we perform our duties faithfully.

Grant that Thy servants, who minister in the affairs of government, may daily renew their faith in Thy divine wisdom and Thy loving kindness. May they be confident that the light of the spiritual ideals and principles is ever their truest guide. May that light never be eclipsed by our doubts and fears.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 22, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 23, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bridges	Hendrickson	Morse
Butler	Hickenlooper	Murray
Byrd	Hill	Neely
Cain	Hoey	O'Conor
Capehart	Holland	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Humphrey	Reed
Connally	Ives	Saltonstall
Cordon	Jenner	Schoeppel
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Kem	Taft
Ecton	Kerr	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Watkins
Frear	McFarland	Wherry
Fulbright	McKellar	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Withers
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Miller	

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent today on business of the Senate, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on public business in the State of Florida.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and I may be excused from the session of the Senate tomorrow because of official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, before the Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, the bill dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate, without speeches and without debate, may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions and offer matters for insertion in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution 124

"Whereas there is a tax levied by the State of New York on the sale of cigarettes; and

"Whereas the revenue therefrom is essential to the payment of the State bonus to veterans and other obligations; and

"Whereas the avoidance of this tax is possible and substantial revenue is being lost to the State by such avoidance; and

"Whereas such avoidance occurs principally through the interstate shipment of cigarettes into the State from non-cigarette-taxing States; and

"Whereas there is no remedy available for the stoppage of such avoidance except by action of the Federal Government, to which by the Constitution of the United States has been delegated by the States the power to regulate commerce between the States; and

"Whereas there are now 38 other States similarly affected: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to speedily pass appropriate legislation effecting the disclosure to the tax administrators of the States taxing cigarettes by shippers thereof in non-cigarette-taxing States of shipments of cigarettes to other than State-licensed distributors in cigarette-taxing States; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully urge the President of the United States to speedily approve such corrective legislation when, as, and if submitted to him for Executive approval; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 23

"Whereas the use of alcoholic beverages is rapidly increasing in Iowa; and

"Whereas the habit-forming practice of the use of alcoholic beverages in many cases results in lowered physical and mental efficiency, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, increased crime, and general disregard for law and order, all detrimental to the general public welfare; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of Iowa does recognize the inherent right and duty of government to protect and safeguard the general public welfare of its people by all proper means; and

"Whereas the above habit-forming practice is constantly being stimulated and encouraged by the use of advertising and propaganda, much of which comes from out of State and which has for its purpose financial profit rather than the general public interest and welfare; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in Congress, at various times, legislation to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertising of alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas it is desirable to place this General Assembly on record as not favoring such advertisement in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Fifty-third General Assembly of Iowa disapproves of the practice of advertising of alcoholic beverages in publications printed in this State or transported into Iowa in interstate commerce, and urges both the Congress of the United States and the next General Assembly of Iowa to take such steps as are necessary to control and eliminate such practice to the end that the general welfare of the people and especially the youth of Iowa and of the United States be safeguarded and protected."

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

Two joint rsolutions of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"Be it resolved by the senate of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the house of representatives concurring herein):

"Whereas it has become increasingly apparent that the United States must turn to synthetic sources to supplement its petroleum resources, and it is also becoming apparent that the proportion of the world's oil available to the United States may diminish markedly; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore passed the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act for the purposes of promoting the development of new domestic sources of fuel oils and gasoline, including the promotion of coal synthetic liquid fuel plants; and

"Whereas it is doubtful that private industry will find the investment sufficiently attractive at this stage of development to warrant undertaking plant construction without Government assistance; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado ranks first in bituminous coal reserves in the United States, second in subbituminous reserves and fourth in anthracite reserves, with billions of tons of coal capable of producing many billions of gallons of fuel oils, gasoline, and countless byproducts; and

"Whereas several associations have been formed and are now being formed throughout the State of Colorado for the purpose of urging the Government of the United States to establish coal synthetic liquid fuel plants in the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas it is apparent that the coal industry in Colorado, because of a lack of sufficient market and increasing use of gas and oils, is declining to an alarming low ebb, and that for the coal industry to survive it is essential that other uses of coal be found; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States S. 6, a bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels, which provides for loans to private industry up to $350,000,000 for the purpose of fostering and encouraging production by private industry of synthetic liquid fuels and provide such financial and other assistance as may be necessary to promote and accelerate the construction and operation of commercial-sized liquid fuels plants; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the house of representatives concurring herein), That a committee of six members of the legislature be appointed by the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives to make a full and thorough investigation of the possibilities of obtaining for the State of Colorado a liquid fuel plant or plants, and to confer and consult with rep-

resentatives of associations interested in the construction of said plants in Colorado, and consult and confer with Members of Congress from Colorado with a view of encouraging the construction of said plants of Colorado; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Governor of the State of Colorado, the president of the School of Mines of Colorado, Members of Congress from Colorado and to the Colorado Industrial Development Council, John L. Lewis, president UMWA, Frank Hefferly, president UMWA, District 15, and be it further

"Resolved, That there is hereby apportioned from the 'contingent for all purposes fund,' as provided for in house bill No. 4, enacted by the thirty-seventh general assembly, and approved by the Governor on January 18, 1949, the sum of $2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of defraying the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee pursuant to this memorial. All expenditures made pursuant to this paragraph shall be approved by the chairman of the committee and shall be payable by warrant upon the State treasurer, and shall be signed by the State controller and countersigned by the State treasurer.

"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.
"PAT MAGILL, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 1549, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, which provides aid and assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is the corridor through which an air attack will be launched against the United States in the advent of a shooting war, it being the shortest route to America, with three-fourths of the world's population on the other side of this vast empire, with an area of about 590,884 square miles, which is one-third greater in size than the Atlantic States from Maine to Florida, rich in timber, agricultural land, minerals, furs, fish, and game, and which has been a part of the United States for over 80 years; and

"Whereas the security of the United States is dependent on the security of Alaska, and Alaska can only be strong if real American citizens settle, control, and develop the land and develop its resources, the last of the United States undeveloped territory; and

"Whereas there is an increasing demand for the settlement of Alaska, and public lands are difficult to obtain under existing laws; and

"Whereas there are many veterans who are desirous of having an opportunity to establish a home and a business in Alaska; and

"Whereas the lands presently available for homesteading, business sites, and home sites are inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact speedily into law H. R. 1549, which provides aid and assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress.

"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.
"PAT MAGILL, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 529, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, which provides for the establishment of a Veterans Employment and National Economic Development Corporation

"Whereas during the period between World War I and World War II there were approximately 2,000,000 veterans who were unemployed at one time; and

"Whereas there are four times as many veterans now with the probability of four times as many veterans unemployed in any future depression; and

"Whereas, the unemployment level of veterans will increase as additional veterans terminate their educational and on-the-job training; and

"Whereas veterans are at a disadvantage because of their loss of job opportunities, job property rights, job seniority, experience, financial gain, and contacts suffered by them during their war service; and

"Whereas veterans will have greater difficulty getting into and staying in business than the average businessman and professional persons because of the time they have lost in war service; and

"Whereas the strength of the United States and its national security depends on the economic strength of the Nation, which in turn depends on the opportunity given its citizens to develop independent enterprise and to create jobs where none heretofore existed, placing the jobless man on the manless job; and

"Whereas, There does not exist today a governmental agency which can aid the veteran by creating jobs and economic opportunities for these veterans nor render services as would be supplied by the Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact speedily into law S. 529, which provides for the establishment of a Veterans Employment and National Economic Development Corporation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress.

"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.
"PAT MAGILL, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"FRED C. FERGUSON,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HENRY CHRISTENSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"A joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

"Whereas the right of most veterans of World War II to receive readjustment allowances under title V of the Federal Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (known as the 'GI bill of rights') expires July 25, 1949; and

"Whereas only about one-half of unemployed Minnesota veterans of World War II have rights to benefits under the Minnesota employment and security law; and

"Whereas unemployment amongst Minnesota veterans is increasing; and

"Whereas economic conditions in the near future may be such as to cause great hardship and financial distress to such veterans and their families; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota do herewith memorialize and petition the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America now in session in the city of Washington, D. C., to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved April 12, 1949.

"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF MINNEAPOLIS (MINN.) CENTRAL LABOR UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1160, providing for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution in favor of S. 1160, Missouri Valley Authority

Whereas during the past several years, the Missouri Valley Development Trades and Labor Council has, from time to time, discussed the question of the so-called Pick-Sloan plan versus a Missouri Valley plan similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

Whereas up to the present time we have been primarily interested in the development of the basin, and therefore have not pushed the question as to what set-up or plan under which the development should be carried out; and

Whereas on March 2, 1949, the Honorable Senators MURRAY, from Montana, GILLETTE, from Iowa, and HUMPHREY, from Minnesota saw fit to introduce S. 1160 which provides for a Missouri Valley Authority along the pattern of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

Whereas Senator HUMPHREY so ably pointed out the shortcomings of the Pick-Sloan plan both in its planning and the management thereof; and

Whereas we have experienced great expense and difficulty and not much success in dealing with the numerous bureaus and divided authority which exists under the present set-up; and

Whereas dealing with a centralized management would simplify the establishment of uniform conditions for all the different projects in the valley: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, in meeting assembled this 13th day of April 1949, go on record in favor of S. 1160 as introduced in the Senate on March 2, 1949, by the above-mentioned Senators, and that we do everything possible to have said bill enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States,

and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the 10 States included in the Missouri Valley Basin; and to all building-trades councils within this area.

THE UNITED NATIONS AS A WORLD GOVERNMENT—RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF ROWLEY, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the people of Rowley, Mass., at their annual town meeting held on March 16, 1949, favoring the making of the United Nations into a world government, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve peace and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it effective for the maintenance of world order; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law, and some measure of world government: Be it

Resolved by the people of Rowley, Mass., in town meeting assembled, That we call upon our representatives in the Congress, in the executive department of the United States, and in the United Nations to take note of these truths and forthwith to take such steps as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter of the purpose of making the United Nations into a world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the town clerk to both Senators from Massachusetts, the Congressman from this congressional district, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representatives in the United Nations.

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND—RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF WATERTOWN, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the citizens of the town of Watertown, Mass., relating to the unfication of Ireland, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on the unification of Ireland

Whereas Ireland, the ancestral home, either by birth or descent of so many of our law-abiding and God-fearing citizens, has suffered from oppression for over 700 years, and today still is economically and unnaturally partitioned by Great Britain in a manner definitely opposed to the geographic boundaries as Almighty God planned it, surrounded only by the sea, and against the American concept of liberty for all small nations; and

Whereas American citizens of Irish blood of our town, county, State, and Nation have contributed mightily to the civil, cultural, educational, industrial, commercial, and religious progress and development of our great country, and in every war gave unselfishly of their time, talents, wealth, and when necessary, suffered, and some are still suffering, sacrificed their lives in the defense of the United States of America, from the Revolutionary War down to World Wars I and II. They fought in these wars also to protect the small nations of Europe and the world from oppression by outside powerful nations; and

Whereas these, and all liberty-loving American citizens are still contributing of their wealth through taxes and United States bonds to the Treasury of the United States of America for the protection of small nations and to fight communism and bring peace to the world; part of this money through the so-called Marshall plan or European recovery plan is given or loaned to Great Britain for recovery purposes, and in turn a portion of this loan or grant is siphoned from the government in London to the puppet government in Belfast, northern Ireland, to subsidize and maintain the northern Ireland puppet government of six of the nine counties of the Province of Ulster as the last British foothold in Ireland; and

Whereas these American citizens of Irish blood are among the strongest foes of communism, through their Christianity, in this Nation of the United States of America, so too through their faith in Almighty God, among all the nations of Europe, the Republic of Ireland, in the 26 counties, stands out as a bulwark against communism in Europe, and as America's only hope to find a nation in Europe free of communism today in case of war; and

Whereas the town of Watertown, the county of Middlesex, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, through its citizens, have always been foremost in efforts to aid the oppressed at all times even to the extent of war: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the town of Watertown, at its annual town meeting of March 21, 1949, does hereby memorialize and petition, the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, United States Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., and United States Congresswoman Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS to take necessary action to prevent the allocation or spending of American taxpayers' money by Great Britain to support armed forces to maintain the border or partition between the 6 northeast counties of northern Ireland from the 26 counties of the Republic of Ireland, and further to take necessary steps to prevent the allocation or spending of American taxpayers' money by Great Britain to subsidize the puppet government in these six northeast counties of the Province of Ulster, namely, the counties of Antrim, Armagh, Derry, Down, Fermanagh, and Tyrone; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, United States Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., and United States Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, and that these resolutions be spread on the historical records of the town of Watertown, Mass.

DANIEL JOSEPH CLIFFORD.
JOSEPH W. ANDREWS.
WILFRED J. PAQUET.
JOHN G. REARDON.
THOMAS J. KELLY.
MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN.

ESTABLISHMENT OF TAX-SETTLEMENT BOARD—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF WISCONSIN SOCIETY OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a significant resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Society of Certified Public Accountants. This resolution urges adoption of House bill 2983, introduced by Representative MILLS, now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. The purpose of this bill is to set up a tax-settlement board to conclude controversies over tax deficiencies. I believe this resolution will be of interest to many of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and thereafter be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas certified public accountants through their national and State societies have for many years sought to simplify the Federal tax laws and to reduce the cost of paying taxes; and

Whereas a bill has now been introduced in Congress to bring about, through creation of an independent tax settlement board, prompt and informal adjustment of disagreements between taxpayers and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, especially those involving amount of tax rather than legal complications; and

Whereas this bill, known as H. R. 2983 and introduced by Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, is deserving of the full support of taxpayers for acceptance by Congress, in that it will serve to minimize the need for court action in safeguarding the interests of taxpayers, particularly small-business enterprises and individuals; and

Whereas leaders in the accounting profession have endorsed the proposed tax-settlement board as one of the most constructive suggestions in the history of income-tax legislation: Be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Wisconsin Society of Certified Public Accountants in behalf of its 575 members, hereby unanimously endorses the establishment of the Tax Settlement Board as serving the public interest; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Wisconsin Member of the House of Representatives and to each United States Senator from Wisconsin and that this resolution also be brought to the attention of the citizens and business organizations within the State of Wisconsin.

FINANCIAL AID TO CERTAIN AGED AND DEPENDENT PERSONS—RESOLUTION OF COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DUNN COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have this morning received from Mr. Leonard Kingsley, county clerk of Dunn County, Wis., an important resolution adopted by the board of supervisors urging that the United States grant aid to counties for the establishment and maintenance of homes for aged and dependent persons. All of us know that with more than 10,000,000 Americans now aged 65 years or over the problem of adequate care for our elder folks is one of the most important challenges to our people. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is, in general, an increase in the number of elderly people needing financial assistance; and

Whereas many counties lack adequate institutions and other provisions to care for such aged persons due to the financial inability of the counties to provide proper care; and

Whereas these aged persons have during their years of productivity contributed to the State and Nation as well as the counties and such State and Federal Government should assume fuller responsibility for their care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the County Board of Supervisors of Dunn County, Wis., at a meeting duly assembled this 19th day of April A. D. 1949, at the courthouse in the city of Menomonie, Dunn County, Wis., hereby request that the legislative bodies of the State of Wisconsin and the United States grant aid to counties for the establishment and maintenance of homes for aged and dependent persons; and be it further

Resolved, That the county clerk of Dunn County be and he is hereby instructed to mail a copy of this resolution to our representatives in the legislative bodies of the State and the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 276. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 286).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 113. A bill for the relief of Floyd Oles and Helen Louise Oles; with amendments (Rept. No. 300);

S. 222. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Westway, legal guardian for Bobbie Niles Johnson, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 301);

S. 623. A bill for the relief of George Krinopolis; without amendment (Rept. No. 287);

S. 934. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; with amendments (Rept. No. 302);

S. 1152. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; with an amendment (Rept. No. 299);

S. 1266. A bill for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon; without amendment (Rept. No. 288);

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Troth; without amendment (Rept. No. 292);

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Smolowitz; and Mrs. Sylvia D'Arpe; without amendment (Rept. No. 293);

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of James I. Matthews; without amendment (Rept. No. 294);

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; without amendment (Rept. No. 295);

H. R. 2231. A bill for the relief of Marie E. Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 296);

H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Emma Armstrong; without amendment (Rept. No. 297); and

H. R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Benjamin Betts; without amendment (Rept. No. 298).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 289) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-3371030, Allegretti, Giovanni.
A-6032034, Alvear, Manuel, or Manuel Alvear Rabanal (alias Ravenada).
A-1255106, Anderson, Neoniella Ermakova (nee Vasielievna Tsiba Ermokova).
A-2928933, Barbiani, Giordano, or George Barbiani.
A-6249264, Bogikes, Maria.
A-6322600, Borgman-Brouwer, Peter Willem.
A-9769944, Budicin, Pietro or Peter.
A-7743584, Cambel, Ali Bulent.
A-3406806, Canela, Ignacio.
A-5391859, Carson, Donald Frank.
A-6782691, Cerniglia, Pasquale.
A-7029166, Chien, Alan Richard.
A-7029175, Chien, Philip Karl.
A-7029165, Chien, George David.
A-7756420, Chow, David Zai-Chen, or David Chow.
A-6460377, Churchill, Ethel Lightfoot, or Ethel Lightfoot.
A-5767700, Deighton, Josephine Amelia, or Josephine Amelia Deighton (nee Suchy); Josephine Amelia Suchy Deighton.
A-5630032, De Jimenez, Teresa Ramirez.
A-6777954, Del Castillo, Jose Manuel Villa, or Jose Manuel Del Castillo.
A-6242876, Delinanos, Evangeline (nee Siotka).
A-6288933, De Luzuriaga, Luis Ruiz.
A-6768501, De Saldana, Marhta Reyes, or Martha or Marta Reyes de Saldana.
A-6768502, Saldana, Elisa, or Maria Elisa Saldana.
A-7544398, Dickson, Mary Lynn Holland.
A-5962202, Eckardt, Ruth (nee Jankwitz).
A-4745580, Eddy, Maria Inez (nee Cabanellas).
A-4263542, Estrada-Marquez, Edmundo Gamaliel, or Edmundo Gamaliel Estrada.
A-6702829, Fenner, Muriel Constance Steele.
A-5592138, Fiedler, Otto Erich (alias Otto Fiedler).
A-6834463, Florent, Benoit Charles Leys, or Benedict Leys.
A-6357990, Forles, Mary (Maria), or Maria Fourlis.
A-6509155, Fung, Ng.
A-1316941, Garcia, Cristobal Bandera, or Christobal Garcia or Critobal Garcia.
A-6343310, Garcia, Maria Jesus.
A-6170348, Garcia, Maximiano Macaya, or Max Macaya Garcia.
A-6167326, Garcia, Brigida Yulo.
A-9679152, Gerovich, Anthony Lennard.
A-6310308, Gerstein, Joseph; Joseph Gershon; Joseph Paul Gershon; Joseph Gerstien.
A-6698983, Gobas, Eudokia Nicholas (alias Erdokia Gobas alias Eudokia Demetrius Zoidou).
A-9571845, Guldberg, Fleming Halfdan.
A-9689722, Gundlach, Arend.
A-7755524, Hua, Chung Wu, or Chung-Hua Wu.
A-7755855, Wu, Ming-Hua Lee (nee Ming-Hua Lee).
A-9731513, Johnannesen, Jorgen.
A-4909615, Juristo, Julius, or Julian Juristo Zabala.
A-6439318, Kolakowski, Anna, or Anna Francis Kolakowski or Anna Franciska Kolakowski (nee Polanska).
A-6261655, Koulakiotis, Alexandra (nee Tzamtha Coulakotis or Colakiotis).
A-6693180, Lehti, Unto Oskari.
A-2270826, Leong, Ruth Lee (nee Yee-Yan Lee).
A-6179704, Li, Yuan Chuen, or Lee Yung Chuen or Yuan Chuen Lee.
A-6328292, Limas, Casimiro Sanchez, or Casimira Limas Sanchez or Casimira Sanchez Limas.
A-3787921, Mansour, Iris Isaac Ades.
A-9770907, Marcellin, Andre Louis.
A-4350535, Masi, Luigi.
A-5948065, Mattsson, Matts Erik.
A-5648086, Mellinger, Paul Frederick.
A-6542774, Moulton, Raymond John, formerly Rowe.
A-6542775, Moulton, Lynne Esther Alice, formerly Rowe.
A-6430367, Mozzano, Lentino or Valentino.
A-6222124, Muzzin, Marcellina Moro (nee Moro).
A-1434172, Myers, Myrtle Haley (nee Skeene).
A-1189354, Nyi, Huai Fen Li, or Gloria Huai Fen Li Nyi or Mrs. Henry Nyi.
A-6082644, Olivera, Roque Tanada.
A-1958978, Owens, Stanley Jasper.
A-5834601, Penna, Bruno.
A-3545828, Pineiro, Enrique Hermo, or Enrique Hermo.
A-6860766, Pulli, Toivo.
A-6362105, Rivera, Jose.
A-6751755, Rodriguez, Eusebio, or Eusebio Rodriguez-Carbajal.
A-6659026, Rodriguez-Hernandez, Aurelio (alias Aurelio Rodriguez, alias Jose Zamora Hernandez).
A-6594435, Rosen, Harold.
A-6505853, Roth, Richard John, or Richard Roth.
A-6731254, Sanchez, Jesus, or Jesus Sanchez-Sosa or Jesus E. Sanchez.
A-6449732, Sassoon, Frank.
A-1448203, Schwitz, Agnes (nee Adams alias Curtis and Moran).
A-4954930, Simmons, Evelyn Nora.
A-6261749, Sisco, James Everett, or James Everette Sisco.
A-6304543, Skenderoglou, Jordan or John or Ioannis Skenderoglou.
A-5277095, Spektor, Izak.
A-5277096, Spektor, Rebeka (nee Kawenoki).
A-4470680, Steinfeld, Marie Rose Armanda (nee Lafond, Rose Corrin, Rose Vallee).
A-9694266, Strand, Andreas.
A-2536642, Stronge, Thomas Ranken, or Strong.
A-5564088, Tetrick, Margaret Elizabeth, or Margaret Hedwig Tetrick or Margaret Warren (nee Coyne).
A-5932931, Thomas, Gracita.
A-4513706, Tolmunen, Martha (nee Tivanainen).
A-3455195, Tuckett, Ebenezer.
A-2224563, Uddin, Tomiz.
A-9558677, Van Der Leek, Hendrik.
A-9660569, Zwart, Jan, or Jan Lawrence Zwart.

Mr. McCARRAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 290) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has

suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-2245432, Bag, Mufijur Rhoman, or Mufijur Bag Rohman or Beg.

A-6076552, Chang, Mavis Clare (nee Chen See).

A-6000256, Davalos, Ernestine Bautista.

A-5895486, De Corral, Concepcion Corbala, or Concepcion Talamantes De Corral.

A-5882388, Corral, Jaime Rafael (alias James Rafael Corral).

A-5071174, De Delgado, Rafaela Rodriguez Delgadillo.

A-9771218, Ellingsen, Nils Johan.

A-7754666, Esteves, Nelson Geraldo.

A-6706061, Folie, Sophie.

A-3744021, Gazzola, Ernesto.

A-1772858, Graske, Kurt Robert, or Lais Christiansen.

A-4929343, Kannewischer, Walter Oswald, or Walter Brandt or Walter Parker.

A-6245688, Kastanos, George C.

A-6245687, Kastanos, Helen C.

A-2744895, Kesisoglu, Romylos (alias George Iades or Georgiades).

A-9582707, Kristoffersen, Harald.

A-5950003, Macridis, Elefterios Sava or Makridis.

A-6261584, Pavlis, Ekaterini, or Aikaterini Pavlis (nee Voidomatis).

A-6249424, Psaltides, Fotini, or Fotini Sotiriades.

A-6596905, Renteria, Jesus Jose, or Jesus Jose Renteria Macias.

A-3018729, Shulman, Louis.

A-5779075, Sklavoonos, Angelo, or Evangelos Sclovounos.

A-3192396, Vorlop, Kurt.

A-4468240, Waxman, Ethel (nee Rosenbaum or Rosen).

A-6144178, Aboitiz, Maria Antonia.

A-6144179, Aboitiz, Teresita Isabel.

A-6144180, Aboitiz, Jose Miguel.

A-6144181, Aboitiz, Xavier.

A-2838965, Berman, Samuel or Sam.

A-4279093, Broinstein, Sam, or Schaja Broinstein.

A-6178429, Calvo, Manuel Rosello, or Manuel Calvo or Manuel Calvo y Rosello.

A-6178427, Calvo, Norma.

A-6178428, Calvo, Angelita.

A-6240206, Chillemi, Agata (nee Russo).

A-5280371, Chin, Arthur, or Chin Git or Chan Git.

A-4780293, Coons, Olga Alexandra or Hoffman (nee Tuovinin).

A-1813401, Curiel, Mauricio Santiago.

A-5911335, Daniel, Emma Ianthe, or Emma Iantha Daniel (nee Smith, Emma Ianthe Smith).

A-6737910, Santillan De, Rufina Garcia.

A-6743422, Santillan, Silvia Garcia.

A-2582183, Grando, Ive Grgas, or John Grgas Grando.

A-5151416, Hackshaw, Mona May (nee Cockran).

A-5858390, Jackman, Woodrow Wilson.

A-9520106, Jorgensen, Petrus Kornelius.

A-2589465, Robberstad, Trygve, or Teddy Robberstad.

A-9767518, Roosekrans, Petrus Johannes.

A-5995270, Santellan-Lopez, Baldomero (alias Gustavo Tempzen-Lopez alias Gustavo Lopez Tempzen).

A-4929003, Shamarides, Adonis Arghyrou, or Adonis Shamarides or George Chamer.

A-6668113, Soininen, Seppo Paavo.

A-4837403, Thordahl, Preben Eric, or Preben Gustav Eric Thordahl.

A-4814618, Tonani, Fred.

A-3059166, Uras, Pasquale, or Patsey Uras.

A-6591993, Baker, France Stella, or France Stella Juhel-Renoy.

A-2320986, Ciocchi, Luigi.

A-6404791, Cuni, Battistina Elena (nee Vaerini).

A-5333650, Davis, Stanley Arundel, or Stanley Davis.

A-6391237, De Fonte, Sallustio.

A-9520698, Dollah, William Henry.

A-6424465, Kenedi, Tamas Klein or Thomas.

A-6627021, Malouf, George Sleiman, or Georges Maalouf.

A-4383150, Percival, Norward Edward.

A-9778306, Spithogiannis, Stefanos or Spetogianis.

A-5877274, Antzoulatos, Gerasimos, or Gerry or Jerry Angel.

A-9634730, Ballarin, Massimo.

A-6246740, Barraza, Cecilio, or Cecilio Alvarado Barraza.

A-5716466, Bekavac, Anton Ivan.

A-2739693, Boldin, Anthony or Baldin (alias Antonio Vittorio Isidoro Baldini, alias Antonio Nino Baldini, alias Nino or Nine Baldini).

A-1514544, Casas, Jose, or Jose Casas Rosales or Jose Covos or Cobos.

A-6234266, Edwards, Muriel, or Muriel Daniel or Daneil.

A-4456999, Ferghina, Teobald Isaia, or Ubaldo Isaia Ferghina.

A-6193663, Flores, Buenaventura Garcia, or Buenaventura Flores (alias Joe Garcia).

A-3161313, Francz, Jacob, or Jacob Frantz.

A-6241948, Gagner, Marie (nee Minard or Mimi).

A-4947594, Gilcourt, Charles Henry, or Chas. Gilcort or Charles Gilcourt or Gilcort.

A-7511447, Hall, Bertram Carlton.

A-5932958, Harrigan, Ethel Margery (nee Peterson).

A-5133402, Henden, John Hovde.

A-2724762, Kelly, Joseph Francis.

A-5965000, Krost, Ernst Wilhelm.

A-4521987, Kruse, William Herbert.

A-2813449, Leon-Sanchez, Jose Gregorio, or Jose G. Leon.

A-6373564, Lopez, Mauro (alias Mauro Lopez Rodriguez).

A-6624960, Morales, Esteban.

A-3478894, Pavich, Joseph, or Jose Pavic or Yoso Pavic.

A-2883717, Perales, Carmen Dolores Guevara, or Carmen Guevara or Carmen D. Guevara or Camoli.

A-5911572, Raymond, Inez Eugenia (nee McKelly or Inez Eugenia Raymond).

A-6578928, Reasola, Antonio.

A-6578929, Reasola, Maria Remedios Olvera.

A-2288481, Sacco, Pietro Vincenzo.

A-5331600, Saia, Carmelo.

A-4704221, Scarcella, Leonardo Agostino.

A-5985487, Silano, Carmine Sabino.

A-5612486, Smith, Richard (alias Richard Valba).

A-6677956, Storie, William Aitken Stewart.

A-1626396, Tchekowitch, Alexander Borisovich, or Alexis Boris Alexander.

A-2578314, Von Hoefer, Frederic Joseph, or Fred Von Hoefer.

MRS. HATTIE TRAUX

Mr. McCARRAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Traux, and I submit a report (No. 291) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 112) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 411) entitled "For the relief of Mrs. Hattie Traux" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1679. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance and public health and to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and other health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1680. A bill for the relief of Chaskiel Wajnryb and his wife Anna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1681. A bill to prohibit the picketing of courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. ECTON) introduced Senate bill 1682, to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Blackfeet Reservation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1683. A bill for the relief of Antonio Tralonga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1684. A bill to extend the benefits of the pension laws to certain male nurses who served under contract with the United States between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1685, to require non-Communist affidavits of management in labor disputes and of other persons in licensing proceedings, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 1686. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in or near Morgantown, W. Va., for researches and investigations in the mining, preparation, and utilization of coal and other minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1687. A bill to provide for the appointment of female doctors and specialists in the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; and

S. 1688. A bill to provide for certain adjustments on the promotion list of the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1689. A bill to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. ECTON):

S. 1690. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the better utilization of the resources of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, and for other purposes; and

S. 1691. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Fort Belknap Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1692. A bill to amend title 6 of the United States Code to provide for the issuance by the United States of official bonds covering Government officers and employees without charge to such officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Karin Margareta Hellen and Olof Christer Hellen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1694, to amend the Immigration Act of October 16, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY OF BLACKFEET INDIANS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Blackfeet Reservation, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Henry Magee, chairman of the Blackfeet Tribal Business Council, addressed to William Zimmerman, Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., dated April 12, 1949, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1682) to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Blackfeet Reservation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. ECTON), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter is as follows:

APRIL 12, 1949.

Hon. WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN,
Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: We are submitting to you a bill to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians. We respectfully ask your assistance in enacting this measure into law. The enclosed draft represents the best thinking of our tribe, in which we have had the assistance of several Bureau employees and the assistance of legal counsel of our own choosing. We recognize that this draft is subject to further improvement and we hope that in the hearings which may be called on this measure there will be ample opportunity to consider any possible improvements of language and of detail.

We believe that the general objectives of this measure will have the sympathy of all men of good will who are familiar with our problem. In the solemn treaties and agreements with the Blackfeet Nation the United States pledged its assistance to our people "to obtain the means to enable them to become self-supporting as a pastoral and agricultural people, and to educate their children in the paths of civilization." Our people have faithfully carried out every obligation we have undertaken toward the United States.

Our people have demonstrated their ability to make a success of the livestock business. In 1918 we had about 80,000 head of Indian-owned cattle on our reservation. Lack of credit, combined with changing Indian Bureau policies, shifting personnel, and growing complications of land status, have prevented our people from making the best economic use of our resources. By 1935 our Indian-owned cattle were reduced to less than 2,000. Since then, with access to a revolving credit fund, we have built up our cattle total to approximately 15,000 head. We need an expanded credit program to make full use of our resources. These resources are probably potentially adequate to provide our people with a decent American living standard, which we do not now have. In order to make effective use of these resources we must have adequate sources of credit for livestock expansion, for other forms of agricultural production, for the consolidation of economic land units, and for the intensive development of other reservation resources. We also need adequate credit for a program of home-building. These things we have been doing on a limited scale for the past decade. We have done enough to prove our ability to carry such a program to success. We have repaid all our tribal debts without any default or delay. Our income from oil royalties, grazing permits, leases, and other sources is adequate to give the United States ample security for reimbursement of the loan we now ask.

We have studied the Marshall plan and the law carrying out that plan which sets up an economic recovery program for Europe. The Blackfeet Nation is poorer than any nation of Europe aided by the Marshall plan, poorer than any of the nations that our boys helped to free from dictatorship. Yet, we ask no charity. We ask only a chance to build our own future and to free ourselves from economic subordination. All we ask of the United States is the credit facilities which will help us to help ourselves and the right to expand our own funds. In this we count on your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

HENRY MAGEE,
Chairman, Blackfeet Tribal Business Council.

NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS OF MANAGEMENT IN LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill with a two-fold purpose.

(a) To amend the Taft-Hartley law so as to extend the principle of non-Communist affidavits which will have to be filed by management if its complaints are to be heard, and

(b) To amend the Administrative Procedure Act to require that with certain exceptions all applications for Federal licenses must also be preceded by the filing of a non-Communist affidavit.

I believe that this bill is necessary in the public interest, is constitutional and eminently necessary in view of the critical threat of subversive forces in our times.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD followed by statements which I have prepared on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1685) to require non-Communist affidavits of management in labor disputes and of other persons in licensing proceedings, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 449) as amended by section 101 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 136) is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(i) No complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by an employer under subsection (b) of section 10, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12 months period by each officer of such employer that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of title 18, United States Code section 1001, shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits."

SEC. 2. Section 9 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(c) Except with regard to patents, trademarks and copyrights no application for a license required by law, or for a renewal of such a license, shall be entertained unless there is on file with the agency an affidavit or affidavits executed contemporaneously with the application or within the preceding 12-month period by the person or party making the application stating that neither he nor his officers, as the case may be, are members of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that neither he nor his officers, as the case may be, are members of or support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1001 shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits."

The statements presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

STATEMENTS BY SENATOR WILEY

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO EXTEND PRINCIPLE OF NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS TO ALL FEDERAL LICENSE APPLICATIONS

I am introducing in the Senate a bill extending the principle of filing of non-Communist affidavits. At present, there is a provision in the Taft-Hartley law which requires that officers of labor organizations which desire to avail themselves of the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board must file with the Board affidavits attesting to the fact that the officers are not members of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that they do not believe in and are not members of or support any organization that "believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional means." Thus, the Board cannot issue complaints on behalf of any organization whose officers have not complied with that requirement.

This provision has worked very well as evidenced by the fact that the Communists have been screaming against it, because it is so effective in exposing the men who refused to indicate whether they are or are not Reds. It seems only fair that management should also have to sign non-Communist affidavits before its complaints are heard by the National Labor Relations Board. That

then is one of the purposes of my bill—to extend the nonaffidavit principle to management.

However, the most important part of my bill is to apply the non-Communist affidavit principle to applications filed with all Government agencies involved in the Administrative Procedure Act. Thus, all agencies having to do with the granting of licenses or certificates or other privileges would have to receive within their files a non-Communist affidavit by the applicant before, for example, his application for a radio station could be entertained. It is ridiculous that the United States should be conferring interstate privileges in, let us say, the field of radio and television communication, or that the privileges of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, or other agencies should be extended to any individual who is unwilling to swear that he is not trying to overthrow the very same government which grants him the privilege.

We have heretofore followed what amounts to a suicidal policy in granting special privileges to those who are sworn to murder our way of life.

Thus, my bill extends the affidavit idea with one exception to all of the functions covered under the Administrative Procedure Act. That exception is in the field of patents, copyrights, and trade-marks, where for obvious purposes it was felt that, for example, to deny a Communist his right to secure a copyright on his publication might in effect be considered as an abridgment of the freedom of the press.

There is sound reason for Communists to oppose my bill, but I do feel that any sincere patriotic individual who is not a Communist can lend support to it. The bill would serve to bring out within the spotlight of exposure all persons who would use the privileges of the United States to destroy the United States.

It is not repressive legislation for the sake of spite or discrimination. It is merely a protective approach to a vital problem of our times. Some individuals may scoff and say that this legislation is unnecessary. We have seen, however, in our times how a small, tightly organized minority under iron discipline can take over control of an entire nation, particularly because the Communist minority invariably mobilizes, a considerable crew of fellow travelers, misguided dupes, and others who play the Red game whether or not they realize the stake involved.

On the basis of a thorough study of the matter, it appears that my bill is completely constitutional and would, if enacted, be entirely upheld by the courts.

STATEMENT ON CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SENATOR WILEY'S AMENDMENT TO TAFT-HARTLEY LAW AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Note must be taken of the court decisions on the constitutionality of section 9 (h) of the Taft-Hartley law, dealing with non-Communist affidavits. To date there have been several decisions, the key cases being *National Maritime Union of America et al.* v. *Herzog et al.* ((1948) 78 F. Supp. 146, partially affirmed, 334 U. S. 854), and *Inland Steel Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((1948) 170 F. (2d) 247). Both of these decisions were made by three-judge courts and in both there were dissents as to the constitutionality of the requirement. In affirmed *National Maritime Union of America et al.* v. *Herzog, supra,* the Supreme Court said per curiam; "* * * We do not find it necessary to reach or consider the validity of section 9 (h)" (p. 855). The lower three-judge court had held specifically that section 9 (h) did not impinge on a union officer's freedom of speech (p. 163); that it did not deny a constitutional right but rather that it imposed a condition by which a union officer could deprive his union of a privilege created by statute; that the provision did not deny the right peaceably to assemble or to associate as guaranteed by the first amendment; that it did not diminish or destroy liberty of association without due process; that it did not constitute a bill of attainder or constitute a punishment without a judicial trial (p. 164). Concerning the element of free speech the lower court said (78 F. Supp. 165):

"It is fully established by reiterated holdings of the Supreme Court that the right of free speech is not absolute but must yield to national interests justifiably thought to be of larger importance. The same is true of the right to remain silent. When legislating to avert what it believes to be a threat of substantive evil to national welfare, Congress may abridge eiher freedom. The right to be silent may be interfered with in either of two ways: As an incident to the accomplishment of a legislative purpose, Congress may require an individual to make a statement specifically prescribed by it; or it may require generally that an individual make any statement essential to avert the anticipated evil, without defining the statement."

The court then went on to say (p. 173):

"It is too well known to require citation of authority that the sovereign may regulate activities charged with a public interest, and may prescribe the qualifications of the persons engaged in those activities. A fortiori, the qualifications of a person exercising quasi-governmental functions may be prescribed by the sovereign. Congress clearly has the right to assure the minority of the workers, who are represented against their choice by the agent, and the employer, who must deal with the agent to the exclusion of others, that the agent possesses minimum qualifications for the post. It is not necessary that the Government, in order to ask whether the prospective agent is qualified, show a clear and present danger to the national economy from selecting one not qualified."

This reasoning was accepted by Circuit Judge Swan and District Judge Coxe in *Wholesale and Warehouse Workers Union, Local 85, et al.* v. *Douds* ((1948) 79 F. Supp., 563, 564). District Judge Rifkin dissented on the ground that the requirement was "incompatible with the first amendment"; that it abridged the freedom of speech and the right of assembly "without a showing of clear and present danger" (p. 565).

It should be noted that there is another constitutional provision involved in this problem—that of the guaranty of a republican form of government. Concerning this guaranty, District Judge Davidson in *Oil Workers International Union* v. *Elliott* ((1947) 73 F. Supp. 942) said (p. 944):

"The powers of Congress are outlined and defined by the Constitution of the United States. Section 4, article IV, I believe it is, which provides that the National Government shall guarantee to each State a republican form of government. It is recognized that the communistic form of government is not a representative form of government. Ours is a representative form of government, whereby the representatives of the people chosen by the people, determine the policies of the Nation. In the Communistic form, you have more of the dictatorial type. It nowhere has functioned except by and in the hands of a dictator, therefore, it behooves the National Government to curb the growth of any system that would destroy representative government and bring about government by force.

"We think that is a matter of policy for Congress to determine."

Circuit Judge Kerner stated (p. 264) in the Inland Steel Co. case:

"It is to be borne in mind that the act was not passed because Congress disapproved of the views and beliefs of Communists but because Congress recognized that the practices of persons who entertained the views * * * might not use the powers and benefits conferred by the act for the purposes intended by Congress. * * *

"It is to be remembered that neither belief, nor speech, nor association is the subject matter of the policy of section 9 (h) and that neither that section nor the Board's order imposes any limitation upon what any labor leader may think or say, nor does the order or section 9 (h) attempt to prohibit or restrain anyone from joining or supporting any organization. Neither the order nor section 9 (h) denies to Communists the right to speak and to publish freely their views, beliefs, and opinions. They may speak as they think. There is no invasion of political rights. Communists are not denied the right to remain members of the Communist Party. The section does not make such affiliation or beliefs punishable either criminally or by imposition of civil sanctions. * * *

"It is unquestioned that Congress may conclude that the policies of the act, i. e., stimulation of commerce and the security interests of the Nation, would be deterred by an extension of the benefits of the act to labor organizations dominated by officers who are Communists or supporters of organizations dominated by Communists, and that it may take steps to effectuate its conclusions. In fact, the 'congressional authority to protect interstate commerce from burdens and obstructions is not limited to transactions which can be deemed to be an essential part of a "flow" of interstate or foreign commerce. Burdens and obstructions may be due to injurious action springing from other sources. The fundamental principle is that power to regulate commerce is the power to enact "all appropriate legislation." * * * That power is plenary and may be exerted to protect interstate commerce "no matter what the source of the dangers which threaten it."' *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1). * * *

"Congress has the power to withhold benefits which it confers for the accomplishment of legitimate purposes within its constitutional powers from those who, it has cause to believe, may utilize those benefits for directly opposite purposes."

The majority then go on to reject the contention that section 9 (h) constitutes a bill of attainder and to quote Mr. Justice Murphy in *North American Co.* v. *Securities and Exchange Commission* ((1946) 327 U. S. 686, 711) "nothing in the Constitution prevents Congress from acting in time to prevent potential injury to the national economy from becoming a reality."

In this connection, attention is invited to the following broad language used by Mr. Justice Jackson in *U. S.* v. *Women's Sportswear Manufacturing Association, et al.* ((decided March 28, 1949) 17 L. W. 4271, 4272): "Restraints, to be effective, do not have to be applied all along the line of movement of interstate commerce. The source of the restraint may be intrastate, as the making of a contract or combination usually is; the application of the restraint may be intrastate, as it often is; but neither matters if the necessary effect is to stifle or restrain commerce among the States. If it is interstate commerce that feels the pinch, it does not matter how local the operation which applies the squeeze."

If the premises of the majority are accepted and affirmed, then Congress can, after proper legislative determination that the activities of persons such as were designated in section 9 (h) are hurtful to the national interests and a burden to the flow of interstate and foreign commerce, limit the activities of such persons in commerce. It should be noted that Congress has already made the advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence a crime (U. S. C. 18: 2385; Public Law No. 772,

80th Cong). Accordingly, I see no present constitutional impediment to extending the requirement of section 9 (h) to management. In fact, if the basic propositions are accepted, the requirement can be extended almost indefinitely with regard to privileges granted by Congress and to the regulation of commerce.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 712) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

PEACE AND SECURITY COME FIRST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Peace and Security Come First," delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ BEFORE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF RIVERS AND HARBORS

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Congress of Rivers and Harbors at Washington, D. C., on April 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ADELA THOMAS BEFORE PAN-AMERICAN LIAISON COMMITTEE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Adela Thomas, of the Argentine Republic, before the Pan-American Liaison Committee on March 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the long-range program for agriculture, prepared by him and presented in a radio-interview broadcast by Upton Close on April 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE ASIATIC AREA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of American foreign policy in the Asiatic area, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CORNERSTONES OF DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR TUCK, OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Cornerstones of Democracy," delivered by Gov. William Munford Tuck, of Virginia, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR NEW HORIZONS—ADDRESS BY BENJAMIN M. NAMM

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our New Horizons," delivered by Benjamin M. Namm, immediate past president of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, before the Piedmont Sales Conference held at Charlotte, N. C., April 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WANTED: A NEW APPROACH TO FARM PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY MURRAY D. LINCOLN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Wanted: A New Approach to Farm Problems," delivered by Murray D. Lincoln, president, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, at the national convention, Americans for Democratic Action, Chicago, Ill., on April 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER—ARTICLE FROM LOOK MAGAZINE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Flood, Mud, Dust, and Disaster," published in the April 26, 1949, issue of Look magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANAGEMENT-LABOR RELATIONS—ANALYSES OF WOOD BILL

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two analyses of the second Wood bill, H. R. 4290, and comparison with the Taft-Hartley law, prepared by Woll, Glenn, and Thatcher, general counsel, American Federation of Labor, and by the CIO, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN AND THE AMERICAN DEFENSE BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time To Call a Halt," published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of April 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOP-FLIGHT EXECUTIVES FOR GOVERNMENT POSTS—EDITORIAL FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: Top Men for United States Posts," written by Harlan Trott and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S POLICY TOWARD CHINA

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "BRIDGES Is Right," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union, of Manchester, N. H., and an editorial from the New York World-Telegram entitled "Misinformation About China," which appear in the Appendix.]

CAPITAL LIFE & HEALTH INSURANCE CO.—STATEMENT BY LESTER L. BATES

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Lester L. Bates, president of the Capital Life & Health Insurance Co., celebrating the opening of the new home office building at Columbia, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTEST AGAINST INCREASE OF POSTAL RATES BY WARREN ZIMMERMAN, OF LAWRENCE, KANS.

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter opposing an increase of postal rates addressed by Warren Zimmerman, of Lawrence, Kans., to the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD the seventh, eighth, and ninth articles of a current series in the Baltimore Sun on the monetary cost of the social-welfare programs recommended to the Congress by President Truman—programs officially estimated to cost the people $1,250,000,000,000 over a 50-year period.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 23, 1949]

SOCIAL SECURITY—NEW PLAN MAY TAKE 14-PERCENT PAY-ROLL TAX

(This is the seventh of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—The cost of social security has just begun to rise.

It will rise at an accelerating pace for the next 50 years, or until the system reaches actual maturity.

Take just one of the programs—old-age and survivors insurance—and the records show that 2,300,000 persons now are receiving about $50,000,000 a month benefits.

But in the year 1960, according to official forecasts of the Social Security System actuaries, there would be a minimum of 7,134,000 persons on the benefit rolls under the President's new program.

And their minimum benefit checks would total $388,000,000 a month.

That is the lowest estimate. The actuaries admit that if there is a high level of retirements and other factors, the number of beneficiaries by 1960 may rise to 10,270,000.

And the monthly benefit checks would average $600,000,000—or $7,200,000,000 a year—for old-age and survivor benefits and temporary disability.

But by 1970—10 years later—the lowest estimate of the number of beneficiaries is 15,655,000.

And the lowest estimate of cost for 1970, under the Truman proposals, is $650,000,000 a month.

The Ways and Means Committee was told recently that the total entitled to benefits by 1970 might rise as high as 17,672,000 out of a population of 163,000,000 people.

The cost then would be a little over $900,000,000 a month.

At the end of 50 years the number of beneficiaries under old-age insurance may reach 30,600,000 and the monthly cost may be running $1,720,000,000 every month, Congress was told.

These are not figures conjured out of some reporter's head or guessed at by some politician.

They are the official figures which the Social Security Commissioner gave Congress on March 24—the day he appeared to ask that the program be vastly enlarged.

Part of the higher costs would result from the larger benefits and broader coverage the President proposes, and part from an accelerated rate of retirement.

Here's what the new program would add next year:

In the January budget the President estimated that without his new program, old-age and survivor benefits in fiscal 1950 would require $745,000,000.

But with the new program, the President said, the cost would be $2,245,000,000—$1,500,000,000 higher for the first year.

But this is only a beginning.

So far, officials estimate, only one-half of the persons who could retire and claim benefits have done so.

MANY NOT DRAWING PAY

In 1948, they say, there were 925,000 fully insured persons over 65 who were not drawing benefits.

Some of these, of course, will never retire.

If all of these decided to retire quickly, the benefit rolls would jump at once from $50,000,000 a month to close to $90,000,000—at the present old-age benefit rates.

If Congress votes the new higher benefits asked by the President, the benefit rolls, both in numbers of retired and in dollar benefits, would quickly skyrocket.

Here was the monthly benefit list at the close of 1948 as compiled by the Federal Security Agency:

	Number of beneficiaries	Amount of monthly benefits	Percent of total number
			Percent
Retired workers, age 65 and over	1,040,000	$26,350,000	45
Wives, 65 and over of retired workers	320,000	4,300,000	14
Widows with young children	140,000	2,925,000	6
Children of retired or deceased workers	580,000	7,525,000	25
Aged widows (over 65) of deceased workers	210,000	4,325,000	9
Aged dependent parents of deceased workers	12,000	160,000	1
Total	2,300,000	45,575,000	100

In 1960, when the total reaches a minimum of 7,134,000 beneficiaries under the new plan, there would be 2,580,000 retired workers with 1,032,000 wives over 60 drawing benefits.

In that year, the officials estimate there would be a minimum of 1,795,000 widows drawing benefits as survivors in their own right.

And 326,000 young mothers with 1,229,000 surviving children would be drawing benefits.

But these figures give only a part of the cost picture.

In addition to old-age and survivor insurance—known generally as OASI—there is old-age assistance—or, as more familiarly referred to, public assistance.

Over 5,000,000 persons are now receiving some form of public assistance.

The cost of this assistance—in the form of Federal grants to States—is set at $1,064,000,000 in the 1950 budget.

That is about $90,000,000 a month. That is only what is costs the Federal Government. The State's costs are additional.

The President has asked that this program be broadened to include all needy persons.

OTHER RETIREMENT PLANS

Railroad workers also have their own retirement program, which often gets overlooked in discussions of social security.

On a pay roll of about $5,000,000,000, the workers and their employers are paying taxes of about $700,000,000 a year. Benefits at the moment are running about $360,000,000 a year.

Railroad workers have old-age benefits, unemployment, sickness, and maternity benefits in their program. Their costs will rise, too, until they reach close to $1,000,000,000 a year by the year 2000.

Federal Government workers have what is known as the civil-service retirement program. Its costs are something over $300,000,000 a year and they are rising.

In the program now pending before Congress, the President has asked that workers be insured against temporary disabilities—that is, against sickness or other incapacity lasting less than 6 months.

Social-security officials estimated for the Ways and Means Committee that this new program would cost about $1,000,000,000 a year.

It would require a 1-percent contribution—or tax—on pay rolls and would cost about $90,000,000 a month.

HEALTH PROGRAM COSTS

The proposed national health program has not yet received the approval of Congress. So no present expenses are being incurred.

But the President asked in his budget for a small initial sum—$15,000,000—to begin preparations for the system.

And he asked for a small nominal tax to produce $260,000,000 toward a national health trust fund.

But when, or if, this system gets to functioning on a Nation-wide full-time basis—if Congress approves—the minimum cost would be about $3,600,000,000 in the first year.

One thing is certain:

Whether Congress approves the enlarged old-age system proposed by the President or not, and whether it adds disability insurance, health insurance, and other things or not—somebody is going to have to put up more money for the existing system.

Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner, told the Ways and Means Committee that with the rate frozen since 1940 at 2 percent the system has so far incurred $7,000,000,000 more of obligations for future benefits than the trust fund will ever produce.

That amount probably will have to be made up out of the General Treasury as it comes due in the future.

TAXES MUST BE RAISED

But taxes—the weekly contributions by workers and employers—will also have to be raised quickly if the system is to be put on a sound financial basis, Altmeyer has told Congress.

He told the Ways and Means Committee that assuming present wage levels are maintained over the next 40 or 50 years, an average tax of about 6 percent on pay rolls will finance old-age benefits.

That, of course, does not include temporary disability, which would take 1 percent additional.

Or health, which would take somewhere between 4 and 6 percent.

Contribution rates now in the law for old age alone call for 2 percent for the remainder of 1949; 3 percent, equally divided by worker and employer, in 1950 and 1951; and 4 percent for 1952 and thereafter.

But these rates will not cover the full needs of the system in future years.

The plan of the Government is for the Treasury to begin making contributions to the system when the day arrives that combined employer-employee contributions are not enough to keep the trust fund from decreasing.

Whenever the Treasury had to put into the fund more than half of the amount which employer-employee together were putting in, the tax rate would be raised.

On a low-cost basis, the actuaries have forecast that after 1980 a 5-percent rate would be needed to maintain the old-age fund.

But on a high-cost basis—assuming the same high level of employment—the rate would have to jump to 5 percent from 1965-71.

And it would rise to 6 percent for 1972–78; to 7 percent for 1979–85; to 8 percent for the years 1986–92, and for 1993 and thereafter to 9 percent.

In short, social security, health and disability may some day cost a pay-roll tax rate of 14 percent—9 percent for old age, 1 percent for disability, 4 percent for health.

[From the Baltimore Sunday Sun of April 24, 1949]

SOCIAL SECURITY HEALTH PLAN—INITIAL COST—$9,000,000,000

(This is the eighth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—The national compulsory health program which President Truman outlined to Congress yesterday will cost $9,000,000,000 a year.

This is the estimated cost from the start.

When fully established—if Congress approves the whole program—it will cost a great deal more.

The authority for these statements is the President, himself.

He said that the country is now spending about 4 percent of its total national income on health.

The national income for 1948, according to the Department of Commerce was $204,000,000,000.

Four percent of this is $8,960,000,000—the amount the President says health is now costing the country.

Actually, at present, Federal, State, and local Governments are spending roughly $2,000,000,000 for health and private persons and institutions $7,000,000,000.

But, said the President, this does not "meet the health needs of the country."

"More and better care can be obtained," Mr. Truman told Congress Friday, "for the same amount of money under the program I am recommending."

WOULD REVERSE SITUATION

Under the President's program the situation would be reversed. Private persons and institutions would spend only about $2,000,000,000 and Government about $7,000,000,000 at the start.

But this $9,000,000,000 a year would be only a beginning, the President has indicated.

"Furthermore," he told Congress, "we can and should invest additional amounts in an adequate program—for the additional investment will more than pay for itself."

Neither the President nor the administration bill has given a break-down on actual prospective costs of the program.

Here is a broad estimate compiled from administration sources:

1. The Nation-wide system of compulsory health insurance, financed by a 3-percent pay-roll tax shared equally by workers and employers	$3,600,000,000
Contribution from the General Treasury	700,000,000
Total for compulsory health program	4,300,000,000
2. Medical care for the non-insured needy (outside institutions)	150,000,000
3. Government expenditures—Federal, State, and local, for civilian health purposes	2,420,000,000
4. Private medical expenditures by individuals and institutions	2,100,000,000

But this $9,000,000,000—as the President intimated—is only the beginning of the costs which the program would call for.

VERY QUICK RISE FORECAST

Very quickly after its launching—according to Government experts—the cost of the compulsory health program—"prepaid medical insurance," the President has named it—would rise to at least $6,000,000,000 a year.

And the remainder of the program would rise to $4,000,000,000.

Eventually, according to reliable forecasts, the health insurance alone would rise to $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 a year.

Other costs for civilian health—not including veterans' outlays—would also rise under the program until by 1960 they would reach more than $4,100,000,000.

This was the official estimate made by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, in a 10-year Federal health program submitted to the President September 2, 1948.

The heart of the President's program, however, is the compulsory insurance program which he has estimated will insure some 120,000,000 of the Nation's 150,000,000 inhabitants.

Because it would take about 3 years to get this system established fully, the President urged that it be launched at once.

Under the administration plan $15,000,000 has been asked in the 1950 budget to begin "tooling up" the system.

Benefits would not begin until July 1, 1951, but the pay roll taxes would begin January 1, 1950.

TAXES NOT STATED IN BILL

Nothing is said in the administration bill about the tax rates, as such, because to have proposed taxes in the bill would have required that the legislation go first to the House Ways and Means Committee.

The 3-percent pay-roll tax, shared equally by workers and employers, would begin July 1, 1951. It would be applicable to the first $4,800 of earnings—the same as proposed in the pending old-age and survivors insurance legislation.

The commencing rate expected to be requested of Congress is one-half percent, equally shared by employer and employee, beginning January 1, 1950.

For the fiscal year 1951—beginning July 1, 1950—the rate would be stepped up to 1 percent, equally shared by employer and employee.

A year later the rate would go to 1½ percent for each.

According to the President's 1950 budget the initial one-half percent rate starting in January would produce $260,000,000 for the national trust health fund by July 1, 1950.

Benefits proposed under the administration bill which is to be introduced in Congress Monday, would include virtually every medical or hospital expense an American family ever incurs.

HEALTH SERVICES PROPOSED

The bill offers personal-health service to insured workers and their families and dependents and to the self-employed as follows:

1. Medical services, dental services, home nursing, hospital services, and auxiliary services.

2. Medical services to include preventive, diagnostic, and therapeutic care, and periodic examinations by physicians engaged in general or family practice of medicine, and specialists' services in office, home, hospital, or elsewhere, as necessary.

3. Dental services, also including specialists' services.

4. Home nursing services to include nursing care of the sick by a registered professional nurse or a qualified practical nurse.

5. Hospitalization, up to a maximum of 60 days in any benefit year, including necessary nursing services, physician, laboratory, ambulance, and other hospital services.

6. Auxiliary services, consisting of chemical bacteriological, pathological, diagnostic X-ray and related laboratory services; X-ray, radium and related therapy; physiotherapy; services of optometrists and chiropodists; prescribed drugs which are unusually expensive, special appliances, and eyeglasses.

For needy persons not eligible for benefits under the provisions covering workers and the self-employed the bill would provide medical and hospital assistance in connection with the public-assistance provision of social security.

The administration's health goal, as outlined by Mr. Ewing, is:

1. That everyone should have ready access to adequate health and medical services.

2. That everyone should have the kind of services, and all the services, he needs to promote better health.

3. That everyone should be able to obtain these without regard to the level of his personal income.

RESOURCES SHORT AT START

Medical resources from the start—doctors and hospitals especially—will be short, the administration admits.

It is for this reason that the President emphasized the inadequate supply of doctors and asked for Federal funds to subsidize medical education.

Not only is the supply of doctors, dentists, nurses inadequate but it is improperly distributed, he said.

The program would call for some redistribution of these facilities—especially to provide more adequate medical care in rural communities.

Moreover, according to the Federal Security Administrator, there are not enough hospital beds by at least 600,000.

For this reason the administration bill calls for immediately doubling Federal grants to States for hospital construction.

Ultimately, substantial Federal funds for hospital maintenance also are to be provided.

Action on the whole multi-billion-dollar program is urgent, the President has declared, "because a scant 20 percent of the people can afford all the medical care they need."

About half of the families of the country—those with incomes below $3,000—find it difficult "to get even routine medical care," Mr. Ewing told the President.

On $3,000 to $5,000 income families severe illnesses and hospitalizations "impose a severe burden."

Every year, the Security Administrator says, 325,000 people die who could be saved under a proper program of medical service.

COULD AVOID WORK LOSS

And a substantial proportion of the 4,300,000 man-years of work which are lost annually through bad health might be avoided with proper medical assistance.

Under the health program proposed by the President there would be a better distribution, he says, of the health spending of the American people.

About two-thirds of the $6,500,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 spent privately now for medical service would be transferred to the compulsory health program.

This would be a redistribution of costs already being incurred.

But such expenditures, administration sources admit, would be far from covering the needs of the millions of workers and self-employed now unable to finance medical services.

The expected $4,300,000,000 of benefits paid in the first year of the system would be a mere start.

They would jump sharply as more adequate services are made available—requiring either substantial boosts in the pay-roll tax rates or deep dips into the Treasury—or, perhaps, both.

Administration spokesmen have admitted that the home nursing and dental expenses might require a one-half percent boost of the rate soon after the first year of operation.

And within a few years thereafter at least another one-half percent boost for the medical program.

Experts outside the Government insist that administration estimates are far too low, and assert that by 1960 the program would require at least a 6-percent rate, equally shared by workers and employers, instead of a 4-percent pay-roll tax.

Basically, the idea of the administration is that a mandatory health scheme will compel employed persons to budget for health purposes while they are well and earning money.

And it will require persons in high-income brackets to help pay for the medical needs of low-income people who cannot help themselves out of their own meager earnings.

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 25, 1949]

SOCIAL SECURITY—TRUMAN HEALTH PLAN COVERS WIDE SCOPE

(This is the ninth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—The President's national-health program not only would call for substantial new pay-roll taxes from workers and employers but it would tap the National Treasury sharply as well.

Compulsory health insurance, to be paid out of pay-roll taxes is only a part of the administration health program.

From the start—and maybe for a long while—the General Treasury would be called on for contributions to the health-insurance fund.

It would also be called on for some $40,000,000 or more a year for medical services to persons under the public-assistance program.

And it would be tapped much more heavily than now for grants for hospital construction, hospital maintenance, medical education, medical research, and the promotion of public health.

WHAT HEALTH GOALS ARE COSTING

These health objectives are now costing the Federal, State, and local governments $2,000,000,000 a year.

Under the new program they would rise at once to about $2,500,000,000 a year, and by 1960 would reach a total in excess of $4,100,000,000.

The gradual expansion of health services and resources called for by the President would carry the program to a peak of costs in about 10 years.

Here is the estimate of civilian health costs—not including the compulsory health insurance—as forecast for the year 1960 by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, in a report to the President last year which is the basis for the proposed legislation.

[In millions of dollars]

	Federal share	State and local	Total
General medical care for the needy	40	40	80
Community health	570	680	1,250
Hospitals:			
Construction	210	275	485
Maintenance, TB hospitals	335	695	1,030
Maintenance, general	25	30	55
Maintenance, Federal hospitals	900		900
Rehabilitation	70	30	100
Health training	82	45	127
Research	80		80
Total	2,312	1,795	4,107

These costs are in addition to the prepaid-medical-insurance program which by 1960 would be costing around $6,000,000,000.

All of the $4,107,000,000 will come out of general taxes.

And part of the $6,000,000,000—probably $1,000,000,000—will also come out of general taxes.

The national health objectives of the legislation which the administration will introduce in Congress tomorrow are summarized below.

GRANTS TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS

First, the program calls for Federal grants to aid medical schools expand.

"We are short of doctors, hospitals, nurses," the President told Congress in January.

"We must remedy these shortages," he warned.

The object is to expand the supply of physicians by 1960 from 190,000 to 227,000.

To increase the supply of dentists from 75,000 to 95,000.

And to supply the needed nurses financial aid would be given with the purpose of raising the total supply from 318,000 to 443,000.

At the current rate of output of doctors, the Nation would be short 42,000 by 1960 unless training is accelerated by Federal aid, the administration says.

Actually, the country will need by 1960, the administration states, a total of 254,000 physicians to give adequate services under the proposed health-insurance plan.

But to achieve this goal would require doubling the capacity of medical schools almost literally, overnight.

Particular attention is to be given a program for training Negro physicians.

Negroes comprise 10 percent of the population, but produce only 2 percent of the physicians.

The shortage of dentists in the country is also described as serious. In 1940 the ratio was 1 dentist for 1,870 persons.

WOULD INCREASE PREVENTIVE WORK

The administration says there is an accumulated need of 400,000 man-years of dental work, which probably can never be made up. The program is aimed at increasing preventive work in the future.

But the program also includes increased public funds for rural health activities, public health services, maternity and child health services, aid for crippled children, hospital construction, and medical research.

The proposed administration bill would raise the Federal grants for hospital construction to $150,000,000 a year at once.

Eventually the hospital program would rise to more than $200,000,000 of Federal outlays annually for buildings.

By then the Government plans to include substantial aid to States to construct and maintain mental-hospital facilities.

The administration bill calls for a survey of the mental-health situation and a report within 2 years with a recommendation program of action.

States and localities would be given Federal aid to "establish adequate local health units."

A program of research "to extend the frontiers of medical knowledge" would be financed.

By 1960, according to Mr. Ewing, Federal nonmilitary research should reach a total of $80,000,000 to $100,000,000 "if enough qualified scientists are available."

Under the Public Health Service many special programs would be launched or expanded.

MENTAL-HEALTH PROGRAM

One of these would be a mental-health program.

On any given day, the authorities say, one-half of the patients in the Nation's hospitals are victims of some form of mental disease.

In most States, and notably in Maryland, there is a grave lack of manpower, hospital facilities, and clinics to treat and prevent mental diseases.

Mental ill health costs now approximately 40 percent of the Federal budget for health purposes.

But Congress has just been told by Dr. William C. Menninger, president of the American Psychiatric Association, that this is far too low.

Instead of the $6,000,000 provided for the national mental-health program, Dr. Menninger says $30,000,000 a year is needed at once.

And for training psychiatrists and workers in mental health, $12,000,000 is needed, he said, for graduate purposes and $6,000,000 for undergraduates in this field.

The administration program calls for gradually expanding Federal outlays in this field.

The President's health proposals also include projects for rehabilitation of physically handicapped and disabled persons.

Currently the Government is spending about $23,000,000 a year for this purpose.

The goal is $100,000,000 a year to rehabilitate some 250,000 men and women who are disabled annually through sickness or injury.

MATERNAL CARE PROVIDED

The administration bill also provides about $25,000,000 a year for maternal and child-welfare services.

The Federal Government is now spending in grants to States $11,000,000 a year for maternal and child-health services, $7,500,000 for crippled children, and $3,500,000 for child-welfare services.

These would be increased under the administration bill.

The program ultimately would expand these costs "several times" "to assure to every child in the country the utmost degree of health."

"If present public programs were extended to reach all the child population in 1960, the cost—at present prices—would be about $430,000,000 a year," Mr. Ewing estimated.

Similarly, he said, if services now given to crippled children were extended to all handicapped children the cost at present prices would be about $258,000,000 a year.

A special program to improve rural health is included in the administration bill. It would provide subsidies of about $35,000,000 a year to encourage doctors to settle in rural and other areas where medical service now is inadequate.

The program also contemplates extensive expenditures in the years ahead for accident prevention, community sanitation, and water-pollution control.

For the last-named program—water-pollution control—Congress already has authorized $22,500,000 a year in loans for each of 5 years. But this would be only a beginning.

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR COST FORESEEN

By 1960 the administration foresees a broad program for this purpose costing $400,000,000 a year to local communities.

Why should the Federal Government participate in these programs?

Because, answer the authorities, many small communities lack the resources to help themselves.

Nine thousand towns and cities with 6,000,000 population need complete sewerage systems.

Nearly 10,000 towns with 80,000,000 population need improved sewerage systems.

And in rural communities nearly 33,000,000 people need new or improved facilities.

Mr. Ewing has estimated that a complete sanitation program at present prices would cost around $7,000,000,000.

The hospital construction program under the 1946 act, the President said, is pitifully inadequate.

The bill sponsored by Senator MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, for the administration carries $150,000,000 a year of Federal funds.

It is estimated that this, along with local funds, would provide one-eighth of the country's needs by the end of 1951.

At this rate it would take 40 years, it has been estimated, to build the needed hospitals for the health program.

GOAL OF 600,000 NEW BEDS

The goal of the administration is 600,000 new beds in hospitals by 1960, and 900,000 new beds in hospitals by 1965.

Eventually the hospital construction program will cost $485,000,000 a year, of which the Federal portion will be $240,000,000.

The medical-training program has been estimated to call for $135,000,000 a year, of which the Federal share will be $90,000,000.

The plan to spend some $10,000,000 a year on construction in medical schools, $6,000,000 of other help for schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and public health.

And to provide grants to States for scholarships of $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 a year.

The proposals outlined in the President's message and in the administration bill being submitted to Congress is the start of a long-range health program.

The eventual cost within a decade if approved entire by Congress would reach $12,000,000,000 to $13,000,000,000 a year at a minimum.

THE SITUATION IN CHINA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, several Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle received recently a letter from one who is well informed on the situation in China. The writer formerly represented the National Resources Commission of China, but is no longer in that position. He writes as a well-informed American citizen interested in doing what he can for our friends in China. I ask that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD following this brief statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1949.

DEAR SENATOR: Early last year when I took on the account of the National Resources Commission of China as one of my clients, it was with the understanding that my principal function was to interest American capital in investment in Chinese business enterprises. At that time the situation looked hopeful, especially in view of the backing promised to the Nationalist Chinese Government by the Aid to China Act of April 1948.

When the help promised under the Aid to China Act was delayed, I felt obliged to look into the political phase of this situation. What I discovered surprised me greatly. When the Communist push started in the latter part of October, my plans had to be changed. Certainly no business could be done with a country in which stability was to be so questionable. My first impulse was to abandon the situation. Upon reflection and study, however, I came to the conclusion that I would take up the cause of China politically, with one reservation. That reservation is embodied in the following cable which I sent to the Premier on January 21, 1949, when Acting President Li took over after Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek retired:

"I have complete confidence that you will under no circumstances compromise with the Communists. Such a course would compel me to resign and would lose the support of the majority of the Congress who I am confident are now in favor of helping China fight communism and will demonstrate this shortly. My efforts in your behalf are unceasing, and in spite of difficulties will be successful. Count on me. Kindest regards."

Of course, Senator, I couldn't retain for 1 minute any client who proposed to coalesce with the Communists, first because of the great eternal principle that compromise with evil is wrong and, second, because of the practical example of the failure of such

compromise given to us several times in Europe during the past few years.

In my studies of the situation, I couldn't escape the blows to my pride as an American that the following three factors in this situation inflicted upon me: First, the foul betrayal of China at Yalta. Second, the stupid (unless stupid, it was vicious) insistence by our representatives in China in 1946 that the Nationalists form a coalition with the Communists in China. Third, the stalling in the delivery of arms and ammunition ordered by China under the Aid to China Act of April 1948. The shipments of small arms and ammunition reached the Nationalists too late to be of much value in fighting the Communist push in late October and, also, too late to have any effect upon the deteriorating morale of the people under Nationalist Chinese rule.

Every time some prominent statesman mentions that the Chinese Nationalist soldiers had no will to fight, I try to put myself in the position of one of them and suggest that you try to do the same. In view of items 1, 2, and 3 above, would you have had any confidence in Nationalist China or in the promises made by the United States to Nationalist China? If you were a Nationalist Chinese and read the glowing tribute paid to anti-Communist Chinese and, particularly, to Chiang Kai-shek in the Aid to China bill passed last April and then saw shipment of arms and ammunition delayed to your leaders until it was too late to use them in fighting the Communist push, would you not incline to the view that there is a guiding influence behind the scenes in the United States which pays little attention to Congress? You certainly would if you were to come across the column written by C. L. Sulzberger in the New York Times of February 21, 1949, headed "Wait and see China policy is defended in Washington," subheading, "State Department holds oriental nation must disintegrate before we take action." This article purported to g've the views of those in the State Department whose views on China now prevail. The series of expressions of opinion contained therein serves the purposes of the Kremlin more skillfully than anything I have read in many months.

I am enclosing the article and suggest you study it immediately, first because as an American citizen and one who represents American citizens, you will be alarmed at it. Second, as a Member of the Senate, you will realize that the article purporting as it does to state American foreign policy on the subject of China, flatly contradicts everyone who voted for the passage of the aid-to-China bill last April 1948, which bill specifically stated the American policy to be:

"In the judgment of the committee, the Nationalist Government of China, led for 20 years through tremendous difficulties by the selfless patriotism of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, represents our common contest against threats to international peace and security and against Communist aggression, and deserves support within our resources as proposed in this act. Further, the aid authorized by this act is tangible proof of American interest in the independence and integrity of China, in the welfare of the Chinese people, and in stabilized peace in the Far East."

This bill was signed by the President.

The whole article by Sulzberger reveals a technique on the part of his source that, if not Communist technique, is certanly as good as any I have ever read in my 30 years of observation of their tactics.

The cowardly statement contained in the sixth paragraph of the article reflects upon the courage of all Americans. Finally, the four long-range objectives laid down, especially Nos. 2, 3, and 4, indicate a desire or a tendency to go along with communism, which is in sharp contrast not only with the statement of American policy laid down by the Senate body last April, as quoted above, but also in even sharper contrast with the noble call to a crusade against communism announced by the President on January 20 and, finally, in contrast with the spirit of the North Atlantic Pact.

Moreover, the attitude of the State Department official interviewed by Mr. Sulzberger is in sharp contrast with the statement of the majority leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, on February 14, in which he said:

"We cannot let China become subject to Communist government.

"By the way, in my opinion, a coalition government of China is nothing but a Communist government, and I hope that the Nationalist Government will not capitulate in China. I hope China will not become subject to domination and become another satellite nation of the Soviet Union.

"This is a great question, the world question, the question of the ages. Its solution in the main rests with the United States of America."

And finally, this tendency on the part of the State Department spokesman to pave the way for conciliation and compromise with communism in China must be galling to the soul of great statesmen like TOM CONNALLY, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and SAM RAYBURN, the indomitable Speaker of the House, in whose souls, hearts, and minds are firmly and indelibly written the traditions of the Alamo—no compromise with or surrender to an evil enemy.

Bluntly, it looks to me as if someone in the State Department is trying to formulate foreign policy instead of, and in opposition to, the President and the Senate, although article II, section 2, of the Constitution, plainly indicates that that is the function of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This tendency of usurpation by the State Department division of the executive department of our Government should be abruptly halted.

There is one fact that should be faced frankly and without further delay; that there is no such thing as an honorable and just peace with the Communists especially within any divided political unit in which they have an interest. The silly, almost asinine (unless it be vicious and I say this advisedly) attitude on the part of some people in the State Department that we must wait until the dust settles is worthy of only one comment. The dust has settled—in their eyes! The truth is that there is not much time for us to delay in supporting 100 percent the opposition to communism in China. That opposition is typified by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the man who succeeded him when he retired, Acting President Li.

The vehemence with which the Communists have always attacked the generalissimo and now attack President Li should be a signal to us here in the United States that they are the ones the Communists fear most. These attacks by the way are not confined to the out-and-out Communists but are participated in by some of their sympathizers whose reports, skillfully written, find their way into American newspapers. The Communists, of course, have always hated Chiang Kai-shek since he drove them out in 1927. By 1937 China was well on the way toward prosperity and peace when the Japanese attacked. Even in spite of this set-back, the generalissimo kept the Communists under control until after that "awful thing" at Yalta happened. By the way, I think Mr. Alger Hiss was on the scene at Yalta!

Then came the skillfully arranged surrender of the Japanese Army to the Russians who used the arms and ammunition captured from the crack Japanese army to rearm the Chinese Communists. Shortly thereafter we started the policy of refusing to send to the Nationalist Government of China the small arms and ammunition which they needed so badly for an infantry army. Contrary to all the lies repeated, repeated, and repeated over the air and in the newspapers, there were no substantial shipments of small arms and ammunition from the United States to Nationalist China during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948, with the exception of the one substantial shipment in June 1947, and the few shipments made since October 1948. I stress this emphatically because in this failure to supply the Nationalist Government of China with the small arms and ammunition they needed so badly, lies the key to what is wrong in Washington and which, unless corrected, may be a very disturbing factor in the event of war with Russia. In plain language, there is something very dangerous in the State Department and I think it is up to the United States Senate to ferret it out. It is obvious that there have been thieves and traitors in the State Department during the past 10 years, but I refer to someone more skillful, someone who guides opinion of the executive into channels that help Communists and handicap or injure those who are fighting communism!

In spite of the published plans of the Communist International for the conquest of China (copies of which are on file in the United States Government files) the impression emanated from the State Department to the effect that the Chinese Communists were merely agrarian reformers. After Mao Tse-tung's victory this past fall, he announced that he was in full agreement with Moscow. Yet, in an interview published by Sulzberger on February 21, referred to hereinbefore, a State Department official gave the impression that they think they can get along with the Communists in China. On March 19 the New York Times headline read "Chinese Reds Vow War Aid To Russia—Editorial Calls Stalin Leader of Peace Forces—Atlantic Pact Termed Provocative." In the newspapers of April 4, this alliance with Moscow was proclaimed in even stronger language by the Communist leaders of China.

The question arises—how much more evidence do our experts in foreign affairs need to have presented to them in order to know the score? The Chinese Reds are our enemies as much as any other Communists. They follow the party line obediently. The Nationalists are our friends. We need their help. Chiang Kai-shek and acting president Li are the central figures of the Nationalists. We must support them and the other Nationalists in their effort to stem the Communist advance in Asia. The time to act is now, not after China, the rest of Asia, Japan, and the Philippines have gone to the enemy.

The great error that our legislators have made and the great error the rulers of all countries have made in fighting communism is, namely, they fail to understand and take into consideration the fact that communism is no more Russian than it is Polish, Chinese or American. It is an ideology which grips people of all nations, races and colors, but not of creeds (that is, not of people who actually believe in God and love their neighbors as themselves for the love of God.) The Communist ideology has split practically every nation on the face of the globe. The appearance of unanimity in Russia and other countries where the Communists have gained control of the machinery of government, including the army and their own peculiar secret police, is due, of course, only to the iron curtain which prevents the truth from getting out. There are millions of anti-Communists in Russia. By the same token there are many Communists in this country. I am afraid there are some in the State Department. I call upon the Senate to investigate

thoroughly lest that fear be verified too late. This is not a witch-hunt any more than if a physician were examining a patient for cancer. The cancer exists somewhere in our governmental body. Let's find out where and operate!

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. GOODWIN.

P. S.—How Henry Wallace must be laughing behind President Truman's back? Although Wallace was defeated, certainly he has had his way completely in the Chinese situation.

MRS. MARION T. SCHWARTZ

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1169) for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

CARL E. LAWSON AND FIREMAN'S FUND INDEMNITY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND STRATEGIC STOCK PILING ACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, dated April 22, 1949, together with the seven statements referred to in his letter.

There being no objection, the letter and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1949.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: This refers to your letter of April 8, 1949, in which you request that certain dates submitted to you with our letter of September 22, 1948, be brought current.

Enclosed are the following statements which reflect the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the various categories during the first 8 months of the fiscal year through February 28, 1949:

1. Statement of purchases and sales proceeds—by Commodity, all programs. These data include purchases and collateral acquired in settlement of loans under price-support programs and purchases under the foreign purchase and supply programs. Purchases by the United States Department of Agriculture under the National School Lunch Act and section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended, are not included. Sales figures include domestic as well as export sales. Deliveries for export are shown in the separate tables below.

2. Sales to cash-paying foreign governments, as invoiced.

3. Transfers to the United States Army, as invoiced.

4. Transfers to Bizonia (formerly Joint U. S.-U. K. Bizone), as invoiced.

5. Transfers to the Economic Cooperation Administration, as invoiced.

6. Transfers to miscellaneous relief agencies, as invoiced.

Except for minor adjustments to accounts related to prior period shipments there were no further transactions recorded under the Japanese-German Cotton, United States Foreign Relief, Greek-Turkish Aid, and Interim Foreign Aid programs and the data which were previously furnished you on such programs may be considered final.

Also enclosed is the Report of Financial Condition and Operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of February 28, 1949, on page 14 of which there appears a statement of the inventories held by the Corporation as of that date.

Very truly yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

Statement of purchases and sal es proceeds by commodity, all programs, fiscal year 1949 through Feb. 28, 1949

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Value		Quantity	
		Purchases [1]	Sales	Purchases [1]	Sales
Ammonium nitrate	Ton	$443,668.90	$443,668.90	9,035.4	9,035.4
Animals, live	Head	[2] 388.54			
Barley	Bushel	23,723,271.56	24,170,010.51	16,108,027	15,745,433
Beans, garbanzos and lentils, dry	Pound	4,677,533.26	4,544,042.20	59,500,400	53,333,764
Coconut oil	do	182,005.82	184,043.67	748,633	748,633
Copra	do	11,095,403.70	11,217,126.55	59,212,282	59,212,282
Corn	Bushel	56,525,855.72	34,605,737.51	37,282,451	21,353,618
Cotton, American-Egyptian	Bale	6,903.48		32	
Cotton, upland	do	4,981,733.24	5,368,704.13	40,194	39,431
Eggs, dried	Pound	31,613,180.38	8,318,754.87	34,844,649	6,433,474
Eggs, liquid and frozen	do		12,567,338.49		35,812,748
Fats and oils (unclassified)	do	[2] 326.10	30,464.53		165,537
Feeds and grains	Ton	154,188.88	156,258.97	2,248	2,265
Flax fiber	Pound	672,142.26	342,437.87	1,434,556	696,301
Flaxseed	Bushel	131,723,075.49	14,804,717.92	21,898,146	2,326,213
Flour, grits, meal and related products	Pound	74,988,789.82	83,971,304.80	1,475,579,534	1,611,473,101
Flour, potato	do	14,716,821.19	13,225,086.31	211,809,940	188,010,058
Fruits, dried or dehydrated:					
Apples	Pound	413,746.33	417,405.18	2,902,475	2,902,475
Apricots	do	1,103,730.13	1,127,074.04	5,608,990	5,608,990
Dates	do	133,149.33	135,172.91	1,502,500	1,501,825
Figs	do	1,238,647.41	1,249,816.94	15,024,639	15,024,639
Peaches	do	1,247,504.77	1,278,334.82	10,565,550	10,565,550
Prunes	do	9,164,772.52	7,728,848.63	104,373,470	82,650,140
Raisins	do	5,879,615.12	3,308,995.70	72,517,230	38,991,720
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	18,461,337.38	17,589,011.82	6,997,678	6,557,518
Hemp fiber	Pound		305,725.80		1,292,448
Honey	do	742,959.66	272,546.96	5,837,068	5,837,068
Lard and other animal fats	do	1,008,691.00	1,196,687.18	5,525,152	6,109,593
Linseed	do		7,116.85		93,827
Linseed oil	do	22,425,117.25	2,657,014.26	83,423,569	9,229,774
Macaroni, vermicelli and similar pastes	do	39,550.00	41,579.53	400,000	399,920
Meat, canned	do	27,398,750.27	4,168,204.17	99,135,810	14,292,201
Milk, dried	do	18,002,378.96	20,329,151.70	105,902,943	112,095,482
Milk, fluid (evaporated)	do	7,208,105.25	7,964,435.64	57,475,174	59,058,663
Milk products	do	71,111.15	47,616.62	625,680	368,080
Molasses and sirup	do	22,970.00	24,378.14	386,750	386,735
Naval stores—turpentine	Gallon		296,579.62		754,850
Oats	Bushel	3,447,799.70	2,573,531.16	4,308,638	2,759,482
Oiticica oil	Pound		[2]—1,567.38		
Palm kernels	do	659,689.80	659,976.78	6,539,546	6,539,546
Peanuts	do	104,587,945.20	61,719,657.23	778,695,588	481,476,851
Peas, dried	do	1,687,281.99	625,202.14	28,827,200	9,870,900

[1] Purchases include collateral acquired in settlement of loans.
[2] Deduct. Prior-year adjustment.

Statement of purchases and sales pro ceeds by commodity, all programs, fiscal year 1949 through Feb. 28, 1949—Continued

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Value		Quantity	
		Purchases [1]	Sales	Purchases [1]	Sales
Potatoes:					
Irish	Hundredweight	$130,336,045.86	$15,582,020.83	53,903,874	52,020,363
Seed	Pound	97.28	131.07	1,566	1,571
Sweet	Hundredweight	233,831.21	293,756.04	76,972	76,555
Rapeseed	Pound	458,763.75	458,940.30	4,693,450	4,693,450
Rapeseed meal	do	155,677.50	155,736.05	4,843,300	4,843,300
Rapeseed oil	do	324,415.00	319,095.82	1,579,760	1,579,760
Rice	do	22,518,847.10	23,675,649.04	302,864,952	302,862,552
Rye	Bushel	5,395,964.60	3,694,114.37	3,017,068	1,898,342
Seeds:					
Field	Pound	3,550,594.92	3,556,371.55	27,104,601	25,954,967
Hay and pasture	do		264,493.72		7,229,569
Vegetable	do	2,585,064.12	2,614,900.53	20,699,109	19,708,413
Winter cover crop	do		2,358,713.45		33,195,774
Sesame seed	do	996,200.46	996,630.99	6,808,386	6,808,386
Soybeans	Bushel	9,345,877.73	4,992,348.12	3,609,855	1,863,341
Soybean oil	Pound	964,011.77	1,348,596.16	5,640,625	6,145,536
Sugar	do	50,669,750.66	50,736,105.26	1,229,397,578	1,229,397,578
Tung oil	do	178,066.55	1,697,522.83	713,331	7,467,610
Vegetable oils	do	1,389,233.83	1,228,135.08	5,816,675	4,877,509
Wheat	Bushel	521,167,317.97	541,646,080.39	226,564,337	218,686,670
Wool	Pound	37,719,280.96	60,302,450.71	48,261,087	107,590,831
Miscellaneous	do		[2] −64,185.93		3,685
Total		1,368,437,753.05	1,065,509,800.05		

[1] Purchases include collateral acquired in settlement of loans.
[2] Deduct. Prior-year adjustment.

Sales to cash-paying foreign governments invoiced during the fiscal year 1949 through Feb. 28, 1949

Country and commodity	Pounds	Dollars
Arabia: Wheat	26,879,940	1,178,220
Belgium: Wheat	190,748,160	8,100,906
Egypt: Wheat	142,695,600	6,076,552
India:		
Wheat	869,429,040	35,649,973
Grain sorghums	204,962,240	5,193,938
Total	1,074,391,280	40,843,911
Ireland: Wheat	72,350,880	3,086,984
Israel:		
Flour	3,057,100	158,574
Wheat	31,281,180	1,438,286
Total	34,338,280	1,596,860
Portugal: Wheat	306,179,640	12,820,389
Union of South Africa:		
Wheat	60,479,220	2,494,198
Burlap bags	1,008,000	252,655
Total	61,487,220	2,746,853
Peru: Wheat	39,366,000	1,635,481
Switzerland: Wheat	400,137,960	17,010,138
Summary by commodity, for all countries:		
Wheat	2,139,547,620	89,491,127
Grain sorghums	204,962,240	5,193,938
Flour	3,057,100	158,574
Burlap bags	1,008,000	252,655
Total	2,348,574,960	95,096,294

Transfers to the U. S. Army, as invoiced during fiscal year 1949, through Feb. 28, 1949

Commodity	Pounds	Dollars
Rice	24,312,314	1,967,131
Soybeans	34,817,880	1,501,116
Wheat	1,697,432,280	67,278,811
Corn	170,877,896	5,004,410
Sugar	456,124,463	19,193,085
Soybean oil	1,112,038	253,245
Flour	612,273,236	32,282,332
Flaxseed	7,821,451	843,398
Barley	542,724,816	17,477,375
Grain sorghum	80,640,000	2,500,874
Copra	13,171,200	1,434,600
Linseed oil	128,026	38,088
Tung oil	3,110,493	716,941
Milk powder	11,303,091	1,787,324
Dried whey	272,080	35,617
Peanuts, shelled	25,546,061	4,071,674
Seed, sweetpotatoes	2,070,000	53,250
Beans, dry	4,713,200	405,656
Rye	999,992	35,892
Meat and gravy (Mexican)	939,138	270,789
Total	3,690,389,655	157,151,608

Transfers to bizonia [1] invoiced during fiscal year 1949 through Feb. 28, 1949 [2]

Commodity	Pounds	Dollars
Milk powder	38,528,101	6,233,505
Soybean oil:		
Refined	364,904	91,284
Crude	2,262,810	517,699
Peanuts	67,380,019	10,798,883
Dried fruits	115,387,864	8,216,865
Potato flour	169,348,642	12,035,537
Beans, dry	10,299,600	880,050
Barley	41,318,688	1,436,063
Corn	360,529,176	10,465,199
Rye	14,000,000	452,035
Wheat	4,475,258,280	187,249,236
Grain sorghums	181,440,000	5,244,205
Flour	456,103,226	24,321,003
Seed, field	19,540,317	3,115,590
Beef and gravy	6,407,601	1,871,924
Lard	393,096	97,568
Sugar	632,507,773	26,052,641
Honey	5,837,068	368,813
Seed, vegetable	4,576,671	1,347,497
Total	6,601,483,836	300,795,597

[1] Formerly joint United States-United Kingdom bizone.
[2] Wholly U. S. Army financed during this period.

Transfers to the Economic Cooperation Administration program, as invoiced during the fiscal year 1949, through Feb. 28, 1949

Destination and commodity	Pounds	Dollars
Austria:		
Wheat	642,955,863	26,914,21
Wheat flour	155,906,985	8,244,208
Rye	70,166,245	2,485,437
Corn	32,480,000	947,351
Barley	37,556,347	1,176,181
Rice	6,607,600	527,554
Soybean oil	6,379,950	1,561,742
Linseed oil	430,066	139,106
Peanuts	45,933,097	7,284,646
Copra	9,549,120	1,023,957
Palm kernels	3,424,512	347,567
Sesame seed (for crushing)	4,603,786	703,431
Sugar	139,169,195	5,664,937
Honey	386,750	24,623
Horsemeat (canned)	540,390	75,469
Milk, dried	1,116,675	176,385
Eggs:		
Dried	2,257,054	188,836
Frozen	20,943,520	3,871,555
Seed, field	5,826,180	609,612
Beans	5,609,400	485,476
Peas	2,060,000	134,691
Fruits, dried	5,654,880	383,455
Undistributed expense		67,675
Total deliveries, Austria	1,199,557,615	62,729,108
Prior period adjustment: Cotton		−3,030
Adjusted deliveries	1,199,557,615	62,726,078

Transfers to the Economic Cooperation Administration program, etc.—Continued

Destination and commodity	Pounds	Dollars
Belgium:		
Wheat	371,125,933	15,779,407
Eggs, frozen	1,102,320	192,079
Total, Belgium	372,228,253	15,971,486
China:		
Wheat	161,205,300	8,530,892
Wheat flour	78,492,950	2,650,845
Rice	253,444,128	20,111,533
Undistributed expense		43,823
Total, China	493,142,378	31,337,093
Denmark: Corn	25,620,000	751,811
France:		
Wheat	241,363,499	10,356,121
Linseed oil	6,629,301	1,889,494
Tung oil	2,204,656	532,961
Peanuts	35,557,256	5,739,586
Palm kernels	689,974	69,585
Undistributed expense		87,707
Total deliveries, France	286,444,686	18,675,454
Prior period adjustments: Wheat flour		−78,884
Adjusted deliveries	286,444,686	18,596,570
Germany—bizonia:		
Grain sorghums	188,709,600	4,768,071
Corn	405,049,944	11,767,035
Oats	88,303,430	2,585,258
Barley	88,207,094	2,759,117
Linseed oil	1,181,667	350,252
Soybeans	76,943,621	3,541,997
Peanuts	75,113,248	12,013,823
Copra	60,046,124	7,004,618
Rapeseed meal	3,443,300	111,823
Total Germany-bizonia	986,998,028	44,901,994
Germany—French zone:		
Wheat	442,988,960	18,460,704
Graham flour	85,570,700	3,915,887
Beans	5,920,000	512,358
Peas	4,491,300	289,535
Total, Germany-French zone	538,970,960	23,178,484
Great Britain: Eggs, frozen	6,999,780	1,331,157
Greece:		
Wheat	520,699,284	21,665,736
Wheat flour	151,214,660	7,944,644
Corn	20,160,000	565,545
Barley	18,936,520	586,740
Linseed oil	860,714	256,803
Milk, evaporated	37,668,711	5,160,207
Undistributed expense		74,365
Total, Greece	749,539,889	36,254,040

Transfers to the Economic Cooperation Administration program, etc.—Continued

Destination and commodity	Pounds	Dollars
Ireland: Barley	3,494,400	102,394
Italy:		
Wheat	1,131,259,503	47,092,469
Wheat flour	19,985,300	1,042,178
Tallow, inedible	1,664,725	281,951
Copra	6,720,000	874,728
Undistributed expense		17,650
Total, Italy	1,159,629,528	49,308,976
Netherlands: Wheat	639,906,880	26,668,517
Norway: Wheat	234,470,363	9,789,771
Trieste:		
Wheat	42,000,000	1,750,993
Wheat flour	19,921,113	1,057,590
Fatty acids (from tallow)	165,537	30,712
Tallow, inedible	220,040	35,294
Soybean oil, crude	197,490	40,673
Coconut oil	748,633	185,884
Peanuts	2,950,263	474,436
Meats, canned (Mexican beef)	342,000	100,235
Milk, evaporated	5,563,780	743,514
Undistributed expense		18,605
Total, Trieste	72,108,856	4,437,936
All destinations combined:		
Wheat	4,427,975,585	187,008,824
Wheat flour	425,521,008	20,939,465
Graham flour	85,570,700	3,915,887
Rye	70,166,245	2,485,437
Corn	483,309,944	14,031,742
Grain sorghums	188,709,600	4,768,071

Transfers to the Economic Cooperation Administration program, etc.—Continued

Destination and commodity	Pounds	Dollars
All destinations combined—Continued		
Oats	88,303,430	2,585,258
Barley	148,194,361	4,624,432
Rice	260,051,728	20,639,087
Fatty acids (from tallow)	165,537	30,712
Tallow, inedible	1,884,765	317,245
Soybean oil	6,577,440	1,602,415
Linseed oil	9,101,748	2,626,655
Coconut oil	748,633	185,884
Tung oil	2,204,656	532,961
Soybeans	76,943,621	3,541,997
Peanuts	159,553,864	25,512,491
Copra	76,315,244	8,903,303
Palm kernels	4,114,486	417,152
Sesame seed (for crushing)	4,603,786	703,431
Rapeseed meal	3,443,300	111,823
Sugar	139,169,195	5,664,937
Honey	386,750	24,623
Horsemeat, canned	540,390	75,469
Other canned meats (Mexican beef)	342,000	100,235
Milk:		
Evaporated	43,232,491	5,903,721
Dried	1,116,675	176,385
Eggs:		
Dried	2,257,054	188,836
Frozen	29,045,620	5,094,791
Seeds, field	5,826,180	609,612
Beans	11,529,400	997,834
Peas	6,551,300	424,226
Dried fruit	5,654,880	383,455
Undistributed expense		309,825
Total deliveries	6,769,111,616	325,438,221

Transfers to the Economic Cooperation Administration program, etc.—Continued

Destination and commodity	Pounds	Dollars
All destinations combined—Continued		
Prior period adjustments:		
Wheat flour		−78,884
Cotton		−3,030
Adjusted deliveries	6,769,111,616	325,356,307

Transfers to miscellaneous relief agencies, as invoiced during fiscal year 1949, through Feb. 28, 1949

	Pounds	Dollars
International Children's Emergency Fund:		
Milk, dried	60,884,551	11,983,348
Cotton	5,249,874	2,016,972
Lard	2,993,424	648,238
Total	69,127,849	14,648,558
International Refugee Organization:		
Flour	15,608,400	829,463
Beef and gravy (Mexican)	2,231,040	664,569
Total	17,839,440	1,494,032
Near East Foundation: Beef and gravy (Mexican)	203,400	60,673

Summary of commodity inventories as of Feb. 28, 1949

Program, commodity branch, and commodity	Unit of measure	Quantity	Value (cost)	Reserve for losses	Net book value
Price-support program:					
Cotton:					
Cotton, American-Egyptian	Bale	32	$6,993.87		$6,993.87
Cotton, upland	do	828	85,664.27		85,664.27
Flax fiber	Pound	527,329	248,649.40	$84,400.00	164,249.40
Fats and oils:					
Flaxseed	Bushel	19,484,778	122,068,184.76		122,068,184.76
Linseed oil	Pound	74,583,358	20,459,253.87		20,459,253.87
Peanuts, "farmers stock"	do	253,504,897	27,498,188.64	16,951,000.00	10,547,188.64
Peanuts, "shelled"	do	46,597,372	7,181,737.42		7,181,737.42
Tung oil	do	2,988	844.60		844.60
Fruit and vegetable:					
Fruit, dehydrated or dried:					
Prunes	do	21,721,930	1,820,699.98		1,820,699.98
Raisins	do	33,528,480	2,707,509.65		2,707,509.65
Potatoes, Irish	Hundredweight	2,946,411	6,641,074.57	6,199,100.00	441,974.57
Grain:					
Barley	Bushel	27,124	20,942.27		29,942.27
Seeds, hay and pasture	Pound	1,103,611	183,037.11	68,600.00	114,437.11
Wheat	Bushel	409,300	798,255.03		798,255.03
Livestock:					
Wool, appraised	Pound	[1] 95,622,562	76,479,887.39	10,707,500.00	70,081,741.64
Wool, unappraised	do	7,693,896	4,309,354.25		
Poultry:					
Eggs, dried	do	26,858,461	34,175,923.72	14,323,500.00	19,852,423.72
Eggs, liquid or frozen	do	1,665,345	535,493.39	35,000.00	500,493.39
Tobacco:					
Naval stores—turpentine	do	1,145,007	752,104.16	300,800.00	451,304.16
Tobacco	do	[2] 6,385,297	1,741,087.97		1,741,087.97
Total price-support program			307,723,886.32	48,669,900.00	259,053,986.32
Supply program:					
Dairy:					
Milk, dried	do	1,689,549	224,205.65		224,205.65
Milk, evaporated	do	5,134,655	545,938.97		545,938.97
Whey, solids, dry	do	257,600	27,796.48		27,796.48
Fats and oils:					
Soybeans	Bushel	1,745,892	4,530,885.21		4,530,885.21
Soybean oil	Pound	2,642,023	403,651.96		403,651.96
Fruit and vegetable: Flour, potato	do	23,770,571	1,641,951.69		1,641,951.69
Grain:					
Barley	Bushel	667,445	1,007,338.79		1,007,338.79
Beans, dried	Pound	6,127,800	468,661.73		468,661.73
Corn	Bushel	15,902,707	24,409,941.54		24,409,941.54
Flour, rye	Pound	3,000,000	110,044.00		110,044.00
Flour, wheat	do	55,953,400	2,701,574.59		2,701,574.59
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	440,160	1,187,304.65		1,187,304.65
Oats	Bushel	1,544,673	1,367,797.00		1,367,797.00
Peas, dried	Pound	18,955,000	1,116,917.87		1,116,917.87
Rye	Bushel	1,116,660	1,935,377.72		1,935,377.72
Seeds, field	Pound	1,232,573	175,892.02		175,892.02
Seeds, vegetable	do	1,070,697	127,622.46		127,622.46
Wheat	Bushel	39,743,170	95,080,874.21		95,080,874.21
Livestock: Mexican meat, canned	Pound	92,895,515	26,500,128.88		26,500,128.88
Total supply program			163,563,905.42		163,563,905.42
Total			471,287,791.74	48,669,900.00	422,617,891.74

[1] Grease wool 51,737,536 pounds; scoured/carbonized 43,885,026 pounds.
[2] Dry weight.

NOTE.—Inventories of commodities as shown on this report include commodities committed to sale or otherwise obligated. Thus, the quantities shown do not represent the quantities available for sale or other disposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, would it be in order to call up my amendment A?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order to call up any amendment except the committee amendments, until they have been disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the first committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "Section 4 (b)" and insert "Section 4 (h)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 9, after the word "acquire" to insert "by lease, purchase, or otherwise."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of these amendments?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the first committee amendment, which has just been adopted, merely changed the designation "Section 4 (b)" to "Section 4 (h)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair believes that it is the second committee amendment in which the Senator from Tennessee is interested.

Mr. JENNER. The second committee amendment is on page 2, line 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The second committee amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 9, after the word "acquire" it is proposed to insert "by lease, purchase, or otherwise."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to be recognized on the amendment?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I want farmers to have every opportunity to obtain Government loans on their crops as a price protection measure, if they want to have those loans. Adequate storage on the farms and off the farms is needed if the loan program is to be effective.

So far as off-farm storage is concerned, wherever and whenever it is demonstrated that the farmer co-ops and other private storage operators cannot or will not meet the need, then the Commodity Credit Corporation should be authorized to provide whatever additional storage is required.

But, Mr. President, I object strenuously to the word "otherwise" in section 2 of the bill. Section 2 states that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall have the power to acquire real property or any interest therein for storage purposes by lease, purchase, or otherwise.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, told us on Friday that the word "otherwise" is all-embracing. He said:

> The intention was to give the Government the power, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to acquire property, by lease or purchase or by receiving it as a gift or, if necessary, if conditions justified it, by taking it over by the power of condemnation.

That statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 22, 1949, at page 4930, in column 1. In other words, if we legislate the words "lease, purchase, or otherwise," we do it with our eyes open to the unlimited power of Government to regiment crop marketing and to encroach upon private enterprise.

If we want this $5,000,000,000 Government corporation to have the power to condemn property, let us come right out in the bill and say so. Why wrap the power of condemnation in the deceptive garment of the word "otherwise"?

If it is the intention of this legislation to give the Corporation the power to condemn property, the power to receive property by gift, the power to acquire property by transfer from other Government agencies, or by any other means, let us say what we mean.

The word "otherwise" also means foreclosure, as the Senator from Oklahoma said. The Commodity Credit Corporation can make loans to farmer cooperatives or other groups to construct storage facilities; it can get the cooperatives and others "in hock" to them; and if they are not able to pay back the loans on schedule, the CCC can move in and take over their property by foreclosure.

All right, Mr. President, if the Corporation is to acquire property by foreclosure, by lease, purchase, gift, transfer, and also by condemnation let us say so.

Let us not fool the American people about this matter.

I suspect that administration lawyers wrote the language of this bill. They wanted the CCC to have all-embracing power to acquire property and they figured the word "otherwise" would do the trick. To use mild words to cover harsh powers has long been a typical trick of Washington planners and bureaucrats.

Mr. President, I do not have any mandate from the people of my State to play tricks on them. I want the bill to say exactly how the Commodity Credit Corporation can acquire property and go no further. I do not want any trick words or loopholes.

Judging from the statements of the Senator from Oklahoma I think the word "otherwise" is all-inclusive and means that too much power would be given to a $5,000,000,000 corporation to take the property of people by harsh tricks.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the bill provides exactly the same language that ordinarily is provided in bills which give the Government the power to acquire property—in other words, by lease, purchase, or in any other way the Government sees fit to take property. The word "otherwise" means that.

There is no purpose in this bill to build competing storage. There is no purpose in this bill to build storage at any point where storage exists. There is no purpose in this bill to provide storage for tobacco or cotton or for cold storage purposes.

So far as I know, the bill is limited to storage for grain, such as wheat, corn, perhaps flax, perhaps flax seed, or it might be barley or rye; but not storage for cotton or tobacco, or cold storage warehousing.

Mr. President, if the Government is to have the right to acquire property, the right should be given in such terms as to enable the Government to acquire property. Under the terms of this bill the Corporation can acquire property by purchase or lease; or, when the bill uses the word "otherwise," it might be by gift or foreclosure. Certainly if the Government has a loan on property it must have the right to acquire property by foreclosure, because if the loan were not paid foreclosure would have to follow, or else the loan would be in the nature of a gift. That is the purpose of the bill.

The only instance I can imagine of the Government undertaking to condemn would be in some area where warehousing does not now exist, in some wheat or corn or rye or other area where a grain crop is being produced and where storage does not now exist.

It is the purpose, under this proposed law, as I understand it, to give the Government the right to build storage facilities in an area where storage facilities are needed, and to do so either by putting storage facilities on leased property or on property which is purchased; for, in the event the Government would not lease the property or in the event the Government could not buy the property, then, unless there were some other way by which to obtain the property, the Government could not provide the storage.

Thus, the word "otherwise" means the power of condemnation in a case of that kind.

I agree with the Senator from Indiana that the Government should not build competing storage. It should not build storage where storage is not necessary. Certainly it would not do that. I cannot foresee a Commodity Credit Corporation or a Secretary of Agriculture or an administration which would permit the expenditure of public funds where it was not needed.

So, that is the purpose of the proposed legislation—namely, to permit the Government to condemn property if it is found to be necessary to condemn a small tract upon which to build an elevator or a warehouse; and the word "otherwise" is included only as a matter of necessity.

So I think the language proposed for the bill is not only desirable but is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question. Is it contemplated that the Commodity Credit Croporation shall be given the power to make loans, as the RFC and the Bank of Cooperatives now make loans?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think that is provided in the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation itself.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, after making a loan and getting a mortgage as security, the word "otherwise" would eventually empower the Commodity Credit Corporation to obtain property by that advice; would it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Where that is necessary.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I think it is unnecessary, and I think it is all-inclusive. If this amendment is adopted, the first thing we know, the Government will be owning and operating all the storage facilities in the United States.

In my section of the country, for example, millions of bushels of storage capacity are owned by private companies and cooperative companies. But under this amendment, if it becomes law, there is a possibility that at some time in the future an ambitious board of the Commodity Credit Corporation might take over those storage facilities. I am not saying that the present Secretary of Agriculture or the present members of the Commodity Credit Corporation's Board would wish to do that; but those particular men will not always be in control of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the gentleman who now is Secretary of Agriculture will not always occupy that position.

Mr. President, why put something in a bill which makes it possible to defeat the very purpose for which the bill is enacted? I, as a wheat grower, know absolutely that if the Government keeps its nose out of private business, there will be adequate storage facilities built in the United States. For instance, if any wheat grower wants a commodity loan and desires to hold his wheat, he will build his own storage and hold it on his own farm. He cannot afford to do otherwise, because the Government pays him for the storage on his own farm. He cannot lose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Montana just hear the Senator from Oklahoma say that where the Commodity Credit Corporation found it necessary—which means of course, necessary in its judgment—to make loans for the building of storage facilities, it would be empowered to do so? Does the Senator from Montana know of any instances in which loans could not be obtained from private banking concerns for the building of any storage facilities which are economically justifiable?

Mr. ECTON. No, I do not. I know that in my State, under the farm program, when an individual is unable to put up the money himself, the local banking institution is more than glad to loan him the necessary money to build adequate storage facilities.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana, if I understand him correctly, intend to express a concern about the eminent domain powers which apparently exist under the word "otherwise" in the amendment, and fear that, like most things, though started in a small degree, yet if the power can be exercised in small degree, it can likewise be exercised in large degree, if it is not checked? Is there not in the amendment the danger of a blank eminent domain power on the part of the Corporation?

Mr. ECTON. I may say in reply that the very able Senator from Oregon has expressed the situation in a concise and clear manner, much better than I myself could. That is exactly what I fear in this kind of amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator recognizes that there is pending an amendment proposed by me to this section, and also an amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware jointly with the Senator from Massachusetts, which amendments are identical in words, and which would absolutely assure that the powers given the Corporation would not be utilized by the Corporation for acquiring real property or any interest therein unless the Corporation determined that existing privately owned storage facilities were not adequate, and so forth? Every effort is made by that amendment, which was worked out after a good deal of consultation, to make sure that the fear of groups that the private field would be invaded is not well-founded. Does not the Senator feel that that will be helpful in the situation?

Mr. ECTON. I am sure it will be helpful, and I thank the Senator from New Mexico. But what I cannot understand is why we should go ahead and adopt the committee amendment, which causes all this consternation, and then expect to remedy it later by an individual amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as the Senator from New Mexico has pointed out, the Senator from Massachusetts and myself have an amendment pending, which we think will take care of the situation. The Senator from New Mexico also has an amendment which is practically identical, word for word. The reason we are adopting the committee amendment first is because we were advised by the Parliamentarian that we must take the amendments in order. Neither our amendment which the Senator from New Mexico intends to call up is in the bill at this time, and it would not be in order until later. But we have been advised by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that he will not oppose the amendment, and that at the proper time he will accept the amendment which, as the Senator from New Mexico says, will make it impossible for the Corporation to use this power in order to extend its facilities in any manner, unless first it has been determined that the existing storage facilities in the given area, supplied by private industry, are inadequate, and storage cannot be so provided. Only in instances where private industry could not or would not take care of the storage requirements would the Corporation be allowed to use this authority in any manner. It has been our endeavor to work that provision into the law in the best possible manner. I think it is pretty well covered by the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts and myself; which amendment I think we shall withhold in deference to the Senator from New Mexico, so as to allow him to offer his amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On Friday, Mr. President, with special reference to section (b) in the first paragraph, on page 2 of the pending bill, it was my understanding, and I made special inquiry, though not of the Parliamentarian, because I thought the committee probably would take care of it, that if the Senate were to adopt the presently appearing committee amendments, the Senate would be precluded in effect from acting upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico. I was therefore under the impression that the procedure would be to offer the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexica as a substitute for section (b). I am very much interested in the Senator's amendment and I should not want the parliamentary situation to become any more difficult than it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced Friday that the committee amendments would be disposed of first, that amendments were in order to the committee amendments, and that an amendment might be offered to the bill after the committee amendments were disposed of. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Without presuming to control the action on the floor of the Senator from New Mexico, would it be proper for him to offer his amendment at this time to section 2 of the bill, or would the proper procedure be to adopt the committee language first, and then to have the amendment offered to section 2?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is not an amendment or a substitute for the committee amendment, but the language of the bill may be amended following adoption of the committee amendment, by any amendment which may be offered and agreed to by the Senate. As the Chair understands, the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is an amendment to the section of the bill, not to the committee amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if I may make the suggestion, it is not technically an amendment to the committee amendment, but it very greatly modifies the effect of the committee amendment, and I hope it will relieve the apprehension concerning the words "or otherwise." Since it is a limitation upon the

use of the words "or otherwise," I should be pleased if there were an opportunity for me to present my amendment at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may move to strike out any part of the language of the bill that includes the committee amendment and offer a substitute for it, or an amendment to the committee amendment in that form, if he so desires.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, in view of the explanation, I shall be glad to resume my seat and allow the Senate to proceed with the amendments, provided I have assurance that the bill will not be left in such form that at some time in the future some Secretary of Agriculture or Director of the Commodity Credit Corporation can take over all storage facilities owned and operated privately, and also storage facilities owned by cooperatives. I think it is dangerous for us to attempt to take care of this situation through an amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is at the end of line 15. It is, therefore, not an amendment to the pending committee amendment. It may be in order, when the committee amendments are disposed of. Therefore, the question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, with the explanation which has come from the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Delaware, and others, I am perfectly agreeable to accepting the amendment, with the understanding that later on the matter will be clarified.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to inquire the reason for the words in line 11 on page 2, "other than storage for cotton or tobacco." Why are cotton and tobacco excluded?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the reason for that is that there is no demand for storage facilities for either tobacco or cotton.

Mr. CAPEHART. There may be in the future.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Congress will be in session, and we can provide them if the demand should arise. There is at present ample storage for both tobacco and cotton. The cotton producers do not see any reason for building additional storage, when there is no demand for it. The Department says it has no idea of building any additional storage for either cotton or tobacco. The Senator from Nebraska has an amendment on this point, adding some other provisions. There is no demand for those facilities, and it was perfectly agreeable to put in an exemption with regard to cotton and tobacco.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it in order to offer an amendment to the committee amendment to strike out the word "otherwise"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is perfectly in order to offer an amendment to the pending committee amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I move that on page 3, line 9, the words "or otherwise" be stricken, so that the language will read: "acquire by lease or purchase, real property," and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out from the committee amendment the words "or otherwise" and to insert the word "or" before the word "purchase."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be adopted. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the bill very carefully. We worked with farm organizations, with the Department, and heard testimony of representatives of the grain trade. The word "otherwise" is fully explained by the statement of the chairman of the committee last Friday, and by the statements of all the sponsors, which have the effect of the law itself. It is the intention of the committee members fully to protect the grain trade, cooperatives, and others, where there are private facilities sufficient to take care of storage needs. There are cases, however, where additional property may have to be acquired. If the word "otherwise" is stricken out, the Commodity Credit Corporation may not be able to adequately take care of these needs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What other means may the Commodity Credit Corporation use besides lease or purchase? It is said that there are other means which the Corporation might use. What are those means, other than lease or purchase?

Mr. YOUNG. Eminent domain. The Senator from Oklahoma explained on last Friday that there are instances in which private grain-trade facilities are not adequate, or the facilities of cooperatives are not adequate, and that the Corporation might need to acquire property on a siding along a railroad on which to establish a warehouse, but the present holder of the land may not wish to give authority to do so. There are instances of that kind in which the Corporation might have to purchase property.

I think, with the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will offer, the trade interests are fully protected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is the language so broad? Why should we not say "by lease or purchase, or, if they are unable to acquire land on which to build a warehouse, they may do so by other means"?

Mr. YOUNG. I suppose a lawyer could figure out an amendment a mile long that would accomplish the purpose; but the committee felt that this language would adequately cover the situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is certainly broad. Would "otherwise" also mean that the Corporation could condemn private property and take it over?

Mr. YOUNG. No. I think it has been fully covered by the statement of the chairman and the statements of the sponsors.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not care what the chairman of the committee has said or what has been said on the floor by other Senators. I am interested in what shall go into the law, because the important thing is what is written into the statute and not what some Senator says on the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Last year, when the Aiken farm bill passed the Senate, the Senator from Vermont made many statements which the Department interprets as having the effect of law. The Supreme Court of the United States, in deciding the constitutionality of a law or interpreting a law, goes back to the statements made on the floor not only by the sponsors of the bill, but by any other Members. What they have had to say about a bill carries the same effect as the language in the bill itself.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the words "or otherwise" are certainly all-inclusive and permit the Corporation to take any action it might see fit to take.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Indiana will yield for a statement?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that on Friday this issue was raised rather extensively. I was one who raised the very point which the Senator from Indiana is raising, with regard to the unlimited authority which might be delegated under the bill to the Secretary of Agriculture to condemn existing private facilities. There had been some misunderstanding with regard to that matter. The Senators sponsoring the bill, as well as the chairman of the committee, made it very clear that there is no intention or thought to convey to the Secretary of Agriculture or to the Commodity Credit Corporation the right of condemnation of existing privately owned facilities. There might be occasions, and probably would be, in the emergency of a big harvest, when the Department might be unable to find sufficient existing facilities anywhere in the location, and might have to acquire land upon which to place temporary storage facilities, near a railroad track. The words "or otherwise" were left in without explanation, with the idea of giving the Commodity Credit Corporation not only the most complete latitude in exercising its obligations and duties, but also in order that the Commodity Credit Corporation would have responsibility for doing the job.

So far as I am concerned, I feel many of the same qualms about extending the authority of a Government agency as does the Senator from Indiana. But, after the discussion on Friday, which, I believe, quite clearly defined and limited

the extent of the authority under the words "or otherwise," I became satisfied that the intention of the bill is fixed sufficiently to protect against any unwarranted expansion of the right of condemnation over private property or private facilities. I have much the same feeling as has the Senator from Indiana, as he has expressed it, but I say to the Senator that I feel confident we have sufficiently defined the meaning of the words that I, at least, am willing to accept the words "or otherwise" as words of latitude, but also as words of limitation, with the full explanation which has been made.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it looks to me rather queer and odd that the words "or otherwise," should be written into the bill after having provided that the Corporation has a right to acquire by lease or purchase. I cannot conceive of the Government taking property away from anyone without either purchasing it or leasing it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If I may venture a suggestion, 2 or 3 days ago there came over the ticker located just outside the Senate Chamber an item dated Hutchinson, Kans.:

> Experts said today that despite all transportation and storage arrangements part of the Kansas wheat harvest this year will be stored on the open ground.

Friday I submitted a picture showing in Texas a vast amount of wheat stored on the ground. That is what is going to happen at Hutchinson, Kans.

Suppose this bill should be enacted containing just the words "lease or purchase," and the Commodity Credit Corporation should decide to provide some storage at Hutchinson so that the farmers who produced the wheat crop this year could get some loans in the fall. Suppose they should seek storage, and suppose private parties would not build it, no cooperative would build the storage facility, and the Government could not afford to build it. Suppose the Government should attempt to lease some land on which to build storage, and the owners refused or failed to lease, and then the Government tried to buy the land, and they refused to sell. How could the Government provide storage at Hutchinson, Kans., for this year's wheat crop under those conditions? It would have to proceed under the power of eminent domain, and by condemnation acquire some land next to a railroad track, or as near to the railroad track as possible, and probably build a short spur to the warehouse, and get storage space in that way. I do not think the Corporation would be required to do that, but the wording in the bill might be used in the nature of influence—I would not say as a club, but such wording is often times used—in order to obtain needed property so as to enable them to do what the law authorizes them to do. That is the only instance in which the Government would be justified in acquiring land by condemnation.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the only time when they would take advantage of the words "or otherwise" would be when they were unable to lease or buy?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. When they were unable to buy land in order to build storage facilities upon it, or unable to acquire it in any way other than by condemnation, this provision would give them the right to condemn?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was the statement I made Friday, and that is what I believe.

Mr. CAPEHART. With that explanation, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana is withdrawn.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has cleared up the problem I had in mind, but because we are laying a foundation for a legislative intent, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would, for the record, answer two or three questions I should like to put to him. I wish to say to the Senator that I think perhaps he has already answered the questions, but I should like to have them all at one point in the RECORD so that there can be no question as to the legislative intent.

My first question to the Senator from Oklahoma is this: Is the exercise of the grant of authority to acquire land under the bill to be limited to carrying out the price-support program of the Corporation?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Entirely.

Mr. MORSE. Would the authority granted by the proposed act authorize the Corporation to acquire interest in real estate so as to provide storage facilities only, not connected with the price-support program of the Corporation?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the whole series of legislative acts is under the price-support program. I understand that this provision is to be added as a portion of the price-support program.

Mr. MORSE. Under the authority here given would the Corporation be permitted to provide storage facilities for commodities, title to which had not passed to the Government?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think perhaps in some cases it would permit the use of this class of storage facilities for storing commodities on which loans had been made. If the loans later were not paid, the Government would, of course, be entitled to take over the commodity. Storage facilities would be available at the time when the Government had only a loan on a commodity, and not the title.

Mr. MORSE. It would always be in those instances where the Government had at least some interest in a commodity?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Either when it had made a loan or had title.

Mr. MORSE. Under the authority here provided would the Corporation be authorized to acquire iinterest in real estate to engage in business in the commercial sense of (1) storing; (2) handling; (3) processing; or (4) distribution, either in the natural state or as processed commodities or articles over which it had control under any of the Corporation's program?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. An amendment is now lying on the desk which will cover that point. It is to be offered by the Senator from Nebraska. It limits the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the exercise of its power. It is not to have power to provide storage for cotton or tobacco, or for anything that can go into a refrigerated warehouse.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. So far as I am concerned, I think we now have, without any question, a clear statement as to the legislative intent.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to a further question to clarify the question regarding cold storage?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. There is some property now owned at Atchison, Kans., known as the Sandstone Cave, which is used as a cold-storage warehouse. In the event the bill absolutely excluded the Commodity Credit Corporation from entering into such business, would that compel the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of the Sandstone Cave.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As I understand, the Department has possession of this cave, either by lease or title, and in my opinion the proposed legislation would not interfere with that. I think the fact that the Government is using that property for public purposes would place it also without the purview of the legislation.

Mr. THYE. We would want to be absolutely certain on that point, because it would be very disastrous and embarrassing, in the event the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation should be compelled to sell or otherwise dispose of that Sandstone Cave, in which they have millions of dollars worth of improvements. That is the only reason why I asked the question.

I personally am opposed to any cold storage or any storage facilities which are unnecessary, and for that reason I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, but I do desire to safeguard the Federal Government against having to sacrifice its investment in the Sandstone Cave at Atchison, Kans.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. My answer to the question would be that, inasmuch as the Government has this property already, the proposed legislation would not affect it. The bill is to give the Government authority to acquire warehousing where it does not now have it. If it has a cave in Kansas that is not artificially cooled, but naturally cooled, where powdered eggs and other farm commodities are stored, I am certain the proposed legislation would not affect that facility. It is only in the event the Government tried to acquire property that the legislation would take effect, but having it now, it would not be affected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask this question so that any doubt existing in my mind may be removed. In the type of situation, where the corporation loans money for the building of a storage facility to a private concern or to a cooperative, for example, and then the loan is paid, will the facility then become the property of the private concern, and thereby obtain the advantage that it would obtain from the loan in competition with other private concerns.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should think that would be covered by the contract which the Government entered into with the cooperative. I think the contract would provide as to that.

Mr. MORSE. So that under this arrangement it would be possible then in effect for the corporation to give certain preferences to certain individuals or combinations or associations in competition with private concerns?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If a group of citizens, such as in Hutchinson, Kans., where there is not sufficient storage, should see fit to build a cooperative facility this summer they might get a loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation with which to pay the expenses of construction of the facility. Later on, if they pay the loan, then the property should belong to them, and would belong to them for such use as they might see fit to make of it in the future.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is now suggesting a field of operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation which I did not contemplate would be considered. In response to the question by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the Senator from Oklahoma said the cooperatives have the right to go to banks for loans, and I believe under certain circumstances they can go to the RFC. It was not my thought that we were setting up the CCC as another banking agency for private businesses. I would hate to have the Commodity Credit Corporation set up under this legislation as another banking agency when we already have several other agencies loaning money to private operators, and I consider a cooperative to be a private operator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not suggesting that the Commodity Credit Corporation would make this loan, but if the RFC made the loan, and thereafter the cooperative officials paid off the loan, then the property would become the property of the local group and they could use the property as they saw fit to use it under their charter.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am raising no objection to the existing loan agencies being authorized or enabled to make loans such as they are now set up to make. I am raising this question however: Is it possible that we are setting up another banking agency here?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No, the bill gives the Commodity Credit Corporation no additional authority to make loans for any purposes. It acts on a different basis entirely. It can acquire property by lease, it can acquire property by purchase, it can acquire property by condemnation. Those are the only methods by which I can see any outlay of cash made by the Corporation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But if the Commodity Credit Corporation makes loans, if it is another agency to make loans to private operators such as cooperatives, or private individuals, when the property in question is the property of the private individual and it is the credit of the Commodity Credit Corporation that would be building up the property of the private individual.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Commodity Credit Corporation has that power now then the proposed bill would not change that power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is not my understanding that the Commodity Credit Corporation has that power now.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then if it does not have that power now, there is nothing in the proposed legislation that would give the Corporation that power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope that point is clarified, because I believe that in connection with private operations, there are agencies where private groups can go and secure Government credit at this time for the enlargement of their facilities. But I think we ought to look at this matter quite carefully to see if we are in any way enlarging the existing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans to private individuals. Now if we are not and if I correctly understand the Senator's statement, he construes this act as not in any way enlarging the present existing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. We are not touching upon that proposition.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To make private loans?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Corporation has the power now to make such loans, the proposed legislation would not interfere with that power. If the Corporation does not have the power now to make loans to cooperatives, then the proposed legislation does not suggest that they should have that power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator have information as to whether the Commodity Credit Corporation now has that power under the present Commodity Credit Corporation Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I would not want to answer that question "Yes" or "No." It has been my thought that the Corporation has had the power heretofore, but I would not be certain. The Corporation has had the power heretofore to provide in some manner for the erection of small bins on farms for storage of small grains on the farms. The Corporation has had the authority to acquire storage space to store a farmer's grain on his farm. The legislation might enlarge that particular authority. But with respect to the point raised by the Senator, if the Corporation does have the power to make private loans, the legislation does not enlarge it. If it does not have that power, the legislation does not give it to the Corporation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator that I believe the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to be able to furnish temporary storage, either on the farm or somewhere else, but the facilities for temporary storage I understand now remain the property of the Government. I did not know that we have contemplated setting up another lending agency, or that we proposed permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation to go about lending money to private individuals to build their own facilities which are, at the time they are built, the property of the individual, and which, after the loan is paid, will remain the property of the individual, the Government getting clear out of it and having no interest and responsibility for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is nothing in the proposed legislation that deals with that subject. The Commodity Credit Corporation, which I will call the Government, may find that some storage should be provided, for example, at Hutchinson, Kans., or at some point in my State, or some point in some other State, and the storage does not now exist. The Government may state to the people of the section, "In order for you to secure loans on your wheat this fall you must have storage." Now if we cannot provide that storage by private capital, and if we cannot provide it by cooperatives getting money from some source, then we will have to step in there to see if we cannot do something about it. Otherwise the farmers in that territory will be denied an opportunity to secure loans on their commodity.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree thoroughly that under the state of facts proposed by the Senator, the Commodity Credit Corporation is perfectly within its field in either constructing temporary storage or maybe some reasonable type of permanent storage, if those facilities are not available in the area. It is not quite that point that I was getting at. It is the question of lending money to private individuals to build their own privately owned storage facilities, and using a new medium, which would be the Commodity Credit Corporation funds, to finance these loans. I think cooperatives, for instance, have ample facilities, with the Bank for Cooperatives to get their money. I am not objecting to that. I think private individuals can go to the RFC, for instance, and I think cooperatives may also, under certain circumstances, be able to make loans from the RFC. There is a little difference in the backgrounds of those loans. But private individuals already have sources of Government credit or Government loans with which to enlarge their facilities. I was merely raising the question of setting up another Government lending agency here, when ample facilities are already in existence.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am satisfied there is nothing in the suggested legislation on that point.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment, on page 2, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 11, after the word "storage" to insert "(other than storage for cotton or tobacco)."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have had some conversation with the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is in charge of Senate bill 900, and on behalf of myself, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 9, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "cotton or tobacco" and insert in lieu thereof "cotton, tobacco, or commodities customarily stored in public refrigerated or general merchandise warehouses."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the only change the amendment makes in the committee amendment is to add refrigerated warehouses. Inasmuch as no testimony was submitted to the committee, as I remember, that asked for facilities for storing goods in cold storage or warehouses, speaking for the committee, I accept the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to the suggestion he made to me a while ago, to add the word "farm" before the word "commodities." Is it the Senator's desire that the amendment be modified by making that addition?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That would make the amendment more certain. The addition of the word "farm" so as to read "farm commodities" would limit it to farm products.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to see a copy of the amendment. I think as it was read it goes far beyond what has been discussed. It would eliminate the storage of wool. A general-merchandise warehouse could include a great many things. I certainly hope this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, would it be agreeable if the word "general" were eliminated?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe that the elimination of the word "general" would help. It is the word "merchandise" that troubles me. It is proposed to say that storage cannot be provided for any commodities "customarily stored in public refrigerated or general merchandise warehouses." In a small community eggs are customarily stored in public-refrigerated warehouses. Would that mean that the egg-price-support program would not be available to the farmers in the West?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment on page 2, line 11.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I do not think there is any objection to adding the word "farm" to the word "commodities," so as to limit this section to farm commodities rather than other kinds of commodities.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The only question that has been raised with me has been with respect to cold-storage facilities. It was not felt that there was any necessity of including cold-storage facilities under this provision of the act, inasmuch as we had excluded cotton and tobacco. If there is some doubt as to how far the restrictions of this amendment go, we must clarify that point before the amendment is accepted. There is the wool question, as well as the egg question. I can foresee at least half a dozen questions which I would want to raise before I would vote in favor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, with the consent of the chairman of the committee, I should like to suggest a further modification of my amendment. It is not the purpose to put the Commodity Credit Corporation at a disadvantage in fulfilling its responsibilities under the law.

As I now offer it, the amendment would read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike out "cotton or tobacco" and insert in lieu thereof "cotton, tobacco, or farm commodities customarily stored in public refrigerated warehouses."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was the understanding I had of the amendment, and, inasmuch as no request was made before the committee for additional storage facilities for refrigerated warehousing, I saw no objection to adopting the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that the testimony before the committee shows that there is in fact an apparent surplus of refrigerated warehouse facilities at the present time, so that there would be no danger of a shortage of refrigerated space for farm commodities over which the Corporation might have some jurisdiction?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In the testimony before the committee no one suggested the need of additional refrigeration for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment on page 2, line 11, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "cotton or tobacco" and insert in lieu thereof "cotton, tobacco, or farm commodities customarily stored in public refrigerated warehouses."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may I ask the author of the amendment whether this amendment covers butter? Butter is customarily stored in refrigerated warehouses. The Chairman pointed out what happened when grain could not be stored in grain elevators. There might be need to assist in constructing facilities for the storage of butter, eggs, and a great many other commodities.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that no testimony has been given to the effect that there is any shortage, or even a threatened shortage, of storage facilities of this kind. It is for that reason that the amendment is proposed. A shortage in warehouse storage facilities does not show up overnight. There will be ample time at a future date to amend the proposed law, if it needs amendment, in this or any other respect. At the moment I believe that the proviso would in no way hamper the Commodity Credit Corporation in taking care of its obligations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have no desire to see the Commodity Credit Corporation launch into the construction of refrigerated warehouses, but I am keenly aware that during the war there was a shortage of refrigerated space. While those who operated refrigerated warehouses steadily maintained that such warehouses were being used only to 90 percent of capacity, as a practical matter, that is about the maximum that can be expected when commodities are being moved in and out. We were acutely short of warehousing facilities during the war period, and we might be again. I do not anticipate that any more such facilities are to be constructed. I had hoped that we might act on the amendment which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and I had pending, namely, the provision that existing private facilities should not be duplicated, but that a survey must be made to show that they are inadequate before anything can be done about it. I should greatly prefer to see that language in the bill. However, I have no great objection to having the amendment apply to cotton, tobacco, or refrigerated cold-storage facilities. But when other commodities are included, we may find that they are customarily stored in such facilities, but that they may still need some protection. I want to be sure that what we are doing is saying that cold-storage facilities shall not be built by the Government for these particular commodities.

I should like to refer to the point made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The caves at Atchison, Kans., were quite an experiment. There was grave doubt for a long time whether they would be useful. The Government has spent approximately $2,000,000, and has found that programs can be devised to make the fullest possible use of these excellent natural coolers. I am hopeful that we can make very certain that the Government will not lose its right to operate those coolers as long as it may be desired. The Government does not now own title to the land, but has an option which it must take up shortly. It is accumulating funds so that the purchase may be made. I hope it is clear that we are not foreclosing the Government in its right to complete the purchase of those caves.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, is it not true that under our present price-support program we may get into rather large-

scale operations this fall in support of pork prices? There is not sufficient cold storage at the present time to provide for a very large-scale program in respect to pork. We may be getting the United States Department of Agriculture into a great deal of trouble with this amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so. Moreover, we could get into a great deal of trouble with dairy products. At the present time we have an abundance of such products. At certain seasons of the year we want to put away dried skim milk. Certainly evaporated milk must be stored. At the present time I believe that storage facilities are ample for everything we want, but we are accumulating great surpluses of lard, and perhaps a great many pork products ought to be purchased and stored. I think we would go far enough by the adoption of the amendment which has been submitted to so many Members of this body, providing that the Government must not build facilities without determining that private facilities are inadequate. If it is found that private facilities are not adequate, then the Corporation must make some arrangements to supply the needed facilities.

But I think we would put the Department of Agriculture in a position in which it might be able to shirk its duties, if we were to say that it did not need to store the things which are customarily stored in refrigerated warehouses. That would let it "off the hook" in the case of butter and lard and pork. I think the Congress should not give such permission to the Department of Agriculture. I think Congress should say that the Department must store the products it acquires, preferably in private establishments, generally in private establishments, and should not build any storage facilities so long as private storage facilities are adequate.

With that as a general rule, I do not think the owners of private facilities need worry.

During the war we virtually had authority to build almost anything we needed; and yet at no time did the Department of Agriculture seek to build any such facilities at all, except in the case of caves, near Atchison, Kans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 11.

Mr. YOUNG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. It seems to me that what he is trying to do is to exempt storage of a certain kind, rather than storage for the miscellaneous kinds of products he has mentioned.

I suggest to him that perhaps his purpose might better be served if, where the committee amendment is now found, on page 2, in line 11, the following words were placed within the parenthesis: "other than storage for cotton, tobacco, and refrigerated cold storage."

That simply would exempt, in addition to storage for cotton or tobacco, a general additional type of storage which would be referred to as refrigerated cold storage, without bringing into question what products are affected thereby.

I suggest that that amendment might be made to the Senator's amendment, and might meet his purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I think that would cover the situation, so far as I am concerned. Does the Senator from Florida offer that as a substitute?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe I could offer it as a substitute to the committee amendment, under the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has a right to modify his own amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator from Nebraska adopt my suggestion if he wishes to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as I stated to the Senator from New Mexico and to other Senators, I have no desire to handicap the Commodity Credit Corporation in the operation of its program. I am satisfied that it is true, as the Senator has said, that at the moment there is no shortage of refrigerated storage facilities. I think the persons who are operating refrigerated storage are entitled to exactly the same protection or assurance that is provided for the storage facilities for cotton or tobacco.

So I accept the proposed amendment, and will make it my own amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. BUTLER. I modify my amendment in the way suggested by the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, in line 11, after the word "tobacco," it is proposed to insert "and refrigerated cold storage."

Mr. HOLLAND. That will carry out the suggestion I made.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment will be stated again.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 11, the committee amendment as proposed to be amended by the amendment, as modified, will read as follows: "other than for storage for cotton, tobacco, and refrigerated cold storage)."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think the present situation demonstrates exactly why we cannot properly handle amendments of this sort on the floor of the Senate. Who knows whether this amendment would take the Department of Agriculture "off the peg" so to speak, in supporting hog prices this fall or in supporting butter prices or the prices of eggs? We have no information from the Department of Agriculture as to what effect this amendment would have in these price-support fields. So I think it would be very dangerous for us to accept the amendment as modified. No testimony to show the need for it was presented to the committee. I think it would be most unwise for the Senate to adopt the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I think the Senator from North Dakota heard the statement made by the former Secretary of Agriculture, the present Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], to the effect that the Department was virtually authorized, during the war, to construct Government storage facilities—or, if perhaps not exactly authorized, at least that every request it made during the war period was granted, and that it was not necessary for the Department to construct cold-storage facilities, even under wartime conditions, and it was not necessary for the Department to construct cotton or tobacco storage facilities.

I can see no possible situation which would require within any reasonable time the construction of such storage by the Department.

Mr. YOUNG. The hog situation now is entirely different. We have a large surplus of fats and oils, and a big hog crop is coming on.

Mr. BUTLER. There will not be a greater storage problem than that which existed during the war.

Mr. YOUNG. Oh, yes, a much greater problem—perhaps not this fall, but certainly next year, in supporting hog prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 11.

On this question the yeas and nays have been requested? Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kerr	Stennis
Eastland	Kilgore	Taft
Ecton	Knowland	Taylor
Ferguson	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Long	Thye
George	McCarthy	Tydings
Gillette	McClellan	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	Malone	Withers
Hickenlooper	Martin	Young
Hill	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. ROBERT L. COFFEY, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND STRATEGIC STOCK PILING ACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment on page 2, line 11.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, it is proposed to insert, after the word "Directors," the words "Advisory Board: (a)."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After the committee amendments are adopted I should like to offer an amendment. Do I correctly understand the proper procedure to be that after the adoption of the committee amendments I may offer my amendment to strike out the section of the bill to which I have reference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was on page 2, lines 23 and 24, to strike out "of not less than six nor more than 10 members" and insert "of six members."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, lines 12 and 13, to strike out "A majority of the minimum number of Directors required on the Board" and to insert "A majority of the Directors."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, to insert a new paragraph (b), as follows:

(b) In addition to the Board of Directors there shall be an advisory board reflecting broad agricultural and business experience in its membership and consisting of five members appointed by the President of the United States, not more than three of whom shall belong to the same political party. The advisory board shall meet at the call of the Secretary, who shall require it to meet not less often than once each 90 days; shall survey the general policies of the Corporation, including its policies in connection with the purchase, storage, and sale of commodities, and the operation of lending and price-support programs; and shall advise the Secretary with respect thereto. Members of the advisory board shall receive for their services as members compensation of not to exceed $50 per diem when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such, together with their necessary traveling expenses while going to and coming from meetings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 15, it is proposed to strike out the period and quotation marks after the word "Corporation" and insert a colon and add the following: *"Provided,* That the authority contained in this subsection (h) shall not be utilized by the Corporation for the purpose of acquiring real property, or any interest therein, in order to provide storage facilities for any commodity unless the Corporation determines that existing privately owned storage facilities for such commodity in the area concerned are not adequate: *And provided further,* That nothing contained in this subsection (h) shall limit the duty of the Corporation, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, to utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce in the warehousing of commodities."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee amendments having been agreed to, do I correctly understand that this is the first individual amendment, and it is with reference to line 15 on page 2 of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this is an amendment which I offered in my name, but in connection with it I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The purpose of the amendment is to make sure that the Commodity Credit Corporation assures itself that there are no adequate facilities existing before it can move for the improvement of the storage situation.

I do not desire to take a great deal of the time of the Senate. I believe it is a good amendment. It was adopted by the House committee for precisely the same reasons for which it is offered here. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am not opposed to the amendment, but I should like to have it clarified. Line 7, on page 2, contains the words:

Unless the Corporation determines that existing privately owned storage facilities for such commodity in the area concerned are not adequate.

I wish to ask the Senator this specific question: Supposing that in the town of Albuquerque, N. Mex., there are some wheat elevators; that in the season of the year when there is a rush those elevators do not have adequate storage facilities; and that the management says to a farmer, "You have to sell immediately. We cannot store your wheat." Does the Senator not know—I think he does from his experience in the past—that many farmers who desired to store their wheat have lost money because of the lack of storage facilities? Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Corporation decide the question in the month of December or January, long before the crop season comes along, and say, "Because of the fact that in previous years the storage capacity has been insufficient, therefore we shall have to build an elevator here so as to provide additional storage space"?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that I believe the chairman of the committee has repeatedly stated how the grain storage situation might work out. I believe that in a case in which year after year storage has been insufficient, the Commodity Credit Corporation would move to try to make facilities available at the particular point. But, first of all, it would try to aid private facilities or cooperatives. The last resort would be for the Government to build its own facilities.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. But may I ask one further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield further.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose the elevator located at a particular place pays insufficient prices over a period of years, or let us say it docks much more than it should dock: In the judgment of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, would that situation authorize the Corporation to decide the facilities in that area were not adequate?

Mr. ANDERSON. In such a situation I do not think this bill would permit the Corporation to construct new facilities. The purpose is not to police the grain business, desirable as that may be in some localities. The purpose of the bill is to make sure that where existing facilities are not adequate, other facilities may be constructed.

I will say to the Senator that I believe making facilities adequate will do away with most of the things the Senator very properly is worried about. But I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture or the Director of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be justified in building new elevator facilities in any particular locality merely because it was felt that the existing elevator managements were not ethical in their dealings.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield further.

Mr. LANGER. I cannot quite follow the Senator. Let us suppose that a farmer has a field on which flax was grown, and the next year there is a volunteer crop of flax, which is worth only 80 cents to $1 per acre. There is a

local elevator, the management of which says to the farmer, "We shall not pay you anything for this flax. We call it dockage." In other words, the manager of the elevator docks that flax from the farmer. Because of the limited amount of grain raised in that locality there is no private concern which wants to build a competing elevator. Under the police powers of the state, the existing elevator cannot be policed. In such a case how is the farmer to be protected?

Mr. ANDERSON. I tried to answer the Senator frankly, and perhaps that is my difficulty. I have said there is nothing in the bill which, in my opinion, would justify the Commodity Credit Corporation in undertaking to police the grain business all over the United States, and that I believe a great deal can be accomplished by making sure that facilities are adequate. I do not say that would cure all the defects; I simply say I hope the Senator goes along with the bill on the theory that it is a move in the right direction, even though it is not a final move.

Mr. LANGER. I intend to go along and vote for the bill. But does the distinguished Senator, who was formerly Secretary of Agriculture, know of any law which protects the farmer in the situation which I have described?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not. I regret to say that, but I think it is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the section which the Senator from New Mexico is proposing to amend. I think he has a very constructive and clarifying amendment. I believe it strengthens the purpose of the bill, and clarifies many of the points at issue. I think it should go far toward relieving the minds of many who have had questions about the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So far as I am concerned, I have one sentence which I considered at some length suggesting as an addition to the amendment. Because of the legislative history made here, and because the amendment has been clarified thoroughly, I have decided not to offer the suggestion, because the Senator's amendment has been agreed to by a number of Senators. What I originally proposed to add to the Senator's amendment was the language:

Provided further, That the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make loans to any person or persons, association, corporation, or other group, for the purpose of providing permanent-type storage facilities.

In view of the discussions in the Senate last Friday, and the statements made by the chairman of the committee and others today, I believe the bill is sufficiently defined and clarified to indicate that it is not contemplated that the Commodity Credit Corporation will go into the business of lending to private or semiprivate corporations, that it will confine its activities to the purposes of the Commodity Credit Corporation, support the prices of commodities, and provide storage space which will belong to the Government, when storage space in the regular commercial channels, or otherwise, appears to be inadequate for the purpose of storing commodities. I am satisfied, and I hope the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be agreed to. I believe it is constructive and helpful in the interpretation of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, and to urge that the Senate agree to it. It is similar to, and pretty much in identical language, with the amendment which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I have had printed and which lies on the desk, which we intended to offer, but will not offer if the pending amendment shall be agreed to. I think the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico goes far toward clarifying the intention of the committee and the Congress, at the same time leaving the Corporation adequate power to take care of the situation if an emergency arises. I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in my opinion the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is a good amendment to be added to the bill. I have been trying to get some information from the Department, because there is an item in the budget for $25,000,000 for the purchase of real estate. Last week, on Wednesday, I furnished the Department a list of some 17 questions, to which I have been endeavoring to get answers, but so far have not been able to get the information I desired. I wondered whether the able Senator from New Mexico might have the answers to the questions I have submitted.

The first question was: In view of the budget request for an appropriation of $25,000,000 for grain-storage facilities under legislation to be proposed, did the Department of Agriculture justify its request before the House committee? As I understand, they have not justified it. Has the Senator from New Mexico any information on that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Michigan yield for the purpose of having his question answered?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose, if we might conduct the debate in this way, rather than in the way required by the rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Senator from Michigan realizes that there is no way in the world for me to know whether the Department had to make justification before the Bureau of the Budget. I have been away from the Department since May 1948, and at that time no justification had been made. I doubt if one has been made, but I have no way of answering the question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume, then, that the information would not be in the hands of the able Senator from New Mexico as to this item, and I shall have to wait until the Department sees fit to answer the questions.

Mr. ANDERSON. I regret that I cannot answer.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a word in support of the statements by the Senator from Delaware and by the Senator from New Mexico. I have had a good deal of correspondence from persons in the warehouse business in my State, who are very much interested in the adoption of the amendment, and I join with these Senators in hoping it will be agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will permit me to do so, I should like to submit a question to him so that his answer may appear in the RECORD. I should like to ask him if it is his intention, and the intention of the other sponsors of the amendment, to provide by the amendment that if, in the sole discretion of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which means the sole discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, a determination is made that existing privately owned storage facilities for a commodity in question in the area concerned are not adequate, authority will exist, upon that sole determination, for the Corporation to take whatever steps may be necessary to provide adequate facilities. Is that the purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON. If I may reply to the Senator from Florida——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the committee, as the Senator well knows, we considered whether there were other ways by which that determination could be reached, but I would not say it was to be based upon the finding of the Department. The answer to the Senator is, yes, this is the sole determination that would be necessary.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to point up the answer which the Senator has made, if I may do so.

Do I correctly understand the Senator from New Mexico, in his answer, to hold that it is not the question of fact as to the adequacy of the storage facilities in existence, but the question of whether or not the Corporation, meaning the Secretary, has determined their inadequacy, which determines the right and authority of the Corporation to proceed to supply the additional facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not sure that I can answer the Senator. Not being a lawyer, not knowing what legal implication there might be in this matter, it was surely my thought that there should be but one finding, and that finding should be by the Corporation, that it had the sole right to determine whether facilities were adequate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the Senator from Iowa, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my impression, hearing the question of the

Senator from Florida, that he is differentiating between any connotation that the necessity for a hearing of both sides be had, which might delay action of the Corporation in making its determination, and building the facility, or providing it. He touched upon one phase of this matter, and I have given assurance to persons who have made inquiry about that very point.

It was proposed by at least one Member of the Senate that an amendment be inserted in the bill requiring that the Secretary of Agriculture first canvass the situation, and that some formalized hearing be had or finding made. I believe the Senator will recall, as I know the chairman of the committee will, that in the committee hearings some such suggestions were made. But I believe the committee was unanimous in saying that if a formalized procedure were provided for hearings on these matters, undue delay might occur, and the very purposes of the proposed legislation might be defeated. Therefore I have advised those who were interested in that phase that in my judgment the bill clearly sets forth that the Secretary should not be captious in his findings, he should not disregard all the evidence, that he is expected to use common sense and judgment, and the sustainable information, that is at hand, in coming to a sound conclusion, one which he eventually could sustain under fire if necessary, as to whether or not existing facilities were adequate. I am ready and willing to rest upon that assumption. I feel that we would be endangering the program if in the law, we set up cumbersome machinery which would have to be categorically followed before the construction or supply of adequate facilities could be had.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator. I merely wanted to observe that the statement he made was in full accord with what I myself understood the situation to be.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question with a view of clarifying in my own mind the answer which was made to the question asked by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. As I understood, the Senator from Florida, referring to the proposed amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, inquired whether or not that amendment contemplated the exercise of the sole discretion of the Corporation, and then the distinguished Senator from Florida said, as I understood, "That is, of the Secretary of Agriculture." Assuming that the bill should pass in the form it has been submitted, with the management of the Corporation to be vested—although in the Board of Directors, nevertheless subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary—I take it the proposed amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico would leave the sole discretion in the Secretary of Agriculture. The question I desire to ask the Senator from New Mexico is this: Suppose that there shall be adopted later today or at any other time before the bill is passed, an amendment under which the Board of Directors shall continue, as under the existing law, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and under which the power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States, as it is today. On the assumption I have just made of an amendment leaving the law as it is now as to who appoints, who confirms, and who may remove, is it the idea of the Senator from New Mexico that the sole discretion contemplated in his amendment would be in the Corporation as exercised by the Board of Directors of the Corporation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I would say so.

Mr. DONNELL. I want to be perfectly clear on that point.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is that way, regardless of whether we adopt the amendment the Senator from Missouri suggested might be adopted. By my amendment I think the discretion would be in the Corporation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I assume that the Senator from New Mexico would concur with me that if the bill, S. 900, should be passed as it originally proposed, so that the action of the Board of Directors is subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary, the ultimate decision under the Senator's amendment would be in the Secretary of Agriculture; but that if the Corporation should continue as it is under the present law, subject to the management of the Board of Directors, then the ultimate final discretion under the Senator's amendment would be exercised by the Corporation acting through its Board of Directors.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is entirely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very happy over the answers just made by the Senator from New Mexico. The purposes of my question were two. One, as stated by the Senator from Iowa, namely, to bring out as clearly as we could for the RECORD, that no formal course of action is required by the bill which might invite litigation in each case as to whether or not its terms had been accurately and closely and completely followed. And, second, to make the determining factor as to whether or not this authority could be exercised, not the existence or nonexistence of a certain fact, but the making of a determination by the Corporation that the inadequacy existed, so as to make that a conclusive finding, upon which jurisdiction is given by this amendment to the Corporation to go ahead and supply the necessary facilities, rather than to have the accuracy of its findings subjected perhaps in each case to long and tedious and costly litigation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In order to correct what might be interpreted as some loose language of mine a moment ago when I referred several times to the Secretary in connection with this authorization, I may say that I believe the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico applies equally to the authority of the Secretary or to the authority of the Board of Directors, if the authority is lodged in the Corporation. I referred repeatedly to the authority of the Secretary to make this decision. I want it to apply with equal force and effect to the Corporation, if it operates through a board of directors. In other words, it would apply to whatever authority is set up to operate the corporation.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, and that was the intention of my question.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. This is in line with the question just asked by the Senator from Iowa, and in order to make clear, in my own mind at least, what the Senator from Florida means. As I understand, the proposed amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from New Mexico provides for certain determination by the Corporation. I refer particularly to line 7 of page 1. The question I desire to ask the Senator from Florida is this: Even if it be true under the bill, S. 900, as it was originally presented, that the ultimate decision and determination contemplated would be in the Secretary of Agriculture, because he would have, under that bill, the general supervision and direction over the Board of Directors, I assume, and I ask the Senator from Florida if he agrees with me, that if the bill shall be amended so that the management of the Corporation shall be retained in a Board of Directors to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and the power of removal of which is vested in the President, then the ultimate determination of these very facts and matters set forth in the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be vested and retained in and by the Corporation, represented by the Board of Directors, which has the power of management and direction of the Corporation.

Mr. HOLLAND. In answer I would say that the Senator is correct. The two points I make are equally applicable whether the bill is left as it is now worded, in which case, as the Senator has properly pointed out, the Secretary of Agriculture is really the one who makes the decision, or if the bill is changed so as to make the Corporation function as ordinary corporations do, when the final decision would be vested in the Board of Directors. The point I was trying to make by my two questions would apply equally in both cases. First, that we are not under this amendment prescribing any formal course which is to be followed by the deciding power in making the determination. Second, that it is not the actuality of the facts as to the inadequacy of the facilities that shall govern, but the fact that the deciding power has made the determination that there are inadequate facilities, that gives the authority to go ahead and construct the facilities which are needed, because, Mr. President, the

view of the whole committee, as I understood it at the time this matter was discussed, was that under no circumstances did the committee want to have language written into the bill which would invite litigation in each instance when the Secretary tried to move to supply facilities he found to be inadequate, or the Corporation found to be inadequate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator's very clear statement, and I am obliged to him for it. I want to ask him whether or not, however, he has in mind this possible modification of that statement. While the ultimate determination, as I understand, is to be vested in the Corporation under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, there conceivably could be some case of a gross abuse of discretion by the Corporation, could there not? For illustration, we will take a community which needs only 10 warehouses. Suppose there were 10 or 20 or 30 warehouses in the community. The mere fact that the Corporation should determine that additional facilities were necessary would not be conclusive as against complaint that there had been a gross abuse of discretion. Would not the Senator agree that that modification would necessarily inhere in the nature of the language used in the amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; it would be my feeling that that complaint would have to come to the Congress. It is my understanding that this wording leaves the determination to the Corporation or to the Secretary, as the case might be, in which event, if there were an abuse of power, then, of course, there would be answerability to the Congress. But the intent, as I see it, is for the amendment not to leave an open door by which litigation and delay will be invited in each instance where it is found necessary to go ahead and construct additional facilities.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to say first that I am very glad to have the Senator's idea, because we might as well have it perfectly clear as to what the proponents have in mind. I should like to say also that in my questions I have not in any sense intimated that I am expecting any gross abuse of discretion. I am very much obliged to the Senator for the expression of his idea, which, as I understand, is that this language makes the determination by the Corporation final and conclusive. Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the understanding of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the amendment now pending has been agreed upon, so I shall be very glad to see it adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the discussion on the floor in the past 2 days during which the bill has been under consideration has developed certain ideas to which I think the Senate should give full consideration. One point relates to the number of members on the Board, and whether or not the members of the Board should be confirmed by the Senate. The bill as originally drawn provided that the Board should consist of either 6 members in addition to the Secretary, which would make 7, or 10 members in addition to the Secretary, which would make 11. The bill now before the Senate provides for a Board of 6 members in addition the Secretary, making 7 in all.

I desire to offer an amendment to amend section 9 of the existing law by striking out the number of 5 in the existing law and making it 7; and a further amendment to section 9 of the existing law by striking out the last two sentences of that section. Those two sentences read as follows:

> Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board.
>
> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an interim Board consisting of five members, including the Secretary, who shall serve until October 1, 1948.

The reason for striking the first sentence to which I have just referred is that under the present law the Secretary or the President must go outside the Department of Agriculture to name at least two members of the Board. So under the present law the Board must consist of at least two members from outside the Department, and it may consist also of three members inside the Department. If the President is to name all the members of the Board, I suggest that this inhibition be stricken, so as to let him name all the members from the Department, if he so desires, or all the members from outside the Department, if he prefers.

The purpose of the original bill was to give the Secretary a little more control over the Corporation by requiring all members of the Board to be members of his Department. First, they would always be on the job; second, they would be under the general supervision and control of the Secretary, because they would be his appointees. If we strike out the number of five under the existing law, the new board will consist of seven members, six besides the Secretary. Appointments would be made by the President and confirmed by the Senate, but the President would not be required to go outside the Department to name two members, or any number of members. He could appoint them all from the Department if he saw fit to do so.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. That means, then, that the President could go entirely outside the Department of Agriculture if he chose to do so. He would have complete freedom of actior, either in the Department of Agriculture or outside.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. He would have entire freedom of action. I think the courts have held that the President cannot be directed as to whom he shall appoint. Under this amendment he could appoint all the members from the personnel of the Department, or he could appoint them all from outside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out lines 18 to 25 inclusive, and lines 1 to 16 on page 3, and insert:

> Amend section 9 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act as follows: (a) Change the number of the Board members from five to seven; and (b) strike the last two sentences of said section.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before the amendment can be offered, from a parliamentary standpoint I shall have to ask the Senate to reconsider the first part of section 3. The Senate has already adopted an amendment with respect to line 24 on page 2. In order to offer my amendment I shall have to ask that that amendment be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that that will not be necessary. The Senate has already adopted this section, as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask that that action be reconsidered in order that I may offer my amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I think he would perhaps clarify the situation somewhat if he would withhold his amendment temporarily and permit consideration of my amendment, which would strike out certain sections of the bill. After that, he could offer his amendment. I think that would be the more orderly course.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this is one of the matters upon which we thought we had agreement. If we can have this amendment adopted, I think we can take care of the other sections in short order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it will not be necessary for the Senator from Oklahoma to make a motion to reconsider. He can offer his amendment to strike out the section as amended and substitute the language which he has presented.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask for action on the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understood the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, it did not include the entire section, but only through line 16 on page 3.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be to strike out that portion of section 9, as amended, and

substitute the language proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma goes down to line 16. The amendment I intend to offer would continue beyond that point. It is my understanding that my amendment A, which is on the desk, is acceptable.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware embraces numerous provisions, and I shall have to ask for a division of his amendment. If we can dispose of this amendment, we can take up his amendments in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to the division of my amendment, provided the understanding is that my amendments will be adopted after being divided.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not see how that assurance can possibly be given. I do not see how the Senate can be committed to strike from the bill the provision for an advisory board. In the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry there was quite a discussion over how the Board should be constituted. After days of discussion, with due regard for the feelings of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and other Senators, language was suggested for the creation of an advisory committee. Whether or not the members of the Board of Directors are selected from among employees of the Department of Agriculture, there still might be brought in persons of wide agricultural experience to consult with respect to policies. I know that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma did not mean to strike out that provision.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was not a part of my amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. All I am trying to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee is that while I have a preference for the language of the bill over what he has proposed, I am not going to be captious about it. I will accept his amendment. However, I am not going to commit myself thereby to vote for the elimination of the provision with relation to an advisory committee. That was a part of the basis upon which we were able to persuade many Senators to report the bill.

I further suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that even if his amendment is accepted, corrections will still need to be made when the bill goes to conference. For example, in the language which he is moving to strike out there is the provision that if an employee of the Department is utilized as a member of the Board and his salary happens to be higher than the salary received by members of the Board of Directors, he will still draw his higher pay. For example, if the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture should receive an increase in salary above $10,000, and he should be selected for service on the Board, he would not be limited to $10,000 a year.

I am happy to trust the distinguished chairman to arrive at a satisfactory solution in conference, so that there will be no question about it. But I believe that if there has been any other understanding, we should get to it, because I have said to the Senator from Delaware that although I prefer the language of the bill as proposed by the committee, yet if it will help any to have the members of the Board nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, I shall be very happy to join in having that arrangement placed in effect.

As a matter of fact, when the proposal was made, a year ago, to amend the original charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to have the members of the Board nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, that proposal was stricken out, not by the Department of Agriculture, but by the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore I am sure I can support the suggestion the Senator has offered.

I do not know what other suggestions the Senator from Delaware has in mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma proposes that we amend the existing law by increasing the number of Directors of the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation from five to seven, but first I think we should settle for once and all the question whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture will run the Commodity Credit Corporation. The question of whether he is to run it with five figureheads or with seven figureheads is immaterial.

Before voting on the number of directors, I think we should vote on the question whether or not the Secretary is to have complete control over the Corporation. The Senator's amendment does not touch at all the provision on the first page of the bill, which would place the supervision and direction of the Corporation in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that is the arrangement which I definitely oppose.

I thought it was definitely understood with the Senator from Oklahoma that we would vote on this issue as a distinct and separate matter. If the Senator from Oklahoma sees fit to oppose that request, then we shall discuss it and shall show the Senate why we think it is dangerous to place such unlimited powers in the hands of any official of the Government. This bill unless my amendment is agreed to will place in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the power to borrow money, pledging the security of the United States to the extent of $4,750,000,000 without even consulting the Congress. This is more power than is exercised by the President of the United States himself.

Certainly it seems to me it is out of order for us to seek to amend existing law by changing the number of directors from five to seven without first deciding what authority will be given to the board of directors.

So I ask the Senator from Oklahoma to withhold his amendment for a moment until we can settle the other question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it was my purpose, after this amendment is adopted, if it is, to ask consideration for a proposal to strike out section 1 of the bill, which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have general "supervision and direction" of the Board. If we provided that the Board shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, it would be a hard slap at the confirmed members of the Board to give the Secretary the power to tell them what to do.

If my amendment is adopted, I shall be very glad to support the proposal to strike section 1 from the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then why does not the Senator from Oklahoma include in his amendment a provision to strike section 1 from the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under our procedure, there is division of questions. I think each question should be decided separately on its merits.

So far as I am concerned, I am agreeable to striking section 1 from the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At this time I am asking for a vote on the proposal which was made this morning. I do not recall that there were exceptions to it, but if there were, at least we have a right to take a vote on the amendment I have proposed. It seems to me ridiculous to increase the Board of Directors from a membership of five to a membership of seven, and then simply have seven dummies, rather than 5, inasmuch as none of them will have any authority to do anything other than to draw the salary unless my amendment is adopted.

Therefore I insist my amendment be considered first.

If the Senator from Oklahoma is going to insist on the amendment as it is, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold for a moment the suggestion of the absence of a quorum and yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I realize that we are anxious to dispose of this measure today. I had intended to address myself to it for a few moments. However, instead of doing so, I now ask unanimous consent to have the speech I have prepared printed in the RECORD, together with a copy of a statement by the American Banker regarding the action last Friday of the Federal Reserve Board in announcing a further relaxation in consumer credit controls, regulation W.

There being no objection, the speech and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, last Friday the Federal Reserve Board announced a further relaxation in consumer credit controls, regulation W.

Since the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I have the honor of being chairman, recommended to the Senate the legislation permitting the Board to regulate consumer credit, and since I am aware how concerned the small business interests of the country are with the effects of these controls, I felt it was particularly important to keep myself and the committee informed as to the operation and effects of the program. One of my first instructions to the staff of the banking committee when I assumed the chairmanship was to look into the credit-

control program and keep it under continuous study.

Our committee, when it reported the legislation last year, Mr. President, expressed the hope that the Board adopt flexible and sensitive policies which will maintain the highest possible level of production and employment in the durable-goods industries, on which so much of the Nation's standard of living and well-being depend. The Board has fulfilled that hope.

In January and February of this year the volume of consumer credit decreased and sales in small business establishments throughout our Nation began to fall off. We were in touch with the Board at the time and were in agreement that some relaxation in credit terms seemed to be in order. As you know, the Board on March 7 did decrease the down payment required and increased the period of repayment for a number of items.

We followed the effects closely, and as I predicted at the time, merchants and retailers did not take advantage of the relaxation by increasing prices. I predict they will cooperate in the same way this time, for they know as well as anyone that a prosperous business enterprise can only be maintained in the long run by fair prices and good sales volume.

The elimination of all goods costing less than $100 from credit controls, the decrease in down payments on furniture and appliances from 15 to 10 percent, and the extension of the period of repayment from 21 to 24 months should be helpful, particularly to hundreds of thousands of small-business men and their customers.

The extension of the repayment period from 21 to 24 months on automobiles should prove particularly beneficial to thousands of used-car dealers whose sales have been falling off during the last 6 months. At the same time thousands of families who could not afford to make the high monthly payments up to now will be able to get that long-needed car.

The elimination and relaxation of controls have not and will not result in foolhardy or unfair credit policies. It will merely allow business to resume normal trade practices now that it is possible to allow them to do so. It means, in effect, allowing each businessman to determine for himself in his own interest and in terms of his customers' welfare and circumstances what credit policy he should put into effect.

I want to commend the Board and its Chairman, Mr. McCabe, for its heads-up approach to this problem. It proves false the argument that "once the Government gets its hands on something it can't let go." Congress is more willing to grant increased powers and responsibilities to agencies of the Government when they demonstrate, as the Board has, that these powers and responsibilities are used with caution, discrimination, and good sense.

[From the American Banker of April 21, 1949]

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD DEFENDS RECORD IN CONSUMER CREDIT AND URGES CONTINUED CONTROL

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The Federal Reserve Board "believes that regulation of installment credit can be a helpful, supplementary tool as a part of a program of credit policy to help maintain a stable, high level of economic activity."

So states the Board today in what appears to be a defense of its regulaiton of installment credit. Included are appraisals of recent changes in this type of credit.

The Board finds there has been some slackening in the growth of installment credit. A decline in the rate of repayment is recorded. With all types of consumer goods available, there came a falling off which was recorded in the fourth quarter of 1948. The demand for many items has weakened.

With the changes in consumer demand and plentiful supply of goods, the Board said it acted to soften the required terms of purchase under its regulation W.

It is too early to appraise the effect of these changes, the Board notes. It adds "there is evidence that some lenders and retailers have not deemed it advisable or necessary to adopt down payments as low as the minimum, or maturity terms as long as the maximum, permitted.

"This emphasizes the point, sometimes overlooked, that the regulation establishes boundary lines beyond which credit terms are not permitted to go. Within the limits set by the regulation, lenders and vendors have discretion to offer terms which in their judgment are reasonable and in line with sound business principles."

The Board observes "there are indications that many retailers and financial institutions will maintain more stringent terms for the sale of furniture, radios and television sets, and certain household appliances than those permitted," under the present regulation.

Looking to the future, the Board "recognizes that regulation, by itself, is of limited effect and is by no means a substitute for broader measures to influence the volume of bank credit.

"However, the area affected by the regulation of the volume of credit in the area is feasible without undue hardship to consumers or excessive interference with business or financing practices.

"It is in this light that the Board, in conjunction with the President and his Council of Economic Advisers, has recommended legislation to continue the authority of the Board to regulate installment credit."

THE NATIONAL INTEREST IN INSTALLMENT FINANCING

The current Federal Reserve Bulletin for April, just issued, spells out the issue on regulation W in terms of its national monetary and credit responsibilities, rather than on the question alone of control on consumer installment credit. In banking circles, where criticism of the installment credit controls has been widespread, along with demand for their abandonment forever, the point raised by the Federal Reserve Board is seldom discussed. Generally it appears assumed that the Federal Reserve Board has sufficient other powers over money and credit, and that specific controls over the installment phase of credit is not necessary.

In the current April bulletin, the Reserve Board states:

"The Board of Governors believes that regulation of installment credit can be a helpful, supplementary tool as a part of a program of credit policy to help maintain a stable, high level of economic activity. The Board recognizes that the regulation, by itself, is of limited effect and is by no means a substitute for broader measures to influence the volume of bank credit. However, the area affected by the regulation is a strategic one, and regulation of the volume of credit in the area is feasible without undue hardship to consumers or excessive interference with business or financing practices. It is in this light that the Board, in conjunction with the President and his Council of Economic Advisers, has recommended legislation to continue the authority of the Board to regulate installment credit."

In other words, the Reserve Board argues that there is a national interest in the volume of consumer purchasing financed by installment credit, and that this is paramount to considerations of the individual consumer's desires for goods, his ability to pay for them over a period of time, and the desire of a bank or other lender to risk its funds in underwriting the installment loans necessary to enable the consumer to mortgage his savings and buy what he wants on the easiest terms he can get.

Bankers are inclined to argue that as lenders they will not overextend credit, and that, if the individual loans are sound, the Nation's installment-buying picture will be sound over-all. Non-bank-financed loans, they point out, involve only private capital; if they are not sound, it is only private capital that would be lost.

The Reserve Board sees itself concerned with the volume of such credits as factors in overextending purchasing power in boom times, and overcontracting it—as buyers pay off loans—in times of recession. That issue needs more discussion in banking circles.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it be in order for me to offer my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was going to ask that the Senator from Delaware have an opportunity to tell us what his amendments are, so that we may consider them in connection with the proposal made by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it would not be in order for the Senator from Delaware to offer his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, because the proposed amendment of the Senator from Delaware takes in territory additional to that encompassed by the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand from the Senator from Oklahoma that he will not withdraw his amendment until this matter can be disposed of?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it makes no difference which one we vote upon first. The Senate will have a chance to pass upon both amendments in due course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendmentment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Murray
Brewster	Hill	Myers
Bricker	Hoey	Neely
Butler	Holland	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kefauver	Stennis
Connally	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Kerr	Taylor
Eastland	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McFarland	Tydings
Fulbright	McGrath	Watkins
George	McKellar	Wherry
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Gurney	Martin	Young
Hayden	Maybank	
Hendrickson	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, if adopted, as I pointed out before, would merely provide for increasing the number of $10,000 dummies from five to seven. There would be no provision in the bill, if the amendment is adopted without the inclusion of my amendment under which any of the members of the board of directors would have a single power other than advisory powers and the power to collect their salaries. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma were adopted, and the bill passed, there would be seven dummies operating as a board of directors, with no power whatever to formulate policies. They could at any time be overridden by the Secretary of Agriculture. To assist the seven dummies, there would be an advisory board, to which it is proposed to appoint five men, who would draw $50 a day for coming to Washington to advise the board of figurehead directors, none of whom have any authority whatever under the bill. I see no sense in it. I think the Senate should determine once for all whether any authority is to be given to the board of directors; if not, then let us keep that group as small as possible. I see no reason for enlarging it to seven $10,000 men, who, according to the Senator from Oklahoma, are not capable of directing the affairs of the Corporation. The Secretary would still run it since he would have the power to remove from office the first one of them with whom he disagreed. I had hoped the Senator from Oklahoma would withhold his amendment until we could settle the other issue, but, since he will not, I should like to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it in order for me to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, as follows: on page 1, after line 2, to strike out the remainder of the section, through line 9?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that such a proposal would enlarge the scope of the pending amendment and therefore would not be in order. It could be offered later as a separate amendment, but not as an amendment to the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there would be no object in offering it later as a separate amendment. Either my amendment should be accepted or rejected. First because if my amendment should be rejected I will be placed in the position of having to oppose the amendment now offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma may withhold his amendment and that the Senator from Delaware may be permitted to offer an amendment at this time, ahead of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that I was agreeable to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, on condition that my amendment is adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not know that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If my amendment should not be adopted, I would not be in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, would a motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. President, I so move.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the Senator from Delaware if he will withhold his motion until I address a question to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall withhold my motion for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if I correctly understand that the effect of his amendment is to strike out all of section 9, lines 18 to 25, on page 2, and all of lines 1 to 16, on page 3?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It changes the number of Board members from five to seven——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. All it does is to increase the number of Board members from five to seven. The present law provides that the President must select all of the Board members. That section is eliminated, and he can appoint them all from outside or all from inside the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this is a very important question, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is a quorum call in order after a motion to lay on the table has been entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a quorum call is in order after the order has been made for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. I abide by the decision of the Chair, of course, and shall not appeal, if that is the ruling. I felt differently about it, but if that is the ruling, I bow to it.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. ANDERSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry. Has any business been transacted since the last quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted.

Mr. WHERRY. Then is a quorum call in order, if objection is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order if objection is made.

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made to a quorum call.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have a substitute which I should like to submit. If the amendment of the distinguished chairman of the committee shall be brought to a vote, will I then have an opportunity to present the substitute, or will I have an opportunity to present it before that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Motion has been made to lay on the table the amendment which is pending. If that motion shall not be agreed to, the Senator's substitute would be in order. If it shall be agreed to, the whole matter will be on the table. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, one more parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. No action has yet been taken on the motion to lay on the table, and if the Senator who made the motion desires to withdraw the motion, may he do so without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska is directed to the right of the Senator who made the motion to lay on the table to withdraw the motion, is it?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On that motion the yeas and nays have been ordered. It can be withdrawn by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Maine desires to make a statement, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator can either withdraw it or not withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Delaware to repeat his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent that my motion to lay the amendment on the table be temporarily withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, am I to understand the Senator from Delware to indicate that he wishes temporarily to withdraw his motion to lay the amendment on the table, or does he withdraw the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was presented as a request for temporary withdrawal.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does that answer the inquiry of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; but will the Senator from Delaware permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Why does not the Senator withdraw the motion? He can always renew it, after the Senator from Maine has an opportunity to address the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I intended, to withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is a motion to table debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, Mr. President, if the motion to table was withdrawn temporarily, the question is debatable. I object to withdrawal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the Senator from Delaware say that he modified his request, so as to ask unanimous consent that he might withdraw the motion completely? There was to be nothing temporary about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was done, of course, but the Senator from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I objected to temporary withdrawal, not permanent withdrawal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Delaware to state his unanimous-consent request again.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the motion to lay the amendment on the table? The Chair hears none, and the motion is withdrawn.

POTATO PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on a matter that is not entirely extraneous to the present discussion, and I trust that during the brief time I shall take there may perhaps be progress in the adjustment of whatever the other problem is.

I wish to address myself to the repeated statements of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding the potato production program, as it is a matter of very great concern to many of us that the use of potatoes at all, and the extent to which they are used, should be employed as an excuse for such a violent alteration of the agricultural program.

I have before me the most recent statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, before the House committee this morning, and I shall quote briefly from it. Mr. Brannan said:

> I believe a satisfactory production-payment program can be operated for a great deal less money than we have been spending on potatoes.

Then on the next page he said:

> With the use of $225,000,000, we could have reduced the price to consumers to about $1 per bushel and retained the farm price at the support level.

In other words, in one breath he says he could have saved money, and in the next breath he apparently contemplates the expenditure of the $225,000,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Maine observe that possibly a deal is being made between the distinguished minority leader, the able Senator from New Mexico and the fine Senator from Delaware? I see them talking together on the floor and deals on the floor seemed to assume a certain notoriety on Thursday—rather than making them in the cloak rooms.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am certainly not able to overhear the discussion, but I welcome the participation of any Senators in discussions calculated to expedite and economize the Government's financial program.

Mr. LANGER. I might add that that is what I tried to do last Friday night.

Mr. BREWSTER. I emphasize "economize."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish that the Secretary of Agriculture in his public discussions and statements, both through the press and over the radio networks, would state specifically that one of the reasons why the potato-support program has cost the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Federal Government as much money as it has actually cost is because we were unable in the Eightieth Congress in any manner to protect ourselves against the enormous costs of the Steagall amendment which was entirely an incentive payment program, an incentive program to increase production, and that if we had not been defeated in our attempt to provide a long-range agricultural program effective in the calendar year 1949, instead of commencing in the calendar year 1950, we might have avoided to a great extent some of the excessive costs which the Secretary of Agriculture has been referring to and discussing. What the Secretary was confronted with in the calendar year 1948 was the support price written into the law fixing his powers, it being made mandatory on the Secretary that he should support potatoes at not less than 90 percent, and that the acreage planted to potatoes was not an excessive acreage on the part of the growers. The growers produced this excessive amount of potatoes on 30 percent less acreage than previous years. The Secretary was bound by wartime legislation which specifically provided he must continue for 2 years after the end of hostilities, and the end of hostilties came when the President acted by executive order December 31, 1946. The Steagall amendment for 2 years thereafter, ending December 31, 1948. All the excessive costs to which the Secretary referred have been incurred because we were unable in any sense to amend the wartime legislation in the Eightieth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will admonish the Senator from Maine that he can yield only for a question, and not a speech.

Mr. BREWSTER. I gathered that the Senator from Minnesota was inquiring whether I understood what he had been stating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair failed to hear the interrogation.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator should have had a rising inflection at the conclusion of his statement. At any rate, I hope I will not be penalized for the errors of either my colleague or the Chair.

Mr. President, in the discussion of the potato program all through this past year there has been repeated reference to the potato program as a monstrous example of the fallacy of the present law. That naturally is a matter of great concern to those interested in the potato farmers of the United States, and I think much of the criticism has been unwarranted, so far as its political import is concerned.

It has been intimated that the present situation is the result of the law passed by the Eightieth Congress. In my judgment, such a statement has absolutely no warrant in the record. The present law, under which we are functioning, was enacted by the Congress during the war years, with the support of both Democrats and Republicans, although the Democratic Party was in control in both the Congress and the executive.

I have no criticism to make of the action of the Congress in the war years in stimulating the production of potatoes by the means adopted, through the so-called Steagall amendment. It may be said that the present expense of the program could be attributed to the action of the last Congress, the Eightieth Congress, because of the fact that at the present time the potato crop of 1948 is being bought by the Government as a result of the extension of the time allocation. Therefore there could be technical support of the contention that it was the result of the action of the Eightieth Congress.

Permit me to point out, however, that the entire motivation of that action was the plain and very essential fact that the potato crop of 1948 would be going into

the market during 4 months. I speak with rather intimate knowledge, because it is during January, February, March, April, and May that the Maine potato crop, which is the largest in the country, is marketed.

It is quite true that if the law had not been amended in 1948 by the Eightieth Congress there would not have been in effect any program to take care of the potato crop remaining on January 1, 1949, as a result of the 2 years' extension, which ran to December 31, 1948. However, I do not believe any Member of this body, I do not believe any member of the Department of Agriculture, I do not believe anyone in this country, is so naive as to assume that if that law had not been extended, the Government on December 31, 1948, would not have owned every bushel of potatoes remaining from the 1948 crop. The Government was obligated up to December 31, 1948, not under a Republican law, but under the Democratic wartime law, to take all of the surplus potatoes on hand, and so far as the State of Maine or the State of Idaho or any other potato-producing State was concerned, if the farmers had known on December 31, 1948, that $1.75 a bushel would be paid for their potatoes, and that on January 1, 1949, there would be no Government support price program at all, it does not take very much intelligence to know that the farmers would have been sufficiently capable of sizing up the situation and selling their entire crop to the Government, which would have presented a perfectly insuperable problem in the matter of storage and marketing. Therefore, so far as the 1948 crop was concerned, the Eightieth Congress, with, I think, unanimous action, extended the time for the support price for the remainder of the crop-marketing year.

The State of Maine was chiefly concerned because most of our potatoes are marketed in the closing winter months, after potatoes in Long Island, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and all the other States have been marketed as a result of long-time marketing practice.

In my judgment this does not warrant any suggestion that the Eightieth Congress was responsible for the war program of incentive payments as to potatoes or anything else. Nor am I criticizing the Democratic Party for having taken the action referred to during the war years, in order to win the war and to secure the production of essential food. I am merely trying to clear the record so that the Secretary of Agriculture will have no occasion hereafter to suggest that the Republican Party or the Eightieth Congress was primarily responsible for the $225,000,000 it has cost this year to retire the surplus of the 1948 crop.

As to whether or not the proposed bill which I have discussed, which I understand is not yet in existence, the bill which Mr. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture has been discussing, would provide any improvement, I assume it remains to be demonstrated after we see the provisions of the bill. These repeated attacks upon the potato program, which has been singled out from all the other programs for a variety of reasons, with the apparent purpose of discrediting the entire historical program, should not continue.

Mr. Brannan has suggested at times that the potato support program in the last 8 or 10 years has cost $400,000,000. I think that is correct. But he has used these words so generously and so loosely that in one of the most reliable newspapers in the country—I refer to the Christian Science Monitor—one of its most reliable reporters, Miss Josephine Ripley recently printed as a lead on its front page that the potato support program for 1948 had cost $400,000,000. I am sure an examination of the RECORD would show there is no warrant for that statement. Mr. Brannan points out today that it is $200,000,000 to $225,000,000. But it shows the extent to which this exceedingly misleading propaganda has permeated the avenues of information, even those we sometimes consider most sacrosanct.

Now as to the best way of handling this situation, Mr. Brannan says:

> I believe a satisfactory production payment program can be operated for a great deal less money than we have been spending on potatoes.
>
> When the CCC has fulfilled its obligations under the existing law to support the price of potatoes for the marketing season of 1948, it will have expended approximately $225,000,000. This program will have maintained the price to producers at an average of $1.75 per bushel for grade A potatoes. The total production last year was 445,000,000 bushels. Therefore, in order to maintain this level it will be necessary to withdraw from the market and dispose of approximately 123,000,000 bushels. With the use of $225,000,000, we could have reduced the price to consumers to about $1 per bushel and retained the farm price at the support level.
>
> Let me make it very clear, that, in my opinion, the major portion of the potatoes withdrawn from the market during the 1948 season represents excessive and unjustified production, which by the use of production payments, acreage allotments, or marketing quotas, or marketing agreements and orders, should be eliminated in future years so that such losses to the Government on a single crop would not be incurred.

We are actually operating this year—I refer now to the 1949 crop year—on a potato program under the new law enacted by the Eightieth Congress, which established the so-called flexible parity, that is that the figure may be determined at from 60 percent to 90 percent of parity. The Secretary of Agriculture last November, in the exercise of his discretion, decreed that the support price for potatoes for the current crop year 1949 should be 60 percent instead of 90 percent. He also enforced marketing agreements under that law so that cooperating producers would cut their crops by an average of 25 percent. It is true that many have not cooperated because of the absence of what were considered adequate enforcement measures. So far as my part of the country is concerned, the great majority of potato producers have cooperated and are under that restriction at this time—not only of a 60 percent parity support, but a 25 percent reduction in acreage.

I talked with Secretary Brannan the other day and he told me that in 1949 apparently there would be another similarly excessive crop. In 1948 445,000,000 bushels of potatoes were produced. The estimate of the apparent requirements of this country was 350,000,000 bushels. I have used that figure not only because it represents the normal consumption, but because under our Tariff Act and under our agreement with Canada, it is provided that if production of potatoes in any crop year falls below 350,000,000 bushels for the year, then Canadian potatoes may come in under tariff concessions to make up the difference between our production and 350,000,000 bushels. That certainly is a clear implication that 350,000,000 bushels is a normal crop, and one that is adequate for our needs. We produced 445,000,000 bushels in 1948, and it has resulted in the necessity of very large Government purchases.

Now is there warrant for Secretary Brannan's statement that this year we are going to face a similar situation? That is the statement which has apparently been implicit in much of his discussion of this matter.

I have before me the official figures by which alone any estimates could be formed. There are, as yet, no estimates from the Department of Agriculture of an official sort as to what the production will be. The intentions to plant for 1949 by the potato farmers—and this is from the Department of Agriculture—cover 1,980,000 acres. This—and again I gave the official figures—is about 7 percent less than was planted in 1948, when 2,127,300 acres were planted. In other words, so far as acreage is concerned, planting will be down 7 percent. The acreage reduction will be around 20 or 25 percent in the State of Maine, and less proportionate reductions in other areas where potato farmers are not cooperating. This compares with a 10-year-average acreage of 2,998,700. This year's acreage is 29 percent less than the acreage for the 10-year period. That certainly is an indication that, so far as acreage is concerned, there has been an enormous reduction even under the operation of this program, and all the stimulus incident to the potato-support programs during the war years.

The 10-year-average production of potatoes was 392,000,000, which is practically 400,000,000, or about 50,000,000 more than apparently would be required for normal domestic use. There are no figures as to production outside the southern crop, as to which there has been an increase. However, the so-called early potatoes are a really negligible factor in the total production. I have now before me the figures for Florida and the early Texas crop. They produced 3,599,000 bushels as against 3,168,000 bushels for the growing season of 1948. That is an increase of about 400,000 bushels. That was the result of the Department's advice of unusual growing conditions. But I point out that is approximately only 1 percent of the total of the country, and certainly since the conditions are so utterly diverse, is nothing on which we could base a reasonable estimate as to whether conditions in the North or the West would be good, bad, or indifferent. In other words, it seems to me impossible at this

time to anticipate what kind of a crop we will have in the State of Maine, where the crop will not even be planted for another month. It will be the first of June before the Maine acreage is in the ground. Whether the same thing is true of Idaho I do not know, but in most areas the crop is only now being put into the ground.

I want to be entirely fair to Mr. Brannan and to say that the estimates of conditions on early potatoes are accurate and correct. I have before me the estimated condition on April 1, when on the basis of a 10-year average it was 78 percent, on the basis of the 1948 average it was 77 percent, and in the case of the 1949 crop for early potatoes it was 85 percent.

In other words, there was an indication that conditions in the South were more favorable, that a larger crop would be produced, and such has actually been the fact so far as Florida and early Texas potatoes are concerned. The Department neglected, however, to point out that one of the factors in the southern situation has been the admission of a considerable quantity of Canadian potatoes, which were permitted to come in for seed purposes, but were sold very widely in Florida in plain violation of our reciprocal trade agreement, and especially of agreements by our State Department, as table stock. We took it up with the State Department. The State Department told us to go to the Department of Agriculture. We took it up with the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture told us to go to the Commerce Department. So we were in a circle. As a result many of the Florida potatoes were obliged to be dumped on the Government at support price because Canadian potatoes were being consumed in Florida at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to see that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is interested, because this was a matter of very great concern to all of us throughout the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am afraid that I did not catch all of the Senator's remarks with reference to Florida. I wonder if the Senator from Maine would start where he brought Florida into the picture and repeat from there on?

Mr. BREWSTER. I pointed out that there had been an increase in production of potatoes this spring in Florida and Texas, as a result, apparently, of unusually favorable growing conditions. I pointed out, however, that this was no criterion as to the remainder of the country, because the entire production in those two areas was only a little more than 3,000,000 bushels, which is about 1 percent of the 350,000,000 to 400,000,000 bushels we will produce in the country; and that early potato conditions have very little relation to the climate of Maine, Idaho, or other States. However, I pointed out that one of the reasons why we had to expend some Government money in retiring the Florida potato crop this year was not the unusual production, but was the result, even in spite of the 60 percent of parity support price, of permitting Canadian seed potatoes, which under the reciprocal trade agreement and under the special diplomatic arrangement of last November were permitted to come in only for seed purposes under careful restriction, to be sold as table stock in Florida. Without comparing the attractiveness of Canadian seed potatoes with Florida early market potatoes, it was evident that a good many people in the markets in Florida bought the Canadian seed potatoes, which were widely sold.

We reported this to the State Department and asked them to stop it. They said they could not do it, and referred us to the Department of Agriculture. We went to the Department of Argiculture and were told, "That is up to the Department of Commerce. They handle imports." We took it up with the Department of Commerce, and were referred back to the State Department. We were run around in a circle. We could see what the impact of this situation was going to be.

That is why I feel that Secretary Brannan has done far less than justice to the entire potato industry of the country in the presentation which he has made and in his repeated exploitation. He announced last Friday that Rhode Island had the highest potato support in the country. It was something like $23,000 a farm. When we looked into the situation further we found that only 34 farms were involved. So Rhode Island did not register very high as a great potato-producing State.

I think that is hitting a little below the belt. I think Mr. Brannan, as a public official, should try to give a fair picture; and I think he should tell the country pretty soon that we are not operating under the democratic law of 1940—I am not criticizing that law—and are not operating this crop year of 1949 even under the extension of the earlier law by the Eightieth Congress which covered the retirement of the 1948 crop which has cost $200,000,000; but are operating under an entirely distinct program. Any suggestion that he or anyone else on earth can tell how many potatoes we are going to have under the Aiken-Hope bill of the Eightieth Congress, with 60 percent parity and 25 percent reduction in acreage on the part of cooperators, on the basis of 7 percent of the production of the country, is certainly entirely unwarranted at this time.

For this year the law applies exclusively to potatoes. That was the compromise we reached in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress—that potatoes constituted the only crop in the country that would come under flexible price support in 1949. The potato growers were ready to welcome the solution, because they realized that 90 percent of parity had not operated to their advantage or the advantage of the country, and they were ready and willing to accept the flexible price support at between 60 and 90 percent. The Secretary fixed it at 60 percent, with a reduction in potato acreage.

Until the law has had at least 1 year to operate, to see whether it will economize so far as the Government is concerned, and at the same time supply us with the potatoes we need, I believe that potatoes should not be made the "spanking child" of the agricultural program. If this situation continues, so long as Mr. Brannan goes about the country talking about potatoes, and the tragedy of the potato situation, I shall feel it incumbent upon me to stand on this floor, as the only forum in which I can appropriately answer him, and ask him to give the public the whole story of the potato program, past, present, and future, in order that we may consider the farm program now and hereafter in light of a no longer distorted picture of who or what is responsible for the conditions which have prevailed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. My first question is this: Does the Senator have any dependable figures as to the amount of Canadian seed potatoes consumed in this country, improperly, as he says?

Mr. BREWSTER. No, because that operation was entirely irregular and illegal. The only thing we know is the number that were brought in. We received complaints not only from Florida, but from Virginia and North Carolina, where such potatoes were being brought in. Also, I filed affidavits by persons who had seen Canadian seed potatoes in the great restaurants in Florida, obviously being consumed in the restaurants.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the Senator any figures as to the total amount of Canadian seed potatoes brought into the country?

Mr. BREWSTER. We cannot get the figures any nearer to date than about 2 months ago. They are about 2 months behind in reporting, so we had only February figures. For March we had reports of shiploads of 100,000 bushels of potatoes at a time that were coming in. We were concerned over the problem during March. I took the matter up with the late Senator Broughton of North Carolina. I was to have discussed it with him the morning of his untimely death. He was greatly concerned about the situation in North Carolina.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator place in the RECORD the figures which he had as to the total amount of seed potatoes stating as of what date they applied?

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be very glad to do so. I have not the figures as to the total imports. I shall be very glad to get them and place them in the RECORD, if I may have permission to insert them at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Subsequently, Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following memorandum and table for printing in the RECORD:

Canada exported in the United States from its 1948 crop, 7,780,000 bushels. This was the record up to and including the 23d of April. Of this amount 1,100,000 bushels were table stock and 6,680,000 bushels were sent here as seed potatoes.

Under the existing law, the first 1,000,000 bushels of table stock were exported under the low tariff rate of 37½ cents per hundredweight. The first 2,500,000 bushels of seed

potatoes came in under the 37½ cent rate. All of the other potatoes coming in from Canada came under the larger rate by law of 75 cents per hundredweight.

What figures are available showing that because of the Canadian potatoes sent into three Southern States created a depressing local market for native produced potatoes and the United States Government was called upon to purchase Alabama potatoes to the extent of 7,400 bushels. These were purchased by the Government at $1.20 a bushel under the support-price program of 60 percent parity. In Florida, where larger shipments of Canadian potatoes were made, the Federal Government was called upon to take off the Florida market 206,000 bushels of native potatoes for which the Government paid Florida producers $1.92 per bushel. The Government was also forced to go into Texas and take 62,000 bushels of native Texas potatoes off the Texas market for which the taxpayers paid $1.92 a bushel. This made a total Federal Government purchase of early State potatoes 275,400 bushels. Now the Government disposed of these by giving the school lunch program 135,000 bushels; awarded the livestock feed 115,000 bushels and the remainder of 25,400 bushels was ground into flour to be sent to Europe for relief purposes.

This is the earliest time in history when the Federal Government was forced to enter local Florida markets to purchase native potatoes because of the inability of native producers to sell their potatoes in the open market.

This was the agreement entered into last November by the State Department and Canadian Government. Under the strict terms that Canadians selling seed potatoes would require a sworn statement by American purchasers that the potatoes would be sold for seed purposes only, the State Department declared that it is not responsible nor was it interested in any enforcement of this agreement and as a consequence the potatoes came in openly as seed potatoes and sold openly as table stock.

Here is a case whereby the action of one department forced a financial loss condition upon another department, all at the taxpayers' expense. These purchases were made by the Department of Agriculture without question.

It is very interesting to know of the following Canadian shipments into our Southern States:

State	Seed potatoes	Table stock	Total
Florida	548,658	149,343	698,001
South Carolina	113,058		113,058
North Carolina	50,000	10,896	60,896
Georgia	359,461	41,873	401,334
Virginia	629,400	122,680	752,080
Grand total			2,035,342

These figures are through February 26 on potatoes shipped direct into the ports of those States, but does not include those shipped into other States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one further question that I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maine, and that is this: Upon what official or agency or industry did he place the responsibility, if he placed it, for the improper use of seed potatoes brought in from Canada?

Mr. BREWSTER. The permission for them to come in was the result of a very unusual—and I think almost unprecedented—diplomatic arrangement of last November, when the northern markets were being flooded with Canadian potatoes and the Government was retiring great quantities of American potatoes while millions of bushels of Canadian potatoes were being brought in. So the State Department, with a promptness for which I very much congratulate it, made an agreement with Canada that this would not be permitted to be done, except for seed potatoes in specified areas and at specified times.

Therefore, when this question arose we went to the State Department. The State Department apparently took the position that the implementation of the agreement was none of its business. We were told to go to the Department of Agriculture. We went to the Department of Agriculture and were told to go to the Department of Commerce, which handled imports. We went to the Department of Commerce, and were told, "That is the business of the State Department." We were unable to place the responsibility for the enforcement of that agreement. The State Department rather threw up its hands and said that it was a rather nice agreement, but that no one could enforce it. That gave us a great deal of concern. The taxpayers of the United States were paying the bill. For every bushel of Canadian seed potatoes improperly used, a bushel of potatoes had to be bought from the Florida crop by the Government, at the support price. So the joke was not really on the potato growers. It was on the Government, which was paying the bill.

A little while ago I mentioned Rhode Island in connection with the price-support program. I stated that 34 farms received an average of $23,000 a farm. If that were typical of the rest of the country, it might well be occasion for concern. I believe that even the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who sometimes poses as a farm authority, would agree that potatoes are not one of the matters with which the State of Rhode Island is primarily concerned, and that the incident, so far as Rhode Island is concerned, was entirely casual, and is not likely to recur.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] by way of a substitute for the language in lines 18 to 25 on page 2, and lines 1 to 16, inclusive, on page 3.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the only point of controversy is the order in which these amendments shall be presented.

The Senator from Delaware insists that his amendment to strike out section 1 of the bill be handled first. I have no objection to doing that; and in order that we may make progress in handling this bill, I now withdraw my amendment to section 3, and invite the Senator from Delaware to offer his amendment now if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I move, on page 1 of the bill, to strike out the language beginning with line 3 and ending with line 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1 of the bill, it is proposed to strike out the following:

That section 2 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (Public Law No. 806, 80th Cong.) is amended by deleting the words "direction and control of its Board of Directors" at the end of the said section and substituting therefor the words "supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I now move on page 2 of the bill, beginning with line 16, to strike out all down to and including line 16, on page 3. The purpose of these two amendments is to leave the control of this Corporation in the hands of a board of directors appointed by the President and subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, beginning in line 16, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 16, on page 3, reading as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 9 of the said Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Directors, Advisory Board: (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall be an ex officio director and shall serve as Chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist of six members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by, and hold office at the pleasure of, the Secretary. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at such rate not in excess of the maximum then payable under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, as may be fixed by the Secretary, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Federal Government the compensation for which exceeds such rate may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question: Would it be agreeable for me to offer my amendment in place of the portion of the bill proposed to be stricken out by the Senator's amendment? If I do not do so now, I shall do so immediately following the action by the Senate on the Senator's amendment. He proposes to strike out certain language. My amendment proposes to insert new language, in lieu of the language proposed to be stricken out by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such an amendment is in order, and would take precedence over the amendment to strike out the entire section.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. However, Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware prefers to have action taken on his

amendment first, it is agreeable to me to have his amendment voted on at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to change the section numbers of the bill, so that after the bill is passed the section numbers will appear in consecutive order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. Section 9 of the said Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall consist of seven members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the amendment as offered, does the special provision for the Advisory Board beginning in line 17, on page 3, remain in the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It does.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I suggest to the chairman of the committee that the words "Sec. 2", at the top of page 2, should be stricken out, and——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me remind the Senator that I have already obtained unanimous consent to have the clerks change and correct the section numbers, after the bill is passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have another amendment at the desk, and I offer it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 15, after the word "corporation," it is proposed to strike out the period and quotation marks and add the following:

And, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed or approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation. In effecting such exchange of goods, normal commercial trade channels shall be utilized insofar as practicable and priority shall be given to commodities easily storable and those which serve as prime incentive goods to stimulate production of critical and strategic materials. The determination of the quantities and qualities of such materials which are desirable for stock piling shall be made in the manner prescribed by section 2 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596). Strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation in exchange for agricultural commodities shall be transferred to the stock pile provided for by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, supra; and when transferred to the stock pile the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for the strategic and critical materials so transferred to the stock pile from the funds made available for the purpose of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, in an amount equal to the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the material transferred to the stock pile.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This matter has been generally discussed. So far as I know, there is no serious objection to the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. As the Senator from New Mexico knows, I have offered two amendments which in my opinion make the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico square with the Strategic Materials or Critical Materials Act of 1947, as I believe the date is. I ask the Senator whether he is willing to accept additional wording as follows:

On page 2, in line 4 of the Senator's amendment, after the word "piling," to add "and the determination of which materials are strategic and critical."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. It is my belief, and I have so expressed it to the Senator from New Mexico, that we should not have two agencies spending out of the strategic materials fund at the same time, and that therefore there should be one controlling agency. In order to be sure that that is done, I suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that he also accept additional wording, in line 9, on page 2 of his amendment, after the word "shall," as follows: "to the extent approved by the Munitions Board of the National Military Establishment."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico so modifies his amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, no reimbursement shall be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation from such funds for the first $250,000,000 worth of materials so transferred.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I regret to say that I do not find myself in agreement with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota on this matter, because it merely provides that $250,000,000 more shall be added to the stockpile fund. While I should be very happy to have that done with commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation might acquire, it seems to me that a proper respect for the appropriations committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and for the other committees properly handling that matter would prohibit us from accepting the amendment.

I shall be willing to add the following language:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall limit the authority of the Corporation to acquire and hold such quantity of strategic and critical materials as it deems advisable in carrying out the functions of the Corporation and protecting its assets.

In that case, it might be possible for the Critical Materials Board to suggest to the Department that it was not ready to accept and pay for certain quantities of materials, but that it believed the Department would acquire them, and that it could indicate the fields in which the Department could operate.

But, Mr. President, I would hate to see an appropriation of $250,000,000 made in this way.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submitted the first two amendments to the Senator from New Mexico, and he and I were in complete agreement on them, and I thank the Senator for accepting them as modifications of his amendment.

I knew that he had differences of opinion with me in regard to the amendment which has been offered now to his amendment.

As I see it, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico would create another agency, another sales agency or another purchasing agency, for critical minerals and materials. It would allow the Department of Agriculture to go into world markets wherever possible, to search out those who are in need of foodstuffs and other commodities, including wheat, corn, cotton, and anything else those countries may need

more than they need minerals, which in the United States are critical. Therefore I completely favor the Senator's amendment. I believe it is a good idea where we can to trade the grain surpluses of this country for critical minerals and materials of all kinds which we might sorely need.

Still, as I see it, the Senator's amendment merely creates another buying agency, for it is limited entirely to appropriated funds. Last year, as I remember it, we appropriated approximately $400,000,000 for the purchase of critical minerals and other materials and there was unobligated, as of January 1, 1949, about $78,000,000. My amendment seeks not only to obtain more critical minerals and materials, but also to increase the ability of the Department of Agriculture to trade surplus grains, and so forth, on which we should otherwise be required to take a loss. I believe the Congress would much rather appropriate additional money to pay for critical materials than to appropriate money to take care of operating losses incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Without question there will be losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is the responsibility of the Corporation under the job we have given them to take care of and regulate the total subsidy paid on farm products. We know there will be a loss, because the Corporation does not begin its operations until the market is less than loan value. I think our experience in the last few years has been that, because of subsidy payments, operating losses have run into huge amounts. I may say there are indications, at least in one bill, to the effect that others in Congress know we need additional huge amounts of critical mineral and materials. I know of one bill which mentions a total of $5,000,000,000. In other words, the idea is to authorize the National Military Establishment to purchase necessary critical minerals for our stockpiles and to issue notes backed by the minerals and other materials in the stockpiles.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. GURNEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I correctly heard the distinguished Senator, he spoke about a $250,000,000 authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct—an additional authorization.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the amount authorized, together with the appropriation, totals about $750,000,000? The second deficiency bill, which has already passed the House, includes an appropriation of $50,000,000 cash, and an additional authorization of $270,000,000, does it not?

Mr. GURNEY. I believe that is correct. The only thing I can base my statement on is the legislation enacted in previous years, and the stock-piling report, which I believe shows a total appropriation of $400,000,000 last year, practically all of which was obligated as of January 1, 1949.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the Treasury and Post Office bill, consideration of which has just been concluded by the committee, includes an item of $39,000,000 over and above the amount previously appropriated? I mean, there is a supplemental appropriation of that amount to carry out the authorization is there not?

Mr. GURNEY. I can readily believe that.

Mr. MAYBANK. The second deficiency bill came from the House very recently. While the Committee on Appropriations has not yet considered it, I notice from reading it that it contains a request for $50,000,000 additional cash to be used in the purchase of strategic materials by the Treasury Department; which, as the Senator knows, has been making purchases. That is in addition to the authorization of $270,000,000.

Mr. GURNEY. The requests for additional funds, contained in the deficiency bill, I am quite sure result from the fact that, above the actual amount of cash appropriated by the last Congress, provision was also made for contract authorizations. The contract authorizations for the prior year are now coming up for payment. That is my belief.

Mr. MAYBANK. The contract authorizations are now being necessarily increased, owing to the fact that the second deficiency bill calls for new contract authorizations involving an additional $270,000,000.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator very much. In that connection I may say I am quite sure there are many who believe we should authorize additional purchases of critical minerals and other materials.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is it the Senator's view, as it certainly is the view of the Senator from Oregon, that the need for critical materials to add to the stock pile of this country is far greater than the available funds for the purchase of such materials will provide?

Mr. GURNEY. I believe that sincerely, and I have indicated that bills have been introduced seeking to grant authorizations as high as $5,000,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Could the Senator conceive of any use to which commodities purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation in order, as is required, to maintain a reasonable price on commodities, could be put than to exchange them on a fair basis for the equivalent in scarce strategic minerals, and could the United States in any other way get a better value for the commodities so purchased?

Mr. GURNEY. I entirely agree with that statement by the Senator. I think double benefits are to be received; first, if we can trade surplus commodities to other nations and get such commodities out of our country and out of the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, that will tend to help the domestic market for the remaining farm products still to go to the market. That is the first benefit. The second benefit, as I think we will all agree, is that we need critical minerals and materials of all kinds. I am thinking at the moment of manganese.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I am in complete sympathy with his first two amendments, and with what is attempted to be done. But I should like to ask this question: If I recall the amendment that was read by the distinguished Senator, it provides that no other appropriation shall be made to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, it is not an additional authorization of funds, is it?

Mr. GURNEY. That is absolutely what it is. We have in other bills given the Munitions Board power to make contract authorizations, and, as the Senator from South Carolina has so aptly stated, we are now getting the bill to pay for those prior-year contract authorizations. The purpose of my amendment is to give the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, if you please, the same contract authorization, so that the Secretary may use surplus commodities in an effort to acquire critical materials. It would be a contract authorization. If the Secretary finds the critical materials, they will have a cash value. He will have to turn them over to the Munitions Board, the custodian of the stock pile. Therefore, if the amendment is adopted, the Congress can expect to receive a bill to pay for this additional contract authorization. But by incorporating the provision in the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, as it is now worded, the entire program will be the responsibility of the Munitions Board as to amounts, what commodities are critical, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that this is an authorization. An appropriation will be asked for after the authority has been exercised by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. After the Department of Agriculture has been successful in trading surplus commodities for critical materials of which the Munitions Board sees the need.

Mr. WHERRY. So, until that shall happen, it is not an appropriation, and when it does happen the Appropriations Committee would have jurisdiction over the appropriation. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. It is actually a contract authorization, which indicates an approval by Congress of the proposition that we should rather appropriate for critical materials than to appropriate for a basic operating loss in commodity credit a year from this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not giving a war board too much authority. Some of us want to see legislation adopted which will provide for the use of marginal mines to produce critical minerals for stock piling. This would help develop mining in our own country which, as we found in the last war, is very important to our national defense. I would want to see careful consideration given as to how the Senator's amendment would affect the program provided for in pending legislation before the amendment is adopted.

Mr. GURNEY. I will say, in answer to the Senator, that I think the question is completely covered, because the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has accepted an amendment making it possible to deal only to the extent approved by the Munitions Board, and that only such strategic and critical materials shall be bought as are requested by the Munitions Board. It will operate, under the Critical Materials Act, the same as would purchases made for cash by the Munitions Board. It all comes under the act which was passed last year.

I am as jealous as is the Senator from Arizona of our domestic production opportunities, but I still think that today the world situation is so critical that we should take more vigorous steps to acquire commodities which we need at this time. Therefore, I have limited the amount specifically, and it is much less than has been indicated by other Senators as being asked of Congress.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not say that in the end I shall object to this type of provision, but I do say it should not come as an amendment to this bill. It should come as a separate bill, after careful consideration by a committee. An amendment such as this one should not be adopted on the floor of the Senate until we have had an opportunity to look at it and see how far it might reach and what might result from its adoption.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall try to answer the Senator by saying that I did not bring up the question. It was brought up by the fact that the Senator from New Mexico felt that surplus commodities could be traded for critical materials. Because his amendment did not increase the amount of critical materials on hand, and because I thought it was pretty well agreed that we do need increased amounts, and that we would rather appropriate for critical materials than for operating losses, I offered the amendment which is before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico a question? I was not on the floor at the time of the discussion of his amendment "A." That amendment was adopted, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. It was.

Mr. WHERRY. It provides, in effect, that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not construct storage facilities for any commodity unless the Corporation shell determine that existing privately owned storage facilities for such commodity in the area concerned are not adequate. Is there anything in the Senator's mind, or was there anything added to the record by him, relative to how the Corporation shall make such determination?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the Senator that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] asked a great many questions about it, as did the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. I think the real purpose of the section, and how the situation would be handled in actual operation, has been developed. It would not be a judicial determination, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Would there be an investigation and a thorough canvass made as to the facilities?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico make an observation about it, if he does not mind. It seems to me the amendment which the Senator has offered is a good one, and I would be in favor of it. It was agreed to by a voice vote, and I was not on the floor at the time. I think that a thorough canvass should be made, and that, if we cannot write it in the bill, it should be not a discretionary proposition, but should be mandatory upon the agency to determine what the facilities are. I had an amendment which I had intended to offer, but the Senator's amendment has now been adopted. If it is the intention that a thorough canvass is to be made and an administrative decision made based upon a complete canvass, we would accomplish what probably could have been provided for in my amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I again express the hope that if the Senator will read the remarks made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] he will find the facts established to his satisfaction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Department of Agriculture. During the debate, many statements were made on the floor which obviously no Senator could answer. So I took it upon myself to ask the Department of Agriculture to make a statement, and it is that statement which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILLIAMS' CHARGES CONCERNING STORAGE SITUATION

1. Senator WILLIAMS, in his discussion on the floor of the Senate on April 22, made a number of statements concerning the storage situation, designed to create the impression that the Department's concern over the matter was only political.

A. His statements ignore many of the facts of the matter, as I shall point out.

2. The Senator said the President signed the CCC Charter Act and said nothing against it.

A. While the President did not make a statement concerning the act on the day he signed it (June 29, 1948), he did 4 days later, on July 3, 1948, when he signed the Agricultural Act of 1948.

(1) He had no choice but to sign the CCC Charter Act as it was passed, because the Corporation would have had to cease operations as an agency of the United States after June 30, 1948, if he had not signed the bill.

B. His statement was as follows:

"In connection with the price-support program continued by this act, two points should be noted concerning S. 1322, which I signed a few days ago and which continues the Commodity Credit Corporation. In carrying out the price-support laws it will be necessary to use the Commodity Credit Corporation. In fact, that is the Corporation's primary function. S. 1322 vests control of the Commodity Credit Corporation in a Board of Directors. H. R. 6248, however, makes the Secretary of Agriculture responsible for supporting the prices of farm products at specified levels. This would appear to create an unworkable separation of authority from responsibility. Fortunately, however, there are provisions in H. R. 6248 which require the price support operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be carried out under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. Since H. R. 6248 was signed later than S. 1322, the provisions of H. R. 6248 will, of course, be controlling to the extent that the provisions of the two acts are in conflict.

"S. 1322 also prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation from continuing its long-standing policy of leasing or acquiring land where necessary for storing commodities as close to the farm as possible. This restriction will mean that the Corporation will have to ship grain for livestock feeding, for example, from farms to distant points for storage, and then later to ship it back again to farm areas. This will obviously increase costs for carrying grain reserves. Only those special interests who will make money by unnecessary handling of grain will profit from this provision—which will in the end be paid for by farmers and consumers."

3. The Senator said no one in Congress, the Department or anywhere found fault with the act until a big corn crop came along and there wasn't enough storage.

A. This contention could not possibly be further removed from the actual facts.

B. On June 16, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture addressed a letter to the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, at the latter's request, in which he set forth specifically what would happen if the Charter bill passed as reported out by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

(1) The bill finally passed included the provisions which restricted the Corporation's ability to assist in providing storage in the manner set forth in that letter.

(2) A copy of the letter is attached.

C. Congressman HOPE and Congressman CARL ANDERSEN both attacked the House committee bill when it was considered on the floor of the House.

(1) They could not offer amendments, though they stated they desired to do so, because the bill was considered under a suspension of the rules prohibiting amendments from the floor.

(2) Their comments, and letters from farm organizations which they referred to, appeared on pages 8871–8872 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 18, 1948.

(a) A copy of an excerpt of these comments is attached.

D. Thus, it is apparent that influential and capable Members of Congress, the Department, and the President were all aware of the damage done by the restrictive provisions inserted in the Charter Act by the House Banking and Currency Committee, headed by Congressman WOLCOTT of Michigan, and later enacted into law under the pressure of the last hours of the session.

(1) Every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD knew the faults of the act.

4. The Senator said he had no recollection that any Member of the Senate found fault with the bill at the time of its passage.

A. He did not say also, though, that the Senate conferees objected vigorously to the provision restricting the Corporation's ability to provide storage, but in the closing hours of the last session of the Eightieth Congress were forced to agree to a compromise measure in order to avoid killing the Corporation.

(1) There was no real possibility of changing the bill after the conference report was presented.

5. The Senator said the Corporation actually had authority under section 5 (b) of the charter to provide bins to farmers, as long as it didn't acquire them in its own name.

A. Making gifts of grain bins to farmers is not an effective way to solve the grain storage problem.

(1) I doubt that any Member of Congress would approve of this kind of a direct subsidy to certain farmers.

B. The Corporation could not in a sound manner aid in providing storage without power to acquire or lease real property.

6. The Senator accuses the Department of delay in getting its recommendations to Congress.

A. The Department submitted its recommendations in a letter to the President of the Senate on February 7, 1949, only 15 days after the Eighty-first Congress convened.

7. The Senator states that the charge last fall that the Eightieth Congress was responsible for the situation of inadequate storage facilities is a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts.

A. I think I have indicated quite conclusively that it was the Eightieth Congress, which made it impossible for the CCC to do anything more than talk insofar as assisting in providing adequate storage.

JUNE 16, 1948.

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee.

DEAR MR. HOPE: This responds to your oral request for an expression of the views of this Department with respect to the effect upon the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation of certain provisions contained in H. R. 6263, the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The bill as reported omits from section 4 containing the general powers of the Corporation the power (included in subsection (h) of section 4 as originally introduced) to acquire, hold and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary in the conduct of the Corporation's business. This is an essential power. Obviously, the Corporation could not engage in loan, purchase, sales and other operations with respect to agricultural commodities without this power.

As reported, the bill prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for warehousing, transporting, processing or handling of agricultural commodities or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein except the rental of office space. This prohibition would have the following harmful effects, among others:

The Corporation could not, therefore, lease sites for the approximately 20,000 grain bins which it now maintains for stand-by storage, principally in the corn-belt.

The Corporation could not acquire by lease or otherwise emergency facilities necessary to preserve agricultural commodities.

The Corporation could not acquire an interest in real property for the purpose of securing or discharging debts owing to it or protecting its interests in foreclosure proceedings.

The Corporation could not utilize excess storage space owned and made available by other Government agencies despite that economy in Government operations would demand that such space be utilized.

Your particular attention is called to the last paragraph of section 5 of the bill as reported, which reads as follows:

"In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce."

This provision was originally proposed to the Congress by spokesmen for certain grain-trade interests in their appearance before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The provision was rejected by that committee. Among the probable serious adverse effects are the following:

The CCC could not purchase commodities directly from producers in carrying out its price support or other programs.

The CCC could not sell commodities directly to users or to foreign governments.

The CCC could not utilize its own grain bins or other storage facilities even on an emergency basis.

The CCC could not avail itself of the services of the county agricultural conservation associations or committees in the acquisition, care, and disposition of commodities acquired by the Corporation.

Doubt would exist as to the utilization of newly formed cooperatives where private trade facilities already exist.

Section 9 of H. R. 6263 provides that the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of Agriculture or his nominee, and the remaining four shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than one-half of the members of the Board could be employees of the Corporation or any Department or agency of the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture is divested of the authority of general supervision of the Corporation.

The provision in the bill which would prevent a majority of the Board from holding any other office in the Corporation or the Department of Agriculture or elsewhere in the Federal Government is an undesirable one. Service on the Board, where no other duties are involved, would only take a relatively small part of any Board member's time. Therefore, the provision would appear to contemplate that a majority of the Board would serve on a part-time basis, and could devote the balance of their time to their private interests. As a practical matter, it is difficult to visualize the effective operation of a Board of Directors so constituted. If the directors did not divest themselves of possible conflicting private interests and associations, they as individuals and the Board would be subject to criticism. Moreover, it would be hard to find persons with the desirable experience who would be willing to divest themselves of such private interests and associations. While generally a weekly meeting of the Board suffices, it is frequently necessary to call special meetings on a few hours' notice in order to dispose of emergent business. With outside Board members, such emergency meetings on such short notice would not be possible unless such members permanently resided in or near Washington, D. C.

Although section 2 of the bill provides that Commodity Credit Corporation shall be within the Department of Agriculture, this would be true only in a technical sense, since the Corporation would be managed by a Board of Directors which would not be responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture. The management of the Corporation by such a Board of Directors would permit the Board to adopt policies and carry out programs to which the Secretary was opposed. The Secretary of Agriculture could not be charged with overall responsibility for the formulation and administration of the agricultural programs authorized by Congress. Congress and the President would have to look to both the Board of Directors of the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Commodity Credit Corporation was transferred to the Department of Agriculture in 1939 to assure, through the general supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, the effective integration and coordination of its activities with those of the Department. Experience gained since the transfer has demonstrated the continuing need for such integration and coordination.

Section 10 of the bill provides that responsibility for day-to-day conduct of business of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers who shall be responsible to the Board and shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation.

The requirement that the executive officers of Commodity Credit Corporation devote full time to its affairs would not only be disadvantageous as far as the Corporation is concerned, but also would be a disadvantage to the Department as a whole.

The executive officers of the Corporation now consist of a president, three vice presidents, a controller, a treasurer, and a secretary. The executive officers of the Corporation are also officials of the Production and Marketing Administration—for example, the President of Commodity Credit Corporation is Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration and the vice presidents of the Corporation are Assistant Administrators of the Production and Marketing Administration. This has made possible the most effective, efficient, and economical utilization of the personnel and facilities of the Department of Agriculture.

Programs of Commodity Credit Corporation are so closely related to other programs such as those involving section 32 funds that it is essential that they be administered by the same officials. Also, price support ties in so closely with production goals that it is highly desirable for the officials who are responsible for the administration of the one to participate in the establishment of the other. The programs of the Corporation at the State and county levels are carried out to a large extent through committees of farmers that are also responsible for other Department activities. These committees should not be required to look to a large number of Department officials for their instructions and guidance. The recommendations of farmers at the

House long-range agriculture legislation hearings have indicated a desire to deal with fewer Government officials.

In view of the vital role that Commodity Credit Corporation plays in the agricultural economy of the Nation, it is sincerely hoped that amendments to H. R. 6263 will be adopted which will remove the objections to the bill referred to above.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

EXCERPT FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 18, 1948, PAGES 8871–8872

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that this bill is being brought up under suspension of rules which does not permit amendment. This is a very important measure. The Commodity Credit Corporation furnishes the machinery through which the price-support programs on agricultural commodities are carried out. Without the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would be impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the mandate of Congress that prices on certain agricultural commodities be supported.

There are two very serious defects in the bill as it now stands. One of them is that the bill prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein except the rental of office space. The bill also contains a provision reading as follows:

"In the Corporation's leasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce."

These provisions which severely restrict the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation would, in my opinion, make it very difficult for the agency to carry out the duties imposed on it by law. However, I shall not detain the House with a detailed discussion of these points because my time is limited and this particular matter will be discussed by the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] a little later in this debate.

The provisions of this bill to which I particularly wish to call attention and to discuss in some detail are those which provide for setting up the Board. Section 9 of the bill provides that the Board of Directors shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of Agriculture or his nominee, and the remaining four to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than one-half of the members of the Board could be employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture is divested of the authority which he has previously had, of general supervision of the Corporation.

This means that three members of the Board of Directors must be appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Government, and that the control of the operations of the Corporation would be in the hands of the appointed members. What would occur under those circumstances is that, while the Secretary of Agriculture would have the responsibility for carrying out the provisions of law relating to support prices, under the terms of this bill he would lack the authority to do so effectively. It would simply be another case of what we already have too much of in the Federal Government—that is divided authority. Under the arrangement provided in this bill the Board could, if it desired, adopt policies and carry out programs to which the Secretary was opposed. Congress and the President would have to look to both the Board of Directors of the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the Congress does not give the Secretary of Agriculture full power over this Board, how can we hold the Secretary of Agriculture to account for the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOPE. There is no way that we can do so.

The principal purpose in putting the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture, where it has been since 1939, was to get away from the division of authority and to assure that the activities of the Department and those of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are so closely related, would be coordinated and integrated.

At present the officers of the Commodity Credit Corporation are officials of the Department of Agriculture who are also in charge of departmental programs relating to the production and marketing of agricultural commodities. The programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation are necessarily closely related to the others of the Department of Agriculture. They are tied in with programs which involve section 32 funds. Price supports are tied in closely with production goals. The programs of the Corporation at the State and county levels are carried on largely through committees of farmers who are also responsible for other departmental activities. If the Corporation were under the control of a separate Board which had no knowledge of these activities and no part in them, there would without question be a tremendous amount of overlapping and confusion, and there would always be the possibility of conflicting programs.

Another factor, which it seems to me, should be taken into consideration is that there is no way by which members of the Board appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture could devote full time to the affairs of the Corporation. I mean by that that there is no necessity for full-time directors to pass on the matters which would ordinarily come before the Board.

It would be expected, I presume, that the members of the Board would be men who were acquainted with and experienced in the buying and selling of agricultural products. There is nothing in the bill which requires that they divest themselves of outside interests in those activities before becoming members of the Board. I believe that most men who are qualified for a position on the Board would not feel that they could afford to divest themselves of conflicting private interests. If they did not do so, they and the Board would certainly be subject to criticism. Thus, in practical operation, it would probably turn out that members of the Board will be those with conflicting private interests or persons without adequate experience to conduct such important business activities.

The provisions of this bill to which I have alluded are matters of deep concern to farmers everywhere. Some of our leading farm organizations have gone on record as being greatly disturbed by the provisions now contained in this bill. I have here in my hand a letter from Mr. Albert L. Goss, master of the National Grange, reading as follows:

JUNE 15, 1948.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: We sincerely hope the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be amended to eliminate the divided responsibility under which the Secretary is charged with the duty for supporting commodity prices, but with means for carrying out this duty under the control of a Board not responsible to him. We believe that the bill should also be amended to eliminate those sections which would channel all operations through the grain trade who might easily wreck the Corporation's essential stabilization operations or make them prohibitively expensive.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

I also have the following telegram from Mr. John J. Riggle, assistant secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives:

"Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
"Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
"House of Representatives:

"Urge that H. R. 6263, Commodity Credit Corporation bill, be amended to eliminate divided authority between Secretary of Agriculture to support farm prices and handle surplus and the independent Board to direct affairs of Corporation, and to provide for Corporation to own real and personal property necessary to handle surpluses of farm products which normal channels of trade do not handle at or above support levels.

"JOHN J. RIGGLE,
"Assistant Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives."

The American Farm Bureau Federation has stated its position in the following wire, signed by Roger W. Fleming, director of its Washington office:

"Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
"House Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Urge support amendment to H. R. 6263, Federal charter CCC, eliminating restrictive grain-trade provisions, and substituting language requiring CCC, in buying, selling, and other operations, to use normal trade channels insofar as practicable. Because of congressional mandates on loans, price support and other operations control of Corporation should be left with Secretary of Agriculture.

"ROGER W. FLEMING,
"Director, Washington Office, American Farm Bureau Federation."

If this bill had been brought up under such circumstances that amendments were permitted, I would offer the following amendments, which, if adopted, would cure the serious defects to which I have referred:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "its Board of Directors" and insert in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as 'Secretary')."

Page 8, line 12, strike out section 9 in its entirety and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Directors: (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary, who shall be a director and serve as chairman of the Board. The Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum and shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, and one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members

of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Department of Agriculture, the compensation for which exceeds such rate, may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

"(b) Vacancies in the Board, whether arising from failure of the President to nominate or the Senate to confirm the original or subsequent members of the Board, so long as there shall be four members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and a majority of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board."

Page 9, line 13, strike out section 10 in its entirety and substitute the following:

"SEC. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded, and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661)."

Since it is not possible under this procedure to offer amendments, I have inserted them in the RECORD, with the hope that when this bill goes to conference, the conferees may agree upon provisions which are substantially the same as those contained in the amendments above quoted.

As indicated in the beginning of my remarks, I regard this matter as one of the greatest importance to the agricultural producers of this country.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Because of the unusual parliamentary situation, has the gentleman from Kansas any information as to how these matters may be handled in conference if this bill is passed by this body?

Mr. HOPE. We have a Senate bill, and I understand that the Senate bill will be substituted for this bill, and that everything after the enacting clause will be stricken out of the Senate bill, and the subject matter of the House bill inserted. That would get the bill into conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree 100 percent with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had to say about the divided authority which is created by the provisions of this particular bill. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, regardless of who is Secretary of Agriculture, if we in Congress want to hold that official responsibility for Commodity Credit's operations, we must give to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make decisions. I sincerely trust, as Mr. HOPE has stated, that this subject will be considered in confidence.

There is another defect in this particular bill. If you will turn to section 5 of H. R. 6263, you will see a mandatory provision there in which it is required that practically all operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in regard to the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities shall utilize—note the word "shall"—the customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

What does that amendment mean? May I say first that the gentleman from Michigan has very kindly agreed that an amendment will be placed in this particular paragraph after the word "shall," which will not make this particular section mandatory. But under this particular section if left in the bill as it is, the Commodity Credit Corporation along with other things could not purchase commodities directly from producers. It could not sell commodities directly to farmers. It could not extend the price support to farmers through purchases in areas where dealers are not willing to participate in the program. Frankly it would render ineffective entirely the great sealing program that we have had in effect throughout the Middle West in corn especially and other grains.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the committee for their willingness to accept this amendment, which will not make this section workable.

I am also disturbed about page 24, line 22. The language as written there practically says to the Commodity Credit Corporation, "You cannot utilize the 22,000 or more small steel grain bins which you have had as extra storage space." We can plainly see that in case of a glut on the railroads or in the terminal markets the present language would mean that it would be practically impossible to carry out a grain-sealing program. Here, again, I am glad that the gentleman has agreed to an amendment, which does not go as far as I would like to see it, but nevertheless it does help a great deal. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has been very helpful in getting the matter adjusted.

Will the gentleman state what, in his opinion, his particular amendment to that section on page 4, line 22, would do? Would it assure the right of the Commodity Credit Corporation to own personal property? There is no such definite assurance in the bill. I would like a definite assurance that the Corporation can own these 20,000, or more, steel tanks, if needed, to carry out its functions as the vehicle for price-support programs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I am in a position to assure the gentleman—surely, I would state it is my understanding—that there is no limitation upon the amount of personal property which the Corporation may own. There is a limitation which applies only to leases and real estate, and, as the gentleman says, they will be authorized under this amendment to continue existing leases.

RESULTS OF CCC OPERATIONS

1. Senator WILLIAMS has accused the Department of misrepresenting facts when it stated last fall that CCC had operated at a profit.

A. He cited letters from the Budget Bureau setting forth the fact that the Corporation had lost over $2,100,000,000 from 1933 to December 31, 1948.

B. He also cited a Budget Bureau letter stating the $2,100,000,000 didn't include $1,700,000,000 of section 32 expenditures.

(1) Senator WILLIAMS then proceeded to add these two figures and claimed the CCC has shown a loss of almost $3,900,000,000.

C. He says the only way CCC can claim a profit is to count as income appropriations it has received or notes that have been canceled for it.

2. Senator WILLIAMS' charge and the basis on which he attempts to substantiate it are completely false.

A. He has twisted the facts to make it appear that the CCC has been a costly burden on the taxpayer, while, in fact, the Corporation has operated most economically considering the jobs it has had to do.

B. The Bureau of the Budget apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

3. The facts were that as of June 30, 1948, the Corporation did have a profit from all of its program operations other than wartime consumer subsidies, in excess of $180,000,000, as indicated in the Secretary's speeches.

A. However, since Senator WILLIAMS has inserted in the RECORD detailed figures as of December 31, 1948, which he obtained from the Bureau of the Budget, I explain the Corporation's position as of that date.

4. In the first place, the $2,146,930,367 cited by Senator WILLIAMS as lost through December 31, 1948, included all of the wartime consumer subsidies which were paid through the CCC.

A. These subsidies totaled $2,102,979,821 as of December 31, 1948.

(1) These subsidies were for the benefit of consumers—to hold the line on OPA ceiling prices.

(2) They happened to be paid through the CCC because it was an existing agency with sufficiently broad authorities to handle the job in the wartime emergency.

(3) They were not a part of the operations the CCC was set up to carry out (the Corporation was set up primarily to help the farmer), but the Corporation undertook the job as a part of the general cooperative effort to win the war.

(4) These subsidies, by the way, are estimated to have actually saved consumers much more than they cost, because they held down the cost of food.

(a) Food items were part of the weapons of war, and very important ones.

B. The net result of program operations other than subsidies, i. e., the difference between what the CCC put into loans on and inventories of individual commodities, and what it got out of them, was a net gain of $82,000,000 from 1933 to December 31, 1948.

(1) To get a clear picture there should be added back to this $82,000,000, $56,000,000 of losses taken by the Corporation on disposal of price-support commodities at the caloric value of wheat as specifically instructed by Congress and for which Congress provided the Corporation would be reimbursed by cancellation of notes.

(a) This $56,000,000 was really a part of the United States Government's cost of foreign relief feeding.

(2) This would make the program gain total $138,000,000.

(3) The Corporation had net overhead and interest costs of $79,000,000 more than interest and other such general income from 1933 to December 31, 1948.

(4) Deducting this amount from the program gain of $138,000,000 gives a final realized gain on all CCC operations other than subsidies of $59,000,000.

(a) The gain would have been $22,000,000 greater if the interest paid by the CCC on money used to pay subsidies had not been included.

4. In the second place, section 32 funds cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered a part of the CCC operations.

A. These funds are appropriated funds provided the Department by the Congress for specific purposes.

B. They are not used by the CCC any more than is the appropriation to the Army or to ECA.

5. In the third place, it is absurd to accuse the Corporation of counting as income the amount of appropriations or cancellations of notes authorized by Congress for the purpose of restoring capital impairments.

A. It is obvious from what I have told you that the impairments the Congress has had

to make good were largely those caused by the use of the Corporation as the medium through which to pay consumer subsidies.

B. The Corporation presents the full facts concerning its operating results since 1933 in its monthly statements.

6. It should be apparent from the facts that I have cited that the charges made by Senator WILLIAMS have no basis in fact.

THE $366,000,000 OF ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

1. Senator WILLIAMS persists in making comments about a statement in the GAO audit report of the CCC as of June 30, 1945, in a manner designed to imply that the Corporation has lost $366,000,000 of the taxpayer's money and can't find it.

A. This, of course, is not true.

2. What the GAO report said in simple language was that the Corporation could not—as of June 30, 1945—provide the auditors with a detailed listing showing the name and address of each person, firm, or agency of Government which owed the CCC part of the $366,000,000 shown by its books as of June 30, 1945, to be due it on account of sales, and how much each owed.

A. That was true—the corporation could not, as of that date—June 30, 1945—provide the detailed listing the auditors wanted, and the reason was the backlog of work caused by the tremendous volume of wartime business that the Corporation handled with inadequate help and lack of enough accounting machines.

(1) The whole matter was reviewed thoroughly by the House committee under Judge Tarver which conducted the war-food investigation in 1945.

(2) As soon as the Corporation could get adequate and qualified help, and enough machines, after the war, it cleaned up its wartime backlogs and checked this item out along with all others.

(a) The job was done by September 1947 and GAO approved the Corporation's plans.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture has set forth the facts concerning this item in two letters which have been printed in the RECORD.

A. The first was a letter to Senator LUCAS on March 29, 1949 (copy attached), inserted in the RECORD on March 29, 1949, by Senator LUCAS.

B. The second was a letter to Chairman SPENCE of the House Banking and Currency Committee on April 5, 1949 (copy attached), inserted in the RECORD by Senator THOMAS on April 29, 1949.

4. The same GAO audit report on which Senator WILLIAMS bases his comments about the $366,000,000 states that the Corporation now has a sound accounting system.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 29, 1949.

The following is the text of a letter, with attachments, which Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan has sent to Senator LUCAS in reference to recent statements about wartime records of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

"Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
"United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: I wish to give you a brief statement of facts on the allegations made by Senator WILLIAMS on March 25 concerning the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senator's comments refer to a report on the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1945, which I understand the Comptroller General intends to make available to the Congress in the very near future.

"Unfortunately, the statements made by the Senator are fragmentary in character and do not reflect the more complete discussion of these matters which, I am informed, will be contained in the audit report. Some of the most pertinent facts, from the point of view of the public interest, are not recognized by the Senator.

"1. The $350,000,000 was accounted for. It was a net book figure representing the results of some 2,000,000 transactions. The program was liquidated in accordance with plans known to and having the concurrence of GAO auditors, and resulted in a profit to the Corporation. It was not possible, however, because of wartime backlogs to furnish the auditors a detailed listing of amounts due the Corporation by name and address of debtors as of June 30, 1945. This apparently is what the Senator refers to.

"2. There has been no charge or intimation of fraud or dishonesty on the part of any employee, or of loss to the Government.

"3. The period covered by the report ended nearly 4 years ago, while the country was still at war.

"The facts regarding these wartime problems are, of course, not new to the Congress. They were thoroughly covered in investigations conducted by Judge Tarver pursuant to House Resolution 50 in the spring of 1945, and they were dealt with again before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in connection with hearings on S. 1322 a year ago.

"Senator WILLIAMS is now, therefore, bringing up matters which have already been thoroughly investigated and on which full corrective action has already been taken.

"I am enclosing a brief discussion of the facts about each of the points, as definitely as we can identify them, which have been raised by Senator WILLIAMS. We shall be glad to furnish any further information which may be desirable.

"Sincerely yours,
"CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
"Secretary."

The following are attachments to Secretary Brannan's letter of March 29, 1949, to Senator LUCAS:

"LACK OF SUPPORT FOR GCP RECEIVABLES

"Senator WILLIAMS' statement (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1949): 'It has been reported to me, from sources which I consider very reliable, that over $350,000,000 of receivables in the general-commodities purchase program could not be supported or verified because of faulty accounting policies and poorly devised procedures' (p. 3190).

"Also: 'I think it is well to know whether we can get an accounting of the $350,000,000 which it is reported the books are out of balance' (p. 3191).

"Also: 'Four years have elapsed, and if the Corporation cannot make a determination today closer than $350,000,000, it is time the country knew about it. I desire to know as one, why that cannot be done' (p. 3191).

"Comment: These statements pertain to operations under the general-commodities purchase program conducted by the Corporation for the War Food Administration, which was subjected to a complete investigation under House Resolution 50 in December 1944. The report submitted by Mr. Tarver from the Committee on Appropriations on June 27, 1945 (Rept. No. 816, Union Calendar No. 238, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), contained a full disclosure of the condition of the records and financial statements of these operations.

"These receivables largely represented unbilled deliveries under the lend-lease program, and were payable from Federal funds appropriated during the emergency period to the Lend-Lease Administration and its successor agencies. Shortly after July 1945, the Corporation undertook the task of liquidating the program on a reasonable and practicable basis. It was determined that due to the volume of transactions and the administrative costs involved, and since there would be no effect on the over-all interests of the United States Government, intragovernmental receivables would not be reviewed in detail by the Corporation. Other transactions were reviewed in detail. This determination was made following an interchange of correspondence with representatives of the General Accounting Office and discussion with various investigators from the House Committee on Appropriations during hearings on administrative expenses for lend-lease liquidation. The GCP program was liquidated with a net gain to the Corporation. A report as of June 30, 1947, on these actions was submitted to the General Accounting Office on September 24, 1947, and again on December 26, 1947 (copy attached), and, in accordance with the request of the GAO, has been supplemented from time to time to show the progress in liquidating claims.

"The attachment referred to above follows:

"DECEMBER 26, 1947.

"Mr. CLARK L. SIMPSON,
"Assistant Director, Corporation Audits Division,
"General Accounting Office,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. SIMPSON: In discussions as early as April 1946 with your office you concurred in our general approach to the problem of liquidating account balances reflecting GCP payables and receivables, and in your letter of April 16, 1947, you concurred in our proposed plan to make no further investigation of transactions representing deliveries (1) under the lend-lease program prior to September 2, 1945 (VJ-day) and (2) under procurements made for other agencies of the United States Government, provided that it could be demonstrated that there will be no over-all loss to the United States Government.

"A comprehensive report was forwarded to you September 23, 1947, with respect to the liquidation of the GCP accounts payable and accounts receivable and the adjustments in the accounts incident thereto. However, in view of our previous discussions and understandings, it is believed appropriate to also briefly summarize the project and its results.

"As you know, the total activity during the period under discussion amounted to approximately $8,000,000,000 and involved individual transactions running into the millions. The unit for inventory and accounting purposes was usually a carload of the commodity involved so that when such unit is multiplied by the purchase, movements, storage, cost determination, sale, billing, and collection transactions which must be recorded in each instance, the magnitude of the total undertaking almost defies comprehension in terms of usual commercial undertakings.

"During the war period and for some time thereafter it was not possible to maintain the accounting operations, including the accounts payable and accounts receivable, of the GCP program on a current basis. With respect to payables, deliveries by vendors and payments therefor based upon documentation called for by the contract were usually recorded currently as each event occurred but were not related to each other for the purpose of ascertaining and recording the normal adjustment for differences between estimated charges based upon shipping information and actual payments based upon certified documentary evidence of delivery.

"With respect to receivables much the same situation existed, i. e., liftings based upon shipping information and bills and collections based upon certified documentation were each recorded as currently as possible as the events transpired but were not related to each other for the purpose of ascertaining and recording normal adjustments

for differences between estimated lifting values and actual bills and collections. Since there were several million transactions involved in these accounts, it can readily be seen that by not making such adjustments currently the differences accumulated in the accounts and eventually grew into large dollar amounts, although perhaps not disproportionate to the billions of dollars of activity involved.

"In order to determine the amount of these differences to be adjusted and also in order to determine as at June 30, 1947, the outstanding payables and receivables with respect to the GCP program, the procedure as outlined in our report of September 23, 1947, and as briefly summarized hereinafter was followed.

"With regard to accounts payable, an abstract showing the detail of each delivery by the vendor and each payment by the Corporation was prepared for each contract. If this indicated deliveries which had not been paid for, the data were reviewed and audited with the documents and records reflecting the shipment and storage of commodities. Following this examination the contracts which still appeared to reflect open items were forwarded to the field fiscal office which had made the payments for further reconciliation and verification. After this work was performed, current liquidations (payments) were verified with the remaining contracts. As of June 30, 1947, there remained only 42 contracts with balances totaling $11,676,960.68 out of the billions of dollars of contracts involved on which it was necessary to undertake a final verification for the purpose of determining the validity of the amounts carried as payables. The balance of the accounts payable reflected in the general books at June 30, 1947, prior to adjustment was $72,843,595.19. Thus the net adjustment required to properly state the accounts was made in the amount of $61,166,634.51 by reducing accounts payable with a corresponding reduction in cumulative costs of sales.

"Should there be claims subsequently submitted by vendors for deliveries which were not included in the amounts established as payables, a complete examination will be made to assure the validity of such claims prior to payment. Also, in collaboration with the Office of Audit, Production and Marketing Administration, and your office a further verification is being completed with respect to the $11,676,960.68 remaining on the books as of June 30, 1947.

"With respect to the accounts receivable liquidation it was necessary to first balance the detail representing lot-by-lot shipments, invoices, and collections to the general ledger control accounts for the period March 1, 1944, through June 30, 1947. After the detail was balanced the transactions were segregated into groups so that detail verification could be made for the purpose of establishing amounts due from commercial customers, foreign governments, and lend-lease deliveries after VJ-day. In accordance with our plan concurred in by your office, we did not examine in detail the transactions representing lend-lease deliveries prior to VJ-day or deliveries to other government agencies since, as previously discussed, any overcharges or undercharges in lend-lease billings and collections prior to VJ-day will not affect lend-lease settlements with foreign governments and since any overcharges or undercharges to other government agencies will not result in any loss or gain to the Government as a whole. However, test checks were made in conformity with generally accepted audit principles, and the results of such test checks revealed that the invoicing and collection operations of the Corporation were generally satisfactory. In addition to the analysis and verification of outstanding accounts receivable which were developed from the detailed entries to the accounts, all shipments (involving over $2,000,000,000) to Cash-Paying Foreign Governments and UNRRA were reconciled with the quantities invoiced and paid, in order to independently establish that any amounts owing and due to Commodity Credit Corporation from these claimants were billed and collected. The status of each contract balance was verified with the accounts prior to the closing of the books as of June 30, 1947, excepting for minor differences which were examined and adjusted in the books subsequent thereto. The results of this work were made available to your office for confirmation with the debtor or creditor in conjunction with your audit.

"Adjustments were made as of June 30, 1947 of $64,627,243.64 and $31,842,483.09, respectively, to the general books to properly state accounts receivable—unbilled and accounts receivable—billed. Again, although the dollar amounts involved are large, they must be related to the billions of dollars of activity to get a perspective.

"Abstracts of the accounts, work papers, supporting documents and files were accumulated during the progress of liquidation of the payables and receivables of the GCP Program so as to provide your office with such data as required to verify the adequacy and accuracy of the work involved in this project. Also, the Office of Audit, PMA, is making an examination of the audit of UNRRA and Cash-Paying Foreign Government accounts referred to for the purpose of determining the accuracy of the work performed.

"Consequently, we believe the action which was taken by the Corporation was in conformity with our mutual objective of seeking to avoid the incurring of unjustifiable administrative expense by the Corporation and the Government in the correction of wartime accounting deficiencies, but to exert all reasonable efforts in the collection of amounts from sources outside the United States Government.

"Very truly yours,

"K. A. BRASFIELD,
"Treasurer."

"VERIFICATION OF INVENTORIES

"Senator WILLIAMS' statement (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1949): 'The book value of the inventories held by the Corporation as of June 30, 1945, was in excess of $1,000,000,000, but it has been reported to me that it was not possible to verify that amount physically' (pp. 3190–3191).

"Also: 'Mr. President, the book value of the inventories held by the Corporation as of June 30, 1945, was in excess of $1,000,000,000, but it has been reported to me that it was not possible to verify this amount physically.

" 'My experience in business has been that when the Government agent comes around to audit my account, I must verify every item. I see no reason why we should extend special exemption to the Government Corporation. If they cannot verify the inventory, let us find where the money went. If they can verify the inventory, the matter can be cleared up rapidly. If the charge is unfounded, I shall be the first to place that fact in the RECORD. I feel we should know the truth. I received this information from persons whom I believe to be reliable, and I believe the report to be correct. If I did not believe it to be correct, I would not be standing on the floor of the Senate at this time asking for the facts' (p. 3191).

"Comment: The complexities of making a physical verification of approximately $1,000,000,000 of commodity inventories as at any specific date during the war period is readily understandable in view of the nature of the Corporation's operations. A large volume of commodities held in inventory was evidenced by warehouse receipts issued by bonded warehouses. With respect to fungible commodities such as grain, oilseeds, etc., stored in public warehouses it would be impossible to take physical inventories as at any specific date of the portion against which receipts were held by the Corporation. In the case of processed and packaged commodities, purchases by the Corporation from the commercial vendors were delivered f. o. b. railway cars at shipping point or f. a. s. vessel. Therefore, huge quantities were always in transit to port, in pier storage, located on wharves for lifting, or in process of being lifted or aboard vessels, as of any specific date.

"On March 12, 1945, the President of the Corporation, pursuant to a resolution approved by the Board of Directors on March 10, 1945, requested the General Accounting Office to take a physical inventory of processed commodities. This request was prompted by the realization of the Corporation that serious deficiencies existed in inventory-control procedures, which was indicated by the findings included in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the investigation of the War Food Administration, made in June 1945 to the Congress. The effectiveness of this endeavor was materially impaired by the factors explained above.

"In the conduct of its day-to-day operations at the present time, the Corporation controls its inventory of all processed commodities on a lot-by-lot basis, and makes periodic verifications with respect to individual commodities, as conditions warrant. Generally such verifications are made when commodity movements permit or at the end of the fiscal year. In the case of fungible commodities and other nonprocessed commodities, evidence of ownership is periodically verified through confirmation with warehousemen.

"OVERSTATEMENT OF WHEAT LOANS

"Senator WILLIAMS' statement (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1949): 'I also understand that the wheat loans are overstated by about $4,000,000, with the corresponding overstatement in accounts payable' (p. 3190).

"Comment: When loans are called, and the price of wheat on the open market is below the loan rate, farmers deliver large quantities of collateral in a relatively short period. In many areas, local storage capacity is not sufficient to store grain, and it is shipped to subterminals or terminals almost as rapidly as it is delivered.

"Under conditions such as these, it is inevitable that bills of lading and warehouse receipts will be received from elevators more rapidly than reports of delivery at country points are received, audited, and recorded. Accordingly, a suspense account is necessarily used in which to record wheat received in connection with which the loan settlements have not been effected and recorded.

"A similar situation with respect to wheat loans may well occur this year, but currently effective procedures are designed to correlate to the maximum possible extent the liquidation of the loan with the delivery of the collateral.

"OMISSION FROM SALES OF BARLEY SHIPPED TO RUSSIA

"Senator WILLIAMS' statement (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1949): 'Furthermore, an incident has been called to my attention where barley has been shipped to Russia in the amount of $1,000,000, under the trading program, and the item has been omitted entirely from the sales' (p. 3191).

"Comment: In its June 30, 1945, trial balance on 1944 barley submitted to the Washington office, the Portland office reported a reduction in inventory by transfer to the GCP program of $1,137,007.90. Examination by the Washington office of the GCP trial balance and related records as of the same date disclosed that only $48,140.40 of this

amount was recorded on GCP trial balance. Accordingly, the Washington office made a worksheet adjustment in preparing the overall financial statements as of June 30, 1945, adjusting the interoffice transfer account and setting up as unbilled receivables—lend-lease—the difference of $1,038,867.50. The Portland office in July 1945 reversed the inventory transfer entry in the amount of $1,038,867.50, and in September 1945, recorded the delivery as a sale. The transaction to which these entries relate was a transfer of barley to Russia under the lend-lease program.

"ACCURACY OF AMOUNT OF COTTON LOANS

"Senator WILLIAMS' statement (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1949): 'In the case of certain other programs it was also impossible to support the recorded balances of receivables, particularly in the case of claims in the case of cotton loans held by the Corporation. It had made no effort to prove the accuracy of the total amount of loans, and therefore I understand that the total amount of loans reported by the Federal Reserve banks, as custodians, could not be reconciled with the records of the Corporation. At least one duplication of over $2,000,000 has been reported to me' (p. 3190).

"Comment: The books of the New Orleans office of the Corporation did reflect $2,329,485 as loans held by lending agencies as of June 30, 1945, in error, since these loans had previously been purchased by the Corporation. This error, of course, was subsequently corrected. The comment regarding the reconcilement of individual loan account balances refers to the inability of the New Orleans office to perform as of June 30, 1945, a reconciliation between punch-card cotton loan records in that office, the records maintained by the Federal Reserve banks acting as custodians of cotton-loan documents, and the general ledger control balances of the New Orleans office. This situation existed as of the date stated over 3½ years ago, but has been corrected since.

"The individual IBM bale-card system was established primarily to facilitate the physical handling of the huge volume of cotton involved in the CCC loan and purchase programs, and worked well for that purpose. The CCC made loans on approximately 14,000,000 bales of 1940–44 crops of cotton, bought 2,600,000 bales of 1944 crop cotton, and acquired or pooled for producers approximately 9,500,000 bales of loan cotton after August 1, 1939. The problems involved in the record keeping for, as well as the physical handling of, this volume of cotton were tremendous.

"During the war the New Orleans office was handicapped by a limited number of trained personnel and inadequate accounting-machine equipment. Consequently, some auditing and accounting functions, including the comparison and reconciliation of loan and accounting records of the New Orleans office and the Federal Reserve banks were not currently performed.

"After 1945, concerted effort was expended toward eliminating all backlogs and balancing all accounts with related subsidiaries. Also, a detailed survey of the accounting system and procedures used was undertaken and a new over-all system was devised and placed into effect. This system worked satisfactorily under the tremendous work load of a 5,000,000-bale loan this year."

The bill (S. 900) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes."

PROMOTION OF HEALTH OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 139, Senate bill 1411.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES OF SUBVERSIVE ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Immigration Act of October 16, 1918.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1694) to amend the Immigration Act of October 16, 1918, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the course of the last year and a half, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has been engaged in a comprehensive study of our entire immigration system. One facet of this study is an investigation of the entrance of subversives into this country. There is in the custody of the subcommittee evidence which establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that there is extensive subversive activity being carried on in this country under the active direction and leadership of agents of foreign countries. This evidence is extensive, conclusive, and alarming. These agents supply the lifeblood for subversive activity in the United States.

Although our present immigration laws provide for the exclusion and deportation of certain types of dangerous and subversive aliens, through the years these provisions have been made subject to a number of exceptions and provisos which have opened a back door for the admission into the United States of agents of foreign powers who enjoy a practical immunity from our laws. The administration of the legal mandates has frequently been lax and indecisive. By default, additional avenues of entry have been provided for otherwise excludable aliens.

Mr. President, this situation has been vastly complicated by the growth of numerous international organizations and commissions with headquarters or offices in this country, and the resultant groups of aliens that have been permitted to enter the United States.

Our entire immigration system has been so weakened as to make it often impossible for our country to protect its security in this black era of fifth-column infiltration and cold warfare with the ruthless masters of the Kremlin.

We must make adequate provision to protect ourselves. We must bring our immigration system into line with the realities of Communist tactics.

The time has long since passed when we can afford to open our borders indiscriminately to give unstinting hospitality to any person whose purpose, whose ideologic goal, is to overthrow our institutions and replace them with the evil oppression of totalitarianism.

We can no longer entertain with lavish hospitality or with amused indifference the sworn enemies of the United States.

I have just now introduced a bill to revise our immigration laws in such a way as to place in the hands of the Government adequate powers to cope with the fifth-column tactics of international communism. The purpose of this bill is to plug the loopholes of the present law, so that any alien—and I emphasize the word "any"—who engages in espionage or other subversive activity must be excluded or deported.

Let me emphasize in the beginning that this legislation will not in any way curb the legitimate activities of anyone, whether he be an immigrant, a visitor, a diplomat, or a delegate to an international organization. The bill has only one purpose: to protect the people of the United States from any alien who abuses the traditional American hospitality by working for the overthrow of our Government. And, Mr. President, I mean any alien.

My bill is designed to sever the international lifeline which is feeding the Communist conspiracy in this country.

There is no obligation upon the United States—or, for that matter, upon any other nation—to harbor within its borders aliens who are working for its destruction. The duty to protect itself—the obligation to defend itself—against alien subversion is the fundamental responsibility of every government. We cannot continue to abdicate this duty.

Mr. President, I want to impress the Members of the Senate with the earnestness with which I propose this measure. My proposal is based on a careful consideration of evidence now in the possession of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the honor to be chairman. We have found glaring loopholes in our immigration system, complicated by the laxness with which the existing exclusion and deportation provisions have been enforced. The cold fact it that agents of international communism move freely across our borders to engage in espionage, sabotage, anti-American propaganda, and subversive activities, to plot with almost complete impunity the destruction of our free institutions.

The threat which we must eliminate—and which I am convinced this bill will eliminate—consists of five distinct problems.

First. The Communist International has in its employ a network of agents whose sole function is to organize and promote Communist activity, espionage,

propaganda, and terrorism. These agents are sent into the United States and other countries as the policy of the Stalinist high command dictates. Although some of these persons are native born or have acquired citizenship through naturalization, a substantial number of them are aliens. Under my bill these people would have to be excluded from admission, or deported if found in the United States.

Second. Occasionally aliens who come to this country as immigrants do not leave behind them their loyalties to foreign governments and foreign ideologies. Some of them engage in subversive activity, organize or join Communist organizations, or engage in propaganda activities among their neighbors. Under my bill these people would have to be deported.

Third. Agents of communism have used the customary courtesy extended by the United States to representatives of foreign governments, including diplomats, consuls, and other representatives, as a screen behind which to engage in espionage and other activities designed to overthrow our Nation by force and violence. Under my bill, these people would have to be excluded from admission or deported if found in the United States.

Fourth. Since the establishment of international organizations in this country, Communist agents have used them as a facade behind which to operate and to carry on anti-American activity. The evidence in the files of the subcommittee shows conclusively that many representatives and staff members of international organizations are engaging in subversive activities, beyond the scope of their legal duties. Under my bill, these people would have to be deported.

Fifth. We have for many years extended the privilege to certain foreign governments to establish in this country missions, such as trading commissions and news agencies. Some of these, too, have been integrated into the international Communist espionage-sabotage-subversion network. They have expended vast sums of money for propaganda and intelligence work and have frequently supported Communist enterprises by direct contributions. Under my bill, these people would have to be deported.

Mr. President, we are faced by the most tightly organized, the most extensive international conspiracy this world has ever seen—and may God grant, shall ever see.

That the Soviet Union actively engages in preparation for the communization of the United States and the rest of the world is no longer a question of doubt. The articles of the Comintern—the basic creed of the Communist Party—the utterances of Soviet leaders, the activities of the Communist Party everywhere; in fact, the foreign policies of the USSR, are directed at destruction of the United States as the one powerful barrier to conquest of the great globe itself.

The Moscow imperialists have never tried to conceal their hopes for world revolution and world conquest. The very philosophy of Karl Marx speaks of an inevitable destruction of existing states and their replacement by a Communist society. The plan for world revolution has been openly expressed by the leaders of Soviet Russia. The fundamental line of the Soviets was laid down in the clearest terms by Lenin in his declaration that—

> We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet republics side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before this end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.

The Communist International has itself made public declaration of the Soviet ambitions to subject the entire world to the Red system of oppression. The Sixth World Congress proclaimed openly that—

> The ultimate aim of the Communist International is to replace world capitalist economy by a world system of communism.

The program adopted by the Sixth Congress of the Communist International in 1928, states clearly the revolutionary objectives of the Soviet Union within the borders of other nations:

> The successful struggle of the Communist International for the dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes the existence in every country of a compact Communist Party, hardened in the struggle, disciplined, centralized, and closely linked up with the masses.
>
> The party is the vanguard of the working class and consists of the best, most class conscious, most active, and most courageous members of that class. It incorporates the whole body of experience of the proletarian struggle. Basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism and representing the general and lasting interests of the whole of the working class, the party personifies the unity of proletarian principles, of proletarian will, and of proletarian revolutionary action. It is a revolutionary organization, bound by iron discipline and strict revolutionary rules of democratic centralism, which can be carried out, thanks to the class consciousness of the proletarian vanguard, to its loyalty to the revolution, its ability to maintain inseparable ties with the proletarian masses and to its correct political leadership, which is constantly verified by the experiences of the masses themselves.

Mr. President, centralized control from Moscow of the international network of communism requires the establishment of a vast spiderweb of communication. It is of prime importance that the Kremlin shall be in a position at all times to communicate instructions to its partisans, to call them to task for blunders, to receive in turn intelligence reports, and to provide for the training and entry of agents provocateurs.

To this end the Soviet Union has created an international organization without equal and without rival in history. The falsification of passports and identities, the disguises behind which trained operatives of communism move, have been developed to an exacting science which has successfully penetrated the vigilances of all nations of the earth.

Every person sent from the Soviet Union or its satellites is or becomes an agent of Soviet espionage and sabotage. He is assigned a task to fulfill and his complete compliance is generally assured by threats against his person and his family and by the ubiquitous terror of the secret police. In testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee Victor Kravchenko affirmed that—

> I must state in general that no person holding an important position in connection with the economic, political, or military organizations and arriving in the United States from the Soviet Union arrives without a special assignment as to the collection of secret information.

Lenin confessed that in its endeavors the Soviet Union would not be governed either by ethics or morality. In the drive to communize the world he wrote in The Infantile Sickness of Leftism in Communism:

> It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth.

The violations of American integrity, sovereignty, and friendship have increased in vigor and scope. Since the termination of the late war the temporary wartime mask of allied friendship has been dropped by the Soviet Government, and its efforts to undermine our institutions have become a matter of common knowledge.

Soviet agents and contact men have found cover behind every iron curtain mission, private or public, in the United States. Special representatives of the Kremlin have found the friendly attitude of this country a haven within which they are able to move to their destinations and indulge in their nefarious tasks unhampered.

Since the end of the war the Soviet Union has found a new and infinitely superior channel through which it can introduce its agents into the United States. The constellation of international agencies established in this country provides a means of transit from the Soviet Union and its satellite countries unhampered by the usual, if limited, restrictions placed upon private persons and diplomatic officials.

The results of the war have placed the U. S. S. R. in a position to take complete advantage of the facilities afforded by international bodies. The collection of satellite nations behind the iron curtain offers fertile fields for the recruitment of agents and for their importation into the United States.

The cold fact is that every person officially assigned to an international organization by any country subject to Communist domination is an agent of international communism.

The real function of iron-curtain functionaries in this country is no longer a matter of speculation. The evidence which the subcommittee has obtained, a part of which will be made public in due time, leave no doubt on this score. Some of our information cannot be publicly disclosed for security reasons and because we must protect our source of information. I assure the Senate, however, that in due time every word which I am uttering will be amply substantiated by cold, hard facts. We have obtained the text of the oral instructions which iron-curtain officials coming to the United States are given by their Communist masters. Let me read a portion of these instructions, which are typical of the orders under which Communist representatives in this country operate.

This text was prepared by former diplomats and representatives, whose knowledge is based on personal experience:

We need to incite discontent, uneasiness, in the capitalistic and bourgeois states. The greater is the discontent in each capitalistic and bourgeois country, the ground for communism is more fertile. * * * Already now we have to revolutionize European and Asiatic continents. Strikes, revolutionary impetus of the trade unions and labor, the weakening of capitalism through the demands of high wages so that they are not able to compete with the Soviet Union, the obstruction of different reactionary governments in their anti-Communist policy, the incitement of nationalism everywhere, the hatred against the colonial empires, the uprising of trade unions against their governments, the various help to the Communist Party in the capitalist country, propagandizing the hatred against the reactionary in every country, particularly developing in the United States the impression that the economic depression must be inevitable.

Much of the evidence of the conspiracy against us is already a matter of public record. The hundreds of Communists and Communist-controlled organizations which have sprung up like poisonous weeds bear dramatic evidence that infiltration of un-American ideology has been eminently successful. I need only to recall names like Gerhardt Eisler, Harry Bridges, George Pirinsky, Ferdinand Smith, and Hans Eisler to prove that much of the work of the Communist organization has been done by aliens in this country.

The arrest of Valentin Gubichev, an employee of an international organization, for espionage has brought to public attention the fact that Soviet Russia is using international organizations as a front for the importation of espionage agents. There are other cases of this nature, some of which will be revealed by the subcommittee.

We know further that organizations such as Amtorg, the Soviet trading agency, Tass, the Soviet news agency, Tanyug, the Yugoslav news agency, and similar organizations planted in this country by the iron-curtain countries are engaged in propaganda and other forms of subversive activity. This information, too, will be made public by the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I know what an outcry will be raised against this bill by the subversive propaganda machine. Tomorrow the Communist press and the coterie of fellow travelers will whip themselves into a frenzy of self-righteousness. They will shout themselves hoarse crying: "Red baiting!" "Hysteria!" Police state!"

Let me, therefore, make this one point abundantly clear. This bill is not a result of hysteria. This bill is not intended to provide a platform for Red baiting.

This bill is a sober, carefully considered proposal to protect the security of the United States of America from an enemy whom we have permitted to infiltrate our shores.

Mr. President, there is nothing really novel or unusual about the bill which I have just introduced. Much of the language used, and two of its three principal provisions are in substance the law of the land, both in the Espionage Act and the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The bill merely extends application of deportation and exclusion provisions to all aliens, in order to meet changing conditions, including those created by the establishment of international organizations. The reluctance of the State Department and other agencies of the Government adequately to enforce even the existing statutes on subversive activity has created a no man's land within which Communist agents are building a system of ideological fortifications for the expected assault against the United States.

Mr. President, I have also written into the bill adequate safeguards to protect the innocent from prosecution, to safeguard the rights of aliens in the United States who may have unwittingly become associated with one of the hundred of Communist fronts which have been organized in this country. Many of these associations have masqueraded behind the facade of charitable or welfare organizations. They have cloaked themselves in high-sounding phrases to attract and deceive the American public.

Let me here emphasize that under this bill the major responsibilities, powers, and functions would be placed in the hands of the Attorney General because he is the principal law enforcement officer in the United States, and because it is his department which is responsible for our internal security.

There is no obligation upon us under international law or custom to harbor or to afford protection to aliens who use the freedom extended to them for subversive purposes.

The argument will be raised that we cannot protect ourselves from alien agents because action by us in that connection might upset our relations with other countries or might result in the placing of restrictions upon our diplomats abroad.

Mr. President, I find it difficult to provide a rational answer for such irrational arguments. If our foreign relations with any nation depend upon the entry of spies, of saboteurs, of an assortment of subversive agents, then I say the time has come when such relations should be terminated. If we must pay tribute in the form of allowing aliens to subvert our form of government as a condition to temporary good will, we would be better off without it.

As for restrictions on our representatives in iron-curtain countries, I need not point out that they are already surrounded by secret police, and are limited in their movements, and harassed in their activities to such an extent that any further restriction would not be possible. Certainly we can derive no gain from a relationship in which we permit a foreign government to import into our Nation a dozen active agents for each isolated representative we send abroad.

Mr. President, the time has come for the Congress to face this issue squarely. We have always been a tolerant people. We have leaned backward to extend every courtesy and every privilege to anyone who came to this country. We have thereby exposed ourselves to subversion and injury. The struggle in which we are engaged is the fight for the survival of democratic government on this globe. We cannot let that fight go by default.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in view of the bill against alien subversive activities which has just been introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I think it appropriate that we recall the celebrated discovery of an espionage ring in Canada and its connection with similar espionage rings in this country. It is important, Mr. President, because the evidence brought out by the Royal Commission to Investigate Espionage Activities in Canada bears directly on the subject, proving that officials of the Soviet Government are sent to the United States for the purpose of spying on our defenses.

The facts, as most Senators will remember, are these:

About 8 o'clock on the evening of September 5, 1945, Igor Guzenko, lieutenant in the Red Army, and cipher clerk of the Soviet Embassy in Canada, left his office with the intention of severing all his connections with the Soviet Union. He carried with him a group of secret documents containing the details of an extensive Soviet spy ring in Canada.

After unsuccessfully attempting to communicate his story to official Canadian sources and to Canadian newspapers, Guzenko, afraid for the safety of his family, was forced to seek refuge among neighbors. He related that his apartment was watched and that attempts were made by representatives of the Soviet Union to get in.

On the evening of September 6, three officials of the Soviet Embassy broke into his apartment and began to ransack it. They were caught in the act by the Canadian police. On the morning of the 7th, Guzenko was finally taken into the office of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, to whom he transmitted his documents.

The information supplied by Guzenko was of such sensational nature that the Canadian Government took extraordinary steps to set into motion a full investigation. By order in council of October 6, special powers were granted to hold and interrogate persons "in such place and under such conditions" as the Minister of Justice might determine.

On February 5, 1946, a further step was taken to investigate the spy ring by the establishment of a Royal Commission with special powers to require evidence.

The Commission issued a printed report of 733 pages. This document constituted a guide book of Soviet espionage. It brings out clearly that the diplomatic mission of the Soviet Union constituted little more than a screen behind which the Russians operate an entire series of espionage and subversive networks. From the information supplied by Guzenko and those who were implicated, it is clear that similar networks are equally active in the United States.

Guzenko testified that the Soviet Government is engaged in preparations for a third world war against the democracies, and for this purpose is establishing

both a fifth column and an espionage network in the United States, Canada, and other countries. He stated:

Holding forth at international conferences with voluble statements about peace and security, the Soviet Government is simultaneously preparing secretly for the third world war. To meet this war, the Soviet Government is creating in democratic countries, including Canada, a fifth column, in the organization of which even diplomatic representatives of the Soviet Government take part.

The announcement of the dissolution of the Comintern was, probably, the greatest farce of the Communists in recent years. Only the name was liquidated, with the object of reassuring public opinion in the democratic countries. Actually the Comintern exists and continues its work, because the Soviet leaders have never relinquished the idea of establishing a Communist dictatorship throughout the world.

Take into account least of all that this adventurous idea will cost millions of Russian lives, the Communists are engendering hatred in the Russian people toward everything foreign.

To many Soviet people, here and abroad, it is clear that the Communist Party in democratic countries has changed long ago from a political party into an agency net of the Soviet Government, into a fifth column in these countries to meet a war, into an instrument in the hands of the Soviet Government for creating artificial unrest, provocation, etc.

Through numerous party agitators the Soviet Government stirs up the Russian people in every possible way against the peoples of the democratic countries, preparing the ground for the third world war." (Royal Commission, pp. 639–640.)

Mr. President, that is a quotation from Mr. Guzenko's statement as it appears in the minutes of the Royal Canadian Commission which investigated that matter.

Guzenko explained the extensiveness of the Soviet espionage organization, pointing out that numerous parallel networks existed around each Soviet mission: a constellation of agents about the Soviet suns. The network which he was able to expose he said "is only a modest or small part of all that is really here."

There are—

He continued—

other societies and other people working under every embassy, under every consul in each place where there is a consulate. It is just like a number of small circles. There are parallel systems of spies or potential agents. (Royal Commission, p. 19.)

Mr. President, note particularly this part of his statement:

The same thing was true in the United States, according to a telegram I saw. The chief of the technical bureau is head of one parallel system; military intelligence has another system. (Royal Commission, p. 20.)

Mr. President, some of the persons mentioned in the report of the Royal Commission had connection in the United States. This includes the officials of the Embassy as well as Canadian espionage agents. Although this information is limited and includes only minor reference to the subject, they are of interest as an indication of the potential danger of Soviet espionage and subversive activity in the United States.

Following are a number of references and excerpts taken from the official report of the Royal Commission, plus some additional explanatory material, which has any bearing upon the United States or indicates the movement in the United States of Canadian agents.

On August 29, 1945, Colonel Zabotin sent to the chief of the Red Army's intelligence headquarters in Moscow, a telegram including the following paragraph (the word "center" refers to the Moscow headquarters):

"I would like to complete the fairly complicated task of obtaining a passport for our man in America (the director knows about it) and after this to leave for the center." (Royal Commission, p. 541.)

Speaking of the widespread Soviet network in Canada, Guzenko said:

"The same thing was true in the United States, according to a telegram I saw. The chief of the technical bureau is head of one parallel system; military intelligence has another system." (Royal Commission, p. 20.)

Colonel Zabotin's notebook contains the following information on contacts with Arthur Steinberg (cover name "Berger") in Washington. ("Debouz" is one of the cover names for Fred Rose, convicted leader of the Canadian spies and head of the Communist Party; the "corporation" is the Communist Party.)

Mr. President, this is official Canadian information as uncovered by the Royal Commission. I quote further from Colonel Zabotin's notebook, as released by the Canadian Commission:

"Debouz is to tie up with Berger and, depending on the circumstances, is to make a proposal about work for us or for the corporation. Contact in Washington with Debouz's person. To work out arrangements for a meeting and to telegraph. To give out $600. If Debouz should be unable to go to United States of America, then there should be a letter from Debouz to Berger containing a request to assist the person delivering the letter to Berger." (Royal Commission, p. 491.)

During the questioning of Guzenko by the Royal Commission, the significance of this matter was further explained as follows:

"Question. Do you know if Debouz went to Washington, or was it his friend who made the contact with Steinberg?

"Answer. In later telegrams that were sent it was pointed out that Debouz's man had handed over Steinberg to the military intelligence in Washington.

"Question. That is the Russian military intelligence in Washington?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. And the contact was to be made in Washington?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. Through the officials of the Russian service?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. So Debouz did not go himself; it was his man who made the contact in Washington?

"Answer. This telegram to which I refer was sent much later, and it was not indicated whether Debouz had made the contact, but the contact was established." (Royal Commission, p. 492.)

Prof. Raymond Boyer, who was one of the agents for the Soviet Intelligence, gave the following testimony concerning Arthur Steinberg:

"Question. Who is Arthur Steinberg?

"Answer. He is an American geneticist who came to Montreal to teach genetics, I think in 1940 or 1941. However, I did not meet him until 1942 when we became close friends. We moved to where he and his wife lived. He left Canada in June 1944 and went to a job with the American Navy, a research job, and he has been in Washington ever since.

"Question. Is he a Communist?

"Answer. I do not know; he has never said so. I know he has certain sympathies.

"Question. He is sympathetic to the Communists?

"Answer. Yes." (Royal Commission, p. 493.)

AMERICAN MILITARY INFORMATION SOUGHT OR OBTAINED THROUGH THE CANADIAN SPY NETWORK

The Director of the Military Intelligence Service in Moscow issued numerous instructions to his chief agent in Ottawa, Colonel Zabotin, which involved secret American military information. The following are excerpts from some of these instructions as published in the Report of the Royal Commission.

(At this point Mr. EASTLAND yielded to Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and debate ensued, which, by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. FERGUSON.)

Mr. EASTLAND. I continue the quotation:

TASK NO. 1

1. Tactical and technical facts of the naval and coastal hydroacoustic stations working in ultra-sound diapason. Common review on the Caproni's stability of the United States of America and Great Britain.

5. Plants, workshops, scientific research institutes and laboratories in England and in the United States of America which are making and planning the hydrophonic apparatus." (Royal Commission, pp. 91–92.)

Mr. President, those are from the official records of the Canadian Royal Commission to Investigate Espionage in Canada, which shows one of the orders going out to Russian agents in the city of Washington to seek out information necessary to the security of our country.

On September 11, 1945, Colonel Zabotin received from the director the following:

It is very important to receive information on the following questions:

(a) To confirm the official data about the transfer of American troops from Europe to the United States of America and to the Pacific, also the headquarters of the Ninth Army, Third, Fifth, Seventh, Thirteenth Armored Corps, Eighteenth ADK, Second, Fourth, Eighth, Twenty-eighth, Thirtieth, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, One Hundred and Fourth Infantry Divisions and Thirteenth Tank Division. To establish the dates of their transfer.

(b) Dislocation of the headquarters of the Eighth, Sixteenth Armored Corps; Twenty-ninth, (75), Eighty-ninth Infantry Divisions, Tenth Tank Division, Thirteenth and Seventeenth ADD. Also about the dislocation of the Brazilian Infantry Division.

(c) Are the Sixth and Twelfth Army Groups in Europe, what is their composition and their dislocation, the dates and direction of their transfer?

(d) Has there been organized a headquarters of the American occupation forces in Germany, its location, who was appointed as its commander?

(e) The dislocation of the First Air Borne Army, the plans for its future use.

Hurry. (Royal Commission, p. 93.)

An assignment note, dated June 8, 1945, contains this instruction:

To obtain any material on the American airplane radio locator of the type an/aps-10 and also on the radio navigation periscope. (The assignment sheet contains the significant marginal note "fulfilled May 7, 1945.")

That the Canadian Soviet espionage ring was successful in obtaining American military information is evidenced by this message from Colonel Zabotin to the director of Soviet military intelligence in Moscow:

We have received from Badeau 17 top secret and secret documents (English, American, and Canadian) on the question of magnicoustics, radio-locators for field artillery; 3 secret scientific-research journals of the year 1945. Altogether about 700 pages. In the course of the day we were able to photograph all the documents with the help of the Lecia and the photofilter. In the next few days we will receive almost the same amount of documents for 3 to 5 hours and with one film we will not be able to cope with it. (Royal Commission, p. 92.)

Among the items listed by Colonel Zabotin as having been mailed to the director in Moscow, are the following:

North American Committee of Coordination Report of November 23, 1944 (Royal Commission, p. 425). North American Committee notes and report November 23, 1944 (Royal Commission, p. 425). Notes on the conference of May 31, 1944 of the Joint War Production Committee, Canada and the United States. (Royal Commission, p. 427.)

Mr. President, "31–5–44," Mr. President, evidently means that they received the notes of that conference which occurred on the 31st day of May 1944.

On July 9, 1945, Colonel Zabotin sent to the director a telegram concerning information obtained on United States military equipment. The telegram reads:

On our task Alek has reported brief data concerning electronic shells. In particular, these are being used by the American Navy against Japanese suicide fliers. There is in the shell a small radio transmitter with one electronic tube and it is fed by dry batteries. The body of the shell is the antenna. The bomb explodes in the proximity of an airplane from the action of the reflected waves from the airplane on the transmitter. The basic difficulties were: The preparation of a tube and batteries which could withstand the discharge of the shell, and the determination of a rotation speed of the shell which would not require special adaptation in the preparation of the shell. The Americans have achieved this result, but apparently have not handed this over to the English. The Americans have used a plastic covering for the battery which withstands the force of pressure during the motion of the shell. (Royal Commission, p. 453.)

"Alek" is the cover name of Allan Nunn May.

ATOMIC ESPIONAGE

One of the principal goals of the Canadian espionage ring was to obtain information on the atom bomb. The Soviet anxiety in this field is evident from the brief telegram of August 22, 1945, sent to Colonel Zabotin by the Director of Soviet Military Intelligence:

Take measures to organize acquisition of documentary materials on the atomic bomb. The technical process, drawings, calculation. (Royal Commission, p. 452.)

The principal sources of atomic information for the Soviet spy ring were Raymond Boyer, cover name "Professor," and Allan Nunn May, cover name "Alek." Among the documents taken from the Soviet Embassy by Guzenko are a number of items referring directly to atomic-energy work in the United States. Among them is this telegram from Zabotin to the director:

The Professor reported that the Director of the National Chemical Research Committee, Stacey, told him about the new plant under construction. * * * The Americans have developed wide research work, having invested in this business $660,000,000. (Royal Commission, p. 447.)

On July 9, 1945, Zabotin sent the following telegram:

To the Director: Facts given by Alek: (1) The test of the atomic bomb was conducted in New Mexico (with 49", "94–239"). The bomb dropped on Japan was made of uranium 235.

Mr. President, here is official information secured from the Soviet Embassy in New York, copies of telegrams which were transmitted to the Chief of Soviet Intelligence in Moscow. I quote further:

It is known that the output of uranium 235 amounts to 400 grams daily at the magnetic separation plant at Clinton. The output of "49" is likely two times greater (some graphite units are planned for 250 megawatts, i. e., 250 grams each day). The scientific research work in this field is scheduled to be published, but without the technical details. The Americans already have a published book on this subject. (2) Alek handed over to us a platinum with 162 micrograms of uranium 233 in the form of oxide in a thin lamina. We have had no news about the mail. (Royal Commission, p. 450.)

In February 1946, May was arrested in London and tried. He was convicted and sentenced to 10 years' penal servitude. His written confession contained the following admission:

I gave and had given careful consideration to correctness of making sure that development of atomic energy was not confined to the United States of America.

At one meeting I gave the man microscopic amounts of uranium 233 and uranium 235 (one of each). The uranium 235 was a slightly enriched sample and was in a small glass tube and consisted of about a milligram of oxide. The uranium 233 was about a tenth of a milligram and was a very thin deposit on a platinum foil and was wrapped in a piece of paper. (Royal Commission, p. 455.)

The man also asked me for information about the United States electronically controlled antiaircraft shells. I knew very little about these and so could give only very little information. (Royal Commission, p. 456.)

Mr. President, that ends the quotation from the confession of the traitor May who was convicted in Great Britain.

OFFICIALS OF THE SOVIET EMBASSY IN CHARGE OF THE CANADIAN ESPIONAGE RING WHO HAD CONTACTS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Many of the members of the Soviet Embassy spy ring in Canada had contacts with the United States, where some of them had held posts, or were to come in later. I should like to present to the Senate some of the information concerning these people, and to quote pertinent passages from the authoritative official report of the Royal Commission:

Sergei N. Koudriavtzev, chief of the Soviet espionage ring at the Embassy in Canada and predecessor to Colonel Zabotin, was granted a visa in 1947 to enter the United States as a member of the Soviet UN delegation. Apparently as the result of unfavorable publicity, he was withdrawn and returned to Moscow.

Mikhailov: "Major Sokolov, on his arrival in Ottawa in 1942, began to reform the previous organization, and was directed by 'Molier', who has been identified as one Mikhailov, an official of the Soviet Consulate in New York who came to Canada for that purpose. Major Sokolov, whose cover-name was 'Davie', came to Canada before the opening of a Soviet diplomatic mission here, ostensibly as a Soviet inspector to work in Canadian factories in connection with the Canadian Mutual air program to the U. S. S. R." (Royal Commission, p. 15.)

Colonel Zabotin's notebook contains the following information concerning the activities of Mikhailov ("Molier") in New York: "Davie" is the cover name of Major Sokolov, predecessor of Colonel Zabotin; "Fred" is the cover name of Fred Rose, one of the chiefs of the Canadian ring; "The Neighbors" refers to the N. K. V. D.; "The Corporation" is the Communist Party.

1. Fred—director of corporation. Previously worked at the Neighbors, up to 1924. In May–June 1942 came to Davie with a proposal to help. Davie checked up on Fred through New York (Molier). The Neighbors proposed to make use of Fred. After this, 1942, in September Fred contacted Davie on instructions from Molier. Molier was sent to work in Ottawa, for organizing the work. (At the present time on the electoral lists to Parliament in Quebec.) (Royal Commission, p. 481.)

SOVIET AGENTS IN UNITED STATES

Zheveinov was one of the correspondents of Tass, official Soviet news agency in Ottawa. He was a member of the Zabotin ring under the cover name of Martin. Zheveinov was apparently sent to San Francisco in 1945 ostensibly to cover the UN Conference there. Following his return, Colonel Zabotin sent the following telegram to the director in Moscow:

Martin received a reply from Dekanozov with permission to leave for home. As a result of Martin's work at the San Francisco Conference and his sickness about a month, the latter was unable to write reports on your task. The questions of the present-day situation in Canada after the elections and the distribution of the class forces in the country, he will write here and we will send them to you by regular mail, while the remaining questions of the task he will write at the center. (Royal Commission, p. 377.)

Dekanozov was one of the assistant commissars of foreign affairs. The word "center" refers to Red Army intelligence headquarters in Moscow.

The nature of Zheveinov's assignment is perhaps explained by the following entry under his name in Colonel Zabotin's notebook:

Basic task—information on the army and looking for new people. (Royal Commission, p. 430.)

Ignacy Witczak entered Canada in 1930 as a Polish immigrant being granted a naturalization certificate in 1936. In 1937 he applied for a passport to join the Communist armies fighting in Spain. His application was granted and he proceeded to Spain to become a member of the International Brigade. In 1938, Witczak landed in the United States. Witczak subsequently registered as an alien in 1940 in Los Angeles. Actually, however, Witczak had died in 1937 and the man who came to the United States with his identity was an imposter regarded by

Moscow as a very important agent whose continued presence in America was highly desirable.

This is confirmed by the following telegram sent by Zabotin to the Military Intelligence Headquarters in Moscow on August 29, 1945—the center refers to Intelligence Headquarters.

I would like to complete the fairly complicated task of obtaining a passport for our man in America (the director knows about it) and after this to leave for the center. The receipt of the passport is expected in the next few days. I will report the receipt of the latter immediately. (Royal Commission, pp. 541 et seq.)

NON-SOVIET MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN RING WITH UNITED STATES CONTACTS

The agents employed by the Soviet Embassy spy ring in Canada also had close connections with other agents in the United States, or had assigned to them espionage tasks in their country. I will, therefore, present a summary of these cases and quote pertinent passages from the report of the Royal Commission.

SAM CARR (SAM COHEN, SCHMIL KOGAN)

Carr was, along with Rose, the main Canadian cog in Zabotin's organization of espionage agents. His name and his activities run throughout the piece. Before Zabotin took over in June 1943, Carr was already head of a group of agents, the Ottawa-Toronto group. (Royal Commission, p. 108.)

The registration card of Sam Carr in the Soviet Embassy contained this information:

Has an excellent knowledge of the Russian language. He graduated from the Lenin School in Mascow.

The Lenin Institute in Moscow is the official Soviet sabotage and espionage school.

Carr has made a number of trips to the United States as shown by the following evidence:

Carr disappeared early in 1940 and his literary contributions to the Communist Party antiwar effort are believed to have been written in a hide-out in Philadelphia, United States of America. (Royal Commission, p. 98.)

March 1, 1945, a day or two before he was granted a Canadian passport to the United States, Mexico, and Cuba. (Royal Commission, p. 105.)

But one frequent, one very frequent commuter to the United States who contacted him (Gerhart Eisler, Commintern Representative to the U. S), or sought to, at least, on two or three occasions, is Mr. Samuel Carr, otherwise known as Kogan, who was then national organizer of the Communist Party, and I know of at least three occasions, in which personally, I was visited by him, that he was to see Mr. Eisler-Berger. (House Committee on Un-American Activities, p. 31.)

Eisler-Berger is Gerhart Eisler.

ERIC ADAMS

Adams was born in Hull, Quebec—his father had been born in the United States, his mother in Canada—and he graduated in engineering from McGill University in 1929 and subsequently from Harvard in 1931 with the degree master of business administration. In 1934 he made a trip to Europe, spending from 6 weeks to 2 months in Russia. After some intermediate employment with Canadian concerns he went to New York, where he remained in the employ of a firm of consulting engineers until 1939 when he went to Toronto and set up practice there as an engineer.

The notebook of Colonel Zabotin, head of the Soviet spy ring, contained the following significant information concerning Adams—who used the cover name Ernst:

Ernst—Jew; he works on the Joint ——— of Military ——— (U. S. A. and Canada) (coordination). He gives detailed information of all kinds of industries' plans for the future. Supplies detailed accounts of conferences. Has been giving material weekly. Good worker. (Royal Commission, p. 171.)

DAVID SHUGAR

The embassy dossier which was produced before the Royal Commission by Guxanko contains the following tasks to be assigned to Shugar:

1. Tactical and technical facts of the naval and coastal hydroacoustic stations working in ultra-sound diapason. Common review on the Caproni's stability of the United States of America and Great Britain.

3. Sets of the Sonar's type, working on the radio direction-finding principle so-called hydrolocation-finding sets.

5. Plants, workshops, scientific research institutes and laboratories in England and in the United States of America which are making and planning the hydrophonic apparatus. (Royal Commission, p. 283.)

He also had had occasion to visit a number of establishments in the United States both before and after his trip to England. All this was, of course, secret work. (Royal Commission, pp. 282–283.)

He had access also, as already mentioned, to Naval establishments in the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Accordingly, he was well qualified to supply the information required. (Royal Commission, p. 285.)

Upon being asked during his interrogation:

How many labs did you visit all told in connection with your work?—

Shugar replied:

There were the ones mentioned previously in England. In the United States there was the Bureau of Ships, the Naval Research Laboratory, the Laboratory at Orlando, Fla., and at Fort Lauderdale. There was one laboratory at Mountain Lakes, N. J. Then there was the one at Sagam and in Springfield, Ill. There was the University of Toronto, department of chemistry, and the Montreal Pulp and Paper Research Institute. (Royal Commission, p. 286.)

Under interrogation, Igor Guzenko made the following statement concerning United States naval information sent to Moscow through Shugar:

As I remember this telegram, it was "Asdic Nos. 203, 204, and 207." There was a big list, each Asdic obviously having a number. So Moscow knew this, evidently, and knew what kind of numbers are in the United States Asdics, and they requested these Asdics. Then there came another instruction about installing Asdics on naval cruisers of the United States naval forces, and so on; specific questions, and this was again sent to Sam Carr from Rogov and again given to Shugar (Royal Commission, p. 301).

ALLAN NUNN MAY

May has been convicted in the Canadian Criminal Courts for espionage. His work under the cover name "Alek" is revealed in part by the following telegram sent to Moscow by Zabotin:

On our task Alek has reported brief data concerning electronic shells. In particular these are being used by the American Navy against Japanese suicide fliers.

In his signed confession, May admitted that he had not only supplied Russian agents with information about the atom bomb but "at one meeting I gave the man microscopic amounts of U. 233 and U. 235 * * *."—Note: For full details see under heading "Atomic espionage."

JOHN GRIERSON

Grierson was admitted to the United States on a number of occasions in 1947 and 1948 with diplomatic immunity as representative to UNESCO, although the State Department had prohibited his entry on a permanent visa because of his connections. Grierson was involved in the Canadian spy situation as indicated by the following entry in Col. Zabotin's notebook—"Freda" refers to Freda Linden, an espionage agent who is now a refugee from Canadian justice; the "Professor" is Raymond Boyer, convicted for his connection with ring:

Research Council—report on organization and work. Freda to the professor through Grierson. (Royal Commission, p. 486.)

GERMINA (HERMINA) RUBINOWITCH

One of the persons supplying information to the Soviet spy ring in Canada.

She joined the International Labor Organization at its headquarters in Geneva in 1929, and arrived on this continent, traveling from Lisbon to New York, on a Greek boat, in the early days of September 1940, to work in the headquarters of the ILO, then temporarily transferred to Montreal.

With the exception of several trips to the United States, she always remained in Montreal where she had in fact permanent residence at 539 Pine Avenue, West. The office of the ILO then at 3480 University Street, Montreal.

Most of her relatives are in Europe, but a few are in the United States of America. She had a mailing address care of Leonard Carleton, New York, who is a son-in-law of one Kulischer, a former member of the Russian Economic Institute. She keeps funds in a bank in New York.

As soon as she arrived in the United States she applied there for citizenship; she said that her case is presently under advisement. Her intentions, she said, are to go to the United States and seek employment with the United Nations Organization if and as soon as United States citizenship is granted to her. (Royal Commission, pp. 565–566.)

On May 5, 1944, Koudriavtzev, then head of the Canadian ring gave Rubinowitch a letter from Soviet Military Intelligence including the following important instructions (Sis and Paul were Soviet agents in Switzerland):

We ask you to forward $10,000 to that watch company according to Sisi's instructions. Make arrangements with our representative about forwarding of this sum of money to you in U. S. A. All your personal expenses will be paid. (Royal Commission, p. 579.)

Rubinowitch herself made the following confession during the questioning by the Royal Commission:

I went to New York on one of my trips. I went there several times a year, as I have said, and I was approached in New York by a man I don't know. I don't know his name,

and he handed me $10,000, with a request to give it to the watch company, to Helbein, for A———; and I did that. (Royal Commission, p. 584.)

DURNFORD SMITH

One of the convicted agents in Canada. His cover name was Badeau. His dossier from the Soviet Embassy includes the following notation for September 18, 1945:

Urgent meeting held respecting photographing. He was just returned from the United States of America, brought nothing. He will bring for the next meeting his account of his journey in the United States of America and other materials in accordance with our directive. Is unable to photograph. He only has a camera and nothing else. (Royal Commission, p. 157.)

On the 27th of September 1945 Colonel Zabotin was able to wire to the director that—

We have received from Badeau 17 top secrets and secret documents (English, American, and Canadian) on the question of magnicoustics, radio locators for field artillery; three secret scientific-research journals of the year 1945. Altogether about 700 pages. (Royal Commission, p. 159.)

Mr. President, the facts brought out by the Royal Commission in Canada are sufficiently well documented, and their investigation has been thorough so that we must accept the finding that the situation in this country is parallel. I respectively submit that the time has come for us not only to investigate the situation, but take active steps in this Congress to remove this cancerous enemy from our land. If it cannot be done through administrative steps, it is certainly the responsibility of the Congress to enact manadatory legislation now.

For that reason, Mr. President, I shall support the bill introduced today by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and I shall work for the passage of that bill. It is necessary that it be enacted to protect the United States, to secure the safety of our country and the labor of our people.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject which has been discussed by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. President, we can no longer continue to tolerate the flagrant violations of our interests by Communist agents. We have looked with increasing apprehension at the continuing infiltration into our country of alien agents, saboteurs, spies, and propaganda. We have, therefore, listened with considerable relief and gratitude to the proposal of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] lends his support. It is obvious, as Senators have so ably pointed out, that our hospitality should be reserved for those who are not engaged in trying to injure, subvert, or destroy us.

As a sovereign Nation we have the right to protect ourselves.

It can be expected that many arguments will be propounded, and more abstruse terms will be mouthed by the Communist press and by the misguided fellow travelers whose names adorn the letterheads of hundreds of Communist-controlled organizations. They will contend that we are upsetting our country's delicate relations with the Soviet Union.

To forestall these dubious discussions, we can remind the Senate that the Soviet Union should actually welcome legislation such as this, since it will assist that country in meeting her obligations entered into on November 16, 1933.

On that day Foreign Commissar Maxim Litvinoff made a pledge to the United States as a condition to obtaining recognition of the outlawed Communist Government, which had risen to power by terrorism and oppression. Let me read the text of the pledge made by the Soviet Government on November 16, 1933:

1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories or possessions.

2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories and possessions.

Mr. President, we know that this commitment was never kept by Russia. We know that the Soviet Government continued to sponsor, to support, and to direct Communist activity directed at undermining the United States. As early as 1935, the American ambassador in Moscow was instructed by our Government to protest to the Kremlin the violations of the 1933 pledge. Let the text of the protest speak for itself. Here it is:

The Government of the United States would be lacking in candor if it failed to state frankly that it anticipates the most serious consequences if the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is unwilling, or unable, to take appropriate measures to prevent further acts in disregard of the solemn pledge given by it to the Government of the United States.

As former Ambassador William Bullitt so ably pointed out in his book, The Great Globe Itself:

Stalin paid no attention to this protest, refused to honor the pledge he had given to President Roosevelt, and continued to direct both the Soviet Government and the Comintern—including the American Communist Party.

It would seem to me that the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Nevada will help the Kremlin in keeping its solemn pledge by promptly throwing out of our country any alien who engages in activities inimical to the interest of the United States of America.

For that reason, Mr. President, I shall support the main purposes of this proposed enactment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there can be little doubt that those who would destroy our institutions come to America on visas, but that is no reason why we should stop all immigration. The fault lies, not with those who come here to make the United States their home because they choose to live in the United States, and are no longer satisfied with life in other nations and under other governments, but with those who come here only temporarily, later to return to other countries, and who are here for the purpose of trying to destroy America. It is those about whom we should speak.

Mr. President, those who come to our country to spread propaganda here are becoming bolder than they have been in the past. Not so many days ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a pamphlet which was sent to the young people at the University of Michigan. That was one of the first times that a pamphlet of propaganda for the Communist Party was signed with the name of the Communist Party.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that those who are disseminating such propaganda do so in an attempt to create confusion in the United States; in fact, they are determined to bring about confusion in such a way and to such an extent that there can be no doubt about its existence.

On March 8 of this year, I introduced Senate bill 1196, a measure to protect the United States of America against un-American and subversive activities. The purpose of that bill is to require the registration of those who would destroy America and thus to bring them out into the open. The bill provides for a board to register the political activity committees which are subversive in nature and which seek to destroy the United States, and also to register Communist-front organizations. If that is accomplished, there will be afforded a means of doing exactly what is provided by the bill which has been introduced today by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

I should like to join the Senator from Nevada in his statement that foreign-born citizens, who constitute a large proportion of the industrial workers of the United States, have been loyal and have always been willing to contribute their labors and their lives in the defense of their adopted country. But we are dealing with a new philosophy which employs the method of external alien infiltration. Communist agents have attempted to sever the loyalty to the United States of some of our citizens and to trade upon their natural desire to help their less fortunate families and friends who still reside in foreign countries. Alien Communist agents have been especially active in the propaganda field, and a number of Communist foreign-language newspapers have been successfully established and maintained for years in the United States and in other nations outside of Russia and her satellite countries.

Mr. President, in this connection it is significant to recall that the editors and staffs of such Communist newspapers have frequently been aliens imported into the United States for that specific purpose. Today those newspapers are not listed as Communist newspapers; they purport merely to be catering to foreign-born people in the United States, but actually they are disseminating communistic propaganda among our foreign-born citizens or residents, who read those newspapers innocently without being aware that they are edited and contributed to by Communist-front groups or Communist agents.

That fact is significant because it indicates clearly, in one aspect at least the modus operandi of these subversive forces. The great majority of those who, as immigrants, come to this country do not support Communist enterprises and will not lend themselves to the job such enterprises are attempting to do, provided they are informed. I think that is why we must be able to place out in the open those who are spreading Communist propaganda in the United States.

There is no question in my mind that it is the obligation of the Government to take every possible step to rid the country of aliens whose purpose and goal and intention it is to destroy our freedoms by force or by violence. We have always been, and we are today, a generous and hospitable Nation. The loyal foreign-born Americans—and I refer particularly to those in my own State—have more than justified the welcome and cordial reception which the United States has extended to people of less fortunate countries; but it is essential that we provide adequate protection against aliens who would come here, not to help us build a finer and greater and more prosperous America, but to destroy it.

I think the time has come when we must take action. Oh, yes; a prosecution is under way in New York against those who are charged as heads of the Communist Party with activities which would destroy America by force and violence. I understand from the press today that there has been started in the District of Columbia, the Capital City of the Nation, the trial of a person charged with taking information from the files of the Government with the intention of giving it to one who would transmit it to a nation that would use it to the injury of the United States.

We read today in the press of America that there are those who come here upon diplomatic visas for the express purpose of obtaining information which will be of assistance to the countries from which they come. Not long ago I had occasion to look into a matter dealing with persons who come here upon visas—yes, persons who came here, let us say, under the advice and counsel of the State Department—in order that they might go to the great State of Michigan and there work in factories and with machinery of a kind which, when developed in Russia, could be used later against the United States of America. They came here upon visas, I say, diplomatic visas. They were permitted to go to the State of Michigan, and into the city of Buchanan, to work in a factory, in order that they might learn all about America's industry, so far as that particular company was concerned, and later to return to their native land and there employ their knowledge.

But, Mr. President, if an American citizen desired to go to Russia to obtain the same kind of information, he would not be able to get a visa. When only a few weeks ago, persons came from abroad to attend a peace conference in New York City, they came upon visas. But, in August 1947, when applications were made by Senators of the United States to go to Russia to visit the American Embassy, visas were refused. So I say the time has come in America when we must have reciprocity in the granting of visas. When foreign governments will not allow Americans to enter or travel in their countries, the time has come when we should prohibit travel visas to their nationals under similar circumstances.

The time has come, Mr. President, when these important problems should be dealt with by the Congress, in order that we may protect the institutions and the freedoms of America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

During the delivery of Mr. EASTLAND's speech,

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi will yield long enough to enable me to make clear the parliamentary situation, so that Senators may know what the program is to be for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield for this purpose without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. After the pending bill, S. 1411, is concluded, we will take up the companion bill, S. 246. The acting majority leader, who is not present at the moment, asked whether it would be agreeable temporarily to lay aside the pending bill in order that an appropriation bill might be considered, at the instance of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. In the meantime, several Senators are anticipating taking the floor to discuss the question which the Senator from Mississippi is now discussing. If the Senate may have some understanding about when it is planned to recess and what is to be done today, I know it would be very much to the convenience of all Senators concerned.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was my hope that, immediately after the Senator from Mississippi concluded his address, I might ask the Senate to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and consider the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and Federal Security (H. R. 3333). There is very little controversial matter in connection with it, and I know if Senators would remain here for a brief moment we could pass and at least get out of the way that appropriation bill. It was reported unanimously by the full committee. There was a little controversy on one particular item, on which differences of opinion were outlined by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and other members of the committee, but we have agreed on an amendment which the Senator has in mind, and I am sure there will be no controversy if we can proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in view of the inquiry as to the parliamentary situation and what is to be done later on today, I should like to state that if the appropriation bill to which the Senator from New Mexico has referred shall be brought up, I shall feel it my duty to suggest the absence of a quorum. The bill is one of great importance and involves a very large amount of money. I think it would be well to inform the Senate to that effect.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall not object to laying aside the unfinished business for the consideration of the appropriation bill, but I do not wish to have it displaced for a great length of time. I should like to know when we can hope to return to the consideration of the pending bill, and whether we must remain tonight in order to do so.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in view of the announcement, it occurs to me that after the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has completed his statement, we might temporarily lay aside the unfinished business to take up the appropriation bill, which I understand is not controversial. There may be an item which will require considerable discussion, but I am informed that we should be able to pass it in a reasonably brief period of time.

So I announce to the Senate that after the Senator from Mississippi has completed his remarks, we might temporarily lay aside the unfinished business to take up the appropriation bill, and then return to the bill which is presently under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the Senator from Pennsylvania was making a request. I understood he was making an announcement.

Mr. MYERS. It was only an announcement. I may say, further, that in view of the suggestion of a quorum call, I think it would be better, after the Senator from Mississippi has concluded his remarks, and after the order of business has been worked out as I have suggested, for the Senate to take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan would like to be heard upon the matter now being discussed, after the Senator from Mississippi has concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I have no objection to that. I did not intend to move a recess

until the Senator had had such an opportunity.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, two other Senators desire to speak on the same subject. I ask unanimous consent that this colloquy be placed in the RECORD following the last speech on the subject of espionage.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator mean the last speech that shall be made on the subject this afternoon?

Mr. EASTLAND. There are two short speeches to be made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the colloquy would necessarily have to be printed in the RECORD today.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, I mean today; but it can be placed in the RECORD today following the last speech made on this subject.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF CHARLES CHAPLIN

After the conclusion of the speeches of Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. FERGUSON,

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in connection with the bill presented by the Senator from Nevada, I should like to point out that the Communist so-called "peace offensive" which has manifested itself in a congress at New York and another at Paris shows that a large number of alien Communists and sympathizers have been involved.

I have in mind, in particular, a man who has every reason to appreciate the United States, who has every reason to show gratitude to this country of ours. He has made a fortune in this land of free enterprise, he has risen to the top of his profession.

I have reference to one Charles Chaplin, who has lived in the United States for many years without ever bothering to become a citizen. What a sad contrast there is between his conduct and the conduct of the tens of thousands of other foreign-born persons who, out of understanding and gratefulness for the benefits offered by America, have made the securing of citizenship their first and continuing order of business. As a matter of fact, Chaplin, who is a supporter of the Communist peace congresses, has a record of Communist-front affiliations equal to very few of the highest ranking Communists in the country. He has gone on record repeatedly as professing a much greater appreciation of communism and of the Soviet Union than he has ever seen fit to show for the country which has sheltered and fed him during most of his adult life. It seems to me that the point of hospitality is stretched to the breaking point with such a person, and I have frequently wondered why steps have not been taken to deport him as an advocate of an ideology which is contrary to the precepts of freedom upon which our Republic is founded. Certainly under the bill presented by the Senator from Nevada there would be little question but that the Attorney General would be required to take Chaplin, or any person with a similar record, and deport him from the country.

In order, Mr. President, to give you a picture of the types of organizations with which Chaplin has been connected, I should like to list the names of a few of the more obvious Communist fronts to which he has given aid and comfort.

On November 14, 1942, Pravda, the official organ of the Soviet Communist Party published a telegram of congratulations from "Charlie" Chaplin.

The Daily Worker of June 16, 1947, reports that "Charlie" Chaplin signed a protest on behalf of Eugene Dennis and Leon Josephson, two Communists convicted of contempt of Congress.

On June 4, 1947, Chaplin signed a statement on behalf of Gerhart Eisler, notorious Comintern agent in this country, who is now under indictment for contempt of Congress. The Daily Worker, of May 15, very aptly stated that Chaplin was a friend of Eisler's.

The Worker of September 19, 1948, reports that Chaplin received the praises of Ilya Ehrenburg, one of the most notorious Soviet propagandists.

According to the Washington Post of December 10, 1947, Chaplin wrote a letter to Pablo Picasso, French Communist painter, on behalf of Hans Eisler, a deported Communist agent.

Chaplin was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which is listed as a Communist front by the Attorney General of the United States, by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Chaplin was a sponsor of the People's Radio Foundation, which is a Communist-front organization attempting to infiltrate the radio industry. It is cited as a Communist subversive organization by both the Attorney General of the United States and the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Chaplin has been a contributor to the magazine New Masses, an official organ of the Communist Party, which fortunately is now defunct.

Chaplin was a speaker on the Artists' Front to Win the War, a Communist-front organization, cited as such by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Chaplin was a generous contributor to the Wallace campaign last year, along with other equally notorious Communists and fellow travelers.

Mr. President, this is merely a perfunctory review of the subversive activities of "Charlie" Chaplin. If I were to present his entire record it would consume many pages of testimony and many hours of research. It is my hope that the Senate Immigration Subcommittee will look into this situation and decide whether or not the American people are required to harbor and support persons who seemingly would much rather be in Soviet Russia.

Mr. President, a tightening up of our laws concerning the entry and deportation of subversive aliens is of particular interest to the people of the west coast. Because of our strategic position and our vulnerability in the event of another world conflict, we have been plagued with an abnormal amount of Communist activity. The alien agents of the Kremlin have made the west coast a center of activity. I cannot fail to concur with the Senator from Nevada, that Communist agitation is sponsored, and supported, and directed directly from Moscow. It is evident on the basis of the situation on the west coast that a substantial proportion of the Communists are aliens or of alien origin.

The west coast has been invaded by many Communist agents, particularly those trying to subvert the foreign-born population. This is of great significance because the crews of fishing and cargo vessels plying west coast waters are often of foreign origin. These vessels operate in the strategic approaches to our Pacific shores, and would be of considerable interest—Mr. President, every Senator should think about this—to any power with which we might be engaged in war—cold or shooting. If my memory serves me correctly, Peter Grigorov, the former Communist editor and agent in Detroit, was active on the west coast. Anthony Gerlach, a Communist organizer of Yugoslav origin, has also been working among the people of the west coast. There have been many others, and unless we have adequate legislation to throw them out of our country, we will certainly endanger one of the vital areas of national defense.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be judge of the Tax Court of the United States, for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Paul C. Herring, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska, vice James H. Patterson, term expired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Boyce A. Williams, of Leesburg, Fla., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla., in place of Allis J. Angle.

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Ardell B. Colyar.

Senior dental surgeons to be dental directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Frederick W. Harper	Pendleton J. Slaughter
Hubert H. Martin	H. Trendley Dean
David Cooper	Allen M. Perkins

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a Presidential designation as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

IN THE COAST GUARD RESERVE

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the United States Coast Guard, dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with prescribed regulations:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Charles J. Hanks
Neale O. Westfall

To be ensign

Frank J. Fegan

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Byron B. Harlan to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1948.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be medical directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Winfield K. Sharp, Jr.	William H. Sebrell, Jr.
Fred T. Foard	Homer L. Skinner
Estella F. Warner	Alonzo F. Brand
Lucius F. Badger	James A. Crabtree
Edwin H. Carnes	William W. Nesbit
Franklin J. Halpin	Joseph F. Van Ackeren
Gregory J. Van Beeck	John R. Murdock
Erval R. Coffey	Anthony P. Rubino
Fletcher C. Stewart	Frank S. Fellows
Adolph S. Rumreich	Ralph B. Snavely
Alfred J. Aselmeyer	Richard B. Holt
Raymond A. Vonderlehr	Edgar W. Norris
	Charles Ferguson
Bengt L. K. Hamilton	Kenneth R. Nelson
Jack Masur	William F. Ossenfort
Paul H. Stevenson	Vane M. Hoge
Maurice A. Roe	Frank F. Thweatt, Jr.
Percival E. Faed	Lee C. Watkins
Oswald F. Hedley	Paul A. Neal
Joseph O. Dean	Gilbert L. Dunnahoo
Ivan W. Steele	A. William Reggio

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Katherine M. Herrold	Leroy E. Duncan, Jr.
Henry H. D. Sterrett, Jr.	Luther M. Mace
	Clifford H. Jope
David R. Hawkins	Richmond T. Prehn
John Bareta	Arnold W. Pratt
Fred W. Love	Andrew W. Para
Walter S. Dietrich	Frederick S. Layton
Noah L. Krall	Gregory S. Slater
William J. Zukel	Paul C. Wetzig
Carl G. Baker	

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

John R. Hartmann	Ed G. Hopkins, Jr.
Herman H. Gray	David Carson
Roger S. Waterman	Wallace R. Johnson
Charles A. Jarvis	Julian J. Platt

To be senior sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Clarence C. Ruchhoft

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Robert R. Harris

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Evelyn Rahm

To be senior sanitary engineer to be sanitary engineer director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

John J. Bloomfield

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

James A. Shannon

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Emlen J. Bell

To be assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Arthur S. Keats

To be senior scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Mayhew Derryberry

To be pharmacists to be senior pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Raymond D. Kinsey	George F. Archambault
Thomas C. Armstrong	
Thomas A. Foster	George B. Hutchison

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Carl L. Anderson
Ruth Sumner

To be assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

John M. Vogel

To be senior scientists to be scientist director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Willard H. Wright
Floyd S. Daft
Justin M. Andrews

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1949

Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 56, the House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that after the loneliness of Gethsemane and the tragedy of Calvary, there is the glorious promise of the life to come. He who rolled the stone away has sealed this eternal hope in the human breast.

Our Father, as we assemble today we are impressed with the uncertainties of life, and the absorbing importance of working while the day lasts, lest our call cometh at an hour we know not. We are reminded of one of our Members, so brave and strong in the defense of his country, yet was cut down before his task seemed finished. His clean, heroic life cannot die, but lives to bless others who are to follow on.

As we face our duties, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, and Thine shall be the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 14, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 14, 1949:

H. R. 3856. An act to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.

On April 15, 1949:

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; and

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On April 16, 1949:

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor.

On April 18, 1949:

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1113. An act for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren,

copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; and

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland.

On April 19, 1949:

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of Laura Spinnichia;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1579. An act to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents;

H. R. 1757. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; and

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled, "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein.

On April 20, 1949:

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 2708. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.; and

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

On April 21, 1949:

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif:

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy; and

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

On April 22, 1949:

H. R. 595. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States.

On April 23, 1949:

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 111):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR., late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee to be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives, when it reconvenes on the 25th instant, and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. MYERS and Mr. MARTIN members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1070. An act to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 164. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, Calif.; and

H. R. 1579. An act to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on April 14, 1949, he did on April 15, 1949, sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H. R. 164. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, Calif.; and

H. R. 1579. An act to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 59)

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

(For message of the President, see pp. 4936–4938 of the Senate proceedings of April 22, 1949.)

DISTRICT COURT FOR THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 162)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill H. R. 581 "to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska.

The bill confers jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, or any of them, all of Anchorage, Alaska, for any losses and damages sustained by them in the mink-ranch business conducted by them at Anchorage, Alaska, arising out of air flights or maneuvers of the United States armed forces or by virtue of any acts of officers, agents, or employees of the United States in connection with the operation of military aircraft or the establishment or maintenance of military posts or bases in Alaska.

It appears that claimants conducted mink farms in Anchorage, Alaska, and that during the period between the middle of May and the middle of June 1941 518 young mink were born, which are commonly called kittens. It was apparently a common custom among mink farmers to guard breeders carefully against any noise or disturbance, since such noise tends to frighten them and cause them to become excited and destroy their young. It appears to be claimants' contention that during the maneuvers of Army planes in and about Anchorage they were flown at low altitudes directly over claimants' property daily. As a result, it is alleged, the breeders destroyed 452 of the kittens, leaving claimants only 66 of the original 518. Claimants subsequently disposed of their mink farms, and, according to statements submitted by them, the total amount of loss suffered as a result of such disposition was $32,000, including losses of prospective profits.

While this legislation was passed by the Congress in the belief that the bill would not do anything more than simply accord the claimants their day in court (S. Rept. 173, 81st Cong.), there is a strong possibility that in its present form it would accomplish more than this and operate to preclude the Government from interposing any defense upon the substantive merits of the claims (*Stubbs* v. *United States* (86 C. Cls. 152)).

I would be glad to give my approval to a bill in such form as would waive the statute of limitations and the Government's immunity from suit, so that these claimants may have a forum in which to present their claims, and which would accord to the United States the opportunity to interpose such defenses as may be available to it.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1949.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and, without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

SYLVIA M. MISETICH—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 164)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 572, a bill for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich.

The bill would direct the payment of $5,000 to Sylvia M. Misetich, of Portland, Oreg., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of infection from a vaccination for smallpox administered to her pursuant to orders of her supervisor at the Portland subport of embarkation, Portland, Oreg., on January 10, 1944.

It appears from the records of the Government and from the House and Senate reports that Miss Misetich was vaccinated on January 10, 1944, while employed as telephone operator by the former War Department, as the result of vaccination administered pursuant to an official directive by military personnel at the dispensary of the port of embarkation. The vaccination became infected and as a consequence Miss Misetich lost time from work and incurred medical and other expenses for which she has thus far not been compensated.

On April 4, 1946, Miss Misetich filed a claim with the War Department under the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372, 31 U. S. C., 1946 ed., p. 223b), in the amount of $2,415.50 on account of the medical and hospital expenses incurred and loss of earnings sustained by her as the result of the infection. The claim was disapproved by the War Department on May 21, 1946, because the act of July 3, 1943, does not apply to claims of civilian employees of that Department or of the Army for injuries incurred "incident to their service."

On January 3, 1949, Miss Misetich filed a claim for compensation with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742, U. S. C., title 5, ch. 15, sec. 751, et seq.), alleging that her injury was sustained in the performance of her duties. It appears, however, that neither notice of her injury nor claim for compensation was filed by Miss Misetich within 1 year as required by law, but she submitted to the Bureau certain evidence in explanation of her failure to give such notice and to file a timely claim. The Director of the Bureau has now found that evidence to be sufficient to enable him to apply in her favor the provision of Public Law 161, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, approved July 28, 1945, permitting a waiver of noncompliance with the statutory time limits for the giving of notice and the filing of claim. Accordingly, he has ordered that the claim be adjudicated upon its merits.

If the claim now pending before the Bureau of Employees' Compensation should be decided in her favor, upon its merits, Miss Misetich would be entitled under the law to compensation for any period for which she may be able to show compensable loss of wage-earning capacity and she would also be entitled to reimbursement for reasonable medical expenses properly incurred by her as the result of her injuries, as well as any expense incident to obtaining such medical treatment.

Inasmuch as Congress has provided a regular and orderly procedure by general law for compensating civil employees of the United States injured in the performance of their duties, I believe it to be a sound principle to require such employees to pursue their remedies under such general law, which is applicable to all alike, rather than to permit them to obtain such relief by special legislation, which is in its nature discriminatory. It would seem, from the reports of the congressional committees which considered the present bill, that the committees, and the Congress, were unaware that a claim under the Compensation Act had been filed by Miss Misetich, and that they were under the impression that the provision authorizing a waiver of noncompliance with the regular time limitations of the statute could no longer be invoked. The ground for awarding relief by special law was that the War Department, having rejected her claim because filed under an inapplicable statute, was derelict in not bringing the proper remedy to her attention. It appears, however, that if there was a failure in that regard, Miss Misetich was not injured thereby since she did eventually become aware of her remedy under the Compensation Act and the Director has decided to waive noncompliance with the time limits.

In view of all the circumstances, I feel constrained to return the bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 19, 1949.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

MAMIE L. HURLEY—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 163)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 594, a bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley.

The bill would direct the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Federal Security Agency to receive and decide on its merits, without regard to the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as to notice of injury and time for filing of claim, the claim of Mamie L. Hurley for compensation under that act on account of the death of her husband who died on March 21, 1945, allegedly from injuries said to have been received in August 1940 in the performance of his duty as a Federal employee.

The accident alleged to have occurred in August 1940 was not reported to the Veterans' Administration at which the decedent was employed or to the former United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and no notice of injury was ever given or claim filed by the employee under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. On March 12, 1946, his widow, Mrs. Hurley, filed a timely claim for death benefits. In view of the fact, however, that the employee had failed to give written notice of the injury within 1 year after its occurrence, as was at that time thought to be required by the provisions of sections 15 and 17 of the Compensation Act (5 U. S. C. 1946 ed., secs. 765, 767), the Bureau deemed itself without authority to consider the merits of the claim and accordingly rejected the claim on February 13, 1947, on that ground.

Section 15 of the Compensation Act provides that "Every employee injured in the performance of his duty, or someone on his behalf, shall, within 48 hours after the injury, give written notice thereof to the immediate superior of the employee." Section 16 prescribes the contents of such notice, and section 17 provides that in the absence of such notice within the time specified no compensation shall be allowed, unless the immediate superior has actual knowledge of the injury, except that compensation may be allowed if the notice is filed 1 year after the injury.

Subsequent to the rejection of the claim on the ground indicated, the Bureau has had occasion to reconsider the interpretation of the statutory requirement, which was based on rulings of the former United States Employees' Compensation Commission whose functions are now vested in the Federal Security Agency. Upon such reconsideration, the Director of the Bureau concluded that the requirement of notice of injury does not apply to a widow's claim for compensation on account of her husband's death. The Director, therefore, decided to review his former determination in this case under section 37 of the act and, upon such review, reopened the case, considered the claim on its merits, and denied the claim on the ground that the evidence did not establish entitlement of the claimant to compensation.

It appears, therefore, that the purpose of the present bill has been accomplished. The Bureau has received the claim as properly filed, has held that the notice-of-injury requirement does not apply, and, upon consideration of the claim, has made findings of fact and a decision on the merits. In view of these facts I am returning the bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1949.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed

There was no objection.

R. C. OWEN, R. C. OWEN, JR., AND ROY OWEN—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 161)

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen.

The bill provides for payment of the sum of $8,437.98, to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners doing business as R. C. Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., which sum represents the amount they paid to the United States for internal revenue tobacco stamps, which stamps were completely destroyed on December 24, 1945, when a fire destroyed claimants' factory, together with the equipment, tobacco, and tobacco stamps therein.

It appears that claimants' firm was a dealer in leaf tobacco and also a manufacturer of certain tobacco products in Gallatin, Tenn. On the night of December 24, 1945, one of the buildings belonging to the firm, part of which was used as a factory and part as a warehouse, was destroyed by fire. According to affidavits submitted by R. C. Owen, Jr., as a member of the firm, the chief of police, and the assistant chief of the fire department, the building, including its contents, was a complete loss. The firm filed a claim with the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the value of the tobacco stamps allegedly on hand in the factory at the time of the fire and therefore destroyed by it, but this claim was disapproved by that Bureau on the ground that under existing law refund could be made only where the stamps were submitted to the Bureau in a recognizable condition or were destroyed under the supervision of a deputy collector.

A person who loses currency through destruction by fire may recover such loss only to the extent that such currency can be submitted in a recognizable form for replacement. Such rule is necessary to protect the Government against fraudulent claims. A similar situation prevails with regard to postage stamps. The Government does not assume the obligation of an insurer at the time of selling internal-revenue stamps to a taxpayer for subsequent use in payment of a particular excise tax. Enactment of the bill would grant relief to this firm which is not granted to other persons similarly situated, and such special treatment would be discriminatory against taxpayers generally.

The regulations which prohibit refunds in cases of this type were promulgated with the view to preventing frauds upon the Government. The situation of claimant firm is not different from that of a number of other persons who have been refused refunds because of their inability to comply with the regulations pertaining to such refunds. The Government cannot make refund in the absence of satisfactory proof that the stamps in question were actually destroyed.

Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1949.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1070. An act to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 15, 1949:

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On April 18, 1949:

H. R. 164. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California; and

H. R. 1579. An act to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. COX (at the request of Mr. VINSON), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

THE LATE ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, when the news of the untimely death of our colleague, ROBERT COFFEY, came to us it came as a distinct shock, particularly to those of us who knew BOB COFFEY and knew him well.

I do not suppose there was another hero of this war who had a better or a more spectacular record than did Colonel COFFEY. He was engaged in 97 combat missions over the enemy lines. On two occasions he was shot down. He received the Distinguished Flying Cross 3 times and was decorated over 30 times for bravery.

That a man so young, so conscientious, so sincerely interested in the welfare of his country, should be taken from us at an early age makes us wonder. When the judgment from which there is no appeal is made it is never questioned, but we sometimes wonder why it has to be a particular individual.

During the course of his service in the House of Representatives Congressman COFFEY gave every indication of having the ability, the integrity, and the love of country so necessary to become a great statesman. He was a great war hero. He proved himself to be a diplomat of unusual attainments during the course of his service in Chile. To him is credited much of the resistance of the Chilean Government to the Communist movement, which was gaining headway so rapidly while he was there.

After his determination that he could best serve his country in the Halls of Congress, Congressman COFFEY did not lose his interest in aviation. It is a very significant thing that he met his death while engaged in maneuvers designed to determine what the "bugs" were in the type plane he was flying, imperfections which had caused the death under similar circumstances of other men. He died as much in the service of his country in this cold war as he would have had he met his untimely end during the period of his fighting on foreign soil. All of us have suffered a great loss. The State of Pennsylvania has suffered a great loss because Colonel COFFEY was rendering great service to our State. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to that brave little wife of his and to those babies who will never now the kind hand of a great man.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished dean of the Pennsylvania delegation, Mr. WALTER.

It has brought sorrow to the hearts of all of us to see the sudden passing from our midst of so young a man; one who had such a brilliant record in the war and who bore such promise of great accomplishments in the field of government and statesmanship.

ROBERT COFFEY was an energetic man; he was a man always solicitous and inquiring; always seeking from others who had more years of experience in Congress than he, the ways in which he best could serve his constituency at home and his brother Members in the Halls of Congress. He was assiduous in his attention to his duties; always eager to do his work well. He was a very companionable sort and in the few short months he served in these Halls, he already had earned the respect and the affection of the Members. It is my opinion that he would have become one of the leading statesmen of the country. In times such as these we can ill afford to lose men of the character, experience, and accomplishments such as were possessed by Colonel COFFEY, and we are indeed saddened at his departure. To his bereaved widow and her two tiny children, to his mother and father, and to his brother goes our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, when I received the message of the passing of our colleague, Colonel COFFEY, it was a great shock because I had come to know him quite well some time before he entered the Congress. His district and my district adjoined, and there were many occasions when we met on a friendly basis and discussed the problems of the day. I was particularly impressed by his conscientious spirit and his extreme desire to be of service to our Nation. His one great purpose in coming to the Congress after leaving the military service was to be of aid and assistance in the Government of the United States. He so expressed himself to me frequently. I cannot forget and I shall never forget when, on Thursday after this body had adjourned, he dropped into my office for a chat and discussed the problems confronting the Congress. He told me of his plans. He told me that he intended to use the Easter recess to put in some flying hours as a Reserve officer. He also told me of his plan to go to the Pacific coast and do some jet flying. We chatted quite a bit about that. The next thing I heard about BOB COFFEY was that he had met his untimely death in New Mexico. It was an extreme shock to me because I had come to admire him and hold him in high esteem. I know his family. They are most respected in the community in which they live. The people in his district learned to know him and love him because he was honest, sincere, and conscientious.

Indeed, this country and this body lost a distinguished servant. It lost a man of particular attainments in his chosen field. He would have done a great deal of good in this body, due to his experience in the service, as outlined by our distinguished colleague, Mr. WALTER.

I wish to extend to his family my sincere sympathy. There is not much that one can say in times like this. We are all quite helpless. The very least we can do, and even the most we can do, is to sympathize with the bereaved family.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the thought struck me in attending the memorial service on Friday in the city of Johnstown, Pa., wherein the friends and family of our collegaue assembled in the Memorial Baptist Church that here was a young life snuffed out too early because of his firm belief in the ideas and ideals of his country. Not only in action but in thought and in deed did BOB COFFEY believe in the supremacy of the air power, and that through the medium of its defensive qualities and aggressive ability we might as a Nation and as a leader of the nations of the world, by being alert to this supremacy, be able to maintain the future peace of the world and the world's civilization.

In the less than a year that I had known our colleague those were his thoughts as he conveyed them to me in conversation. He lived them; he believed in them; and he died for those ideals.

He was one of three boys of parents from the State of Tennessee, who moved to Pennsylvania. His younger brother paid with his life in the late war, and BOB with his in trying to be of service in perfecting the air instrument. To his mother and dad who have given a lot to their country and at a very precious price, to his young wife and to his children who survive him, may his name be a symbol of what young America, in its endeavor, means to the world and to the peace of the world. Alert, alive, and ever ready to pay its price so that our way of life may endure and at all times be a living symbol.

Not just peace in our times—but peace and freedom for all peoples for all times.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, a week ago Thursday, when the Members departed to go to their several homes, our hearts were overflowing with the recollection that the day following marked the passing of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and that then on the following Sunday, out of the agony of Gethsemane, and out of the tribulations and trials of life, that He should rise from the tomb and ascend unto His Father.

It so happened to be my privilege that on Thursday I was seated in the dining room when the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Colonel COFFEY, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WAGNER], came down and sat beside me. There, in the flow of language, soul to soul, there was a revelation of this young man as he told me of his plans and his desire to help strengthen the defenses of America. He was a true patriot—young, handsome, courageous, filled with the thought of his country and its deeds; utterly unselfish, very modest, very diffident, rarely speaking of his own record. But beneath it all was that sublime aspiration to live and be a true American.

I cannot tell you the shock that came to me. I was a patient undergoing an operation myself, and I could scarcely realize that within 1 week this brave young man had laid down his all, his life, on the altar of his country. I am sure that every heart, every Member, is thinking in terms of the sacrifice that he made. He has left us all a marvelous heritage.

May God bless his family. And in this hour of tribulation and sorrow may they be comforted and consoled by the realization that underneath them are the everlasting arms; that as their days are, so shall their strength be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to use these moments to say a word about BOB COFFEY, whom I think I have known perhaps, with the exception of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] much longer than the other Members of the House. I first met Col. BOB COFFEY when he was the handsome, dashing, and distinguished Air Force attaché of the Embassy of the United States in Santiago, Chile. My colleagues in the past few moments have said gracious, and gentle, and fine things of Bob; but let me assure you that Colonel COFFEY loved life. Bob did not want to die then, or today, or tomorrow. He was handsome, "a mirror of fashion, the mold of form," yet a skilled and brilliant fighter pilot—oh, not one of the kind that in the musical plays did it "without hands"; no; he was a student of aerial dynamics, a student of the game. He had been through the mill and he knew other things had to be done for the generation of fighter pilots now in service and yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first breach in the Pennsylvania delegation on the third floor of the Old House Office Building. We are a clannish crowd, the Pennsylvania Democratic delegation. We are very proud of each other. We work very, very, closely together. BOB COFFEY'S office was right next to mine and right across the hall was the distinguished dean of the Pennsylvania delegation, the Hon. FRANCIS WALTER, where he could keep his eye on the several of us in that corridor. Day after day in the past three or four months we would gather in my office or in that of Congressman WALTER and there settle great and momentous problems of state. I remember that in the first weeks of this session Bob wanted very much to be on the Committee on the Armed Services; he felt that he could bring to that committee all of his experiences. He was a "red-hot" pilot and a "red-hot" Congressman. But it was pointed out to him that in accordance with the great and beloved traditions of this honorable and distinguished body, one had to be a good soldier, one had to take one's place in line, and one had to bow to seniority and bide one's time.

We said to him, "It will not be long, Bob; you will be on there next term."

Well, Bob will never serve on the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives. It is our loss and the loss of the Nation.

Some people say that they do not care whether they are Members of this House or not; some say, "Maybe I will not run this year, it was not my idea anyhow"; but not COFFEY. He loved every minute of the few—sadly few—weeks and months that he was with us as a Member. Let me assure you again, Mr. Speaker, every minute he loved.

It so happened, as several of my colleagues have reminisced in this eulogy, that Bob and I had dinner the night before he left on recess because I was leaving by plane the next morning at 9 o'clock for Cuba. He took the pains to bring to me a little present of greeting that he wanted me to deliver to a husband and wife who had served with him in Chile, Commander Hal Thompson and his lovely wife, Julie, a gracious Chilean lady. It was on Thursday in Habana at the American Chancellery offices that the American ambassador brought to me BOB COFFEY'S friend and said, "This is the fabulous friend of your fabulous friend."

So today for the few of us who had the chance to enjoy the intimacy and the humor and the friendship of BOB COFFEY, I am privileged to add these few words. Progress and a jet pilot are

words that in themselves are synonymous. I said to COFFEY time and time again: "Bob, you are no boy any more. Why not stop fooling around with those things? You will kill yourself some day. Jet fighters are for kids." He said, "Look, FLOOD, there are bugs in those things. I am going to find out where they are."

He did and he died.

"Better love hath no man—."

Mr. Speaker, I have lost a good, good friend, not a gentleman by an act of Congress or as an officer of the Air Force, but a born gentleman, a great soldier, ah, let me assure you, a wonderful father, a loving husband.

> He is not dead,
> As we that are left shall die,
> Age shall not weary him,
> Nor the years condemn,
> At the going down of the sun,
> And in the morning,
> We shall remember him.

My heart breaks to think of his lovely and gracious wife—his children. But how proud these young ones can be—a noble heritage, a hero father, a great name—he will come to them out of the east on the wings of morning—until the day when they join him in "the wild blue yonder."

I am sad today at his passing. May God have mercy on his soul.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, when I said goodby to BOB COFFEY on the last day of the session before the Easter vacation, little did I think that I would be standing in the well of this House today paying tribute to his memory. I feel a little sense of guilt, because on that day I asked him if he would not come up to Pittsburgh to attend a meeting of the Pennsylvania Democratic Committee. I have felt since then that had I used a little greater power of persuasion, he might still be with us today. Few people in this House realize that BOB COFFEY made a sacrifice when he ran for and was elected to Congress, because BOB COFFEY was already established, and could look forward to a great and distinguished military career. This morning I had breakfast with a major of the United States Army who told me that in BOB COFFEY's death the Air Force suffered a terrific loss. He told me that a few men in the United States had the wide and extensive knowledge that Bob had accumulated in his experience as a pilot. Just think of it. A man 30 years of age. Why, that man had lived three ordinary lives. In his twenties he was shot down over enemy territory. Avoiding capture, he joined the underground forces in France and fought alongside of those valiant heroes for a long time.

Our hearts go out to his beautiful and brave wife, to his two children, and to his devoted parents. But, we have this heartening thought that in their grief perhaps there may be some amelioration when they realize the high esteem in which this great and courageous man was held by his colleagues. Our country has suffered a great loss at a time that it can ill afford to suffer that loss. The military forces of our country have suffered a loss, as has the Congress of the United States, because BOB COFFEY, just as he was a natural-born soldier, looked to me to be a natural-born statesman. He was a man surrounded by drama, by romance. He looked like a legendary figure in his uniform. He looked like he came out of a great romantic novel. So filled was he with love for his country and with the desire to serve his country that he lost his life, because he told me, just as my colleague, DAN FLOOD pointed out, that he was looking for the bugs in jet planes. He died a martyr to his country.

We have lost a great soldier. We have lost a man who had the potential to be a great statesman. We have lost a great American, a great friend.

May his soul rest in peace throughout eternity.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the tragic death of Representative BOB COFFEY I gave out a statement to the press in which I said that he was one of the outstanding new Members of the Eighty-first Congress. The more I think of it the more thoroughly am I convinced of that fact.

He was the best informed man on the subject of aviation, at least, in the Democratic cloakroom. He had the proper view that if this Nation was ever attacked our defense lay in the strongest air force on earth. He was assigned to the Air Force here in Washington, and if this Nation had been attacked, in 30 minutes at the outside, BOB COFFEY would have been in the air driving off those enemies that threatened to bring about our destruction.

I am probably more enthusiastic about the Air Force than the average man who has taken as few flights as I have.

Approximately 20 years ago, on this floor a man by the name of Frank Reed, from Illinois, who has now passed away, a Republican Member of the House, joined me in the defense of Gen. Billy Mitchell when he was being crucified by the brass hats in Washington, and the background was being laid, if you please, for the destruction of Pearl Harbor.

If General Mitchell had been properly treated and his advice had been followed, there would have been no Pearl Harbor disaster and we might have avoided World War II.

When young COFFEY came to Congress I had never heard of him, but I became well acquainted with him and we discussed this issue thoroughly. I am shocked at the stupid order wiping out segregation in the armed forces, and I realize the disastrous consequences it may bring. If they had consulted BOB COFFEY I dare say such an error would never have been made.

He was one of the most pleasant men I have ever known. As I said, I considered him one of the most valuable new Members of this Congress, and the one who knew more about the subject of aerial warfare than any other human being with whom I have discussed that issue in recent years. I am convinced, and he was convinced, that if we get into another war it will not be a war of artillery, it will not be a war of infantry, it will be a war of airplanes and atomic bombs.

There never was a time on earth when this country needed men like Mr. COFFEY in the Congress of the United States to help protect this Nation, not only against our enemies at home and abroad but against stupidity at home, such as I have just mentioned.

God bless his sacred memory. Our hearts go out to his bereaved wife and children. We will forever revere this noble patriot who gave his life for his country.

May his memory ever be an inspiration to all patriotic Americans, and when his immortal spirit lands on that distant shore may he greet the coming of another age of youth and usefulness in another radiant Easter beyond the gates of night.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal inadequacy that I undertake to speak a few words in memory of our recently departed colleague. I cannot lay claim to have known ROBERT COFFEY intimately. I met him only after he came to Congress. Nor can I lay claim to anticipating what his future might have been, or what he might have contributed to this great land of ours and to the world had he been permitted to remain with us. I cannot say that. But I attended the services in Johnstown, his home town, on Friday of last week, and there saw an outpouring of the citizenry of that town in sincere attestation of their belief in the young man and that for which he stood; a proof of their confidence in him for the future. By that expression of their deep sympathy and their horror, almost, at the thought that he who gave promise for so much in the future was gone, I know that he was a man. In the brief span of 30 years, he had done far more, in many respects, for his country, than any of us will ever do. At the time of his death, his star was in the ascendancy. What our country and our great State will lose by his passing will never be known. But let us, his colleagues, learn from him. Let us look forward to doing here in the House of Representatives that which we know he would have accomplished, had he been permitted to be with us.

I join all in the House of Representatives in expressing our sympathy to his parents, his widow, and his children. May God bless them and our country to which he contributed so much.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we often think that death is for old men. But death is for the young and the brave, too. Death is not always for strangers. It is often for our friends and our families. When we find a young man cut down at the peak of his powers, we often cannot grasp the implications at the moment.

As a member of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation I knew BOB COFFEY

in Congress as a Member who was true to his trust and faithful to his duty. I came to know him as a friend, because we had many mutual friends. Our offices were close together, and he represented my neighboring city of Johnstown, Pa.

I knew him not only as a hard-working individual, but as a quiet and unassuming man. He went about his duties in such a way as to show great promise. We Members of Congress knew him as a distinguished member of the Air Forces in the last World War. As a Republican Member, myself, I saw in his loyal opposition great promise, and I had great hopes that he would rise to be one of the leaders in this body in the future. We, who knew him and were his friends, will miss him. We ask that Heaven bless his family, his wife and his children, and keep his memory alive in the future.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my lot to come from a congressional district that adjoins the one from which our departed colleague, ROBERT L. COFFEY, Jr., was elected.

I first met him in the course of the primary that preceded his election last November.

During the course of both primary and election, it was not unusual for him to enter my district and for me to enter his district to speak in behalf of each other and the Democratic Party. The most vivid memories I have of him are distinct from those made by the able speeches he made for our common political success. They are the many occasions on which the time or the program of a political meeting was changed or altered in order that he might be with his adored wife and children in Puerto Rico, or with his beloved parents at Johnstown, or with his comrades of the Air Force Reserve in flights that were necessary for him to retain his commission of colonel. His devotion to wife, child, parent, friend, or country was neither artificial nor pretended. It was a devotion as true and constant as the rising and the setting of the sun. I saw it in my association with him here on the floor of this House. I saw it at the social functions that follow the life of a Congressman and his family here at this Capital City of our Nation. I saw it when his Shooting Star streaked across the skies with its destination at Puerto Rico, at Johnstown, at Albuquerque, or elsewhere. I saw it in the depth of his eye and the warmth of his hand when he met his fellow man in friendship and in brotherhood. I saw it in the many decorations that were pinned upon his youthful breast for gallantry in the services he so unselfishly gave in defense of the country that he loved so well. I saw it in the tear and bereavement of the adored wife, parent, child, and friend over his violent and sudden death. I see it now in that newly dug grave on Arlington Ridge where a grateful and understanding Nation has laid his mortal remains to rest among those of other heroes and defenders who, as he did, gave to the last full measure of devotion so that this Nation under God might endure and be the shibboleth of peace and freedom the world over for all men and women of good will.

Mr. Speaker, no art, no magic, and no words can gather up the remains of our departed colleague and give back to them their wonted warmth and flow of life. The cup was upturned 'ere it was filled to the brim, and our departed colleague, as the water spilt on the ground, cannot be gathered up again. But we, as the water yet unspilt and in the cup upright, can gather up an added sparkle unto the water for that our departed colleague, journeying this way, tarried a while and then moved on.

May the sympathy of this grateful and understanding Nation be some solace to his bereaved wife, children, parents, and kin.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that a man so young has had the opportunity to contribute so much to his country.

It was my privilege to become acquainted with BOB COFFEY when he came to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. As has been explained, that was not his first choice; but, being a good soldier, he not only accepted his place, but also fulfilled his responsibility on that committee with enthusiasm and with great intelligence. His contributions had already been recognized and his work appreciated. I wish to say briefly that although his time and his work in the Congress were short, his service to his country was great; his contribution was the greatest any man could give, because he gave his all.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Delegate from Puerto Rico.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in the name of the people of Puerto Rico concerning our good friend, BOB COFFEY. He spent some years with us in the little island of the Caribbean, serving in the armed forces, together with many Puerto Rican boys who came to feel that he was one of them. He married a distinguished Puerto Rican lady. Out of this marriage two little children were born.

When BOB COFFEY was elected a Member of Congress he came to Puerto Rico, he saw the leaders of the island, he met with the people. He told them all that while he had been elected by one of the districts in the great State of Pennsylvania, he was not only going to look after the interests of that district, and of his State, and of the Nation; but that in his big heart there was also a place for Puerto Rico, for which he felt he had special obligations, it being the land of birth of his beloved wife, and, of course, also a part of the United States.

The death of BOB COFFEY has caused a tremendous shock and deep sorrow in Puerto Rico. I express the feeling of the whole people there when I say that we have lost not only a great friend but we feel also that we have lost one of our own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I first met our late colleague in my native State several weeks before this Congress convened, and because of our early meeting I presume I got to know him as well as, if not better than, any of the new Members of our great body; and, as I learned to know him, I learned to have for him the same respect and admiration which has been expressed so beautifully today by those who knew him for a much longer period of time.

Mr. Speaker, as we attempt to fathom the mysteries of life and death, I presume we invariably try to find a reason for things that happen. As we look at the premature departure of this magnificent young American we can find, I believe, one commanding lesson in his life. His life, as short as it was, was a living refutation of those who would destroy our great country. Here was a young man born of poor, honest parents, who worked with his hands in coal mines, who came up in what we as Americans describe as the hard way. From a humble beginning he rose to a place of great honor and respect in our beloved country. He wore on his breast the highest decorations that our Nation could award. He received from his fellow citizens one of the greatest trusts that can be bestowed upon a man. So, here in his life, the life of one humbly born, is a living refutation of those who would destroy our way of life.

If there is a further lesson to be learned, as I see it, from the so early departure of our young friend, it would be that as long as our country can nurture men of the stature and of the vision and of the wisdom of Colonel COFFEY; as long as we can be preserved from the shackles of the minds of little men; as long as we can produce big men, broad men, brave men, our country is indeed safe.

I had the pleasure of knowing his lovely wife, and I join with you, my colleagues, in extending to her and to his parents our sympathy and our love. To his children go the greatest heritage that any person can receive, and that is a good, a brave, and a noble name.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to know Mr. COFFEY very intimately. I met him on the paddle ball court in our gymnasium. But I was impressed with his very congenial, likable personality. After I met him I went back to my office and decided I wanted to know more about him. So I looked in the Congressional Directory. When I read of his meteoric career in the Army Air Force, I was still more impressed. When I read of his career in civil life I was still more impressed.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years before his great career in the Air Forces it was my privilege to have a fraction of that kind of a career. He flew 97 missions. I flew 27 missions. Consequently I think I have a better understanding than most Members of the House of what that man went through. Ninety-seven times he flew over the enemy lines risking his life on behalf of our great country. Once he was brought down, but through the grace of God he survived. What impressed me

more than anything else about that experience was the fact that after he had been knocked down he could have submitted by becoming a prisoner of war and coasting out the war in a prison camp. But he fought his way out, he broke through the German lines and got back to the American forces to fight again.

Those of us who pioneered aerial warfare in the First World War have taken a paternal interest and pride in the accomplishment of the airmen in the recent World War. They measured up in every particular to the traditions and aspirations of the Air Forces. ROBERT L. COFFEY, Jr., was an exceptional specimen of those brave men. Every old airman was thrilled with the record this young flier made and with the thought that he was one of those who pioneered in the combat service in which Colonel COFFEY made his phenomenal record.

It certainly is tragic that a young man of this type has to be taken away from us. I sometimes wonder when these things happen, and God feels that he must take somebody from this Chamber, why he does not take some of us who are older in order that a young man like COFFEY, with a tremendous future ahead of him and with a great career and experience behind him, could remain. If we are to fashion the peace in the world, it is these young men, especially those that were forged in the crucible of conflict, that must forge the peace. They have an understanding of the necessity, the absolute necessity, of having a peaceful world much better than those of us that are older. I wish this young man might have lived on through the successful years he undoubtedly would have had had he remained in this Chamber so that he could devote his talents to building world stability and ultimately world peace. As I say, it is very tragic for the Congress to lose him, and it is even more personally tragic for his wife and darling children to lose him. My sympathies go out to them in this sad hour.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, words are very inappropriate and inadequate to express yourself at a time like this. I cannot add anything to the beautiful words of tribute that have been spoken for my friend, BOB COFFEY. I can simply say that since I have known him here, I have grown tremendously fond of him. I considered him a real friend. It is my prayer that God will comfort, console and bless his loved ones in their and in our country's great loss.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, words cannot express how shocked I was to hear on last Thursday of the death of my good friend, Congressman BOB COFFEY. I did not know him before becoming a Member of this Eighty-first Congress, but he was one of the first of the new Members with whom I became acquainted. I learned to love him. There was not a day passed that he and I did not sit down together and discuss the doings and the workings of this Congress and the country. He would either visit my office or I would visit with him. We ate lunch together frequently, and it was my privilege to have lunch with him on the day of adjournment, which Congressman GRAHAM spoke of. He and I and Bob had lunch together. BOB COFFEY never spoke an ill word of anyone. He had a deep understanding of the problems of the country and a deeper understanding of the problems of the armed forces of the Nation. It was a disappointment to him when he was not placed on the Armed Services Committee. I had the privilege and the honor of occupying a seat next to him on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. We on that committee fully appreciated BOB COFFEY'S wisdom, his understanding, and his willingness to work. Bob was so willing to work that while he never missed any sessions of our committee, he also attended faithfully and religiously every meeting of the Armed Services Committee that he possibly could. He was a man who was not interested in a title or prestige; he was interested in going forward and working for the good of his country. By coincidence Bob's wife and my wife became acquainted the first week we were down here. I got to know his wife and his two little children, and my heart goes out to them in this hour of need. Besides his other attributes, BOB COFFEY was a great soldier. He had a record that was the envy of everyone who was in the services. Yet, as close as he and I were, he never mentioned one word of his war record to me. I found out what a hero he was from his friends. On many occasions when Bob was having a little time off from his congressional duties, he would devote himself to further study of aerodynamics with jet planes. The Army and the Air Force were part of his life.

I said to him on several occasions, "Bob, you have done your job. You are a Congressman now. You are doing a job here. Please quit taking chances on getting killed." He said, "Well, if you are supposed to go that way, I guess that is the way you are supposed to go. It is a part of me. I am going to do all I can to make these jets perfect."

On his cross-country flights BOB COFFEY never failed to send me a post card with some little kidding remark about the stay-on-the-ground boys not being able to get out and go up in the air with him.

I sincerely miss BOB COFFEY. I will miss his daily stops in my office. I will miss his wise counsel. He was a friend such as few of us have the privilege of knowing. I know his body lies over at Arlington Cemetery. He had a brilliant future ahead of him as a statesman. His spirit lives on and will guide us in our future deliberations for the welfare of God and country. Bob, I know you are going to keep an eye on us.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there are certain bonds of friendship that unite men who fly airplanes for their country in time of war. BOB COFFEY and I were both members of that great fraternity of the air in World War II. Because of this, perhaps, we very quickly made friends at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress.

I admired BOB COFFEY, first, because he was a man worthy of admiration, and further, because he made the combat record overseas I did not have the chance to make because of an airplane accident in South America.

He was a great soldier and a great patriot. His few months in the Eighty-first Congress had already shown him to be a great statesman. My hat is off to BOB COFFEY. As was said a few moments ago, we can ill afford in these days to lose men of his caliber.

My sympathies go to his family and his loved ones.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I had just had the pleasure of being the guest of the Coffeys the night before the accident occurred. We can well remember how as we came in the door BOB COFFEY met us and gave us the news he was going to fly to our State and to my district the next day. We were given a little map to drive out to their place, so we could find the way. They called it the Coffey Pot, and that night we were truly impressed with the number and the kind of friends the Coffeys had. The Coffey Pot actually percolated and bubbled over with friendship and cheerfulness. It was a happy home.

The other morning a few of us were at the services and those of us at the memorial services at Arlington on Saturday morning were duly impressed with the military honors that were rightfully tendered BOB COFFEY.

There was a band and a military guard in blue. As many of us stood there and watched the guard and the honors being paid to BOB COFFEY, we thought back to the time, a few days preceding, when the military appropriations bill was before this body and how someone suggested that the Air Corps should not be allowed to have a separate uniform. We thought of how BOB COFFEY stood up for his Air Corps and offered the suggestion that certainly the Air Corps should have the right to have the kind of uniform that it wanted, and that if it was a blue uniform, its members should be allowed to wear blue uniforms. As we stood there that day and saw the men in blue uniforms, who were paying him his last honors, we thought of the part that BOB COFFEY played in the House of Representatives and the part that he will forever play in the Air Corps with its blue uniforms. So far as I am concerned, whenever I shall see a member of the Air Corps in a blue uniform, it will always serve as a living memory of the work BOB COFFEY did in the House of Representatives and for his country.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE].

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said on the floor of the House today concerning the untimely and

unfortunate passing of our beloved colleague, BOB COFFEY. It strikes me that words are futile things at a time like this. It was my good fortune to have met BOB COFFEY in the opening weeks of this session of Congress. We were the same age, and I look upon his passing as do the other young men in the House. I believe everyone was aware of a certain elusive and indefinable quality of spirit which surrounded BOB COFFEY. He had a nobleness of character which was evident to all. His passing should give us cause for thought and consideration. We, in the Congress, receive a great deal of criticism, but where, in all America, would you have found a finer citizen or a greater American to serve in the Congress of the United States, and where else are such Americans as BOB COFFEY needed as in the Congress? His loss is not only an irreplaceable loss to his lovely family, but a loss to the Congress and to the Nation. May God give us the strength to carry on as he would have done if he were present with us today.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened over the death of our colleague, ROBERT L. COFFEY, Jr.

While I met Bob only a few months ago, I got to know him very well. He was one of the most brilliant young officers to emerge from the recent war and was perhaps the most decorated man in the House. He was an outstanding pilot of the fastest type of planes. But he was very modest and rarely talked of his war experiences. The records of the Air Force, however, show that he completed 96 missions over enemy countries. He was shot down on one occasion and after a month of harrowing experiences found his way back to the American lines.

He rose from the status of flying cadet in 1942 to the rank of colonel, a rank usually reserved for much older men. BOB was only 30. He was a great soldier.

His legislative career has been cut short but during his stay here he made a remarkable record. As a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments he contributed much to the work of the committee. He demonstrated highest qualities of statesmanship. His sense of fairness and temperament was such that he would have gone far in Congress.

He was the type of man you liked immediately. He had a personality that made him friends wherever he went. You liked him because he was a regular fellow.

We shall miss him and I know the sorrow that is his family's is shared by every Member of the House. To his family I express my deepest sympathy and I ask that the Lord sustain them in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, ROBERT COFFEY, will be greatly missed by those who have come to know him. He died, however, as he lived—in the service of his country. His notable war record will remain a monument to his memory. His courage was superlative, his ability unquestioned, his character of the highest. His family, his constituency, and his beloved country have been suddenly and sadly deprived of a great American, a valiant soldier, and a good man. We shall miss him very much, and we hope and pray that he enjoys the peace and rest of which he is so deserving.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the tragic death of my friend and colleague, BOB COFFEY. He and I came to this Congress at the same time, both representing districts from the State of Pennsylvania.

We had something in common outside of our congressional duties. Both of us had served our country in time of war. He in the air, and I in the ground forces. His interest in the air arm was almost a passion with him. While not a member of the Armed Services Committee, he attended the hearings of this group, and made his presence felt on legislation affecting his branch of the service. While on the floor, during discussion relative to the national defense of our country, he continually spoke in favor of the air arm, and supported all measures that would tend to improve it.

He did not rest on his laurels as some do, but was ever trying to improve himself so that if his country again called he would be ready to go.

His last day alive found him in the airplane soaring away "into the wild blue yonder." For his country he gave up his last full measure of devotion, for the service he loved so well—the Army Air Corps.

Now Bob has gone "West," and from us forever. His figure, his voice, and his wonderful personality will always be living truths to me.

Beneath the green in Arlington Cemetery, forever connected with the honor of those who served, lies Bob with his comrades. Above his grave the trees sway in their grandeur, an imperishable monument.

I desire to express my heartfelt sympathy and condolences to the mother, and wife and children of one who has fallen in a cause as imperishable as will be the names of those who have fallen to defend it.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days within which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am moved to join with those who mourn the untimely passing of our esteemed colleague and friend, the Honorable ROBERT L. COFFEY, Jr. In the short time we were privileged to enjoy his companionship in this House we came to know him as a sincere and studious legislator and also as an amiable and cheerful associate. Beyond these persuasive considerations which drew us to him there was also that unstinted admiration which all men reserve for those who have distinguished themselves in battle and who by their outstanding service have earned and received the highest acclaim of their compatriots.

As we mourn the departure of this stalwart American our hearts turn in fullest sympathy to those bereft and we pray that a compassionate and all-wise Maker will guide them along the pathway which is now obscured by clouds ahead.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would not be fulfilling the dictates of my heart if I did not say a word at this time about my friend and our former colleague, BOB COFFEY. Bob was a young man and he was a Member of Congress for only a short time, yet he made a great impression upon all of us and I know that his influence will continue to be felt for a long, long time. He brought a fighting spirit to Congress which we needed, a spirit that challenges all of us to carry on in a manner fitting to his memory. Bob had a zeal for his work and for the attainment of peace on earth and good will among men which was unsurpassed by anyone here.

He was my friend. I respected and admired him, as all of us did who knew him best. Bob's influence has not died and I know that he will live with us as we go about the great task of trying to bring about harmony in national and international affairs. I know that Bob's spirit will help to guide and direct our activities. The Eighty-first Congress is a better Congress and our great country is a better country because of the life of our friend, BOB COFFEY.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 192).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROBERT L. COFFEY, Jr., a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

533. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $110,500 for the legislative branch, Library of Congress (H. Doc. No. 166); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

534. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1950, in the total amount of $5,272,200,000 for expenses of the European recovery program (H. Doc. No. 167); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

535. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legis-

lation to amend section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to combat the citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale; to the Committee on Agriculture.

536. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Army recommending enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of female doctors and specialists in the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

537. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its annual meeting in September 1948 entitled "A bill to transfer the office of the probation officer of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the office of the Register of Wills for the District of Columbia, and the Commission on Mental Health from the Government of the District of Columbia to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for budgetary and administrative purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

538. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy recommending enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1452, Revised Statutes, relating to Presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

539. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Public Health Service to admit to its hospitals persons committed by State courts who are beneficiaries of the Service or narcotic addicts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

540. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report for the calendar year 1948 with respect to tort claims paid within the Housing and Home Finance Agency by the Office of Administrator and the constituent agencies, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

541. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a report of the proceedings of a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States held at Washington, D. C., on March 24 and 25, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

542. A letter from the acting assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

543. A letter from the acting assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

544. A letter from the acting assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the purchase of additional farming land for Leavenworth Penitentiary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

545. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

546. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of Erik Nestor Ernfried Back, file No. A-5919879, CR 21864, be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

547. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of Jesus Villa, file No. A-3418149, CR 22617, be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

548. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

549. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 20, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Delaware River, N. Y., Pa., N. J., and Del., with a view to constructing dams in the vicinity of Tocks Island, Belvidere, and Chestnut Hill, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on January 24, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

550. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to appoint Paul A. Smith as representative of the United States to the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization without affecting his status and perquisites as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

551. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a request for return of a report dated September 10, 1948, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Finneys Creek, Accomac County, Va., and the channel connecting said creek with Wachapreague Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Public Works.

552. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize loans through national farm-loan associations in Puerto Rico; to modify the limitations on Federal land-bank loans to any one borrower; to repeal provisions for subscriptions to paid-in surplus of Federal land banks and cover the entire amount appropriated therefor into the surplus fund of the Treasury; to effect certain economies in reporting and recording payments on mortgages deposited with the registrars as bond collateral and canceling the mortgage and satisfying and discharging the lien of record; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

553. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

554. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report, as Librarian of Congress, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and a complete set of the Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions, the supplements to the annual report; to the Committee on House Administration.

555. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

556. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

557. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

558. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the Alaska game law of January 13, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

559. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain members of the Flathead Nation of Indians, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 452); to the Committee on Public Lands.

560. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

561. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Secretary of the Army, recommending the enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. 962; 16 U. S. C. 513), relating to membership of the National Forest Reservation Commission"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

562. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the four remaining corporations of the Inter-American Affairs group for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 749. An act for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler; without amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 716. A bill for the relief of Mark H. Potter; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 717. A bill for the relief of Groover O'Connell; without amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of August Michela, infant; with amendments (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield; with an amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1125. A bill for the relief of

Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner; with an amendment (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of June C. Dollar; with an amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano; with an amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1592. A bill for the relief of Howard R. Amundsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Carolyn McMillan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett; without amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4138. A bill for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4312. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance and public health and to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and other health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 4313. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance and public health and to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and other health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4314. A bill authorizing the construction of a multipurpose reservoir on the Pend Oreille River in Idaho for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4315. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to proceed with construction at stations of the Alaska communication system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4316. A bill to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4317. A bill to establish a Federal waterlands reserve and to provide for aid to the public schools with a portion of the receipts therefrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4318. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the better utilization of the resources of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4319. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Fort Belknap Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4320. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp having on its face the imprint of the Capitol, the United States flag, and the official pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4321. A bill to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 4322. A bill to provide that the tax on toilet preparations shall not apply to articles sold for the care of babies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 4323. A bill to encourage construction of rental housing on or near military installations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4324. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Edgar Allan Poe; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4325. A bill to provide for a memorial stadium for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4326. A bill to transfer the employment service administration of the various States to the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4327. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4328. A bill to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 4329. A bill to amend section 3403 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4330. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction and acquisition of school facilities at Parker Dam power project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4331. A bill to establish the United States Study Commission on the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4332. A bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4333. A bill to permit widows of officers and enlisted men of the armed forces to purchase from Army and Navy commissaries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4334. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit the payment of survivor annuities to individuals for months in which they render service for wages of less than $75; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Res. 193. Resolution providing for compensation for one special messenger for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, effective May 1, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Japhet K. Anvil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Marie Vickers Franks and Irene Outten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Chiara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4338. A bill for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4339. A bill for the relief of William Lawrence McGrory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Frederic (Frigyes) Gorog, Margit Gorog, Josephine Schon, Andrew Friedmann, and Vera Friedmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4341. A bill to provide for the extension of Patent No. 1,854,475, issued April 19, 1932, to Edgar Earle Littlefield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4342. A bill for the relief of J. R. Holden, R. C. Biggadike, and John Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 4343. A bill for the relief of J. P. Acker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4344. A bill for the relief of James Oliver Farlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4345. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. R. Allmon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

597. By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 529, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, which provides for the establishment of a Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

598. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 1549, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, which provides aid and assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

599. Also, memorial of the Colorado State Legislature in regard to promoting the development of new domestic sources of fuel oils and gasoline, including the promotion of coal synthetic liquid fuel plants in order to supplement the petroleum resources, because it is becoming apparent that the proportion of the world's oil available to the United States may diminish markedly; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

600. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Castle County, Del., containing 223 signatures, in support of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

601. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Silverbrook, Wilmington, Del., containing 42 signatures, in support of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

602. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dover, Del., containing 15 signatures, in support of H. R. 2428, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

603. By Mr. DONDERO: Memorial of the Michigan Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the United States mint to strike off a commemorative silver half-dollar, appropriately designed, a number to be dated 1948, the greater number to be dated 1949, in commemoration of a century of railroad operation out of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

604. By Mr. FORAND: resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island to give close attention to and work for the passage of Senate bill 67, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session, 1949, and approved by the governor on April 15, 1949; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

605. Also, petition of Bee Jackson, of Chicago, Ill., and 24 others, in support of H. R. 1750, Eighty-first Congress, a bill to repeal the wartime excise tax on bulk cosmetics used professionally in beauty and barber shops; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

606. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 38 residents of New Brighton and vicinity, Pennsylvania, urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

607. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of W. H. Westerman and 35 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging Congress to repeal the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

608. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Ansonia, Conn., memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

609. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of 39 residents of West Englewood, N. J., urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

610. By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma (for himself and the Oklahoma delegation in Congress): Petition of the Oklahoma Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for carrying out and performing items 1 to 13, both inclusive, of interim survey report for the Arkansas River and tributaries of the lower Arkansas River watershed, made by the Soil Conservation Service in conjunction with the United States Forest Service, and memorializing Congress not to provide funds for carrying out and performing item 14 of said report; to the Committee on Public Works.

611. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk of the City Council of Toledo, Ohio, urging the passage of Senate bills 1278, 1279, 1280, 1281, 1282, 1284, and 1285; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

612. Also, petition of Rev. R. F. Coleman and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

613. Also, petition of R. C. Swope and others, Sanford, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

614. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

615. Also, petition of Mrs. Birddie B. Fulton and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

616. Also, petition of G. D. McRae and others, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

617. Also, petition of Mrs. J. D. Beach and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

618. Also, petition of Joseph S. Buckley and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

619. Also, petition of Henry Casado and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

620. Also, petition of O. V. DeLong and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

621. Also, petition of C. W. Newman and others, Winter Garden, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

622. Also, petition of J. A. Baker and others, New Smyrna Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

623. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

624. Also, petition of E. B. Jackson and others, New Smyrna Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

625. Also, petition of Agnes C. Gleason and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

626. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

627. Also, petition of G. G. Hair and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

628. Also, petition of J. C. Michael and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Mans.

629. Also, petition of Mrs. Minnie Neuhart and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

630. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Norton and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

631. Also, petition of Louis Alvarez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. P. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

632. Also, petition of George Ramos and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

633. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Roberts and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

634. Also, petition of Mrs. Elizabeth Reese and others, Clearwater, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. Also, petition of Sam Cavalier and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

636. Also, petition of Mary M. Buckley and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

637. Also, petition of N. L. Whittemore and others, New Smyrna Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

638. Also, petition of Florence Hamlin and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

639. Also, petition of Rosa A. Sherman and others, Sarasota, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

640. Also, petition of Mrs. Bertha Miller and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

641. Also, petition of J. H. Justice and others, Coral Gables, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

642. Also, petition of Joe Rivers and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

643. Also, petition of Richard J. Sanchez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

644. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Garnett and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

645. Also, petition of J. H. Williams and others, Clearwater, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

646. Also, petition of J. A. Pinder and others, Maitland, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

647. Also, petition of Alma A. Nickles and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

648. Also, petition of Henry Perez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

649. Also, petition of Manuel D. Mendez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

650. Also, petition of R. W. Stephens and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

651. Also, petition of Maude M. Gibson and others, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

652. Also, petition of A. P. Marshall and others, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

653. Also, petition of Mary E. Stackhouse and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

654. Also, petition of Miss Mary I. Lee and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136; known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we beseech Thee to be present and favorable unto these, Thy servants, granting them grace and wisdom to meet the tasks of this day with a pure and steadfast devotion.

Fill us with a greater desire to incarnate the spirit of the Master in whose character and conduct we find the clear and commanding revelation of our duty toward Thee and our fellow men.

Inspire us to give ourselves faithfully and resolutely to the high adventure of building a nobler civilization. Show us how we may mobilize the great moral and spiritual forces in promoting friendship and understanding among the nations of the earth.

We bring our petitions in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 25, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Chavez	Ferguson
Bricker	Connally	Flanders
Bridges	Donnell	Fulbright
Butler	Douglas	George
Byrd	Eastland	Gillette
Cain	Ecton	Green
Chapman	Ellender	Gurney
Hayden	Long	Schoeppel
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Hill	McClellan	Sparkman
Hoey	McFarland	Stennis
Holland	McGrath	Taft
Humphrey	McKellar	Taylor
Hunt	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Ives	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Tobey
Kem	Myers	Tydings
Kerr	Neely	Vandenberg
Kilgore	O'Conor	Wherry
Knowland	Pepper	Wiley
Langer	Robertson	Williams
Lodge	Saltonstall	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is attending a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is attending a meeting of the appropriations subcommittee on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and insert matters in the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WATKINS was excused from attending the session of the Senate today.

Mr. FREAR asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, by direction of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to sit this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF FLATHEAD NATION OF INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 452), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on the tort claims paid by that Agency and its constituent agencies, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration, for the calendar year 1948, under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OFFICES TO ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer the office of the Probation Officer of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the office of the Register of Wills of the District of Columbia, and the Commission on Mental Health, from the Government of the District of Columbia to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for budgetary and administrative purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUDIT REPORT OF CORPORATIONS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS GROUP

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Corporations of the Inter-American Affairs Group, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 26

"Concurrent resolution protesting the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting the sentence of Ilse Koch and requesting the proper authorities in Washington to have the matter reviewed in order that the ends of justice may be served

"Whereas voices of protest in strong indignation are being heard against the impending release of Ilse Koch of Buchenwald from imprisonment and against the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting her life sentence to a 4-year term of imprisonment; and

"Whereas the revolting atrocities of which Ilse Koch is accused have shocked the civilized world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature protest the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting the life sentence of Ilse Koch to a 4-year term of imprisonment, and request the proper authorities in Washington to have the matter reviewed in order that the ends of justice may be well served; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Harry S. Truman, to the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, to Gen. Omar Bradley, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress, with the urgent request that action be taken in memory of those World War citizens of the United States who made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields in defense of their country and in prison camps.

"Adopted by the senate, April 13, 1949.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, April 14, 1949."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 23

"Whereas the National Guard of the United States and of the several States has performed outstanding service to both State and Nation in defending this country in two great wars, providing leadership and initiative and displaying courage, resourcefulness, and integrity reflecting great credit upon these individuals and their organizations; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that: 'The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by the Congress'; and

"Whereas the Bill of Rights in the second amendment provides: 'A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed'; and

"Whereas the framers of the Constitution contemplated a standing Army as the only Federal military force as proven by the arguments advanced by Hamilton (see Federalists Papers, 24-28, inclusive) whereby he persuaded the States to accept the principle of a standing army, large enough to accommodate the immediate proposal of Congress only, its size to be controlled by limited appropriations for a period of 2 years only, and he also persuaded the States to agree not to keep troops in time of peace without the consent of Congress in exchange for the provision that Congress should have power to provide for the organizing, arming, and training the militia with the States reserving the power to appoint officers and the authority for training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; and

"Whereas the Committee on Civilian Components, appointed by the Secretary of Defense on or about November 7, 1947, commonly referred to as the Gray Board, in its report submitted on or about June 30, 1948, which report was not released to the press until August 16, 1948, recommended that all services each have one Federal reserve force, that the National Guard and Organized Reserves should be incorporated into the Army Reserve under the name of the National Guard of the United States; and

"Whereas this action, if successful, would result in complete dismemberment of the National Guard of the United States and of the several States, destroying an organization consisting of over 320,000 men contained in 27 infantry divisions, 520 air units, and other tactical units; and

"Whereas this action would rob the United States of an adequate national defense at a time when this country's foreign policy demands maximum military strength; and

"Whereas this action would be in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States and would foist fantastic costs upon the Nation and the several States, requiring immediate expenditure of billions of dollars for housing and training facilities for the Federal force and impose a tremendous financial burden upon each State in maintaining its own militia for local security needs, in addition to providing cutthroat competition among all the services for available personnel to man these forces: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the members of this Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Missouri condemn, without reserve, the report of the Committee on Civilian Components recommending the establishment of a single Federal Reserve or Militia, as unconstitutional, un-American, and contrary to our concept and philosophy of life and Government and, furthermore, that their proposals are ill-advised, illegal, and if put into effect, would destroy the National Guard, which, by the committee's own admission, had rendered outstanding service and performed with effectiveness and efficiency in two World Wars and since its reorganization in less than 2 years had completed amazing strides in building an M-day force; be it further

"Resolved, That the members of this assembly call upon the Congress and the President of the United States to resist this effort to centralize the military power in Washington; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Congress, to the President of the United States, and the Secretaries of Defense, Army, Navy, and Air, and the members of the Committee on Civilian Components."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income-tax law

"Whereas the present Federal income-tax law is so drawn that in the event a taxpayer pays more income taxes than necessary for him to pay, the overpayment is refunded to the taxpayer, plus interest thereon at 6 percent per annum; and

"Whereas, as a result of this provision of the income-tax law, many taxpayers take advantage thereof by overpaying the amount of their taxes in order to procure interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum during the time such overpayment is in the hands of the Government; and

"Whereas, this practice is resulting in an undue and unjust burden upon the Federal Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memoralize the Congress of the United States to amend the income-tax law so as to provide that an interest rate of 2 percent be paid on the amount of income tax overpaid by a taxpayer during the period such overpayment is in the hands of the Government; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved April 15, 1949.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing the President and Congress of the United States to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to excise taxes on furs, and to amend House Roll No. 1211 to provide suitable import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer

"Whereas the fur-farming business in the United States is in critical condition due to abolishing of import quotas on foreign furs by Executive order of the President of the United States; and

"Whereas the 20-percent luxury tax now imposed by Congress on domestic furs is prohibitive, and has seriously curtailed the consumer demand for furs in the United States; and

"Whereas existing legislation enacted by the Congress intended to subsidize fur farming has failed in its purpose in that the requirements for loans to fur farmers by the Federal Government are such that almost all of those engaged in the fur-farming business within the United States have been unable to meet the requirements to secure a loan; and

"Whereas fur farmers throughout the Nation have investments of millions of dollars in animals and equipment and Minnesota is particularly affected in that it is the second largest fur-producing State in the Union: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring herein), as follows: (1) That the President of the United States is hereby memoralized to vacate his Executive order abolishing import quotas on foreign furs; (2) that the Congress of the United States is hereby memoralized to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to excise taxes on furs; and (3) that Congress amend House Roll No. 1211 now pending to provide import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer, and that the foregoing action be taken by the President and Congress of the United States during the present session of Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be directed to forward a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and

House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved April 14, 1949.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"To Whom It May Concern:

"This is to certify that the following resolution was adopted by the Senate of the State of California on April 11, 1949:

" 'Senate Resolution 83

" 'Whereas under the provisions of the Lea Act the Congress of the United States has authorized appropriations to match funds contributed by the State of California for the development of waterfowl feeding and management grounds to relieve depredations to farm crops; and

" 'Whereas the wildlife conservation board on March 19, 1949, made available to the California Fish and Game Commission a total of $2,380,000 for the purpose of developing five key units in the system of projects being jointly planned and developed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Fish and Game Commission to accomplish the foregoing objectives; and

" 'Whereas this cooperative program is of such vast importance to the production of food as well as to the management of the waterfowl resources of the continent that it deserves to be pushed to completion as rapidly as possible: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the senate,* That the Senate of the State of California respectfully memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full $250,000 recommended by the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and that thereafter a minimum of at least $250,000 be provided annually in the appropriations to the Department of the Interior until the current conditions have been corrected; and be it further

" '*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States.' "

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"House Resolution 161

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Senate of the United States to curb the practice of filibustering in order to prevent the undermining of democratic processes and the neglect of State needs

"Whereas the present Senate rules have led to an abuse of free speech by those who have engaged in long speeches known as filibusters for the sole purpose of blocking action on vital legislation; and

"Whereas this practice is an antiparliamentary device which nullifies democratic processes and violates the principle of majority rule and is a procedure unknown to the Constitution; and

"Whereas this device has been used from time to time to block the passage of legislation desired by an overwhelming majority of people and has on occasion resulted in endangering national security; and

"Whereas there are at present the guaranties of free speech and adequate debate in that every bill is fully discussed in committee and on the floor of both Houses of Congress; and even after cloture is invoked each of the 96 Senators is allowed an additional hour of debate which ordinarily would consume 4 to 6 weeks of debate; and

"Whereas the filibuster has become a serious national problem and a matter of vital concern to the respective States of the Union and important to relationships and legislation affecting their interests: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the assembly respectfully memorializes the Senate of the United States to change its rules in order to prevent this practice of filibustering by allowing cloture to be invoked by a simple majority of the elected Members; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and to each Senator from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Memorial 5

"To the Office of Chief of Engineers, to the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the community of Nenana, Alaska, has periodically suffered severe flood damage from seasonal overflowing of the Tanana and Nenana Rivers; and

"Whereas this damage has consisted not only of the carrying away and injury of personal and public property but also of the polluting of the domestic water supply of the town of Nenana with consequent threat and injury to the health and life of the inhabitants; and

"Whereas the periodical floods at Nenana have threatened on occasions to render impossible operation of the Alaska Railroad, which is the main transportation artery for the interior of Alaska, including the major defense installations there:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that the Corps of Engineers immediately institute studies and flood control works designed to prevent damage from high waters in the town and vicinity of Nenana, Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 15

"To the Congress of the United States, the United States Public Health Service, and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in nineteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the people of Alaska are desirous of bringing the Territory to a high state of development and the health of our people is of prime importance in the development of the Territory; and

"Whereas the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, has introduced an amendment to the Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act to provide $250,000 in place of $100,000 per year now authorized to construct hospitals in the Territory in order to provide the best possible care for Alaskan citizens; and

"Whereas Alaskan communities must depend on Federal subsidy to assist them in constructing community facilities:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that the Congress favorably consider the amendment to the Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act introduced by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress from Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial 4

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the United States Forest Service, the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Public Roads Administration, and to the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the Public Roads Administration has two sections of road known as the Tongass Highway leading to Ketchikan, the southern section being 8 miles long and the northern section being 16 miles long, which said two sections terminate at the city limits of Ketchikan and are linked only by a single, inadequate, and unsafe thoroughfare through Ketchikan, said thoroughfare consisting of 15,000 linear feet of wooden trestle or narrow paved fills; and

"Whereas, this single thoroughfare is of temporary construction, requiring maintenance costs of $50,000 per annum, has numerous bottlenecks of less than 20 feet in width and has many temporary sections which, within a short time, must be replaced in their entirety; and

"Whereas, existing governmental agencies, including the United States Coast Guard, Alaska Communications System, and the United States Forest Service, have facilities located along the north and south Tongass Highways, and personnel and vehicular equipment of these agencies must use the above-described connecting link in traveling between their rural stations and their city offices; and

"Whereas some 2,000 persons presently reside in approximately 550 homes along the north and south Tongass Highways, and require a reliable means of transportation to the city center; and

"Whereas industrial demands at present tax this inadequate link of the highway system, and the advent of Ketchikan's suburban area of the largest new industry in southeastern Alaska, namely, the $30,000,000 pulp and paper mill to be located 6 miles north of Ketchikan on the north Tongass Highway, will double the traffic on Ketchikan streets and will make the above described thoroughfare totally inadequate; and

"Whereas the advent of the pulp industry will bring increased homes to Ketchikan, all of which require fire protection and necessitates the need for a permanent thoroughfare for rapid transit of personnel and equipment; and

"Whereas the only feasible routing, because of topographical features, is over difficult terrain along a rocky shoreline, requiring for permanent construction considerable portions of concrete trestlework, fills and retaining walls, with construction costs tentatively estimated at $2,000,000; and

"Whereas the Organic Act limits taxation and bonded indebtedness to a point so low as to place this project entirely beyond the means of the city of Ketchikan:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, prays that the Congress of the United States appropriate special funds to assist the city of Ketchikan to accomplish this vitally needed project.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"Senate Joint Memorial 27

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress From Alaska, and the General Manager of the Alaska Railroad:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas considerations of national defense and of strengthening the economy of the Territory of Alaska require that the federally owned Alaska Railroad be placed in condition for efficient operation; and

"Whereas substantial progress toward this goal has been made by the present General Manager of the Alaska Railroad and his associates under the so-called Alaska Railroad rehabilitation program; and

"Whereas the sum of $38,000,000 has been requested from the Federal Government to carry into effect so much of the program as is feasible in the 1950 fiscal year, such request now being considered by the Congress:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests that the General Manager of the Alaska Railroad, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Alaska, the Congress of the United States, and all others who have had a part in drawing up and effectuating the Alaska Railroad rehabilitation program should be, and the same are hereby, complimented and thanked for their efforts on behalf of the people of Alaska.

"Your memorialist further prays that the Congress make available the requested $38,000,000 for carrying on the rehabilitation work on this federally owned and operated railroad throughout fiscal 1950.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 26

"To the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is desirous of implementing its democratic process so that the laws of the Territory may reflect more closely and truly the will of the people thereof; and

"Whereas it is the tradition and policy of the United States of America to grant more self-government to its Territories so that they too may enjoy the blessings of individual and collective liberty and self-determination; and

"Whereas the initiative and referendum and recall have been a tested and proven means whereby, in many States, these blessings have been secured to the people; and

"Whereas it has been well settled in the courts that the initiative and referendum and recall are constitutional and are in harmony with the republican form of government:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will give the people of Alaska the powers of initiative and referendum and recall.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"Senate Joint Memorial 18

"To the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the United States Army Engineers, and the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas many of the residents of the town of Haines, Alaska, depend upon fishing for a livelihood, and use a sizable fleet of small fishing boats in carrying out their occupational activities; and

"Whereas there are no harbor facilities for small boats at Haines and during the winter months said boats are at the mercy of the northern winds which often wreak destructive havoc upon the unprotected fishing fleet; and

"Whereas there is plenty of native material available near Haines for the purpose of constructing a seawall which would provide adequate protection for the Haines fishing fleet; and

"Whereas the town of Haines is without funds sufficient to build said seawall for the construction of a small boat harbor for Haines:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist prays that the proper departments of the Government take prompt and necessary steps to bring about construction of the harbor facilities as above indicated, as soon as possible.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 32

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate amendments of title 28 of the United States Code, entitled 'Judicial Code and Judiciary' to take effect upon the admission of Hawaii to statehood

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact amendments of title 28 of the United States Code, entitled 'Judicial Code and Judiciary,' to take effect upon the admission of Hawaii to statehood, as provided by H. R. 3780 introduced on March 24, 1947, or in such other form as may be appropriate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby particularly requested, in enacting such legislation, (1) to protect and preserve as credit applicable to the retirement and disability benefits provided by said title 28, years of judicial service in the courts mentioned in section 373 of said title 28, as provided in said H. R. 3780 or in such other form as may be appropriate, and (2) to specifically provide, by amendment of said H. R. 3780 or in such other manner as may be appropriate, that in no event shall such amendments of title 28 effect any decrease in the rights of any judge who had relinquished his office prior to the admission of Hawaii to statehood or whose office as established by the Hawaiian Organic Act is terminated by the admission of Hawaii to statehood, based upon his years of service, age and salary, and the law in effect as of the date when his office was so relinquished or terminated; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution upon its adoption shall be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 35

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact a bill numbered S. 566, and entitled "a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii," now before the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America, providing an increase in the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the present Federal compensation allowed to supreme court justices and circuit court judges of the Territory of Hawaii is grossly inadequate; and

"Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America has reported favorably upon and recommended the passage of a bill numbered S. 566 and entitled "a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii," which bill, if enacted, would increase the Federal compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges of the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact said S. 566 entitled 'a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii,' as reported and recommended by the Committee on Judiciary of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to price support for eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on April 22, 1949, p. 4905, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relating to the establishment of a veterans' employment and national economic development corporation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on April 25, 1949, p. 4953, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relating to a liquid fuel plant or plants for the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on April 25, 1949, p. 4952, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relating to assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on April 25, 1949, p. 4953, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relating to appropriations for carrying out an interim survey report for the Arkansas River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on April 21, 1949, p. 4833, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest in the town of Ayer, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See text of resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on April 22, 1949, p. 4906, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See text of resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. LODGE (for himself

and Mr. SALTONSTALL) on April 22, 1949, p. 4906, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Honolulu (T. H.) Council of Social Agencies, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the control and eradication of the oriental fruitfly in Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the North Carolina Employees Association, of Raleigh, N. C., signed by Mason E. Swearingen, president, praying for the enactment of the deficiency appropriation bill providing funds for the Bureau of Employment Security; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Methodist Federation for Social Action, of New York, N. Y., signed by Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary, relating to a cut in the national military budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Pennsylvania Realtors Association, of Harrisburg, Pa., signed by Charles E. Horner, chairman, legislative committee, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing public housing and slum clearance to be paid for by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Partisan Republicans of California, in meeting assembled at Los Angeles, Calif., relating to an investigation of communism in the State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Tennessee State Junior Chamber of Commerce, relating to a federal union of Atlantic democracies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Unico National, at Chicago, Ill., relating to Government use of certain properties confiscated from the Germans in 1917 in Hoboken, N. J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ansonia, Conn.; the St. Mary's Lyceum, Inc., of Bondsville; and the SS. Peter and Paul School alumni, of Three Rivers, both in the State of Massachusetts; the Town Council of the Borough of Ambridge, Pa.; the City Council of the City of Mesa, Ariz.; and the Common Council of the City of Marinette, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the executive council, Missouri State Dental Association; the Little Rock (Ark.) Association of Insurance Women; and the Kentucky State Dental Association, of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF OMAHA (NEBR.) BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Omaha Bar Association, Omaha, Nebr., on April 21, 1949, relative to the proposed national health program.

This resolution endorses a program to provide the necessities of good health, including medical care, administered at local levels, but protests against any system of compulsory sickness insurance designed for national bureaucratic control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRODUCTION OF POTTERY AT VEGA BAJA, P. R.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from local union No. 6, Chinaware, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of Wheeling, W. Va., signed by George W. Friedrich, secretary, relating to the production of pottery at Vega Baja, P. R., and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL UNION NO. 6, CHINAWARE,
NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
OPERATIVE POTTERS,
Wheeling, W. Va., April 5, 1949.

The Honorable JOHN W. BRICKER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inasmuch as 60 percent of our members are residents of the State of Ohio, I have been instructed by our local union to write you regarding a pottery which is soon to start production at Vega Baja, P. R. We understand they will be able to produce 15,000 dozen pieces of ware a week. The workers who produce this ware will receive about 30 cents per hour, which is about 25 percent of our common labor rate in American potteries, and 15 percent of our average skilled labor rate.

We understand this plant is being opened by the Crane China Corp. at Syracuse, N. Y., which, we understand, is also the Iroquois China Co. of New York. I am sure you can readily see what it would mean to the American potteries to have this amount of ware dumped on their market at 50 percent less than our prices. We wish to urge you to take whatever steps you possibly can to safeguard our job opportunities.

Trusting you will give this matter your most earnest consideration,

Yours very truly,
GEORGE W. FRIEDRICH,
Secretary.

SAXON PEOPLE OF TRANSYLVANIA, RUMANIA — COMMUNICATION FROM WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR AMERICANISM, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a communication from the Women's League for Americanism, Cleveland, Ohio, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR AMERICANISM,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 7, 1949.

To the Congress of the United States:

ARE WE CHRISTIANS OR CRIMINALS?

The desperate cry for justice of a despondent and vanishing people, the Saxon people of Transylvania, Rumania, is reaching our country. The fate and future of these most unfortunate people are resting in the powerful hands of our Congress.

This urgent appeal for help may be answered in a Christian way or it may be criminally ignored by the Congress of the United States.

The Saxon people, like many other Christian people of Europe, are the victims of the treaties signed at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

The air from Transylvania and the far steppes of Russia to the Capital of the United States is filled with cries of agony from broken souls of Morgenthau's enslaved human beings.

If the Saxon people who are without protection are to survive as a link in the great chain of Christian civilization, their homeland must be restored. Their schools, churches, hospitals, municipalities, and private property which has been confiscated must be returned: Their family members must be freed from communstic slavery, torture, and misery.

We believe that it is the sacred duty of Congress to act in behalf of the Saxon people without further delay. If Congress should ignore this call at this late hour, our hearts will be filled with sadness because this experience would lead us to believe that our beautiful America has lost the Providence in its course of destiny.

Very truly yours,
MRS. ANNA WOLF,
President.
MRS. RENATE TIMM,
Secretary.

CONSERVATION OF WASTE PAPER—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF MANITOWOC, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from Arthur Post, city clerk of Manitowoc, Wis., an important resolution adopted by the mayor and common council of that city. The resolution pertains to the conservation of waste paper, a subject to which we gave much attention during the war years, but which now, unfortunately, we tend to forget.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas for many years there has been a shortage of lumber so vitally needed for so many purposes, one of the biggest items being for the making of paper; and

Whereas during the war all of the people in the United States were requested and urged to save newspapers and magazines and other materials made of paper, which were gathered up and used again to make paper, thus conserving the lumber supply in the United States, which is gradually getting less and less; and

Whereas the people of the United States are no longer asked to save paper material, and the price of old paper has gone down so much that it does not even pay for the junkman to gather the same; and

Whereas we all realize that this tremendous waste of paper should not be permitted to continue, because eventually our people and country will suffer as a result of this tremendous waste: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Manitowoc, That we urge upon our representatives at Washington to give this matter their careful consideration, with a view of adopting legislation by the Congress of the United States providing ways and means to save paper, thus conserving our greatly needed lumber supplies in this country.

Adopted April 18, 1949.

W. C. RANDOLPH.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN PERSONS—RESOLUTION OF ROSS E. FRENCH POST, NO. 2328, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, WILLISTON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolu-

tion adopted by Ross E. French Post, No. 2328, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Williston, N. Dak., relating to un-American activities of certain persons, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to our attention that certain individuals who profess to be American citizens who have openly indicated that if the United States should become involved in war with a certain foreign power that their allegiance would be with such foreign power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ross E. French Post, No. 2328, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Williston, N. Dak., at a regular meeting held Tuesday, April 5, 1949, by unanimous vote, recommend that action be taken immediately to curb such un-American activities of such persons and that immediate legislation be enacted to prevent further impositions against the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Department headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG and to Representatives USHER L. BURDICK and WILLIAM LEMKE.

Dated at Williston, N. Dak., this 8th day of April 1949.

ROBT. WINJE,
Post Commander.

RESOLUTIONS OF ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, MILNOR, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference three resolutions adopted by the Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, of Milnor, N. Dak., relating to rural telephone service, shortage of electric power, and the development of the Missouri Valley, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"RESOLUTION NO. 1 ADOPTED BY THE ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, OF MILNOR, N. DAK.

"Whereas rural telephone service is not available to the major portion of our farm population, and whereas such service is an essential service needed by all farmers; Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we heartily endorse and support legislation now pending before Congress to amend the National REA Act to provide for expansion of rural telephone service."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"RESOLUTION NO. 3 ADOPTED BY ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, MILNOR, N. DAK.

"Whereas there now exists in our State a severe shortage of electrical power, and of transmission lines to distribute power to the many various REA substations and whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has definite plans for construction of such transmission lines at some time in the future: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully request Congress to immediately appropriate adequate funds and give authorization and direction to the Bureau of Reclamation to enable them to construct at once these aforementioned transmission lines."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION NO. 4 ADOPTED BY ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, OF MILNOR, N. DAK.

"Whereas a coordinated development of the Missouri Valley is essential to the welfare of all our people and whereas S. 1160 creating a Missouri Valley Authority has been introduced in Congress by Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON YOUNG and 14 other Senators: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we heartily endorse S. 1160; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we highly commend our distinguished Senators MILTON YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER for their support and sponsorship of said S. 1160."

COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON STATE GRANGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present a letter from Morton Tompkins, master of the Oregon State grange, Portland, Oreg., transmitting resolutions adopted by the McMinnville Grange, No. 31, the Lincoln Grange, No. 395, of Lincoln County; the Goldson Grange, No. 868, of Lane County; the Maine River Grange, No. 550, of Lane County; and the Bridge Grange, No. 730, Coos County; all in the State of Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter, together with the resolutions, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, Oreg., April 11, 1949.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed are copies of original resolutions favoring the principles of a Columbia Valley Authority which are similar in character to those which I sent you under date of April 7. The original of all of these resolutions have been sent directly to the President.

Sincerely,

MORTON TOMPKINS,
Master.

Whereas the development of the Columbia River watershed both for power and for irrigation is too great an undertaking for State or political subdivision; and

Whereas the development of this great waterway is necessary to complete the economic fulfillment of the Northwest; and

Whereas there are too many problems developing this great natural resource to permit its being entrusted to the service departments of Government or to the States adjacent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor a Columbia Valley Authority which shall be charged with the development and administration of the herein mentioned activities; be it further

Resolved, That in establishing this Authority the Congress be enjoined to convey to the several States adjacent to the Columbia River as much of the administration of the Columbia Valley Authority as is feasible.

McMINNVILLE GRANGE, No. 31,
LAWRENCE E. SCHREIBER, *Master.*
MABLE TOLIVIER, *Secretary.*

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia River Authority taking into account the characteristics and needs of the regions, and the interests of all parts of the executive branch; and

Whereas the people of the State of Oregon are fully aware of the advantages to be gained by the establishment of a Columbia River Authority as an aid to industrial development, national defense, flood control and land and forest conservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Lincoln Grange, No. 395, request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia River Authority to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley.

Adopted, March 1949.

LINCOLN GRANGE, No. 395,
LINCOLN COUNTY, OREG.,
PAUL F. KEADY, *Master,*
MARY A. ZEEK, *Secretary.*

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Goldson Grange of Oregon feel that the Columbia Valley Authority program would help our community and others by providing better flood control and more power, plus many other advantages. Since there is no unified program for the reclaiming and conservation of range lands here, full development of the resources of the Columbia Valley cannot be fulfilled with the existing bureaus with no regional and local control.

We resolve that the Congress of the United States should enact legislation for the establishment of a CVA to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley, including such benefits as flood control, navigation, irrigation, industrial and domestic water supply, and electric power.

Adopted by Goldson Grange No. 868 at a regular meeting of its members this 2d day of March 1949.

WILLARD M. POWELL,
Master.
YVONNE HANSEN,
Secretary.

(Goldson Grange, No. 868, Lane County; number of members, 48.)

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the rapid population increase of the Pacific Northwest makes a complexity of increasing problems more acute, among which are need for measures to conserve forests, range lands, and fish life; to provide for measures to conserve forests, range lands, and fish life; to provide development of phosphate production for increased agricultural productivity; to increase acreage of productive land through irrigation and drainage projects and to institute a program of flood control which becomes more urgent yearly; and

Whereas an effective solution to these and other interrelated problems demands coordinated effort on a scale more comprehensive than that of local or even State activity, and

Whereas the need of such coordination of activity on a regional basis has been recognized by the President in his recommendation to the Eighty-first Congress that a Columbia Valley Authority be established: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That national legislation be enacted for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate and direct development of the water and other resources to the end that the optimum benefits, including electric power, accrue to our growing population presently and in the future.

Adopted by Main River Grange No. 550 at a regular meeting of its members March 5, 1949.

ELLA WAYTE,
Secretary.
HARRY LINDBLOQM,
Master.
JAMES A. CADDELL,
W. E. WAITE,
RALPH PETERSON,
Executive Committee.

(Main River Grange No. 550, Lane County; number of members, 72.)

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority; and

Whereas Coos County has a very definite power shortage; and

Whereas Coos County has vast possibilities in the development of industries now held back because of said power shortage; and

Whereas Coos County, being a county of such varied interests as dairying, farming, fishing, logging, and mills, is very anxious for a unified program covering all different interests fairly, and

Whereas such a unified program of full development of the resources of the Columbia Valley to benefit all equally as much as possible cannot be worked out with conflicting bureaus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley.

Adopted by Bridge Grange No. 730 on this 12th day of March 1949.

BLANCHE L. DAVIS,
Secretary.
POWELL LANCASTER,
Master.
CHARLES G. MACK,
MARION E. BROWN,
T. J. DAVIS,
Executive Committee.

(Bridge Grange, No. 730, Coos County; number of members, 60.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3762. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," and title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 303).

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original bill to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and I submit a report—No. 304—thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1704) to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1695. A bill to permit the sending of Braille writers to or from the blind at the same rates as provided for their transportation for repair purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LONG also introduced Senate bill 1696, to prohibit the use of 1-cent postal cards for transmission of commercial advertising or business solicitation, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1697. A bill to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate bill 1698, to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1699. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of public-school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1700, to establish a Federal Waterlands Reserve and to provide for aid to the public schools with a portion of the receipts therefrom, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Marcus; and

S. 1702. A bill for the relief of Riyoko Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1703. A bill to provide that unclaimed animals lawfully impounded in the District of Columbia be made available to educational, scientific, and governmental institutions licensed under this act, shall be made available for scientific purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 1704) to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1705, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF CERTAIN POSTAL CARDS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the use of 1-cent postal cards for certain purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement of the purpose of the bill prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1696) to prohibit the use of 1-cent postal cards for transmission of commercial advertising or business solicitation, introduced by Mr. LONG, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no postal card or private mailing or post card shall be accepted for delivery or delivered through the mails at the 1-cent rate if such card is being transmitted for purposes of commercial advertising or business solicitation. This act shall not be applicable to any such card deposited or caused to be deposited, for mailing or delivery, by any organization which is exempt from taxation under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, or to any such card mailed for local delivery at a post office where free delivery by carrier is not established and such card is not collected or delivered by a rural or star-route carrier.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

The 1-cent postal card is losing the Federal Government approximately $57,000,000 a year. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee is considering legislation to increase the 1-cent postal card from 1 cent to 2 cents, or possibly more. We are told by the postal authorities that less than 10 percent of the 1-cent postal cards are used by poor people and private individuals for whose benefit this card was designed. Instead, more than 90 percent of the 1-cent postal cards are being used by large business organizations for commercial advertisements and business solicitations.

Personally I prefer to see the 1-cent postal card continued for the use of the ordinary individual for whom it was intended, and for that reason I am introducing a bill making it unlawful to use the 1-cent postal card for commercial or business purposes. This proposal eliminates charitable, religious, agricultural, labor, and nonprofit organizations from its provisions, in order that worthy undertakings, toward which the Federal Government has seen fit to extend tax exemption, may continue to receive the benefit of this cheap postal service. By the passage of this bill we will be able to retain the penny postal card, which has become an American institution, at a small cost to our postal service.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE VITALIZATION AND RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1698) to amend section 302 (c) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The traditional American policy for national security depends upon a large and trained Reserve to supplement the Regular services in time of war or national emergency.

One of the outstanding pieces of legislation to create and maintain a vigorous Reserve was the enactment of Public Law 810 by the Eightieth Congress.

Under the provisions of this law, a reservist may earn a modest retirement after 20 years of satisfactory service and having reached the age of 60.

Public Law 810—Eightieth Congress—providing for longevity retirement for Reserve and National Guard personnel was enacted June 29, 1948.

Unfortunately, the effective date of this act on which the reservist must begin earning retirement credits should have been more carefully specified.

The present situation is that credits on the basis of 50 per year must be earned for each retirement year beginning June 29, 1948, even though by the statute itself, the services did not have to publish the regulations for earning those credits until the end of 1948.

Only now are the bulk of the Reserve and National Guard personnel learning the details of those regulations and the services themselves were unable to set up the administration for carrying out the provisions of the law until early in 1949.

These administrative delays, due to the fault of no one has made it difficult, if not impossible, for the great majority of the reservists to fulfill the requirements for the current year ending June 29, 1949.

My bill would correct this situation and would establish July 1, 1949, instead of June 29, 1948, as the date upon which the reservist would be required to begin to earn their point credits to qualify for retirement under Public Law 810.

This bill will clarify the confused situation and correct the delay which inevitably marked the start of this new system.

AID TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Federal Waterlands Reserve. This bill provides for turning the tidelands oil over to the schools of the United States.

The bill (S. 1700) to establish a Federal Waterlands Reserve and to provide for aid to the public schools with a portion of the receipts therefrom, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 138 (legislative budget) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is suspended pending further study and until otherwise provided by concurrent resolution or law.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF ALASKA RAILROAD AND CANAL ZONE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1359) to repeal the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and sections 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3333, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 260)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on the District of Columbia on the bill (H. R. 3704) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, which were ordered to be printed.

REVIEW OF REPORT ON INTEROCEANIC CANAL ACROSS NICARAGUA—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, upon its introduction on April 2, Senate bill 1489, authorizing a review of the report on the interoceanic canal across Nicaragua contained in House Document 139, Seventy-second Congress, first session, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Armed Services. I have consulted the Parliamentarian, and he advised me that this bill should properly be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I therefore ask that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCORPORATION OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.—RECOMMITTAL OF S. 1418

On motion of Mr. MCGRATH, and by unanimous consent, the bill (S. 1418) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes," was taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it our intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 44, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 502. (a) The Secretary of Labor, with respect to appropriations made in title I of this act, and the Federal Security Administrator, with respect to appropriations made in title II of this act, are authorized and directed, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions in the amounts to be expended from the appropriations made in each such title as will in the aggregate equal at least 5 percent of the total amounts so appropriated therein (less in the case of title II amounts appropriated for grants under titles I, IV, parts 1, 2, and 3 of V and X of the Social Security Act, and grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment-services administration), except that appropriations for grants under title I, IV, parts 1, 2, and 3 of V and X of the Social Security Act, and grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment-services administration shall not be reduced. The Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator shall certify the reduction in each appropriation account to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. The amounts so certified shall not be expended but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"(b) Such reduction shall be made in a manner calculated to bring about the greatest economy in expenditure consistent with the efficiency of the service.

"(c) No item of appropriation contained in either of such titles shall be reduced more than 20 percent.

"(d) A statement of each reduction hereunder, including the amount thereof, shall be included in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1951."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG AT ANNUAL AWARD DINNER OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the annual award dinner of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, New York City, on April 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARITY TRUSTS—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Curb the Charity Trust Racket," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW TWIST IN THE COMMUNIST LINE—BROADCAST BY JACK BEALL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a broadcast by Jack Beall, of the American Broadcasting Co., relative to a new twist in the Communist line, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KRAVCHENKO TRIAL IN PARIS—ARTICLE FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Courtroom Victory in Paris for Kravchenko Was Russian Defeat," published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROBERT N. DENHAM, GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLES BY CHARLES H. HOUSTON

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from three articles by Charles H. Houston, relative to the National Labor Relations Board and Robert H. Denham which appear in the Appendix.]

ROBERT N. DENHAM, GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—ARTICLE BY MARJORIE McKENZIE

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pursuit of Democracy," by Marjorie McKenzie, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO EDUCATION—LETTER BY DR. EDGAR FULLER

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative to Federal aid to education, by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, published in the New York Times of April 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, the first entitled "Socialized Medicine," and the second "Socialized Medicine II," published in The Dalles Chronicle, respectively, of April 7, 1949, and April 8, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

LOUIS JOHNSON—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Is Johnson Running for President?" written by Marquis Childs and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISMANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FISCAL POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE BEND (OREG.) BULLETIN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Avert the Danger," published in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of April 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the tenth of a series of articles published in the Baltimore Sun on what the American public would pay, and what it would receive, if Congress approves President Truman's social welfare program, which it is estimated, over a 50-year period will cost $1,250,000,000,000.

Today's article is entitled "Two Billion Dollars Yearly for Disability Pay."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—TWO BILLION DOLLARS YEARLY FOR DISABILITY PAY

(This is the tenth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—On any given day nearly 4,000,000 men and women of working age in the United States are suffering from some disability which makes it impossible for them to work.

President Truman in January said to Congress that these people must not be left to the mercy of charity.

He urged then that they be partially insured against loss of income due to illness.

He has now asked Congress in an official administration bill to insure workers against two sorts of disabilities:

1. Temporary disability, that is, incapacities enduring for more than 7 days but not more than 26 weeks.

2. Permanent, or extended, disabilities which last more than 6 months.

The bill before Congress would provide:

1. For employees covered by old-age insurance (except Federal and military employees) temporary disability benefits ranging from $8 to $30 a week for single persons and up to $45 a week for married persons with three or more dependents.

2. For all employees and the self-employed suffering permanent disabilities, benefits to be the same as those for old-age and survivor insurance.

Benefits for the short periods of disability would be based upon previous wages and number of dependents.

The maximum of $45 a week could be claimed only by a worker earning more than $64 a week, the bill states.

Benefits for the permanent disabilities would depend upon the amount of the insured person's previous wages, his length of time in the insurance system, and the number of dependents.

NOT RELATED TO HEALTH BILL

These benefits would have no relation to the proposed compulsory health insurance, on which a bill was sent to Congress today.

The basic idea of disability insurance, Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner, told Congress, is to prevent families from suffering total loss of income through the illness or incapacity of the breadwinner.

"While it exists," Altmeyer said to the Ways and Means Committee recently, "disability may be economically more disastrous for a worker and his family than unemployment, death, or forced retirement."

Temporary disability-insurance benefits, the Commissioner estimated, will cost from the start about $1,000,000,000 a year.

He estimated that they will require contributions amounting to 1 percent of pay roll equally divided between worker and employer.

The pending bill proposes to add that amount to the weekly pay-roll tax on January 1, 1950.

The bill also proposes that the old-age and survivor tax, now 1 percent each for the employer and employee, shall go to 1½ percent for each on July 1.

That, together with the one-half percent for each to cover disabilities, would make a 2-percent pay-roll tax effective the first of next year.

In addition, the administration will ask for an extra one-fourth percent each from employer and employee to finance the start of compulsory health insurance.

Health insurance has quite a different purpose from disability insurance. Its purpose is to insure families against medical, dental, and hospital expenses.

About one-half of the persons disabled on a given day—about 2,000,000 in all—have been laid up for 6 months or more either from chronic illness or accident.

In figures given the Ways and Means Committee, costs of permanent disability ranged from a low of $430,000,000 a year to a high of $1,961,000,000 by the year 2000.

They are expected to run a little less than $1,000,000,000 a year until about 1960.

Social-security authorities estimate that the annual economic losses resulting from temporary disabilities range from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000.

At present the only governmental cash sickness benefits are those provided under the Railroad Retirement and Insurance Act and by three States—Rhode Island, California, and New Jersey.

TO AID IN REHABILITATION

Not only does the bill propose to give partial insurance against loss of income to the disabled, but it also promises rehabilitation and return to work, if possible.

For working women, maternity benefits would be provided for a period of 8 weeks.

Temporary disability benefits would be payable after 1 week if the disabled worker "cannot engage in his usual, most recent, or reasonably similar work."

But the test for permanent disability would be that the worker "is found incapable of engaging in any substantially gainful work."

Benefits would, of course, be terminated if recovery occurred and the worker could return to work.

The bill says that beneficiaries under permanent disability would have to "undergo periodic examinations to determine whether disability still exists."

The doctor's fees for such examinations—called in the bill "redeterminations at necessary intervals"—would be paid out of the disability fund.

So would any "necessary travel expenses" to obtain such an examination.

If in the judgment of the administrator persons disabled for an extended period could be rehabilitated and restored to permanent work, the legislation would authorize and direct him to undertake it.

The bill reads:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that rehabilitation of disabled individuals who are or may become entitled to extended disability benefits serves at least three very desirable purposes—

"It promotes the welfare of the individual.

"It conserves the assets of the national social insurance trust fund.

"It increases the potential economic products of the Nation."

It goes on then to say that "to the greatest extent practicable" the administrator shall undertake to rehabilitate all such persons and return them "to the labor market."

The existing vocational rehabilitation act would be made the basis for restoring disabled persons to the labor force.

And the pending bill states that the administrator may "cut off" a disabled person's benefits "if he refuses to co-operate" in getting rehabilitated.

If he refuses to be examined, he may also be cut off.

And, also, he may be denied benefits if he leaves the United States.

COST NOT ESTIMATED

There is no estimate available as to the probable future costs of rehabilitations under the disability program.

The 1950 budget carries an item of $23,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation next year.

Some disabilities, of course, can be traced to work-connected origins—that is, caused by the nature of the work—and are thus covered under workmen's compensation.

But an advisory council study last year found that less than 5 percent of permanent disabilities could be traced to such origins.

More than half of the cases of protracted disabilities occur at younger ages when workers have heavy family responsibilities, the studies indicated.

Because many such disabled workers may have young children, the benefits would be keyed not only to wages earned while working and length of employment but also to the number of a disabled worker's dependents.

Under the pending bill an aged disabled husband or widower, who is the dependent of a woman worker, would be given the same sort of protection as dependents of a male worker.

INSURANCE COMPANY VIEWS

Mr. Altmeyer told Congress the administration plans to use the same administrative machinery for short-term and extended disability, and to use the existing old-age insurance bureau's facilities.

Employers would only have to keep one set of wage records, he said, and prepare only one wage report covering old-age, survivors, and disability insurance.

In the present hearings before the Ways and Means Committee the life insurance companies of the United States raised what they called "grave doubts" about the feasibility of setting up a permanent disability system.

"The insurance companies," they told Congress, "have had an impressive adverse experience with total and permanent disability benefits."

But on that point Mr. Altmeyer cited a view expressed last year by the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security, which said that the experience of the life insurance companies was important but not conclusive.

As to the administration of temporary disability benefits, widely different views have been laid before the House committee.

"The administration of temporary disability benefits," the insurance companies told the committee, "would require a new and huge Nation-wide Federal bureaucracy of doubtful efficiency.

The social security commissioner said it would require very little addition to the administrative machinery.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR PETERSON, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB AND EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech delivered in New York on April 23 by the Honorable Val Peterson, Governor of Nebraska, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and immediately following his speech that an editorial appearing in the April 25 issue of the New York Herald Tribune also be printed. This speech contains some statements relating to the development of the Missouri River Basin which will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GOV. VAL PETERSON, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 23, 1949

My pleasure in coming to New York does not result solely from the hospitality which I have received, gracious though that hospitality has been. It arises primarily from the opportunity afforded me to discuss with you some of the perplexing problems which confront the American people and the Republican Party. We believe in advancing the welfare of all sections of our country and all classes of our people, and we give our loyalty to the Republican Party only because we believe it to be the most effective instrument available for the achievement of that high purpose.

Some of my friends in Nebraska suggested that it was fortunate that I could address your group in an off year when the tensions and bitterness which mark our presidential elections are absent. Today we can temper our partisanship with a touch of objectivity, and can afford the luxury of seeing ourselves as do others. I know that you join with me in the wish that more light and discernment and less heat and bombast might be evident in our party councils and activities at all times.

It is encouraging to observe that since November last, the Republican Party has been doing some intensive soul-searching. Virtually every party leader has offered a diagnosis of our ills and prescribed a cure. In addition we have been told by writers, columnists, lecturers, and commentators, both friendly and otherwise, just why we have lost the last five presidential elections, and what we must do if we expect to win another.

There are those who also tell us that we aren't going to win no matter what we do and that we are through. My response, from Republican Nebraska, to this defeatist palaver is to recall Mark Twain and state that the report of our demise is greatly exaggerated.

A few months ago, the Republican National Committee met in our State in the city of Omaha. It was my privilege to address this gathering. Since then I have received about a thousand letters from people, big and small, about the country, who seemed genuinely interested in what I had to say.

The Chicago Daily Tribune was anything but flattering about my comments. In fact it made a lengthy editorial tirade upon one of my views. According to the renowned Colonel's paper, Roosevelt, and not the Japanese, bombed Pearl Harbor, and your fair city of New York is a hostile foreign country. We can all be happy, indeed, that his narrow nationalistic views have had limited acceptance. Be that as it may, the general response I received convinced me that many people of the rank and file, to which I belong, want of our party, the Republican party, an organization which is alive, breathes fresh air, and enjoys a healthy circulation.

Our principal difficulty arises from a lack of agreement as to what is wrong and what we ought to do about it. For example, on one hand we are told that the Republican Party has been reactionary in domestic and isolationist in foreign affairs when both the national interest and public opinion required the opposite policies. We must, therefore, out-promise the Democrats and out-new deal the New Deal.

On the other hand it is alleged that the Republican Party has not had the courage to stand by its guns and defend the economic and political principles of our fathers. We should return to the isolationism and reactionary economic doctrines of yesteryear.

Needless to say, I do not subscribe to either of these extreme points of view. My own approach to these problems is one which I like to think is, if you please, a cautious, though progressive, liberalism, or an enlightened conservatism. This, I take it, is what the Greek philosophers meant by the Golden Mean, or "all things in reason and nothing to excess."

I reject both the "me too" and "do nothing" positions. I want a Republican Party that will face today's problems forthrightly and take intellingent, effective action. I find nothing but discouragement in the attitude of those who would rather do nothing and be nothing than acknowledge any virtue, however slight, in the opposition.

Certainly we will get nowhere by demanding that Government withdraw from every activity into which it has entered in the last generation. The clock cannot be turned back, and we must recognize that we do not live in a frontier society in which government can confine itself to validating land titles and warding off the Indians.

Our party cannot be an agency of obstructionism, blind opposition and narrow personalism. It must be a party of the people, drawing its inspiration from the people. It must provide for the people the things which they want and which are in their best interest. If the desires of the people are not compatible with their long-range welfare, and that is, of course, the Nation's welfare, then it is the Republican party's duty and privilege to lead the people to an understanding of what is best.

I recognize a certain idealism in the suggestion made by Phillip Wilkie, which leads professional politicians and office holders to stamp it as impractical. Yet I am of the opinion that there is merit in his proposal that we hold a general Republican conference in which the rank and file of our party throughout the length and breadth of this land might meet to discuss, fully and frankly, the problems that face America and our position with respect to them.

I do not subscribe for one moment to the belief that the formation of the policies of our party should be the exclusive province of our congressional representatives, our State or local administrations, or the national committee. Certainly these groups have no corner upon the best thinking of America.

Our party must outline a set of fundamental principles upon which we can agree. Words and terms must be defined so that when we employ them we communicate thoughts which are understandable. We need, in fact, a party-wide course in elementary government. Take the expression, "me, too." In my judgment it would be ridiculous to apply it to a great Republican leader, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

In discussing the Republican Party in the current issue of Fortune magazine, he says: "We believe that Government has the obligation to promote better education, better health, better housing, better security for our people, and equality of opportunity." And he goes on to say that because of our tremendous productivity, "we can maintain a minimum floor under education, health, housing, and food."

Whenever you talk about floors or ceilings in an economic society, obviously you are talking about a society in which free enterprise is limited. Some will say this, and other proposals in Mr. TAFT's article, make him a "me, tooer." Certainly I can see no foundation for such a statement.

We need to know the meaning of free enterprise; to what degree it is possible in a modern society, whether it means the same thing to the small-business men and farmers of America and to the monopolists, who, while paying lip service, grow rich by doing everything to eliminate it. We need to understand that for over 50 years Republicans and Democrats alike have agreed upon the need to regulate big business and high finance in the interests of the little people who were unable to stand up against these modern giants. Further, both parties have utilized governmental undertakings to compel monopolies to reduce their rates and have extended Government enterprise into fields unoccupied by private enterprise. In short, Government has protected the weaker members of society by collective action.

What do we as Republicans believe is the function of government? Should it be limited strictly to maintaining law and order?

Some might answer "Yes." If so, would they be prepared to eliminate the public schools in America? Certainly that function could be performed by private enterprises. Yet that issue seemingly was settled approximately 100 years ago when it was a matter of bitter controversy. The same question might be asked about road, street, and bridge building, libraries, public health services, college education, the varied services supplied by our farmers and our businessmen, the subsidies to the air lines, the former subsidization of railroads, the postal system, rural free mail delivery, public recreation, and a multitude of other activities in which present-day governments engage.

We need to state honestly what functions of government we would be willing to fight to eliminate. We should outline those things which we have a reasonable hope to believe could be eliminated. To suggest such a course is to portray the enormous difficulty of our task.

No serious student of government, with whom I am familiar, would suggest that government need not regulate business in the interest of the general public, to protect the weak and unorganized against the strong and predatory. Such great Republicans as Charles Evans Hughes, Theodore Roosevelt, Elihu Root, and William Howard Taft accepted this as a proper responsibility of government. The new imperative in government, as Walter Lippmann calls it, was stated and implemented by a Republican President, Herbert Hoover. Did this action constitute a foundation for the undue development of statism in America, or was it a proper act by government to protect the public, our fellow citizens, friends, and neighbors against suffering and disaster?

President Hoover said during the difficult depression days, "The function of Federal Government in these times is to use its reserve powers and its strength for the protection of citizens and local governments by support to our institutions against forces beyond their control."

On the basis of that statement, he went forth to meet the depression with a program which competent students have said contained all the more specific principles of President Franklin Roosevelt's recovery program. Recognizing that he was departing radically from governmental precedent in not permitting the economic depression to run its course without interference, President Hoover stated, "We have not feared boldly to adopt unprecedented measures to meet the unprecedented violence of the storm."

Modern society no longer affords us the choice of a government that is neutral in matters economic. Modern life would be utterly impossible under such a situation. To propose it is to advocate anarchy. We can, and must, control the degree of governmental interference and direction which we will permit over our lives. To preserve individual initiative and enterprise we must check statism, the welfare state, the exponents of all-wise, all-powerful government, the womb-to-the-tomb "do-gooders." We must also check the monopolists and cartelists, business or labor, who are enemies of American free enterprise and competition as surely as are the inhabitants of the Kremlin.

In fact, when the people obtained the suffrage and free education, the foundation was laid for recognition that their lot could be improved by pressures through their government, directed at the Public Treasury. The people have the ultimate power in a democratic society. It is the responsibility of the leaders of our party to help lead the people to the wise use of that power so that choices beneficial to America are made. But if we aren't willing to have the people exercise their power, we admit lack of confidence in democracy and a willingness to see it destroyed.

I have lived in the Middle West all my life and am proud of the influence my Nebraska environment has had upon me. Above all, I have been taught the necessity and virtue of frugal living. I believe that this virtue is as applicable and necessary to State and National Government as it is to the individual. The trend under the New Deal has been toward bigger and more costly government—and it has been a trend which has gained momentum like the winter blitz we suffered in Nebraska only a few weeks ago.

Government this year will consume one out of every four dollars the individual earns. Actually this cost may increase in the near future as administration spending becomes greater, and particularly if the economic weather changes for the worse. For me the handwriting is on the wall. If we are honest with ourselves and meet our responsibilities to community, State, and Nation, we must pledge our party, the Republican Party, to fight relentlessly against present inflated government.

That's exactly what we are doing in Nebraska. In spite of the fact that for the fiscal year 1948, our per capita State taxes were the fifth lowest in America, the budget which I proposed to the Nebraska Legislature calls for an increase of only 5.7 percent in State expenditures for the coming biennium.

Economy, like charity, begins at home. I firmly believe that those of us who shoulder political responsibility must practice what we preach, because what we do as representatives of the party speaks louder than what we say.

Today the world faces squarely the necessity of immediate conservation and careful management of its natural resources in order to provide adequate subsistence for its inhabitants. The fact is that over half the people on the earth at this moment, and that's over a billion people, are suffering from chronic malnutrition and millions die of starvation annually. Part of this is due to inadequate transportation systems, but in the main it results from the ruination of great natural resources over wide portions of the world.

During the recent war, in company with thousands of other Americans, I served in the Orient, and the nature of my military duties was such as to take me over all of western China, India, Burma, the Middle East, and North Africa. In China, and in the other places mentioned, I saw widespread evidences of erosion which had destroyed what were formerly fertile areas upon which lived prosperous, happy people. Today in those areas live blighted populations whose lack of food is always revealed by the telltale bloated bellies of their little children. I have seen Chinese peasants trudging from the river bottom to high upon the sharply sloping, rocky hills, with a bucket of slime and muck slung from the ends of the yokes saddled upon their shoulders. Nothing was more valuable to them than the life-giving soil which they spread out upon their barren patches. Great sections of the earth have been ruined by men through overgrazing, careless handling of the soil, and destruction of forests. Men have lived as though the treasures of the world were inexhaustible, and even in this modern age we seem to assume that the magic of our scientists is such that we can disregard the warnings of nature as we blithely destroy her gifts, many of which if not beyond our power to re-create, at least cannot be restored, except at tremendous cost and over exceedingly long periods of time. Upon every continent, in every country, the effects of man's neglect and destructiveness are to be seen. We have been particularly profligate in the United States where we have been so richly endowed.

In the last few years, we have become aware of the necessity for conservation of the soil, our forests, and our water. Much has been accomplished, but in view of the stakes which are in the balance, what we have done to date is inadequate. We must expand our efforts until we apply upon every foot of our land the best soil management practices known. We must stop senseless destruction of our forests and put every drop of water to work producing for man.

In the Missouri Basin, we are presently engaged upon the greatest resource development undertaking of its kind in the history of the world. There is nothing comparable to it anywhere, except possibly the Russian development being carried on in the Volga River of which we know, of course, very little. In an area covering 530,000 square miles of territory and reaching from inside Canada to St. Louis, we are attempting to manage our soil in such a way as to contain in it the maximum amount of moisture which the Lord permits to fall upon it. Then, recognizing that there will be, in certain seasons, a tremendous run-off, we are building upon the main stem of the Missouri River and its tributaries 110 gigantic dams to impound behind them life-giving waters which can later be utilized for irrigation upon the parched soils of our western areas and to develop tremendous quantities of electric power as they are released. In addition, we are firming navigation upon the Missouri River, providing better municipal water supplies for our great river cities, and constructing exceedingly fine recreational areas. Briefly, instead of permitting the twin destructive forces of drought and flood to play dominant roles in our area, we intend to make the water which falls upon our soil work for our people from the time it descends in the form of raindrops and snow until it leaves our borders at St. Louis.

In one flood, in June 1947, we lost over $175,000,000 in property damages and in my State the lives of 13 people were taken. In 1935, 110 people lost their lives in a Nebraska flood. While the 1947 property damages were tremendous, they represent only a fraction of the value of the loss which the Missouri Basin sustained in the millions of tons of irreplaceable topsoil which were swept down the river to pile up in the deltas below New Orleans.

The work presently being done in the Missouri Basin is a fine example of constructive action by Government. The job is too big for the localities and States alone and requires the resources of all of the people of America applied through the National Government. The development of the basin, which contributes an important portion of the foodstuffs and raw materials of America, and is vital in many other respects, represents an investment in a more prosperous America. As a matter of fact, our Nation cannot afford not to develop this great area.

Construction in the area is presently going forward under the direction of a committee made up of representatives of the five great Federal agencies involved and the governors of five of the States. Governmental action is taken only after full and free democratically conducted inquiry, debate, and decision. The procedure represents democracy in action. Here is government at its best: government as the servant of the people, not as a master, not dictating, not ordering, not directing—but rather serving. Presently some enthusiasts of centralized governmental power are clamoring for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority in the area. We do not want such an alien influence in our midst. We are resolved to fight against this evidence of bureaucracy. It can do nothing that is not already being accomplished efficiently and effectively. We know that those who believe that the voice of local citizens should be heard in government will rally to our support. Here is an issue of public welfare which transcends partisanship. But to the extent that partisanship

may be necessary, the Republican Party must stand for popular government against centralized controls.

The ever present thought of war looms just as disturbingly in the minds of the people of Nebraska as it does in yours. The plaintive hope for peace in our time hangs heavy over every city, town, and hamlet. In frequent tours of my State, whether it be to a remote cattle ranch in northwest Nebraska, or to an old people's home in one of our cities, I am asked the same question, Will there be another war?

If ever there was need for a unified foreign policy endowed with vision, wisdom, and clarity it is now. Unfortunately, such has not been the case. Since the last war the United States has spent millions of dollars in secret diplomacy and billions of dollars in direct economic concessions to European nations for the purpose of containing the Soviet Union. In spite of such acts of government, in spite of the organized hopes of millions of Americans, the Red bear in 1949 is perhaps stronger as a world power than ever before in history. It almost appears that the Soviet capacity for inciting world fear has grown in ratio to the increase of American expenditures to check such growth. After 3 years of the American containment program, the east-west deadlock continues and the cold war goes on.

There is no evidence that the United States has stopped the spread of Soviet influence in eastern and southern Asia. The Russians have increased pressure on the smaller nations of the Middle East, while in the past year and a half we vacillated hither and yon, losing prestige of all nations concerned on the Palestine question. By withdrawing in China we have yielded one-half of the world to Stalin after wildly tossing billions of dollars about in an attempt to stem the onslaught of his imperialism—a procedure which to me is as senseless as fighting to win a football game in the first half and then doing everything possible to lose it in the second. And the Russians have won the battle of Asiatic opinion through the west's fumbling efforts in Indonesia.

If American influence exceeds that of the hammer and sickle at all, it is only in the Western Hemisphere, at a few remote points in Asia, and what has been described as a deep beachhead in western Europe.

Russian imperialistic aggression, backed by the world's greatest military force, must, of course, be stopped. Further, the zealots, native and foreign, who seek relentlessly to undermine existing governments and replace them by Red ones, must be met head-on, and fire must be fought with fire. It is not enough to contain Russia. It is our job to meet her on every front and to point out clearly to the inhabitants of the areas in which we clash the many ways in which our democratic system is greatly superior.

I welcome the Marshall plan, I support the United Nations and approve the Atlantic Pact. I know, of course, however, by first-hand experience over much of the globe, that we live not in one world or in two worlds, but in many worlds. True, rapid transportation and communication make our world appear small and create a sense of oneness, but the important divisions are in men's minds, and we cannot have world federalism until we are able to eliminate, or at least soften greatly, the tremendous forces of ignorance, greed, religious, and racial prejudices, narrow nationalism, differing languages, political and economic ideologies which divide us. It is in the minds of men where one world must first be attained.

Despite the readiness of the American people to cooperate with the present administration in the tremendous expenditure of effort and material, our foreign policy has not been successful. The threat of war is perhaps as imminent today as since VJ-day.

The people of America are tired of the incessant bickering about the labels of international plans. We are committed to every peaceful endeavor for an effective world partnership of peace-loving nations. In the Atlantic Pact we have reflected American determination to sacrifice even peace, if need be, for the principles of freedom and self-determination for individuals and nations. We are dedicated to fight for our peace. Let us enter that fight with clean hands. Aggression must not have our support in any part of the globe. If we are to build friendship the world over, we must practice what we preach. We cannot stand as an inspiration to the people of other nations in the pursuit of a democratic way of life while lending tacit, if not outright, support to totalitarian governments. It matters little that such dictatorships currently may or may not be out of sympathy with the Soviets.

The Republican Party must make up its mind to stand up for a realistic foreign policy based on national survival. A realistic foreign policy would have found a way to save China. To be against reactionism in China certainly does not imply support to the Chinese Reds, any more than to fight the EAM forces in Greece implies that one is a Fascist. We Republicans must do what we can to prevent a repetition of the grevious China error. America cannot afford such bungling policies.

In 1854, Abraham Lincoln was debating with himself what political issues to discuss and defend. While so debating, he spoke the famous words, "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." Nearly 100 years later, the Republican Party in this critical moment of its history asks itself the same question.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 25, 1949]

GOVERNOR OF NEBRASKA

Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, made his voice heard through the Nation by a timely and powerful speech at the Omaha meeting of the Republican National Committee last January. New York has looked forward to a visit from him, and over the week end had the satisfaction of hearing him state his views on various problems. The Governor spoke with the forthrightness we expect from him native Midwest, in a tone which he himself described as "a cautious, though progressive liberalism * * * an enlightened conservatism." He struck the note which the Republican Party needs to hear, and which in its best seasons has come to it like a strengthening wind from across the continent.

Saturday, at a luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club, Governor Peterson announced that his party "certainly will get nowhere" by demanding that Government withdraw from every activity into which it has entered in the last generation. We must recognize, he said, "that we do not live in a frontier society in which Government can confine itself to validating land titles and warding off the Indians." Among the specific examples of the new functions which Government must undertake, the most interesting and the most novel to easterners was Governor Peterson's discussion of the immense resource conservation and development program now going forward in the Missouri Basin.

He described this work as the greatest of its kind in the history of the world, with nothing comparable to it anywhere "except possibly the Russian development being carried on in the Volga River." Over an area covering 530 square miles, land reclamation, flood control, and power development is being achieved through cooperation among five States and with the Federal Government. The Governor denied that a Missouri Valley Authority could accomplish anything not now being done. It is from this whole-hearted acceptance of the need for constructive action, combined with an insistence on methods more healthful than centralized authority and increased bureaucracy, that Governor Peterson's greatest contribution to his party and his Nation derives. We hope that we may be hearing more from him.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in accordance with the understanding reached last night, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that an appropriation bill may be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3333, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer a brief statement as to the contents of the bill.

The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $2,396,337,265, which is an increase over the House bill of $185,643,180.

Normal restorations of House reductions are recommended in the amount of $5,205,200, of which the largest amount was $3,200,000 for the strengthening of local health units.

Added to that, the committee felt duty-bound to go beyond the budget recommendations on the following programs which are vital to the welfare of the Nation:

Further development of vocational education	$9,458,980
Peptic ulcer research	50,000
National Cancer Institute	627,000
National Heart Institute	1,000,000
Dental research construction	2,000,000
Veterans Employment Service	450,000
Total	13,585,980

The largest increase is for payment of military service credits to the railroad-retirement account in the amount of $166,852,000. The committee recommended that the full commitment be made in the bill, but also recommended that the funds be made available in installments over 4 years, starting with a quarter of the total of $166,852,000 for the next fiscal year.

As a comparison with the increases recommended, the bill as reported to the Senate is $161,947,980 over the estimates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 11, after the word "public", to strike out "$1,074,000" and insert "$1,154,000".

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES IN OPERATIONS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to page 4990 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday. As Senators are well aware, yesterday we were discussing the extension of certain powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. During that debate, on Friday of last week, I invited the attention of the Senate to certain irregularities in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the preelection period. It was rather noticeable that no Member of the Senate challenged those statements at that time. It was rather noticeable that during the 2-day interval from Friday to Monday, they were not challenged. I was discussing S. 900, the bill which was being debated, in which it was sought to give the Secretary complete power over the Commodity Credit Corporation. Recognizing the justification of my opposition to this provision, the Senate denied the Secretary of Agriculture control of that Corporation. However, just before the passage of the bill a statement was inserted in the RECORD for which evidently the chairman of the committee did not have too much respect, because for some reason he did not insert it in the RECORD earlier, and did not call it to the attention of the Senate during the debate. Evidently he must have felt that it would not have influenced the votes of Senators, although it was pertinent to the subject.

The Secretary saw fit to deny certain of the remarks which I made. I presume that had the chairman of the committee felt that those remarks were worthy of consideration, the statement of the Secretary's in reply to them would have been inserted in the RECORD earlier, or called to the attention of the Senate before the vote.

I should like to read a portion of the statement found on page 4990:

1. Senator WILLIAMS has accused the Department of misrepresenting facts when it stated last fall that CCC had operated at a profit.

A. He cited letters from the Budget Bureau setting forth the fact that the Corporation had lost over $2,100,000,000 from 1933 to December 31, 1948.

B. He also cited a Budget Bureau letter stating the $2,100,000,000 didn't include $1,700,000,000 of section 32 expenditures.

(1) Senator WILLIAMS then proceeded to add these two figures and claimed the CCC has shown a loss of almost $3,900,000,000.

C. He says the only way CCC can claim a profit is to count as income appropriations it has received or notes that have been canceled for it.

2. Senator WILLIAMS' charge and the basis on which he attempts to substantiate it are completely false.

A. He has twisted the facts to make it appear that the CCC has been a costly burden on the taxpayer, while, in fact, the Corporation has operated most economically considering the jobs it has had to do.

B. The Bureau of the Budget apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

Mr. President, I should like to repeat the last statement I have just read:

The Bureau of the Budget—

According to the Secretary of Agriculture, who is one of the members of the Cabinet, and is in charge of one of the administration's departments—

apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be clear, I am going to review those letters and the inquiry which I made at that time.

On February 1, 1949, I wrote the following letter:

FEBRUARY 1, 1949.

MR. FRANK PACE, JR.,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PACE: Would you please furnish me at the earliest possible date the net results, from a taxpayer's standpoint, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception in 1933 to the latest date you have available. I would like included in this report all moneys which have been expended by the Commodity Credit Corporation, including section 32 funds, minus the amount which has been returned to the Federal Treasury.

It is not necessary that this information be broken down in any manner, since the only answer I am interested in at this time is the net profit or loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation during its lifetime.

That letter was signed by me.

Mr. President, the only statement contained in that letter which I can conceive of, as being confusing to Secretary Brannan, is the statement made in the first sentence, which I shall read again:

Would you please furnish me at the earliest possible date the net results, from a taxpayer's standpoint, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation—

Evidently Secretary Brannan has never heard of any request of a department to review its operations from a taxpayer's standpoint.

I read the reply to that letter, from F. J. Lawton, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget:

FEBRUARY 9, 1949.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In answer to your letter of February 1, 1949, the net loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from its organization on October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1948, was $2,146,930,367.

He includes in the letter a breakdown of the losses, although I did not ask for that.

I now read another section of that letter:

Because corporate funds have been replenished by congressional appropriations, the records of the Corporation show a surplus of $52,544,719 on December 31, 1948.

In the letter he goes on to point out that nearly $4,000,000,000 has accrued to this Corporation through cancellation of notes or through appropriations. He said that because that was counted as income, the Corporation was able to show a $55,000,000 surplus.

In the same letter Mr. Lawton pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation had expended nearly $2,000,000,000 under section 32. I wished to be sure that the Bureau of the Budget was correct in that respect, so I wrote another letter to the Bureau of the Budget; here is the second letter to Mr. Frederick J. Lawton, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.:

FEBRUARY 9, 1949.

DEAR MR. LAWTON: I received your letter of February 9, 1949, containing the information requested in my letter of February 1, 1949.

Am I correct in my understanding that the $2,146,930,367 designated as the loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from the date of its organization through December 31, 1948, does not include the $1,743,960,803 mentioned in the second paragraph of your letter * * *?

Here is Mr. Lawton's reply to that letter, on February 16, 1949:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1949.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In confirmation of the telephone conversation with your office relating to your letter of February 9, you are correct in your understanding that the $2,146,930,367 designated as the loss sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation from the date of its organization through December 31, 1948, does not include the $1,743,960,803 mentioned in the second paragraph of our letter as expenditures under section 32.

Yours sincerely,

F. J. LAWTON,
Assistant Director.

If no one in the Department can understand that language, Mr. President, I think it is time that we put in the Department someone who can understand it.

At this time I should like to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who inserted those documents in the RECORD, and I would like to ask him what there is in those letters that is not plain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware requests unanimous consent that he may ask a question of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the question I should like to ask the Senator

from Oklahoma, after reading those letters, what is it that is not clear enough in my letters and what is his opinion of the statement in which the Secretary said:

> Senator WILLIAMS' charge and the basis on which he attempts to substantiate it are completely false.

The Secretary of Agriculture there was referring to the loss. Then he says:

> He has twisted the facts to make it appear that the CCC has been a costly burden on the taxpayer, while, in fact, the Corporation has operated most economically considering the job it has had to do.

Continuing—

> The Bureau of the Budget apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

At this point I should like to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, to have him comment on that statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. During the past several days and even weeks we have heard many charges made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Delaware against the Commodity Credit Corporation and against the Department of Agriculture, and perhaps against others. After those charges were made, I requested the Secretary of Agriculture to read the charges in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then submit his answers. He complied with my request and submitted some answers. I placed those answers in the RECORD on yesterday.

I am not willing to participate in the debate between the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the Department of Agriculture. I do not have the facts, in the first instance; and I do not have time to develop the facts. So the information I placed in the RECORD, as stated, was the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma this question: Did I correctly understand from him that the statements are not his, but are the views of the Secretary of Agriculture, only?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As stated in my request for the insertion of that material in the RECORD, they were developed at my request, but they were the statements of the Secretary of Agriculture, and, of course, not my own. I do not have the facts. I could not enter into the debate on this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The facts were in the RECORD. I am glad to have the Senator from Oklahoma clarify his position by stating that he himself was not supporting the position taken by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that the views expressed are those of the Secretary of Agriculture, only.

I should like to point out that the only rebuttal which has been made to any of the statements I have made regarding this agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation, has come from the Secretary of Agriculture alone. So far, I have not seen anyone submit any facts anywhere, in any record, which would deny anything I have said. The only resort the Secretary now has is his own statement that—

> The Bureau of the Budget apparently either was misled by the manner in which the Senator presented his inquiry, did not know how to properly state the facts, or made no effort to do so.

In other words, he says that when I asked the Bureau of the Budget to report on the question from a taxpayer's standpoint, the Bureau was not used to that kind of language, did not know how to reply to it, and gave an answer which was wrong.

Mr. President, I admit that probably I got an answer from the Bureau of the Budget different from any which I might have gotten from the Secretary of Agriculture, because I got the truth from the Bureau of the Budget, which is more than I have ever been able to get from the Secretary of Agriculture.

If the Secretary of Agriculture wished to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD anything bearing on the record of the financial operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I would glady insert it in the RECORD myself, if no other Senator wished to do so. If he can show from a taxpayer's standpoint where the Corporation made money, I wish he would do so, because the letter of the Bureau of the Budget which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Friday showed a detail of all the appropriations Congress has made, and the Bureau of the Budget subtracted from the total of those appropriations all the payments the Corporation has made back into the Treasury, and the net loss is shown to be nearly $4,000,000,000, over and above the net worth of the Corporation today.

Mr. President, it is obvious that any man who, as a Government official, says that Corporation has made money, simply is not capable of handling public money properly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been very much impressed by the amount of work the Senator from Delaware has done with regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have in mind a situation. I wonder whether the Senator has given it any thought or study, and what his reaction to the situation is. I refer to the Commodity Credit Corporation's handling of the situation insofar as rye is concerned. The Senator knows there is a support program for rye. I do not know how many rye farmers there are in Delaware. There are about 6,000 in my State, and it is of great concern to them. At this time the price our farmers are receiving for rye is about $1.06 as against the support price of $1.47. That means that if the Commodity Credit Corporation must take up all this rye, it will cost the taxpayers again millions upon millions of dollars.

As I understand—and I wish the Senator would follow this closely and tell me, if I am wrong—the facts which brought about this situation are as follows: The Agricultural Department has taken the position that there is a shortage of rye in this country, and in effect has invited the importation of a sizable amount of Canadian rye. That rye of course goes into the elevators, where it is intermixed with American rye. The Army has requested the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase large quantities of rye, which is needed in the occupation areas in Germany and Austria. Of course the Army under the law cannot do that purchasing directly. It must be done through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The ECA has requested the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase rye. Because of the present price of rye, it costs less according to caloric content I believe than any other available food. Here is an unusual situation as I understand. The Commodity Credit Corporation says it will not purchase that rye for the Army. It will not purchase any rye that is in an elevator in which there is any Canadian rye. The end result has been that the Army must go to the Argentine, where it is purchasing rye, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is artificially and purposely—and I use the word "purposely" because I cannot find any other explanation—depressing the price of rye in this country, to the end that they must spend huge amounts of money to bring rye back up to the support price.

In that connection I may say the two Senators from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and I called upon the Secretary of Agriculture about 6 weeks ago and asked for an explanation of what appeared to be a very ridiculous situation—a situation in which the Secretary of Agriculture says "We will deliberately depress the price of rye," to the injury of farmers in the Middle West, and at the same time at great cost to the taxpayers, since the price of rye must be brought up to the support price, after it has been artificially depressed. He was unable to give us any explanation whatever of this act. I wonder whether the Senator has any comment upon this deliberate attempt, first, to injure the farmer, and second, to make it necessary to spend huge amounts of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am sorry I am not sufficiently familiar with the particular transaction to discuss it. However, I am aware of some of the facts, and as I understand, they are very nearly as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin. I am not at all surprised at the procedure they are following, because it is merely another example of the stupidity of this organization under its present management. That was one of the reasons for my being so insistent on the floor of the Senate during the past 2 days that the control of the Corporation be placed in the hands of an independent board which could be held accountable to Congress, and not placed in the hands of a man whose sole ambition was to further the political fortunes of his party. I put

in the RECORD Friday certain records which showed how they had pulled the plugs from under the grain market in the preelection period, which in my opinion was done for the sole purpose of influencing the outcome of the election. It is very significant to note that in Secretary Brannan's reply, inserted in the RECORD, he offered no explanation whatever, and made no effort to deny the charge. The reason he made no effort to deny it is, I am sure, he knows I got my information from the records of his own office. If there is a denial, however it may be voluminous, I shall be glad to insert it in the RECORD. I think it is, I shall not say criminal, but inexcusable negligence on the part of the administration to manipulate the markets to the detriment of the farmers, purely in order to gain in many instances nothing but political advantage.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator think there is any significance in the fact that each year while the farmers have their rye in their bins, where they still own the rye, then the market is artificially depressed by actions such as the Commodity Credit Corporation has taken this year? I may say its actions in other years have had the same effect, though they have been of a different type. But we have had a history each year of the rye market being depressed until the rye gets out of the farmer's hands and into the hands of speculators, and then the Commodity Credit Corporation promptly takes steps to bring the price of rye up, after they can no longer do the farmer a penny's worth of advantage. Does the Senator think that is at all significant?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That practice has been followed in respect to many crops, as I have pointed out repeatedly during the past 2 years. I pointed out again last Friday that it was done last fall in connection with the corn crop particularly. I pointed out how the market had been manipulated as late as February 1949. I pointed out how in the month of February, in the week ending February 4, they cut purchases drastically, almost overnight, 93 percent below the preceding week, with the result that the grain market was completely demoralized for 3 or 4 weeks. They stayed out of that market, and in the early weeks of March they entered the market, with heavy buying that shot the market up. I said then that if they did not know any better, it was time we had somebody in the Corporation who did know how to operate; and, if they did know better, it was inexcusable.

The Secretary points it up again, questioning the accuracy of my statement regarding the fact when I said the Commodity Credit Corporation bill last year was passed without any objection on the floor of the Senate. If there was any objection on the floor of the Senate I wish again some Senator would rise and tell me who objected on the floor of the Senate. I should be glad to yield to anyone who wants to point out in the RECORD where anyone objected, because I cannot find it in the RECORD.

I shall read the record which was taken on the day the conference report was submitted in the Senate. It is the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I read from the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on bringing in a conference report, but I am a little curious to know for how long it extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. This conference report gives perpetual existence to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The principal change from the Senate bill is this: The Senate bill provided for a board of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The House bill provided for a board of five members, three of whom must be outside the Department of Agriculture. The conference committee report provides for a board of five members to be appointed by the President, two of whom shall not be employees of the Department of Agriculture, leaving the Board comprised of three who may be employees of the Department of Agriculture and two chosen from outside the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Secretary of Agriculture a member of the Board?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed. I am sure he is a member of the Board.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that this Board, as constituted under the terms of the conference report, will be closely integrated with the work of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The Senator from Vermont is satisfied that probably three members chosen out of the five will be within the Department of Agriculture. The Senator from Vermont is not satisfied that the Board of five is large enough, but has hope that the next Congress may see fit to enlarge the Board if the five members prove to be inadequate.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

If there was any objection, or if there was pointed out anything objectionable in the conference report I fail to find it. I repeat, when the President signed that bill he made no statement whatever of any objection. True, he made statements later. Yes, he made numerous statements, with many of which I did not agree. But, again, he did not come back to the special session of the Congress to ask for the repeal of any of the legislation we had passed. If he had recognized this as such a dangerous piece of legislation, why did he not include that in his recommendations to the special session last summer?

Furthermore, if what the Secretary of Agriculture says is true, as he says it is, and if he recognized at the time the law was passed its inadequacy to meet the situation, why had he not bought the grain bins which were needed for the 1948 crop? He admits he had ample authority under the old law to buy all the grain bins he needed, and to put them in the name of the Corporation. He had the power to buy all the land he needed, or to lease it; but up to July 1, 1948, the effective date of the law which was passed last year, yet he took absolutely no action on the question anywhere. He was still selling grain bins. He sold them in May, June, July, August, and right straight through up to December. There was nothing in either law which said he had to do it. There was not anything written anywhere to that effect.

According to the statement of the Comptroller General, in auditing the accounts, a situation existed particularly regarding grain bins, in which the Corporation itself did not know how many grain bins it owned. It did not know whether it owned any; it did not know where they were located and did not know what was their condition. In other words, its records were in a deplorable condition. That is the reason why the farmers got caught without grain bins. The Department of Agriculture was asleep on the job and awoke in the middle of the 1948 crop year and tried to find someone to be the goat.

I still insist, Mr. President, the Corporation was selling grain bins during the period when it was bewailing the fact that it was short of grain bins. I asked the Secretary to produce to the Senate the report, which is in his own files, and to which I referred last Friday, which is so highly confidential that the Department is afraid to reveal it to the Congress and to the people because that report will confirm every statement I made last Friday. The Secretary knows it will confirm my statements.

There is another part of his statement to which I shall refer briefly. I shall not reply to it at this time, but shall reply to it at a later and more appropriate date. I refer to the answers in the RECORD which were made in reference to the shortage of $366,000,000. I merely want to recognize that statement at this time and to say that I have not overlooked it. I have not changed my position from the first time when I stated that an investigation was justified. I have reason to believe that such an investigation should and will be conducted. Therefore I shall not reply to that statement at this time.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I respectfully withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the first committee amendment, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "$1,074,000" and insert "$1,154,000", is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 16, after the word "Columbia", to

strike out "$1,064,200" and insert "$1,093,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$391,000" and insert "$550,000."

THREATENED ABANDONMENT OF AMERICA'S HISTORIC TRADITION OF SOVEREIGN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the American people now confront their most fateful decision beside which ECA, the Atlantic Pact, the rearmament of western Europe, the inevitable Mediterranean pact, and the prospective Pacific pact, are all incidental.

The fateful decision to which I refer is the question of whether we are finally to abandon forever our historic tradition of a sovereign independence and constitutional guaranties and safeguards of our economic, social, political, and personal rights and liberties.

Why is it, Mr. President, that at a time when this, and this alone, is the single decision before us, the American people are not up in arms fighting desperately to expose and oppose those forces which, behind a deliberate barrage of cynical propaganda, are steadily undermining the whole foundation of our heritage of freedom?

The reason for this tragic circumstance has been ably stated by one of America's outstanding journalists, Mr. Herbert S. Agar, when he said:

> The first duty of citizens in a country which is trying to be free is that you should know and make a greater effort to know what is going on, and also an equivalent effort to know what ought to be going on. Until you put the two things together, the news isn't dangerous. That is the reason I think there is likely to be underemphasis on the importance of interpretation and what ought to be going on, because the facts are not explosive, not dangerous, and therefore, the public doesn't resent the facts until they are related to a picture of what ought to be happening.

Mr. President, such a condition is dangerous enough, but when the facts themselves are twisted, distorted, or slanted, out of all recognition, in relation to the reality which they are alleged to reflect, no people—not even the American people—can save themselves from the inevitable consequences.

When the truth is deliberately distorted by clever falsehoods, not even the American people can distinguish between the two. Much less can they organize a united opposition to expose and check the political pied pipers who are leading us astray. As a consequence, it becomes almost impossible for those who do know what is going on to rise above a blind, negative opposition, to formulate and champion any constructive alternative course of action.

Mr. President, nowhere are these truths more startlingly revealed than in a recent editorial which appeared in the British paper, the Recorder, which was published in London on February 26, 1949. I hope every Senator who is not present will read what this British newspaper has to say about America. I quote from the editorial, as follows:

> It is chiefly from America that the talk has come of war, if finally necessary to stop Russia.
>
> But if a step involving war does become necessary to stop Russia oppressing, dominating, conquering, subjugating and enslaving little peoples, then Britain will have to make it.
>
> The United States, as again we have said before, is inexperienced in world diplomacy compared with the two or more centuries of success in foreign affairs which is the record of Great Britain. * * *
>
> American inexperience in diplomacy has brought the world nearer to war. Now the firmness of Britain will have to prevent that war. * * *
>
> The British Empire is one. It is still the greatest power in the world. The British Empire will have to take over again the leadership of the world.
>
> No use now for the United States to continue speaking and writing earnestly about responsibility of the American century of suggesting even taking a hand in the running and development of the colonies of the British Empire. The United States is still a new country of conglomerate peoples. It has much to learn. And its Constitution does not allow the moral courage which must be evident in a leader of the world. * * *
>
> And if war should come—which, please God, historic breadth and firmness such as is embodied by Mr. Winston Churchill will prevent—then America would be dragged in as she was by Japan, for Stalin does not believe that the present Russia and the present United States can long continue to live side by side in the world. And the vast industrial output of the United States would play its great part in defeating Russia as it did in the final years of the wars against Germany. * * *
>
> The British Empire has strength as well as experience and moral courage. These can yet prevent war if there is no more blundering diplomacy—American words—and if the wide and united British Empire once again, and now takes up its rightful leadership of the world.

Mr. President, for those Americans who are now concerned to read the signs of the times aright, this British editor has rendered an invaluable service. For behind this editorial are three basic facts, a full understanding of which reveals the staggering implications of a permanent acceptance by the American people of their present role in the internationalist propaganda policies and programs, to which they are now committed.

Mr. President, the first fact is that which this editor cautiously refers to as America's blundering diplomacy, which has brought the world nearer to war. This refers to the outrageous roles that two American Presidents have played as international power politicians at the secret conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. As a consequence, Mr. President, the world has been torn in two. The system of sovereign independent nation states, upon which all our international law of the past 400 years has been founded, has been destroyed. Russia stands today outstretched across half the world. International free trade, based on the free-enterprise system, is now fighting for its life against a closed door, slave labor, state-controlled trade monopoly in the hands of those who are determined to use the products of agriculture and industry as a major political weapon, even at the expense of their own people. And America has been left with the impossible task of underwriting, in the midst of civil and guerrilla warfare, the two bankrupt imperial possessions of western Europe and eastern Asia.

In addition, Mr. President, America has been committed for the past four postwar years to the underwriting, at the expense of the American people, of the most savage policies of revenge, of destruction, of mass deportation, of slave labor, and deliberate mass starvation of millions of the helpless and innocent.

As a consequence of these policies, to which the American people have been committeed without even their knowledge or consent, we have been financing and legalizing the most pro-Communist policies and programs conceivable, even though they not only betrayed our American and Christian principles, but actually threatened our national security as well.

It is little wonder then, that this British editor refers to all of this as "blundering diplomacy," for, dependent as Britain is on the continued outpouring of American resources to save her own neck, the British are as determined as our own present administration not to breathe a word of the criminal betrayals that have thus far taken place, under the auspices of Anglo-American diplomacy.

Is it not tremendously significant that in the document titled "The North Atlantic Pact," which the Department of State prepared as an explanation of the pact itself, there is not a single reference to these outrageous secret agreements which continue to legalize Russian aggression while they are still on the diplomatic books?

Here, then, is what the American people are being asked blindly to embrace, namely, a series of outrageous secret agreements, which for sheer brutality and cynical repudiation of the rights of private property, and the dignity of human personality, are unmatched in history.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JENNER. Not only were there secret agreements, but is it not a fact that France and England, two of the signatories to the North Atlantic Pact, now have an open agreement with Russia that they will not enter into any coalition of any kind without Russia's consent?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is exactly correct.

Does anyone in his right mind believe, Mr. President, that the American people would adopt the permanent role of underwriting, with what remains of our blood and treasure, the suicidal consequence of these secret agreements, if the

American people were honestly told what has happened?

Mr. President, more than 2 years ago I made a demand on the floor of the Senate that those secret agreements, of which I said even the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were ignorant, be produced for the benefit of Senators at least. I may add they have not been produced to this day.

The second fact to which the editor of this British newspaper has referred is the charge that our "Constitution does not allow the moral courage which must be evident in a leader of the world."

Mr. President, I am certain that this British editor did not have the slightest idea of calling our attention to the tragic irony that underlies his charge. It is obvious that what is referred to is the fact that our Constitution contains limitations of power and safeguards against secret commitments by an American President which involve the American people in entangling alliances with foreign nations. This is what is meant by the lack of moral courage which a leader of the world must possess.

By inference, we are led to believe that we cannot either protect our vital domestic interests or play our rightful role on the international stage if we permit these constitutional limitations of power and safeguards against secret commitments to remain on our statute books.

This is the new propaganda line, Mr. President, which has been imported from the leaders of the British Empire, and which is being faithfully echoed by pro-British administration spokesmen. Yet, before the American people permit themselves to be victimized by this propaganda and permit the permanent abandonment of the constitutional safeguards of our freedom and independence, they must be fully warned of the implications.

What are these implications? If we are to believe our British brothers, it is the moral courage of the leaders of the British Empire upon the imitation of which our salvation is dependent.

Under the British form of government, in contrast to our own, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister have the legal power, and the moral right, to commit the British people to any kind of an expedient move as pawns on the bloody chessboard of international power politics. Yet, Mr. President, the nature of these commitments and their brutal consequences have been so offensive, even to the British conscience, that British statesmen themselves have not dared to take the British people into their confidence, in spite of the fact that their actions are based on a legal and moral right to use any means to gain an allegedly justifiable end.

I want briefly to read into the RECORD a series of as sorry admissions of chicanery and deception as has ever been perpetrated on a free people, all coming from eminent Britishers.

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, Disraeli, for many years Prime Minister of England, wrote:

> All great events have been distorted, most of the important causes concealed, some of the principal characters never appear, and all who figure are so misunderstood and misrepresented that the result is a complete mystification. If the history of England be ever written by one who has the knowledge and the courage, the world would be astonished.

Those are the words of the Prime Minister of England, not the words of a Senator of the United States.

In 1932, David Lloyd George admitted in his book, Reparations and War Debts, that in spite of all the grandiose hopes and dreams that were peddled to the world by the British propagandists for the League of Nations, and in spite of all the pious pretention of the inherent justice of the Versailles Treaty, behind the scene the following condition prevailed:

> Though the peace treaties were signed, and a League of Nations was set up to keep the peace, some of the nations never abandoned their wartime mentality. The first reaction of any calamity is to create an intense desire to prevent its repetition, and to concentrate all thought and energy on that particular kind of disaster to the exclusion of all other possible or probable mishaps. The danger of that state of mind is that it is apt to be neurotic and unbalanced and that its energies are misdirected. It is haunted with the spectre of symptoms and secondary causes, and not with the root cause of the evil.

Some time later, Mr. President, Mr. Aldous Huxley, the brilliant British man of letters, charged:

> At no period of the world's history has lying been practiced so shamelessly or, thanks to modern technological progress, so efficiently, or on so vast a scale as by the political and economic dictators of the twentieth century.

Then, in 1938, the eminent British historian, Mr. H. G. Wells, warned that even in England—

> The adjustment of history to reality has become a matter of extreme urgency. * * * Common history remains still national or regional propaganda lightened by gossip.

In 1939, Lord Lloyd warned the British people that—

> We cannot, however much we flatter ourselves to the contrary, be moral and purposeful when it suits us, and flaccid, indolent, and cynical when we do not feel our self-interest threatened. * * *
>
> For nearly 20 years the English people have been living in a fool's paradise, taught that the world was moving at an ever-increasing pace toward millennium, when palpably and clearly it was rushing straight for disaster.

Mr. President, nowhere is the determination of the British leaders to deceive their people as to the terrible consequences of the commitments which those leaders are legally and morally empowered to make more evident than in the following quotation from the April 1946 issue of the Nineteenth Century and After, which reveals that—

> It was at Tehran that Russia won the peace and Great Britain lost it. Eleven countries—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria—lost their independence. With one stroke the greatest constructive achievement of the First World War, and the principal aspiration of international liberalism during the last 100 years, were brought to nothing. The balance of power, which was being restored by the defeat of Germany, was again tipped against England, whose security, in Europe as a whole and, more particularly, in the eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf, was subjected to a new and formidable menace. And all this happened with hardly a comment in the British daily press or wireless, and without a protest from those organs of liberal and socialist opinion which, but a few years before, had stormed against the subjugation of the Abyssinians, had denounced as infamous the cession of the Sudetenland to Germany.

This, mind you, is an English publication talking.

At the same time, Mr. President, the Review of World Affairs, published in London, charged that—

> When one compares the real situation in Britain and abroad with the average political speech, one is, indeed, almost staggered. The gap between reality and declamation is almost incredibly wide.

I say, Mr. President, that the American people have been deceived time and time again, as I shall prove further on.

Mr. President, this distortion of fact and suppression of truth which has marked British diplomacy even throughout the greatest days of its imperial splendor, continues to blind the British people to the implications of the policies their leaders are pursuing, both on the international and domestic stage.

On March 5, 1949, about 7 weeks ago, the leading editorial of the London weekly Time and Tide stated:

> Whether it be true or not that a country gets the government it deserves, it cannot at the moment be said that the country gets the opposition it deserves.
>
> If Opposition policy is to be at all relevant to the coming situation, Conservatives must cease to think in terms of wooing the electors and set about the business of warning them. It may be, of course, that nothing will finally disillusion the people with the Labor Party but actual confrontation with the economic consequences of their policy, when American aid ends and the harsh winds of reality blow for the first time. But in the meantime no opportunity should be lost of emphasizing the fundamental economic realities on which the welfare state rests and from which it cannot escape. The equally inescapable fact that the mechanism for total state benevolence is inextricably interwoven with the mechanism for state despotism should be placed before the public in emphatic terms.

Mr. President, the extent to which the power of the British Cabinet goes, both on the domestic and international scene, was forcefully revealed on March 9, when Mr. Herbert Morrison, the Labor Government floor leader, refused in the House of Commons to promise that the members would be taken into confidence and permitted a debate on the North Atlantic Pact before it was signed. As his reason for this action, Mr. Morrison said that the Government, and not Parliament, must take the responsibility. Note the distinction, that the Government, and not the Parliament, he said, must take the responsibility.

Mr. President, I have gone to this length to prove how fearful British leaders are to take the British people into their confidence on domestic and international matters, which the British Cabinet is legally and morally justified in committing the British people to underwrite.

I have done this, in order to call attention to the length to which an American President must go to withhold from

the American people the truth about his actions under similar circumstances. An American President who indulges in these practices violates our whole tradition of noninvolvement in the affairs of other nations, and also his solemn oath to abide by and uphold the American Constitution.

Before the American people finally embrace a permanent repudiation of our tradition of constitutional representative Government, it is their duty to review the extent to which two American Presidents have gone to deceive them in order to cover up the grim consequences of Presidential action, which constitutes a deliberate violation of those same constitutional safeguards against involvement in the affairs of other nations, which we are now asked to surrender.

The following sordid series of deliberate deceptions that have been practiced by two American Presidents within the last decade, reveal how far these Presidents have gone, in spite of the legal restraints upon them. It is from this picture that the American people can get the clearest understanding of what is in store for them if such monstrous abuse of power is legalized by the removal of the constitutional prohibition against such practices.

Mr. President, there is no malice aforethought in my desire now to read into the RECORD the evidence of this monstrous deception of the American people by two American Presidents. I read it only because I deem it my duty to the American people to do so.

Mr. President, in the November 1943 issue of Fortune, there is a long and revealing article on the state of the nation, by Sherry Mangan, in which it is charged that—

> The American people were eased into the war by a process of discreet gradualism, and manufactured inevitability. The present study is not concerned with moral judgments on President Roosevelt's prowar policy; it wishes only to underline the fact that, beginning with his quarantine-the-aggressors speech, through the tortuous trail of cash-and-carry, revision of the Neutrality Act, the destroyers-bases deal, lend-lease, all-aid-short-of-war, to the final acts of undeclared war against Germany, the United States Government pulled the American people, bemused in the isolationism-versus-internationalism discussion, into the war by their coattails. The final desperate riposte of the Axis at Pearl Harbor merely legalized the accomplished fact.

The truth is, Mr. President, that when an American President launches on such a course of action he is forced to play the role of a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in order to hide from the American people by deliberate deception the true import of both his words and his deeds.

The extent to which such a compromising situation forces an American President to practice deception is clearly revealed in the Tyler Kent incident. Mr. Kent was an American decoding clerk in our Embassy in London who was so startled by the contents of the secret messages that passed between the late President and Mr. Churchill that he tried to get word to American Senators of the plain violations of the Constitution that were being enacted. Mr. Tyler Kent was arrested, tried in British courts for a breach of American law and, with the connivance of our State Department, was convicted and sentenced to 6½ years of solitary confinement on the Isle of Wight.

To this day, the American people do not know the contents of these messages, or the commitments they involved. Yet, on April 18, 1945, Mr. Churchill admitted to a full House of Commons, in his eulogy of the late President, that—

> As soon as I went to the admiralty in September 1939 he telegraphed, inviting me to correspond with him direct on naval or other matters if at any time I felt inclined. Having obtained the permission of the Prime Minister, I did so. Knowing President Roosevelt's keen interest in sea warfare I furnished him with a stream of information about our naval affairs. * * *
>
> When I became Prime Minister and the war broke out in all its hideous fury, when our own life and survival hung in the balance, I was already in a position to telegraph to the President on terms of association which had become most intimate and, to me, most agreeable. * * *
>
> I may mention that this correspondence which, of course, greatly increased after the United States entry into the war, comprises, to and fro between us, over 1,700 messages. Many of these were lengthy messages, and the majority dealt with those more difficult points which come to be discussed upon the level between heads of governments only after official solutions had not been reached at other stages.

Mr. President, the deliberate deception by this same administration is further revealed in a speech by Mr. Herbert Agar, contained in the April 1941, edition of "Bostonia"—the Boston University alumnae magazine, in which he said:

> I believe with all my heart that the lend-lease bill debate was a sign of the reason why our kind of a world is being defeated everywhere and is in grave danger of disappearing off the face of the earth.
>
> I am now going to talk entirely about my side in the lend-lease bill debate. My friends in the Senate and the supporters of my opinion in the Senate seemed to be lying all the while when defending the bill. Most of the newspapers in favor of the bill were lying all the time.
>
> I believe you can't win the kind of a fight we are up against now by lies. I believe the reason people like Senator Wheeler, who, after all, have not extraordinary ability, made such fools out of my friends, the supporters of my side of the Senate, was because Senator Wheeler said at least what he thought. Nobody was saying what they thought on my side. Everybody was saying "This is a bill to keep America out of war." That is the bunk! It is a bill to beat Hitler. As Senator Wheeler himself said—and he made almost all the good remarks—on the last afternoon: "This is not a bill to keep America out of war; this is a bill to enable the President to fight an undeclared war against Germany." Which is precisely what it is.

Mr. President, just within recent months we learn from Mr. Frank S. Tavenner, Deputy American Prosecutor in the Tokyo War Crimes Trial, that early in 1941 the Japanese not only postponed a decision on the Nazi request to fight Russia in the north, but went so far as to notify Hitler that Japan would not fight immediately if the United States did enter the war in Europe.

It is now clear, according to Mr. Tavenner, that this same attitude held true until some time after July 1941, when something as yet undisclosed prompted a change in policy in Tokyo.

It is true that for months during this period Mr. Roosevelt had been promoting a secret and nondeclared naval war against Germany in the Atlantic. Admiral Stark himself hoped for an incident in the Atlantic, as is revealed in his own words that—

> The Iceland situation may produce an incident. * * * Whether or not we will get an incident because of the protection we are giving Iceland and the shipping we must send in support of Iceland and our troops, I do not know—only Hitler can answer.

We now know from testimony at the Nuremberg war-crimes trial that Grand Admiral Doenitz was under strict orders from Hitler to do nothing that would offer Roosevelt an excuse to get into the European war. We also know that Premier Konoye, leader of the moderate influences in Japan, sought desperately to arrange a personal meeting between himself and the late President on Pacific matters, and it was only after Mr. Roosevelt's persistent refusal that Konoye resigned with his entire cabinet and General Tojo and the militarists took over the Government of Japan.

We now know, Mr. President, that at the Atlantic Charter meeting in August 1941, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill laid their plans to get the United States into the war via Japan. In a secret memorandum drawn up by Sumner Welles on August 11, 1941, aboard the *Augusta*, we learn that the late President committed the American people to war against Japan.

Mr. Welles also revealed that the President committed us to an Anglo-American alliance to fight the war and to rule the world when the war was over. According to Mr. Welles, the President insisted that he would not "be in favor of the creation of a new Assembly of the League of Nations, at least until after a period of time had transpired and during which an international police force composed of the United States and Great Britain had had an opportunity of functioning."

Then, Mr. President, Secretary Stimson disclosed in his own diary that on November 25, 1941, the day before Secretary Hull sent his ultimatum to Japan, Mr. Roosevelt and his war cabinet joined to discuss "how we could maneuver them—the Japanese—into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."

Mr. President, I know that some Senators will not like this particular speech I am making; and I do not blame them. But it is the old, old story. Sooner or later truth will out. As the years have gone by the participants in some of these meetings—Stimson and others—in their diaries and in their books have told what actually happened.

Mr. President, it is a matter of record that never before have the peoples of the world been so shocked as by President Roosevelt's jocular admission at his press conference of December 19, 1944, that nobody had ever signed the Atlantic Charter, that so far as he knew there had never been any formal copy in existence, and that, in any event, it was nothing but "scraps of scribbled paper."

It is obvious, that a war that had been entered into by such shocking and devious methods, could only be prosecuted on the same basis, nor could the outcome be anything but a gigantic lie.

We now know what happened at Tehran. By the stroke of a pen, President Roosevelt tore Europe in two and turned over to Russian slavery 100,000,000 people in eastern Europe, paralyzed the European economy, and set the stage for a third world war.

Yet, 2 weeks before the national elections, which resulted in his being chosen for a fourth term, President Roosevelt solemnly declared in his speech before the Foreign Policy Association in New York on October 21, 1944:

> After my return from Tehran, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field.

Mr. President, let the American people make their own choice as to whom to believe—President Roosevelt at Tehran or President Roosevelt when he talked in New York a few days before the election.

Yet just 3 months following that, President Roosevelt went to the Yalta Conference, which will go down in history as the most criminal betrayal of the aspirations and hopes of human liberty of all time. These criminal betrayals of interest and principle, for which an American President is responsible, sold Asia into the hands of Russian tyranny.

Yet, upon his return from Yalta, President Roosevelt solemnly assured a historic joint session of Congress, which I myself attended, on March 2, 1945, that—

> Quite naturally, this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war.

Yet the record now shows, Mr. President, that at Yalta, by another stroke of the pen, President Roosevelt, without the knowledge, advice, or consent of the Chinese, not only sold China down the river, not only turned over to the Russians everything China had been fighting Japan 10 years to get back, but also agreed to play the role of a stooge to Stalin. According to the Yalta agreement, the outrageous commitments entered into by President Roosevelt would:

> Require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

Then, at Potsdam, President Truman, following the perfect pro-Russian line that Germany was the only menace to world peace, signed the Potsdam Declaration, which, in the annals of historic documents signed in the name of peace, will remain America's eternal monument of shame.

Here, then, Mr. President, is the story of what lies behind the charge that our Constitution lacks the moral courage required by a world leader of today. I remind my colleagues, and the American people, that this monstrous series of deceptions has been practiced on the American people by American Presidents, in spite of our constitutional safeguards against such outrageous abuses of presidential power.

It needs no stretch of the imagination to anticipate what lies in store for the American people if these constitutional limitations of power and moral prohibitions against such abuses are permanently removed from our statute books.

It is, indeed, strange, Mr. President, to discover that intelligent men, who now are caught in the international anarchy and the unprincipled rule of brute force which has resulted from these outrageous deceptions, would now be clamoring for the destruction of our constitutional safeguards against the repetition of such suicidal practices in the future.

It is perfectly obvious that if the American people permit these safeguards to be destroyed, instead of strengthened, they will never be able to escape from the consequences of the past, or to prevent their repetition in the future, because they will no longer have any way to hold their own leaders accountable for their actions. This is the basic cause for our present dilemma, as has been so ably stated in the leading editorial of one of this country's oldest papers, from which I quote:

> It seems to us that in relation to its foreign policy our national administration is very much in the position of that boy whose deceits had caught up with him.
>
> It is not so much that there have been mistakes and errors of judgment; our diplomatic corps could have been so many Solomons and still not avoided those. It is rather the attempt to hide the errors, to withhold the facts that might cause the country to condemn a policy before it could be undertaken, to pursue a course long after its bankruptcy was clear, to substitute propaganda for facts. * * *
>
> One could pile up instance on instance. One makeshift is improvised and proclaimed as a policy and all the agencies of propaganda are put behind it. Failure ensues. But failure is not acknowledged. Instead, another improvization is set up on the ruins of the previous one. Then the propaganda begins again.

Just as in the case of the United Nations, Mr. President, anyone who ever dared speak against it at the time when it was being considered by the Senate was regarded as a traitor and was said to be in favor of war, instead of peace; but now, instead of admitting that the United Nations is bankrupt, instead of admitting—as the political leaders in nearly all foregin countries have admitted—that it is a thing of the past, we are told that we must have the Atlantic Pact.

I read further from the editorial:

> If at this moment there is danger of war, it comes less from the cold calculations of the Russians than it does from the desperation of our own policymakers.

Mr. President, I say—I say it as a Republican—that it is partially due to the bipartisan foreign policy which we have had for the last 4 years.

I read further from the editorial:

> A successful foreign policy cannot be had until the mistakes of the past are liquidated. They cannot be liquidated until they are acknowledged. And the men responsible will not acknowledge them. They will not come ashore and face the music.

The result, Mr. President, of such a gigantic face-saving deception is the dilemma in which our own leaders find themselves. On the one hand, they demand increases in armaments, in order, as they say, to prevent war; on the other hand, they continue to follow policies which lead to exploitation, impoverishment, slavery, and human misery, all of which make war inevitable.

As Anne O'Hare McCormick, one of the late President's closest confidantes, has said:

> There is no use outlawing the atomic bomb if the great powers follow policies that produce the conditions of war.

Mr. President, if these conditions can exist in spite of our historic traditions and in spite of our legal and moral prohibitions, can there be any doubt of how fatal would be any action whereby we permanently legalize, moralize, and adopt such practices?

No one is more apprehensive than I of the threat of the Communist scourge. No one is more determined to fight, not only to prevent its spread, but also to find a means to free the hundreds of millions who have become its miserable victims. But, for the life of me, Mr. President, I cannot see how the destruction of our form of government and our way of life, and the endless squandering of our substance, in a wild-eyed world crusade against a Communist bogey, can accomplish these ends.

I believe there never has been a time when there has been such a crying need for a sober, cold-blooded, intelligent, courageous, and patriotic analysis of what America has at stake as now. The record of the past decade clearly proves this fact. Russia has had guiding her destiny a loyal, unswerving champion of Russia's interests. Britain has had an indefatigable champion of British imperial interests fighting for the preservation of the British Empire. But where are those who unashamedly have championed America's vital interests and principles in world councils and conferences of recent years?

The truth is, Mr. President, that instead, American statesmen have degraded everything America stands for by insisting upon the identification of our way of life, first, with the Russian, and now with the British.

This brings us, Mr. President, back to the third point contained in the editorial of the British newspaper The Recorder, upon an understanding of which the future of our way of life now depends. That point lies behind the statement that—

> It is no use now for the United States to continue speaking and writing earnestly about responsibility, of the American century, of suggesting even taking a hand in the running and development of the colonies of the British Empire. The United States is still a new country of conglomerate peoples. It has much to learn. The peace of the world still depends on the British Empire joined with the United States.

Mr. President, I have no desire to confuse the grave issues now before us. But

honesty compels me to recognize historic facts for what they are, and as the following facts will conclusively show, any man who continues to identify America's future and the principles for which it stands with the British Empire is not only rendering this country a terrible disservice, he is, blindly advancing a thesis which the British themselves have always repudiated.

In other words, Mr. President, the time has come for the American people to recognize the predicament they are in for what it really is. The truth is, so far as America's erudition is concerned, we are engaged not only in a struggle with Russia to preserve that tradition, we are caught in a grim struggle, at the same time, with the British imperial interests.

This side of the story has been suppressed as effectively as the treasonable pro-Russia propaganda line suppressed what Russia has been doing. And the time has come for the American people to realize that even under the terms of the North Atlantic Pact they are being maneuvered by the British into a position where the British can use everything we possess for their own national and imperial ends, except our whole history and tradition of liberty. They want no traffic whatever with the principles and ideals in which we really believe.

Mr. President, America is caught now in two world struggles, from which only the wisest and most courageous American statesmanship can save us. For years now we have not only played Stalin's game, but we have been pulling British imperial interests out of the fire. Nowhere is this fact more clearly revealed than in the story of what happened immediately following Tehran.

It was there that Mr. Churchill found all his hopes and plans for an Anglo-American domination of the postwar world shattered to bits. For the Tehran agreement destroyed any hope of restoring a balance of power upon which England had been dependent for hundreds of years, for her own security.

It was there that Mr. Churchill determined to make the American people pay to the limit for the blundering American diplomacy of which he and the American people were the victims. This is where it must have been determined that America would furnish 75 percent of the manpower in Europe and 95 percent of the manpower in the Pacific, by a man who helped trick us into the war on the basis of the slogan, "You'll furnish the guns and we'll furnish the men."

Mr. President, the extent to which this determination went is revealed in the following quotations. In December 1944, an issue, not of the Daily Worker, but of the Stars and Stripes, contained this following charge:

> British and Russian preoccupation with objectives other than the defeat of Germany was responsible for Allied failure to achieve expectations in the United States that the war in Europe would be over by now. Since D-day in France, greater preoccupation has been shown by Russia in her Baltic and Balkan campaigns intended to insure her security, and by Great Britain in Italy, Greece, and Albania to protect her life line through the Mediterranean to India than in achievement of the prime objective of our American armies—prompt defeat of Germany.

Russia was taking care of herself. England was taking care of herself. Seventy-six percent of the boys who were invading Europe were American boys. Of the 116,000 casualties among those who went into Normandy, over 80,000 were American boys.

A well-informed Britisher also made the following observation on December 22, 1944:

> As the power of Germany declines, the struggle for power between the victorious Allies takes its new form. And its new form is that which was inevitable, the Allies being who they are, namely, Britain and Russia—the form is civil war. It is prevented only where one of the two Allies is in effective military occupation. One may prophesy that wherever and whenever that military occupation is withdrawn, civil war will ensue. The next chapter of this fearful book of European history will begin.

No less an authority than Mr. Demaree Bess said, on March 10, 1945:

> Lately the roles to be played by our allies have become quite clearly defined, not only in such published treaties as the Anglo-Soviet alliance and the Franco-Soviet alliance but also through unpublished informal understandings. It is evident, for instance, that in countries occupied by the Red Army, the Russians are disposed to encourage drastic reforms, such as the breaking up of all large landholdings, the public ownership of much industry, and the liquidation of all those elements which have been hostile to the Soviet Union in the past, the reforms already begun by the Russians are far-reaching.
>
> Great Britain, on the contrary, has discouraged violent and sudden reforms in the countries she has liberated, in accordance with her traditional methods, yielding to Russia on one point in order to gain another. British statesmen are working from a permanent set of blueprints, upon principles devised long ago to safeguard the interests of the British Empire.

Mr. President, no one has more keenly analyzed the nature of this double struggle in which we have been caught than Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, the man whom President Roosevelt, himself, sent to China, who told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just before he resigned in protest over what was going on, that—

> We began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. * * * We finished the war in the Far East, furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars.
>
> There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialisms against Communist imperialism.

Mr. President, what could be plainer than those words of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who for a year and a half was in China? But no; Senators upon this floor knew so much more than Mr. Hurley. As was said a little while ago by the author of the article in Fortune, Senator Wheeler was scorned when he talked upon this floor. Of course. The author says now that the other side was wrong, and knew they were wrong. The fact nevertheless remains, because Senator Wheeler and men like him were not listened to, millions of boys today are casualties as a result of the war that took place. As I said, no one has more clearly analyzed the situation in China than Gen. Patrick J. Hurley.

Mr. President, the military conduct of the last stages of the war can only be explained in terms of a secret British-Soviet agreement made in the spring of 1944, which formally established spheres of influence in southeastern Europe, implementing the Tehran agreement. The record clearly shows that Britain was far more concerned to preserve her imperial life line to the east than to throw her full weight into the major task of concluding the war both in Europe and Asia. So much for the military record.

Further proof of how Britain has used American resources for her own imperial end is found in the sequence of the international agreements to which we have been a party and that have been largely financed by the resources and taxes of the American people.

By way of illustration, Mr. President, when the Morgenthau plan was suggested to Mr. Churchill at Quebec in 1944, he so strenuously objected that Mr. Morgenthau actually purchased his cooperation with the promise of $6,000,000,000. This accounts for the real basis of the fraudulent British loan which wiped out the billions of lend-lease indebtedness of the British people and laid the foundation for the incredible folly in which we now are caught.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the British knew perfectly well just how far-reaching Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam were in terms of geopolitics. They knew it spelled the end of the old-fashioned imperial policies of the past. They knew they could no longer exploit the masses of dependent and colonial people, by supporting corrupt native one-party systems of government in the hands of those who were willing to thwart the development of their own backward peoples, for a price. They knew that a new age of imperialism had been ushered in by these outrageous secret betrayals of Europe and Asia. So, having received what amounted to the promise of a permanent subsidy by this Government in 1944, the British Government in its white paper on employment policy repudiated private enterprise and committed the British people to the managed economy of a socialistic police state.

Mr. President, it is this new kind of British imperialism which the American people have been financing during and since the war. And as each successive international agreement has been made, it has become increasingly obvious of the role America has played.

Following the Yalta agreement, the British knew perfectly well that their ability to maintain this new imperial venture depended on their continuing control of the financial manipulations of the sterling-bloc area. This is why, when the Bretton Woods agreement was signed, nothing was done to compel England to abandon her policies of financial manipulation, which has enabled her

to exploit colonial peoples all over the world.

Mr. President, the significance of these concessions has been completely lost on the American people. It is time we realized just how vicious these financial manipulations on the part of the British Empire have become. The following story comes from one of America's ablest economists, who reveals that—

During the period 1866 to 1895, inclusive, a span of 30 years, a bushel of wheat exchanged for an ounce of silver with quite constant regularity. In other words, wheat should have averaged approximately $1.29 per bushel, the monetary value of an ounce of silver. But, in 1873, for reasons that have never been explained, silver was demonetized as a medium of foreign exchange. The United States retained the domestic monetary value of $1.29 per ounce for silver and the difference between the silver price and the monetary value went to the Government as profit or seigniorage.

The demonetization of silver had a very drastic effect upon our own economy and that of other nations. After analyzing the effect, it is easy to form the conclusion that the primary reason for the demonetization of silver was to exploit those nations which were using silver as a monetary base for their monetary systems. It directly affected approximately two-thirds of the world's population.

By 1895 the price of silver as a commodity had dropped to 60 cents per ounce instead of the monetary price of $1.29 prior to 1873 and an average market value of $1.34 per ounce during the 25-year period preceding 1873. As a direct result, even though a bushel of wheat continued to exchange for an ounce of silver, the price per bushel had dropped to 80 cents. This shut off over one-half the income from a bushel of wheat and hard times prevailed in our economy. The depressive conditions in the nineties brought forth the Populist movement in the agricultural areas and the William Jennings Bryan movement for remonetization of silver.

China, India, Mexico, South America, and other nations that were using silver as a monetary base were forced into a depression and into a position where they had to furnish double the amount of commodities formerly required to exchange for an ounce of gold. These nations were thus forced into a condition of economic slavery that still exists at the present time. In fact, their impoverished condition will continue to exist until foreign exchange is reorganized on an equitable and stable basis.

The demonetization of silver which resulted in the exploitation of the nations mentioned is a dark page in the history of the western nations that pride themselves as believers in Christianity. As a comment, it would seem rather futile for the western nations to try to teach the Christian doctrine in China or India and then permit a foreign exchange dominated and under the control of the Christian nations to exploit them. In like manner, it seems futile to try to teach them our kind of government as long as we permit this exploitation to keep them in economic bondage.

That is what we are doing with the Dutch, Mr. President. We are compelling them to keep the millions of Indonesians in subjection, and it is being done with planes furnished to the Dutch by American taxpayers.

Mr. President, the following countries belong at present to the sterling area, in which the British manipulation of currency can be used to exploit others:

The United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, Ceylon, Southern Rhodesia, British dependent territories, trust and mandated territories, protectorates and protected states. The following non-British countries are also part of the sterling bloc: Burma, Iraq, the Faroe Island, Egypt, Iceland, and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

Mr. President, added to this financial exploitation, which these new economic planners of Britain have entered upon, is the following pattern of commercial exploitation upon which the British are launched. On December 21, 1943, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley wrote to President Roosevelt.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that only a few weeks ago I finally secured the correspondence and placed it in the RECORD. It was correspondence which for a long time, was suppressed. It was between the late President Roosevelt and Gen. Patrick J. Hurley. Here is what Mr. Hurley wrote to Mr. Roosevelt:

The deterioration of America's position in Iran and in the entire Middle East and the debacle of the principles of the Atlantic Charter was initiated in Washington. The element in the State Department that made plans for the defeat of your Iranian policy justifies the sale of lend-lease goods by the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. * * *

Because of the demands made on your time, I do not believe that you have ever fully realized that the money of the American taxpayer is being used in the name of democracy and in the name of the Atlantic Charter to establish an international trade monopoly that has for its purpose the exploitation of the people of the weaker nations throughout the Middle East, Africa, and elsewhere.

So that you may have a sketch of the gigantic operations of this monopoly, which we are supporting through lend-lease, I submit here a rough outline of the set-up of the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries.

A. The United Kingdom Commercial Corp. is a government corporation having its headquarters in London. Its subsidiary corporations operate in each of the following nations under the name indicated: UKCC (Egypt), Ltd.; UKCC (Libia); UKCC (Sudan), Ltd.; East Africa; UKCC (Ethiopia), Ltd.; UKCC (Eritrea), Ltd.; UKCC (Palestine), Ltd.; UKCC (Syria and Lebanon), Ltd.; UKCC (Iraq), Ltd.; UKCC (Persia), Ltd.; UKCC (East Africa), Ltd.; UKCC (Algiers), Ltd.; UKCC (Turkey), Ltd. In addition there are branch offices at Cyprus, Aden, and Jibuti.

B. Global subsidiaries: United States, India, Argentina, Portugal.

Then, Mr. President, as the situation in Europe continued to deteriorate, on September 16, 1945, Prime Minister Attlee sent one of the most scathing notes to President Truman that any American President has ever received. That note from Prime Minister Attlee to President Truman has not yet been made public. It still lies buried in the archives, in spite of the fact that in it the British Government charged us with a lack of good faith, insisted we could not be depended upon, and informed this Government that the British were going to get out of the Mediterranean, leave us holding the bag, and completely reorient their whole system of imperial defenses around the African Empire.

Sometime later Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Bevin met in Europe. Mr. Byrnes insisted that the American people would not stand for the use of American troops to police the British Empire. Mr. Bevin trotted out the old formula, again saying, "Give us the guns and we'll furnish the men."

This agreement, Mr. President, lies behind the Greek-Turkish loan, in which we agreed to furnish the money and the guns, yet no sooner was this agreement enacted than the British began to renege on their commitments in Greece and the eastern Mediterranean. They say "send troops, send American boys to Greece." It was in all the newspapers 2 weeks ago that England was saying "We want American troops in the Mediterranean area." The same thing happened when we signed the Italian treaty.

Yet these are the steps whereby we have moved in and guaranteed to underwrite British imperial interests that have become bankrupt economic absurdities. Meanwhile, Britain continued her exploitation of colonial areas and used the additional proceeds, along with American gifts, to expand the very collectivist philosophy of national socialism which we went to war against Germany to destroy, until today Britain's state-controlled trade monopoly and trade barter system is equal to the practices of Nazi Germany, and her government manipulation of financial control threatens to outdo the Nazis themselves.

These trends had developed by 1947, Mr. President, to the place where Mr. Bevin and Mr. Stalin got together on trade arrangements, based on the state-controlled trade-barter systems. As a consequence of the paralysis of both European and Asiatic economies, Britain was forced to make a deal to insure continued access to raw materials and markets for her manufactured goods just in order to survive. Russia's great raw material potential, and desperate need for manufactured goods, offered one way out. We now know that Mr. Stalin made tremendous offers of concessions to Britain in exchange for British neutrality in the gathering conflict between Russia and the United States. Britain, who was struggling for survival, had to make a deal either with Russia or the United States, or, if possible, with both. And that is just exactly what she has done. This is what the Marshall plan means. We bought continued British cooperation for the time being, even while Britain continues to enter into wider areas of trade relationships with Russia.

Mr. President, where does American interest lie in such circumstances? It is perfectly obvious now that we not only are not underwriting American interests, that we are not only not underwriting American principles, but that, instead, we have been maneuvered into a situation where we are building up both sides of the very conflict which we are being asked to underwrite the Atlantic Pact to avert.

And all of this, Mr. President, is taking place at the expense of our natural resources, our financial solvency, our constitutional government, and our economic freedom. We are being used to finance our own suicide as a free people.

In the first place, we are becoming permanently involved in the British scheme to use American subsidies in order to keep the colonial areas of the world permanently impoverished. So

that the President's new program to raise the standards of these people, who are the victims of this exploitation we are subsidizing, is nothing but vicious nonsense.

In the second place, Mr. President, England has reneged on her commitments in the British zone in Germany. And we are now financing 90 percent of the British costs of occupation. At the same time, when the Humphrey committee has been trying to halt the senseless dismantlement of the industrial potential of Germany, both the cost and effects of which we are continuing, the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation revealed in its report of December 31, 1948, that—

> The British and French Governments have resisted every major step in the work of the Humphrey committee. Delay was encountered in getting permission for the committee to visit the British and French zones of Germany. Agreement was never obtained to suspend all dismantling pending completion of the survey, although after long negotiation it was agreed that dismantling of most of the plants on the list would be held up until December 15, 1948.

Mr. President, the reason for this obstruction is further evidence of the British intention to exploit their position at the expense of others, including the American people.

In a recent issue of the paper British Jeweler and Metal Worker this trade publication made the following brazen admission:

> Lengthy negotiations and discussions have been conducted by Mr. Barrett (chairman of the export group) over the past 3 years with a view to fixing the future level of the German horological industry below the 72 percent of the 1938 level which had been agreed by the Allied Control Commission. It is pleasing to be able to record that the final result has been to reach agreement that the German industry is to be reduced to 50 percent of the 1938 level. This result is what we wanted to achieve, and, although there can be no doubt that the Germans will ultimately redevelop their horological industry on a strong basis, the present position means that the British industry has been given a certain amount of breathing space in order to become organized on a sound basis. The thanks of the association have already been conveyed to Mr. Barrett for his patient and untiring work in achieving this result. Following upon this, the contents of a number of German factories are to be thrown up for reparations, and Mr. W. W. Cope has recently made an inspection of these factories, as also of certain other machines which are available to this country.

Further evidence of the British determination to use American subsidies to destroy potential German competition is revealed in the fact that the British bitterly opposed any reduction in the artificially pegged exchange rate of the German mark, which would make it easier for the Germans to earn their own way by marketing their wares abroad.

Mr. President, last week I was in New York City and visited Radio City, where, at the request of the military occupation authorities in Germany, there is an exhibit of leading German corporations. Those corporations manufacture a variety of articles, among them surgical instruments. There is a big automobile concern operating in Germany, as well as other corporations. An automobile is manufactured there which cannot be shipped to the United States because of the regulation of the currency by the United States and Britain together. As a result, not one car manufactured there can be shipped to the United States. I talked with the general manager of a huge automobile concern in Germany, which operates in Europe in competition with General Motors, and in competition with an English automobile called the Austin. This German corporation leads them all and already has as many cars sold as can be manufactured in a year and a half. It is an automobile with the engine in the rear. But they cannot sell that automobile in this country because of the regulation of the currency.

Mr. President, American taxpayers are contributing $1,200,000,000 toward German recovery this year, which is equal to 6 percent of the income taxes collected from individuals in the United States this year. In spite of this fact, a recent report of what the British have plundered from just north Rhineland Westphalia during 1948—a report which the British have suppressed—discloses that the British have taken, let us say confiscated, out of this one area within the total British zone the following articles: 261,000 upholstered chairs; 15,000 clubhouse installations; 90,000 arm chairs; 500 ladies' umbrellas; 3,784 refrigerators; 800 fountain pens; 1,000 electrical railways; 949 cigarette boxes; 5,568 bicycles; 6,100 bridge tables; 13,000 ladies' writing desks; 250,000 pairs of shoes; 37,000 ladies' dresses; 75,000 ladies' sweaters; 100,000 polo shirts; 14,000 rubber baby pants; 70,000 diapers; 50,000 carpets; 300,000 bathroom carpets; 3,500,000 bottles of Steinhager liquor; 910,000 bottles of gin; 15,000 ladies' blouses; 2,100 underwear; 30,000 ladies' shirts; 12,000 children's overcoats; 2,000 children's suits; 2,500 baby dresses; 20,240 boys' sweaters; 2,000 boys' pants; 2,000 boys' jackets; 16,000 pairs children's socks; 50,000 aluminum pots; 29,000 bread toasters; 21,314 toilet outfits; 14,757 wash bowls; 76,000 book cases; 4,000,000 electric bulbs; and 76,000 mattresses.

Mr. President, the same British determination to run her own affairs in her own way, and her refusal to subordinate her immediate interests to a future overall good, is nowhere better stated than in a recent statement by Christopher P. Mayhew, British Under Secretary of State, who told us on February 23, 1949, that so far as the Marshall plan was concerned—and so far as Britain's willingness to integrate its program with the European recovery program, as a whole was concerned—"The purpose of Marshall aid is to set us free from dependence on America. We have not the slightest intention of modifying our economic, our social, or our political plan in order to qualify for aid."

Mr. President, the same condition exists in the Far East. During the past few weeks a British trade mission has been negotiating with our far eastern experts in the State Department concerning the export levels which are going to be permitted the Japanese. Here, too, the American people are subsidizing 70,000,000 people who have been crowded once more back on to these small islands off the Asiatic coast. If this is not to become a permanent penal colony, subsidized by the American taxpayer, the Japanese have got to manufacture and export—or die. With the grave threat of communism spreading throughout the Orient, we could not make a more fatal mistake than to condemn the Japanese to such a fate. Yet, recent unpublished reports of the results of these trade conferences with the British reveal that they have succeeded in getting our American representatives to retreat from their former liberal attitude toward Japanese export levels, which means that the British are willing to risk the loss of Japan along with China by insisting upon continued exploitation, at our expense, of the most highly industrialized people in the Orient.

Finally, Mr. President, we now learn that Britain is foremost among the Marshall plan countries who have entered into 91 separate trade pacts with the Soviets and their satellites—the very ones the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] was asking me about a few minutes ago—under the terms of which $3,000,000,000 worth of goods a year are flowing across the iron curtain, and at this very moment Britain is negotiating a new trade agreement with Russia that involves the shipment of such strategic materials as tin and rubber, and durable goods to the Soviets.

At the same time we learn, Mr. President, in a report from Paris on March 12 by the United Press, that a high ECA spokesman admitted "the present ECA policy is to encourage European countries on both sides of the curtain to stimulate and restore necessary and essential east-west trade."

The tragedy is, Mr. President, as the London Economist stated on January 8, 1949, that in spite of all the aid we are pouring out—in spite of the vicious exploitation of the other people which we are subsidizing:

> Whatever its labors, western Europe cannot achieve a balance by 1952 on the basis of its present plans, of its present standards of living, and of the existing conditions of world trade. If no further action is taken, the shock to the European economic system caused by the ending of foreign aid will bring such economic and social dislocation that political stability will be undermined. The malady is more obstinate and deep-seated than was thought.

So the London Economist intimates that when the billions of dollars which are at present expected to be provided under ECA are exhausted, there will be demand for more and more and more money. Some Englishmen say they are going to need such help for 10 years after 1952.

Mr. President, the time has come for America to reevaluate its whole position in the present world predicament and honestly and clearly to analyze the conditions under which our interests, our principles, and our future can best be secured. The American people are still half-drugged by the poisonous collectivist propaganda which has popularized both the Russian and British economic and

social experiments. Yet this whole collectivist trend has depended for its very life upon the outflow of the resources and the wealth which the American people have accumulated under 150 years of economic freedom and personal liberty.

The time, indeed, has come to correct the evil consequences of America's blundering diplomacy of the past few years, to reassert our traditional moral courage as a people who believe in freedom, and no longer to be intimidated or propagandized into the suicidal identification of our form of government and our way of life with any other modern ideology, which is only an ancient tyranny masquerading in a modern dress.

To those who may not agree with me, to those who may possibly say I am prejudiced, Mr. President, I want to reemphasize the evil and the dangers that are involved in any American foreign policy which is based on a complete identification of America's interests with the vicious and brutal imperialist practices of the British Empire, or any other imperialism.

I call as witness no less a person than the late President Roosevelt himself, whose real attitude toward British imperialism is revealed by Elliott Roosevelt in his book As He Saw It.

During the Atlantic Charter meeting President Roosevelt is quoted as saying to his son:

> The British Empire is at stake here. * * * We've got to make it clear to the British from the outset that we don't intend to be simply a good time Charlie who can be used to help the British out of a tight spot, and then be forgotten forever.
>
> I think I speak as America's President when I say that America won't help England in this war simply so that she will be able to continue to ride roughshod over colonial peoples.

Then we learn, that at the Casablanca Conference the late President added the following grim warning as to just what America's underwriting of the colonial system really meant when he said:

> The thing is, the colonial system means war. Exploit the resources of a Burma, an India, a Java—

That is what the Dutch are doing—exploiting the resources of Java, as President Roosevelt said, according to his son Elliott—

> take all the wealth out of those countries and never put anything back into them, things like education, decent standards of living, minimum health requirements—all you are doing is storing up the kind of trouble that leads to war. All you are doing is negating the value of any kind of organizational structure for peace even before it begins.

Mr. President, the record now clearly shows that we are engaged in perpetuating these very colonial systems which President Roosevelt admitted meant war, exploitation, poverty, suffering, and human degradation. And we are launched on a course of action which means that the American people will be increasingly exploited, regimented, and impoverished, the farther down this road we travel.

Again I say that it is time the United States Senate dragged the whole sorry history of how we were tricked into this last war, and sold out both to Russia and to western imperialism during and since the war. Then it is our solemn duty to repudiate these outrageous secret betrayals of American interests and principles and start afresh, by rewriting American foreign policy, on the basis of American principles right here on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by George Sokolsky under the heading "These days," published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1949, which bears out the very thing I have spoken about this afternoon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The assumption of every people at war is that their arms will lead to victory. But the meaning of victory is often ambiguous. For instance, in the Revolutionary War, victory for the Americans had to mean independence; but during the Civil War neither side could be or ever was sure of what victory would bring.

In World War I, victory meant the defeat of the Kaiser's Germany, but that was insufficient for Americans, so we invented several goals—"the war to end all wars," "the war to make the world safe for democracy," "the 14 points."

Yet all these phrases were surprisingly meaningless in themselves and therefore the victory dissolved itself in an astonishingly short time into a defeat and into the need for a new war.

World War II was fought without the terms of victory. It was a blind date with destiny. The most that could be said was "down with Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo," minor figures on the historic scene.

Conferences were called at Quebec, Moscow, Tehran, Cairo, and Yalta to discover what victory might mean.

Yet the closest to a program for victory was the so-called Morgenthau plan, which was at best a Carthaginian monstrosity, and the Charter of the United Nations, which laid the foundation of a world state.

Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, correctly appraised that when he said:

"* * * Basically, these problems could all be reduced to one great question. How far would the Soviet Union go in exploiting the postwar situation so as to extend its territory and increase its might?

"This question was no idle speculation. We had seen the boundaries of Russia extended first in 1939 and 1940 at the expense of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Finland.

"As the war went on, it became clear that the promise of freedom to Poland would not include these eastern Polish provinces, which were, in fact, eventually surrendered by Poland to the U. S. S. R. After the war's end, parts of Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary were also added. By 1945 the boundaries of the Soviet Union had been pushed farther to the west than ever before in Russian history."

In a word, to Soviet Russia, victory meant imperialism and in that direction Stalin guided his nation during the Hitler-Stalin alliance, during the partnership with the United States and Great Britain, and during the cold war. That imperialism is completing itself in the conquest of east Asia.

Blundering through a war without meaning is not likely to produce peace. Talleyrand realized that at the Congress of Vienna, where the powers which had coalesced against Napoleon fell apart when their symbolic enemy had disappeared.

Talleyrand struggled to give peace a meaning—a European meaning. He only succeeded after Napoleon reappeared: Then Europe gave itself a century of peace.

The yearning of the Western World is for permanent peace—that is, a peace as permanent as human institutions can be. But peace is impossible while one nation is practicing imperialism; it is equally impossible when great states dominate small states; or when nationalism is interpreted to mean exclusive hatred. Peace must be of the spirit of civilization.

In some respects, the deepest contribution of the West to civilization has been freedom of exchange of knowledge and ideas. Throughout the wars of Europe for 1,000 years that freedom was uninterrupted.

The symbols of civilization were hardly involved in the meaning of victory. That was not true during World War II, which destroyed without regard to the inevitable necessity for rebuilding. Nor can it be true in the imperialism of Soviet Russia, which bears an Asiatic grudge against the civilization of the West.

The question then must arise as to whether the North Atlantic Pact is more than the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Nine-Power treaty, the Stimson doctrine, and similar efforts toward giving meaning to victory.

Can the North Atlantic Pact mean more than the covenant of the League of Nations or the San Francisco charter? The answer hinges upon the spiritual objectives of the statesmen: Do they give meaning to victory and peace in terms of their own civilization or are they merely bringing a bad situation to an end? This needs to be answered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bricker	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Bridges	Hill	Miller
Butler	Hoey	Morse
Capehart	Holland	Mundt
Chapman	Ives	Murray
Chavez	Jenner	Myers
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Kem	Russell
Ecton	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Knowland	Sparkman
Flanders	Langer	Taylor
Frear	Long	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Tobey
Gillette	McGrath	Tydings
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Magnuson	Young

Mr. KERR. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are detained in a meeting of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

GOVERNMENT AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I wish to express a few ideas that I have had on my mind.

I should like to outline very clearly what I mean when I refer to the situation which we in the United States face today. There are two rival paths between which

our country and our economy must choose. In other words, we are at the crossroads. One of the roads is that which has been taken by the countries from one end of Europe to the other, the road to increasing Government intervention in the affairs of the people. We can call the last stop on that road anything we choose to call it, such as socialism, fascism, collectivism, paternalism, totalitarianism, or what have you, but the net effect is the same, namely, a government increasingly monopolizing the private affairs and regimenting the lives of the people. Such a course would destroy the most significant thing in American life, which stands out like a beacon light to the world, but which the world does not seem to appreciate very much, namely, our system of checks and balances. That we must maintain.

The other road open to us is the road of freedom, a dynamic, forward-looking approach. Recognizing that changing times require changing outlooks and changing procedures, at the same time the road of which I now speak leads to the encouragement of private investment and the encouragement of the individual to develop his initiative and his inventiveness; in other words, it is the road which calls for the individual to expand and grow and develop. To follow that road, Mr. President, means more private business, more jobs, more wealth, more industries; it means economic health in America. Those who take that road recognize, of course, that ours is a complex society, that government cannot simply stand by or stand aside and do nothing, but at the same time, when it does take action, it should not be to regiment or dictate or interfere with private rights, but to encourage, stimulate, and help the private citizen meet his challenges.

The greatest single problem in the United States today is the need to awaken our people to the threatened loss of our heritage of freedom. The greatest menace to that freedom does not come solely from communistic infiltration.

The Communist menace is a serious one, as outlined yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]; and I do not minimize the effect of that great movement upon the world stage. But, Mr. President, infinitely more serious is the apparent lack of understanding—we may term it apathy, if we please—of some of our people toward the trends which inevitably will lead us down the long, dreary road to a concentration-camp economy and a socialized government. We can fight communism at home and abroad, but it is more important that on our American stage we awaken to the impact of forces, that we shake off the apathy, if we may term it such, or the lack of comprehension, perhaps, of many of our people in regard to what is the real problem in the United States and what is our responsibility to the world.

Mr. President, as everyone realizes, this little globe on which we live is a very small speck in creation. Sometimes we think it is all of creation, but geographically it is only a very small, insignificant piece of dust. On this piece of dust there are 2,300,000,000 human souls; but less than 300,000,000 of them seem to have any comprehension or understanding of what we call the American way. I am sorry to say that in this country there are a number of persons who, because they were born to the American way in this blessed land, take it for granted, and fail to realize that our American way can be dissipated, just as a material fortune can be dissipated. In other words, eternal vigilance is imperative and necessary; otherwise, we will go down the long, long trail that other nations have followed toward state socialism, and eventually toward a police state.

Mr. President, some terms are used in so many different ways by various persons that they become virtually meaningless. We hear such words as "democracy" used, and then we hear Joe Stalin say that he is the great exponent of democracy. We hear words such as "liberalism" used, and then we find that those who stand for curtailing individual liberty and initiative and putting into the hands of the state the control of the lives, property, and business of the people are called liberals. So it is obvious that mere terms mean nothing.

What we must do is take off the hide and see what lies underneath. Many a wolf is camouflaged in sheep's clothing. In other words, Mr. President, I am attempting to say that the real fifth column in the United States is the feeling of indifference and complacency which lends itself to the campaign of misinformation on basic ideas which has been and still is under way. Let me illustrate my point by a little story which I was told the other day: It is said that a few years ago there came to the United States a prominent German professor who, although he understood the English language, of course, did not understand the idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms which are used in the United States. One of his friends was always saying, when something pleased him, "That is good horse sense" using that expression as synonymous with the expression "common sense." So one day the German said to him, "What is this horse sense you talk about so much?"

His friend replied, "That is something that a jackass ain't got."

Mr. President, somehow I feel that we need more horse sense or more common sense in appreciation of what we have in this country of ours.

As I have said, I feel that the world has been contracted. The old dogmas and old concepts, which we thought were inviolate, have to a large extent had to be replaced by new ones. What do I mean? In the days of Washington it took weeks, sometimes months, to cross the ocean; we were physically isolated; but today, with our inventions, with the atomic bomb, with planes traveling 750 miles an hour, with guided missiles that will go 2,000 miles, with the creation, as it were around this entire country, of a radar screen, there is recognition of the fact that the world has been contracted, and, with its contraction into a relatively small piece of land, we find that every other nation is literally in every other nation's back yard. With that comes the responsibility that is ours.

Tomorrow the Committee on Foreign Relations begins hearings on the North Atlantic Pact, public hearings to be held in the caucus room. We must again recognize that we are stepping out into a new field; we are embarking on a new adventure; but we are doing it because the world has been contracted, and man's ingenuity and inventiveness have brought us to this impasse. We have placed America literally at the back yard of every other nation, and vice versa; hence the pact. Much has been said about the pact. Much has been said which would be valid were we living even 25 years ago or 50 years ago, before the advent of the airplane, before radio, before the bomb, before the guided missile. But today we find ourselves literally in a new world. We find ourselves facing new problems such as the founding fathers never faced. They call, however, for the old common-sense dogmas and also for a revaluation of our domestic affairs and a revaluation of our relationship to the world.

Mr. President, if you and I fail to inform ourselves of these tides, as I have called them, or these currents, we shall not be adequately meeting the challenges which, whether we be Senators or whether we be citizens, confront us today. One of the tides we must meet head-on is the tremendous fear that America will be inadequate. I, for one, do not have that fear. As down through the decades there has been the golden thread of faith in the Almighty—true, sometimes in only a remnant of our people—I feel it is present now more than ever, faith that we shall be guarded and guided to do what is necessary, and that we shall be adequate. I do not ask that action in the consideration of this matter be taken on a political basis. I think the problem is so large and the consequences that might follow are so serious that it is well that all political alinements be thrust aside and that we face the situation head-on. In fact, if we are to succeed in counteracting certain trends in America today, it can only be because serious, sober-minded men of all parties, sober-minded men of all religious faiths and of diverse political faiths, join hands.

One of the trends on the domestic front, Mr. President, which I think we should consider very seriously, relates to certain significant facts about our Government. I think history will demonstrate that there never was a time when over a long period of years, the government of any nation became, as it were, omnipotent and took unto itself the management—yes, the political thinking and sometimes religious thinking of its people—that it did not become a police state. I am not at all pessimistic about the figures I am going to cite, but they are very significant. They are figures which should really be given consideration.

I may say that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on many occasions has on this floor told about the centralization of wealth in certain corporate interests. Today I want to cite facts about a corporation, the American Government, which will truly

be revealing as to how much economic power is lodged in its hands.

Do you know, Mr. President, that the Federal Government is the world's biggest banker, with $10,109,000,000 in loans outstanding at the end of 1947? That is one-fourth of the total loans held by the 15,000 banks of the United States. It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is today the world's largest security holder, with securities having a face value in excees of $20,000,000,000.

The Federal Government operates the largest life insurance company, with more than $40,000,000,000 of life insurance in force.

The Federal Government is the world's biggest farm-mortgage holder, with about one-fourth of all the farm mortgages in the United States.

It is important, Mr. President, for you and me to know that the Federal Government is the biggest single landowner in the Nation, owning 36 percent of the total American land area, 24 percent of the continental United States. If concentrated in one place, the Federal land would exceed the combined acreages of all the following States: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Ohio, Alabama, Kentucky, and Indiana.

It is important for us likewise to realize that the Federal Government is the biggest landlord of the Nation. I am not now referring to the vast acreage owned by the Federal Government, but to the Government as a landlord. The most recent figures showed there were 407,000 families paying rent to the Federal Government. For another 150,000 families the Federal Government pays annual contributions to local housing authorities, and of course that will be extended when the housing bill we recently passed becomes the law of the land and the Government undertakes the building of more and more houses.

Besides being the country's biggest landlord, the Federal Government is also the Nation's biggest tenant. It is holding by lease 340,000,000,000 square feet of space over the entire country.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is the biggest employer in the Nation. In 1947, exclusive of the armed forces, it employed more than 2,000,000 men and women. Last year, throughout the 48 States, State and local governments combined, numbering 155,000, had only about 2,000,000 employees. At the present time the Federal Government has more than three and a half times the number of civilian employees it had in 1932.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is the world's biggest foreign trader and controls all exports from the United States through loans and grants to foreign countries, and has financed about one-third of our total exports.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government has the largest income in the world, an income exceeding the aggregate incomes of the 6,000,000 farmers in the United States.

It is important for us to know that the Federal Government is the world's greatest spender. In the fiscal year 1947–48 it spent approximately $37,000,000,000 or $38,000,000,000, which is more than two and a half times the amount spent by all the local governments in the Nation. It is important to know that the Government spends approximately 20 percent of the Nation's income at this time. Yes, it is important for us to know that one out of every six adult Americans receives some money from the Federal Government. It is important for us to know that, on the average, every man, woman, and child in the United States spends approximately $300 a year to operate the Federal Government.

It is important for us to know that the debt now stands at more than $250,000,000,000, which amounts to more than $1,700 for each individual. It is important to know that we are coming closer and closer to a time when we shall have to live under a government controlled by a bureaucracy, unless the Government maintains inviolate its system of checks and balances. Such bureaucratic power will cause this Government to become more and more autocratic, and liberties will go out the window. Perhaps we should not call it a Socialist state, but, Mr. President, when we refer to England—and we hear much about England and what is going on there—I thought it might be worth while if the figures could be gotten together to show the direction in which the trend is leading.

If the representatives of the States in the Congress, in the Senate and in the House, will see to it that the vast sum of money which is collected from the taxpayers is so spent that the Government itself shall receive a dollar's worth for every dollar invested, and will see to it that as much of the balance as may be available is siphoned back to the States, without strings, perhaps, Mr. President, we can stop this current which is apparent not only in this country but abroad in the world everywhere, of the state taking hold of the wealth and assuming great power, automatically becoming, as is the case in many other nations, a police state. Then freedom, liberty, and incentive go out the window.

Mr. President, I trust that both parties will make it a point to consider the Hoover report and, while they may not adopt it in its entirety, I hope they will take it, segment by segment, accept those portions which are applicable to the present, and see to it that the report is adopted and put into effect, to the end that more of the tax money which is collected from the American people may be available to the States, because in many cases the States themselves are in no position to levy additional taxes because the Federal Government so largely preempts the field.

So, Mr. President, a challenge is presented to this august body. Today we are debating an appropriation bill. Machinery for the purpose is not adequate at the present time, but I hope it will not be long before we see to it that when appropriation bills are passed a provision is placed in each bill which will make it possible when we come to the end of the session to fit the national income to the cloth; in other words, to provide that appropriation bills shall be automatically cut by some kind of a review process.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How is the Senate to carry out the idea of the Senator from Wisconsin automatically to cut appropriation bills, and how are we to keep from making appropriations when the Senate and the other House continue to pass bills which authorize appropriations for whatever purpose Congress has in mind.

If the Senator will permit me, briefly——

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to yield further.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think if we cut appropriations, Congress will not authorize so many of them, but when Congress passes a law by voice vote, which authorizes an appropriation of $5,600,000,000, what are we to do about it except to appropriate the money?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I covered a part of the answer to the Senator's question. We were at that time considering foreign relief. Personally, I feel that the Appropriations Committee has been lax in the past in acting on the assumption that authorization is equivalent to appropriation. If that policy should continue to be followed, I feel that the Appropriations Committee would be lax, particularly in relation to foreign aid. I shall explain why I say that, and that will probably give the distinguished Senator the answer to his question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. In a moment. When the foreign-aid question was before the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and every other member of the committee said that because of the changing world, because of the known fact that the value of the dollar is increasing in purchasing power and costs are falling and because of improved conditions in Europe, it was becoming more and more apparent that the European nations were becoming more and more adequate, and that factor, as well as others, including the need in our own Nation of taking care of unemployment and looking after our own economy, should be considered and judgment rendered thereon by the Appropriations Committee. It was felt that when and if the appropriation were made, which would be in June or July, factors would be known which were not known in November when Mr. Hoffman's estimate was received. Those are things which make it imperative for the Appropriations Committee to screen the items and arrive at an independent conclusion, and not follow the lead of the authorization.

I made the suggestion that I hope we shall become more effective, efficient, and adequate, so that we shall not continue, as we have heretofore, passing appropriation bills, irrespective of what we think the Government can collect in taxes. In other words, when the tax money comes in and we have a final estimate, we should fit our appropria-

tions to the amount of money available. That is important, for the reason that the Federal Government has outstanding a debt of $250,000,000,000, and while, during the past 2 years, we have had a balanced budget and have reduced the debt, it is now important that we do not go into the red, and that, above everything else, we set for the world an example in fiscal policy, in balancing our budget, and in making ourselves economically sound.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made a suggestion, which I think merits consideration, as to what should be done in relation to appropriations. His suggestion was that all the authorizations be considered toward the end of the season in one bill, and then the desired reduction could be accomplished. I do not know whether that can be done; but, Mr. President, the time calls for constructive thinking on this whole subject, because we do not live unto ourselves alone; other nations and this Nation are in one great family.

We also have the Russian impact, whatever that may mean. I, for one, feel that there is a great deal of hysteria, and I feel it more strongly today, since it appears that the Russians are willing to talk. Of course, we should talk with Russia, but we should lay down the terms upon which we will talk. When I say "Russians," I do not mean the great Russian people; I mean Joe Stalin and his confederates. They are the great international poker players. They have through the centuries taken lessons from the Europeans, and we are neophytes. We have paid a terrible price because of that fact. But we are learning. In view of the fact that the initiatory steps are in the hands of the Executive, I, for one, feel that we should leave the decision to the Executive. In other words, he should answer the proposition which appears to have come over the wires today.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume too much time, but there are a few domestic considerations which I think require our attention. I believe that we should take action on the displaced persons question. I have offered a number of amendments to the present law, on which I feel action should be taken. I think the appropriate subcommittee should consider the amendments. I say that, having in mind everything the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] said yesterday, and recognizing that we are dealing with international personages, Mr. Stalin and his crowd, who are playing an infiltration game. Yet we know that a large percentage of the displaced persons after being properly screened can be brought to this country, where positions are available to them. In my own State, because of the failure to bring displaced persons to this country, the farmers have served notice that unless they can get them in 30 or 40 days they do not want them, because they would have to take their families and feed them during the winter. They want them throughout the season. I think that is one of the things to which the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary should give consideration.

I now wish to speak briefly about another important subject, namely, our obligations as Americans. While we claim to be heirs of all the ages, it is our obligation to preserve the heritage that is ours. We know that the founders of the Republic did not teach, as many of our people teach now, that ease and luxury are the essence of existence. Rather, they recognized that what was needed was the hardening of the muscles, the joy of work, of accomplishing, of striving, and they stressed the importance of a sense of honor, of self respect born of integrity, and of happiness in the things of the spirit. The founders of the Republic reached out and gave us a system of checks and balances such as the world had never seen before, and is not witnessing now except in our own country.

They knew that this system could be maintained only by free men who had the vision and the integrity to maintain freedom of speech, freedom of worship, a free press, right of trial by jury, right of petition, the right to hold office, and the right to work. They knew that men must have a sense of obligation to preserve these freedoms, or freedom could disappear, as, to repeat, material wealth could be dissipated. They knew that human passions and prejudices becloud men's vision, so that oftentimes ideas garbed in sheep's clothing would prove to be ravenous wolves ready to devour the fabric of the Republic.

With reference to the subject of education, we must recognize that it is as much our task as it is the task of the school teacher and the professor. We have known of people who have obtained doctor's degrees and master's degrees in the universities of the country, and yet simply accumulated a lot of worldly wisdom. They did not have the qualities the fathers had. That is why folks like Miss Bentley and others, and some famous Englishmen, are not sensing the worth whileness of the great system of freedom which England still preserves. They love their country, but they are literally sabotaged mentally by the Marxist theory as exemplified by Stalin and his gang.

Our fathers knew that freedom was not compatible with laziness of body and of mind. They knew that if a people grew complacent and let a central government or a government of individuals or a group gain complete control—in other words "let George do it"—they would soon find that an Adolf or a Benito or a Stalin would take over.

Last year, in San Francisco, Mr. President, coming down from Coit Tower which overlooks San Francisco Bay and affords one of the finest sights in America and the world, I noticed that the elevator man spoke with an accent. I said to him, "Where were you born?" I still thrill to his response, because he said, "Sir, I came to this country 44 years ago, and I landed at that pier," and he pointed to the pier. "I came from Italy. But this is my country."

What did he mean? He was not like many of those born here, who do not appreciate America. He came here and raised his family, saw his children go to our schools and enjoy the freedoms which are here; he acquired a home, voted for the candidates he wanted, and went to his own church. He had a comparison in his mind, so he said, "This is my country." I admit that a thrill went through me, as I realized that what we need in this land more than anything else is an appreciation of what we have here.

There are those, of course, who will say that there is not absolute material equality, but there is a vast equality such as no other people know. As we look back over the years and see what our people have accomplished, we must somehow get a little iron in our own systems, and be adequate to meet the problems as they come over the horizon.

"This is my country." That is what I would want for all of us to feel and know, and not simply be mentally sabotaged by the mechanical things which arise day by day.

We have many problems, economic problems, the problem of balancing our budget and not going into a wild spree, thinking that the world can be remade by our planning.

One of our great editorial writers, Walter Lippmann, said in his column a few days ago:

> It is significant, I think, that we have done well—perhaps in the perspective of history brilliantly well—where we have used American military and economic power for broad general purposes—to redress the balance of power, to prohibit aggression, to help others to help themselves. But we have not done well where we have undertaken to intervene directly and intimately in the internal affairs of distant and alien countries and have entangled ourselves in the business of governing or managing them.

So, Mr. President, we see that what is needed is horse sense, common sense, balanced thinking.

Mr. President, I wish to mention one other subject in connection with this discussion. In our campaigns and otherwise we have seen put into play what I have called "security psychosis." Many have been fooled into believing that if and when they are promised security all will be well; that the Nation should and could look after everyone's physical welfare from the cradle to the grave. That is a very intriguing but a very disintegrating concept. Many of the people who are in favor of this policy are humanitarians, good citizens, and, of course, they call themselves liberals, advanced thinkers. They are blind to the fact that if you follow this idea to its lair you will find that it will result in spending your money for you and in giving away your right to control your own business and social relations, and, what is worse, it will mean delimiting your freedom and liberty by imposing restriction on your personal conduct and activities. These paternalists fail to realize that man cannot long remain free if he throws upon the Government or upon any group of men the obligation of looking after him and relieve him of his responsibilities and duties of life, and, what is more, his duties as an American citizen. Duties and responsibiilties are a part of a freeman's inheritance. The end result of the promises to set you free from fear and want and insecurity and injustice, of insuring you against all hardships, and creating an army of public servants to watch over you and to make

you happy and virtuous—the end result would be the welfare state with no checks and balances to protect the freedoms of man—the welfare state such as they have it in Russia, such as we have seen it under Hitler and Mussolini. A welfare state, I repeat, means a police state.

It is very apparent I am sure, to all Senators that with this great conflict between those who believe in maintaining individual freedom by strengthening the individual and the power of local self-government, and the pseudo-liberals or paternalists who are hastening so-called social reforms. I say "so-called," because many of them are nothing but wolves covered with sheep's clothing who, by increasing the powers of a centralized national government, would bring about a welfare state. So, business, the farmer, the laboring man, and the Nation itself are at the crossroads. Where are we going? That is for us to decide. It is the action we take here that decides what corner we shall turn. We shall have to be on guard against the synthetic thinking of those using the channels of psychological warfare.

Where did we learn of this psychological warfare? That is another one of the isms which have come from Europe. Hitler used it. Since the war ended Stalin, by the use of psychological warfare, has gained control of 100,000,000 people and never fired a shot in doing so. It takes the form of a campaign of fear, worry, false suggestions, promises, which calls for keen analysis by the individual American citizen. Much of this psychological warfare hides, unfortunately, behind our great freedoms of speech, of the press, and of the radio. Are we taking a different direction than we should take? Are we taking a different direction because of American ingenuity and invention, and the airplane, and the atomic bomb?

Where are we going? We have got to decide. If and when the Senate ratifies the Atlantic Pact, Mr. President, which I spoke of in the beginning, we shall have taken a new tack. We must keep our eyes open to the responsibilities we assume if we ratify the pact, but we must also keep our eyes open to the responsibilities if we do not adopt the pact.

We have become involved in two World Wars. The first was after the Kaiser had come to believe, and in this he was advised by Bernstorff and others, that we would not fight. Yet we got into the First World War.

In the Second World War Hitler and the Japs thought we could not prepare, that we were not efficient and competent enough to get ready. So Pearl Harbor followed. We got into that war.

Now there is under consideration a new pact. We are now trying to take a new tack. We are now notifying the world as we did in Revolutionary days, what our position is, only we have enlarged our scope. In the days of the Revolution our first flag bore the motto "Don't Tread On Me," and the serpent appeared on the flag. We are now saying "Don't tread on me and my copartners."

There is a domestic highway leading down toward the socialistic state, or in the other direction leading away toward providing for our people more and more independence. There is a highway in our international affairs which on the one hand leads toward the pact, and if we move in that direction we will notify the world where we stand, so there can be no mistake about it, or we can move in the other direction and let Russia and other aggressors know or think they know that we will stand by and do nothing. It is not an easy decision for us to make. But a decision will have to be made, not in the light of the circumstances which prevailed in the world 150 years ago, but entirely on the circumstances as they prevail in the world today, in the light of America's ingenuity and her invention.

A few words and I shall close. I believe that all of us can profit by the statement I made in the beginning respecting "horse sense." We do not need a lot of educated "nincompoops" to direct our course. What we need is the vision the fathers had, so we may do what is necessary under the circumstances. We have to have faith in our course. We have to know that we will do what is right, that we will "do justly," that we do not want war with the great Russian people or any other people, that we will not engage in aggressive war, but that we will live at peace with all the peoples of earth. And, what is more, that we will extend our hand continually to help the unfortunate.

Then we ask understanding from those whom we help, so that they will not permit themselves to be targets of psychological warfare, which is built on lies and misrepresentations. Of course, we are living in a human world. But we are something else. And that something else will carry on when we have laid aside this mortal shell. In this age, as someone has said, the greatest age in the world's history, with the greatest challenges, it is our function to perform adequately and to have faith that the great American people will meet every challenge, will face courageously every situation, and will be adequate in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have heard some of the remarks of the able Senator from Wisconsin dealing with the dangers of recurring national deficits, and with that thought I am in complete accord. The Senator said he would like to see the Appropriations Committee provide the machinery to bring the national budget into balance, and not appropriate more money than was collected; in other words, to make expenditures equal income. I am in accord with that statement.

Mr. WILEY. I feel flattered, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have always been in accord with that theory. My purpose in rising was to tell the eminent Senator from Wisconsin that I have pending before the committee of which he is a member, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, a constitutional amendment which would make it mandatory in peacetime for the Congress to live within its means. It simply provides that whenever Congress appropriates more money than the national income, the President is authorized to reduce all appropriations by uniform percentages so as to bring expenditures into balance with income. If the Congress wanted to spend more than the Government collected, it could levy new taxes, so that then the President would be forbidden to reduce the appropriations, because the new taxes would make up the deficits.

The proposed constitutional amendment has had the benefit of the thought of some of the leading economists of the country, some of our great financiers, and giants of industry with whom I have corresponded over a period of 5 or 10 years. I am a little reluctant to mention their names, but they are preeminent in the field of finance and budgeting.

I hope the Senator, who I know is an advocate of the philosophy I am expressing, will try to prevail upon his fellow members in the Committee on the Judiciary to get that constitutional amendment to the floor of the Senate, because I feel certain that it will receive sympathetic consideration by the Congress. I am vain enough to believe that the State legislatures would ratify it.

It is absolutely ridiculous for the Congress to spend more money in peacetime than it takes in; but under our present system of constitutional government we could have recurring deficits from now until doomsday so far as any restraint upon ourselves is contained in constitutional limitations. As I stated, briefly, the amendment provides that when Congress appropriates in peacetime more than it takes in, the President is authorized to reduce all appropriations by uniform percentages until the budget comes into balance. For example, if Congress should create a deficit of 2 percent in excess of its income, every appropriation would be reduced 2 percent. It would not hurt anything. Probably we would all get along just as well with a 2 or 3 percent reduction as we would on the entire amount.

The Government would then be operated just as a business is operated. If a business does not have the money to pay for something, it does not appropriate it. If the money were not available, the Congress would not appropriate it; or, if Congress were to overappropriate, the President would say, "We have not the money; therefore I am going to reduce the appropriations to the point where we have it."

I have corresponded with the economists of such concerns as General Motors, who have devoted a great deal of thought to the problem of economics and finance in their businesses. I have corresponded with eminent members of the judiciary. I have corresponded with teachers of economics. While I would not want to say that the amendment which I have proposed is perfect in all respects, it would be such a great improvement over the existing situation that even in its introduced form it would be a great step forward if it could be adopted. I have introduced it for the past 5 years and more. I have written articles about it in the Saturday Evening Post, and have received thousands of letters of commendation. I have made six or eight

speeches on the floor of the Senate, and I have heard no one say a word against it. It has been considered by the Appropriations Committee, which reported it to the Senate without recommendation, except that it go to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

Everyone deplores these annual deficits. Everyone knows that they are bad for the country. Yet here is a piece of legislation which would deal with the question; and it is difficult to obtain consideration of it and get it to the floor of the Senate.

The eminent Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], when he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, joined with me in proposing this amendment. Both of us have spoken upon the subject, and we have appeared before numerous citizens' organizations all over the country. No one seems to be against it, but somehow or other in every session of Congress we have from a dozen to 50 speeches deploring annual deficits, and no one does anything about it. I have done something about it, and I sincerely hope that the Committee on the Judiciary may do something about it.

Let me say in support of the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin that if he will study the financing of the Italian Government from the time Garibaldi joined the eight independent republics together until the advent of Mussolini, a period of 66 years, I believe, he will find that for 44 of the 66 years, or two-thirds of the time after the day of Garibaldi, the Italian Government lived on borrowed money. For 44 of the 66 years of its existence it spent more than it took in.

One of the reasons Mussolini was called to power, one of the reasons why there were barricades in the streets and industrial unrest, fear, and uncertainty was that two-thirds of the time the Italian Government existed it lived upon the future. When borrowing became more difficult the people found that in proportion to their wealth they were the most heavily taxed people on the face of the earth. So, rebelling at last against the results of their own parliamentary indifference, mobs rioted, and Mussolini, a dictator, came upon the scene.

I shall not transgress upon the time of the Senate to speak of a similar situation, in varying form, under Hitler. History abundantly proves that one of the greatest contributing factors to the rise of Mussolini and Hitler was the policy of deficit spending practiced by the Italian and German Governments, which finally brought dictatorship on the people.

I am hopeful that the Committee on the Judiciary will give serious study to this amendment. If it will do so and eliminate any "bugs" in it and bring it before the Senate for consideration, I think that committee will have rendered a real service to the perpetuation of the democracy we love, the freedom we enjoy, and the free enterprise we want to keep.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to have confirmation from the distinguished Senator from Maryland of some of the statements I have made. I assure him that at the next meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary I shall speak to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the chairman of the committee, and see if a subcommittee cannot be appointed, if one has not already been appointed. After the persistent efforts of the Senator from Maryland, I feel that it is time to have hearings, and that the whole subject should be properly aired before the American people so that they can not only see the wisdom of the amendment, but also the wisdom of safeguarding the Nation's economy.

There is just one other subject about which I wish to speak very briefly at this time. I have had a great deal of correspondence from people asking why we do not send representatives to Spain. Today I took occasion to look into the subject. I find that back in 1946 there was a General Assembly resolution regarding relations between Spain and the members of the United Nations. In that resolution the General Assembly recommended that the Franco Government be barred from membership in international agencies established by or brought into relationship with the United Nations, and that members recall their ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary from Madrid. That, apparently, we did.

In view of the world situation, and in view of Spain's strategic importance and resources, I ask whether it would not be best for the United States to send an ambassador, or to take the lead in the United Nations in an effort to bring about more harmonious relations.

We have taken the position that it is not our function to go into other countries and change their form of government. Many people feel that Franco should go. Many others feel that he should remain. We have found, as I have illustrated by quoting from Walter Lippmann's article, that when we do such things we make a failure of it, as exemplified by our conduct in a number of places on the globe since the termination of the war. We know that mere withdrawal of ambassadors has been too weak an instrument to force the modification of the Franco regime. We know that Spain is one of the strongest anti-Communist countries. It seems to me that it should be allied with the rest of the western world in the struggle against communism.

Mr. President, we are engaged in a great international poker game. We are in the United Nations; we are going to engage in the North Atlantic Pact; we are going to send money to the European countries to strengthen their economy so that once more there will be, not an iron curtain, but a human curtain between us and any aggressor. The question of whether Spain should continue to be excluded from the United Nations because she is a dictatorship is, of course, something which the United Nations will have to determine. However, it should be pointed out that a number of the present members of the United Nations have a dictatorship form of government, as all of us know. Despite the resolution, the Latin-American countries already have sent their ambassadors to Spain; so, in the interest of Western Hemispheric solidarity, I ask whether we should not follow suit.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time because I am sure that the initiatory steps must be taken by the President and the State Department. Of course, Spain does not like the treatment we have given her. We maintain an ambassador in Moscow, and in all the satellite countries we have ambassadors. So is there any reason why we should not send an ambassador to Madrid?

I trust that these interrogatories will immediately come to the attention of the State Department, and the next time any representative of the State Department appears before the Foreign Relations Committee I hope I shall be able to get the answers.

Again I say, Mr. President, that we are living in a very small world. Apparently we cannot choose all the players with whom we are engaged in the international poker game, but the ones we do choose we select with our eyes open, with the idea of having them prove of value to us in case of any international emergency.

Mr. President, in view of all the circumstances of today—not of 4, 5, or 6 years ago, but in view of the present situation—it seems to me that it is imperatively necessary that this entire situation be reviewed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Ives	Murray
Bridges	Jenner	Myers
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarran	Taft
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Thye
Green	McKellar	Tydings
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hayden	Magnuson	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	
Hoey	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

HEARINGS BEFORE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE—MEMBERS EXCUSED FROM SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations, which, tomorrow, begins hearings on the North Atlantic Pact, may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until further notice, and that on quorum calls, there may be made a statement, at the end of the quorum calls, to the effect that the Committee on Foreign Relations has been excused because of hearings, so as to protect the members of that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1705) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced amends the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in two important respects.

First, the bill provides for an increase in the number of displaced persons to be admitted into the United States from 205,000 in 2 years to 507,000 in 4 years.

Second, the bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, not to exceed $5,000,000, to be used for loans to public or private agencies to finance the inspection and transportation of persons admitted from ports of entry within the United States to places of final destination; the purpose of this second provision being to further assure a general distribution of the displaced persons over the United States, particularly to the rural areas.

What is the justification, Mr. President, for increasing the number of displaced persons to be admitted to 507,000, a number which exceeds the number provided for in any bill thus far introduced?

What is the justification, when we know of the tremendous and ever increasing influx of people into the United States; when we know, for example, that during the course of the last year there was a general migration into the United States from Puerto Rico, with a net gain to this country of approximately 116,000 Puerto Ricans who, because of their citizenship status, may enter without limit? What is the justification, Mr. President, when we know that during the course of the last year, over 200,000 illegal entrants were returned across our borders to adjoining countries? What is the justification, when we know that the records of the immigration and naturalization service shows an arrearage of thousands upon thousands of cases for investigation and that estimates of the total number of illegal aliens in this country run from one to five million persons? What is the justification, when we know that the deportations or forced departures from the United States for the last 5 years have exceeded the number of immigrants entering the country legally during that time, notwithstanding the tremendous increase in legal immigration? What is the justification, Mr. President, when the statistics reveal that during the last fiscal year approximately 500,000 persons were admitted to the United States on a temporary basis as technical visitors, many of whom do everything possible to remain indefinitely in the United States? What is the justification when we know that in just one district alone, there is a backlog of over 20,000 overstayed visitors?

What is the justification for increasing the number to be admitted under the present law to 507,000 when, during the Nazi regime, some 250,000 refugees were admitted into the United States under our quota laws for permanent residence and some 200,000 were admitted temporarily, many of whom still remain in this country in an illegal status? What is the justification, Mr. President, when the United States has, in addition, pursuant to a presidential directive in 1945, admitted an additional 40,000 displaced persons, and has provided, by the present law, for an additional 205,000 displaced persons? What is the justification, when the statistics reveal that a disproportionate number of persons who have been and are being admitted into the United States are settling in the congested metropolitan areas where the housing shortage is most acute? What is the justification, when the statistics of the United States Department of Labor reveal that unemployment in this country is steadily mounting and that unemployment is approximately 600,000 higher than a year ago, and when we know the inevitable impact on our employment situation by the eventual curtailment of our foreign aid program?

The justification, Mr. President, is simply this, that 507,000 will not be a drop in the bucket compared to the number who will be admitted into this country, if we follow the route of the proposals which are currently pending in the Congress to expand the category of eligible displaced persons from the group presently embraced, namely, the war-displaced persons, to include refugees and displaced persons irrespective of considerations of time or geographical area.

The present displaced-persons law, Mr. President, was designed to afford a measure of relief, consistent with the best interests of the United States, to those persons who were displaced by the war, or shortly thereafter. The war in Europe ended on May 8, 1945, at which time the United States and other occupying powers in Germany and Austria became the guardians of those persons who had been displaced by the war and who could not return to their homelands. This group, which may be designated as the war-displaced persons, are embraced in the present law which has a cut-off day for eligibility on December 22, 1945, a date which is some 7 months after the conclusion of the war. Beginning some year or two thereafter, and continuing up to the present time, because of the chaotic condition of the world, tens of millions of persons have been and are being displaced all over the world.

Under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, the term "displaced person" includes not just a person who was displaced by the war, but any person who, at any time, now or in the future, is displaced. The fact is—and I know concerning what I speak, for I have, within the course of the last several months, studied this entire subject exhaustively—that the displaced person and the refugee situation is of staggering proportions, and involves millions upon millions of people all over the world whose ranks are constantly being swelled.

As every Senator knows, the pressure which is currently being brought to bear to open the floodgates of our country, is terrific. The records on file with the Congress pursuant to the Lobbying Registration Act show, for example, that just one pressure group on displaced-persons legislation has to date paid out over $800,000. Where has this money been spent? Aside from the actual buttonholing of Senators and Representatives by high-pressure lobbyists, there has been disseminated over the length and breadth of this Nation a campaign of misrepresentation and falsehood which has misled many public-spirited and well-meaning citizens and organizations.

Just a few days ago, for example, I received a letter from an official of one of these organizations protesting a resolution passed by the organization, advocating changes in the displaced-persons law. This official protested that not a single member of the organization had read a single word in either the present law or in the proposals, and knew nothing of the facts except as presented by one of these propaganda organizations.

The objective of this campaign is to ever widen the scope of the displaced-persons program of the United States and the numbers to be admitted. This campaign has already been reflected in the halls of the Congress by the various proposals thus far submitted. Bills are pending, Mr. President, which start us on the road to tearing down the immigration barriers of this Nation for the admission of millions of refugees and displaced persons from all over the world. We hear the plea of the some 700,000 refugees in the Greek civil war, of some 10,000,000 refugees in India, of millions in China, of some 700,000 Arabs displaced in the Palestine war, of tens of millions in eastern Europe who have not yet joined the ranks. The International Refugee Organization, in the occupied areas of Europe alone, is currently receiving applications at the rate of 20,000 a month and is taking on the rolls some 8,000 persons per month. Recently, upon the reactivation of the regular immigration quotas of Germany and Austria, there was an immediate registration of some 400,000 persons who are now on the waiting list.

Mr. President, the present law has been falsely criticized as being unjust and discriminatory. Wherein lie the injustices and the discriminations? Although it is charged that the present law discriminates against certain religious groups, official spokesmen for some of these groups have denied that the law discriminates against them. Moreover, the facts immediately dispel this charge.

It is charged that the present law discriminates against persons of the Jewish or Catholic faith. As of March 31, of this year, 44 percent of the displaced persons who have been admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Catholic faith. Thirty-nine percent of the persons admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Jewish faith. Eight and one-half percent of the persons admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Protestant faith, and 8½ percent have been of the Greek Orthodox faith.

It is charged that the present law, which requires assurances of housing and

jobs as a prerequisite to admission, is administratively unworkable. The Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission, however, when recently testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, stated that, although the program under the present law did not get under way until October 1948, there are already on file assurances of an aggregate number of 143,000 people. I quote his testimony:

> We have no trouble in getting enough assurances. * * * So far as assurances are concerned, we shall receive many more than 205,000, many more. They are coming in at that terrific rate.

He further testified to the effect that, notwithstanding the lag in getting the program under way, by the summer months, the flow will be at a rate of 16,000 persons a month, and that the aggregate number provided for under the present law will arrive in the United States within a period of 19 months, instead of within a period of 24 months, as provided in the present law.

The present law has also been unjustly criticized as unfair because it gives a priority of 30 percent to agriculturalists and their families. The facts are, however, that this priority is not only eminently fair to the displaced persons but its justified by the need for agricultural workers in the United States and the desire to direct the displaced persons away from the congested metropolitan areas.

The number of displaced persons within the classification for which a 30-percent priority is given constitutes at least 60 percent of the total of the displaced persons. It is thus seen that a 30-percent priority to agriculturalists and their families is eminently fair. The experience under the present law amply vindicates this provision, for, notwithstanding the present law, over 80 percent of the displaced persons who have thus far been admitted have settled in metropolitan areas.

Another provision of the present law which has been criticized unjustly is that provision which gives a 40-percent priority to persons who have fled from those countries which are now de facto annexed by Communist Russia and who cannot possibly return for fear of their very lives. Here again, Mr. President, at least 40 percent of the displaced persons, by number, are actually in this category of persons for whom the priority has been given, but less than 40 percent of the displaced persons thus far admitted have been persons covered by the priority.

What will be the operative effect of the bill which I have introduced? At the present time it is estimated that there are a little over 500,000 war-displaced persons in the occupied areas of Europe who would be potentially eligible under the terms of the present law. The present law provides for the admission of approximately half this number into the United States. The net effect of the bill, then, is to embrace virtually all displaced persons who were displaced by the war, or shortly thereafter, who are potentially eligible under the present law.

I solemnly warn the Senate that, notwithstanding the humanitarian implications of the entire problem of refugees and displaced persons, if we expand the category of eligible displaced persons to include not only war-displaced persons but also refugees and displaced persons irrespective of considerations of time or geographical area, every session of the Congress, from now until decades to come, will see an ever-increasing influx into this country of millions and millions. It is high time, Mr. President, if it is not already too late, for us to give at least a passing thought to the best interests of the United States of America.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has brought out one of the most disturbing aspects of this situation: the unbelievable pressure which has been brought to bear upon Members of Congress by lobbyists and self-appointed pressure groups.

The hundreds of thousands of dollars which have been spent in stirring up unwarranted discontent against the displaced persons law would, if used for that purpose, have been sufficient to give adequate relief and care to thousands of displaced persons whom the selfsame pressure organizations profess to support. The Senator from Nevada has made specific reference to one organization which has spent over $800,000 in approximately 2 years. This organization is the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. It is a curious thing that whenever any organization desires to push for any sort of special legislation, it will invariably cloak itself behind the high-sounding phrase "citizens committee." From a study of the financial statements submitted by this pressure front, it would appear that a substantial part of this money was actually contributed by only a handful of persons in amounts of $500 or more.

I invite the Members of the Senate to study the statements of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons which are filed with the clerk of the House under the Lobbying Registration Act. They will find there the names of the contributors and the items for which this money has been spent. A large portion of the money has been spent for items concerned in promotion and publicity. Many thousands of dollars are listed for such items as literary services, mimeographing expenses, publicity expenses, publicity services and expenses. For example, the report for the first quarter of 1948, which I hold in my hand, lists 18 items under the heading "Literary services," and approximately 75 items under the heading "Publicity services." These items alone run into many thousands of dollars for one quarter of the year. The total expenses listed for that quarter amount to $149,507.96.

Mr. President, it is not difficult for us to conclude into what channels of publicity and pressure these moneys have been spent. All of us are aware of the tremendous flood of propaganda material which has poured into every office of every Member of Congress. We have all been buttonholed by the untold numbers of lobbyists who are determined that we shall bring about the complete breakdown of our immigration system. To this end, there has been expended an additional sum of tens of thousands of dollars for traveling expense. The statement for the first quarter, which I have here, lists $32,734.33 for travel expense. The figures in the other reports are comparable in relation to total expenses.

The money which is spent by this organization is undoubtedly responsible for most of the vituperative attacks made upon any Member of Congress who refuses to be swayed by indiscriminate charges of discrimination. It appears to be the belief of the sponsors of this pressure group, and the others like it, that they can stampede the Congress into adopting any sort of legislation they happen to propose, by spending thousands of dollars for propaganda, by raising a pitiful howl about imaginary discriminations contained in this legislation. Let me say that the present displaced persons law has in it no clause, no provisions which in any way discriminates against any group anywhere.

For centuries our country has been the haven of the persecuted masses of the world. They have enjoyed here new freedoms and new hopes. There has never been any attempt to discriminate against peoples because of their race or creed. The fact that millions of people are still anxious to come here is eloquent evidence of my contention. If Senators will review the history of our great country, they will immediately be impressed by the fact that persons from all parts of the globe and of all religious beliefs have come here to settle—the Quakers of Pennsylvania the Catholics of Maryland, the Puritans of New England, and all the other creeds to which people have adhered.

I submit, Mr. President, that these pressure organizations would perform a more humanitarian service if they took their thousands of dollars in slush funds and used it for the relief of the unfortunate people of Europe; reserving, perhaps, a small portion of it to report to the world that this land of ours stands as the last great stronghold of religious, personal, and civil liberties.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Brewster	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Bricker	Hill	McGrath
Bridges	Hoey	McKellar
Cain	Holland	McMahon
Capehart	Humphrey	Magnuson
Chavez	Ives	Maybank
Cordon	Jenner	Miller
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Ecton	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ellender	Kefauver	Myers
Ferguson	Kem	Neely
George	Kerr	Pepper
Gillette	Long	Reed
Green	McCarthy	Robertson

Russell	Stennis	Wherry
Saltonstall	Taft	Wiley
Schoeppel	Thomas, Utah	Young
Sparkman	Thye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, in line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics," on page 4, line 8, after "(5, U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$5,450,000" and insert "$5,506,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 4, line 21, after "(41 U. S. C. 38)", to strike out "and for the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act transferred by Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1946"; and on page 5, line 4, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$5,361,000" and insert "$5,252,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency-American Printing House for the Blind," on page 6, line 12, after the figures "$115,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used for the printing of large-type, ink-print books."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope this proviso will not remain in the bill. I am a member of the committee, and I say very frankly that I did not object to this proviso when the bill was being considered by the committee, but since then I have received evidence from my home State, from the superintendent of the Perkins Institution, from the Massachusetts School for the Blind, and from other authorities, who express the hope that this proviso will be stricken from the bill. I believe the committee heard only one side of this case, and did not realize that there is very serious objection to the proviso.

Since 1879, the Congress has appropriated annually for the education of the blind. In 1879, as I understand the matter, a nonprofit institution called the American Printing House was organized in Louisville, Ky. It was established to print books in braille and to print other reading material for the education of blind students. The output of the American Printing House was available to schools for the legally blind in the various States of the Union. The products of that company were not available except to schools where legally blind students were being educated.

About 10 or 12 years ago those schools also began to educate children having only a little sight. Such children are still "legally blind," and have to be educated as legally blind students. As I understand the matter, it was found that such students could be educated more quickly and better by the use of books printed in a different kind of type, type of very large size. So the American Printing House undertook to print books with that special type, for the education of legally blind students who had just a little sight, and it made those books available to such institutions.

More recently, as I understand the matter, a commercial printing house has taken up this type of printing. Of course, we do not wish to have the Government compete with private business in the field of printing or in any other field of business, but we wish to make this Federal appropriation available as far as possible for the education of the blind.

I understand that if this proviso remains in the bill, and eventually is enacted into law, the American Printing House, which has set up printing machines for the purpose mentioned, will not be able to use those machines, which are available for the printing of such books in large type.

Furthermore, I am informed by the superintendent of Perkins Institution, in Massachusetts, that this type of education will have to be given up by it if this proviso remains in the bill, because in that case there will not be sufficient money to permit the purchase at commercial rates of books printed in such large type. For instance, the superintendent of Perkins Institution gives as an example an English dictionary which, so he tells me, will cost $35 when purchased by such an institution, if this proviso is enacted into law.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I hope this proviso will be stricken from the bill. I, for one, in the committee, voted on it under a misapprehension.

Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. IVES, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to say that I concur heartily in all the Senator from Massachusetts has said, joining with him in urging the Senate to vote down the proviso embodied in the committee amendment. I wish to emphasize the fact, which the Senator has mentioned, that if the proviso is stricken out the funds appropriated by the Congress will go as they have gone for the past 70 years, to purchase only the large-print books or tangible apparatus for children who are in institutions for the blind in the several States.

I have a letter, addressed to me under date of April 22, by Mr. F. E. Davis, superintendent of the American Printing House for the Blind, the house to which the Senator from Massachusetts referred, to which the appropriation goes for allocations to blind children in the State institutions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The American Printing House for the Blind is a nonprofit institution, is it not?

Mr. HILL. It is absolutely a nonprofit institution. As the Senator has said, the funds go to make the allocations of braille books and tangible apparatus for children in State institutions for the blind. Mr. Davis, writing to me under date of April 22, says:

> Large-print books have come to be considered absolutely necessary for certain peoples classed as blind enrolled in the schools and classes for the blind. In response to a unanimous demand from superintendents of schools for the blind throughout the Nation, it is the purpose of the American Printing House to use these funds for the benefit of these schools in exactly the same way as such funds have always been used in supplying these schools with Braille books and tangible apparatus.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1949.*

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: Referring to my talk with you today I am writing this to make all together clear the fact that out of the funds carried in the pending Federal Security appropriation bill (H. R. 3333) for the American Printing House for the Blind, no part of such funds will be used for the purpose of subsidizing the making of any large-print books furnished to agencies or persons other than the duly authorized schools and classes for the blind. In addition to local audits our books are annually audited by the Federal Social Security Agency to see that funds are expended in accordance with the Federal law.

The American Printing House has been and is a nonprofit institution and any books or apparatus which may be furnished to any sources are on a nonprofit basis. The trustees serve without compensation and wholly for the public good.

I believe you have seen a copy of my letter to Senator CHAPMAN of yesterday, dealing with the proviso in the pending appropriation bill, and this may be considered supplemental to that letter.

Large-print books have come to be considered absolutely necessary for certain peoples classed as blind enrolled in the schools and classes for the blind. In response to a unanimous demand of superintendents of schools for the blind throughout the Nation, it is the purpose of the American Printing House to use these funds for the benefit of these schools in exactly the same way as such funds have always been used in supplying these schools with braille books and tangible apparatus.

I should like to reiterate the statement that if the proviso is permitted to stand, the effect will be to deny a particular group of pupils classed as blind from any benefit from these appropriation funds with the result that if such children are to be supplied with large-print books, the States and Territories will have to purchase them with local funds; whereas, without the proviso they would be allocated in a per capita way to all the schools for the blind and paid for out of these annual appropriations.

I regret that the trustees of the American Printing House had no knowledge that the Senate Appropriations Committee was considering the subject under discussion; else the Printing House would have requested the right to be heard before action on the proviso was taken. If there is any other information you desire, I shall be happy to supply it. I remain,

Respectfully yours,

F. E. DAVIS,
Superintendent, American Printing House for the Blind.

Mr. IVES and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Just a moment. Mr. President, I am handling this bill on the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not mean to usurp the Senator's function. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is all right, but I also should like to have something to say about this proviso, for which both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Alabama voted in committee. I have no objection to the language of the amendment being changed, because I, too, want to do for the blind the things the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Massachusetts are trying to do. This amendment was written by the committee, which included the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Alabama, and was especially dedicated to Senators on the other side of the aisle. The only thing the committee had in mind was to have the Government subsidy used, or efforts made to have it used, so it would not bring about competition with private industry. That is all there is to it. There was not a single member of the committee, including the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Massachusetts, who did not vote for the amendment as proposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall yield in a moment. I have no objection to the proviso language being eliminated, but I insist that Senators who so readily voted in committee for it should at least allow the chairman to explain to the Senate why the proviso was included in the bill and, to state that it was approved by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Massachusetts. If Senators change their minds later, as the result of a misunderstanding which may have occurred in committee, that is all right, but it is not the purpose of the chairman of the subcommittee to take the blame for the insertion of this language in the bill by the committee, and then have somebody else defend the blind.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Pardon me. We hear every day in the week, and we have heard today, about the Government engaging in business, about the Government interfering with local authorities, about the Government doing this and the Government doing that. All the committee was trying to do was to see to it that the subsidy which has been used so well for the blind, be continued in its effective use.

I may say that from 1879 until a year or two ago, this money was used for the blind, not for the near blind, or for those who think they may be blind, but for those who are actually blind. The committee was merely trying to protect them in the use of the money. However, inasmuch as we have the assurance of the Senator from Alabama that the printing house makes proper use of the money—and, incidentally, I was listening to the Senator from Alabama, and we may be sure the Senator was correct, that it would not be used for private purposes—I have no objection whatever to the elimination of the proviso; but I did want the Senate to understand that it was not the chairman of the subcommittee who was responsible. The other Senators are just as responsible for the proviso as I am.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the able Senator from New Mexico is correct in his explanation as to how the proviso came to be in the bill. The proviso was placed in the bill by the committee on the theory that otherwise there might be competition with private enterprise. Since that time, additional information has come to the able Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from Michigan. For example, when I learned from people in my State that there was an objection to the proviso, I wrote them asking for a full explanation. When I received a letter, which I now should like to put into the RECORD, I changed my mind entirely on the matter. I think other members of the committee have changed their minds. The letter contains a better explanation than any I could possibly make on the floor as to why I changed my mind between the time the committee acted and the time the bill reached the floor. I ask that the letter be included in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND,
Lansing, Mich., April 25, 1949.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Thank you for your reply to my letter and telegram. Following is the information you desire:

According to our State law, children of Michigan between the ages of 7 and 19 who have eye defects so severe that they cannot obtain an education in the regular public schools are eligible to come to the Michigan School for the Blind.

You can see that with this broad interpretation there are many children at this school who are not totally blind but who have enough usable vision to read large-print books. According to our eye specialist many of these children will retain what vision they have and consequently it would be unfair to require them to read and write braille. If these children have enough usable vision so they need not study braille but who have not enough vision to read the print used in the regular public-school textbooks, the only answer is textbooks printed in large type.

Because of the increase in the number of visually handicapped children in Michigan, and the shortage of teachers in this field, the State School for the Blind here in Lansing is expected to provide an education for these children.

With our limited budget and the tremendous cost of large-print books, it would be of immeasurable help if these books could be printed at the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, Ky.

I sincerely hope that you will use your influence to have this objectionable clause deleted from the present Senate bill.

Respectfully yours,

W. J. FINCH,
Superintendent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should merely like to say that I, too, have heard from representatives of schools and other persons in the State of Minnesota. I have here a telegram from J. C. Lysen, superintendent of the Minnesota Braille and Sight Saving School, Faribault, Minn., in which he asks for the elimination of the proviso that "none of these funds shall be used for the printing of large-type, ink-print books." I know that members of the committee have already concurred in this view, and I am of the opinion that the Senate will vote down the amendment; I certainly hope so. I think we should remember that this was nothing more nor less than one of those things that happen through what may be called an oversight or misjudgment, in view of certain evidence which was presented. Other evidence which has come at this late hour indicates that the proviso should be eliminated, and that we should continue the same procedure as that which has been followed for many years under our program of aid to the blind. I ask that the telegram, together with a follow-up letter dated April 19, 1949, by Mr. Lysen, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARIBAULT, MINN., *April 19, 1949.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY:

Regarding Department of Labor—Federal Security Appropriation Bill for 1950 Committee has put following limitation: "*Provided,* None of these funds are used to produce large-print books." This would knock out textbooks for approximately one-half of our schools where we have partially sighted children. Would you please use your influence in striking out this limiting clause. Letter follows.

J. C. LYSEN,
Superintendent, Minnesota Braille and Sight Saving School.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
MINNESOTA BRAILLE AND
SIGHT SAVING SCHOOL,
Faribault, April 19, 1949.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This letter is a follow-up to the telegram, which was sent you today. In this telegram, I mentioned the fact that the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation carries a limiting clause, as follows: "*Provided,* None of these funds are used for producing large-print books."

It is my feeling that this clause would not have gotten in there, unless there has possibly been some lobbying on the part of commercial book publishers. Our books are produced at the American Printing House for

the Blind, at Louisville, Ky. Our printing house is now launched on a magnificent program of producing sight-saving books, with large enough type, to be used by children with defective vision, but who are not blind.

The present program of large-type books at Louisville was started several years ago, and I believe that I was one of the chief instigators of the program.

If, therefore, you can knock out this limiting clause, in the above-mentioned bill, I would appreciate it greatly. Please let me hear from you, as to whether or not you succeed.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. LYSEN,
Superintendent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say merely that what the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico, has said, is absolutely correct. So far as I am concerned, speaking as one Senator, I voted for the proviso with the idea of trying to stimulate competition. Later I received information which obviously caused me to change my mind.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to observe that I do not think anybody is to blame for the situation which has arisen. I believe the committee acted in absolute good faith, on the basis of the evidence before the committee at the time. Evidence which has since come to us is very compelling. I have in my hand telegrams from two institutions in the State of New York, nonprofit institutions, begging that the proviso be stricken from the bill. Therefore, I take practically the same position as that taken by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to associate myself with what has been said by other members of the Appropriations Committee. I probably voted for the amendment, too, at the time, because of a general understanding that it possibly was subsidizing an institution that is in competition with private enterprise. The committee did not then have all the facts before it. I do not think it is a reflection upon any member of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, or any other Senator that after having ascertained the truth about what the real situation is we should all agree that the proviso should be stricken from the bill, because every dollar involved, as I am informed and believe, actually goes to help some child who is so nearly blind that this service is required to enable him to become educated other than by the braille system. Therefore, Mr. President, if I voted for the amendment in committee, I am willing to change my position at this time so that we may do what we should do and continue this service to the blind and nearly blind children of the Nation.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. He has been waiting a long time.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, since the statement has been made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that the amendment was adopted in committee under a misunderstanding or misapprehension, and since he has stated to the Senate that he will accept the amendment which is being discussed, I see no need for further discussion.

Since the American Printing House for the Blind was established many years ago, it has always been a nonprofit institution. The adoption of the amendment would have had a very serious effect, because it would mean the deprivation of thousands of children with a vision of 20/200 or less, who come within the accepted definition of blind persons, although they can see daylight. In former years another system was followed by educators of the blind, but during the past 15 years, as I understand, the best authorities on schools for the blind have reached the conclusion that children who are not absolutely blind, but who can be said to be legally blind, can be best taught by the use of large-print books. Since there is no profit accruing to anyone involved, and since it is a humanitarian work carried on by the institution, I am glad the Senator from New Mexico has stated that he will accept the amendment. I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks relating to the American Printing House for the Blind, there may be inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of April 21, 1949, by Mr. F. E. Davis, superintendent of the American Printing House for the Blind.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE
FOR THE BLIND,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1949.

Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAPMAN: You have requested that I furnish you a statement as to the effect of the proviso reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee in H. R. 3333 as to the item of $115,000 for the use of the American Printing House for the Blind during the ensuing fiscal year. This I am very glad to do.

The primary work of the American Printing House for the Blind is the extension of its services to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal act to promote the education of the blind. This act, originally passed in 1879, and now authorizing an appropriation to the printing house up to $125,000 a year, is designed to furnish this institution with the funds to provide the free school texts, tangible apparatus, and other supplementary materials necessary to the education of the pupils under instruction in the public educational institutions for the blind throughout the country. Unfortunately, in many of the States, little or no local funds are available for educational materials for the blind, and the schools for the blind must depend solely on the printing house to obtain them.

The American Printing House for the Blind was originally chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky on January 23, 1858, as a national, nonprofit institution designed to manufacture and provide at cost books and tangible apparatus for the schools for blind.

For 20 years after its incorporation, the printing house supplied its materials on a cash basis through funds raised in the several States. In 1878 the American Association of Instructors of the Blind memorialized Congress for an appropriation to provide a more adequate and permanent source of funds for books and instructional materials for all the schools. As a result in 1879 Congress passed the act "To promote the education of the blind." Since that time the full appropriation from the Federal Government has been used to provide books and tangible apparatus for the education of the blind in the various States on a nonprofit basis. No Federal funds have been used to provide buildings or other facilities at the printing house. The Commonwealth of Kentucky and contributions from interested citizens all over the country have provided funds for the construction of needed buildings and quarters for the printing house operation through the many years of its existence.

In its role as the official schoolbook printery for the blind of the United States and its Territories, the expansion of the services of the printing house has been closely correlated with the historical development of educational methods and curricula in the schools and classes for the blind. In the beginning, books were published in a multiplicity of embossed types, since it was not until 1918 that a single embossed system was adopted in this country. When a more highly contracted system of braille was adopted in 1932, the printing house began printing books in this system. During the thirties the Talking Book—books on phonograph records—was developed, and the printing house established a department for the manufacture of this type of literature. For approximately the past 15 years, there has been a growing sentiment in the schools for the blind that many of the partially blind children under their instruction, whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness, might better be taught by the use of large-print books than braille. For this class of children, totaling between 25 and 30 percent of the blind school population, the printing house has therefore recently undertaken the manufacture of school texts in large print, with a view to supplying parallel braille and large-type editions of educational materials, so that both the blind and partially visioned children in our schools for the blind might be taught within the same classroom.

The American Printing House for the Blind has been a pioneer in dealing with the subject of large-type printing.

The establishment of a department for the printing of large-type materials for the schools and classes for the blind has been under consideration by the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind for the last 12 years. As early as 1936, the printing house actually published a single large-type book—Everyday Manners for American Boys and Girls—which was distributed gratis through the gift of a private benefactor. The first book was published in an effort to determine the technical problems in the manufacture of this type of book and just how well the printing house was equipped to do the job. Although the printing of the book was a success it was not felt at that time that the schools for the blind had their sight-saving programs sufficiently well developed to justify the immediate establishment of such a department at the printing house with a view to adding this type of publication to the services provided through the Federal appropriation "To promote the education of the blind." In the years immediately following, the establish-

ment of our talking book department, and the expansion of our braille printing and tangible apparatus departments crowded the facilities of our plant to capacity, and little active thought could be given to the large-type project.

In 1944, sentiment in favor of establishing sight-saving departments in our residential schools for the blind had developed to such a point that the Little Rock convention of the American Association of Instructors of the Blind passed a resolution requesting the board of trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind to make a study of means whereby textbooks in suitable type might be made available to the residential schools for the blind and the public school braille classes which the printing house now provides with embossed textbooks. In the same resolution, the printing house was requested to give consideration "to the possibility of making these textbooks available to sight-saving classes in public schools provided that this should not be done by the use of money now designated to provide embossed books for the blind, appliances, etc., but either by new appropriations, the use of revolving funds, or through gifts and legacies."

In October 1945 the printing house sent questionnaires to the 53 residential schools for the blind requesting information concerning the number of pupils who could use sight-saving materials. For this purpose, the following popularly used definition of blindness was employed: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting glasses, or a peripheral field so contracted that the widest diameter of such field subtends an angular distance no greater than 20 degrees. Responses to the questionnaire were received from 90 percent of the schools canvassed. The replies received showed that, of the total school population, approximately 27 percent met not only the legal definition of blindness, but had eye conditions which would profit more from the use of suitable large-type books than from braille. In the light of these facts, the general counsel of the Federal Security Agency ruled in 1946 that the act of 1879 to promote the education of the blind includes large-print books designed for the education of the blind. It was further ruled that, for administrative purposes, the above-quoted definition of blindness should be used.

It is the purpose of the printing house to supply large-type materials out of the Federal appropriations solely for the benefit of children who come within the legal definition of blindness—and to no one else. When taking the registration of the blind school population on the first Monday in January of each year, in order to determine the quota allocation of credit for the individual schools on a per capita basis, it is permitted that only those pupils whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness be registered. Further, books and materials in large type are supplied to the schools only in quantities comparable to the registration of their blind pupils. For instance, such materials are not supplied to sight-saving classes whose children are not legally blind and who cannot be registered with the printing house for the Federal appropriation. However, as a private, nonprofit institution for the blind, chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the printing house may supply any or all of its publications or manufactures for cash to any person or institution, provided the price charged represents only the cost of manufacture plus a reasonable overhead—absolutely no profit.

The passage of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" was the result of a memorial to Congress by the schools for the blind. In order to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal funds, the act provided that all superintendents of schools for the blind shall be ex officio trustees of the printing house, and shall exercise complete control, as agents of the Federal Government, in the choice of the materials, and the style and type of their manufacture, which are supplied to their institutions out of the Federal appropriation. The Federal act further stipulated that all materials supplied out of these funds must be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Therefore, if the printing house is not to be permitted to supply large-type materials to the schools and classes for the blind out of the Federal appropriation, then the original intent and purpose of the act will be denied, since the schools have definitely indicated a great need and desire for this type of literature to be supplied to them by the printing house.

In summarizing the reasons for omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill, the following points should be noted:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind," to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the printing house to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only those children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large-type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large-type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind, and is no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.

5. The limiting proviso providing that none of the Federal appropriation can be used for producing large print books will not in any way prevent the American Printing House for the Blind from making available large-print books on a nonprofit basis, but it will prevent the children with 20/200 vision or less, who came within the accepted definition of blindness and who are enrolled in the school for the blind, and who can best be educated by use of large-print books according to the judgment of the superintendents of schools for the blind, from sharing equally with other children enrolled in these schools the Federal funds made available to provide educational materials for all these children.

6. The Federal Security Agency, after due consideration and upon legal advice, ruled that large-print books can be provided under the annual appropriation made for the American Printing House. If the Congress is to make any change of the basic law governing these matters it should be done, I would respectfully submit, only after full and complete hearing of all interested parties upon a measure purely legislative in character.

If the proviso is allowed to stand the schools for the blind will have to purchase the needed large print books for their use with State or local funds and not receive them under the annual appropriation made for the American Printing House.

I trust that the foregoing will provide you the information you desire.

Sincerely,

F. E. DAVIS,
Superintendent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask if it is not a fact that the removal of this restriction will not add to the total expense of the Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It will not add to the total expense of the Government. I reiterate that what the committee had in mind was not to reduce the appropriation at all, but to make sure it was used for the blind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the committee and its chairman for the reversal of their position on this point.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if there is any blame to be borne for this committee amendment, it rests equally on the shoulders of each and every member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and not alone on the shoulders of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. As has been clearly stated, the situation is simply that we now have data, facts, and information, and we now have light which we did not have when the committee amendment was considered by the Committee on Appropriations. We are now able to see the true picture, which we did not see at the time the bill was considered by the committee.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to do what I had intended to do, namely, to pay my tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for the very able, fine, patient, and devoted way in which he conducted the hearings on the bill and in which he guided the bill through the parliamentary procedures, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. He did an extraordinarily splendid job.

So far as any provision with reference to the blind is concerned, let me say that there is no Member of the Senate in whose hands I would rather leave the fate or the fortune of the blind than in the hands of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. The Senator from New Mexico has a deep sympathy for all his fellow men. There is great compassion in his heart for all who may be unfortunate or disadvantaged. There is in his soul the gospel of humanity and of God Himself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter which I have

received from the Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA INSTITUTE FOR DEAF AND BLIND,
Talladega, Ala., April 19, 1949.

Senator LISTER HILL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: I was in Washington last week and wanted to see you; but with the press of time and the fact that you were busy on the floor with the TVA steam plant bill, I had to go on to New York. I heard your speech. It was a good one.

Please note the attached in regard to the appropriation for the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency. I found this when I returned and it may be too late; but hope the *sentence* was deleted in the bill as I understand it was not in the House bill. We are just developing this sight-saving program here at the institute and it amazes me how many children can be helped with the sight-saving classes in our school for blind and it is due in part to making available these large-print textbooks. The enclosed explanation will show the situation at the American Printing House for the Blind in connection with this matter. I believe it is due to lobbying of a specific commercial concern interested in publishing large-print books on a commercial basis only.

You will know what procedure to take in connection with this matter.

I hope you can visit our school sometime and see how this work is progressing. It is certainly a worth-while appropriation.

With highest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. E. BRYAN, *President.*

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if what he has to say is in reference to the amendment?

Mr. MYERS. It is.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I share the views of the Senator from New Mexico that the proviso under discussion should be stricken from the bill. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a telegram from the Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind, a telegram from the Overbrook School for the Blind, a letter from the Royer-Greaves School for the Blind, Paoli, Pa., and a letter from the Overbrook School for the Blind, all asking that the proviso be stricken from the bill.

There being no objections, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 18, 1949.*

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge that limiting clause reading as follows. Provided that none of these funds are used for producing large-print books. Be stricken from Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950 which carries appropriation for the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky., there is great need for large-type books for use, by partially sighted pupils classified as blind by Federal interpretation. The rider attached to regular appropriation bill for the American Printing House for the Blind if left in will greatly hamper us in our efforts to furnish proper educational opportunity through visual aids to these handicapped pupils. We understand that this bill comes to the Senate floor tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, so urge your immediate attention.

B. S. JOICE,
Superintendent, Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 18, 1949.*

Senator FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently solicit your aid concerning Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950. Department of Labor which provides funds for the American Printing House for the Blind, Louisville, Ky., which supplies books to all schools for the blind and near-blind due to lobbying of a small concern. The following clause has been inserted in the above bill: 'Provided none of these funds are used for producing large-print books." Many children in schools for the blind are seriously handicapped and cannot use ordinary books but have limited vision and can see the big-print material. Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction sends 22 such children to Overbrook and a number to the Pittsburgh school. Unless this clause is dropped from the bill these children will suffer loss of this Federal-supplied material and tuition costs will then rise. Will appreciate your efforts to eliminate this clause.

JOSEF G. CAUFFMAN,
Overbrook School for the Blind.

OVERBROOK SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 21, 1949.

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Re omission of the limiting clause in the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950. I sent you a day letter relative to the above, and I should like to send additional information in regard to the omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the printing house to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only these children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large-type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large-type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind and is no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.)

I shall appreciate very much whatever attention you can give to this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEF G. CAUFFMAN,
Principal.

ROYER-GREAVES SCHOOL FOR BLIND,
Paoli, Pa., April 20, 1949.

The Honorable FRANCIS MYERS,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a communication which I have received from the American Printing House for the Blind and which I have marked the important parts.

In this school 15 percent of our pupils are using clear-type books. This is done under the direction of our oculist. As these children are suffering from lack of nerve force, he thinks they should not be under the strain of learning to read with their fingers if their eyes are strengthened by using clear-type books.

If these books cannot be supplied to us by the printing house these blind children will suffer.

We would be glad to have you visit our school.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JESSIE ROYER-GREAVES,
Principal.

ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF THE OMISSION OF THE LIMITING CLAUSE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1950, PREVENTING THE PROVISION OF LARGE-TYPE BOOKS THROUGH THE ACT—TO PROMOTE THE EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

The primary work of the American Printing House for the Blind is the extension of its services to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal act—"To promote the education of the blind." This act, originally passed in 1879, and now authorizing an appropriation to the printing house up to $125,000 a year, is designed to furnish this institution with the funds to provide the free school texts, tangible apparatus, and other supplementary materials necessary to the education of the pupils under instruction in the public educational institutions for the blind throughout the country. Unfortunately, in many of the States, little or no local funds are available for educational materials for the blind, and the schools for the blind must depend solely on the printing house to obtain them.

In its role as the official schoolbook printery for the blind of the United States and its Territories, the expansion of the services of the printing house has been closely correlated with the historical development of educational methods and curricula in the schools and classes for the blind. In the beginning, books were published in a multiplicity of embossed types, since it was not until 1918 that a single embossed system was adopted in this country. When a more highly contracted system of braille was adopted in 1932, the printing house began printing books in this system. During the 1930's, the talking book—books on phonograph records—was developed, and the printing house established a department for the manufacture of this type of literature. For approximately the past 15 years, there has been a growing sentiment in the schools for the blind that many of the partially blind children under their instruction, whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness, might better be taught by the use of large-print books than braille. For this class of children, totaling between 25 and 30 percent of the blind-school population, the printing

house has therefore recently undertaken the manufacture of school texts in large print, with a view to supplying parallel braille and large-type editions of educational materials, so that both the blind and partially visioned children in our schools for the blind might be taught within the same classroom.

It is the purpose of the printing house to supply large type materials out of the Federal appropriation solely for the benefit of children who come within the legal definition of blindness—and to no one else. When taking the registration of the blind-school population on the first Monday in January of each year, in order to determine the quota allocations of credit for the individual schools on a per capita basis, it is permitted that only those pupils whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness be registered. Further, books and materials in large type are supplied to the schools only in quantities comparable to the registration of their blind pupils. For instance, such materials are not supplied to sight-saving classes whose children are not legally blind and who cannot be registered with the printing house for the Federal appropriation. However, as a private, nonprofit institution for the blind, chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the printing house may supply any or all of its publications or manufactures for cash to any person or institution, provided the price charged represents only the cost of manufacture plus a reasonable overhead.

The passage of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" was the result of a memorial to Congress by the schools for the blind. In order to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal funds, the act provided that all superintendents of schools for the blind shall be ex officio trustees of the printing house, and shall exercise complete control, as agents of the Federal Government, in the choice of the materials, and the style and type of their manufacture, which are supplied to their institutions out of the Federal appropriation. The Federal act further stipulated that all materials supplied out of these funds must be "manufactured at" the American Printing House for the Blind. Therefore, if the printing house is not to be permitted to supply large type materials to the schools and classes for the blind out of the Federal appropriation, then the original intent and purpose of the act will be denied, since the schools have definitely indicated a great need and desire for this type of literature to be supplied to them by the printing house.

In summarizing the reasons for omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill the following points should be noted:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 to promote the education of the blind to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the Printing House to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only these children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind, and is in no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on the question, I should like to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the body of the RECORD a telegram from Mr. C. J. Settles, president, Florida School for the Deaf and Blind, together with a letter dated April 18, 1949, from Mr. Settles, in which he substantiates the position which I am sure the Senate will take with reference to the committee amendment.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA., *April 18, 1949.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER:

Am advised that Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950, which includes the annual appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind, Louisville, Ky., for supplying educational materials to schools and classes for the blind, has been reported out of committee to the Senate with following limited clause "*Provided,* None of these funds are used for producing large-print books." If this clause is kept in it will prevent the American Printing House for the Blind printing large-type books for the partially-seeing child. Please see that the limiting clause is dropped from this bill immediately. It was not included in the House bill which has already been passed. The bill referred to is Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950. Will appreciate your immediate attention to this matter.

C. J. SETTLES,
President, Florida School for the Deaf and Blind.

FLORIDA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND,
St. Augustine, Fla., April 18, 1949.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: This letter is in confirmation of a telegram sent you a few minutes ago asking you to see that the limiting clause in the Department of Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill for 1950, which includes the annual appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky., for the purpose of supplying educational materials to the schools and classes for the blind, is dropped from the Senate bill.

If this bill should go through it means that the American Printing House for the Blind, which agency was created by the Federal Government to print books in braille and large or clear type for the partially-seeing child, would have to stop printing clear-type books for the blind. This bill, which has already passed the House, did not include this limiting clause. It is our opinion that it was probably inserted as a result of lobbying by a commercial concern interested in printing large-type books on a commercial basis only.

I am on the board and also a member of the publications committee of the American Printing House for the Blind. Last week I spent two full days in Louisville trying to select books to be put into braille and clear type for the partially seeing child for use in the schools for the blind and classes for the blind in the United States. At that meeting we expressed some concern that some commercial publishing company might try to get this in their hands.

The head of every State school for the blind in the United States is getting in touch with their Senator, so I am sure there will not be any great amount of difficulty in removing this limiting clause.

Thanking you for past favors and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

C. J. SETTLES,
President.

ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF THE OMISSION OF THE LIMITING CLAUSE IN THE "DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1950" PREVENTING THE PROVISION OF LARGE TYPE BOOKS THROUGH THE ACT "TO PROMOTE THE EDUCATION OF THE BLIND"

The primary work of the American Printing House for the Blind is the extension of its services to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal act to promote the education of the blind. This act, originally passed in 1879, and now authorizing an appropriation to the printing house up to $125,000 a year, is designed to furnish this institution with the funds to provide the free school texts, tangible apparatus, and other supplementary marterials necessary to the education of the pupils under instruction in the public educational institutions for the blind throughout the country. Unfortunately, in many of the States, little or no local funds are available for educational materials for the blind, and the schools for the blind must depend solely on the printing house to obtain them.

In its role as the official schoolbook printery for the blind of the United States and its territories, the expansion of the services of the printing house has been closely correlated with the historical development of educational methods and curricula in the schools and classes for the blind. In the beginning, books were published in a multiplicity of embossed types, since it was not until 1918 that a single embossed system was adopted in this country. When a more highly contracted system of braille was adopted in 1932, the printing house began printing books in this system. During the 1930's, the talking book—books on phonograph records—was developed, and the printing house established a department for the manufacture of this type of literature. For approximately the past 15 years, there has been a growing sentiment in the schools for the blind that many of the partially blind children under their instruction, whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness, might better be taught by the use of large print books than braille. For this class of children, totalling between 25 and 30 percent of the blind school population, the printing house has therefore recently undertaken the manufacture of school texts in large print, with a view to supplying parallel braille and large type editions of educational materials, so that both the blind and partially visioned children in our schools for the blind might be taught within the same classroom.

It is the purpose of the printing house to supply large type materials out of the Federal appropriation solely for the benefit of

children who come within the legal definition of blindness—and to one one else. When taking the registration of the blind school population on the first Monday in January of each year, in order to determine the quota allocations of credit for the individual schools on a per capita basis, it is permitted that only those pupils whose vision comes within the legal definition of blindness be registered. Further, books and materials in large type are supplied to the schools only in quantities comparable to the registration of their blind pupils. For instance, such materials are not supplied to sight-saving classes whose children are not legally blind and who cannot be registered with the printing house for the Federal appropriation. However, as a private, nonprofit institution for the blind, chartered by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the printing house may supply any or all of its publications or manufactures for cash to any person or institution, provided the price charged represents only the cost of manufacture plus a reasonable overhead.

The passage of the act of 1879 "To promote the education of the blind" was the result of a memorial to Congress by the schools for the blind. In order to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal funds, the act provided that all superintendents of schools for the blind shall be ex officio trustees of the printing house, and shall exercise complete control, as agents of the Federal Government, in the choice of the materials, and the style and type of their manufacture, which are supplied to their institutions out of the Federal appropriation. The Federal act further stipulated that all materials supplied out of these funds must be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Therefore, if the printing house is not to be permitted to supply large type materials to the schools and classes for the blind out of the Federal appropriation, then the original intent and purpose of the act will be denied, since the schools have definitely indicated a great need and desire for this type of literature to be supplied to them by the printing house.

In summarizing the reasons for omission of the limiting clause from the present Senate appropriation bill, the following points should be noted:

1. It is the purpose of the act of 1879 "to promote the education of the blind" to provide all types of literature and tangible apparatus as are needed in the education of blind students in the public educational institutions for the blind in this country, and which can be manufactured at the American Printing House for the Blind. Any limitations of the above would deny the original intent of the act.

2. Materials supplied by the printing house to the schools and classes for the blind through the Federal appropriation are designed solely for the use of children who come within the legal definition of blindness. Only these children can be registered to receive benefit from the act, and books can be supplied through the Federal funds for them only, although other children of greater vision may be enrolled in the same educational institutions.

3. The provision of large-type materials is needed for approximately 25 to 30 percent of the blind school population who are legally blind. Most schools have limited or no funds for the purchase of large-type materials for cash. If the printing house cannot supply these materials to them out of the Federal funds, then this group of children will be denied the best materials for their education.

4. The American Printing House for the Blind is a private, nonprofit institution engaged solely in the manufacture of literature and tangible apparatus for the blind, and is no way concerned with commercial enterprises. It is not felt that publication of materials for the visually handicapped is feasible commercially, because of high costs of production with relatively small unit distributions of each item. (The present total blind school population is between 5,000 and 6,000 children ranging in age from kindergarten through the high school.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, lines 12 and 13.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Employees' Compensation," on page 6, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$41,000" and insert "$46,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Food and Drug Administration," on page 9, line 15, after "District of Columbia", to insert "and elsewhere."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 12, line 14, after "(20 U. S. C. 15h)", to strike out "$19,842,760" and insert "$29,-301,740"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the apportionment to the States shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $19,842,760 for the current fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 19, after the word "same", to strike out "$1,860,000" and insert "$2,009,800"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which not less than $522,300 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to send to the desk an amendment to the section pertaining to vocational rehabilitation. I think we are coming to page 14 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 17, line 22, after the word "only", to strike out "$13,600,000" and insert "$16,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 6, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$7,350,000" and insert "$7,450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 20, after the word "only", to strike out "$1,000,000' and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 12, after the word "activities", to strike out "$11,387,000" and insert "$11,-612,000"; and in line 13, after the word "which", to strike out "$2,663,000" and insert "$2,888,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I believe that amendment deals with mental health. Would the Senator from New Mexico be kind enough to carry that over and take it up at the same time we consider the heart and cancer section?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PEPPER. I am prepared to offer an amendment now, or deal with the three together.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would prefer that the three be considered together.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that it go over and be taken up after the other committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will go over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. 150)", to strike out "$167,000" and insert "$267,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 11, after the word "animals", to strike out "$11,800,000" and insert "$12,075,000."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to query the chairman of the subcommittee on the item on page 22, line 11.

I am sure the Senator will recall the conversation in the committee about the necessity for adding $50,000 for research in the field of gastroenterology. I admit I am not very familiar with these medical terms. The committee agreed to the increase of the $50,000, and the report definitely shows that the $200,000 now in the bill will be available for research in the whole field of stomach ailments. That is putting it in layman's language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the report so indicates on page 6.

Mr. GURNEY. If I may say so to the Senator, the report is in a way turned around.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee understands that $150,000 was included in the amount allowed by the House for this purpose, and a $50,000 increase recommended will provide a total amount of $200,000 for investigation of peptic ulcers.

Mr. GURNEY. At the time the committee approved the bill, the instruction was the last three words should be stricken, and that the amount would be made $200,000 for the whole field of research in stomach trouble. It should read "for gastroenterology." There is no argument at all with the House action providing $150,000 for research having to do with peptic ulcers. I therefore give notice that the report is written incorrectly on page 6, and I hope the Senator will instruct the conferees to make it clear what the $50,000 raise was to include.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The chairman of the subcommittee will give attention to that.

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly there was no justification for raising this amount unless the research could be all-inclusive in the whole field of gastroenterology.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 22, line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 3, after the word "act," to strike out "$16,400,000" and insert "$17,027,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "only," to strike out "$7,725,000" and insert "$8,725,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment go over, and the item on page 24, line 2, dealing with the National Heart Institute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the items will be passed over.

The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 13, to insert:

Research facilities, National Institute of Dental Research: For the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research, as authorized by section 5 of the National Dental Research Act, approved June 24, 1948 (Public Law 755, 80th Cong.), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, which amount, except such part as may be necessary for incidental expenses for the Public Health Service, shall be transferred to the Federal Works Agency for the performance of the work for which the appropriation is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 3, to insert:

Special vital-statistics projects: For expenses necessary for vital-statistics projects directly related to the seventeenth decennial census, $295,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 18, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital," on page 28, line 3, after the word "illness", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,820,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 30, line 20, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$157,500,000" and insert "$160,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 1, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$4,450,000" and insert "$4,900,000"; and in the same line, after the words "of which", to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator," on page 37, line 1, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$2,292,000" and insert "$2,418,000"; and in line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$335,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 8, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$944,800" and insert "$1,043,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 39, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 207. The Federal Security Administrator, if he finds it necessary for the more practical and efficient operation of the Agency, shall have the authority to transfer with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to the foregoing appropriations under this title from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency such sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator of any of the administrative functions of said constituent units: *Provided*, That no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation of administrative functions will result in a reduction of administrative salary and other expenses and such reduction is accompanied by savings in funds appropriated to the Federal Security Agency which savings shall not be expended for any other purposes but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 20, to change the section number from "207" to "208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 8, to change the section number from "208" to "209."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—Railroad Retirement Board," on page 42, line 10, after the word "act," to strike out "$715,889,000" and insert "$882,741,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the amendment which is in the hands of the clerk, and ask to have it read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 42, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$882,741,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$757,602,000"; and

On page 42, line 17, to strike out "$882,741,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$757,602,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], in charge of the bill, a question without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether I correctly understand that the amendment is in the substance agreeable to him. If it is not, I should like to argue it. If it is, then I shall not argue it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Several Senators are interested in the provision which is now being discussed, including the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, and it seems that possibly there are other Senators who would like to have the matter go over until tomorrow. That was my understanding this afternoon. Therefore, without committing myself to the Senator from Massachusetts on his amendment. I should prefer that we let the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is perfectly agreeable to me. As I understand, the amendment is offered and is a part of the RECORD, so that it will come up for discussion at the proper time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. If the Senate should adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator, in order to make the bill read properly, should not the language begining with the word "of" on line 11 down to and including the word "that" on line 17, and the amount, "$882,741,000", be stricken out?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand the parliamentary situation, if my amendment shall be agreed to, the proviso which is printed in italic to which the Senator from Michigan refers, running from line 11 through line 17, would be opposed and rejected when it came up. If my amendment shall not be agreed to, then of course the committee amendment will prevail. But if, as I have said, my amendment shall be agreed to, automatically the Senate should strike out the committee amendment on the lines indicated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could not the Senator's amendment embrace the entire committee amendment, so that, if agreed to, it would delete that language, but if it were not agreed to, the language would stay in the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I propound a parliamentary inquiry. I inquire whether it is possible for me to include the committee amendment in my amendment? If so, I shall modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment so as to strike out the language inserted by the committee, all as a part of one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to submit an inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. Would the Senator make a similar reply respecting any amendments which other Senators might desire to have considered?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator mean that they would go over until tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are through with the bill except for the amendments relating to cancer, heart, mental health, and the railroad-retirement proposal.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the distinguished Senator if his agreement as to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts applies to the other amendments?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So all the Senate can do this afternoon is to continue to debate committee amendments and vote on them tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. No further committee amendments can be acted upon tonight. And no other action can be taken tonight unless further amendments are offered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I mentioned that I should like to submit an amendment pertaining to the portion of the appropriations bill entitled "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation." I send to the desk the amendment, which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table, and be considered in due time by the Senate, when it discusses the particular portion of the bill to which the amendment applies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS—LETTER FROM O. K. LAROQUE

Mr. MYERS obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that revisions of some regulations and rules have been proposed by the Home Loan Bank Board in connection with various banks, and in view of the fact that there have been some protests by the Federal Reserve Board and some protests by various banking institutions throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my short statement, a lengthy letter of explanation written to me by Mr. O. K. LaRoque, member of the board of the Home Loan Bank Board.

I may add that while these regulations were to have been put into effect within 30 days, the Home Loan Bank Board has held up putting these rules and regulations into effect with the thought that they could probably reach an agreement with the Federal Reserve Board and the various independent and Government banking institutions of the country. My purpose in placing the letter in the body of the RECORD is so that those who have written many letters requesting information can obtain the information by reading Mr. LaRoque's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY
HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1949.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: In response to telephone inquiry from Mr. Thomas H. Daniel, of your office, we are pleased to advise in connection with proposed revisions of rules and regulations relating to the organization and operation of Federal savings and loan associations.

In order to meet changing economic conditions, especially in the thrift and home-financing field, it has been deemed necessary and desirable from time to time to approve amendments to outstanding charters issued to these thrift institutions and amend operating regulations to provide reasonable flexibility in operations while, at the same time, affording ample protection to the public in the investments in these institutions without unreasonable restrictions which might tend to centralize management above the local level.

As a result, an accumulation of amendments to charters, as well as amendments to regulations, has brought about confusion and lack of understanding.

About a year ago, a staff committee acting under the chairmanship of the writer was appointed with instructions to prepare and submit to the Board proposals for a complete revision of charter and regulations not inconsistent with legislative enactments authorizing the creation and operation of these institutions, and in accord with the best practices of local mutual thrift and home-financing institutions. This committee gave careful and diligent consideration to all phases of the field of activity in which these mutual thrift institutions operate, and consulted with the managers throughout the country who have for years operated sound and well-managed thrift institutions.

As a result of these efforts, the committee submitted to the Board a report recommending the adoption of what we believe to be reasonable regulations safeguarding the investments of funds on the part of the public, and providing means for home ownership through sound investment of the savings in these mutual institutions of approximately $11,000,000,000 at this time. After study and consideration by the Board, the proposal to amend and revise the existing regulations was published in the Federal Register on March 11, 1949. Since the date of the publication we have received numerous suggestions for clarification and changes, all of which are being given earnest and sincere consideration by the Board.

Generally speaking, the suggestions received have been of a constructive nature. On the part of those who are familiar with the organization and operation of these institutions, it is an accepted fact that the amendments proposed are nothing more nor less than a mere strengthening, streamlining and bringing up to date existing regulations, and is in no sense intended to change either the type or method of operation, or provide in any manner any conflict with the provisions of statute under which they have been organized.

Under the proposed regulations and charter provisions, no change whatever is made in the legal status of these institutions from the type of mutual thrift associations authorized in section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

It is significant, however, that the Washington office of a trade organization which purports to represent the views of the commercial banking interests filed with us a brief on March 30 assuming to interpret the proposed rules and regulations and insisting that same should not be permitted to be effective and should be withdrawn by the Home Loan Bank Board. This document was filed without inquiry or conference with any member of this board, and numerous allegations are made which indicate a lack of understanding or an intentional distortion of the facts, all of which could have been easily explained had there been evidence of desire for information.

Exception is taken to the use of the term "savings account." Their interpretation of this term indicates their understanding that it establishes a debtor-creditor relationship similar to depositors in commercial banks. A careful reading of the proposed amendment contradicts this interpretation. The proposed regulation merely refers to one type of savings account as a share interest accumulation rather than the three or four types of share accounts heretofore used in these associations, and is intended only to simplify and make more understandable the character of these investments which accumulate as a share interest in the associations. The proposed regulations definitely define the term "savings account" as meaning "the monetary interest of the holder thereof in the capital of a Federal savings and loan association."

The proposed charter refers to the fact that the association may "raise its capital * * * by accepting payments on savings accounts representing share interests in the associations."

There is nothing new in this terminology. In the statute creating the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the term "accounts" is used as descriptive of insurance liability and is defined as "means a share, certificate, or deposit account of a type approved by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which is held by an insured member in an insured institution and which is insured under the provisions of this title."

Another allegation states that the regulations represent an attempt to change the name of Federal savings and loan associations in violation of the statute creating these institutions. The term, or title, "Federal savings association" is clearly defined in the regulations to mean "a Federal savings and loan association chartered by the Board as provided in section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended." The use of this term is descriptive only, just as the term "Board" is used throughout the regulations as referring to the Home Loan Bank Board. Other descriptive terms are used and defined for the purpose of convenience and brevity. The use of this term "Federal savings association" does not in any manner change the corporate title of the institution, and the proposed charter under section 1 states "the full corporate title of the Federal savings association hereby chartered is ------ Federal Savings and Loan Association ------." We have used the term "Federal savings association" merely for the purpose of reference, in a manner somewhat similar to a descriptive term relating to national banks. You, of course, recognize the fact that the national banks call themselves "------ National Bank ------," when, as a matter of fact, throughout the National Bank Act these fine institutions are referred to and authorized to operate as "National Banking Associations." The terms "savings associations" and "savings accounts" are not unusual in similar thrift institutions operating under State charters. In some States this same type of thrift institution is chartered under the corporate title "Cooperative Bank."

Another item which appears to cause some concern in the brief submitted relates to the matter of establishment of branches. Since 1934 the regulations have made provision for the establishment of branch offices under certain conditions. The only change made in this regulation is a strengthening of standards under which such branches may be established. Notwithstanding the fact that provision for branches has been in the regulations for more than 14 years, only a very small number have been authorized. It is a fact that when an application for a branch is filed with this office, we apply the same standards that would apply in the consideration of an application for the organization of a new Federal association, with special reference to the needs of the community and whether or not the establishment of such branch would be injurious to existing thrift institutions. No branch is authorized until after a full and complete notice has been given to the public and to all interested parties and a public hearing held with opportunity for any opposition that may be presented.

The brief refers to a provision in the regulations, which permits certain types of unsecured loans. References to this subject indicate a lack of knowledge or understanding of the regulation, type of institution, and provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This Servicemens' Readjustment Act makes specific provision for certain types of loans that may be made by Federal savings associations and our regulations are intended

to conform to the provisions of this act and for no other purpose.

Numerous other allegations and expressions of opinion are noted. These allegations and expressions of opinion are of such nature that they are not provocative of serious thought and fail to merit the dignity of denial.

Unfortunately, the good citizens and sound businessmen from whom complaints have been received appear to have based their objections and complaints on the information gathered from this brief, which appears to have been widely publicized through the press and other media. Their expressions are no doubt based on this misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the proposed regulations.

It is our firm opinion that should these good people avail themselves of an opportunity to read and analyze the proposed regulations which were published in the Federal Register on March 11, they will more readily understand the misinterpretation and distortion which has been placed upon the proposals through information which has been disseminated from the office of a trade association which assumes to be a competitor of these mutual thrift institutions. We want you and your associates to know of the sincere desire of every member of this Board to fully comply with the spirit and letter of the statutes under which we operate, and that we are conscious of our responsibility to the public interest in the sound development of thrift throughout the Nation.

With assurances of high esteem, I am,

Yours very truly,

O. K. LAROQUE,
Board Member.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Hon. Robert M. Gibson, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Donald C. Means, rector, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Altoona, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we, Thy needy creatures, render Thee our humble praises for Thy preservation of us from the beginning of our lives to this day. We prayerfully beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for the President of our Nation and this House of Representatives assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people, that all things may be so settled and ordered by their endeavors upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. And Thou who hast given us this good land for our heritage, grant that we may always be a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name the authority of government is entrusted, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

In times of peace and prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of adversity suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; for the sake of Him who died and rose again, came among us as One that serveth, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 900. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1169) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 49–10.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1271) entitled "An act for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TERMINATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF 65,000-TON SUPERCARRIER

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, made a courageous and a momentous decision. He ordered the termination of the construction of the 65,000-ton so-called supercarrier.

In years past I helped build a two-ocean Navy. I am proud to think that was correct, for we need a two-ocean Navy to fight any war that comes.

Now we know that if war should ever come again it will be a struggle with a land power.

It is simply a matter of the proper allocation of war missions between the Navy and Air Force.

It is the business of the Air Force to use long-range bombers in time of war. And yet, this carrier was to accommodate such long-range bombers.

We cannot afford the luxury of two strategic air forces. We cannot afford an experimental vessel that, even without its aircraft, costs as much as 60 B–36 long-range bombers.

We should reserve strategic air warfare to the Air Force.

And we should reserve to the Navy its historic role of controlling the seas. I do not now—and I never will—advocate depreciation of our Navy.

Secretary Johnson is to be commended both for the nature of his decision and for moving promptly to resolve this important matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, 1946, the United States Employment Service, under the Secretary of Labor, was transferred to the State agency in each State designated under section IV of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended, as the agency to administer the State-wide system of public employment offices in cooperation with the United States Employment Service.

This bill brings this service back to the Federal Government and places it in the United States Department of Labor, where it was during the war. It was found necessary during the war to have a coordination of our employment service. The United States Employment Service made an enviable record in furnishing manpower during the war. It rendered a service that has not been equaled since its return to the various States and cannot be equaled by the employment services of the various States. There is as great a demand for coordination and for a unified employment system today as there ever was. The same high degree of efficiency is as desirable now as it was during the war. This service simply cannot be operated efficiently when it is necessary to operate as 48 separate agencies; when its employees are in many States under the spoils system. This bill would return these employees to the civil service of the United States Government and to the benefits of such civil service which many of them enjoyed in years previous.

The funds for this service are paid in their entirety by the Federal Government.

Experience has shown us that in industrial and farm labor problems State lines are not respected. Many of our labor problems and labor markets straddle State lines and it is illogical to have a division of authority in the handling of these labor problems.

Farm labor is by its very nature interstate in character.

A careful study and analysis of this problem leads me to the conclusion that the only sensible, satisfactory solution to these employment problems, lies in the return of the employment service from the 48 States to the United States Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "No Depression Yet" by George Soule.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Honorable Robert Jerome Dunne, judge of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Ill.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD relating to a bill he introduced yesterday.

Mr. BURKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Saturday Evening Post; also a letter from the mayor of the village of Rossford, Ohio, on the subject of pollution.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a comparison in short form between his bill, H. R. 4272, and the Lesinski bill, H. R. 3190.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WAGNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star entitled "Out of Tune."

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in six separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Evening Star.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Coatesville (Pa.) Record.

EXTRAVAGANT SPENDING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, today the fliers who have been in the air for 6 weeks, or 1,008 hours, will land at Fullerton, Calif. That is a wonderful feat.

How grand it would be if this present administration, the President, and Congress would soon come to earth; stop spending us into bankruptcy. For 18 years it has been the most extravagant, incompetent, reckless administration in the history of our country or the world. If anyone ever was in the air, it has been this administration. This year they are spending at the rate of over $40,000,000,000. In the 456 years since Columbus' discovery of America the value of all the gold mined in the world has been about $40,000,000,000.

Do you not think it is time to stop? Land, get your feet on solid ground. With Secretary Brannan's ridiculous agriculture program which will cost additional billions, and the President's national health program brought here yesterday adding six or seven billion more, and all the other things this administration has proposed recently costing many more billions of dollars, do you not think it is time for us to get down to earth? Congressmen, we need more business in Government, and less Government in business. Come down to earth, get your feet on solid ground, in the name of all that is sacred. For the continuation of this Government of ours, come to earth. Get out of the clouds of radical spending, come down to earth, land on a solid foundation of honesty, integrity, and good, sound judgment for less government in Washington and more government in the States and the local communities where the people know our people and what is best for them and our country. God save America before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Tuesday, April 19, 1949, entitled "Taxes Versus Plums."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two resolutions.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Iowa Development Commission.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Mothers' Group of the Torrington Council of Catholic Women.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two short speeches.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the Oregon Legislature.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES IN CHINA

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers carry the story of Communist soldiers entering our embassy in China and placing our ambassador un-

der what amounts to house arrest. There is a hint that the embassy property will be redistributed to the people. All this, I presume, will be justified in the State Department as an aspect of agrarian reform.

I wonder if our State Department is really enjoying the consequences of this policy of waiting for the dust to settle in China? When it has settled it may be found to have settled on the ruins of millions of dollars of American property and on the corpses of many American citizens whose only offense was to love their homes and work in China. They will lie in the good earth of China along with those American soldiers who fell in the faith, now betrayed, that an independent China mattered to us. The missionaries may legitimately expect the treatment accorded Cardinal Mindszenty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast by Mr. Henry J. Taylor.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Cincinnati Inquirer.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain newspaper material and also a radio address by Mr. George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. DONOHUE and Mr. HORAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two leaflets by Mr. Nicholson, Washington attorney, and another pamphlet covering the principles of American Government.

COST OF VETERANS' PENSION BILL A TIP TO THE WAITER COMPARED WITH THE TRILLION TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY BILLION FOR SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago we had the soldiers' pension bill before the House. We heard members scream about the billions it would cost.

I wish you could see the information we have on what this proposed social-security program sponsored by the enemies of the veterans' pension bill will cost. By the year 2000 this over-all social-security program that is now being proposed will cost $1,250,000,000,000. The World War I veterans will not be taken care of under it. They will be turned out to gnaw the corncob in their old days, especially the ones on the farm.

Then we find that by the year 1990, so the Social Security Board tells us, the cost of that social-security program will be between $15,000,000,000 and $18,000,000,000 a year. That means a cost of the value of 100,000,000 bales of cotton a year, or as much cotton approximately as is produced in 10 years.

My God, where is this country headed?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Allen, La.	Goodwin	Noland
Andrews	Gregory	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Hall,	Plumley
Bennett, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Bolton, Ohio	Hart	Reed, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Hays, Ark.	Regan
Carroll	Hedrick	Richards
Celler	Heller	Sabath
Clevenger	Hill	Simpson, Pa.
Cox	Hobbs	Smathers
Cunningham	Hoeven	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Jenison	Taylor
Davies, N. Y.	Jennings	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Tenn.	Judd	Thompson
deGraffenried	Kearney	Vursell
Doughton	Kunkel	Walsh
Engel, Mich.	LeCompte	Whitaker
Fugate	McCulloch	White, Idaho
Gamble	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Garmatz	Multer	
Gilmer	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 191 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 13 minutes. I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is about to consider a bill, H. R. 2032, which involves the most important legislation that will be presented to Congress during the eighty-first session.

H. R. 2032 endeavors to undo our greatest legislative mistake since the days of the Volstead Prohibition Act. H. R. 2032 not only calls for the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, but provides for constructive changes in the Wagner National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which it reenacts. These changes in the original Wagner Act curtail and prohibit jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts. It also would set up machinery which encourages collective bargaining and arbitration of disputes arising out of the interpretation of contracts between labor and management. H. R. 2032 improves the Wagner Act by providing for legislation concerning strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest. Under this provision, it does not jeopardize or endanger the basic rights of labor unions or our democratic freedoms as does the Taft-Hartley Act on the same provision. The underlying principle involved in this new labor legislation is the promotion of free collective bargaining between employer and employee.

HARTLEY COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Rules Committee held extended sessions on four different days, hearing testimony from members of the House Labor and Education Committee regarding this bill. I have read the minority report submitted and signed by the Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor. The first five pages of this report are taken up criticizing the chairman of the Labor Committee and complaining that they received unjust treatment during the hearing. This will be part of the Republican strategy during this debate to take our minds off the real issue. Since the Republican committee members are relying on the smoke screen of committee procedure to muddy the thinking on the labor restrictions in the Taft-Hartley law, I think the new Members of the Eighty-first Congress should know what happened in the Hartley Labor and Education Committee 2 years ago.

At that time this Congress was made the victim of the best organized and most highly financed legislative lobby in the history of Washington. I was a member of the House Education and Labor Committee 2 years ago and personally attended 5 weeks of public hearings. Most of these hearings I believe were conducted primarily to send out antiunion propaganda and soften the minds of the American public for the approach of the

Taft-Hartley law. Whenever a celebrated-name witness appeared to present antilabor testimony the caucus room in the old House Office Building was literally cluttered with klieg lights, television apparatus, radio broadcasting machinery, recording equipment, and special installation of tables to accommodate reporters and radio commentators. Very few of us realized 2 years ago that the transforming of the Labor Committee hearing in the House Caucus room into a Hollywood movie lot was just part of the well-organized propaganda of the National Association of Manufacturers and their subsidiaries to undermine public opinion against organized labor in America.

The arbitrary tactics which existed during the hearings continued after the 5 weeks of open hearings were closed. Then the majority members went into secret session and drew the iron curtain against most of the minority members of the Education and Labor Committee. For almost 2 weeks, Chairman Hartley and most of the Republicans members were closeted with Theodore Eiserman, attorney for Chrysler Corporation, Attorney Jerry Morgan, and others, in the drawing up of the most complicated, deceptive, and highly involved piece of legislation that has passed the House in congressional history. Finally, after almost 2 weeks of secret meetings, Chairman Hartley officially called a meeting of all the members of the House Education and Labor Committee and immediately asked that this 76-page typewritten legal document be passed by the committee at that meeting. By reason of strenuous protest on the part of myself and other members who were not asked to sit in with the legal experts, Chairman Hartley postponed the vote on passage until the following day. The following day this complex document was railroaded through the committee section by section without any opportunity of study for possible amendments by a considerable number of the committee members.

Never in my observation of committee procedure was a piece of legislation ever born under such kangaroo-committee tactics as launched the origin of the Taft-Hartley Act on the floor of this House.

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

Anyhow, the unfortunate procedure inaugurated by Chairman Hartley 2 years ago, in conducting the hearings and deliberations of the Labor Committee paralleled the type of legislation which finally resulted from such an ignoble beginning. Two years ago, during debate on this floor members of the House Labor Committee, including myself, protested against the procedure of the committee. The only defense of the actions of Chairman Hartley's committee was brought forth by Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio. On page 3443 of the 1947 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman BROWN'S remarks contain the following quote:

> The Republican Party now has the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action. That is exactly what this committee has done, as I understand it.

I have a great respect for Congressman BROWN'S opinion, but evidently from his remarks, he was interpreting that the November election of 1946 had given the Republican Party a mandate for the Taft-Hartley law. If Congressman BROWN was correct 2 years ago, certainly the Democratic members of the Labor Committee and the Eighty-first Congress, after the verdict of November 1948, have the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action that will repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

The Members who were on the floor before the adjournment of the regular session last summer, remember my good friend and Hoosier colleague Congressman HALLECK, then the majority leader, challenging and daring President Truman and the Democratic platform to make the Taft-Hartley Act an issue before the American people. That and similar challenges by Republican statesmen were accepted by the President and the Democratic Party. The people spoke emphatically last November.

WAGNER ACT NEVER GIVEN FAIR TEST

I think it is well to very briefly review labor legislation since World War I.

Every Member recollects the industrial disputes after World War I and during the 1920's. That period was shadowed with strikes involving bloodshed and loss of life and property. During this period, union labor and the wage earners were unsuccessful in making any progress. Low wages, poor working conditions, chaos, and bitterness hampered production and was one of the reasons for the deplorable depression of 1929 to 1933.

The Wagner Act was passed in 1935. Prominent lawyers told their clients that the act was unconstitutional. Employers acted accordingly. In 1937 the Supreme Court finally decided that it was constitutional. Until then the Wagner Act could not be enforced. During the next 2 years, the same lawyers advised their employer-clients as to the ways and means of evading, obstructing, and violating the Wagner Act.

Then came the war period. With the end of the war, as after every war or serious dislocation, we had a period of readjustment. In changing from a war economy to a peacetime economy, we naturally had labor management difficulties and disputes. During the Eightieth Congress, propagandists cleverly and adroitly dramatized this situation, as I have already outlined, and passed the Taft-Hartley law.

The history of the Wagner Act reveals that at no time has it been given a just and honest test over a period of time.

TAFT-HARTLEY ANTILABOR

Many statements of generality have been made pro and con regarding the Taft-Hartley law. It is my earnest wish that every Member of Congress, before he votes on this legislation, read, line by line, paragraph by paragraph, the complex and involved provisions set out in the Taft-Hartley law.

A short time ago, Business Week magazine, which is recognized as the voice of big business in this country, in an article on the labor legislation, stated in its column:

The Taft-Hartley law has failed—it went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate, from one which could destroy.

A Member of Congress, in voting on this legislation, should not take the word of any commentator or propagandist, but a close study of this law will reveal that Chairman Hartley was correct 2 years ago during the closing hours of debate when he admitted on the floor of this House that "everything that this bill (Taft-Hartley law) contains does not meet the eye."

A close examination of the Taft-Hartley law will present its one-sided restrictions on labor, as set out in its various provisions dealing with: First, injunctions; second, union employer responsibility; third, boycotts; fourth, jurisdictional disputes; fifth, penalties against striking employees; sixth, damage suits; seventh, arbitration of disputes over interpretation of existing contracts; eighth, union security; ninth, general counsel for board procedure; tenth, check-off; eleventh, health and welfare funds; twelfth, free-speech provisions; thirteenth, restrictions on particular groups of employees; fourteenth, complex system of elections; fifteenth, political expenditures; and sixteenth, outlawing closed shops. A study of these items will reveal that the Taft-Hartley law is a union-busting device.

WOOD BILL

Not in my memory has legislation been filed with such mysterious origin as the Wood bill. Two so-called Wood bills have been presented. The first was H. R. 3228 and the second is H. R. 4290.

Congressman WOOD appeared before the Rules Committee in behalf of the first. His knowledge of its content was very limited, according to his own testimony. Laudatory statements were made in the Rules Committee for Congressman Cox and others regarding the first Wood bill. He said that it contained the recommendations of the so-called watch dog committee.

When I was home during the Easter recess, I read in a magazine that the first Wood bill, H. R. 3228, was withdrawn and a second Wood bill, H. R. 4290, was substituted. The article further said that the first Wood bill was more antilabor than the Taft-Hartley law, but that some Republican Congressmen revolted and the gentlemen from Georgia, Congressmen Cox and WOOD, consented to file another Wood bill and make it more palatable to some of the Republican rebels.

Why is the Republican leadership insisting that the good old Republican names like Taft and Hartley be erased from the National Labor Relations Act of 1947?

I ask why some of the Republican members of the Labor Committee have not the courage to lend their name to the so-called Wood bill? Is it because the Grand Old Party suffered such a defeat last November with two grand old Republican names from Ohio and New

Jersey labeling antilabor legislation? I ask why the Republicans are now disclaiming any authorship of this 1949 Taft-Hartley Act known as the Wood bill? Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and most northern Republicans now want to sever all connections with Taft-Hartley and send it as far down south of Mason and Dixon's line as possible. Why pick on the State of Georgia? Has not Georgia suffered enough back through the years? It went through the reconstruction period, the Ku Klux Klan, two governors at the same time, and now the Republican leaders are trying to dump the Taft-Hartley law—lock, stock, and barrel—onto its already overburdened shoulders.

No; you cannot change the Taft-Hartley law by merely changing its name to the Wood bill. You cannot wrap limburger cheese in a beautiful pink, green, and black paper and conceal the odor.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

Most Members remember reading in the newspapers in the fall of 1947 when Earl Bunting, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, admonished the NAM members not to be too hasty in taking advantage of the powers given them under the Taft-Hartley law. Evidently Mr. Bunting did not want the sixty-odd million wage earners in America and the 15,000,000 union members in America to realize its restrictive provisions until after the election in November 1948. I do not know whether Mr. Bunting has issued any orders to his members since November 2, 1948, but the American people on that day issued an order to the Congress of the United States. One hundred and three Members who voted for the Taft-Hartley law in the Eightieth Congress are not present today. In my own State of Indiana, 9 of our 11 Members in the Eightieth Congress voted for the Taft-Hartley law—6 of them are not in the Eighty-first Congress.

The Taft-Hartley law, as it is now written, must be repealed in this session of the Eighty-first Congress. The issues were drawn last November and the people spoke at the polls—let the Congress carry out the mandate.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule which is presently under discussion is an open rule. It will make in order a consideration of the Lesinski bill but will permit every Member of the House to present germane amendments which can then be acted upon by the House as a whole.

I do not believe that any bill on which a rule has been asked in recent years has been as fully discussed as was this bill. The Rules Committee devoted the better part of 5 days to its consideration. The Rules Committee did this because the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, in his opening remarks, requested a closed rule. It was soon apparent from the testimony given that this request for a closed rule, which would have allowed no Member to offer an amendment on the floor of the House, followed quite logically the procedure which had been pursued within the committee itself.

The Lesinski bill, while bearing the name of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, was drafted in the Government departments. Hearings on it were held by a subcommittee, but never by the full committee. The subcommittee voted out the bill exactly as it was originally drafted. The full committee then accepted the recommendations of the subcommittee without even reading the bill section by section so as to allow different members of the committee to speak for it or even to offer amendments. In other words, the gag rule was applied in committee. Before debate on this matter has been concluded, you will undoubtedly hear a great deal more with respect to the proceedings within the committee itself.

I am glad that the rule now under consideration is an open rule. If adopted, it will allow the House of Representatives to work its will in a democratic way. It will allow of sufficiently long debate so that every Member should have a much better appreciation of the great issues that are involved in trying to write any labor-management legislation.

When general debate begins on the Lesinski bill, members of the committee will tell you in detail just what the Lesinski bill would do. I shall content myself with but one brief statement in regard to the Lesinski bill. It repeals every part and every provision of the Taft-Hartley law and reenacts the Wagner law with some amendments, none of which were found in the Taft-Hartley law. In other words, it states legislatively that there was not a single provision of the Taft-Hartley law which was worth retaining—a statement insulting to the many Members of this House who, in good faith, voted for that law. No one has ever claimed that a perfect labor-management relations bill could be written or that any bill could not be perfected by amendment. But an assertion that a law which has been on the statute books for nearly 2 years and which has, in most respects, operated extremely fairly to both labor and management must be destroyed in toto is clearly the product of heavily prejudiced minds.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it might be worthy of note that on the final passage of the measure 106 Democrats voted for it and 71 against it; that the final vote was 331 for the bill, 83 against. A majority of the present Members of the House voted for the bill.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

From the evidence presented before the Rules Committee, it was obvious that many members of the Committee on Education and Labor were anxious to benefit by the hearings that had been held in subcommittee and by the public testimony which has been given over the last 18 months by representatives of labor, management, and the public with respect to the Taft-Hartley law. They were apparently convinced that there were a number of changes which should be made in the existing law. This conviction was derived mostly from the testimony of leaders of organized labor. As these members were precluded from offering amendments to the Lesinski bill, they drafted a separate piece of legislation which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. WOOD, a member of the Committee, as a substitute for the Lesinski bill.

In the event that such a motion is made, then the procedure before this House would be as follows: The substitute bill would be in the nature of an amendment to the Lesinski bill. Perfecting amendments to any part of that amendment could be offered, thus making the word substitute an effective vehicle on which the House could work its will. After every perfecting amendment which was offered had been disposed of, then a single vote would come on accepting the main amendment. If accepted in committee, the Committee would then rise and the amendment could be roll called, but none of the perfecting amendments could be voted upon separately.

In the event that the amendment should fail of adoption in the Committee of the Whole, the Lesinski bill itself would then be read section by section for amendment. Anyone who is familiar with the Lesinski bill must know that it is so drafted as to make any substantive amendment virtually impossible. To insert even the least controversial features of the Taft-Hartley law would require at least 60 printed pages of amendments.

I have examined with great care the substitute bill to which I referred, and which I hope will be offered. It is a good bill. While it repeals the Taft-Hartley law, it nevertheless reenacts many of its principal provisions and incorporates a number of amendments. Each one of these amendments is intended to meet a specific objection of labor leaders which, in the opinion of members of the Committee on Education and Labor, were valid objections. It could be termed neither a promanagement nor a prolabor bill. It is a sincere effort to legislate in a spirit of fair play to both sides while, at the same time, keeping the public interest constantly in mind.

Let me examine briefly the principal changes which it makes in the existing law and the objections posed by labor leaders which these changes are intended to correct.

First, leaders of organized labor have severely criticized, as being too cumbersome and seeking to undermine their representatives, the provisions of existing law which prohibit unions from negotiating for a union shop contract without being first authorized to do so through an election among the employees involved. These leaders were also extremely critical of the provisions that required approval by a majority of the employees eligible to vote rather than a majority of those voting. The Wood substitute has met both of these criticisms and proposes to do away with the union-shop authorization election entirely. Thus under the Wood substitute, labor organizations will be able to negotiate union-shop contracts without specific prior authorization of the employees involved.

Second, leaders of organized labor both in the Senate hearings and in the

House hearings, as well as in the press, have been very critical of the union-shop provisions of the present law which make nonpayment of dues the sole ground on which unions can demand the discharge of an employee who has been expelled from the union. They have pointed out that it is illogical for the Taft-Hartley Act to attempt to make unions liable in damages for breach of their contracts, while at the same time denying to them the only means that they have of disciplining members who engage in strikes and other activities in violation of union contracts. Moreover, unions have pointed out that even if they expelled a member because he is a Communist, they still cannot compel the employer to discharge that individual. Both of these criticisms of the existing law are met in the Wood substitute, and the Wood substitute specifically authorizes unions to compel the discharge of employees who have been expelled from the union for engaging in wildcat strikes and employees who have been expelled from the union for being members of the Communist Party or other subversive organizations.

I might add by way of interpolation, Mr. Speaker, that the statement made by the American Federation of Labor in its analysis of the Wood bill so far as this particular provision is concerned contained a number of complete misstatements of fact.

Third. Union leaders have contended that the present law completely outlawed the union hiring hall and prohibited an employer from recruiting workers through a union hiring hall. In connection with this criticism they have pointed out that the union hiring hall has been established and utilized for years in various industries and that the Taft-Hartley Act had the effect of disrupting this long-established institution. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by providing that it is not to be considered an unfair labor practice for an employer to notify a union hiring hall when he has jobs to be filled.

Fourth. Labor union leaders have presented much testimony designed to show that the secondary boycott provisions of existing laws are unfair, because they require union members to "scab"—as unions call it—on their own brother members. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by permitting employees in the same local to strike against goods being produced for the account of an employer against whom other members of the local are striking.

Fifth. Labor union leaders have pointed out that under the present law if employees strike in violation of or in disregard of the requirement that unions give 60 days' notice of their intention to negotiate changes in contracts, the employees lose all of their rights under the act, whereas if employers disregard or violate such notice requirements they are not penalized in any way. The Wood substitute abolishes this apparent disparity of treatment between employees and employers.

Sixth. One provision of the present law against which the leaders of organized labor directed particular criticism is the provision stating that employees on strike who are not eligible to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote in representation elections. These leaders contended that this provision coupled with other provisions of the act could be used by employers to bust unions. The Wood substitute meets this criticism made by union leaders, and specifically provides that employees on strike can vote in representation elections if they have not been validly replaced for 90 days or more by a permanent replacement. Thus under the Wood substitute an employer would not be able to bust a union by employing strikebreakers rather than bona fide employees to replace strikers.

Seventh. Union leaders criticized the Communist disclaimer provisions of the present law on the ground that it was unfair to apply such provisions to them and not impose the same requirements on employers. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by requiring that officers of employers as well as officers of labor organizations file affidavits disclaiming Communist affiliation as a condition of being able to invoke the act.

Eighth. Labor organizations very severely criticized the provisions of the present law which compel the general counsel of the Board to apply for injunctions against unions in secondary-boycott cases and contain no provision for mandatory injunctions against employers. The Wood substitute meets this criticism by abolishing the mandatory injunction and giving the general counsel discretion to apply for temporary injunctions either against employers or unions whenever he thinks that it is necessary to do so to prevent irreparable injury.

Ninth. Labor-union leaders were extremely critical of the provisions of the present law that required an election to be held among employees on the employer's last offer in disputes involving the national health and safety.

In one case the union directed its members to boycott such an election, and as a result no votes were cast whatsoever. The Wood substitute meets this criticism of the existing law by abolishing the election on the employer's last offer.

These proposed changes I have enumerated which are made by the Wood substitute are all made in a sincere effort to meet justified union criticism of the present law and to achieve an evenly balanced labor-management policy. All of the changes are important. There are doubtless other changes that Members of this body will wish to propose. I want to emphasize again that any change or changes in the present law can be proposed, using the Wood substitute as a vehicle. And I also want to emphasize that virtually no change in the present law except outright repeal of every last provision can be made using the Lesinski bill as a vehicle.

There is one criticism of the present law that union leaders have made which is met only partially by the Wood substitute. Union leaders violently oppose all provisions authorizing injunctions against union activities, whatever they may be and whatever form they may take. With the present power of unions, it is not possible to do away with injunctions entirely and still protect the public interest. Even the Lesinski bill provides for injunctions against labor unions in secondary-boycott cases and jurisdictional strikes, so the Lesinski bill itself recognizes the need for the injunctive remedy. The Wood substitute continues, however, a provision of the existing law which the Lesinski bill omits—namely, the provision authorizing the President to seek injunctions to protect the national interest when the national health and safety is imperiled. I do not believe that it is in the public interest to do away with this provision of existing law, and I do not think that the abuses of the injunction power in the past, when the injunction was used as a means of enforcing yellow-dog contracts, is any argument for abolishing the injunctive remedy for protecting the public from irreparable damage. The concessions made by the Wood substitute are all in the public interest.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] five additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today we are beginning the consideration of what is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we shall have during this Congress. There has been a good deal said about how it was handled in the Labor Committee now and how it was handled in the Labor Committee when the Taft-Hartley bill was under consideration, about arbitrary conduct, and so forth. Well, I am not concerned with that. I think my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. PAUL SHAFER, could tell you a little anecdote that would probably explain what is going on and who is doing it. The question that we are to consider is the question of the merits of this measure.

Now, the Committee on Rules has granted an open rule for the consideration of this bill, and by an understanding and agreement before the rule was reported, when the first section of the Lesinski bill is read, it will be in order and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] will offer as a substitute for that bill the so-called Wood bill. That is going to give the Members of this House the opportunity to vote on the two philosophies of labor legislation, one represented by the old National Labor Relations Act which, by pressure of public opinion over the years, was repudiated 2 years ago. The Lesinski bill restores all of the evils of the old National Labor Relations Act. The Wood bill is based upon the theory of the Taft-Hartley Act and will give those of you who were in the Eightieth Congress and voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, and who constitute a majority of the present membership of this House, an opportunity of voting on the Wood bill to decide whether you were wrong then or whether you are wrong now. So, this method presents to you the two theories of labor legislation, and I want, in these brief few moments that I have, to tell you something about what the various bills do.

I want you to know that if you vote against substituting the Wood bill and vote for the Lesinski bill, that there are certain important things that you are repealing that a majority of you voted for 2 years ago. The Lesinski bill will repeal that provision which separated the supervisory forces from the laboring forces in collective bargaining. If you vote for the Lesinski bill you will vote to repeal the free-speech clause contained in the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act, strange as it may seem, reiterates the constitutional provision that everybody shall have the right of free speech. Before that an employer could not say a word to his employee about labor relations.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill you vote to repeal the constitutional privilege of free speech.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you vote to repeal the action you took 2 years ago in prohibiting secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. The Lesinski bill retains only those prohibitions against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts where they involve a dispute between two labor unions. The broad field of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes is not touched. That is repealed by the Lesinski bill.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill you will be voting to restore the old featherbed practices, namely, the right of a labor union to force an employer to pay for work that is not to be performed. If you believe in that, you vote for the Lesinski bill.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you vote to repeal the right of an employer to petition for an election to determine with whom he ought to bargain. That is a surprising thing, but under the National Labor Relations Act two unions can fight interminably over the right to represent the employees in a factory and the employer does not have the right to go before the Labor Board and say, "Have an election and settle this thing so that I can go on in my business." That is what you are going to repeal if you vote for the Lesinski bill.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you vote to change what you did 2 years ago relative to the prohibition of the closed shop.

If you vote for the Lesinski bill, you are voting to do away with the Communist oath. The Wood bill makes the Communist oath applicable to both employer and employee, but the Lesinski bill wipes it out. If you do not want an employee to be required to say if he belongs to the Communist Party, you vote for the Lesinski bill.

I think the most important thing you are going to vote on if you vote for the Lesinski bill is the States' rights provision. You all know that recently the Supreme Court has upheld the right of a State to legislate on the closed shop. The Lesinski bill in specific terms reverses the Supreme Court of the United States and says that that decision shall no longer be the law of the land.

Is there anybody here in this age of progress who still believes in something in the nature of States' rights? If you do, when you go back home I want you to explain to your people, those of you who vote for the Lesinski bill, why you voted for a measure that reverses a decision of the Supreme Court which said that your State should have the right to police in these matters.

I think some gentlemen will be embarrassed if they are asked that question when they get back home. Do not forget, whatever you do, the States' rights provision and the repeal of the States' rights provision in the Lesinski bill is the most important and vital thing in this whole bill. You are going to have to explain to somebody, if you vote to say that your State shall not have the right to exercise its police powers in the control of these matters, particularly if you happen to be one of those who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act 2 years ago.

Somebody is going to rise here and tell you, "Don't take the Wood bill. That is not the way to do this thing. We are going to take the Lesinski bill and then we are going to amend it off the face of the earth, so nobody will know what it looks like, and we are going to give you a lot of things like the protection the Wood bill is going to give you in strikes endangering the national health and welfare.

That is the next most important thing. If you vote for the Lesinski bill you vote to take away the power of your Government and the power of your President to prevent strikes in emergencies that affect the health and the welfare of the American people. Do you want to vote for that?

They are going to say, "Oh, no, we are going to amend the Lesinski bill." Well, they did not amend the Lesinski bill in the committee, and you do not find anything about it in the Lesinski bill as presented here.

Many of these Members making this argument are going to vote against giving the President of the United States any such right. But the Lesinski bill is so formed and so phrased, that I challenge anyone to get up on the floor of the House and tell us how you can amend the Lesinski bill. I studied both bills. Read the Lesinski bill and tell me how you would ever manage to amend that bill so as to put back into it the features necessary for the protection of the general public—not for the protection of labor unions, and not for the protection of corporations, but for the protection of your people back home. Will someone stand up and tell me how the Lesinski bill can be amended so as to put those features in it? It just cannot be done. Take my word for it.

Those are the questions you are going to have to determine and are going to have to decide for yourself. But do not get fooled on the idea that you can vote down the Wood bill and then ever get a bill in this House that is going to protect the rights of your people and protect the rights of your States, and the rights of the workingman. Let me say something to you. Let me say—and you all probably know it—you can talk all you want about the Taft-Hartley law, but the Taft-Hartley law has more in it for the protection of the workingman, for the protection of the man who wears the overalls than all the other legislation that has ever been proposed by these fellows who stand up here and say, "We are all for labor."

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HARRIS]. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss the details of the so-called Lesinski bill or the details of the substitute bill which is going to be proposed, nor to any considerable degree, the details of the Taft-Hartley law, which is still on the statute books. You will all agree with me, I am sure, that we are facing here in the House of Representatives an exceedingly important issue. The country is watching us. I am sure that the average citizen is hoping and praying for a just solution of a most difficult problem. I cannot boast of being versed in the law, not having been admitted to the bar; but it occurred to me several years ago at the time when the original Wagner Labor-Relations Act was passed, that with the passage of that act labor unions were for the first time, if I am correct in my recollection, given definite recognition by Federal statute. They were given statutory recognition, which extended to them the right of collective bargaining. Of course, in extending that right, there was imposed, in a sense, upon the employer the duty of cooperating with the union in collective bargaining. In any event, I think I am not far wrong in saying, that by that act the Congress of the United States clothed organized labor unions with a public interest, just as Congress and State legislatures from time to time have clothed other organizations with a public interest by recognizing them under statutory authority. So today, unless I am very much mistaken, the labor union is literally clothed with a public interest. May I try to point out to you, inadequately I am afraid, the situation which existed, let us say, in 1946. A dispute would break out between management and labor in a huge industry. All the work in that industry ceased as a result.

The representatives of management and the leaders of the labor unions involved met in a hotel in some great city, like Chicago or New York or even Washington, and began to discuss and argue amongst themselves as to what they were willing to do and what they were not willing to do. A crowd begins to gather on the street outside, small at first, perhaps impelled by curiosity, waiting to see what this little group of men, perhaps not exceeding 8 or 10 in number, decide upon with respect to what they are going to do about a great industry.

As the days go by the crowd increases, gazing furtively up at the fourth-floor windows, wondering where they are going to get their food tomorrow; wondering perhaps when they will get their clothing, and the thing goes on and on and on until the crowd represents nearly the whole people of the United States.

That was the situation, as I view it, which we faced in 1946—a lack of a

sense of responsibility on the part of those clothed with the public interest. So, an honest effort was made in 1947 to equalize that burden of responsibility between the two parties to the end that they would be conscious of the fact that they owe a responsibility to the country as a whole which overtops their responsibility to their respective groups.

Men have said that as a result of that effort in 1947 to balance the burden of responsibility between the two groups and to bear in mind the vital interest of the public which was standing in that street in ever-increasing numbers labor has lost ground; that labor unions have been weakened; that their life has been threatened.

Mr. Speaker, since 1947 the membership of labor unions has increased tremendously. Numerically they are more powerful today than they ever were, and, believe it or not, I rejoice in that. I am glad to see labor unions increasing in membership. Other things being equal, that is a healthy thing. Again, it has been said that the act of 1947 would cause a great increase in strikes. It had exactly the opposite effect, a marked decrease in strikes. And then, strange to say, in view of the dire prophesies made with respect to the act of 1947, the wages of the workingman, according to the statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics have gone up literally a little higher proportionately than the cost of living. So that today the hourly wage of the average American workingman purchases more goods than it ever has in the history of the United States. And I rejoice in that, also.

Do I contend that conditions are perfect? No, I do not. I merely cite some of these uncontrovertible facts to show that the act of 1947 has had no tragic consequences whatsoever.

But coming back to my original creed, it is this: that as we legislate here today let us at least, for 2 or 3 days, forget the special interest of one group or the special interest of another group, be they management or be they labor. We must remember the overweening interest of the public; for, I can assure you that the public does not want to return to the conditions that confronted it in 1946 with that crowd in the street waiting for the group of dictators, management and labor leaders, to decide how they, the great American public, shall live.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] talk about the so-called Wood bill, I was forced to believe that what he was talking about, in plain words, was the Taft-Hartley bill.

As I understand the strategy, you will not have any chance to vote on the Lesinski bill; you will have a chance to vote on the Wood bill if it is accepted after the enacting clause is stricken. They expect to go along offering amendments to the Wood bill and trying to make that bill satisfactory to the membership.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And everyone who advocated that has always advocated antilabor legislation in past years in this body.

Mr. KELLEY. That is correct; since I have been here that has been true.

Ostensibly we are going to consider the bill, H. R. 2032, to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes. At this point I think it would be well to analyze the provisions of the bill, H. R. 2032.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2032

Section 101 repeals the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act.

Section 102 reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, commonly known as the Wagner Act, as it existed prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The various subsequent sections of the bill amend the Wagner Act, along the lines long advocated by the President and to which the Democratic Party committed itself before the last election. The Thomas-Lesinski bill is thus designed to carry out the pledges made by the President and by the Democratic Party. I will now take up one by one the various amendments of the Wagner Act.

Section 103 continues the present National Labor Relations Board as a five-member tribunal, instead of the three-member tribunal provided for under section 3 (a) of the Wagner Act. The heavy volume of work and the large backlog of cases now on the Board's docket necessitated the continuation of the larger Board. Provision is also made for the continued use of the present panel system, by an amendment of section 3 (b) of the Wagner Act.

Section 104 (2) amends section 4 (a) of the Wagner Act as follows: The salaries of Board members are increased to $17,500 a year. The salary of a Board member under the Taft-Hartley Act is $12,000 per year. The increase is to take into account the rise in living costs, and to give the members of the Board salaries commensurate with the importance of their functions.

Section 104 (b) is a purely technical provision deleting from the Wagner Act a provision with regard to the old NIRA Labor Board.

Section 105 bars the National Labor Relations Board and the courts from taking any action in cases arising under title I of the Taft-Hartley Act unless such action could be taken under the new act with respect to cases occurring after the passage of this bill. It thus modifies the provisions of the General Savings Act of February 25, 1871, which saves pending causes of action in cases of repeal of legislation. Section 105 also prohibits the Labor Board from issuing complaints on unfair labor practices occurring prior to August 22, 1947, unless charges with respect thereto were pending before the Board before January 1, 1949.

Section 106 adds to the Wagner Act provisions dealing with certain types of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes. These additions may be summarized as follows:

Section 106 (a) is of an introductory character. It is a general finding that unjustifiable conflicts between labor organizations lead to industrial strife, and that the public interest requires abatement of such strife.

Section 106 (b) defines "secondary boycott" and "jurisdictional dispute."

Secondary boycott is defined as a concerted refusal to handle a particular product because the product has been or is to be manufactured, produced, or distributed by another employer.

Jurisdictional dispute is defined as a dispute between two or more labor organizations concerning the assignment of work by an employer. Under this definition, jurisdictional dispute is limited to a controversy between two or more labor organizations. It does not include a dispute between a union and an unorganized group of employees or between a union and an employer over the employer's assignment of work to unorganized employees. The definition thus avoids one of the objectionable features of the jurisdictional-dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act—section 8 (b) (4) (D)—which was not limited in its application to disputes of labor organizations. The Taft-Hartley provision could be used by an employer to undermine a labor organization by transferring work from organized to unorganized employees.

It is intended that the term "jurisdictional dispute" shall include only disputes over the assignment of work and not representation cases which involve competition between rival unions for recognition as the bargaining agent for the same group of employees. Representation cases do not involve a dispute over the right to perform particular work, and are more appropriately resolved by an election than by arbitration.

Section 106 (c) amends section 8 of the Wagner Act by making it an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to assign a particular work task in accordance with an award made in a jurisdictional-dispute case under section 106 (e) of the bill. This unfair labor practice is thus designed to implement enforcement of the awards provided for in section 106 (e).

Section 106 (d) amends the Wagner Act by adding to section 8 of that act provisions for unfair labor practices by labor organizations. These provisions make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike for the purpose, first, of compelling an employer to violate his statutory obligation to bargain with another labor organization; or second, to further a jurisdictional dispute.

The first of these situations is covered by a provision making it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike to compel an employer to bargain in any one of three situations: First, where an-

other labor organization has been certified by the Labor Board and such certification is still in effect; second, where the employer is required by an order of the Board to bargain with another labor organization; or third, where another labor organization, although uncertified, has a valid and subsisting collective-bargaining agreement which at the time of the strike or boycott would constitute a bar to the raising of a question concerning representation.

The purpose of this provision is to protect certifications and orders of the Board determining the status of a bargaining representative, and to safeguard the employer from pressure by a rival union when he is dealing with the majority representative of his employees as required by law.

Section 106 (d) also makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike for the purpose of compelling an employer to assign a particular work task contrary to an award made pursuant to the arbitration provisions of the bill. This provision, like the parallel provision of 106 (c) which applies to employers, serves to implement that portion of the bill providing for the arbitration of jurisdictional disputes.

Section 106 (e) sets forth the procedure for the arbitration of jurisdictional disputes. It amends section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 by the addition of these provisions.

The procedure for the arbitration of jurisdictional disputes may be invoked by either an interested labor union or an employer when a secondary boycott or a strike is in effect or threatened. The bill authorized the Board either to hear and determine the jurisdictional dispute itself or to appoint an arbitrator. The award of the arbitrator is to be given the same effect.

Whether the dispute is to be heard by the Board itself or by the arbitrator, opportunity must first be afforded the parties to settle the dispute themselves. Emphasis is thus placed upon voluntary adjustment.

Standards for the determination of the work-assignment issue are set forth in the bill. These include prior Board certifications, union charters or interunion agreements, decisions of agencies established by unions to consider the jurisdictional disputes, the past work history of the contending labor organizations, and the policy of the act. By the inclusion of these standards it is sought to give the Board or the arbitrator adequate statutory guidance, and to avoid the charge made with respect to the jurisdictional-dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act—section 10 (k)—which contain no standards, that they are an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.

This section permits the Board to treat the case as one involving a petition for an election under section 9 (e) if at any stage of the proceeding it appears that the dispute is not a jurisdictional one but one concerning representation.

It is intended that, in any derivative unfair-labor-practice case, the award made pursuant to the provisions of this section of the bill shall generally be determinative of the work task assignment issue. This procedure is patterned after present procedure in representative cases and refusal to bargain cases, in which the prior certification is ordinarily decisive of the representation issue in the derivative unfair-labor-practice case. It has the advantage of limiting issues and expediting the decision in the subsequent unfair-labor-practice case. This is covered by section 106 (f).

That concludes the treatment of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes.

Section 107 amends the proviso to section 8 (a) (3) of the Wagner Act to make it clear that the Federal statute overrides State laws which prohibit or restrict the closed shop or the check-off of union dues. These are matters which, except in the case of purely local enterprises, manifestly require uniform treatment on a national basis. There is no conceivable reason why a union dealing with the United States Steel Corp. should be permitted to negotiate for a closed shop and check-off in Pennsylvania but be denied that right by State law in some other State. Nor should the State be encouraged or permitted to bid for the location of industry within their borders by adopting repressive antilabor legislation. A major reason for the creation of the United States and for the adoption of the Constitution was to guarantee that the country would constitute an economic unit, with matters affecting interstate commerce being handled on a national and uniform basis. Section 107 secures this uniformity in the case of labor relations, and places such matters as the closed shop and the check-off in the area of free collective bargaining between labor and management.

Section 108 makes it an unfair labor practice for either an employer or a labor organization to terminate or modify existing agreements except upon 30 days' advance notice to the United States Conciliation Service. This requirement will enable the service to be apprised in advance of situations which may develop into industrial conflict.

We now come to title II of the bill. This title provides for the reestablishment of the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor. This step, our committee concluded, is necessary for a sound and properly coordinated administration of Government-labor functions.

Section 201 reestablishes the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, and contains certain provisions to its administration.

Section 202 describes the functions of the Service and permits the Director to intervene in any labor dispute when, in his judgment, such intervention would assist the parties in settling the dispute. The Director is authorized, however, to enter into agreement with State and local mediation agencies relating to the mediation of disputes whose effects are predominantly local in character.

Section 203 prescribes conduct of the conciliation officers.

Section 204 declares that it is the duty of employers and employees to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain collective-bargaining agreements and to participate fully in meetings called by the Service to aid in settling disputes. The purpose of these provisions is to emphasize the importance of peaceful and voluntary methods of adjusting industrial disputes.

The same policy underlies section 205 which declares it to be the public policy of the United States that collective-bargaining agreements shall provide for the arbitration of disputes growing out of their interpretation. The Conciliation Service is directed to assist in developing procedures for arbitration, in framing issues, and in selecting arbitrators. The provisions of this section are intended to encourage resort to the process of voluntary arbitration.

Section 206 provides for the appointment of labor-management advisory committees to advise the Secretary of Labor on questions of policy and administration affecting work of the Service.

We come now to title III of the bill which deals with national emergencies resulting from strikes in vital industries. The provisions of title III are intended to provide a method by which the Government can effectively assist in the settlement of such controversies. It is contemplated that the procedures provided are to be used only in exceptional cases involving a grave national emergency.

Section 301 provides that whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because of a stoppage of work in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

Section 302 provides for the appointment by the President of an emergency board. This board is required to make its report to the President within 25 days after he issues his proclamation. This section, unlike the Taft-Hartley Act, requires the board to make findings and recommendations. The bill thus makes it possible to secure from a group of impartial experts findings and opinions upon the basis of which an informed opinion can be reached. It is believed that the rallying of public opinion behind such recommendations will be a powerful factor in settling such disputes.

The section prescribes a total cooling-off period of 30 days; 25 days during which the emergency Loard is making its investigation and report, plus 5 days after the report has been submitted. The bill does not provide for enforcement of this waiting period by injunction, but both of the great labor organizations have pledged themselves to observe it. It will be recalled that a much broader no-strike pledge during the war worked very well indeed.

Section 303 grants the emergency boards the necessary powers to carry out their duties, and carries administrative provisions.

That completes the major provisions of the bill. Title IV contains various miscellaneous provisions.

Section 401 is declaratory of what the law would be anyway, and makes it clear that the prohibitions in the Norris-LaGuardia and the Clayton Acts against the issuance of labor injunctions are restored in full force.

Section 402 restores the political-contributions provision of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act as it existed prior to the War Labor Disputes Act by striking from the Federal Corrupt Practices Act provisions relating to labor organizations.

Section 403 defines certain terms which are used throughout the bill.

Section 404 makes it clear that no provision of the act is to be construed as compelling an employee to render forced labor or to work under abnormally dangerous conditions.

Section 405 provides that titles II and III shall not be applicable with respect to matters which are subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. It is not necessary to include title I in this exclusion since the definition of "employer" in title I has the same effect.

Section 406 contains the usual separability provision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has 8 minutes remaining. No time remains on the other side.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for so much of the 8 minutes as he may consume.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to correct an impression left by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Listening to the gentleman from Virginia one would believe that the Wood bill was a piece of legislation that had been before the House for some time and with which every Member was familiar. The Wood bill—and I do not know yet whether the gentleman from Virginia was referring to the Wood bill that was filed first or the Wood bill that was filed the day before we adjourned for the Easter recess.

The first Wood bill was supposed to be the bill that was going to bring out the recommendations of the watchdog committee. I am going to make a statement now, and I do not think it can be contradicted. I hold in my hand the bill H. R. 4290 which is the new Wood bill. I received this bill about 3 hours ago. It is made up of 67 printed pages. I say that there are not 20 Members of Congress who have read or know what is in the second Wood bill, yet we are going to be asked to substitute this piece of legislation for H. R. 2032 which has been pending in Congress since January 3.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I regret that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] did not yield to me while he had the floor. I wanted to ask him about Wood bill No. 2 which he said preserves States' rights. While that is true in regard to any State forbidding the closed shop as provided in section 14 (b); section 14 (a) definitely strikes down States' rights in these words: "No employer subject to this act shall be compelled to deem individuals defined herein as supervisors as employees for the purpose of any law, either national or local, relating to collective bargaining."

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Virginia to explain to me what became of his regard for States' rights when they wrote section 14 (a).

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that I do not like that provision either. However, I did not write the Wood bill and I suggest that he offer an amendment to strike that out and I will go along with him.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Virginia was very enthusiastic about the fact that the Wood bill outlaws the so-called closed shop.

I have in my hand an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune in October 1947. I am sure my friends on the left side of this House will certainly listen attentively to what the Chicago Tribune has to say about the closed shop. The Chicago Tribune and all newspapers in the Chicago area have been tied up in a paralyzing strike for 18 months. Thousands of members of the printers' union have been without work for that period of time and millions of dollars have been lost.

Here is what the "world's greatest newspaper" says about the closed shop which the Wood bill seeks to retain:

"When the law was under discussion in Congress, as our readers will recall, we advised against outlawing the closed shop. We did so, among other reasons, because we knew that the closed shop worked well in our own plant and had worked well for half a century or more. Congress did not take our advice. Neither the Tribune nor the Typographical Union writes laws of this country."

Somebody is going to have to explain to the Chicago Tribune if this Wood bill is accepted as is. However, our old friend, Curley Brooks, is out in Illinois and has plenty of time to explain to the Chicago Tribune just what the Taft-Hartley Act did to him.

My friends, I want to call another fact to the attention of the House. You remember when our good friend, Fred Hartley, the former chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, closed debate 2 years ago on the Taft-Hartley law, his closing words in asking for votes on the Taft-Hartley legislation, before the vote was taken were, "Remember," he said, "if you vote for this bill you will have John L. Lewis in a box." Well, John L. Lewis has been in everybody's hair several times since the Taft-Hartley Act has been passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Hartley also said in his closing remarks that there is more in this bill, the Taft-Hartley bill, than meets the eye.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right, and over 61,000,000 wage earners in America, and about 16,000,000 union members have discovered most of the hidden booby-traps and concealed antilabor restrictions since that time, and that is why the Eighty-first Congress was elected to repeal that act. Yes, they took John L. Lewis out of a box. During one of his strikes, he was ushered into a conference, with our good friend, the present minority leader, who was then Speaker and the distinguished Senator BRIDGES. These three arbitrators settled the strike in 10 minutes, but the Taft-Hartley Act had nothing to do with that.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] stated that the labor unions have increased their membership. Why, the greatest membership I ever saw in a union hall in my district was after those good old years of Republican depression back in 1934–35. Then the union members and the wage earners knew that they must get together and organize so that another depression, with its unemployment and low wages would not strike this country. We had great gatherings in the union halls back in 1934, 1935, and 1936 when wage earners started to organize in order to increase wages and improve working conditions in America. The big mistake labor made is that they went to sleep in 1946, and thought that they had won their battle, but they did not figure on the Eightieth Congress. That is why labor-union membership is increasing in 1948 because they are going to repeal and undo the damage done by the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 369, nays 6, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—369

Abbitt	Beckworth	Buckley, N. Y.
Abernethy	Bennett, Fla.	Burdick
Addonizio	Bentsen	Burke
Albert	Biemiller	Burleson
Allen, Calif.	Bishop	Burnside
Allen, Ill.	Blackney	Burton
Andersen, H. Carl	Bland	Byrne, N. Y.
	Blatnik	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Camp
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, La.	Canfield
	Bolling	Cannon
Angell	Bolton, Md.	Carlyle
Arends	Bonner	Carnahan
Aspinall	Bosone	Carroll
Auchincloss	Boykin	Case, N. J.
Bailey	Bramblett	Case, S. Dak.
Barden	Breen	Cavalcante
Baring	Brehm	Celler
Barrett, Pa.	Brown, Ga.	Chatham
Barrett, Wyo.	Brown, Ohio	Chelf
Bates, Mass.	Bryson	Chesney
Battle	Buchanan	Chiperfield
Beall	Buckley, Ill.	Christopher

Chudoff	Javits	Pfeiffer,
Church	Jenkins	William L.
Clemente	Jennings	Philbin
Cole, Kans.	Jensen	Phillips, Calif.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson	Phillips, Tenn.
Colmer	Jonas	Pickett
Combs	Jones, Ala.	Poage
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	Polk
Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Potter
Corbett	Karst	Poulson
Cotton	Karsten	Powell
Coudert	Kean	Preston
Crawford	Kearns	Price
Crook	Keating	Priest
Crosser	Kee	Quinn
Cunningham	Keefe	Rabaut
Dague	Kelley	Rains
Davenport	Kennedy	Ramsay
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Rankin
Davis, Wis.	Kerr	Redden
Dawson	Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.
Deane	Kilday	Rees
Delaney	King	Regan
Denton	Kirwan	Rhodes
D'Ewart	Klein	Ribicoff
Dingell	Kruse	Riehlman
Dollinger	Lane	Rivers
Dolliver	Lanham	Rodino
Dondero	Larcade	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Latham	Rogers, Mass.
Doughton	LeFevre	Rooney
Douglas	Lemke	Sadlak
Doyle	Lesinski	Sadowski
Durham	Lichtenwalter	Sanborn
Eaton	Lind	Sasscer
Eberharter	Linehan	Scott, Hardie
Elliott	Lodge	Scott,
Ellsworth	Lovre	Hugh D., Jr.
Elston	Lucas	Scrivner
Engle, Calif.	Lyle	Scudder
Evins	Lynch	Secrest
Fallon	McCarthy	Shafer
Feighan	McConnell	Sheppard
Fellows	McCormack	Short
Fenton	McCulloch	Sikes
Fernandez	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Fisher	McGrath	Simpson, Pa.
Flood	McGregor	Sims
Fogarty	McGuire	Smith, Va.
Forand	McKinnon	Smith, Wis.
Ford	McMillan, S. C.	Spence
Fulton	McMillen, Ill.	Staggers
Furcolo	McSweeney	Stanley
Gary	Mack, Ill.	Steed
Gathings	Mack, Wash.	Stefan
Gavin	Madden	Stigler
Gillette	Magee	Sullivan
Golden	Mahon	Sutton
Gordon	Mansfield	Taber
Gorski, Ill.	Marsalis	Tackett
Gorski, N. Y.	Marshall	Talle
Graham	Martin, Iowa	Tauriello
Granahan	Martin, Mass.	Teague
Granger	Mason	Thomas, Tex.
Grant	Merrow	Thornberry
Green	Meyer	Tollefson
Gross	Michener	Towe
Gwinn	Miles	Trimble
Hagen	Miller, Calif.	Underwood
Hale	Miller, Md.	Van Zandt
Hall,	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
Leonard W.	Mills	Vinson
Halleck	Mitchell	Vorys
Hand	Monroney	Vursell
Harden	Morgan	Wadsworth
Hardy	Morris	Wagner
Hare	Morrison	Walter
Harris	Morton	Weichel
Harrison	Moulder	Welch, Calif.
Harvey	Murdock	Welch, Mo.
Havenner	Murray, Tenn.	Werdel
Hays, Ohio	Nelson	Wheeler
Hébert	Nixon	White, Calif.
Heffernan	Noland	Whitten
Herlong	Norrell	Whittington
Herter	Norton	Wigglesworth
Heselton	O'Brien, Ill.	Williams
Hinshaw	O'Brien, Mich.	Willis
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Okla.
Holifield	O'Neill	Wilson, Tex.
Holmes	O'Sullivan	Winstead
Hope	O'Toole	Withrow
Horan	Pace	Wolcott
Howell	Passman	Wolverton
Huber	Patman	Wood
Hull	Patten	Woodhouse
Irving	Patterson	Woodruff
Jackson, Calif.	Perkins	Worley
Jackson, Wash.	Peterson	Yates
Jacobs	Pfeifer,	Young
James	Joseph L.	Zablocki

NAYS—6

Nicholson	Rich	Smith, Kans.
Norblad	St. George	Wier

NOT VOTING—56

Allen, La.	Goodwin	Marcantonio
Andrews	Gore	Multer
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Murphy
Bennett, Mich.	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Bolton, Ohio	Hall,	O'Konski
Brooks	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Hart	Reed, Ill.
Clevenger	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Cox	Hedrick	Sabath
Curtis	Heller	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	Hill	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	Hobbs	Stockman
DeGraffenried	Hoeven	Taylor
Engel, Mich.	Jenison	Thomas, N. J.
Frazier	Judd	Thompson
Fugate	Kearney	Walsh
Gamble	Kunkel	Whitaker
Garmatz	LeCompte	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Macy	Wickersham

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs—

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Fugate with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Moulter with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Murphy with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Walsh with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. SHAFER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2032, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I want to make clear at the outset of this debate—we of the majority present this measure in no spirit of partisanship, nor with any purpose of reprisal.

We are not interested in repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of sound, substantial labor-management relations merely because the Taft-Hartley Act was a Republican measure and was driven through the Congress in a spirit of hysteria and vengeance. We are not here seeking to play politics, or to curry favor with any group.

And I appeal to the members of the House on both sides of the aisle to approach this debate in that same spirit of fair-mindedness, determined as always to legislate in the interests of our entire country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 2032, is conceived in that spirit. I believe that it is one of the most vital measures that will come before this Congress.

It deals with one of the most vital relationships that exists today in our society—the relationship between labor and management and the public.

If we are to achieve a stable society, if we are to avoid the bitternesses and conflicts of class warfare, we must deal wisely with this relationship between labor, management, and the public for it is one upon which many governments in our time have floundered.

We have seen the breach between these three vital elements of our community widened and widened until, at times, it threatened to plunge us into the bottomless pit of anarchy. We have seen proponents of class hatred—on the side of labor and on the side of management—seize upon each and every opportunity to put shackles and chains upon the other.

That was the spirit, Mr. Chairman, that motivated the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that was the driving force behind those who, in the Eightieth Congress, whipped up the frenzy and the hatred against labor organizations that are expressed in that act. And it was on the coat-tails of that frenzy and that hatred that the Taft-Hartley Act rode to passage.

The President of the United States, Mr. Chairman, was well aware of this when he returned the Taft-Hartley Act to the Congress without his approval.

At that time he declared—and I quote from his veto message:

> The bill taken as a whole would reserve the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

The President also noted, Mr. Chairman, that this bill—and again I give you the very words—

> would go far toward weakening our trade-union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management and by injecting political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action. I think it would be extremely dangerous to our country to develop a class basis for political action.

I cannot emphasize too strongly—

The President continued—

the importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace.

We cannot be strong internationally if our national duty and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.

Following that message, Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act was put into our great democratic crucible of public debate.

Countless hours of valuable radio time were consumed with discussion and debate. Thousands of columns of newspaper and magazine space were filled with printed words which examined the merits and demerits of the Taft-Hartley Act. On public platforms all over the land speakers expounded their views on the virtues and the faults of this legislation.

And, Mr. Chairman, last November this issue was put squarely before the voters of the Nation.

The platform of the Democratic Party, Mr. Chairman, stated clearly the policy of our party with respect to labor-management relations.

It declared:

We advocate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress over the President's veto. It has failed. The number of disputes has increased. Recent decisions prove it was poorly drawn and probably, in some provisions, unconstitutional.

The platform of the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, was also clear in its support of the Taft-Hartley Act. It termed it a "sensible reform" of the labor law.

The candidates for President spoke even more plainly. The President openly and on numerous occasions voiced his opposition to the Taft-Hartley law and his desire for sound, well-considered legislation covering labor-management-public relations. The Republican candidate for President made it equally clear that he was standing by the Taft-Hartley law.

And on November 2, 1948, Mr. Chairman, the people of the Nation gave their great decision. After months of debate, after more than a year's experience, after a public scrutiny of the law that was detailed and painstaking, the voters of the Nation expressed their opinion.

They put their approval on the candidate and the party who stood for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and for the enactment of sound legislation in this field.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that by taking this action the people of our country took a great step forward, not only in strengthening our own democracy here at home but in strengthening beyond measure the hands of those abroad who preach the cause of democracy.

As the Members of the House know, there are today in Europe growing numbers of working men and women who resist the encroachments and the blandishments of communism. To the lies and propaganda of the Communists and the opponents of democracy, they reply with facts and proof from the United States, the great stronghold of the democratic faith.

The fact that we in this country could plunge so important a piece of legislation as that governing labor-management relationships into the crucible of democratic debate was itself impressive. The fact that out of this crucible we can pour a revised measure that will eliminate the evils and shortcomings of that legislation will be even more impressive.

It is, Mr. Chairman, a demonstration that democracy can work and does work.

If we break faith with the people of our own country, we do more than destroy the precious fabric of our own democratic faith. We rip to shreds the painful and expensive beginnings that we of the democratic faith are today making in western Europe. If we break faith with our own people—who expressed themselves so clearly and in such detail last November—we confess to the people of western Europe who are today desperately seeking the truth that the forces of communism speak the truth, while we practice hypocrisy.

I know that this House will not make such a confession. I know that this House will keep the faith of our own people and of the people in other lands who look to us to keep the torch of democracy always lighted.

Weakening the rights of labor and taking away its strength to bargain collectively, as the Taft-Hartley Act does, is the first step away from democracy, and toward fascism, communism or any other brand of totalitarianism. If we are to continue leading the countries who look to us for guidance, we must not only preach democracy, we must be a democracy. And in a democracy, the rights of labor must be respected.

The President of the United States took steps toward the fulfillment of our pledges to democracy and the democratic faith at the first opportunity.

In his message to this body on the state of the Union on January 5 of this year, he declared:

If we want to keep our economy running in high gear, we must make sure that every group has the incentive to make its full contribution to the national welfare. At present the working men and women of the Nation are unfairly discriminated against by a statute that abridges their rights, curtails their constructive efforts and hampers our system of free-collective bargaining. That statute is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, sometimes called the Taft-Hartley Act.

That act should be repealed.

The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within that Department should be placed in it.

The bill which our committee has placed before the House carries out those recommendations.

We have listened to days of testimony and we have had the benefit of the even more extensive hearings that were held by the appropriate committee in the other body of this Congress. Every Member of this Congress has had before him for nearly 3 months a copy of this bill which he could read and study.

Every issue was thoroughly explored. Every shade of opinion among management, labor, the farmers, and the public at large was given an opportunity to be heard. The experts in labor law and labor-management relations gave our committee their considered judgment on the legislation now before us.

Against this background, the committee has given careful consideration to the purpose of H. R. 2032, and a majority of the committee has concluded that it is sound legislation and should be passed.

I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, at this time to go into the specific provisions of H. R. 2032. That will be done by the other members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the House will act upon this measure in the spirit in which it is presented—a spirit of fair play and a consciousness that what we do here with this measure will have an overwhelming effect on the structure and growth of our society here at home and on the painful gropings of people elsewhere in the world toward the creation of a free society composed of freemen and free institutions.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that I call upon the House to pass H. R. 2032 without amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I do not yield. The gentleman can get time on his own side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has consumed 17 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 33 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who up until this year was a member of the Committee on Labor. The gentleman from Indiana spoke of the procedure used in pushing the Taft-Hartley bill through the committee.

I would like to draw a comparison between the two periods we are discussing, the action of the committee in the Eightieth Congress on the Taft-Hartley bill, and the action of the committee in the Eighty-first Congress on the Lesinski bill.

The full committee in the Eightieth Congress, controlled by the Republicans, held hearings on labor-management problems for approximately 6 weeks. The full committee, I repeat, conducted the hearings. Under the present procedure of this labor committee, the Lesinski bill hearings were held by a subcommittee for approximately 10 days, sandwiched in between voting, and other matters which took our attention.

In the Eightieth Congress, at the end of 6 weeks of hearings and the taking of 2,000,000 words of testimony, the majority members of the committee proceeded to write the bill. No department of Government and no special interest or out-

side organization had anything to do with the bill which was drawn up for this House in the Eightieth Congress by the majority members of the labor committee. After we had finished with our deliberations, which took us approximately 10 days, the bill was brought before the full committee and it was read for amendment. Approximately 29 amendments were adopted, as you will see if you will read the report back in that period.

Now, let us contrast the present situation. Many of us came back to this Congress with the thought that we would have an opportunity to consider in detail and very carefully this critical and important problem. It became obvious to us shortly after we began our hearings before the subcommittee that there was no intention to have the bill changed in any particular. As a result, when it was brought before the subcommittee, and then before the full committee, there was no discussion. When the substitute bill was offered by me, I did not even have any opportunity to explain some of the provisions of that bill and some other amendments which I wished to offer. After that, a vote was taken, the substitute bill was defeated 13–11, and then the Lesinski bill was voted out of the committee with no intervening discussion. The Republican Members went before the Rules Committee and asked for an open rule, one which would permit amendment and allow the bill to be written on the floor of the House.

There has been some question about the use of the name of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], on the bill. As far as I know, it is a very honorable name; I know nothing wrong with the name. It happened to be the only bill to my knowledge that contained the various features of the present labor law so that when it came to the floor of the House it could be considered in an intelligent fashion as a substitute. Certainly there was no intention of getting rid of the names Taft and Hartley that I knew of, but it just happened to be the only bill before the committee conforming to the general pattern of the Taft-Hartley bill, as amended by recommendations of the joint House-Senate committee which was set up by action of the Eightieth Congress.

This is a big piece of legislation we have before us today. We must consider not only the administration bill, the Lesinski bill, but we also have to consider the Taft-Hartley and Wagner Acts, and the Wood bill. It becomes very confusing, undoubtedly, to many people, so I have deliberately set up the program on our side in such way that we can develop the procedure that we believe will be correct; also, that we will be able to tell you the past history of other legislation, as well as what the Lesinski bill does and does not do, and what the Wood bill will do. That will be developed during the course of our discussion in the next 2 days.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. There are a couple of other things that I believe it might be well to have cleared up at this juncture; the first is the reference by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] for whom certainly I have the highest respect and admiration, that the so-called injunctive processes of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 had never been effective against Mr. Lewis and the coal strike. As I remember, it was that very process that was invoked, and it runs in my mind that it was quite effective; at least it resulted in the collection of a fine. The President himself ordered the Attorney General to obtain the injunction.

Secondly, reference was made to the fact that no one knows what is in the revised Wood bill. At this juncture let me say that some days ago I received from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] a carefully worked out analysis of his bill and the revised Wood bill. I have read it and studied it with interest, and I commend it to the consideration of every Member. All Members undoubtedly also have copies of the comparative analysis. As a matter of fact, I think it should be pointed out that the bill was introduced on April 14.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that the RECORD ought clearly to show that the coal strike, if I remember it correctly, was a dispute over the disposition of welfare funds. Three trustees were set up in that particular union; one of the trustees was in favor of the union's distribution of the fund; the operators' trustee was not in favor of it, and the neutral trustee resigned. As a result of this dispute on the conflicting provisions of the contract there was a question as to whether or not there was an actual strike. When John Lewis passed the message back to his people that the operators had violated the provisions of the contract they walked off the job.

It was then, as I recall it, that the gentleman from Indiana as he addressed us from the well of the House said that it was not the injunctive process but it was the present minority leader and a certain Senator who was instrumental in getting a new trustee selected, which new trustee sustained the position of the union. The welfare fund was then disbursed. So, actually, the injunctive process had absolutely nothing to do with the strike itself.

It is true, however, that they fined the union; it is true also that when the case was carried to the district court of appeals the court sustained the union. Of course, the injunctive process was used as a punitive measure.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, it is our intention to present various parts of this labor-management problem. I intended to present here today as the lead-off speaker on the Republican side the general background which preceded the labor-management laws as we are now considering them.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted today with one of the most critical issues with which this Congress will deal. That issue is whether we shall blindly discard in toto every last provision of an act that passed this body less than 2 years ago, with a majority of the Members of both parties voting in favor of it. That is what the majority of the Democratic Members who reported the bill now before us recommend that we do, for that bill would scrap every single provision of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

When the act was passed, no one considered it to be perfect, and no one considered that defects would not develop from experience under it. The Republican minority concedes that defects have developed and that such defects should be corrected. Others will doubtless develop in the future, for the Labor-Management Relations Act is no different from other legislation in this regard.

But the existence of some defects in the present law is in our opinion no justification whatever for discarding all of its provisions—regardless of their merit. It has been the traditional practice of Congress, and of all other legislative bodies, when defects in existing legislation are shown, to formulate specific amendments to correct them. Scarcely a year goes by but what the need of changes in some of the provisions in our revenue laws is not pressed convincingly on Congress. Yet it has never been proposed that because certain tax provisions can be shown to be inequitable or defective we should repeal all of our tax laws. Yet this is the underlying premise of the bill now before us.

In 1947 when the unprecedented industrial chaos of a year and a half which had resulted from the partisan and one-sided administration of the Wagner Act and extreme judicial interpretation of the Norris-LaGuardia Act clamored for the attention of the Eightieth Congress, those of us who served in that body did not begin our task by repealing those statutes. Instead we invited representatives of industry, labor, and the public to appear before our standing committees and give us their views as to what should be done to remedy the situation. The legislation we ultimately passed—the Labor-Management Relations Act—was carefully drawn so as to save all the sound features of the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and so as to supplement those provisions with provisions giving recognition to the fact that management, the public, and the individual worker also have a stake in any sound Federal industrial relations policy. In enacting that legislation we were careful to preserve the very language of the earlier enactments upon which the protection of the right to organize, to bargain collectively, and to engage in concerted activities were embodied.

The Labor-Management Relations Act was not the sole and exclusive invention of the Eightieth Congress. Virtually all of its major provisions had a previous legislative history. Such fundamental reforms in National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction and procedure as the establishment of unfair labor practices for unions as well as management, the right of free speech, the separation of prosecuting and judicial functions, and the application of the rules of evidence and judicial review to Labor Board findings, were embodied in a bill which

passed the House overwhelmingly in the heavily Democratic Seventy-sixth Congress. That bill was the result of the only exhaustive investigation a committee of this Congress has ever made of the actual administration of the Wagner Act.

In the ensuing Seventy-seventh Congress, also heavily Democratic, the House by a big majority passed another bill which also contained a number of provisions which the Taft-Hartley Act ultimately enacted into law, including provisions enabling the Government to obtain temporary injunctions in strikes endangering the national safety. In the rapid developments of the war which followed, this measure, a forerunner in many respects of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, was not acted upon by the other body.

The Seventy-eighth Congress—also Democratic—dealt with labor problems by enacting the Wage Stabilization Act and the Smith-Connally Act. Such measures, of course, with wage fixing and plant seizures, were justified only against the background of wartime conditions.

The expiration of these wartime measures brought forcibly home the grievous results to the public of the long-standing failure of Congress to remedy the inadequacies of the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts. Large and powerful international unions speaking for and controlling all of the workers throughout entire industries were able to paralyze our economy. In the 5-month period which followed the end of the war, reconversion was set back by the loss of approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor through strikes. This total was tripled in 1946 when 116,000,000 man-days were lost and the number of strikes reached the unprecedented figure of 4,985.

In an attempt to cope with these problems the Seventy-ninth Congress, also strongly Democratic, attempted to curb some of the more flagrant labor abuses by enacting the Case bill.

This measure contained provisions dealing with the compulsory organization of supervisory personnel, contained effective curbs against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, conferred jurisdiction upon the Federal district courts in suits for breach of collective-bargaining agreements, established an independent mediation service, treated certain unjustifiable union practices of a monopoly character as violations of the antitrust laws, and placed restrictions on the unregulated control and expenditure by unions of welfare funds exacted from employers.

As a result of the veto of this bill by the President, the Eightieth Congress was forced to consider anew the problem of dealing with all these abuses as well as with the defects in Labor Board procedure and practice which would have been remedied years before had the other body concurred with the action of the House in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses.

So the Labor-Management Relations Act was truly the culmination of an evolutionary process. I have listened to and read all sorts of arguments against it. Very few of those arguments are directed at specific provisions. They are rather arguments which might have been made with respect to the industrial-relations picture a generation or so ago. When we hear such phrases as "union busting," "government by injunctions," "slave labor," "sweatshops," and "yellow-dog contracts," a person unfamiliar with our present laws would think that we are legislating today against the background of the early 1920's. A person unfamiliar with our present laws would infer that statutes for the protection of the workingman that have been enacted during the last 20 years—such as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Antistrikebreaker Act—had never been written—or, if they had, that the Eightieth Congress had erased them all from the statute books.

I believe that there are few, if any, Members of this body who would not agree that prior to the enactment of those laws workers who wished to organize and bargain collectively were in many, many cases prevented from doing so and unfairly treated. I believe there are few, if any, Members of this body who would not agree that organized labor in the past had a long and slow uphill battle to secure recognition in law of the right of workers to organize and engage in concerted activities for the purposes of mutual protection. But that right received the protection of law over 15 years ago, is still incorporated in the law today, and was not disturbed by the Labor-Management Relations Act.

In the early days of this century the concerted activities of labor organizations were held to be subject to the antitrust laws, with the result that workers engaged in concerted activities at their peril. Congress attempted to remedy this in the enactment of the Clayton Act in 1914, but the interpretation put upon this act by the courts did not improve the situation. During the 1920's, as a result of the emergence of the yellow-dog contract and the continued application of the antitrust laws, the doctrine that injunctions were an appropriate remedy to prevent workers from engaging in concerted activities came into full flower. That situation was corrected by the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932—and every essential feature of that act is still in effect today.

None of us here looks with pride upon the treatment of organized labor a generation ago. But that is not the situation today, and it is not that situation that we are here legislating about.

All of the acts that I have referred to that have been enacted in the last 20 years for the protection of workers are still intact in all of their essential provisions, and not even the most violent opponent of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, can deny this.

When the bill reported by the committee was the subject of hearings before our subcommittee, not one witness was able to point to a single case of a union being smashed or of a sweatshop or yellow-dog contract being sanctified by the Taft-Hartley Act. Not a scintilla of evidence has been produced to show that any American worker has been enslaved since its passage. On the contrary, during the 2 years the law has been in effect the number of organized workers has steadily increased, the number of strikes has steadily decreased, and the wage scales prevailing in collective-bargaining agreements are higher than at any point in our history.

What the bill before us would have you do would be to blindfold your eyes to the situation that exists today and return to the one-sided laws that were enacted to deal with an entirely different situation. I do not use the words "one-sided" in any critical sense, nor do I for a moment suggest that the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act did not meet a need for genuine reform at the time that they were passed. In those years more than 10,000,000 persons in our working force were unemployed. Labor organizations had shrunk in membership to less than 2,000,000 and hence were relatively weak and ineffective in protecting the standards and conditions of employment of wage earners. But when the larger part of our factories, mines, and transportation facilities were organized by large and powerful labor unions, the shortcomings in these statutes to deal with the changed picture soon became apparent.

The bill that we have before us would return to all these shortcomings, and this is not because the laws to which the bill would return were bad at the time they were enacted. It is rather because we are today facing an entirely different factual situation than that which existed in 1932 and 1935. But the bill would do even more than merely return to the one-sided Wagner Act. It would go far beyond this. For example, some 21 States have restrictions of one sort or another upon compulsory union-membership agreements. An even larger number of States have restrictions on the check-off. These State laws were never interfered with in any way by the Wagner Act, and yet the bill we have before would erase all of these from State statute books and State constitutions.

It is claimed by the proponents of the bill that the bill is really two-sided, since it provides for certain unfair labor practices by labor unions. Let us examine this claim for a moment. Labor unions, like corporations, can act only through agents. When a person purporting to act for a labor union does something that is unlawful, the question inevitably arises as to whether his act is the act of the labor union so as to make the labor union liable. Under the bill we have before us it will, in practical effect, be impossible to ever hold a labor union liable for an unfair labor practice because the bill makes the ordinary laws of agency inapplicable to labor unions. Instead it would require in effect that the union pass a formal resolution specifically authorizing its officials to engage in illegal activities before a union could be held liable for committing one of the proposed new unfair labor practices.

What the bill proposes to do, however, is not nearly so significant as what it proposes to omit from the present law.

First. All of the provisions of the present law which give to the Government the power to protect itself against the

effects of strikes and lock-outs which imperil the national health and safety would be discarded and the United States left helpless when situations like this arise.

Second. All of the provisions of the present law which protect workers from mass picketing and other organized union violence would be discarded.

Third. All of the reforms made to protect individual workers against arbitrary union action by unions having compulsory union-membership agreements with employers would be scrapped.

Fourth. The bill would discard all of the provisions of the present law which make boycotts having no purpose other than monopoly unlawful.

Fifth. The provisions of existing law protecting the political freedom of individual workers would be scrapped, and the workers, through the combination of compulsory union membership and the check-off of union assessments without the workers' consent, would be compelled to support candidates and doctrines with which they do not agree.

Sixth. The bill would omit the provisions of existing law which protect the right of free speech in labor controversies.

Seventh. It would omit all the provisions of existing law which give to employees a method of getting rid of a union which has lost the employees' majority support.

Eighth. The provisions of existing law imposing on unions a mutual duty to bargain collectively would be omitted.

Ninth. The provisions of existing law which make unions subject to suit like all other persons for violation of contract would be discarded; and, moreover, the bill would even discard the provision of existing law which exempts the property of individual union members from execution to satisfy a judgment against the union.

Tenth. The provisions of existing law which recognize the line between labor and management, and which exempt supervisory personnel from domination by labor unions controlled in fact or in practice by the very personnel which the supervisor has been hired to direct would be scrapped.

Eleventh. The provisions of existing law which enabled the Atomic Energy Commission to protect atomic secrets from Communist labor officials would be completely done away with. As a matter of fact, this bill actually encourages the infiltration of Communists and their leaders into unions and opens the door to complete Communist domination of unions. It sanctions the use of closed-shop for Communist objectives and compels employers engaged in the highly secret operations of the Atomic Energy Commission to bargain and deal with Communist-dominated unions. Therefore, I most earnestly appeal to you, my colleagues, to consider the danger to our national security that could result from the enactment of this labor legislation.

Twelfth. All of the procedural reforms in Labor Board practice would be thrown into the discard.

All of these provisions of existing law would be omitted by the bill reported by the Labor Committee, and you can read the majority report on the bill from beginning to end without finding a single word to justify what the bill does in this regard. It is the position of the Republican minority that the House should have an opportunity to consider all of these provisions, decide whether it is desirable to retain them as part of our law, and make only such changes in existing law as the facts justify.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to the editorial in today's Washington Post, dealing extensively with the important legislation we have before us today, which says, in part:

> We suspect that a large majority of the Members of the House know in their hearts that the enactment of this measure without extensive amendment would be a colossal blunder.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, this is, indeed, an auspicious occasion. As the Congress begins debate on the pending Labor Relations Act of 1949, the event should be marked as a red-letter day on the calendar of every American who loves freedom, cherishes justice, and who has a sincere regard for the constitutional guaranties of a free people.

Mr. Chairman, economic slavery is just as distasteful to a free people as physical servitude. I say to you, my colleagues, that our beloved America cannot long endure half free and half slave. This was so in the days of Lincoln. It is particularly true in our present highly industrial state.

There is no room in these United States for a second-class citizenship such as is set up under the Taft-Hartley Act. There must be reborn in these sacred halls the faith of our fathers—a faith and a determination that there is and shall continue to be in our Republic equal justice under law.

Big business as we know it, eager to exploit, demands that the welfare of our Nation makes necessary the continuation of our system of free enterprise. With this idea, labor is in full accord. In return labor asks only that it be permitted to organize, and that it be accorded full right to free collective bargaining in the sale of its services. To this big business, in its desire to amass huge profits, replied through the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 that labor must be restricted, both politically and economically.

What, may I ask, has happened to that era of good feeling and mutual confidence and respect that existed during the last war, when business was prone to say collective bargaining was necessary to the continuance of this same free-enterprise system. If teamwork was necessary to win the shooting war, why is it not equally necessary to win this cold war that now engulfs us.

They say history repeats itself. I agree fully. At the close of the First World War big business succeeded in breaking most labor unions and this one-sided policy led us to economic disaster in 1929, when our free-enterprise system was without counterchecks and balances, and rugged individualism ran roughshod over human rights to the detriment of our public welfare.

At the close of World War II we again see big business, aided and abetted by the Republican Party, engaged in another drive to make material things, not human welfare, the theme song of the postwar era. The first Republican-controlled Congress in 15 years—the Eightieth Congress—gave you the so-called Labor Relations Act of 1947—the Taft-Hartley Act—and in so doing they turned back the clock of labor-management relations a quarter of a century to the post-World War I era, when government by injunction was legal.

For what do these Republican gentlemen propose to punish labor? For winning the war, on the battle front and the industrial front? For establishing an all-time record of production? For making America the arsenal of democracy? During 4 years of global warfare, with all its hardships and heartbreaks on the home front, and while the husbands and sons of the workers were fighting, less than one-half of 1 percent of all available working time was lost by reason of strikes. Had industry kept its high-sounding no-war-profiteering pledge as well as labor kept its no-strike pledge, our national debt today would not be so high.

I see before me men, Members of this body, grown old and gray in the labor movement, who remember the infamous Hinchman Coal Co. and the Eagle Glass Co. cases that originated in the United States district court in West Virginia, in the period of the First World War. These cases set the pattern for a national policy that soon became a stench in the nostrils of liberty-loving Americans.

My native State of West Virginia emerged from the crucible of the Civil War with the motto Montani Semper Liberi, which means Mountaineers Always Free. Despite this love for liberty and freedom, our State during the 1920's saw constitutional government submerged to the will of the courts. So flagrant were the abuses by the mine guards and the Baldwin-Phelps detectives, operating under cover of mandatory injunctions, that rioting and violence broke out, which finally led to an armed march of thousands of workingmen in protest to these abuses and in protest to the contravening of their constitutional guaranties.

Men demanding only simple justice were charged with treason. Instead of a trial before a jury of their peers, they were held in contempt of a mandatory injunction of the United States court; and instead of a trial at the scene of the alleged crime, they were dragged hundreds of miles away to a distant part of our State and tried in the same courtroom in which they tried John Brown for treason in the Civil War days. Many of them went to prison following their conviction by a three-judge United States district court.

I say to you, my colleagues, that there is in the present Taft-Hartley labor law and the proposed Wood bill the foundation for a recurrence of this disgraceful episode. God forbid that my native State, or any other State within

this Union, shall once again be prostrated at the feet of those whose motto is the "almighty dollar."

Where, may I again ask, is that unity, that singleness of purpose that carried our Nation to victory in the world's most gigantic struggle. What about those promises made under patriotic compulsion, that we would never forget those who fought so gallantly on the field of battle and those who labored so diligently in our mines, in our mills, and in our factories, to make possible that great victory.

Two years after the cease-fire order ended the greatest of all wars we see those, who shed crocodile tears over the need for national unity in wartime, engaged in an all-out economic war to hamper and even destroy organized labor. Why, I ask, would a sane America want to weaken our first line of defense against Communist ideology? Why would we want to destroy that very segment of our population on which our Nation must depend in the event of a third world war, that now appears inevitable?

After years of struggle to be freed from the constant threat of the Federal injunction, labor appeared to have reached the promised land through the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932. This act was hailed by a labor spokesman "as a protective shield against invasion of rights that always belonged to labor." In 1947, however, the protective shield was badly cracked by the injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act, Mr. Chairman, has revived the use of the Federal injunction in labor disputes and has reinforced it by directives for its immediate use by public officers against unions. The Thomas-Lesinski bill contains no provision requiring or authorizing the use of the injunction. The Taft-Hartley Act, however, had made such inroads upon the Norris-LaGuardia Act that in drafting the Thomas-Lesinski bill it was considered necessary to restore the Norris-LaGuardia Act to its original status.

The proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act have attempted to justify its injunctive provisions on the grounds that injunctions can be sought only by the Government; that they are not made available to private employers. Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, that is not entirely true. Section 302 of the act, relating to welfare funds and the check-off, provides for the use of injunctions to restrain violations of the section and such injunctions are not restricted to the Government.

But what difference does it make, Mr. Chairman, that only the Government can seek these modern, streamlined Taft-Hartley injunctions? Should that fact make them more palatable to the labor organizations which are restrained from striking, picketing, and other activities for legitimate objectives? Does the fact that the Government secures these injunctions make them any less effective in hampering workers in their exercise of basic rights? Obviously not. Indeed, the fact that the Government seeks these Taft-Hartley Act injunctions has a decided advantage for employers, not the least of which is that the costs and inconveniences of litigation are borne by the Government.

The history of the use of injunctions, Mr. Chairman, shows that the intervention of the Government made the injunction an even more oppressive weapon. It was the Government that accelerated the use of injunctions in labor disputes by showing the way in the Debs case. Injunctions had been secured prior to the Debs case, but after that case the trickle of injunctions became a flood. I do not think I would be wrong in saying that it was Government use of the injunction, more than employer use, that led to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Then there is the injunction authorized in section 10 (j), which permits the Board to seek injunctive relief in the case of any unfair labor practice immediately upon the issuance of a complaint and prior to the adjudication of the case by the Board. While this type of Taft-Hartley injunction is available against both employers and unions, the score thus far is 6 to 2 in favor of the employers.

The use of this injunction, Mr. Chairman, is discretionary with the general counsel and he saw fit to announce that he considered it a very sacred trust to be used sparingly and only "where either a large segment of the public welfare is endangered or where life and property are seriously and in reality threatened, or where there is a principle involved that will result in substantial and widespread irreparable damage or injury of more than a merely private nature."

Now let us look at the pressing issues which warranted resort to the use of this sacred trust in some of the cases against unions. One case involved the retail meat departments of 11 A & P stores out of a total of the 5,000 stores in the national chain. In the ITU case it was alleged that "there would be paralysis in the newspaper industry" although newspapers printed by substitute methods have continued to reach readers in the Chicago area despite a strike that has been in progress for over a year.

In another case, the Conway Express case, there were involved the operators of an independent freight carrier doing a small volume of interstate work, and a companion case arose out of a temporary cessation of deliveries at the shipping dock of one store outlet of the large Montgomery Ward chain. Where was the danger to a large segment of the public welfare, the serious threat to life and property, the substantial and widespread irreparable damage or injury of more than a merely private nature in these cases? Let us not place any more sacred trusts in an administrative agency which can lead to such an indiscriminate use of such a powerful weapon as the injunction.

The third type of Taft-Hartley injunction, Mr. Chairman, is provided in section 10 (1). This section requires the Board to seek injunctive relief against unions in the case of secondary boycotts and related matters. The employer really gets service under this provision. Such a complaint is given priority over all other complaints and if, after investigation, the Board's agent has reasonable cause to believe that a complaint should be issued, he must—it is mandatory—petition a Federal court for an injunction.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, in such cases a different test of coverage of the act is applied than in any other case. In a recent case the Board declined jurisdiction over a plastering contractor who had been charged with an unfair labor practice on the ground that his activities were essentially local and had only a remote and unsubstantial effect on interstate commerce. The Chairman of the Board stated, however, that the Board would not have a similar discretion to decline jurisdiction if the same case had involved a secondary boycott by a union. The effect of this is well stated by another member of the Board who disagreed with the Chairman. He stated:

> If the employer commits an unfair labor practice, the employees are left without redress; whereas if the union violates section 8 (b) (4) (A) the employer is afforded plenary relief.

I am sure the Chairman of the Board reached his conclusion reluctantly. He had no choice, however, under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

These mandatory 10 (1) injunctions, Mr. Chairman, can be secured only in the case of union unfair labor practices. In answer to criticisms of the one-sided nature of this provision, our opponents have tried to justify this one-sidedness by arguing that this injunction is directed at union practices which threaten the very existence of a business. What are some of these horrible practices, Mr. Chairman? In one case it was the distribution of an "unfair list" and peaceful picketing by one picket. In another case union members refused to work alongside of nonunion workers installing floor coverings, the nonunion men being employees of the supplier of the floor coverings, a retailer of housing material. These are typical of the threats to the existence of businesses which the Board has been required to enjoin under the Taft-Hartley Act.

These injunctions, Mr. Chairman, are issued after a summary proceeding which is in no sense a determination of the merits of the case. The summary nature of injunction proceedings is particularly objectionable when you realize that the effect of an injunction in a labor dispute is not to maintain the status quo, but to upset it by stopping the picketing, boycott, or strike and returning the situation to where it was prior to the action in question. In other words, Mr. Chairman, although these injunctions are supposed to be temporary relief pending the adjudication of the case by the Board, they really effectively and finally determine the outcome of the dispute.

The effect of these injunctions, Mr. Chairman, is to deprive unions of these economic weapons, because their effectiveness depends upon their use at the strategic moment. The lapse of time

between the issuance of the injunction and the final adjudication by the Board of the merits of the case does the union irreparable damage. If the Board later finds that no unfair practice has been committed by the union, there is no possible way to undo the damage done to the union by the injunction. The passage of time is a very effective weapon of advantage to the employer.

Some supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act are willing to retreat to the extent that they will remove the mandatory-injunction provision and leave only the permissive injunction. The new Wood bill makes two major changes in the injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Both are more objectionable to labor than the Taft-Hartley bill itself.

It removes the provision making it mandatory for the general counsel to secure an injunction against an unfair labor practice as defined in sections 8 (b) (4) (A), (B), and (C)—secondary boycotts—the bill would grant new and broad injunction power to the general counsel. In section 10 (j) of the Wood bill, it is provided "whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice under this act, the general counsel may petition any district court of the United States for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter." This means that the general counsel may secure an injunction as soon as a charge is filed with a regional office and before any complaint has been issued in that case.

Section 10 (j) also permits the court to grant a temporary restraining order, an ex parte proceeding—to be effective for not more than 5 days—without any notice or hearing to the party against whom the injunction is issued. Here we have an example of a real labor czar with unlimited powers. I object, and I am sure other Members of the Congress object, to placing such legal authority in the hands of an executive officer.

I want no part of the injunctive provisions, permissive or mandatory. I am basically opposed to any legislative enactment that contravenes a citizen's constitutional guarantees to the right of free speech, free press, and the right to a trial by a jury of his peers.

Injunctions are inherently one-sided since they are much more effective against unions than employers. The effectiveness of the economic weapons of unions depends upon their use at the strategic moment and I do not want any general counsel tipping the scales in favor of employers by exercising his discretion to seek an injunction. The history of labor legislation, excluding of course the Taft-Hartley Act, is the history of efforts to free labor from the pressure of poorly informed and sometimes hostile courts.

The supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act have ridiculed the charge that there has been a revival of government by injunction and have pointed to what they describe as the limited use of Taft-Hartley injunctions. As of January 31, 1949, Mr. Chairman, 41 injunctions had been sought under sections 10 (j) and (l) of the Taft-Hartley Act, all but two of which have been directed against unions. Thirty-nine petitions for injunctions against unions in a period of 18 months. When you consider the far-reaching effect of the injunction upon the relationships of the parties to a dispute, you must agree that this is a high number in a period of generally favorable economic conditions. Compare this number to 83 cases brought under the Sherman Act during the period of 1890 to 1930—83 injunctions in 40 years against 39 injunctions in 18 months. The charge of government by injunction is well-founded.

The fourth Taft-Hartley injunction is that provided in section 208, which authorizes the President to direct the Attorney General to petition for injunctive relief against work stoppages of a national emergency character. Authorities in the field of labor relations have testified that an injunction in most cases serves to aggravate a dispute and to delay its settlement. Of course that criticism is directed to the effectiveness of injunctions. The most ardent supporters of the Taft-Hartley legislation must agree that in the period of slightly less than 2 years in which the law has been operating, it has never settled a single labor dispute through injunctive procedure. In all the instances where the injunction was resorted to, the strike was finally settled around a bargaining table. One instance was the bituminous coal strike of 1948 where the final settlement on a contract was reached 12 days after the expiration of the 80-day period provided for in the injunction procedures.

Once more the Wood bill goes a step further than the existing Taft-Hartley Act in that the procedure for dealing with national emergency strikes is so changed so that the President must get an injunction before he can use the procedure of appointing a board of inquiry to determine the facts in the case. In effect, this provision means that the President may not attempt to use the board-of-inquiry method for settling the dispute until he has secured an injunction to force the workers to continue at their jobs or to return to them.

Here you have a grave constitutional question in which you deny the worker the right to strike. This new move of the coalition against labor is aimed solely at weakening the President's position in settling strikes affecting the national welfare. It kills the 30-day cooling-off period provided in the Lesinski bill and if adopted, would kill the 80-day inhibition against strikes contained in the present Taft-Hartley Act.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that regardless of their effectiveness, the use of injunctions in these situations is fundamentally bad. They increase the resentment of workers who are compelled to work for private employers with no comparable burden put upon the employer and encourage employers to refuse to bargain, knowing that they will have the labor of their employees for at least 80 days on their own terms. In effect, Mr. Chairman, this injunctive provision presents to employers a gift of the forced labor of their employees for a period of 80 days. The injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have been aptly described as hateful and unnecessary. The sole test of a labor-management law should be its effectiveness in promoting collective bargaining and peaceful industrial relations. The sanctions of the injunction, with its overtone of compulsion, will never create harmonious relationships between management and labor.

There is no justification for arbitrary legal prohibitions or compulsions in labor-mangement disputes, no matter how pressing the need for such steps might appear to be in the heat of the moment. The distinction between strikes that affect the public health and safety and strikes that do not is an extremely questionable one, and it is easy to confuse mere inconvenience with emergency. It is safe to say that we have never had a strike in this country that created a genuine national emergency involving a clear and present danger, as distinguished from temporary inconvenience. No such emergencies occurred during the years when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was in full force and they will not occur when that act is restored to full force. Workers and their leaders are no more unpatriotic and no more immune from the force of public opinion than any other groups in our society.

Only a police state can abolish strikes. No country which values free labor can abolish strikes in any industry, however affected with the public interest, so long as the employers are private persons or corporations. The ambiguous and yet undefinited terms "national emergency" and "public health and safety" have been used to cloak a multitude of sins—it should be recalled that Hitler used them to seize and secure his total power over the lives of the people of Germany. Surely a law which justifies and makes possible suppression of the basic freedoms by the Government on these vague grounds creates a greater inherent threat to the public welfare than the contingencies at which it is aimed. The enactment of a law that impairs the rights of one group today establishes a precedent for the impairment of those of other groups tomorrow.

It is revealing that those who have been the most insistent in their use of the catch-all phrase "public health and welfare" to justify the suppression of free collective bargaining in wide sectors of industry are the same ones who oppose most strenuously Government activities designed to further the public health and welfare in limited fields where a genuine need is most apparent and readily definable, such as housing, social security, and health insurance. Their pet peeve is summed up in the phrase "creeping socialism." They are really the mouthpiece for the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Where this injunction procedure has been used, it has definitely hindered the ironing out of grievances and that voluntary mutual agreement between the parties directly concerned that is the essence of collective bargaining and the only sound basis for lasting industrial peace and stability. Strikes are not the causes of industrial unrest but the effects of more basic underlying grievances. The arbitrary suppression of effective

protests against those grievances only serves to aggravate them further and build up pressures that would be bound to eventually culminate in an outburst that all the laws on the books could not control.

Speaking facetiously, Mr. Chairman, may I make the point that all that labor wants out of the Eighty-first Congress is its "two front teeth" which were kicked in by the Taft-Hartley law.

More seriously, Mr. Chairman, labor does not plead for charity. It demands equal justice under law. The right to free collective bargaining. The right to be a part of this great America of ours on an equal footing with all other segments of our society. To grant their plea the Congress must repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reject the vicious provisions of the proposed Wood bill as a substitute for the pending legislation.

I trust it will be the privilege and the pleasure of the House to grant labor's plea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has again expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, according to the schedule which the minority side has worked out under the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], I am going to treat the subject of strikes in national emergencies.

It should be perfectly apparent that we must have industrial order and industrial law just as we have civil law. Without industrial law and procedure we will have anarchy, licensed and legalized, just as we might have lynching, without civil law.

Our trouble with regard to strikes and injunctions, which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] dwelt upon, probably would have been settled under the common law, and gradually worked out in the absence of special legislation. When strikes, under the common law, became concerted action, conspiracy, and a fraud against the individual as well as the public, the courts dealt with such lawlessness. We got into difficulties. Conditions were rough in relations between management and labor. Strangely enough, most of the evils of strikes and injunctions that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] described were a quarter of a century ago. We had not worked out our civil rights in labor relations. I, for one, would be in favor of repealing the Taft-Hartley Act if at the same time we should repeal the Wagner Act, and go back to the free society, rough and tough as it might be. We should be able to work it out under the common law. But we quit that possibility with the Norris-LaGuardia Act. At that time we began to exempt labor unions entirely from the law. We made them anarchists on their own account. They could strike and picket and commit violence; after that there was no satisfactory legal procedure by which order could be restored.

Now we have a system of law that has been developing over the past 15 years, a system of procedures in the Labor Relations Board, in the general council, in conciliation, and in the courts. There is no excuse now for labor not to submit to law and regular proceedings like any other individual or group must submit to law. Certainly, labor cannot be the one exception to the law, the one group that is free to take the law into its own hands. It cannot be allowed to decide what is right by mere men compelling other men to do right or to cease from doing wrong through the compulsions of an individual or a group of individuals without regard to the law or the courts. Under that exemption from law, the Wagner Act was a specific invitation to one group alone in our society to do as it pleased. It was invited to settle its own affairs according to strikes, picketing, and compulsion.

In 1946 we experienced the evils of the railroad strike. That was so bad, prior to the Taft-Hartley hearings, that the President himself introduced a bill in this House to draft the railroad employees into the Army in order by that method to compel the settlement of the railroad strike. Then we got into the coal strike with no law covering the situation. At a nod or a wink, which the court described, 400,000 men quit instantly in an industry Nation-wide, by concert of action in the digging and transporting of coal in the wintertime. That had been a regular annual occurrence for years; something dreaded by the whole Nation. There was no adequate law or procedure to deal with the problem. Squads of rough, tough guys would ride roughshod through a town to warn the people to obey the arbitrary will of a single boss, affecting the property rights of owners, the right to work of individuals, and ignoring completely the public health and safety.

You all remember that. Then came a series of other acts of violence. Whole States were paralyzed by strikes. Half of the State of Pennsylvania was in the grip of a beer war carried on by widespread violence of the transport union.

The provision in the Taft-Hartley Act known as the National Emergency Provision, section 206, was enacted as a result. May I read it to you:

SEC. 206. Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations or engaged in the production of goods for commerce will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof; and if the court finds such threatened or actual strike or lock-out.

First, affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, or if permitted to occur or to continue will imperil the national health or safety, the Attorney General shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike, or lock-out, or the continuing thereof for a period of 80 days.

This does not in any case refer to the right of the individual to quit work. Nobody can argue in reason that when 400,000 men in an entire industry covering a whole nation and the source of supply of the whole nation quit on the tick of a watch in concert that that is merely the exercise of the right to quit work in the ordinarily accepted term. That is instead a conspiracy against the public. It is a use of force, a taking into their own hands the exercise of rights over the property of others and over the rights of individuals to work or not to work, all of which is accompanied generally by violence or threats of violence. Those 400,000 men are not exercising the right to work or not to work as individuals. Their rights are subjected to the whim and will of another mere man who alone gives the nod restoring those individual rights and the rights of property and the health and safety of the public. He alone grants or denies industrial peace.

The Taft-Hartley law covered, therefore, a conspiracy, a lawless act and violence that protected rather than violated constitutional rights.

The best test to find out whether it works honestly and fairly and by orderly procedure is to review very briefly the national emergencies and threatened strikes since the Taft-Hartley Act.

We start with the injunction secured in the atomic-energy case. There the court found, and the affidavits so stated, that the experimentations going on at that time, which was March 5, 1948, in the most critical laboratory of all, having to do with one of the two known materials that have to do with the making of atomic energy and having to do with the carrying on of the national defense, was selected by a group of labor unions for a strike. On the basis of maintaining the continuity of that delicate operation and of our national security, the court granted an injunction. After the appointment of a fact-finding board and after conciliation services were brought to bear under the act, the strike was settled.

In the same month, on March 16, a meat-packers strike was threatened and another national emergency was created. The President immediately declared a national emergency affecting the health of the people and the Attorney General secured an injunction. In that case, and after orderly procedures, the meat-packers strike was settled. There was no disorder; there was no violence to speak of, there was no endangering of the public health, there was no violation of property rights.

And so we went into the second threatened coal strike, into the communications strike, into the maritime strike in June 1948, and finally again into the coal strike of June 1948.

I have copies of the documents here before me. They are perfect representations of what legal procedure does in order to bring about orderly settlements. The final order in the atomic-energy case illustrates fairly well what has happened under this provision of the land. Here is a part of the order of the court:

And, upon the oral hearing of the application of the United States of America for such temporary restraining order, counsel for all defendants—

That is, all of the unions; there were something like 20 of them—

having agreed and stipulated in open court that further hearings are unnecessary and are waived and that, in lieu of the entry of such temporary restraining order and a further hearing on plaintiff's application for a preliminary injunction and for further relief, a final injunction as contemplated by sections 208–210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 may be entered against all defendants in this action on the basis of the showing made at the application for the temporary restraining order.

In other words, the whole business had been satisfactorily settled out of court. The 80-day cooling-off period had worked.

In the Thomas-Lesinski bill there is no such orderly legal procedure provided for at all. First, it provides that the President may make a proclamation in the case of a national emergency in which he asks the parties to desist just as he might make a proclamation for Thanksgiving, asking the parties to observe Thanksgiving or asking the Nation to observe National Flower Week, or some other national occasion, with no power whatsoever to carry out anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As an illustration, I think it was last year, the President appealed to the commercial bankers of the United States to soften down on the aggressiveness of making loans, to make loans more restrictive, in the hope of doing away with some of the inflationary forces. The bankers were not obligated except from the standpoint of protecting the public generally, and, had they not responded, they could have gone on. Now, as I understand the gentleman, under this condition the President would simply make a proclamation that there is an emergency and solicit the assistance of the two parties carrying on the strike which interfered with the national welfare.

Mr. GWINN. Exactly so; exactly as he might have returned to the 1946 period, when he might have proclaimed to all of the railroads in the country, "Gentlemen, there is an emergency; there is snow and ice on the ground; it is terrible to contemplate the shutting down of the railroad systems of the United States." And, yet, that is all he could say, and that is all he did say, and it did not work. So, he had to ask the Congress to draft the men into the armed service. In the coal strike it was the same thing.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentleman referred to the provision of the Thomas-Lesinski bill as just giving the President the power to make a declaration. Is it not true that under that provision the President is given the power to appoint a board with power of investigation, power of research, and power of recommendation?

Mr. GWINN. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. For a period of 25 days.

Mr. GWINN. Now then, let me go on.

Mr. DOYLE. But the gentleman has not stated that yet.

Mr. GWINN. I have not gotten through stating the first one yet. I have here my notes, which I interrupted to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but he should state that fact.

Mr. GWINN. I understand that, and I intend to cover the whole thing.

The proclamation itself has no more power in it than what I have said. The President also has the power to appoint a board to study the situation for 25 days if he declares there is an emergency in national health and safety, but what is his remedy after the board reports? The third provision of the bill is to the effect that his remedy is to request or direct the men to go back to work, with no power to make them go back. If he had that power, that clearly would be unconstitutional. He would be attempting to tell men as individuals, after they have struck and are back home or are working someplace else, to go back to work. But he is without any legal authority to compel them to do so. And he should have no such power. That would be bad in every respect. It violates section 502 of the act. Let me read it to you. It protects the individual's right to work or not to work:

SEC. 502. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent; nor shall the quitting of labor by an employee or employees in good faith because of abnormally dangerous conditions for work at the place of employment of such employee or employees be deemed a strike under this act.

The Thomas-Lesinski bill presumes to give the President power to request or direct without any real authority to exercise compulsion to go back to work, which would be a definite violation of the individual's right. The original Taft-Hartley act and the Wood bill which is proposed make a very great and fundamental distinction in law. The whole process of conspiring as a group to strike in the first place is the illegal act, and the union officials, such as Mr. Lewis, are directed by the injunction not to make the nod in the first place which commits 400,000 men on a national scale to strike. It stops men from conspiring in the first place as an illegal act. It fines the leaders who commit the illegal act. The injunctive process stops the illegal acts instead of trying to compel the individual men go back to work once they are out.

Our plea is that we submit ourselves to legal procedures. That we govern ourselves according to laws. That we put strikes and closed shops and all such exercises of individual compulsory power of men over other men without legal process as wholly illegal and violent and contrary to the concept of a free society under law.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the gentleman from New York who just preceded me does not believe in the principle of free collective bargaining. At any rate he has done his dead level best to keep the Taft-Hartley law on the books ever since hearings started before the Committee on Education and Labor. He has referred many times during the debate to the necessity of the injunction and has referred to coal strikes. Since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law we have only had two work stoppages in the coal industry. The first was in 1947, when there was a memorial period commemorating the Centralia mine disaster which killed 111 coal workers in Illinois. There were no walk-outs in protest against the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On June 30 the mines were returned to the private operators and a brief stay away followed until the new contract was completed giving the miners additional benefits together with 10 cents a ton for welfare funds, which was justifiable inasmuch as no new contract was completed.

In 1948 the dispute was over the disbursement of welfare and retirement funds which was later settled in a manner which was detailed here this afternoon. No one will argue that their leader should be condemned for holding out for a well-financed welfare-fund royalty.

Concerning these gentlemen who have undertaken to defend the Taft-Hartley law and the amended Wood bill, I think we should look in the background and see who is the author of the Taft-Hartley law, and see whether or not it undertakes to protect free collective bargaining. In my judgment it puts the Government on the side of management. In other words, instead of letting the unions and management bargain at the bargaining table, as the Wagner Act did, and which was the basis of the Wagner Act, the Taft-Hartley Act enables management to take a seat at the bargaining table and destroys the principle of free collective bargaining. We have heard much talk about the authorship of the Taft-Hartley law. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, if he had yielded to me earlier this afternoon, if he would be willing to accept the name of the amended Wood bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I am sorry; I do not understand the gentleman. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. PERKINS. I mean, would you be willing that the amended Wood bill carry the name of McConnell?

Mr. McCONNELL. That is agreeable to me. I have nothing against the Wood bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, when these hearings were being conducted a lawyer by the name of Gerald D. Morgan appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor. He revealed the backstage draftsmanship of the House bill. He stated that he had first obtained permission from ex-Representative Hartley and Congressman HALLECK, of Indiana, before appearing before the committee. He stated that several months after the Taft-Hartley law was enacted he received compensation from the Republican National Committee. In the course of that hearing I

asked Mr. Morgan this question. You will find that question on page 1160 and following of the hearings which were held before the Committee on Education and Labor:

I want to make the observation that I have been wondering, ever since we started these hearings, up until I heard this witness, just who prepared the act. I am glad to have this information along with the other counsel who assisted you in the preparation of the act.

I notice from your statement that you applied approximately 24 hours a day in drafting the act for a period of several months, and that you received no compensation until several months after the bill became law. You further stated that when you were paid compensation you were paid by the Republican National Committee and that you had no contract with Representative HALLECK or Mr. Hartley concerning what your compensation would be.

Inasmuch as you applied yourself so diligently and you have disclosed the fact to the committee, would you mind telling the committee just how much compensation you received from the Republican National Committee for this difficult task that you have detailed to the committee?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir, I would not. I received $7,500.

Mr. PERKINS. That is, from the Republican National Committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

The successful efforts of the Republican National Committee in getting the Taft-Hartley law enacted was the first step to take away the gains and benefits which the laboring people received during the 13 years under President Roosevelt. The so-called amended Wood bill is the second attempt of the Republican leadership to hold fast to all gains under Taft-Hartley by forming a coalition group and sponsoring a bill to be offered as an amendment which is even more drastic on the principle of free collective bargaining than Taft-Hartley.

In committee, the original Wood bill was offered as a substitute for the Lesinski repealer, by the ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Committee, and the Democratic members voted down their substitute.

In comparing the amended Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, you will readily detect that the name of Taft-Hartley is eliminated. Notwithstanding the fact that the bill repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and reenacts the Wagner Act; the latter, however, is amended by provisions taken either verbatim or in substance from the Taft-Hartley Act except in a few instances. Although we have a change of name, we still have the Taft-Hartley law incorporated in this so-called Wood bill.

The Democratic Party will not stand idly by and permit the Republican leadership to swap names and at the same time pass another labor law which in some respects is more drastic and oppressive on labor unions than Taft-Hartley.

Now, looking a little further into the background of the Taft-Hartley law, let us see just who did prepare this bill.

Mr. Morgan stated that he was the only person other than the Representatives who sat in on all of the executive sessions during the drafting of the entire Taft-Hartley law. He stated that he received technical assistance from one Gerald Reilly. The evidence before our committee showed that Gerald Reilly at the time of the hearings was receiving $3,000 a month as a lobbyist from General Electric, not considering his many other corporate clients. Mr. Morgan also stated that he received technical assistance from Theodore Iserman, chief counsel for the Chrysler Corp.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] in those hearings made the comment, and I quote his comment. This is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], the ranking minority Republican member of the committee.

He said:

If you had said $25,000 I would not have been surprised, knowing the charges for that kind of work throughout the country.

Here is what Mr. Morgan said about the original draft of the House Taft-Hartley bill:

I have taken the Smith committee amendments to the Wagner Act that had passed the House in 1940, and the vetoed Case bill that had passed both Houses in 1946, combined the two into one document for working purposes, and had incorporated therein a number of additional ideas.

He used those for his preliminary discussions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The average American would be shocked to know that the so-called Taft-Hartley bill was written by the most vicious big-business lobbyist and paid for by the National Republican Committee rather than being written as a fair law to provide equality of bargaining power between management and labor.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the record ought to be straight. What was Gerald Reilly's position at the time of the drafting of this legislation? Is it not true—I am not sure about it, I do not believe I know Mr. Reilly; I do not think I would know him if I saw him, but my understanding is that he was special counsel to the Senate committee at that time; and certainly I believe the gentleman wants to be fair about this.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; that is right. He was special counsel for Senator Ball, so I am informed.

Mr. HALLECK. It was my understanding that he was special counsel for someone in connection with the drafting of the legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not believe that he was employed by the House Committee on Education and Labor. I think that was brought out. As I understand, he was chief counsel for Senator Ball.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. JACOBS. I believe it was well understood by our committee that he was special counsel for someone; we did not know whom.

Mr. PERKINS. I accept the correction from the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Good names are hard to make and preserve; slurs are very cheap and easy to make. The gentleman has been making some statements here concerning Mr. Gerald Morgan.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentleman that Mr. Morgan was for a long time counsel for and served the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives; he was a member of the drafting staff of the House of Representatives. He was regarded by every man who knew him as one of the finest young men who has ever served with us in such capacity. I believe that statement will be concurred in by everyone.

Whatever the gentleman has to say concerning whom he represents is all right with me, but I may say to the gentleman that Jerry Morgan never told you a lie; Jerry Morgan never tried to mislead you; Jerry Morgan never refused any answer that related to anything he did. I just thought that ought to go in the RECORD. He is no employee of mine; I do not even know what State he is from; I do not know what his politics are, and I do not care; but in my opinion Jerry Morgan is a young man of fine ability trying to make a living, and I am not going to sit idly by and let him be slurred.

Mr. PERKINS. In response to the gentleman from North Carolina I wish to state that in my judgment Mr. Morgan is a very astute lawyer, and I do believe that he told the whole truth before the committee when he appeared as a witness. As to whom he was employed by at the time he drafted the act I am not certain; and I want to make the correction in that regard because I was informed that he was counsel for Senator Ball, although that may be incorrect.

Mr. BARDEN. Who is that?

Mr. PERKINS. Gerald Reilly.

Mr. BARDEN. In other words, the gentleman knows nothing improper about or nothing that was detrimental to the good name of Jerry Morgan.

Mr. PERKINS. No; I do not know anything.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman has referred to who wrote the Taft-Hartley Act or law. Can the gentleman tell us and tell the Members of this House who wrote the Lesinski bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Our Members helped us draft that bill. That is in the record in the Senate.

Mr. PERKINS. In my judgment, the Thomas-Lesinski bill was prepared by

Members of Congress for the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2032 is a bill which restores the national policy of free collective bargaining and adds some provisions designed to make the policy even more effective. I want to take a few minutes to explain why, in that bill, we did not include two provisions that are in the Taft-Hartley Act—the provisions requiring the filing of a non-Communist affidavit by representatives of unions, and the use of the injunction in so-called unfair-practice cases of employees as well as in labor disputes.

The elimination of Communists would seem to be the purpose of this provision of the Taft-Hartley Act, but it does not accomplish that. The act affects only a limited number of officers. If these do not sign non-Communist affidavits, then none of the members of the union nor the union itself can avail themselves of the services of the NLRB.

But, at the same time, the union cannot protect itself under the Taft-Hartley Act against disrupters and Communists so long as they pay their dues. They now have rights which the Taft-Hartley Act seeks to protect. It is an unfair labor practice to require the employer to dismiss these disrupters and Communists. If they pay their dues, they can continue to propagandize among loyal workers; they can continue to bore from within; they can continue to agitate for quickies and for political strikes; they can continue to make the life of the union precarious in every way.

Is that the way to weaken the influence of communism in unions?

Communism is a major issue of our time. Let us deal with it as a whole, not in this underhanded way, which strengthens the influence of Communists in unions, on the one hand, while, on the other, it tries to create the impression that Communists are to be found only in unions.

As President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, pointed out at our hearing, we need to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act as an object lesson that unions are free in the United States and that they are encouraged by law to attain equality of bargaining power with employers and corporations.

Of all the provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act, the return to government by injunction is the most objectionable. Injunctions prejudge cases when they are issued at the request of the Government, just as they do when issued at the request of the employer. For practical purposes, the issue of an injunction in an unfair-practice case is an immediate victory for the employer. It settles the issue in the employer's favor and the union rarely finds it advantageous to continue the case in the hope of overcoming the prejudice thus created.

The provision in the Taft-Hartley Act regarding the handling of strikes or threatened stoppages which would jeopardize the national health and safety is the wrong way to approach this problem. The Director of Conciliation testified before the Senate committee that they sometimes had to stop negotiations at a critical period before the dead line provided in the act was reached in order that a board of inquiry might be set up, since a report had to be filed before the President could ask for an injunction. The result was that weeks before the dead line firm positions were taken and negotiations effectively cut off. Then the Board made its report without recommendations, injunctions were sometimes issued, and the question became, not one of settling the controversy but rather of living up to the terms of the injunction. According to the former labor-relations director for New York City who appeared before our committee, the emergency strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act hindered the settlement of the tugboat and longshore disputes in New York.

The Lesinski bill recognizes that there may be national emergencies because of an actual or threatened work stoppage and that the public interest must be protected, but it avoids the use of the injunction process of unhappy experience.

When the President declares that a national emergency exists, he may appoint an emergency board to investigate and make findings and recommendations, which are not permitted under the Taft-Hartley Act, thus missing the opportunity to focus the interest of the parties and the public on a reasonable solution. The status quo will be maintained without the threat of an injunction, as it has been under the Railway Labor Act. This is generally acceptable to both labor and management.

There is no record that the use of the injunction as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act has either solved industrial-relations problems or provided a guaranty against work stoppages. In a number of cases a strike ensued after the entire waiting period was consumed. The effect of the injunction was to delay the strike and then to delay the settlement while discussing the issues raised by the injunction.

The provision in the Lesinski bill shortens the waiting period to 25 days, but it requires that the status quo be maintained during this period and that the board of inquiry make actual recommendations. According to the most experienced men in conciliation and mediation, this is an improvement over the provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act and makes completely unnecessary the resort to the injunction process.

In my judgment—and I do not think that this committee can get away from it, when you consider how this Taft-Hartley Act was drawn up and how big business operated in drafting the Taft-Hartley Act—that we cannot permit the Taft-Hartley Act to stand on the books, and neither will we permit a change to the Wood bill, which is nothing more or less than Taft-Hartley No. 2 that carries some added features, which makes the injunctive power more destructive to labor.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have never been very much given in my service in the House of Representatives to getting up over a tempest in a teapot. But since the matter has been brought up here, I am very happy that the gentleman from Kentucky, who has just spoken, has done what he has to lay the ghost of the charge that the NAM or the Chamber of Commerce or some other business organization wrote the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. He has helped to establish that the act was written by Members of Congress in the exercise of their legislative responsibility.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I just wish to state that it would be my best guess that the NAM furnished the money.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, the gentleman can engage in guesses all he wants to, but there come times when people ought to speak with authority and with integrity. The gentleman should know that his guess is wrong.

The gentleman spoke of Jerry Reilly being employed by General Electric. I do not know whether he is or not. But, I have just had inquiry made, and I understand that——

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me first answer the gentleman. I have had inquiry made and I am informed, not knowing him, and I do not now know what his employment is, but at the time this legislation was being written Jerry Reilly was on the professional staff of the Senate committee. So the gentleman from Kentucky made the wrong guess there.

As far as Jerry Morgan is concerned—and my interest in this is probably as much because of the insinuation about his character or capacity as anything else—I first became acquainted with Jerry Morgan when I met him as an active member of the Legislative Drafting Service of the House of Representatives. I was actively associated with him in his official capacity many times. Since 1935 he had much experience in drafting labor legislation. When it became necessary to arrange for the services of a technician to do the work of drafting legislation to express the policy determined by Members of Congress, I could think of no better person to do the job than Jerry Morgan. He worked on the legislation for almost 6 months for the Members of Congress and no one else, and I saw to it that he was honorably paid for his services.

In my contacts with him I always found him to be completely objective, completely fair, and recognized as undoubtedly the best and ablest authority on matters of labor-management legislation in the whole country.

May I say to my friend from North Carolina that he happens to be a registered Maryland Democrat, first employed by a Democratic Congress. I agree with

the gentleman from North Carolina that he has the confidence and the respect of every man who has served in the Congress who knows him, and I challenge anyone to say anything different.

The manner of his payment was all down on the records in the reports of the committee. I might have put him on my staff to fill the job of administrative assistant, but I never filled that position all the time I was majority leader, for 2 years. I saved the Government a little money by practicing a little economy. However, there were reasons why, from his standpoint as a practicing attorney, with absolutely no connection to prejudice or embarrass him at all, that was not desirable.

So I make no apology for the conduct of the matter. The truth of the matter is that I am glad that this tempest in a teapot has been raised, because it definitely establishes for everyone to know and understand that this Labor-Management Relations Act was written by the Members of Congress who were charged with that responsibility, obtaining the technical assistance and service of an acknowledged authority in helping them, not to write his opinions into the legislation, but simply to do the technical work. That, I may say to the gentleman, as he stays here through the years, if he does, he will find to be highly valuable in writing the legislation the Congress has to pass on.

When we Republicans came in to control of the Eightieth Congress we could not and did not send down to the departments to have a flock of Government lawyers run up here to go to work. The chairman of the committee has said very frankly that the administration helped to draft the present measure. I assume that is right. I trust they conferred with some of the members of the committee up here. I do not believe they conferred with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], who is the ranking Republican member or any other member on our side.

Certainly the manner in which the legislation was written in the last Congress—the Eightieth Congress—ought to commend itself to every fair-minded person in the country. It was a job tackled and done by Members of Congress in the discharge of their responsibility. The bill was then taken before the committee and read for amendment line by line over a period of several days, with 29 amendments adopted. Then the bill went through the process of consideration and amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I say that is something which contrasts with the situation that exists here today, when we have before us a bill drafted by goodness only knows who, after consultations with no one knows who, brought up here and rubber stamped by the committee, written before hearings were held, not after hearings were held, sought to be brought to the floor by the chairman of the committee under a gag rule that would foreclose any amendment, seeking to force the House of Representatives, a great representative, deliberative body, to rubber stamp it without even having a chance to amend it. If that is representative government in action, I cannot see it.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I think some Members are probably mistaken. Nothing has been said which would cast any reflection upon the character or reputation of Jerry Morgan. The point is that the Republican National Committee paid him. The gentleman from Indiana says that they did not have control of the executive branch of the Government and therefore they could not call experts from that branch to write the legislation. What was the matter with the committee of the House at that time, the Committee on Education and Labor, paying? That is the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago an enlightened Federal program for dealing with labor-management relations was brought to an abrupt end by the Eightieth Congress. In the words of one who should know, and I now quote from page 3 of a book entitled "Our National Labor Policy," by Mr. Fred A. Hartley, Jr., a former Member of this body:

> The enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act marked the beginning of a new national labor policy.

The basic purposes of our national labor policy, prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, were to encourage collective bargaining and to protect the rights of workers to organize and designate representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of collective bargaining. Accordingly, the Wagner Act was a simple piece of legislation which legally guaranteed to workers the free exercise of an inherent human right by requiring of employers only that they refrain from using certain unfair practices which interfered with the right of workers to organize and that they, the employers, bargain with the freely chosen representatives of their employees. The Wagner Act provided the minimum of Government interference with the voluntary procedures of free collective bargaining upon which our national labor policy was and should be based. The Wagner Act stated briefly its requirements; established the Board to administer them; provided for judicial enforcement and review; and established a minimum of procedures for the guidance of the Board, properly leaving the further development of administrative procedures to the Board's discretion. To repeat, Mr. Chairman, it was a simple act which could not be less meddlesome.

The Eightieth Congress in a period of emotional stress transformed this uncomplicated act into an intricate piece of legislation into which was placed every provision inspired by the "there ought to be a law" complex which so many persons seem to have—provisions dealing with matters of public policy outside the proper scope of labor-management legislation, provisions collateral to and not directly connected with the subject of labor-management relations.

In the limited time allotted, I want to speak briefly about this one basic issue of national policy in this debate and about three among the many errors contained in the Taft-Hartley Act which contributed to the break-down of the act itself which has now come about.

The basic question is the matter of a national labor policy.

The errors are the writing into the Taft-Hartley Act of one, the requirement that the Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board shall be furnished with facts about the internal organization of unions and financial statements; two, the requirement that before unions can apply for the advertised protection of the act the union officials shall execute affidavits swearing that they are not members of the Communist Party; and three, the so-called mutual obligation to bargain laid upon employers and upon unions.

These three errors are typical of many embedded in the Taft-Hartley Act. It was this assortment of fishhooks and legal booby traps planted throughout the act that justified the comment, made immediately upon the passage of the law in 1947, that the Taft-Hartley Act was hell for workers, purgatory for employers, and heaven for the lawyers. Experience since that date has shown that statement to have been fact.

Today, as the inevitable result of the attempt to put labor relations in this country in a legal strait-jacket, to say "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" at every hour in the daily relationships between workers and management, with stipulated procedures, with the continual overhanging threat of arbitrary use of the injunctive power by the NLRB general counsel at the request of the employer, with both the NLRB and the Labor Department bogged down in paper work required under these and other evil provisions, the administration of the act is a complete and utter failure. It has broken down. By delaying justice for 1 and 2 years, it is denying the justice to workers it was advertised as protecting.

The regional office of the NLRB in the city of Detroit is telling the unions who appeal to it for action on complaints against employers that no action whatever can be expected for at least 4 months.

This means that effective action cannot be expected by workers and their unions in less than a year or 2 years, if the employer takes the matter through the courts.

Meantime, as has been said, employers can get service while they wait in the form of injunctions against unions. They get this short-order service from the ever eager and obedient NLRB General Counsel Denham, who has become expert at serving requests for injunctions off the cuff and sliding them down the counter on demand.

Before discussing this matter of national labor policy and the three evils in the act I should like, Mr. Chairman, to state that I know at first hand out of my own experience the harm that bad labor-management relations can do to all con-

cerned—workers, employers, and the entire community. I know, likewise, the beneficial effects of good labor-management relations. In the industrial city of Toledo it has been my privilege to serve the United Automobile Workers of America, CIO, the Toledo CIO Industrial Union Council, the Toledo municipal government, and the State of Ohio in a variety of official capacities. Both as an official of organized labor and as a public official, I have had opportunities to see the internal workings of the collective bargaining process. Let me assure my colleagues that the problems of labor-managment relations are not nearly as grim, as complex, as difficult of solution as I have heard them described here in this Capital City of our country.

It has been our experience in Toledo, where labor-management relations have been unusually cordial in recent years, that good relations between unions and management depend on good faith. The Toledo plan, which has been studied and praised by scores of industrial-relations experts, was an experiment in good faith. And it worked. It has worked—and it is still working—for the benefit of workers, of management, of the entire community.

The element of good faith has been present in labor-management relations in the city of Toledo for many years. At one time we had perhaps more than our share of discord in my home city. We had strikes—long, bitter strikes in which workers sought only recognition of their union and higher pay for their toil. We had police violence, and the National Guard—and plenty of bloodshed, I regret to say.

But eventually the employers of Toledo came around to the viewpoint that labor organizations were composed of decent, law-abiding citizens who wanted only their share of the American standard of living. Eventually, most employers came around to accept the view that unions are responsible organizations, democratic, and thoroughly in the American tradition. With that acceptance of unions, with that grant to the unions of equitable status at the collective-bargaining table—and in the entire community life—we climbed aboard the industrial peace train in my city of Toledo.

Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act was intended to destroy in dozens of ways—and does destroy—equality of status as between employers and unions. It thereby destroys the basis for sound, equitable, and peaceful relations between labor and management. Already it has wrecked good relations in many plants. If permitted to stand, I fear it would damage, and I feel sure in time would destroy, the good work accomplished under the Toledo plan and all other local and broader arrangements for sound labor-management relations.

A one-sided law, a law loaded against labor as the Taft-Hartley Act is loaded against labor, does not promote collective bargaining, fair dealing, and peaceful relations. It does not promote industrial peace because it denies industrial justice.

Because it provides a legal labyrinth for snaring workers and their unions into endless negotiations, litigations, injunctions, damage suits, and the like, the Taft-Hartley Act is productive only of mutual suspicion, fear, dislike, disgust, industrial conflict, leading to industrial war—a war that would be not of the workers' making, but a conflict forced upon them by individuals, groups, and forces determined, as in the 1920's, to weaken, divide, and destroy unions and the very idea and practice of unionism and collective bargaining in this country.

Turning now to what has been, what is now, and what should be our national labor policy, the single historical fact that stands like a mountain on the great plain of half a century of experience in industrial relations is this: more than wages, more than hours, more than working conditions, more than security of employment, American workers throughout our industrial history have wanted, have organized to get, have petitioned for, have demanded, have gone on strike for, and have sacrificed even their lives to win the right freely to organize into unions and to bargain collectively through unions of their own choosing with employers regarding all these conditions of employment. I insert at this point in my remarks excerpts from findings of commissions and committees that have investigated the Nation's major labor disputes since 1894, the year of the great Pullman strike:

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY OFFICIAL BODIES SHOWING THAT THE PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF INDUSTRIAL UNREST HAS BEEN ATTEMPTS TO DENY TO WORKERS THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE AND TO BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

1894: United States Strike Commission, appointed by President Cleveland, examined 111 witnesses and found, as a cause of the strike, that "the Pullman Co. is hostile to the idea of conferring with organized labor in the settlement of differences arising between it and its employees."

"The company (the Pullman Co.) does not recognize that labor organizations have any place or necessity in Pullman, when the company fixes wages and rents, and refuses to treat with labor organizations. The laborer can work or quit in the terms offered, that is the limit of his rights. This position secures all the advantages of the concentration of capital, ability, power, and control for the company in its labor relations and deprives the employees of any such advantage or protection as a labor union might afford. In this respect the Pullman Co. is behind the age" (p. XXVI).

1898: The Industrial Commission, consisting of 5 Members of the Senate, 5 Members of the House, and 9 management and labor representatives appointed by the President, employed 27 experts, examined 700 witnesses and in its report declared:

"It is quite generally recognized that the growth of great aggregations of capital under the control of single groups of men, which is so prominent a feature of the economic development of recent years, necessitates a corresponding aggregation of workingmen with unions, which may be able also to act as units. It is readily perceived that the position of a single workman face to face with one of our great modern combinations, such as the United States Steel Corp., is in a position of very great weakness. A workman has one thing to sell—his labor. He has perhaps devoted years to the acquirement of a skill which gives his labor power a relatively high value, so long as he is able to put it in use in combination with certain materials and machinery. A single legal person has, to a very great extent, the control of such machinery and in particular of such materials. Under such conditions there is little competition for the workman's labor. Control of the means of production gives power to dictate to the working men upon what terms he shall make use of them" (p. 800).

"The tendency toward unified control of capital and business has only intensified without changing the disadvantages of the wage worker in his dealings with employers. Even when the number of employers is considerable, the number of workmen is far greater. The competition for work is normally far sharper than the competition for workmen."

"The seller of labor is worse off in several respects than the seller of almost any physical product. His commodity is in the highest degree perishable. That which is not sold today disappears absolutely. Moreover, in the majority of cases, the workman is dependent upon the sale of his labor for his support. If he refuses an offer, the next comer will probably accept it, and he is likely to be left destitute. * * *

"Considered merely as a bargainer, as an actual participant in the operations of the market, the workingman is almost always under grave disadvantages as compared with the employer. Except the trifling haggling which he may do in the purchase of his small necessities, he is accustomed to bargain only in the sale of his labor and the bargains which determine the sales are likely to be made at somewhat long intervals. Every employer, small or great, of necessity devotes a considerable share of his attention to bargains of purchase and of sale. If the labor bargain is made with a foreman, the foreman is continually engaged in such bargaining and develops in it a very special skill. * * *

"But aside from all questions of mental dexterity and acquired skill, the workingman is at a disadvantage in that his economic weakness is well known to his employer. The art of bargaining consists in a great degree in concealing one's own best terms and learning one's opponents. The workman cannot conceal his need of work, and cannot know how much his employer needs him. He is relatively ignorant of the conditions of the market, both the market for labor and the goods which his employer produces. It is the business of the employer to keep himself informed of the state of both markets. The employer is able to judge what he can afford to pay for a given quantity and kind of labor rather than do without it. Under such conditions the results of free competition is to throw the advantages of the bargain into the hands of the stronger bargainer" (pp. 801–802).

ECONOMIC RESULTS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"An overwhelming preponderance of testimony before the industrial commission indicates that the organization of labor has resulted in a marked improvement of the economic condition of the workers. * * * (p. 802).

"The power of labor organizations to maintain wage rates, even in industrial depression, is repeatedly referred to in the testimony before the commission, and it is regarded by several witnesses as an influence of great importance in moderating the severity of depression and diminishing its length. By keeping up wages the organizations are asserted to increase the purchasing power of the wage workers, and so to diminish the tendency to overproduction and underconsumption" (p. 804).

DEMOCRACY IN INDUSTRY

"As the units of industry have become large, the individual workman has been further and further removed from the control of his own daily life. He has found himself under the control of powers upon whose conduct he has been able to exercise no direct influence" (p. 804).

"By the organization of labor and by no other means, it is possible to introduce an element of democracy into the government of industry. By this means only, the workers can effectively take part in determining the conditions under which they work. This becomes true in the fullest and best sense only when employers frankly meet the representatives of the workmen and deal with them as parties equally interested in the conduct of affairs. It is only under such conditions that a real partnership of labor and capital exists. * * *

"* * * If the working people are prevented from introducing an element of democracy into industrial life by way of labor organizations, they will undertake to introduce it in another way" (p. 805).

1902: United States Anthracite Coal Strike Commission, appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt, examined 558 witnesses, made a comprehensive study of the circumstances surrounding the 1902 coal strike, and its causes and concluded:

"The occasion of the strike of 1902 was the demand of the United Mine Workers of America for an increase in wages, a decrease in time * * * the cause lies deeper than the occassion and is to be found in the desire for recognition by the operators of the miners' union" (p. 31).

"The Commission is led to the conviction that the question of the recognition of the union and of dealing with the mine workers through their union, was considered by both operators and miners to be one of the most important involved in the controversy which culminated in the strike."

1913: United States Commission on Industrial Relations report upon the Colorado coal strike of 1913 stated that this strike involved:

"* * * as its major issue the demand of the miners for a voice in determining the conditions under which they worked. * * *

"In judging the merits of the miners' demand for collective bargaining, for that share in the management of the industry itself which is called industrial democracy, the Colorado strike must be considered as one manifestation of a world-wide movement of wage earners toward an extension of the principle of democracy in the workshop, the factory, and the mine * * *" (p. 6).

"By industrial liberty is here meant an organization of industry that will insure to the individual wage earner protection against arbitrary power in the hands of the employer" (p. 8).

This report stated that the operators refused to meet with the representatives of the miners.

"* * * in the light of Mr. Bowers' (a representative of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co.) admission that a mere conference would have prevented the strike, the operators' refusal to grant such a conference must be regarded as making them responsible for all the disasters that followed" (p. 86).

In describing in detail the violence in the strike, particularly the "Ludlow massacre, in which 5 men and 11 boys were killed by bullet wounds, and 11 children and 2 women by suffocation as a result of the deliberate firing of the tent colony by the State militia, Federal troops were subsequently sent in by President, and peace was restored."

Responsibility for "a condition of absolute prostration of government and of actual revolution" was placed upon the employers, and particularly upon John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the length of the strike, 7 months, as well as the violence that took place.

Discussing the company union set up and sponsored by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., the report concluded that it embodied "none of the principles of effectual collective bargaining, and instead is a hypocritical pretense of granting what is in reality withheld."

1916: From the final report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, at public hearings throughout the country over a period of 154 days, listening to 740 witnesses, stated:

"It has been pointed out with great force and logic that the struggle of labor for organization is not merely an attempt to secure an increased measure of the material comforts of life, but is a part of the age-long struggle for liberty; that this struggle is sharpened by the pinch of hunger and the exhaustion of body and mind by long hours of improper working conditions; but that even if men were well fed they would still struggle to be free."

The report quoted the testimony of Louis D. Brandeis, later Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court:

"* * * And the main objection, as I see it, to the large corporation is that it makes possible—and in many cases makes inevitable—the exercise of industrial absolutism. It is not merely the case of the individual worker against employer, which, even if he is a reasonably sized employer, presents a serious situation calling for the interposition of a union to protect the individual. But we have the situation of an employer so potent, so well organized, with such concentrated forces and with such extraordinary powers of reserve and the ability to endure against strikes and other efforts of a union, that the relatively closely organized masses of even strong unions are unable to cope with the situation."

And the report continued:

"Both in theory and in practice, in the absence of legislative regulation, the working conditions are fixed by the employer.

"It is evident, therefore, that there can be at best only a benevolent despotism where collective action on the part of the employees does not exist."

1919: The report of the industrial conference called by President Woodrow Wilson to consider the causes of industrial unrest and to devise methods of solution, recommended:

"* * * Employees need an established channel of expression and an opportunity for responsible consultation on matters which affect them in their relations with their employers and their work * * *" (p. 9).

"* * * Representatives must be selected by the employees with absolute freedom. In order to prevent suspicion on any side, selection should be by secret ballot. There must be equal freedom of expression thereafter. All employees must feel absolutely convinced that the management will not discriminate against them in any way because of any activities in connection with shop committees."

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to turn to pages 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the majority report recommending enactment of this bill. Therein is set forth a condensed history of our national labor policy previous to the Wagner Act, under the Wagner Act, and under the Taft-Hartley Act, which is now about to be repealed.

I will not cover that history in detail, other than to point out that, when the Congress enacted the original Wagner Act in 1935, it had reviewed and accepted half a century of experience in industrial warfare caused by the persistent refusal of employers to accept union organization and collective bargaining. It had found that when the National War Labor Board in World War I for the first time applied on a limited scale the principle of collective bargaining, the number of organized workers had doubled, from 2,500,000 in 1915 to more than 5,000,000 in 1920.

In the next 10 years, the Nation had retreated to normalcy, to the phony prosperity of the frenzied twenties. Union membership dropped to less than 3,000,000 organized workers in 1933. Once strong unions, such as the United Mine Workers, were empty shells, having only a few thousand members and nearly empty treasuries. Good union men were compelled by the hunger of their families to conceal their union membership and to work at starvation wages in nonunion mines, mills, and factories.

Some may say there was comparative industrial peace in the twenties. It is true work stoppages dropped from 3,400 in 1920 to 637 in 1930. But this peace was not a peace brought about by industrial justice but by industrial terror and servitude on the employers' terms, policed by labor spies and enforced by court decrees.

Wages dropped to pre-World War I levels while prices stayed high. A depression resulted because the wage earners of America could not buy back a fair share of the products which they produced.

Farmers burned grain for fuel while miners starved because coal could not be sold to busted farmers.

The one exception was in the railroad industry. There, collective bargaining was established.

In 1933, one of the first steps to fight depression was enactment of Section 7–A of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which established the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

With the invalidation of the NRA, the Wagner Act became a necessity and was enacted in 1935. The Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, outlawing the use of injunctions in industrial disputes, changed the climate of industrial relations. Union membership increased from 2,857,000 in 1933 to 7,218,000 in 1937, to nearly 9,000,000 in 1940, to 15,000,000 in 1947.

Then in 1947, as had happened 27 years before, after World War I, we had a return to normalcy.

But this time there was a difference; instead of turning over to the private employer the power to determine the terms and conditions of employment, the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 laid upon the Federal Government the duty to use its powers to determine the terms and conditions of employment under the guise of some paramount public interest.

To enforce these Government injunctions, the Federal injunction was again revived and given statutory directives for immediate use by public officers against unions without a fair hearing. Accused unions and their members were to be hanged first and tried afterward.

At this point, I should like to point out that H. R. 4290 artfully offers to wipe out some of the antilabor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, but at the same time would clothe the NLRB General Counsel with the most monstrous powers ever sought to be assigned to a

civilian officer in peacetime under our form of government.

H. R. 4290 says with a sly smirk that the mandatory use of injunctions on a Number One priority basis under certain circumstances is to be repealed; the use of injunctions is to be made discretionary with the NLRB General Counsel, who shall have the power to seek an injunction in any case in which there has been a charge of an unfair labor practice.

Mind you, the injunction may be obtained by the general counsel before any complaint has been issued by the NLRB, before there has been any hearing on the charge made by an interested party, before there has been any examination of the facts and evidence, before there has been any responsible determination by anyone aside from the NLRB general counsel. Again, we meet Judge Lynch, the law west of the Pecos, that proposes to "hang 'em first and try 'em afterward."

Mr. Chairman, when I consider this and other provisions of H. R. 4290, I feel that we are like children playing with dynamite caps. Believe me, there are dynamite caps strewn all through H. R. 4290 and in other amendments that are to be offered in the course of this debate.

H. R. 2032 is a sober, responsible, carefully considered measure intended and designed to reestablish and implement a national labor policy that helped to bring us out of the depression of the twenties and early thirties, that assisted in giving us as a Nation the productive strength and the greatest industrial production in the history of mankind, and that helped powerfully to win World War II.

We would be stronger now, Mr. Chairman, if we had not taken the wrong turning in 1947, blaming and seeking to punish labor for an inflation and a period of postwar industrial unrest in which wage earners, individually and in unions, were the principal victims.

If labor had been stronger in 1946, if the ranks of the unions had included substantially all the wage earners in the Nation, we would be stronger today, in terms of our internal economy, in the international economy, and in terms of national security. We would have today a healthier distribution and balance of our national income; farmers would be assured of a more stable market at fairer prices for their products; independent businessmen would be assured of a more stable market at fairer prices and profit margins; the specter of unemployment, underemployment, wage cutting, stretch-outs, speed-ups, and shake-outs of the aged would not today haunt the 46,000,000 nonagricultural wage earners in our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this House to defeat legislation that, while paying lip service to union organization and collective bargaining contains deadly booby traps and land mines for the destruction of labor unions and the elimination of collective bargaining in the months and years ahead. By the pessimistic reckoning of some employers, we shall have a surplus of labor that will permit them to pick and choose on what organized labor calls the bad old "red apple for the foreman" basis of favoritism.

Here we get at the real issue in this debate. The issue is between those who really believe in the practice of collective bargaining between free unions and free employers and those who are afraid of the practice of collective bargaining between free unions and free employers and who prefer a pretense at collective bargaining in which labor, no longer free, is handicapped at every stage by the legal and procedural strait-jackets, and ankle-irons proposed in the Wood bill and other amendments to H. R. 2032.

A vote for H. R. 2032, without weakening amendments, is a vote for free unions and free employers; a vote against it or in favor of H. R. 4290 or similar perverting or weakening amendments is a vote against free unions today, against free employers tomorrow, against the practice of democracy in industry. And, not so far down the economic and political road, a vote against H. R. 2032 will amount to a vote against the practice of democracy in both the economic and political fields.

Let us make no mistake about this. Democracy is simpler than regimentation. The Wagner Act and H. R. 2032 are simpler than the Taft-Hartley Act and H. R. 4290. The Wagner Act and H. R. 2032 assert and implement the right to organize and to bargain collectively. That is the living rock on which any sound democratic labor policy must be based.

H. R. 2032 adds to the Wagner Act certain important substantive provisions providing for effective machinery in handling jurisdictional disputes and in declaring that secondary boycotts in support of jurisdictional disputes are unfair labor practices by unions.

In a free society a national labor policy need not and should not go far beyond the establishment of legal guaranty of the right to organize and to bargain collectively. It is fair and proper that an employer should be protected against being caught in the middle of a jurisdictional dispute brought about by no act or wish of his own, and that is provided in H. R. 2032.

One of the Taft-Hartley Act's principal errors was in attempting to take free unions and free employers a long way down the road toward complete "legislative determination of the terms and the conditions of private employment."

That is the issue, Mr. Chairman. We who ask for the adoption of H. R. 2032 are for the exercise of freedom and democracy in American industry; those who urge H. R. 4290 or additional regulatory amendments to H. R. 2032 are lending themselves, I have no doubt unconsciously in many instances, to a regimentation that would apply to wage earners today and, should their substitute be adopted and become the law of the land, to employers tomorrow.

It is obvious to me that such a national labor policy must recognize that collective bargaining is a two-way process. The Wagner Act recognized that fact. It put an end to a whole range of discriminatory practices that had been used by employers to discourage unionism, to break strikes, and to blacklist workers sympathetic to the cause of labor organization.

I realize that it has become fashionable in certain advertising agencies and public-relations outfits to picture the Wagner Act as one-sided. The products of these streamlined agencies were used by the National Association of Manufacturers and many corporations in the newspapers and magazines of this country, and this was fully developed in our subcommittee hearings. But a lie repeated a million times does not become the truth. No matter how many times they tried, big business in America could not disprove the fact that the Wagner Act was legislation designed to curb certain malpractices of industry and to make possible a basis for free collective bargaining. That and nothing more.

It has become equally fashionable to maintain that the Taft-Hartley Act restores a balance. But it does nothing of the sort. In fact, it only restores an earlier lack of balance and then adds repressive features against labor to aggravate still further that lack of balance.

Let me warn my distinguished colleagues as emphatically as I can, so long as the Taft-Hartley Act or its major provisions remain on the statute books, we can never have fundamentally cordial labor-management relations in these United States. So long as workers know the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act form an arsenal of legal weapons for the use either of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or for any employer who wishes to use them, we cannot build good faith and a sound basis of industrial peace.

Our experience is clear. You do not get cooperation at the end of a gun. And the Taft-Hartley Act is just that. Full page ads in slick magazines, widely-circulated questionnaires full of loaded questions, the shrill hysteria of certain radio commentators—none of these can hide the one-sidedness of the Taft-Hartley Act from the workers who are its victims.

No section of the Taft-Hartley Act shows more openly its one-sidedness and its confusion than that section which calls upon elected union officers to sign non-Communist affidavits if they wish to use what few facilities of the National Labor Relations Board are still of importance to them.

My own experience, and the conversations I have had with many union leaders—in national offices and local offices—confirms the fact that the anti-Communist affidavit is of little use to anybody but the factories which produce the paper for the affidavits, and a few clerks at the Department of Labor whose jobs may depend on filing the affidavits into neat bundles. There should be something better for them to do.

I have always opposed Communists in labor unions and everywhere else. My union, the United Automobile Workers, has had considerable success in rooting out Communists from positions of leadership. Other unions in the Congress of Industrial Organizations have had similar successes in recent years. But the affidavits had nothing to do with this

cleansing of Communists from union positions.

There are Communists still holding some positions in some unions in this country. They did not sign the affidavits; they just stepped into other jobs and let their stooges take the elective posts and sign the affidavits. But the Communists were not swept from office in my union by affidavits, and they will not be swept out of their jobs in any other unions, until the members do the job.

The men who have been most successful in meeting the problem of communism in the American labor movement—who have the most experience—do not like the affidavit. President Murray and Secretary-Treasurer Carey of the CIO, President Reuther of the United Automobile Workers, and many others, are unanimously opposed to the affidavits. I think we should heed the words of these men, who might well be considered technical experts on the subject.

Some of the people who still support the Taft-Hartley Act acknowledge the correctness of labor's criticism of affidavits—but with typical refusal to face the facts, they seek to compound error upon error. Rather than repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and its affidavit section, they say: "Let's extend the affidavits, and make employers sign them too." Presumably those paper manufacturers and those Labor Department file clerks will welcome the extra work—but I think their services can be put to better use. I am willing to concede that the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers does not contain a single Communist—though I am often tempted to think that in their opposition to all progressive legislative proposals, they are acting just the way the Communists want them to act.

Even the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, headed by former Senator Ball, admitted that extension of affidavits would have no effect—except perhaps to fool workers into thinking the Taft-Hartley Act was being modified. And the committee pointed out that proposals for such an affidavit by employers might be tossed out by the United States Supreme Court as completely meaningless legislation.

The affidavit section was unnecessary legislation. So was the proposal that unions must file financial statements with the Federal Government. When the Taft-Hartley Act was first under consideration, its sponsors were told that almost every union files public financial statements. It was pointed out that there was nothing secret about those figures.

But Congress legislated on the subject anyway. The unions still publish their financial statements, and the Government files get further clogged with useless papers. Congress legislated against menaces that simply did not exist—both so far as the financial registration provision was concerned and on the whole subject of labor-management relations.

It is time that we heeded the call which they sounded at the voting booths last year. As a first step, we should repeal that evil legislation which has come to represent reactionary spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we pass H. R. 2032 to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act—as a first step toward enactment of the Fair Deal program which the people of the United States so earnestly demand.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, many years ago, some place, I heard the following philosophical bit:

> Don't trouble trouble if trouble doesn't trouble you.

Applying this pithy truth to the serious and important problem before the House today, I make these observations:

The Taft-Hartley Act is a trouble creator. It is a trouble stimulator. It sparks combustible matter.

Successful plant labor relations systems existing in many of our industrial enterprises throughout the country are of delicate, sensitive structure. They are the result of many fine adjustments created by employers and unions through the collective-bargaining process. Generally, in the employee relations history of these plants, there have been some rough periods; strong disagreement between managements and employees, strikes, misunderstanding of motives. Yet, out of these have grown fair and democratic rules of work and pay embodied in negotiated labor agreements. The scars have healed but are remembered.

Suddenly, from the outside, an all embracive statute, the Taft-Hartley law, superimposes a prefabricated labor relations policy tailored to much of the worst in labor relations and little of the best—and these successful plant systems find themselves modified by a heavy superstructure of detailed Federal law. What the original Wagner Act brought together the Taft-Hartley Act rips asunder.

What do we find?

First. Bootleg labor agreements where the employer and the union, having lived with the closed shop, continue to do so without benefit of the law.

Second. Technical rules for serving notices of varied description; employer to union, union to employer; 60-day notices, 30-day notices; notices to reopen a contract, notices to terminate a contract—all calendar-controlled and perilous if a day is missed.

Third. Legal strikes. Illegal strikes. Uncertainty as to where and when legality turns into illegality.

Fourth. The legalisms of "causing," "attempts to cause," "inducements," "attempts to induce," and so on until management and labor representatives turn into curbstone lawyers scanning a statute, long and involved, slated for years of Supreme Court interpretations.

And so on, can I enumerate the new and the novel our industry and our labor finds itself faced and concerned with.

The unnecessary irritations of the law become a factor in the relations between the parties. Sometimes, when misunderstandings arise over new terms and conditions of employment, the Taft-Hartley law provides the cover under which a bad-faith bargainer hides. He gets technical. The law gives him many technicalities for this unworthy purpose. Unions and employers can and do equally utilize this law for subterfuge purposes. Collective bargaining becomes subverted. The National Labor Relations Board becomes many times the recipient of this failure of the parties to meet their responsibilities. These failures are oft clothed in cases filed with the Board—and, when filed, the parties sit back and direct their energies at what amounts to lawsuits rather than collective bargaining. I cite you the Boeing Aircraft Co. case in Seattle, Wash., as an excellent example in point.

I submit that we should not trouble the waters of the fast and rocky stream of industrial labor relations. Let us clear the channel by removing the Taft-Hartley Act and bring back the Wagner Act. Let the Wagner Act be a mere greasing agent for the skids that direct each new ship into the collective-bargaining stream.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee have already been accurately informed on the high-handed methods which were employed in bringing this pending measure to the floor without consideration by the appropriate congressional committee. I must, however, in due fairness, pay tribute to the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in certain respects. In the first place, he made his position and his policy crystal clear. He did not engaged in any double talk or in any way try to mislead the members of the committee. He said, "So far as I am concerned, I am going to follow the instructions of the administration." He made it clear just where he stood and all of us admire this in any man, whether we agree with him or oppose him. And second, I must commend him on doing just what he said he was going to do. I think all of us share an admiration for those qualities in a man which lead to achievement of purpose.

The majority has taken the position that there was no need to consider this legislation in executive session or read the bill for amendment in committee. It has stated that the issues are clear and that the proposed measure merely reenacts the Wagner Act with certain amendments in the field of secondary strikes and boycotts and in jurisdictional disputes. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not entirely true. In section 107 of the bill, there is a so-called improvement of the original Wagner Act which gives legal sanction to the deduction from employees' pay without their consent of virtually any sums the unions might assess. The pending bill extends the automatic check-off to all membership obligations. This would include not only members' dues and initiation fees, no matter how discriminatory or how exorbitant, but also any assessments which the union might levy against the members generally or against particular

individuals. This would mean that unions, in many cases by a simple majority vote of those present at a union meeting, could assess all members substantial sums to be used for purposes to which many minority members might be opposed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would that cover a fine assessed by the union upon a member?

Mr. MORTON. As I understand the pending bill, it covers a fine assessed by the union on a member. For example, let us suppose that a certain union feels that it would be an act of charity and good will to contribute to the parent-teacher association of a nearby school in an underprivileged neighborhood to provide more adequate luncheons and health facilities for the children. Let us further suppose that 20 percent of the membership of this union belong to the Catholic faith and send their children to parochial schools which they support by voluntary donation. These men might justly feel that they would not want to contribute to a fund for the aid of children attending public schools. Yet if the majority so decided, they would have no choice. They would have to stand for the assessments or lose their jobs. It is a part of the American tradition that the majority must work its way. It is also a part of the American tradition that in so doing, the rights of the minority must be protected.

In the areas in which the majority admits that the Lesinski bill departs from the Wagner Act; namely, secondary strikes and jurisdictional disputes, we find a highly complex situation which should have been carefully explored in committee session. The fundamental fallacy of all the arguments in favor of secondary strikes is that they are inconsistent with the basic right of employees to make a free choice as to whether or not they will join a union and bargain collectively through their own representatives, free from coercion by employers. In the face of that right, secondary strikes and boycotts have no justification, for the secondary strike is not directed to persuading nonunion employees to join the union because of the benefits they can obtain by becoming members. It is directed against the employer of those employees.

Both under the original Wagner Act and under present law, the employer cannot take sides. He is forbidden to interfere with his employees in the exercise of their rights. He is forbidden to discriminate in regard to hire or tenure of employment, to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization. Many secondary strikes when used in the past were to force an employer to force his employees to join a union. Under either the Wagner Act or present law, that forces an employer to break the law.

This type of secondary strike and boycott might have had some justification in the era before labor's bill of rights was passed. Since that time a strike by union labor in order to compel their employer to cease dealing with a nonunion employer should have been an unfair labor practice, because the nonunion employer may not legally control or affect the union or nonunion status of his employees. The method by which the union should seek to unionize the employees is not the method of indirect coercion but the direct and democratic method of persuasion and selling itself by the advantages which it offers.

There is one form of secondary strike prohibited under present law which works an injustice to organized labor and it certainly should be corrected. The Taft-Hartley Act has a flat prohibition against the secondary boycott in all circumstances. This provision has been justly criticized on the ground that under it an employer whose men are on strike can farm out his work to another employer who may hire members of the same union. The present law should be amended so as to premit union members to refuse to work on contracts that are farmed out by employers whose employees are engaged in a legitimate strike.

In section 8 (b) (4) (A) of the present law, the owner of a small business is protected against enforced membership in a union organization or even in an employer organization. Most of the members of the committee are familiar with the Dock Street case which was to some degree responsible for the inclusion of the section above referred to in the present act. The Lesinski bill is silent on this subject. Just recently the International Barbers' Union, at its last convention, directed all union barbers to refuse to work at any shop unless the proprietor himself joined the union and paid dues, initiation fees, and special assessments, even though such proprietors had no right to participate in union affairs. Only after charges had been filed under the National Labor Relations Act did union officials agree to stop pressing this demand. If the Lesinski bill is adopted as presented, proprietors of barber shops as well as thousands of other small-business men would be at the mercy of such union demands.

Not content with diluting the prohibitions against secondary boycotts until they are almost meaningless, the authors of the Lesinski bill also seek to eliminate any effective enforcement machinery against such limited boycotts as they concede to be against public policy. Under the Taft-Hartley Act the General Counsel is empowered, if the investigation of the field staff shows a charge to be meritorious, to apply to the United States district courts for injunctive relief. The Lesinski bill deliberately omits any provision for temporary injunctive relief even in the most flagrant case of secondary boycott. The only remedy provided is that the parties aggrieved may file an unfair labor practice charge. The irony of this suggestion becomes clear when it is remembered that the Board is now so far behind in its work that it would take 18 months even in the simplest case between the date of the filing of the charge and the issuance of a cease and desist order. And even then a defiant union could continue to inflict severe economic damage upon innocent third parties and be completely immune from any financial liability, for the Lesinski bill, although providing for the judicial enforcement of Board orders, significantly eliminates any provision for the award of money damages.

The so-called prohibition against jurisdictional strikes which the Lesinski bill contains is just as empty. The Taft-Hartley Act in unequivocal terms made jurisdictional strikes an unfair labor practice and a cause of action for damages unless the employer involved in the jurisdictional dispute was violating a certificate or order of the Board by not assigning the disputed work to members of the striking union. The Lesinski bill not only contains no provision for suits for damages in order to deter jurisdictional strikes but does not make them even unfair labor practices. What it does is to provide that in the event of a jurisdictional strike the Labor Board may appoint an arbitrator. It is only after the arbitrator's award becomes final and binding that it becomes an unfair labor practice to continue a jurisdictional strike. In other words, the bill provides no method of obtaining any effective relief for at least 2 years after such a strike begins if the Board's present pace in keeping up to its docket may be accepted as a fair index.

The problems that I have covered are only a few of the many that we will encounter in trying to write a fair labor-management-relations law here on the floor of the House. I think an overwhelming majority of the people of this country agree that there was a need for the Wagner Act at the time of its passage. I think an equal majority will agree that there has been need for amendment in the years since 1935. The late President Roosevelt, when he signed the act, said that future amendments would in all probability prove necessary.

During the years that followed the passage of the Wagner Act, the union movement grew from childhood to manhood in this country and became the great agent for free collective bargaining. It has made a great contribution to our dynamic economy and to the living standard of the American people. As it grew and as our economy became more complex and more closely integrated, the need for remedial and clarifying legislation in the field of labor-management relations became apparent, but nothing was done by the Congress. This was so because the Wagner Act came to be regarded as a political sacred cow. The elections of 1946 made apparent a great public demand for legislation in the labor-management field. The Taft-Hartley Act was the result of that demand, and its severe impact, both real and emotional, in the labor movement can be, in large measure, attributed to the 15 years immediately preceding in which nothing was done. The present law in its application has demonstrated that it needs amending in several important respects. I favor the amendment of the present law in the light of present needs. I do not see why we should return to something that was passed nearly two decades ago in an entirely different set of circumstances and try to move forward from that point. The union movement in this country

today is strong, powerful, and vociferous. Management in this country today is also strong, powerful, and vociferous. Each of these giants is trying to get the best possible break for himself in the pending legislation. That is human nature. The task that is before us is difficult. We must first free ourselves of the acrimony and emotional overtones which accompany this fight between two giants. We must then proceed to write a bill here on the floor of the House which will protect the traditional American human rights and the welfare of the general public. I urge the members of the committee to proceed on this basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, I spoke and voted against the so-called Taft-Hartley bill when it was before this House for consideration during the Eightieth Congress. I felt it was a mistake at that time and the best proof that those of us who voted against the bill were right is the fact that a coalition is here with a bill which makes a gesture of amending this antilabor law instead of repealing it outright and enacting a new law in keeping with the desires of millions of organized and unorganized workers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I was chairman of the Committee on Labor during the Hoover administration and was complimented by that administration for the humanitarian and constructive legislation reported and enacted into law at that time. Members of the House for years sought membership on the Labor Committee for the purpose of relieving the burdens of the toiling masses instead of reporting and helping to enact into law oppressive antilabor legislation. If you will read the House rules and manual pertaining to the powers and duties of committees you will find that every legislative committee of the House, such as Agriculture, Armed Services, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Post Office and Civil Service, and Veterans' Affairs, consider and favorably report legislation helpful to and in the interests of those who come under their jurisdiction, with the exception of the Committee on Education and Labor, which committee during recent years has been doing the very reverse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire for amity between employers and employees. I have always deplored strikes, for the time and money lost through paralyzing strikes can never be regained. I do not condone acts of some labor leaders, and at the same time I am unalterably opposed to legislation oppressive and punitive to nearly 60,000,000 workers by reason of the acts of a few. I do not condone acts of unscrupulous lawyers who have been disbarred from the practice of their profession. But no sane person would attempt to condemn and punish the entire legal profession, from which the judicial branch of our Government is drawn, for those who disregard the ethics of that noble vocation. I do not condone acts of doctors who destroy human lives before they have seen the light of day, still I would be the last to attempt to condemn every member of that calling because some doctors have disgraced their profession.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore the effects of the Taft-Hartley law on the party founded by that great humanitarian Abraham Lincoln. Our democratic form of government calls for two strong parties numerically divided as nearly as possible. The 60,000,000 workers in this country, with the exception of a few, are God-fearing, law-abiding, home-loving patriotic people. The Taft-Hartley law in effect has been an indictment of these workers. Regardless of the intent of the proponents of the act, it has been generally accepted as an indictment and is strongly resented by them.

During the Revolutionary War, when the American Colonies were fighting for their independence, British Imperialists and Tories were demanding the extermination of what they termed the rebels. Edmund Burke, a great statesman and orator of that day, made a speech in the British Parliament urging conciliation in which he said:

> I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people. I cannot insult and ridicule the feelings of millions of my fellow creatures.

Burke made that statement concerning less than 4,000,000 people in the American Colonies; how much more true are his words when you multiply this to sixty million.

The Taft-Hartley law evidently cared nothing for the nearly 60,000,000 workers in this country, with the result that the law has driven millions of workers away from the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, and reduced it to a hopeless minority.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill which is before us wisely makes no provision continuing the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations established by the Taft-Hartley Act. It wisely makes no provision for any committee similar in set-up and authority to the so-called watch dog committee.

The watch dog committee has for all practical purposes expired. I would not have it revived. This committee functioned long enough to demonstrate its ineptness and undesirability. It functioned long enough to demonstrate the manner in which quasi judicial functions can be interfered with by Members of Congress. In that way, and that way alone, it performed a useful function.

Public investigatory bodies, of course, may perform a valuable function, if they are constituted with due regard to the interests to be affected by their actions. Official commissions of one kind and another have performed and are performing laudable services for this Government. In this connection, it will be remembered that the President recommended to the Eightieth Congress the appointment of a temporary joint commission to inquire into the field of labor-management relations before laws on this subject were passed by that Congress.

In recognition of the correlative responsibilities involved, the President at that time in 1947 recommended that such commission be composed of Members of Congress, chosen by the presiding officers of the two bodies, and representatives of labor, management, and the public to be appointed by him. The Congress did not provide for such a commission. Instead, Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act, besides substantially doing away with the Wagner Act, did create an investigatory committee. This committee was authorized to study the field of labor relations and to make recommendations to Congress. The President had recommended that similar authority be reposed in a commission. As authorized however, the distinction between the joint committee and the President's recommended commission was fundamental. Neither labor, nor management, nor the public interests were directly represented on the joint committee. It was strictly congressional. It was not formed to obtain helpful tripartite assistance, as the Government had so often done in the past, or to share responsibilities in the complex, dynamic field of labor relations with leaders in this and allied fields. It walked alone. It is not strange that such a committee was ineffectual. It is not strange that it failed in obtaining cooperation. Listen, however, to this puzzled expression of the committee in its report issued in March 1948:

> Early in December 1947 we issued a public statement inviting unions, employers, employees, and the public to bring to our attention any case of an inequity created by the new law. We promised a complete investigation followed by recommended amendments should such an inequity be established. Our statement received wide publicity in the press, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and was extensively circulated. There was no response to our invitation.

The committee was surprised. I cannot say that I am.

The joint committee was authorized specifically to investigate, among other related subjects, the administration and operation of Federal laws relating to labor relations. It is the exercise of this authority which has earned it the name "watchdog." It is the manner in which this authority was exercised which runs counter to the independence of the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

Chancelor Kent considered the separation of powers between the three branches of our Government, as provided in our Constitution, a vital principle of freedom. I believe that such a division of powers is generally held to be vital to our system of government. It is the province of the United States Congress to pass laws. It is not the province of the Congress to execute laws, to expound laws, or to enforce laws. It is furthermore not appropriate for the Congress to inject its influence directly into the execution or the exposition of the laws.

The general counsel of the Board clearly stated before a committee of the Senate considering his confirmation that he felt it would be a privilege to consult the joint committee as to its interpretation of the various questions regarding the act before he took a position upon them. The close relations subsequently maintained between the members of the watchdog committee and the Government officials administering the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, certainly created a ready channel for the transmission of committee interpretations. Other evidence before the labor committees of this Congress show that communication between members of the respective bodies and their staffs was a constant occurrence. These communications, furthermore, involved personal conferences. Reports to Congress appraising the work of the Board, including the discussion of pending cases, were printed and circulated. There was no doubt as to the opinion of the committee on this law and its operation. No means of reaching the Board officials seemed to have been overlooked.

I believe that the fostering of police committees which offer the possibility of interference with the other branches of our Government is contrary to the effective organization of that Government. I believe that any committee which functions as the Taft-Hartley watchdog committee functioned imperils in basic aspects the liberty of our administrative and judicial officers.

H. R. 2032 does not provide for constant legislative scrutiny of the Labor Board activities. It does provide for cooperative efforts by the various interests of our country in improving the highly important functions of labor-dispute machinery. These efforts would be directed to the prevention of labor disputes, as well as to the formulation of policies and procedures most conducive to the peaceful settlement of disputes which do arise. Labor, management, and the public would express their views on these subjects through representation on labor advisory committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor. These advisory committees would assist the Secretary in administering the mediation and conciliation functions which would be restored to the Department of Labor under the bill. The creation of such committees would be a revival of a practice previously instituted by the Secretary of Labor. You will recall that the services of tripartite committees were most advantageously utilized by the Secretary of Labor in behalf of the Conciliation Service prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the conciliation and the mediation functions of the Government which may be exercised by the Federal Mediation Service are restricted in several respects. These restrictions would be removed from the reconstituted Conciliation Service under H. R. 2032. In the first place, the assistance of the Service would not be prohibited in connection with any particular class of cases. In the second place, it would be able to assist freely in the settlement of disputes involving existing agreements. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, Federal assistance may be offered in grievance cases under existing agreements only as a last resort and in exceptional cases. This appears to me to be a serious deficiency. A labor dispute is just as undesirable whether it arises under an existing contract or from conditions outside of the contract. It is just as costly, just as wasteful and disruptive of the interests of all concerned. The treatment of arbitration procedures under the Taft-Hartley Act is, in my opinion, not tenable. It is, of course, true that settlement by the parties concerned under a method agreed upon by the parties is the most desirable method for the settlement of any disagreement. But the parties should not be pushed into providing such a method. This is too much the same thing as compulsory arbitration. It is not in any sense free collective bargaining. Disputants in large numbers of cases should not be penalized by being deprived of governmental assistance in reconciling their differences. The Federal Government desires, it is my understanding, to foster industrial peace. The Federal Government desires to minimize industrial strife. But its assistance in attaining these aims is halfhearted under the Taft-Hartley Act. For disputes arising under existing agreements, the Federal Government may come in as a last resort, or in exceptional cases.

The state of desperation should not be a condition precedent to Government aid in labor disputes even under existing agreements. An effective conciliation service should assist the parties to a dispute in developing and perfecting arbitration techniques when necessary at any stage of disagreement. Such a service can also give invaluable aid to the parties to a dispute in framing basic issues to be decided by arbitration. These services can be utilized before an impasse had been reached, whether the dispute involves an interpretation of an existing contract or otherwise. These services could prevent an impasse with its undesirable psychological influence and time-consuming effects. You will recall that the United States Conciliation Service when it was located in the Department of Labor successfully performed functions relating to arbitration.

H. R. 2032 would remove the restraints on conciliation and mediation services imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act. Within the discretion of the Director of the Conciliation Service, the facilities of such Service could be made available in any labor dispute. This bill would also remove the impediments regarding the role of the Federal Government in arbitration. Assistance by the Service in connection with arbitration procedures would be authorized whether the terms of an existing agreement are an issue or not. The Service could once again function in the area of arbitration without serious hindrance. This area is a critical one. I believe that here the Federal Government can perform a valuable service in stimulating industrial peace. For this and other reasons I give H. R. 2032 my hearty support.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make these remarks during this debate because the cancellation of construction of the great carrier by the Secretary of National Defense affects so much business and business management and labor that I think it should be brought up and considered during this debate.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ACTS WITHOUT AUTHORITY

In my remarks I am going to include the editorial written by Mr. David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Star for Monday, April 25, 1949. This article deals with the devastating blow that has been dealt to the United States Navy by the autocratic method used in abolishing the construction of the large aircraft carrier.

May I remind the leadership of this Congress and all of the Members that by law—by statute—enacted in Congress this carrier was authorized. In other words, there is a Federal statute on the law books which states the United States Navy can go ahead and build this great ship. Now, I ask you, is there any law which gives the Secretary of Defense, or any person, the authority to nullify an act of Congress and thereby show the world disrespect of this great legislative body? Is this a dictatorship or is this a Government of the people conducted by their representatives in Congress. Are we selling out our freedom from within or is this Nation going to remain a democracy? This act of the Secretary of Defense shows most clearly that he has failed—and utterly failed—to consider this problem from all viewpoints. He has injured most severely the morale of the great United States Navy—the same Navy that defeated Japan in the Pacific; the same Navy to which the great Japanese Empire surrendered. He has dealt a devastating blow to the national security of the United States.

How about the representatives of the people? The Secretary of Defense by this single-handed act of dictatorship has cast disrespect upon the leadership of this Congress. I am just a woman, but a woman interested in national defense, a woman interested in our form of government. If this Congress is to hold the respect of the people of this Nation—yes, if the freedom of this country is to survive, I appeal to this leadership to stand up and fight. Join my voice and let the Secretary of Defense know that Congress is still in operation and that Congress is still the legislative body of this Nation that determines policy, and that Congress will not stand idly by and permit any person in Government or out of Government to violate the authority of the people's representatives assembled.

My fellow Members, this carrier was authorized by the President of the United States. The President of the United States told the Navy he approved of this ship and he wanted it constructed. Has he made any statement or taken any responsibility in this momentous autocratic decision of the Secretary of Defense? That is a question I should like to have answered.

My time is up. I appeal to you to read the article by Mr. David Lawrence, included here in my remarks, and I appeal

to every Member here, if he believes in the respect of Congress and in constitutional government, to rise up and inform the Secretary of Defense he has made a grave error and that it is the intention of Congress to correct that error.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of April 25, 1949]

JOHNSON SEEN DEFYING CONGRESS BY HALTING WORK ON NEW CARRIER—UNIFICATION THREATENED BY LETTING TWO SERVICES VETO PROJECT OF THIRD

(By David Lawrence)

Unification of the armed services—long sought by Congress and the American people as a desirable objective—has just been dealt a devastating blow.

In defiance of the express authority of Congress, the new Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, has permitted two of the armed services to pair off against the other.

Instead of confining the Joint Chiefs of Staffs to the definition of functions and missions agreed upon in the famous Key West document on joint operations, the Secretary last week asked the head of each service to sit in judgment on what tools the other services shall have to carry out their missions. It is a plain violation of the spirit of the Key West agreement.

This is what the decision to halt work on the super aircraft carrier means. Twice Congress had the matter up and authorized the Navy to allocate its tonnage according to its own best judgment. There is no power in any existing law which authorizes either the President or the Secretary of Defense to ignore the authorizations made by Congress for the armed services.

Yet last week Secretary Johnson, in effect, put before the Joint Chiefs of Staff the question of whether the will of Congress should be superseded. The Joint Chiefs of Staff met and decided to put its views in writing. Three letters were delivered to Secretary Johnson on Saturday morning last and within half an hour the decision of the Secretary was given to the press—even before the head of the Navy, Admiral Louis Denfeld, knew about Mr. Johnson's decision.

NO CONSULTATIONS HELD

Worse than this, at no time since Mr. Johnson became Secretary of Defense has he consulted the Chief of Naval Operations about the matter nor has he given the Secretary of the Navy, John L. Sullivan, a chance to talk with him about it.

This merely confirms what has been suspected ever since Mr. Johnson took office—namely, that he came with preconceived judgments and did not approach the problems with an open mind. No man now should be given the powers which have just been asked of Congress for the Secretary of Defense after such a flagrant example of arbitrariness has been revealed.

It is not the halting of work on the aircraft carrier which is so important. It is the basic principle which is at stake.

For if, by a stroke of the pen, the Secretary of Defense can ignore the statutes of Congress, he can overnight ask for a vote from the Joint Chiefs of Staff on whether the Marine Corps shall be absorbed in the Army and whether the naval air arm should be absorbed in the land-based air forces and these steps really could mean the weakening of the defense of the United States.

This is not unification but disintegration. The blow that has been struck at the morale of the Navy will be felt throughout that service. All eyes had been fixed on the Secretary of Defense to see how he would handle the carrier issue. He was, however, not even graceful in his disposal of a difficult problem. He did not give either the Secretary of the Navy or the Chief of Naval Operations the courtesy of a personal conference.

SULLIVAN'S SITUATION

It is difficult to see how Secretary Sullivan can continue in office or how any self-respecting man can accept office as his successor if he is to learn of important decisions affecting his department by reading about them in the press. It is difficult to see how the Joint Chiefs of Staff is to function effectively hereafter without a specific definition of its duties. For otherwise, the Navy head, for instance, will be called on to decide how many tanks the Ground Forces shall have and whether B-36's shall or shall not be built in quantity and other details of the weapons desired by other armed services with which the Navy is not familiar.

The vote by the JCS was two to one—with the Army and Air Force chiefs voting against the Navy. Neither the Army chief nor Air Force chief had a top command in the Pacific or saw a large-scale naval war. The carrier problem is a technical matter in which the Navy is expert. It won the war against Japan largely by naval carrier action.

The only solution is to let each armed service specialize in its own way, each helping the other on joint missions as worked out already in the famous Key West agreement which was unanimous. This can be accomplished only if, after a lump sum is decided on as a total for all services, the right of each service to use to the best of its ability the money allotted to it will not be impaired. If the Navy's appropriation had been cut in half recently, it still would have preferred to develop the new aircraft carrier because it believes that weapon is vital to naval operations and to antisubmarine warfare. It is a sad and tragic story which should be fully aired in Congress so that the American people will know the whole truth.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, on July 5, 1935, the Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act of 1935—the so-called Wagner Act. The stated purpose of that act was to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes. The act contained provisions for the organization of employees into labor organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining, defined unfair labor practices of employers, established a National Labor Relations Board with investigatory and enforcement powers, and provided for judicial review of orders of the Board.

The Wagner Act continued in effect until the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947—the so-called Taft-Hartley Act—which was passed by the Congress on June 23, 1947, and became effective on August 22, 1947.

The stated purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act was to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The Taft-Hartley Act enlarged the National Labor Relations Board to five members, provided that employees may refrain from labor activities, defined unfair labor practices of labor organizations, modified procedures of the Board, established an independent agency—the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—to assist in the settlement of labor disputes, provided machinery to function in connection with strikes imperiling the national health or safety, contained provisions for suits by or against labor organizations and provisions for boycott and other unlawful combinations, prohibited labor organizations from making political contributions, and created a Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management to study the subject.

On January 5, 1949, the President in his message on the State of the Union stated that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed and added:

> The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.
>
> The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within that Department should be placed in it.

The present Taft-Hartley Labor Act was conceived in a punitive spirit. It is not fit for piecemeal correction. It is an offense to our democratic processes. The present labor law has not reduced strikes. It has merely loaded the legal scales against unions, it has exposed their treasuries to harassing suits. It has had only a limited effect on reducing Communist influence in unions. The non-Communist affidavit sections of the act that have been introduced into our law are a dangerous menace and a definite threat to our liberties.

The proposed bill (H. R. 2032) will protect every legitimate public interest. It would continue to protect employers against minor but generally irritating union practices. And it would rid the country of the anti-union spirit of Taft-Hartley.

The proposed bill would abolish the specific legislative sanctions for injunctions to deal with so-called national paralysis strikes. It would eliminate Taft-Hartley provisions abolishing the closed shop, limiting the union shop and absolutely banning all secondary boycotts. It would restore to unions the right to bargain freely for a full closed shop and would repeal the Taft-Hartley provisions expressly inviting State laws against union security more drastic even than Taft-Hartley.

Organized labor is clearly subject to appropriate regulation by Congress. But Taft-Hartley is not the base from which to start.

The Taft-Hartley bill is intertwined, interdependent, one section upon another, and interrelated. So that to try to amend Taft-Hartley without full repeal would lead to a very confusing, contradictory, and extra legal labor law, almost inconceivably unworkable.

President Philip Murray, of the CIO, branded the original Wood bill as being more viciously repressive of labor's basic

rights than the Taft-Hartley Act itself. The gentleman from Georgia, Congressman WOOD, has now revised his original bill purportedly to meet some of the objections of labor to the original draft. An analysis of the revised bill, however, demonstrates that the present Wood bill, H. R. 4290, still reenacts most of the substantive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and in several important particulars strengthens Taft-Hartley provisions to make them even more objectionable to labor. No one who reads the Wood bill, H. R. 4290, will be deceived by the language which purports to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. This statement in the bill is mere sophistry. The Wood bill is the Taft-Hartley Act plus additional anti-labor prohibitions. The few concessions in the Wood bill purporting to eliminate or change Taft-Hartley provisions are inconsequential and insubstantial. They constitute window dressing which will deceive no one.

Any vote that may be cast for the Wood bill is a vote against labor and against the public interest.

The following is an analysis of the salient provisions of the revised Wood bill, H. R. 4290:

First. The discretionary right of the general counsel of the NLRB to obtain injunctions is retained and in fact enlarged by permitting injunctions to issue merely upon a filing of charges that an unfair labor practice has been committed and without investigation, proof, or hearings. This would extend rather than curtail government-by-injunction which is conceded to be one of the outstanding abuses of the Taft-Hartley Act. Under this provision the Norris-LaGuardia Act would become a virtual nullity.

Second. The disenfranchisement of economic strikers imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act, and conceded even by Senator TAFT to be unjust, is substantially retained in the Wood bill through the device of permitting economic strikers to vote only if they are not replaced 90 days or more before the election. Obviously, employers by delaying petitioning for election until 90 days after the hiring of strikebreakers can still effectively prevent economic strikers from voting in Labor Board elections.

Third. The Taft-Hartley Act language which has been interpreted to prevent peaceful picketing by labor unions is retained by the provision of the Wood bill prohibiting restraint or coercion by unions.

Fourth. The ban on secondary boycotts provided in Taft-Hartley is modified only to a very limited extent. The modification permits a union, if its collective agreement so provides, to refuse to work on struck goods where the striking employees are members of the same union. Most justifiable economic boycotts are, therefore, still prohibited. The provision of the Taft-Hartley Act making it mandatory for the general counsel to seek injunctions in secondary-boycott cases is modified to give the general counsel discretion whether to seek such injunctions. But as pointed out above, this discretionary right is extended to permit injunctions to be issued merely upon the filing of charges alleging the union has committed this or any other type of alleged unfair labor practice.

Fifth. Unions continue to be subject to unwarranted lawsuits in the Federal courts, as permitted by Taft-Hartley.

Sixth. The check-off provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are made more restrictive by making it necessary to procure new check-off authorization cards each year, thus burdening unions with this additional unnecessary administrative burden not now required under Taft-Hartley which permits automatically renewable check-off cards.

Seventh. While the Wood bill purports to eliminate the Taft-Hartley requirement for a union-shop authorization election it provides that 30 percent of the employees can petition for an election to prohibit a union shop and retains most of the other complicated Taft-Hartley election procedures, including employer election petitions and decertification provisions.

Eighth. The Taft-Hartley Act permits discharge for nonmembership in a union under a union-shop agreement only if the employee was discharged from the union because of failure to pay dues. The Wood bill, while permitting discharge also for expulsion because of Communist affiliation or participating in a strike in violation of a contract, would not permit discharge for expulsion from the union because of antiunion activity, embezzlement of union funds, or other recognized intolerable practices.

Ninth. The Taft-Hartley provision making more restrictive State laws against union security superior to the Federal law is retained.

Tenth. The Wood bill would make illegal closed or union-shop agreements entered into prior to the Taft-Hartley Act and continuing for a term of years. Such agreements are prevalent in industries enjoying stable collective-bargaining relationships and their validity was recognized and preserved by Taft-Hartley. The Wood bill in this as in other respects goes beyond Taft-Hartley. Furthermore, the general prohibitions against all closed-shop contracts is retained although it is declared not to be an unfair labor practice for an employer "merely to notify a union of opportunities for employment." This vague language does not realistically meet the need of legalizing the hiring hall and other similar forms of union security.

Eleventh. Taft-Hartley restrictions on collective bargaining in relation to welfare funds are preserved.

Twelfth. The Government's power to to seek injunctions in national emergency strikes is broadened by providing for the issuance of such injunctions even before the appointment of an emergency board rather than as in Taft-Hartley after such appointment.

Thirteenth. The agency definition of the Taft-Hartley Act under which international and local unions have been held responsible for acts not actually authorized or ratified is retained.

Fourteenth. The Taft-Hartley restriction on political contributions and expenditures by labor unions is retained.

Fifteenth. The so-called free-speech provision of Taft-Hartley which goes far beyond the legitimate protection of the constitutional right of employers to free speech is retained.

Sixteenth. The Wood bill, like the Taft-Hartley, would preserve the general counsel of the NLRB as a labor czar by continuing the present separation of powers as between the Board and the general counsel first introduced in the Taft-Hartley Act. This is contrary to the unanimous expert opinion that the NLRB, like all other similar administrative agencies should be restored to the procedures prescribed in the Administrative Procedures Act.

Seventeenth. Like Taft-Hartley, the Wood bill provides for a separate Conciliation Service rather than for the return of the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor where it properly belongs.

Eighteenth. Numerous other provisions of the Wood bill are Taft-Hartley provisions like the individual-grievance clause, the exclusion of supervisors from the protection of the act, the jurisdictional-dispute section which, in fact, is made more unworkable by limiting the opportunities for parties to settle their own disputes and the non-Communist-affidavit requirement which is enlarged to require such affidavits by employers as well as unions.

Now no amount of apology or any number of alibis will only serve to further confuse the membership of this body. You have a clear mandate to remedy an abominable situation. I call upon you to exercise that right.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has a responsibility to the people which it intends to fulfill. In the elections of last November 2, the people were given a clear choice in the important matter of labor legislation. One major party, in its platform, endorsed the Taft-Hartley Act and called for its continuance. The other major party, in its platform, came out unconditionally for the repeal of this particular statute. The issue was also clearly drawn in the campaign addresses of the candidates of the respective parties.

On November 3, when the votes were counted, the preferences of the people became known to the Nation and the world. The American people had elected the Presidential candidate who opposed the Taft-Hartley Act. At the same time the electorate sent into oblivion members of the Eightieth Congress who endorsed the Taft-Hartley Act, choosing in their stead legislators pledged to repeal.

The facts were placed clearly before the American people in the campaign of 1948. The issue was sharply drawn. Then, on election day, the people spoke. We in this House are representatives of the people. They have given us their mandate. It is a clear and undeniable mandate. We must carry it out or else stand convicted of a breach of faith.

I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House, as sincere believers in the democratic process, feel as I do that the Congress desires to carry out this mandate of the people. And I am equally sure that many

members of the Republican Party, although their platform favored retention of the Taft-Hartley Act, will vote in favor of the bill now before us. For the people's mandate expressed on November 2 last is a mandate to the Eighty-first Congress as a whole—to all Members of the House and Senate alike. It cannot be denied, however, that the obligation is particularly emphatic in the case of the Democratic Members of the present Congress. Let it never be forgotten by any Member of this House in this month of April 1949, that we solemnly pledged, by the mere act of running for election under the Democratic standard, that we would uphold and carry into execution the provisions of the platform. The provision of that platform which binds us and concerns us now is the provision calling for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been a malicious law. It has done grave harm in the 2 years that it has been on the books. Its chief injury has been in the breeding of bitter resentment among the tens of millions of patriotic citizens who are classified as wage earners. The working people of the Nation, who sacrificed so much and contributed so tremendously to our victory in the recent war, feel that they have been rewarded for their sacrifices by being slapped in the face. The working people are convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act, while ostensibly the creation of Mr. TAFT, Mr. Hartley, and like-minded legislators of the late and unlamented Eightieth Congress, was actually drafted by the gang of high-priced corporation lawyers sent to Washington in 1947 by the National Association of Manufacturers and its allies.

The Taft-Hartley Act is regarded by the workers of the Nation as a millstone around their necks. Instead of having the opportunity to strive for the redress of grievances and for a somewhat fairer share of the wealth they produce, the workers of this country, thanks to the Taft-Hartley Act, find that the scales are weighted all the more heavily in favor of the employers.

This country has come a long, long way since the time of Judge Gary and others of similar convictions. No longer is it believed beneficial to the Nation to have men and women working for a miserable pittance. No matter where one goes, whether it be among industrialists or wage earners, economists, or lawmakers, there is general agreement that the United States can be economically strong and can continue to progress only if purchasing power among the millions is kept at a high level. We can produce so much of every conceivable commodity that it is imperative that we make all the people of our Nation, not merely the wealthy and the well-to-do, capable of becoming customers for these commodities.

Experience has shown that we can look to only one institution to bring increased purchasing power to the tens of millions of average working people of our Nation. That institution is the trade-union. Because the trade-union performs this most essential function in our economy, labor organization deserves to be protected and encouraged. Everyone benefits when there is adequate purchasing power in the possession of the people. The farmer benefits because the worker with money in his pocket can buy an adequate supply of what the farmer produces. The merchants benefit in a similar manner. The doctor and the dentist, the manufacturer of shoes, and the manufacturer of automobiles, indeed every person or company with something to sell benefits when mass purchasing power is kept at a high level.

This is so elementary that it ought not to be necessary to take time to spell it out. Unfortunately, there are people who overlook this basic factor. The authors of the Taft-Hartley Act overlooked it. As a result of the vicious law which they wrote and which the Eightieth Congress enacted over a Presidential veto, the purchasing power in the hands of the masses of our people is today inadequate to maintain prosperity in America. As everyone knows, the sales of shoes, hats, dresses, household furnishings, and a thousand and one other useful articles in the stores of our Nation have fallen off sharply. It is no secret that hundreds of factories around the country have this year closed down for varying periods, sometimes 1 week, sometimes 10 weeks or more, because the little people of the Nation just do not have the money to buy all the shoes and all the refrigerators and all the other commodities which we can produce and must sell.

This is the great harm which the Taft-Hartley Act has caused. If there had been no Taft-Hartley Act, the trade-unions of this country would have been able to go forward during the past 2 years. They would have been able to win added and necessary purchasing power for the working people of the Nation—the largest segment of people in our country at the present time. Instead, the unions have been compelled to fight hard and often at tremendous expense, as, for example, in the case of the typographical workers in Chicago, merely to keep from being driven back.

Well, the Taft-Hartley Act must go. That is the decision of the American people. That must also be, and I am confident that it will be, the decision of this House as well as of the Senate. The Taft-Hartley Act is a very bad law and we shall rid ourselves of it.

What is to take its place?

The House now has before it an excellent bill. This bill is H. R. 2032, reported favorably after careful consideration by the Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 2032, which is usually referred to as the Lesinski bill, is now before us, and I strongly urge its passage by the House as it is written.

The Lesinski bill does three necessary and very constructive things. First, it eliminates the one-sided, brutal Taft-Hartley Act. Secondly, it reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. Thirdly, it modifies and strengthens the statute of 1935 so as to make the proposed new law, which will be known when passed as the National Labor Relations Act of 1949, a model labor-management relations statute.

The Wall Street Journal, the Journal of Commerce, and the publications of the National Association of Manufacturers have unleashed a barrage of misrepresentation in regard to the Lesinski bill. At this late date, their false charges are clearly recognized for what they are. No intelligent Member of this House is going to be swayed by irresponsible and mendacious allegations against a splendid bill which emanate from such sources as the NAM and the journalistic mouthpieces of big business.

H. R. 2032 is a highly meritorious bill in that it does away with the monstrous Taft-Hartley Act and reenacts the Wagner Act. This is what the country wants and needs. Under the Lesinski bill wage earners will once again have the right to organize and bargain collectively without interference from their employers. Collective bargaining is the only sound means of attaining fair working conditions and fair wages.

The Wagner Act was a fair and constructive statute. It did not attempt to dictate and control every act and decision of the employers or the workers. It sought only to bring about an approach to equality of bargaining between workers and employers. This it achieved. And it achieved equality of bargaining, so desirable in the public interest, with a minimum—an absolute minimum—of interference.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a club in perpetual motion against the workers and their organizations, which they formed in order to protect themselves and further their economic interests. The Taft-Hartley Act has a thousand and one prohibitions and hobbling and interfering features. "Don't do that, don't do this," says the Taft-Hartley Act. "You can't do that. Oh, no, that's prohibited. As for this, that is absolutely forbidden. No, you daren't do that." And so on and so forth. Governmental interference carried to the *n*th degree—and all this, oddly enough, at the behest of an association—the NAM—and a political party—the Republican Party—which have long cried out loudly against this self-same evil.

The Wagner Act affords a refreshing contrast to the Taft-Hartley Act. In the Wagner Act there was the absolute minimum amount of interference which history had shown to be essential. The Wagner Act simply says:

First. Employers must not use unfair labor practices that interfere with the freedom of workers to organize.

Second. Employers are obliged to bargain with the representatives of their employees.

The Lesinski bill reenacts the Wagner Act. It also provides for the return to the safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in 1932. It was passed—by a Republican Congress, incidentally—because of the evil of the use of injunctions in labor-management relations.

Now, I have said that the Lesinski bill amends the Wagner Act in certain respects. There are several amendments and, in my judgment, as in the judgment of the Committee on Education and Labor, these are wholly constructive. I shall refer to these amendments a little later and explain just what they are.

The Lesinski bill is the type of bill which deserves to have the support of fair-minded legislators, of Members of this House who believe in justice not only for the employer but also for the man and woman who must work in order to live.

The Lesinski bill embodies the principles of justice in the realm of labor relations. It encourages free collective bargaining. It is designed to afford an opportunity to workers to secure a fair return for their labor. It requires the employer to play the game according to rules that are fair and square.

The Taft-Hartley Act, in sharp contrast, merely has given lip service to these principles of fair play. Actually, it was written to encourage antilabor employers to fight the organization of labor and to undermine genuine collective bargaining by ranging the power of government on the side of the antilabor employer.

Until the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, the policy of this Nation for 15 years had been the encouragement of free collective bargaining. This policy had served us well. It was a major factor in pulling the Nation out of the worst economic depression in history.

It is necessary that the Federal Government shall play a part in the effectuation of the policy of encouraging genuine collective bargaining. This is dictated by the realities of modern economic life. However, while playing its necessary part, it is imperative, if we are not to flout the basic principles of our democracy, that the amount of Government interference and coercion should be at a minimum.

These requirements of a satisfactory labor-relations law are fulfilled completely in the Lesinski bill, now before us.

Since 1935, when the Wagner Act went into effect, experience has demonstrated the need for certain changes. The President has pointed this out at various times in his messages and reports to the Congress. H. R. 2032, therefore, in addition to repealing the Taft-Hartley Act and reenacting the Wagner Act, embodies the amendments necessary to bring the Wagner Act up to date.

Let us go through the bill to see just what it contains. This is a very important piece of legislation. It is, therefore, essential that we should take the time necessary to analyze and understand it thoroughly.

There are four titles. Title I, section 101, provides for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Section 102 reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 as it existed prior to Taft-Hartley.

Section 103 of title I continues the National Labor Relations Board as a five-member tribunal. Provision is also made for the continuation of the present panel system. It has been found that the work of the Board is accomplished more expeditiously with five members than under the three-member set-up established by the Wagner Act. Another change is an increase in the salaries of Board members from $12,000 a year to $17,500 a year.

Title I, section 106, deals with the subject of unjustifiable secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes. The Lesinski bill has been written in accordance with the principle that only those employer or union practices which prevent or interfere with free collective bargaining should be prohibited. Disputes between two or more unions over which one has jurisdiction over the performance of a particular work task do not promote free collective bargaining. If an employer is guilty of an unfair practice when he deals with a union other than the one chosen by the majority of employees, it should likewise be an unfair practice for a union to compel him to do this.

Therefore, the Lesinski bill provides certain amendments. These amendments make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to cause employees to engage in a secondary boycott or a strike for the following purposes: First, to compel an employer to bargain with one union if another has been certified by the Labor Relations Board, or if the employer is required by an order of the Board to bargain with another union, or if the employer already has a contract with another union and a question of representation cannot appropriately be raised under the act; second, to compel an employer to assign certain work tasks contrary to an award issued by the Labor Relations Board under the proposed amendment to section 9 (d) of the Wagner Act.

There is no blanket prohibition of all types of secondary boycotts in the Lesinski bill, as there is in the Taft-Hartley Act. This provision in the Taft-Hartley Act has been used ruthlessly to prevent unions from using legitimate measures in the defense of wage standards and conditions of work.

The Lesinski bill makes provision for the appointment of arbitrators in jurisdictional-dispute cases. Either the Board or an arbitrator named by the Board may make an award in a jurisdictional dispute.

Section 107 of title I amends section 8 (3) of the Wagner Act to permit employers to make collective-bargaining agreements providing for the closed shop or other forms of union security or for the check-off of union dues and assessments, notwithstanding the provisions of State laws. The purpose of this provision is to eliminate the subjection of employers and unions in interstate industries to conflicting rules.

Section 107 will remove the illegality of closed-shop agreements introduced by the obnoxious Taft-Hartley Act. The stabilizing influence of the closed shop in the printing industry, in garment manufacture, in construction, and various other industries, is well established. Section 107 has the effect of enabling employers and unions once again to bargain freely and to agree upon such union-security provisions as they find mutually desirable.

In this connection it is appropriate to refer to a statement made by Mr. Paul M. Geary, executive vice president, National Electrical Contractors Association, when he appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate. Mr. Geary said:

> As employers, we feel that legislation outlawing the closed shop impairs the employer's right of contract. If an employer prefers to deal only with a group of men who have sold him their worth and responsibility, should he not be permitted to do so? To ban the closed shop is merely to restrict further the employer's right to bargain and to contract with persons of his own choice.

Title II of the Lesinski bill deals with mediation and arbitration. This title provides for the return of the United States Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor, which is where it obviously belongs. The bill emphasizes the function of the Conciliation Service as an aid to collective bargaining and industrial peace and by stressing the need for the Service to assist the parties in settling their differences voluntarily through arbitration as well as through the aid of mediation and conciliation.

Title III of the Lesinski bill deals with situations which arise when work stoppages occur in vital industries which affect the public interest. Wherever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he is to issue a proclamation and appoint an emergency board.

This board must make its report to the President within 25 days after the issuance of the proclamation. The report will include both the board's findings and its recommendations. The report will be transmitted to both parties to the dispute and it will also be made public.

A total cooling-off period of 30 days is provided—25 days during which the emergency board is making its investigation and report and five additional days after the report has been submitted.

As is well known, the force of public opinion is a mighty force indeed. The procedure established under the Lesinski bill makes it possible to secure from a group of impartial and respected experts findings and recommendations upon the basis of which an informed opinion can be reached. By directing the emergency board to make recommendations as well as findings, both of which are to be made public, this national emergency provision of the Lesinski bill invokes the tremendous power of public opinion as a stimulus to agreement between the paries.

Title IV is the last title of the Lesinski bill. It is entitled "Miscellaneous Provisions."

Section 401 restores in full force and effect the prohibitions in the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act against the issuance of labor injunctions.

Section 402 deals with political contributions. It restores the political-contributions provision of the Corrupt Practices Act as it existed prior to the Taft-Hartley Act. It is no more than right that this correction should be made. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, labor organizations were singled out as the one

type of volutary unincorporated association whose political activities should be restricted. This ban was not applied to voluntary organizations representing farmers, veterans, businessmen, or other groups.

H. R. 2032, which is now before the House, is identical with S. 249, the Thomas bill, which has been reported favorably to the other Chamber. H. R. 2032 has been endorsed by the Nation's foremost authorities on labor-management relations. For example, Dr. William M. Leiserson has spoken highly of this bill. Dr. Leiserson is impartial. He knows whereof he speaks. He was formerly a member of the National Labor Relations Board and chairman of the National Mediation Board. This is what he said:

I think this is the kind of bill that we need at this time.

The Lesinski bill is a bill which carries out the mandate of the American people. It carries out the recommendations of the President in his message on the state of the Union, delivered last January 5. The need for this bill has been made clear in the evidence presented by witnesses who testified before the committee when the Lesinski bill was under consideration there.

The sooner there is a restoration of harmony and mutual respect between the parties in the realm of labor-management relations, the better it will be for all Americans—for employers as well as workers, for farmers, for businessmen, for merchants and, indeed, for all who participate in our economy. The sincere practice of collective bargaining, with both labor and employers satisfied that the Federal law treats both sides equitably, will enable our country to go forward once again.

The Lesinski bill is fair to labor, fair to employers, and fair to the country as a whole. It is an excellent bill in every respect. Its prompt enactment would be clearly in the national interest.

For all of these reasons, I earnestly call upon the Members of this House to brush aside the last-minute substitute proposals of those who wish to nullify the popular will and I strongly urge that the Members proceed as promptly as possible to the passage of the constructive, honest, and fair Lesinski bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, on the roll-call vote today on the rule, under misapprehension and misinformation, I voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show I intended to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will stand. The vote itself cannot be changed at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I sought and obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a chart. I have been informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $300 to print this chart. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the additional cost it may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include addresses and newspaper material.

Mr. BURKE asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include certain material mentioned.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLEVENGER (at the request of Mr. JENKINS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMPSON until April 27, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

563. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Secretary of the Army recommending enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for certain adjustments on the promotion list of the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

564. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for the requirements of Federal aeronautical agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

565. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for baseboard radiation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2514. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3181. A bill to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3717. A bill to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to the Swan Island Animal Quarantine Station; without amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2906. A bill to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4081. A bill to amend section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to permit the delivery of excess peanuts to agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and to define the term "cooperator" with respect to price supports for peanuts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Louis Esposito; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter; with amendments (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3458. A bill for the relief of Celeste Iris Maeda; without amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3497. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; without amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4346. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the contruction of public school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 4347. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit certain former citizens of the United States to regain their citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4348. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 4349. A bill to provide that unclaimed animals lawfully impounded in the District of Columbia be made available to educational, scientific, and governmental institutions licensed under this act shall be made available for scientific purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4350. A bill to name the twin highway bridges over the Potomac River in the District of Columbia the "George Washington Memorial Bridge" and the "Thomas Jefferson Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4351. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to convey to the port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal or port purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4352. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS (by request):

H. R. 4353. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4354. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4355. A bill to provide for lump-sum payments to certain Reserve officers assigned to duty as naval air navigators or naval air observers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 4356. A bill to make it an offense against the United States to use the flag of the United States for advertising purposes, or to mutilate, defile, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 4357. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure by contract in the open market and in the manner common among businessmen, the services of engineers, engineering associations, or organizations needed or required in connection with the acquisition or construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 4358. A bill to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4359. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to extend assistance to veterans with certain service-connected disability, involving the loss of both lower extremities, in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 4360. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4361. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize regular appropriations for the construction of rural local roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 4362. A bill providing for the conveyance to the Franciscan Fathers of California approximately 40 acres of land located on the Hunter Liggett Military Reservation, Monterey County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower Congress to regulate the use and ownership of trade-marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. Res. 194. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Mary Leimgruber; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. Res. 195. Resolution for the relief of Doris Batey Cox; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to appropriations for the propagation of fish in Arizona; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full $250,000 recommended by the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and that thereafter a minimum of at least $250,000 be provided annually in the appropriations to the Department of the Interior until the current conditions have been corrected; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the work of Dr. Ralph Johnson Bunche in bringing about a peaceful settlement of the Arabian-Israeli dispute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolutions 7 and 21, to enact legislation relating to the disposal of temporary housing; and memorializing the Federal Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Federal Government in relation to reimbursing the State of California and the reconstruction of flood-control works on the Sacramento River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 529, which provides for the establishment of a Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 1549, which provides aid and assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to making a full and thorough investigation of the possibilities of obtaining for the State of Colorado a liquid-fuel plant or plants; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to require price support of eggs at the top grade, including frozen and shell eggs, with deductions for under-grade eggs, and to eliminate the present practice of supporting only the price of dry eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation to return the grounds and buildings of the Fort Des Moines Army post to the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose all legislation designed to establish a single Federal Reserve force and to retain intact the National Guard as it is now organized, thus reserving to the States the controls provided by the Constitution and insuring that the National Guard will be at the disposal of the State in time of peace; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging prevention of eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest in the town of Ayer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation to provide compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts for certain services rendered by them to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, protesting the action of Gen. Lucius D. Clay in commuting the sentence of Ilse Koch and requesting the proper authorities in Washington to have the matter reviewed in order that the ends of justice may be served; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to direct the United States mint to strike off a commemorative silver half dollar in commemoration of a century of railroad operation out of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the rights and privileges of veterans of World War II under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to excise taxes on furs, and to amend H. R. 1211 to provide suitable import quotas on furs to protect the domestic producer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to condemning the report of the Committee on Civilian Components recommending the establishment of a single Federal Reserve or militia as unconstitutional, and to resist this effort to centralize the military power in Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation effecting the disclosure to the tax administrators of the

States taxing cigarettes by shippers thereof in non-cigarette-taxing States of shipments of cigarettes to other than State-licensed distributors in cigarette-taxing States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass appropriate legislation effecting the disclosure to the tax administrators of the States taxing cigarettes by shippers thereof in non-cigarette-taxing States of shipments of cigarettes to other than State-licensed distributors in cigarette-taxing States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide funds for carrying out and performing items 1 to 13, inclusive, of the interim survey report for the Arkansas River and tributaries of the lower Arkansas River watershed made by the Soil Conservation Service in conjunction with the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to keeping the National Guard of the United States intact; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and to make appropriations for the development of a harbor suitable and sufficient for ocean shipping at the mouth of the Rogue River on the Oregon coast in Curry County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging appropriation of Federal funds to assist in Ketchikan road project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting legislation to give the people of Alaska the powers of initiative and referendum and recall; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that Senate bill 533, Eighty-first Congress, not be enacted into law; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that H. R. 976 and 2031 or other suitable legislation be enacted to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting an appropriation of funds for the study, control, and eradication of fruitfly pests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the enactment of S. 566, a bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate amendments of title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," to take effect upon the admission of Hawaii to statehood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Nora Toma Trabilsy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarence F. Moore, John Robert Lusk 3d, J. R. Lusk, Sr., Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk, Mrs. Willie Pruitt, and Mrs. Billie John Bickle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4365. A bill for the relief of Fe'R. Dumaguing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4367. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Jose Joao Santo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4368. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Jose Casimero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Eugene F. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of May Hosken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Shiro Takemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Bernadette Jones Marchbanks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Ray. G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 4374. A bill for the relief of Filipe Guerreiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Michele Belardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. D. Broughton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4377. A bill for the relief of Adelchi Colecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wisniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

655. By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memoralizing the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation concerning the granting of loans to members of the fur-farming industry in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

656. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition of the City Council of the City of Pittsfield, favoring the establishment of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

657. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging prevention of eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest in the town of Ayer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

658. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation to provide compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts for certain services rendered by them to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

659. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the Arizona House of Representatives, relating to the propagation of fish; to the Committee on Appropriations.

660. Also, memorial of the mayor and City Council of the city of Mesa, Ariz., memorializing the Congress to pass, and the President to approve, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

661. By Mr. NELSON: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, opposing all legislation designed to establish a single Federal Reserve force, and to retain the National Guard as it is now organized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

662. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Dr. Harvey L. Zwald and citizens of Eldred, McKean County, Pa., urging repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

663. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Fifth Congressional District Conference of Townsend Clubs, Sanford, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means

664. Also petition of Mrs. Fannie E. Thomas and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that we may have the mind and mood of the Master as daily we seek to find a just and righteous solution to the problems of human relationships.

We pray that Thou wilt take our groping and faltering spirits and transform them into centers of light and power in the building of a finer social order. Kindle within us a keener sense of responsibility for the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

May we have the faith and the courage to believe in the coming of the Kingdom of God. May our vision of its splendor be so glorious that we shall make its consummation the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors.

Hear us in the name of the blessed King. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 26, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hunt	Neely
Anderson	Ives	O'Conor
Brewster	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cordon	Knowland	Stennis
Donnell	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Gurney	Magnuson	Wherry
Hayden	Malone	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hill	Miller	Withers
Hoey	Mundt	Young
Holland	Murray	
Humphrey	Myers	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent because of illness in his family.

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations is conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact, and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], asked that an announcement be inserted after each quorum call to this effect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and insert matters in the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on Friday of this week and Tuesday of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to hold hearings on several housing bills tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 1194 AND S. 1196 RELATING TO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, April 29, 1949, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1194 and S. 1196, similar bills relating to the control of subversive activities. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee immediately so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred, as indicated:

REVISED ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 60)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation involving an increase of $464,000, Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1950, in the form of an amendment to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 5, 1948 (Public Law 897) entitled "The Agricultural Act of 1948" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution urging Congress to support the Ickes plan for a Federal educational trust to be administered in behalf of Federal aid to State education

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in a case argued by the Honorable J. Howard McGrath when he served the people as Solicitor General of the United States, has ruled that the paramount interest of the people must prevail in their ownership of tidelands' oil; and

"Whereas the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, formerly Secretary of the Department of the Interior and Oil Conservation Administrator during World War II, has proposed, with the endorsement of President Truman, the establishment of a Federal educational trust; and

"Whereas under the terms of the trust, the royalties from the sale of the people's oil in the tidelands shall be placed in the trust, to be distributed among the States for Federal assistance to education, public and private; and

"Whereas such a trust would result in the avoidance of any Federal taxes for the purpose of extending Federal aid to education in the States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the general assembly, mindful of the need for additional Federal aid to education in the various States, does record its support of the Ickes proposal for a Federal educational trust; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the members of the congressional delegation from Rhode Island, and to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes."

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"A joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood

"Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii have applied to be admitted to statehood; and

"Whereas these Territories have long been valued possessions of these United States, and the people thereof in times of both peace and war have demonstrated their loyalty, their spirit of self-sacrifice, their trustworthiness, and their abilities to be good citizens; and

"Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are important outposts in the preservation of world peace and in the defense of the shores of the continental limits of these United States, and their admittance to statehood will strengthen the position of these Territories in the defense of our shores and in the maintenance of world peace; and

"Whereas the peoples of these Territories are capable of self-government and are desirous of joining the family of States comprising this American Republic: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood and that the necessary enabling legislation therefor be enacted during the current session of Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. E. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved, April 21, 1949.
"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in whole or in part

"Whereas the Secretary of Defense brought into being in 1947, the committee on Civilian Components, commonly known as the Gray Board, and which committee was directed by the Secretary of Defense to make a comprehensive, objective, and impartial study of the armed forces, and

"Whereas said Committee on Civilian Components on June 30, 1948, in its report to the Secretary of Defense, recommended, among other things, that national security required that all services have one Federal Reserve Force which should be accomplished—

"(a) by establishing the reserve forces of the Army under the 'Army Clause' of the Constitution;

"(b) by similarly establishing the reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate legal authority;

"(c) by incorporating the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps into the Army Reserve force under the name of 'The National Guard of the United States';

"(d) by incorporating the Air National Guard and Air Reserve into the Air Force Reserve force under the name of the 'United States Air Force Reserve'; and

"Whereas on December 15, 1948, the Secretary of Defense recommended to the President of the United States, among other things, the federalization of the Air National Guard; greater Federal control over the personnel, equipment, facilities, allocations of money to the States; and

"Whereas federalization of the National Guard, in whole or in part, by the organization of a single Federal Reserve force under the army clause of the Constitution instead of under the militia clauses of the Constitution as the National Guard is now organized and under which the soverign States retain the authority for the appointment of the officers of the National Guard and the authority for the training of the National Guard in time of peace in accordance with the discipline prescribed by the Congress; and

"Whereas such federalization would violate the principle of 'States' rights' in that the framers of the Constitution contemplated a standing army as the only Federal force is clear from the arguments advanced by Hamilton, whereby he persuaded the States to accept the principle of a standing army, large enough to accomplish the immediate purpose of the Congress only; its size to be controlled by limiting appropriations to a period of two years only, with the further agreement that the States would maintain no troops in time of peace, other than with the consent of Congress, in exchange for the provision that the Congress would have power to provide for the organizing, arming, and disciplining (training) the Militia and reserving to the States only the power to appoint officers and the authority to train the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; and

"Whereas complete federalization would violate the principle upon which the States bargained, as above explained, by giving to the Federal Government, in addition to its own standing army, a part of the militia over which the States would have no control or power whatsoever, instead of the control provided in clause 16, section 8, article I of the Constitution; and

"Whereas nowhere in the Constitution is there any power given to the Federal Government to do other than raise and support armies and standing armies only were contemplated with no power ever given to the Federal Government to organize and support a Federal militia and none exists; and

"Whereas Federalization of the National Guard as now constituted under the militia clauses of the Constitution, in whole or in part, would not only violate the principle of States' rights but would violate existing agreements between the Federal Government and the soverign States whereby the States accepted in good faith the allotments made by the War Department in 1945, and have completed the organization of such allotments, insofar as authorized by the Congress and for which funds have been provided; and

"Whereas federalization of the National Guard, air or ground, as recommended by the Secretary of Defense and the Committee on Civilian Components, would destroy at one blow the National Guard as it now exists and which has rendered exceptional and valiant service to the Nation in two World Wars and in time of peace would impose fantastic costs beyond the ability of the Nation to meet and would seriously jeopardize our national security and would result in the centralization of all military power in the Federal Government and ultimately in the hands of a few, and thus pave the way for the establishment of a dictatorship, military or otherwise, in this country; and

"Whereas on February 6, 1946, the Federal Government allotted to the several States, Territories and the District of Columbia some 6,000 units of the National Guard to be organized into divisions, brigades, regiments, regimental combat teams, nondivisional units and of the Air National Guard, which units the States accepted in good faith and have at this time organized upwards of 5,000 units with an approximate strength of upward of 312,000—all that the Congress has authorized for the fiscal year 1950; and

"Whereas the federalization of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Gray Board on June 30, 1948, and the federalization of the Air National Guard, as recommended by the Secretary of Defense on December 11, 1948, would result in the complete destruction of the National Guard, almost overnight, and leave the Nation almost defenseless at a very critical time and, in addition, impose fantastic costs for national defense, and

"Whereas the States would be left without an internal security force and would be compelled to organize and maintain State troops at great cost to the States with the result that there would thus be maintained a Federal Reserve and State military force, creating a great duplication of effort and expense while the National Guard, as it is now constituted and controlled, not only furnishes the necessary internal security for the States but, in addition, serves as a component of the Army of the United States and a first line of defense thereof as provided by the National Defense Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby memorialized to retain intact the National Guard of the United States, ground and air, as it is now organized under the militia clauses of the Federal Constitution and thus reserve to the States the controls provided by the Constitution in time of peace and insure that it will be at the disposal of the States in time of peace and that there will be unity in the armed forces of the Nation at a time when unity is so essential; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress and Members of the Minnesota delegation in Congress.

"Approved April 21, 1948.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee battlefield in Renville County, Minn.

"Whereas on September 2 and 3, 1862, there was fought at Birch Coulee in Renville County a battle with the Indians of great historic importance, at which soldiers and pioneer citizens, heroically fighting against overwhelming odds, laid down their lives; and

"Whereas said battlefield has been set apart and designated as a State park and cemetery of the State of Minnesota by laws 1929, chapter 75; and

"Whereas said battlefield, by reason of its unsurpassed natural beauty and advantageous location is eminently suitable for a national cemetery for soldier and sailor dead, and there is urgent need for such cemetery in this section of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Minnesota, the house of representatives concurring, that the Congress of the United States of America be and hereby are requested to establish a national cemetery upon said battlefield, and to provide for the acquisition by the United States of the necessary ground therefor, including the ground already set apart as a State park and cemetery, or so much thereof as may be required; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this legislature that in case the Congress shall establish a national cemetery upon said battlefield, the State of Minnesota will cede to the United States that part of said battlefield which has already been set apart as a State park and cemetery and will consent to the acquisition by the United States of such further ground as may be desired for a national cemetery; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, by the proper officers of both houses, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the presiding officers of Senate and House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN O. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved April 20, 1949.
"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, Mrs. C. D. Wright, chairman of the legislation department, General Federation of Women's Clubs, sent me a telegram yesterday informing me that at the annual convention of the federation, now being held in Florida, a resolution was adopted endorsing the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2. This is the amendment now before the Senate Judiciary Committee calling for a reform of our procedure for electing the President and Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas under the present procedure the election of the President and Vice President of the United States does not necessarily reflect the will of the people: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1949, urges the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing the electoral college and dividing the electoral vote in each State in proportion to the popular vote.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF CAROLINAS-VIRGINIAS HOSPITAL CONFERENCE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Assembly of the Carolinas-Virginias Hospital Conference at Asheville, N. C. on April 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolution ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CAROLINAS-VIRGINIAS HOSPITAL CONFERENCE, ASHEVILLE, N. C., APRIL 22, 1949

A motion was made and passed unanimously that the Assembly of the Carolinas-Virginias Conference go on record as endorsing the voluntary health insurance bill introduced by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, to the Congress of the United States on March 30 last, and that the following be a resolution spread on the minutes of the conference and that each State separately report this action to its association members:

"On March 30, 1949, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, introduced to the Congress a bill which authorizes grants to enable the States to survey, coordinate, supplement, and strengthen their existing health resources so that hospital and medical care may be obtained by all persons on a voluntary basis.

"It is a significant reinforcement of a highly successful voluntary effort by the American people to provide health protection for themselves.

"It emphasizes the fact that local government still best recognizes the needs of its people, and, thereby provides for local and State participation financially and administratively.

"It recognizes that many areas of health care are still not completely provided for—such as mental and tubercular facilities—and stipulates that surveys shall be made in each State in order to develop plans for meeting the needs, and ultimately extending the complete health services to all the people.

"To us locally, it means that there will be no change in the purchase of voluntary pre-payment plans by those people able to afford such a purchase. For those without the ability to provide prepayment plans for themselves, the bill provides that it will be necessary to apply to the local government for assistance, but the important factor is that the application will be made prior to the need for medical care and hospitalization.

"More importantly, we are left an initiative to make such provisions as we see fit—still retaining the individual choice of doctor and hospital—and at the same time providing through voluntary budgeting, the financial means to better support the community health services which, in turn, will continue to improve because of that support."

PROGRAM FOR REMOVAL OF ILLITERACY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from William M. Cooper, secretary-treasurer, National Conference on Adult Education and the Negro, Hampton, Va., together with a resolution adopted by the conference relating to the program for the removal of illiteracy.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAMPTON INSTITUTE,
Hampton, Va., April 21, 1949.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I am sending enclosed a copy of a resolution passed by the Seventh National Conference on Adult Education and the Negro held at the South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, April 6 to 8, 1949. The conference voted overwhelmingly to urge the passage of Senate bill 320, to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes. We are deeply concerned about the passage of this bill, because we know as well as most people how much it is needed not only in the southern region but in other regions throughout the United States.

Kindly keep me informed as executive secretary of this organization as to when hearings are to be held so that we may arrange to appear and testify in its behalf.

Accept my sincere congratulations on your sponsoring of this measure and do let us know if we can be of service in contributing toward its enactment.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM M. COOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer, National Conference on Adult Education and the Negro.

Resolution urging the passage by the Eighty-first Congress, first session, of bill S. 320, a bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes

Resolved, That the National Conference on Adult Education and the Negro, assembled at its seventh annual meeting at South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, S. C., on April 8, 1949, hereby endorses and urges the enactment of Senate bill 320, known as the Kilgore bill, to assist the several States in the removal of illiteracy. The conference considers the passage of this bill especially important at this time when the future peace of this Nation and of the world depends directly upon an intelligent total manpower.

The organization stands ready through its representatives to assist in the enactment of this legislation so sorely needed by sending representatives to testify as to the specific needs for the services the bill is intended to render.

GOOD FRIDAY—LETTER FROM ST. JOSEPH'S ACADEMY ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION OF WHEELING, W. VA.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from the St. Joseph's Academy Alumnae Association of Wheeling, W. Va., signed by Dorothy E. Weitzel, president, relating to Good Friday.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. JOSEPH'S ACADEMY
ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION,
Wheeling, W. Va., March 21, 1949.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The St. Joseph's Academy Alumnae Association, an organization of 2,000 members, asks you to voice the following request and place it on record.

We ask that Good Friday be set apart as a day of religious observance in grateful remembrance of the passion and death of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

I have the honor to remain,
Yours very truly,
DOROTHY E. WEITZEL,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1433. A bill amending Public Law 125, Eightieth Congress, approved June 28, 1947, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 306).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 55. A bill to authorize completion of construction and development of the Eden project, Wyoming; with amendments (Rept. No. 308); and

S. 1477. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View Irrigation District, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

MORATORIUM WITH RESPECT TO APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PRICING LAWS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1008) to provide a moratorium with respect to the application of certain laws to individual, good-faith, delivered-price systems and freight-absorption practices, and I submit a report (No. 305) thereon. This bill provides a moratorium until July 1, 1950, on certain provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, regarding quotation and use of delivered prices or the absorption of freight in industry, in the absence of

conspiracy or combination or other agreement in the restraint of trade.

Widespread uncertainty is to be found throughout the country as to the effect of recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and difficulty has been encountered in determining what may be proper methods to be employed by shippers in various parts of the country. The legitimate interest, both of consumers as well as of suppliers, requires that a thoroughgoing and an exhaustive study be made by the Congress of pending legislation covering this subject matter. It is for that reason, among others, that this moratorium bill is proposed.

Inasmuch as the question of constitutionality may be raised, it is pertinent to note that the committee sought and secured an opinion from the Federal Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, in which the committee counsel and two other members of the committee's professional staff concurred, testifying as to the constitutionality of this proposed moratorium.

It is a matter in which there is widespread interest and which has induced considerable discussion. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1008), to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

AMENDMENTS

Amendments proposed by the committee are shown in detail in the committee print of the bill which accompanies this report. The net result of the committee amendments is to make the bill read as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That until July 1, 1950, the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, shall not be construed as depriving individual companies, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, of the right to independently quote and sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith in any and all markets.

"SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect any proceeding pending in any Federal court of the United States on the date of approval of this Act. The provisions of this Act shall be operative with respect to any activities engaged in between the date of approval of this Act and July 1, 1950, but shall not otherwise affect the enforcement of any order which was entered on or before the date of approval of this Act."

The committee also proposes amendment of the title so as to read: "A bill to confirm the right of individual companies to use certain pricing practices during a specified period for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith."

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill has been generally referred to as a "moratorium." The duration of this "moratorium" would be, under the committee amendments, from the time of approval of the act until July 1, 1950. During this period of time, the bill would operate as a temporary clarifying amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, guaranteeing the right of individual companies, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, to independently quote and sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith.

While such clarification has, in the opinion of the committee, been made necessary by the very confusion of legal thinking on the subject of pricing practices as affected by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 683), it definitely is not intended, by approval of this "moratorium" bill, to hold or imply that the particular pricing practices named are now, or hereafter are to be, illegal. The primary purpose of this legislation is to safeguard the legitimate interests both of consumer and supplier and end confusion during a period within which the Congress may give further study to the whole question with a view to determining the need for permanent legislation in this field.

At the same time, it must be clearly recognized, as the sponsor of S. 1008 testified during hearings before the committee, that enactment of this legislation will not and does not commit the Congress to any predetermined course of action, either with respect to the nature of permanent legislation to be enacted or with respect to the enactment of any permanent legislation at all.

DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

In eliminating section 1 of the bill as introduced, the committee have sought to avoid controversial language as well as to avoid language which might be interpreted as permanently committing the Congress with respect to any issue here involved.

In changing the expiration date of the "moratorium" period to July 1, 1950, the committee have chosen a date which marks both the close of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, and therefore the end of the period within which the Eighty-first Congress might act on permanent legislation.

Substitution of the phrase "quote and sell at delivered prices" for the phrase "use delivered price systems," in section 2, is intended to eliminate any possible contention that the Congress intends to legalize, even during the period of the moratorium, the systematic use of basing-point pricing, which proponents of the bill have testified is not an objective.

Use of the phrase "for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith" in place of the phrase "to meet competition" is for the purpose of providing greater flexibility in the stand for independent action during the moratorium period. As witnesses pointed out, in order to compete, it might be necessary not merely to meet the price of a competitor, but actually to sell at a lower price, especially in the case of an unknown brand competing with a nationally advertised brand. Furthermore, competition in good faith might embrace coming close to a competitor's price without actually meeting it. Under the language proposed, the criterion will be engaging in competition in good faith, rather than the resulting price.

Fixing the beginning of the moratorium period as the date of approval of this act, instead of an arbitrary date named in the act, with respect to pending proceedings in court, and orders already entered, is proposed in order to insure that, first, there will be nothing retroactive in the provisions of this section, and, second, that there will be no period of hiatus between the date of approval and the applicability of the act to proceedings begun thereafter.

The committee version of the final section of the bill is designed to give freedom of action, during the period of the moratorium, even to those companies against whom orders have been issued, while at the same time making it clear that the Congress is not attemping to extend a blanket pardon for any violations of such orders which may have occurred before the date of approval of the act. Under this language it is contemplated that any company will have the right to quote and sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight, for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith, during the period of the moratorium, but that no inducement will be held out to reopen cases which have been adjudicated or to seek modification of orders already issued. This is accomplished by making the moratorium apply to any activities engaged in after the date of approval of the act and before July 1, 1950, but making the provisions of the act otherwise inapplicable with respect to enforcement of orders entered before the date of approval of the act.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 1008

Careful consideration has been given by the committee to the question of the constitutionality of this bill. As an aid in its consideration of this question, the committee sought and secured an opinion from the Federal Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, in which the committee counsel and two other members of the committee's professional staff concurred. A brief memorandum of this opinion, holding S. 1008 to be a constitutional exercise of congressional power, is printed hereafter as appendix A of this report.

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM RE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 1008

It is undeniable that the construction of a statute is a judicial prerogative (*Elmendorf* v. *Taylor* ((1825), 10 Wheat. 152)); *Bank of Hamilton* v. *Dudley's Lessee* ((1829), 2 Peters 495)), and that Congress may not constitutionally impose upon the courts an arbitrary rule of decision (*U. S.* v. *Klein* ((1872), 13 Wall. 128); Harris, The Judicial Power of the United States ((1940), 78)).

S. 1008, however, does not impose an arbitrary rule of determination upon the courts. Instead, the bill in effect proposes an amendment to the existing law and creates new circumstances by which the activity involved is to be tested. In a number of decisions, beginning with *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Co.* ((1855), 18 How. 421), the Supreme Court has upheld the right of Congress, in the exercise of its plenary power over interstate commerce, to enact legislation overriding or reversing previous court decisions construing particular matters. (See *Prudential Ins. Co.* v. *Benjamin* ((1946), 328 U. S. 408) and cases cited at n. 28.) In each instance the Supreme Court "has given effect to the congressional judgment contradicting its own previous one" (ibid.). As stated in *In re Rahrer* ((1891), 140 U. S. 545, 562), "No reason is perceived why, if Congress chooses to provide that certain designated subjects of interstate commerce shall be governed by a rule which divests them of that character at an earlier period of time than would otherwise be the case, it is not within its competency to do so." And the fact that the statute involved uses the words "shall be construed," or words of similar import, apparently has not been regarded as creating an unconstitutional infringement of the judicial power. (See the McCarran Act of March 9, 1945, 59 Stat. 33, 15 U. S. C., secs. 1011–1015, upheld in *Prudential Ins. Co.* v. *Benjamin*, supra; see particularly nn. 32, 33, 34, and 39 of the opinion.)

In this connection, also, the language of the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *Klein*, supra, is enlightening. In that case, the

Court declared that Congress could not impose on the courts rules of decision which would determine controversies before them, and then said:

"We do not at all question what was decided in the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling Bridge Company*. In that case, after a decree in this court that the bridge, in the then state of the law, was a nuisance and must be abated as such, Congress passed an act legalizing the structure and making it a post road; and the court, on a motion for process to enforce the decree, held that the bridge had ceased to be a nuisance by the exercise of the constitutional powers of Congress, and denied the motion. No arbitrary rule of decision was prescribed in that case, but the court was left to apply its ordinary rules to the new circumstances created by the act. In the case before us no new circumstances have been created by legislation. But the court is forbidden to give the effect to evidence which, in its own judgment, such evidence should have, and is directed to give it an effect precisely contrary."

It is believed that S. 1008 is distinguishable upon a like basis and thus is a constitutional exercise of congressional power.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMPS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make a report in reference to action of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on a subject in which all the new Senators are interested. Some time ago on the Senate floor we discussed the matter of commemorative stamps. At that time I announced to the Senate that the committee would take some action upon the subject. At this time I report that the committee unanimously adopted a resolution providing that no resolutions or bills on the subject of commemorative stamps will be considered during the Eighty-first Congress. That was the action taken by the committee, for the reason that numerous commemorative-stamp bills have been introduced. Every Senator wants one for his State. Probably every Representative wants one for his congressional district. In the past, until a few years ago, this matter was handled by the Post Office Department. Therefore, the Committe on Post Office and Civil Service intends at this time to leave the matter to the Post Office Department, and the committee suggests in the resolution that the number of stamps be limited to not more than 12.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution in regard to commemorative stamps

Whereas the policy of the Eightieth Congress in directing by legislation the issuance of 19 commemorative stamps over and above the 10 stamps scheduled by the Post Office Department for 1948 created confusion in the administration of the commemorative-stamp program, caused expensive overtime for engravers and printers, deferred printing of needed precanceled and coil stamps, and jeopardized the production of the requisite number of 1½-cent and 3-cent stamps needed for holiday mailings; and

Whereas in previous Congresses the committee charged with the responsibility of postal policy refused to consider such bills for commemorative stamps as were referred to it, and the Postmasters General exercised their authority under law to select the subjects for stamps in a fair, equitable, and satisfactory manner; and

Whereas the committee in this Congress has had referred to it more than 60 such stamp resolutions, with many more to come if such stamps are directed legislatively, and the Bureau of Printing and Engraving and the Post Office Department are staffed to handle annually only 12 issues with proper art work and fair distributions; and

Whereas the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate, with its broad responsibility for the personnel policy of the Government as it affects 2,000,000 employees, and with responsibility for the policy matters governing the vast postal service, which service is considered among the largest businesses in the world, the committee is without the time or facilities to determine the relative merits of the many subjects proposed for such commemoration, or to exercise legislatively a function that has been administrative (except for the 80th Cong.), since the first commemorative stamps in 1892: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the United States Senate hereby agrees not to consider any pending bill or resolution or any that may be introduced in the Eighty-first Congress providing for the issuance of commemorative stamps, and further that the determination of the subject matter of commemorative stamps shall be considered an administrative matter under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General, as called for under existing law, and that this committee recommends to the Postmaster General that not more than 12 commemorative stamps be issued in any given year.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of George R. Merrell, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submited:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

John F. Kelley and Jay P. Dayton, officers of the Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the Coast Guard;

Edwin W. Coleman and John W. Cherry, officers of the Coast Guard Reserve, to be commissioned in the Coast Guard, and John H. Speckin, for appointment in the Coast Guard;

Charles J. Hanks and several other officers of the Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the Coast Guard; and

William Talmadge Adams II, and sundry other cadets, to be ensigns in the Coast Guard.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Russell P. Smith, of Cambridge, Md., to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.;

Boyce A. Williams, of Leesburg, Fla., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla.; and

De Graff Austin, of San Diego, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 25, with headquarters at San Diego, Calif.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably the nominations of 20 postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1706. A bill to authorize the Public Health Service to admit to its hospitals persons committed by State courts who are beneficiaries of the Service or narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1707. A bill to amend section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize lump-sum settlement in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1708. A bill to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to convey certain lands to the town of Nashua, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1709. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to the manufacture and distribution of goods; to strengthen small business in its economic struggle for survival; to promote competition by prohibiting a manufacturer from engaging in the retail field and by prohibiting a retailer from engaging in manufacturing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KEM):

S. 1710. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, to provide for the making of payments in lieu of State and local taxation of certain property transferred to service departments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 1711. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 with respect to the terms "brother" and "sister"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1712. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lena Mae West, a minor; and

S. 1713. A bill for the relief of the Wilson County Fair, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request):

S. 1714. A bill to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes;

S. 1715. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation;

S. 1716. A bill to amend the Alaska Game law;

S. 1717. A bill to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes;

S. 1718. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation; and

S. 1719. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special commemorative stamp to mark the one hundredth anniversary of the cranberry industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3838) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REGULATION OF OLEOMARGARINE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MUNDT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COLLECTIVISM AND THE MODERN LAWYER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Collectivism and the Modern Lawyer," delivered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Boston College Law School, April 26, 1949, at Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEM BEFORE MIDWEST COUNCIL OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Midwest Council of Young Republicans, at St. Louis, Mo., on April 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Progress of European Recovery delivered by Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Reserve Bank Conference of Ninth District Bankers, at the Hotel Nicollet, Minneapolis, Minn., April 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM H. HASTIE TO AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by William H. Hastie at a banquet of the National Convention of the Americans for Democratic Action in Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR BOWLES, OF CONNECTICUT, TO AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Governor Bowles, of Connecticut, to the National Convention of the Americans for Democratic Action, at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ARTICLE BY FORMER SENATOR WILLIS, OF INDIANA

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lest We Forget. Let's Look at the Record," written by former Senator Raymond E. Willis, of Indiana, and published in the Steuben Republican of Angola, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—ARTICLE FROM SOUTH BEND (IND.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "When Medicine is Socialized" published in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune, of April 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, at a postal rally at New York City on April 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN L. LEWIS—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK SUNDAY NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lewis Isn't All Crocodile," published in the New York Sunday News of March 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOU HAVE A STAKE IN SPAIN'S SECURITY—ARTICLE BY THE REVEREND JOSEPH F. THORNING

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article headed "You have a stake in Spain's security," written by the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., S. T. D., published in the April 24, 1949, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, of Huntington, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

ANNUAL CONVENTION, SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, ENDORSES VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAM ESTABLISHED BY SMITH-MUNDT ACT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the endorsement by the American Society of Newspaper Editors at their annual convention recently held in Washington of the so-called Voice of America publicity program, established by the passage of the Smith-Mundt Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—STATEMENT BY FAMILY ECONOMICS BUREAU, OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Family Economics Bureau, of Minneapolis, Minn., regarding the number of Government employees—Federal, State, and local—which appears in the Appendix.]

BRANNAN PLAN NEEDS ARMY—ARTICLE BY JULIAN BRADBURY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Brannan Plan Needs Army," written by Julian Bradbury, and published in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of April 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY BRANNAN'S FARM PROGRAM—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Salvaging the Brannan Farm Program," written by John D. Black, Henry Lee professor of economics at Harvard University, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATE FILIBUSTERS—EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Filibusters Show the U. S. A. Is Still a Union of States," published in the Saturday Evening Post of April 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INJUSTICE TO MUSICIANS OF 20-PERCENT AMUSEMENT TAX—ARTICLE BY LEO CLUESMANN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Leo Cluesmann, secretary, American Federation of Musicians, commenting on the injustice to the musicians of the 20-percent amusement tax, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR CHINESE VOID—EDITORIAL FROM MANCHESTER (N. H.) EVENING LEADER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Chinese Void," published in the Manchester (N. H.) Evening Leader of Monday, April 25, 1949, and relating to the necessity for a foreign policy for Asia, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE NATION'S FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Higher Education in the Nation's Future, delivered by him before a luncheon meeting of the American College Public Relations Association on April 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPTY SEATS IN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Those Empty Seats in the House and Senate," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of April 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the eleventh in a series of articles published in the Baltimore Sun, on what the American public would pay, $1,250,000,000,000; and what it would receive if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals.

Today's article is entitled, "Five Million Now Get Public Assistance."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—5,000,000 NOW GET PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

(This is the eleventh of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Public assistance—financial aid for certain needy people not eligible for old-age and survivor benefits—last year cost $11 for every person in the country.

This was the cost of caring for the needy aged, the needy blind, and dependent children.

The total cost was $1,600,000,000, of which the Federal Government contributed $977,000,000 through grants to the States.

For the next fiscal year the President has asked the Federal Government also to extend aid to all needy families. By these are meant persons under 65 who are unable to work, and indigent adults supporting orphaned children.

The 1950 budget calls for an appropriation of $1,064,000,000 for public assistance, but if the program is broadened the cost will rise considerably above this figure.

For the present—and authorities say it will be true for some years to come—twice as many people are receiving aid from public assistance as from old-age and survivor insurance.

About 5,000,000 are drawing assistance through the Federal-State system of aid, whereas only about 2,300,000 are beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance so far.

The President has urged Congress to broaden old-age insurance so that eventually this contributory insurance system will absorb a large part of the needy people now drawing public assistance.

Some 2,500,000 old people—those who once were taken care of by towns or counties or, as often as not, by relatives—are now getting assistance.

This assistance consists of monthly cash allowances.

AID MUST BE CASH

Congress, in establishing the assistance program in the original social security act in 1935, specified that it must be cash aid and not relief in kind—such as baskets of groceries or bushels of coal.

In addition to the old people drawing aid, 1,700,000 persons in families are receiving aid for dependent children. And 86,000 blind persons are being assisted.

Needy persons outside of these three groups continue to be the responsibility of the States and localities alone.

But under the public welfare bill now pending, the Government would extend assistance to these, too.

This would include the physically and mentally handicapped as well as other needy persons not now eligible for cash aid.

Who is a needy person would continue to be determined by the States themselves.

The proposed welfare bill would considerably enlarge the limits of assistance the Federal Government would give to the States.

The maximum assistance in which there could be Federal participation would be $50 a month per person.

Or, if there is more than one needy person in the home, $50 for each of the first two such needy persons, and $20 for each additional person above two.

At present the law allows $50 a month maximum for the aged and blind, but only $27 for the first child, and $18 for each additional child. And nothing for parents.

There is no exact estimate of how much it will cost the Federal Government to extend aid to all needy persons.

Authorities estimate not more than $100,000,000 a year for the immediate future.

Needy persons for whom there is at present no Federal aid through grants to the States are costing the States themselves about $200,000,000 a year.

WELFARE COST RISING

But these costs and all other welfare costs are rising sharply in some States. In some of them, the public-assistance beneficiaries are receiving bigger checks than the beneficiaries under Federal old-age and survivors insurance.

And the situation is worrying Members of Congress.

As an example of how public-assistance beneficiaries are increasing, take the State of California.

Last June, California had 188,000 needy on its rolls. At the end of February this year, it had 207,000—and its monthly outlay for aid was $14,500,000.

The average assistance has risen from $50 a month last June to $70, too.

Or take Louisiana, where last June 57,000 people were on public assistance and, at the end of this February, 114,156.

And average aid in Louisiana had more than doubled—from $22.87 a month last June to $47 in February.

Standards of assistance in the various States, under the pending bill, are to be determined by the States on a basis of individual needs and State resources.

The Federal grants-in-aid would be made to the States on the basis of their per capita incomes.

The States with the highest per capita income would receive 40 percent of aid costs from the Federal Government.

The States with the lowest incomes would receive 75 percent of their costs.

The aim is to give the aged, the needy blind, and dependent children a better break in the poorer States.

The December report of the Social Security Bureau shows, for example, that in nine States the needy aged and blind received less than $25 a month.

In eight States families with dependent children received less than $40 a month.

The highest old-age aid in December was paid in Colorado—$78.18 a month.

The lowest—$16.38—was paid in Mississippi. Its benefit was only slightly more than one-fifth as large as that paid by Colorado.

The highest aid for dependent children—just to show the wide range between States—was $115.14 a family in Massachusetts.

The lowest was $26.30 a month per family in Mississippi.

BLIND AID VARIES

Aid for the blind ranged from $22.04 a month in Kentucky to $77.08 a month in California.

In Maryland the December aid rate was $36.40 a month for the aged, $82.81 a family for dependent children, and $39.22 for the blind.

General aid in Maryland—for which there is no matching Federal contribution under existing law—was $43.38 in December.

The Administration has told Congress that the only way to help reduce the disparities between the payments made by various States is for the Federal Government to give special aid to the low-income States.

That is proposed in the pending public welfare bill.

And, at the same time, it is proposed that the maximum Federal contributions be raised.

The general idea of the pending welfare bill is to give more Federal help to States where personal incomes are low and less to States where such incomes are high.

Under the social principle of sharing, taxpayers in some States would thus help to provide relief in low-income States.

And the Federal Government, which began in 1937 bearing about 25 percent of the direct relief needs of the country, would next year bear approximately 50 percent of a $2,000,000,000 public-assistance program.

In the poorest States, such as Arkansas and Mississippi, the Federal Government's contribution under the pending bill would be $3 for each $1 the States put up.

But in rich States such as New York and Nevada the Federal contribution would be only $4 for each $6 raised by the States.

FIFTY-FIFTY IN MARYLAND

For an indigent couple living in Maryland, on the other hand, and getting a maximum relief payment, the State would put up 50 percent and the Federal Government 50 percent.

In 29 States the Federal Government would pay from 55 percent to 75 percent of the relief costs.

The rise of the increased Federal burden under the plan would be gradual because some States need legislation before the plan could go into effect.

In a few years, however, according to testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the public assistance contribution by Uncle Sam might rise to $1,500,000,000 a year or more.

But in a decade the social security authorities count on its starting to taper off as the proposed enlarged old-age and survivor program becomes effective.

It has been pointed out to Congress, however, by critics of the administration's public welfare program, that the same sort of forecasts were made in 1935.

When public assistance through a Federal-State plan was launched as a part of social security it was predicted by officials that in a relatively short time grants-in-aid would taper off.

Old-age insurance was counted on to take up the burden. But from grants of $27,000,000 in 1936 and $158,000,000 in 1937 the Federal share has now risen to more than $1,000,000,000 a year.

Despite the high level of employment since the end of the war, the number of relief recipients has risen more than 1,000,000. The total is now almost 4,000,000.

And under the administration bill now pending it would rise even higher.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA (NEBR.) WORLD-HERALD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial published in the Morning World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., on Monday, April 25, entitled "Do You Believe It?" which emphasizes some of the grave questions the American people should consider in connection with the administration's social-security program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO YOU BELIEVE IT?

President Truman's far-flung social-security program his experts estimate could be put into effect at a cost of only $17,500,000,000 a year.

Only that much. Merely a million dollars multiplied 17,500 times.

A mere bagatelle, in the estimation of Mr. Truman's experts who have a supreme contempt for silly dollars. Add these multibillions to the other multibillions spending and to be spent by Government—and what of it? There are plenty more where they came from. They can be obtained by taxing, by borrowing, or as easily as the German Government created trillions of marks. And the French Government, and the Italian Government created trillions of moneys. Just before all three governments, and all Italians, Germans and Frenchmen went stony broke. All, that is, save those who were on the inside and had inside information and favor.

The United States is now enjoying the privilege of contributing largely to their support. Out of the sweat and brawn of American workers. But that's another story.

Return to the "far-flung" story.

The President's Social Security Commissioner guarantees that the bite out of the pay roll to provide all sorts of social security for everyone will not exceed 15 percent.

Another bagatelle. Even when added to the various other bites. Why should the worker care? The employer, the bold New Deal promises, will pay a third of it. And the kindly Government will pay another third itself.

Where will Government get that third? Why, as Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, "out of the toil and sweat of the workers." The people—the employees included—will pay it. Government will simply collect it from the producers and pay it back—expenses of administration, heavy expenses indeed, to constitute another "deduct."

And the employer—where will he get his third? Out of prices, out of wages, if he gets it at all. When he doesn't get it he will go broke, and then employees and consumers and all other taxpayers will add that share of the burden to their own increasingly heavy share.

For the plain truth is that the people pay it all. Out of their toil and sweat and enterprise comes everything the Government collects and pays.

Soft for Government. Soft for bureaucrats. Soft for all who sit in the seats of power, who constantly extend their power, along with it their own personal profits and emoluments, by bribing the people with false promises to pay back to the people more than they contribute. "Just keep on voting for us and we'll give you more and more (of your own money) for greater and lusher benefits."

Do you believe it? If you do, and act in that belief, you'll deserve what's coming to you—and to your children.

But, say some, the objectives of the program are desirable, anyhow.

Just how desirable—if along with it goes the breaking down of the morale of the American people, the tragic weakening of their spirit, their ingenuity, their enterprise, their self-dependence? If they come, instead, to accept the role of dependents who are to be insured by a paternalistic bureaucracy of full security from the womb to the tomb? Whether I work or am idle, whether I try or don't try, whether I save or am profligate, in health or in illness, come good or bad fortune, Government will see that no serious ills befall me or my family.

Does all this constitute the spirit in which strong men and women are developed, in which society and Government are made secure, in which nations become great and prosperous? If even the strong are seduced and consent to be bribed with fairy money, is there hope in the end for anyone?

ARMY FERTILIZER PROGRAM FOR OCCUPIED AREAS—LETTER FROM GORDON GRAY TO SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me, and signed by Gordon Gray, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, so it may be available for information of Members of the Senate. The article refers briefly to the policies of the Government respecting the operation of fertilizer plants by the Department of the Army, to meet the fertilizer requirements of the occupied areas. It is contemplated that the Army will put on sale these fertilizer plants. There has been much inquiry about them from Members of Congress. This has prompted me to ask that the letter from the Department of the Army be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Knowing your interest in the Army fertilizer program for occupied areas, I am taking this means of informing you of our latest plans in this respect.

You will no doubt recall that since 1946 the Department of the Army has been operating certain of its wartime munitions plants to manufacture anhydrous ammonia and finished ammonium nitrate to meet fertilizer requirements for occupied areas. The appropriation, "Government and relief in occupied areas," has provided the funds for this purpose. By furnishing fertilizer materials to occupied areas, purchase and shipment of food are materially reduced, and self-help for the peoples in these areas is assured. At the present time, the Army is operating three anhydrous ammonia plants, three ammonium nitrate solution plants, and four ammonium nitrate graining plants to meet these requirements. It has long been the plan of the Army that production at these plants would continue only so long as necessary to obtain fertilizer for occupied areas which could not be procured from commercial sources and that the plants would be made available for commercial purposes, either through lease or sale, when they were no longer needed by the Army.

It now appears that the Army's requirements for occupied areas and firm commitments to the Economic Cooperation Administration for Korea require a production of 373,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia during the fiscal year 1950. For the same period, our production capacity will be approximately 463,000 tons. Thus, the anhydrous ammonia capacity of the Department of the Army is surplus to firm Army occupational and Korean requirements by about 90,000 tons.

For purely military commitments, the anhydrous ammonia production of the Ohio River Ordnance Works, one of the three anhydrous ammonia plants referred to above, some 65,000 tons, would not be required in the fiscal year 1950.

During the fiscal year 1949, 36,500 tons of anhydrous ammonia were being furnished to the domestic economy in accordance with Public Law 793. In addition, the equivalent of 40,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia is being furnished for export to nonoccupied areas in accordance with this same law.

By releasing the Ohio River Ordnance Works from Army production and selling it so that it may be operated by private enterprise, its entire capacity of 65,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia will be available for the domestic economy. This is almost double that being provided from Army-operated plants during fiscal year 1949. In addition, some 25,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia will be available, if required for export to nonoccupied countries, from the production of the two remaining plants which will be operated by or for the Army during fiscal year 1950.

On this basis, it appears advantageous to dispose of the Ohio River Ordnance plant under the most favorable conditions to the Government and to prospective purchasers. Therefore, our plans contemplate advertising this plant for sale under the terms of the national security clause which provide that it be available in an emergency when required by the Secretary of the Army.

I trust this information will be of interest to you and your committee.

Sincerely,

GORDON GRAY,
The Assistant Secretary of the Army.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SUGGESTION PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, everyone talks about Government economy but very few of us ever do anything about achieving it. The Hoover Commission reports, to be sure, represent a tremendous opportunity for achieving Government economy, for streamlining agency offices, and eliminating needless positions. I am sure that the Commission's recommendations will have the earnest attention of the Congress, but it is obvious that applying those recommendations will be a long, slow process.

One of the more immediate ways by which we can achieve economy is by giving every possible encouragement to the suggestion systems already in effect and those than can be put into effect in Government agencies. I have had considerable correspondence with the United States Bureau of the Budget on this theme and I hope to be in close contact with the Bureau further on this subject.

I have just received a report summarizing the results of the Government suggestion system for the 1948 fiscal year. During that year, 83,000 suggestions were submitted of which 16,000 were adopted. Thirteen thousand awards were made, because these suggestions involved estimated savings to taxpayer of over $15,750,000.

Now $15,750,000 may be regarded as small peanuts in these days of $40,000,000,000 budgets, but every cent of that money is a cent saved for the long-suffering taxpayer.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, the exchange of correspondence which I have had with the Bureau of the Budget on the suggestion program. I invite particular attention to the fact that unfortunately the suggestion program has not been designed to encourage specifically suggestions on complete elimination of certain functions and/or turning those functions over to State and local governments.

I am hoping that the various agencies will stimulate the suggestion system and encourage suggestions even and particularly if they result in elimination of entire Government functions.

I congratulate all those folks involved in the limited success of the suggestion system so far. While I have at times, as have my colleagues, made certain criticisms of Government agencies when we felt such criticisms were justified, I feel that it is equally incumbent upon us to give praise where praise is merited. Certainly abundant praise is deserved by all of the employees who have thus far won awards because of their suggestions for Government savings. More power to them and to the agencies in carrying on this vital work in the interest of real economy and efficiency.

I have been in correspondence with Government officials in relation to the Federal employees suggestion program. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the exchange of correspondence with the Bureau of the Budget with regard to this program, including several statements giving information with regard thereto.

There being no objection, the correspondence and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
March 22, 1949.

Hon. FRANK PACE,
Director, United States Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DIRECTOR PACE: As some of your staff will recall, it has been my pleasure to write to the Bureau of the Budget in the past re-

garding the results of the employee suggestion program in the Federal Government. I have always felt that this program fulfills many splendid purposes:

(a) For good morale in Federal employees;
(b) Increasing managerial efficiency;
(c) Achieving Government economy.

The Bureau has in the past kindly supplied me with statistics on the actual results achieved by the suggestion program in terms of the money and manpower saved as related to the total amount of awards given.

The purpose of this letter is therefore to ask if the Bureau could bring me up to date as to the statistics for the suggestion programs throughout the Federal Government during the 1948 calendar year, or perhaps if the results are kept on a fiscal basis, during the 1949 fiscal year.

Included among such statistics would, I presume, be:

1. Total number of agencies with suggestion programs;
2. Total number of suggestions received in each agency;
3. Total amounts of awards given and amount of awards;
4. Total amount of suggestions resulting from program, together with any related data.

I would not want the Bureau to go to a great trouble in preparing this report, but if these statistics are fairly readily available, I would be most appreciative to receive a report on same in duplicate.

I was wondering, too, just how the experience of the Federal Government's suggestion program compares to the experience of comparably large business enterprises. I recognize, of course, that we cannot make a comparison on several grounds, but it seems to me that perhaps there might be some basis for comparing results.

From my review of the suggestion work in the past, it seems to me that our Federal Government program is lagging considerably behind the suggestion set-ups in most modern business enterprises. It seems to lag not only in proportionate amount of suggestions, in proportionate savings, but it seems not to have made the impression upon all of the Government's employees that suggestion programs have made in private industry on its personnel. Perhaps I am wrong in that conclusion, although it seems to me to be confirmed by statistics which I have seen in the past and by personal conferences which I have had with Government officers and employees.

May I ask, therefore, what we in Congress might do, if anything, to help the Bureau of the Budget and to help the Government agencies improve their suggestion set-up? What, for example, might the Senate and House Appropriations Committees do in their evaluation of suggestion plans and in their provision of necessary funds to pay awards or to give certificates of merit?

The whole purpose of this letter is not, I assure you, to be critical because I think that the Government has made some splendid progress along this line; rather its purpose is designed to be helpful and I would be most appreciative if you would give me in turn your specific suggestions on what, for instance, I can do to be of assistance.

I need not tell you, of course, of the staggering budget with which our country is faced or of the ominous reports of future Government deficits. One of the keys toward preventing such deficits seems to me to be possible through this suggestion program.

I recognize, of course, that the total amount of savings possible under the Federal suggestion program may to some extent be limited, but every dollar saved is a dollar that the taxpayer will not have to spend.

I am wondering, too, if the suggestion program has specifically made provision for soliciting suggestions designed to decrease Federal functions completely. In other words, is our suggestion program exclusively geared toward doing present tasks on a more efficient basis or does it actively solicit suggestions which might afford clues toward turning over some functions to States and localities or to private enterprises, rather than continuing them as Federal functions?

A related question is, Does our employee suggestion program in the Federal Government actively solicit suggestions on ways and means of making agencies and bureaus more self-sustaining for instance by charging modest prices or fees for some Federal services? I recognize of course that these would amount to policy suggestions rather than procedural suggestions, but it seems to me that we should not close the door on policy suggestions because they would involve far greater savings than would be involved in mere suggestions on changing this or that machine or this or that form. If we can tap the reservoir of employee ideas on cutting Government tasks completely or on making Government bureaus more self-sustaining, it seems to me that we will be doing the sort of over-all streamlining job that is contemplated under the Hoover Commission's approach to the reorganization of Government.

I recognize that this is rather an extended letter, that some of the answers to its questions may not be very easily attainable and will take considerable time to compile, but I assure you that they will be put to the best possible use from the standpoint of advancing the public welfare rather than from any partisan approach.

Thanking you for your kind and prompt attention to this inquiry and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of March 22 in which you express your continued interest in the operation of Federal suggestion systems. Reports on employee suggestion systems are compiled on a fiscal year basis following the close of the fiscal year. I am enclosing two sets of tables containing statistics on operations during 1948, together with comparisons between 1947 and 1948.

You may be interested to know that in the spring of 1948 the Federal Government, cooperating with the National Association of Suggestion Systems, held a conference on suggestion systems. This conference, attended by about 400 Federal officials, consisted of promotional talks on suggestion systems by speakers from Government and private industry, followed by a clinic session on suggestion-system administration. Since that meeting the directors of agency suggestion-system programs have been meeting monthly on an informal basis to work out methods of improving the operation of their programs.

Current interest in the subject was also evidenced by the spirited program on suggestion-system problems at the March 31 round-table meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Management.

In working with the National Association of Suggestion Systems, we have had some opportunity to compare problems of suggestion-system administration in industry with those in Government. From these contacts it would seem to be generally true, as you indicate in your letter, that Government suggestion-system programs have not been as effective as those in private industry, although private industry experience is quite spotty. Discussions of the problem with suggestion-system people in private industry indicate that the success of suggestion systems in office-type operations generally lags behind that of technical and industrial operations. This conclusion seems borne out by Federal experience in which by far the greatest proportion of suggestion-system savings comes from the National Military Establishment and especially from industry-type operations in that agency.

In striving to increase the effectiveness of Federal suggestion systems we are currently concentrating our attention on improving the administration of such systems in the belief that this will bring the greatest long-time benefit. Both Government and industrial experience seem to indicate that the best results will be obtained from a steadily growing system rather than one that is based on a highly advertised drive to secure suggestions. From the legislative point of view, we feel that we have been provided sufficient authorization through Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, and that at present the main problem is one of making the best administrative use of that legislation. The encouragement and interest that you and other Members of Congress are giving has been of great value in promoting the increased use of this method of obtaining greater Government efficiency.

Your letter also questions whether or not suggestion programs "specifically make provision for soliciting suggestions to decrease Federal functions completely." The typical suggestion consists of an idea on how to do an employee's job more efficiently or effectively and does not get into the policy question of whether or not broad functions or activities should be performed. Although suggestions often involve the question of whether or not specific tasks should be performed, the more basic problems of distribution of functions between State and Federal Government, between private industry and Government, and methods of financing them are given primary attention by operating officials and specially trained management staffs. Ultimate decisions on such matters are, of course, dependent upon legislative action.

Let me again thank you for your interest in the Federal suggestion-system program.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Comparative summary of suggestion system operations in fiscal 1947–48*

AGENCIES WITH SUGGESTION SYSTEMS

	Paying awards		Not paying awards		Total	
	1947	1948	1947	1948	1947	1948
Number of agencies	9	22	13	7	22	29
Number of suggestions submitted	53,714	83,173	3,742	911	57,456	84,084
Number of suggestions adopted	12,342	16,076	1,205	551	13,547	16,627
Cash awards, the number made	11,444	13,861			11,444	13,861
Cash awards, the total amount	$428,174	$448,296			$428,174	$448,296
Estimated annual savings	$16,739,878	$15,781,663			$16,739,878	$15,781,663

EXHIBIT 2.—*Departments and establishments having suggestion systems in which cash awards were paid in fiscal year 1948*

Agency	Date system installed	Number of employees covered	Number of suggestions submitted	Participation (number of employees per suggestion submitted)	Number of suggestions adopted	Percent adopted	Number of awards paid	Number of awards paid, by amount of award payment: $10	$11 to $50	$51 to $275	Over $275	Amount of highest award paid	Total of awards paid	Average amount paid	Total of estimated savings
Department of Agriculture	Nov. 7, 1947	67,850	431	157.4	122	28.0	7	4	3	------	------	$50.00	$140.00	$20.00	$1,999.80
Civil Service Commission	Apr. 15, 1948	4,089	52	78.6	16	31.0	1	----	1	------	------	50.00	50.00	50.00	1,421.00
Department of Commerce	Aug. 1, 1947	40,935	2,146	19.1	139	4.0	119	59	43	16	1	325.00	4,217.50	35.44	72,670.08
Federal Housing Administration	May 28, 1947	4,700	112	42.0	5	4.0	5	2	2	1	------	100.00	190.00	38.00	4,923.75
Federal Power Commission	Nov. 13, 1947	789	53	14.9	5	9.0	5	2	2	1	------	225.00	295.00	59.00	8,000.00
Federal Security Agency	May 20, 1947	34,000	1,267	26.8	218	17.0	47	31	15	1	------	75.00	855.00	18.19	12,636.64
Federal Works Agency	Mar. 28, 1947	23,721	115	206.3	10	9.0	8	2	4	2	------	165.00	400.00	50.00	11,860.00
General Accounting Office	Mar. 18, 1947	9,816	54	181.8	9	17.0	9	3	2	4	------	275.00	805.00	89.44	32,188.51
Department of Interior	Nov. —, 1943	43,949	778	56.5	---------	---------	11	2	7	2	------	100.00	360.00	32.73	11,000.00
Interstate Commerce Commission	Mar. 17, 1947	2,320	12	193.3	1	8.0	1	1	------	------	------	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Department of Labor	Jan. 14, 1947	4,514	51	88.5	4	8.0	4	2	2	------	------	50.00	85.00	21.25	852.00
Maritime Commission	May 2, 1944	6,000	26	230.8	8	31.0	7	----	5	2	------	150.00	440.00	62.86	11,000.00
National Archives	July 3, 1947	346	6	57.7	2	33.0	4	1	3	------	------	50.00	120.00	30.00	3,515.00
National Gallery	July 1, 1947	315	9	35.0	7	77.0	2	-----	2	------	------	50.00	100.00	50.00	3,000.00
National Military Establishment:															
Air Force	June 2, 1943	112,362	10,557	10.6	1,943	18.0	1,943	-----	1,938	------	5	2,128.00	76,206.72	39.22	3,625,572.52
Army	Sept. —, 1943	253,143	14,476	17.5	2,619	18.0	[1] 2,619	-----	------	------	------	941.65	81,842.53	31.25	4,052,306.84
Navy	Aug. 4, 1919	261,882	33,632	7.8	9,549	28.0	8,380	-----	7,384	695	301	1,500.00	258,060.00	30.79	6,740,232.00
Panama Canal and Railroad	Apr. 3, 1947	22,840	101	226.1	26	26.0	9	1	5	3	------	175.00	510.00	56.67	13,480.00
Post Office Department	Apr. 14, 1943	498,000	837	595.0	28	3.0	29	9	13	6	1	375.00	1,995.00	68.79	77,063.00
Treasury Department	Aug. 2, 1947	90,500	6,879	13.2	305	4.0	178	100	57	17	4	375.00	5,985.00	33.44	198,075.00
Veterans' Administration	Sept. —, 1947	206,150	8,692	23.7	949	11.0	362	174	134	51	3	375.00	11,244.78	31.06	347,304.09
War Assets Administration	May 15, 1947	32,536	2,887	11.3	111	4.0	111	51	50	9	1	1,000.00	4,385.00	39.50	551,953.00
Total	----------	1,720,757	83,173	20.7	16,076	19.3	[2] 13,861	444	9,672	810	316	8,544.65	448,296.53	32.34	15,781,663.23

[1] Further break-down not available.
[2] This total includes 2,619 suggestions for which no break-down was available.

EXHIBIT 3.—*Departments and establishments having suggestion systems in which cash awards were not paid in fiscal 1948*

Agency	Date system installed	Number of employees covered	Number of suggestions submitted	Participation, number of employees per suggestion	Number of suggestions adopted
Bureau of the Budget [1]	Feb. 5, 1947	525	1	525.0	0
Central Intelligence Agency	Mar. 30, 1948	(2)	9	(2)	?
Civil Aeronautics Board [1]	June 10, 1947	600	1	600.0	0
Government Printing Office [1]	Sept. 18, 1947	7,300	209	34.9	41
Public Housing Administration	1945	5,700	131	43.5	52
Smithsonian Institution [1]	1948	650	0	0	0
Tennessee Valley Authority	1942	15,000	560	26.8	456
Total	----------	29,775	911	32.7	551

[1] Agency having provision for cash payment.
[2] Withheld for security reasons.

EXHIBIT 4.—*Departments and establishments not having a suggestion system in operation during fiscal 1948*

Agency	Installation planned during fiscal 1949	Installation under consideration	No installation contemplated
American Battle Monuments Commission	----------	------	X
Atomic Energy Commission	----------	------	X
Office of Defense Transportation	----------	------	X
Economic Cooperation Administration	December 1948	------	------
Export-Import Bank	----------	X	------
Federal Communications Commission	November 1948	------	------

EXHIBIT 4.—*Departments and establishments not having a suggestion system in operation during fiscal 1948*—Continued

Agency	Installation planned during fiscal 1949	Installation under consideration	No installation contemplated
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	----------	X	------
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	January 1949	------	------
Federal Trade Commission	----------	X	------
Housing, Home Finance Agency:			
Administrator's Office	January 1949	------	------
Home Loan Bank Board	----------	X	------
Office of the Housing Expediter	----------	X	------
Indian Claims Commission	----------	------	X
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	----------	------	X
Justice Department	July 29, 1948	------	------
Library of Congress	----------	X	------
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	----------	X	------
National Capital Housing Authority	----------	------	X
National Capital Park and Planning Comsion.	----------	------	X
National Labor Relations Board	1949	------	------
National Security Council	----------	------	X
National Security Resources Board	January 1949	------	------
Philippine Alien Property Administration	----------	------	X
Philippine War Damage Commission	----------	------	X
Railroad Retirement Board	----------	------	X
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	----------	X	------
Securities and Exchange Commission	----------	X	------
State Department	July 1948	------	------
Tariff Commission	----------	------	X
Tax Court of the United States	----------	X	------
Total		8	10	12

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certain committee amendments were passed over yesterday. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "$11,387,000," and insert "$11,612,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment passed over was, on page 23, line 3, to strike out the numerals "$16,400,000" and insert "$17,027,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment passed over was on page 23, line 21, to strike out the numerals "$7,725,000" and insert "$8,725,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment passed over was on page 42, line 10, to strike out the numerals "$715,889,000" and insert "$882,741,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment to the committee amendment has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 10, in the committee amendment, in lieu of the figures "$882,741,000" it is proposed to insert "$757,602,500," and that the committee amendment beginning in line 11 and extending down to and including the figures "1953" in line 16, and

the committee amendment in line 17, be deemed to be disagreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment on page 42, beginning in line 10.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I again ask the Senator from New Mexico if this amendment is acceptable to him. If not, I should like to debate it. I ask unanimous consent to ask him that question without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the request of the Senator from Massachusetts, but the Senator from New Mexico does not feel justified at the moment in accepting the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. I do not for one moment say that it would ultimately reduce the expenditures of the Government to any substantial degree. What the amendment does is this: It reduces the appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 for the purpose of complying with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act affecting railroad employees who went into the armed services to the amount which is to be used by the Government in the fiscal year 1950.

The bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee would appropriate for the fiscal year 1950 the amounts which the Government would be expected to pay out in the fiscal years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953. The Budget Bureau Director advocated that all amounts be left out of this year's budget. He stated that the retirement fund of the railroad employees would not be in any way affected, and that no one would lose his rights. He also stated that the Budget Bureau would try to ascertain the exact amount before putting in any figure.

The House committee left out any appropriation for this purpose. I believe that the House committee stated in its report that the matter might well be considered by the Senate committee. The Senate committee put in the entire amount. In this year, particularly when we are trying to keep down appropriations, when the problem of balancing the budget is in serious doubt, I submit that we can cut $123,000,000 from this year's appropriation without in any way affecting any obligations of the Government, and without in any way affecting the retirement fund or the rights of anyone under the retirement fund, and in that way help to bring the budget into balance.

Before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations the head of the retirement fund was asked by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MCCARRAN] whether or not this could be done properly. The head of the retirement fund himself stated that no harm would result from this cut, that the funds would be kept intact, and that all the obligations of the Government would be fulfilled.

Mr. President, I hope that this amendment may be adopted. I made the same motion in the full committee, and the decision as to whether or not it should be done was close. Since that time I believe that Senators have gained a better understanding of the question, and I sincerely hope that the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator to say that this amendment would not impair the railroad retirement fund, if the cut were made?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the statement which I made and it is a statement based upon the testimony of the head of the retirement fund himself before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, after extensive hearings, due deliberation and discussion by the subcommittee and by the full committee, it was decided to recommend this item to the Senate. The Congress itself passed the law taking care of the retirement privileges of the railroad workers who joined the military forces during the war. While it is true that the Budget Bureau did not make an estimate for this item, the reason given by the Bureau was that it desired to study the matter further, to see if factual information could be obtained as to the number of those who would benefit under the law and by the appropriation. That is precisely what the committee did.

We are committed and authorized to pay these benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. All the committee did was to say, "Very well; if that is the case and you want to study it further, let us pay them now the amount that has already been ascertained; let us be true to the workers, and appropriate the whole amount, notwithstanding they will not be paid until a complete study is made, within 4 years."

So we are proposing to appropriate the entire amount, which no one denies is due, but it is not to be paid, under the provisions of the item and the provisions of the bill, except in four equal installments, in 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Why appropriate it then, if it is unnecessary to pay it? Why not appropriate as it is needed? If three-fourths is not to be paid in the current fiscal year, why add it to the appropriation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because the committee felt duty-bound to appropriate the money at this particular time. We thought it was due. We thought we should appropriate it, even if they were not to get it until complete studies were made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it not a fact that if the amount is made available but only one-quarter of it will be spent in 1950, the Treasury balance will be affected by only one-quarter of the amount?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Nevertheless, the committee felt that the whole amount should be appropriated at this time. We felt justified in doing that. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be voted down, and that the recommendation of the committee will be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think the question is involved as to whether we are going to increase the amount of appropriations for this fiscal year. As the bill now reads, there is no doubt that the money is appropriated, and thereby the total appropriation is increased. But the money is not to be paid except in four annual installments.

I believe no member of the committee wanted to see the fund depleted in any way; but I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, in which other Senators have joined, in no way impairs the fund. It all depends on whether the Retirement Board is willing to trust the Congress in future years to appropriate the total fund, in order that there may be no impairment of the fund whatever. I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be adopted. I know Congress has authorized the full amount. It passed a bill to provide for the retirement fund certain payments while railroad workers were in the armed services. There is now a question involved as to how many men actually were in the service. Using a certain formula, the cost figure arrived at is $166,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The figure of $166,000,000 was arrived at by the Railroad Retirement Board itself, was it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It was determined in accordance with a certain formula. The formula is a very difficult one to apply, but I am not disputing the amount.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that the committee had testimony regarding the formula, and also testimony to the effect that the result was 95 percent correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt about that. I am not disputing the total figure. However, I think the Retirement Board can trust the Congress to appropriate the necessary amount each year, rather than to appropriate the full amount now, and thus at this time increase the total appropriations. That is the only question involved in the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if I may merely say one additional word, the reason I became interested in the amendment, and the reason the Senator from Michigan also is interested in it, is simply this: We do not contend that the adoption of the amendment will ultimately save the Government any money;

but we do say that at the present time, when we are struggling so hard to balance the budget, when we are confronted with ECA payments, and expenditures for a very substantial Military Establishment, when we desire to avoid the effects of deficit spending and the necessity of increasing taxes, we can with perfect propriety take $123,000,000 from this year's appropriation, and rely upon the integrity of the Congress to discharge its obligation to the retirement fund and appropriate the required amount in future years. In view of the circumstances, it is our responsibility and duty in these difficult times, to take the action I have suggested. As the various appropriation bills come forward, we are going to face the problem constantly of deciding whether to attempt this year all the things we would like to do, or try to keep within what is practical to be done, in order to keep the budget in balance.

I do not want to leave with any of the Members on the other side of the aisle, or on this side of the aisle, the impression that ultimately much money will be saved by this method. But what I say is that we come $123,000,000 nearer to making it possible to provide other very necessary appropriations this year, without detriment to the Railroad Retirement fund, and, in the words of the Chairman himself, without harming any individual citizen; at the same time making it possible to assist in other ways where we may have need, as time goes on, before we exhaust all the Government's available funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely want to express the hope that the Senate and the Congress will not get into the habit of appropriating money to be paid in future years. In considering the bill and particularly this amendment, after the bill left the committee, I came to the conclusion that it is a poor procedure to appropriate the full amount of money and then say it shall be payable in future years. The Congress should make all necessary appropriations, as nearly as possible, and should make them available in the year in which they are to be expended. That is all the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts attempts to do. We could increase appropriations by billions of dollars. Whenever we erect a building or a dam or anything else, we could appropriate the total anticipated sum, and then say it shall be used within a certain number of years. That is not the ordinary and customary way of appropriating money. We appropriate so much to be used this year, and we appropriate so much next year, to be used in that year.

While I am in full accord with paying the full amount to the Retirement Board—I have talked the matter over with the chairman, and I believe there is authorization for it—while we are duty-bound to appropriate it, we should nevertheless appropriate it in four yearly installments. That was satisfactory to the chairman. We should not make a lump-sum appropriation this year and thereby increase aggregate appropriations at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to say a final word, and then I shall be through. In answer to my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], whose judgment I certainly respect, let me say that it seems to me that when we talk about our commitments to ECA and the other activities, we are likely to forget other commitments which were made at a time before ECA was thought of. If it had not been for the boys who are now the recipients and beneficiaries of the law we passed, probably there would not be any ECA.

Let me state to the Senate for a moment what railroad retirement authorities say about this appropriation:

> It is certainly necessary to appropriate the full amount at this time in order to give effect to the law—to comply with the specific provisions of section 4 (n) (ii) of the Railroad Retirement Act. This is so because the Railroad Retirement Act is financed on a level-premium basis.

Further the railroad retirement authorities have this to say:

> In appropriating to the account immediately the full $166,852,000 provided the necessary certainty as to the assets of the account. This immediate appropriation, however, would still fall short of compliance with the law if there were not also a corresponding payment into the account. It was, therefore, essential for such compliance that some immediate payment be made even though the payment constitutes only a part of the amount actually appropriated. This part payment completes the legality of the appropriation action without which such action would be compliance only in part. Aside from making compliance with the law complete, this immediate payment would enable the account to earn additional interest, which is essential under the actuarial reserve principle, and will facilitate the payment of the benefits attributable to military service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the committee has not recommended the payment of the whole $166,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The committee has not voted to give the Railroad Retirement Board the money on which interest can be earned. The committee is not doing what was requested, but the committee is saying that this money would be over a period of 4 years.

I quite agree with the Senator from Michigan that we should not appropriate now something that will not be paid until 4 years from now. If we were to make such appropriations, on the same theory we should appropriate now the interest on all the bonds which are outstanding, because they are obligations of the United States and the interest will have to be paid next year and the year following and the year following that. But, Mr. President, we do not do that. We appropriate only for this year in connection with what we are obligated to pay this year.

If the committee has decided that it is not willing to have the money paid in advance and is not willing to have it placed in a fund from which it can subsequently be paid, but favors having the money paid only in installments, I can see no necessity for appropriating now for 3 or 4 years from now. It seems to me that to do so would be a bad precedent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the committee was completely satisfied that we are not going to lose anything, as the Senator from Michigan has stated, and we are not going to gain anything; but it is just a matter of keeping faith with the law. That is all it amounts to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has made two speeches on the amendment and cannot be recognized again to speak on it again.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I understand this proposition, the $166,000,000 is to pay the premiums which the soldiers would have paid if they had stayed on their jobs, but which they were prevented from doing because they went to war.

The Congress passed a bill providing for payment into the Railroad Retirement Fund of the amount those soldiers would have paid had they remained in the employ of the railroads during the war.

When in our early years we buy a $1,000 life-insurance policy and pay so much a year in premiums, we probably pay total premiums of $600. The only way the insurance company has of having the $1,000 available when the policy comes due is to earn interest on the premiums which are paid. On an actuarial basis, this $166,000,000 should be paid in so that the premium will earn interest and the full amount of the policy will be available when retirement is requested by the group of railroad workers who served as soldiers. If the money does not go into the fund, it will not draw interest, and then someone must pay an additional assessment. That someone will be either the men working for the railroads or the railroads or the Government.

In the committee we realized that this amount of money should have been paid in as the soldiers went into the war; it should have been paid during the year in which their payments would otherwise have gone into the fund if they had continued to be employed by the railroads. So we are late now in making these payments; we are possibly 3 or 4 years late.

We realized, too, that we did not want to provide all of it in any one year, for that would be too much of a load on this year's appropriations. Therefore, we said that we shall do the best we can; we shall pay a quarter of it now and shall catch up as quickly as we can in getting the remainder of this obligation out of the way.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may read two paragraphs of the committee hearings, at the point where there occurred a colloquy which I think is very important.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the hearings before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on House bill 3333, show, at page 389, a colloquy between the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman of the subcommittee, and Mr. Kennedy, chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, as follows:

Senator McCARRAN. If the committee should find that the Railroad Retirement Account is entitled to this amount of $166,000,000 but should, nevertheless, wish to keep the present budget as low as possible, would the Railroad Retirement Board be satisfied with a limited appropriation of this amount, but to be payable in four installments of about $42,000,000 each, the first to be paid this year, and the remaining three installments to be paid one each in the next 3 years?

Mr. KENNEDY. As Chairman of the Board, Senator McCARRAN, I think I can speak for the Board without having discussed it with them. I am certain in my own mind that the Board would receive such a recommendation favorably, if it was made by this committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS LAW ENACTED BY THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the campaign which closed last fall, the President of the United States upon different occasions said that the displaced-persons law passed by the Eightieth Congress was discriminatory against Jews and Catholics. In the Democratic National Convention that charge was reiterated.

I hold in my hand the Democratic platform. At page 11, we find that the Democratic Party there said:

We pledge ourselves to legislation to admit a minimum of 400,000 displaced persons found eligible for United States citizenship without discrimination as to race or religion. We condemn the undemocratic action of the Republican Eightieth Congress in passing an inadequate and bigoted bill for this purpose, which law imposed un-American restrictions based on race and religion upon such admissions.

More than that, Mr. President, in the closing week of the last session of the Eightieth Congress the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] stated upon the floor of the Senate that the displaced-persons bill discriminated against Jews and Catholics. That charge was denied by the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Yet, all through the campaign we heard the question of religion shamefully raised by the Democratic Party. Its candidates raised it all over the country; but the truth eternally catches up with lies. Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] had this to say on page 5042 of the RECORD upon the occasion of introducing a new displaced-persons bill:

The fact is—and I know concerning what I speak, for I have, within the course of the last several months, studied this entire subject exhaustively—

Then he goes on to say, on the same page:

Mr. President, the present law has been falsely criticized as being unjust and discriminatory. Wherein lie the injustices and the discriminations? Although it is charged that the present law discriminates against certain religious groups, official spokesmen for some of these groups have denied that the law discriminates against them. Moreover, the facts immediately dispel this charge.

It is charged that the present law discriminates against persons of the Jewish or Catholic faith. As of March 31 of this year, 44 percent of the displaced persons who have been admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Catholic faith. Thirty-nine percent of the persons admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Jewish faith. Eight and one-half percent of the persons admitted pursuant to the act have been of the Protestant faith, and 8½ percent have been of the Greek Orthodox faith.

Then we have the words of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], also a member of the Judiciary Committee and also a Democrat, as is the distinguished Senator from Nevada. What does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi say? At page 5043, in connection with the displaced-persons bill introduced yesterday by the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Mississippi said:

I invite the Members of the Senate to study the statements of the Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons which are filed with the Clerk of the House under the Lobbying Registration Act.

Then he goes on to tell about the vast amount of money this organization has spent, and he says:

The total expenses listed for that quarter amount to $149,507.96.

Then the distinguished Senator goes on to say:

The money which is spent by this organization—

Referring to the Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons—

is undoubtedly responsible for most of the vituperative attacks made upon any Member of Congress who refuses to be swayed by indiscriminate charges of discrimination. It appears to be the belief of the sponsors of this pressure group, and the others like it, that they can stampede the Congress into adopting any sort of legislation they happen to propose, by spending thousands of dollars for propaganda, by raising a pitiful howl about imaginary discriminations contained in this legislation.

Listen to this, Mr. President. This is a Democrat speaking, a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

Let me say that the present displaced persons law has in it no clause, no provisions which in any way discriminates against any group anywhere.

I am very happy to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, particularly in view of the fact that the senior Senator from Nevada and the senior Senator from Mississippi are both Democrats. I remember very well that at the time the question was raised by the Senator from Rhode Island it was indignantly denied by the Senator from Wisconsin. It happens that I am also a member of the Judiciary Committee. I resented the statement at the time it was made upon the floor, at the time it was made at the Philadelphia convention of the Democratic Party, and also during their campaign, because I knew the statement was not true. I am happy at this late date that the two Democratic Senators whom I have mentioned rose upon the floor and publicly made their statements.

SUSPENSION OF LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement concerning the concurrent resolution which I submitted on yesterday. It is Senate Concurrent Resolution 33. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee in charge of the appropriation bill to permit me to take it up by unanimous consent, because I think the Senate will agree to it. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 138 (legislative budget) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is suspended pending further study and until otherwise provided by concurrent resolution or law.

Mr. President, in the Reorganization Act passed August 2, 1946, section 138 provides: (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress, and, after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts, and expenditures for such year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment.

Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Tennessee—I have to put it in the form of a question, due to the rules of the Senate—whether he knew the question had been before the Committee on Rules and Administration this morning, and that committee did not report the resolution of the Senator from Tennessee, but that there was a general consensus of opinion that we would consult the Senator from Tennessee, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, and other Senators concerned with the problem, and that, rather than countenance the subterfuge, more or less, of having a dead letter in the statute, it would be far better for the committee to

report a joint resolution to repeal the section itself.

I should like to ask the Senator if he also knew that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, as I understand, is now in the process of holding a committee meeting on a joint resolution rather than on the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I have just been informed of that in the last few moments. That affords an additional reason why I think I should make the statement I am making.

The chairmen of the four committees which constitute the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and myself, have met to consider the subject, and have very carefully considered it.

I wish to say to the Senator from California that I felt that the provision of the act we are discussing should be repealed. We have found that by experience. It has been postponed twice already by resolution. It was tried out in the fiscal year 1948, and it did not work, and I thought it should be repealed. But the Members of the House on the committee felt that a resolution of the kind I have submitted would be the better way to get the matter through the House, because there is a limited time in which to get action in the House. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, submitted a concurrent resolution, in exactly the same words as in the concurrent resolution I submitted yesterday. He said that could be adopted by the House, that inquiry had been made of the other members of the committee, Republicans as well as Democrats, and they felt sure the concurrent resolution could be adopted in the House without trouble. It was for that reason that I offered the concurrent resolution yesterday.

Mr. President, this is rather a subterfuge. I say to the Senator from California that in my judgment the purpose behind the provision for a legislative budget is excellent, but the method which has been adopted for bringing it about is not excellent. It is unworkable, and we will have to disregard it, repeal it, or postpone it until a future date. That is the situation.

I feel sure that if the Senator from California were now a member of the Committee on Appropriations, of which he was once a distinguished member, he would have felt just as the other members of the committee felt about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want the able Senator from Tennessee to be clear in his mind that I am not making a criticism of him for having submitted the concurrent resolution. I am concerned merely with the mechanics of accomplishing what is desired, and I wanted the Senator to know the Committee on Rules and Administration had considered the subject this morning.

It is the personal belief of the junior Senator from California that a repeal measure, a joint resolution, would go through this body with far less debate, very likely, than a mere postponement resolution. It was to expedite matters and inform the Senator that I would have to object to a unanimous-consent request to withdraw the concurrent resolution from the committee prior to the time the committee has had a chance to report the joint resolution that I rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. I think, however, I should make a statement at this time, which I shall do if the Senate will permit me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. What does the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator provide? I am not familiar with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall read it again:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That section 138 (legislative budget) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is suspended pending further study and until otherwise provided by concurrent resolution or law.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is a concurrent resolution?

Mr. McKELLAR. A concurrent resolution. It does not have to be signed by the President.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is not the time to oppose such a measure, but I call attention to the fact that I spoke on this subject in the Senate, I think on February 10. I think the provision for a legislative budget has real merit. If the majority had desired, they could have obtained a sufficient staff at the beginning of the year to work on this matter, and to prepare the budget in time. It would have been a great aid to the Congress in balancing the budget so that we would keep within our revenues. I think it will be a sad day for the Nation when we repeal or suspend the legislative budget, and I shall have more to say later, when the matter comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to proceed to make an explanation, as I consider this a matter of importance.

Mr. President, as I have said, in the Reorganization Act passed August 2, 1946, section 138 provided that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, should be appointed a joint committee to make a report on the legislative budget. Subdivision (b) provided:

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $———.

The first meeting of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget appointed under section 138 of the Reorganization Act was held in January 1947. The joint committee made its report to the respective bodies on February 15, 1947. The resolution passed the House, but in the Senate it was amended, and the amended resolution went to conference. The conferees were deadlocked on the issue involved, and no further action was taken on the legislative budget of that year.

The second meeting of the joint committee was held January 22, 1948. Another meeting was held in February.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

1947

On February 21, 1947, the House of Representatives sent to the Senate the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20), in which it requested the conrurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the fiscal year 1948 will approximate $39,100,000,000, and that expenditures should not exceed $31,500,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $24,000,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

On March 3, 1947, the Senate adopted a substitute for the House concurrent resolution as follows:

That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate $39,100,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $33,000,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $25,100,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year. It is the further judgment of the Congress that sound fiscal policy requires that not less than $2,600,000,000 of the excess of revenues over expenditures be applied toward reduction of the public debt during said fiscal year.

It is further declared to be the judgment of the Congress that all proceeds from the transfer or disposition of property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, which are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts should be applied toward reduction of the public debt.

The Senate asked for a conference on its amendment to the concurrent resolution, to which request the House agreed, but no agreement was ever reached by the conferees, and the concurrent resolution died with the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress.

I am sorry the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is not now present, because what I have just read shows the trouble the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget is in. We had to consider the House in adopting such a concurrent resolution, and the House would not agree. House Members declared, and with truth, I think, that the budget of the Senate was somewhat of a guess, and

it was somewhat of a guess, as we all know.

1948

On February 9, 1948, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], for the Senator from New Hampshire Mr. BRIDGES, by unanimous consent, from the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, submitted a report, together with the views of the minority—Report No. 887—accompanied by the following concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 42:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate $47,300,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

Ordered, That the report be printed and that the concurrent resolution be placed on the calendar.

On February 18, 1948, the above concurrent resolution, after debate, was agreed to.

1949

On February 7, 1949, the House of Representatives agreed to the following concurrent resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 22:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

On February 10, 1949, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution. An amendment by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to amend the concurrent resolution by striking out "May 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 15" was rejected by a vote of 24 yeas, 43 nays. The concurrent resolution was then agreed to.

At that time the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was chairman of the joint committee and he made this statement:

Before anything else comes before the meeting there is a general feeling, I believe, among members of the subcommittee to which you entrusted the task of preparing this report on the legislative budget, that although the Reorganization Act passed by Congress was a step forward, there were some features of the act which have proved impractical. It has proved impracticable to determine at such an early date as February 15 an actual picture of the necessary appropriations or expenditures for the coming fiscal year. I think it was the general feeling of the committee of 20, although no formal action was taken, that some amendment to the law would be necessary in the course of the present congressional session. Some individuals have different ideas as to the best manner of amending the law to bring about the desired objective. However, we are faced with the fact that the law is on the statute books, and as long as it remains on the statute books we must do our best to comply with it. Therefore, you have the recommendations of your subcommittee today.

I might say that the subcommittee had made the best guess it could at that time and I voted to sustain the committee, and in full committee voted for the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate $47,300,000,000, and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

To conclude the history of the matter, I wish to say that later on, on February 15, 1949, a resolution was adopted giving the committee until May 1 to make the report.

The chairmen of the four committees have met with other members of their committees a number of times and I beg to say that we have found it next to impossible to reach a conclusion as to our report.

In the nature of things any report would be largely a guess. In order to make a report that would be of any value it would be necessary to have a vast amount of research of the facts so that we could make a report of value. The committee has not had the time to go into these facts to the extent to which they ought to be gone into and it has not had a sufficient force—indeed it does not have any force—to have the matter examined properly.

As I look at it, any fixation of limitations of either revenue or expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year would be largely a guess.

At all events, Mr. President, we have not been able to reach a conclusion about the matter and yesterday I took the liberty of submitting a concurrent resolution suspending section 138—legislative budget—of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and I hope very much that the concurrent resolution may pass the Senate.

We have only a short time before the last extension ends, and as it ought to be acted on immediately I shall ask unanimous consent to take the resolution up at the very first opportunity.

Mr. President, I am going to make a unanimous consent request to bring up later in the day the concurrent resolution which I have already read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 33.

Was it the intention of the Senator from Tennessee to ask that that be done now?

Mr. McKELLAR. I prefer to have it done now, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the interest of several Senators who are members of the committee, and who are very much interested in the situation, I must respectfully object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a further statement on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the purpose of this provision of the law is excellent. Everyone agrees that we need to exert the greatest care in making our expenditures. I think everyone realizes that our expenditures should not exceed our revenue. The budgetary system is an excellent one. We have such a system and that budget is sent in regularly at the beginning of Congress by the President. If we could set up a permanent legislative organization to work on our legislative budget, taking the President's budget as the basis, each year it would undoubtedly aid the Government greatly toward limiting our expenditures and toward living within our receipts. But this particular resolution, drawn as it is, is cumbersome and I do not believe we can get the proper result under it. It ought to be carefully studied and amended so as to do the work.

As before stated, it was passed August 2, 1946. In 1947 it was acted on but the provision was unsatisfactory and a disagreement arose about it in the two Houses and it was lost in conference. In 1948 it passed both Houses and became the law but no attention was paid to it.

The maximum estimate of expenditures as reported by the committee was $37,200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949. I am advised by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee that the total amount appropriated in the second session of the Eightieth Congress was $41,764,383,348. The estimated receipts were $47,300,000,000.

In 1948 the President sent in his budget estimate of expenditures of $39,669,000,000. His estimate of receipts was fixed by him at $44,479,000,000. Later on, in January 1949, he sent in a revised estimate for these figures for 1949 fixing the receipts at $39,580,000,000 and the expenditures at $40,180,000,000. These figures have been readjusted largely because of refunds of taxes. The latter figures on receipts show that it is impossible for a legislative budget to do more than guess in the matter unless a permanent organization for that purpose is created.

In addition to that the joint legislative committee guessed these receipts for 1949 at $47,300,000,000 and the expenditures at $37,200,000,000.

Another reason for these divergent views about estimates and receipts is that in the meantime last year Congress passed a law reducing taxes $5,400,000,000.

In other words, Mr. President, it is my own view that the purpose of this legislative budget is fine. We need something of the kind. It is very necessary especially when our income is decreasing and our appropriations are going up but it must be done in a different way. It cannot be done by guessing.

I am not an expert on these matters but for the Congress to make headway along the lines of keeping expenditures within appropriations it would be absolutely necessary to set up a legislative budget similar in nature to the executive budget.

The chairmen of the full committees have had a number of meetings lately and I believe they have reached the same conclusion that the law must be changed in order for us to make effective checks and balances on income and out-go of Federal funds. The first year of the act, the fiscal year 1948, the Congress was so uncertain about what was to be done that the legislative budget estimate was lost in conference. The next fiscal year 1949, the joint legislative committee

recommended figures that were adopted by both Houses of Congress but nothing was done under it and nothing has been done up until this time, and I believe that everyone who has looked into it regard these figures made in the fiscal year 1949 as mere guesses and for that reason we recommend the adoption of the resolution that I have presented.

That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is not workable is not only shown by the Congress' failure to make it work but it is shown by the budget bureau in having to revise its own estimates as heretofore shown by me. These figures show for 1948 that the budget estimate of expenditures was $39,669,000,000 and the revised estimate was $40,180,000,000—a difference of $511,000,000. The first estimate of receipts was $44,479,000,000 when actually the receipts were $39,580,000,000, a difference of $4,899,000,000.

Mr. President, to complicate matters further there is a difference between expenditures and appropriations. Frequently money is appropriated that is not spent. There are also carry-overs. At the same time after budgets are made events occur that require appropriations that must be made like the large appropriations that we made for storm relief out West and other emergency matters.

So I feel there is but one thing to do and that is to pass this resolution and undertake, after further research, to adopt a plan of the legislative budget that will be effective. This one is certainly not effective.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is very important that we have a legislative budget, but it should be a legislative budget somewhat in the nature of the present executive budget. We must have experts, men who know, men who conduct research and furnish the facts on which the Senate and the House can act. We cannot act upon mere guesses.

I have already suggested that the present budget is sometimes readjusted. It is of immense help, certainly to the Appropriations Committees, and I believe to both Houses of Congress. It is a very wise provision of the law. In my judgment a legislative budget would be equally wise, especially in these days, when it is necessary to conserve our resources. We should take every step to live within our means. We should take every step to avoid appropriating more money than we expect to receive or do receive from the taxpayers of the Nation in any one year. Such a legislative budget would be of great value.

However, this provision of the law is not operative, and either we should suspend it until greater research can be made—I think that is the best way to go about it—or it ought to be repealed, because it is an unworkable measure. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee last year and the year before, made a speech last year in which he took the same position I am now taking, namely, that it is an unworkable measure. Any Senator who will examine it will find that it is unworkable, and must be amended in order to be of any real benefit to the Congress or to the country.

For that reason I am submitting the concurrent resolution. I have asked unanimous consent for its present consideration, but objection has been made. That ends the matter until it can come up in the regular order.

Mr. President, I felt it my duty to make this report to the Senate, because the act requires that such a report be made, and I am giving the Senate the facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. While the question is not before the Chair, it might be worth while to suggest to the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators that this section of the Reorganization Act is a part of the rule-making provisions of the law, so recognized in the Reorganization Act itself. That being true, the Chair is of the opinion at the present time that that section could be repealed by a concurrent resolution as well as by a joint resolution, because, being a part of the rules, and so recognized in the law itself, only concurrent action would be necessary to repeal it. It is not the function of the Chair to pass upon whether it ought to be repealed, but purely from a parliamentary standpoint the Chair makes that suggestion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the suggestion.

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is chairman, and the committee is now considering it. I believe that the Senator from Arizona is considering introducing a bill to repeal this section of the act. It might be just as well for him to introduce a concurrent resolution repealing that provision of the act, if it can be done that way. Personally I think the present provision of the Reorganization Act is so utterly unworkable, so utterly deficient for carrying out the purposes for which it was intended, that that section of the act should be repealed, and I urge that course upon my colleagues.

It is said that the purposes of the act were good. I agree that the purposes are good, and that some such act should be passed. But we must act under the law so long as it is the law. We must act with the House. The House Members being opposed to the repeal of this provision, there was nothing I could do but accept the suggestion of Representative Cannon, who offered this resolution in the House. I believe that the best way to handle the matter this year is to adopt the resolution which I have submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] having objected, the question is not now before the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator will agree with me, will he not, that the leaders of my party who sit on this side of the aisle, who know and have studied this subject, have the same thoughts as does the Senator from Tennessee. However, they feel at present that the committee should give more careful consideration to this very difficult subject than can be done hastily on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely all right. However, I did not expect objection, because I know that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who was chairman of the committee last year, has exactly the same view about the situation that I and other members of the joint committee have. For that reason I did not think there would be objection.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Bridges	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Downey	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Lodge	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarran	Taft
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Thye
Gillette	McGrath	Tobey
Green	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gurney	McMahon	Watkins
Hayden	Magnuson	Wherry
Hendrickson	Malone	Williams
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Withers
Hill	Miller	Young
Hoey	Millikin	

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment, proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], on page 42, in line 10.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, Mr. Joseph H. Freehill, counsel for the Railway Labor Executives Association, has just authorized me to say to the Senate that the railroad men believe the pending amendment, if adopted, would be prejudicial to their welfare. The friends of the praiseworthy railroad employees should, on the approaching roll call, vote "No."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should merely like to say before the clerk calls the roll, that I am as friendly to railroad employees as is any other Senator. I have plenty of friends among them. I am basing my action upon the statement of the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board himself, in an-

swer to a question, when he testified before the committee, in which he said no one's rights would be affected, no one would be prejudiced, no one would be injured by the amendment which I am proposing. The amendment will give them everything this year they would otherwise have, whether or not the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the part of the record quoted by the Senator from Massachusetts, to which he is now calling the attention of the Senate, reads as follows:

> Senator McCARRAN. If the committee should find that the Railroad Retirement Account is entitled to this amount of $166,000,000 but should, nevertheless, wish to keep the present budget as low as possible, would the Railroad Retirement Board be satisfied with a limited appropriation of this amount, but to be payable in four installments of about $42,000,000 each?

That is exactly what the committee did.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that is exactly what my amendment proposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	George	Schoeppel
Brewster	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Knowland	Taft
Byrd	Lodge	Thye
Cain	McCarthy	Tobey
Cordon	Millikin	Vandenberg
Donnell	O'Conor	Watkins
Ferguson	Robertson	Williams
Flanders	Saltonstall	

NAYS—51

Anderson	Hunt	Malone
Chapman	Jenner	Maybank
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Miller
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ecton	Kem	Myers
Ellender	Kerr	Neely
Fulbright	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Gillette	Langer	Pepper
Green	Long	Russell
Gurney	McCarran	Sparkman
Hayden	McClellan	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McKellar	Wherry
Holland	McMahon	Withers
Humphrey	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Graham	Taylor
Butler	Kefauver	Tydings
Capehart	Lucas	Wagner
Connally	Martin	Wiley
Eastland	Morse	
Frear	Reed	

So Mr. SALTONSTALL's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 42, line 10.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May we get action on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 42, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of offering an amendment. I yielded to the Senator from New Mexico in order that the committee amendment might be agreed to. Is the amendment about to be stated a further committee amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the committee amendments have all been acted upon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have an amendment which I wish to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that there are two more committee amendments to be considered, the first on page 42, line 11, and the second on line 17.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 42, line 11, which will be stated.

The amendment on page 42, line 11, was, after the word "That" to insert "of the amount of $166,852,000, included herein as an appropriation for military service credits under the Railroad Retirement Act, $41,713,000 shall become available in the fiscal year 1950, and $41,713,000 shall become available in each of the fiscal years 1951, 1952, and 1953: *Provided further*, That".

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was on page 42, line 17, after the word "amount," to insert "of $882,741,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in behalf of myself, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I offer the amendment I send to the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$17,027,000" and insert "$21,650,000." On page 23, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$15,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 23, line 3, was agreed to this morning will have to be reconsidered before the amendment would be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment of course is to increase the amounts which the committee recommended for the National Cancer Institute. I think there is very compelling reason why the amounts should be increased to the extent suggested in the amendment just offered.

In the Seventy-fifth Congress a bill was passed, which is now Public Law No. 244, which established the National Cancer Institute. The Institute has been a very successful undertaking by the Government. Many Senators have visited it, and probably gone through it. It is situated in Bethesda across from the Naval Hospital, in the hospital building area. The purpose of the Institute has been to promote research in cancer. It is not a bed hospital, but it is engaged in correlating all the cancer research it is possible to correlate, and provides a meeting place for those studying cancer in various private institutions, or individually, or in universites, a place where they can meet and put all their discoveries and all their information on the table, so as to determine whether the Government cannot spearhead the research and correlation, and if something cannot be done about the dread disease of cancer.

Mr. President, Congress has provided some money for this Institute. The Senate and the House started with an appropriation of a million dollars. The land on which the Institute is located was donated by a citizen of Maryland. We established the National Advisory Cancer Council, which is composed of the great cancer experts not only of the United States, but of the world. They have guided the Institute, through the Public Health Service. Congress has increased the appropriations from year to year. We did not do so much during the war, but last year we appropriated an increased amount.

The purpose of the amendment is to make the funds adequate, particularly for the building of more research agencies throughout the country, and for granting more fellowships, to encourage scientists and the youth of the Nation to go into this work, and to secure a greater correlation of the work being done in cancer research by all institutions, whether they be public or private.

I know the committee gave consideration to the figures submitted, but it has been pretty difficult to get information as to the exact amounts which may be needed. All the information available to me indicates that the added amounts suggested should be appropriated for the Cancer Institute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the figures in the report. The 1949 total appropriation for this particular item was $14,180,000. The estimate for 1950 was $16,100,000. The House added $300,000, and the Senate committee recommended an increase of $627,000. The additional amount allowed in the Senate committee was for the following items:

Special control grants	$250,000
Trainees grants	75,000
Direct operations	802,000

Mr. President, I know the Senator is sincere, and I should like to help him out with his amendment, but I wanted to read these figures in order to show the Senator that both the House committee and the Senate committee did pretty well, in my opinion. Furthermore, I might say that under the item for contract authority, the budget had asked for $900,000. The House made that $1,500,000, to which increase the Senate committee agreed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am familiar with those facts, and I know the committee has always had much sympathy with this great project of cancer research on which the Government has embarked. But the best information I have indicates that the amounts should be increased, for the simple reason that the Institute now has on file applications for funds to construct research facilities totaling in excess of $10,000,000. Fifteen States and seventeen separate institutions are involved. I have in my hand a list showing all the universities and hospitals in the 15 States which have pending construction grant applications.

The other part of the amendment provides for an increase in the amount for fellowships and research grants. Applications have been made by reliable institutions, such as the University of Arkansas School of Medicine, the University of California at Los Angeles, Stanford University, George Washington University, and other universities and colleges, including Meharry Medical College in Tennessee. Moreover, a great number of colleges and universities have expressed intention to apply for cancer-research facilities, for further construction grants, numbering in all 28, some being private hospitals, some great research institutions privately conducted, but as nonprofit research institutions. All these applications and expressions of intent to make applications, seem to me to make it imperative that we do more respecting the cancer problem than the committee is doing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list to which I have just referred may be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Cancer Institute

LIST OF PENDING CONSTRUCTION-GRANT APPLICATIONS

State	Institution	Requested
Arkansas	University of Arkansas School of Medicine	$34,865
California	University of California at Los Angeles	884,736
	Stanford University	505,555
District of Columbia	George Washington University	600,000
Indiana	Indiana University	162,400
Kansas	University of Kansas School of Medicine	200,000
Maryland	Johns Hopkins University	1,102,816
Massachusetts	New England Center Hospital (Tufts College Medical School)	400,000
Missouri	St. Louis University	600,000
North Carolina	Duke University	1,300,000
	University of North Carolina	460,950
New Jersey	Princeton University	270,000
New York	Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases	286,700
Ohio	Ohio State University	1,500,000
Oklahoma	Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation	125,000
Pennsylvania	University of Pennsylvania	225,000
Tennessee	Meharry Medical College	30,385
Total (15 States, 17 institutions)		8,688,407

EXPRESSED INTENT TO APPLY FOR CANCER RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANTS, AS OF MAR. 4, 1949

Alabama	Isbelle Aglime Co.	(1)
California	Mount Zion Hospital, San Francisco	(1)
	College of Medical Evangelists	(1)
Connecticut	Yale University	$750,000
Florida	Dade County Cancer Society	75,000
	Florida State Board of Health	(1)
Illinois	Brokaw Hospital, Bloomington	(1)
	Loyola University, Chicago	(1)
	Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago	200,000
Indiana	University of Notre Dame	(1)
Louisiana	Louisiana State University	(1)
	Tulane University of Louisiana	(1)
Massachusetts	Harvard University	300,000
Michigan	Detroit Institute of Cancer Research	(1)
	Dr. M. W. Mattes	(1)
New York	Albany Medical College	(1)
	Montefiore Hospital, New York City	(1)
	Syracuse University	(1)
North Carolina	Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem	(1)
Ohio	Western Reserve Hospital	600,000
South Dakota	University of South Dakota	(1)
Tennessee	Baroness Erlange Hospital, Chattanooga	250,000
	Vanderbilt University	(1)
Vermont	The University of Vermont	(1)
Virginia	The Memorial Hospital	(1)
Washington	The Tumor Institute of the Swedish Hospital	500,000
Wisconsin	Marquette University	(1)
San Juan, P. I.	San Juan City Hospital	(1)
Total		2,675,000

[1] No estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington desire to have both amendments he has submitted voted on together?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, Mr. President, I desire to have both amendments voted on together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Senator from Washington will have to ask unanimous consent to amend the text of the bill, on page 23, line 12. Does the Senator make such unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make that unanimous-consent request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, what is the Senator from Washington asking?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington desires to offer an amendment to the text of the bill, on page 23, line 12.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I understood the Chair to say that the Senator was asking unanimous consent to amend the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One part of his amendment applies to line 12. Another part of his amendment is in line 3, to amend the committee amendment. The Senator wants both amendments voted on at the same time. The

Senator received unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 23, line 3, but in order to have both amendments voted on at the same time, the Senator from Washington must receive unanimous consent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In order to make the situation clear, Mr. President, I understood the Chair to say that the Senator had asked unanimous consent to amend the text of the bill, which would be an amendment in and of itself. If the Senator from Washington is asking unanimous consent for reconsideration of action taken on the committee amendment, so he can present his amendment and have it acted upon, as an amendment to the committee amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The purpose of my request is to enable action to be taken on both amendments together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in addition to the reason I cited, there is another compelling reason why I think these amounts should be increased, which is that scientific institutions and schools, hospitals and other institutions, are involved in this problem. I want to read certain matter to the Senate. I shall not be long, because my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has other amendments to offer which are just as important. I think what I propose to read should go into the RECORD. There has been placed on each Senator's desk a résumé of the cancer problem.

Cancer is the No. 2 killer of our people. One out of every eight people who died in 1947 died of cancer.

Nineteen million thirty-eight thousand five hundred people now alive will die of cancer unless new treatments and cures are found.

One hundred eighty-nine thousand eight hundred eleven persons died of cancer in 1947 in the United States, or 1 out of every 8 deaths.

In 1937, it was estimated that 930,000 people were suffering from cancer and other tumors.

At least 555,000 people are presently under treatment for cancer.

About 325,000 new cases of cancer are diagnosed each year.

If this condition continues, Mr. President, about 1 out of every 5 people now alive in the United States will have cancer at some time in his or her life.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. This is a very important question, and I ask the Senator if he would have any objection if I suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would rather wait until the Senator from Florida obtains the floor, because what he proposes to submit and what I have submitted are related subjects.

Mr. LANGER. The subject involved is so very important I thought we should have a quorum of Senators present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

This, Mr. President, is a very startling thing. Only about 1,834 special cancer beds are available in both private and public hospitals in the United States for the estimated 555,000 patients under treatment for cancer. The purpose of my amendment providing a small increase in construction loans is to increase the number of beds.

In contrast with this, 81,328 special beds are available for tuberculosis patients. Tuberculosis killed 48,064 people in 1947, while cancer killed 189,811. I do not mean by that that we should not have beds for tuberculosis patients, but I do say that the figures show considerable neglect on the part of all of us respecting this No. 2 killer of our people.

We have only about 129 cancer-detection centers approved by the American College of Surgeons, for people with no apparent symptoms, in the United States; or one detection center to every 1,120,000 people.

We have only about 503 approved cancer-treatment and diagnostic clinics, of which 74 are only diagnostic clinics, in the whole United States. Doctors will tell us that there is a need for a cancer clinic for every 100,000 of the population, one within a radius of from 30 to 50 miles of each patient.

There are only 10 public hospitals, having 1,049 beds, which are concerned only with cancer. Yet 1 person out of 5 in this Chamber is going to have cancer sometime in his life.

We have spent about $10,587,000 for research and only $8,000,000 for construction of research facilities, which I have divided up, and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH MONEY IS AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH TO FIND NEW TREATMENTS AND CURES FOR CANCER?

About $10,587,000 for research and $8,000,000 for construction of research facilities, divided as follows:

Government funds: Congress has appropriated approximately $6,060,000 (exclusive of Atomic Energy Commission figure, which is not available but not exceeding $5,000,000) for cancer research, plus $8,000,000 for construction of research facilities at various institutions, during the fiscal year 1948–49.

Nongovernmental funds: Voluntary agencies spent approximately $4,502,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the American Cancer Society in 1948 raised about $10,000,000 for education and service to cancer patients and for lay and professional education in this field. But the sum total of both public and private contributions in this manner means that we are spending about $55 per cancer death annually, or $19 per known case.

In contrast with this; the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis allocated $1,779,576 for research in 1947, or nearly $1,000 per death, as compared to $55 per cancer death.

Congress appropriated $29,716,000 for the Department of Agriculture in 1948 for research in the control and cure of plant and animal diseases—almost double the amount we appropriated for cancer research.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement of how much money the Government has spent for the establishment of cancer clinics and services.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH IS THE GOVERNMENT SPENDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CANCER CLINICS AND SERVICES?

1. The National Cancer Institute, United States Public Health Service, has about $2,500,000 for the year ending July 1, 1949, for grants-in-aid to States for establishment of clinics and services to cancer patients.

(a) This makes a total of about $12,500,000 for service and education in this field, both from voluntary organizations and Government funds, to be spent over a 14-month period.

2. In contrast to this, the United States Public Health Service alone has available for grants-in-aid to States to establish clinics and services—$15,008,507 for control of venereal diseases, and $6,790,000 for tuberculosis control.

(a) 12,671 deaths were attributed to syphilis in 1947 and 48,064 deaths to tuberculosis; but cancer killed 189,811 people in the same year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, here are some more startling figures: In contrast with the total of approximately $10,587,000 which was available from public and private sources for cancer research, in 1947 we spent in the United States approximately $1,565,000,000 for theater tickets; $725,000,000 on toilet articles and preparations; $287,200,000 for flowers, seeds, and potted plants; $85,000,000 in nonvending coin machines. The notation here is "receipts minus pay-off." I do not know what that means. We spent $32,400,000 for veterinary service and purchase of pets.

I do not say that these things are wrong; but I do say that in contrast with all the other things which we are doing, publicly and privately, there is a startling neglect of the great problem of cancer.

Nearly four times as many people died from cancer as died from tuberculosis in 1947. Nearly 330 times as many people died from cancer in 1947 as died from infantile paralysis in the same year; and we appropriate and spend almost 10 times as much money on infantile paralysis as on cancer. Nearly two and a half times as many people died from cancer during World War II as were killed in action in the armed forces.

Of the 182,000 deaths from cancer and other malignant tumors in 1946, 92,295, or more than half, were under 65 years of age. Too many people think that cancer is primarily a disease of old age. More than half the deaths in 1946 were

of persons under 65 years of age; 9 percent were under 45; and 2 percent under 25 years of age.

There are leads in cancer research in many directions, including the use of radio-active materials, for which we must have more money for laboratories; the use of nitrogen mustards in the treatment of leukemia and Hodgkins disease; antibiotic substances and chemical compounds which affect cancer tissue; use of hormones, particularly estrogens and androgens in the treatment of several types of cancer; study of nutrition; and improved methods of surgery, including new methods in the use of X-ray, and many other specific studies.

Mr. President, I believe that if we keep this program going, and sufficiently accelerate it with the funds which the experts say they can use, we may some day arrive at a cure for this dread disease.

Here is some good news: Dr. Huggins, of the University of Chicago, has discovered a simple blood test for the determination of cancer in a human being. This test can be performed in any standard hospital by technicians at the rate of approximately 15 tests an hour. This is one of the most important steps forward in the cancer problem, and may lead to much further light on the cause of cancer. But in order that those 15 people may come in every hour, and in order that the 1 out of 5 people in the United States who will die of cancer may be treated, we must have more research and more laboratories. I believe that the small increase we have asked is consistent with what the men who know the problem say they can use. I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Millikin
Anderson	Humphrey	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Murray
Bricker	Ives	Myers
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kem	Reed
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Long	Sparkman
Flanders	McCarran	Stennis
Fulbright	McCarthy	Taft
George	McClellan	Thye
Gurney	McGrath	Tydings
Hayden	McMahon	Watkins
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Malone	Williams
Hill	Maybank	Young

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations is conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). A quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, by letter delivered to me at approximately 2:20 this afternoon, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and I were invited to appear at a meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this afternoon at 2:30 p. m., to ask Secretary of State Acheson appropriate questions respecting his testimony on the North Atlantic Pact. Therefore, I request unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is given.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as the Senator from Missouri has stated, I also received a letter inviting me to be present at the meeting this afternoon of the Foreign Relations Committee, to ask questions of Secretary of State Acheson. Therefore, for that purpose, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] which are being considered en bloc.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] of which several of us are privileged to be cosponsors. I say I shall speak only a short time, because there is hardly anything which can be added to what has already been so well said by the able Senator from Washington; but I thought I might venture to add several statements by way of explanation.

This amendment is an application for an increase to the extent of approximately $15,000,000 in aid of research and in aid of the construction of additional research facilities for cancer, above the amount the committee has allowed in the bill as reported.

Mr. President, every dime of the amount requested by the Senator from Washington and his associates in connection with the amendment has been recommended by outstanding cancer specialists in the United States. I refer to private physicians, such distinguished men as Dr. Rose, head of the Cancer Memorial Hospital in New York, and the outstanding cancer specialist in the United States. Moreover, every dime sought by the Senator from Washington and his associates in connection with the amendment is requested and desired by the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. President, let me state how the money requested by the Senator from Washington and his associates would be distributed: $1,000,000 more than the committee has requested would go for the establishment of clinics in the several States, for the early detection and diagnosis of cancer. At the present time, 17 States have such clinics, and in aid thereof the Federal Government is appropriating less than $15,000 to each project, although it has been found that a minimum of $25,000 is required in order to have an effective clinic for the diagnosis and detection of cancer; and, as I have pointed out, only 17 States are now gress, was killed by a committee of the the present limitation of funds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the able Senator from Florida agree with me that the best medical advice on the subject of cancer is that early detection affords a better chance of saving life than almost anything else that can be done?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct, and I am grateful that he emphasizes the point. That is exactly what these clinics are designed to accomplish.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator further, since I was necessarily absent from the floor of the Senate, whether he or the Senator from Washington placed in the RECORD the telegram from Mr. James S. Adams, chairman of the executive committee of the American Cancer Society. If not, I should like to have the opportunity of doing so.

Mr. PEPPER. It has not been placed in the RECORD. I thank the Senator from California. I should like to add, Mr. Adams is one of the prominent business men of the country, a responsible citizen who has been devoting most generously of his time and efforts to this great effort.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram from James S. Adams printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 22, 1949.*

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Senate 1950 appropriations for Labor-Federal Security, H. R. 3333, report No. 265, Calendar No. 247, to be considered on floor today or Monday following Commodity Credit bill. The American Cancer Society following its consistent program for most effective cancer control urges that adequate funds for the construction of cancer-research facilities be provided in this bill. Eight million dollars were appropriated in 1949 for this purpose. Current bill for 1950 now provides only $2,500,000 which is insufficient to meet 24 requests for construction of cancer-research facilities totaling $11,363,407 now on file at National Cancer Institute from 24 institutions in 20 States. Funds raised by the American Cancer Society in its public campaigns are spent for education, service, and research but may not be used for construction.

Urgently recommend substantial additional funds for construction be included in current appropriation bill so that the Nation's fight against cancer, now well planned and properly integrated, may be made increasingly effective.

JAMES S. ADAMS,
Chairman, Executive Committee, American Cancer Society.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to ask the Senator from Florida a question in connection with the statement made by the Senator from Washington. I understood him to say there were about 500,000 cases of cancer now. Am I correct in that?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe it was further stated that there are only about 1,800 special cancer beds available. Is it not the Senator's opinion that there are many cases that have not come to the attention of the medical profession?

Mr. PEPPER. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not further the opinion of the Senator that many people have died of cancer, whose death has been attributed to other causes, through lack of knowledge and lack of hospitals throughout the country?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will yield, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina there were 555,000 patients, which does not include any of those who may have cancer but who do not know it, they not having been examined for cancer.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. The next item the Senator from Washington and his associates are seeking is an additional $250,000 for control projects. These are projects in the States, not here in Washington. This quarter of a million dollars is designed to improve technique by experimentation, by which cancer may be detected and diagnosed in its early stages, when, as the Senator from California so well emphasizes, it is still in the curable period or possibly curable period of its existence.

The next item is $4,000,000. That is to pay for the cost of projects authorized in the last fiscal year by the Congress, approved by the National Cancer Institute and the Public Health Service and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, which projects in many cases have already been constructed or construction undertaken. So this is simply to pay for what we have already authorized to be done.

Of course, Mr. President, we want to carry on the program of these projects throughout the country. Let me emphasize I am not talking about projects here in Washington. I am talking about research projects at universities, colleges, and medical schools, being carried on by private institutions or by private citizens or groups of citizens. They are away from Washington, so we are not talking about building up something here to come under the direction of a bureaucracy.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator I have received numerous letters from doctors in North Dakota saying that unless the pending bill is passed, together with the adoption of amendments that have been suggested, not only in connection with cancer but also other amendments dealing with mental health, certain of the sparsely settled States will be entirely without adequate assistance in carrying on this essential work. I may say further that in certain of these States more money is being spent on cattle and hogs than in the care of little children.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is quite right. I thank him for emphasizing that fact. Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of projects already approved. The $4,000,000 item for which we are asking will go to pay for work which has been done or which will be done under these approved projects.

The first project is Alabama: Medical College of Alabama, and Jefferson County Health Department, $47,000 plus. I shall not go into figures below $1,000. The next project is California: University of California Medical School, $1,000,000. This is typical of what the authorization is for—construction and equipment for the Cancer Research Institute. In other words, here is a great State university medical school that is carrying on a segment of the research. This project has been approved by the National Advisory Cancer Board composed of six laymen and six specialists, doctors or technicians. It has been approved by the National Cancer Institute and by the Surgeon General, and the funds are to pay for the construction of these projects.

Another one is Los Angeles County Hospital, $35,000. Another, Colorado: University of Colorado, $400,000, cancer research construction.

Connecticut: Yale University, animal laboratory building, $250,000.

District of Columbia, but not the Government—this is Georgetown University Medical School, $148,000. That is for additional animal and research laboratories devoted to research on cancer. We want to carry that on.

Georgia: Emory University, $500,000, cancer research construction.

Illinois: University of Illinois, $450,000.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. How are the various amounts determined? I notice that Yale University, Connecticut, gets $250,000, whereas for the University of California Medical School, there is an authorization of $1,000,000. I am merely curious to know how that comes about.

Mr. PEPPER. My understanding, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, is that the institution itself submits its project, with estimates of cost. Then the various projects and estimates go to the National Advisory Council on Cancer. This is a group of private technicians. They of course then try to relate them one to another, taking into account the requested sums, and taking into account the money they have to distribute. It then goes to the National Cancer Institute; finally, to the Surgeon General, who finally determines the amount approved for any project.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for the question.

I have mentioned Illinois. Maine: Jackson Memorial Laboratory. One project is $250,000; another is $100,000 for genetics in relation to cancer and other forms of growth. Massachusetts General Hospital, $700,000. Massachusetts again: New England Deaconess Hospital, one project, $400,000. Tufts College Medical School, $133,000. Minnesota: University of Minnesota, one project for $543,000; another project for $135,000.

Missouri: Washington University, one project, $450,000; another one for $250,000.

New York: Columbia University, College of Physicians and Surgeons, a project for $1,000,000.

Again, New York: Bellevue Medical Center, $575,000; University of Rochester, $434,000.

Oregon: University of Oregon Medical School, $10,000.

Pennsylvania: One project for $149,000; another one for $56,000.

South Carolina: One project for $16,000.

Tennessee: Meharry Medical College, a Negro school, located at Nashville, gets $20,000 for construction of cancer research laboratories. The University of Tennessee, $491,000.

Texas: University of Texas, Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research, $200,000.

Virginia: Medical College of Virginia, $10,000. Another Virginia project, $75,000.

Utah: One project at the University of Utah Medical School, $416,000.

Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Medical School project, construction of a clinical research unit, $975,000.

Florida: This is typical of the need for new construction. The State of Florida has made available to the University at Gainesville a small building for cancer research by transferring activities into the new building, which cost the State $175,000. The Damon Runyon Fund has granted $150,000 to the university for research in cancer. The Atomic Energy Commission has also provided some funds for research. However, $80,000 is still needed to remodel and equip the building, $20,000 for remodeling and $60,000 for special equipment. Unless some help can be provided, the money which the State, the Damon Runyon Fund, and the Atomic Energy Commission have appropriated cannot be properly utilized. That is the next aspect of the question. That is for new projects of the sort which I have already described. The amounts which I have just read are for approved projects which are in process of construction, and the money we ask is to pay for the construction costs.

Mr. President, I emphasize the fact that this essential work is being carried

on all over the country in some of the finest institutions of the Nation. We ask an additional $10,500,000 authorization. I regret to say that the authorization was decreased from $8,000,000 in last year's bill to $2,500,000 in the committee bill this year. The Public Health Service requested a $6,000,000 authorization. We are asking an addition of $10,500,000.

Mr. President, as I emphasized, that is only for construction of physical properties throughout the country, in connection with projects approved by the Cancer Advisory Council, the National Cancer Institute, and the Surgeon General.

So, Mr. President, it would certainly seem that in dealing with a disease which may take 1 out of 5 persons, if statistics of the past prevail in the future, when the money is being so wisely and so well spent, and when, as the Senator from Washington has said, such signal progress is being made in the research field, surely this is not the place to be penurious and this is not the time to deny to the skilled experts and leaders in this field the means with which they may not only save the lives of Senators, but the lives of citizens of the country who await, if the disease be not arrested, the terrible anguish and agony of the death throes of cancer.

So, Mr. President, the amount suggested is more than justified upon the base minimum. There should be more, but this little will not be denied by the Senate of the United States, when it means so much to so many in life, in health, and in substance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I can readily understand the feelings of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Florida, and I heartily agree that something should be done. But I want the Senator to be informed as to what the Senate and House committees did with reference to this particular appropriation for the National Cancer Institute.

Last year's appropriation amounted to $14,180,000. The budget estimate for the year 1950, or the bill which we are now considering, was $16,100,000. The House increased that estimate to $16,400,000 and the Senate Committee on Appropriations increased it to $17,027,000.

Let us look at the figures for contract authorization. The budget estimate for 1950, the bill which we are now considering, was $900,000. The House increased it to $5,000,000 and the Senate committee kept it at $5,000,000. It appears to me that when we increase the budget estimate from $16,000,000 to $17,000,000 and the authorization from $900,000 to $5,000,000, the Senate committee has been, perhaps, not adequate, but at least has been extremely liberal, so far as this particular item is concerned.

I wish we could give the Cancer Institute $50,000,000 a year instead of what we have provided, but I do not want the Senate to vote under any misapprehension that the Senate committee, or the House committee, for that matter, have been negligent in their duty in connection with this particular item, because certainly that is not the fact.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. NEELY rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the pending amendment to increase the appropriation for war on cancer is of life-and-death importance.

On the 18th day of May 1928 the Senate passed a bill which I had previously introduced and by means of which I sought an appropriation of $5,000,000 to finance a Nation-wide search for a cure and preventive of cancer. Overzealous economists in the Senate reduced the $5,000,000 requested to the pitiful sum of $50,000.

This bill, which contained the first declaration of war on cancer that was ever approved by either branch of the Congress, was killed by a committee of the House.

In 1928, when I began my one man ceaseless battle against this most hideous of all the destroyers of humanity, it was snuffing out one life in the United States every 5 minutes and 30 seconds. Nineteen years later, its rate of destruction was one every 2 minutes and 36 seconds. In 1947—the last year for which accurate figures are available—it sent more than 189,000 American men, women, and children to the grave.

In November 1928 I was defeated for reelection. In the next Congress, a distinguished Senator from Georgia reintroduced my anticancer bill in this body. He was ignominiously slain by the foe he was heroically striving to conquer before the Senate even attempted to pass the bill.

In 1931 I returned to the Senate. There I joined Senator Bone and more than 90 other Senators in sponsoring a comprehensive anticancer bill. That measure was enacted into law, and as a result of its provisions, we now have the well-known National Cancer Institute at nearby Bethesda.

During my 26 years in the House and Senate, I have seen many, many funeral processions for Members of the Congress who had been slowly tortured to death by the insatiate, loathsome cancer monster. Within the last quarter of a century, this defiant, frightful foe has sent to the dissolution of the grave one or more Members of the Senate or House from practically every State in the Union. It has caused more weeping, wailing, anguish, and death than all the wars that have ever cursed the world.

Experts say that at least one member of every other family in the land will eventually be slaughtered by this abomination of desolation, which has definitely doomed the shocking total of more than 19,000,000 of our living to extermination in agony greater than any tongue can ever tell.

This brutal demon of death is no respecter of persons, rank, or station. No one is rich enough to buy immunity from the danger of its aggression; no one is poor enough to escape the peril of its visitation.

It is conservatively estimated that the Nation's entire economic loss from cancer in 1948 was more than $1,225,000,000. Yet face to face with this appalling situation, we are quibbling over the question of increasing the totally inadequate appropriation provided by the bill to $37,000,000 with which to combat a more aggressive, relentless, and terrifying foe than ever fought us at home or abroad on any field of battle.

In behalf of the 88 of our fellow Americans who have died of cancer since the Senate convened 4 hours ago; in behalf of the more than 500 who will die of this unspeakable, hideous scourge between now and this time tomorrow; in behalf of the 19,000,000 who will ultimately be tortured to death by this diabolical abomination, I entreat the Senate to adopt the pending amendment by an overwhelming majority, and thus make a small but praiseworthy contribution to the war on cancer, and extend the hand of heartfelt sympathy, hope, and help to every suffering cancer victim in the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I have here a telegram from Charles Seymour, president of Yale University, in which he expresses the hope that adequate funds for the construction of cancer research facilities will be restored in the current appropriation bill. I am happy, by the vote just registered, that we have succeeded in doing that, because, of course, nothing we can do for the American people and their health would be a greater blessing than to bring them relief from the kind of disease the Senator from West Virginia has just described. I think the Senate can well be proud of what it has just done.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and myself, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$8,725,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,779,000", and on page 24, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$3,850,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$32,725,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the committee amendment on page 23, line 21, has been agreed to, and that it will be necessary for the vote to be reconsidered.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be recon-

sidered, so that the proposed amendment may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in order to save the time of the Senate I send to the desk and ask that there be incorporated in the RECORD at this point a summary of facts on diseases of the heart and the circulatory system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISEASES OF THE HEART AND CIRCULATION

I. How many people die of diseases of the heart and circulation every year in the United States?

1. The No. 1 killer of our people is heart disease.[1]

2. More than one in every three deaths is due to a disease of the heart or circulation.[2]

3. 626,176 human being died of diseases of the heart and circulation in 1947.[2]

4. Nearly 64,000,000 Americans now alive will die of diseases of the heart and circulation unless new treatments and cures are found.[3]

5. During World War II, 1,967,468 people died in the United States of diseases of the heart and circulation.[4] This is nearly eight times as many people as were killed in action in the armed forces.[5]

II. How many people are suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation in the United States?

1. Between 9,000,000 and 10,000,000 people are suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation.[6]

2. In contrast with this, 670,302 Americans were wounded in action in World War II.[7]

3. A total of at least 152,000,000 work days a year are lost because of diseases of the heart and circulation.[8]

III. How do deaths from diseases of the heart and circulation compare with deaths from other diseases?

1. 43 percent of all deaths are caused by diseases of the heart and circulation.[3]

2. Diseases of the heart and circulation kill:

(a). Over 3 times as many people as cancer.[9]

(b) Over 12 times as many people as tuberculosis.[9]

(c) 1,700 people every day, more people than die of infantile paralysis or diphtheria in a whole year.[9]

IV. How many doctors specialize in diseases of the heart?

1. Only 199 doctors limit their practice to diseases of the heart; another 439 give special attention to this field. This makes a total of only 638 doctors who specialize in cardiology.[10]

V. What facilities are available for special care of people with diseases of the heart and circulation?

1. For the minimum number of 9,000,000 people suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation, there are in the entire United States only about 909 beds for convalescent cardiac patients, divided as follows.[11]

Cardiac homes for children	545
Foster homes for children	103
General homes for adults	261

(a) These beds are located in only 8 States, and 344 of the 909 beds are in New York City.[11]

2. There are less than 200 beds set aside for clinical research in diseases of the heart and circulation.[12]

3. In contrast with this, about 86,429 beds are available for tuberculosis patients, not including those in Army, Navy, Marine and Veterans' Administration hospitals, mental and prison hospitals and preventoria.[13]

VI. How much money is available for research in this field annually?

1. About $4,334,000 divided as follows (appendix I):

(a) Public funds: The National Heart Institute, USPHS, and the Veterans' Administration, have appropriations for research for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, of about $2,355,000.

(b) Private funds: Voluntary agencies allocated for 1948 approximately $1,978,000.

2. In other words, we are spending only about $6.95 per death annually for research to find the causes and cures of the greatest killer of our people.

VII. How does this compare with what we spend on other research?

1. In contrast with the total of about $4,334,000 being spent for research in diseases of the heart and circulation:

(a) Congress appropriated a total of $56,086,535 for the Research Administration of the Department of Agriculture.[14]

(b) $29,716,877 was allocated by Congress in 1948 for research and control of plant and animal diseases to the Department of Agriculture alone.[14]

(c) For industrial research, to improve manufactured products (excluding atomic energy):[15]

American industry is spending $450,000,000 a year; the United States Government spends $625,000,000 a year; universities and other agencies are spending $85,000,000 a year.

This means that Americans are spending a total of $1,160,000,000 for industrial research, but only about $4,334,000 to save the lives of people suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation.

2. We live in an economy where, in 1945, American manufacturers spent these amounts for industrial research: Bendix Aviation Corp. for research and engineering—approximately $18,150,000;[16] Allis Chalmers Manufacturing Co. for development, testing and experimental expenditures $3,286,234.[16]

3. About $10,587,000 is being spent in the field of cancer research—the second cause of death in the United States.[17] This contrasts with only about $4,334,000 for diseases of the heart and circulation, the first cause of death.

4. The total amount available from all sources for research in diseases of the heart and circulation is less than one-fourth the amount voted by Congress for forest trails for the current fiscal year.[18]

5. $1,529,300,000 is spent annually for personal care, including cosmetics and barber and beauty shop services,[19] in contrast with about $4,334,000 spent for research in diseases of the heart and circulation.

VIII. Is heart disease primarily a disease of old age?

1. No. Of the 588,451 people who died from diseases of the heart and circulation in 1946, nearly 40 percent, or 230,126, were under 60 years of age.[20]

2. At least 30 percent of all deaths in the 20–59 age group are caused by cardiovascular diseases.[21]

3. In 1944, more children died of diseases of the heart than the total number of deaths of peoples of all ages from infantile paralysis.[22]

(a) Among children under 15, more than twice as many died of diseases of the heart in 1944 as died of infantile paralysis.[23]

IX. Do people of the United States think more research in this field is necessary?

1. 83 percent of the people questioned in a recent poll were in favor of the Governments appropriating $100,000,000 for research in tuberculosis and diseases of the heart and circulation; and 80 percent were willing to pay more taxes for research and study to find new diagnoses and treatments of these diseases.[24]

---

[1] National Office of Vital Statistics. (1 out of 2.31 deaths in 1947; 1 out of 2.37 deaths in 1946.)

[2] National Office of Vital Statistics: Total deaths, 1947, 1,445,370; deaths from diseases of the heart and circulation, 626,176.

[3] Forty-three percent of the total deaths in 1947 were caused by diseases of the heart and circulation; 43 percent of 148,000,000 (estimated U. S. population) is 63,913,060.

[4] National Office of Vital Statistics.

[5] Killed in action in World War II—Army, 176,432; Navy (died overseas) 72,269; total, 249,701. (World Almanac 1948, p. 551.)

[6] Dr. Rolla E. Dyer, director, National Institutes of Health; estimate based on analysis of the health of the Nation, 1940. (Memorandum dated May 28, 1947.)

[7] Wounded casualties in World War II—Army, 571,822; Navy, 98,480; total, 670,302. (World Almanac 1948, p. 551.)

[8] National Health Survey, 1938.

[9] National Office of Vital Statistics. 1947 deaths: Cancer, 189,811; tuberculosis, 48,064; infantile paralysis, 580; diphtheria, 799.

[10] American Medical Association—letter dated August 13, 1947.

[11] Miss Margaret Matheson, executive secretary, New York Heart Association. Letter dated March 26, 1947, enclosing excerpt from report prepared by Dr. Robert L. Levy, published by the New York Academy of Medicine, entitled "Convalescent Care"—pp. 64–69. 1940.

[12] Fact brought out in hearings before Senator BRIDGES and PEPPER on need for additional research funds for heart disease, by group of heart specialists, April 24, 1947.

[13] Hospital-bed census conducted by USPHS Tuberculosis Control Division in 1946; includes beds in United States and Territories.

[14] United States Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

[15] Science and Public Policy—A Report to the President, by the President's Scientific Research Board, Vol. I, p. 12. August 27, 1947.

[16] National Industrial Conference Board.

[17] Government funds for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948: $6,085,000 (exclusive of Atomic Energy Commission figure, which is not available); voluntary agencies: approximately $4,502,000; total: $10,587,000.

[18] $16,300,000 was appropriated for forest highways and trails for 1948–49. United States Budget, Fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, p. 347.

[19] America's Needs and Resources, by J. Frederic Dewhurst & Associates. (Twentieth Century Fund survey.) 1947, p. 703. Figure is for 1942.

[20] Dr. H. L. Dunn, Chief, National Office of Vital Statistics. (Letter dated August 27, 1948.)

[21] Dr. Rolla E. Dyer, Director, National Institute of Health. (Memorandum dated May 28, 1947.)

[22] National Office of Vital Statistics: Deaths of children under 15 from heart disease, 1944—1,866; total deaths from infantile paralysis, 1944—1,361.

[23] National Office of Vital Statistics: Deaths of children under 15 from infantile paralysis, 1944—758.

[24] Pilot poll conducted by Research Associates, New York City, January 1947.

APPENDIX I

Funds available for research in diseases of the heart and circulation

Public funds:

1. National Heart Institute, through U. S. Public Health Service, for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948: [1]	
(a) Intramural research	$257,009
(b) Research projects (grants-in-aid)	1,875,000
(c) Research fellowships	150,000
Total	2,282,009
2. Veterans' Administration, for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948 [2] (allocated to date, with indeterminable sum still available for fiscal year 1949)	73,600
Total public funds	2,355,609

[1] Distribution of USPHS funds, National Institute of Health, Div. of Research Grants and Fellowships (chart 7/26/48) — fiscal year 1949:

Intramural research	$257,009
Research projects (grants-in-aid) (represents actual commitments at this time—amount budgeted for this purpose $1,875,000)	1,463,300
Teaching and aid to medical schools, fellowships (includes $51,600 for research fellowships awarded at this time—amount budgeted for this purpose is $150,000)	226,600
Grants-in-aid to States	175,000
Other	512,079
Total	2,633,988

[2] E. H. Cushing, Assistant Medical Director, Veterans' Administration. (Letter dated August 13, 1948.)

Private funds:

1. Whitney Foundation [3]	$200,000
2. New York Heart Association [4]	[5] 272,973
3. Life insurance medical research funds [6]	640,505
4. American Heart Association [7]	[8] 250,000
5. Miscellaneous voluntary agencies throughout the country [9]	615,000
Total private funds	1,978,478
Total, all funds (approximate)	4,334,000

[3] Whitney Foundation—fiscal year beginning January 1, 1948.

[4] New York Heart Association—fiscal year beginning January 1, 1948.

[5] In addition to contribution of $50,000 to American Heart Association.

[6] Life insurance medical research fund—fiscal year beginning January 1, 1948.

[7] American Heart Association—fiscal year beginning January 1, 1948.

[8] Includes contribution of $50,000 from New York Heart Association.

[9] Survey made in 1944 by Dr. H. M. Marvin, American Heart Association.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the data I have sent to the desk show many facts, among them that one out of every three of our citizens die every year from heart disease.

I also send to the desk and ask to have incorporated detailed data showing the justification for the requested increase.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Heart appropriation

Item	1949 appropriation	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate committee	National Advisory Heart Council	Public Health request to Budget
Grants to States	$536,410	$700,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000
Research grants	1,575,000	1,800,000	2,300,000	3,300,000	5,000,000	4,200,000
Fellowship grants	150,000	150,000	300,000	300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Teaching grants	100,000	200,000	500,000	500,000	2,500,000	1,775,000
Traineeships	75,000	75,000	150,000	150,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction			1,000,000	1,000,000	10,000,000	3,000,000
Direct operations	484,851	1,075,000	1,475,000	1,475,000	2,279,000	2,417,000
Total cash	2,921,261	4,000,000	7,725,000	8,725,000	24,779,000	16,392,000
Contract authorizations:						
Research		630,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	6,400,000	4,200,000
Teaching			500,000	500,000	5,325,000	2,000,000
Traineeship			150,000	150,000	1,000,000	525,000
Construction			2,000,000	2,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000
Total		630,000	3,850,000	3,850,000	32,725,000	12,725,000

1. Grants to States: Four States now have chronic-disease divisions with cardiovascular diseases representing one section. Eight more States have submitted new heart program plans to the Health Service. Need to develop clinics for early diagnosis of heart disease. Need to establish heart demonstration units and to furnish consultative services.

2. Research grants: The advisory council has already approved grants for $3,482,000 ($2,057,855 were for projects but funds are not available for these projects and the council expects to approve at least another $800,000 by June 1949), bringing the total to $4,200,000; $1,708,000 were pending as of March 1949. Council is not indiscriminate. It has disapproved over $2,000,000 in requests.

3. Fellowships: Research fellowships of $1,000,000 would mean an average of about six per State, whereas the $300,000 in the House and Senate bills would cover only 44 men.

4. Teaching grants: A minimum grant of $25,000 is necessary for a grant to a 4-year medical school. Grant of this minimum alone to the seventy-some 4-year schools would require $2,500,000. Amount awarded in House would permit only 30 grants.

5. Traineeships: The $1,000,000 request would enable training 300 individuals.

6. Construction: Survey by council at end of 1948 showed total applications for construction $31,768,000.

National Heart Institute list of construction grant applications revised as of January 1, 1949

	Amount
Medical College of Alabama and Jefferson Health Department	$416,931.32
University of California Medical School	1,250,000.00
University of California Medical School at Los Angeles	884,736.00
University of Southern California School of Medicine	1,000,000.00
University of Colorado	$254,540.00
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C	909,900.00
Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.	500,000.00
University of Georgia School of Medicine	58,000.00
University of Chicago	750,000.00
University of Illinois	2,350,000.00
La Rabida Jackson Park Sanitarium, Chicago, Ill	400,000.00
Loyola University, Chicago, Ill	45,000.00
Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill	2,647,950.00
Northwestern University School of Medicine, Chicago, Ill	50,000.00
University of Kansas School of Medicine	100,000.00
Touro Infirmary, New Orleans, La	22,500.00
Tulane School of Medicine, New Orleans, La	1,010,500.00
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md	1,266,928.00
Children's Medical Center, Boston, Mass	800,000.00
Harvard University, Boston, Mass	41,191.00
House of the Good Samaritan, Boston, Mass	235,000.00
Massachusetts General Hospital	1,120,000.00
Peter Bent Brigham Hospital, Boston, Mass	250,000.00
Wayne University, Detroit, Mich	337,226.00
University of Minnesota	1,659,000.00
University of Mississippi	4,435.00
Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo	300,000.00
University of Buffalo	335,000.00
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, N. Y	1,000,000.00
Cornell University, New York, N. Y	200,000.00
Montefiore Hospital, New York, N. Y	125,000.00
New York Hospital	800,000.00
New York University-Bellevue Medical Center	1,625,000.00
University of Rochester	414,368.00
Syracuse University	1,145,000.00
Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, N. C	51,700.00
Duke University, Durham, N. C	1,347,000.00
University of North Carolina	516,800.00
Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio	275,000.00
Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation	325,000.00
University of Oregon	230,000.00
Children's Hospital of Philadelphia	385,000.00
Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia	1,000,000.00
University of Pennsylvania	500,000.00
Temple University Hospital and Medical School, Philadelphia	900,000.00
Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania	169,645.30
Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tenn	177,660.00
University of Tennessee	468,600.00
Southwestern Medical College, Dallas, Tex	500,000.00
University of Utah School of Medicine	60,000.00
University of Virginia School of Medicine	208,000.00
University of Washington	500,000.00
University of West Virginia	5,860.00
University of Wisconsin	800,000.00
Total	31,728,470.62

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in the case of the cancer amendment, that the two amendments I have offered may be voted on as one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objections? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, every dime of the appropriation requested was asked by the National Advisory Council on Heart, headed by the outstanding heart specialists of the country, private specialists in this field. Every dime was requested and desired by the National Institute on Heart. I am sure the Senate is willing to trust the judgment of these specialists in this vital field, and I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Ives	Mundt
Brewster	Jenner	Murray
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Butler	Kefauver	O'Conor
Cain	Kem	Pepper
Chapman	Kerr	Robertson
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Douglas	Langer	Schoeppel
Eastland	Long	Smith, Maine
Ecton	McCarran	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarthy	Stennis
Ferguson	McClellan	Taft
George	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Thye
Hill	Malone	Wherry
Hoey	Maybank	Williams
Holland	Miller	Young
Humphrey	Millikin	

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment on page 23, line 21, and to the text of the bill on page 24, line 2.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I understand that during my absence the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in connection with the National Cancer Institute was agreed to. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which that amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Washington was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I was called out of the Chamber for a few minutes when the vote occurred. Had I been present I would have consulted with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was led to believe that a quorum call would be had, followed by a yea-and-nay vote. I was not present in the Chamber at the time. I had to go to the cloakroom briefly, and during the time I was absent the amendment was agreed to. Hence, I press my motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the pending question the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Washington was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion has been agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we are now about to vote on the amendment offered by myself and other Senators, to increase the amount for cancer research funds. Is not that the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by unanimous consent, because the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is now the pending question before the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the cancer amendment be considered without prejudicing the position of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Magnuson amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the roll is called, I should like to make a few observations.

This is a case of a very worthy project. I know that every Member of the Senate is interested in cancer research. Personally I am very much interested in it. I have supported legislation designed to combat the dread disease of cancer and appropriations for cancer research. I go back to the time when I was governor of my State of New Hampshire. We established in that State a cancer commission, and started cancer research and clinics throughout the State. I am deeply sympathetic toward the purpose of the amendment.

However, the Committee on Appropriations has held hearings and has heard testimony. It has presented a report on this subject. The question is whether we are to overturn the report and recommendation of the committee dealing with this problem. The committee has dealt with it very generously, although perhaps not so generously as some would like.

The question is not what is desirable, but what is necessary. With budget estimates mounting we must apply to every program into which we enter the test, not what is desirable, but what is absolutely necessary. Although I am in full sympathy with the purpose of speeding cancer research and establishing facilities for the treatment of the disease—and my record proves it—I feel that the report of the committee should be sustained, and that we should not start increasing individual appropriations by large amounts.

It is proposed to increase the appropriation from $17,027,000 to $21,650,000. The authorization item has already been increased from $5,000,000 to $15,500,000, a tremendous increase.

I believe that Senators should understand that when we vote on this question we are not voting against cancer research or the provision of cancer research facilities. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who has not a very definite interest in promoting cancer research. However, the question is whether or not this large increase is necessary, and whether the report of the committee should be overturned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire know that, for example, in my State we are allowed only $15,000 of the present appropriation to set up cancer research activities, whereas the doctors say at least $25,000 is required for that purpose?

Let me inquire also how is it that only 17 States receive Federal money for this purpose? Will not the smaller States be able to receive such assistance if we adopt this amendment? Certainly they will not be able to receive assistance of this sort if we do not accept the amendment; will they?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when we already have in the bill an item of $17,027,000, and another item of $5,000,000, certainly it should be possible so to adjust the program of the Public Health Service as to permit the money to be equitably divided among the States, for minimum research.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. The present appropriation is divided and in North Dakota we receive $15,000 to set up this research work. I repeat that our doctors say the research work cannot be properly set up for $15,000, but that $25,000 is required for that purpose. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire believe that the smaller States, which have smaller populations, should be treated on a basis of equality with the larger States?

Mr. BRIDGES. If 17 States now are receiving funds for this purpose, that means that 31 States are not receiving such aid. If $15,000 is multiplied by 31, the result is $465,000. An appropriation of that amount would not require for that purpose an increase of $15,000,000 in the appropriation, as proposed by the amendment. If the amendment proposed a small increase in the appropriation, there might be a talking point in favor of it; but certainly such a large increase is not needed to provide such assistance for North Dakota or any of the other States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand the matter, the experts have estimated that the proposed increase is needed for the work in the other 31 States, and that the amount of the proposed increase is no more than fair.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I find it somewhat difficult to understand the matter now before us. Am I correct in my understanding that the committee recommendation is almost a million dollars more than the recommendation submitted by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. Let me give the Senator the facts in regard to this matter: Under the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute, the Bureau of the Budget estimate for 1950, the fiscal year for which we are now making appropriations, is $16,100,000, and the budget estimate for contract authorizations for that purpose is $900,000.

The House increased the direct appropriation from $16,100,000 to $16,400,000, or a $300,000 increase over the amount of the budget estimate. The Senate committee increased the appropriation item over the budget estimate by nearly $1,000,000, as the Senator will see; and in respect to the item for contract authority, which was estimated by the Bureau of the Budget at $900,000, that item was increased to $5,000,000 in the House of Representatives, and our committee has reported the item at the same figure of $5,000,000, or some $4,100,000 over the amount of the budget estimate.

However, by the amendment it is now proposed to increase that item by $10,000,000.

Mr. President, my point is that in this case we must distinguish between what is desirable and what is really necessary. There are many persons in this country who wish to have appropriations made for many very desirable purposes, and such appropriations may mean a great deal to those persons. From all over the world, very hungry, greedy eyes are looking to the United States for assistance. All kinds of demands will be made upon the Members of this body for Federal appropriations.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I say we must decide between what is desirable and what is absolutely necessary. In all good conscience, I think Senators can favor cancer research and the development of cancer research facilities—and I favor them, and I loyally supported those items in the committee—without increasing the appropriations reported by the committee to the very substantial extent that is proposed by this amendment. Furthermore, Mr. President, the amendment would overturn a committee report, which would be a very bad precedent to establish.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell me the amount appropriated for this purpose in the House of Representatives?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I think I can answer that question, because I have just looked up those figures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire can yield only for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then I shall answer the question of the Senator from Nebraska. The House of Representatives voted to appropriate $16,400,000, and the Senate committee recommended an appropriation of $17,027,000. The House voted to appropriate $5,000,000 for contract authority, and the Senate committee reported an item in the same amount, which would be an increase of $4,100,000 over the amount of the budget estimate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the amount recommended by the President?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amount recommended by the President, which is the amount of the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget, was $16,100,000 in direct appropriations and $900,000 in contract authorizations.

Mr. WHERRY. What increase has the Senate committee recommended over that estimate, as the subcommittee has reported?

Mr. BRIDGES. As reported by the committee, the appropriation would be increased $927,000; and for contract authorizations the committee has voted to increase the item by $4,100,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the amendment is offered with the idea of having the Senate make larger appropriations than the Appropriations Committee has recommended. I ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who probably has had as much to do with establishing these research medical projects as has anyone else, if he believes that the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], has provided an ample program, as justified by the evidence which came before the committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to answer the question which just was asked?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senate committee has gone considerably beyond the Budget estimates in the case of both these items. Our committee went as far as the testimony presented before the committee would justify us in going. From the standpoint of actual need, we have done a thorough job in this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have just checked the RECORD. The National Cancer Institute requested only $17,750,000. The amendment now before us would increase that amount to $21,650,000.

The Senate Appropriations Committee—and I wish to say there was great sympathy for this cause in the committee; there was no objection at all to the cause, and the committee was trying to allow for this purpose what could be used this year—was requested to allow $17,750,000. The Senate committee allowed $17,027,000, or very nearly the amount which had been requested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Plus the amount for contract authorizations, which is $5,000,000 more.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call the Senator's attention to these two facts: In considering all these projects and proposals, to a certain extent we must consider together the items for cancer research and the items for heart research. The amendment of the Senator from Washington, plus the amendment of the Senator from Florida, would increase the cash appropriations for the coming fiscal year for cancer research and heart research over the amounts appropriated by the House of Representatives by $20,677,000, and would increase the amounts for contract authorizations, which will have to be paid, by $39,375,000, or a total of approximately $60,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If we are going to consider the heart items together with the cancer items, I should like to give the Senate the actual figures: For heart research and work, the 1949 appropriations for the Heart Institute were $2,921,261. The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1950—in other words, the budget estimate under the bill we are now considering—for the Heart Institute was $4,000,000, and the House of Representatives voted $7,725,000 for that purpose. But the Senate committee was not satisfied with that; we increased that amount to $8,725,000.

Not only that, but the Budget estimate for the Heart Institute for contractual authorizations and grants amounted to $630,000. The House of Representatives increased that figure to $3,850,000, and the Senate committee has accepted that action on the part of the House of Representatives.

So it cannot be said that neither the House nor the Senate committee voted to exceed the amounts of the budget estimates.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one more question, referring to the ap-

propriation for cancer research. As a member of the subcommittee, working with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I thought we voted to allow the full appropriation which was requested when this matter came before the subcommittee; in other words, we voted to allow the requested increase, which in reality exceeded the budget estimate, as I recall. That is the increase which was requested. I should like to ask if any evidence of any kind has been introduced or brought to the attention of the Appropriations Committee since that action was taken and since the full committee wrote the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There has been no evidence whatever presented to the committee since the committee reported the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Lest it might be thought the Senate committee or the House itself was rather reluctant to follow the advice of the authorities, or the advice of the National Cancer Institute, or the National Heart Institute; I am trying to impress upon the Senate that we were not. We went away beyond the budget figure. The Senate went away beyond the House figure in the case of the heart institute. The House bill contains $2,300,000 for research. The Senate went $1,000,000 beyond that, on the research item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not believe that we did not think the committee had given very serious consideration to the matter of appropriations for cancer research. At the outset of my remarks I said that certainly the committee had increased the appropriations; but since that time, I have read a list from nearly every State in the Union of some of the finest institutions in the United States, which think and believe they can add something to the cancer program with a grant in aid and some help in research. I do not criticise the committee for what was done. I merely say I think we can go much further, and I think we can apply ourselves to this job. We talk about $15,000,000! Do we forget that cancer kills annually more people than were killed in the whole World War II? We are talking about the cost of one destroyer.

There are in this list some fine institutions. I do not see any from Nebraska, but I see listed institutions for cancer research in Alabama, California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New York, and other States. I notice that the tumor institute of the Swedish Hospital at Seattle is seeking a small grant to enable it to go forward. Certain important discoveries have been made; but, unless the increase is allowed, these institutions will not be able to function effectively in cancer research. I think it is worth a chance. I think the investment we make in cancer research will be paid back a hundredfold—yes, a thousandfold. I am not criticizing the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire, since the question has been raised as to whether additional evidence has come to the committee, whether he is familiar with the fact that Mr. James S. Adams, chairman of the executive committee of the American Cancer Society, addressed a telegram to the Senator from California, which I assume may have been sent to other Senators, in which he stated the following:

> The American Cancer Society, following its consistent program for most effective cancer control, urges that adequate funds for the construction of cancer research facilities be provided in this bill. Eight million was appropriated in 1949 for this purpose. Current bill for 1950 now provides only two and one-half million, which is insufficient to meet 24 requests for construction of cancer research facilities totaling $11,363,407 now on file at National Cancer Institute from 24 institutions in 20 States. Funds raised by the American Cancer Society in its public campaigns are spent for education, service, and research but may not be used for construction.
>
> Urgently recommend substantial additional funds for construction be included in current appropriation bill so that the Nation's fight against cancer, now well planned and properly integrated, may be made increasingly effective.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether that is not indicative perhaps of the fact that they are not asking for an increase in the top item, but that they very urgently feel that for the construction item additional funds are necessary?

I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire the reason for my being impressed by the telegram from the American Cancer Society is that during the Eightieth Congress I served as chairman of the subcommittee now headed by the Senator from New Mexico. At that time, when requests were made for very large increases which could not be justified, the American Cancer Society itself indicated to the committee that they felt that a too greatly enlarged program would not be justified, due to the lack of research assistance then available, but they did make certain recommendations which seemed sound. It appears to me that the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico to the effect that the American Cancer Society had not asked any additional funds is partially true. It is true in the upper part, but is not true insofar as the construction program is concerned. Does the Senator, under the circumstances, agree?

Mr. BRIDGES. The telegram which the Senator read would indicate that Mr. Adams indicated a distinction between the two; and that would certainly be true.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I may ask the Senator, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, did not the Appropriations Committee a short time ago refuse to allot $54,000,000 to China?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator inquires whether the committee refused?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Refused what? I am not clear as to the Senator's question.

Mr. LANGER. When it came to considering foreign aid and when the amounts for foreign aid were drawn up, did the committee not say it was not going to give any money to China?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not recall that. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, I have always favored giving aid to China in the way it can be used. There may be something under the ECA authorization for that purpose. I do not recall exactly what the Senator refers to.

Mr. LANGER. May I refresh the Senator's recollection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. In the ECA set-up, there is nothing said about giving $54,000,000 or any similar sum to China, yet upon the floor of the Senate mention was made, I believe by the distinguished Senator from California, of $54,000,000 being given to China through the bill which was passed. Certainly that was done without any additional hearing and without new evidence being taken.

Mr. BRIDGES. With the Senator's permission, I may ask the Senator from California whether he will explain that?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, the $54,000,000 to which he refers was in the authorization bill, not in the appropriation bill. It was not a new authorization. It was the unexpended balance of the amount which had previously been authorized for China, the balance which had remained unexpended. That amount was not increased. There was a single limitation put in it to the effect that the balance of the $54,000,000 authorization could not be used in any area in China dominated by Communists. That was the only action by the Senate. It was not new money.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator not admit that in the report made to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee the $54,000,000 of unexpended balance was not mentioned? The idea was that it would not be spent, so it was not included until a later date, when it was included on motion of the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My understanding of the situation is that when the bill was reported from the committee it did not include the China-aid program. There was a bill which was in process of being acted upon by the House of Representatives, which was a separate bill, but the Senator from California felt that inasmuch as the two had been tied together in 1948 legislation, it was quite proper that they should be tied together in the legislation passed this year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Therefore, there is ample precedent for the cancer appropriation in what happened in the case of China, when we appropriated $54,000,000 for a foreign country, and yet when it is proposed to provide $50,000,000 for our own people, the question arises whether we should adopt the committee report just as it has been submitted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that it was from the Foreign Relations Committee that the report came to the floor, leaving out China aid, and that it was inserted in the authorization, and had nothing to do with the appropriation, because the money had been previously appropriated but had not been spent?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. But, nevertheless, after the report was made, without any new evidence being taken, upon motion of the distinguished Senator from California the Senate adopted an amendment authorizing the expenditure of $51,000,000 for China.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There was no evidence offered. In fact, the money had been appropriated previously, so there was no need for any hearings, because it was a continuation of the previous appropriation, putting it into the new authorization.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield further.

Mr. LANGER. Will not the Senator admit that in the report on ECA $54,000,000 was specifically excluded and was only put in afterward on a motion of the distingushed Senator from California?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is a fact, so far as the Committee on Foreign Relations is concerned, because, as I understand, they were dealing alone with the ECA and were not favorable to giving China aid. It required some persuasion on the floor in order to get into the authorization aid for China, which was $54,000,000 from a previous appropriation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. There are a few of us, including the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Washington, who are trying to use some additional persuasion in connection with this matter. The situation is similar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will please refer to page 303 of the Senate hearings, in view of what was stated by the Senator from Washington, regarding the list, beginning with the Mt. Zion Hospital, and so forth, I should like to ask if there are not 9 or 10 institutions involved?

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator give me the page again?

Mr. WHERRY. It is page 308. I am referring to the list at the bottom of that page. I ask the distinguished Senator if that is not a list of applications which are in a class called intent to apply for appropriations, and was it not so considered in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee; and is it not also a fact that the Cancer Institute did not even request appropriations for those institutions which simply filed their intention to ask for funds at some future date?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator is correct. In the hearings there will be found a list of the pending construction applications.

Mr. WHERRY. The pending applications are in the first column. Is it not true that they are now pending?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And they total approximately $8,688,407, do they not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Cancer Institute ask the Appropriations Committee, in connection with those pending applications, for $8,688,407? Did they ask appropriations in connection with the pending applications?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. They asked for a total of $17,750,000, and the Appropriations Committee provided $17,027,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That did not include either the pending applications or those who declared an intention to file applications at some future date.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, I am informed by the chairman of the subcommittee. The committee did allow the appropriation asked for by the Cancer Institute, and the evidence was before the committee in the hearings.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to mention three or four different units involved in this matter. First, there is a group of experts called the National Advisory Council on Cancer. That group is under the National Cancer Institute. It is a group composed of outstanding specialists on cancer. They advise the National Cancer Institute and, of course, the Surgeon General and the Public Health Service. The National Advisory Council on Cancer requested and recommended the amount which the Senator from Washington and his associates are asking of the committee. The amount requested and recommended was found by them to be necessary for a minimum program for the present. The amount which the Senator from Washington and his associates are asking was also recommended by the National Cancer Institute for the Public Health Service. But the Surgeon General had to go before the Bureau of the Budget, and the amount requested by the Advisory Council and the National Cancer Institute was reduced. Then the Budget made certain reductions. So, when it reached the Congress, the Budget recommended $16,100,000 for the various research expenditures, and $900,000 for construction authority.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the institutions shown on page 308 of the hearings apply, or did they merely file their intention to apply for an appropriation?

Mr. PEPPER. The top group actually applied. The others had given notice of intention to apply.

Mr. WHERRY. But they did not apply?

Mr. PEPPER. They had given notice of intention to apply, and undoubtedly some of the applications have been received since these figures were compiled. They go back to last March.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall try to answer the Senator from Nebraska from the record. At page 374 of the House hearings Representative KEEFE asked this question:

> Have those been approved by the National Advisory Cancer Council?

Those are the ones we are talking about. Dr. Heller said:

> No, sir; they have not. Since no money is presently available the Council thinks it would be unwise to go on record as approving these grants at this time. May I say, Mr. KEEFE, that in addition to these 17 institutions requesting $8,688,407, we have information—

Just information—

> that 24 institutions have expressed intent to apply for a total sum of $3,555,000. Somewhere, roughly, then, in the neighborhood of $12,000,000 seems to be the best we can figure. The Council may screen these to the point that they will be less than the $12,000,000 necessary, but the $8,688,407 seems to be, in our judgment, worthy of consideration.

Just worthy of consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, that is the very point. If we give them $50,000,000, there will be so many applications. If we give them $17,000,000 there will be so many applications.

If we increase the appropriation as requested by the Senator from Florida—and it is a worthy cause—naturally there will be additional applications. The applications will be based upon the appropriation the Congress makes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer given by the Senator from Michigan is that the House considered all the applications which were filed for intent, also those

which were pending, and the conclusion was that they would give them consideration if and when the appropriations should be considered. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think we are getting this all mixed up. What happened was that the Cancer Institute and the Advisory Board, the scientists and the Research Board, have a liaison. There are three applications on the list of intent that I know are all ready. They have been examined and screened. But the Advisory Board says, "If we are not going to get this money we do not think we will pass on them." We say, give them the money and this research will proceed. The projects are all ready. That is all there is to it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to page 309, where it is said:

> Programs are being held up in Alabama, Georgia, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota.

I wanted to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he was willing to say to the people of Nebraska, "All you will get under this appropriation is $15,000," and then vote against the proposal that would give them enough so that they could get started with $25,000?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield so that I may answer?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As a member of the committee I say that we gave consideration to every application before the committee, which included the total amount asked for. I knew nothing about this evidence. The evidence was there, but no applications came before us, other than the amount that was asked for by the Cancer Institute. We granted practically every dime they asked for. That is my answer to the people of Nebraska.

I want the RECORD to show that I am just as much in sympathy with the development of cancer research as is any other Senator, and I think we did the best we could with the evidence at hand, granting every application which was before us at the time the hearing was held.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator again to pages 308 and 309. Where on those pages is there any mention of an application from the State of North Dakota or the State of Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. According to page 308 there does not appear to be any application on file.

Mr. LANGER. That is the situation, exactly.

Mr. WHERRY. I am as anxious to get funds for the State of Nebraska as is the Senator from North Dakota to get them for his State, and I should be very much interested in seeing the screening process put into operation, where that can be done. I want the money distributed geographically in order to get the best results.

I was a member of the subcommittee, and I thought the subcommittee did everything it was asked to do by way of recommending the several appropriations requested by the cancer institute. That is the point I am making. We increased the appropriation to $17,000,000, which is nearly $3,000,000 more than the House appropriated, and we increased the contract authorization from $900,000 to $5,000,000.

It is my understanding that the subcommittee recommended to the full committee every dime the cancer institute requested for spending at this time. I certainly have the greatest respect for the Senator from Washington, and I feel as he does, that the applications should be screened, and when the interested parties come forward and ask for appropriations, as fast as possible they should be granted. But I wish to say, as a member of the subcommittee, that we certainly thought, at least I did, that we were granting the full amount of appropriation asked for by the cancer institute, and that in doing that we were giving the fullest consideration possible at this time.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I agreed to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I might say to the Senator from Nebraska that as a member of the subcommittee he voted to report the bill before he saw the telegram read by the distinguished Senator from California, a telegram that has been put into the RECORD, and which completely changes the picture.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suppose that as we go along from day to day, and as the work of the Cancer Institute progresses, additional applications may be made, just as the Senator from Nebraska has stated. But somewhere there must be a stopping point for appropriations. I beg the Senator from North Dakota to understand my viewpoint. We have recommended the appropriation of every dime asked for at the time it was requested. If it was justified by the evidence, in the subcommittee and finally in the full Committee on Appropriations the full amount asked for was allowed.

Mr. LANGER. The telegram read into the RECORD changes the picture, both as to North Dakota and Nebraska.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me answer the Senator from North Dakota. I respect him highly, and he knows how I feel toward him personally. If the Senate is going to change its mind every time a telegram comes in concerning a bill that is being considered, we will not do any business at all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Just a moment; I am not through. No one is more sincerely desirous of doing something to combat cancer than I am. I am sure the subcommittee and the full committee took to heart the matter of cancer research. It was considered in good faith, it was considered in good conscience, to such an extent that we increased the appropriation beyond the budget figure.

If the committee and the Senate itself are going to change their minds every time a telegram is presented, when will we get through with any bill, I care not what bill it may be whether an appropriation bill or a legislative bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In an attempt to clarify this matter somewhat, and to explain the reason for the telegram, I may say that the amount of contract authorizations in the bill itself, so far as any lay person, not being familiar with legislative procedure, can understand, is $5,000,000. That does not show the break-down. In order to get the break-down we must turn to page 6 of the report of the subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security, which lists the contract authority and shows that the break-down of the $5,000,000 is—

Research, $1,500,000.

Teaching, $1,000,000.

Construction, $2,500,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Keeping our attention on the one item for the moment, the $2,500,000 contrasts with a comparable figure of $8,000,000 allowed in the last appropriation bill.

The American Cancer Society did not wait unitl this late date, or approximately late date, in order to bring this matter to the attention of the committee. I call attention to page 261 of the hearings before the Labor and Federal Security subcommittee, in which the testimony shows the following:

> That is about the problem as I see it. I would urge first on behalf of the American Cancer Society that you do not cut back your research program but certainly increase it somewhat. We need it badly on research alone and second, that the construction program which has been cut back from $8,000,000 to $2,500,000 should not be less than last year. We need $10,000,000 and this $10,000,000 I assure you will get another $10,000,000 in one way or another added to it and provide the additional funds for the American Cancer Society.
>
> Senator HILL. Did you get $8,000,000 last year?
>
> Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. Adams was the witness who was testifying at that moment before the committee.

> Senator HILL. The House cut you down?
>
> Mr. ADAMS. To $2,500,000.
>
> I might say, gentlemen, that I believe there is a policy to postpone these construction matters, and I can understand it, until such time as we need it for public works. However, I can tell you now that here is a situation in which you are not talking about construction, you are talking about

the tools with which we can carry on a program that we can develop here and I believe intelligently for the American people, and I urge your careful consideration of this thing.

Then, apparently after the American Cancer Society learned what the final action of the committee was, which of course the society could not learn until after the committee had acted, and the report had been made by the committee, the society sent a telegram to the junior Senator from California, and I assume to other Members of this body, in which the society pointed out that the amount had been cut from $8,000,000 last year to $2,500,000 this year, and reemphasized the fact that $8,000,000 was necessary, and that actually there were on file with the National Cancer Institute requests for construction of cancer research facilities totalling not $8,000,000 but $11,363,407. So they were merely trying again to bring the facts to the attention of the Senate before the bill should finally be acted upon.

The junior Senator from California may say that during the Eightieth Congress he happened to have had the privilege of being the chairman of the same subcommittee now presided over by the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and it was my experience that the American Cancer Society was very sound, conservative, and constructive in its estimates. I know that one proposal was made to the subcommittee, when I presided over it, that a greatly increased amount be provided, and the American Cancer Society itself wrote to me and said that in its judgment the amount could not at that time be intelligently expended because there were not a sufficient number of trained experts who could make use of the funds. Therefore the society itself recommended that the amount be cut below what some Members of the Senate and some other groups had recommended. I thought the Senate should be told that the society has taken a very constructive attitude.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with everything the Senator from California has said respecting the American Cancer Institute.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not treat this matter as though each State felt itself entitled to certain buildings and to certain appropriations for cancer research. For instance, it was said by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] that institutions in both North Dakota and Nebraska were making requests. I think the question is a much broader one than merely that of geography. I believe the National Cancer Institute, which is a governmental agency, which the Government is using to conduct research, combined with the American Cancer Society, Inc., which is a private concern, are justified in their endeavors to raise funds through grants from the Government, and, as they are doing daily, through donations from the general public. I am all for them in what they are doing. I hope the general public will respond generously. But I am sure the general public is not going to respond on the basis that the contributions made by it will be used in a particular State, any more than the Federal Government will respond to requests made for use of funds in a particular State.

Mr. President, what we tried to do was to provide all the money that could be reasonably used. I hope the American Cancer Society does not feel that they have been in any way slighted in this program. I do not believe the Society intends, by the telegram it has sent, to infer that Congress has neglected it. The two organizations are raising funds in various ways; not only from the Federal Government, but in other ways. I think the Congress is generous in providing $17,027,000, whereas request was made for $17,750,000. The cancer research organizations are raising funds by private subscription. We have given them a building fund which amounts, in effect, to $5,000,000. I think we have been more than generous, and that they will not be able to use any more money than that, because they do not have the facilities or research personnel to do the job on a greater scale than it can be done with the money provided.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, my viewpoint is not sectional at all in this matter. The testimony, however, shows that the cancer programs are being held up in Alabama, Georgia, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and South Dakota. I want North Dakota and South Dakota, those two States in the Northwest, to have buildings dedicated to cancer research, and to have such construction as is provided for any other State. I am not ashamed to stand here upon the floor and plead for the States of North Dakota and South Dakota.

Mr. PEPPER rose.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; I want to speak in my own right.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire will indulge me for just a moment? During the Second World War the Nazis, the Japanese, and our other enemies, combined——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire can yield only for a question.

Mr. NEELY. I am about to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to what occurred during the war, preparatory to asking him a question.

During the Second World War our enemies killed, all told, 273,000 Americans. During the same period cancer killed 501,019 of the American people, or almost twice as many as were destroyed in the war.

Congress appropriated for the prosecution of the Second World War at the rate of $221,000,000 every day. That money was provided for the purpose of defending the country against enemies who could kill only 273,000 of our people in a long and cruel war.

During the same period of time we appropriated less than $12,000,000 to defend our country against the monster which devoured 501,000 of the American people.

In view of the fact that, if deaths from cancer continue in the same ratio as in 1941, one out of every five Members of the Senate is doomed to die in agony of this most horrifying of all diseases, does the Senator from New Hampshire believe that $37,000,000 is too much to appropriate in an effort to combat this dreaded scourge? If the amendment sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and various other Senators whose names are well known should be adopted, $37,000,000 is all that would be appropriated by the Federal Government to protect the Nation against an enemy more deadly than the Nazis and more ferocious than the Japanese. Does the Senator from New Hampshire believe that this sum is greater than the appalling emergency requires, or terrified humanity demands?

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the Senator from West Virginia, I will say that when the Senator compares the total amount spent in fighting cancer with the total amount spent for prosecuting the war, and when he compares the number of persons who died from cancer with the number of persons who died as a result of enemy action, his comparison is erroneous in one major aspect, and that is that on the outcome of the war depended the survival of our Nation. We would not be a nation or an independent people any longer had we lost the war. Therefore there is a distinction between the two cases.

Mr. President, I do not question the motive of the Senator or the objective the Senator seeks. I favor adequate measures for the study and control of cancer. I have fought for such measures in this Chamber and long before I came to this body. I believe a well-rounded, well-planned cancer-control program is under way in this country, supported by private sources, by generous contributions from the American people and by reasonable appropriations by the Federal Government. Hearings have been held and I believe the committee has acted wisely. While the Senator from West Virginia can make a good case for greater appropriations, at this time larger appropriations are not necessary. They may be desirable, but they are not necessary in view of the existing well-rounded program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am deeply interested in the statement made by a witness by the name of Teeter, secretary of the Research Committee of the American Cancer Society. It was brought to our attention by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The statement appears on page 309. As has already been pointed out by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Teeter states that—

Programs are being held up in Alabama, Georgia, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. If the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ] would like to answer it, I shall be glad to have him answer it. What program is being held up in Nebraska? I see no application on file in the list of pending construction grant applications. I see no mention of the State of Nebraska in the list headed "Expressed intent to apply for cancer research facilities construction grants." I should like to ask what program is being held up. I am intensely interested in that question. If a program is being held up, I should like to know about it.

If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I ask unanimous consent to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from New Mexico will turn to page 309 of the Senate report, about the middle of the page, he will find the following statement:

> The cancer research bed is an integral part of the applied or developmental phase of the research program which could be met by these additional funds.
>
> The need for adequate funds particularly for construction is delaying the mass attack on cancer. Programs are being held up in Alabama, Georgia, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota.

The one who is testifying is a man by the name of John H. Teeter, secretary of the research committee of the American Cancer Society. I cannot find an application on file in the list of pending construction-grant applications. There is no mention of Nebraska in that table, and it is not mentioned in the table headed "Expressed intent to apply for cancer research facilities construction grants." What program is being held up in the State of Nebraska?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will turn to page 337, he will see a list of the active cancer research construction grants, alphabetically listed by States. He will note that for some reason or other the State of Nebraska was forgotten.

Mr. WHERRY. Why?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know. So was New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. Has there ever been an application on file from the State of Nebraska?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not that I know of.

Mr. WHERRY. Has any request for research been received from that State?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is said that the program is being held up in Nebraska, New Mexico, and other States. I do not see New Mexico in either of the lists which have been referred to. The Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation has an application on file, but neither Nebraska nor New Mexico is on the list.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me point out in answer to the Senator's question that this is a very interesting statement:

> Programs are being held up in Alabama, Georgia, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota.

I ask Senators to cast their eyes for a moment over the list of members of the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate, and compare the list of States from which they come with the list of States within which it is said that program is being held up. Every one is a State represented in the membership of the Senate Committee on Appropriations—Alabama [Mr. HILL], Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Could it be merely a coincidence that every single State in which it is said that programs are being held up happens to have representation on the Appropriations Committee, on which such pressure is being brought? Is that a coincidence, or what has happened?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I make the observation that if Hemlock Jones, the celebrated detective, were called in he would very likely say that it is not a coincidence.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, no one is opposed to an adequate program for cancer research. We have an adequate program in this country, financed from private sources and by the Federal Government. We have a fine research program.

When we talk about geography, it does not make any difference whether cancer-research facilities are developed in Bar Harbor, Maine, or in Omaha, Nebr. Why? Because if some new cure for cancer is developed, or some method of advancing the fight on cancer is discovered, of course such discovery will be made available to all the people of the country, and I hope to all the people of the world. So it makes no difference where the discovery comes from. Insulin, the treatment for diabetes, was discovered in Canada, but it is now used in almost every State and almost every town and city, by every family which has a member suffering from that dread disease. Of course, if cancer research is pursued in various States it does not make any difference which State develops it. We shall all receive the benefit of it. This is a Federal program, supported in a private way and in a Federal way, and I think adequately so.

Mr. President, I believe that the report of the committee should be upheld.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that Senators are not fully aware of the facts if they say that we have an adequate program, or that sufficient funds are available to be employed efficiently and competently in aid of cancer research and for the cure of some cancer victims.

Let me try to make plain the facts as much as I can. The amendment of the Senator from Washington and his associates asks that there be added to what the committee has approved $1,000,000 for clinics in the several States for the early detection and diagnosis of cancer.

What is being done so far? Seventeen States are now receiving funds from the Federal Government to establish such clinics. Every one of those States receives less than $15,000 from the Federal Government, with the present limitation of funds. Experts say that at least $25,000 is required to establish a diagnostic center and detection clinic.

What we are asking is that the funds available be such as to allow $25,000 for each of the several States. When only 17 States can get funds under the present appropriation for the detection and early diagnosis of cancer, how can anyone say that we are doing all we can? We are merely asking that not only 17 States, but 48 States shall be able to get money enough to establish preliminary diagnosis and clinical centers for the early detection of cancer.

We know that it is possible to cure certain types of cancer when the disease is discovered in time. That is the purpose of the $1,000,000 for which the Senator from Washington and his associates are asking. There was a request for $2,500,000 to do what I have said was possible. We are asking $1,000,000 more to extend the clinical centers to every State.

The next item we request is $250,000 to be added to the $1,000,000 requested by the Public Health Service, above the amount provided in the bill. What is that appropriation of a million dollars for? It is to set up better techniques, through what are called control projects for the early detection and diagnosis of cancer. That is to be done by providing better facilities and techniques in the clinical centers distributed among the several States.

The other item is one of $4,000,000, which we ask for in addition to what the committee has allowed, to pay for the construction of projects authorized in the bill of last year. In other words, the construction authorization for last year—not for Washington, D. C., but for projects throughout the country, in the several States and areas where projects were presented and approved—was $8,000,000. Under that authority, granted by the Congress, the Surgeon General approved projects in various sections of the United States. Those projects were made ready for getting under way, but now the necessary money would not be allowed to pay for the construction which already has been undertaken or for the contracts which already have been let, although that was done acting pursuant to the authorization made by the Congress last year. So the $4,000,000 would go to pay for the construction of projects in the States of Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Utah, and Wisconsin.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. In that connection, will the Senator permit me to invite his attention to a telegram I have just received from Paul C. Reinert, S. J., president of St. Louis University; and Edward T. Foote, S. J., regent of St. Louis

University, School of Medicine, from which I quote in part, as follows:

The American Cancer Society promoting effective cancer control urges adequate funds for construction of cancer-research facilities be provided in this bill. Bill for 1950 provides two million which is insufficient for eleven million in requests for construction of cancer-research facilities. Cancer Society is providing public education but research is most direct and efficient approach to ultimate control of cancer. Research drains finances of institutions and progress is limited without substantial assistance.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri, and I know the Senate is glad to have that additional information.

What I have said, Mr. President, is that $1,250,000 and $4,000,000—or a total of $5,250,000—is requested for the payment of the cost of projects already authorized by the Congress, already approved by the National Cancer Institute and by the Surgeon General, and for the item of research grants to States for clinical laboratories and detection centers and control projects.

The other item in the amendment of the Senator from Washington—a $10,500,000 increase over what the committee provided—has already been well explained by the Senator from California.

The Congress authorized, for construction in various parts of the United States—in the field—for the last fiscal year, $8,000,000; but this year the amount is reduced in the bill to $2,500,000. As has been pointed out, there was before the Congress advice from the Public Health Service, the Federal Security Agency, and the National Cancer Institute that $8,000,000 was applied for, and that those projects were ready to be approved if the money were made available. Since that time, projects have been applied for to the extent of more than $12,000,000; they are ready to be approved when the money is available. Such projects have been applied for by some of the finest colleges and universities and medical schools in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the able Senator from Florida agree that the testimony generally is that in the field of cancer research, the more people we can have effectively working on the problem in our great colleges and universities and other research institutions, the more likely we are to find an ultimate solution? While objection might quite properly be raised if we were trying to concentrate in one great institution alone—for instance, one in the city of Washington, D. C., with only one group of experts working in this great field—the objection does not lie when we have the best minds and the best facilities of the country working on this problem; and it is probably in that way that we shall find the cure to this dread disease, whereas without that type of research we may go on for another 20 or 30 years trying to find the solution to the problem.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from California has shown very emphatically the virtue of this program. Instead of having this work centered in Washington, D. C., it is now proposed to have such projects in many of the States. Let me read the list:

The Medical College of Alabama; the University of California Medical School; the University of Chicago; the University of Colorado; Columbia University, College of Physicians and Surgeons; Emory University; Georgetown University Medical School; Institute for Cancer Research, Philadelphia, Pa.; Jackson Memorial Laboratory, Bar Harbor, Maine; Los Angeles County Hospital, Calif.; Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.; Meharry Medical College; University of Minnesota; New England Deaconess Hospital; New York University, Bellevue Medical Center; University of Oregon Medical School; University of Pennsylvania; University of Rochester; Medical College of the State of South Carolina; University of Tennessee; University of Texas; Tufts College Medical School; University of Utah; Medical College of Virginia; University of Virginia; Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; University of Wisconsin; Yale University.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida knows—although I feel sure that he does—that there are many persons who are devoting their lives to this work, and who feel that we must get out of the "guinea pig" stage, so to speak, so that we can work with people who are suffering from cancer; and that unless proper facilities are provided we may lose all those people, or at least a considerable number of them, whom we would have a chance to save provided we could get out of the "guinea pig" classification.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from California is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, let us consider what the House committee said, even though it did not provide any money to implement the statement it made. I quote now from page 19 of the House committee report:

In order to make available at least some measure of relief to present sufferers of cancer, without awaiting further research, cancer diagnostic and treatment services need to be considerably extended; grants to the States are one of the avenues through which this objective is sought to be attained.

Yet the House of Representatives did not provide any money for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, it did; it provided $2,500,000.

Mr. PEPPER. But not for that kind of work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; for that kind of work, as the Senator will find if he will examine the items.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh yes; that is correct.

But as I pointed out a while ago, Mr. President, the presently allowed fund provides for clinics in only 17 of the States, and even they cannot get more than $15,000 in each case. However, the doctors say we might just as well not have a clinic unless we allow as much as $25,000 for each one, if they are to do effective work.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to call attention to the fact that in connection with the manufacture of the atomic bomb we had scientists and factories at work in all but three States of the Union to do that job. However, in the present case, instead of having a proposal to engage in the manufacture of a bomb to kill many persons, the proposal is to provide for the means of saving the lives of many persons. So, should not we be willing to spend a few more million dollars for work of this kind?

Mr. PEPPER. That is my last point, Mr. President. It may be that my view of the matter is somewhat twisted; perhaps my sense of values is somewhat distorted; I do not know. However, the total amount, including contract authorizations of $15,000,000, asked from the Federal Government by the Senator from Washington and his associates in connection with the amendment, for cancer work in all forms, is $37,000,000. On the other hand, the amount allowed for the development of the atomic bomb was $2,000,000,000. Yes; it cost $2,000,000,000 to manufacture the atomic bomb, and this year we have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for research in weapons of war. Then, Mr. President, do Senators mean seriously to say that human life is worth no more than that? Can Senators feel their consciences clear if they deny the earnest petitions and requests of the doctors who labor every day with this problem?

Yes; Senators are right in saying the budget did not estimate as much as we ask. But they did not tell us the doctors did not ask what we are asking. Yes; the Public Health Service did not ask what we are asking. They had to beat down what the cancer institute begged for and what the doctors pleaded for. But, Mr. President, as we have been told all our lives, there is such a thing as being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Can the Congress forget such a doctor as Dr. Rhoades, head of the Cancer Memorial Hospital in New York, seeing day after day people die in the anguish of cancer in his hospital, seeing his research projects hampered and strangled and paralyzed because he cannot get a few more dollars? Other doctors of similar prestige came here and made a plea to Congress, "Give us a little more money. We might find the answer tomorrow, next week, or next month." Senators, it might save you. Yet, Mr. President, when Senators come here and ask for a few million dollars to try to find, through the efforts of the best colleges and universities and the best researchers in America, a cure for this mysterious cause of death, they are made to feel almost as if they are criminals to ask it, because in the opinion of some it is an extravagance. I am sure Senators do not mean that.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. NEELY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope that before the Senator concludes, since the colloquy which occurred a while ago took place when some of the Senators were not

present, but who are now present, the Senator will reemphasize what I know has been told him by competent research workers and doctors to the effect that, if cancer can be discovered soon enough, many people can be completely freed of the disease, whereas as to those same people, if the presence of cancer is not discovered soon enough, there is probably no present known means by which they can be saved. If we could do nothing else than to educate the American people, the medical profession, and all others who are interested in this cause, and put at their disposal the means now known to science, so that the presence of cancer could be detected early enough, literally hundreds of thousands of people, who otherwise will be condemned to death, might be saved.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is completely correct. We are negligent. We are painfully if not almost humiliatingly deficient in every field in the assistance we give. One is the field of research as to the cause and cure. Another is the field of detection. Another is the field of treatment of those in whom the disease is discovered. In every one of those fields the aid we propose to give is "too little and too late." I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Senator's statement about our being lax in providing facilities for the detection of cancer may be emphasized, I think, by the figures I am about to cite. Today in the United States there is 1 cancer-detection center for each 1,120,000 of the American people, and there are only 1,834 special cancer beds available, in both private and public hospitals, for 555,000 American cancer patients.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, to show how pathetic the problem is, let me recount the experience in my State. The Florida Legislature 2 years ago allocated $200,000 to local county health units, to provide medical and hospital care for indigent persons with cancer, for whom there was no hope of cure. The funds were quickly exhausted. Now, in the latest petition from my State, they are imploring another $75,000 from somewhere, merely to provide miserable sanctuary for these wretched people already condemned to death. There is no place even for them to die.

Mr. President, as has already been stated, one out of eight persons dies of cancer, or did, in 1947. One out of every five now alive will have cancer at some time in his life. As I look around the Senate, Mr. President, I hesitate to contemplate what may be visited upon us if somewhere, in some research laboratory, there is not at work a genius who will find the kernel and cause of this deadly disease. In Chicago the other day a research worker in a laboratory, after having tested 300 people by a new method, found what he thought was a method of discovering the existence of cancer. He was speaking of it to Mrs. Lasker and some others who have done so much with their own money as well as with their effort and their prayers in this field. There had to be some further refinement, and he was begging for more money.

Mr. President, we realize that we have our problems in finance, in budgets, and in taxes; but is there anything more important than the lives of our people? Have you, Mr. President, ever looked into the face of a man or a woman or a child dying from cancer? It might have been that a few more dollars wisely spent would have made the ordeal and the anguish and the horror of that death unnecessary. I cannot square my conscience with voting for $5,350,000,000, or any other sum, to put Europe back on its feet; I cannot vote for research in the field of agriculture and horticulture and animals, and then say I cannot afford by my vote to contribute $37,000,000 of which $20,000,000 is in contract authorization for the building of facilities, to obtain equipment, and to employ personnel with which to wage war against one of the deadliest killers of mankind.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida to increase the item for heart research?

Mr. PEPPER. No, it is the item of cancer. It relates to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington with respect to the cancer item.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Since the two items are closely related, and apparently all who favor an increased cancer research appropriation also favor an increase in the item for heart research, I suggest that, by unanimous consent, the two items be consolidated and disposed of with one yea-and-nay vote, which has already been ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. I should be very glad to do that, Mr. President, if the Senate will allow it because the issues are substantially the same. We are asking, for heart research, exactly what the American Heart Society and what the leading specialists in the heart field and the National Heart Institute request, just as we are doing in the cancer field. The question involved is the same.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With all due respect to the Senator from Virginia, I quite believe it would be a mistake to consolidate the two items. There is a difference. In the first place, if we compare the situation which now exists with the situation which existed a year ago, it will be found that a year ago, by way of grants for construction, the Congress allowed for contract authorizations $8,000,000. That has been cut to $2,500,000. The major part, or at least a considerable part, of the increase proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington and those associated with him is to bring the contract authorization item up to where it was last year, plus a percentage increase, which I imagine might be 20 or 25 percent—I have not figured it out—over what was actually allowed last year. I think a very strong case can be made for that proposal. I do not mean that a strong case cannot be made in connection with the heart situation, but I do not think the two should be blanketed together. I think they should be debated on their merits.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, since it is approximately 10 minutes to 5, I am wondering if it would be agreeable to the acting majority leader, inasmuch as the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington is to be voted upon out of turn, according to the unanimous-consent request, if there might be further consideration given to the construction costs, with the idea that amount of the appropriation might be worked out amicably if we were given a little more time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the committee considered the items which are being discussed this afternoon. I do not know what would be gained by going further into this particular matter. The committee, acting on the information it had, has recommended certain things to the Senate. I think the bill should be acted on one way or the other. We have completed everything except the cancer, heart, and mental-health provisions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think there is one more amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, is there not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The committee has acted in the best of faith. I have told the Senate this afternoon, and throughout the day, that the committee has increased the items for cancer. If the Senate itself wants to take the responsibility and agree with the Senator from Florida, it is all right; but I should like to conclude debate on the bill this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may say to the chairman of the subcommittee, with whom I worked industriously in connection with this appropriation, that I am anxious to know what project is being held up in the State of Nebraska. I should like to investigate it myself, because, if there is a contract authorization, and the difference between $2,500,000 and $8,000,000 is preventing it from proceeding, I should like to find out about it. There is no evidence in the report regarding it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The great desire of the Senator from Nebraska to find out about the situation in his State is very laudable, but, nevertheless, I do not think it will help the appropriation bill at all, any more than would the ascertainment of the reason for New Mexico being left out. If the Senate wants to agree with the Senator from Florida, it is perfectly satisfactory to me, because, after all, the Senate has to act.

If Senators will turn to page 6 of the report they will find that in 1949 Congress appropriated $14,180,000. They will also find that the budget estimate this year was $16,100,000. They will also find that the House increased the amount to $16,400,000, and the Senate committee

did better than that. The Senate committee increased that particular item to $17,027,000. Not only that but the budget estimate with reference to construction authority to construct buildings amounted to $900,000. The House increased that amount to $5,000,000, and the Senate committee adopted that figure.

Please turn, now, to page 7, and note——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Just a moment. Let me finish explaining this, and then the Senate can do as it pleases.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If Senators will turn to the item of research, they will find that the 1949 appropriation was $1,575,000. The Budget estimate for 1950, which is covered by this bill, is $1,800,000. The House allowed $2,300,000, and the Senate committee, notwithstanding that increase, recommended a further increase to $3,300,000. What more the committee can do I do not know. But the Senate is deciding the matter, and I am willing to go through with it now and let the Senate decide.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. This vote is to be on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, and has to do only with the proposed increase in the Cancer Institute appropriation; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL (when his name was called). On this amendment I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent on public business, and his pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] has been previously announced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Kefauver	Millikin
Anderson	Kem	Murray
Capehart	Kerr	Myers
Chapman	Kilgore	Neely
Douglas	Knowland	O'Conor
Downey	Langer	Pepper
Eastland	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Hill	Long	Sparkman
Humphrey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Hunt	McCarthy	Thye
Ives	McFarland	Tobey
Jenner	Magnuson	Tydings
Johnson, Tex.	Malone	Williams
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Withers

NAYS—34

Brewster	Gillette	Mundt
Bricker	Green	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Gurney	Robertson
Butler	Hayden	Russell
Cain	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Cordon	Hoey	Taft
Ecton	Holland	Watkins
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Wherry
Ferguson	McClellan	Young
Flanders	McKellar	
George	Martin	

NOT VOTING—20

Baldwin	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	McGrath	Taylor
Connally	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Miller	Vandenberg
Frear	Morse	Wagner
Fulbright	Reed	Wiley
Graham	Schoeppel	

So the amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON on behalf of himself and other Senators was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] for himself and other Senators, on page 23, line 21, in the committee amendment, to strike out "$8,725,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,779,000" and on page 24, line 2, in the text of the bill, to strike out "$3,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,725,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that is the heart amendment, and I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee that the matter has already been fully discussed. The amendment involves the same principle as that involved in the cancer amendment. I shall not detain the Senate further.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Florida inform the Senate as to the amount of the increase provided by the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. The House allowed $7,725,000. The Senate committee increased the amount by $1,000,000, making the amount $8,725,000. We ask in this amendment $24,779,000, which is the amount recommended by the National Heart Advisory Council, and requested by the National Heart Institute for research and grants to the several States.

Then in respect to authorization for construction throughout the country where projects have been approved, for colleges, universities, and medical schools the increase requested is from $3,850,000—since the program is just getting under way, and which amount was not raised by the Senate committee—to $32,725,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is the increase over the figures of the Senate committee? From $8,725,000 to what amount?

Mr. PEPPER. For grants to the States for early diagnosis and clinical care, research grants, fellowships, teaching grants, traineeships and liquidation of construction already authorized, the Senate committee provides $8,725,000. The amendment contemplates $24,779,000, which is what the National Heart Institute and the National Heart Advisory Council recommended and requested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I simply want the Senate to know what it is doing. I have no objection if the Senate wants to take such action. The total appropriation for 1949 was $2,921,261. The budget estimate on this particular item was $4,000,000. The House increased the amount to $7,725,000. The Senate committee upped that by $1,000,000, to $8,725,000. Now it is proposed to increase this amount to $24,000,000. If the Senate wants to take such action, it is perfectly satisfactory to me, so long as Members of the Senate know what they are doing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What was the testimony of the various heart groups and medical groups respecting the amount of money they could effectively and properly use in the next year for increased activities in heart investigations?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senate committee gave that particular point most careful attention, and put into the bill practically everything that authorities such as the Heart Institute wanted at the particular time. It is true that after the Senate committee had acted, after the bill had been reported, suggestions have been made in the Senate as to how much New Mexico should get, or how much Nebraska or some other State should get, and suggestions have been made that practically every State in the Union should get something, and it has generally been called to the attention of the

Senate that a number of these States have representation on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Was there any evidence before the committee, as there has been in the past, at least during cancer investigations, that the money provided can only be spent economically as fast as properly qualified technicians are developed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator of the opinion, or can he speak for the committee, as to whether or not the technicians in the country today are sufficient in number to be able to use only the amount of money the committee recommended to be appropriated?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee provided the amount of money that could be used efficiently. It increased the amount with the idea of trying to train individuals of the type the Senator has in mind.

If the Senator will turn to page 7 of the committee report he will find the different projects set forth. He will find the item:

Appropriated funds: Grants to States, $250,000.

That is the 1949 appropriation. The budget estimate for the year 1950 is only $300,000. The House made that item $2,000,000, $1,700,000 more than the budget estimate. The Senate committee stuck to that figure.

The next item is "Research." That is the item involving young persons the Senator has in mind. For that item the 1949 appropriation was $1,575,000. The budget estimate was $1,800,000. The House allowed $2,300,000. Notwithstanding the fact that the budget estimate was only $1,800,000, and that the House allowed $2,300,000, the Senate committee went $1,000,000 beyond that, and provided $3,300,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I know no one in this body who has any desire to do anything but vote all the money that can reasonably be used for the fight against cancer, and for research in connection with heart ailments, and the cure of heart disease—all the money that can be used within the services of the available technicians and the available facilities for reasonable and efficient research. But from the testimony I have heard in the past, and up to this time—and I have had some interest in cancer research—I am fully convinced that we are appropriating today more money than can be used at this time for efficient research, considering the trained personnel now available, and those to be put in training, and the facilities available for efficient, progressive research in connection with cancer and heart disease.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what the committee had in mind.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I know he is interested in cancer research and heart-disease research. Is he convinced and is his subcommittee convinced that the amount of money recommended by his committee for both cancer research and for heart research is adequate and sufficient for the efficient use that can possibly be foreseen within the limitations of the technicians we have and the programs that can reasonably be implemented in the coming year?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Not only is the chairman of the subcommittee so convinced, but the subcommittee itself is convinced, the full committee is convinced. We raised the contract authority alone for the Cancer Institute from $900,000 to $5,000,000, and with respect to the Heart Institute we raised the item for research work alone from the Budget estimate of $1,800,000 to $3,300,000. We are convinced that that is all the Institute can use efficiently.

There is no question that the amounts recommended are adequate for the work that should be done in research and for cancer investigation or heart-disease investigation. There is no question whatsoever that the committee was satisfied that that was all that could be used. But I still maintain that the Senate is supreme; and if the Senate wants to increase the appropriation by $20,000,000, it is all right with me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, because of hearings in progress before the Committee on Foreign Relations I was unable to be present in the chamber this afternoon except briefly on one or two occasions when the cancer appropriation amendment was before the Senate.

I believe that I am as sympathetic as any other Member of this body toward voting all the money that can be used efficiently and progressively for research in the study of cancer and for research in the study of heart disease. They are two of the greatest killers in the world today.

More especially last year than this year, I have had some occasion to look into the efficient utilization of moneys appropriated by Congress and moneys raised by private contributions for research in these two great fields. I have become convinced by statements of able technicians and medical experts in these fields that the problem is the development of technicians to handle increased appropriations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall finish in a moment, and then I shall yield the floor.

I recall that last year we were told that the various agencies could not efficiently use the appropriations which we proposed to give them because they did not have the technicians properly to use the money. I know that various institutions would like to get large amounts of public money and begin research activities, in most instances not having the trained personnel to implement those activities, but in the hope that in the future they might have them.

I believe that most of the experts in the cancer and heart research field—at least those who have talked with me—take the position that they would rather proceed carefully and soundly in their research with the development of able technicians, and that today they are getting all the money they can use efficiently. They feel that excess money at this time could not be devoted efficiently to the purposes for which it should be used. They would prefer to go along and have the appropriations increased year by year as their techniques develop and as new discoveries unfold.

Mr. President, I will vote for as much money for cancer and heart research as can be efficiently used. I believe that the committee has studied this question carefully, and has come to a sympathetic understanding of the problem. I believe that it has recommended all the money that can be efficiently applied in both these fields. Therefore when I cast my vote against this amendment, it will not be a vote against heart research, but a vote against what I believe would be a waste of money at this time, over and above what sensible examination and careful thought and study have indicated as being a generous amount, considering our techniques and our facilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, no Member of this body is more sympathetic toward this item than I am. I had to do with the item as a member of the Appropriations Committee last year, and as a member of the subcommittee, and also as a member of the full committee this year. I am sympathetic toward the attitude of the able Senator from Florida. However, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has hit the nail on the head. All the research agencies are trying to find brains to conduct research. At the present time there is a shortage of those capable of carrying forward research.

I ask the able Senator from Florida what the authorization part of his amendment is?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, our amendment proposes, as was recommended by the National Heart Institute and the National Heart Advisory Council, to increase the funds for research grants to States, fellowship grants, traineeships, the liquidation of construction previously authorized, and direct operations in Washington from what the committee provided, $8,725,000, to $24,779,000. The 1949 appropriation was $2,921,261. The budget estimate is $4,000,000. The amount in the House bill is $7,725,000. The Senate committee recommended $8,725,000. The National Public Health Institute requested of the Budget $16,392,000 for the same items, and the National Advisory Heart Council recommended $24,779,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does that include the contract authorization?

Mr. PEPPER. No. That is for the items which I have described. There was nothing in the 1949 appropriation, and that is the reason why these amounts are so large now. We are just getting started with the heart program

Mr. McCARRAN. What does the Senator's amendment contemplate for contract authorizations?

Mr. PEPPER. Our amendment would increase the authorization for construction from $3,850,000, which is in the bill, to $32,725,000, as recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council and the National Heart Institute.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator may accept a suggestion in this respect.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be very glad to have it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The thought occurs to me that we are traveling pretty far and pretty fast in a new venture. My mind is with the Senator. I should like to see the program go forward. However, I am afraid that the money cannot be judiciously expended. I respectfully suggest that the Senator modify his amendment to $10,000,000, and reduce the contract authorization at least 50 percent as compared with what he is asking for. Then I shall be able, as an individual Senator to support his amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to place in the RECORD the advisory figures from the various agencies, let me say that the National Advisory Heart Council recommended the amount now in the Senator's amendment, $24,779,000.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But I also notice, on page 214 of the hearings, that when the Senator from Florida was before the committee he made this statement:

> I am requesting $16,392,000 in cash appropriations and $12,725,000 in contract authorization.

However, according to the amendment he has now offered, and on which we are about to vote, the Senator from Florida has increased those items beyond what he told the committee he desired—one to $24,000,000 from $16,392,000, and the other item from the Public Health Service request, endorsed by the Senator from Florida, of $12,725,000, to $32,725,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct. Let me offer just a word of explanation.

The figures which the Senator from Florida mentioned before the committee were the recommendations of the Public Health Service and the Bureau of the Budget. In both instances the authorization and the grants and research contributions which I presented to the committee for myself were the amounts recommended by the Public Health Service and the Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget cut those figures somewhat. Of course the committee cut them grievously below what the Public Health Service recommended. For example, the Public Health Service recommended $16,392,000, which I advocated before the committee. But the Senate committee cut the total to $8,725,000, or approximately half of what the Public Health Service recommended.

The Public Health Service recommended $12,725,000 for contract authorizations, but the committee allowed only $3,850,000. Mr. President, the more I reflected upon the matter and the more I conferred with other Senators, the more I thought that we should present to the Senate what the National Advisory Heart Council and the National Heart Institute recommended to the Public Health Service, and what, of course, they also presented to the committee. They testified after I had testified before the committee, as the Senator from New Mexico will recall.

Mr. President, those are the figures which were used in regard to cancer. The group of Senators who decided to offer these amendments saw no reason why in this matter we should not be governed by what the best authorities in the United States tell us should be done and can be done at the present time.

I regret to say that the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was in error in his statement that the money requested could not be used effectively. If the Senator from Nevada will permit me to continue for a minute more, I shall refer to the record made in the hearings, when Dr. Paul White, executive secretary of the National Heart Council, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Dr. White is Dr. Paul D. White, of Boston, Mass., clinical professor of medicine at Harvard University; consultant at the Massachusetts General Hospital; executive director, National Advisory Heart Council; former president of the American Heart Association; and a private practitioner of medicine and a specialist in cardiology.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit an interruption?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida. Everything he has said about the good doctor is correct; but the Senator failed to state one thing, namely, that the doctor does not have the responsibility, under oath, of doing his duty as a United States Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. But the doctor does have a knowledge of the need for heart research in the United States, and he does know that heart disease kills one out of three of our people who die—one of whom was a distinguished Member of the Senate who died only a few days ago from heart and vasculatory disease.

Mr. President, we talk about cancer, and I advocated as strenuously as I could the appropriation for cancer. I am sure that death by cancer is more horrible than death by heart disease, because death by cancer is longer drawn out; but the fact is that one out of every three people who die in the United States die of heart and circulatory disease. I saw my own father die from it, with no one able to do anything which could give any prospect of relief.

Let me quote from the statement Dr. White made before our committee. A while ago the Senator from Iowa said this money could not be used effectively, and he said we do not have sufficient experts to be able to use it. Here is what Dr. White said, when testifying before the committee:

> It appears to those of us who have had experience in this field during the last 25 years that this is an absolute necessity, demanding the very first priority in this great country of ours today.
>
> Fortunately the stage is now set and we are ready to go, provided we are supplied with adequate funds even to make the most modest start. The sooner we get at it and the more funds within reason that we receive, the sooner will come a successful reduction of heart disease.

Those are the words of Dr. Paul White, who, together with his society and with his distinguished aggregation of experts, recommended the amount we are asking the Senate to appropriate this afternoon.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take the floor away from the Senator from Nevada, who has yielded to me; but before I conclude, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the reasons why the amount requested for work relative to heart disease is larger than the amount requested for work relative to cancer. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if it is not a fact that he was the first one in the Senate who, year before last, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, supported and allowed the first appreciable appropriation which had ever been made—an appropriation of $500,000—for heart research work; and I also ask him whether he was one of four Senators—the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and myself—who introduced and promoted the passage through Congress, last year, of the first law providing for a National Heart Institute? Incidentally, let me say that the reason why the appropriations we now request for research in heart disease are so large is that work in that field is just beginning, and, of course, it is necessary to build up to some momentum in respect to it, whereas in the field of cancer research work has been going on for several years.

Let me ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether I am correct in my statement of the history of this legislation.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Florida is correct as to the history of it. Of course, I think all of us agree with him as to the goal we seek to attain. Obviously the situation in regard to research in connection with heart disease is different from the situation regarding research in the field of cancer.

I wish to see the program of research relative to heart disease be successful; but from my point of view, the tremendous increase in the appropriations requested, over and above the recommendations of the committee—and likewise in the case of the appropriations for cancer—are a serious matter and deserve careful consideration.

The Senate already has overridden the committee by a material amount in connection with the item for cancer research; and now the Senator from Florida wishes to have the Senate do the same in regard to the item for heart disease research.

I wish there were some agreement as to the proper figure to be used in this case. In connection with this matter, Senators now are confronted with the question of whether to support the committee. Of course the work to which

the amendment relates is very worth while, but we are also confronted with the question of whether to support the committee. Moreover, there is the question of whether by our action we shall propose an unwieldy figure which will be very difficult to handle in the conference committee, because of a tremendous increase which will be difficult to justify. If an agreement could be worked out in the way of an in-between figure, such a figure might be easier to handle.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield further to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada, who long has been interested in this matter, and in view of what has just been stated by the Senator from New Hampshire, let me inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would accept and take to conference the amounts proposed by the Public Health Service, which met with the main requests of the National Heart Institute, so that our amendment would be modified from the $24,779,000 requested to $16,392,000; and then the amount of authorizations for contracts would be reduced from $32,725,000 to $12,725,000. Would the Senator from New Mexico accept that change?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to go to conference with those figures.

Mr. PEPPER. In that case, Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly, assuming that for that purpose I have the agreement of my colleagues who are associated with me in offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what we ask in the mental health field, which is also new, is not very much of an increase, though it is an increase. It also carries the same kind of reduction we have just agreed to with respect to heart research. In other words, instead of asking what the National Mental Health Association and National Health Service ask, if the Senator would take it to conference on the Public Health request, which is the figure that the Public Health Service requested of the Bureau of the Budget, I think we could dispose of it. That would be an increase from $11,612,000 to $16,250,000 for grants to the States in research fellowships and scholarships and traineeships, and then increasing the contract authorization for the construction of facilities, a good bit of which goes to two large mental institutions now in existence, supported by the Federal Government, from $2,150,000 to $6,100,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to hear the proposal discussed a little more before I will agree to it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we have chosen these three problems to present to the Senate, because they are related. They are three of the major causes of illness among our people. About 8,000,000 people in the United States, or more than one in every 18, are now suffering from some form of mental illness. One out of every 10 persons will need the help of a psychiatrist sometime during his life. This means that about 14,800,000 persons now living in the United States will require psychiatric care at some time. One out of every 20 persons will spend some part of his life in a mental hospital. That means that about 7,400,000 people now living in the United States will be hospitalized for mental illness at one time or another. One out of every two hospital beds in the United States is occupied by a mental patient. Fifty-one percent of the patients comprising the average daily hospital census in 1946 were patients in nervous and mental hospitals.

Mr. President, about 226,000 patients, new and old, were admitted to mental hospitals in 1944. Prewar studies showed that at one time there were about a million persons sufficiently disabled by mental illness to warrant hospitalization, although only a little more than 600,000 were hospitalized. We know there was a very serious rejection from selective service because of mental deficiencies. About 1,846,000 or 38 percent of the 5,000,000 men rejected before induction were rejected for neuropsychiatric disorders. One out of 8 of the 15,000,000 men examined was rejected for neuropsychiatric reasons. Of the men discharged for mental disability after induction, about 37 percent from the Army, and 32 percent from the Navy, were discharged for neuropsychiatric reasons. About $400,000,000 was spent in 1947 to provide long-term hospital care for mental patients.

In the Public Health Service, about $527,600 for research was allocated for the fiscal year beginning June 1, 1948, on the basis of 635,000 patients in mental and nervous hospitals. This means that the United States Public Health Service is spending only about 83 cents a year for research for new treatments and cures for each hospital case.

Mr. President, I do not want to drag out the argument on this matter. I should like to put in the RECORD however a "fact sheet" which is on every Senator's desk, which shows in detail the gravity of the mental-disease situation in the United States.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS THE MENTAL HEALTH SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY?

I. How many people in the United States are suffering from some form of mental illness?

1. About 8,000,000 people in the United States are suffering from some form of mental illness.[1]

(a) This means that more than 1 in every 18 persons is now suffering from some form of mental illness.

2. One out of every ten persons will need the help of a psychiatrist at some time during his life.[1]

(a) This means that about 14,800,000 persons now living in the United States will require psychiatric care at some time.[1]

3. One out of every twenty persons will spend some part of his life in a mental hospital.[1]

(a) This means that about 7,400,000 people now living in the United States will be hospitalized for mental illness at one time or another.

4. Severe mental illness:

(a) One out of every two hospital beds in the United States is occupied by a mental patient.[1]

(b) 635,769 or 51 percent of the 1,239,454 patients comprising the average daily hospital census in 1946, were patients in nervous and mental hospitals.[2]

(c) 226,393 patients, new and old, were admitted to mental hospitals in 1944.[2] Of this total, 128,475 were new patients.[3]

(1) 271,209 patients were admitted to nervous and mental hospitals in 1946.[2]

(d) Prewar studies showed that at any one time there are about 1,000,000 persons sufficiently disabled by mental illness to warrant hospitalization, although only a little more than 600,000 get it.[3]

5. Minor mental illness:

(a) About 50 percent of general practitioners' patients suffer from some form of mental illness.[4 5]

(b) About 30 percent of hospitalized general medical and surgical cases are more or less neurotic.[6]

II. What did selective-service examinations show about the people's mental health?

1. Rejection before induction—About 1,846,000, or 38 percent of the 5,000,000 men rejected before induction were rejected for neuropsychiatric disorders.[7]

(a) About 12 percent, or 1 out of 8, of the 15,000,000 men examined were rejected for neuropsychiatric reasons.[7]

2. Discharge after induction—Of the men discharged for medical disability after induction, about 387,000 (or 37 percent of Army medical discharges) were discharged from the Army, and 76,621 (or 32.4 percent of Navy medical discharges) were discharged from the Navy, for neuropsychiatric reasons.[7 8]

(a) This means that more than 1 out of 8 men medically discharged from the armed forces were discharged for neuropsychiatric reasons.

(b) This is exclusive of the 163,000 Army men and 91,563 Navy men discharged administratively for such reasons as psychopathic personality, mental deficiency, drug addiction, or homosexuality.

[1] Former Surgeon General Thomas Parran in One Out of Ten, This Week, November 17, 1946.

[2] The Journal, AMA, April 12, 1947, pp. 1071–1072.

[3] National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 1946 Annual Report, pp. 9, 17, and 21.

[4] Dr. William C. Menninger quoting C. A. Rymer: Psychiatric Education, Am. J. Psychiat., 102: 548–551, January 1946.

[5] Dr. William C. Menninger quoting F. G. Ebaugh: The Care of the Psychiatric Patient in General Hospitals, Chicago Amer. Hosp. Assoc., 1940.

[6] Dr. William C. Menninger quoting B. Mittelman et al.: Personality and Psychosomatic Disturbances in Patients in Medical and Surgical Wards, Psychosomatic Medicine, 7: 220–223, July 1945.

[7] Dr. William C. Menninger quoting Medical Statistics Division, Surgeon General's Office, 1946.

[8] Dr. William C. Menninger quoting F. J. Braceland: Psychiatric Lessons from World War II, Am. J. Psychiat. 103: 587–593, March 1947.

III. How many hospitals for mental disease are there in the United States?

1. About 575 hospitals, with a capacity of 674,930 beds.

(a) Ninety-seven percent of all mental patients are in public hospitals.[9] [10] Eighty-seven percent are in State hospitals.[10] Only about 3 percent of mental patients are cared for in private hospitals.

2. There is an immediate need for 307,000 more beds for mentally ill patients.[9]

IV. How many clinics for mental disease are there in the United States?

1. About 688 clinics, including both part- and full-time clinics. This includes all those organized by communities, divisions of State or county governments, and the Veterans' Administration. Two hundred and eighty-five of these are for children only.[11]

(a) Twenty-five States are without a single community psychiatric clinic of any type; and there are vast areas in other States where no psychiatric help is available.[12]

(b) At least 1,400 full-time community clinics are needed.

V. How much is being spent to run these clinics and hospitals to take care of mental patients in the United States?

1. About $400,000,000 was spent in 1947 to provide long-term hospital care for mental patients.[13]

(a) Virtually all of this money comes out of tax funds.

2. In contrast to this, the people of the United States spend about $1,000,000,000 for service in beauty parlors and barber shops.[14]

VI. How much is the United States Public Health Service spending for research to prevent and cure mental illness?

1. About $527,600 for research has been allocated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948.[15]

(a) On the basis of 635,769 patients in mental and nervous hospitals, this means that the United States Public Health Service is spending only about $0.83 per year for research for new treatments and cures for each hospitalized case.

(b) In contrast, Congress appropriated $29,716,877 for the Department of Agriculture in 1948, for research in control and cure of plant and animal diseases.[16]

VII. How much in United States Public Health Service spending for establishment of mental health clinics and services?

1. $3,550,000 has been allotted for grants-in-aid to States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948.[15]

[9] "The Nation's Health," by Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator—September 1948.

[10] Dr. Wm. C. Menninger quoting from Patients in Mental Institutions, 1942, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, GPO 1944.

[11] 1947 Social Work Year Book, Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 319 and 320.

[12] Dr. Martha M. Eliot, Associate Chief, Children's Bureau. (Hearings on S. 1160, 79th Congress, March 8, 1946, p. 94.)

[13] Estimate of Mental Hygiene Division, United States Public Health Service, from J. A. H. A. October 1948, vol. 138, No. 7, p. 517.

[14] How People Spend Their Money. United States Department of Commerce, itemized annual budget 1946.

[15] Distribution of U. S. P. H. S. funds by types—fiscal year 1949; chart (July 26, 1948) from National Institutes of Health, Division of Research Grants and Fellowships:

Intra-mural research	$57,600
Research projects (grants-in-aid)	470,000
Teaching and aid to medical schools, fellowships	1,530,000
Grants-in-aid to States	3,550,000
Other	3,420,400
Total	9,028,000

[16] Budget of the United States, fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

(a) These funds are to be matched by State funds at the rate of 50 cents for each Federal dollar.[17]

VIII. How much is being spent for research on mental health in both private and public institutions and clinics in the United States?

1. A little over $3,000,000 is available annually, divided approximately as follows:

(a) Public funds (including Veterans' Administration), $2,500,000.[18] [19]

(b) Private funds, about $700,000.[18]

2. On the basis of 635,769 patients in mental and nervous hospitals, this would indicate that the amount spent annually per individual hospital case, employing both private and public funds, is less than $5.

(a) This figure compares with $94 per patient for research in infantile paralysis.[20]

3. In contrast, the Nation spent $7,700,000,000 for alcoholic beverages alone in 1946,[21] an average of about $55 annually for each man, woman, and child.

IX. In how many institutions in the United States is research in this field being conducted?

1. Results of a recent poll of mental institutions, nervous hospitals, medical schools and universities, etc., show that there are about 160 of these institutions that have research facilities and are engaged in research in one or more of the phases of mental illness.[18]

(a) About 80 percent, or $2,494,896 of the approximate total of $3,000,000 is being spent by 19 institutions throughout the country. Of these, 3 are supported by Federal Government; 6 are supported by State governments; 10 are privately supported.

(1) Of this $2,494,896, $2,049,262, or 82 percent, comes from public sources; $445,634, or 18 percent, comes from private sources.

X. Do the 635,769 patients in mental hospitals receive adequate care?

1. No. The average cost of State, county, and city hospital long-term patient maintenance in the United States was only $549 per year, or $1.50 per day in 1947,[22] and $1.25 per day in 1942.[23]

(a) The average cost of food for these patients was only 22 cents per day in 1942.[23]

(b) These figures compare with $5 per patient per day for acute and recovering mental hospital patients and $2.50 per patient per day for chronic cases which were considered the minimum standard,[24] and $13.13 per patient per day in a general hospital, average cost in New York City in 1947. It is estimated that this cost will approximate $14.50 in 1948.[25]

2. Whereas the approved standard for State hospitals is 1 psychiatrist for from 30 to 50 patients, and 1 nurse for from 10 to 50 patients,[26] and in the Army 1 psychiatrist for each 50 patients, the actual ratio is 1 psychiatrist to each 298 patients and 1 graduate nurse to each 183 patients.[27]

(a) It is estimated that there are the following deficiencies in State hospital employees:

(1) All employees—42 percent.[28]
(2) Clinical psychologists—91.9 percent.[28]
(3) Social workers—70.8 percent.[28]
(4) Trained nurses—80 percent.
(5) Attendants—50 percent.

XI. How many doctors and other medical personnel specialize in the care of mental patients?

1. In 1947 there were 4,432 psychiatrists in the United States, many of whom are administrators or retired.[29] Of these, only 2,475 hold diplomas from the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology.[30]

(a) The present need in the United States is for at least 15,000 more psychiatrists.[31]

(1) There are approximately 2,583 graduate nurses specializing in psychiatry in the United States;[32] 20,390 other nurses and attendants;[32] and 3,000 psychiatric social workers.[33]

(a) The National League of Nursing Education estimates our need is 47,000 psychiatric nurses,[34] or almost 19 times the number we now have.

(b) Of the 1,307 accredited nursing schools in the country, only 32 are located in mental hospitals. Fourteen States have no training facilities in psychiatric nursing.

(2) There are approximately 1,500 trained clinical psychologists[35] and at least 1,700 more needed.[36]

(b) It has been estimated 10,000 new psychiatric social workers are needed in this country.

[17] Washington Report on the Medical Sciences, No. 62, August 9, 1948.

[18] Survey of Research in Mental Institutions, National Committee for Mental Hygiene, March 1948. Public Funds: $2,209,516. Private Funds: $716,895.

[19] Letter dated August 13, 1948 from E. H. Cushing, M. D., Assistant Medical Director for Research and Education, Veterans' Administration: Research in Mental Health $356,000.

[20] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, Vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, p. 13. Chart on Research.

[21] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, Vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting from Walter Lippmann, Washington Post, April 27, 1947.

[22] Press release September 1948, Mental Hygiene Division, United States Public Health Service.

[23] Dr. William C. Menninger, quoting from Patients in Mental Institutions, 1942, Bureau of the Census, 1944.

[24] Dr. William C. Menninger, quoting from American Psychiatric Association, Committee of Public Education release, May 29, 1946.

[25] United Hospital Fund Report for year ended December 31, 1947, p. 18.

[26] Dr. Wm. C. Menninger quoting Standards for Phychiatric Hospitals and Out-Patient Clinics Approved by the American Psychiatric Association, 1945–46, Am. J. Psychiat. 102: 264–269, September 1945.

[27] Dr. Wm. C. Menninger quoting Normal Capacity, Administrative Staff and Expenditure of State Hospitals for Mental Diseases, 1945, Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Series MP No. 13, April 1947.

[28] Dr. Wm. C. Menninger quoting R. H. Felix: Psychiatric Plans of the United States Public Health Service, Ment. Hyg. 30: 381–389, July 1946.

[29] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting communication from the administrative assistant, Austen Davies, dated August 27, 1947.

[30] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting communication from Dr. F. J. Braceland, secretary, dated August 29, 1947.

[31] Editorial Research Reports, Mental Health, vol. II, No. 2, July 9, 1948, p. 481, F. L. Van Schaick quoting Dr. Lawrence Kubie, Office of Scientific Research and Development.

[32] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting Normal Capacity, Administrative Staff and Expenditure of State Hospitals for Mental Disease, 1945. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Series MP No. 13, April 3, 1947.

[33] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting communication from Mrs. Elizabeth Ross, dated February 15, 1947.

[34] Dr. Wm. C. Menninger quoting National League of Nursing Education, 1945. Pamphlet on New Frontiers in Psychiatric Nursing.

[35] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting Pepper, C.: National Mental Health Act, Senate Rept. No. 1353, May 16, 1946.

[36] Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, vol. 12, No. 1, January 1948, quoting communication from Dr. David Rapaport, dated February 15, 1947.

Mr. PEPPER. I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement dated February 1, 1949, showing the growth of mental hospital cases from 1903 to 1946, issued by the Public Health Service as a current report on mental hygiene statistics.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH OF MENTAL HOSPITAL POPULATION—1903 TO 1946

In 1946, there were more than half a million patients in hospitals for the long-term care of mental patients. The population of these hospitals, nearly 530,000, was somewhat larger than the 1940 population of the State of Idaho. This figure represents an increase of approximately 380,000, or about 250 percent, over the 150,000 patients present in mental hospitals at the end of 1903. A part of this increase obviously reflects the growth of general population in this country in the period under consideration. However, the population of mental hospitals has increased at a rate considerably greater than that for the general population. As the accompanying chart indicates, in 1903 approximately 186 persons out of every 100,000 in the general population were to be found in mental hospitals, whereas by 1946 this number had increased to about 382, an increase in excess of 100 percent.

The increase in rate of hospitalization cannot be ascribed solely or even largely to an upward trend in the incidence or prevalence of mental disorders. For the separate States, usually, there are higher hospitalization rates where facilities are available in greater abundance, when they are easy of access, and when the type of treatment provided is well thought of in the communities served. For the country as a whole, there seems little doubt that rising hospitalization rates reflect the progress that has been and is being made as follows:

1. The more adequate provision of facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally ill.

2. A considerable and fairly continuous increase in knowledge concerning the nature of mental illness on the part of the medical profession and of psychiatrists in particular; this has resulted in an increased number of cases formerly not recognized as mentally ill being diagnosed and committed to hospitals.

3. A growing realization on the part of laymen that mental illness is a problem in which the individual patient requires psychiatrically oriented treatment and also an increasing knowledge that the individual patient is susceptible of improvement and recovery if treatment is taken in time.

4. An increasing public confidence in the management of a large number of hospitals for the mentally ill with increased use of these hospitals on a voluntary basis by persons who formerly avoided treatment or remained in seclusion elsewhere.

The trend in the hospitalization rate (that is, the number of resident patients per 100,000 of the population) is characterized by a moderate increase in the period between 1903 and 1922, a somewhat more rapid increase between 1922 and 1942, and a temporary decrease during the war years. This decrease, in all probability reflects changes related to the wartime situation, notably the induction of large numbers of males of military age into the armed forces, which disturbed the normal flow of patients into the hospitals under consideration. The fact that before 1933, data were available only for the years 1903, 1909, and 1922 creates an illusion of regularity in the trend in these earlier years which might not exist if annual data had been plotted. It is conceivable, for example, that annual figures for the period of World War I might have shown an irregularity similar to that of the period of World War II.

Throughout the period, the great majority of mental patients were hospitalized in State hospitals. The number of patients in those hospitals constituted about 85 percent of the total in 1933, and 84 percent in 1946. The proportions of all patients in county, city, and in private hospitals decreased during the period, and Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospitals, first established in 1919, accounted for 9 percent of the total in 1946.

Mr. PEPPER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, on the subject of mental health, a compilation showing the 1949 appropriations, the budget estimates, and other pertinent information, together with a brief summary.

There being no objection, the compilation and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mental health

Item	1949 appropriation	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Public Health Service request
Community services	$3,656,730	$3,664,411	$3,550,000	$3,550,000	$4,179,257
Hospital services	3,708,000	4,031,000	3,852,000	4,077,000	5,107,506
Research	731,100	675,000	550,000	550,000	2,100,625
Training	1,696,085	1,780,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	5,111,353
Miscellaneous	346,226	715,089	2,124,000	2,124,000	761,259
Total cash [1]	10,438,141	10,865,500	12,576,000	12,801,000	16,250,000
Contract authorizations:					
Research	1,800,000	140,000	800,000	800,000	1,100,000
Training	1,500,000	----------	1,350,000	1,350,000	5,000,000

[1] Includes reimbursement figures.

1. Research: The advisory council by January 1, 1949, received and considered 241 requests amounting to $2,764,772 and only approved $730,000 for 67 requests and paid only $504,000 to 43 applicants. Another 24 were not paid because of lack of funds.

2. Training: The council received requests for over $5,300,000. It recommended $5,371,411 covering 1,099 stipends. It was only able to award $1,593,297 because of lack of funds.

3. Construction: The National Committee on Mental Hygiene estimates that about $7,500,000 is needed for construction, lease, and equipment of projects for which applications have been received.

4. The Mental Health Division asked Public Health to approve $24,483,000. PHS asked Bureau of Budget for $16,250,000. Budget allowed $10,865,000 and $140,000 in contract authority for research.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have been chairman of a committee conducting hearings on the cut-back in the hospital program. We heard witnesses from 19 States who came to tell us about the need for psychiatric hospitals and of the neuropsychiatric treatment of veterans throughout the country. They told a pitiful tale of civilian institutions being jammed and overflowing with patients needing mental treatment, of the veterans hospitals being grossly inadequate to care for mental cases, and of the lack of doctors. I have the figures here to show that there is just a handful of doctors in the country who know anything about neuropsychiatric illness, and effective methods of treatment.

The money for which we are asking would be saved 10 times over in veterans' pensions, a large number of doctors testified, if mental cases could be detected early enough to save men before they become permanently disabled as mentally disordered persons and unable to regain their equilibrium and sanity.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is not the Senator talking about mental aid to civilian hospitals, and are not veterans cared for in veterans' hospitals?

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, the Veterans' Administration supported, I may say to the Senator, from the beginning, the mental institute and research in the mental field, because they knew that the results of the research would be very valuable to the Veterans' Administration in the care of mental patients. Here is what I said to the committee:

The Veterans' Administration has said that by the middle of 1948 the Treasury had been saved about $40,000,000 by the operation of clinics which prevented the hospitalization of at least 25 percent of its patients. For good mental health care is costly—our present State and local expenditure per patient is about $1.50 a day and minimum standards for good treatment range from $2.50 to $5 a day. The Nation is now spending $500,000,000 to hospitalize mental patients.

Of the amount we are talking about, hardly any of it goes for treatment. It is for research to try to find what may be the cause and the cure. It is for clinical diagnostic centers.

So, Mr. President, this is the amount, as I said, recommended by the Public Health Service. It is a meager amount. The Mental Institute was established only last year, as was the Heart Institute. We have hardly been doing anything in this tragic field, and yet all we are asking today is about $9,000,000 above what the committee has recommended, about $5,000,000 of which would be for grants to the States for research projects and about $4,000,000 of which would be for contract authorizations to build facilities out in the country at great schools, colleges, and hospitals where this kind of research can be carried on appropriately.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the committee has made a report to the Senate. If the Members of the Senate will turn to page 20, on line 12, of the bill, they will note that by its amendment the committee recommended $11,612,000. This amendment would increase the item to $16,250,000. On the same page in line 23, the item of $2,150,000 recommended by the committee would be increased to $6,100,000. The committee has in the best of faith listened to all the testimony.

We know what research for mental defectives means. As a matter of fact, if $16,000,000 is appropriated instead of $11,000,000, there will be more cases in the institutions. That is about all that will happen.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not for the moment. But if the Senate wants to take that responsibility, I have more faith in the United States Senate than I have in any committee of the Senate. So I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The Chair is advised that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Chair's pardon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida is out of order, unless the vote on the committee amendment is reconsidered. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the committee amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Chair state the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment inserting $11,612,000, in line 12, was agreed to this morning.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am sure the Senator from New Mexico will tell the Senate that this is in the same situation as the heart amendment and the cancer amendment. All three were adopted this morning, only it had been agreed that they would be carried over until we had an opportunity to——

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. I want to have the Senate take any responsibility, so I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it requires unanimous consent to consider the amendment out of order, does it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is not out of order. A motion to reconsider would be in order. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which, this morning, the committee amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$11,612,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$16,250,000"; and on page 20, line 23, to strike out "$2,150,000"——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the motion to reconsider the vote the question pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has been agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the question was not put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida made the motion, and the announcement was made that, without objection, it was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. The yeas and nays have been asked on the motion to reconsider. I was on my feet——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am against the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, but I should like to see the question decided on its merits. What difference does it make whether it is covered by a vote on a motion to reconsider, or on its own merits? I have asked for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall make no further objection. If the Senator from New Mexico wants the yeas and nays on the amendment, it is all right with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. On what is the Senate about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, which has just been stated by the clerk, but which the clerk will again state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$11,612,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "$16,250,000"; and on age 20, line 23, to strike out "$2,150,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "$6,100,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the vote is taken let me say that the Senate has gone along very generously today in providing for cancer research. It did so over my opposition. It certainly has acted very generously in providing for heart research, authorizations for construction, and so forth. Now we come to the mental section of the bill. If we continue to spend money as we are spending it in this Congress, and as it is being spent by the administration, we shall need considerable mental research in this country. So perhaps we are foresighted when we increase the appropriation for mental treatment.

In this matter the committee has heard the evidence, has acted in good faith, and has certainly been very adequate.

The mental problem has been a problem of the ages. It is being adequately met in most of the States of the Union. The Federal Government has now entered the picture, and we have a reasonable program. The evidence is in, and it seems to me we can at least call a halt on increased appropriations on this subject, and I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed with the roll call.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL (when his name was called). On this amendment I am paired with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who is absent on public business, has a pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] which has been previously announced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—25

Aiken	Kerr	Murray
Douglas	Kilgore	Myers
Downey	Langer	Neely
Green	Lodge	Pepper
Humphrey	Long	Sparkman
Ives	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Tex.	McFarland	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Magnuson	
Kefauver	Millikin	

NAYS—43

Anderson	George	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson
Bricker	Hayden	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Cain	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Capehart	Hill	Taft
Chapman	Hoey	Tobey
Chavez	Holland	Tydings
Connally	Kem	Watkins
Cordon	Knowland	Wherry
Donnell	McCarran	Williams
Eastland	McKellar	Withers
Ellender	Martin	Young
Ferguson	Maybank	
Flanders	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—28

Baldwin	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Lucas	Schoeppel
Byrd	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	McGrath	Taylor
Frear	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	Malone	Vandenberg
Gillette	Miller	Wagner
Graham	Morse	Wiley
Hunt	O'Conor	
Jenner	Reed	

So the amendment offered by Mr. PEPPER on behalf of himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am about to make a motion that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Before doing so, I shall be glad to yield to Senators who may wish to insert matters in the RECORD.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I merely desired to point out to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], having noticed what happened a moment ago before he cast his vote, that he must have had in mind the Scriptural proverb that "in the multitude of counselors there is safety." [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say that the multitude of counselors did not include the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the able Senator from New Mexico. I am sure that it was not the intention of the Chair or of the Senate to deny Senators opportunity to propose any amount less than that requested in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor, and yielded for the purpose of permitting Senators to put matters into the RECORD.

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator desires to have the matter go over until tomorrow——

Mr. MYERS. I merely wanted to make the announcement that we would be unable to finish consideration of the bill this evening.

Mr. PEPPER. If it is understood that the matter is still open, I have no objection, but I want it understood that the mental health amendment is still open to amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Why is it still open?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Was there objection to the committee amendment being agreed to?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I object. If the committee amendment is agreed to, of course it would not be subject to amendment. I merely wanted the committee amendment held in abeyance until tomorrow so that it would be subject to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry. I distinctly heard the Chair state that the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President. There was never any vote on the adoption of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Announcement was made that without objection the committee amendment was agreed to. The Chair heard no objection.

Mr. LONG. Several Senators were addressing the Chair at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the statement of the Senator from Florida that he did object and does object, the Chair rules that the matter will be held open.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but I may say that I am very greatly interested in the hearings now in progress on the subject of the North Atlantic Treaty. I respectfully request unanimous consent that I may be excused to attend any or all of the future meetings of the committee on that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

TELEPHONE SERVICE FOR RURAL AMERICA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "Telephone Service for Rural America," and S. 1254, a bill to provide for rural telephones.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HILL ON TELEPHONE SERVICE FOR RURAL AMERICA, AND SENATE BILL 1254, TO PROVIDE FOR RURAL TELEPHONES

Mr. President, I hope that we may soon have hearings by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the rural telephone bill, S. 1254, which I introduced last month on behalf of myself and nine of my distinguished colleagues, Senators JOHNSTON of South Carolina, GILLETTE of Iowa, PEPPER of Florida, SPARKMAN of Alabama, JOHNSON of Texas, KERR of Oklahoma, AIKEN of Vermont, and YOUNG and LANGER of North Dakota. We sincerely desire that all who can do so will state to the committee their views on this important matter so that the fullest possible expression of opinion can be had.

For several years I have been deeply concerned over the deplorable condition of rural America's communication facilities. This condition is strikingly shown in the official census statistics: In 1945 there were actually fewer farms with telephones (1,866,109) than there were in 1920 (2,498,493). Unfortunately this is still true today (2,473,000) although during the first year or two after the war some improvement was made. The fact is that even today about 3 out of 5 of our farms are without telephone service. Furthermore a large proportion of those farms which have telephones have to get along with inadequate and unreliable service.

More than 4 years ago (December 8, 1944), during the closing days of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I first introduced a bill which would have established a loan program for financing the extension of rural telephone service. That there was urgent need for such a program was clearly demonstrated by the findings made in 1945 by a finance task group of the rural telephone service committee of the United States Independent Telephone Association. It was the job of this task group to study the needs of small telephone companies for credit. The report of this group opens with this significant statement:

"The problem of financing for the small telephone company to provide funds necessary for plant replacement and improved equipment is one of major importance in the indepe dent industry."

The problem of financing has not yet been solved. Until it is solved, the small telephone companies whose operations are largely in the rural areas will be unable to carry out greatly needed programs of service extension and the improvement of existing facilities. S. 1254 offers these companies financial help to do just that kind of job. In this legislation there is, for the telephone industry, an opportunity to obtain financing suited to the needs of the thousands of small independent and mutual systems for plant expansion and improvement. S. 1254 provides the industry the opportunity to carry forward the job of furnishing adequate and dependable communication service to the millions of farm and rural people who are today without such service.

The bill is simple, direct and straightforward. Briefly, this is what it provides: S. 1254 would authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans for the extension and improvement of rural telephone service. These loans may be made for a period of not more than 35 years, at an interest rate of 2 percent per annum. They are required to be self-liquidating within the time agreed upon and may be for the financing or refinancing of expansion and improvement of existing facilities.

This legislation will enable the rural telephone industry to help farmers make another long step toward achieving a level of living more in keeping with that enjoyed by urban people. First, it will make possible the extension of telephone service to the millions of rural families who now are almost as isolated as they were a century ago, insofar as quick communication is concerned. Second, it will enable the industry to improve and modernize its plant so that rural subscribers can receive the kind of service they should have. The opportunity the legislation offers for the refinancing of existing loans is of primary importance to those systems which have outstanding debt, in some cases carrying burdensome rates of interest and amortization schedules which are beyond the system's capacity to meet, and which prevent any modernization of service. The liberal loan terms would be a life-saver to the many systems which have unsuccessfully been seeking to float new issues with which to extend and improve their rural lines.

On February 14, I appeared before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture to support a similar bill which is now pending before the House of Representatives. In the testimony presented by witnesses before the committee on that date were two recent instances where independent telephone systems operating in my own State had been granted authority by the Public Service Commission to borrow modest sums for the purpose of purchasing new equipment and expanding their plants to serve new subscribers. These companies offered 5 percent interest in one instance

and 4¾ percent in the other, but have been unable to borrow this money from private sources even at those rates. I have learned of many similar instances, all of which indicate that private financing is not available, and that there is an urgent need for a program of Government credit in this field.

Subsequent to my appearance before the House Committee on Agriculture, representatives of some of the larger independent telephone companies and of the Bell companies testified against the bill. I was not surprised by the position taken by the Bell people. It is well known that their financial needs are amply provided by the parent holding company. But I was surprised to learn of the adverse position taken by those who allegedly spoke for the independent systems.

The testimony these witnesses submitted is completely contradictory to the views expressed to me in letters which I have received from operators of small independent telephone companies throughout the country. These letters indicate that the telephone lobby here in Washington does not speak for their companies as they strongly support this legislation intended to help them. This lobby, which is carrying on a widespread propaganda campaign against this legislation, apparently reflects only the views of the large interests which dominate the telephone industry. On the other hand, thousands of the small independent and mutual systems see in this type of legislation their only hope of being able to modernize and improve their facilities and continue successfully in the telephone business. Permit me to read excerpts from a few of their letters to me.

One company in Georgia writes:

"Today thousands of our subscribers are forced to get along on noisy circuits that could be corrected but we just don't have the money to put up.

"I find many farmers that have no service would like to have a telephone and I want them to have it but we can't get there with our load.

"If we could get this bill of aid we could employ more men and do so much for the rural section."

A company in North Carolina says:

"We surely hope you will be able to get your rural telephone bill passed by this Congress so that the small telephone companies would be able to borrow money from the Government at a low rate of interest to build farmer lines so we could give the farmers the much-needed telephone service. It seems to us that it is just as important for the Government to help the farm telephone business as it is the farm power business. There is a great demand at the present time for farm telephones and the small telephone companies with the low rates do not have the money for the country expansion."

An independent in Alabama, strongly supporting the bill and offering to come to Washington and appear before the committee, writes:

"As far as the need for financing in our industry, it is certainly grave. I find that most of all our telephone men in neighboring companies, and about over the State are able and competent telephone men, ambitious to serve their territory with adequate telephone service, but financing has virtually made it impossible in our dreams, plans, or hopes."

In a letter from a large Midwest independent, the president of the company states:

"We desire to congratulate you on your constructive efforts and extend the hope that this very fine bill will be enacted at an early date.

"In this world of ours it seems that negative thinking is cumulative even when constructive purposes are clearly evidenced. Notwithstanding all that has been said opposing the rural telephone bill which you are sponsoring, I desire to go on record as positively favoring the bill.

"The writer represents approximately 66,000 telephones in 7 States, including the South and Middle West, where present costs permit only selective extensions of rural service unless long-time money is available at a low rate. Therefore, to do a good job, it is absolutely essential that we secure assistance which cannot be classified as a Federal 'hand-out.' The provision which makes loans available to independents and others for a 35-year period at 2-percent interest adequately meets the need."

The president of another large independent, vigorously supporting the legislation, makes this observation:

"While the problem of the syndicated companies is not so serious, particularly in the more densely settled sections, most assuredly the small individually owned exchange is in a distressed situation insofar as rehabilitation of its existing equipment, and in an almost hopeless position as to its ability to extend into unreserved rural areas contiguous to existing exchanges in sparsely settled areas.

"The development of telephone cooperatives in the contiguous areas of privately owned telephone systems such as was done by the REA in the electric field would, in my opinion, benefit the small telephone exchange owner and generally improve the service to all telephone users in the United States."

In conclusion this same writer states:

"In the absence of the insurance companies or bankers being willing to step in with a blanket form of mortgage in order to spread their risk and to lend capital to the small companies at interest rates and length of amortization of debt, similar to your proposed legislation, the alternative is for the Federal Government to do so. Thus far the bills in Congress offer the only glimmer of hope in this distressed situation."

In addition to the flood of printed propaganda which has been directed against this legislation, I have been informed within the past few days that a "whispering" campaign is being conducted against it, too. This campaign is directed at convincing small independents and mutual systems that the terms under which the money would be loaned would carry certain onerous conditions. For example, I understand that the claim is being made that certain additional "service charges" would bring the interest rate up to 4 percent instead of the 2 percent that the bill calls for.

This claim, of course, is as utterly absurd as was the power company propaganda in the early days of REA which sought to convince farmers that they would be mortgaging their farms if they took electricity from REA-financed systems. The telephone bill specifically sets the interest rate at 2 percent and any additional service charges to the borrowers would be impossible under its provisions. As to REA's policies in this connection and its relations generally with its borrowers, I would suggest that independent and mutual telephone companies which might be interested in obtaining loans under this program consult with any of the agency's more than 1,000 electric borrowers. These include private power companies, cooperatives and public agencies.

But, as I have already indicated, there has also been a great outpouring of sentiment favoring the bill. This comes from the grass roots, the farm and rural people who look to this legislation as a means of obtaining the telephone service they want and need and from the small telephone companies which seek to serve farm and rural people.

There has been a significant lack of opposition from private banking and financial quarters. Apparently, they are not interested in financing this type of activity and see in the bill no threat of competition with them.

I have attempted to appraise the claims and arguments which have been made in opposition to the legislation and have been most impressed by their lack of validity when weighed against the facts. I hope that the following analysis of a few of the claims, which has been made in the light of the facts, will be helpful to my colleagues in appraising the expressions which they are receiving with respect to S. 1254.

1. The bill provides no subsidies that will cost taxpayers billions of dollars. Instead, it establishes a self-liquidating loan program and expressly requires that all loans be repaid with interest. The wonderfully successful 14-year history of rural electrification financing by REA completely refutes this claim.

2. The bill will not destroy or "socialize" the telephone industry, as the lobbyists charge. On the contrary, the bill will give a new lease on life to the thousands of small companies, both profit and nonprofit, which otherwise face extinction or involuntary absorption by other companies. By providing credit where credit is not otherwise available, the bill will pump new vitality into the very considerable segment of the telephone industry which has nowhere else to turn for financing on terms and conditions which meet its needs. Banks, railroads, utilities and hundreds of other businesses have borrowed billions of dollars from the Federal Government without either losing their independence or being "socialized."

I sincerely trust that the small telephone systems will not be misled by propaganda into opposing this legislation which offers so much to them and to all rural America. Instead of undermining private business, this legislation will strengthen and bulwark free enterprise in the telephone industry against the monopoly that is rapidly destroying its freedom and independence.

It is my own studied conviction that the powerful telephone lobby here in Washington has raised the cry of "socialism" against this legislation to cover up and protect the monopolistic domination of the industry by one large company. This company through its subsidiaries and some of the so-called larger independents in which it owns substantial interest have already succeeded in "gobbling up" the major portion of the more lucrative territories in this country. Year by year more and more of the small independents and mutuals are being pushed to the wall and "absorbed."

3. Some opposed to the bill have sought to create fear in the minds of the operators of small independent and mutual companies that if this legislation is enacted the Federal Government or the REA co-ops would take over or supplant these small companies. Such propaganda is utterly untrue. This legislation is specifically designed to help, not hinder, the smaller operators. There is nothing whatever in either the House or Senate bill which would authorize REA or any other Government agency to acquire by seizure or purchase, or any other means, existing facilities, or to construct and operate new facilities. Under the proposed legislation, REA would have only the power to lend money and to furnish technical assistance where wanted and needed. Furthermore, from what I can learn, the electric cooperatives themselves are not interested in going into the telephone business where their members are now receiving or have any prospects of getting adequate service from another source. In my opinion, few, if any, loans under this program would be requested by the established electric cooperatives.

Of course, farmers would continue to have the right to establish new telephone enterprises to serve themselves where their territory is unserved or inadequately served by existing suppliers. They will have that right whether the pending bills are passed or not. Persons now operating telephone facilities in rural areas should not lose sight of the fact that the bills expressly give them the same preference to receive loans as cooperatives and public agencies will have. In my opinion, there would be little tendency for rural people to embark upon new enterprises where existing suppliers are willing to expand and improve their facilities to adequately serve the territory. Where the present operator in a town does not expand into the surrounding areas, the farmers could organize a new system to serve the rural area and work out a switching agreement with the system in town which would be mutually beneficial to all concerned, including the local merchants who would thereby gain better communications with their rural customers. Instead of putting them out of business, this bill offers an opportunity and a means whereby thousands of small telephone exchanges will be able to stay in business and provide the service their subscribers want.

By way of summary, I should like to say this to all small independent and mutual telephone companies: You have a great deal to gain and absolutely nothing to fear from this legislation. If you are now doing an adequate job of serving your rural areas, and do not need additional financing or other assistance, then this legislation will not affect you one way or another. Certainly no agency of the Federal Government is going to finance the installation of facilities where adequate service is already being provided.

On the other hand, if the small systems do need low-cost, long-term funds to modernize and extend their lines in rural areas, and many of them have said they do, then this legislation provides a means whereby they can obtain such assistance.

I hope that this statement will serve to dispel some of the confusion which has been created about this legislation and to remove any doubt as to its value and importance not only to the rural people who want telephone service but also to the systems which will serve them. I think the rural telephone systems would be doing themselves and their subscribers, both present and potential, a great service by giving careful study to this legislation. I know I should like very much to have them write me giving me their considered reactions to this proposal based upon a study of the bill itself rather than upon the propaganda they may have received. I am sure that my colleagues here and in the House of Representatives would be glad to hear from them also.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 28, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

George R. Merrell, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles E. Green, evangelist, of St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, we come into Thy presence in the name of Jesus, desiring to thank Thee and to praise Thee for Thy divine mercy and grace, and all of the rich forms of freedom—home, religion, and industry in this great Nation. Grant that we may protect them with ever-increasing devotion.

We thank Thee for this the Eighty-first Congress and we pray that each Member might fully realize the great responsibility resting upon his shoulders. Grant that they shall prove their fidelity to all of the fundamental principles of our Republic.

In our Saviour's name, the name of Jesus, we ask Thee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include three separate articles: First, an address by Dr. Walter T. Tunks on the subject, Do We Want Socialized Medicine?; the second, an article entitled "The American Way—What Is It?" by Juney Fasick, of Springfield, Ohio, an American Legion essay winner; and third, an essay on the same subject, The American Way—What Is It? by Bobby Grear, of South Solon, Ohio, also an essay winner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an excerpt.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech recently delivered by him.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a statement on the subject of maltreatment of Greek seamen in the United States, and in the other to include an article on excess profits aid to social security.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter regarding the destruction of wild horses in Wyoming and in the second an article from the Atlanta Journal on Georgia's last Confederate soldier.

Mr. WAGNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with reference to the essay contest of the American Legion, department of Ohio, and include two essays by the winners residing in his county.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the North Texas Oil and Gas Association.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short essay on the subject of why democracy works.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered in the United Nations by the chairman of the Ethiopian delegation to the United Nations.

Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include House Joint Memorial No. 6 of the Oregon Legislature.

GIVING AWAY OUR BIRTHRIGHT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I predict, with a national debt of $252,000,000,000, going in the red by spending billions more than we receive by taxes, means bankruptcy and a change in our Government form that no American will like or want. Why do we not wake up, America, before it is too late? Oh, it is imperative—every American who loves liberty—wake up and take care of our own. Look what gifts we gave to others:

WORLD AID

House Coordinator of Information comes up with interesting facts on United States foreign aid. Since beginning of World War I we have given or loaned without repayment more than $92,000,000,000 to foreign nations. Here's Coordinator's break-down:

Unpaid balance on World War I loans	$15,460,248,348
Lend-lease (through Mar. 31, 1948)	50,205,229,787
Marshall plan (through June 1950)	9,254,000,000

Army relief in occupied areas (through June 1950)	$3,774,000,000
Loan to Britain	3,750,000,000
UNRRA (through March 1947)	2,700,000,000
Export-Import Bank loans (through June 1950)	2,007,000,000
International Bank for Reconstruction Fund	1,585,000,000
Surplus war goods[1]	1,148,000,000
Philippine aid and war damages (through June 1950)	682,000,000
Greek-Turkish aid (through June 1950)	607,000,000
China aid (through June 1950)	520,000,000
UN displaced persons fund (through June 1950)	477,000,000
Total	92,169,478,135

[1] In addition, services disposed of $6,434,000,000 of surplus for which no liquidation agreement is reported.

You are on the New Deal road to bankruptcy with the President's proposals. Socialized medicine, controls of everything, Government aid to education, slum clearance, arming foreign countries, means ruination for America.

You are biting off more than you can chew.

Stop, look, listen, before it is too late.

PAUL ROBESON

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by Mr. Paul Robeson before the World Peace Conference in Paris must be considered as only his personal individual views. By no stretch of the imagination can Mr. Robeson speak for all of the Negroes in the United States and neither can I.

I can, however, summarize the general feelings of most of the Negro masses including myself. They are:

First. We are Americans.

Second. We are against any type of aggressive war on our part or on the part of any other nation.

Third. We are going to keep on fighting to our very fullest—short of violence—to obtain in America everything that God and the Bill of Rights ordained that we should have.

Fourth. In the hour of national crisis we will be loyal to our Nation as we always have been, reserving the right to criticize constructively as we did in World War I and World War II.

Last, in the event of war at any time against anyone, we will do our part as we always have done insofar as it does not conflict with our individual religious beliefs or conscience.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the American Federation of Labor.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2032, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago I addressed the House on the Hartley bill then pending before it for consideration. I declared at that time:

If the legislators who are the proponents of this measure imagine for 1 minute that it is going to bring peace between labor and management, they are in for a sudden and serious awakening. The American workingman is a long-suffering individual, as past history will prove, but he will subject himself to chains only so long. The day will always come when he will rise up and smite his enemies. The supporters of H. R. 3020 must overlook the fact that anything that circumscribes the liberties of the workingman and his right to improve his working conditions and security is violently resented, because it is not only he but his family who is affected. It is the threatened impoverishment of his children, the deprivation of proper food and clothing and education, which creates bitterness in him. So we had better weigh well the consequences of any kind of legislation that affects the intimate life of our working people.

I made this statement at that time because, as a Member of Congress, I was concerned over the effect which legislation of the Hartley bill type would have on the welfare of the entire Nation. Let me emphasize this fact. My concern over the then pending action of the Eightieth Congress on this bill arose from my conviction that the Hartley Act would adversely affect not only the millions of wage earners in this country but small business, the farmer, and eventually management as well. I was convinced of this as a Member of Congress, and I was convinced of this as an employer who has been dealing with labor for many years.

As intimate and close a relationship as necessary exists between industry and labor if industry thinks that it can escape the effects of government first, it is mistaken.

Experience has unhappily vindicated my position. Where Federal legislation should have developed cooperation, the Taft-Hartley Act disrupted sound collective bargaining. Where Federal legislation should have encouraged industrial peace, the Taft-Hartley Act created industrial unrest. Where Federal legislation should have assisted the wage earner, the Taft-Hartley Act harassed him, defeated the exercise of legitimate rights and undermined his collective bargaining strength. Where Federal legislation should have reduced Government intervention, the Taft-Hartley Act injected the Government into labor disputes to the advantage of management and to the disadvantage of labor and the Nation. And where Federal legislation should have encouraged free collective bargaining, the Taft-Hartley Act restricted it.

This is the lesson of experience under labor legislation which is based on hostility, anger, and confusion. This is the experience which prompted the subcommittee of which I was chairman to approve the Lesinski bill. And this is the experience which requires early approval of that bill by the Congress. As was so aptly pointed out in an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of January 17, 1949:

A lot of water has rolled under the bridge since the wave of big strikes and the framing of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946 and 1947. A few widely held assumptions have been swept down the stream of experience. It ought to be clear by now that American workers, by and large, want to join unions and do so of their own free will; that, by and large, the rank and file dictate the acts of their leaders and back them up, and that, with very few exceptions, American labor doesn't like political strikes or Communist machinations any more than do Americans in general. The approach, therefore, to new labor legislation can be largely freed from some of the concerns which cluttered up the drafting of the 1947 law.

In the labor bill now before you, we have taken the "Hartley" out of Federal labor legislation. We have replaced it with a bill based upon an understanding of sound collective bargaining and upon a proper concern for the Nation's welfare and for the welfare of the American wage earner. We are returning in this bill to free collective bargaining, and we are abandoning that philosophy which would destroy all the great social gains made under the New Deal.

We should not underestimate the significance of the Taft-Hartley Act. As one of its authors, former Congressman Hartley, stated, it was his sincere hope that the Taft-Hartley Act would point the way for the Republican Party to approach its over-all problem of reducing the size and cost of Government.

Once we accept the concept of the Taft-Hartley as a model to begin an interim period leading to complete elimination of the Government labor relations agencies—

Congressman Hartley declared—

we can apply that conception to other areas of Government activities.

I am well aware of the political difficulties of eliminating the New Deal social legislation—

Mr. Hartley said.

It cannot be repealed at a single stroke.

What was the New Deal social legislation that Mr. Hartley sought to destroy? The Fair Labor Standards Act, which has done so much to eliminate substandard wages and to spread employment; the Federal Communications Act, which has contributed so much toward regulating the radio industries in the public interest; the Federal Power Act, and legislation in the field of housing. These are but examples of constructive legislation which sponsors of the Taft-Hartley philosophy sought to destroy.

I emphasize these considerations because as I view the bill now before the House I see in it a significance going far beyond the scope of its provisions. I see

in it a renewal of a trend in the conduct of Federal affairs which is based upon an understanding of our democratic system and of our responsibilities to the Nation and to the citizens of this country.

In the 17 years since the depths of the great depression, our Nation has raised itself to an economic level unparallelled in the history of the world. During this same period we have achieved for ourselves a position of world leadership. This we have done without sacrificing those values which are essential to our democratic system of government. This we have done at a time when nation after nation succumbed to statism. We have demonstrated during this period the strength and vitality of our democracy under the most difficult and threatening conditions.

The threat still remains. The forces of communism are rampant throughout the world and democratic nations everywhere look to us for leadership. It is, therefore, of essential importance that our democracy be made to work. It is of essential importance that we, by our example, demonstrate, time and time again, that our system of government is the only system which properly safeguards the interests and liberty of its people. Only in this way can we meet the threat of communism abroad and at home and lay the proper basis for world peace.

Passage of the Lesinski bill will be a long step forward in assuring continued democratic government in American industry. By laying the basis for sound and free collective bargaining, the bill will enable American industry to make its maximum contribution toward achieving and maintaining a full employment economy, which is one of the major goals of our Federal Government today.

This is the test before the Congress. As the President declared in his message on the State of the Union on January 5, 1949:

> If we want to keep our economy running in high gear, we must be sure that every group has the incentive to make its full contribution to the national welfare. At present, the working men and women of the Nation are unfairly discriminated against by a statute that abridges their rights, curtails their constructive efforts, and hampers our system of free collective bargaining. That statute is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, sometimes called the Taft-Hartley Act.
>
> That act should be repealed.
>
> The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising cut of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for setting up machinery for preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.
>
> The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within that Department should be placed in it.

The Lesinski bill would carry out the President's proposals. It deserves and will receive the support of every Member of Congress who favors free collective bargaining and a strong and vital democracy.

I might add it will also carry out the pledges made in the Democratic Party platform. Every Member in this body who was elected to Congress on the Democratic platform last year has an obligation to carry out that platform and to keep faith with the American people, because that is what we promised.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Allen, La.	Garmatz	Moulder
Andrews	Gilmer	Multer
Bailey	Goodwin	Murphy
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	O'Konski
Bennett, Mich.	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Bland	Edwin Arthur	Joseph L.
Bolton, Ohio	Hall,	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Scott,
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Hardie
Celler	Heller	Shafer
Clevenger	Hill	Short
Cox	Hobbs	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	Hoeven	Smith, Ohio
DeGraffenried	Hoffman, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Judd	Thompson
Engel, Mich.	Kearney	Velde
Fellows	King	Walsh
Forand	Kunkel	Whitaker
Fugate	Latham	White, Idaho
Fulton	LeCompte	Wickersham
Gamble	Macy	Withrow

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2032, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 369 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, men have a natural right to form unions or associations according to their particular trades or occupations in order better to effect their economic advancement. This is not a right conferred by government. It is an inherent right antecedent to government.

Before the advent of the machine or industrial age, employers held a more direct and personal relation to their employees. And during that period employees accepted more or less the status of law in which they were long recognized; namely of servants in relation to masters. The masters had all the rights and the servants had little or none. The justification, if any, of the long-established law of master and servant was that the master would exercise a paternal and solicitous attitude for the well-being of the servant on account of their close personal relationship.

But with the advent of the machine age, this personal relationship disappeared. One employer might have 50,000 or 100,000 employees. He could not know them all and could not have a knowledge of their just individual rights. For a long time then, the employer was allowed by law to form combinations of ownership known as corporations and the employees were left in their individual relationship under the law of master and servant.

The Wagner Act, or the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, as it is more properly called, came into being. Already in 1932 the Norris-La Guardia Act had been adopted, outlawing the writ of injunction in labor disputes and the consequent punishment by contempt of court. A new era in labor-management relations was being ushered in. Workingmen never before organized, formed unions under the protection of the Wagner Act, the Magna Carta of labor, and found, through the means of free collective bargaining, that they could initiate improvement in their wages, in winning decent working conditions, in achieving a progressively increasing measure of security. Hence, it was ludicrous to expect that any employee, who for example, had worked in the automobile industry or in the coal mines or in the steel mills would voluntarily go back to the comparative serfdom that existed before the right of unionization was recognized by Federal law.

The Taft-Hartley Act invited them to return to the settlement of labor-management disputes by the writ of injunction; it invited them to accept the whittling away of the bargaining strength of their unions; it invited them to accept the courts or the executve power of government or the already too heavily concentrated power of management to dictate the measure of progress that might be attained in the employee status in industry.

The result should have been a foregone conclusion. Hardly ever before did a single issue become so predominant and decisive in a national election. The repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was decided in the election of last November 2 when a free electorate gave a mandate to this Congress to undo the travesty on human rights committed by the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, when any law on our statute books is found to be discriminatory against millions of our people; when it means slavery for the working man, and the outlawing of collective bargaining—so necessary to his welfare; when it jeopardizes his right as a free man to strike or not to strike, or to peacefully picket; when it interferes with his right to organize in order to protect himself against exploitation; then we owe it to those millions to get rid of the law.

We must admit that in this country, for too many years, employers and big business held the whip over those who labored. A chosen few made tremendous profits by the sweat of the laborer's brow—not by their own. The laboring man was made to work long hours under

any conditions his employers wished to impose upon him. His being able to earn his weekly wages and to feed and clothe his family was entirely dependent upon the whim of those who employed him. He was paid only what he earned—no vacations with pay for him. If he was sick, to his suffering was added the worry that there would not be a penny coming in while he was forced to remain away from work. He dared not raise his voice to protest against hazardous working conditions, unfair or cruel treatment, or grossly inadequate pay for his work, for fear of being fired.

When the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 was passed, the basic principles of free collective bargaining were laid down by law. In this law, also known as the Wagner Act, labor received its Magna Carta. That guaranty given the laboring man to bargain collectively must be preserved and protected, as it gave him the right to be heard through his unions. The unions, with their effective power to bolster the wages of their members in terms of real buying power through the process of collective bargaining, represent the most democratic means of protecting the working man, and in the long run, industry itself. Such bargaining prevents the kind of boom and bust cycles which have harassed our economy for many years, when business arbitrarily fixed wages without regard to the needs of workers or their ability as consumers to buy products being produced, or even the necessities of life.

Alone, the laboring man dared not raise his voice—nor was he given an opportunity to speak to those who employed him. Now, through his unions, he can speak. The unions have brought to the laborer fair wages in return for his labors; safer working conditions; freedom from oppression and bad treatment. Through the unions he was able to protect himself somewhat against the inevitable rainy day. Many unions provide their members with unemployment benefits, retirement funds, burial benefits, and others. Organized labor has had to battle for the rights it now has, since those who seek high profits would never, voluntarily, consider the plight of the worker. Organized labor has secured the 40-hour week, workmen's compensation laws, and a fair wage, insuring the laboring man a high standard of living.

We must admit that the best way to obtain and maintain industrial peace and stabilize our economy is to encourage—not hinder—collective bargaining.

However, in 1947, the enemies of labor decided to wage a battle against the laborer, and to take away from him his hard-won security as well as some of his constitutional rights as a free man. Then a lawyer was hired to draft a new labor law, the Taft-Hartley Act, for which, it is said, he was paid $7,500 by the Republican National Committee. The bill had for its motives revenge and severe punishment for the laborer, not justice. The provisions of this law work in favor of employers and against labor—and constitute a real threat against our laborers.

We find that the Taft-Hartley Act's ban on the closed shop has resulted in the outlawing of collective-bargaining agreements, which had been equally beneficial to both labor and management, and which had helped maintain industrial peace for a period of over 100 years. Peaceful picketing is completely outlawed in many situations, even such picketing as has been sanctioned by our courts for several decades. It permits enjoinment of violations without regard to the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act safeguards. State labor laws are allowed to supersede the National Labor Act in certain cases.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, injunctions are used to settle labor disputes, and this means that men are ordered to continue at work whether they wish to or not. This is, in effect, slavery. Further, it was provided in testimony given before the Committee on Education and Labor, that labor disputes cannot be settled by injunctions. We know that the injunction of law did not make John L. Lewis' miners mine coal. Labor is resentful of the injunction, and rightfully so. Our aim should be to create a wholesome and reasonable attitude on the part of management and labor toward each other and the public interest.

The Taft-Hartley Act provides elaborate and inflexible procedures which result in delays in settling labor disputes, and under it the President and his subordinates are deprived of their power to take effective action in securing the peaceful settlement of disputes, the 80-day waiting period doing no good, but much harm.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, an employer can, when faced with a strike, hire enough nonunion workers to outvote members of the union, and demand an election. The result of this can mean the ouster of the union.

I maintain that the Taft-Hartley law simply does not, and cannot, work. The Taft-Hartley period has witnessed 8 percent more strikes, 50 percent more workers involved, and 80 percent more items, than the era preceding it. It is antilabor, undemocratic, and has produced bad relations between management and labor instead of the industrial peace we must have in this country if we are to meet the demands made upon us as a nation.

We grant that industrial peace is necessary. Then why should we wish to take away from our workers the right to organize into unions, to have free and fair elections, to choose their own representatives, and then to have the right to bargain with management? Management did not suffer under the Wagner Act. It had no obligation placed upon it, except to bargain freely and equitably with the designated representatives of labor. Management was not, of course, to interfere with the fair elections of labor, and was not to discriminate against workers because they belonged to a union. Under our Constitution, we are given the liberty to organize, and why should we consider it a favor to the workingman when we allow him to organize a union, and why should we consider it our right to legislate against his so organizing?

It is recognized that the worker who feels he is being treated reasonably and fairly is the good worker—he accomplishes more, makes few mistakes, has better health, enjoys working, and in the end the employer benefits. A worker who is ground under the heel of the employer, who suffers from unjust treatment or a feeling of resentment cannot work as efficiently as the one who knows he is being treated fairly. Our laborers have been resentful of the Taft-Hartley law ever since it was passed—and they have good cause. They know that the effect of the law is to break down their unions, and they refuse to accept the fallacy offered them—that they need to be "protected" against their own unions.

In 1948, therefore, the people spoke. They demanded the repeal of the vicious, unfair, discriminatory, slave law known as the Taft-Hartley Act. I am more than willing to carry out the promises I made to the people I represent. I insist that the Taft-Hartley labor law must be repealed and the Wagner Act reinstated without any crippling amendments. Then, under free collective bargaining, the laboring man will regain his dignity and be content. Labor and management will again work in cooperation with each other, and will settle their disputes in a democratic and fair relationship, and our national economy will benefit thereby.

On January 24, 1949, I introduced my own bill, H. R. 1747, to repeal the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 and to revive the National Labor Relations Act—the Wagner Act. Since it is not possible to have my bill considered, I shall support in this House the Lesinski bill, which repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and restores the Wagner Act without any crippling amendments.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is amusing and interesting to listen to some Members who have always supported legislation aimed at labor. We have heard of the vote on the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. Any Member who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act can consistently vote for the committee bill. When the Taft-Hartley Act was up there were several strikes on and public opinion was intense. That bill was passed at a time when labor legislation could not receive rational consideration. Intense emotions existed. It was what in legislative language we call a "spot vote." There were at least 75 Members who spoke to me at that time who told me that they did not want to vote for the Taft-Hartley bill, but that they would have to vote for it if no substitute was offered. There were many others who felt the same way. If the committee bill had been offered as a substitute bill when the Taft-Hartley bill was up in the House, in my opinion, it would have been adopted, and the Taft-Hartley bill would have been defeated. The situation then and the situation now is entirely different. It was the Taft-Hartley bill or no bill. Furthermore, few Members really knew what was contained in the Taft-Hartley bill or what it meant. In addition, we have had the experience of this law for a substantial period of time, and no one is satisfied with it.

Even the strongest supporters of the Taft-Hartley law at that time admit that it must be amended and changed now.

Let me call your attention to this. Hearings were held in May of 1948 and later reports were made by the subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. What did they report? When I read the names of the Members who signed these reports you will be amazed.

Some of the findings are as follows:

Your subcommittee is certain it was not the intention of Congress to include in the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board every small, local business which drew a small portion of its supplies or merchandise from beyond the borders of the State or Territory.

The Taft-Hartley Act did that, but the Wagner Act did not.

Another finding is as follows:

Members of the subcommittee are of the opinion that any attempt on the part of either the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or the Board itself to enlarge upon its own jurisdiction by interpretation is not in keeping with the will or the intent of Congress.

Mr. Denham said he had to do it, because the Taft-Hartley Act directed him to do it, and yet Members who signed this subcommittee report said that he had violated the intent of Congress.

The report reads further:

The members of the subcommittee are further of the opinion, after due consideration of the testimony, that the term, used in both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act "affecting commerce" is too general.

And the report, of course, goes on.

Those are criticisms of the Taft-Hartley Act. The report reads further:

Furthermore, the subcommittee is of the opinion that this new interpretation proposed by the General Counsel of the Board to be placed upon the "affecting commerce" is not warranted either by the previous history of interpretation and administration of the Wagner Act, by the debates on the bill or by the terms of the act itself; that such interpretation is not necessary to effectuate the purpose of the act.

Mr. Denham testified that he had to do it. The law is above everyone. This is a government of law. And he said that the plain language of the Taft-Hartley Act demanded that he do this, to go into every little corner store, as he said in his testimony, to go into a saloon where the hops come from New York into Massachusetts, where one person was employed, and that employee would be covered by the Taft-Hartley Act.

They even recommended that the Board and the Department not act until Congress had an opportunity of passing legislation to remedy it.

Who are the ones who signed that report? They are the Chairman Clare E. Hoffman, George H. Bender, Walter H. Judd, Robert F. Rich, Henry J. Latham, Forest A. Harness, Clarence J. Brown, Ross Rizley, J. Edgar Chenoweth, Fred E. Busbey, Melvin C. Snyder, R. Walter Riehlman, and Ralph Harvey.

Then there is Carter Manasco, Henderson Lanham, Porter Hardy, Jr., and J. Frank Wilson. The other Democrats did not object. I filed an accompanying report, because it was a step in the right direction, but it was an admission by the strongest supporters on the Republican side of the Taft-Hartley Act that they did not know what they were passing, and they were demanding that the Taft-Hartley Act be changed and amended. So I know of no one today who is defending the Taft-Hartley Act in this Chamber.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. In connection with the powers of the General Counsel, I would refer you to the report in which it states "that the incumbent, Mr. Robert Denham, has noted that his powers are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency."

Mr. McCORMACK. That is absolutely correct. During the hearings—you ought to get a copy of these hearings and read them. You ought to read them just from a recreational angle. I spent an evening reading the hearings and it was most interesting recreation to me to hear my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and others, in questioning Denham, say, "You are a dictator." And Denham came back and said, "I am only enforcing the law. You passed it. I am carrying out what you told me to do." Yet we hear the wailings of these strong proponents of such legislation aimed at labor, bemoaning the very provisions of the bill that they brought into being and existence themselves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, of course, is referring, I take it, to suggested amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. I might suggest that no one who supported it has ever contended that it was perfect and that it could not be amended.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with that, you are supporting the Wood bill. The Wood bill is nothing but the Taft-Hartley Act under another name.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, if the gentleman will permit me——

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my opinion.

Mr. HALLECK. That is not quite an accurate statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is sufficiently accurate that I will make it on the floor of this House. The Wood bill, provision for provision, is the same as the Taft-Hartley bill, except a little change here and there, a softening in one or two paragraphs, and making it harder in other paragraphs. So I will express the convinced opinion that, for all practical purposes, the Wood bill is nothing but the Taft-Hartley bill as it exists in law today.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I see my friend from Michigan. I mentioned his name in his absence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I am going to yield, but wait until I get through. I am beginning to enjoy this.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield in just a moment. I notice the chairman of the subcommittee. You remember your loud protestations about the dictatorship of Denham, the General Counsel.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. Sure. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. You are not in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act as it is now written, are you?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not strong enough.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not strong enough?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. But in here you said it was too strong.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, my friend has a very flexible mind and he moves in many strange directions. My friend's strange directions are very apparent. Here is the report, the wailings and weepings of my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. Now he says it is not strong enough, whereas in his own report he admitted the Taft-Hartley Act went too far, and that Mr. Denham was usurping too much power and that he was a dictator.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman will yield to me pretty soon, when he gets through with these other boys?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, of course. My friend from Michigan is one Member that I find it difficult not to yield to.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Of course.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman is familiar with the manner in which the Lesinski bill was reported by the committee, without consideration of amendments, and the original request for a closed rule by the chairman of the committee.

I had understood until quite recently that there was to be no amendment of the Lesinski bill. I read in today's papers, however, and I understand from conversations around the cloakrooms that it has been determined on the gentleman's side to support, or at least to go along with, certain amendments to the Lesinski bill if the substitute is defeated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I remind the gentleman I have only 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, I am sure, desires to be fair. We are always entertained by what he has to say; he is always interested in the orderly transaction of the business of the House of

Representatives. If that report be true with respect to amendments to be accepted to the Lesinski bill, I should like to know what the amendments are so we might possibly expedite consideration of the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. At the present time there is no amendment that I know of. I am discussing the Taft-Hartley Act; I am showing that there is not a Member of the House, even the strongest proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act, who are satisfied with it now in its present form; and I am supporting the Lesinski bill. So, as I said, any Member who having previously voted for the Taft-Hartley Act can now vote for the committee bill and the two votes will be consistent.

It is interesting to note that the only Members who argue to the contrary are those who always fought for antilabor legislation.

What does the Taft-Hartley bill do? In the first place, it takes the Government out of its proper position of neutrality and puts it on the side of management in the industrial field. Secondly, it is punitive and repressive legislation directed at labor. Instead of building and promoting harmony and understanding in the industrial field it has resulted in suspicion, distrust, and discord. You can no more have millions of workers and their families, the backbone of our country, fine Americans, accept this punitive and repressive law than past Congresses could compel the people of the country to accept prohibition.

The keystone of the Wagner Act was union security. Through collective bargaining it assured the individual worker of the liberty in the intense economic era that could be obtained through collective action. The Taft-Hartley Act removed this keystone. Under the Taft-Hartley Act the majority of all eligible employees have to approve. Congress does not have to do this in connection with the passage of legislation or any resolution. Under Taft-Hartley an employer can keep a nonunion worker on for 30 days. In many instances they can by turn-over overload the labor market with nonunion help to destroy unions. Why, the use and abuse of injunctions aimed at unions and at workers organizing resulted in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The antimonopoly laws aimed at the big corporate structures became the instrument by the courts to prevent whenever possible and to destroy whenever possible unions or their formation, and to permit the continuation of exploitation of labor. Their monopoly laws came to be used against labor instead of the great corporate structures, and that is what resulted in the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act—and I voted for that act—to prevent the antitrust laws being used against labor rather than against the abuses at which they were originally directed, the great corporate structures that were engaging in monopolies.

The Taft-Hartley Act is permeated with provisions for the issuance of injunctions against labor, but, strangely, this time through instrumentality of Government. It is amusing to listen to the champions of this law with which no one is now satisfied making the assertions that the Taft-Hartley Act does not interfere with the right to strike. The fact is that the right to strike as well as the right to picket has been limited in a number of serious respects.

The Wagner Act stated:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike.

The Taft-Hartley Act negates this provision, this necessary and valuable right to the worker. The committee bill corrects all of these antilabor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

But let me go further. If an employer charges an unlawful sympathetic strike, mind you, only makes the charge, this charge must be given priority consideration regardless of the number of unfair-labor-practice cases on the docket of the National Labor Relations Board.

But let us take a union charge. What happens under the Taft-Hartley law? No matter how urgent—yes; no matter how important it is—it must take its turn in the long processes of the new National Labor Relations Board created by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, if union members should strike while a contract is in existence, or prior to the termination of a 60-day notice, for the purpose of changing the conditions of a contract, they can be fired outright, with no right to reinstatement. But what happens under the Taft-Hartley Act if an employer locks out union members for the same purpose, or breaches the contract? He may only be charged with an unfair labor practice.

Suppose under the Taft-Hartley law the National Labor Relations Board entertains a charge by an employer of a sympathetic strike, it must seek an injunction. But what about the wrong of an employer? In no kind of unfair-labor-practice charge by a union is the National Labor Relations Board forced to seek an injunction against the employer.

Let us look further on the unfairness, the one-sidedness of the Taft-Hartley Act, and its punitive and repressive provisions. Suppose under the Taft-Hartley Act a union participates in a sympathetic strike, or a boycott, which are unfair labor practices? The employer may sue the union for damages. This is a dangerous power; it is a constant threat to the existence of unions. But you can read the Taft-Hartley Act a thousand times and you will find no right for a union to sue an employer for an employer's unfair labor practice.

The Taft-Hartley Act will enable the return of the vicious and inhuman black list. The Taft-Hartley Act will enable the return of the shanghaiing days. Special committees of Congress years ago looked into those practices and exposed them.

But let us go further. The Taft-Hartley Act prevents union members from fighting sweatshop conditions within their own industry by refusing to handle nonunion goods manufactured under sweatshop conditions. It would prevent a union from handling nonunion goods when it is known an employer of nonunion labor is employing them in violation of the law. The Taft-Hartley Act lets the employer sue the union. And, while on this subject, there is no kind of an unfair labor practice on the part of an employer which also entitles the union to sue the employer.

Look through the Taft-Hartley Act and you will find instance after instance, provision after provision, where certain acts by unions are crimes, or the union can be sued, or discriminated against, or the individual worker or the union denied the right to appear before the National Labor Relations Board; but you see nothing in relation to a guilty employer or one charged with a breach of the law except it is "an unfair labor practice."

There are other provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act I could mention to show its hostility to labor, that it took Government out of its proper position of neutrality in an industrial dispute and put it on the side of the employer and against labor.

I think I have shown enough of the antilabor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to satisfy the rational mind, the fair mind, that its continuance as a law cannot and should not be tolerated.

Now, let us take up the Wood bill. The Wood bill is nothing but the Taft-Hartley Act. Read it, study it, digest it, and you will find that section after section is the same. Oh, here and there, there is a little change, some slight improvement in two or three sections; but there are several sections where it is made more drastic than even the Taft-Hartley Act. That is the bill they want you to vote to substitute. That is the bill that some of my friends, not all of them, on the left Republican side, say they are going to get all of my Democratic colleagues south of the Mason-Dixon line to vote for. Of course they are not, not for that bill. It is amazing the effrontery of some of my Republican friends in making the statement to the country to the effect they are the leaders of the Democratic Members of this body who were elected from districts in the Southern States.

Mr. Chairman, the Wood substitute should be defeated and we should proceed to consideration of the Lesinski bill, the committee bill, and enact a fair bill, an honest bill, a bill that will bring understanding in the industrial field between labor and management.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts is expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I trust that what I may have to say here may be taken in the spirit in which I mean it and in which I say it, which is only to add what I can to an understanding of the problems that confront us.

What I have to say is not made in any partisan spirit. These problems that today confront us have been a deep concern of mine over the years. They were a concern of mine when I served in the

minority; they were a concern of mine when I served with my party in the majority; and they are still my concern.

They deal with fundamentals having to do with the happiness, and the prosperity, and the security of our country. Certainly, on that basis we should all approach them. They should not be approached in the manner of name calling, the resort to epithets, and aptly turned phrases here and there to take the place of real argument and consideration of the facts. They should not be considered on some basis that would have it appear that there is some sort of a sinister agreement somewhere or other that is working against the best judgment of individual Members of the House. So far as I am concerned, I want to consider this measure and all of its parts on its merits.

I would have preferred that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] inform us as to whether or not it is proposed that certain amendments be made to the Lesinski bill, and if such amendments are to be proposed, that he inform us as to what they are to be, because, as I say, I think that would help all of us who are conscientiously striving to work this matter out in arriving at the right solution. But he has not seen fit to do that.

He has seen fit to make some statements about the legislation and how it came to be enacted that—I trust he will bear with me when I say this—were not quite in keeping with his general presentations here on the floor of the House.

Now, let us take a look at this thing. I do not know of anyone here who does not believe in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. I have believed in that all my life, because that is the way men balance up their bargaining powers with management.

Some years ago the Wagner Act was enacted, and for the first time it had the Government saying to the people of the country, "We will undertake to guarantee to the laboring man his right to organize and bargain collectively." The act was put on the staute books, and today I do not know of a single Member of the House who would urge its repeal. There may be some, but I do not know of any.

After that act was adopted we gained experience under the act. It became apparent that there were weaknesses in the law and weaknesses in its administration. The gentleman from Massachusetts will recall that in 1940, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, a Democratic Congress, the Smith committee was appointed to study the act, its administration, its various provisions. It was my privilege and responsibility to serve on that committee. We held hearings for a long time and finally recommended amendments to the Wagner Act that were adopted in this body, then Democratic overwhelmingly, by a 2-to-1 vote.

The amendments there adopted form about 50 percent of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. For instance, they provided for separating the prosecuting functions of the Labor Board from its deciding functions, for free speech, for an improvement in respect to the rules of evidence, and for the right of the employer to petition for an election.

Let me go on from there. Subseqently we had the War Labor Disputes Act, the Smith-Connally Act, and the Smith-Ramspeck Act, down through the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. Many of those bills finally became law. Then in the Seventy-ninth Congress, also Democratic overwhelmingly, both Houses passed the Case bill. It included substantially, I would say, 40 to 50 percent of what went into the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

I recount that only so you may understand that this act that we passed in 1947 was the result of long years of careful study; yes, and of enactments by the Congress of the United States, the enactments being joined in by Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans, not antilabor.

I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts use that term yesterday, as though it would be "antilabor" if one on any occasion gave any consideration to the rights of the public or the employers. I do not so consider it and I never have so considered it.

So the truth is that the act of 1947 was the culmination of all these investigations, hearings, and enactments in years gone by. It was the response, too, to overwhelming demands for change in the law—a law that was an experiment to begin with, that should never have been held up as perfect to its last letter. To say that the law was passed in hysteria, to say that it was spot legislation, in my opinion, is to deny the truth, and is to deny also the whole history preceding its enactment.

What has been the experience under that act? Did it destroy unions? No, there are a million more members in labor organizations today than there were before the act was passed. Men have been getting better contracts under the act.

It was said that it would destroy the right to strike, and in the same breath it was said it would promote strikes. It has done neither. We have had strikes. Why, right here in Washington the other day we could not get our newspapers. The law did not prohibit that strike, did it? And the men wound up with better pay and working conditions, yes, assisted by the Mediation and Conciliation Service, created under the Taft-Hartley Act.

But we have had fewer strikes. In the first year after Taft-Hartley, strikes cost our workers $900,000,000 less than strikes cost them the year before. And in 18 months after Taft-Hartley, we had only about one-third the man-hours lost on account of strikes than we lost in the preceding 16 months. So the act neither abolished strikes nor increased them.

Now, let us get on. No one ever claimed the law was perfect. Least of all would I claim that to be the situation. I say that none of these great matters of legislation that deal with the very life blood of our trade and our commerce and our industry and our human relations and industrial relations can ever be static. The status quo can never be maintained. Ours is a government of change. Hence, as imperfections develop, they should be met courageously and fairly, and that is what is here sought to be done.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says there is nothing in the present proposed substitute that changes the Taft-Hartley Act. I do not know whether he has read the act carefully or not, but I have been reading it. Representations were made by the leaders of labor organizations that there were things in the act of 1947 which they felt were dangerously destructive of their rights. Those things were taken into consideration. Here is what we find as relaxing amendments which you just cannot pass off as having no effect. I am afraid that the gentleman from Massachusetts is a little concerned about the situation here.

First of all, it was said that the election for the union shop was not right and that it should be done away with. The proposed substitute seeks to do that. It seeks to make it easier to get the union shop and to make it just a matter of agreement between the employer management and the men.

It was said that the labor organizations could not police their own affairs and that they could not get rid of the Communists and could not control wildcat strikers because of the prohibition in the law which said that you could only remove a man from the union for nonpayment of dues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. So the proposed substitute, Mr. Chairman, would remedy that situation.

It was said that the law made it an unfair labor practice for an employer to notify the union through a hiring hall of the opportunities for employment and hence to carry on relationships that had been proved good in the past. To meet that situation—and I say to my friends here that the substitute does meet it—the bill proposes language which specifically provides that an employer shall be permitted to make those opportunities for employment known. I think anyone who understands anything about this legislation knows that will be effective.

There was complaint that the secondary boycott provision went too far. As I listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts complaining about the secondary boycott provision contained in the proposed substitute, I wondered whether the gentleman from Massachusetts understood and knew that in the Lesinski bill, which he is supporting, there is likewise provision purporting to control secondary boycotts.

It was objected by leaders of organized labor that when there was struck work in a plant, they could not follow that work when the work was farmed out. So it was said: "We will change that. We will make it possible to follow that work into the plants of the other employer." Is that not very definitely a concession which recognizes that there should be no stubborn resistance to any change, but

rather an effort to keep this thing as nearly in line as we can?

It was said that the prohibition in the 1947 act under which an economic striker who had been replaced could not vote in a representation election raised the possibility of "union busting." Very frankly, I can see the merit of that argument. The proposed substitute meets that criticism and makes perfectly sure that that sort of action could not prevail. The subtsitute provides that for a period of 90 days, the man on strike, even though he is not entitled to reinstatement, may vote as an employee in the election.

May I say at that point that I do not know whether 90 days is the right period of time or not. I do not know whether it ought to be 6 months, but whatever the House here decides, let the House make that decision, and I believe there is enough collective judgment here to do it.

It was said that the non-Communist affidavit which was written in by the House of Representatives on the floor in 1947, and strengthened by amendments offered on the other side of the aisle, should be signed by employers also. Well, I believe that is right. I think the employers ought to sign the affidavits if the representatives of the employees are to sign them. So that is provided for.

Balloting on the last offer in the national emergency provisions is to be taken out in the proposed substitute, and I think that is a desirable thing.

I could go on with numerous other things that are included in this proposed substitute. Let me say to my friends in the committee that numerous proposals to tighten the act have been made. None of the provisions in the proposed substitute tighten the act in any real particular.

If you turn down the substitute, and you rubber stamp in the best fashion I have ever witnessed and adopt the administration bill, sent up here and not amended, reported out by the committee without even being read, you are going to take a lot of things out of the law that we have been voting for—and you Democrats have voted for them too—since 1940.

How does it hurt anyone to say that the constitutional provisions for free speech shall apply, so long as it does not involve some statement on the part of an employer seeking to exercise coercion or intimidation or promise of benefit in order to interfere with the right of labor to organize? How are you going to say that?

I believe in collective bargaining, as I said. Collective bargaining should result in contracts. What a farce we would make of the whole process of collective bargaining if we said that either side to the agreement, once it is entered into, may violate it with impunity?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. The proposed substitute would continue to control secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. The trouble with the administration bill is that it does not have much in it to provide for any sort of enforcement, yet we have heard everybody, from the President down, decry the ill-advised use, so often resorted to, of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. These jurisdictional strikes put the employer in the middle, where he cannot even find out with whom he is supposed to deal. Secondary boycotts, which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was talking about, many times operate in such manner as to raise the resentment of right-thinking people everywhere.

When the Wagner Act was written, I think everyone expected that supervisory employees would be kept on the side of management. To get back to the fundamental principles of collective bargaining, I think it is elemental that if you are going to have collective bargaining you have to have management on one side of the table and men on the other side of the table. Will anybody disagree with that? Of course not. You have to draw the line. So we undertook to draw the line.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman asks if anybody will disagree with that. Does the gentleman think that in the present economic conditions of today a foreman is not an employee, in the main? Of course, I can conceive of some supervisors who might not be, but as a general proposition, I mean?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course he is an employee. The vice president of a company is an employee, but would the gentleman from Massachusetts want to see a situation arise under which the president bargains collectively with the vice presidents of a corporation? Of course not.

The fact of the business is that when the Wagner Act was first put into law the labor-organization people did not want the supervisors and foremen in with them. Why? Because they said they voted against the union and they should not be included.

I say that where a supervisor has the powers of mangement, the powers of discipline, the powers of promotion, and all of these other things, he ought to be on the side of management; and to hold otherwise can only bring about a breakdown in our whole economic system. As a matter of fact, under the law as it presently stands, foremen and supervisors can belong to a union, but they are not considered as employees for the purposes of the act. Now, are you going to do away with that?

Now, let us talk about separating the powers of the Labor Board. You can take that or leave it, but, as I say, you voted for it in 1940. You voted for that in 1940 and you have been voting for it ever since. What does it do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana two additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. It follows the good old traditional practice under which the same person shall not be the investigator, the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury.

Let us go on down through the national emergency injunction. Why do they get so excited about that on the other side of the aisle? They know the President used that provision seven times, and with effect, and it did not enslave anyone. Are you going to do away with that?

Let me tell you, and you might as well face it now as later, that sometime you may wake up and find the country in the same sort of condition of dissatisfaction that was prevalent in 1946.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Not now; I have a few more things to say, and my time is limited.

I could go on through with the other provisions of existing law. They were enacted not in any feeling of hysteria, not in any effort to punish anybody. They were enacted by patriotic Americans, many of whom came up from the ranks, who want to see collective bargaining carried on, and who want to see the labor union movement grow and prosper on a sound basis. Are you going to wipe that all out?

The majority leader has undertaken apparently to assuage the feelings of some of the 331 Members who voted for that act back in 1947 by saying to you that you did not know what you were voting on. I just do not believe that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I have many reasons for opposing the Taft-Hartley Act. I want to mention but one in the limited time I have. That is the separate General Counsel set-up under the present law.

For the 20 months since the effective date of most of this act's provisions, our employers and our unions have suffered from much uncertainty. Uncertainty, not only as to what this law does mean with respect to many labor-management activities, but uncertainty as to who speaks the law—the separate authoritarian General Council, or the five-man Labor Board itself.

On paper, and in a statute, this structural division of function may superficially look good. The General Counsel is the prosecutor, the Board is the judge. But in the test of practice, demonstrated by these past 20 months, what have we seen?

The General Counsel believes hotels are subject to this law. The Board does not.

The General Counsel believes local tool shops are subject to this law. The Board does not.

The General Counsel believes employees afraid to work during a strike should get back pay. The Board does not.

The General Counsel believes the Communist affidavits apply to certain top labor leaders. The Board does not.

The General Counsel believes certain brick and tile companies, cleaning and dyeing plants, noodle manufacturers,

upholstering shops are subject to this law. The Board does not.

Thus, who knows where one stands, whether employer or employee, if he manages or works in these marginal commerce activities, or has a status over which the General Counsel and the Board disagree?

By control over the field offices, the General Counsel applies his kind of law. Through its decisions, greatly delayed in point of time, the Board applies its kind of law.

Sometime ago I read in the daily press that the General Counsel had a bathroom built for himself in his office suite because the Chairman of the Labor Board had one. I thought that a most symbolical expression, though reduced to the ridiculous, of the inherent competition implicit in this divided administering of a phase of our national labor policy. A single team playing with two quarterbacks calling, at times, different signals on the same play. That, I submit, is trying to win the hard way.

Mr. Chairman, let us not continue this clearly demonstrated structural weakness in any revised labor-relations agency. The problems involved in seeking industrial peace are many and difficult. Let us not deform the body that is charged with the duty of seeking these ends.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, working men and women of this Nation value highly the blessings of individual and collective freedom conferred upon them by the organic law of this land. No other group or section of people in the United States places a greater value upon individual and collective freedom than do working people. Freedom to organize into trade-unions and freedom to bargain collectively through trade-unions are regarded as sacred rights by the workers of our country.

Under the free-enterprise system employers freely bargain for the sale of their products on terms and conditions regarded as reasonable and satisfactory; workers engage in collective bargaining to negotiate wage rates and conditions of employment. Such agreements provide for the compensation which they shall receive for work and service performed, and the conditions under which they work. Through the exercise of this right, the workers have succeeded in lifting their standards of life and work. The exercise of these rights by labor and by management have been universally regarded as being both elemental and basic justice ever since the Declaration of Independence was signed.

Now the infamous Taft-Hartley law makes it a crime for labor and management to negotiate certain provisions of a wage agreement customary and satisfactory to both, but no restrictions were placed upon the right of employers to negotiate for the sale of the products of labor on terms which may be acceptable and satisfactory.

Why was such an antilabor law passed by the Congress of the United States? What was the real purpose of this act? Here is the answer. The Taft-Hartley Act was passed for the purpose of making strong unions weak and weak unions still weaker. Its obvious purpose was to deprive labor of the right to negotiate contracts such as employers and employees have exercised during all the years which have intervened since collective bargaining became a fixed practice in the economic life of our Nation.

Through free collective bargaining, wage agreements were negotiated through two world war periods, during which the individual and collective productivity of the workers of the United States reached the highest point in all our history. Even now our Government is inviting employers and workers of European countries to visit our industries to observe methods of management and producing workers. Would this happen if American wage earners did not have an outstanding record for resourcefulness and productivity?

If, as the record shows, free collective bargaining made an immeasurable contribution to the growth and development of our Nation up to the present time, why should it now be made a crime for employers and employees to negotiate a free collective bargaining agreement, acceptable and satisfactory to both?

Free collective bargaining and sound management-labor relationships are a large part of the basis on which a sound national economy rests. When the exercise of this right is denied to either management or labor by legislation or otherwise, the national economic structure is seriously affected.

Labor in fighting for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law is seeking to bring about the restoration of the exercise of elemental individual and collective freedom as granted by the Constitution of the United States. It is fighting for the preservation of the American way of life—for an American principle.

The Taft-Hartley law is filled with legal restrictions upon the exercise of the common elemental rights of labor. For instance, if workers exercise their right to strike against injustice and for the redress of grievances, the employer may employ new workers classified as strikebreakers, and after doing so call for an election for the selection of a new collective-bargaining agent. The strikebreakers alone can participate in such an election; the employees who are on strike are denied the right to vote.

It is difficult to understand why the Congress of the United States would vote to pass a law in which there was embodied such an amazing restriction upon the exercise of the right of the workers to strike against injustice and wrong, and which conferred upon employers the power to destroy unions and protect strikebreakers.

The Taft-Hartley law is un-American, vicious, and reprehensible. The membership of the American Federation of Labor will never become reconciled to such legislation. The sponsors of the Taft-Hartley law and a large number of the supporters of this vicious legislation have stated in newspaper advertisements, in radio addresses, and otherwise, and even on the floor of Congress, that working people generally favor the law and that only the officers of labor unions, classified as labor bosses, are opposed to it. A specific and definite answer was made to these false and untrue statements at the election which was held last November in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and in other congressional and State elections. In my opinion, further answers similar to the kind made at the election which was held last November will be made in other congressional districts during the 1950 election. The opposition among working men and women to the Taft-Hartley law is universal and Nation-wide in character.

The retention of the Taft-Hartley law upon the statute books of the Nation and its operation would serve to promote unrest and procommunism and to threaten the maintenance and functional processes of our free enterprise system. America is the last stronghold of the free enterprise system. Practically all the nations of the world, outside of the United States, have turned to socialism, communism, or some other form of totalitarianism. Communist representatives proclaimed, when revolution was being promoted in Czechoslovakia and other nations, "See what the workers are subjected to in capitalistic countries!" They especially emphasized the fact that in capitalistic America, trade-unions were being wiped out through the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, which had been sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers and capitalists of the United States.

The record in Europe shows that many nations now under cover of the iron curtain were influenced to accept communism because of prejudice, persecution, hunger, and suffering. Communism thrives on hunger, suffering, poverty, and oppression. The American Federation of Labor has stood for the preservation of our form of government, in defense of the exercise of individual and collective freedom. It has been a stanch defender of our free-enterprise system. It can speak, as it has spoken through its representatives, to the oppressed working men and women of Europe, telling them of the benefits and blessings of democracy, freedom, and liberty. This cannot be done effectively by the representatives of Wall Street, the Manufacturers Association, and the wealth of our Nation.

Now, have we arrived at a period in our national history when a stanch, patriotic movement such as the American trade-union movement is to be weakened through the enactment and maintenance of vicious antilabor legislation such as the Taft-Hartley law?

On the contrary, we must show the workers of the world that our form of government and our free-enterprise system is better for working men and women than communism or any other form of totalitarianism. We can make a great contribution to the achievement of this aim and purpose through the prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

In my opinion, the best interests of employers and of our free-enterprise system will be served through the development of strong unions, united into an

organization such as the American trade-union movement, which will stand immovable and uncompromising in defense of our American form of government and in opposition to communism and totalitarianism. Both employers and employees are beneficiaries of such service.

The American Federation of Labor aided in the formulation and adoption of the Wagner Act of 1935 and unreservedly opposed on principle the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Wagner Act provided for acceptance as public policy of the right of wage earners to collective bargaining as their method of determining terms and conditions of work in industry. Collective bargaining enables workers to participate in free enterprise by means of contracts—the normal instrument of business. Collective action which makes for equality of bargaining power with management assures that essential element of a contract—mutuality. The Wagner Act provided the machinery to implement this basic justice. It accepted the principle of voluntarism, which assures rights and relies upon the workers to assume responsibility for knowing and seeking their advancement and welfare. The act prohibited employers from interference and restraint of employees in their efforts to organize and bargain collectively. The Wagner Act assured the benefit of a broad principle of human justice. It wrote this right into public policy. That is why we call it labor's Magna Charta.

The Taft-Hartley Act seeks to define rights of employers and minorities and to limit collective bargaining. The act weakens unions and thus prevents equality of bargaining power with management. By outlawing the requirement for union membership as a condition of employment, and by making excessively burdensome the requirement that all hired must join the union within a limited time, the act strikes at the heart of the union's ability to serve the management and to maintain discipline—an essential to responsibility. The union shop is a practice inherited from the guilds which preceded trade unions. Even the trade-unions of the early nineteenth century operated on a union-shop basis. Any union that assumes responsibility for the technical fitness of members on the job must control training and have experienced workers available for employment. This is a service to industry and assures employment to persons prepared to do quality work.

By proscribing what our opponents term the "closed union shop," the Taft-Hartley law goes contrary to accepted practice in the professions as well as in trade unions. Furthermore, it strikes at the right of voluntary organizations to govern themselves for the advancement of their welfare.

The Taft-Hartley Act weakens unions by encouraging litigation as an alternative to economic action. Courts can punish wrongdoing but cannot solve labor and industrial problems.

Since, under the Taft-Hartley Act, the union can require the discharge of workers only because of nonpayment of dues, the union is denied its most effective disciplinary action. Union officials find it necessary to work side by side with a person who is trying to disrupt or mislead the union and are denied any effective weapon to remedy such a situation. Without discipline no organization can be effective.

Experienced trade-union executives regard the Taft-Hartley Act as punitive, restrictive, and demoralizing in its effects on trade-unions. They foresaw the weakening of trade-unions in the passage of this legislation which would prohibit free workers from participating in free American enterprise. Their fears were increased by the recrudescence of the injunction as a method of dealing with labor disputes. The injunction in the past has denied wage earners constitutional and legal rights and has subjected them to a judicial despotism in which the judge made law, determined whether law had been violated, and the penalties. After years of effort trade-unions freed themselves from judicial government by securing the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which forbade Federal courts to issue injunctions in labor disputes. Labor held that labor disputes could best be settled when workers and management can go over a situation, discuss their own problems, and reach agreement on how to remedy the injustice. An outside agent cannot understand the implications involved in union-management differences as well as those involved in a dispute, and is therefore not in the best position to effect remedies. So, when our Chief Executive was authorized to determine when a strike or lock-out was a menace to national health, with authority to request that an injunction be issued if he finds such action expedient, it put upon the President a responsibility which unfairly hampers him and injects the dispute into partisan politics. Injunctions of themselves do not settle economic disputes but they do arouse resentment and distrust.

Let me review for you the experiences of the Atomic Trades and Labor Council whose members are employed at Oak Ridge:

A dispute over a new contract between Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. and the Atomic Trades and Labor Council of the American Federation of Labor arose. The plant involved was the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, a Government-owned atomic energy plant operated by the company under a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission. The issue concerned was wages and working conditions. Employees voted to strike on March 16, 1948. The President appointed a board of inquiry on March 5, the parties agreeing to maintain status quo until March 19. The board of inquiry submitted its first report on March 15, and 4 days later the Attorney General obtained an injunction. In a last-offer ballot, conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, the employees voted by a large majority not to accept the employer's last offer. The injunction was dismissed at the end of 80 days. Upon intervention by the president of the American Federation of Labor and the officers of the metal trades department of the A. F. of L., the parties sat down, and with the assistance of the Mediation and Conciliation Service, and after 52 hours of constant negotiation, they agreed to a settlement.

It should be noted that in this case the union had all along offered to submit the dispute to impartial arbitration, but the company refused. Responsibility for continuation of the dispute can therefore be laid at the door of the company—but the injunction was issued against the union, with no comparable penalty whatsoever against the company.

The charge made by the workers of the Nation that the Taft-Hartley law is a slave-labor law is based upon that section of the Taft-Hartley law which provides for resort to the use of the writ of injunction. Even honest, sincere, unbiased Members of Congress can be deceived by this provision. It violates the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which provides that involuntary servitude shall not be imposed except as a punishment for crime. When workers are compelled to work against their will by order of the Government, or be subject to punishment for refusal to do so, they are being subjected to involuntary servitude. The workers regard that as slave labor. Many employers have long fought for the use of the writ of injunction in labor disputes. Because they abused this privilege, Congress passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which abolished government by injunction. Now they seek to restore this undemocratic and vicious practice in order that they may be helped by the Government when they stubbornly resist fair and reasonable proposals of labor unions. The injunction helps them to accomplish this purpose. There is nothing in the Taft-Hartley law which provides that employers shall be required or compelled by the Government to do certain things in labor disputes during a so-called emergency which threatens the public health and safety.

The Taft-Hartley law provides for resort to the use of the writ of injunction against labor; employers who reject the reasonable proposals of labor unions are not required or compelled to do anything. There have been nine cases in which national emergency procedure has been invoked. In six of these an injunction was issued and in effect 80 days. The injunction accomplished nothing except the prolongation of the dispute. In no case did the procedure effect an adjustment or even contribute to the final settlement. The board of inquiry procedure has served only as a formality to justify a request for injunctive relief.

There is no justification for arbitrary legal prohibitions or compulsions in labor-management disputes. The parties concerned will get together and settle them if there is no intervention to provide a scapegoat to take responsibility for an unpleasant decision. It is very easy to confuse public health and safety with convenience and danger with discomfort. The public is not separate and distinct from those who work for wages nor is a Government official impartial or above partisanship simply because his functions run counter to those of wage

earners. Under normal conditions it is safe to say that no strike has endangered public health and safety. When there has been public danger, wage earners have been as ready as other citizens to practice restraint in the interests of the Nation.

Neither police power nor a police state can prevent strikes so long as workers are free men. Neither has compulsory arbitration reduced the number of strikes in countries where such laws prevail. Where we have had absence of strikes and industrial disputes collective bargaining is fully developed.

Strikes result from unremedied grievances. They are evidences of underlying injustices that stir workers to protest their wrongs. Unless channels of justice are freely available, the fires of rebellion smolder and finally break down restraints. Those who advocate limitation of the basic right to strike place community comfort and convenience above human justice for workers. There can be no real national health and security based on denial of basic rights. Unless the individual can withhold his labor effectively to promote his own welfare, he has little freedom. No nation is more sound and invincible than one in which all realize their responsibility for maintaining rights, benefiting by justice, and for helping forlorn workers to do likewise. The community has a responsibility to demand and support justice with redress of grievances. This is a far higher purpose than seeking relief from discomforts and upsets.

We protest efforts to outlaw boycotts organized to help fellow workers establish better standards of work. The boycott has an honorable history. We all honor its historic use by our forefathers to prevent taxation without representation. In the labor movement it has traditionally been used against products made under conditions unfair to workers. One of the most valuable attributes of the labor movement is the deep spirit of fraternity that permeates and strengthens it. As a practical matter workers know that the welfare of each is interdependent on the welfare of all. There is every reason why one union should help other unions to establish and maintain labor standards.

On behalf of the American trade-union movement I urge repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and reenactment of the Wagner Act as provided in H. R. 2032.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

THE PEOPLE SPOKE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to go into the merits or demerits of the Taft-Hartley law, or into the merits of the Lesinski bill, for which I shall vote; that has been done by other Members yesterday and today, and will be gone into further during the balance of the day. I wish to concentrate on one or two points.

One point I wish to make is that there seems to be an opinion among some Members of this body that the rank and file of labor are in favor of the Taft-Hartley law—that it is only the union leaders who are opposed to it—so I should like to put it to a test; a very dramatic one, if you will.

I should like all the labor leaders—Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Murray, of the CIO; and the heads of the railroad brotherhoods—to call a demonstration of some kind, such as asking the men to lay down their tools for 1 hour, or some other form of expression. Let the employees of this country, the union people, the rank and file of labor, demonstrate to the Congress and to the country that they are united in their feeling that the Taft-Hartley law is bad for labor, bad for laboring people, and bad for business. I am certain if that is done that the results will show the country that they are against the Taft-Hartley law and in favor of the Lesinski bill.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY COMMITTED

The second point I wish to make is on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. If the Republican Party wants to go to the country and say that they favor, as they always have, big business; that they are the spokesmen for the National Association of Manufacturers, and are opposed to labor, let them do that; that is their privilege.

But I want to appeal to the Democrats—to all Members of this House, but especially to the Democrats—and remind them that the platform of the Democratic Party contained an outright pledge, a plank, calling for the outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

If you want to run out on the Democratic platform, again that is your privilege to do as you please. But those of us who ran as Democrats have pledged ourselves to our constituents that we will when we get the opportunity, and at the first opportunity, vote to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. That is your opportunity here today. You are only being called upon to live up to the pledges that you made to your constituents.

WHAT RUBBER STAMP?

Mr. Chairman, our former majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], said something about not being a rubber stamp. That is really funny coming from the Republican side. I was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House when the Taft-Hartley bill was passed and when our friend, Mr. Hartley, was chairman. I want to tell you that we Democrats never saw the Taft-Hartley bill before it was reported out on the floor of this House. We never had an opportunity to discuss it in committee, we were not invited to any executive sessions of the committee when that bill was under discussion. It came out on the floor of the House for consideration and that is the first we ever heard of it.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include as part of my remarks the text of a telegram which I sent today to four great union leaders asking them to join with me in calling on the American working people to give a dramatic demonstration, through a brief work stoppage, for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I sent a telegram to William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; to Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; to Harvey Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists; and to A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; but because I confined my telegram to these four great leaders of organized labor let no one think I intend to confine my appeal to their unions alone.

The text of my telegram follows:

It is obvious that a reactionary coalition of Republicans and Democrats is determined to frustrate the will of the American people by watering down the Lesinski bill repealing the Taft-Hartley "slave labor" Act.

I have advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act since the day it became law. I know of no reason to change my position. I want to vote for passage of the Lesinski bill as it was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Eighty-first Congress was elected to carry out the will of the people and repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was the No. 1 issue in the campaign. It is a party pledge. The mandate is clear.

If there is a Member of this Congress whose memory is slipping it is the duty of the American people to provide a sharp reminder, and you are in a position to help.

I propose that you, as head of your great union, call a Nation-wide work stoppage as a demonstration of the solidarity of the American people in their demand for Taft-Hartley repeal.

I am making this appeal today on the floor of the House and I hope for your acceptance.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress was elected to do a job—a job of undoing the harm done by the Eightieth Congress.

The main part of that job is repealing the Taft-Hartley Act, without any crippling amendments, and I ask all Members to join in performing that task.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Do I understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], the previous speaker, proposes a national strike for 1 day on the part of organized labor?

Mr. KLEIN. I do not call it a strike. I would call it a demonstration on the part of labor to show that they are all opposed to this Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say that I think that would be most unfortunate for the country and certainly would not make votes in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago I opposed the then pending Labor-Management Relations Act. I believe that time has justified this opposition. Both sides now agree that this act should be repealed. The only question which faces us is what shall replace it.

It is argued on the one hand that we should go back to the fundamental philosophy of the original National Labor Relations Act with some amendments, and on the other hand that we must stand by the philosophy of the 1947 act

while making some concessions to the opposition against it. But both the pending bill and the proposed Wood substitute state that they repeal the 1947 act. I believe, therefore, that both sides of the aisle having decided that the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947—the so-called Taft-Hartley law—must be repealed, it should be repealed with that decisiveness which is typical of the American temper.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was not the creation of any party. It passed here and in the other body over the President's veto with majorities on both sides of the aisle recorded in its favor. It was the product of what the Members who favored it read as the desire of the people and the present repeal in form at least—apparently conceded by both sides—must be the product of what Members read as the desire of the people. The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was considered by labor people as punitive legislation.

Let me say, too, that it has certainly been made clear to me, and I believe to a majority of Members, that the opposition to the Taft-Hartley law, at one time said to come only from leaders of trades-unions, has been proven to come just as vigorously from the overwhelmingly large number of the rank and file of 16,000,000 hard-working Americans who are members of trades-unions.

The American people have never been given to kidding themselves—and though the Wood substitute states it repeals the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 it fails to do so in spirit or in fact. It is true, as my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts so eloquently said, that some efforts are made to meet the inflexible opposition of the trade unions, but whatever the Wood substitute may try to do, it does not remove the fundamental provisions of the Taft-Hartley law which made it in the eyes of laboring people punitive and incurred the opposition which brings us to our present consideration.

Trade-union organization is hobbled—and seriously hobbled—in the Wood substitute by the exclusion of foremen, by the restriction of the right to a sympathetic strike in order to attain unionization, and even by prohibiting workers from refusing the handle scab-produced goods unless the scabbing is in the same local—and I emphasize the word "local"—labor organization; obviously impractical in view of the existence of great national organizations in so many industries.

Union discipline is seriously restricted in the continuing limitations of those whom the employer must continue to employ even though ousted from the union. These include, for example, labor spies—and the La Follette committee of some years ago certainly showed that these exist or can exist in considerable number.

Confidence in the union is permitted to be shaken by an election to recall a maintenance-of-membership agreement on the application of 30 percent of the workers affected, and State laws are permitted to overrule even in cases affecting interstate commerce, the national policy established by the Wood substitute to permit maintenance of union membership agreements. Restriction is placed upon the administration of welfare funds, and the right of private contract arrived at by collective bargaining is materially crippled as a result, with damage to the prestige and influence of unions. Special provisions are made laying unions open to civil suit for huge amounts of damages with resultant danger of wrecking union treasuries.

Finally, and most important the use of ex parte injunctions in labor disputes is continued and under the jurisdiction of the special office of general counsel, rather than the National Labor Relations Board itself, nullifying the fight of the whole trades-union movement which brought about the Norris-LaGuardia Act to prevent the abuse of injunctions in labor disputes—a reform for which the rank and file of labor fought for two generations.

No; the Wood substitute still perpetuates the fundamental idea that labor must be specially restrained and this laboring people have shown that as Americans they will not accept. Let those who are deciding whether to vote for the Wood substitute not be confused. Such a vote will not be a saving one, but will be considered a 1949 vote for a 1949 version of the original Taft-Hartley bill.

There is one other very critical and fundamental point which I should like to urge upon the committee. The fear of national or community paralysis due to strikes in essential utilities like light and power, telephones, transportation, railroads, and coal troubles our people generally and trade-unionists particularly. We must quiet this fear if we are to have a balanced and reasonable approach by the people to the whole subject at all times. Injunctions do not assure operation, and operation needed for the public health and safety in struck utilities is what the people want to be assured of. Accordingly I shall propose at the proper time an amendment giving the President the power to seize struck utilities essential to the national health or safety and to operate them, but only on the minimal basis and for the time required by the national health or safety. Claims of residual power in the President to deal with such national emergencies leave too much to future chance at a time when we are legislating fundamental policy. Given the assurance which my amendment provides, the American people can be encouraged to permit collective bargaining to do its job with the least, rather than as contemplated by the Wood substitute, the most governmental direction.

The five major points of my amendment are: First, the property is not to be operated on a strikebreaking basis, but it is to be operated by the Government only to the minimum extent required to preserve or protect the public health or security. Second, the employees—those who choose to remain on the job—are to be paid not less than prevailing wages in the area, and a special board is to consider the wage scales during Government control. Third, the Government is to pay only just compensation for the value of its use of the seized property, and is not to operate for the account of the employer as if it were a going concern. Fourth, the property is to be restored to its owner when normal labor relations have been restored. Fifth, the President is given authority, not direction, and may act through an officer or department.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the House, there has been considerable discussion of the so-called committee bill, the Lesinski bill, and the Wood bill. The committee bill has been constantly referred to as a bill prepared by the committee, or one handled by the committee.

I hope the chairman of my committee is on the floor. I know the chairman of the subcommittee is on the floor. I want to relate a few facts and at any time during the course of my remarks, if I make a misstatement, I want the gentlemen to interrupt and correct me.

The so-called committee bill was introduced in the House. The Labor Committee was called together. A subcommittee was appointed by the chairman of the committee and the chairman of that committee appointed the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] chairman of the subcommittee. They went about their labors. The first thing was to bring in a recommendation for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The committee promptly refused to listen to that. They returned to their labors and held hearings for several days on this bill, the Lesinski bill.

Mr. KELLEY. I would like to correct the gentleman there. It was 10 full days, many of them running into late at night.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, if the gentleman contends that several days is not 10, or 10 is not several, then I am in error. At any rate I accept the clarification.

All right. They held hearings for 10 full days. They then called a meeting for the purpose of considering the recommendation of that committee. There was not one paragraph of that bill read in that subcommittee for the purpose of amendment, or any amendment permitted. The chairman of the subcommittee then returned to the full committee, and we assembled in executive session.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I will yield for a correction, and that only.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BARDEN. No; I do not yield for that purpose.

If I have made any erroneous statement, then I will yield for a correction.

The subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman KELLEY, returned, and in the same resolution and the same breath reported to the Committee on Education and Labor the so-called committee bill, the Lesinski bill, and recommended that it be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass. Thereupon, several of us raised objection, "For heaven's sake, are you not going to even allow us to read the caption of the bill, or a paragraph, or a line, for amendment?"

The answer was "No."

I turned to my chairman, privately, and I said, "Mr. LESINSKI, you cannot do this. The House does not expect the Labor Committee or any other congressional committee to function in that manner. The House expects us to consider, discuss, and, if necessary, amend it. This committee has not written one word of this bill, and no one except the members of the subcommittee have even had an opportunity to read it. You have the votes to report the bill out, I presume, or you would not be acting in the way you are, but, for heaven's sake, we should go through at least the formality of doing what the House expects us to do, and that is to give this all-important legislation some consideration."

His answer was "No."

It was then that a motion was made for the consideration of the bill. Twenty-four members were present, and 12 voted that it be read in executive session for amendment, and 12 voted against it. That motion lost.

Then the Wood bill was offered as a substitute, and that was defeated. Then the chairman insisted upon the bill's coming out in that method, and I said "Mr. Chairman, if you persist in making a foolish mistake that will not help the standing of this committee in the House of Representatives, then I will help you make it just as foolish as possible." When the Chair called my name on a roll-call vote, for the first time in my whole life, either in this legislative body or in one in which I served prior to this one, I voted "regretfully present," and the bill came to the House. I simply did not want to be a party to any such procedure. Since coming to Congress I have been chairman of 2 committees, and a member of about 12, and never in my life have I ever seen a congressional committee handle a piece of legislation in such a manner.

Mr. Chairman, that is an accurate statement of the treatment this piece of legislation received from this committee, and that is the result of the labors of the committee. Apparently my statement is correct. So much for that.

Not much has been said about the Wagner Act. Let me say this to you. I was a Member of this House when the Wagner Act was passed. I know the history of the Wagner Act and I know the trend of labor troubles from the time it was passed right on, and the increase in strife and trouble. I know the trouble that grand old American Bill Green had. He and that fine gentleman, Joseph Padway, came to my office and stayed and worked with me and worked with me, and Mr. Padway wrote and worked and wrote and worked, and finally a bill was prepared which was H. R. 4749. I introduced it in 1939. I was the only man on the Labor Committee that would introduce a bill to take the shackles off every A. F. of L. craft worker in the United States.

You craftsmen who may be present—those of you who are or were members of the A. F. of L.—know there was a time when that National Labor Relations Board was as biased as anything can be and was choking the very life out of your craft unions. So this bill was prepared. In it we call for the abolishment of the Board and for the setting up of a board which would permit the A. F. of L. to live and exist and carry on their very fine organization. Yet some would hurl the statement around here about members being "antilabor." I have been "anti" many times. Some people apply the word "anti' or some such epithet of that kind to any man who disagrees with them far too often. It seems that when their logic gives out they resort to name calling. Yes, I was anti—I was anti-American, when I was opposed to the Supreme Court packing bill. Time has proven that our Supreme Court is all right—as is or as was. I was anti-capital when I was supporting the holding company bill. Time has proven that that was not so anticapital. I was anti-capital when I supported the TVA. That has not turned out so bad. But has it reached the point that because a man does not happen to agree with you that you are intolerant of his convictions and intolerant of his sincere ideas? Heaven knows that my men in my district expect of me only my sincere and conscientious efforts to do the best that I know how to do for the American people. That is what I propose to do. No one need send me letters saying that they will vote against me if I do not do as they say. I have a son. I have children. God knows that I owe some duty to the preservation of this country and for a place for them to live in that has some of the things that we know of as the American way of life. An orderly society—where the rights of all men are respected—not just the ones who at some particular time might have the biggest club or stick.

I was serving in this body when one of the most tragic and blood-cooling speeches was ever made from the Speaker's rostrum, with the exception of the time we were assembled here to perform that terrible duty of declaring war. That was when the President addressed the House of Representatives while the railroad strike was on. He was sincere. He was confronting a terrible situation. It had gotten to a point that he was helpless and he cried out to the Congress and to the American people to help him in that hour of distress and need. I congratulate him. I think he was doing the duty of a great American to protect our people. The Wagner Act was in effect then. The Wagner Act was in effect then—remember that. As it is now proposed to be amended by the Lesinski bill the Wagner Act says that he can appoint a board and the board can come back and have to rely upon public pressure and public sentiment to do the rest. Now, get your eyes fixed on this Wagner Act that you are proposing to reenact with minor amendments. You had better see some of the "bugs" in it. The original Wagner Act was in effect when the President came here and made this statement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield very briefly to my good friend.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that the proposed Wood bill also reenacts the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

Mr. BARDEN. Well then, why do you not vote for the Wood bill if that is what you want to do?

Mr. Chairman, I want to read some of the language of the President. He is my President and I respect him. Here are his words, delivered to the House of Representatives on May 25, 1946:

> Last night I tried to point out to the American people the bleak picture which we face at home and abroad if the strike is permitted to continue. The disaster will spare no one. It will bear equally upon businessmen, workers, farmers, and upon every citizen of the United States.
>
> Food, raw materials, fuel, shipping, housing, the public health, the public safety—all will be dangerously affected. Hundreds of thousands of liberated people of Europe and Asia will die who could be saved if the railroads were now tied up.

Is that the last time that that tragedy could happen to the United States of America? If it is not, we had better look well to a course of prevention.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I think the RECORD ought to show that the Wagner Act was never applied to railroad labor; that the Railroad Labor Act governs the railroad workers.

Mr. BARDEN. I did not say it applied. I said the Wagner Act was in effect then. Does the gentleman deny that? Certainly he does not.

Then I go along, and the President further said:

> As I stated last night, unless the railroads are manned by returning strikers, I shall immediately undertake to run them by the Army of the United States.

Was he antilabor then? No. My God, he was pro-American, and was defending the American way of life and the health and comfort of the American people.

This is what he had done:

> For months, publicly and privately, I have been supervising and directing negotiations between the railroad operators and the 20 different railroad unions. I have been doing the same with respect to the pending labor dispute in the coal mines. Time and again I have seen the leaders of the unions and the representatives of the operators. Many hours have been spent by me personally, and many days have been spent by my representatives in attempting to negotiate settlements of these disputes.

Think about how many times as much he had done to stop that as you provide for him to do in the Wagner Act that some would have you reenact at this time.

He goes on:

> I assure you that at times it was not easy to be patient.

And then skipping on to the latter part of the paragraph:

> In that action you, the Congress of the United States, and I, the President of the United States, must work together and must work fast.

There was general applause in the House of Representatives. I think there were only three votes in the House of Representatives against the resolution

that we passed, and it later died in the Senate.

Is that the last time that could happen to this country? Of course the tragic answer is "No." It can and may happen again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has again expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. I would not venture the assertion that the President was antilabor on that occasion, although he was accused of being antilabor, and some of the most vicious editorials and some of the most vicious kind of articles were written against him. In that instance I was defending him, and I am defending him now. The truth about it is that labor unions in this country have grown up. They are no longer children. They are a powerful organization and they grew that way through successful collective bargaining and the right to organize. God knows I am in favor of both and I want to preserve both, but you are jeopardizing the rights and privileges and the future of every union man in America if you put an act on the books that is as capable of being warped again as the National Labor Relations Board found it capable of being warped when they had the A. F. of L. over a barrel and were really laying the wood on them. I remember those days. I have been all through that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I referred in my statement a moment ago to the action of the House of Representatives in 1940 in passing by a 2 to 1 vote certain amendments to the Wagner Act. I intended to point out that at that time the President of the American Federation of Labor endorsed those amendments and asked for their passage; and they comprise a great big part of existing law.

Mr. BARDEN. No one can say that Mr. William Green is not a grand American; I mean he is interested in his organization, and no one would question that. But at the same time I think he should be a little bit slower and a little more cautious than to assume that the National Labor Relations Board is going always to be friendly to him; it may be otherwise, as he found it in 1939 and other years.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Right at that point I think we should recall to mind a little bit of history: At the very time when Mr. Green and Mr. Padway, and the officials of the American Federation of Labor were having their trouble with the NLRB, they came before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of which I happened to be a member at that time and demanded that we take away every dollar of appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board and put them out of business. Anybody can read that testimony in those hearings. They demanded because of the operations under the Wagner Act that the then NLRB be put out of business by denying it appropriations.

Mr. BARDEN. There can be no question of that fact. And there can be no question about the fact that Mr. Green was perfectly justified in resenting and resisting the treatment accorded him by the Board. Here are 22 pages of amendments that Mr. Padway suggested. He was not only an able lawyer but certainly was a fine representative of the American Federation of Labor. We spent weeks drawing these amendements, day after day after day working on these things.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. Very briefly, please.

Mr. CARROLL. It seems to me that the solicitude that is expressed for the great leader of the American Federation of Labor is somewhat uncalled for. It is true, as the gentleman has outlined, that he did make those requests in 1938, 1939, and 1940; but what interests me is his attitude today. Today he seeks the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, notwithstanding all the things the gentleman has said about him.

Mr. BARDEN. Listen! Just a minute! I exercise the same right toward Mr. William Green that I exercise toward any other human being regardless of who he is. Mr. William Green has never been right all the time, and I have the right to disagree with him when I think he is wrong; that is what I am doing at this time. He thought I was all right when I was with him. Because a man is right one time does not mean that he can never make a mistake. But I will say this, I am quite sure that if Mr. Green thought there would be another Board set up like the one he was dealing with in 1933–39, and so forth, he would resist the Lesinski bill to the last ditch. For he knows what that Board did to his organization and members.

Considering the Wood bill, briefly: I have been over the Wood bill. Too little has been said about it, because I think it does what the House wants; I think it is exactly what this House wants and would like to reach. It is not anything like as drastic as the T-H bill, and everyone knows that who has read it. When it comes to this question of laying the whip on, that does not frighten me a particle. Your people are going to want to know: How did you look after the American people? Not just this or that group, but the American people. Let us have an organized society; let us have a Government where the rights of men are protected and where there are no special privileges to either group. Heaven knows there is enough fair play in the land for everyone. I stand ready to fight for any group that is being, or in danger of being, mistreated or imposed upon.

If we left it to management and labor neither one of them would submit to any regulation of themselves; but when the dollar was powerful, and so powerful that it ground the very life out of the laboring man, then the Congress of the United States very wisely came to their rescue and said: "You cannot do these things"; and we have been constantly putting those controls on.

We must have a balanced Government for our society is not made up of just management and labor. There is that large group who do not belong to either group, and do not forget they have rights and are looking to this Congress for equal consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina two additional minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman from North Carolina was not so active and so protesting the procedure of the committee in 1947 when Mr. Hartley and his Republicans and the gentleman from North Carolina rushed that Taft-Hartley bill through the committee. Where was the gentleman protesting? The gentleman is protesting now because he is against the bill not because he protests procedure.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the handsome gentleman from Massachusetts that so far as the way the Taft-Hartley bill was handled I was a member of the committee; I think the gentleman from Massachusetts was a member of the committee. We held hearings for a long time; we went into executive session and considered the bill for amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY. For 1 day.

Mr. BARDEN. Just wait a minute. Nineteen amendments were adopted; and the bill was voted out, and it came here after the committee had considered it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] just said that they did not read a line or did not discuss a line of it. The gentleman from New York knows that is not correct. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that what I have just said is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. We spent 1 day on 67 pages.

Mr. BARDEN. All right; if you can do a job in 1 day, why work the second? The job was finished and there were no more amendments offered or to be offered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like particularly to pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman who preceded me. I happened to be in the committee that day when I know he suffered great humiliation in not being permitted to read this bill. It was certainly more difficult for him to have to go through that situation than it was for us as members of the minority because we were more or less relegated to that role.

Personally I was in hopes that I could come to the well of this House today and support a good labor bill, a labor bill that had been written in committee with the conscience of the members of the committee and reported out of committee as sound and functionable and one that we could have dealt with accordingly here on the floor of the House.

As an educator I certainly felt very, very humble when I was not permitted even to turn over a leaf of the bill and read it in committee before it was presented here.

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose, within the time that is available to me, to discuss the subject of injunctions. From the arguments that have been made by the proponents of the bill now before us, one would think that we were here legislating against the background of industrial relations as they existed during the early 1920's.

As many of you know, I am a member of one of the Nation's well-known labor organizations and have been for over 17 years. I joined of my own free will and I have kept my membership because I believe in the trade-union movement. I believe that trade-unions are of great benefit to workers.

There are few, if any, Members of this body who would not agree that prior to 1932 the power to seek injunctions against concerted activities on the part of workers was greatly abused. I, like a great many other people, considered the injunctions that were issued at that time destructive of the rights of workers. But the situation with respect to injunctions that then existed no longer exists, and has not existed since the enactment by Congress of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932. I make this statement knowing that the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 does authorize injunctions in certain cases, but when one examines the Labor-Management Relations Act, he finds that the injunctions therein authorized are authorized in only a very, very limited class of situations.

That was not the case before 1932. In the early days of this century, the concerted activities of labor unions were held to be subject to the antitrust laws. Congress sought to remedy this condition in 1914 when it enacted the Clayton Act. The courts, however, put a very limited construction on the Clayton Act, and as a result injunctions against labor unions remained quite common.

In addition to injunctions against labor unions under the antitrust laws, injunctions were found to be an effective means of enforcing yellow-dog contracts.

The yellow-dog contract came into widespread use in the early 1920's, and continued to be used for some time thereafter. This was a device under which an employee was required to sign an agreement not to join a labor organization while he was in the employ of the particular employer. Thus when a union sought to organize the workers employed by that employer, the employer went into court for an injunction to restrain the union from inducing the employees to breach their contracts.

The yellow-dog contract was in practical effect outlawed by the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932. And, moreover, the Norris-LaGuardia Act had the effect of prohibiting the further use of injunctions against labor unions for alleged violations of the antitrust laws. Then in 1935 Congress, in the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, recognized by law the right of workers to organize into unions and engage in concerted activities for mutual aid and protection.

Labor unions are not subject to the antitrust laws today. Their activities are not impeded by any yellow-dog contracts. Their activities are for all practical purpose immune from injunction in the Federal courts at the suit of private employers.

As I previously stated, I myself am a union man. I want to remain a union man. As a union man I recognize—and I believe most rank and file union people likewise recognize—that unions in pursuing their self-interest sometimes do things that cause substantial injury to the public or to innocent bystanders. I do not believe that unions should be permitted to do such things with impunity any more than I believe any other group in our economy should be permitted to do such things with impunity.

It seems to me that the primary responsibility of all of us is to the community in which we live, and that in exercising what we consider to be our own rights, we must exercise them in such a way as not to interfere with the just rights of others. When any group does things which injure the public, it is the function of government to prevent them from causing irreparable injury.

These principles were recognized in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. But the charge that that act revived government by injunction is utter nonsense. The act provides for injunctions in only three classes of cases.

First, the President of the United States is given authority to prevent unions as well as employers from engaging in strikes or lock-outs throughout the whole of vital industries or throughout substantial portions thereof, where such strikes or lock-outs would imperil the national health or safety. What remedy has the Government got in situations of this kind unless it be the remedy of injunction? Who is it who can better determine whether an injunction should be applied for in such situations except the President of the United States himself?

Since the enactment of the act, the President has found it necesary to apply for injunctions in six cases. In all of these cases the President himself considered that the strikes or threatened strikes would imperil the national health or safety.

Similar cases are bound to arise in the future wherein the national health and safety will be in jeopardy as a result of disputes between employers and labor organizations. What remedy has the Government in such situations unless it be the remedy of injunction? How is the President going to deal with these situations unless he can apply for injunctions?

The Attorney General of the United States contends that the President has some inherent power under the Constitution to apply for an injunction or otherwise to protect the interests of the public. The Secretary of Labor, on the other hand, disagrees with this point of view. The leaders of organized labor who testified before our committee and before the Senate committee were very firmly of the view that the Norris-LaGuardia Act prevented the President from applying for injunctions unless he was specifically authorized to do so without regard to the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

I do not see how we can fulfill our responsibilities as legislators if we leave the question of whether or not the President actually does have inherent powers to protect the public interests to some future determination by some court.

Labor leaders have deluged the country with propaganda about the "slave labor bill" because of the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act which give the President the power to protect the public interest. These leaders claim that enjoining a strike under such circumstances is akin to imposing slavery upon workers—making them work under legal compulsion. This contention is not new. It has been made by union leaders for at least 50 years, and has never been accepted as valid by any court anywhere in our land.

Injunctions under the Labor-Management Relations Act are against concerted action, not against the individual. Under the very terms of the Labor-Management Relations Act itself an individual can quit at any time he sees fit, or stop work at any time he sees fit, without committing any violation of the law or of any injunction issued under the law.

If we could be satisfied that the President actually does have some inherent power to protect the public in connection with strikes imperilling the national health or safety, we would all be willing to rely on the President in this regard. If we could be sure that the President had such power, it would not be necessary to specify any injunctive power in this connection in the law. But if we were sure he had such power, labor union leaders would also be sure he had such power and do everything that they could by amendment to the law to prevent him from exercising it.

If the President does have some inherent power, it is a power that is not subject to any limitations. An injunction secured under such an inherent power would be a permanent injunction—it would not be limited to any 80 days. And it would not be subject to any of the other safeguards that Congress wrote into the Labor-Management Relations Act with respect to these injunctions.

When you seek to rely on some sort of unspecified inherent power of the President when the health or safety of the Nation should be endangered, you are playing with fire.

Injunctions are also authorized under the Labor-Management Relations Act to prevent the irreparable injury that results to innocent people from the effects of union secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. But the Lesinski bill also authorizes injunctions in these cases, so in this connection there can be little argument between the proponents of the Lesinski bill and those who intend to support the Wood substitute as to the appropriateness of the injunctive remedy in the case of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes.

The only difference, in the case of injunctions against secondary boycotts and

jurisdictional strikes between the Lesinski bill and the Labor-Management Relations Act and Wood substitute, is a difference in the time when such injunctions may be applied for. Under the Lesinski bill the injunctions cannot be applied for until after all of the damage has been done, whereas under the Labor-Management Relations Act and under the Wood substitute the injunction can be applied for to prevent the damage from being done in the first instance.

The Labor-Management Relations Act also authorizes—but does not require—the general counsel of the Board to apply for injunctions to enjoin the commission of any unfair labor practice—whether by employers or by unions. There are situations in which it would be very appropriate to exercise this power against employers—for in talking about this power we are not talking about any one-sided provision. An employee who has been the subject of a discriminatory discharge might well seek to have this injunctive power invoked on his behalf so that he will not be subject to the irreparable injury of unemployment while his case is being decided by the Board.

I want to emphasize that there is not one provision of the Labor-Management Relations Act, and not one provision of the Wood substitute, which authorizes injunctions at the suit of a private person—be that person an employer or a labor union. The injunctions can be applied for and issued only to vindicate a public right or a public purpose. Moreover, those rights and purposes are specifically defined in the law. All legitimate concerted activities by workers through unions can be carried on without any fear whatsoever of injunction—a situation that was not the case prior to the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the various State laws outlawing yellow-dog contracts. In other words, the situation with which we are dealing today when we talk of injunctions is not the situation that existed in the 1920's. And I appeal to you not to be misled by emotional slogans such as "slave labor" and "government by injunction." When we came here, we were sent to consider issues dispassionately on their merits and not on the basis of hysterical slogans. Therefore the Nation can only turn to the injunction in the case of a national emergency—and we must continue to do so until it can be firmly established that the President has this power to act in a national emergency under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, April 26, I voted "yes" on a rule that will allow the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032, to be brought before this Congress for consideration. This bill, H. R. 2032, repeals the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, known as the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in the name Taft-Hartley. I do not care what you may call the act that succeeds it. I am interested in the combined welfare of labor, agriculture, little and big business, because I know that any legislation passed should be fair and just to all, and should also be to the interest of over 80,000,000 people, who cannot be classified either as employers or employees. I recognize that whatever legislation is passed by this Congress may not meet the full approval of management, nor of labor, but I think we all realize that we must compromise on certain issues and that we must do our best to pass, within the next few days, legislation that will encourage us all to work together in an effort to keep wages at a high level; agriculture at a high level, and business and production at a high level; so that we can have continuous prosperity in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am against any law that will give business too much power or control, and I also am against any legislation that will put into the hands of a few labor leaders the power to choke the Nation to its knees and slow down and endanger the welfare of our country. I am interested in legislation that will be beneficial to all the people and which will provide the same rights, privileges and prerogatives to both labor and management. If this type of legislation is passed, the right of the individual citizen and the collective interest of the public will be protected. I pledge my support to legislation that will bring this about, regardless of whether it is the Lesinski bill, the Wood bill or some other bill. I hope and pray that we can find a just solution of a most difficult problem.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." I believe those words to be as true today as when they were first spoken. I believe that like causes produce like results and that they always will. I do not care whose lawyers wrote the Taft-Hartley law. I do not care whose money paid them, nor how much of that money they received for their services. The thing that interests me is why we have the Taft-Hartley law and why we are faced with the necessity of repealing it. In my opinion the Taft-Hartley law was enacted because people forgot back in 1946. Labor is partly to blame for the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law because they forgot that they were fully employed at good wages in 1920 when the control of this Government passed from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party. They forgot in 1946 that injunctions, yellow-dog contracts and strike-breaking had been the order of the day all through the period from 1920 to 1932. They had forgotten that they had been forced to come to the Democratic Party in 1932, hungry, jobless and in rags, without money, without credit, and without hope. They had forgotten that the Democratic Party heard their cry of distress and gave them the Wagner Act, a minimum-wage law and social security. They had listened to the propaganda of the Republican Party and forsaken their Democratic faith and gone away following strange gods. They had contributed their part in the election of the Eightieth Congress and paid for their sins by being bound and shackled by the Taft-Hartley law. By November 1948, they had seen the error of their ways and came asking the Democratic Party to break their shackles and remove their chains.

Labor was not alone in this heresy. The farmer contributed his part to the election of the Eightieth Congress. The farmers had also forgotten what they had suffered from 1920 to 1932. They had also come to the Democratic Party in 1932. The farmer came from his broken banks, his foreclosure sales, and his sheriff sales. He came from his taxes that he could not pay and his notes that he could not meet. He came from 35-cent wheat, 12-cent corn, 3-cent hogs, 9-cent butterfat, 5-cent eggs, and 6-cent cotton. He had also forgotten these things by 1946. He should have remembered how the Democratic Party heard his cry and answered it. The Democratic Party had given him production credit, rural electrification, soil conservation program, corn loans, wheat loans, crop insurance, and a floor under his agricultural products. He received his reward at the hands of the Eightieth Congress. His soil-conservation program was reduced more than 50 percent and it was proposed and considered to wipe it out entirely. The Aiken farm bill was passed which would allow the floor under farm products to sink to 60 percent of parity. The farmers also were seeking to return to the fold in November 1948.

I do not know how many times the American farmer and the American laboring man will have to be sold out by the Republican Party before they will cease to believe that the Republican Party cannot and will not be their friend.

When someone incubates a crow's egg and hatches a dove then I will believe that the Republican Party can and will sponsor and enact liberal legislation.

I was farming 75 miles south of Kansas City when the Republican convention was held in that city. We were at the bottom of the depression. A delegation of farmers went to that convention, not to demand but to implore that convention to place in the Republican platform a plank promising relief from the ruinous prices they were receiving for their products. They were told that the convention had no time to spend with a bunch of disgruntled, bellyaching old farmers. But that party could and did find time to lend Charley Dawes, of Chicago, $50,000,000. These are some of the things that we had forgotten in 1946 and the Taft-Hartley law and the Aiken farm bill represent the price of that forgetfulness.

May God grant that this Eighty-first Congress will have the wisdom and the courage to repeal the Taft-Hartley law

and the Aiken farm bill because only by maintaining a high level of employment at good wages and at the same time protecting the purchasing power of the American farmer can we hope to avoid a return to the conditions that prevailed in 1932.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill that seeks to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and to replace it with a more rational approach to the labor-management problem.

The repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the passage of this bill by the Congress is a solemn obligation.

The people of this Nation indicated their dissatisfaction with the Taft-Hartley Act in the November elections. The pros and cons of the issue were presented by the opposing parties. The majority of the people decided that the Taft-Hartley Act was a bad labor law. It seems to me that if we believe in the democratic process, our course is clear. There is no choice on our part. An election mandate is not a thing to be ignored—no matter how great the pressure put upon by lobbyists representing minority interest groups.

It is my considered judgment that the supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act have put over a monstrous fraud on the people of this country.

In the name of equalizing the bargaining power of employers and unions, they have sought to destroy collective bargaining itself.

In the name of equalizing responsibility between employers and unions, they have sought to subject labor organizations to execessive damage suits in an effort to break them morally and financially.

In the name of protecting the rights of the individual worker they have sought to destroy the very existence of free trade unions.

In the name of regulating trade unions they have sought to weaken their ability to defend the wage and living standards of the American worker.

When this act was before the Eightieth Congress I voted against it and spoke against its passage. I voted to sustain President Truman's veto of a bad law.

It was an ill-considered piece of legislation that the people have rejected.

In countless other ways—and always with honeyed words—the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act are trying to return this country to disastrous labor policies of the past. Those policies, long advocated by the National Association of Manufacturers and certain selfish employers and employer groups, would place the employee at the mercy of the employer, would take away from labor organizations the basic right to bargain in the interest of their members.

In the public debate over Taft-Hartley Act there has been much heat and little light. The proponents of the measure insist that the legislation is in the public interest and that it protects, not harms, labor. These claims are contrary to the facts. A reading of the Taft-Hartley Act and the experience we have had with it in nearly 2 years show exactly what effect it has had.

It restores Government by injunction, and puts labor in a special legal category apart from the rest of the Nation.

It restricts right of speech for labor.

It denies labor the right to participate in the political life of the Nation.

It has all but taken away labor's power to bargain collectively on an orderly and equitable basis.

The provisions of the act set a dangerous precedent. They say one thing and mean another. Behind every one of its thousands of words and hundreds of sections and subsections there is a hidden meaning. It is the kind of law that can be used—and has been used—to make a mockery of judicial processes. It is the kind of law that can be used—and has been used—to destroy the very basis of equality before the law.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is not solely the concern of labor. A law which is bad, is bad for all groups. It is bad for the Nation.

In these times of division throughout the world it is imperative that we have unity at home. Laws such as the Taft-Hartley Act divide and disrupt the Nation. The times, and simple justice, demand that we remove such one-sided, special-interest-group legislation from the books. The times demand the passage of sound, equitable labor legislation. The Lesinski bill will restore to labor the dignity and rights inherent to it.

So far, in this debate, we have seen men come into the well of this House who sought by subtle means to minimize the importance of those adversely affected by the Taft-Hartley Act.

"There are only 15,000,000 men affiliated with organized labor," pleads one of them. "Do not heed minority pressure."

While it is true that there may be only 15,000,000 bona fide members of labor unions in the United States, they represent the breadwinners for sixty-odd-million people; 60,000,000 people who are the backbone of America.

Sixty million people whose economic welfare is directly tied to this bad law we seek to repeal today.

Be not misled, my colleagues, by this fatuous reasoning that a mere 15,000,000 people—a minority—are our only concern. It seems to me that the seats formerly occupied by 103 ex-Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act and the presence in the White House of the gentleman from Missouri successfully answers this argument in a rather unique way. The frank admissions by those high in the councils of the party that sponsored the Taft-Hartley Act, that it is not a perfect law—and that is an understatement—show the weakness of their cause.

Their continued protestations of their desire to maintain a strong labor movement are belied a moment later when they urge the substitution of the Wood bill for the Lesinski bill, that would change the name but not the substance of the law.

The Taft-Hartley law was conceived in black passion and was designed to break the labor movement and render it impotent. Let us stand up and do our duty. It should be repealed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] raised the point that the ranking Member on the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], was very pained that he had not had an opportunity to vote for amendments on the Lesinski bill. The reason for it was if that had happened, and we had opened the bill for amendments, we would have been licked. As it was, the vote was 12 to 12, with one Member absent. If it had been opened up, we never would have brought out the Lesinski bill and the Taft-Hartley bill never would have been repealed. I think his argument could have been made with better grace if Mr. KEARNS and Mr. MCCONNELL had objected to the hasty procedure in 1947 in pushing through the original Hartley bill when they had the vote of 19 to 6. They could have given us a little more time. But I just raise that point because there has been a great deal of discussion on it today.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am rather surprised at the reason the gentleman gives, that you did not want the amending period continued, or the bill opened up, because then we would have amended the Lesinski bill. That is a very surprising admission.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is surprising, but true.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We were willing to open up the committee procedure for amendment and reading of the bill in this famous Hartley procedure that you are are always talking about.

Mr. KENNEDY. Because you had the votes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. But we allowed a reading of the bill and offering of amendments, and there were 29 amendments that were presented and accepted to that bill. I think you will find that if you will read the report. I do not think there is any comparable situation between the two.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is just a difference in point of view.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am rather amazed at the admission that you did not want to open it for amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, it is obvious, and I am glad that we acted that way.

Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act, as some have claimed, is not a slave-labor bill in any sense. The Taft-Hartley Act, as some have claimed, does not destroy unions. It is not for that reason that we oppose it in this House.

We oppose it because we believe that the Taft-Hartley Act makes the Government a vital, inept, and prejudiced participant in labor-management relations throughout this country.

Our ambition in the committee has always been to write a bill that will last for many years, so that it will not be necessary to fight this battle every year in the House and so that it will be possible for industrial relations to be carried on without the Government pushing its finger in every pie.

Our function is to protect the public interest, and the public interest certainly as interpreted in the Taft-Hartley bill is not involved in every labor dispute.

The Taft-Hartley Act since its inception has not vitally affected the opportunity of men and women to work for a decent wage. But its effect in time of depression could have been serious. Let me quote from an editorial in Business Week of December 18, 1948:

> Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion, and the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement.
>
> These are the provisions that could do it: (1) Picketing can be restrained by injunction; (2) employers can petition for a collective-bargaining election; (3) strikers can be held ineligible to vote while the strike replacements cast the only ballots; and (4) if the outcome of this is a nonunion vote, the Government must certify and enforce it.
>
> Any time there is a surplus labor pool from which an employer can hire at least token strike replacements, these four provisions linked together can destroy a union.

And there is now developing in this country that surplus labor pool.

The editorial might have added that one of the major defects of the Taft-Hartley Act was the chain reaction effect it caused on the legislatures of various States in encouraging them to pass antilabor legislation. When labor is faced with a restraining legislation on an inter- and intra-State basis, its handicaps are formidable.

I am going to touch on two points in regard to the Lesinski bill. One of the most satisfactory sections of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947 was the provision which enlarged the Board and provided for panel boards to lessen its backlog. The Lesinski bill has continued this reform. The back load of the Board in the past has been tremendous. It does little good for employers, employees, or the Government, if there is a 1-year wait for a Board decision. The grievance remains uncorrected during this period and lessens the chance for industrial peace.

On the other hand, the Lesinski bill corrects one of the most unsatisfactory features of the Taft-Hartley Act in removing the ban on political contributions by unions. I have always felt that this was merely an attempt by the authors to remove themselves from danger from possible repercussions by unions. This provision has little in common with the rest of the bill and did not belong in it. This provision amended and expanded the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. The legislative history of the act of 1925 indicated it had a two-fold purpose: First, to prevent influence in elections which corporations were able to exercise through large financial contributions; second, to prevent the use of commonly owned corporate funds for political purposes without the consent of stockholders.

To compare the collected dues of union members to funds of corporations takes a vigorous imagination.

H. R. 2032 would, I believe, correctly restore the pertinent section of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to the form in which such section was written prior to its amendment to include labor organizations. Since the section was completely amended by the Taft-Hartley Act it is necessary to provide for its reenactment upon repeal of such act. The procedure prescribed by the proposed bill, I believe, is the simplest one to accomplish such reenactment.

I recommend to your consideration and support H. R. 2032, with the grateful thanks of myself and many Members of this House for the work done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], chairman of the subcommittee, and under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Do I understand the gentleman to support the Lesinski bill without any amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am supporting the Lesinski bill, but I will support an amendment dealing with the Communist affidavit to apply to employers and employees.

Mr. NIXON. Is that the only other amendment the gentleman will support?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; if I hear any that is reasonable, I will support it; that is the only one at the present time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, during the past 6 or 7 years we have had many antilabor bills presented in this Congress. For example, the Smith-Connally bill, the Case bill, the Gwynne bill, and last, but not least, the Taft-Hartley bill.

The Taft-Hartley bill was passed 2 years ago by a Republican Congress. This bill was probably the most vicious and far-reaching labor bill passed by any Congress. It contained twenty some odd antilabor provisions. By antilabor provisions, I mean provisions which gave an inequitable advantage to employers to destroy rights which labor had laboriously gained over a period of 50 years of struggle.

The Taft-Hartley bill took away, to a great extent, the rights of collective bargaining, and reduced collective action on the part of the workers to ineffectiveness or, in some instances, to individual bargaining of one man. A multitude of provisions were placed in the act which enabled employers to use injunctions in the courts to delay or prevent the use of the only economic power labor had: the strike.

The act also provided complicated procedures and regulations with which it was almost impossible for labor to comply. And if, perchance, they could comply, the technical requirements and delay periods nullified the power of the strike. While it was labled by its proponents as labor's bill of rights, it was, in fact, a denial of precious rights gained through the years. An important factor for us to remember is that, although this law was passed by a Republican Congress, most of the weapons which were provided for the benefit of the employers were never used. They were held in abeyance pending the capture of the executive branch, and the appointment of the Secretary of Labor by the prospective, newly elected Republican President, who would wield those weapons more forcibly against American labor.

Fortunately, the people of the United States awoke to the crushing threat of the Taft-Hartley Act. This act, which was supposed to take labor out of politics, boomeranged on its authors, and labor organizations, which had been unable to cooperate because of their internecine disagreements, were forced by the act to fight together for the survival of their organizations, and for the protection of 16,000,000 members in their respective groups.

The point has been made on this floor that union membership is growing, despite the Taft-Hartley Act. This is used as an argument by the pseudo friends of labor to justify the Taft-Hartley Act. But I say to you that the reason that union membership is growing is because the American workingmen, both within and without the formal union organizations, are so alarmed at the implications of the Taft-Hartley Act that they have been inspired to band together to defeat this vicious legislation, and to defeat the representatives who have been so shortsighted as to support this type of legislation.

At this point it is well to note that many of these so-called friends of labor are no longer with us here in Congress, and their places have been taken, in the greater part, by true friends of labor who are pledged to vote against the principles contained in the Taft-Hartley Act.

At this point I want to make it very clear that the so-called Wood bill, which will be offered as a substitute, is just as objectionable as the Taft-Hartley bill, in spite of the sugar-coating with which its proponents have tried to conceal the bitter flavor underneath. Make no mistake about it, a vote for the substitute Wood bill is a vote against the best interests of the workingman, and will be considered by the true friends of labor in the same light as the votes cast in favor of the Taft-Hartley bill.

Yes, the membership of the labor unions is growing. It will continue to grow. Labor unions are becoming more active politically today because of this threat to their very existence, and they will continue to be more active politically. One of the great issues of the 1948 campaign was the antilabor Taft-Hartley bill. One of the great issues of the 1950 campaign will be the antilabor Wood substitute bill.

I have no criticism to offer concerning the vote of any individual Member of

this Congress. I question no man's motive in casting a vote on any piece of legislation. I am confident that the people of each Member's district will be the final judge of each Member's voting record. As for me, I intend to vote against the substitute Wood bill for just the same reasons that I voted against the Smith-Connally bill, the Case bill, the Gwynne bill, and the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have come to the conclusion that the Thomas-Lesinski bill would sell America short.

If enacted into law this bill will not serve the best interests of America and Americans. It would serve only the special interests of a special group.

This special group to which I refer is made up of labor-union leaders.

At this point I ask my colleagues to mark—and mark well—the distinction that is intended, and which I do make, between labor-union leaders and labor-union members.

This bill will serve the special and selfish interests of labor-union leaders. It will render an extreme and cynical disservice to members of the unions which these leaders control and dominate.

I have been unable to reach any other conclusion about this bill and, particularly, I find it impossible to place any other interpretation upon the closed-shop provisions of the bill.

America never has thrived—and it never will thrive—on the tyranny, bondage, and serfdom that is proposed for the American workingman under the closed-shop provisions of the Thomas-Lesinski bill.

Strong words, Mr. Chairman, and well I know it. I would like to substantiate my reasons for using them.

But, first, I would like to establish two or three points indelibly in the RECORD:

This Thomas-Lesinski bill has been represented to the Nation, and with special emphasis to the members of labor unions, as a labor bill, a bill to serve and protect the best interests of workingmen.

The Thomas-Lesinski bill also is represented as the administration's labor bill.

Hence, to oppose this bill, or any of its provisions, is to appear in belligerent opposition to the interests of the workingman.

The so-called champions of labor will attempt to smear and discredit anyone who votes against this bill and any of its provisions. This will be done on the false premise, the utterly false premise, that to oppose any legislation that has been branded as labor's bill is to oppose labor and the principles of labor unionism.

Now I would like to address my next remarks directly to the thousands of laboring men in my home State, whether they are members of a union or not, and to the millions of colleagues they have throughout the Nation.

First. I am in favor of legislation that will protect the real and proper interests of workingmen everywhere.

Second. I am in favor, and without reservation, of the high principles of real labor unionism and of the rights and protection to which the members of labor unions are entitled.

Third. I am not in favor of the Thomas-Lesinski bill, and especially am I not in favor of its closed-shop provisions.

My father taught me, as I am sure all good fathers taught their sons, never to sign my name to an agreement of any kind until I had read and understood the fine print.

I have read the fine print of the Thomas-Lesinski bill. I have read the fine print of its provisions on the closed shop and I will not in effect sign it by voting for it as it now stands.

In the vernacular of labor union leaders, a closed-shop contract means compulsory union membership. Where a man's right to work is denied him unless he joins a union, the compulsion becomes coercion of just about its worst sort.

However, the dictatorial effect of a closed-shop contract does not turn on a man's free decision to join or not to join a union in order to obtain work. Whether he agrees willingly or grudgingly to join a union, his right to apply for work hinges on acceptance of his membership by the union's leaders, and the record is full of documented cases where union membership has been denied at the whim and fancy of union leaders on grounds that had nothing whatsoever to do with a man's competence, his integrity, or his willingness to observe the restrictions placed upon him by union membership.

It is important to understand, step by step, just how a closed-shop contract works.

First. A man cannot apply—cannot even apply—for a job until his union membership has been accepted by union leaders.

Second. When management signs a closed-shop contract, it agrees that its employment office will not even give a hearing to a man's application for work until he is a member of the union in good standing.

Third. Furthermore, if an employee under a union-shop contract falls from grace among the union's leaders for whatever reason, the management is required—it is mandatory upon them—to fire the man even though his work and conduct have been completely satisfactory to the employer.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that legislation which condones such conditions grants special privilege of the most dangerous sort to the special interest of labor-union leaders.

It denies the right of a man to even apply for a job without being discriminated against because he is not a union member, or because a labor union leader may not accept his application for membership.

But the special privilege goes deeper, much deeper. A closed-shop contract gives union leaders a whip-hand, a veritable stranglehold, on the destiny of all workers and all business and industry which submit, or are forced to submit, to the terms of a closed-shop contract with a labor union.

Consequently, the public interest—and in times of emergency the public health and safety—rest too heavily within the power and influence of union leaders.

Compulsory unionism is not new. It has increased tremendously in the last several years. At the beginning of the last war only a small minority of employees—less than 20 percent—were affected by contracts containing any compulsory features. In 1947, however, according to the Department of Labor, more than 75 percent of the labor-management contracts then in existence contained some form of compulsory clause. The rapid growth of this monopoly feature should give pause to those who believe in the rights and dignity of the individual, even in the complex industrialized society in which we live.

In 1947, therefore, after a lengthy hearing of witnesses before committees of both Houses and after extended debate, the Congress of the United States passed legislation placing certain mild restrictions on certain forms of compulsory unionism. In simple language it prohibited closed-shop contracts—contracts where an employee had to be a member of a union before he could get a job, and where he could not keep his job without union membership. At the same time it permitted the so-called union-shop contract, which provided that an employee must join a designated union within 30 days after being hired in order to keep his job. The only condition for the union-shop contract was that a majority of the employees involved authorize it by vote. To further protect the individual, the law directed that no employee could be discriminated against, which means discharged, for not belonging to a union if membership had been denied to the employee for reasons that did not apply to his fellow workers so long as he was willing to pay his dues and initiation fees.

That was it in a nutshell—a simple, mild restriction against the abuses of the closed shop which had caused situations like one in New York—Local 65, Wholesale and Retail Workers, CIO—where a special assessment was levied to oppose this same legislation.

When some members objected to the purpose of the assessment and refused to pay it, the union expelled them and directed the employer to discharge them, as the employers are required to do under closed-shop contracts with unions.

Or take the case where a union member was subpenaed to appear in court. He had witnessed an assault upon his foreman by a fellow employee. Because he told the truth upon the witness stand, the union leadership brought about his expulsion, with a consequent loss of his job, since his employer was subject to a closed-shop contract and had to fire the man.

Such are the results of the closed shop. It is the yellow-dog contract in reverse. It is the tyranny of the union over individuals.

These were the kind of situations the 1947 law was drawn to protect against. The individual union member has been given the protection due him, consistent

with American tradition—protection against arbitrary action on the part of any man or group of men who would deny him the right to work wherever he so desires and his talents permit.

Now, let us see what the Thomas-Lesinski bill would do about this situation.

Would it restore the provisions of the Wagner Act, thereby approving the abuses I have touched on?

Yes; it would.

Would it allow labor-union leaders a free hand to coerce the individual worker, with the consequent loss of his job as a penalty for incurring the displeasure of a willful union?

Yes; it would.

Shamefully, the answer is that the Thomas-Lesinski bill would do all of that. And it would do a great deal more.

By a piece of adroit draftsmanship, section 107 of the Thomas-Lesinski bill would legalize contract under which an employer would be required to deduct from a worker's wages what the bill calls membership obligations or sums equivalent thereto.

Think for a moment of what this means. Ponder the far-reaching aspects of what this clause tries to do.

What is a membership obligation? What is the limit of the assessment which the union may choose to deduct from the fruit of a man's labor? The Thomas-Lesinski bill evades this question. But let us look further into the implications of this clause.

There are many jurisdictions, including some of our major industrial States, which have statutes that prohibit any assignment of wages without the written consent of the individual workers. In those States a blanket check-off of union dues always has been illegal. Moreover, Congress, in enacting wage provisions covering employees of Government contractors, has frowned upon the check-off.

Both the Bacon-Davis Act and the Walsh-Healey Act require payment of prevailing wages without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account.

The adroit language of the bill, H. R. 2032, apparently was designed deliberately to sweep away all State and Federal restrictions in this regard that were not affected by the original Wagner Act.

By extending the automatic check-off to all membership obligations, the bill would authorize the deduction from the pay envelope of any sums which a union assessed against its members and for any purpose. This would include not only members' dues and initiation fees, no matter how discriminatory or exorbitant, but also any fines or assessments which the union might levy, either against members generally or against particular individuals.

This would mean that unions, in many cases, by a simple majority vote of those who happened to be present at a union meeting, could assess substantial sums against all members to be used for political activities—activities to which many minority members might be opposed.

Likewise it is not uncommon for unions to levy heavy fines on members for infractions of union rules. All such assessments and levies under the language of the majority bill could be deducted from the employee member's pay without his consent or authorization.

And if the employee objected? The penalty for objection, under a closed-shop contract, is loss of your job and livelihood. The net effect of this provision, plus legalization of the closed shop and the abrogation of State laws dealing with compulsory union membership, is to deny to individual employees even what little freedom and rights they enjoyed under the original Wagner Act. It also would deny them any legal redress whatever if they are discharged and deprived of their livelihood because they happen to incur the displeasure of the union boss.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier that I have read the fine print of this bill. The things I have just mentioned about union assessments and levies against members under an automatic check-off system are typical of what I meant.

I think that all of us, whether we represent industrial or agricultural areas, owe it to ourselves as an obligation of citizenship and as a duty to our fellow men to examine the intent and implications of all the provisions of this bill.

There are many other ways in which the Thomas-Lesinski bill would go beyond the provisions of the Wagner Act.

For instance, the authors of the Thomas-Lesinski bill were not content with restoring the original proviso in section 8 (a) (3) of the Wagner Act legalizing contracts which make union membership compulsory.

The bill also seeks to invalidate all State laws and constitutional provisions which impose restrictions on compulsory union membership. This is something the Wagner Act never did and never intended to do.

The effect of this provision of the bill applies to any industry affecting interstate commerce, and this seems to include virtually all industry today. This provision would invalidate all State laws and constitutional provisions which impose any restrictions whatever on contracts that make union membership a condition of employment, whether the contract is one for a closed shop, union shop, or maintenance of membership.

Thus the laws of some 17 States, adopted in response to overwhelming public demand, would be rendered worthless and ineffectual by the Thomas-Lesinski bill. Moreover, in several States, notably Arizona, the voters have approved such restrictions by the adoption of constitutional amendments or by ratifying legislation in a referendum or both.

When the difference between this provision and that in the present law is considered, the inevitable effect will be to give every worker in this country the definite impression that his Government is committed to a policy of forcing him to join a union in order to work. A more cynical betrayal of individual freedom and disregard of the guaranty to employees of a free choice in joining unions, as set forth in section 7 of the Wagner Act, would be difficult to imagine.

And now, Mr. Chairman, what might be a reasonable and fair provision of law to handle the fundamental problem of compulsory unionism? We shall offer by amendment a provision which will preserve the present prohibition against the closed shop, but which will continue to allow the union-shop contracts to be made by unions complying with the financial reporting and Communist-disclaimer provisions of the bill. It will further eliminate the requirement that an employee election be held authorizing the union-shop provision in the contract. But it will provide for an election to rescind that authority if the employees so desire.

It is intended that thus the privilege of compulsory unionism, which the union shop represents, shall carry with it the obligation to make full disclosure to its members of the manner in which the union is operated, as well as to register on the record the loyalty of union officers and agents to the Government of the United States.

The amendment will further provide that the union could expel a member for participation in a "wildcat" or unauthorized strike, as well as for membership in the Communist Party, or any other organization which teaches the overthrow of the Government by force or by any illegal method. It would, however, specifically permit an employer to notify a labor organization of opportunities for employment.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing this body exists for it is to represent the people of the United States. Our duty is not to represent a special segment of the population of this country as against the interests of other groups, but rather to see that laws are enacted which take into consideration the needs of all our people and that contribute to the general welfare of the Nation. The people of the United States would be ill-served if we passed legislation which would accord the privilege of monopoly to labor organizations in the fact of its plain prohibition in all other areas. They would be ill-served if we placed the stamp of Government approval on the right of unions to deprive a free citizen of this country of his right to work unless he submitted to union dictates. And we would be paying small heed, indeed, to the deep and fundamental principles of individual liberty and freedom to which this country is dedicated were we to ignore the basic rights of our individual citizens and leave them easy prey to closed shop monopoly unionism with all its rackets and abuses.

Mr. Chairman, the historical justification for the closed shop was that nonunion employees could and would undercut the union standards. This argument can no longer be used. Under the Wagner Act, and under all legislation considered since then, the union representing the majority speaks and acts for all, and the employer is prohibited from treating separately with employees who are not members of the union.

It is impossible for a truly liberal-minded person to justify the closed shop on principle. What arguments there are that are made in its favor are arguments of expediency. Why should any private group—union or otherwise—have the power to pass sentence of economic death

over an individual in America merely because he exercises his right to decline to join the group. To me the closed shop is simply the blacklist in reverse.

One of our great Americans, the late Mr. Justice Brandeis—universally revered as a champion of liberalism—had some things to say about the closed shop. On one occasion he said:

The objections, legal, economic, and social, against the closed shop are so strong, and the ideas of the closed shop so antagonistic to the American spirit that the insistence upon it has been a serious obstacle to union progress. (Letter of September 6, 1910, to Lawrence F. Abbott.)

And on another:

It is not true that the success of a labor union necessarily means a perfect monopoly. The union, in order to attain and preserve for its members industrial liberty, must be strong and stable. It need not include every member of the trade. Indeed, it is desirable for both the employer and the union that it should not. Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness; neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are non-unionists. * * * Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer. (Contribution to a discussion entitled "Peace With Liberty and Justice" in 2 National Civic Federation Review, No. 2, pp. 1, 16, May 15, 1905.)

And on still another occasion:

But the American people should not, and will not accept unionism if it involves the closed shop. They will not consent to the exchange of the tyranny of the employer for the tyranny of the employees. (Letter of February 26, 1912, to Lincoln Steffens.)

The above quotations are taken from the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the case of *American Federation of Labor* v. *American Sash & Door Co.* (69 S. Ct. 258, 264).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I remind my colleagues of the concern we all have these days about revolutionary forces that are at work here in the United States and throughout the world.

We deplore political regimentation in other countries.

Every fiber and instinct in every American among us rebels and revolts at the thought of submission to the arbitrary and absolute power of dictators, submission such as millions of human beings in other countries have been forced into.

And so it seems incredible to me that we should consider for very long or very seriously, legislation such as is proposed by the Thomas-Lesinski bill. This bill would wrap up and deliver to union leaders—almost lock, stock, and barrel—arbitrary, monopolistic, and dictatorial powers that contradict the principles of every American who believes in freedom for himself and others.

I repeat, if we vote for this bill we will be selling America and Americans short.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] say that he would support the non-Communist affidavit clause in the new labor legislation to be passed in case it were made applicable to the employer as well as to the employee. That is what I wish to talk about this afternoon for a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, in this fight by employers to retain the Taft-Hartley Act in full, and by union labor leaders to repeal it and reestablish the Wagner Labor Act, I have noted an alarming attitude on the part of these two segments of our American economy to disregard the rights of the general public.

The idea struck me, when I first came to Congress, that perhaps a labor bill could be written which would further promote the cooperation between labor and management, and likewise be beneficial to the general American public. After hearing much evidence pro and con on the subject in committee sessions, and being approached by lobbyists, both for management and labor during the past 4 months, I am now convinced that my original belief was merely a wild dream. But I am still hopeful that we will be able to pass a labor bill here which will show some regard for the American public, at least.

One of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which has caused a great deal of anxiety in labor circles is the non-Communist affidavit clause. Under the schedule arranged by our minority chairman, it is my pleasure to discuss this subject for a few minutes. It is my firm belief that this section of the law is needed now more than ever before, and I for one will do my best to see that it is retained in the law we are writing here now. I was not a Member of the House, of course, when the Taft-Hartley Act was studied or discussed. Had I been here, I would have been particularly interested in the discussion or debate concerning the non-Communist affidavit clause. This provision in the Taft-Hartley Act makes it incumbent on union officials and reads as follows:

Section 9, paragraph h: "No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, no petition (that is, right to an election) under section 9 (e) (1) (secret ballot for union shop) shall be entertained, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10 (unfair labor practices), unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by each officer of such labor organization and the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 35A of the Criminal Code (making false affidavits or claims) shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits."

One of the arguments labor has had with this section of our law is that it unfairly discriminates against a class of individuals. They say that it reflects upon the patriotism of labor union officials who are required by the law to sign the affidavit.

The Wood bill, which I understand will be considered as a substitute for the bill reported out of the committee, contains a similar provision regarding the necessity of labor-union officials to file a non-Communist affidavit before being recognized by the NLRB. The Wood bill also includes the provision which makes it incumbent upon an employer, if a natural person or persons, or such officer of such employer, to file a similar non-Communist affidavit. The Lesinski bill, as reported out of the committee, does not make any reference to such an affidavit in any form. I have stated that I felt that the requirement of the Taft-Hartley law in this respect was good and that it should be retained, but it should of course be applied to the employer as well as the employee, and this is accomplished in the Wood bill. But before I give my reasons for the necessity of such a law, let me say a few words about communism itself.

The provision regarding non-Communist affidavits was made necessary by the attempt of the Soviet Union to overthrow the American democratic system of government. It started back in 1917 in the days of the Russian revolution. The Russian revolution, itself, is an example of the use of the proletariat working-class to overthrow an existing form of government. Karl Marx, Engels, and Lenin all realized that laboring people could be used and led in revolt easier than any other class of citizenry. The Russian leaders, including Uncle Joe Stalin, openly boast of the power of the laboring masses in revolutionary movements. After the revolution in Russia had been completed Lenin and his group set out to establish world-communism, as most of you know—world-communism to cause an eventual destruction of capitalism and free enterprise throughout the world. Lenin stated time and time again, going back as far as the year 1923, that it should be the purpose of Communists in all nations of the world to agree to any sacrifices and even if need be to resort to all sorts of stratagems, artifices, illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges, only so as to get into the trade unions, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work within them at all costs. He and Stalin have made no exceptions in their advice to American Communists. The American Communists are doing all in their power to follow the advice of Russian leaders.

The history of the labor movement in this country verifies that statement. How much longer shall we be complacent about the Soviet schemes and devices to infiltrate through the American labor movement? Stalin has declared that our democracy is weak and that labor unions provide a fertile field for its overthrow. Labor unions in this country are now established as a part of our

economic and political life. The labor-union movement in this country was designed to promote the interests of the laboring man and not to overthrow our Government. Why then should we write legislation which would assist the Soviet in their dastardly scheme?

Many examples have been given to show the effectiveness of Communist domination in the labor union to divest us of our American way of life. Some union leaders have stated publicly the ultimate aims of our laboring union movement as desired by the Soviet. In 1944 Robert Minor made an alarming speech at a convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. An excerpt of the speech he made has previously been given on the floor of this House, but I wish to repeat it at this time as to me it signifies the purpose and intent of American Communists here in America. He says:

> We want the labor movement to obtain physical control and ideological domination of this country. By physical control we mean the governing power—the power to make decisions and enforce them—the power to direct an army and a navy—the power to control industry—the power to say who shall be in jail and who shall be out—in other words, political power. And there is no political power except complete political power.

And quoting him further on:

> But what of our principles, what of the form of rule, what of the Soviet system of dictatorship of the working classes?

Surely Robert Minor recognized that an economy where organized labor owned and controlled all property and owned and controlled all political power would truly be a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now there are many good labor-union men in this country who are devoutly attached to the principles of free government—who are willing and want to stand up and fight against the overthrow of our form of government by a foreign power. They have proven that by their service in the armed forces and by their services to the public during the last World War. Thank the Lord, there are only a few fanatics in this country attached to the labor movement who believe that labor unions should own and control all property. But, it only takes a few people in the positions of power to overthrow and take over all industry and the government. That has been proven before.

The provisions of the Taft-Hartley law relating to the non-Communist affidavit clause is a very short step in the right direction in eliminating these fanatics. Shall we cast this law aside and give encouragement to the Soviet and her agents in this country? Shall we give them a pat on the back, and tell them to proceed to take over all our unions and eventually our whole free economy?

The administration has spent billions of dollars abroad to protect foreign nations from the spreading influence of communism; we recently voted billions of dollars more for this same purpose. The administration calls this expensive activity its cold-war policy on communism. Here at home the administration insists on an entirely different policy on communism which has become commonly known as the "red herring" policy. By its desire to eliminate the non-Communist-affidavit clause from this new labor legislation the administration is admitting an intent and desire to continue its "red herring" policy. It disregards the fact that there are proven and known Russian spies and American Communists working in the executive department of the Government—working and being paid by the executive department of the very Government which they seek to overthrow. The administration also disregards the fact that there are known Russian espionage agents and American Communists in control of some of the strongest unions in the country. The President has failed to heed the warning of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI—and he has failed to heed the warning of his own Attorney General. The Attorney General, as well as the Un-American Activities Committee, have openly declared many of our strong unions in this country to be Communist-dominated and controlled. He seeks to destroy the only effective weapon that labor unions and the public have in eliminating the Communist Party members from positions of power in the labor unions.

Supporters of the Lesinski bill, which includes the administration, whose officials wrote it and insist upon its passage, do not like the section of the law which requires union officials to swear in an affidavit that they are not members of the Communist Party, or of any organization advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence.

The mild penalty for not making such an affidavit is denial of recognition by the NLRB and the privilege of using the labor-management law machinery for investigating and processing unfair-labor-practice charges, representation, and election petitions filed by such unions headed by such officers. The purpose of the provision is twofold: (1) to give the rank-and-file members of unions dominated by Communists something concrete with which to wage a campaign to get rid of such leaders, and (2) to turn the spotlight on unions controlled by Communist officers.

In the face of our Nation's experience with the sabotage of production by Communist-dominated unions in the months before Russia entered World War II, it is inconceivable that we should forget that experience so soon and allow the passage of labor-management legislation which would eliminate these mild deterrents to Communist fifth column infiltration into the American labor union movement.

This would be the result of the passage of the Lesinski bill. The objection which union leaders have advanced against the non-Communist affidavit clause is that it insults the loyalty of union officers by requiring them to sign such affidavits. If such a requirement is an insult then every Member of Congress, and every employee of the Federal Government, up to and including Cabinet officers, is subject to that same insult because of the provisions which have been included in various appropriation bills. These officers are required to sign such affidavits as a condition of receiving their pay. I am sure that nearly all of you Members were proud and happy to sign the non-Communist affidavit before taking your seat here in the House of Representatives. I know that I was. I only wish that a similar requirement could be made of every voter in our country today. I am pleased to note that many of the States are now beginning to act in establishing investigating committees and outlawing Communists and Communist instructors in our schools and universities.

The objection of union officials to signing the affidavit is even less supportable in view of the fact that some of the evidence of Communist-domination of international unions comes from these leaders themselves. Such international unions as the united electrical workers, fur workers, farm-equipment workers, mine, mill, and smelter workers, and longshoremen and warehouse workers of the CIO have been attacked by the latter's own leaders as being Communist-dominated. In fact, on March 25, the officers of the farm-equipment workers defied an order of the CIO that they amalgamate with the UAW, which order has as its avowed purpose the elimination of the Communist leadership of the farm-equipment group.

While I was in my home district over the Easter recess, I was invited to meet with several labor-union groups in my district, as many of you were. I was particularly pleased at the reception given me by all these unions and was especially pleased to receive the viewpoints of the Political Action Committee of the UAW-CIO, Local 974.

The UAW is now the recognized union at the greatest tractor company in the world, Caterpillar Tractor Co. of Peoria, Ill. The viewpoint of this committee of the local union on the non-Communist affidavit section of the Taft-Hartley Act is contrary to the recommendation of the leaders of the International CIO and there is a very good reason for that.

About a year ago the Caterpillar plant employees were represented by the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of the American CIO. In the spring of 1948 they were engaging in negotiations for a new contract as the old contract had about expired. During the course of these negotiations a couple of other unions filed petitions with the NLRB claiming the right to represent these same employees who had been represented by the farm-equipment workers. At that point Caterpillar announced that it had to recess the negotiations because it would not be permitted to bargain with the unions due to the fact that its officers had refused to sign the non-Communist affidavit. Shortly after this recess the plant was struck and was down for about 13 weeks. Near the end of the strike an election was held and the farm-equipment workers were not permitted on the ballot because they still had not filed their non-Communist affidavits at that date. During this period of time there were 17,000 employees out of work for approximately 13 weeks. At that point a former FBI agent, in a speech before the American

Legion of Peoria, publicly exposed the Communist domination of the FEW-CIO union. One of the exposed men was the publicity agent and director of the local union, and another man was the international vice president of the Farm Equipment Workers Union. The public indignation and protest upon the exposure of these individuals was tremendous. At the election held under the auspices of the NLRB, the United Auto Workers-CIO were elected by a fair majority. Their officers had signed the non-Communist affidavit and so bargaining continued in a short while. The plant reopened under a new contract, and a new union representation.

The members of the political action committee of this union with whom I talked were pleased with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to the non-Communist affidavit clause and want a similar section in any new labor legislation that is passed. This is not the only example, of course, of the great good which this clause has done for the workers and the public generally. The experience of Caterpillar employees has been repeated many times throughout the country.

William Green, president of the AFL, told the Senate Labor Committee that while he was not asking for the inclusion of the non-Communist affidavit provision in the law, he had no personal objection to it. Secretary of Labor Tobin, testifying before the Senate Labor Committee, while he objected to the present law, wanted to make it a crime for any union officer to be a member of the Communist Party, which would be an even more stringent preventative.

In view of the many other grave steps which the Congress is taking and will be called upon to take to check Communist aggression and infiltration all over the world, it seems inconceivable that the Congress could accept the provisions of the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032.

To illustrate the attempts of the Soviet Union to infiltrate our unions with Communists, let me read part of a confidential report handed to me recently by an undercover agent who has been a member of the Communist Party in New York City since 1939. This undercover agent, whose name I cannot mention here, has been a member of various Communist factions and front groups, but has especially been interested in the water-front section of the New York Communist Party. He reports as follows concerning Communist infiltration into the labor front:

> On the labor front, I wish to point out that 8 years ago, I sat in on a Communist meeting, where plans were laid to capture transportation, communications, teamsters, warehousemen, radio, and motion pictures. That the party has succeeded in realizing such ambitious plans would be an understatement, for I can now see that every one of these industries has been taken over and are controlled by Communists. Thus, the party has within its power the means to call and hold a Nation-wide strike should the occasion demand it—a strike which could well be the forerunner of a revolution for the overthrow of our Government, and the establishment of socialism. Today, the Communists who are considered by the party to be their top organizers, are being sent to take positions in the railroad brotherhood. Here, they will use the time-worn, but successful Communist method of spreading their propaganda advocating better working conditions, shorter hours, increases in salary, less profits for employers, etc., in order to secure the election of Communist officials in that union. Once the Communist leaders gain control of the union, they will swiftly oust the present clean management of the union, being left free to carry on their Communist political propaganda. Thus another link in their chain will be added for the day when all links will lock for the revolution and socialism.

Some opponents of the non-Communist-affidavit clause have stated that it is unconstitutional. These opponents certainly have a right to their opinions upon the legality of this law, but the only way we will ever determine whether or not it is unconstitutional is by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. This reason proposed by the opponents is not a valid reason for repeal of this provision. If Congress were to repeal every law merely because there is a possibility that it be held unconstitutional we would have very few laws in this country under which to operate.

None of the opponents of this particular section have given what I consider a valid reason for failure to include the non-Communist-affidavit provision in the Lesinski bill. On the other hand, those favoring inclusion of the measure as it is in the Wood bill have pointed out good and substantial reasons for its inclusion.

Shall we give the American Communist Party and the Soviet dictatorship a chance to say, "We are beginning to win the fight in America—we have propagandized the Congress of the United States of America into making it easier for us to gain control of the labor-union movement—Congress has made it easier for us to overthrow the Government of the United States and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat?" I say "No"; if the Wood bill fails to pass, let us amend the Lesinski bill to at least include this non-Communist-affidavit clause to protect the security of our labor-union movement, and the security of our beloved country.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

REPEAL OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, during the progress of the war, labor made a patriotic record. While the losses in killed and wounded in the armed forces amounted to 670,379 men, labor in the same period suffered losses in killed and wounded, 11,112,600.

In addition to that, after the war, no preference was arranged for those who fought in the ranks of labor—no preference for jobs, no preference politically. Labor still remained unrecognized, like millions of civilians who gave all they had for the war effort.

Labor took it on the chin, during the war years, and we know now that they were underpaid. We know now that their standards of living were much lower than an honorable calling like labor was entitled to.

The fighting having stopped, labor set about to have these inequalities corrected and an epidemic of strikes ensued. This aroused the general public; and the shortage of steel, the shortage of coal, inflamed the public and the blame for it was placed not at the door of operators but at the door of labor. Labor was to blame for all the ills which the public was then experiencing, and the greatest complaint of all against labor was the future dread of action that might adversely affect the public. The times were hysterical, and those who defended labor were sought out and roundly condemned.

In this hysteria, the public entirely forgot that the employers were just as much, if not more, at fault than labor itself. The employers received a clean bill from the public and labor, a black mark.

In this period and under these conditions, the Taft-Hartley labor law was passed. Straight thinking in this hysteria was abandoned and a vindictive law was the result. The Eightieth Congress, under the control of the Republican Party, has been singled out for severe criticism for passing this law. The fact is that the Republican Party does not deserve this criticism, for the law as passed, now known as the Taft-Hartley Act, was far more sane, just, and constitutional than the law proposed by the administration. In the President's message to Congress on this subject, it was proposed to enroll all strikers in the armed forces, the effect of which would have meant that strikers would be forced to work at the point of a bayonet. That would have been, if passed, the greatest blow against freedom ever struck in the United States.

The Republicans adopted a milder course and one which was not so flagrant a violation of the constitutional rights of all citizens. They passed the Taft-Hartley Act; and, whether done intentionally or done to appease public opinion, it contained provisions which were unconstitutional. How a Congress filled with great lawyers—men from whose ranks the United States district courts, the court of appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States are filled, could have written a law which abridged free speech and a free press is hard to understand. When you say to a newspaper published by a labor organization or any other organization that it cannot criticize in any way it deems proper, the conduct, the vote, and utterances of Members of Congress, and distribute the same, then a free speech and a free press are no more in this country.

Fortunately, the Supreme Court of the United States could not sustain this doctrine and that feature of the Taft-Hartley Act is out.

It is a dangerous experiment to write a law which gives courts the right by injunction, to settle labor disputes. Those settlements are settlements of coercion and not settlements in the name of justice.

With that right—injunctional suits written into the law, any body of workers can be completely suppressed, regardless

of the justice of their complaints. The merits are not at issue on these cases, and the injunctional order is issued on substantially the following allegations:

First. That a strike is in progress or about to be instituted.

Second. That this action will affect the public adversely.

Third. That it will result in disorder, detrimental to the peace and the lawful conduct of the Government.

On that showing an injunctional order is issued, with notice to make the matter permanent. This compels the labor groups to appear in court and show that there are no grounds for the injunctional order. No matter how just the cause of the strike may be, that is lost sight of, because most strikes do and will affect the public. Most strikes do and will result in a disturbance of the peace, especially when there is a law outlawing strikes.

Labor can make no other showing on this injunctional order, and it is made permanent. Labor is completely squelched regardless of the justice of the causes which have precipitated the strike. The result is that labor has been enjoined but the labor dispute unsettled.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, outlawing injunctions, passed in 1931, was not something gathered out of thin air, but it was the outlawing of a vicious practice, which throttled labor and settled nothing. If I am correct, this was passed by a Republican Congress. After 16 years of operation, the same Republican Party repealed that law—over the protest of labor. Since the practice has been reinstated, not a single injunction has resulted in settling a labor-management controversy. The Republican Party should hear the voice of labor; they should listen as carefully to labor as they do to large corporate interests that employ labor. But they did not—and now the Republican Party is not in control here. If a united stand is made by the Republicans in this Congress to maintain the Taft-Hartley law, or one equally bad to take its place, the party can be resigned to the fact that it will remain a minority party.

The combined strength of some southern Democrats and the great majority of the Republicans in this House may maintain the Taft-Hartley Act or one to take its place, but that will not defeat labor in its fight to operate under agreements openly arrived at instead of by injunction. The membership of this House will be further weeded out, until finally a Congress will arrive that will not ignore the pleas of labor. Remember, we are so conducting our business in America that, year by year we are increasing the ranks of labor, and the so-called conservative who follows the dictates of the National Manufacturers Association, or any other business agency, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, will have plenty of time to meditate on the subject while at home.

Personally, I admire those who work. I will never fail to make their lot easier if I can. I like their company and their companionship because I myself know what work is. I came up the hard way—I have been poor—and ragged. I know what it is to work for any pay the employer was willing to give.

Safety conditions are highly dangerous. There is still much to do for labor. We cannot permit the enormous casualties running over 2,000,000 people during the war years, and last year, 1948, running as high as 1,900,000. That is a severe indictment of the treatment of the workers in the United States.

Instead of looking around to find some new device to hand to the courts to throttle the voice of labor, we should spend some of our valuable time in providing safer places in which the men and women of the United States work.

I think this is fundamental—that labor and capital are partners in a free-enterprise system, and that neither should take too large a slice out of the earnings of a common enterprise. A third party to the controversy is the public, which is bound to suffer in a disagreement between the first two parties. It behooves the public, therefore, after all negotiations between labor and employers have failed, to settle this difficulty at the earliest possible moment, and arrange the laws so that a full open hearing can be had requiring both parties to place all the facts before the tribunal. If labor asserts that the employer takes too much of the common effort, the employer should be required to present his books and records and show just exactly what he is making, with a full expense account. The right of labor to cross-examine on these matters should be preserved as a matter of right.

On the other hand, labor should be allowed to show the cost of living, including food, housing, clothing, medical care and attention for the family, and recreational opportunities; in fact, show the needs of the laborer and his family under a standard of living commensurate with the honorable profession of labor.

The result of this hearing should not be delayed, but should be handed down promptly, with the right of appeal to either party to the Supreme Court of the United States. This decision by the Supreme Court should be a final disposition of the controversy. This appeal should not be on questions of law alone, but should, in all things, be by a trial de novo.

Should the final Court determine that labor is entitled to greater safeguards or more pay, the pay shall be computed with back pay to the date of filing the petition, and the safeguards directed to be installed immediately or as soon as such appliances can be made.

If Congress finds that the National Labor Relations Board is the proper place to lodge complaints and try the issues, then nothing more should be required.

The root of all difficulty between management and labor originates from monopolies. The power resulting from having complete control over any department of American life is so crushing in extent that abuses are not only ignored but actually countenanced. Unlimited power over the production and distribution of a necessity of life can mean, and often does mean, the absolute control over the lives of the people. This is not the American way of life, where the least of the citizens of this Republic is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I am a Republican, and hence would like to see this great party of Lincoln again find favor with the voters of the country. This is absolutely impossible to accomplish as long as the party does not make any effort to cooperate with organized labor. Today, among labor groups, our party is feared. There is no reason why we should conduct the party in a way to antagonize organized labor. The Republican Party has been, and is, friendly with large business interests, and since these business interests are antagonistic to labor our party is tarred with the same stick.

Remember that labor groups are on the increase in the United States, for the more unbridled monopoly there is in this country, the more independent business interests and farmers will be driven into the ranks of labor. As soon as a majority of the American people are pushed over into the labor class, we shall have an out-and-out labor government.

There is no merit in demanding that an employee swear that he is not a Communist. Communism is a belief, and is it unconstitutional to deny a man work because of some belief he may entertain? How much more of an insult it is to ask an honest, loyal American citizen to swear that he is not this, that, or the other. Why do we not ask them whether they are Baptists or Catholics—these are beliefs. Experience of the ages demonstrates that legal action of this kind will only increase the number of those who may believe in an ism outlawed by law.

I do not know the content of the various bills now before Congress to take the place of the Taft-Hartley Act, but the ones that come nearest to the opinion expressed here will have my support. Any law passed in a period of hysteria should be repealed, and the Taft-Hartley law is no exception.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1949.

Hon. USHER BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: The Handbook of Labor Statistics (1947 edition, p. 164) published by the Department of Labor, gives the following estimated figures for labor accidents and fatalities in major industries in the years indicated:

Year	Total injuries	Fatalities
1941	2,180,200	19,200
1942	2,267,700	18,100
1943	2,414,000	18,400
1944	2,230,400	15,900
1945	2,030,300	16,500
Total	11,112,600	88,100

War casualties as published in the 1947 World Almanac (p. 520) from information

supplied by the respective departments concerned were as follows:

	Killed and died	Wounded in action
Navy	48,697	33,670
Marine Corps	21,711	63,919
Coast Guard	1,039	968
Total	71,447	98,557
Army	225,155	571,822
Over-all total	296,602	670,379
Total military casualties	966,981	

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting almost 2 years for the opportunity to vote for the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act. The bill before us, H. R. 2032, repeals the Taft-Hartley law and reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. I am going to support this legislation.

Under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 organized labor made great progress. The act of 1935, commonly referred to as the Wagner Act, recognized that the average worker could not individually protect himself from the standpoint of wages, hours, and other conditions of employment when he attempted to deal with large employers by himself. The Wagner Act enabled employees to join together and deal collectively with their employers through unions of their own choosing. Passage of the Wagner Act was not a new philosophy. It simply recognized that the workingmen and women of America are human beings and not property rights of their employers.

Prior to the passage of that law, labor was suppressed to the point that workers were not permitted to organize. They were afraid to become members of weak, ineffective unions. Not that they did not want to join unions, but in industry after industry laborers saw that men who became members of unions or were active in union organization, were hunted down and fired.

To go back further, there was the practice of many employers to impose the so-called "yellow dog contracts." Under this form of contract workers were given jobs upon the express condition that they would not become affiliated in any way with a labor union. Men signed those contracts, not because they wanted to but because they needed money for the support of themselves and their families.

It was also common practice for courts to issue injunctions which restrained unions from even approaching a man who had been coerced into signing such a contract.

With the passage of the Wagner Act, workers, freed from the fear of dismissal, joined the ranks of unions by the thousands. Many employers cooperated in working out the principles of collective bargaining. It was helpful to them too, as it lightened their own burdens of negotiating with thousands of separate employees and it made our labor force free of the fear of economic reprisals.

Unfortunately, there was a set of employers who never completely adjusted themselves to the Wagner Act. At every opportunity they fought the unions. They disliked collective bargaining, and in November 1946 they thought their chance had come. The Republican Party had won a majority in the Congress and this was interpreted as a mandate to destroy the Wagner Act.

Then came the Taft-Hartley bill. It was a 68-page document driven through the Congress by hatred and hysteria. The fundamental objective was to destroy the rights and benefits that labor had gained over years of struggle. Its 68 pages were filled with injustices for labor. It set up the machinery to break unions and destroy collective bargaining.

The history of this type of legislation is replete with evidence that the Government cannot dictate or legislate harmony between labor and management. Rather than bringing about industrial peace such laws simply set up new barriers between employer and employee. Antilabor laws are not directed to the basic things which cause work stoppages but rather seek to treat only the effects.

Of course no one likes strikes but under our form of government an individual cannot be compelled to work if he does not so desire regardless of what reason he may have for declining to work. This is fundamental. Basically, the only reason for strikes is the desire of the worker to bargain for better remuneration for his labor and improved working conditions. To prevent a worker from trying to improve his standard of life is but little different from slavery.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been on the statute books for almost 2 years. It has been a sad experience and an unwarranted invasion upon the freedom of our citizens. It has severely restricted free collective bargaining and hampered workers in the exercise of their rights. It has vastly increased the number of cases coming before the Labor Board. It has unfairly discriminated against labor organizations. It is much more cumbersome and expensive than the old system. Last, but not least, it has not stopped strikes. The Taft-Hartley Act has been a failure and has done more harm than good.

Our task today is to put our labor relations on a fair and workable basis. We can do this by repealing the Taft-Hartley law and reenacting the Labor Relations Act of 1935. This is perhaps one of the most important matters that will come before us in this Congress. The Taft-Hartley law is a serious threat to American democracy and the sooner it is stricken from the books, the better.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, at the proper moment in these deliberations it is my purpose to offer as a substitute to the pending measure H. R. 4290, which I introduced on April 14, after consultation with many of my brethren as to how we might most intelligently and best discharge our duty of passing a balanced, workable labor law, and might most effectively abort the apparent conspiracy of certain national and international union bosses to ram through this House, in terrifying disregard of the normal practices of representative Government, a bill that ignores our party's platform pledges, that would hoist labor bosses to positions of unparalleled economic power, and that would destroy the constitutional authority of our sovereign States to protect, as they believe wisest, the inherent right of their citizens to work.

I had earlier introduced H. R. 3228, also a labor bill, in the mistaken belief that at some point in its deliberations, the Committee on Education and Labor would consider it along with the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, and possibly with others, and ultimately, through a process of rational compromise, report out a bill conforming to our party platform and meriting the support of every representative. H. R. 3228 was attacked by some union leaders because it contained certain restricted provisions not found in the Taft-Hartley Act. These provisions were based on the report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, and I believed them worthy of the Committee's serious consideration. They are not in H. R. 4290, which, Mr. Chairman, I hope to tender as the rational and balanced bill we had a right to expect from the committee.

It repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and then incorporates the best features of our labor law as we have developed it over the past 15 years. It eliminates those restrictions which experience with the Taft-Hartley Act has shown to be unnecessary.

Our 1948 platform pledged far more than mere repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. We promised to substitute in its place a just body of rules to ensure free and effective collective bargaining, to determine, in the public interest, the rights of employer and employees. We promised the Nation a law that would enable unions to keep their membership free from Communistic influence.

We most certainly did not promise—we would not have dared promise—to go back to the one-sided Wagner Act.

One hundred and six Democrats voted for Taft-Hartley over the President's veto. Ninety of them ran for reelection, and only four were defeated. The people voted for Democrats who had voted for Taft-Hartley. They had faith that under our platform those men would not return them to the evils of the old Wagner Act.

The bill reported by the majority of the committee makes a shameless mockery of our platform. It does tepid lip service to it by repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. But instead of ensuring effective collective bargaining it would entirely remove unions from any obligation to bargain and from responsibility for keeping the bargain if one should be made.

Instead of determining, in the public interest, the rights of both employer and employees, it utterly ignores those of the employer and of the individual working man. It goes back to the discredited Wagner Act theory of sheltering the union, as an organization, at all costs.

Unbelievably, and although we are appropriating billions to stem communism, it ignores entirely our pledge that we would enable unions to keep their membership free from communistic influence.

Section 8 (a) (3) and 8 (b) (2) of the bill I propose honors our pledge, and, when enacted into law, will permit the expulsion from union membership and discharge from employment of Communists. Section 9 requires both employers and unions to show that they are noncommunistic before they can use the Labor Board. These, Mr. Chairman, are provisions that meet the promise of our platform; these are provisions that meet the complaint of unions that the Taft-Hartley Act prevented them from expelling and securing the discharge of Communist infiltraters in their ranks.

It is shocking that the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan did not contain similar provisions when it was drafted. It is more shocking that the majority of the committee failed to put such provisions into the bill while it was in committee.

Why did not they? Why on a matter so clear as this—on a matter on which our platform pledge is so explicit, on a matter on which the will of our people is known and on which the security of this Republic depends, did the committee fail to amend that bill?

It is because that bill is so saturated with injustice, deception, and violation of our party's pledges that once the amendment process was begun the propagators of the bill knew there would be no end to it. They were afraid to open it up because it has many other features that are just as detrimental to the public welfare, as insulting to the rules of decency and fair play, as indefensible, as its failure to deal with the sinister machinations of communism.

A bill that goes backward instead of forward; a bill that destroys States' rights; that does not make union violence and pitiless coercion illegal; that destroys freedom of speech; that abolishes rules of evidence; that would augment uncontrolled bureaucratic power in the Labor Department; that would wipe out the only effective means we have yet devised for dealing with national emergency strikes, does not deserve a place on our statute books as a guide to labor-management relations, and should not pass this House.

The substitute bill I shall hope to propose is a bill, I dare say, not far different from the bill which would have come from the committee had not its majority ruthlessly gagged the minority and closed its mind to reason, its ears to all requests that we legislate in the public welfare, its eyes to all goals except the insatiable drive for unbridled mastery of the Nation and its States by certain power-crazed union officials.

Although I would be derelict to the trust my constituents have reposed in me, and unfaithful to my own sense of public duty were I to be other than unsparing in my criticism of the bill reported by the committee, as well as the tactics employed therein, yet I yield to none in my desire to write a bill that will protect the American workingman, that will foster sound unionism, and promote collective bargaining. From these motives comes the substitute I shall offer.

What does that substitute bill do?

First, it retains all of the substantive guaranties of the Wagner Act. In the exact language of that law it protects labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, to be free from discrimination.

Second, it meets every legitimate objection of the unions to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Let us examine some of them:

The unions asserted that the requirement of Taft-Hartley that they secure a majority vote of all employees affected before making a union-shop agreement was unfair, burdensome, and unduly restricted freedom of bargaining. Labor Board statistics show that the unions have won such votes overwhelmingly and that the task of conducting these union authorization elections greatly increased the Board's case load and slowed down its operations. You will recall that our party's platform complained of this increase in case load. In recognition of those demonstrated facts and conformably to our platform the substitute bill abolishes these elections. However, to protect employees against the possibility of being held in bondage in union shops they wish to terminate, the substitute bill permits "deauthorization" elections when requested by 30 percent of the employees.

The unions criticized Taft-Hartley because they said it forbade them requesting the discharge of members who had engaged in wildcat strikes or who were Communists so long as they regularly tendered their dues. It is unfair, said the unions, to hold us responsible on contracts, when we cannot force the employer to get rid of such individuals. That argument, so far as I know, was wholly suppositious and the hearings record no instance where a union has suffered any penalty or loss in this manner. But be that as it may, the substitute bill removes the objection by providing in section 8 (a) (3) that employers may discriminate against wildcatters and Communists, and in section 8 (b) (2) that unions may demand such action.

The unions said Taft-Hartley was unfair in requiring their officers to file non-Communist oaths in order to avail themselves of Labor Board facilities while placing no similar burden on employers. The substitute bill in section 9 places such a requirement on both parties.

The unions asserted that Taft-Hartley's anticlosed shop and antidiscrimination provisions went so far as to forbid an employer from notifying a union that it wanted to hire people. Section 8 (a) (3) of the substitute bill cures this objection and specifically legalizes such a practice.

One of the provisions of Taft-Hartley attacked by unions was its provision that men should be free to seek jobs without joining a union. The unions have seemed to feel that they have some inherent right to the closed shop which neither the Federal nor the State governments can regulate. They so argued to the Supreme Court this winter in the Lincoln Union—volume 69 Supreme Court, page 251—and the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board—volume 69 Supreme Court, page 516—cases. The Court speedily rejected that startling claim and held that it is well within the power of the Government, Federal and State, to legislate on this subject.

The ban on the closed shop is not a new thing. The Railway Labor Act has always made it illegal in the railway field. And when labor's friends enacted the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932 they put into it as section 2 a declaration of public policy of the United States that although men should be free to associate with their fellows in unions they likewise should have freedom to decline to do so.

That true liberal, Justice Brandeis, said:

> The closed shop seems to me opposed to our ideas of liberty, as presenting a monopoly of labor which might become as objectionable a monopoly as that of capital. (The Brandeis Guide to the Modern World, pp 139–140.)

John L. Lewis, who has a greater monopoly in coal today than John D. Rockefeller ever had in oil, has given a sample of how obnoxious to public welfare these monopolies may become.

A union that by the closed shop controls all the jobs in a plant has a monopoly in a double sense: To the man seeking a job it has a job monopoly to which he must bow; to the public it has a monopoly which controls the flow of goods. Both monopolies are contrary to public welfare.

Some 17 States have laws outlawing or regulating the closed shop and those laws have been held by the Supreme Court to be a proper, constitutional exercise of the States' sovereign powers.

Mr. Chairman, are we in this Democratic House of Representatives, to pass a law saying to the States, you no longer can pass such laws, or, if now on your books, you no longer can enforce them? Are we to say to the States, no longer can you guarantee to even your humblest citizen the right to go out and apply for a job without joining a union? That is what section 8 (a) 3 of the pending bill does. It attempts to kill completely States' rights in this field.

The substitute bill for which I speak handles the problem this way: It, like Taft-Hartley and the Railway Labor Act, and in accord with the declaration of policy of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, outlaws the closed shop. However, it permits a noncommunistic, properly qualified un-

ion to make a union-shop agreement under which employees must join in the 30 days after the beginning of employment. Taft-Hartley permitted that only after an election in which the union had to receive authorization from a majority of all employees affected. The substitute abolishes those elections.

We protect the employee against abuse under the union shop by providing that they cannot be fired if membership was not available to him on terms of equality and if he has regularly tendered his periodic dues and the initiation fee.

And finally we preserve the sovereign right of the States, and 17 of them have exercised that right, to legislate on the subject if they wish to do so.

There can be no comparison between the substitute and the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan on this point. The substitute is a reasoned, moderate approach in accord with national policy and recognition of State sovereignty.

The pending bill by removing all restraints on union coercion and abuses would eventually force all workingmen into unions; by its removal of the ban on foremen and supervisory unionization, it would encourage the same unions to move up vertically into successive steps of management. By approving the closed shop and compulsory unionism and by destroying contrary State laws, it would make it lawful, throughout the Nation, to force all these people, rank, file, and management, into the unions and subject to their fines, rules, and assessments. That bill would not merely restore the Wagner Act—it goes much further. If its objective is gained then the bosses of the unions and not Congress will run the country.

The time allotted to me does not permit full analysis, but I invite attention to the concessions the substitute bill makes by relaxing the ban on secondary boycotts to permit unions to refuse to process their own unions struck work; to the clarification of the 60-day-notice provision; to reinstating the right of economic strikers to vote; to extending the filing time for financial reports; to clarifying injunction procedure.

We retain and clarify the national emergency provisions of existing law and we keep the Conciliation Service as an independent agency rather than making it an arm of the Labor Department.

Before I close I wish to point out the exact situation in which the Members find themselves:

When H. R. 4290 is offered as a substitute for the pending bill, you can vote either for or against its substitution. If you vote for it you know you are voting for a complete, consistent and integrated bill that conforms to the Democratic platform and regulates both employer and union in the public interest. It meets numerous of the objections that union leaders leveled against Taft-Hartley. There is nothing in it that the individual workingman will find onerous or to his disadvantage—on the contrary, it protects him against both unfair employers and unfair union bosses. If it is substituted for the pending bill then it is open to such amendments as the membership may direct.

If, however, the substitute is voted down, the Members will be faced with the gravest responsibility and a most difficult situation. Will the House rubber-stamp the bill which the committee rubber-stamped? Such action would be a national tragedy.

There would be no more certain way of enserfing the workingman to union bosses, of bringing on a wave of strikes, terrorism, and economic upheaval than by the adoption of the pending bill. If we adopted that as law the determined and arrogant national and international union officials could, and would, say truthfully:

> We wrote a Federal law behind the scenes that took all restraints and all responsibilities off us, a law that gives us even more power than the original Wagner Act, a law that throws State laws into the ashcan. We let the committee go through the form of holding hearings, but we made it take our law, our license to rule the country, lock, stock, and barrel, without changing a comma or a semicolon; we made the United States House of Representatives swallow it. We can get what we want, when we want it, and as we want it. Go ahead—the sky's the limit—we're boss.

It is inconceivable that this House will let them say that; that this House will condone union coercion, or betray its pledge to rid unions of communism, or turn millions of dollars of welfare funds over to the unregulated manipulation of union bosses, or embrace the manifold other iniquities of the pending bill.

But those evils are its warp and its woof. They permeate virtually every section of it. Amending them out of it is an almost impossible task. A modern labor bill is not and cannot be a simple statute. Of necessity it must deal with many issues as both of these bills do. Its parts are interrelated and interdependent.

I say to you that if you believe that in the heat of debate, and in Committee of the Whole, this House can rewrite the pending bill to put into it what should be in it, and take out of it what should not be there, you are mistaken. We would end up with a conglomerate hodgepodge that would be a disgrace to our legislative record.

Perhaps the sires of the pending bill and those who have sought to reduce a committee with an illustrious record to a puppet, planned for that chaos—but that is not what the American people want.

The American people want a fair, a workable, a consistent bill, a bill that eliminates unnecessary restrictions in Taft-Hartley, but insures that unions will be responsible agencies; a bill that protects against national emergencies—that is the bill I hope to tender as a substitute.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, as always on a controversial issue, there is more heat than light, and especially on an issue of such magnitude and importance as is the one now before us for consideration. So in the words of the prophet, I plead with you, "Come, let us reason together."

The welfare of every home and individual in America will be vitally affected by the vote we take on this measure of paramount importance.

If we vote for the Lesinski bill, the first result will be to abolish free speech. No longer can an employer in any industry talk to an employee about labor relations.

The second thing we will do will be to revive and permit secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes that have caused so much havoc in the days gone by. Is it not strange that under the Taft-Hartley law all industry everywhere has had the highest percentage of employment, the highest wages, the best living conditions, and the best working conditions that ever existed in any country?

Millions in foreign nations have come to us, and millions more are eagerly awaiting the chance to come here.

No one I have found in this country wants to become a citizen in another country, but many in other countries have I personally seen, who want to come to us—so America cannot be too bad.

The third thing that will be accomplished if the Lesinski bill is passed will be to restore featherbedding, or compel the employer in an industry to pay for work that is never performed.

The fourth thing will be to deny the employer in any industry the right to petition for an election to settle a dispute between two unions, which dispute could hold up the production to the extent of destroying the industry and also making the general public suffer. Once again we will have one union fighting another with both industry and the public, including the laboring men themselves, paying the price for internecine warfare. Everybody will suffer and each one of us will help pay the cost.

The fifth thing is that we will absolutely prohibit the ban on the closed shop and destroy States' rights, and go contrary-wise to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States whereby it has been ruled that each State shall have the right to determine for itself whether or not it shall have a closed shop. Particularly to my friends from the South—and I have Tennessee and Kentucky blood in me—I can appreciate your position on many issues—that is one of the main points in this bill and the one which you should roll over in your minds most seriously.

The sixth point is that if you pass the proposed legislation you will absolutely remove the necessity of any employer or any employee's taking an anti-Communist oath.

Who is back of this bill? It may be said by proponents of the legislation that if you vote down the Wood substitute then you can offer amendments to correct and strengthen the Lesinski bill, but I declare to you that such a thing is impossible. The present bill needs not a doctor but an undertaker. After listening to the iron logic, the irrefutable argument of the very able and distinguished lawyer, the ex-judge, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, yesterday, you know that it is not within the realm of possibility to do such a thing. You have one choice on this legislation: You take the Wood bill, or you

take the Lesinski bill; there is no other choice, and do not be fooled by any demagoguery or emotional appeal to the contrary.

Let us review this legislation a little. What led to the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act? During the war years when we forgot our petty jealousies and differences, when management and labor, Democrat and Republican, Old Dealer and New Dealer, and all of us joined hands and hearts and heads and fought side by side, when your sons and brothers were dying on foreign fields for the sake of liberty, we cooperated, we worked together. I know there are some buccaneers in business and some racketeers in labor, but I believe the majority of businessmen and laboring men in this country are intelligent, patriotic Americans capable of putting the welfare of their country above their own private profits or personal fortunes. We fought in that war, but we were so busily engaged in producing tanks, planes, guns, and munitions of war that we had little time to produce refrigerators, washing machines, automobiles, electrical appliances, or even clothing, and food, and the other durable and consumer goods in this country to meet our domestic demand.

When the war ended almost 4 years ago, the 8th of next months in Germany, and 4 months later, in Japan in 1945, we thought that because of the accumulative savings of the American people due to enormous war profits and exorbitant wages—time and time-and-a-half for overtime—due to the accumulation of bank deposits, of war bonds, of life insurance policies, due to the accumulative shortages during those war years, there would be ushered in after VJ- and VE-day a great era of prosperity.

Certainly there never was such a market, such a demand for consumer goods and durable goods ever before in our history and never was there such purchasing power in the hands and in the pockets of the American people. We had the market, we had the demand for goods, we had the money with which to buy them, but we could not get them. And for over a year following VJ-day our program of reconversion and recovery was stymied and bogged down. Why? Because of an epidemic of strikes.

First, there was the UAW strike, then the steel strike, the telephone operators' strike, the elevator operators' strike, the coal strike, then the railroad strike and a threatened maritime strike—one strike after another that had absolutely bogged this Nation down in an industrial and commercial paralysis. The transportation of this Nation was tied in a hard knot until the people in our populous centers, such as New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, St. Louis—all over the Nation—were threatened with starvation. Why? This conflict between labor and capital did not start overnight. It began back with the sit-down strikes in Detroit years before the outbreak of this last global conflict. The New Deal pampered, courted, coddled, and encouraged those sit-down strikes in order to get votes to maintain itself in political power. That is what happened. We all witnessed those days when they confiscated profits and when they threw employers out or carried them out, as they did Sewell Avery. They smashed windows, destroyed property and cracked heads. Talk about human rights.

We remember how this little boy who called himself Eugene Dennis, but who in reality was a boy named Frankie Waldron, the gray-haired traitor, the blue-eyed deceiver, a miserable failure in his own town, who stole another man's wife, who changed his name, who violated the laws of the United States and went on a fraudulent passport abroad, who came back and encouraged those people up in the Allis-Chalmers factory in Milwaukee to strike and hold up that plant, which was making critical war munitions, for 76 days, the most costly work stoppage in all of our war production. We know what these series of strikes have done. And we know the rats and conspirators who are back of them.

This House passed the antilabor racketeering bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. It also passed the Case bill introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota, but the President vetoed it. Had this legislation become law at that time we would not have suffered all the turmoil we have had in recent months.

I do not want men here to misunderstand me. I believe in the right of labor to organize, I believe in unions, I believe in collective bargaining—genuine, true, decent, honest collective bargaining—I believe in the right of labor to strike; but I also believe in the right of labor to work. I do not believe that any minority selfish group in this country should place its rights and privileges above the general public welfare. I think that the American public is bigger than any segment of our population.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. SHORT. No; I come from Missouri, in that part of the State where Arkansas laps over into Missouri. I come from "lapland."

Mr. O'TOOLE. The gentleman failed to recall how the American people struck in the last November election, and how hard they struck.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, I am awfully glad the gentleman from New York mentioned that. There was no verdict given last November. Only 60 percent of the registered voters of this country cast their ballots, and Harry Truman received 500,000 less than a majority cast for his opponents. That is no mandate. And labor was only one issue. You Democrats did not win the election. We Republicans lost it. We failed to join an issue. Those of us who fought won. Those who pussyfooted or compromised lost. We deserved what we got.

You are right. But the labor question was not the only question in the campaign. You cannot befog our minds or becloud the issues. I have been further back under the barn hunting eggs than the gentleman from New York has been away from home. I do not want him to lecture me about what the election was about. We have had a lot of these things occur. No doubt they will occur again, perhaps in reverse.

Now, let us see what happened. After VE-day and after VJ-day we had this series of epidemics of strikes, did we not? The situation became so bad that the President of the United States—listen—in May 1946, 1 year after VE-day, 8 months after the capitulation of Japan, because of an aroused citizenry that brought its holy wrath down upon the heads of our Government—it was Harry Truman, my fellow Missourian, of whom I am personally very fond—I have had good times with him both on and off the record—but it was Harry Truman who proposed the most radical and drastic slave labor bill that was ever offered by anyone in this Nation. It was he who wanted to draft labor, men off the railroads. I might say three of my sisters married railroad men who belong to the ORC and the BRT. I am for the unions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. No; I cannot yield now. I will a little later. My time is running out.

The President wanted to draft them into the Army of the United States, and this House, in a fit of hysteria—and that is what the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Labor Committee, my good friend, Mr. LESINSKI, must have been thinking about yesterday when he talked about hysteria—this House voted overwhelmingly for that radical, vicious piece of labor legislation, and, thank God, it was due only to the intelligence and the courage of BOB TAFT and two or three others over in the other body who held that legislation up for 2 or 3 days until the atmosphere could be cleared, until tempers could cool, that they prohibited the passage of such a measure. If there is one man in the country to whom labor is indebted it is the senior Senator from Ohio. Republicans went to work and they worked out the Taft-Hartley law. They passed it, and you know how they passed it. They passed it by a vote of four to one in this House and by more than two-thirds majority in the Senate. The figures have been given you. Oh, how can the chairman of your Labor Committee say that this House rushed it through? There were 6 weeks' debate in the committee on the Taft-Hartley law, the substance of it, and you had 10 days by a subcommittee on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. That is how it was rushed through. So I suppose that not only 331 Members of the House but the 68 Members of the Senate were swept off their feet. There were 225 Republicans and 106 Democrats in this House who voted to override the veto, and there were 20 Democrats and 48 Republicans in the Senate who voted to override it.

Now, then, I do not want us to pass vicious and penal legislation that would force the American workingman into servitude. But I have always believed, and I still believe, that labor unions should be incorporated and held liable for damages and made responsible for their acts the same as any corporation.

Labor has become the biggest business in this country. I hold no brief for the sins of industry in the past, but the pendulum has swung to the other extreme. I do not want to see a small group of labor racketeers take over this country. I am for the rank and file of laboring men.

In spite of poisonous propaganda, the Taft-Hartley law is the emancipation of the laboring man. Amend it? Yes; to be helpful. Repeal it? No; to aid labor racketeers and destroy our country. Union leaders also should be compelled to give an accounting of the receipts and expenditures of all moneys.

Violence should be outlawed and goon squads abolished. Labor unions, the same as corporations, should be prohibited from making political contributions. In other words, fairness and justice should be meted out to all alike. Contracts should be sacredly kept. A contract is an agreement that is binding upon both parties. Unless it is binding on both, it is no longer a contract. Every player should abide by the rules of the game. We should not have one set of rules for one club and another set for the other. The sauce that is good for the goose is likewise good for the gander.

It is to be hoped, though after many years in this body you are overwhelmed with a sense of futility after running your head repeatedly into a stone wall, that we can enact permanent labor legislation that will deal out equal, impartial, and fair justice to all. Why should not the different segments of our society be treated alike, and why should one particular class be set aside for personal or prejudiced consideration?

History has proved and experience has shown that free labor has always outworked and out-produced slave labor. If there is one lesson the last war taught us it was that free labor here in America, which we refused to draft, produced more than all the conscript or slave labor of Germany, Italy, and Japan. You cannot dig coal with a bayonet and you cannot run a train with a shotgun. As a friend of labor, I do not want to see any imposition such as that placed upon it. I want it to be free so that in this country every man can walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of magic days the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

If we repeal the Taft-Hartley law, or unless we pass this substitute Wood bill, that changes the name of that law and offers certain corrective amendments which the authors of the Taft-Hartley law themselves are willing to accept, but which will maintain the substance of fair dealing and fair play between employer and employee, between management and labor, and at the same time protect the general welfare of the public, I predict, and I am no prognosticator, that within a few months' time you will see once more economic anarchy restored in this country, with the confusion, the hate, and class bitterness engendered that made it necessary for the President of the United States to offer his most drastic proposal, to draft men from industry into the armed services of the United States.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, Captain Truman and Colonel Johnson have scuttled the proudly named U. S. S. *United States*.

The Secretary of Defense abandons a major military weapon without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy. Suppose, in time of war, he were to operate in such a fashion? Might not our national security be gravely endangered?

Whatever may be the merits of this controversy, Captain Truman has reversed himself and driven one more nail into the coffin where lies his original pledge of congressional cooperation.

This anti-Navy administration can just as quickly—and without advance notice—abolish the Marine Corps and naval aviation.

For years the White House and the departments have not been telling the public what goes on. Now they do not even tell each other.

No wonder it is hard to get self-respecting men to serve in major capacities in the National Defense Establishment.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARST].

Mr. KARST. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and to speak on behalf of the speedy passage of the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032, without amendments.

There are many compelling reasons why the House should erase the Taft-Hartley Act from the books. Some of these reasons are based on highly technical considerations and complicated aspects of law and administrative regulation. I will deal with some of these matters at a later point.

Before taking these matters up, however, I wish to deal with certain aspects of the Taft-Hartley Act which override the legal and the technical. First, I am against the Taft-Hartley Act because of the spirit which animates it. Good legislation in a democratic society preserves the fundamental principle that parties to a dispute have equality before the law. The Taft-Hartley Act does violence to this principle. In my opinion, and in the opinion of both committees of the House and Senate which have considered the matter, the act is one-sided, discriminatory and, in net effect, pernicious in its intent and application.

A law that places the power of government on the side of any party to a dispute cannot be defended on either legal or ethical grounds. A law of that kind truly is destructive of democratic processes. A law that sets out to do that—and its sponsors have admitted that that was its basic purpose—cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered a good law. That kind of law making can only have the effect of undermining the faith of our people in the democratic system.

I have another basic objection to the continuance of the Taft-Hartley Act. I do not believe that Congress, if it is to function truly as a representative body, can set itself up as the arbiter of what is good and what is bad for the people. The Congress under our system has a solemn obligation to act on the basis of the expressed will of the people. When the Taft-Hartley Act was originally passed we were told—by its proponents and by the now discredited poll takers—that this was the kind of labor legislation the people wanted. I doubted the truth of that assertion at the time. My doubts have been confirmed. During the election campaign of last summer and fall the question of the retention or rejection of the Taft-Hartley Act was a major issue. The Democratic Party clearly and unequivocally stated its opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act and in the campaign asked the people whether or not they wished the act retained or not. The Republican Party, which had sponsored the Taft-Hartley Act, sought somewhat evasively, to defend the act before the electorate. The choice of the people was clear and unmistakable. They voted overwhelmingly for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. I think that more than a fulfillment of a campaign promise is involved here. The very integrity of the Congress is at stake. We cannot function as a representative body unless we carry out the will of the people. We cannot thwart the expressed desire of the majority and still claim to be representative. We cannot accede to the pressure of minority special interest groups, no matter how powerful, and still retain our democratic system of government.

Those sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act in the Eightieth Congress told the country that the act would bring great benefits to both labor and management. It has brought great benefits to management, at least to the great corporations, but it most certainly has not helped the laboring people of this country. On the contrary, this legal monstrosity called the Taft-Hartley Act has disrupted labor relations more than any other labor law ever passed by the Congress. It has, through the use of power of government on the side of employers, created a condition whereby the normal collective bargaining has virtually been thrown into a state of chaos.

The months since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act constitute a black chapter in the history of Federal labor legislation. Under the act, the whole weight of the Federal Government has been employed to upset existing collective-bargaining arrangements, to curb the orderly development of collective bargaining and in sum to adversely affect the basic rights and interests of the working people of this Nation.

To properly understand and judge the Taft-Hartley Act we cannot take the view that the act merely changed certain previous rights and obligations of employers and labor organizations. The act has actually completely changed the course of labor relations in this country. It has, and that was its intention, strengthened the more antilabor groups among employers. It gave this group, which had openly and covertly fought the Wagner Act, new hope of breaking the unions. The act fundamentally changed

the attitude of industry toward collective bargaining.

Legislation such as the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be judged solely in terms of its language or the formal orders of the agency set up to administer it. It must be judged on the basis of the attitudes it creates. Those of you who follow the business press know how fundamental the change in the attitude of employers toward sound labor legislation has been since the passage of the act. Whereas before the passage employers generally had come to accept the necessity of dealing with their employees through unions of their own choosing, the Taft-Hartley Act stimulated them to reject collective bargaining out of hand. It has brought about conditions whereby an act of this Congress has been effectively used by employers as leverage to force unions to give up legitimate and equitable bargaining demands and, by contorting the provisions of the act, to hamper and harass organized labor at every turn.

It has been stated by proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act that the restrictions on labor unions feared by labor have not come to pass. Although the effect of the act on labor organization has been serious, and it has been demonstrated to be a bad law, the full effect of the act has not yet been felt. This has come about because certain employers—more specifically, the great corporations—have not yet made full use of the act's antiunion potentialities. Whatever the reason—whether out of fear of demonstrating the real nature of the law or because of the favorable profit picture—nevertheless the testimony on this aspect of the question at the Senate committee hearings prove that the Taft-Hartley Act can, and in all probability will be used to destroy labor organizations at such time as employers see fit to do so. This is confirmed by the observation of a Republican member of the Senate committee who said:

> As one reads the testimony he finds management witnesses confessing, under cross-examination, that the most restrictive uses of the Taft-Hartley Act will come when unemployment becomes widespread.

I must confess that I am not surprised at the effect of the act to date and its dire potentialities. The experience under the act has merely confirmed much of the criticism directed against it when it was under consideration in the Eightieth Congress. Farsighted members of the then minority party pointed out at the time that instead of ameliorating problems between capital and labor the act would intensify them. They said that the major result of the legislation would be to create misunderstanding and a rebirth of aggressive antiunionism. They pointed out that the Taft-Hartley Act would put labor at an unfair disadvantage in the collective bargaining process.

The evidence heard by the labor committees of the House and Senate show clearly that the act was not, as originally claimed, an effort to improve the Wagner Act. It was in fact a complete reversal of our national labor policy. From 1932 when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed, to 1935, when the National Labor Relations Act became law all Federal labor legislation was based on the principle that it was the responsibility of Congress to create conditions under which the right of working people to organize and bargain collectively was protected. Congress took cognizance of this matter because of the proven opposition of large employers to the unionization of their employees. The Wagner Act expressed the will of the Congress that workers must be protected in their exercise of full freedom of association, self organization, and the designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment. In other words, the Wagner Act, like any good law, protected the majority from the predatory designs of a minority.

The Taft-Hartley Act is based on an entirely different legal principle. In effect it reverses the basic concept of the Wagner Act. It interferes with and restricts collective bargaining. It hampers the exercise by workers of their right to join labor organizations of their own choosing. It sets up a competing system of individual bargaining. It places in the hands of the employers a federally sponsored legal mechanism with which to impede the normal and legitimate operation of trade unions.

In much the same way as Mr. Hitler made a falsehood a seeming truth—by repeating the falsehood over and over again until the public came to believe it—the propagandists for the Taft-Hartley Act have sought to make people believe that the National Labor Relations Act was in fact inequitable. They said it placed all the power of the Government on the side of labor. A slick piece of propaganda, it fails to conform to the facts. The National Labor Relations Act, by guaranteeing the right of collective bargaining to labor, merely equalized the economic relationship between employer and employee. It made it possible, for the first time in American labor history, for a trade union through collective bargaining to win benefits for its members more nearly approaching the economic status generally described as the American standard of living. It brought to labor a greater sense of dignity and assured labor of greater purchasing power, thereby strengthening the economic well-being of the country as a whole. Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act, on the other hand, by limiting and impeding collective bargaining, and by weighing the bargaining scales in favor of the employer, has undermined the living standards of the American worker, consequently adversely affecting the national economy.

An examination of the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act makes it clear that the one-sided character of the Act is no mere claim of its opponents. I would like to summarize some of the ways in which the law is loaded against unions.

In order to give the House some indication of the effect of the Taft-Hartley Act it would, I believe, be helpful for me to summarize the findings of the committees of the House and Senate which have recently concluded hearings on this legislation. The testimony presented at these hearings proves that the act has had a number of serious adverse effects.

For one thing, the act has practically brought the organization of the unorganized to a halt. The organization of new members into all of the major labor organizations has slowed down to a rate almost equal to their normal losses due to death and retirement from industry. The Taft-Hartley Act, as was its intention, has made the organization of workers extremely difficult. Employers are without question using the act, with increasing effectiveness, as a means to prevent workers from joining labor organizations.

The Taft-Hartley Act is also responsible for forcing strikes upon labor unions. Three types of strikes have been produced by the act:

First. It has vastly increased the number of so-called organizational strikes. Whereas, under the Wagner Act unions could obtain recognition and bargaining rights without resorting to the strike weapon, under the Taft-Hartley Act it has been virtually necessary for them to take such action.

Second. A second type of strike attributable to the Taft-Hartley Act is the strike created by the terms of the law itself. By forbidding contracts containing closed shops or union-security provisions, strikes have been forced upon workers to retain basic union security. In these instances, notably in the printing industry, long-established employer-employee relations have been disrupted.

Third. A third group of strikes under the act have been caused by disputes over economic issues which could have been adjudicated had employers not found the strike-breaking provisions of the act so attractive as to make a forced strike inevitable.

Most important of all of the effects of the Taft-Hartley Act has been that it has encouraged employers to evade contract standards and to become wholly uncooperative in the settlement of major and minor grievances. They have felt, and perhaps rightly under the act, that it was no longer necessary to continue the give-and-take of collective bargaining. They have come to the conclusion that the Congress of the United States no longer viewed fair dealing between employer and employee to be of any importance.

Aside from the equities in the matter, I think the Congress should by now realize that Government sanction to the unrestrained use of the economic power of the employer is not good for the country. When workers are unable to effectively bargain it is inevitable that they will receive a smaller share of the economic benefits of modern industrial production. By creating inequality in bargaining power the Taft-Hartley Act has unquestionably prevented labor unions from closing the gap between workers' living costs and industry's earnings. It has without question made it easier for industry to deny justified wage increases. The economic effects of this are to decrease the purchasing power of the people as a whole. Congress cannot long condone a situation in which the bulk of the population is denied the just share

of the national income. To do so is to undermine the very basis of our prosperity.

It is a mistaken notion that only labor has suffered and will continue to suffer under the Taft-Hartley Act. The people of this Nation as a whole have felt and will continue to feel its adverse effects.

In coming to the conclusion that the best interests of the country as a whole required repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and readoption of a national labor policy similar to that of the Wagner Act, the views of disinterested persons have impressed me greatly. For example, the distinguished former Chairman of the National Mediation Board, Dr. William M. Leiserson, said:

> I think the Taft-Hartley law needs to be repealed and the Wagner Act restored, and the reason for that is the Wagner Act established a Government policy of collective bargaining, whereas the Taft-Hartley law starts off on an entirely different track, which I consider a bad track.

Dr. Leiserson was buttressed by the testimony of William H. Davis, distinguished lawyer and former Chairman of the National War Labor Board. Dr. Davis said flatly that he did not believe that Congress should preserve the Taft-Hartley bill.

The proponents of the act themselves have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the Taft-Hartley Act was not all it was cracked up to be. There were admissions at both Senate and House committees from avowed proponents that a considerable number of its provisions had had unfair consequences, disrupted even the most rudimentary form of collective bargaining. Employer witnesses listed as many as 14 distinct provisions in this category and recommended amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act to make it what they called more workable.

As the consideration of labor legislation develops in this House, I think it safe to predict that the proponents for retention of the Taft-Hartley Act will seek to make it more palatable by agreeing to amend the present act. The trouble with the Taft-Hartley Act is not in technical details. Its trouble lies in the spirit behind it, and no amount of amending can change that. The only sensible solution is to once and for all rid ourselves of the Taft-Hartley Act. The only honorable course of action is to enact the Thomas-Lesinski bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, common decency and justice to the working people of America demand the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. That law was a central issue in the national election 6 months ago. The promise of outright repeal was written into the platform of the Democratic Party. I campaigned squarely upon that platform. The people in their wisdom placed a Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress. The Taft-Hartley law was tested by their votes and found wanting. The judgment rendered by the people in November we seek to put into effect today.

Two years of experience with Taft-Hartley legislation in the industrial arena were enough to convince the American people that a serious mistake had been made. Let us not prolong the error. Let us repair the damage and build securely upon the foundation of the basic labor code that brought strength and dignity to the American labor movement.

The Taft-Hartley law opened a Pandora's box of evil things for organized labor. In a most subtle and sinister way it has poisoned the atmosphere of labor-management relationships and marked out new areas of industrial conflict. Continuation of the Taft-Hartley law, or an equally bad alternative, means a perpetual cold war between labor and management. If we are sincere in our search for industrial harmony, if we would do more than give lip service to free collective bargaining, then we will erase the Taft-Hartley law from the statute books.

I will not do what others have done better in this House—recite in detail the defects of the Taft-Hartley law, its harmful workings, and its gross inequities. My plea today is for perspective and understanding of the American labor movement that has been built slowly and painfully through the years, to become a vital living part of American democracy. I do not condone its occasional excesses nor overlook its faults, but I remind you that the American standard of living we enjoy today and proclaim with pride to the world is the result of struggle and sacrifice by free working men and women acting together for their mutual welfare.

Those who foisted the Taft-Hartley law on the Nation in a time of public confusion and doubt have depicted organized labor as the bane of industrial life. In the name of the individual worker they have attempted to weaken and destroy the bargaining power of organized workers. The individual worker, whether he belong to a union or not, enjoys the fruits that have been won through the collective action of labor. The Taft-Hartley law is put forth by its proponents as the bill of rights for the individual worker despite the enduring truth that American workers have gained their honored position in the industrial life of the Nation by acting in concert through their unions.

The spirit of the Taft-Hartley Act is a malevolent one—to create dissension and dissatisfaction within the ranks of labor, to turn each worker against his brother, and all against their chosen leaders.

Reams of material come across my desk from great corporations, like General Electric Co., urging the retention of the Taft-Hartley law. Loaded questionnaires and carefully worded polls, with answers dictated by mentors and spokesmen of big business, are attempting to build up a body of opinion to support this corporate position. General Electric, with its scores of plants, its employees numbering in the thousands, its assets measured in the millions, can by a simple business decision influence the livelihood of whole communities and their peoples. Do we want the individual worker to stand up against his gigantic corporate employer without the full protection of his union?

Great corporations are known to weather economic depressions by all manner of protective devices. Concentration of economic power and monopoly control are not curbed but often accelerated when business falls off. What about the people who work for a living? Many of them are uneasy about the shadow of depression that lurks in the distance. They see ominous signs here and there—soft spots in the economy that spell periods of unemployment. Let us not burden them with the complicated restrictions of the Taft-Hartley law. Let us not ask them to face an uncertain future like soldiers with hands tied behind their backs. The Taft-Hartley law must go, so that labor once again can sit at the bargaining table free from compulsion and restraint, and organized workers do what they have rightfully done in the past to advance their welfare and livelihood.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, almost a year ago the Democratic Party met in convention at Philadelphia. The Democratic Party adopted its platform at that convention. I want to quote to you from one of the planks of that platform:

> We advocate the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress over the President's veto. That act was proposed with the promise that it would secure "the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce." It has failed. * * * * * * we advocate such legislation as is desirable to establish a just body of rules to assure free and effective collective bargaining, to determine, in the public interest, the rights of employees and employers, to reduce to a minimum their conflict of interests, and to enable unions to keep their membership free from communistic influences.

Now we all know that Harry S. Truman swept to Democratic victory on the basis of this platform. He advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of a fair law at every whistle stop in this country. When he returned to Washington after his victory, he was requested by the Democratic Members of the Congress for his recommendations to carry out the labor-platform pledges of the Democratic Party. These recommendations were made. A bill embodying them was introduced in the Senate and in this House. Its number is H. R. 2032, the Thomas-Lesinski bill before this House at the present time.

Then there is another bill which some Members of this House are attempting to bring before us at the present time in competition with the Thomas-Lesinski bill. This other bill goes under the number of H. R. 4290. It was introduced by a Democrat, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD]. But, Mr. Chairman, let no one be deceived as to the source of this bill or as to the nature of its provisions. H. R. 4290 contains virtually all of the objectionable features of the Taft-Hartley Act, making only slight concessions in some respects and actually

strengthening these objectionable features in other respects.

The point I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is the source of H. R. 4290. This Wood bill has a little history to it. It was first introduced as H. R. 3228, on March 3, 1949, at about the time when the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor was holding hearing on the Thomas-Lesinski bill. This early Wood bill was considered by the subcomittee. It was also considered by the full committee. In fact, before the full committee voted to report out the Thomas-Lesinski bill, they had the Wood bill before them—not on motion of Mr. WOOD, mind you, even though he is a member of this committee—but on the motion of a Republican, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL]. The committee rejected this Republican motion that the Wood bill be substituted for the Thomas-Lesinski bill. Afterward the Thomas-Lesinski bill was reported favorably by a Democratic majority in support of the party pledge of the Democratic platform.

We have here, Mr. Chairman, in the form of the Wood bill, another example of an unholy alliance to defeat the mandate of the people when they swept the Democratic Party to victory at the polls on the basis of this platform pledge.

When the Lesinski bill came before the Rules Committee, a move to substitute the Wood bill was defeated. As a result, the authors of this original bill tinkered some more with its provisions, attempted to put a new face on it, and the measure was reintroduced as H. R. 4290.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4290, the latest version of the Wood bill, is the Republican program for keeping the Taft-Hartley Act under a different name. Although this bill purports to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to recommend the Wagner Act with amendments, these amendments and the various titles of the Wood bill would reenact, in substance, the corresponding titles of the Taft-Hartley Act. This repeal provision of the Wood bill is an insult to the intelligence of Members of this House. Mr. WOOD and his Republican colleagues have simply taken that old wolf, the Taft-Hartley Act, and dressed it up, hoping to make it look like a gentle little grandmother, in an effort to dupe the American people and the Members of this Congress. Just as in that old story of Little Red Riding Hood, if the people of this country and the Members of the Congress were to say, "But what big teeth you have, Grandmother!" the wolf would jump out of bed explaining, "All the better to do a job on labor, my dear!"

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Wood bill, H. R. 4290, still has the Taft-Hartley Act teeth in it—in fact, some of them have been sharpened up—and do not let it fool you.

These charges which I make against the Wood bill are supported in a form in which every Member of the House can see the truth for himself. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has made available to all of the Members of this House a detailed analysis of the Wood bill, covering 20 major features. The chairman has also made available a comparative chart, showing what the Taft-Hartley Act provides, what the Wood bill provides, and what the Thomas-Lesinski bill provides on every major point in issue. If you will examine this chart and this excellent analysis, your doubts will be set at rest. I want to review these major points for your benefit.

One of the worst features of the Taft-Hartley Act is the revival of the Federal labor injunction. The Wood bill grants broad authority to the General Counsel to secure these labor injunctions in unfair labor-practice cases even before a complaint has been issued and before any hearings or other action has been taken by the National Labor Relations Board. The courts would be empowered to issue ex parte temporary restraining orders without giving the party to be enjoined any notice or opportunity to be heard.

The Federal labor injunctions would also be continued, as under the Taft-Hartley Act, in the case of national emergencies. Here the President would be required to get an injunction even before he could use any emergency machinery to settle the dispute.

The Federal labor injunction, as under the Taft-Hartley Act, would be used for enforcing restrictions on welfare funds and the check-off as provided for under the Wood bill.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been condemned time and again for setting up a General Counsel, independent of the National Labor Relations Board, to act as a super policeman over management and labor. The Wood bill not only keeps these provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act but also keeps in office the present General Counsel, Robert N. Denham, until the end of his present term of office.

The Taft-Hartley Act outlaws the closed shop and requires an election to authorize a particular kind of union shop under which no employee may be discharged for union sabotage so long as he offers to pay his dues. Under the Taft-Hartley Act more restrictive State laws of union security in any State are made the Federal law for interstate industries in that State. All of these provisions are continued by the Wood bill, which outlaws the closed shop and continues the union shop. Minor concessions are made by permitting employers to notify unions of job openings, but the hiring hall and other preferential hiring practices are still being banned. Although the bill slightly relaxes election requirements for the union shop, these elections would still be permitted to rescind authority for the union-shop agreement, even though the history under the Taft-Hartley Act has shown that these elections are completely unnecessary. As under the Taft-Hartley Act, more restrictive State laws on union security would prevail.

The union-shop provisions of the Wood bill add two more grounds upon which employees may be discharged for engaging in wildcat strikes or for membership in or support of the Communist Party or any subversive organization. This last provision would require the National Labor Relations Board to determine in each case whether union members have supported the Communist Party. No provision of the Taft-Hartley Act goes as far as this.

The Taft-Hartley Act permits the closed shop and the maintenance-of-membership shop under contracts existing when the act became effective. These agreements would be immediately outlawed under the Wood bill. This would disrupt existing collective-bargaining agreements in many basic industries and create new and serious problems where none exist today even under the Taft-Hartley Act.

On secondary boycotts the Taft-Hartley Act outlaws all such boycotts regardless of whether they are for the purpose of protecting the legitimate interests of a union in maintaining decent wages, hours, and working conditions. In general, the Wood bill contains the same provision as the Taft-Hartley Act. The only change made by the bill is to permit secondary boycotts against the substitute manufacture of struck goods; but then only if, first, the employer agrees in advance to the boycott in a written contract; and, second, the struck goods would have been worked on by other members of the same local union who were on strike.

On jurisdictional disputes the Taft-Hartley Act makes them an unfair labor practice and provides a means for settling the dispute. The Wood bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act, but completely omits any provision whatever for settling the dispute through the National Labor Relations Board.

The Taft-Hartley Act bans peaceful picketing. The Wood bill retains these prohibitions.

The Taft-Hartley Act wipes out the protection given to labor under the Norris-LaGuardia Act by providing that unions may be responsible for the acts or omissions of strikers, for example, regardless of whether these acts were authorized or ratified by the union. At the same time the Taft-Hartley Act narrows employer responsibility in unfair-labor-practice cases. These provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are retained in the Wood bill.

The Taft-Hartley Act authorizes the President to obtain injunctions in national emergencies while attempting to settle the dispute through the use of boards of inquiry. The Wood bill continues the same boards of inquiry, but requires the President to secure the injunction before he can appoint such a board.

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits employees from voting in an election under the National Labor Relations Act if they are not entitled to reinstatement. The Wood bill continues these provisions except where the striker has been replaced for a shorter period than 90 days before the election. I might add here that the average period between the time of petition for an election and the election itself has been 168 days, thus giving the employers ample time for permanently depriving striking employees of their votes under the Wood bill.

The Taft-Hartley Act provides for suits by and against unions in the Federal courts and for damage suits for breach of collective-bargaining agreements. It

also authorizes damage suits against unions for engaging in secondary boycotts. The Wood bill continues these provisions.

The Taft-Hartley Act provides for an independent agency known as the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to settle labor disputes. The Wood bill contains the same provisions creating this independent agency.

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits the check-off of union membership dues, except under certain conditions. The Wood bill contains more restrictive provisions on check-off than those in the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act makes it a criminal offense for an employer to contribute or the union to receive money for health and welfare funds, except under particular conditions. The Wood bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act on health and welfare funds.

The Taft-Hartley Act prevents the expression of views from being used as evidence of an unfair labor practice if the expression itself contains no threats of force or promise of benefit. The Wood bill strengthens this provision of the Taft-Hartley Act, making doubly certain that the free-speech provisions will not apply to assist unions in secondary boycott and related cases.

Coercion of employers and employees by unions as treated under the Taft-Hartley Act is continued without change under the Wood bill. A union would additionally be permitted, however, to face discharge in cases of wild strikes or of affiliation with the Communist Party or any subversive organization. Here again the National Labor Relations Board would again be required to engage in Communist witch hunts.

The Taft-Hartley Act gave no protection to supervisors or to employees of nonprofit hospitals or Federal Reserve banks. These unfair provisions are retained in the Wood bill, along with the Taft-Hartley Act provisions as to plant guards and professional employees.

The Taft-Hartley Act contained provisions requiring union registration and the filing of financial data. It required union officers to file non-Communist affidavits. It subjected unions under vague language to criminal penalties for making political expenditures. All of these provisions are taken over bodily in the Wood bill, with the addition that employers must file non-Communist affidavits too.

When it comes to elections, the Wood bill is like the Taft-Hartley Act in requiring them in many different circumstances. The Wood bill would continue these elections in at least six of the nine cases in which they would arise under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act required employers and unions mutually to bargain collectively and requires a 60-day notice of contract termination with loss of employee status for striking in this period. The Wood bill extends the 60-day notice to cover additional situations and omits specific provision for loss of status for striking.

And so it goes. One provision after another of the Wood bill is like or almost like the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. I have so far only mentioned about 20 of these provisions. There are a lot more. For example, the act and the Wood bill contain the same provisions on the rights of employees to refrain from organizing; on featherbedding; on initiation fees; on craft unions; on strikes by Government employees; on rules of evidence; and on a host of other subjects. All these provisions were enacted for the first time by the Taft-Hartley Act and would be written into law for the second time in the Wood bill.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for the Wood bill is a vote for the Taft-Hartley Act. A vote for any amendment to the Thomas-Lesinski bill which follows the language of the Wood bill is also a vote for the Taft-Hartley Act. This is a clear-cut issue. If any Members of this House desire to vote for the Taft-Hartley Act, then let them vote for some of these Wood bill type of amendments. For my part, I will have nothing to do with these Republican amendments. My vote will be cast for the Lesinski bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, probably the most significant and illuminating development of the last few weeks is the prevailing sentiment that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. The Democratic Party, more sensitive to the will of the people, made that objective one of its major planks in the successful campaign of 1948. The Republican Party has officially repudiated the Taft-Hartley Act and is rumored to be the putative father of the second Wood bill. Important organs of business opinion are shedding no tears at the bedside of that rapidly failing law. For example in its issue of December 18, 1948, Business Week, a publication of high and wide repute among businessmen, reported, "Few"—businessmen—"are wasting time deploring the doom of the Taft-Hartley Act." The general counsel of the Illinois Manufacturers Association publicly advised his clients that employers would suffer no great loss but would gain from the repeal of the major provisions of that law. It is apparent that its chief proponents are disclaiming paternity of this illegitimate progeny of the Eightieth Congress. The Ohio coauthor no longer loves the baby. Senator Ball does not live here any more. My predecessor, the former Congressman from the Tenth District of New Jersey, did not choose to run again.

This is an encouraging development. It augurs well for our democratic process. The people have spoken at the polls and it is our duty as their chosen representatives to respect and obey the voice of the people.

I am not an expert in constitutional law, nor am I an expert in labor-management relations. But I believe that one need not be an expert in the field of labor-management relations to know that a law is bad indeed if it is not harmonious with the customs and practices of our people. The Taft-Hartley law is not a fair law because it contradicts and runs counter to the principles underlying the emergence of labor unions, the development of the processes of collective bargaining and the sound practices which have been developed by the parties themselves. Labor unions grew out of the social and economic necessities of the people in an expanding mass-production society. Labor unions furnish the only democratic means whereby the fruits of our free-enterprise system can be equitably distributed amongst the people. Labor unions represent democracy at work through which the people themselves fashion the means to make modern industrial society congenial to the human spirit. Any law which threatens the existence of labor unions at the same time casts the shadow of doom over democracy itself. It is not without significance that in totalitarian countries the free labor union is absent. What passes as a labor union in those countries is an obscene facsimile of a free-labor union in a democratic society.

I say that the Taft-Hartley Act carries within itself the seeds of fascism because it repudiates the labor union as a socially desirable and economically necessary institution and denies the democratic vitality of the principle of collective bargaining. That law declares itself to be indifferent to the existence or nonexistence of labor unions and unconcerned whether we have collective bargaining or individual bargaining, as though the two contradictory processes may be equated as equals. As a result the law presents a dual personality, representing, as it were, a case of psychosis fashioned by a schizophrenic.

As Mr. Hartley hinted, this law really has more to it than meets the eye. For instance, the Court of Appeals in New York recently declared that this law was more solicitous of individual or minority-group bargaining than of collective bargaining and held that despite the existence of a duly certified agent, until the certified agent has consummated an agreement resolving a grievance, a minority group has the right to seek the aid of a rival union to achieve its settlement. I venture the opinion that this fantastic result was not foreseen by the authors of this law, nor was it anticipated by the skillful and brilliant legal draftsman employed by the Republican National Committee. Yet there it is, as pointed out by Judge Learned Hand, of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, in the Oppenheim Collins case. It would appear that the employer, though bound to deal exclusively with the certified union, must now also deal with a rival union in the adjustment of grievances presented by a minority group affiliated with the rival union. The decision of the court flows with logic and the promise of future confusion, from the contradictory nature of this law. But this is not all. The irony of this case is that the rival union was one whose officers refused to sign the non-Communist affidavit as required by the law, was denied a place on the ballot, and had been ousted as the collective-bargaining agent. And yet the employer in this case had to deal with this rival union with respect to a grievance over the discharge of certain employees. What makes this bewildering result of the Taft-Hartley Act even

more fantastic is the fact that the certified agent could not settle the grievance because the 51 discharged employees were members of the rival union. To add to this comedy of errors let me point out that a Taft-Hartley injunction had been secured by the General Counsel of the NLRB banning all picketing by the rival union and that a heavy fine for contempt of court for violating this injunction was reversed by the court of appeals on the ground that the law favors individual bargaining even in the presence of a certified union.

The facts in this strange case can be gathered from two opinions by the court. In *Douds* v. *Local 1250* (22 L.R.R.M. 2049, 170 F. (2d) 695) the court held that the rival union could be enjoined from picketing to induce the employer to bargain with the rival union because this was in violation of 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act. But when the lower court imposed a fine upon the rival union for picketing in violation of the injunction, the court reversed the order imposing the fine on the ground that under section 9 (a) of the act the rival union could represent individuals and groups of employees in the adjustment of those grievances not settled by a contract with the certified union. Said the court, through Learned Hand, chief judge:

> It was not an unfair labor practice under section 8 (b) (4) for the local—

The ousted rival Communist-dominated union—

> to try to induce other employees to strike as a sanction upon the employer to compel him to reinstate those employees. * * * It appears to us that, until the certified union had "adjusted" the question of reinstatement, the act did not take from the 51 members the right to do what they did under the aegis of the local. Possibly that is a defect in the plan as a whole; but we think that Congress knew what it meant, and expressed it in what seem to us inescapable terms.

I think the court said this with tongue in cheek, particularly when we bear in mind that the court also pointed out that "friction appears to us inevitable once the right granted by the proviso is conceded"—see *Douds* v. *Retail Store Union* (23 L.R.R.M. 2424).

I am sure you will agree that this is not conducive to the development of a sound policy of collective bargaining.

Let me direct your attention to another strange twist in this law—one which makes it virtually impossible to settle a strike when the employer has hired some replacements. In such a case the employer cannot agree to restore the strikers to their former jobs without discrimination or loss of seniority. This is so because to do so the employer must lay off the strikebreakers. But if he does this he is guilty of a violation of section 8 (a) (1) of the act, and probably 8 (a) (3) as well, since he has interfered with the strikebreakers' protected right to refrain from engaging in concerted activities. One need not be an expert in labor relations to know that under such legal circumstances, the employer cannot lay off the strikebreakers or even place them in their proper place at the bottom of the seniority list and that unless he does so none of the strikers will return to work. We thus have the spectacle of a law enacted for the avowed purpose of reducing industrial conflict and strikes working out in practice to create conflict and prolong strikes.

I have no doubt that these two illustrations are merely predictions of things to come. The plain fact is that this law was deliberately fashioned to reduce the security of established unions and to enable unprincipled employers to obstruct the growth of new unions in the unorganized sections of the country. Into a relationship which flourishes in an atmosphere of mutual trust and cooperation, this law has introduced mistrust, fear, resentment, and obstruction. The labor-management relation, like the marital relation, thrives as a result of mutual efforts to find common ground for the reconciliation of differences. But the Taft-Hartley law relies upon suppression, fear, and punishment as the means of inducing labor and management to work together. It is a false messiah. It brings back the unpalatable injunction, the damage suit, and the jail term as sanctions, though history and wisdom have repudiated them as solvents of industrial conflict. What is more odious to the workers is that it has massed governmental power on the side of management, which scarcely needs it, and against the workers.

These are some of the reasons why I think the workers voted as they did in favor of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Although they cannot articulate by neat syllogism the multiplicity of things which are wrong in the Taft-Hartley law, they know in their bones that it bodes them no good. And in this their intuitions and forebodings are surely right.

Because this law is antidemocratic and betrays its lack of confidence in the people, because it is wrong in principle, because it was enacted against the will of the governed, because it has been repudiated at the polls, I will vote for its repeal and for the reenactment of the Wagner Act with the amendments thereto as contained in H. R. 2032, and urge all of you to do likewise.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, on the occasions during the Eightieth Congress when the so-called Taft-Hartley bill was before this House for consideration, I fought and voted against it. It was wrong at that time and today most of those who voted for it will admit it.

As was stated in an editorial from Business Week of December 18, 1948, the Taft-Hartley law failed "on one of the most important grounds by which a law must be judged in a democratic society. That ground is consent. Only the police state can enforce a law which is believed to be unjust by the people it affects."

We now find the hastily prepared and too hastily considered Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947—the conference report of 73 pages was not made available to Members of this House by the Republican majority until 3 hours before it came up for action on the floor, and debate was limited to 1 hour—not only destroyed rights and privileges which had been acquired by labor during the previous 50 years, but deliberately took the very laws intended for the protection of the laboring man of our Nation and turned those laws around and aimed them at destroying organized labor.

It is the duty of this Eighty-first Congress to undo much of the legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress, which from the day it first convened forgot everybody but big business.

It was recently discovered that the Republican National Committee paid thousands of dollars for legal services in drafting the so-called Taft-Hartley Act, which admittedly was the brain child of the leadership of that party and counsel for big business.

This House now has the opportunity to not only repeal the Taft-Hartley Act but to substitute in its stead the Wagner Labor Relations Act. This cannot be done by your support of the so-called Wood bill, which purports to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, but which actually goes much further in depriving organized labor of rights and privileges justly earned over these many years.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to fully support the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032, which repeals the infamous Taft-Hartley law and reenacts the Wagner Act of 1935.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clear up one or two things that have been stated here in the course of this debate. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, and Eighty-first Congresses, I can say, first, that there were no hearings on the Taft-Hartley law for 6 weeks. I repeat that—there were no hearings on the Taft-Hartley law for 6 weeks. We had hearings on the Taft-Hartley law in committee for 5 hours only. The proof is that there was never any Taft-Hartley bill presented to the committee during the entire course of the 6 weeks we met. The Taft-Hartley law was never seen by 10 of us on the minority side until the day it was introduced to be voted on on that very day. So there were no hearings on the Taft-Hartley law for 6 weeks, despite all the statements to the contrary.

In the second place, however, there were hearings on the Lesinski bill for 10 full legislative days.

In the third place, we will be asked, when we vote tomorrow, to vote for the Wood substitute, on which there have never been any hearings, not even 1 minute.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I understood the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] to say, in the presentation of his bill, he had conferred with his brethren. Was he referring to members of the committee? Did you ever hear testimony upon that particular bill?

Mr. POWELL. As a fellow Baptist and a fellow Democrat of the gentleman from North Carolina, I was not one of the brethren.

Mr. CARROLL. Can you say whether there were any other persons on that committee?

Mr. POWELL. If there were, they were "brethren" beyond the pale of grace, because I do not know with whom on our side he conferred; I am sure not with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] or any of the brethren of our denomination.

So if we look at this bill from the standpoint of the arguments being presented here—that the Lesinski bill was brought forward and shoved down the throats of the Members—I would like the RECORD to show that the Taft-Hartley bill was the bill which was shoved down our throats, because we had absolutely no hearings on it.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think you will have to admit that the full committee gave no consideration to the Lesinski bill; is that not correct?

Mr. POWELL. I would like to agree with you, except for the fact that the full committee had the Lesinski bill before it from the very day that it was introduced in Congress, which means that it had the bill before it for about 2 months. That is something that the full committee in the Eightieth Congress did not have, so far as the Taft-Hartley bill was concerned.

Mr. McCONNELL. There are many, many bills in the Labor Committee. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has read them all.

Mr. POWELL. No; but one bill I certainly would have read if I had been elected to the Labor Committee, and which I did read, was the Lesinski bill, because that was our No. 1 duty in this Congress.

Mr. McCONNELL. It was the general thought, however, that the Lesinski bill would be amended after it was brought to the committee.

Mr. POWELL. That might have been your general thought.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think you men will have to get together. It was just admitted by your own Democrat colleague that they were afraid to let us offer any amendments to the Lesinski bill for fear it would be amended.

Mr. POWELL. Maybe he was one of the brethren.

Mr. McCONNELL. He is the respected gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I do not know how you classify him.

Mr. POWELL. I am not fully acquainted with this new denominationalism that has crept up, but I still repeat, and no one has contradicted me, that there were not 6 weeks of hearings on the Taft-Hartley bill, but only 5 hours.

I would also like to make a correction, and if I am wrong you can correct me. It was reported by the ranking minority member of the committee yesterday that when the Taft-Hartley bill was written "no special interest or outside organization had anything to do with the bill which was drawn up for this House in the Eightieth Congress by the majority members of the Labor Committee."

It so happens that in the course of debate on April 17, 1947, I charged here that the following people wrote that bill: Theodore Iserman, a New York corporation lawyer representing the Chrysler Corp.; Michael Ahern, research director of the Investors' League; and William Ingles, of the farm-equipment companies, labor relations specialist. I charged then, and I asked the Republican Members, I said, "The American people have a right to know if the Republican Party has abdicated representative government." And then the debate went on and on, but no one ever answered my question. It was evaded.

Mr. McCONNELL. Do you want an answer to it now?

Mr. POWELL. Yes.

Mr. McCONNELL. They had nothing to do with the writing of the Hartley bill. I do not know what was done in the other body, but they had nothing to do with the writing of the Hartley bill.

Mr. POWELL. On the floor of this House 2 years ago the ranking Members of the then majority did not offer any evidence to the contrary, and I charged then and I charge now that that bill was written by those gentlemen I named.

Mr. McCONNELL. I would like the gentleman to produce the evidence that he has to show that fact.

Mr. POWELL. The evidence is that what I produced 2 years ago on this floor went unchallenged by the supposed author himself.

Mr. McCONNELL. Only a supposition.

Mr. POWELL. It is what I produced 2 years ago. The gentlemen of your party were in charge of the debate and they did not offer anything to disprove what I charged. I even pointed to Mr. Iserman, who was in the gallery, and he took his coat and hat and left; but that is beside the point.

I want to put these things before you gentlemen who are here today, who possibly were not here during the Eightieth Congress so that you will know the truth. I would like also to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who I esteem more than anyone else in this House when it comes to the question of debate, that he is wrong when he says the Lesinski bill will abolish free speech in that it will bring back the Wagner bill. I am sure he does not mean that the only time that the people in America had free speech was during the 2 years of the Taft-Hartley bill.

I would also like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] to know that the Taft-Hartley law was the No. 1 election issue.

There were 106 Members of this House who were here in the Eightieth Congress who are not here now. They voted for the Taft-Hartley law. If that is not an indication of the thinking of the American people, I do not know what is. A majority of the American people sent most of us to this Congress to repudiate and wipe out the Taft-Hartley law and to give them back the kind of a law which functioned in America under the name of the Wagner Act. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Where are the 106 former Members who are not here now? They voted for the Taft-Hartley law and the electorate purged them on November 2.

Let no one fool you about the Wood bill.

There is little to choose between the Wood bill and the Taft-Hartley Act, as the following analysis of the bill shows:

In several important respects the Wood bill is worse. While it does throw several sops in labor's direction, in reality the bill enlarges and strengthens the most objectionable feature of the Taft-Hartley Act, namely, the use of injunctions against alleged union unfair labor practices and in connection with so-called national emergency strikes.

The new bill permits the General Counsel for the NLRB to file suit for injunction in the Federal courts merely upon the filing of charges alleging the union has committed any unfair labor practice, and without further investigation, and the courts are empowered to issue injunctions in such cases in their complete discretion and without any standards to guide them or safeguards to protect against indiscriminate or arbitrary orders. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the General Counsel can seek an injunction merely upon filing charges only where violations of section 8 (b) (4), relating to secondary boycotts, are charged, and then only after a full investigation has shown the existence of facts making it reasonably certain that the charges are true. Furthermore, in respect to the national emergency injunctions, the new bill permits the President to apply for an injunction immediately upon the threat of strike and without the requirement that a Board of inquiry be assembled to investigate the dispute and make findings prior to the issuance of the injunction as is required under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The few safeguards on the issuance of injunctions in cases involving jurisdictional strikes that are contained in the Taft-Hartley Act are eliminated under the new Wood bill, and under that bill either the Board or the court has complete discretion to issue orders respecting jurisdictional strikes without even affording the parties to the dispute an opportunity to settle the jurisdictional dispute for themselves, as was permitted under Taft-Hartley.

The following is a provision-by-provision comparison of the new Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, showing what, if any, changes are made in respect to each of the various provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act. The analysis follows the same form as that followed when the Thomas bill was compared with the Taft-Hartley Act in a previous analysis made by this office. The following provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are retained, strengthened, or modified by the Wood bill as indicated:

First. Disenfranchisement of economic strikers—modified so as to permit an economic striker to vote in a representation election but only if he has not been permanently replaced for a period of 90 days prior to the election. In other words, if the economic striker has been replaced for 90 days, he cannot vote.

Second. Blanket prohibitions on restraint or coercion by unions—retained and strengthened by permitting injunctions merely upon the filing of charges and without investigation or issuance of complaint as required under Taft-Hartley.

Third. Broad prohibitions on secondary boycotting—retained completely, with the very slight exception that union employees engaged in a lawful primary strike may induce other union employees to assist them in the following limited situation: Where these other employees are employed to work on products ordinarily made at the struck plant, as in a case where such products have been *jobbed* or contracted out, but even then only if these other employees are members of the same local union as the employees on strike and have a contract with their employer permitting them not to work on struck goods. As can readily be seen, cases where the employer has agreed that his employees need not work on struck goods, and where the employees engaged in the primary dispute are members of the same local union as employees making or working on products for the struck plant, will be very few and far between, so in practical effect the so-called broadening provision is meaningless.

Fourth. Prohibition against jurisdictional disputes—retained and strengthened against unions by eliminating opportunity for parties to settle their own dispute and by permitting court injunction merely upon filing of charges and without issuing of complaint or other investigation.

Fifth. Ban on closed shop and restriction on union shop—retained in most respects, strengthened in others, and modified in some. Under the Wood bill, all closed-shop agreements requiring membership in a union earlier than 30 days after employment are outlawed, and this even includes agreements which might have been valid under the Taft-Hartley Act, such as those entered into prior to the passage of that act and made effective for a period of years. While the Wood bill does eliminate the useless union-shop election prerequisite, it permits employees in a bargaining unit to rescind the authority of a union to enter into a union-shop agreement by majority vote. The bill further permits the employer to discharge an employee under a union-shop agreement for two reasons in addition to failure to pay dues and initiation fees, namely, where the employee was expelled from the union for engaging in a wildcat strike or for being a Communist or for being affiliated with a Communist or similar organization. Further, the employer is permitted to notify a union of opportunities for employment, but since the prohibitions on the making and use of union-shop agreeements are very specific, it is impossible to see any material benefit whatsoever which could be derived from this provision. In all other respects the prohibitions on closed-shop agreements and the restrictions on union-shop agreements are identical with those under Taft-Hartley, including the provision making the hodgepodge of State anti-closed-shop laws paramount to the Federal law.

Sixth. Exclusion of supervisors from all protection against employer discrimination and refusal to bargain—retained.

Seventh. Proviso permitting employer to use free speech to abuse unions if no threat of reprisal—retained.

Eighth. Non-Communist affidavit and other filing requirements retained as to unions and extended to include employers.

Ninth. Restrictions on excessive initiation fees—retained.

Tenth. Restrictions on featherbedding—retained.

Eleventh. Definition of good-faith bargaining—retained.

Twelfth. Employer petitions and decertification provisions—retained.

Thirteenth. Opening of Federal courts to damage suits for breaches of contracts and for violation of secondary boycott provisions—retained, with slight limitation discussed under secondary boycott paragraph—No. 3—above.

Fourteenth. Restrictions on welfare funds and check-off—retained and strengthened by making check-off authorization automatically noneffective at the expiration of one year from the date of its execution, thus eliminating automatic renewal and making it necessary to procure new authorizations each year.

Fifteenth. Craft unit proviso—retained.

Sixteenth. Provision for 60-day notice of termination or modification of existing agreement—retained, except that an employee striking in violation of the 60-day clause does not lose his status as an employee.

Seventeenth. Separate conciliation service—retained.

Eighteenth. Provision for enjoining strikes in emergency situations, 80-day cooling-off period and last offer election—strengthened by permitting injunction at any time a dispute is threatened without investigation or fact finding by Presidential board. However, useless last offer election is eliminated. Under the Wood bill, the safeguards inherent in an investigation by a board appointed by the President, which makes an investigation and issues findings of fact prior to the issuance of an injunction, are entirely eliminated. The board now functions only after the injunction is obtained. Thus, the Wood bill makes it impossible for the President even to attempt to settle the threatened national emergency by the appointment of a board of inquiry without first obtaining an injunction. Under the injunction the court can order the parties to the dispute to use their best efforts to settle it, under threat of contempt of court if they fail to do so. The Wood bill, therefore, would arouse all the atagonisms that are automatically induced by the issuance of any injunction in a later dispute before the President is empowered to even try to bring about conciliation or settlement of the issues.

Nineteenth. Restrictions on political contributions by labor organzations—retained.

Twentieth. Separation of powers as between board and general counsel—retained, and powers of general counsel greatly expanded by giving him absolute discretion to seek injunction in any case where charges may have been filed.

From the foregoing section-by-section comparison of the Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, it can be readily seen that, if anything, the Wood bill is more vicious and more oppressive than the Taft-Hartley Act and should be as strenuously opposed. Wherever the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act are loosened, it is for the most part in unimportant respects, and, on the other hand, the most objectionable of the Taft-Hartley Act provisions—those dealing with injunctions against labor organizations—are considerably strengthened. If the foregoing analylsis is compared with the analysis of the Thomas-Lesinski bill, it can be seen that the Wood bill could not, under any circumstances, be considered in any way an adequate substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, in long and extended discussions such as prevail in the instant case relating to labor-management legislation, it is extremely difficult to avoid repetition. Debate on this highly controversial subject will bear repetition if ultimately frank disclosure of opinions will tend to solve the problem before the House.

The labor bills before us in a measure transcend in importance much of the legislation that has been or will come before this House during the present session. I cannot subscribe to the arguments of the proponents of the Lesinski bill that there is no merit in the contents of the Wood bill and that all that is good, noble, and holy has found sanctuary in bill 2032. That bill not only calls for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, but completely emasculates it and ignores any and all provisions now contained in that law.

Labor unions as presently constituted are institutions that form an integral and useful part of our society and the American way of life. Unions are here to stay with us and are as necessary in our industrial activities as are the mechanical devices that keep the wheels of industry moving. In 1936, union membership did not exceed 4,700,000. Within a decade its membership had climbed to 15,600,000. Such growth and expansion calls for congressional legislation, not exclusively for the benefit of labor or promulgated with a view of giving management an unfair advantage, but the present situation requires legislation that gives fair and impartial consideration to both premises. It calls for equal justice for all and special privileges for none.

Is it a bad law that prevents a union member from being fired from his job and kicked out of a union at the whim of a union official?

Is it a bad law that rules out violence, coercion, and intimidation as a means of securing union members?

Is it a bad law to protect the right of secret balloting in voting on matters such as the election of officers or acceptance of an offer to settle a strike?

Is it perpetrating an injustice on a union by calling for an itemized accounting of all its receipts and disbursements?

Is it fair or honest to cry "slave law" because Congress proposes to pass a law to make unions financially responsible for living up to their contracts, and throw proper safeguards around jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts?

To call for necessary and effective legislation to govern the conduct of labor unions is no more out of place than to demand that Congress pass laws regulating railroads or laws that have for their purpose the protection of depositors' money in a banking institution. Yet, when someone has the courage and foresight to do so, cries are immediately raised that such an attitude is indicative of prejudice against union labor and that the individuals who speak out are foes and enemies of organized labor. Nothing could be further from the truth. To be blind to the facts or resort to a willful, obstinate and overbearing attitude will get us nowhere. Labor and management determine the growth and progress of our country and fix the standard of living and the advantages and opportunities that the future holds for us. Our domestic tranquillity depends upon the harmonious relationship that prevails between employer and employee.

That Congress was to be importuned to pass legislation dealing with this very vital and important question of labor and management was stressed by the President in his State of the Union address. It is true that in that address he asked Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, but he promised also to maintain industrial peace and requested of Congress that legislation to outlaw jurisdictional strikes, unnecessary secondary boycotts, strikes to decide interpretations of existing contracts and means to prevent strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest, be ultimately incorporated in the labor laws. The Wood bill, with slight modifications here and there, retains these respective provisions. The Lesinski bill completely ignores them. In that bill, the Secretary of labor becomes the czar and the overlord of all that pertains to labor and management and in the final analysis sits in judgment of all the disputes as court, jury, and executioner. It delegates to one man unwarranted and autocratic powers that are incompatible with reason and good judgment. Reaching out for power in this respect can bring about one result only and that is a state of belligerency and strife between labor and management which undoubtedly will destroy the good will and harmonious cooperation that has prevailed between these two institutions for the past number of years.

We have been much concerned about the people of foreign countries and recently voted billions to give to them in order that peace and harmony might prevail among their inhabitants. We appropriated billions to defend our country from attack and to help our allies in case of unlawful aggression or invasion. Is it not about time that we give some thought to the question of our domestic relations and assistance to the people of our own country? Shall we become the Good Samaritan to all the world and at the same time fail to set our own house in order?

I do not approach the legislation under consideration in this House in a spirit of belligerency or partiality. I am unbiased in my endeavors to support the ideas which I believe will set us on the road to industrial peace and prosperity and bring about that state of contentment and happiness which makes the working man and woman of this country the envy of all the working people of the world. I support the Wood bill not because I believe it will be a complete panacea and a perfect cure-all for each and every one of the ills, either actual or potential, that may present themselves as time marches on; but I do believe that presently the Wood bill is the nearest solution to the vexing and involved problem that is before us and is the only piece of legislation pending here that should be considered as the vehicle for providing remedial legislation as a substitute for the present Taft-Hartley law.

For the reasons already stated and for the many other good and logical reasons that have been submitted by other speakers, I have no hesitancy in supporting the Wood bill as it is now constituted.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, what we do with reference to this legislation will affect every citizen in the Nation. We want to be fair and just to all in writing this legislation. I think we should examine it under the following formula:

Will it encourage, protect, and be helpful to the laboring men, to agriculture, to business, and to all the people?

These three great segments—labor, business, and agriculture—all of which together make such a tremendous contribution to the Nation, must be encouraged equally with legislation that will move them all forward together in a harmonious and cooperative spirit which will not only render the greatest help to these three segments, but will bring the greatest amount of domestic harmony and prosperity to the 140,000,000 people who make up this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, those who are supporting the Administration bill, by their acts, take the position that regardless of the great expansion of business and labor organizations during the past 14 years, when the Nation has progressed in every other direction, that we shall not make any progress so far as labor and management relations are concerned. They would go back to the old Wagner Act and take us back to the jungle of tooth and claw, and to the chaotic conditions that often developed then, between management and labor to the detriment of the entire Nation.

If I were not deeply interested in the welfare of the laboring men, of agriculture, business, and all of the people, and if I wanted to do a great disservice to labor and to all of the people, I would vote against the Wood bill and for the Lesinski bill which is the old one-sided Wagner Act which has caused more strikes, more loss of time to labor, and more damage to the Nation than any piece of legislation passed during the past 14 years.

The Wood bill before us repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and amends it by taking out 15 provisions of the original act which have been objected to by labor. Those who wrote the bill sought to take out of it any provision that might in any way do any injustice to labor in an effort to write legislation that was equally fair to labor and management.

If this bill is written into law it will be of great aid and benefit to the working rank and file of labor and to the entire economy of the Nation. I do not know how we could be more fair in approaching this legislation.

Let me enumerate and briefly explain the 15 changes in the present law. In no instance has the present law strengthened the position of management. These changes were made at the suggestion of labor.

Important variations between my new bill and the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, are as follows:

First. The bill abolishes the requirement that before a labor organization may make a union-shop or maintenance-of-membership contract with the employer a majority of the employees subject to the contract must have authorized it in an election held by the National Labor Relations Board.

Second. The bill permits unions to compel employers subject to a union-shop contract to discharge employees whom the union has expelled for participating in wildcat strikes or for being a member of the Communist Party or some other subversive organization.

Third. The bill makes clear that it is not an unfair labor practice for an employer to notify a union that he has places to fill.

Fourth. The bill specifically makes employees on strike eligible to vote in representation elections even though they are not entitled to reinstatement, subject to reasonable time limitations.

Fifth. The bill deprives employers of their right to invoke the act unless they file with the Board affidavits disclaiming membership in the Communist Party or other subversive organizations.

Sixth. The bill permits struck-work clauses in union contracts to be carried out within reasonable limits without violation of the secondary-boycott provisions.

Seventh. The bill relieves unions of liability for damages for refusing to handle struck work under similar circumstances.

Eighth. The bill abolishes provisions of existing law requiring the general counsel of the Board to seek injunctions in secondary-boycott cases, and substitutes therefor a provision giving him discretion to apply for injunctions against any unfair labor practices, either on the part of employers or labor organizations,

before or after the issuance of a complaint.

Ninth. The bill eliminates that provision of existing law which makes a mere failure on the part of employees to comply with the statutory 60-day-notice requirement a forfeiture of their rights under the act.

Tenth. The bill clarifies the application of the 60-day-notice provision of existing law to "reopening" clauses of collective bargaining contracts.

Eleventh. The bill gives to unions a grace period of 120 days after the close of a fiscal year within which to file with the Secretary of Labor the financial data which the present law requires.

Twelfth. The bill eliminates the cumbersome and ineffectual procedure of existing law which provides for compulsory but unenforceable arbitration of disputes over the assignment of work tasks, thus permitting the Board to handle these disputes effectively under the regular procedure set forth in the complaint and representation sections.

Thirteenth. The bill clarifies the provisions of existing law relating to strikes and lock-outs which jeopardize the national health and safety by enabling the President, when the President finds it necessary, to apply to the courts for immediate protection of the public, without awaiting the report of a board of inquiry, and at the same time making available more effective means of bringing about settlement of the matters in dispute.

Fourteenth. The bill eliminates the requirement that employees must vote on the employer's last offer, thus doing away with the referendum, which the Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service and the joint committee found to have served no useful purpose.

Fifteenth. The bill contains numerous technical changes made necessary by the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

I think the greatest service this Congress can render labor and all of the people of the Nation this particular week is to defeat the Lesinski bill and enact substantially the Wood bill which is proposed as a substitute.

The Lesinski bill takes away from the little locals and the ordinary rank and file of labor many provisions of great benefit to the millions of laboring men which are necessary to their protection not only from the employer but protection against the abuse of the dictatorial power of some labor leaders. The Wood bill preserves these provisions now in the law and is the only bill before us that guarantees the freedom of the workingman from abuses either on the part of labor leaders or business management.

The Wood bill has been drafted for the purpose of carefully protecting the rights of both the employees and the employers. In a score of instances it contains amendments that liberalize the present Taft-Hartley law in an attempt to make certain that any injustices in the present law operating against the best interest of labor are amended or stricken out. The committee has approached the amending of this law with a most sympathetic view toward the welfare of labor.

I feel certain that the Wood bill will generally be beneficial to the laboring men, that it will bring about better relations between the employers and the employees and will benefit the entire economy of the Nation.

The hue and cry that the Taft-Hartley law was a slave-labor law, of course, has always been utterly false. We have heard in the debates today Members of the House make these same charges. False name calling never achieved anything worth while. Let me prove the falsity of these charges once and for all time by quoting figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

RAILWAY WORKERS

Let us see, for instance, how much it has enslaved the railway workers during the past 2 years of 1947–48.

Since this law became effective, railway workers have received wage increases totaling approximately $883,000,000 without the loss of 1 day's pay due to the stoppage of work.

During recent weeks one contract has been negotiated between the railway unions and railway management increasing the pay of 100,000 railroad machinists and their helpers, along with many thousands of the 15 nonoperating railroad unions, by 26 percent, boosting their wages in this one settlement by about $650,000,000. In addition, they got a shorter hour work week.

Certainly the threat of this act, even though the railway workers are exempted, has not enslaved them. Nevertheless, union railway officials continue to write us Congressmen urging that we repeal the Taft-Hartley law before it completely destroys labor. Such charges are an insult to the intelligence of the railway workers, and to the Members of the Congress.

BUILDING TRADES WORKERS

At the close of 1946, before the Taft-Hartley Law became effective, the average pay of brick masons was about $2.06 an hour. Today the scale is $3.00 an hour, with $6 an hour in many instances if they work Saturdays.

Carpenters were receiving approximately $1.65 an hour in 1946. Today the scale is about $2 an hour.

Plumbers were receiving approximately $1.88 an hour in 1946. The pay scale today is around $2.50 to $3 an hour. I ask you, is there any slavery in these wages?

COAL MINERS

At the close of 1946 the average weekly pay of coal miners was $58.03 per week. The average weekly wage today is $72.70. In addition, coal miners who have worked 20 years and reached the age of 62 years are now receiving a pension of $100 a month. This happened during the past 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law, yet their leaders say it is a slave-labor law.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

The millions of industrial workers in 1946 received an average wage of $43.74 per week. Their weekly wage today is $54.63. Do these wage increases enslave anyone?

During 1947–48 union membership in the United States has increased from 14,974,000 workers to 15,700,000, making a total gain in membership under the Taft-Hartley law of 726,000 new members.

These increases in wages and the great increase in membership of unions proves completely false these charges.

INJUNCTION PROVISION IN WOOD BILL

I cannot believe now that the heat of the campaign is over that the administration really wants the repeal of the provisions in the present law which provide for an 80-day period which gives the President and the governmental machinery set-up an opportunity through mediation and conciliation to prevent or settle a strike that would imperil the public health, safety, and the welfare of the entire Nation, particularly in view of the fact that in the past 2 years the President has found it necessary to use that power given him seven times in the successful settlements of such threatened strikes in the interest of all the people.

Some legislation must be worked out to protect all of the people and the economy of the Nation. The Attorney General has testified in substance before the Senate Committee that the President has inherent injunctive power to delay such a strike, if it is necessary. Evidently the administration for political reasons is trying to dodge the injunctive issue, by name at least, on the surface.

Those who want to meet this issue openly and fairly before labor and the people of the Nation contend that if the President has such injunctive power—which they doubt he has—it should be pointed out. If he does not have such power, it should be written into law to cope with Nation-wide disputes between labor and management to protect the people.

By claiming it is not necessary to write the injunctive power into the law, it appears that they may be trying to bypass the injunction, yet at the same time they infer that they have and will use such injunctive power if an emergency makes it necessary.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, we took mediation and conciliation out of the Labor Department and made them independent agencies. They must remain independent from the Labor Department so that business management and labor, who are engaged in negotiation, conciliation, or mediation, will know the board with which they are dealing is fair and impartial. The Wood bill retains this provision.

In other words, everyone wants a fair trial before an impartial jury.

Mr. Chairman, the Lesinski bill puts the Conciliation and Mediation Service back under the Secretary of Labor, who testified before the committee for the administration bill, and whose duty under the law setting up the Labor Department is to promote the interest of the laboring people of America. In fact, the CIO and the American Federation of Labor are generally each given an appointment of one Assistant Secretary of Labor to help run the Department.

You can see at a glance if this is done, business management can have no confidence in mediation and conciliation. It will again put the labor leaders largely in charge of administration and will destroy any chance of bringing about im-

proved relations between labor and management. The Department of Labor will then act as judge, jury, and prosecutor in settling disputes. This must not be done in the interest of labor, business, and the Nation.

NONCOMMUNIST OATH

The Lesinski bill leaves out that section of the Taft-Hartley law which requires union-labor officials to sign an affidavit they are not Communists.

They object on the grounds that such a provision is an insult to the loyalty of union officials. If such a requirement is an insult to them, then every Member of the Congress and every employee of the Federal Government up to and including the Cabinet officers are subject to the same insult. All of us Members of Congress, Cabinet officials, and others are required to, and do, sign such affidavits before we can receive our pay. The Wood bill retains this provision and provides business management must also make the same affidavit.

I cannot believe union officials are entitled to greater courtesy than are the Members of the Congress and the members of the President's Cabinet.

The signing of this non-Communist oath, which has helped to drive Communists out of union leadership, has been of great value to labor and the Nation.

The United Electrical Workers, Fur Workers, and Farm Equipment Workers Unions, and others of the CIO, have been particularly affected and dominated by Communist union leadership.

Phillip Murray, president of the CIO, working with Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers for the past 2 months has been putting on a drive to take over the farm-equipment-workers union into the United Automobile Workers. Their publicly stated purpose is to change the control of this union, because it is Communist dominated.

The failure of officers of the United Electrical Workers, many notoriously Communist, to file non-Communist affidavits was a primary ground on which the Atomic Energy Commission ordered the General Electric Co. to stop dealing with that union at two atomic-energy plants to protect our national security and the secrets of the atomic bombs. If this Communist section is not included in the new legislation the Atomic Energy Commission could not take such action to protect in the future atomic-energy secrets, because the law would then compel General Electric to recognize and deal with the Communist-affected United Electrical Workers.

Mr. Chairman, the following provisions left out of the Lesinski bill, most of which were written into the Taft-Hartley law for the protection of the workers from coercion from both union officials and management, are also contained in the Wood bill:

First. Contracts arrived at through negotiation between employers and employees shall be enforceable by law as to both parties.

Second. Jurisdictional strikes which do such great harm to both the members of the A. F. of L. and the CIO through constant work stoppages in a fight between these unions will continue to be outlawed.

Third. Union officials are compelled to continue to give union members and the Government at the end of each year an itemized account of all money received in dues, what it was spent for, and to whom it was paid.

This clause written into the Taft-Hartley law has saved millions of dollars to the union members in the big cities that in the past was wasted by the extravagance of some union officials, and, in many instances, through graft.

Fourth. The provision in the present law which prevents union officials' going to the employer and having a member of the union fired off of his job, so long as he pays his dues, is retained, but amended to make it more acceptable to labor.

This is one of the most important provisions in the act to protect the union men from abuse by union officials. Under the Wagner Act, when all they had to do was to take a man's union card away from him and go to the employer and have him fired, that not only took away from him the right to earn a living for his family, but took his freedom away from him to express his views on the floor of the union.

Let me close by pointing out to you that during the past 2 years there has been less wages lost by labor through work stoppages. Labor has written the best contracts in its history, wages are the highest in its history, over 57,000,000 people are now employed, and labor unions have had the phenomenal growth of an increase in membership of 726,000 new union members during the past 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law.

It seems evident that the Lesinski bill is a plain political approach to this most important problem of legislation. We do not believe that this labor legislation should be used as a political football for political advantage. It is too important to the rank and file of labor, to business, to agriculture, and to all the people of the Nation to deal with it on a political basis. The question of what is best for the entire Nation is the responsibility of us Members of Congress, and is the paramount question in our approach to this important legislation. I urge you to support the Wood bill in the interest of labor and all of the people of our Nation.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], who has just spoken has so much political courage I am wondering why he resorts to a subterfuge like the Wood bill? Why does he not come right out and vote against repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?

As we continue the second day of debate on the proposal to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act I should like to address myself to some of the reasons why I believe it to be in the best interest of our Nation to wipe this antilabor law off the statute books and at the outset of my remarks I should like to point out that I am among those who believe the election of November 2, 1948, carried with it a mandate calling for repeal of this law.

Of course, some will challenge the statement that the last presidential election brought such a mandate, but I insist without fear of successful contradiction that the major job given to this Eighty-first Congress by the voters of the United States on last November 2 was the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Anyone who traveled with me in my campaign into the factories and the meeting halls of labor would not deny that the enthusiasm shown for the candidacy of President Truman carried with it a mandate against antilabor legislation from the rank and file of American workers.

Yes—I said rank and file. This may surprise some of these people who would have you believe that labor's opposition to the Taft-Hartley Law comes only from leaders in the labor movement, those who like to believe the line handed down by proponents of this Act that it was enacted by a magnanimous Eightieth Congress which had only the best interest of the employees at heart and wanted to save the workers from their own leaders.

But the workers of America have not fallen for that line. That was one thing I checked carefully in my rounds and the first group of workers I visited quickly convinced me that the men and the women in every segment of American labor believed the Taft-Hartley law to be a punitive measure against labor, born in vindictiveness and calculated to destroy the rights of workers to bargain collectively for their labor.

That is what the rank and file of labor really think of the Taft-Hartley law.

I found workers held this opinion whether they belonged to the A. F. of L., the CIO, the machinists, the Typographical Union, any of a number of independent unions, or whether they were unorganized.

If there is one thing on which the rank and file of American workingmen are unanimous it is in their opinion that the Taft-Hartley Act was aimed at the destruction of organized labor.

It is peculiar how the same people who were so quick to see a false mandate in the 1946 Republican election victories, when labor legislation was not made an issue in the campaigns for congressional seats, now refuse to accept a clear-cut mandate given in an election which followed months of vigorous campaigning when the Taft-Hartley Act was definitely an issue.

However, the National Association of Manufacturers recognized that labor had given Congress a mandate in the 1948 election and fearful that it would undo their successes in the Eightieth Congress the NAM began immediately to discount the result of labor's victory at the polls. Many of the large corporations undaunted by the inaccuracies of the Gallup and other polls last November resorted to polls of their own seeking to confuse Members of Congress as to the national thinking on the Taft-Hartley Act.

These management poll takers attempt to prove that workers generally favor most of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, even though they are opposed to the act itself. But everyone knows the questions in the polls were loaded to favor the antilabor law. You cannot cover fairly an issue as broad and deep as the Taft-Hartley Act by 10 or 18 questions seeking "yes" or "no" answers.

The Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed as it is harmful to both management and labor.

And in repealing it no consideration should be given to the so-called Wood substitute. The Taft-Hartley Act by any other name would smell as bad—and the substitute which will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia is, in my opinion, even worse than the Taft-Hartley Act.

Apparently Republican strategy to prevent repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act calls for someone else to carry the ball. They want to reincarnate the Eightieth Congress through a Trojan horse made of wood.

The Republican strategy calls for many changes in the high-handed tactics they employed in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act in the Eightieth Congress. Have you noticed the considerate references to interested parties during the discussions of this legislation by the gentlemen on the left side of the aisle? In the Eightieth Congress you heard much reference to employer and employee. This time it is the working man and the general-public welfare. "Let's kid the working man a little and make him think we're in his corner," is the new strategy of those who see the Taft-Hartley Act as the answer to labor-management differences.

But how can a law that cripples orderly collective bargaining be good for either labor or management? The Taft-Hartley Act is a law that causes, not settles labor disputes. The dispute between the Typographical Union and Chicago newspapers is a fine example of this.

The Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood bill are repressive of labor's basic rights. The former should be repealed, and efforts to replace it with the latter should be defeated. The suggested substitute merely adds more antilabor prohibitions. Any concessions it makes are inconsequential.

The Lesinski bill, which we have under consideration, is an honest attempt to carry out the wishes of the American people as expressed in the 1948 elections. As I have said, I believe the results of those elections provided a clear and unmistakable mandate for the prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the substitution of a new law which would be fair to both management and labor, while safeguarding the interests of the public.

I would not criticize any Member of this House for voting his own personal, honest convictions, whether or not they agree with mine, but I cannot condemn too strongly the formation of any bloc to deliberately cooperate with labor's enemies to oppose the Democratic administration's program, which calls for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In 5 minutes I could not begin to enumerate all of the unfair antilabor provisions of either the Taft-Hartley Act or the Wood bill. Through the general debate Members of the Committee will review these. Both measures are dangerous and repressive and have no place in a free American economy. Born in a vengeful spirit, they are beyond renovation and should be decisively rejected by this House.

True friends of labor in this House will oppose the Wood bill and will support the well-considered, fair, and honest Lesinski bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], former chairman of the Labor Committee of the House.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, today and during the course of the days immediately ahead we shall discuss the proper character and scope of a labor bill primarily concerned with collective bargaining. What we achieve or fail to accomplish will be of the utmost importance to the relationship of domestic labor and industry and through them our national economic well-being, but that is not all. Possibly of greater importance is the effect what we do or fail to do will have in international affairs.

America stands today spiritually and economically strong in a world fraught with fear. It occupies a strategic position in the affairs of nations. By reasons of its strength it is in a position of leadership. But we shall lead only so long as we remain strong and prosperous, and by our example demonstrate that free people in a free society can achieve legitimate aspirations and maintain their freedom.

Do not make the mistake of assuming that we are here treating a purely domestic issue. This issue is of the greatest importance not only to us but also to the world. What we say and do is being watched and will be studied by the foreign press and public as an indication of what they might expect from us on other bigger and far more important issues. Time and circumstances beyond our control and not of our making have placed our forum on the international stage.

These are fateful days for us and for all peoples of the world. There is an increasing division to the left and to the right. But the great middle group in this and in all nations is that made up of the workers and small-business men, clerks and professionals. I like to think of them as the laboring men and women of the world. They are the people who have nourished freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of conscience. They are the people of this and any nation that have no interest in or desire for special privilege.

It is the common man who built and will maintain the systems of government under which the diversities among men are encouraged and glorified. Labor and the men and women of labor proclaim the great spiritual values of the brotherhood and dignity of man. It is they who demand, and have a right to expect, that their governments protect and preserve these basic values and also provide an ever increasingly equitable balance in the distribution of the Nation's wealth. But they demand, and we demand, that it be accomplished voluntarily and not through regimentation.

The Communists, who by infiltration seek to pervert labor to their own miserable desires, really miss the point of history when they make class warfare the challenge of this age. This is not the challenge. For I know of no laboring man or woman who does not respect and who will not defend the right of others whether more or less fortunate in the possession of worldly goods. The challenge is far more subtle and demanding. The challenge is to make the modern industrial plant operate smoothly and productively for the benefit of all. And the true democracies can look to labor to provide the sound middle way to security. There is no need to fear labor or press it down. There is no greater citadel of democracy than the union meeting hall.

Labor is, and by its very nature must be, interested in the policy that determines what the level of production shall be. Labor, management and investors should have a solidarity of interest. And every labor leader I know is aware of this interdependence. Maximum production and full employment provide their only real security. Unless business prospers, labor cannot advance. Unless goods are produced there can be no consumption or distribution, or homes, or families or education, or any of the things for which the ordinary man aspires. The basic security of the Nation itself depends on the ability of labor, management, and investors to work productively.

But this is not a job for one group alone. No one group has the technical knowledge, the know-how, the experience to do it alone. It is indeed a joint responsibility of labor and management to see that the modern industrial plant serves the ends of the public. A strong labor movement is necessary for a balanced economy.

When Congress adopted the Labor Relations Act in 1935, it laid the foundation for a strong labor movement and declared a national labor policy that was at once a wage policy and a policy of governing labor relations. It chose wisely to avoid Government employment contracts. It sought instead to give labor a voice in determining its own welfare and to equalize bargaining power between industrial managements and their labor forces, and leave them free to agree on terms by the process of collective bargaining. Congress recognized that individual bargaining meant, in effect, management dictation of terms of employment. By eliminating employers' unfair labor practices, it tried to establish what the law refers to as actual liberty of contract, and thus avoid also dictation by Government officials. Wages and working rules would be determined by collective agreement and mutual consent.

That the act has been eminently successful in accomplishing its immediate objectives is obvious. The bargaining power of workers has been enormously increased by encouraging and protecting union organization, and all the major industries now recognize and deal with unions. But the collective bargaining policy was adopted not because freedom to organize and equality in negotiating labor contracts were regarded as ends in themselves. The underlying idea was that the public interest in industrial peace and justice in labor relations would be furthered by such a policy.

The Wagner Act did not deal with the subject matter of collective bargaining. It left wages, hours, and working condi-

tions to the agreement of the parties. You will all recall our experience during the war when the Government through the War Labor Board dictated the terms of agreement whenever the parties failed themselves to reach agreement. But that was an emergency. And I doubt that there is one person in the House today who would advocate a return in any event to that or any other form of compulsory arbitration.

The Wagner Act had freed the forces that make for union organization and collective bargaining, and thereby it contributed greatly to our economic well-being, the preservation of civil liberties, to the self-confidence and dignity of the Nation's workers. Its basic provisions should be retained and Government policy built upon them. While the act may have developed some abuses, it still is the best law through which labor-management harmony can be achieved. Any amendments should strengthen the act and not weaken it.

The first amendment to the Wagner Act in 12 years was enacted in 1947 in the form of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was a plausible and appealing piece of legislation. But it was subtle and dangerous. As was said on this floor by its principal sponsor "there is more to it than meets the eye," and how right he was.

It was a vast and complex network of ideas dumped into a single bill with very little regard for what effect it might have upon our economy. It was not a carefully devised bill that sought to redress the balance between labor and industry. On the contrary, it represented another unwise swing of the pendulum and this time in the direction of unreasonable restraint on organized labor.

It may well be that the long delay in correcting the limitations of the Wagner Act was in part responsible. However, this explanation did not make it wise legislation.

The Taft-Hartley bill at a critical time weakened the foundations of free collective bargaining. It transferred to the courts of law the settlement of many labor disputes. Once friends enter court, friendship ends and agreement becomes improbable.

It weakened the power of unions to discipline their own members, and it greatly increased the extent of Government intervention in labor-management relations.

It attempted by legislation to regulate the complicated human and economic problems inherent in the delicate relationship between labor and management, between the individual worker and the group, and between citizens and their Government.

It substituted injunctions and damage suits for collective bargaining. It was in part class legislation because it made injunctive relief mandatory only against one class of society.

Administratively unworkable it singled out the labor agency for crude and inequitable treatment of its administrative processes.

Two years ago I urged Members of the House to reject the Taft-Hartley bill because I felt that it was unworkable, that it limited collective bargaining. I predicted that if enacted, the Congress would hear from the people of the United States who would demand its repeal. The people have spoken. I urge you again, but this time with the demonstrated support of the majority of the American people, that you reject Taft-Hartley and all that it stands for.

We are now considering H. R. 2032, and other proposals surely will be made and, no doubt, numerous amendments will be offered. I do not know now what the final result will be, but I do urge this: that each Member examine the proposals to come in in the light of the Nation's greater interests. I urge that petty politics and provincial prejudices be set aside and that we courageously accept the challenge that has been given us.

Examine H. R. 2032 carefully. It is my considered judgment that the bill is adequate and it is certainly sound. It avoids the technical and restrictive limitations imposed on collective bargaining by Taft-Hartley. It reestablishes collective bargaining in all its proper aspects as the rule of industrial life. It returns American labor and industrial relations to the mutual and reciprocal obligations of the leaders of industry and labor. It provides a framework within which the parties can seek composition of their differences to their mutual advantages. I believe that it is a good bill. However, I shall certainly listen to and analyze the amendments that will be offered.

Having had the experience of 10 years as chairman of the House Labor Committee, I am well aware of how a bill can be destroyed through amendments. Because I believe in collective bargaining, I believe that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed at once and most of the provisions of the Wagner Act put back on the statute books. In my judgment, the matter is not complicated. Everything depends on whether one is really, honestly for or against collective bargaining. If we are sincere and want workers to organize and bargain through their own representatives, we will vote to terminate Taft-Hartley at once. We cannot favor putting all kinds of harassments on unions to stop them from working. The Taft-Hartley does just that, and I believe it was intended to do just that. It should be written off at once.

The Wagner Act was designed to protect, and did protect, collective bargaining. Anyone who knows the facts of industrial life knows that for many years to come the right of workers to organize will require the protection of Federal and State laws. The person who says that unionism is too strong in the United States and that it should be curbed is either discussing something he knows nothing about or is greatly lacking in truth. Actually until unions are strong enough to protect themselves they will need Government protection.

I prayerfully hope that the Thomas-Lesinski bill will not be weakened by amendments and that the Wood bill, H. R. 4290, will not be substituted for H. R. 2032. My experience has been that labor baiters have always tried to substitute a bad bill for a good one. Members of Congress should realize that it is the usual method employed by those who would strangle labor.

Members of Congress should also realize and never forget the magnificent contribution made by labor when the enemy was at our door, and how labor gave everything it had in building and supplying the things which made it possible for us to win that war. Mistakes may have been made. Men tired and weary are prone to exaggerate difficulties but, by and large, they did a great job and I can never forget that victory would have been impossible without their heartfelt and generous contribution.

Let us vote down the Wood bill and support H. R. 2032. In doing so, we will keep faith with the workers of America and serve notice to the workers of the world that America will continue strong and prosperous, a great spiritual and economic leader in the affairs of men, as well as the affairs of nations.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, this whole question of labor-management relations that we now have before us presents one of the most important questions to come before this House. Are we to legislate in the public interest, or are we to yield to the selfish demands, coupled with political threats, of a few union leaders? That, it seems to me, is a fundamental issue which the legislation before us presents.

It is not the general public that is demanding the complete repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nor is it the rank and file of workingmen, both union and nonunion, who understand the law who are making this demand. The demand comes solely from certain union leaders who have conducted a very clever propaganda campaign of misrepresentation. They are opposed to the law not because it is injurious to unions. They are opposed to the law not because it deprives the workingman of just rights. No, they are opposed to the law simply because it takes away from them, as union leaders, arbitrary power over the union organization and over our national economic machinery.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been characterized by them as a slave-labor law. Nothing could be further from the truth. And the union leaders themselves know that it is not true. They have been unable to point to one single provision of the act which could be said to enslave labor. On the contrary the act emancipated the American workingmen and women from the arbitrary dictation of union leaders. It gave the rank and file of membership in a union some control over their own organization.

I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, and I voted to override the President's veto. I believed then, and I believe now, it is a basically sound approach to the complicated problem of labor-management relations. There are a number of reasons why I voted for that act, and one of them is the fact that it gave the average workingman protection in his just rights.

To be sure, the act also gave the employer protection in his just rights, previously denied him; but the point I wish to emphasize here at the moment is that

the act is really the workingman's bill of rights. I emphasize this point because it is so frequently contended that those of us who supported the Taft-Hartley Act are the enemies of labor. We are the friends of labor. We are the real friends of the man who labors, because we seek to give him, not deny him, the rights that are rightfully his.

A man has a right to work or not to work. That is essential to freedom. A man also has a right to join a union or not to join. That, too, is essential to freedom. No one who believes in our way of life would argue for a minute that each and every man should not be protected in those rights. And the Taft-Hartley Act provided just such protection.

The record over the years, to this very day, is replete with undisputed testimony of all manner and kinds of coercion and intimidation being applied by unions to force employees to join their particular organization. The record is also replete with physical violence being used to force workers to engage in a strike. Such action is wrong when used by an employer, and it is wrong when it is used by a union. The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits it being followed by either employer or a union. It thus gave the workingman protection in his basic rights.

And yet, it is proposed by the Lesinski bill now before us to take away from the workingman this fundamental protection. The unions ask that the employer be prohibited from any coercion and intimidation but that unions and their agents be free to engage in such tactics.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the average working man and woman of this great free country do not want this law repealed. It is certain union leaders who are making this demand. They want complete freedom from any restraint whatsoever, regardless of the rights of others.

When a workingman joins a union do you not think that he should have some say as to how his organization should be run? When he pays his dues out of his weekly or monthly wages, is it not right that he should know how those funds are spent? That is the right of a stockholder in a corporation. And this should be the right of every union member.

The Taft-Hartley Act provided that the unions make an accounting to their membership. The leaders object to this. The act required that the so-called health and welfare funds be held in trust for the purpose of paying the benefits to employees for which they are established, so that these funds would not be diverted to a slush fund or some other purpose. The leaders object to this.

And yet, yielding to the dictates of the union leaders, in presenting the bill before us the administration proposes to wipe out these protections for the union workingman. It is proposed to allow the leaders to collect the dues from the members, to collect the employer contributions to welfare funds, and to allow the leaders themselves to do what they please with these large sums of money.

In no way has that provision of law interfered with the legitimate activities of unions. In the past 2 years the number of employees covered by such welfare funds has doubled. I, for one, shall not vote to wipe out the protection provided by existing law to the rank and file of union members against the improper diversion or use of funds that belong to them.

The Taft-Hartley Act also gave the union members protection in another respect. I refer to the requirement that all officers of a union must file what is known as non-Communist affidavits. There is abundant evidence as to how effective this has been in enabling the rank and file of workers to get rid of Communist-controlled unions or Communist leadership of their union.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the workingman does not want this provision repealed. It is the demand of some union leaders. And the administration yields to this demand, notwithstanding the fact that one of the great threats to our national security is the Communist fifth-column. Any one at all acquainted with the Communist movement knows, and knows well, that Communist agents find that infiltration into the labor union is one of the best ways to sabotage production.

The so-called Wood bill, which I intend to vote for as a substitute for the Lesinski bill, provides that both employer and union officers file the non-Communist affidavits. The employer has no objection to that requirement, and the union leaders should have none.

I have only touched upon just a few of the rights which the Taft-Hartley Act preserves for the average workingman. Unfortunately, because of the effective manner in which the union leaders, aided and abetted by the administration, have misrepresented the act, I doubt if the majority of union members actually know what the act provides. If they did, I am sure they would be for it.

I shall not take the time to elaborate upon the rights of employers, which are also protected under the act. Suffice it to say that prior to its enactment we had a one-sided labor law under which the employer was completely helpless against unscrupulous union organizers. In the Taft-Hartley Act recognition was given to both the just rights of employers and the just rights of employees and, most important, the rights of the general public.

Above all else, it must be recognized that the paramount right is the right of the general public. We were not sent here to represent management or to represent unions. We were sent here to represent the people as a whole. What we do here must be for the benefit of all the people, in all walks of life, from all sections of the country.

Are not the national health and safety matters of primary importance? You will recall the days of the railroad strike when President Truman recommended that legislation be enacted to draft workers into the Army if they did not work. There was no adequate law to prevent our whole transportation system from coming to a standstill. You will also recall the days of a Nation-wide coal strike. And there was no adequate law to deal with that problem. You will recall a whole series of strikes and acts of violence in 1945 and 1946.

We wrote into the Taft-Hartley Act a provision to the effect that whenever the President found that a threatened or actual strike would imperil national health or safety, he could direct the Attorney General to petition the court to grant an injunction. And that injunction, if granted, would be for a period of 80 days, sometimes known as the cooling-off period.

This provision has been known as the national emergency provision. It is designed solely to protect the entire country. It deals only with a strike affecting an entire industry or a substantial part of it. It pertains solely to that which would imperil national health or safety. It enables the parties to have their day in court. It gives the parties opportunity to work out an amicable settlement.

In the Lesinski bill it is proposed to repeal this provision. The administration is recommending this, again yielding to the demands of union leaders, notwithstanding the fact that at one time the President himself proposed even more drastic action and notwithstanding the fact that the President has used this provision on six different occasions. It is almost beyond all understanding why any administration, faced as we are with many threats to our national security, would recommend to the Congress that we remove from the statute books such an important emergency provision to protect the country as a whole.

Much has been said about a mandate in the last election to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. To me that is just nonsense. There was no mandate of any kind, and certainly there was no mandate from the people of the United States to take the action that is proposed here today. The only mandate that I can see is that which the administration has received from certain union leaders in return for political support. This bill is not designed to serve the public. It is designed to pay a political debt.

If there was such a mandate, why is it that the majority of the Members of Congress here today are Members who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act? And why is it that the Republican Party candidate for President carried the large industrial States? If there was any mandate, it was to keep the Taft-Hartley Act on the statute books.

I know that certain groups vigorously opposed me because of my support of the Taft-Hartley Act. And I suppose I will have even more vigorous opposition because of what I have said here today. Their campaign will undoubtedly be well financed and well conducted to conceal the objective. If they should find that they cannot defeat me on the issue of the Taft-Hartley Act, because of the sentiment of the people of my district, they will try to find some other issue upon which they hope to divide my supporters. Somehow I must be defeated. That will be the attitude of certain union leaders.

However that may be, I intend to do what I believe to be in the best interests of the people. I intend to vote for the Wood bill, which preserves the substantive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act

with certain modifications. There are certain improvements that can be made in the bill. I do not consider it perfect. Neither did I consider the Taft-Hartley Act perfect. But I certainly cannot accept the Lesinski bill which would have us go back to all the shortcomings and all the evils that existed when the Republican Eightieth Congress courageously met the problem of labor-management relations.

Look at the situation that confronted the country in 1946 and compare it with the situation today. In 1946 there were more strikes, more man-days lost, more wages lost, and more production lost than at any time in the history of the United States. Our whole economy was almost at a standstill. Today we have fewer strikes, the workers have been getting better contracts in wages and in hours and in all respects, and the unions continue to grow.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act is a fair, just, and sound law. We can improve it. We must not repeal it. To repeal it would be a betrayal of the average working man and woman, both union and nonunion, and it would be a betrayal to the general public whose interests are paramount.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is apparent from the remarks of the Members who have preceded me that the legislation which we are considering today and which we will be considering tomorrow, and perhaps the next day as well, is probably the most important piece of legislation that the Eighty-first Congress will consider during its existence. I recognize that this is a statement which is often made by members of committees who are speaking on legislation which comes from their committees, but considering the issues involved, considering the conflict of opinion—and there is a very honest conflict here which should be recognized by everybody—considering the fact that this matter was one of the issues in the recent campaign, and considering the number of people who will be affected by the legislation, it is vitally important that this House adopt the very best labor-management relations bill possible under the circumstances.

There are some of my colleagues on the other side who will disagree with me but my opinion is, and it should be stated, that when the majority on the committee refused to allow any consideration of the bill through reading it for the purpose of offering amendments, a serious blow was struck to the possibility of obtaining a fair and adequate piece of labor legislation from this Congress. I say that because we are dealing here with a very controversial and technical matter, and such legislation just cannot be written in what might be called the hurly-burly atmosphere of floor debate. The provisions of this legislation should have been hammered out in committee until finally we could present to the House a bill for consideration which would have resolved as nearly as possible the various differences of opinion on this legislation.

However, that is water under the bridge, and it does not do any good at this time for me or anybody else to criticize that procedure. We are now confronted with a difficult situation, due to the failure of the committee to carry out its responsibility in an orderly manner. We are faced with the problem of considering the bills which are before us and of selecting the one which will provide the best framework with which to work in writing an adequate and fair law on the floor of the House.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the Lesinski bill, on the one hand, and the Wood substitute, on the other. The discussion generally has run not to the provisions of the bills but rather to name calling and charges and countercharges as to the origin and sponsorship of the measures.

I think, however, that what we should bear in mind, as we begin to read the bill for amendment tomorrow, is that the House has the responsibility of selecting whichever of the bills we have before us which will best serve the interests of the House in getting a workable piece of legislation in the end. If we use the Lesinski bill as the vehicle which the House would proceed to amend in an attempt to get a fair piece of labor legislation, we must bear in mind certain facts which are extremely important. While it is true that the Lesinski bill contains some minor amendments to the Wagner Act, in regard to secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and national emergency strikes, I wonder if the Members of this House are aware of the number of important items which the Lesinski bill does not cover, the number of items in which there is no provision at all in that bill from which to start?

There is, for example, no provision at all in the Lesinski bill covering the matter of union security. I recognize, of course, that it will be contended that there is a provision in the bill which goes even further than the Wagner Act in that it invalidates State laws which would have the effect of restricting the abuses of the closed shop. But I think most of us on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of this labor question recognize that there have been abuses in the use of the closed shop; that what we should try to do is to adopt provisions which will correct those abuses without at the same time denying to unions an opportunity to obtain union security. This is at best a difficult task and we do not have in the Lesinski bill any provision at all from which to start.

Nor do we have a provision in the Lesinski bill on the matter of contractual liability; and again I say whether you are considered to be in the labor camp, and I do not like the way in which we in the House are dividing into two camps on this issue, because we should not; but, whether you consider yourself to be in the so-called prolabor group or in the group of those who are attempting to retain what we think are the good features of the present law, I think all of us will recognize that there should be some provision in the law making both unions and management responsible for their contracts. In the Lesinski bill we have nothing whatever to start with.

The same is true with regard to the problem of organization of foremen.

One provision of the present law which has received very little criticism and a great deal of praise is that which made the Conciliation Service independent of the Department of Labor. We have no provision in the Lesinski bill covering that matter.

For a year and a half we have had the Taft-Hartley Act as the law of the land. For a year and a half all of the provisions that I have mentioned have been in effect; and for the most part as far as those provisions are concerned, they have not been effectively criticized by the opponents of the legislation. I say that what we should do in considering this legislation is to take every one of those provisions, consider them on their merits and then either reject them, adopt them, or amend them. We cannot do this if we do not have the provisions before us.

In addition to the provisions I have mentioned, there are others in the Taft-Hartley Act which are clearly in the interest of union members, such as the provision for the proper handling of welfare funds, the requirement that union officers make financial reports to their members, the prevention of unauthorized use of union funds for political purposes, the provision that union dues shall not be checked off except where the member expressly authorizes it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems to me each one of those provisions, while individually good, yet taken collectively, put an unnecessary burden on the unions.

Mr. NIXON. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I believe he has raised a point which has been raised before by people who are attempting, as I realize the gentleman from Massachusetts is attempting, to find a fair, equitable piece of labor legislation. But my answer to the gentleman is that if you take the specific provisions, and if you find in considering each one of them that they have not been harmful in practice during the last year and a half, then I think that the House has the responsibility to continue those provisions in the law.

I believe that we should consider the various provisions of the law on their merits and not on a name-calling basis to the effect that all the provisions taken together are bad although if you take them singly they are good.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not think that is a name-calling proposition. It is like having a drink or 12 drinks. There is a principle involved. As things expand, even though separately they may be good, they may have a stultifying effect, and I do not think that is a name-calling proposition at all.

Mr. NIXON. I did not mean to say that the gentleman is using name-calling tactics. I believe the gentleman is attempting to find a fair piece of legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It strikes me that the interrogation of the gentleman from Massachusetts is just another evidence of what is coming to be a very obvious fact in the country. That is that as many of these provisions are inquired about individually the people affected by them say, "Why, there is nothing the matter with that." I must say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I cannot go along with the proposition that if 12 individual things are good, to put them together and say that hence as a whole they come to be something bad.

Mr. NIXON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has made a statement and I want to put a question to him as the ranking committee member handling this bill. I will preface the question by the statement that in discussing the provisions of the present law not contained in the Lesinski bill I did not mention the provision on the anti-Communist affidavit, the provision in regard to free speech, nor the one providing for use of injunctions in disputes affecting the national health and safety. The reason I did not is that it has been my understanding from the talk that has been going the rounds today that the leadership on the majority side has already agreed to accept amendments to the Lesinski bill covering these matters. I wonder if the gentleman will indicate so we may know just where we stand what amendments his side has agreed to accept?

Mr. KELLEY. I know of no amendments. I have agreed to nothing.

Mr. NIXON. That leaves the issue very clear. In other words, we find, as far as the ranking members of the committee on that side are concerned, it is the Lesinski bill or nothing. I say to the members of the committee that this means we are faced with a most difficult decision. If we turn down the opportunity which we will have to work with the Wood bill as the framework of this legislation, we shall be closing the door on the possibility of obtaining a fair, adequate piece of labor legislation; labor legislation which will protect the country against national-emergency strikes, which will provide for anti-Communist affidavits, which I know the gentleman from Massachusetts is particularly interested in, and labor legislation with a free-speech proviso, which several Members who intend to support the Lesinski bill have indicated they favor. Under the circumstances, and I submit this in all good faith and in all sincerity, when we have the Wood bill up for consideration tomorrow we should make an honest attempt to consider its provisions, striking out those we do not like and amending those we think should be amended. But we should not attempt to sabotage that bill, as has been suggested by some Members on the majority side. Otherwise you are going to get the Lesinski bill shoved right down your throats whether you like it or not.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. I stated this morning we should accept the Lesinski bill as is. I did not say this which I have constantly repeated in the past, and that is that labor legislation such as this is a very complex matter, as gentlemen have said before; therefore, you cannot write it in a committee, you cannot write it on the floor of the House. What should have been done long ago was to set up a commission to sit down with labor and management and work out a labor code the same as the railway people did.

Mr. NIXON. I know the gentleman has a bill pending for that purpose, a bill which has been approved by the committee. But I think from the gentleman's remarks it is still apparent that the leadership on that side is going to oppose all amendments to the Lesinski bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Personally, that is the position I take.

Mr. NIXON. I am glad to get the gentleman's position clear on that point.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I think one of the obvious things to us is the fact that the majority leader did not answer that question when it was put to him earlier in the afternoon; in other words, it leads us to the supposition that certain proposals may have been given to various Members of the Democratic Party that amendments will be acceptable if they will go along with the Lesinski bill. Now, that has never been denied by the top administration officials of this House.

Mr. NIXON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I should like to say at this point, because I probably will not have the chance to say it later, that the members of the Committee on both sides have appreciated the very fair manner in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] has handled the time on our side, and also the way in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has handled the time on the other side.

Now, coming to the crux of this matter, as I see it at the present time there are members of this Committee who certainly will not favor the Wood bill as it is; there are some who may want to make the Wood bill stricter than it is; there are others who may favor relaxing it. There are still others who are not satisfied with the Lesinski bill; in fact, personally I have found very few Members on either side who are satisfied with the Lesinski bill, because, obviously, it is a completely inadequate bill. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the better procedure and the only way in which we are going to get a fair, balanced piece of labor legislation is to take the major provisions of the Wood bill, consider those provisions on their merits, and if it takes a week, let us take that period of time, and at the end of that time I think we will have a piece of legislation which represents the thinking of a majority of the Members of this body.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I realize that the gentleman is very sincere and has made a very clear presentation here. It seems to me there is more than just a desire to write a bill of this type in the well of this House, because there is a fundamental, philosophical conflict, for example, on the free-speech provision. This is no different in the Wood bill than in the Taft-Hartley bill, and under the Lesinski bill those of us who believe in free speech believe that there is ample free speech permitted on the part of the employer. Now, there is no amendment than can change that at this time. Under the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, this doctrine of free speech is clearly set out. There can be no dispute about that in the well of the House except by those who want to sustain the present provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. NIXON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, because I recognize that he has studied this measure and this provision very thoroughly, but the gentleman well knows that the reason the free speech provision was written into the Taft-Hartley law, and the reason so many Members on that side have insisted that they want more or less the same language in regard to free speech in the new bill was that the National Labor Relations Board, in interpreting the Wagner Act, did deny free speech to the employer. All we want is fairness. Technically you may say that the Wagner Act did allow free speech to employers but if the employer exercised that right he ran the risk of being held guilty of an unfair labor practice.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further? I should like to make one other observation. As I said before, I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman from California, but the more I hear such statements from the well of this House, I am convinced that a great majority of the Members of this body do not understand the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, nor of the Wood or Lesinski bills, or they would not make such wild statements.

Mr. NIXON. I think the gentleman will probably recall, if he attended the hearings of the Committee on Rules, the occasion when the Members of the majority who were supporting the Lesinski bill were asked to explain the provisions of the bill. If he had seen that performance I think he would have made his statement even more strongly than he did as to the lack of understanding of certain Members of the provisions of the law.

But, the point I wish to make is this. If the Members do not understand this provision, if they do not know what is in the law, let us work with a vehicle which has all these provisions in it so that we will have something in front of us, rather than just amendments which are taken up to the Clerk, read, debated, and accepted or rejected. That is why we have to use, in my opinion, the Wood bill which does have provisions, adequate or inadequate, on all these items.

There is one final thing that I would like to say. I feel and I think most of us agree that we must have honest respect for the opinions of those who disagree with us.

As I look on the other side of the aisle I see a number of people who I know on this issue will probably vote differently from the way I will on many of the issues which come before us. I recognize that those individuals will be voting their convictions and I feel that I will be voting my convictions. But in any event, I think it is essential that the Members of this House vote their convictions on this bill and that we vote on it without any duress of threats of reprisal at the election in the event we vote one way or the other. I think that under the circumstances, of course, we must truly represent the people in our districts. That is our responsibility. But we also have a responsibility to get the very best and fairest labor legislation we can possibly write on the floor of this House.

For that reason, I was particularly disturbed, and I think I will be joined by most of the members of this committee, in my concern, at the statement made today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] and the news release which was handed to me an hour or so ago which he gave out to the members of the press. Let me read from that news release so you will realize the type of pressures which may be put on this committee and this Congress in considering this legislation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] says he has wired Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Mr. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, and Mr. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. All of these men, incidentally, are very able, honest American trade-union leaders. He has wired these men, and this is what he has said to them:

It is obvious that a reactionary coalition of Republicans and Democrats is determined to frustrate the will of the American people by watering down the Lesinski bill repealing the Taft-Hartley slave labor act.

I have advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act since the day it become law. I know of no reason to change my position. I want to vote for passage of the Lesinski bill as it was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Eighty-first Congress was elected to carry out the will of the people, and repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was the No. 1 issue in the campaign. It is a party pledge. The mandate is clear.

If there is a Member of this Congress whose memory is slipping it is the duty of the American people to provide a sharp reminder, and you are in a position to help.

I propose that you, as head of your great union, call a Nation-wide work stoppage as a demonstration of the solidarity of the American people in their demand for Taft-Hartley repeal.

I am making this appeal today on the floor of the House, and I hope for your acceptance.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is my firm conviction that any such effort on the part of organized labor would be a most dangerous precedent in the United States and most certainly would have a boomerang effect on the Congress of the United States and the people of our country. Just think of it. A work stoppage preventing hospitals and other institutions of that kind from operating.

Mr. NIXON. All of which are organized. That is correct.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. My comment on that would be, "Thank God that the leaders to whom that telegram was sent are more stable than the gentleman who sent it."

Mr. NIXON. The gentleman took the words right out of my mouth, because I am confident that these men, all of them, will resist this appeal that has been made to call a Nation-wide work stoppage in order to compel the Members of this House to vote one way or the other, either for or against their convictions, as the case might be.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. It is my opinion that the gentleman from New York who issued that statement has done a grave disservice to the cause of organized labor.

Mr. NIXON. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, if such a stoppage were called, it might well have the effect of insuring without question the retention of most of the major features of the present law. Much as I might like to see that occur, I should not like to see these great leaders of organized labor resort to the use of tactics which have been used in some countries across the Atlantic to force legislative bodies to take action against the interests of a majority of the people because of the pressures of well-organized, powerful minority groups.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I agree with the gentleman that the heads of all these unions that he enumerated are patriotic, decent Americans, and, as such, I do not think they should be held responsible in any way for the mouthings or words of any individual Congressman.

Mr. NIXON. I agree with the gentleman and I am glad that he has made that statement. The point I wish to make, and I say this only for purposes of illustration, is that it is true we have in our districts labor leaders; it is true that we have in our districts representatives of management; it is true, too, that we have representatives of the general public, who do not happen to fall in either classification, but I say it is the responsibility of all of us, as we sit here, in the consideration of this bill in the next few days, not to be moved by the pressures which come—pressures from men on both sides of labor and management, who may not understand the provisions of this act. We should try to consider them coolly, calmly, and we should consider not only the interests of labor and management, but of the general public as well. If we do that, we will come out of this House with a fair and honest piece of labor legislation, and only if we do that, will we accomplish that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time at my command I wish to speak in favor of H. R. 2032, the Lesinski bill, calling for an outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the reenactment of certain provisions of the Wagner Act, and the addition of other worth-while new provisions.

Without going into any specific provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, I can say truthfully that this law is a legislative monster in the minds of many of the people of our country, both in and out of labor unions, and is in truth and in fact a legislative monster and monstrosity to those who have taken the time to intelligently read and study its language carefully, and learn the possibilities it presents for bad big business to punish and enslave honest American labor, and destroy labor unions generally.

In it every suspicion is cast upon labor. The loyalty and patriotism of union leaders have been questioned and they must make a non-Communist affidavit, but the leaders of big business need make no such affidavit, or any affidavit that they are not Fascists.

Oh, the supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act state that they can see no wrong in making either labor leaders or business leaders take a non-Communist oath. Why should sordid communism be so publicized? Why should the finger of suspicion be pointed at any American and he be required to make a defense before any proof is offered tending to show disloyalty? This surely is not the way to proceed in the United States. Why not require an oath of allegiance instead, if you must presume one to be probably guilty before any proof is offered showing guilt? No, gentlemen, that provision regarding the non-Communistic affidavit was not the decent American way to handle that situation.

In the Taft-Hartley Act every sanction is against labor unions, and there are no sanctions against bad big business.

In my opinion, this Taft-Hartley Act was conceived in the bawdy house of big business by its bawdy-house minds, filled with bawdy-house ideas, and was laid like an abandoned waif upon the doorstep of Congress, who gave it "a local habitation and a name," and a mantle of legislative decency which it ill-deserved, and which did not befit it in any way or manner whatsoever.

There will be no peace until it, the Taft-Hartley Act, is dead and buried in an unnamed grave without pomp, ceremony, or marker.

Good capital and American labor are a great two-horse hitch, and should pull together, instead of against each other, if our Nation is to prosper as it deserves to prosper.

Capital never created anything although some of the professional chanters for big business so contend. Labor has

created everything. True big business has furnished the capital but capital basically is nothing in reality except stored up labor—the labor of some entity or person in the past days.

If any group of Americans should have the helping hand extended to them, it is honest and patriotic organized labor. It has never turned its country down in either war or peace. Its members have given their very lives for their country, as well as furnishing the sinews of war and peace. It has, on the whole, been in the ever faithful class, and has been the backbone of the United States, and yet it has been compelled for years to exist under some sort of industrial slavery. Just how any liberty-loving, Abraham Lincoln Republican can join hands with reactionary Democrats and support the Wood bill, or any other substitute bill, is beyond my comprehension. Will they now abandon the doctrines of freedom of the great Abraham Lincoln and be for some sort of industrial slavery for the organized laborers of America? Has it come to pass that old foes shall now be political bedfellows—that the lion shall lie down with the lamb—that the ideas of Jefferson Davis and Abraham Lincoln shall now become fused and that labor shall live and toil under a sort of industrial slavery—and will they also join hands on civil-rights slavery?

I have no appreciation for labor-baiting, labor-enslaving, bad big business. I remember that it has been and now is a real discredit to the Nation.

Through its past oppressive methods, its starvation wages, its brutalizing all-around conduct, it has been all of these things:

The father of blighting child labor.

The father of juvenile delinquency.

The father of the greater part of crime.

The father of malnutrition.

The father of many of the childhood diseases.

The father of many of the diseases of adults.

The father of starvation wages and superlong hours.

The father of inordinate greed and selfishness.

The father of the greater share of the ills which beset today the United States of America, in that they make the nests of ideas in which communism hatches. They furnish the incubators for communism. If unbridled they will make these United States a part of a growing communistic empire. If we really want to combat communism do not grind down organized labor, but give it a healthy helping hand, and curb the selfish and imprudent acts of bad big business, and the acts of selfish, unprincipled men who steer the selfish courses of bad big business.

If bad, big business had had its selfish way in the United States there would not have been an able-bodied man or woman in the United States to fight either one of the last two World Wars in which we took part.

Everything which is decent which it touches it puts the hand of tar and pollution upon.

The Democratic platform calls for a repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. We as the majority party have a mandate from the people to do just that. We must vote to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, we must strike down this Wood bill where reactionary Democrats and Republicans join unholy hands to perpetuate in America some kind of slavery—either industrial or otherwise.

Let me say in conclusion that if you vote to enslave labor we may not enjoy seeing many of your faces again in the Eighty-second Congress, for the same reason that many other faces are absent here today in the Eighty-first Congress. Any wrong you do to labor now will not go unnoticed or unforgotten. The fate of the United States of America and your own fate are in your very hands. Please help to strike a blow for freedom and not for industrial slavery for honest organized labor.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

CONCILIATION SERVICE

Mr. GREEN. The report of the Hoover Commission on the Department of Labor, Mr. Chairman, speaks of the Department as having been steadily denuded of functions at one time established within it. Of course the Republican Eightieth Congress could not resist getting into this stripping act. Despite the emphatic statement of the 1944 Republican Party platform that all governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor, the Eightieth Congress, the same Republican Congress which later defeated efforts to retain the United States Employment Service in the Department, enacted the Taft-Hartley Act and thereby divested the Department of the United States Conciliation Service, establishing it as an independent agency. The Taft-Hartley Act, Mr. Chairman, deprived the Department of Labor of an important function which had been entrusted to it by its Organic Act, which, incidentally, was approved by another Taft, then President, as one of his last official acts on March 4, 1913.

The United States Conciliation Service, Mr. Chairman, had been in the Department of Labor for 34 years and during that time had successfully settled more than 100,000 cases where disputes had arisen. It had achieved a record of settling without work stoppage over 90 percent of the cases to which a conciliator had been assigned prior to a stoppage. Despite the long record of successful operation in the Department of Labor, the Taft-Hartley Act on the ground, unsupported by any factual evidence, that the Service could not be impartial so long as it was within the Department, removed the Service from the Department of Labor. It should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that in this respect, as in so many others, the "new and revised" Wood bill is identical with the Taft-Hartley Act. The Wood bill provides for the continuation of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service as an independent agency, outside the Department in which it properly belongs.

The only argument, Mr. Chairman, advanced by the proponents of an independent conciliation service is that employers may suspect the impartiality of a service which is within a department that is responsible for fostering, promoting, and developing the welfare of the wage earners of the United States. All those who argue along this line piously preface their remarks with the statement that they know that Secretary Tobin is not biased and that they know that the Department of Labor will not be partial, but they can appreciate an employer's suspicion and consequential reluctance to use the facilities of a conciliator attached to a department which the employer may suspect of bias. No evidence showing bias upon the part of any particular conciliators in the past is produced. No, Mr. Chairman, there is no attempt to prove bias on the part of the Conciliation Service when it was located in the Department of Labor.

These advocates of an independent conciliation service who pay so much attention to the unfounded suspicions of employers and their desire for a conciliation service outside the Department of Labor pay no attention at all to the sentiments of labor on this matter. They seem to forget, Mr. Chairman, that there are two parties to a labor dispute, and that labor, as well as management, must accept conciliation if it is to be effective. Every labor organization was opposed, at the time the Taft-Hartley Act was being considered, to the separation of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor and today all are wholeheartedly in favor of the return of this function to the Department.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that no matter what the status of a mediation and conciliation service may be, there will always be charges of partiality and bias made by a few. The National Mediation Board has been an independent agency since its creation, but that has not prevented it from being charged with partiality by some who have had occasion to use its facilities.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, that the Eightieth Congress was dismembering the Department of Labor and adding to the already numerous Federal labor agencies, the same Congress was enacting a law declaring the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of public business by, among other things, consolidating services of a similar nature. For the purpose of carrying out this policy the Congress established the Commission popularly known as the Hoover Commission. The first report of this Commission, Mr. Chairman, stated:

> The executive branch is not organized into a workable number of major departments and agencies which the President can effectively direct, but is cut up into a large number of agencies which divide responsibility and which are too great in number for effective direction from the top.

The Commission came to the conclusion that in order to improve the organization and administration of Government there must be a more orderly grouping of the functions of the Government into major departments. In a task-force report, the Commission pointed to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service as an example of the

creation of independent agencies in the labor field which had left the Department of Labor stripped of its proper functions.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the interests of sound government require the re-creation of the United States Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, where it will have access to the results of the research into industrial relations which is constantly in progress in other bureaus of the Department and where the prestige of a Cabinet officer will be available to facilitate its efforts in the more serious labor disputes which may arise.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, without going into the merits and demerits of the Lesinski bill or the Wood bill, I wish first to comment briefly on the Taft-Hartley law.

The average Congressman, like the average American citizen, does not have the time to study—as much as he would like to—the more than 4,000 pages of testimony which was presented before the House and Senate committees.

The many weaknesses of the elaborate and burdensome provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were brought out over and over again in the long debates. Anyone who reads, with an open and honest mind, the facts in the testimony of the many witnesses before the Senate and House Labor Committees knows that the Taft-Hartley Act has many fatal weaknesses.

Senator TAFT, the author of this measure, has himself exploded the myth of infallibility concerning this law.

I have not had an opportunity to search completely the hearings of the Senate Labor Committee.

I have, however, been able to get the benefit of Senator TAFT's thinking on a number of issues.

Here are some of the criticisms that Senator TAFT makes of the Taft-Hartley Act:

First. Concerning mandatory injunctions against unions: Senator TAFT agrees that the mandatory injunction is one-sided and should be dropped—pages 1034, 1037.

Second. Concerning jurisdictional disputes: Senator TAFT agrees that it would be a good thing to add to the Taft-Hartley law by giving power to the National Labor Relations Board to appoint an arbitrator, as provided in the Lesinski bill—pages 155, 156.

Third. Concerning the power of the General Counsel: Senator TAFT admits that the Taft-Hartley Act gives great power to the General Counsel to make unreviewable decisions; Senator TAFT suggests that the National Labor Relations Board be made prosecutor and that a court pass on the question; Senator TAFT thinks Denham has assumed too much power in some cases—pages 169, 177.

Fourth. Concerning secondary boycotts: Senator TAFT admits that secondary boycotts are not improper to prevent an employer of a struck plant to farm out work to others.

Fifth. Concerning a closed shop: Senator TAFT agrees that opening union membership to all without discrimination is an alternative to a closed-shop bill—pages 165, 166, 221, 222.

Sixth. Concerning union-shop elections: Senator TAFT agrees that union-shop elections should be abolished—pages 160, 1718.

Seventh. Concerning the 60-day-notice provision: Senator TAFT has admitted that the notice provisions of the law in section 8 (D) are poorly drafted and create difficulty and confusion in connection with wage reopening clauses in collective agreements. Senator TAFT recognizes that the penalties which may be imposed upon unions for violations of the notice provisions are too severe—pages 128, 625, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073.

Eighth. Concerning the voting rights of economic strikers: Senator TAFT agrees that section 9 (c) (3) should be repealed, since this provision could be used to break strikes—pages 149, 501, 1769, 1916.

Ninth. Concerning welfare funds: Senator TAFT agrees that section 301's provisions in this respect should be completely redrafted—page 531.

Tenth. Concerning national emergency strikes: Senator TAFT has conceded that the present injunctive provision of the Taft-Hartley Act dealing with emergency strikes permit too broad an application.

Senator TAFT has conceded that the provision polling the employees at the end of the 80-day, no-strike period with respect to the employer's last offer should be eliminated.

Eleventh. Concerning political expenditures: Senator TAFT agrees that provisions are difficult to enforce, but not sure that the section should be done away with. He agrees that provisions are ambiguous and states that he favors their amendment—pages 704, 705.

Twelfth. Concerning non-Communist affidavits: Senator TAFT agrees that it is poorly drafted and that if it is retained it should be applied to officers of employers—page 1917.

Thirteenth. Concerning the coverage of the act: Senator TAFT has insisted that the act be amended to limit its scope—pages 1025, 1026.

So, ladies and gentlemen, without going into the merits of Senator TAFT'S recommended changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, I have merely pointed out a few of the changes which the author of this bill feels are necessary.

I have done this to emphasize the point that all thinking Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who have given considerable time, thought, and energy in studying the Taft-Hartley Act know that we need many changes in our present labor law.

As a young, green, freshman Congressman, I am taking my assignment on the important Education and Labor Committee very seriously.

I am still young and idealistic enough to believe that writing good legislation is more important than political consideration.

When I took my seat on the House Education and Labor Committee I had not indicated to the voters in my district how I would vote on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I am not and never have been under any pressure from organized labor.

As a matter of fact, there is very little organized labor in my district.

I feel that I am in an excellent position to write objective labor-management legislation.

I feel that a good labor-management law should include provisions to protect the health and safety of the American public from a labor gangster.

I think that a good labor-management law should protect collective bargaining.

I think that a good labor-management law should protect the members of a union from the abuses of a union.

I kept these objectives in mind in deciding to vote with the majority of my committee in reporting out the Lesinski bill.

Frankly, neither the Lesinski bill nor the Wood bill nor the Taft-Hartley bill protects the worker from the abuses of a union.

I, personally, would like to see some legislation making unions democratic and providing remedies for individual workers when they have been abused by union bosses.

Under the guise of protecting the individual the Taft-Hartley bill gave management a club to use against the union.

The Taft-Hartley bill is certainly no bill of rights.

It simply uses abuses within unions as a reason for giving management additional power.

The Lesinski bill does not deal with the internal affairs of unions.

Perhaps it is best not to include legislation dealing with the internal affairs of a union in a labor-management act.

Regardless of which bill is passed, I hope that this Congress will at a later date see fit in its wisdom to pass legislation to protect the workers within a union.

While neither the Lesinski bill nor the Wood bill protects the right of the individual within a union, the Lesinski bill does protect the right to collectively bargain.

While labor unions have not been destroyed under the Taft-Hartley Act, the story might have been different had there been millions of unemployed in this country.

The December 18 issue of Business Week admits that the Taft-Hartley law went too far in this respect.

This business magazine in referring to the Taft-Hartley Act said, and I quote:

> It crossed the narrow lines separating a law which aims only to regulate from one which could destroy.

As far as a national emergency is concerned, I do not believe anybody knows the answer.

I believe that two intelligent men could come to different conclusions on the provisions dealing with a national emergency.

In comparing the Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley, we find that they are very similar.

I am afraid that under the Wood bill or under the Taft-Hartley, where there is

not a tight labor market, the effectiveness of unions can be destroyed.

I refuse to vote for a measure which does not protect the right to bargain collectively.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, previous speakers have described the manner in which the Taft-Hartley Act abridges the rights of wage earners and hobbles the democratic process of free collective bargaining. The House has also heard a detailed description of the Lesinski bill, which is indeed a most constructive and equitable measure and one which I heartily endorse.

Not to retrace ground which has already been covered, I should like to bring to the attention of this House two points which are very pertinent to the present discussion—two very important points, I assure you.

The Taft-Hartley Act is bitterly resented by working people for a number of reasons. A law is expected to be an expression of justice, but the Taft-Hartley Act is unjust—it discriminates unfairly against those who must work for a living. I do not intend to take the time of the House to list all the reasons why the Taft-Hartley Act has made the wage earners of our Nation restive. One point, however, is made over and over again by working people when they list the evils of the Taft-Hartley Act. They refer with great bitterness to the fact that the Taft-Hartley Act brought back what is known as government by injunction.

If there is one thing that should be clear to every observant American by this time, it is the fact that no device exists which is better calculated to produce resentment among working people than the injunction.

The evil of government by injunction is no new phenomenon. It came upon the scene in industrial disputes in this country more than half a century ago. Employers who refused to recognize unions, who sought to continue to impose their own terms and conditions of employment upon workers in the most arbitrary and inhuman fashion, were overjoyed to discover that they could use the courts as tools to destroy the unions.

A union with legitimate grievances would ask the employer for an opportunity to present its grievances and discuss them with him. The employer would refuse. He would hire and fire in ruthless fashion. He would work his employees 14 or more hours a day. He would pay whatever he pleased.

When the workers felt that they could no longer endure the miserable working conditions and the flat refusal of the employer to recognize their union, they would go out on strike. Whereupon the employer would send his lawyer into court and the judge would quickly hand down a writ of injunction. The workers would be deprived of their constitutional rights. The antilabor employer would chortle in glee.

This evil continued for some years. The Nation gradually became aroused to the vicious unfairness of the use of the injunction in labor disputes. In particular, there was great resentment of the fact that the courts of equity were giving assistance to the rich and the powerful against the poor and the weak. This was entirely contrary to the purpose for which the courts of equity were originally established. Thus, we have Lord Chancelor Ellsmere describing his court in these words: "It is the refuge of the poor and afflicted."

The indignation against the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes in the United States resulted in the passage of the Clayton Act in 1914. The purpose of the Clayton Act was to stop the issuance of injunctions against unions, but it failed of this purpose. Drastic injunctions were issued against unions after the passage of the Clayton Act.

The lawless actions of the courts at the behest of brutal employers caused such bitter resentment that finally, in 1932, a Republican Congress and a Republican President found it desirable and necessary to place upon the books the Norris-LaGuardia Act outlawing the utilization of judicial writs in industrial disputes. The Norris-LaGuardia Act, a well-considered statute, was approved not only by labor but by enlightened employers and by the public at large. President Hoover and the Republican Congress of 1932 were alike praised for their part in righting a wrong which, if continued, would have produced the most serious consequences.

Under government by injunction, labor was forbidden to do things which are entirely lawful. For example, Judge Jenkins in 1893, in the Northern Pacific case, issued an injunction so sweeping as to forbid the workers to leave their employment. There were hundreds upon hundreds of injunctions issued against labor which prohibited the doing of things which are and must always be lawful so long as the Constitution of the United States remains alive and operative.

These injunctions which actually broke the laws of the land and violated the Constitution were often modified, upon appeal, but when this relief came it was too late. Entirely proper and lawful strikes of labor had meanwhile been broken. The courts had served as very effective strikebreakers on the side of unfair, greedy, grasping, and ruthless employers.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, to put an end to this evil which, among other things, brought our courts into disrepute with the overwhelming majority of our population, was passed in 1932. That is 17 years ago. Labor will not now and can never in the future be expected to accept the setting aside of this statute, the result of decades of struggle for a square deal. We must be realistic. The American people are a freedom-loving people above all else.

The working people of America cannot ever be expected to have respect for any legislation which brings back the evil of government by injunction, which was so wisely and so properly outlawed in 1932 and which should remain outlawed.

Listen to these words of Justice Howard, a wise judge of the New York State Supreme Court, speaking many years ago:

> The courts should not carelessly cast the weight of their mandates into the strife between employers and employees.
>
> In an evenly balanced labor struggle, an edict of the court, leveled at the strikers, shakes the morale of the workingmen. This is not the purpose of an injunction, although it is frequently, and perhaps generally, the purpose of the employer who seeks it.
>
> The moral effect of an injunction order in such cases is tremendous. At once it gives the impression in the community that the strikers have violated the law. The court seems to have taken a hand in the struggle. This is the layman's view. The injunction, thus shaping public opinion, is often decisive.

In the years preceding the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932, respect for our courts was greatly undermined among the millions of working people of the Nation. Why was this? The reason is clear. It was because the courts, by acting as strikebreaking allies of antiunion employers, earned the distrust and the contempt of fair-minded people. Of course, only a minority of judges outraged the American concept of fair play in this shameful manner. Nevertheless, the antilabor bias of this small minority of judges was enough to shake confidence in the courts.

Now, in the bill before us title III offers a sound procedure for dealing with emergency disputes. Under this procedure the President names an emergency board, there is a cooling-off period while the board investigates the dispute and makes its report, and then the recommendations as well as the findings of the emergency board are made public. The tremendous power of public opinion will, of course, be marshaled behind the recommendations and findings of the emergency board. The parties to the dispute, under the pressure of an aroused public opinion, will be moved to reach a quick agreement.

Oh, yes, there are those who want to use the compulsion of a court injunction. Well, let us examine the record. Is the injunction useful? Is it effective? What are the facts? As the Members of the House fully understand, there is an injunction procedure in the Taft-Hartley Act. Has it been a good thing? The only answer which any reasonable man can make is an emphatic "No."

The experience under the Taft-Hartley Act has been that the use of the injunction has almost invariably delayed settlement of labor-management disputes. This happened in the Atomic Energy case, in the Pacific Coast Maritime case, and in the Atlantic Coast Longshore case. No settlement was reached in any of these cases until after the injunctions obtained under the procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act had run their course and been discharged.

Listen to what William H. Davis, probably the outstanding impartial authority

in the entire Nation in the field of labor relations, has to say about this question:

The record on this subject—

He told the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on February 7—

is absolutely clear.

As I have pointed out, there has not been a case under the Taft-Hartley law in which a settlement has been reached during the cooling-off period under an injunction.

Then he goes on to answer the natural question as to why the injunction is ineffective. This is what Mr. Davis says:

Because men are not encouraged to be reasonable and to reach an agreed settlement, when they are under order of the court to work for a private employer whether they want to or not.

Cyrus Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, who was, by the way, a labor-relations representative for an NAM corporation and not a representative of any labor union, says this:

One of the conclusions which the Service is undoubtedly justified in drawing from its experience of the last year is that provisions for an 80-day period of continued operations, under injunctive order of a court, tends to delay rather than facilitate settlement of a dispute.

Mr. Ching elaborates his point, calling the 80-day period of the injunction "a warming-up rather than a cooling-off period." He gave illustrations of settlements reached after the conclusion of the 80-day period, which could not be reached at all with the injunction hanging over the heads of the unions.

Mr. George Taylor, former member of the War Labor Board and well-known expert in mediation, has this to say:

When the rights to strike are withdrawn, a most important inducement to agree is removed. Each party is reluctant to make any concessions around the bargaining table. The number of issues is kept large and formidable. Why not? There is everything to gain and nothing to lose by trying to get one's unusual demands approved without cost.

The experience of the War Labor Board in World War II, as well as scattered returns from those States which recently passed anti-strike legislation applicable to public-utility industries, strongly indicate that possession of the rights to strike and lockout is essential if labor and management are to settle their differences by their own agreement.

Gentlemen, we cannot turn the clock back even if we were so inclined. The evil of government by injunction is an evil which cannot be made to vanish by mere denial or even by a flow of oratory. It was recognized as an evil and ordered abolished in 1932. It is just as evil a thing today as it was then. And, in addition to being repugnant to all who want to maintain respect for our judicial edifice, experience has taught us during these past 2 years that the injunction is useless and worthless.

The Taft-Hartley Act contains three provisions for three different types of injunctions. Under these three combined sections, some 48 injunctions have been sought. Two of the total were brought by labor against management, of which one was granted. Six of the forty-eight were sought by the Attorney General in strikes involving national emergencies. The rest came under the vicious mandatory injunction clause, which today even Senator TAFT repudiates.

None of these injunctions led to a happy solution of the dispute. All of them aggravated the irritations and grievances which caused the dispute in the first place. Most of them were in worse shape at the end of the injunction period of 80 days than at the beginning.

There is a disposition to retain the injunction in cases involving national emergencies, as a protection to the public interest. The dangers in such a plan were recognized even by Senator TAFT himself when he stated "the tendency today is to call anything a national emergency."

Inasmuch as the injunction has little to be said for it and a great deal to be said against it; inasmuch as it contributes not one iota to the acceptance and sincere practice of genuine collective bargaining, I am hopeful that this House will repeal the action of the Eightieth Congress and reject any bill perpetrating the evils of government by injunction.

Labor-management relations are human relations, and they must be recognized on that basis. We want labor and employers to work together and live together, for their own mutual advantage and for the well-being of the community and the Nation. They have to work as a team. And you cannot make a team of horses pull well together by tangling them up in barbed wire; that is what the Taft-Hartley Act does in its attempt to force labor and management to cooperate by government intervention.

Now I should like to touch on another very important aspect of the problem before us.

We want labor and employers to work together and live together, for their own mutual advantage and for the well-being of the community and the Nation. This can be achieved by legislation which is scrupulously fair to both sides. No legislation which enables one side to run into court and there obtain a sandbag to belabor the other unmercifully is fair. Such legislation is obviously one-sided. It can only produce turmoil and resentment of the utmost intensity.

I am sure there is no intelligent Member of this House, whether he be on this side of the aisle or on the other, who does not realize that there is a world-wide contest in progress at the present time. This contest is for the sympathies and the support of the peoples of the world. The Communists seek to conquer the world for their way of life—the way of slavery. The democracies say that the Communist push must be halted. We are at the head of the democracies. We stand for the free way of life. We denounce, and very properly, the slave philosophy and the slave practices of Soviet Russia.

We have also taken affirmative actions. We have the European recovery program. Now we have the North Atlantic defense pact. We explain our way of freedom to the peoples of Europe and the world. We know that freedom has far more appeal for humanity than slavery, and so, if the people of other lands can be persuaded of our sincerity, if they can be made to believe that we do indeed enjoy the freedom of which we speak, they will line up with us and against the Communists. And, Mr. Chairman, never was it more important for our Nation to win the support and the friendship of the freedom-supporting peoples throughout the world. I am sure that this is clearly understood, and so I shall not belabor the point.

Well, Soviet Russia says—and she says this 24 hours a day, in all the languages of the world, over the powerful Radio Moscow transmitters and in her propaganda publications issued not only in Russia, not only in the satellite countries but also in other countries—that the Americans only talk of freedom, but it is just a pack of lies.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been cited thousands of times by the Russians as proof that the United States Government has shackled the workers of this country.

The Russians, of course, accept this view. But what is more dangerous is that the same idea is held in the democratic countries. They are not influenced by Russian propaganda on it, but they understand the issues as clearly as American workers do, and they recognize the Taft-Hartley Act as an indication of an antilabor trend in the American Government. And they fear this antilabor trend at home will be extended to an attitude of hostility to labor and labor governments abroad.

The contest now going on is in reality a battle for the world. It is a battle between democratic liberalism on the one hand and totalitarian reaction on the other. We, the United States of America, are the standard bearer for the democratic cause. We need all the strength we can muster. But such an enactment as the Taft-Hartley Act constitutes a terrific blow to our strength. It has made us appear hypocritical, saying one thing and doing the opposite, in the eyes of the peoples of Europe as well as of other parts of the world.

Now let me just take a few minutes to bring this home to you. I have gone into this matter very carefully because I feel very strongly that it is tragic for the Congress of the United States, at a critical time in history, to sabotage America's role in world affairs. This most assuredly was done by the Republican Eightieth Congress when it passed the Taft-Hartley Act.

The newspapers of Britain and France—not the Communist papers, but the regular democratic papers, such respected publications as the London Times, the London Economist, the French newspaper Le Populaire, published in Paris—declared after the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act that "in the United States reaction triumphs." This is an exact quote from Le Populaire. Similar comments appeared in right-wing and middle-of-the-road newspapers. American observers who have been in Europe during the past 2 years confirm that this view has been accepted by the people of Europe.

Obviously, this act of the Eightieth Congress played right into the hands of the Kremlin. Our friends in Europe—and when I use the word "friends" I mean the democratic peoples of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, and other lands—were shaken. The Communist propaganda machine had been pumping out poison for months, calling America reactionary and imperialistic, charging that we were not interested in helping but only in extending our sway over other countries. Well, these democratic friends of ours did not believe these Communist lies.

But then, in June 1947, the word went flashing over the water that the Taft-Hartley Act had been passed over President Truman's veto. Our friends were shocked. The Kremlin gloated and said: "Well, we told you so; didn't we?"

The damage that the Taft-Hartley Act did to the democratic cause cannot be measured. But there can be no question that it was tremendous all through the final 6 months of 1947 and up until the elections of last November 2. Then, when the American people spoke up for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the democratic peoples of Europe, whose friendship we want and must have, were relieved at last. Then and only then did the tide really turn against Moscow. Do not ever forget that very basic fact, my friends.

Our own American newspapers of November 3 and November 4 of last year give ample proof that our democratic friends in Europe were greatly heartened. They said so. And this has been confirmed also by the two great Americans, both of them outstanding businessmen by the way, Paul Hoffman, of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and his roving Ambassador in Europe, Averell Harriman.

Our friends in Europe were heartened and the Reds were hit in the solar plexus not simply because the Democratic Party had won the election. No; there was more to it. It was because the Democratic victory meant that the Taft-Hartley Act would soon be eliminated, thus putting the United States back in the column headed "Fair play to its own working people."

Now, are we going to hesitate to strengthen our Nation for its vital role in world affairs? The damage that was done by the Eightieth Congress must be undone. It must be undone promptly. The Taft-Hartley Act undercut the position of the United States. In fact, it is not too strong to say that the Taft-Hartley Act was actually an act of unwitting sabotage of the effort of our Nation to achieve peace.

The damage has been tremendous. Let us now move with the utmost expedition to undo this grave injury to our own country in its relations with the rest of the world and in its magnificent effort to cement together the democratic nations of the world against the brutal aggression of the new totalitarian monster.

We must realize that the position of the United States is not what it was 50 years ago. We are today the most important Nation on earth. Our actions, even in the domestic realm, have repercussions thousands and thousands of miles away, in distant lands. Bearing this in mind, and because simple justice to our own laboring people so dictates anyway, let us now get rid of this unfair statute, conceived by the National Association of Manufacturers, which has been so detrimental to American interests since June of 1947.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to those who spoke here to save the Taft-Hartley law and who now hope to keep it simply by changing its name.

They tell us that this law has not harmed labor unions—that it gave protection to workers and guaranteed the right to work. Another point they stress is that the law is in the public interest. They also say that union membership has increased and wages have gone up.

But if we carefully analyze these questions and study the facts, and look at the record, we will find that the law is as unfair and as vicious as any of its critics have dared to charge.

All my adult life I have been close to labor-management problems. From experience I have learned that the average employer is a pretty decent fellow. I have also learned that workers and labor unions are not without sin.

Strikes do not come because of a desire to be mean, nor because they are enjoyed by workers, nor because so-called union bosses glory in such strife. Strikes usually cause suffering. Those who feel the results most are strikers themselves. Strikes are a form of civil war—and nobody likes war. We do not have wars between nations because either side loves the mass killings, slaughter, and destruction.

Can we expect the lion and lamb to live peacefully on the home front, yet our own Nation must spend 78 cents out of every dollar for war. Can we look forward to any real hope of peace so long as the right to organize is still challenged by powerful industrial interests?

Strikes, like war, are wasteful. Every effort should be made to prevent them, or to minimize the danger that results. All fair means should be used for speedy settlement when conflict comes.

If we can by fair legislation prevent crippling strikes, especially those which so seriously affect our economic life, I am sure that every sensible labor leader would approve.

But, my good friends, Taft-Hartley is not the answer. Actually it fans the flames of strife. Despite the many millions of dollars that have been spent to put this law on the books, despite all the Taft-Hartley propaganda of radio and press, opposition continues to grow against this punitive legislation.

Already we have evidence of how one-sided and unfair this law really is. But far more unfair and dangerous is the real intent of this law which has not yet been felt. Actually there has been no real test of this act. And God forbid that the time will ever come in our country when the full impact of this law is felt by the American people.

It has been rightfully labeled as a delayed action bomb. The real blast was to have come at the proper time—when the reactionary forces gain full control of the machinery of government.

But the forces of reaction suffered a terrible shock last November because they underestimated the intelligence of the American people. Despite their tremendous advantage of having control of all the great propaganda devices, with phony pollsters working tirelessly in their behalf, they went down in a defeat which was far more drastic than the margin really shows.

Last week the Labor Board made a decision against three southern textile mills which discharged all union sympathizers.

This decision even though won by the union is an example of the unfairness of the law which waits 2½ years to make a decision against firms who have resorted to the worst kind of discrimination and violence in order to defeat organization and to keep their workers docile and humble.

Another example is what this law has done to the printing industry where a long history of peaceful labor-management relations has been turned to endless conflict.

It is true that labor-union membership has increased, but it is also true that the increase would have been far greater were it not that Taft-Hartley has made it difficult for workers to organize. It has bared workers to the dangers of the loss of jobs and to the blacklist and employer violence as the case of the southern textile mills so clearly shows.

The real test of whether unions will be hurt is when we have the full effect of a recession or that necessary float of unemployment which the top brass of industry have been praying for. It is then that the Taft-Hartley dream of antilabor bosses would come true.

I do not wish to challenge the good faith of my colleagues who boast about the guaranty by Taft-Hartley of the right to work. I think they do not really understand.

Just last year in my district an industrial plant closed its doors and cast 400 people out of jobs.

The first notice of the shut-down was on the morning of the day the plant closed its doors. They moved to Alabama for cheap labor where they still count workers as heads or hands. It did not seem to worry them that many workers gave a life of service to piling up profits for the firm and great riches for the owners.

No one seemed to care about the right of these faithful employees to work. But there are many such employers now down South pleading with their representatives to pass this kind of legislation under the guise that it protects workers. This is only a small sample of how phony the right to work is under Taft-Hartley.

Of course, the right-to-work bait in the Taft-Hartley law is used when employees protest against a nonunionist being permitted to work and enjoy union-shop conditions while he seeks to undermine the standards of his fellow workers.

When Taft-Hartley gives such rights it is actually interfering with the rights of the many who do not wish to work

besides those who would tear down conditions gained by years of sacrifice and effort in building a union. It is a wedge to destroy the security of the workers, their conditions, and the union itself. That is the real motive behind this so-called right.

Yesterday I heard something said about law and order and the prevention of violence in connection with this law. I am sure that we are all in favor of that.

But I wonder how there can be so much blindness to the kind of violence which seems quite legal, and is accepted, especially by proponents of this legislation, as a normal and natural thing.

I refer to the kind of violence used against people who, like in the closed plant I mentioned, are abruptly and unmercifully kicked out of jobs they have worked at all their lives.

Think of the mental agony and the suffering which often leads to serious illness and premature death in the families affected. Think what it does to happy homes and families—to the children and the old folks.

Far greater human suffering comes from such legal violence which somehow does not disturb those who so freely speak about the virtue of law and order.

Whenever reaction seeks to enact antilabor legislation or to fight social legislation, big tears are shed for the poor little fellows, as they do in Taft-Hartley about the right to work.

When they oppose housing legislation in the interests of financial and real-estate interests they would have us believe that they want to save the freedom of the little fellows who would be regimented by public housing. They would keep them all free in the slums.

Now we hear the voice of reaction telling us that legislation to extend the wonders of science to bettering the health services to the people of the Nation would take away the freedom of the little fellow to choose his own doctor.

Nothing is more vicious in the Taft-Hartley Act than the section which seeks to outlaw the political freedom of workers and to prevent contributions in political campaigns.

In totalitarian nations opposition parties are destroyed. In Germany the Nazis and Junkers destroyed labor unions and outlawed political freedom. Here reaction seeks to forbid workers to act in unison on the political field. It fits in perfectly with the Taft-Hartley pattern to destroy free union.

It goes even further when it seeks to gag the labor press. This trend was stopped only when the Supreme Court disagreed with Senator TAFT's version of the act and of course, by the elections of last November 2.

Why should not workers be permitted to pool their funds for political action? They can never equal the enormous sums being spent by employers to influence elections and legislation.

Think of the millions being spent by big business for radio commentators and for full-page ads. Cannot this money be truly termed as political contributions? It is all part of the drive to influence the people and Congress. It is the most powerful kind of a lobby and it works every day throughout the year, peddling its propaganda as news and impartial comments.

Think of the newspaper space used for columns and editorials which serve in the same manner.

Under this act a union must have 51 percent of the total number of voters in a plant to win a union shop. A union can win a large majority of votes cast and still lose an election.

If this is democracy, I challenge this House to apply the same rules to the election of Members of Congress. Very few of you would today be qualified to hold your seats under such a provision. I think that is especially true among the most ardent supporters of this act. Those who speak so much about making unions democratic—really fear democracy—and hope to curb the freedom of workers economically and politically.

Let me, in closing, make this observation. This legislation is more important than any measure that has been before Congress in many years. In the public interest this bill should be wiped off the statute books.

The proponents of antilabor legislation have constantly opposed social legislation which helps all the people of this Nation. The labor unions are the hard core of the forces which have long fought to better the lot of the the common folks.

When you hurt organized labor, you hurt the people. Workers, organized and unorganized, have a common interest in the legislation which labor unions fight and sacrifice for. When you hurt labor you also hurt the farmers and small business. I am afraid too many have forgotten the dark days of the early thirties.

I ask that we erase this stigma from our Nation's good name. I especially appeal to my colleagues from the South. I know the pressure that has been placed on them by reactionary forces.

I know that in order to win your vote you are being flattered in many of the papers. They say that you are independent and that you are not being bossed by the President. What they really want is for you to play the rubber stamp game for reaction.

I have great respect for those southern colleagues of mine whom I have learned to know during the months I have been here. I know they want to be fair. I know that this question is not as close to them as to some of us from industrial areas.

But let me say that time and history is on the side of those who vote against this antilabor legislation. The workers of the South, like the workers of the North, will not long accept the kind of freedom that antilabor bosses bestow upon them. Times are changing fast.

Remember the Democratic Party platform. Remember the mandate of last November.

On November 3 of last year the Wall Street Journal, like many other Republican publications, declared that the election of Tom Dewey was the people's endorsement for the Taft-Hartley Act.

It gives you an idea what the daily papers and Republican Members would be saying if the election tide would have turned the other way last November.

Now the papers and the proponents of this law say that the people did not vote for Taft-Hartley repeal and the Truman program.

They are doing now what they did before November 2. Just as they opposed President Truman then, they oppose his program now.

But they are as wrong today as they were then. Do not let them use you.

Let us get rid of Taft-Hartley and do not let the stigma of a Wood bill mar your good record in this Congress and forever haunt you the rest of your political life.

I want to see the greatest possible cooperation between labor and management. There is much we all have in common if we can eliminate waste and useless strife. But Taft-Hartley would not help.

There are many sections in this bill which only mess up good labor-management relations.

Do not fall for a phony substitute for the Lesinski bill or those so-called perfecting amendments.

Let us pass the Lesinski bill and lay the foundation for peace and progress on the industrial field in America. In doing so, we will strengthen the cause of democracy in the Nation and tell the world that America is going forward in its task of building a better nation and a better world.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and for the substitution of the proposed Thomas-Lesinski bill, which would be the National Labor Relations Act of 1949.

The Labor-Management Relations Act which we have been working under has brought nothing but confusion to the field of labor relations, has placed what we have known as collective bargaining, in a miniature area, where it has been hemmed in with no opportunity to expand, and furthermore it has limited the rights of our working men and women.

Collective bargaining is the background of our over-all national labor policy and it definitely works to the advantage of the general public. We must have collective bargaining not bargaining through the individual. All people who are conversant with labor relations must necessarily recognize the fact that the present law must be repealed. Justice for all is our American tradition.

Surely from our past experiences we cannot say, that the working man does not want the right to vote on whom he wants to represent him. Thousands of elections have been held since the enactment of the present act, and in 98 percent of these elections the members have voted authorization to the union, to represent them. With such proof available to all can there be any doubt as to the preclusion of the present section on the conduct of elections?

Today, after our past experiences, both the employer and labor are interested in a system of labor relations under which all can live together. Yes, both parties agree that some restraints are a necessity. The Thomas-Lesinski bill makes it possible for the employer and

labor, with the friendly assistance of Government, to sit down and amicably settle their own problems. There is nothing difficult in such an arrangement, nothing that could be offensive to either party. It is merely American democracy at work.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE].

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, the United States today is producing one-third of the world's goods. Production of goods and national income have reached record figures in the past few years. There has been a substantial increase in our general standard of living, a wider distribution of goods and services we produce among all our people. In addition, our production has successfully carried, first, the stupendous task of winning a world war and then of helping in the reconstruction of the war-torn countries.

This has been possible because agriculture, labor, and management have worked together.

Now, the question is: can we continue in time of peace to maintain high-level employment and high-level production? If we hope to achieve our goal of world peace we must. And, again, we can do this only if there is cooperation and good will among farmers, workers, and entrepreneurs.

We must not only achieve high-level production and employment, but achieve it under our democratic system of free institutions and free enterprise. Today our economy is so complex, we are each so interdependent one on the other, that we are forced to have regulations. We have no choice as to that. But we do have a choice between a drastic extension of Government controls on one hand and voluntary action making such controls unnecessary.

This alternative is the key to the controversy over the Lesinski bill based on the philosophy of the Wagner Act and the Wood bill based on the philosophy of the Taft-Hartley Act. Before reaching a conclusion on any particular point in either bill we should be clear on this fundamental difference in basic philosophy for we are enacting legislation which touches directly the lives of 14,000,000 organized workers, their families and their employers and which influences our entire economy and thus the lives of our entire population.

Now both bills assume that collective bargaining is an essential element of relations between employers and employees. Collective bargaining is accepted in the abstract. The conflict comes in its practical application.

The Wagner Act and the Lesinski bill are based on the belief that the entire country would prosper through a better distribution of our production and that this better distribution and the resulting higher standard of living can be achieved only through permitting the workers to join unions of their own choosing and prohibiting employers interference with that right. There must be order in industry. The Wagner Act and the Lesinski bill would attain order through the development in management and labor of the habit of working together on the solution of their problems; in the acceptance of the fact that they have a common interest in high level employment, high level production, and in low-cost production—better wages, better profits and more goods at lower prices for the consumer.

Although the Wagner Act laid down a broad Federal labor policy with respect to collective bargaining, the area of Government intervention was sharply delineated. The Government could only step in if employers were interfering with their employees' right to join unions of their own choosing, or if employers were refusing to bargain collectively with their employees' representatives.

Once the employees were organized, once the employers bargained in good faith with representatives of the employers, intervention by Government under the Wagner Act ceased.

The Wagner Act made collective bargaining possible. Its goal was to create the initial condition and then leave the working out of the details of problems to the voluntary organization of workers and the employer. The Wagner Act does not attempt to deal with the many complicated situations which arise in the collective-bargaining process. Those of us who support the Lesinski bill do not believe that Government should attempt to control collective bargaining nor dictate as to how collective bargaining should be carried on or with what it should deal. We believe in free collective bargaining with Government in the role of traffic cop and not of collective-bargaining dictator.

The basic philosophy of the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood bill is quite different. The Wagner Act was a simple statute which restricted Government intervention to a minimum. The Lesinski bill follows the same pattern. The Taft-Hartley Act (and the Wood bill) are complex labor codes which inject the Government into the collective-bargaining process at many points.

Attempts to amend the Wagner Act began immediately upon its passage. Those seeking amendments argued then without any factual basis, as they do today that it was one-sided and resulted in giving labor an overbearing position in its dealing with management and that amendments were necessary to give management a position of equality with the unions.

The facts are all against this argument. I regret there is not time to review them here. But one point must be made. The great majority of witnesses in favor of amendments, in favor of Taft-Hartley, were from industries where management has been unable or unwilling to achieve a satisfactory collective-bargaining relationship and which have never genuinely accepted collective bargaining with effective trade-union organizations as a permanent feature of American economic democracy. These groups in favor of the Taft-Hartley philosophy are against Government intervention in matters concerning their activities. They favor it in the case of collective bargaining because, as drawn, the Taft-Hartley Act gives them a favored position.

The voluntary character of the collective-bargaining process has been seriously affected by the Taft-Hartley Act. Government is injected into the collective-bargaining process itself—by prohibiting the closed shop, by spelling out an approved union-shop provision and by restricting health and welfare provisions—all of which have been traditionally subjects of agreement through collective bargaining. The extensive use of the injunction and the right to bring suit gave the National Labor Relations Board and the courts an important and frequently decisive role in the collective-bargaining process.

Harmonious human relations cannot be legislated, cannot be enjoined by the courts. They can be achieved only by the slow process of working together, of learning to cooperate, of developing mutual trust and confidence.

The Wagner Act provided a favorable climate in which collective bargaining could develop. Only a small percentage of eligible employers were covered by collective agreements in 1935, and about half were covered in 1947. Strike statistics which I do not have time to quote here tell the same story.

Labor has gained under the Wagner Act but not at the expense of management. The share of national income going into corporate profits has increased from 5.3 percent in 1935, the year the Wagner Act became law, to 12.2 percent in 1947. From 1935 to 1947 the over-all increase in corporate profits after taxes was 687 percent, as compared with an increase in wages of 244 percent.

Do these figures indicate an overweaning labor organization, the need for a redress in the balance of power between management and labor? Certainly not.

Those who oppose the Wagner Act, the Lesinski bill, do not really want equality, but the old-time pre-1935 balance in favor of management. They do not fully realize the fact that modern industry calls for a well-organized, well-paid labor force if we are to maintain a high level of prosperity for the whole country.

The fundamental question is, Do we want genuine collective bargaining between equals which will lead to order in industry based on cooperation between labor and management or will we have order imposed by Government boards and courts? In brief, if we believe in voluntary action, in the educational processes, in democracy in industry, we favor the philosophy of the Wagner-Lesinski bill; if we prefer the seemingly quicker route to order, the intervention of Government and Government control with its inevitable consequences of loss of democracy in industry, then we will favor the philosophy of the Taft-Hartley-Wood bill.

As a believer in a free democratic economy and in the common interests of labor, management, and the public, I strongly urge the support of the Lesinski bill as the type of legislation which will lead to industrial peace, and to stable industrial democracy. To the world, we, the people of the United States, are the symbol of democracy. They look to our actions to indicate, or in the case of the totalitarians to condemn, democracy. Can we preach political democracy, on one hand, and strangle industrial democracy on the other? We dare not. We

must follow the fundamental philosophy of voluntary collective bargaining with a minimum of Government interference and the maximum of industrial democracy as embodied in the Lesinski bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I had hoped that this debate would not close without affording an opportunity to the many other Members who wish to speak in favor of this bill. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and as a member of the subcommittee which heard the testimony on this bill, I want to say that I uphold the position the chairman and subcommittee chairman took in this matter. I think they acted very democratically. I want to remind the Members of this House that there were three members of our committee who voted with the members of the Republican minority at all times. There may come a time when we will not have any members of our own party on the committee lined up against our party's platform. You cannot reason with people who are in the camp of the minority because their philosophy does not follow that of the party they claim to belong to even though they accept the favors of their party. I was wondering about the validity of the statements of the southern gentleman who plans to offer a substitute bill here. He stated that this bill does not follow the Democratic Party platform in many respects. What platform of what party was he talking about? He was certainly talking about the Republican Party platform, judging from the endorsements given his bill by so many of our Republican colleagues.

There is no question but what the great mass of people in this country desire to build a better society. They desire better schools, better housing, more adequate hospitalization, purer foods, less crime, better administration of justice, cleaner politics, better wages, better working conditions, more comforts and more security in time of sickness and old age.

Most of us heartily endorse these things, and since America is a Nation of generous people we give our hearty support and applause to efforts to relieve suffering and to improve conditions. Has it ever occurred to you, however, that nearly all moves to improve conditions have to be fought for? Have most of you ever stopped to speculate on the reason why this is so? Those of you who have thought deeply enough upon this question will have discovered why all social improvements have to be so bitterly fought for. It is because we have two political parties with opposite economic and social philosophies. Our great Democratic Party, founded by men like Jefferson, stands for the things that I have just spoken of. The other, the Republican Party, has always stood for special and private interests. Why has it been such an uphill fight to abolish child labor in America? Not because we believe that child labor is a fine and valuable thing; no, indeed. It is because child labor has been economically profitable to some people, and they therefore have spent much effort and great sums of money to fight against abolishing it. Why did it take a bloody Civil War to free the slaves? Not because the people considered human slavery a fine and valuable social institution, but because it was a source of economic profit to a great many, and they fought to retain it. Why have we had such a long, desperate struggle to shorten working hours, and improve working conditions, and increase wages? I am not thinking of the organized workers only, but also of the great bulk of unorganized workers, the clerks, the factory workers, the agricultural workers and all those who make up the 60,000,000 who are now working today. It was not because most of us think that long hours, arduous working conditions, and starvation wages are a fine thing; not at all.

Those things I have just mentioned were the very keystones upon which the Republican Party was established by that great American, Abraham Lincoln. It is shocking to me to see and hear on this floor so many who profess to follow the basic philosophy of Lincoln backsliding from the very fundamental beginnings of the Republican Party. I suspect that there may be selfishness involved, either on their parts or on the parts of their party backers.

This bill is a strict bill designed to protect the interests of employees, employers, and the public. It is not spineless. It contains some features that do not please organized labor as the Wagner Act did. Yet labor realizes that it has grown up, so to speak, and in the process has acquired the know-how to really work amicably with business and management for the building of an even greater America.

The skillful propagandists of the opposition have fed the Congress and the general public from their flowing mills of deception the impression that if this bill is passed, the rights of employers would be so lessened that they would be at the very mercy of their employees' unions. They have even been brazen enough to forecast another horrible depression if the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed. Nothing could be further from the real truth.

As I shall point out later in my analysis of the bill before us, the public's interest is amply protected by the very language of section 301 of the bill. There can be no question but that the President does have the inherent right to act in the public's interest and obtain injunctive relief when other methods for settling labor disputes have failed. The opposition would like to have each of us believe that those rights do not exist. Yet the inescapable fact is that the President does have that power.

Because the rank and file of the American people believe so heartily in the right of working people to organize for the protection of their own rights, they believed last November 3 and they still believe and subscribe to the statements made by our President when he campaigned throughout the country asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act because it in effect would ultimately eliminate and liquidate the recognized right of working people to organize for their own protection.

Even the Republican campaigners from Governor Dewey on down the line recognized the basic right of employees to organize.

Yet they engaged in a lot of doubletalk when they admitted that working people should continue to have the right to organize for their protection because at the very same time they defended the Taft-Hartley Act which virtually nullifies that right.

Because so much has been said of a misleading nature by opponents of the bill, I do feel I should discuss some of those points at this time.

It has been said so many times that the Taft-Hartley Act is so loosely drawn in some of its provisions that almost any self-serving action can be taken under some of the broader provisions of the act. This new bill attempts to define in exact language some of the rights of both employers and employees so that each may know those things before disputes arise.

An additional paragraph in section 106 of the bill has been used to define and declare the policy of the act in relation to other provisions of that section. That, in itself, is a radical departure from the original Wagner Act. The paragraph I refer to reads:

> Experience has further demonstrated that certain unjustifiable conflicts between or among labor organizations lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife which substantially burden or obstruct commerce, and that the failure of employers to maintain a neutral position aggravates and prolongs these conflicts. The public interest requires abatement of such industrial strife through just, peaceable, and final settlement.

Going ahead from that point section 106 deals with the questions of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes, giving new definitions to clarify the exact scope of the two terms for the better understanding of both management and labor. Without question those definitions should be of invaluable assistance to the administrators of the act in carrying out the policies of the act. Those two new definitions are:

> 1. The term "secondary boycott" means a concerted refusal in the course of employment by employees of one employer to produce, manufacture, transport, distribute, or otherwise work on articles, materials, goods, or commodities because they have been or are to be manufactured, produced, or distributed by another employer.
>
> 2. The term "jurisdictional dispute" means a dispute between two or more labor organizations (not established, maintained, or assisted by any employer action defined in this act as an unfair labor practice) concerning the assignment or prospective assignment of a particular work task by an employer.

Then section 106 proceeds to add to the unfair labor practices of employers as defined in section 8 of the 1935 act a new unfair labor practice as follows:

> (6) To refuse to assign a particular work task in accordance with an award under section 9 (d) of this act.

Section 9 (d) provides a method of settlement of jurisdictional disputes by the National Labor Relations Board which is somewhat similar to the method provided by the Taft-Hartley Act.

In section 106 is subsection (b) which defines certain unfair labor practices upon the parts of labor organizations. That subsection reads:

(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization—

(1) to cause or attempt to cause employees to engage in a secondary boycott, or a concerted work stoppage, to compel an employer to bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if—

(a) another labor organization is the certified representative of such employees within the meaning of section 9 of this act; or

(b) the employer is required by an order of the Board to bargain with another labor organization; or

(c) the employer is currently recognizing another labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any employer action defined in this act as an unfair labor practice) and has executed a collective-bargaining agreement with such other labor organization, and a question concerning representation may not appropriately be raised under section 9 of this act.

The above quoted sections (b) (1) (a) (b) and (c) make unlawful any picketing or any conduct upon the part of a labor organization which causes "a concerted refusal in the course of employment of employees of one employer to produce, manufacture, transport, distribute, or otherwise work on articles, materials, goods, or commodities because they have been or are to be manufactured, produced, or distributed by another employer."

That section means, contrary to the statements of the propagandists of the opposition, that one union cannot refuse to work on materials which are manufactured by some other employer using workers belonging to an entirely different union organization that (a) is the certified representative of such employees, or (b) belong to an organization which the other employer is required by the Board to bargain with or (c) who belong to an organization that the employer is currently recognizing and which organization is not company dominated and has executed a collective-bargaining agreement with the other employer.

The unfair labor practice just mentioned—the practice of picketing or boycotting an employer because he has recognized another certified union or because he may be following a Board order to bargain with another union—has been pretty thoroughly condemned by the courts because it forces employers to commit unfair labor practices against other unions in violation of the law. This provision puts into statute form what the courts have held to be the intent of the law.

Paragraph (b) (1) (c) which makes it an unfair labor practice on the part of labor organizations to boycott an employer who is currently recognizing another labor organization—not established, maintained, or assisted by any employer action defined by this act as an unfair labor practice—and has executed a collective-bargaining agreement with such other labor organization, and a question concerning representation may not appropriately be raised under section 9 of this act.

Then section 106 of the bill then proceeds to make it an unfair labor practice on the part of labor organizations, as follows:

(2) To cause or attempt to cause employees to engage in a secondary boycott, or a concerted work stoppage, in furtherance of a jurisdictional dispute if such labor organization is seeking to compel an employer to assign a particular work task contrary to an award made under section 9 (d) of this act.

Dealing further with jurisdictional disputes is section 9 (d) of the bill. That provision, in some respects, is not, in my opinion, as favorable to organized labor as section 10 (k), title I of the Taft-Hartley Act. The section of the bill we are considering reads:

Whenever a jurisdictional dispute results in or threatens to result in a concerted work stoppage, or a secondary boycott, affecting commerce, the Board may hear and determine, or appoint an arbitrator to hear and determine, the dispute, and issue an award, first affording the labor organizations involved in the dispute a reasonable opportunity to settle their controversy between or among themselves. In determining the dispute, the Board or the arbitrator, as the case may be, may consider any prior Board certification under which any such labor organization claims the right to represent employees who are or may be hired or assigned to perform the work tasks in dispute, any union charters or interunion agreement purporting to define areas of jurisdiction between or among the contending labor organizations, the decisions of any agency established by unions to consider such disputes, the past work history of the organizations involved in the dispute, and the policies of this act.

To clarify in your minds the powers of the President to act in cases of national emergency, I wish to call your attention to the language of section 301 of the bill which provides:

Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work, or if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

Section 302 (a):

After issuing such a proclamation, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an emergency board.

Section 302 (b) provides that said emergency board "shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 25 days after the issuance of the proclamation, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public."

In my opinion, when section 301 gives the President the power to "call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work, or if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest," and section 302 provides that "until 5 days have elapsed after the report has been made by the board appointed under this section, the parties to the dispute shall continue or resume work and operations under the terms and conditions of employment," the President would have the legal right to enforce that power by injunctive action. (The case of *United States* v. *United Mine Workers of America and John L. Lewis* (330 U. S. 258, 67 S. Ct. 677), is very much in point.) The bill provides no remedy for the President if his orders made under the law are flaunted. Actions in courts of equity are ordinarily based upon the assertion that there is no remedy at law.

Section 302 (c) provides that—

After a Presidential proclamation has been issued under section 301, and until 5 days have elapsed after the report has been made by the Board appointed under this section, the parties to the dispute shall continue or resume work and operations under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect immediately prior to the beginning of the dispute unless a change therein is agreed to by the parties.

It is true that section 401 of the bill provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act "are continued in full force and effect in accordance with the provisions of such acts; except that the provisions of such act and such sections shall not be construed to be applicable with respect to section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act."

That provision does not change the law as it existed prior to the Lewis case above cited wherein the Supreme Court held that—

Statutes which in general terms divest pre-existing rights or privileges will not be applied to the sovereign without express words to that effect.

The citations just given show clearly, in my opinion, that the President, acting on behalf of the Government, does have the power under this bill to act on behalf of the public by use of the power of injunction, if the need be, to safeguard the public welfare.

The Taft-Hartley Act is unfair, both to labor and management, and because of that it will eventually cheat the public of the proper and full benefits to be derived from the amicable labor relations which create prosperity and well-being.

The present bill now before us is both fair and adequate to safeguard the interests of labor, management, and the public. For those reasons I sincerely hope that this House will vote overwhelmingly for passage of this bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, as we meet here today to discuss this vital issue of labor legislation, all of us realize that the subject with which we are concerned has been debated and discussed at almost incredible lengths. We know that spokesmen for both industry and

labor have expounded their ideas over and over again on each minute point in the whole issue. We have literally been deluged with reports, analyses, studies, inquiries, investigations, opinions, briefs, and practically every form of written and spoken argument on every detailed phase of the issue.

I suppose we all thoroughly know the provisions of the Wagner Act and the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

We are not discussing these provisions. What we are discussing here is a philosophy and the character of our discussions reveals our attitude toward the milions of working men and women of this country. A vote for the Wood bill is a vote for the Taft-Hartley philosophy. The gentleman from Virginia has made this crystal-clear.

The restrictive measures of the Taft-Hartley Act in times of full employment are repressive. They curtail and hold down the activities of labor unions. In times of unemployment, the Taft-Hartley Act, because it so clearly undermines the worker's means of self-defense, could break and destroy labor unions.

Do we believe in collective bargaining or not? That is the question we answer here. Do we believe that the men and women who turn out the raw materials and goods from our mines, factories, and mills and fields should be granted enough power by law to bargain for a living wage and decent working conditions.

When the working men and women can protect themselves against the machines of giant corporations, freedom is assured and democracy is protected. One does not find labor unions—independent, free labor unions—in a Fascist or Communist state.

Why is it that the first attack in a Fascist state is on the labor union? Because if working men and women who are the very heart of our society meet freely and express themselves, there can be no dictator.

There are any number of sources that one can go to prove this point. But I quote from a document printed here in the Congress of the United States, Fascism in Action:

> The role of labor in the Fascist economic and political system is one of subservience. One of the most important changes fascism brings about is the abolition of free collective bargaining and of self-governing labor organizations. Labor policy under fascism first of all takes away from the worker all means of self-defense. It renders all militant labor action impossible.

And for the farm Representatives, I might say that in a Fascist or Communist state the co-ops are No. 2 on the death list, because they, too, contain the deadly germ of democracy—quote from Robert Ley.

It has always seemed ironic to me that the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress wrote into the labor act a requirement that labor leaders must sign a non-Communist pledge.

While the Eightieth Congress professed to be fighting communism, actually they were following an economic pattern which if carried out logically throughout our economy could lead only to fascism or communism.

The majority of the American people live on very limited incomes. Statistics show that about 46 percent of all families throughout the country have incomes below $3,000 and almost 30 percent below $2,000.

Some folks forget that. The big corporations and Wall Street, despite tremendous economic power they possess, do not represent the desires and aspirations of Americans, whether they work in the factory or in the fields, in the ships or in the offices, whether they be doctor, teacher, or lawyer.

And that, I believe, is the greatest understatement of this debate.

That is why the four issues in the recent election were housing, farm price support program, reclamation and development of the West, and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. That is why the farmer voted with labor. The farmer and labor saw the handwriting on the wall—big corporations and Wall Street, in addition to their tremendous economic power, were again to make and enforce the rules. The farmers and labor remembered what happened in 1929.

Between 1929–1933, auto production dropped 80 percent but prices dropped only 16 percent.

Between 1929–1933, iron and steel production dropped 83 percent but iron and steel prices dropped only 20 percent.

In this same period while agricultural production dropped only 6 percent, agricultural prices dropped 63 percent, and in this same period somewhere around 12,000,000 consumers found themselves without any income.

Politicians and Congressmen may forget these figures, but the farmer and the laboring man cannot. He remembers them in the pit of his stomach.

In 1948, after paying taxes, profits of corporations were $21,000,000,000. $7,000,000,000 were distributed in dividends, $14,000,000,000 were undistributed.

Labor unions are desirable not only socially but economically, if enough money is to get back into the consumers' hands to keep production rolling and maintain full employment.

It is my own feeling that because of the extraordinarily extensive debate on the details of the legislation before us, we have perhaps failed to see the forest for the trees. In other words, I have a feeling that we have failed to focus our attention on the basic question involved in the whole matter. Dare we in the face of the tremendous corporate concentration in this country, repress and hold down the activities of labor unions?

Is it fair or just for the Congress of the United States to impose, by statute, restrictions which make it almost impossible for labor organizations to grow, or even to survive while at the same time granting to big business full permission to expand until it has achieved a virtual monopoly of practically all lines of industry?

Let us be realistic and face the economic facts of life. On the one hand there are three major labor organizations in this country—the CIO, the AFL, and the railroad brotherhoods—plus a number of independent, unaffiliated unions such as the International Association of Machinists. Each of these three major organizations is composed of numerous individual unions, the functions of which are to try to secure for their members higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions.

In order to make any accomplishment whatsoever, they must negotiate at every stage with the employers. They have only one final instrument of action—if all reasonable negotiations fail—to strike, the effectiveness of which is limited by the ability of the worker and his family to survive without food, clothing, and other essentials of life while the strike is in progress.

In the May 31, 1948, issue of Life magazine, there was a fright article of two pages of figures which showed that 32 of the major unions with a membership of 8,115,800 had in treasury assets, the combined wealth of $224,000,000. This was supposed to scare the country to death.

Let us look at tnese assets. This figure of $224,000,000 must cover trust funds, payment for old age, disability, death, and other welfare benefits and all emergencies, including possible strikes.

In contrast, consider the economic power represented by the organizations on the other side of the table. The giant corporations count their resources not in terms of a few million dollars but in billions. Unlike the labor organizations, they do not have to negotiate with any other organization in carrying on most of their activities, such as determining prices, setting production levels, expanding their operations, and so forth. Unlike the labor unions, they have numerous instruments of action, such as the restriction of output, each of which is far more effective than the instrument of the strike. And unlike the unions, the corporate officials and directors do not have to go without food and other essentials while a strike is in progress. They are paid by the year with pensions of $25,000 a year when they are too old to work and too young to die.

Before we get too scared over the assets of labor unions, let us look at just one great corporation.

General Motors in 1948 made $478,300,000 after taxes, 29.5 percent of net worth. In other words, 1 year's earning after taxes of one corporation, General Motors, doubled the assets of the 32 major labor unions in the whole country. And remember these assets of labor unions are spread over 48 States and must provide protection for over 8,000,000 people—less than 28 pitiful dollars per person.

It would seem, therefore, only logical and appropriate that the Congress of the United States, in viewing these two types of organizations, would inevitably come to the conclusion that the degree of economic power held by the giant corporations is infinitely greater than that of the labor organizations.

Yet, paradoxically, the Congress has closed its eyes to the problem represented by the giant corporations, and instead has devised a wide variety of detailed restrictions designed to curtail the activities of the infinitely weaker form of economic power—labor unions which

protect the living standards of millions upon millions of American families and which tend to stabilize the markets for food, clothing, and other manufactured goods.

And past Congresses have done this even though the problem of giant corporations long antedates the existence of large labor organizations. For example, in 1929, long before anyone had heard of the CIO and when the AFL consisted largely of small, scattered craft unions, the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations owned no less than 48 percent of all the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations in the country. In that same year, these 200 giants received fully 43 percent of the total net income of all corporations. And in the field of manufacturing alone, 316 large corporations held 40 percent of the total working capital of all corporations. By way of contrast, in 1929, only 11 percent of the wage earners in manufacturing belonged to labor unions, and only 10 percent of all nonagricultural workers were union members.

In industry after industry, this same situation prevailed. In the steel industry, the four largest producers in 1930 held 55 percent of the total rolling mill capacity; in 1939 there was no United Steel Workers Union.

In that same year, the three largest automobile companies made 83 percent of the total number of automobiles produced; in 1930 there was no United Automobile Workers Union.

In that same year, the four largest producers accounted for 76 percent of the total copper mined in the country; in 1930 there was no United Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union. Thus there can be absolutely no doubt concerning the existence of a high degree of concentration of industry prior to the emergence of industry-wide labor organizations. This is no "which came first, the chicken or the egg" dilemma. It is perfectly clear that the giant corporation in industry long preceded the labor organizations and forced the growth of labor organizations. Congress should remove from the back of labor those restrictions which seriously impede its activities.

It is my profound conviction that this issue before us today of collective bargaining is a matter of great and compelling importance to the future of the democratic system. The people cannot be expected to place much faith in democratic processes if they gain the impression that bigness in corporations is all right, but that bigness in labor organizations is all wrong; that there is one set of laws and practically nonexistent restrictions for the corporations and an entirely different set of crippling restrictions for the labor union; and that, in effect, there is one law for the rich and one for the poor.

I am not unmindful of the existence of the antitrust laws. Although I am certainly not an authority on the antitrust laws, it seems to me that the facts clearly indicate that we are getting nowhere fast.

It is unfortunate and indeed tragic that the antitrust laws have not been more effective in arresting the growth of monopoly. But the antitrust laws, while they could have been effective in the past, and should be made effective in the future, actually have been almost completely unsuccessful in halting the growing concentration of economic power.

The reasons for this are threefold—the judicial, the administrative, and the legislative branches of government. On its part, the judicial branch has contributed powerfully to the ineffectiveness of the laws by holding that it is permissible for a single corporation to control an entire industry. Although the Sherman Act states that "every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, shall be deemed guilty," the Supreme Court has held, in effect, that this law does not prevent any corporation from monopolizing up to 90 percent of an industry.

Unfortunately I do not possess the legal knowledge which would be necessary in attempting to reconcile this legal interpretation with a law which to a layman, such as myself, seems so clear. I can only say, however, that the facts clearly reveal that, with the exception of the recent Aluminum decision—the practical effect of which was subsequently nullified by the more recent Consolidated Steel case—the Court has steadfastly held that size and power, no matter how great, do not, in themselves, constitute a violation of the law.

On its part, the administrative branch of the Government has never received enough funds to enforce these cases. I might add that this condition has persisted during both Republican and Democratic administrations. In recent years following Thurman Arnold's vigorous enforcement of the law, the administrative branch of the Government has taken much more interest in antitrust activity.

Congress must accept its share of the responsibility for the relative ineffectiveness of these laws since, throughout the years, Congress has only seen fit to appropriate a small fraction of the amount of money actually needed to effectively enforce the laws. The two antitrust agencies combined receive the munificent sum of around $6,500,000 a year with which they are supposed to break up existing monopolies, prevent the further growth of concentration, protect small business, eliminate price fixing, halt collusive restrictions of production and division of markets, prevent price discrimination that destroys competition, protect consumers against false and misleading advertising, see to it that products labeled "wool" actually are wool, keep Congress and the public constantly informed of significant changes in the concentration of industry, and in their spare time also administer a number of other laws, including the Webb-Pomerene Act, the Lanham Trade-Mark Act, and others. All this they are supposed to do with a sum of money which would have been sufficient to carry on the war effort for about half an hour and which is only slightly more than a single industry will spend in one antitrust case—the cement industry having spent more than $5,000,000 in lawyers' fees alone in the recent Cement case.

Only this month I watched this body reduce the appropriation of one of these antitrust agencies, the Federal Trade Commission, by about 80 positions below the meager force which it already has.

Regardless of which part of the Government—the judicial, administrative, or legislative—bears the greatest responsibility, the fact remains that the antitrust laws have been relatively ineffective in restricting the giant corporations.

Mr. Chairman, when I speak of the concentration on the other side of the table; when I speak of corporate monopolies, giant corporations, big business, and so forth, I am not dealing in abstractions. Rather, I am speaking of something which has been accurately measured and presented in cold statistics.

All of us, I believe, share a vague feeling that there is such a thing as big business, and that it probably does control a sizable share of our industry. But I will venture the opinion that very few Members of this body will realize just how big big business actually is, and how much of our economy it actually does control. Unless I am mistaken, the figures which I am about to present on the present power held by big business will come as something of a shock to most Members of this body. At least, I can truthfully say that these figures, which were presented by the Federal Trade Commission to the House Small Business Committee last fall, came as a shock to me.

Mr. Chairman, according to the evidence presented by the Federal Trade Commission, 113 giant corporations owned in 1947 no less than 50 percent of the Nation's industrial physical plant, that is, its net capital assets. Think of that. One-half of our productive facilities owned by 113 huge corporations, with the other half spread out among some 70,000 smaller corporations. Is there anyone who wishes to contend that this is not a shocking concentration of economic power?

This is the situation which prevails in the industrial economy as a whole. The degree of concentration in most of our major individual industries is even higher. After I present these figures, I believe that everyone will have to agree with me that concentration is indeed so high that it is not in the public interest to perpetuate crippling restrictions on labor in these industries—on the grounds that labor is a monopoly—but to take no action against these giant corporations, which are the very embodiment of monopoly.

Let us examine for a moment the steel industry. There is a labor organization in that field, the United Steel Workers, headed by Mr. Philip Murray. This union, of course, has been seriously hampered in its work by the restrictions in the Taft-Hartley Act.

There also are in this industry a few giant corporations which are neither being broken up nor regulated in the public interest. Specifically, the top three companies alone—United States Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and Republic Steel—account for approximately 60 percent of the Nation's basic steel capacity. The United States Steel Corp. alone, as of

January 1, 1945, owned 57 percent of the Nation's total steel capacity for making rails, 53 percent of the capacity for making sheared and universal plates, 43 percent of the capacity for structural shapes, 42 percent for wire nails and staples, 41 percent for seamless pipe and tubes, 40 percent for reinforcing bars, 40 percent for barbed wire, and similar high percentages for most of the other important steel products.

Corporate concentration has reached alarming proportions in many industries. The very existence of such concentration in industry and the refusal of Congress to do anything about it knocks the props out from under the position of those who support the Taft-Hartley law on the grounds that labor is a monopoly.

The existence of this corporate concentration places them in the ridiculous and absurd position of trying to contend that concentration in the form of labor unions represents a grave and serious danger to the American way of life, but that the obviously greater degree of concentration represented by the corporate monopolies represents no danger whatsoever and must be permitted to go unimpaired, uninhibited, and unfettered. I, for one, do not wish ever to be placed in the highly embarrassing position of having to make such a ridiculous and absurd argument before my constituents.

As I say, it is the very existence of corporate concentration which knocks the props out from under those who would cripple labor unions but do nothing to break up or control the giant corporations. It reveals that they are, in fact, urging the fatal political argument of one law for the rich and another for the poor.

Let us examine the corporate concentration which exists in other of our major industries. I have mentioned steel. But the extraordinary degree of concentration which exists there is not an exception; it is the rule. According to the evidence presented last fall by the Federal Trade Commission to the House Small Business Committee, a high degree of corporate concentration is to be found in most of our major industries. Let me cite some examples from this evidence for a number of important industries.

Let us take the copper industry. It is dominated by four companies: Kennecott Copper Corp., Phelps Dodge Corp., Anaconda Copper Mining Co., and American Smelting & Refining. The first three mentioned control the mining fields almost exclusively. American Smelting & Refining, originally organized to consolidate domestic lead smelters, is the leading copper refiner—with 37 percent of electrolytic capacity—and together with Anaconda—29 percent of capacity—and Phelps Dodge—22 percent of capacity—controls most of the refining capacity. Kennecott, the largest copper-mining company in the country, has no electrolytic refineries but is closely associated with American Smelting & Refining through the Guggenheim interests.

Then there are the closely related fields of lead and zinc. The country's largest producer of lead, St. Joseph Lead, accounted for about one-quarter of the domestically produced lead in the 1920's, but increased its proportion to about 40 percent of the total in 1944. New Jersey Zinc is by far the largest producer of zinc and occupies a position in the industry roughly similar to that of St. Joseph Lead in the mining of lead.

One of the most concentrated areas of the American manufacturing economy, the automobile industry, occupies a position of critical significance in the Nation's economy. This strategic industry is dominated by three giant corporations—General Motors Corp., Ford Motor Co., and Chrysler Corp. In 1948 the so-called Big Three produced about 80 percent of the passenger automobiles, with the balance divided among the rest of the industry. General Motors accounts for about one-third of the United States bus production, sharing the leadership with Twin Coach, ACF-Brill, Mack, and White, and for a time was part owner of the Greyhound Corp., leading bus line. In addition to operating automobile plants in leading countries of the world, General Motors is said to be negotiating to take over the Fiat and Lancia companies, leading automobile manufacturers of Italy. Moreover, this industrial colossus makes a wide variety of nonautomotive products, producing, for example, about one-fourth of the Nation's domestic refrigerators.

Then there is the field, important to all housewives, of domestic appliances. Here the most striking feature is the recurrence of the same large companies as the major producers of several different types of appliances, reflecting both the flexibility of operation and the power of brand names.

For example, in 1940–41—the latest period for which information is available—General Electric Co., with its subsidiaries and affiliates, was the largest producer of domestic vacuum cleaners, with 21 percent of the total production; the fourth largest producer of electric fans, with 8 percent; the largest number of electric flatirons, with 22 percent; the largest producer of domestic washing machines, with 13 percent; and the largest producer of electric ranges, with 39 percent. In terms of specific products, in 1941 the four largest producers—Frigidaire, General Electric, Nash-Kelvinator, and Westinghouse—accounted for 66 percent of the total production of mechanical refrigerators. The next four companies produced 24 percent of the total, and there were only three other companies which produced more than 1 percent each. During 1940, only four manufacturers produced sewing machines, although 22 other companies made components and attachments. The leading producer, Singer Sewing Machine Co., accounted for 49 percent of the total. In regard to domestic vacuum cleaners, the largest four producers turned out 55 percent of the total in 1940 and 1941. And in 1941 there were only 30 producers making electric fans, 9 of which produced 85 percent of the output.

Then there is the field of agricultural machinery which is, of course, a matter of vital importance to the farmer. The largest three companies—International Harvester, Deere, and Allis-Chalmers—together accounted for 65 percent, and the Big Six for 80 percent, of the business in 1940, distributed as follows:

	Percent of total sales
International Harvester Co	37.3
Deere & Co	18.8
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	11.1
J. I. Case Co	5.4
Oliver Farm Equipment Co	4.3
Minneapolis-Moline Implement Co	3.5

The important field of chemicals is also highly concentrated, with the production of industrial chemicals being centralized in the hands of three giant concerns: E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Allied Chemical & Dye, and Union Carbide and Carbon. When examined from the point of view of individual products, the degree of concentration in industrial chemicals is little short of extraordinary. Thus in 1945, out of 238 general chemical products surveyed, in the case of 102 the entire output was accounted for by 4 or fewer companies. One-fifth of these 102 products were produced by one concern, and almost two-thirds were made by 2 companies. Of the 136 products made by more than 4 firms, nearly three-fourths were produced under conditions where 4 companies accounted for 70 percent or more of their entire production.

Besides the industrial basic chemicals, the chemical industry includes such consumer products as soaps and drugs. In soap production, the leading firms include such old-line establishments as Procter & Gamble, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co., and Lever Bros., the American subsidiary of the British firm of Lever Bros. & Unilever, Ltd. The three largest producers of soap products before the war were reported to control about 80 percent of the business, divided approximately as follows:

	Percent
Procter & Gamble	40
Lever Bros	20
Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co	20

Like most other branches of the chemicals industry, the manufacture of drugs, medicines, and related products is highly concentrated, most of the leading corporations having gained their positions through mergers and acquisitions, frequently maintaining their status through cartels, patent and trade-mark agreements. Five of the Nation's eleven largest drug corporations—Rexall Drug, Inc., Bristol-Myers Co., American Home Products, Sterling Drug, Inc., and Vick Chemical Co.—stem from the so-called Sterling group. In 1942, these five companies together accounted for 29 percent of the total sales in the drug industry.

If you drive an automobile, you are, of course, interested in the rubber tire industry. In that field Goodyear, Firestone, United States Rubber and Goodrich together have for several years accounted for over 90 percent of the total assets of rubber tire companies. By virtue of long-standing arrangements with the large automobile producers, the Big Four completely dominate the sale of tires and tubes for use as original equipment. It is a well known fact, for example, that Goodyear sells mainly to Chrysler; Firestone is the chief supplier of Ford; and General Motors is United

States Rubber's best customer. Significantly, the Du Ponts are the principal owners of both General Motors and United States Rubber. Replacement tire sales, while more widely distributed, still are dominated by the Big Four.

Even cigarettes are a product of monopoly. The tobacco industry has had a long and lurid history of monopoly and concentration. The old American Tobacco trust, a product of the great combination movement of the 1890's, was dissolved in 1911, at which time it controlled 76 percent of the smoking tobacco, 80 percent of the fine-cut tobacco, 85 percent of the plug tobacco, and 96 percent of the snuff. Despite this dissolution proceeding, the constituent parts of the old American Tobacco trust still maintain a substantial degree of control. In the recent decision against the American tobacco companies the court found the big tobacco companies have, for example, continued to conspire "to fix and control prices and other material conditions relating to the purchase of raw material in the form of leaf tobacco for use in the manufacture of cigarettes." In 1939 the Big Three—American Tobacco, Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., and R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.—produced 68 percent of all domestic cigarettes, 63 percent of all smoking tobacco, and 44 percent of all chewing tobacco. By 1947 the predominance of these companies in cigarette manufacture had risen to a point where they accounted for no less than 82.5 percent of the output.

And so it goes. Industry after industry has in effect been taken over by the "Big 3," the "Big 4," the "Big 6," or sometimes by simply "the leader." The extent of corporate concentration in American industry is little short of staggering.

It is the real danger to our American way of life. It is the real threat to our free democratic constitution. It is the real menace to the maintenance of economic prosperity.

As long as this condition prevails, we can ill afford to tell workers that they cannot organize or bargain effectively because their unions represent an excessive concentration of power.

And, lastly, there is no legislation that can be written to prevent strikes. Men and women cannot be forced to work. There is only one way people can be forced to work against their will and that is to call out the army and put guns at the backs of the workers.

In a free society, one does not resort to such methods. One uses the council table and the process of collective bargaining.

Free strong labor unions express the healthy determination of free men to remain free.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, it comes with some consternation to me that the President's own Congressman should see fit to make this labor legislation a partisan issue. In my opinion labor is entitled to as much bipartisanship as are the foreign nations. Personally, I think it is a disservice to labor cynically to treat these questions as a political football. In my opinion labor is entitled to be influential in both parties.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I have been given information in the recent afternoon, which has caused me to change the remarks I had prepared to be extended in the RECORD. I am advised there is a committee of three or four members of the CIO just outside our Hall calling out the Members of the House and telling them that they are going to be seated in the galleries and that they had better vote for the Lesinski bill and against the Wood bill, or else. I am glad they are in the galleries.

I am not informed whether any of them are registered lobbyists or not, but I am reliably informed about what they are doing. They have not approached me.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with other Members who have previously spoken that this subject is not new to this House. Very disagreeably to this House, and very unfortunately to the Nation and to the peace and prosperity of individual workingmen, their wives, and the public, no subject is more familiar to us. For 12 long years, session after session, this House has been lashed around and around a miserable circle of occasional argument and temporary expedient. It, of course, would be unfortunate if this important subject is being used, as has been inferred by some Members, as argument for the occasion of political expediency.

Like other gentlemen of the House, I have just returned from my congressional district. I have found many constituents desirous of reasonable amendments to the existing law of the land and they insisted, as they justly should, that I protect the rights of individual workingmen, their wives, and families. They, of course, demand that we define in understandable terms the rules under which our national Government may limit the activities of employers or unions when those activities substantially threaten the public interest.

To be sure, I found employers particularly interested in prospective changes of the present labor law that would affect them, and the executives of organized labor, as we know it in the Tenth Congressional District, were desirous of protecting their rights. The only persons I heard using the phrase "people's mandate" also admitted instructions from national labor leaders to meet with me during the holiday.

I am sure the Tenth District of California expects me to support the right of employees to organize and reasonably implement collective bargaining. They also expect that I will protect necessary rights of employers, as well as labor leadership, but never forget in discussing that subject that there is involved the rights of individual workingmen, their families, and the public interest. It is my hope that when this Congress adjourns sine die, I may be classed with you gentlemen as having given my full support to this constitutionally independent branch of government that makes it possible for our people to be free; that it will be clearly apparent that I have listened to all groups, but taken instruction from none; that I am not content to be merely a weathercock on top of this edifice exalted for my levity and versatility and of no use but to fool part of the people in someone else's political gale.

History demonstrates many instances when existing laws proved inadequate to protect individual rights because of changing economic and social conditions. The rigidity of the common law and the resulting growth of the law of equity in early England is an outstanding example. The strictness of property laws is admittedly necessary for stable civilizations, and it seems equally apparent that such laws must be slow to change. The result is that the moral rights of individuals and their families resulting from economic change are usually difficult to guarantee and enforce for a long period of time. Certainly they can hardly be enforced as a matter of law until the new moral rights have at least been defined.

Industrialization of our country in the last 50 years has deprived workingmen of much of the family security that was available to them prior to the days when they moved to heavily populated areas where the only guaranty for the necessities of family life was a monthly pay check. The traditional demand of our people that peace and quiet be guaranteed through enforcement of law can hardly be denied. Yet today they partially acquiesce in violence and threats of violence in industrial disputes. Today law enforcement agencies refuse to enforce the law in such disputes. Magistrates enjoin peace officers from using their customary methods in quieting mob violence. Our clergy make charitable expressions but fail to distinguish between individually coveting your neighbor's goods and doing it in groups. At least some workingmen tolerate unreasonable acts of labor leadership. These conditions seem to evidence the fact that a large segment of our population believes that individual workingmen today, living in congested residential areas, without their acre of ground with its garden and cow, has a moral right for family security that in some manner should be guaranteed by industry in a free competitive economy.

For failure to legally define this new right, the governments of other industrial countries have been overthrown by revolutionary theories of statism. A close examination of all of the requested legislation by our present administration in this Congress demonstrates that it believes we need at least some of the powers of statism. Oddly enough, it has the express support of organized labor leadership who purport to speak for all workingmen who themselves are descendants of the men who offered their lives to be individually free.

To my knowledge, neither this Congress nor any other Congress has sought to define this new moral right. Except for the Eightieth Congress, the majority party has contented itself with making trip after trip around that miserable

circle of occasional argument and temporary political expedient.

The theory of our labor legislation is that so long as the striking combatants comply with reasonable rules prescribed by Congress and the States, it is a case of "dog eat dog" at the expense of the public for loss of production, at the expense of the employer for loss of profits and capital, and at the expense of individual employees for loss of wages. Peculiarly enough, the only party to such disputes that suffers no loss is the labor organization or organizations involved. It is their powers that were greatly expanded by the Seventy-fourth Congress. That same Congress created quasi public officials as leaders of organized labor. That Congress made no attempt to define proper union structure nor did it provide adequate judicial means to define alleged conflicting rights between different unions or branches of the same union. If there was a people's mandate for the Seventy-fourth Congress, it necessarily had to be for the benefit of individual workingmen and their families. A review of the congressional hearings of the Eightieth Congress should convince any mind that the powers granted the new public trustees by the Seventy-fourth Congress had been abused. That abuse resulted in unnecessary injury to employers, to unreasonable invasion of the rights and homes of employees, and to uncontrolled breaches of the peace and national disturbances that threatened the national security.

The Eightieth Congress knew as we know that many workingmen believe that they needed a union for their protection and family security. It also knew that those workingmen objected to certain actions of labor leadership which resulted in unnecessary losses and violence.

The present law of the land, as established by the Eightieth Congress, seeks to define the rights of organized labor together with those of management in industrial relations. It also guarantees the protection of individual workingmen and their families, protects them from being hired and fired by irresponsible persons, and protects the national interest.

We are told that the Lesinski bill is a people's mandate to turn the clock back to the Seventy-fourth Congress. When people first conveyed their property and valuables to strangers to avoid the rigidity of the common law of conveyancing, they did so because of economic necessity. When the British Parliament accepted as part of the law of England the growing church law of involuntary trusts, the British mandate was to protect the true owners. There was never a mandate to enlarge the powers of the involuntary trustees who had abused their privileges by fixing their own terms of office, the amount of their fees, and claiming complete title and supervision of the property.

We are told by the mandated Members supporting the Lesinski bill that the President and they received a mandate because they campaigned on the proposition that they would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. They demand that we accept that mandate without committee hearings for our districts that voted against it for the reason that 22,000,000 people voted for the successful President in the last campaign, while 22,000,002 voted against him. They want us to assume that the individual voters of the country understood the Taft-Hartley Act in a few short months of its existence. Yet they and their majority leader profess a lack of knowledge of the act. For that reason they repeal only that part of the present law that defines unfair labor practices of organized labor and that part of the act that places responsibilities on labor leadership. The Lesinski bill repeals all of the provisions of the law that were placed in the Labor-Management Relations Act by the Eightieth Congress for the protection of the individual and his family and the public. Is that today's mandate? It removes local control of these quasi-public individuals and organizations. It grants these new trustees complete control of the industry and income of the voters in the last election and expressly removes them from customary judicial proceedings. Is that the people's mandate? It forces a man to work against his will for 35 days if the President so decides. Was that discussed last November as part of the people's mandate? Are we to believe part of the people's mandate was to repeal the Communist oath because it implies something bad? If so, why not repeal all use of the oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, on which this Christian civilization is founded. Must we believe that the people have instructed us to remove any restrictions on these new trustees to fix their own fees, levy their own assessments, initiation fees and dues, to pick their own disputes, and expend accumulated funds without right of audit or account?

What is this mandate? Should we believe the proponents of the Lesinski bill when they tell us we must repeal all prohibition against secondary boycotts except in connection with jurisdictional disputes? Was it through lack of voters' knowledge or my inability to understand that gives us a people's mandate against the people and their innocent employers? Do the people so mistrust their own courage and intelligence that they have instructed us to deprive them of the right to discuss their grievances directly with the men who pay their salaries? Have men working in crafts instructed us to deprive them of the right to form a craft union inside plants? Has the voice of the people said that they must be forced to strike against their will? Has any Member present heard any candidate or ordinary voter state that the American working people want to be refused a job or fired by Government-anointed trustees when the man who pays the pay check wants them on the pay roll?

This is the reactionary mandate expressed in the Lesinski bill. If any single voice other than labor leadership so spoke in the last campaign, surely it did not include the wives of the men who work or the 16,000,000 returning veterans who want to work. Have we a mandate that the American working people are not fit to be free?

Has the great American voice said unions must not be responsible for financial loss resulting from their illegal acts?

Does that voice say that the right to work and the right to freedom of speech now means that a union member must refrain from objecting to his leadership's decisions under penalty of losing his job?

Can there possibly be a mandate from a free people depriving themselves of the benefit of government decrees to avoid beatings and home bombings by flying goon squads whose membership is usually unknown?

The moral right we seek to establish is the right of security of American families in a growing industrial economy. If there is a mandate to change the labor law, it must be in the interest of the individual workingman, his family and the public.

What is this mandate granted by the people to deprive them of livelihood and security for the benefit of a special interest?

What is this mandate to set up irresponsible individuals with governmental powers within a free government and who can fix their own terms of office and salaries?

What is the voice of this mandate which causes some of our Members to point to the legislative freedom of others as evidence of secret influences?

Can it be that 250,000 precinct workers in the last election have created a mandate in favor of quasi-public officials, one of whom is accused of sequestering $800,000 of his membership's money in the shadow of the Capitol while this debate proceeds? What is this voice?

What can this mandate possibly be that was given by some and claimed for the benefit of others so that they may forgive $165,000 judgments rendered in favor of union membership and against its leadership?

Surely the hearings in the committee were too short or the gentlemen from the labor districts would better understand their mandates. As a matter of fact, the beneficiaries of our labor legislation were not present at the committee hearings. The only persons present were employers desiring to protect their ability to employ and these new quasi-public officials. Elected representatives of the people and the public interest were present, but the mandated Members decided no discussions were necessary, and that it was unnecessary to read the bill.

What is the voice of this so-called mandate that some of us have not heard but of such strength as to swell the nostrils of certain Members to simulate a row of bear caves, and compel them in the interest of the voice to deliberately pass the bill out, so as to avoid discussion by the people's representatives.

Some of us on the Committee wonder who it was that determined the language of the mandate and expressed it in writing with such confidence in his own ability as to convince the mandated majority of the committee that the bill was perfect in the interest of the people who granted the mandate.

I want to emphasize that I believe the workingmen of the United States should be permitted to organize and that their association should be so implemented as

to permit them effective collective bargaining. I believe there are employers who in effect are infections in our American economy and against whom such action is necessary. I believe that if Government is a matter of will upon any side, our constituents without question ought to be superior, but government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment and not inclination. Certainly it would be a new kind of reason if determination should precede discussion, and one set of men deliberate and another set decide. It is a very difficult problem where the people who form the conclusions are perhaps 3,000 miles from those who hear the arguments. However, there surely is no mandate from those people that by secret ballot they elect their representatives and that they tolerate other self-appointed representatives to instruct us in conclusions.

The vanity, restlessness, and spirit of intrigue of these new involuntary trustees who attempt to hide their total want of consequence in bustle and noises and puffing and mutual quotation of each other, makes some imagine that the American voters' contemptuous neglect of their activities is a general mark of acquiescence in their opinions.

I do not believe that to be true. Just because a few bugs in an open sore makes a field ring with the bawl of an infected critter while thousands of other cattle lay quietly in the shade of American sycamores chewing their cud and are silent, we should not assume that the one who makes the noises is the only inhabitant of the field or that the bugs which have a cleansing function are overwhelming in number, or that they are other than the little shriveled, meager, hopping, although troublesome insects of the hour.

Mr. Chairman, we face a clear cleavage in philosophy in the alternative bills that are before us—the issue is responsibility or irresponsibility of labor unions.

The bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan would absolve unions from all responsibility for their actions: It would give them carte blanche to bulldoze, threaten, and coerce individual workingmen; to interfere with their rights to select their own representatives for collective bargaining; to dictate to employers who the employers' representatives had to be; to force small, independent businessmen running one-man or one-family businesses into unions and to pay tribute to them; to carry on strikes, and to put out mass picket lines, blockading access to plants and business places even where the Labor Board had certified another union as the exclusive bargaining agent; to charge exorbitant initiation fees before permitting employees to join a union; to exact featherbedding tribute for work not done nor expected to be done. Indeed, that bill goes so far as to abolish the rule that unions must be responsible on contracts they have voluntarily entered into.

The Wood bill retains the principles of responsibility which the Lesinski bill would destroy.

Pass the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Chairman, and you will have given a clear signal—a signal of unmistakable import—a signal that certain national and international union figures are waiting for—a signal that they may violate contracts, that they may picket, harass, and blockade with impunity; that they may stop the commerce of this Nation to advance their personal power or their political aims.

The honorable Members may think that union conduct was shocking and indefensible in the outrageous days of the early sit-down strikes, but if you pass the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, then what will ensue will make those days look like a Sunday-school picnic.

It was one thing for the Government in those early days to have developed no rules enforcing union responsibility. It would be quite another and more foreboding thing for a government that has legislated in the public interest, enforced responsibility on both sides, to abdicate that function of impartial umpire and say, as it would say if we passed the bill, that it is either too weak to continue in that role, or that it is too biased to give both sides an even break, that it is not the policy of the Government to require unions to be responsible.

The principles of responsibility for which I argue are not primarily for the benefit of the employer or the union. They were enacted into law in the public interest and to protect the individual working man against abuse from either unfair employers or exploitation by unscrupulous union leaders. They impose no standards that any decent American citizen has any trouble living up to or finds any fault with.

Let me quote a man sometimes said to be an authority on such matters, Mr. Merlyn S. Pitzele, now labor editor of the magazine Business Week, and formerly an organizer for the CIO and a teacher in the A. F. of L. labor college. Speaking under the heading of "Public interest and union responsibility," he said before the American Management Association in October 1947 after enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act:

> We have come to the stage of public interest and union responsibility in the development of this Nation's labor policy, in which the Government has rules for both sides. The principles I have enumerated—

And they are the principles to which I have alluded, Mr. Chairman—

> are principles which the public, and labor union members among them, accept. * * * To suggest that any event or developments will work a change in the public mind on these principles is, I think, no more tenable an estimate than the suggestion that the public may be ready to abandon the principle that unions have a legitimate place in our society.

I submit to the House that in saying that the learned editor was correct—the public, looking out for its own, and its best, interest, does not want us to abandon the principle that unions have a legitimate place, and, equally, does not want us to abandon the principles of public interest and of rules for both sides.

But the simple and inescapable fact is that although union leaders have always been loud in proclaiming that their unions do not coerce or intimidate, and have been equally loud in proclaiming that they are responsible organizations, they always have opposed, and they continue to oppose, any law or the enforcement of any law that makes intimidation and coercion illegal, or that converts responsibility from a high sounding moral platitude into a legally enforceable obligation.

In 1947, when Congress was considering the Taft-Hartley Act, union leaders came in and said: "Pass no law—leave everything as it is." Now, in 1949, although their organizations which have qualified under the law have prospered both financially and in increased memberships in the interim, they are back saying: "Repeal everything. Put management back in its old strait-jacket. Back to the good old days of unrestrained union power and irresponsibility."

Union leaders would shriek so that they could be heard across the country if it was so much as suggested that employers should not be responsible under their contracts. Yet they have the gall to ask this Congress to repeal a law that does no more in this respect than to say to them, "If you voluntarily enter into a contract, you can be sued if you break it."

Every other segment of the economy, every other organized endeavor in this country, every person, is held responsible on its contracts. Labor unions alone ask the royal prerogative of irresponsibility. The king can do no wrong.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was adopted, the union propagandists asserted vehemently that there would be a deluge of lawsuits against unions and that those suits would bankrupt them. How good was this prophecy of doom? The fact is no such thing has occurred. The report of the Joint Congressional Committee states that as of the end of the year 1948 there had been a total of only 57 suits in the entire country, of which 37 were brought by employers against unions and 19 were by unions against employers. One was by an employee against an employer. As of that time none of the parties had recovered a judgment against anyone, and a large proportion of the cases had been dismissed or settled.

What actually happened was clear: Knowing that they had to be responsible in fact as well as in theory, unions conducted themselves with more responsibility. Union contracts since Taft-Hartley have ceased being unilateral instruments enforceable against employers only. Union contracts now are contracts.

Two or three years ago, the Members know, one could scarcely pick up a daily newspaper without reading of wildcat strikes, here, there, and the other place. Today wildcat strikes have become a rarity, and when they do occur they are speedily settled, usually by having the particular point at issue handled as it should be and as the union contract usually provides, through the grievance procedure that the parties worked out between themselves.

The bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan would do more than merely relieve unions from responsibility on their contracts. It would exempt them from the duty to negotiate about the making of any contracts whatsoever.

It would even exempt them from the duty to bargain in good faith. It may seem inconceivable to the honorable Members that such is the purport of the bill which the labor union bosses secretly wrote up and jammed through the union-dominated majority of the committee, but that is precisely what it provides. Under that bill, if a union wanted to bargain, it could compel the employer to bargain in good faith as determined by the Labor Board or be guilty of an unfair labor practice, and if a bargain was arrived at, it could force the employer to sign it.

Some union apologists have said it is not necessary to have a provision in the law that a union must bargain; that that is what unions exist for; that is what they do anyway.

Why, then, if such be the fact, do they so bitterly oppose having this made a legal requirement? The answer to that is plain. They wish to be in a position to dictate, and not to bargain. They wish, with their massive international organizations, to tell the small-business men and manufacturers throughout the country, "Take our terms, or else" and when they say "or else," they want it to be under a law which will let them use all of the unfair practices we have outlawed. They want to use the right to dictate, not discuss terms, as a bargaining technique.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this House would be guilty of utter folly if it ever gave to any economic group, much less to one which openly proclaims that it wants no responsibilities laid upon it whatsoever, the right to dictate the terms under which men may work and business be conducted throughout the country.

And may I point out that in all the testimony that was given in the hearings by proponents of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, not a single voice was raised in behalf of the individual workingman. The interest and rights of the individual man were ignored in the interest of the organization as such. I repeat, not a single proponent of that bill came in and said, pass this bill because it will do this or do that for the individual man. No indeed. Their cry was: "Take all restraints off our organizations. Forget the public interest. Let us, and us alone, decide what we shall do. Lay down no limits on the pressure we may use, or the tactics we may employ."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that only men whose sense of perspective and fairness has become completely benumbed and corrupted by their implacable urge for more and more power would be blind enough, intransigent enough, to make so unabashed and so daring a demand.

The Taft-Hartley Act enumerated specific unfair practices against workers, against employers, and against the public, which the Labor Board could require unions to cease using. Additionally, it said unions could be sued for violations of their own contracts, and in such suits the ordinary rules of agency would apply in determining for what officers and agents the union as an organization would be responsible.

Despite all the oratory and name-calling, the record to date shows no miscarriage of justice under any of those provisions. The record to date shows that they are still necessary:

The Board's decisions in the Sunset Twine & Line Co. case and in the Smith Cabinet Manufacturing case show that some unions still engage in indefensible violence, in tipping over automobiles, assaulting employees, barricading railroads and streets. Investigations of the Joint Committee, since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, at Benton Harbor and Dowagiac, Mich., show the same thing. In the meat packing strikes, assaults were common. In the Shakespeare case in Michigan, automobiles were destroyed, women assaulted, and a plant was invaded by goon squads.

With that kind of a record, Mr. Chairman, I say we would be foolhardy to have the Federal Government condone such lawlessness by removing all restraints on unions. Is this Government too weak, too supine, too timid, to take a stand against these things?

The Taft-Hartley Act forbade all secondary boycotts as vicious weapons of industrial warfare that spread the industrial conflict rather than confined it, and that drew innocent employers and innocent employees into labor disputes to which they were not parties. The unions complained that by the complete ban of Taft-Hartley on all secondary boycotts that a situation was presented whereby union members could be forced to do so-called struck work; that is, that an employer whose shop was struck could contract to have some other manufacturer supply his customers. Recognizing some validity in this criticism, the substitute bill will permit the inclusion in contracts of a clause that will permit employees to refuse to work on orders being performed on account of an employer whose employees who normally perform such work are engaged in a lawful strike if the employees involved are members of the same local labor organization. The substitute bill, therefore, remedies the only legitimate complaint the unions had against the unfair labor practice sections of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Chairman, we have no mandate from the people to legislate for one side only. Our duty is to lay down fair rules for both sides. I predict, sir, that Members who fail in their duty to the public will not be reelected—and duty to the public requires that unions be held responsible for their actions just as everyone else is held responsible. Furthermore, I say, and please mark my words, that we would be doing a disservice, an irreparable injury, to the legitimate union movement, if we should give these union leaders the power they are demanding.

Finally, Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, I want to say this: The fundamental issue with which we are dealing no longer is the question of the relative bargaining strengths of the employer and his employees. The issue today is labor union power; a power which brazenly demands as a right that it shall be unrestrained and irresponsible before the law. What we do on this issue may determine whether we are to be dominated by this power, or whether the people, through their Government, shall rule.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley law was passed by the Eightieth Congress over the veto of President Truman. I voted for it and I voted to override the veto because it is a sound law. It placed the public interest first and at the same time protected the rights of both workers and management under law.

The repeal of the Taft-Hartley law started as an irresponsible political promise by the Truman Fair Dealers to gain favor with union bosses and others, some of whom do not want industrial peace in this country.

I shall oppose repeal of this law. If public good is to be the controlling factor, I predict that the House will vote to retain the important provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

These preelection deals made between labor racketeers and New Deal politicians for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law were accompanied by other pledges. One was to drastically lower the food prices in the country. The result is that we have had a steady decline of farm prices. Most farm-commodity prices have consistently fallen since Mr. Truman's election.

If we are to have a high national income, we must have a high farm income. Falling farm prices, a war against the farmer, will result in lower total national income—at a ratio of $7 national loss for each dollar the farm income drops. This could amount to an income loss of billions of dollars and, in turn, a loss of tax revenue with a deficit for the Federal Government.

A great many workers in the country, as well as the general public, approve of the individual provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. They feel that we should have a law that would enable the Government to act in national emergencies. No group in America, regardless of its power, should ever be allowed to impair the national security. The Taft-Hartley law permits the Government to go into court and enjoin the commission of certain unlawful acts. The Taft-Hartley law made both unions and employers responsible for their acts and permitted both to be subject to suit in the courts.

Who is there to say we should have one type of justice for one side of the table and another brand of justice for the other side? The rank and file of the workers have no objection to this, neither do they believe in secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes or picketing when used to aid a secondary boycott. These things were properly prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act.

The law passed by the Eightieth Congress, the Taft-Hartley law, gave the workers of the country more control of their unions. It provided workingmen with more information about how their union money was being spent. It allowed the worker to decide whether or not money would be taken from his pay check for union dues.

Who should answer this question if it isn't the worker? Let me point out that the people fighting for repeal of this law are not the servants of the workers of America. They repfesent the high-salaried all-powerful union bosses with their huge expense accounts. The Taft-Hartley law has brought about industrial peace and prevented a great many strikes and has resulted in the workers of America receiving $900,000,000 in wages that they would not have received if the threatened strikes had not been prevented.

Events around the world in recent years have caused all Americans to cherish their rights of free speech. The Taft-Hartley law preserved that right for both sides in an industrial controversy. That is Americanism. To repeal this freedom of speech is one of the things union bosses are asking.

The Taft-Hartley law provides that employees shall not be coerced by either employers or unions. This is a valuable right of employees and it should not be repealed.

For some time, the laws of the land have prohibited a corporation from taking the stockholders' money and contributing it in a political campaign. The Taft-Hartley law prohibited the union from taking the workers' money and contributing it to a political campaign. There is no restraint on the individual worker to contribute to the political cause in which he believes. It preserves his right as an individual American. Why, then, does the Truman administration insist that union bosses be permitted to contribute huge sums to them at election time?

The Taft-Hartley law has worked well. It is not perfect, however. Amendments, that experience has shown necessary, should be adopted. Those, who are pledged to the destruction of this law, however, are not the ones to suggest amendments to improve it.

Mr. Chairman, again let me say that these efforts to repeal the Taft-Hartley law should be defeated. Those who seek repeal are playing politics with the welfare of the country. This means yielding to pressure groups. It is not in the workers' interest. It is not for the public good. The rank and file of the American public will watch carefully the action we take on this issue.

It is shocking to learn of such things as the telegram sent by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] to several of the top labor leaders of the country in which he said:

> I propose to you, as head of your great union, call a Nation-wide work stoppage as a demonstration of the solidarity of the American people in their demand for Taft-Hartley repeal.

It is my opinion that the rank and file of the laboring people of America would have nothing to do with such a suggestion. They would not follow their leadership in any such work stoppage. Think of the human suffering that would result if we had a Nation-wide strike in all activities. It would mean the cutting off of all food supplies, the stoppage of transportation, the elimination of all forms of communication, the closing of our hospitals, the turning off of the electricity on every X-ray, light, machine, and instrument used in the operating room. Can such enthusiasm for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law be in the public interest?

The Taft-Hartley law has been maligned and misrepresented throughout the country as were many of the other constructive acts of the Eightieth Congress. The Eightieth Congress reduced the taxes for all Americans with the greatest share of the relief going to people of low income. Yet that bill was denounced as a rich man's tax bill. The Eightieth Congress provided for the largest development of rural electrification and the greatest irrigation construction program in the history of our country. Yet the same crowd who branded the Taft-Hartley Act as a slave-labor act said that rural electrification and irrigation were being sabotaged and destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider this matter in the light of the truth and on the basis of the record. Let us make the public interest paramount. If that is done, the main features of the Taft-Hartley law will be retained.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the eyes of every American worker are directed upon the actions that will be taken and the votes that will be cast in this House this week. The complete and absolute repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the eradication of the whole Taft-Hartley philosophy of labor relations is what is involved in our deliberations. Promises and pledges have been made and men have been elected to this House on such promises and pledges, which today are being washed out through a series of diabolical deals and compromises directed specifically against the interests of the American workers.

We are debating legislation to reestablish equal justice before the law. Despite what anyone may say in these Halls, the American workers and the American people generally went to the polls and voted against everything that is represented by the Taft-Hartley Act. And they expect delivery on their vote.

The bill now before the House ostensibly would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Everyone sitting in this House knows of the discussions that have been going on to line up the votes behind this bill. Everyone of these discussions have been in terms of the crippling amendments which will produce sufficient votes to pass it. None of us here are being fooled by the performance on the floor, and remember that no one here is going to fool the American people and the American workers when the final version of this bill is passed by the House.

What the American workers are expecting today and what has been pledged to them is not only the repeal of the language of the Taft-Hartley law, but even more important, a clear-cut repudiation by this Congress of the Taft-Hartley atmosphere that now pervades collective-bargaining relations. It cannot be denied that if this House passes a bill which retains but one clause of the infamous Taft-Hartley Act, it will be a signal to every antilabor employer in the United States that he can continue as he has been doing in the past 2 years.

Any amendment, no matter what the sponsorship and no matter what the support from any groups or organizations, which continues the Taft-Hartley approach to labor relations is a repudiation of every election promise and election pledge.

It is no secret that up to this moment the line-up of votes in support of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act has been one in terms of the broadest kind of compromise and the most vicious kind of sell-out. What American labor and the American people who have been sorely beset by the return to the jungle of labor relations really want today is a straightforward vote rejecting this infamous and unjust law.

There is little doubt in my mind that the full impact of Taft-Hartley has still not been felt. For this is the weapon the employers want to keep and to use when unemployment and depression begin to hit harder. In fact, the relative strength of the trade-unions and the so far easy economic situation we have been enjoying have caused many employers to hold off using the Taft-Hartley Act in its full strength.

Those of you who come from industrial areas—and many from rural districts as well—are fully aware of how widespread and deep unemployment has become. It is certainly the most urgent problem already facing millions of American citizens. And as unemployment continues to spread—there certainly are no signs to indicate an abatement is on the horizon—and as men and women begin to grow hungry and to press desperately for any job at any rate of pay, hoping only to keep body and soul together, this vicious Taft-Hartley Act will emerge in its full sordid glory. With it unions will be smashed, labor standards debased and labor relations reduced to a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

Facing this kind of an economic prospect, the American workers and their families are today waiting to see that this Congress enacts legislation to return them to an equality of bargaining relations with their employers, to relieve them of the bonds with which they and their trade-union organizations have been shackled. Those most significant efforts which the trade-unions have made in the past years in support of the economic standards of all the American people will have to be doubled and redoubled when the economic picture becomes dark once again.

Those of you who vote this week for any part of Taft-Hartley are voting to weaken the American workers in the days ahead when they will be facing mass lay-offs and wage cutting. This is a fact—and it will come home to roost on every political fence that is being straddled on this issue.

We have before us a series of amendments to the Taft-Hartley repealer which have been sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] and

which are supported by the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats that has so far successfully defeated or watered down every piece of progressive legislation that has come before this body. It is not necessary for me to detail the vicious antilabor character of these amendments. There is certainly no doubt in my own mind nor, I am sure, in the minds of those sponsoring this bill, that in many respects it is even worse than the Taft-Hartley Act itself.

But what these gentlemen—openly fighting labor—do is their own concern. At least they have told the world and the American people where they stand and the kind of America they want to see. I will continue to fight them with every ounce of energy that I command.

It is the friends of labor, however, that I wish to turn to most directly. To these colleagues I say there is no place for summer soldiers today. If ever there was a time in the history of America when those from labor and those who see their future and that of the democratic structure of our country in the strength and vigor of the labor movement to stand fast, it is right now and it is in this House.

No other piece of legislation is so vital to the American workers and through them to our Nation as this before us today.

The very essence of the democratic tradition and the democratic attitude is at stake in the legislation before us. Do not be misled or confused into believing that this is just another measure around which many compromises can be made without destroying the essential objective.

Nothing could be further from the truth. At stake here is the very dignity of the American workingman—his ability to stand up and say what he thinks and to fight for what he wants. You will take this from him if you retain a single line from the NAM's Taft-Hartley Act.

And this should be remembered. Working men and women are once again feeling the terror and intimidation that is so frequently the constant companion of those millions of Americans who work in factory and mill and mine. The degrading attitude toward working people that so long marked American employer-employee relations is once again returning to the plants. And the Taft-Hartley Act has brought it back.

It is finally time that we who are of and for labor made perfectly clear that the attitude of class superiority and of antilabor bias and hatred must be driven out of American life. It has no place in our country and our institutions, and it has no place on our statute books.

The fact is that no amendments are the concern of those Members of this House who are prepared to live up to the pledges they have made to American labor. Those who claim to be the friends of labor must this week take their stand on the position of the most absolute and unequivocal refusal to make a concession on any amendments whatsoever. Only a stand on this line will bring about the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reestablishment of healthy and sound labor relations in our country.

In the earlier stages of the maneuverings—I cannot honor what has been going on by describing it as a real effort—to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, simple repealers similar to my own bill, H. R. 259, were introduced. These have all been dropped by the wayside as the steamroller got under way. Today we have already come a long way from the unqualified pledges to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have arisen to propose and to urge—if we are to maintain our integrity—that a simple repealer of the Taft-Hartley Act be passed and that the Wagner Act be reinstated. The only honest prolabor approach is to vote down every amendment, be it offered by the administration or by anyone else. Any other course of action will be a betrayal of the American working people.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege and honor of appearing before the subcommittee of the Labor Committee, headed by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], so that I might testify in opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act and urge its repeal. For the purpose of the record, I would now like to refer the committee to my testimony on page 32 of the published hearings held before that subcommittee on H. R. 2032, known as the Lesinski bill, to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, (the Taft-Hartley Act), to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (Wagner Act), and for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Taft-Hartley Act had as its intent and purpose, if not the destruction, certainly the acute and extreme limitation of the theory of collective bargaining and of the activities of organized labor.

All day yesterday and today I have heard the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle speak in support of the Taft-Hartley Act. Man after man of them professed his love for organized labor and seldom have I ever been present at such an expression of bleeding hearts.

Then today I hear praises being showered upon the Wood bill and these same gentlemen straining themselves to point out to us the many advantages of the Wood bill and the manifold blessings it would shower upon organized labor. Listening to these bland remarks I think of the ancient expression "Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts." Time and again these traditional enemies of organized labor now play the part of Little Red Riding Hood as they discuss this labor legislation, and long and loud do they insist upon their concern for the welfare of the working man.

Mr. Chairman, I must paraphrase an expression from Shakespeare and say "me thinkest the gentleman protesteth his virtue too much."

Organized labor knows who are their friends and who are their enemies, and if they did not know until this moment it would be very apparent to them during the course of these proceedings. At the moment the Taft-Hartley Act passed the demarcating line of being corrective legislation, then it became destructive legislation, and it is my opinion that not only did the Taft-Hartley Act actually so pass that demarcating line, but I believe it was the intent and purpose of the act, at its very inception, to be destructive legislation so as to destroy organized labor.

I am opposed further to any attempt made by law which would use the weapon of injunction for the purpose of preventing picketing. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was the intention of the gentlemen who favored the Taft-Hartley Act to introduce amendments in the Eighty-first Congress. But in between the time of the passage of the act and their new intention there interposed an election and it was this election last November which has prevented their controlling this conclusion and introducing the harshest possible amendments to make the Taft-Hartley Act even a greater antilabor act than it is.

I might say further that I take issue with the premise which is bandied about a great deal and about which much has been said, that the Taft-Hartley Act is opposed by only labor leaders and not by the working man, and that the poor working man has not the faintest idea what the proper intention is all about.

Certainly the working people of America and the average citizen and the average Congressman for that matter does not know the statute from cover to cover. But I can say this for the great body of the members of the United Mine Workers of America and for the workingmen from the other great labor organizations in my district—they are conversant indeed with their rights and privileges as American citizens and as free workingmen in this country, and they are aware as well of their duty as American citizens. I have spoken to thousands of these men and women, who are all good Americans and all members of organized labor, from time to time on this subject and in many instances they are just as conversant as I am. I am not hesitant in making that statement. Not all of them, certainly, but a sufficient number. The vast majority indicate their full awareness of the purposes and intent of the Taft-Hartley Act, and of its bad provisions, and to the same extent as I believe the average Member of this Congress is so aware today.

Mr. Chairman, in my testimony before the Labor Committee on the hearings on this bill I dealt at length on the subject of signing the so-called Communist affidavits and upon the history and philosophy of the law with reference to injunction within the body of our common law. I touched as well upon the great Americanism of organized labor in America in fighting communism and Communists in their union in this country, yes, and among their fellow workers in other nations of the world. Because of the limit of time allowed to each speaker on this debate, and properly limited because I am happy to note so many of my colleagues have joined with me in seeking the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, I cannot for the lack of time develop these

subjects further or touch upon the many other important phases of the pros and cons of this historic debate.

I can enumerate, however, Mr. Chairman, that there are to my mind seven outstanding charges that I can make for the purpose of showing what is wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act.

First. Mr. Chairman, I indict the Taft-Hartley Act in that it has put all unions under a cloud of suspicion.

Second. Mr. Chairman, I indict the Taft-Hartley Act in that it has disrupted peaceful bargaining relations.

Third. Mr. Chairman, I indict the Taft-Hartley Act in that it has turned the National Labor Relations Board into a weapon against organized labor.

Fourth. Mr. Chairman, I indict the Taft-Hartley Act in that it has helped employers to evade unionization.

Fifth. Mr. Chairman, I indict the Taft-Hartley Act in that it has made it impossible for unions to act together as a labor movement.

Sixth. Mr. Chairman, I indict the Taft-Hartley Act in that it has increased hostility between employees and employers.

Seventh. Mr. Chairman, I indict the Taft-Hartley Act in that it has hindered settlement of national emergency strikes.

It is my conclusion that the Taft-Hartley Act has failed for the reason that it has gone far beyond the law of reason. As I have mentioned above, it has crossed that narrow line which separates a law of regulation from a law which is penal in scope to the point of destruction, and in my opinion, the substitution of the so-called Wood bill for the Taft-Hartley Act merely by changing its name smells to high heaven. I recall the expression "a rose by any other name." I suppose you could say the same thing about stinkweed for the Taft-Hartley Act and its illegitimate child, the Wood bill, are 100 percent noxious odors.

The Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed in order that a fair and equitable status quo, under the magna carta of the Wagner Act, would permit labor in equality to sit at the table with management and Government in order that a fair and proper law—fair to labor, management, the public, and the Government—could be written in the atmosphere of understanding, conciliation, and achievement. That cannot be done on the floor of this House amidst the incrimination and heat of what is obviously becoming a partisan debate.

I am not interested in the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act merely because it was a Republican measure. I am not here to play politics for such a basic and fundamental issue one way or the other, and I hope from the bottom of my heart that my colleagues of both parties approach the days ahead when we discuss amendments to this bill with decorum, a sense of fair play, and a legislative intent that there shall be a law passed for the greatest good of the greatest number of all of our people and for the best interests of America.

I wish at this time to read into the RECORD a quotation from Business Week, December 18, 1948, entitled, "Why the Taft-Hartley Act Failed." Certainly no one would ever accuse Business Week of being a labor publication. But I think this is a clear indication of the fair-minded segments of management and Government understanding:

WHY THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT FAILED

What was wrong was that the Taft-Hartley Act went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate from one which could destroy.

Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion—and the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement.

These are the provisions that could do it: (1) Picketing can be restrained by injunction; (2) employers can petition for a collective bargaining election; (3) strikers can be held ineligible to vote—while the strike replacements cast the only ballots; and (4) if the outcome of this is a no-union vote, the Government must certify and enforce it.

Any time there is a surplus labor pool from which an employer can hire at least token strike replacements, these four provisions, linked together, presumably can destroy a union. (Business Week, December 18, 1948.)

Mr. Chairman, I realize that my time is about to expire and I shall, at this point, include a copy of the testimony that I have already mentioned given by me before the committee:

TESTIMONY OF HON DANIEL J. FLOOD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FLOOD. I have been requested by my disinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. JOHN ROONEY, who is now sitting as chairman of one of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, to ask the indulgence of the chairman to insert a statement in opposition of the Taft-Hartley Act in the record.

Mr. KELLEY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement is as follows:)

'STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. ROONEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, URGING REPEAL OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

"Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee on Labor and Management Relations, I am grateful for this opportunity to express to you my views concerning the infamous Taft-Hartley law.

"Inasmuch as I represent a heavily populated working-class district in the city of New York, I feel that I am qualified to speak on the problems which have arisen as the result of enactment of this vicious antilabor legislation. I have opposed the bill since it was first introduced, and the day that it became a law, over the President's veto, I committed myself to the repeal of it.

"The measure was conceived in a spirit of antagonism toward labor and clause by clause written by attorneys for the labor-hating National Association of Manufacturers. While there may have been some doubts as to its harmful effect on labor-management relations on the part of some of our citizens at the time of the enactment of this legislation, I am sure we all know now that it was deliberately designed by big business to shackle and destroy the American labor movement. The law has been a complete failure and has neither increased industrial productivity nor brought harmony or stability to industrial relations. It has created resentment and bitterness on the part of labor and has become a symbol of oppression and tyranny to working men and women throughout our Nation. The effect that it has had on relations between employers and the International Typographical Union is merely one instance where this hastily conceived law has disrupted employer-employee relations which had been amiable over a period of many years.

"A large portion of our businessmen now agree that the Taft-Hartley law defeated itself and is contrary to the best interests of all concerned. In that connection, I will quote from the conservative McGraw-Hill publication, Business Week, issue of December 18, 1948:

" 'For the Taft-Hartley Act did fail—on one of the most important grounds by which a law must be judged in a democratic society. That ground is consent. Only the police state can enforce a law which is believed to be unjust by the people it affects.

" 'What was wrong was that the Taft-Hartley Act went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate, from one which could destroy. Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion—and the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement.'

"I trust that this committee will promptly accede to the will of the working people of America by repealing this obnoxious law. I strongly feel that such repeal is a prerequisite to cementing better understanding in labor-management relations."

Mr. FLOOD. And for myself, I appreciate this opportunity of being permitted to appear before the subcommittee of the Labor Committee, and to express my opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act, and to express the hope that this subcommittee recommend its immediate repeal.

It is my opinion that the Taft-Hartley Act had as its intent and its purpose, if not the destruction, certainly the acute and extreme limitation of the theory of collective bargaining and of the activities of organized labor.

At the moment the Taft-Hartley Act passed the demarcating line of being corrective legislation, then it became destructive legislation, and it is my conclusion that not only did the Taft-Hartley Act so pass that line, but that it was the intent and the purpose of the act at its inception. I think the act initially had that purpose.

I may say that I am not at all satisfied that legislation is necessary at this point to deal with the entire broad field of labor-management relations. I would say, although it is not before the committee, and I do not like to be presumptuous or impertinent, but I prefer the kind of legislation under the circumstances that there has to be legislation suggested by my distinguished colleague, Mr. KELLEY; but that is not before us, but if there is going to be legislation, then I favor the bill that is now before this committee. I am of the impression, and it is my opinion, that the Taft-Hartley Act was created, and if it was not the deliberate intent, at least the result and the effect was to establish in this country a second-class citizenship—organized labor. There was to be a definite class distinction, and I cannot imagine any more antagonistic purposes of why we are all sitting here as Members of the House.

I am opposed to any attempt made by law which would use the weapon of injunction for the purpose of preventing picketing, and I think the act would do that, and its administration certainly executed that purpose. There is certainly that indication in the attempts to extend the law by amendments for the purpose of strengthening it as an antilabor weapon.

I believe further that insofar as the provision of this act having to do with demanding non-Communist affidavits is concerned, is one provision to which I certainly would object. There is certainly nobody in this Congress who can be identified as being more opposed to everything that communism represents than I am. I would introduce legislation, if necessary, outlawing the Communist Party. I had some doubt in my mind

as to such law, and that was one of the things on which Mr. Dewey and I agreed, that should be done, that the Communist Party should not be regulated out of existence, and he gave reasons upon which I had strong reasons to agree; but I have now changed my opinion, and I would vote to outlaw the Communist Party, now that they have shown their colors and have indicated their purpose is to overthrow the Government by force and arms.

So by making my position clear as to communism I can say that I certainly would sign no affidavit declaring whether I am or am not a Communist, and I do not think any Member of the House should be requested to sign such an affidavit, and I do not see why any working man should have to do that. I think that deliberately is an unconstitutional effort on the part of the legislature to impose a burden upon a class of citizenship. I would object to any provision, and I would object to making any arrangement whereby the same condition should be asked of management. I do not think that section of the statute should exist in any law. If you are going to abolish the Communist Party, let us abolish them, period.

I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, as to the extent of my time.

Mr. KELLEY. Go ahead.

Mr. FLOOD. I might say further that I take issue with a premise about which a great deal was made and is being made, that the Taft-Hartley Act is opposed only by labor leaders, labor racketeers—big shots—and that, in the language of his enemies, "the poor laboring man"—the poor, down-trodden, dim-witted, stupid American laboring man—has not the faintest idea what this law, or its purpose, or intent, is about. Certainly the working people of America and the average citizen does not know this statute from cover to cover. I cast no aspersion upon the integrity, the hard-working ability and understanding of statutes by the Members of this House, but certainly we have reasonable cause to assume at times that even we are not conversant with the punctuation of our statutes, upon which we act. I may say that I can speak only in a limited way for my own district. I have the privilege of representing the Eleventh District of Pennsylvania, which is the very heart and center of the hard-coal industry, the anthracite coal mines. I do not believe there is any union in which the members are more conversant with their rights and privileges and duties as American citizens than the membership of our union. The members with whom I have spoken, from time to time, on the subject, are just as conversant with it as I am. I have no hesitation in making that statement. Not all of them, certainly; but a sufficient number to indicate their awareness of the intent of the act, and its bad provisions and to the same extent as I believe the average Member of this Congress is aware.

And so, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, may I inquire if I can revise and extend my remarks, or am I excluded from doing that? I request to revise and extend my remarks with reference to the same subject.

Mr. KELLEY. You will have that opportunity.

Mr. Powell?

Mr. POWELL. I have no questions.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. BAILEY?

Mr. BAILEY. I believe, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in his testimony referred to the injunction procedure of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am sure the gentleman is conversant with our constitutional guaranties contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, and I am speaking of the right to free speech, free press, and free assembly, and particularly to the right to a trial by jury. In view of the procedures carried out under this injunction provision, the fact a number of people quite often have in the past been deprived of their right to a trial by jury, I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not feel that this injunction procedure in the Taft-Hartley legislation contravenes the average citizen's guaranty?

Mr. FLOOD. That is very interesting. I have never been of the opinion that the court of equity, keeping in mind how it was born, is without moral violation of the constitutional provisions.

Let me say it this way: The repeal of this act, an act born in the heat of discord, an act born in a period of tension, was probably conceived, or the accouchement was brought about, may I say, in an ill-advised atmosphere.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, on the contrary, was passed by this Congress at a prior session in a kind of an atmosphere that I believe was conducive to sound legislation.

Let us repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and return to the status quo, and then in that atmosphere of the status quo determine if this Congress, with ample opportunity for everybody to be heard, should take any further action.

I say that when the Congress in passing an act such as the Norris-LaGuardia Act——

Mr. KELLEY. Will you yield, Mr. BAILEY?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Did you say the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in the last session of Congress?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, no; I said it was passed in an atmosphere that was more conducive in this kind of law.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed some years ago.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Certainly to use the injunction as a weapon, as is the intent of the act, is contrary to the purpose and the reason for the very existence of the whole broad field of equity within the English common law. The injunction process under our system of jurisprudence was never meant to be appealed to, if and when there was adequate limits of the law. When that arises, there is no problem; it is academic.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. PERKINS?

Mr. PERKINS. I believe you stated you were opposed to the Communist-affidavits provision?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. PERKINS. I wonder if you agree with me that as we think of a Communist we think of a person who opposes our democratic form of government?

Mr. FLOOD. Not only do I think that, sir, but I think the chief purpose and sole aim of communism is the destruction of Christianity, and I cannot think of anything more un-American.

Mr. PERKINS. Would you also consider the affidavit requirement, that labor and management both be required to sign affidavits before they could require the services of the NLRB, unconstitutional?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; I do. I would say that that provision in the act is unconstitutional, and any act which contains such a provision.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe under our form of government, and especially any person who is charged with any crime, is presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty?

Mr. FLOOD. I so believe.

Mr. PERKINS. And do you not believe this affidavit requirement puts an undue burden upon any American citizen when he is required to sign this affidavit? Do you not think that that casts some reflection upon his loyalty to his country, by putting that into law?

Mr. FLOOD. You state my position much more effectively than I do.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. JACOBS?

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. FLOOD, you are familiar, as a lawyer of course, with the Constitution as to amendments against bills of attainder?

Mr. FLOOD. I am.

Mr. JACOBS. Do you feel it might infringe upon that provision?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. JACOBS. Can you state to us whether or not a traitor, a convicted traitor to his country, has a legal right to bring a tort against a person who has done an injury to his body?

Mr. FLOOD. If there has been a conviction, the rights have been deprived. If he has lost his right of suffrage, his rights have been deprived.

Mr. JACOBS. I mean, suppose he walks across the street and a man recklessly runs him down with an automobile?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, no; as a matter of fact, there is ample law to cover that.

Mr. JACOBS. In other words, any man can be convicted of any crime in the curriculae of our statutes and he can bring an action for redress, but in the case of a union which has an officer who cannot sign an affidavit, then the union is powerless to bring unfair labor charges against the employer?

Mr. FLOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. JACOBS. Then, a Communist hanging around in the union may be pretty handy for the employer, might he not?

Mr. FLOOD. The history of labor-management relations—the relations between labor and management—down through some of the unsavory periods in the early days gave birth to many unsavory characters, and we had the stool pigeon and the labor spy; and the Communist, in my judgment, has no sense of morals whatsoever, and would lend himself to either side if he can produce chaos, which is his chief goal. Any Communist stool pigeon would willingly be a scab or labor spy for the purpose of creating any kind of disorder within this country, and I certainly do not think management as a whole would participate, or any longer thinks of participating, and I think that era has gone by the board, but there still remain some stray groups who would cooperate. A dictatorship of the right or a dictatorship of the left is equally bad and equally un-American, and if you extend the arms of dictatorship out long enough, you will finally get them together. All these green shirts and brown shirts and red shirts we went through for the last 15 years are just dirty shirts, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. JACOBS. If I understand the summary of what you said, it amounts to this: If we are going to proceed against the Communist, let us do it directly, and particularly where it, incidentally, deprives people of their normal legal rights, and even more incidentally immunizes someone in the violation of the law?

Mr. FLOOD. As I said, sir, I was undecided, and went through quite a struggle for the last year about what to do on that kind of a bill, and what I would do if somebody introduced a bill to outlaw the Communist Party, because I was afraid we might drive them underground, but Communists are underground anyway in actively trying to undermine the Government of the United States. But now, if I had any doubt in my mind, it has been erased as the result of this patent conspiracy and adherence to orders of these agents of a foreign power who are Communists. I think communism and Americanism now are a contradiction in terms.

Mr. JACOBS. But you would do it directly rather than by circumvention?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. BURKE?

Mr. BURKE. No questions.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. WIER?

Mr. WIER. I have no questions.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. MCCONNELL?

Mr. MCCONNELL. It is a pleasure to listen to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. MCCONNELL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As I gather from listening to your discussion of the Communist-affidavit problem, it is this, that you approve of the purpose sought, but you do not like the method employed; is that not correct?

Mr. FLOOD. That is well said, Mr. MCCONNELL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I also get the impression that you would desire to have the Government less active in the affairs of labor and management?

Mr. FLOOD. May I say it this way: I would like to have the Government assume a more neutral position than it must assume if it properly executes the Taft-Hartley Act. May I go a step further?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I am not at all satisfied that it is the province of Government to inject itself into the relationship between management and labor. I would prefer—maybe it is a panacea, I do not know—I would prefer to see management and labor, as I believe they want to be, or should be in the United States, handle their relationships between themselves. I am still a firm believer that that can be done in this year of our Lord 1949. I can see where at one time regulation against management might be necessary because of the historical developments of the Nation. I can see where perhaps legislation affecting labor, if the pendulum swings, might be necessary for exactly the same reason; but I think labor is now mature and intelligent, and I think our great public-school system, and I think our great method of disseminating knowledge through the press and radio, and the manner in which Congress deals with the problems, has the American public conversant.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would generally approve of your philosophy of not too much interference of Government. It would seem to me the problem is where to stop. You do need a certain amount of law and legislation in connection with labor-management relationship, but the problem is how far to go in that matter. The Eightieth Congress did not bring the Government into labor-management relationship; it was in before the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. Whether it was in too far is a matter of argument and discussion. Whether the Taft-Hartley Act went too far is what we are trying to find out here, but somewhere there is a happy medium for the Government in labor-management relationships, and if we can work out a bill, bearing in mind the correct position, I would say——

Mr. FLOOD. May I interpose this, Mr. MCCONNELL?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to see that done, but in fairness to all parties concerned, and to get from under the cloud of being on the defensive, I believe the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed, period, and then we will do what you suggest: sit down and talk about it.

Mr. MCCONNELL. What do we start with, or do we start with the Wagner Act, where the Government is in the relationships more on one side than the other?

Mr. FLOOD. You return to that act, and then you discuss it as to those points, and we remove this atmosphere of the Taft-Hartley Act one way or the other, and then, if and when that situation arises, and if and when the Government and labor and management and Congress feel something should be done, in the words of Mr. Justice Holmes, "When that situation arises we shall endeavor to deal with it."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Of course, if you go back just to the Wagner Act you are bringing Government into labor relations, but mainly on one side, and there are even various labor groups who feel that way, or at least their leaders feel that way, in private conversation. I have talked to some of them before we acted on the Taft-Hartley Act, and they made some suggestions and provisions that are now in the Taft-Hartley Act itself.

Mr. FLOOD. I would be glad to discuss that when that situation arises.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Getting back to this Communist matter again: Is it not a fact that before any effort was made to get after Communists in labor organizations, we had examples of the existence of a great deal of communism among various labor organizations?

Mr. FLOOD. I could not accept the phrase, sir, "a great deal." There was evidence, but no more evidence than in other strata of society.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Certain unions were classified that way; were they not?

Mr. FLOOD. "Certain unions" as opposed to many, many men and women in organized labor, and I cannot imagine any group in American society who did more to aid in the fight against communism in France and Italy in the underground, and certainly I would say that I confer upon organized labor the accolade of approval for its action against communism, rather than to censure them because of the isolated cases.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In certain unions the union has been split virtually in two on the Communist problem?

Mr. FLOOD. That is right.

Mr. MCCONNELL. And that was not a small amount?

Mr. FLOOD. I think they are entirely capable of handling it, and the very unions of which you speak, I understand, have met that problem head-on, and are fighting to its death against that cancer in its heart.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is true, but much of the aggressive action occurred after the inclusion of the non-Communist affidavit in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. BURKE. I quite disagree with the statement, that it was only after the Taft-Hartley Act that that movement that has been under discussion here started. I know for a fact that it had been under way for a period of 12 years prior to that.

Mr. MCCONNELL. They must have been losing that battle, then, up to near that time, because the Communist membership in unions were increasing, and they became quite a problem. They were split right through the middle. It may have been a coincidence that it worked out at the same time, or near the same time as the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, but it did become more aggressive at that time.

Mr. BURKE. It became more public, but not more aggressive.

Mr. FLOOD. That is what I was going to point out. This matter may have become more vocal, but certainly within the core of the bona fide union membership there is just as much antagonism, as I vehemently express here, and I do not propose to be a mouthpiece for anybody.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. SMITH?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. FLOOD, I have been a member of this committee for the last 2 years, and have listened to about 9 weeks of testimony in the last Congress, and I am probably going to listen to a lot more, and I want to compliment you on your analytical reasoning on this matter, and I think I agree with you. You have analyzed it down to the province of the Government, but you should go a little bit further, and say, "Let us abolish the Wagner Act if we are going to abolish the Taft-Hartley Act," and see just how little we can get the Government into the matter of field legislation. I think you were excellent and fine in the analysis of communism, and the repealing of the Taft-Hartley Act, because there is too much Government now, but let us go to the whole way and be consistent, and say, "Let us abolish the Wagner Act, too."

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure this committee is very fortunate to have the distinguished Member from Kansas, but may I point out to my friend that the ability of labor to be in the position where it is recognized as an equal is only the result of the Wagner Act, and to repeal the Wagner Act would send us back to the Middle Ages in relation to labor and management, and then the advantage again would be with management.

I hold no brief for the Wagner Act today, and if there is anything wrong with that act—as Members have indicated there might be—then certainly that act, from cover to cover, is no more sanctimonious than is the Taft-Hartley Act from cover to cover, but it is—if I may plagiarize a phrase—for the purpose of permitting organized labor in America to sit down with a mental attitude of equality, if nothing else, and the Wagner Act is their Magna Carta. That is what organized labor thinks, and I am sure, if it is mature, as I hope and pray it is, that when you sit down and there are violations of the Bill of Rights, or of anything else in that Magna Carta, then certainly King John would be just as willing to minimize that great charter of rights as would management, and I think the barons of old would demand their rights and rest on it down through the years. So I say, sir, it may place me in the position of being illogical unless I point out that organized labor would not feel a sense of equality in discussion if you took from it its reason for sitting at the table, which is the Wagner Act, right or wrong. That is what they think; and you seem to be a very fair gentleman and would not remove from them that feeling, that hope, that confidence. You certainly would have the ability when that atmosphere exists, and that is the atmosphere, gentlemen, you must have, until labor and management feel a sense of equality. They had reached the point of saturation and something had to be done, and it was the Wagner Act, so, let us sit down with the act, and I am sure both sides in this country can do this properly.

I believe I am right when I say the union in New York City contributed to the Communist unions in both France and Italy. But that does not prove the rule. That is one rotten apple that is not going to spoil this barrel.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. WERDEL?

Mr. WERDEL. Your district is Ohio?

Mr. FLOOD. Pennsylvania, sir; the anthracite-coal fields.

Mr. WERDEL. And Mr. Lewis, of the miners' union, believes the Wagner Act should be repealed, as well as the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. FLOOD. John L. Lewis?

Mr. WERDEL. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. That I do not know.

Mr. WERDEL. In your comments about communism I am not too clear that I have your reason why the affidavit should not be required in the organizations which have the power that a labor union has.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not like to sound like a 100-percent Yankee, sir, but is that not my question?

Mr. WERDEL. What do you mean?

Mr. FLOOD. Why should it be there? What right does the Congress of the United States, acting within its rights, have to put a burden on an inherent right to work? You are or are not a Communist, so why must there be a burden of proof by legislation imposed upon an inherent right? The Congress of the United States cannot place a condition upon an inherent right: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is a sacred, inherent right in a human being to work, to earn a living, and the Congress has no constitutional right to impose a condition precedent.

Mr. WERDEL. Why do you think an individual of a labor organization would object to signing a Communist affidavit?

Mr. FLOOD. My dear sir, we are in a clearing path; why should he be required to? I do not like to be impertinent, but you see it is impossible to go beyond my question.

Mr. WERDEL. You are too clever to be impertinent, Mr. FLOOD; you are just evasive.

Mr. FLOOD. Let me say this: I certainly have tried—let me apologize—I have tried to be very blunt and to be very clear about my position. I am very serious. I am not being cute. I say this: A leader of a union represents by a process that we recognize as a democratic process—to represent that union; now, if he has not been elected properly, and if there is some question about the democratic process within his union, that is a matter for his union. If he is a faker or a fraud, let the union clean him out and get rid of him.

Mr. WERDEL. Under the same token, would you favor modifying the court laws so we would not protect the stockholders in voting to protect their rights?

Mr. FLOOD. Are you using that as an analogy?

Mr. WERDEL. The only reason a Christian man—as I take it both you and I are—would have for not making an affidavit would be because somebody thought he might be a Communist?

Mr. FLOOD. We are now at diametric and irreconcilable opposites. I am a Roman Catholic.

Mr. WERDEL. So am I.

Mr. FLOOD. Perhaps it is not good manners to say so, and ordinarily it is not in the discussions in Congress, but I work at the trade, and I am sure you do, too; but to have somebody say to me, "Mr. Flood, before you can drive a truck, or before you can go to work, you will have to sign this affidavit that you are not a Communist"; I will starve first.

Mr. WERDEL. And why?

Mr. FLOOD. Because nobody else has a right to cast an aspersion upon my Christianity; not in this country.

Mr. WERDEL. You say we have no constitutional right to do that. We have a form of government which, I believe it is generally conceded everywhere, could not possibly exist unless it were for the Christian teachings.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. WERDEL. The basis of our form of enforcement of law and order is that we put a person on the witness stand, and even though he is a Catholic priest, or some other clergyman, we ask him to raise his right hand and swear he will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Mr. FLOOD. That is only partly true, sir.

Mr. WERDEL. Let me finish, please. What is the difference between that aspersion and the one that asks a man to swear he is not a member of an organization which both you and I condemn?

Mr. FLOOD. Your premise is only partly right. A witness goes on the stand, and he is handed the Bible and he is asked to raise his right hand and swear, and every once in a while a witness stands up and says, "I am an atheist, and I do not believe in God; take your Bible away. I am an American citizen, but I am an atheist," and the court says, "Very well, do you affirm?" And that is all. He does not believe in God, but he is an American citizen; that is his right. As a Christian I do not like to introduce Voltaire, but you know his premise.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. FLOOD, that is very fine, but as a matter of fact, when we require an affidavit our general laws also provide, as you know, as a lawyer, that if a person is not a Christian he can supply the fundamentals of the affidavit by affirming.

Mr. FLOOD. But the purpose under the English law is not the same purpose you are indicating here.

Mr. WERDEL. I realize that, but the point is your non-Christian man can satisfy the requirements of your non-Communist affidavit. You have made some enlightening remarks, but you have not set forth a distinction.

Mr. FLOOD. It is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. WERDEL. Getting back to our use of the word "injunction": You will agree, will you not, that the injunction has its place in our law of equity?

Mr. FLOOD. It is one of the keystones on which the law of equity was founded.

Mr. WERDEL. And it was applied to labor disputes prior to the Wagner Act, in which it was prohibited?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WERDEL. The Wagner Act removed the restrictions so the injunction would apply when the conditions necessary for its application were found by the court to be present; is that not correct?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir. I regret, sir, that your time is limited.

Mr. WERDEL. So do I, Mr. FLOOD; I am enjoying this.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 4290

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4290, the latest Wood bill, purports to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to reenact the Wagner Act with amendments. However, the proposed amendments in substance reenact the corresponding sections of the Taft-Hartley Act, except for title IV which created the "watch dog" committee. The following analysis shows that H. R. 4290 contains virtually all of the objectionable features of the Taft-Hartley Act, making slight concessions in some respects but strengthening certain antilabor features in other respects.

INJUNCTIONS

The bill grants a broad authority to the General Counsel to secure court injunctions in any unfair-labor-practice case even before a complaint has been issued and before any hearings or other action has been taken by the National Labor Relations Board. Not only can the General Counsel secure an injunction before any complaint is issued, but also the courts would be empowered to issue ex parte temporary restraining orders without giving the party to be enjoined any notice or opportunity to be heard—section 10 (j) .

The bill would require the President to get an injunction in the case of a national emergency strike before he can take any steps, such as mediation, conciliation, or fact finding, to settle the dispute—section 206.

The bill retains the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act for enforcing the restrictions on welfare funds and the check-off by means of injunctions in the Federal district courts—section 302.

While the bill makes an apparent concession in omitting the provisions requiring the General Counsel to seek court injunctions in the case of boycotts and certain other union practices, it places in that single officer the broad discretionary power, mentioned above in the first paragraph, to secure an injunction in any unfair-labor-practice case—section 10 (j).

GENERAL COUNSEL AND BOARD PROCEDURES

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act for a five-member National Labor Relations Board—section 3 (a).

It also retains the office of the General Counsel, independent of the Board, with final authority to investigate charges and issue complaints and with general supervision over employees—other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members. However, the General Counsel is given the new authority to seek injunctions in any unfair-labor-practice case. The Hoover Commission has said that the General Counsel is at the same time prosecutor, administrator, and policy-maker—sections 3 (d) and 10 (j).

The bill specifically safeguards the present 4-year term of office of the present General Counsel, and the present terms of office of the five Board members now in office—sections 3 (a), 3 (d).

UNION SECURITY

Like the Taft-Hartley Act, the Wood bill would outlaw the closed shop. It purports to permit the so-called "preferential union shop"; but, in fact, merely authorizes employers to notify unions of job openings. An election to authorize a union to bargain for a union shop would no longer be required, but provision would still be made for employee votes to rescind authority for the union-shop agreement—sections 8 (a) (2), 8 (b) (3), and 9 (e).

As under the Taft-Hartley Act, more restrictive State laws on union security in any State are made the Federal law for interstate industries in that State—section 14 (b).

Even under a valid union-shop contract, employees could be discharged at the request of the union only for nonpayment of dues—as under the Taft-Hartley Act—or for engaging in a "wildcat" strike, or for membership in or support of the Communist Party or any subversive organization. The last provision will require the NLRB, composed of labor experts, to determine when individual union members have given such support to the Communist Party or other subversive organization as would justify their expulsion by a union so that discrimination by an employer would not be an unfair labor practice—sections 8 (a) (2) and 8 (b) (3).

The new bill adds a new restriction to the existing Taft-Hartley Act limitations on union security by banning of closed-shop provisions in existing contracts. This is done by striking out section 102 of the Taft-Hartley Act, which safeguards union-security contracts in effect on the effective date of the act for as long as such contracts are in effect. This would disrupt existing collective-bargaining agreements in many basic industries and create new and serious problems where none exist today even under the Taft-Hartley Act—sections 8 (a) (3), 8 (b) (2).

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

The bill in general contains the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to secondary boycotts. Boycotts to protect legitimate interests of the

members of the union in the maintenance of work standards, wage rates, and the preservation of the union would continue to be banned. The only change made by the bill is to permit secondary boycotts against the substitute manufacture of struck goods, but then only if, first, the employer agrees in advance to the boycott in a written contract; and, second, the struck goods would have been worked on by other members of the same local union who are on strike—section 8 (b) (4) (A).

Unlawful secondary boycotts continue to be unfair labor practices, as under the Taft-Hartley Act, and court injunctions may be obtained before any complaint is issued and before any Board hearing or final action. Unions also continue to be subject to damage suits for violation of the secondary-boycott provisions—sections 8 (b) (4), 10 (j), 303.

JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to union participation in jurisdictional disputes. It continues to outlaw strikes and boycotts to force an employer to assign particular work tasks to employees in particular unions or in particular trades or crafts, unless the employer is failing to comply with a Board order of certification. The bill, however, completely omits any provision whatever for procedures to settle jurisdictional disputes—sections 8 (b) (4) (D), 10 (j), 303.

PICKETING

The bill retains the Taft-Hartley Act prohibitions on peaceful picketing—sections 8 (b) (4) (A), (B), (C).

UNION AND EMPLOYER RESPONSIBILITY

The bill contains the same provisions on union and employer responsibility for the acts or omissions of individuals as are contained in the Taft-Hartley Act. These provisions make unions responsible for such acts or omissions regardless of whether they were actually authorized or subsequently ratified. Such a rule must be followed not only in court actions against unions but also in proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board. Thus, the bill, like the Taft-Hartley Act, in effect wipes out section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which required actual authorization or ratification by the union to impute union liability in any court action—sections 2 (13), 301 (e).

At the same time the bill continues the Taft-Hartley Act provisions which narrow employer responsibility for the acts or omissions of individual foremen or supervisors by eliminating the clause of the Wagner Act which holds an employer responsible for the acts of persons "in the interest of an employer"—sections 2 (2).

NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

In national emergencies the bill goes even further than Taft-Hartley by requiring the President to get a court injunction before he can use any emergency procedures to settle the dispute. Otherwise these procedures are the same except for the elimination of the last offer ballot—sections 206, 209.

PENALTIES AGAINST EMPLOYEES WHO STRIKE

The bill would continue the present provision of the Taft-Hartley Act prohibiting employees from voting if they are not entitled to reinstatement, except where the striking employee has not been permanently replaced for a full period of at least 90 days before the election. A slight concession is made by the bill in the deletion of the Taft-Hartley Act provision depriving employees of status under the act if they strike before the expiration of the 60-day strike notice required to be given—sections 8 (d), 9 (c) (3).

DAMAGE SUITS

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act under which unions can sue and be sued in the Federal courts, without regard to the usual requirements as to the amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship. Damage suits for breach of collective-bargaining agreements continue to be specifically authorized—section 301.

CONCILIATION SERVICE

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act for an independent agency known as the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to settle labor disputes. The only change is the elimination of provisions directing the service to suggest secret ballots upon employers' last offer when all other attempts at settlement have failed—sections 201–205.

CHECK-OFF

The bill contains more restrictive provisions than the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to the check-off of union membership dues. The present law permits continuing check-off authority after the original consent of the employee so long as there is a period for revocation at least once each year or at the end of the contract term, whichever occurs first. The bill, however, requires renewed specific consent of the employee to the check-off at least once each year or at the end of the contract term, whichever occurs first—section 203 (a), (b), and (c) (4).

HEALTH AND WELFARE FUNDS

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act making it a criminal offense for an employer to contribute or an employee representative to receive money for health and welfare funds unless they are for particular purposes and administered in a specific manner. In addition to imposing criminal penalties for violations of these restrictive provisions court injunctions are also available—section 302 (c), (e).

FREE-SPEECH PROVISION

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act providing that the expression of views, arguments, or opinions shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice, if the expression contains no threat of force, reprisal, or promise of benefit. The deletion of the phrase "under any provision of this act," makes doubly certain that the free-speech immunity granted to employers will not be granted to the expression of views by unions in secondary boycott and related cases. Thus the discrimination of the Taft-Hartley Act against unions is strengthened by the Wood bill—section 8 (c).

COERCION OF EMPLOYEES OR EMPLOYERS BY UNIONS

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act, making it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to restrain or coerce employees or employers or to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discharge an employee under a valid union-shop contract, except for refusal to pay dues or initiation fees. Two additional grounds for discharge are added, however, namely, striking in violation of a contract and affiliation with or support of the Communist Party or other subversive organization—section 8 (b) (1), (2).

EXEMPTIONS AND SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR PARTICULAR GROUPS OF EMPLOYEES

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act excluding supervisory employees and employees of Federal Reserve banks and nonprofit hospitals from the act. Similarly, guards may not be included in bargaining units with other employees, and units of guards may not be represented by unions which admit nonguards to membership or which are affiliated with such unions. Also, professional employees are excluded from units which include nonprofessional workers, unless the majority in the professional group vote for inclusion—sections 2 (c), 2 (3), 2 (11), 9 (b) (1), 9 (b) (2), and 9 (b) (3).

FINANCIAL INFORMATION AND NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to union registration and filing of financial data and the filing of non-Communist affidavits, but in addition requires employers to file non-Communist affidavits—section 9 (f), (g), (h).

POLITICAL EXPENDITURES

The bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act making it a criminal offense for corporations and labor organizations to make contributions or expenditures in connection with any election or convention involving the choice of Federal officers. Thus, unions continue to be singled out as the only type of voluntary association which is made the subject of such restrictions. Other voluntary associations, such as employer trade associations, bar associations, medical societies, and farm organizations are not subject to these restrictions—section 304.

ELECTIONS

The bill contains most of the provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act which would require elections in many different circumstances. The Taft-Hartley Act requires elections in at least nine circumstances, at least six of which are provided for in the bill as follows:

First. Elections on whether professional employees desire to be excluded from a bargaining unit representing nonprofessional employees—section 9 (b) (1);

Second. Separate elections for plant guards—section 9 (b) (3);

Third. Elections for certification as statutory bargaining agent—section 9 (e) (1) (A) (i);

Fourth. Elections to decertify a labor organization or other representative previously designated—section 9 (c) (1) (A) (ii);

Fifth. Elections where the employer files a petition alleging that a union is claiming recognition as collective-bargaining agent—section 9 (c) (1) (B); and

Sixth. Elections to rescind authority for a union to negotiate a union-shop agreement—section 9 (a) (1).

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The bill includes all of the special provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act requiring employers and unions mutually to bargain collectively and also extends the 60-day-notice provision with respect to contract termination or modification so that it applies in the case of an intention to invoke a reopening clause in the contract. The only concession made by the bill is to omit the provision under which an employee loses his status under the act if he engaged in a strike within the 60-day period—sections 8 (d) (1), (2), (3), and (4).

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, when driving on the open highway did you ever take the wrong road? You go a short distance and learn your mistake. So you solve the situation in the only way possible. You return to the fork and set yourself right. Keeping on the wrong road would only lead you farther and farther from the intended destination.

That is exactly what happened when two years ago the Eightieth Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley labor measure. We must return to the fork of the road, the Wagner Act, then proceed. This Nation had taken the healthy high road in labor relations, away from the kind of capitalism that had sunk it in economic chaos. We had drawn away from that picture of factories lying idle, banks closed, bread lines and apple selling. But many of us could remember the despair and hopelessness of American industrialists who came to the Messiah they had heaped with abuse when he ran for high office.

In well-ordered fashion he put their financial and industrial houses in order again and one of the potent instruments in that process was the Wagner Labor Relations Act. It was a measure that was long overdue. In the course of its evolution American industry had ridden high, wide, and handsome, and practically unregulated. It played the game with loaded dice for it had court injunctions, the National Guard, along with public and private police, to keep labor well in hand. Labor was treated like a commodity, to be purchased in competition if possible, like its raw products. The slogan for that day of the Republican Party was "the full dinner pail." Workmen were supposed to be smug and happy if they had enough to eat.

The Republican bigwig in Pennsylvania of that era was United States Senator Boies Penrose. He chairmaned the powerful Senate Finance Committee. One time in a moment of foreign crisis he was asked by a newsman for his views on the situation. He replied: "I am not interested in foreign affairs. I am in the Senate to represent the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association." And so it was in the State legislatures and in this Congress during that period. Until F. D. R.'s day in Washington, most of the efforts for labor consisted mostly of throwing sops, particularly at election time.

During its continuous reign in the late nineties and the early part of this century the only thing the Republican Party did for labor was mention it at national convention time and appoint an innocuous Secretary of Labor. Labor's voice was weak because its ranks were relatively unorganized. If in wage bargaining the industrialists were in command it was because of the strength inherent to their position. As Adam Smith said back in 1776, the employers, being fewer in number, can combine much more easily to keep wages from rising. The individual employer, moreover, exercises control over a substantial number of job opportunities. In a sense there is a natural monopoly on the employer's side in the matter of employment. Too, you can hoard capital but you cannot do the same with man-hours.

Even when American industry was sowing its wild oats a gleam of truth showed here and there. On the witness stand and under oath was John D. Rockefeller, Sr., as ruthless and successful a capitalist and industrialist as America was ever to know. He was asked: "Capital, management, and labor, which of these is the most important to American industry?" He replied, "Which is the most important leg on a 3-legged stool?" They were equally important, but when they met to settle wage scales, the three did not meet on equal terms.

Now labor is not just a name. It is millions of human beings who love and marry and rear children, who join the sons of capitalists and management to fight our wars when they arise. Labor cannot be bid for like copper and aluminum. It is living, breathing people who buy Plymouths, Chevrolets, Frigidaires, radios, and television sets. They must not be arrayed against each other to bid each other down else they will not be able to purchase the very gadgets that industry sets out to sell. The champions of the "American right to work" want rugged individualism for the American workman so that he can be handled more easily.

Everything important in this world begins with an attitude. A lot depends on attitude in regard to your life, your marriage, your job, your country. The attitude which prompted the writing of the Wagner Act was friendly toward labor and this legislation was fashioned by a Congress with that frame of mind. However, there was a smacking of Republican lips—with a few notable exceptions—when the Eightieth Congress convened, because it was bent upon "putting labor in its place." The Dixiecrats liked that prospect, too. Together they conspired to send America on the wrong road.

In turning the clock back, in industrial progress, the T-H advocates had to pass the bill over the veto of President Truman. During the period it was under discussion no expense was spared to give it unprecedented ballyhoo. This evoked comment from Senator AIKEN, who said:

> It is a wonder that Members of the Senate can hold their tempers and vote on the bill according to their best judgment because we have been subjected to the most intensive, expensive, and vicious propaganda campaign that any Congress has ever been subjected to.
>
> I refer to a propaganda campaign which has cost well into the millions of dollars. I should not be surprised if the total amount spent in this campaign would amount to $100,000,000. It was told the Senate last spring that the single March advertising campaign in the newspapers against labor by the National Association of Manufacturers cost $2,000,000, and that statement has not been contradicted as yet, although it was made a year ago.
>
> This propaganda campaign has been conducted through letters to the press; it has been conducted through radio commentators whose services have been for hire by various organizations; it has been conducted through speakers sent everywhere in the United States where they could get the opportunity to expound the antilabor doctrine.

Proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act claimed its passage was required to break labor monopoly and that the Wagner Act had caused widespread and disruptive strikes. It alleged the new enactment was required to stop jurisdictional disputes and to bring about democracy within labor unions. Union officers would be required to take a non-Communist oath. Let us consider some of these allegations.

LABOR MONOPOLY?

This argument is usually advanced by those who declaim loudly for free enterprise, something we all applaud when being free means responsibility to others who also have rights. They claim that unionism interferes with the free operation of market forces when determining wage rates. As a matter of fact union negotiators frequently emphasize points that have nothing to do with wages, and hence costs. They have asked instead, as an instance, for such considerations as a voice in the review of discharges by management. Stake in the job and stake in the industry, of which they are a part, was more important than mere pay increases.

WHAT ABOUT SETTLEMENT OF WIDESPREAD AND DISRUPTIVE STRIKES?

The right to strike is an inherent American one to which even Republicans give agreement. So let us see how fairly the Taft-Hartley Act deals with this right.

The statute denies to economic strikers—those striking over such issues as wages, hours, and other working conditions—who have been replaced, the right to vote in a Labor Board election. In greatly increasing the risk in striking it curtails the exercise of the right to strike. When men are competing for jobs, in times of widespread unemployment, it would make every job seeker a potential strikebreaker.

No better example can be found, of this curtailment of right to strike under the Taft-Hartley law, than the case of the Pipe Machinery Co. A strike was called by the International Association of Machinists, which had represented the company's workers. A petition for an election was thereupon filed by the company's independent union. The National Labor Relations Board, acting under the mandate of the Taft-Hartley law, held that only replacements could vote in the Board election. Strikers who had been replaced were ineligible to vote. Thus the Taft-Hartley law acted as the instrument by which the machinists' union lost its position as bargaining agent. That may be strike settlement to some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle but to me it spells labor crucified by Government decree.

JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES AND SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

In the cause of lazy thinking and a favorable press, these have been termed "racketeering practices," with the pitiable employee and the poor public as innocent victims. A just decision cannot be made so conveniently. In very many cases there is justification. Secondary boycotts make plenty of sense when the man not on strike has his welfare seriously imperiled. As to jurisdictional strikes let us see just how widespread they were in the years before the Taft-Hartley law operated. Here are some figures from the United States Department of Labor on the ratio of work stoppages due to inter and intra union matters to all strikes:

1944:	
Percent of all stoppages	4.1
Percent of workers involved	5.4
Percent of man-hours lost	10.0
1945:	
Percent of all stoppages	4.2
Percent of workers involved	5.5
Percent of man-hours lost	5.6
1946:	
Percent of all stoppages	4.9
Percent of workers involved	4.8
Percent of man-hours lost	0.9
1947:	
Percent of all stoppages	4.5
Percent of workers involved	1.5
Percent of man-hours lost	2.4

An example of how anxious was the Eightieth Congress to be fair to the worker, the Taft-Hartley Act set up a Conciliation Service outside of the Department of Labor. Now the Department of Labor is headed by a Cabinet officer, responsible to the President. It seems reasonable that he should know all that is going on within the realm of labor. Under the Wagner Act, it was empowered to act as referee, nothing more. It could not engage in a labor dispute if it would. Yet to be "fair," the T-H Act set up a separate agency, headed by, of all people, a former officer of the National Association of Manufacturers. For all I know, he is an impartial arbiter, but the whole procedure smacks of asking Knute Rockne to referee the Army-Notre Dame football game.

Another example of "fairness" to labor is that non-Communist oath which the T-H law requires to be taken of labor representatives only. We all know that labor unions in whatever country are the first line of attack from Moscow. Party members and fellow travelers got into our unions early and they had been instructed how to wrest control. Alarmed unionists have pretty well purged them, as witness the happenings in the auto workers' organization. They were on the way to doing this without benefit of any T-H law. The Communists have been ousted because so many union members performed military jobs in Germany, Italy, and the South Pacific. They do not like government dictatorship from any quarter, including Joe Stalin.

It was an affront to these men to insert that non-Communist oath in the T-H enactment. A good many of these fellows remember that some industrialists were members of international cartels before the war and that they were considerably un-American in their operations. Yet no oath about cartels was required of the industrial conferees.

As recently as 1938 a senatorial subcommittee was created to investigate violations of free speech and the rights of labor. Among other things it found that a number of large concerns, including General Motors, were buying machine guns and tear-gas bombs to use against their employees in case of strike. Remington-Rand hired Pinkerton labor spies to perform Benedict Arnold duty within unions. The National Metal Manufacturers Association was recruiting strikebreakers from the underworlds of our big cities. Yet the Taft-Hartley labor law did not require an industrial negotiator to answer the question: "Have you laid in any machine guns lately?" These questions would have been just as pertinent and fair as the one about Communists exacted of labor conferees.

You gentlemen across the aisle heard your candidate speak of unity in his campaign last November. We heard our President ask for it at his inauguration. You have recently appropriated more money for the armed forces than the President asked for. You have not withheld money from our European friends, so the Marshall plan can operate unhampered. In the cold war it is apparent to all of us that we are in a constant state of defense. And in this labor legislation we are passing on the greatest measure of national defense that can come before us.

For we must return to the concept that American industry is a three-legged stool where capital, management, and labor are of equal importance with Government the trusted and impartial referee. We were well on our way and all three elements thrived under the Wagner Act. Let us return to it and from there on make only such revisions that are consistent with the dignity of the workingman of America.

I never believed I would live to quote a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, here or elsewhere. But the truth is the truth, no matter who utters it and from what source we draw it. Eric Johnston is the former United States Chamber of Commerce head who is now president of the Motion Picture Association of America. He has made considerable study of economic factors and governments in Europe. Mr. Johnston has conducted first-hand research in the satellite countries and in Russia itself, including a long interview with Stalin. So he speaks with some authority and knowledge when he outlines this threefold program to stop communism in the world. He suggests:

First. Mobilize human and natural resources in a giant industrialization program to raise living standards.

Second. Give practical help to labor unions and all other democratic forces and institutions around the world.

Third. Guarantee democratic governments against military aggression and democratic people against coups.

I leave with you, gentlemen, Mr. Johnston's second step in the war against communism. Let me repeat it: Give practical help to labor unions and all other democratic forces and institutions around the world.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago I addressed the House on the Hartley bill, predicting that labor-management relations would not be improved if the bill became law.

Since the Taft-Hartley Act has gone into effect, numerous cases have been cited to me throughout my State of California to show that the prediction I made 2 years ago has come true.

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed by legislators who said: "We must balance the power between labor and management." Also, they said: "We must protect the individual against labor bosses."

These two slogans were used as the central theme of a Nation-wide propaganda campaign. The slogans represented two easily accepted American concepts—equality and individual freedom. Equality between two powerful groups and the freedom of the individual worker from alleged tyranny by labor bosses.

In order to establish the necessity for this kind of equality and freedom, one must accept the premise of the Taft-Hartley exponents. They said that labor was more powerful than management and that individuals were not free in labor unions.

Actually, these people wanted to limit and, if possible, eliminate the labor movement as any kind of an economic, social, or political force.

The framers of the Taft-Hartley law recognized that the people of this country approved the philosophy of the Wagner Act because the words of that philosophy were carried over into the Taft-Hartley Act.

You find that the public philosophy of Taft-Hartley is not much different from that of the Wagner Act.

The Taft-Hartley law says:

> The inequality of bargaining power between employees who do not possess full freedom of association or actual liberty of contract, and employers who are organized in the corporate or other forms of ownership association substantially burdens and affects the flow of commerce.

The Taft-Hartley Act retains, without change, the Wagner Act provision that—

> It is the policy of the United States that sound and stable industrial peace and the advancement of the general welfare, health, and safety of the Nation * * * can most satisfactorily be secured by the settlement of issues between employers and employees through the processes of collective bargaining.

The stated philosophy of the Wagner Act and of the Taft-Hartley Act is the same—that workers must be encouraged to join unions in order to cope with the economic power held by the employers.

But where the Wagner Act made it possible for workers to join unions, the Taft-Hartley Act has made it much more difficult.

The Taft-Hartleyites said on the one hand: "Workers must be encouraged to join unions." And, on the other, they said: "But after they've joined, they become too powerful." So they passed a law to restrict the growth of the labor movement.

Despite statements to the contrary made during the debate, proof that the new law has hampered the growth of the labor movement is contained in the figures of labor-union membership in relation to the total work force of this Nation. During the first half of the present decade, the total membership of labor unions in this country increased more than 50 percent. But during the past 2 years, since the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted, the rate of increase has dropped off very sharply. The total membership in all unions is now approximately 16,000,000. There are about 62,000,000 workers in this country.

The issue is simple:

Those who are for the retention of the Taft-Hartley Act have never stated that they wish to encourage the growth of the labor movement.

Those who are against the act publicly proclaim their desire to encourage the growth of the labor movement—in order to put into practice the stated philosophy of the act itself.

With that purpose in mind, a law should be drafted which would equitably regulate the relationship between industry, labor, and the nation as a whole.

To prove that the Taft-Hartley law, while saying it wishes to encourage growth of the labor movement, has actually hampered growth, here are some examples:

In Los Angeles, which used to boast of being an open-shop city, there is a plant where a valid contract existed between the employer and local lodge 311 of the International Association of Machinists. Through their elected representatives, the members of that local union asked for a wage increase. Their wage scale was below the standard for the locality.

The employer refused to bargain. The men went on strike. They were on strike for 8 months. Those men had a right to strike, the law says.

But the employer replaced these men with strikebreakers. Then under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law the employer petitioned the National Labor Relations Board for an election to determine what organization would represent his employees in collective bargaining. The law allows the strikebreakers to vote and forbids the strikers to vote. So when the employer called for an election, all of his old employees who had walked a picket line for 8 months were not allowed to vote. Consequently, of course, these men not only lost their jobs but the union was destroyed. As a result, there is a company-dominated union in that plant today.

There is the answer to people who claim the Taft-Hartley Act is not a union-busting act. There is a plant where the union organization was destroyed. Why? Because the men chose, in a democratic way, to go on strike—a right they have under the law. But these men were not protected in this right, so, actually the right did not exist for them.

What is the theory under which the employer may hire strikebreakers? The theory is that commerce must not be interrupted and that the employer has a right to conduct his business. With this, I agree. But I believe the workers have a right to those jobs, too. And with this theory the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law do not agree.

The problem which confronts Congress now, as I see it, is to balance the rights, the rights of the employer to continue his business without interruption and the right of the men who work for him to stop work and retain their employment until collective bargaining results in a new contract. And upon the same scales must also be balanced the rights of the public.

Under the Taft-Hartley law the employer has practically all of the rights, the workers suffer and the public suffers because the public is adversely affected by the dissolution of the labor movement.

If the declared philosophy of the Taft-Hartley Act were followed, it would be recognized that the employer has more power than the employees—with or without a labor union. Because of that basic inequality, the men have the right to strike, by law. And the employer has a duty to bargain. But if the employer has the right to destroy the strike, then the right to strike is a hollow right and is actually a liability.

Now here is a case of men who wanted a union but, under the Taft-Hartley law, were prevented from getting one because of the employer's economic strength.

Local 2018, of the United Steelworkers of America, conducted an organizing campaign at a small plant, also in the Los Angeles area.

Local 2018 succeeded in signing up a majority of the workers and notified the employer that it wished to be recognized as the bargaining agent. The employer immediately commenced a campaign against the union. He called all the workers together and told them: "If you join this union, there may be serious results." He did not say the men would be fired but he didn't have to. And he was protected under the Taft-Hartley law's so-called free-speech provision.

But the union continued its fight to be recognized. Then the employer invited all his employees to a big dinner at a leading hotel in Los Angeles—complete with several kinds of wine and excellent food. At that dinner, he offered the employees a 10 cent an hour wage increase. But, of course, he did not mention seniority problems, vacations or grievance procedure.

Of course, the men attended the dinner—if they wanted to keep their jobs. Of course, they accepted the pay increase. Of course, they could do nothing about vacations and seniority.

This story would not be unusual if the employer were in the habit of throwing such a banquet every week. But this was the first time he had demonstrated such hospitality—and, of course, his hospitality resulted in a very nice saving.

That employer used his economic power in a way that he would not have been allowed to do under the Wagner Act. As a result of the use by this employer of his unequal power, there is no union at all in that plant today.

In a court case in California, involving the A. F. of L. Retail Clerks' Union, a most important interpretation of the Taft-Hartley law has indicated what the real philosophy of that law is.

In the case of *Simons* v. *Local 770, Retail Clerks' Union,* reported in 21 LRRM 2685, the Court said, of a union which has not complied with the Taft-Hartley law, that such a "union is an outlaw and may be enjoined from picketing an employer."

The Court said that a noncomplying union "has no legal standing to represent or bargain for employees of any business over which the Board has jurisdiction."

In other words, a union may be destroyed if it does not comply with the act's provisions—which make compliance voluntary. So, unless you voluntarily perform an act, you have no right to exist. This does not sound very voluntary to me; it has more of the tone of being compulsory. The law actually says to unions: "You must comply with all the law's provisions or you cannot continue to exist."

In the retail clerks' case, the union had not complied and, as a result, the Court declared it could not picket the employer—and, therefore, there was no further reason for existence.

The problem of noncompliance has created many serious conditions in the State of California.

The most serious, in my opinion, was the 3-month coastwide maritime strike of last year.

In the twilight period, before the Wagner Act died and the Taft-Hartley Act came into effect, a contract was signed by the west-coast dock workers and their employers.

The union asked for no wage increase and the employers, of course, offered none. The employers made no outcries about anything—they signed promptly.

But things were not so easy when the contract expired in midsummer of last year. The Longshoremen's Union had not complied with the Taft-Hartley Act. The union's international president had refused to sign the non-Communist provision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This was the kind of a case which the framers of the act had sought to control: A union president frequently accused of Communist sympathies was supposed to be smoked out by the affidavit provision of the act.

The record shows that the act failed, totally and completely. More than that, the act galvanized the membership behind the union officers, an effect which none of the proponents of the law would ever have predicted.

At contract expiration time, the union and the employers headed toward the so-called cooling-off period which the law had set aside for them. The expiration date arrived. There was no contract. So a strike was called and the two parties started to cool off.

During this period the employers announced that the union must comply with the non-Communist affidavit provision or the employers would never bargain with the union again. The west coast was faced with an unlimited lock-out.

If the strike was over economic issues, the lock-out was based upon the Waterfront Employers' absolute refusal to bargain unless the union officers signed the voluntary affidavit.

What effect did this have upon the union leadership? Did the men, fearful of remaining out of work forever, immediately start a campaign to oust the union officers? They did not. Any student of elementary psychology knows that men rally behind a leader who is under attack. At least, Stalin discovered that when he singled out Marshal Tito as a traitor.

If the employers thought they would divide the International Longshoremen and Warehouse Union or the CIO by their attack on the officers, they found they were completely mistaken. Instead their ultimatum on the Taft-Hartley affidavits actually strengthened the union and brought to its aid other unions, A. F. of L., CIO, and independent.

Finally, after the national election, the strike was settled without any union leader signing any affidavit.

Recently the leadership of the employers, not of the union, has been changed as a result of the employers' disastrous Taft-Hartley lock-out. And today, both union and employers are working against General Counsel Denham of the NLRB in his efforts to declare the hiring hall provisions of the west-coast longshore contract illegal. Only a few months ago the employers had been demanding the abolition of the hiring hall provision as contrary to the letter and spirit of the Taft-Hartley Act.

What caused this amazing reversal? What brought the lock-out to an end? What made the employers, who were against the hiring hall, turn around and become its champion?

The answer is simple: It was the election of 1948—in which the people voted—whenever they could—against the men who put the Taft-Hartley law on the books.

The leadership of any union is representative not only of its members but of the economic and social conditions of the industry in which those members work. If the conditions need improvement the members will vote into office somebody who can lead them into better conditions; if the conditions are acceptable, the union members will elect officers who will maintain amicable relations and retain those conditions. Therefore, it is the character of the industry itself—over which the employers have control—which determines the type of leadership a union selects. No law will change that leadership. It will endure until the conditions of the industry become satisfactory to the workers.

I am convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act has reversed the basic direction of our national labor policy, as established in the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 and the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. That policy was to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining.

I think it is obvious that the framers of the Taft-Hartley Act did not want to encourage collective bargaining because they feared the growth of the organized labor movement. Apparently, they had no faith in the democratic spirit of the average American worker.

As for me, I believe that the future of America and the preservation of the American way of life depend upon a strong and prosperous labor movement, dedicated to democratic principles and to a fair deal in labor-management relations. I shall vote to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and to restore collective bargaining to its proper place as the foundation of the American labor policy.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Missouri said, I would like to talk a little reason about this legislation. I probably will not talk so loud nor discuss the dire danger of this country should we enact legislation that removes from the statute books some of the admitted unjust restrictions on labor.

What I will do is to go back and in brief outline consider the history and the background that has brought us to the present day and the labor problems confronting us.

Perhaps it would be well for us to note at this time that at common law both corporations and labor unions were illegal, and perhaps it would be well for us to think of why we have made these concessions to combinations; and then realize that it is because we want automobiles and radios and refrigerators and the things that modern industry produces. We must not become so emotional that we forget that those combinations of wealth are necessary to produce those things that we want for what we consider a better life; that it has been necessary also to make concessions to organizations and combinations of men in order to give them equal bargaining power with those combinations of wealth.

This is not a new struggle—not by any means. My good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, told you earlier that in 1935, for the first time the law afforded labor the legal right to bargain. I am sure that it was an inadvertent error upon his part. But in our own State of Indiana, in the year 1893, the legislature made it a misdemeanor to coerce an employee in exercising his right to bargain. The gentleman from Indiana was prosecuting attorney of the Jasper-Newton judicial circuit in Indiana, and I assume that he knew about that law because it is a criminal statute. But perhaps he did not. I have in my file a letter which was put out by the Employers' Association of Indiana last year, in which the members were told, in substance, Do you know that there has been a statute sleeping upon the statute books of Indiana since 1893 which forbids the discharge of a man for joining a union? It came as a great surprise, because that statute had lain upon the books for all these years unenforced. I might say to the gentleman from Virginia who talked about States' rights the other day, that there is a typical example of how the States have dealt with these questions. The gentlewoman from California mentioned combinations of wealth that had grown to great proportions. Today in my State there is a utility rate case going on. My State has an assessed valuation of about $5,000,000,000. The corporation with which it is at grips today has a valuation of almost $10,000,000,000. If you fear collectivism, you must think of collectivism of wealth and not become so excited over the collectivism of a few men who toil for their daily bread; who organize to meet that collectivism of wealth.

Now, we finally come down to the year 1935, when the Wagner Act was enacted. All that the Wagner Act ever did was two simple things—it forbade the employer to coerce an employee in his right to organize and form a united front to meet the employer at the bargaining table. It also afforded the employee the opportunity of voting and thus selecting a bargaining agent. But the ink was hardly dry on the Wagner Act when those who had always fought the idea of collective bargaining began to say that the pendulum had swung too far. They kept swinging that pendulum until 1947 when the Taft-Hartley law was enacted. There has been a great deal of talk about mandates. In 1946 when the Republican Party was made the majority party I am sure that in good faith they believed they had a mandate to enact some labor legislation. There was some nebulous legislative idea in the air. They had a mandate to pass something, and they passed the Taft-Hartley law. My good friend and colleague from Indiana, I am informed, although I was not here, walked to the well of this House in the early part of last year and threw down a challenge in the face of the President of the United States, and dared him to make the Taft-Hartley law an issue. The President of the Democratic Party accepted that challenge. So, we had an issue over something which was not ethereal, something that was not in the air, something that was not nebulous, but a law which was written in black and white, something that you could read, something that the people had lived under. Finally, we went to the polls, and I do not mean to the poll-takers. I mean the polls where the people went into the voting booths and cast their ballots. The verdict was upon something that was not

nebulous and ethereal but upon this law that is in black and white.

Now, my time will not permit me to go into the many phases of the Taft-Hartley law, but I want to take up one matter that has been spoken of emotionally for so long. It is one that appeals to the average person. That is this thing of free speech. I defy any man to prove that he has any more faith in American ideals than I have, that he believes more firmly in free speech than I do. But section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley law does not have any more to do with free speech than a dime novel. Section 8 (c) is a rule of evidence. Under the Wagner Act a man could say what he pleased. Employers ran advertisements asking people to come back to work when they were on strike. They wrote them letters. They told them why they should come back. They talked to them when opportunity presented itself. No policeman ever tapped anyone on the shoulder and took him to jail for saying what he wanted to. But it meant this, that what that man said about the time he may have committed an act, was evidence against him in court, exactly like if I would express hostility to the gentleman here and it is known that I am his enemy. I let it be known from my own mouth. This man is found badly injured and there is some evidence to show that I am the guilty man. Then I will have my words repeated against me in court. No less person than Gerald Reilly, the architect of the Taft-Hartley law, admitted that that is what it was, in our committee hearings. That has been blown up as a great issue, when all it amounts to is that a different rule of evidence is laid down in the case of the employer who may say, "I am against unions. They are bad people and they should not be in my plant," and he walks down and fires all the union officers the next day; you cannot prove that he has made this statement in order to draw any inference or conclusion that his vote was because of ill feeling to the union. The attorney for the Bus Operators' Association also admitted that they could not name another situation in the whole field of American jurisprudence where that rule of evidence applied.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Would you say that under the Lesinski bill employers are free to advise workers against joining or fighting for a union so long as threats or coercion are avoided?

Mr. JACOBS. Absolutely.

Mr. CARROLL. And under the Taft-Hartley bill, if he did make any statements, as you have outlined the rule of evidence, they could not use that in court against him unless coercive?

Mr. JACOBS. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. And that is the great difference in this free speech problem.

Mr. JACOBS. It is a rule of evidence, pure and simple, that protects the employer from hearing his own words repeated against him in court. In no other case does that rule of evidence apply in American jurisprudence. It has been admitted by the best lawyers who appeared before our committee, and lawyers for management.

Now, there has been a great deal of talk about the Wood bill. You get confused because there are too many Wood bills. What happened? The Wood bill was first brought before our committee on the day we met in full committee to consider the report of the subcommittee. No man on that committee, as far as I know, ever heard of it. I know I never did. It was offered by the ranking minority member [Mr. MCCONNELL] as a substitute for the Lesinski bill. What was that substitute they offered then? They talk about getting their feet on the ground. That first Wood bill was about twice as bad as the Taft-Hartley law. Why? Because under the Taft-Hartley law it was impossible to win an economic strike. Under the conditions as outlined by the gentleman from Massachusetts, when he read Business Week, it was conceded. But the other end of the sack was sewed up by the first Wood bill. You could not win an unfair labor practice strike under the first Wood bill. Not only that, but in craft disputes, the only chance a craft had was under section 10 (k) where an award could be made. Both the Wood bills omit section 10 (k).

Incidentally, some of you folks know that Charles E. Wilson testified before our committee. I told Mr. Wilson and his experts the day before he went on the witness stand, 24 hours before, that I was going to ask him where there was any remedy in the Taft-Hartley law for a union in a craft dispute.

I asked him the question; he referred it to his vice president who referred it to his attorney, and finally when it got down to the attorney, the attorney told me the question was immaterial.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I am sorry, but I tried on five separate occasions to get Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle to yield to me without success.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman has used my name; that is why I wanted him to yield.

Mr. JACOBS. If the gentleman under the circumstances feels that I should yield, I will. What for? A question?

Mr. McCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. JACOBS. All right.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman has spoken about no consideration of the Wood bill, or no amendment or anything else; I wanted the opportunity to offer amendments to the Wood bill. Did you ever give me any such opportunity?

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman was given an opportunity to offer the Wood bill which apparently at that time was satisfactory to the gentleman.

Mr. McCONNELL. If the gentleman remembers——

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman asked a question. Does the gentleman want an answer, or does he just want to talk?

Mr. McCONNELL. I want it answered. Then I will ask the gentleman a further question because he is making a misstatement. Go ahead.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman offered the Wood bill as a substitute to the Lesinski bill; and, as I recollect, we voted it down.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. JACOBS. That we did not vote on it?

Mr. McCONNELL. No; the gentleman is incorrect about the Wood bill. I offered it with certain amendments, but you never gave me any opportunity to explain those amendments at any time.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. The vote was 13 to 10, rejecting the Wood bill in the committee.

Mr. JACOBS. At any rate, it was my recollection that it was voted on, and we voted it down. Now, apparently it is not satisfactory to the gentleman, because they came forward with another Wood bill, which came out just the day before we went on vacation.

Fortune magazine, Life magazine, Business Week, Senator TAFT, all admitted that these provisions regarding the economic strike were unfair. Then the press picks it up and says that it has been admitted that one provision of the Taft-Hartley law is unfair. It is not 1 provision; it is about 12 provisions that all converge together that bring about that effect. Let us let the truth be given to the public once. We finally come down to the 1st of January 1948, and they begin to regret all these confessions that have been made in these business publications that the Taft-Hartley law is unfair. Then they began to put on the pressure, and we got poll sheets from all over the country. They say that people who belong to unions should not be permitted to spend a dollar for political activity, yet these pollsters spend $40,000 to print up some poll sheets; and a radio commentator takes it up and he begins to read them on the air. I might comment with reference to that radio commentator, Mr. Chairman. In my district I was elected despite the press, for one newspaper often would not publish anything that I had to say; and when I called them about that, their answer was that they had a shortage of newsprint. Then I began to check things up to see what they did with their newsprint, and I found that they gave the Republican candidates enough newsprint to equal a double Indian blanket. I checked again, and found patent-medicine ads running a close second; then I checked again, and I found that reports on obscure people from far-away places who were switching to Calvert came in a close third. So it was quite interesting to me after Fulton Lewis, Jr., decided to take my hide off that a friend of mine came up with a full sheet from Esquire magazine, whose mailing rights were somewhat questionable here a while back because of obscenity, with a full-page picture of Fulton Lewis announcing in that publication the glad tidings that he himself had switched to Calvert.

I suggest two more switches for Fulton:

First. That he switch to drinking water to avoid the fumbling effects of his broadcasts and to further avoid eating old crow.

Second. That he switch to truth serum for obvious reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post of today.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article in one instance, and in another instance two articles pertaining to the University of Chicago.

Mr. McSWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a letter from the director of education of Ohio relative to the disposition of Federal surpluses.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Harold E. Stassen given before the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $225, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a letter from Henry Field, of Shenandoah, Iowa.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today after any special orders previously entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CANCELLATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF SUPERCARRIER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Secretary of the Navy Sullivan and also an editorial from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Secretary of Defense acted without lawful authority when he ordered the cancellation of the construction of the supercarrier the U. S. S. *United States*. This carrier was authorized by an act of Congress. The initial appropriation for the construction was a part of the naval appropriation for the fiscal year 1949. This appropriation constitutes and is an act of Congress. I submit to you the question, How can any official of the Government so deliberately disregard the acts of Congress? Are not the laws as passed by Congress binding on officials of Government the same as all other people in the Nation? Can officials of the Government wave aside and disregard the laws of Congress whenever it seems to satisfy their purpose? Who has the responsibility of the defense of the United States, the Secretary of Defense or the Congress? Again I desire to emphasize that the action of the Secretary of Defense in this case is a clear case of violation of and a total disregard of the Federal law. If this is a precedent of future action is it not possible to conclude the power of Congress has been taken over by Executive decree and instead of a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people we have a dictatorship. Is this the next step? The answer to this question should cause everyone to pause and think. It should cause the people of the Nation to rise in protest. It should cause the leadership of the Congress to stand firm and strong and say, "This cannot be done. This we refuse to permit. This we will correct." A dangerous precedent is a threat to the Nation. There is more involved here than the cancellation of the construction of the great carrier. Constitutional government is hanging in the balance.

I include here as a part of my remarks the text of the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John L. Sullivan to the Secretary of Defense. It should be read by every Member of the Congress and thoroughly studied for its complete meaning. Also I include an editorial entitled "Stop, Look, and Listen" appearing in the Washington Evening Star for today, Wednesday, April 27, 1949.

TEXT OF SULLIVAN'S LETTER ASSAILING JOHNSON ON CARRIER

On Saturday, April 23, without discussion with the Chief of Naval Operations, without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, you directed the discontinuance of the construction of the U. S. S. *United States*, the construction of which had twice been approved by the President.

This carrier had been the subject of intensive study in the Navy Department since it was first proposed early in 1945 by the late Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, whose combat experience had convinced him of the necessity. In a hearing with the Director of the Budget on December 16, 1947, with the approval of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I volunteered to surrender $307,000,000, which was the cost to complete the approved construction of other vessels, to insure that funds would be available for the U. S. S. *United States*. Its construction was explicitly approved by the reports of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House on June 2, 1948, and June 9, 1948, respectively.

In the Naval Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1949, the appropriation for the first year of construction of the U. S. S. *United States* was approved by the Congress. Again on December 17, 1948, in a conference with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I abandoned construction of other vessels in the amount of $57,000,000 to assure the continuance of the carrier and other vessels.

Additional funds for the continuing construction of this vessel in the fiscal year 1950 were included in the budget message which the President sent to the Congress on January 3, 1949, and were included in the National Military Establishment appropriation bill passed by the House on April 13, 1949.

Professional naval men, charged with the task of planning for a Navy adequate to the defense of America believe that the construction of the U. S. S. *United States* is so indispensable to the continuing development of American sea power that they have twice sacrificed other substantial construction because of the carrier's highest naval priority.

On Monday, April 18, while discussing a variety of subjects with you, the question of the continuance of work on the U. S. S. *United States* was raised, and my opinion was asked. I started to give my opinion, but before I had talked more than a minute you advised me that you had another appointment and would discuss this matter with me at a later date. The following day I sent you a very brief memorandum touching on only one phase of the justification of this carrier. In this memorandum I referred to my desire to resume the discussions that had been interrupted the previous day.

I heard nothing about this again until Saturday, April 23, when in Corpus Christi, Tex., I was advised by long distance telephone that you had sent me a memorandum directing the discontinuance of construction.

I am, of course, very deeply disturbed by your action which so far as I know represents the first attempt ever made in this country to prevent the development of a powerful weapon. The conviction that this will result in a renewed effort to abolish the Marine Corps and to transfer all naval and marine aviation elsewhere adds to my anxiety.

However, even of greater significance is the unprecedented action on the part of a secretary of defense in so drastically and arbitrarily restricting the plans of an armed service without consultation with that service. The consequences of such a procedure are far reaching and can be tragic.

In view of the foregoing I am sure you will agree with me that no useful purpose can now be served by my remaining as Secretary of the Navy. I have accordingly submitted my resignation to the President.

I deeply regret the circumstances that lead to my departure from the National Military Establishment at such an interesting and crucial period of its development.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of April 27, 1949]

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

Perhaps the President and Secretary of Defense Johnson wanted to force John L. Sullivan to resign as Secretary of the Navy. If so, there is a certain logic to the way in

which the matter of canceling out the supercarrier was handled.

But if this was not the case, if there was no intent to get rid of both the carrier and Mr. Sullivan, then one is left to the conclusion that this incident was characterized by a degree of ineptness, if not outright rudeness, which promises trouble in the future.

For reasons which have already been set forth, the Star believes that the decision to abandon the super carrier was correct. But the manner in which that decision was made and announced leaves much to be desired.

According to Mr. Sullivan, the Secretary of Defense called him in 10 days ago and in the course of a general conversation asked for his views on the super carrier. After Mr. Sullivan had talked for about a minute the Secretary cut him off, saying he had another engagement. Mr. Johnson said he would discuss the matter later, and on the following day the Navy Secretary reminded his superior in writing of his desire to present his views.

That opportunity never came. Mr. Johnson obtained the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which presumably were 2 to 1 against the carrier. After that he talked to the President, and then he drafted and published the order for abandonment of the carrier. Mr. Sullivan never got his chance to be heard. He did not even know that the order was being issued, although the carrier was the Navy's top-priority project. Of course he resigned, as any man with a vestige of self-respect would have done.

This procedure raises two considerations. One has to do with the President's oft-repeated complaint that he cannot get able men to come to Washington to work for the Government. In this instance Mr. Truman supports Mr. Johnson, and, by inference at least, endorses his methods. Does he think that this sort of thing is going to encourage men of the caliber he wants to come to Washington?

The second consideration concerns the President's request that Congress grant much greater power to the Secretary of Defense than he now has.

The Sullivan episode is bound to raise misgivings on this score. The Star has taken the position, and still believes, that the Secretary needs more authority if the goal of real unification of the armed services is to be attained. But that authority, if granted, ought to be used with a sense of discretion. After all, service people and their civilian chiefs are like other people. They expect to be treated with appropriate consideration, and if this is not done their morale suffers as does the morale of anyone else.

When a decision has to be made, and when attempts to obtain an agreement have failed, then, of course, the responsible official has to use his authority. But even in that contingency authority should be used with the maximum consideration for other people, and there is no indication that this was done in this instance.

Secretary Johnson has not told his side of the story. Perhaps he has good reasons for not doing so. But Congress, before granting additional authority, ought to be satisfied that the added powers will be used to strengthen the Military Establishment. If they should be misused, it could easily be weakened.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR AND 1949 LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial published on January 17, 1949, the Christian Science Monitor posed the question, What must a labor law do? Since that is a question facing the Congress at the present time the views of this respected paper deserve careful consideration.

The Christian Science Monitor asserted that "Congress will end up writing a new labor code to replace the Taft-Hartley Act" and explained what in its opinion 1949 legislation should set out to accomplish.

At the outset the Christian Science Monitor noted:

> A lot of water has rolled under the bridge since the wave of big strikes and the framing of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946 and 1947. A few widely held assumptions have been swept down the stream of experience. It ought to be clear by now that American workers, by and large, want to join unions and do so of their own free will; that, by and large, the rank and file dictate the acts of their leaders and back them up, and that, with very few exceptions, American labor doesn't like political strikes or Communist machinations any more than do Americans in general. The approach, therefore, to new labor legislation can be largely freed from some of the concerns which cluttered up the drafting of the 1947 law.

The editorial then sets forth four criteria by which 1949 labor legislation should be judged. It is worth considering the Taft-Hartley Act and the Thomas-Lesinski bill by these standards:

First. The bill should seek to establish the best possible conditions conducive to labor and management settling their own differences and reaching their own agreements by, first, refraining from too much legislation; second, making sure that what legal regulation is necessary does not needlessly disrupt long established practices; third, protecting labor's right to organize; and, fourth, assuring that representation for collective bargaining purposes is determined by democratic choice of the workers and not by pressure methods of minority groups or employers.

As the majority reports of the Senate and House Labor Committees so forcefully demonstrate, the Taft-Hartley Act piled regulatory provision upon regulatory provision, thrust the Government into nearly every aspect of the collective-bargaining relationship, disrupted long-established practices, especially in the field of union-security agreements, and undermined labor's right to organize by either forbidding entirely, or placing innumerable obstacles in the way of, many legitimate union activities which are necessary to achieve and effectuate union organization and collective bargaining. In other words, the Taft-Hartley Act provided too much legislation. As Business Week stated in its editorial of December 18, 1948:

> The Taft-Hartley Act went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate from one which could destroy.

As the report of the Senate committee demonstrates, the objections so pervade the entire Taft-Hartley Act that the good cannot be severed from the bad. This results from the preoccupation of the drafters of the legislation with a few widely held assumptions which have been swept down the stream of experience. As the Christian Science Monitor concludes, "new labor legislation can be largely freed from some of the concerns which cluttered up the drafting of the 1947 law." For that reason, the administration bill discards the Taft-Hartley Act entirely.

The Thomas-Lesinski bill seeks to accomplish the objective set forth in the editorial. The evidence demonstrates that there is still enough antiunion feeling in this country to make it necessary for the Government to continue to extend its protection to employee efforts to achieve union organization and free and effective bargaining. Equalization of the bargaining power of employees, with that already possessed by employers, can be achieved only through union organization. The exercise of this equality of bargaining power through collective bargaining is, after all, the basic policy upon which sound and equitable labor-management relations must be built.

The Wagner Act contained the minimum standards necessary to achieve these ends. The administration bill, therefore, reenacts the Wagner Act. It protects the employee's right to organize and insures the employees freedom from coercion by employers and by minority groups by removing the encouragement which the Taft-Hartley Act gave to individual bargaining. Only a union which is selected by a majority of employees in the appropriate unit is entitled to certification by the National Labor Relations Board.

The administration bill also insures that long-established bargaining practices shall not be disrupted. It does so by removing the stigma of illegality which now attaches under the Taft-Hartley Act to closed-shop agreements and by restoring such agreements and other union security arrangements to the processes of collective bargaining wherever employers are subject to Federal jurisdiction.

Second. The bill should provide for a strong Federal mediation and conciliation service and should continue and, if possible, improve aids to free negotiation and agreement.

The administration bill does this by, first, returning the Conciliation Service to a department carrying all the weight and prestige of Cabinet rank and with the research and informational resources related to the work of the Service; second, restoring to Federal conciliators the power to enter disputes of a local character when the parties request their assistance; and third, restoring to the Conciliation Service the duty to encourage and assist the parties to settle their differences voluntarily through arbitration, as well as mediation and conciliation.

The Taft-Hartley Act not only failed to do these things but actually restricted the discretion of the Conciliation Service with regard to some of them. By placing the Conciliation Service outside the Department of Labor, it denied to it the resources of that Department. It restricted its activities in the field of arbitration and local disputes. These weaknesses are corrected by the administration bill. This is especially true with regard to disputes over the interpretation of existing collective bargaining contracts. Furthermore, the bill steers clear

of any implications of imposing compulsory arbitration upon the parties and merely declares the national policy to be one of encouraging the parties to incorporate in their agreements, procedures for the settlement of such disputes peacefully rather than through the use of economic weapons.

Third. The bill should set limits to economic coercion, defining and banning unfair labor practices for both management and labor. This calls for outlawing such tactics as mass picketing, use of force or violence, secondary boycotts, and the use of professional strikebreakers.

By returning to the Wagner Act, the Thomas-Lesinski bill returns to the limits which that act imposed upon employer interference with the organizational and collective-bargaining activities of employees.

However, to the Wagner Act provisions on employer unfair practices, the administration bill adds provisions setting limits upon certain employee and union activities by making them unfair practices. In this field, the bill is based on the principle that the suppression of force, violence, and mass picketing on the part of unions and employees is a matter more appropriate for local than Federal law and that the effective remedy for such offenses must be a quick one—arrest, trial, and punishment—not an administrative hearing followed some months or years later by a cease and desist order. Furthermore, contrary to wide-spread opinion, under the Board's administration of the original Wagner Act, the employer retained the right to discharge strikers for violence and trespass against his property, for striking in violation of a no-strike agreement or of Federal statutes, or for striking to compel the employer to violate the law. This is a far more effective remedy than a cease and desist order.

In this field of unfair practices, the bill also avoids one of the basic defects of the Taft-Hartley Act, its interference with, and prohibition of, many legitimate union activities without which organizing and collective bargaining cannot be truly effective. The bill limits union unfair labor practices to the use of strikes or secondary boycotts to compel an employer to recognize one union when another has been certified as bargaining representative, and to compel an employer to assign particular work tasks to one union when the Board has determined that they belong to another. The administration bill avoids the blanket prohibitions of the Taft-Hartley Act on secondary boycotts which, experience conclusively demonstrates, provide a shield for nonunion employers and encourage other employers to engage in strikebreaking by subcontracting work to nonunion employers.

The use of professional strikebreakers is already prohibited by another law, the so-called Byrnes Act. That act makes it a crime to transport in interstate commerce any person employed for the purpose of interfering by force or threats with peaceful picketing in disputes over wages and other working conditions, or with organizational or collective-bargaining activities of employees.

Fourth. The new law must grant the Government specific powers and lay down specific procedures for settling national-emergency disputes. Its job is not to say to the disputants, "You must agree," but rather, "The essential goods or services you supply shall not be denied the people while you find agreement."

The Thomas-Lesinski bill does this. The Taft-Hartley Act has cumbersome, inflexible, and too-elaborate procedures which tend to prolong and aggravate, rather than to settle the dispute. The administration bill cures these defects by making the procedures as simple as possible, but with sufficient power behind them to achieve these ends without undue Government interference. The bill provides for a period of 30 days during which the parties are not to strike or lock out so that the public will not be denied essential goods and services while the parties find agreement. The procedures are designed to insure conditions under which the parties will be induced to settle the dispute themselves. An emergency board, appointed by the President to investigate the dispute, is also charged with the duty of seeking to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute themselves. Those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, such as the use of injunctions to secure the cooling-off period, and the employee votes on the employer's last offer, which experience demonstrated frequently delayed settlement of the dispute and increased hostility and bitterness, have been omitted from the administration bill.

The bill embodies the principle, supported by expert witnesses who testified before the Senate committee, that a cooling-off period will be secured without the compulsion of an injunction if the parties feel that sincere efforts are being made to help them to settle the dispute privately without Government compulsion. The great majority of disputes do not involve such a public loss that the use of drastic measures and the denial to the parties of otherwise legitimate activities are justified. Such few disputes as may result in a truly national emergency of a character actually imperiling the public safety can be met successfully through measures for bringing all the tremendous forces of public opinion effectively to bear in support of the President and in such a manner as to induce settlement by the parties themselves. To this end, the administration bill gives the emergency boards the power not only to investigate the dispute but to make recommendations.

It is thus apparent that the Thomas-Lesinski bill meets the Christian Science Monitor's standards for 1949 labor legislation. It takes realistic account of all these four aspects of labor-management relations. As suggested by the Christian Science Monitor, the administration bill discards the widely held assumptions which were largely the basis for the general orientation of the Taft-Hartley Act. These assumptions have proved unfounded and the legislation based on them is consequently unnecessary.

In drafting the Thomas-Lesinski bill, its authors were largely freed from some of the concerns which cluttered up the drafting of the 1947 law. They were, therefore, able to meet the Christian Science Monitor's criteria of a simple and comprehensive labor law.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 28, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

566. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

567. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a request of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake certain projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports which, in his opinion, should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1950, in accordance with the Federal Airport Act (Public Law 377, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

568. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1948 (Public Law 897, approved July 3, 1948), entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1948 (Public Law 897), entitled 'the Agricultural Act of 1948' "; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 75. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, so as to permit the transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., in foreign vessels; with amendments (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 1360. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 485). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2282. A bill to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3341. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Fifty-ninth Annual Reunion of Confederate Veterans to be held in Little Rock, Ark., September 27 through September 29, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2566. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana,

North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; without amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3754. A bill providing for the temporary deferment in certain unavoidable contingencies of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4026. A bill relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within the authorized boundaries of Acadia National Park, in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 227. An act for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 4381. A bill to provide cumulative sick and emergency leave with pay for teachers and attendance officers in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 4382. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the arrival of the Oblate Fathers in the Rio Grande Valley and in Texas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4383. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Department of the Army to accept certain gifts and foreign decorations tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4384. A bill to provide for the appointment of female doctors and specialists in the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4385. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden jubilee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4386. A bill to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4387. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4388. A bill to amend section 1452, Revised Statutes, relating to Presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 4389. A bill to provide for the transfer of the temporary housing project known as Harvard Court, Nebraska 25066, to the city of Harvard, Clay County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 4390. A bill to authorize the conveyance, for school purposes, of certain land in Acadia National Park to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4391. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate a century of railroad operations out of Chicago, Ill., and to commemorate the Chicago Railroad Fair of 1948–49; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4393. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend sections 10, 11, and 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 4395. A bill to provide additional benefits for certain postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4396. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain functions with relation to instruments conveying surplus property of the United States to State and local governments and tax-supported and nonprofit institutions under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4397. A bill to amend Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, to provide assistance to certain veterans with paralysis resulting from brain injury in order that they can acquire specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4398. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate a century of railroad operations out of Chicago, Ill., and to commemorate the Chicago Railroad Fair of 1948–49; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4399. A bill to amend section 3944 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to salaries of collectors of internal revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4400. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in or near Morgantown, W. Va., for researches and investigations in the mining, preparation, and utilization of coal and other minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4401. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4402. A bill to provide additional punishment for violations of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4403. A bill to facilitate the administration by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, of the recreational uses of lands and waters within reclamation, flood-control, power, and other Federal reservoir projects; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4404. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide increased retired pay for certain Army officers retired prior to July 1, 1922; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4405. A bill to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 4406. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 4407. A bill to provide a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of not to exceed $500 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4408. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1924, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," so as to grant rights to members of the United States Park Police force commensurate with the rights granted to members of Metropolitan Police force as to time off from duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital or dispensary for heroic services to the officers and men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on bills entitled "Amend the Constitution with respect to election of President and Vice President"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Investigation of United States Foreign Policy in the Far East; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 196. Resolution to obtain information from the Secretary of State regarding denial of visas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the federalization of the National Guard of the United States and the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, in whole or in part; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery at Birch Coulee battlefield in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain intact the National Guard of the United States, ground and air, as it now is organized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the suspension of the effect of Revised Statutes, section 2324 (30 U. S. C. A., sec. 28), pertaining to mining claims, until noon of July 1, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 4409. A bill for the relief of Richard O. Marsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 4410. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lasagna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 4411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Mary C. Mangle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4412. A bill for the relief of José Vázquez San Martín; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4413. A bill for the relief of José A. García Galarza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Dora M. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4415. A bill for the relief of Yee Yong Moi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4416. A bill for the relief of William G. Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4417. A bill for the relief of Judith Leone Banks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4418. A bill for the relief of Jack Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEENEY:

H. R. 4419. A bill for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4420. A bill for the relief of L. Foster Udell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

665. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 529, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, which provides for the establishment of a veterans' employment and national economic development corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

666. Also, memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 1549, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, which provides aid and assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

667. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Harold Swillinger and 37 other residents of Cincinnati and Norwood, Ohio, urging repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

668. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, asking Congress to take the necessary steps to prevent eviction of veterans and their families from Devencrest, in the town of Ayer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

669. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, asking Congress to enact legislation to provide compensation for employees of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts for certain services rendered by them to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

670. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of H. A. Snyder, Council Bluffs, Iowa, containing approximately 2,000 signatures of railroad employees, recommending certain amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act: (1) to provide retirement after 30 years of service at half pay, pay to be based on the five highest years of earnings not to exceed $4,000 a year; (2) widow's pension equal to one-half her husband's earned annuity; (3) minimum pension for employees of $100 per month and optional retirement at 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

671. By Mr. WHITE of California: Petition of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, asking that the Congress, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a world federal government, open to all nations, with powers which, while defined and limited, shall be adequate to preserve peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

672. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Jay C. Stilley, vice president, Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, Dallas, Tex., requesting that the Eighty-first Congress provide a two-price system for marketing American cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

673. Also, petition of Charles W. Sherrill, president, West Colorado Boulevard Improvement League, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a case styled *"United States of America, petitioner v. 79.64 Acres of Land, More or Less, in the City of Dallas, Tex., and Mrs. Gonie Houston, et al., defendants*, No. 896, Civil"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

674. Also, petition of Textile Workers Union of America, Cohoes, N. Y., asking for immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

675. Also, petition of Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce, Rio Grande Valley, Tex., stating their opposition to H. R. 3190, the Lesinski bill, and urging that it be voted against and defeated; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

676. Also, petition of Rev. H. W. Hall, United Steel Workers of America, Johnstown, Pa., expressing sorrow and regret at the passing of their friend, Robert L. Coffey, Jr.; to the Committee on House Administration.

677. Also, petition of Douglas McDonald, president, Gibson General Hospital, Princeton, Ind., expressing emphatic opposition to compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

678. Also, petition of Daniel E. Bogorad, M. D., Maryland Academy of Medicine and Surgery, Baltimore, Md., stating opposition to proposed legislation that will bring the practice of medicine in this country under Federal direction and control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

679. Also, petition of Herbert L. Taub, secretary, Tenth District Dental Society, Jamaica, N. Y., stating opposition to the enactment of any legislation containing the principles of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

680. Also, petition of Arne M. Mattson, chairman, Region 6 Association of Chiropodists, Omaha, Nebr., stating their unanimous opposition to any form of compulsory insurance or any system of political control as proposed by S. 5, H. R. 783, or H. R. 345; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

681. Also, petition of David R. Morris, president, City Council of Ambridge, Pa., requesting the passage of the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

682. Also, petition of John Cervase, secretary, Unico National, Newark, N. J., relating to their vigorous protest concerning the gross injustice that has been done to the city of Hoboken, N. J., resulting from the arbitrary confiscation of the North German Lloyd and Hamburg-American Line piers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

683. Also, petition of John B. Miller, president, Weiser Chamber of Commerce, Weiser, Idaho, requesting that such legislation as proposed in a bill to create a Columbia Valley Administration not be passed; to the Committee on Public Works.

684. By Mr. WHITE of California: Petition signed by 38 citizens of Fresno, Calif., submitted by C. M. Janney, druggist, protesting the 20 percent excise tax on toilet goods and requesting its repeal as quickly as possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

685. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul H. Anderson, president, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Honolulu, T. H., requesting an appropriation of $2,000,000 for the study, control, and eradication of fruitfly pests endangering the agriculture of the United States and incorporated Territories; to the Committee on Appropriations.

686. Also, petition of Dallas C. McLaren, principal, Kaimuki High School, Honolulu, T. H., stating their resentment to implications that communism has any hold whatsoever on the students of Kaimuki High School; to the Committee on Public Lands.

687. Also, petition of A. J. Ross and others, Oneonta, N. Y., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

688. Also, petition of Clyde Wood and others, Oneonta, N. Y., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

689. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. F. Thompson, Jr., and others, Oneonta, N. Y., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

690. Also, petition of Mrs. Bertha Miller and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

691. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

692. Also, petition of Mrs. John Anstett and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

693. Also, petition of A. J. Lopez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, in all the turmoil of this violent world we are grateful for the daily quiet moment beside this wayside well of peace and prayer. As our thoughts are hushed to silence, may we find Thee moving upon our minds, higher than our fallible understanding yet nearer to us than our very selves. Bend our pride to Thy control, bringing all our desires and powers into conformity with Thy will. Prepare us for the role committed to our hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only the preservation of our own dearly bought liberties but also keeping the beacons of freedom aflame on all the continents and the isles which wait for Thy law. In the name of that One who is the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 27, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Myers
Baldwin	Hunt	Neely
Brewster	Ives	O'Conor
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Eastland	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Long	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarran	Stennis
Flanders	McClellan	Taft
Frear	McFarland	Taylor
Fulbright	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
George	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	Martin	Thye
Hayden	Maybank	Tobey
Hendrickson	Miller	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Withers
Hill	Mundt	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are detained because of an appointment with the President of the United States.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are detained at a meeting of the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and insert matters in the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained consent to be absent from the session of the Senate for the remainder of the day.

Mr. CAIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Saturday.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HERMAN P. EBERHARTER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 5, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Hon. Robert M. Gibson, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representation as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER]; and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

REFUND OF TAXES DEDUCTED FROM CERTAIN MEXICAN RAILROAD WORKERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the refund of the taxes deducted pursuant to the provisions of subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code from the wages of Mexican railroad workers employed in the United States under the agreement of April 29, 1943, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and for other purposes, which, with accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas R. S. section 2324 (30 U. S. C. A., section 28) requires that on each mining claim located, until a patent therefor be issued, not less than $100 worth of labor shall be performed each year or improvements of the aggregate value of $100 shall be placed thereon during each year; and

"Whereas the costs of labor and materials are now so high, and the price of gold is now fixed at so low a figure that to comply with said statutory requirement for the present is wasteful and a burden upon the locators of such claims; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress legislation to suspend the effect of said section 2324 until noon of July 1, 1949; and

"Whereas such legislation, if enacted, would be of great benefit to locators of mining claims in the State of Oregon, many of whom are elderly people of small means, who have held their claims for many years and who can ill afford to perform their assessment work under present conditions; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation authorizing the suspension of the effect of said R. S. section 2324 until noon of July 1, 1949; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate, April 2, 1949.

"WM. E. WALSH,
"President of Senate.

"Concurred in by house, April 13, 1949.

"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
"Speaker of House."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution urging the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation which will render assistance to peach growers of this State whose crops have been damaged by cold weather

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has from time to time rendered assistance to groups of people suffering loss of a catastrophic nature from things beyond their control; and

"Whereas recently the peach growers of this State suffered immense losses from killing frosts; and

"Whereas for the Government of the United States of America to assist peach growers of this State who have suffered such losses is in line with the policy of the Government in such matters: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, That the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully urged to enact legislation which will to some extent compensate the peach growers of this State for the severe losses incurred by them on account of the damage to the crops by cold weather.

"In the house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., April 26, 1949."

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the federalization of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY on April 27, 1949, p. 5090, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring the enactment of legislation establishing a national cemetery at Birch Coulee Battlefield in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY on April 27, 1949, p. 5090, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY on April 27, 1948, p. 5089, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

FREEDOM OF WORSHIP IN LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION OF KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted at the annual convention of the New England District of the Knights of Lithuania, held in Boston, Mass., on April 24, 1949, relating to the restoration in Lithuania of the inalienable right to worship God, our Creator, according to the dictates of one's conscience, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Knights of Lithuania is a Catholic national organization which strives to unite the Lithuanian-American youth into a strong organized force for the purpose of making them better citizens of "God and country." Their common heritage creates a feeling of good fellowship which unites them in their efforts to make America a better place to live in and Lithuania a better known country to the outside world. At the annual convention of the New England district of this organization, held on April 24, 1949 in Hotel Vendome in Boston, Mass., the priests, delegates and guests from the New England councils unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the recent mock trial of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary by the Moscow dominated court of that country, and the less recent one of Archibishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia by the Communistic court of Marshal Tito served to arouse an apathetic world to a realization of the religious persecution of Christian peoples by Communistic Russia; and

"Whereas 200,000,000 Christians have been martyred by Russia, thus becoming innocent victims of Soviet persecution and the modern martyrs of the Catholic Church; and

"Whereas 3,000,000 of these are of Lithuanian descent, many of whom have been forcibly deprived of their farms and homeland in Lithuania and mercilessly exiled to the barren wastes of Siberia and the Arctic regions of Russia; and

"Whereas the Catholic Church in Lithuania is being subjected to a persecution as severe and terrible as any that took place under the early Roman emperors, in keeping with the asserted policy of the Moscow Government to annihilate it completely; and

"Whereas one Lithuanian archbishop, three Lithuanian bishops and over 500 priests have been banished by Russia into places unknown outside the iron curtain and 700 other priests, who are still in their parishes, are terrorized, persecuted, and surrounded by spies while their parishes are taxed exorbitantly; and

"Whereas the present policy of Soviet Russia, contrary to all humanitarian principles, has for its purpose the dechristianization and the denationalization of Lithuania, the ruthless destruction of her government and her industrial, educational, and agricultural systems, and the wholesale plunder of her people by killing, imprisonment, and exile; and

"Whereas the United States, Great Britain, and the other great powers have not raised their voices in behalf of the innnocent and unfortunate victims of Russian cruelty but rather have adopted a policy of acquiescence toward Russian treatment of them: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and the other great powers be urged to take immediate but definite steps to force Russia to abolish the religious persecution of Lithuania and her suffering people; be it further

"Resolved, That the practice of the inalienable right to worship God, the Creator, in accordance with the dictates of one's conscience be at once restored to the religious people of suffering Lithuania; be it further

"Resolved, That the United Nations and all liberty-loving peoples of the entire world be urged to launch an effective crusade against the Soviet which persists in openly and shamelessly violating all divine and Christian precepts; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; to the heads of the United Nations; to the head of the United States delegation to the United Nations, the Honorable Warren R. Austin; to the delegations of Australia and Bolivia to the United Nations; to the Senators from all the New England States; to the Representative from the Twelfth Congressional District in Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. McCormack, and to the press."

JOSEPH A. LOLA,
President.
BERTHA CIOCYS,
Secretary.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF FARRELL, PA.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from L. O. Clowes, city clerk, of the Common Council of the City of Farrell, Pa., dated April 26, 1949, transmitting a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the council, relating to General Pulaski's Memorial Day, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARRELL, PA., *April 26, 1949.*

The Honorable FRANCIS MYERS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Herewith find enclosed a certified copy of a resolution passed in council April 21, 1949, in regard to the proposed General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

Yours respectfully,

L. O. CLOWES,
City Clerk.

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Farrell and State of Pennsylvania:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States,

the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania.

Adopted April 21, 1949.

MICHAEL NEVANT,
Mayor and President of Council.

PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES IN LIEU OF TAXES ON FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF SUPERIOR, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a letter from R. E. McKeague, city clerk of Superior, Wis., transmitting a resolution adopted by the city council of Superior, favoring the enactment of House bill 1356, which would authorize payments to municipalities in lieu of taxes on federally owned property.

I have previously pointed out in the Senate that our municipalities throughout the Nation are tremendously hard pressed to find sources of local tax revenue. In the city of Madison, capital of my State, for example, I am informed that 20 percent of the property is tax-exempt. If the Federal Government continues to add more property within its jurisdiction, if it continues to intrude upon local areas of taxation, thus drying up local springs of revenue, obviously our cities will simply have to come to the Federal Government for more and more money.

I believe therefore that H. R. 1356 deserves our careful consideration. In addition, I am hoping that the bill which I have cosponsored, S. 810, and which Congressman BOGGS, of Delaware, introduced in the House of Representatives—which will survey the whole field of Federal, State, and local taxes—that these bills will be passed by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SUPERIOR, WIS., MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT H. R. 1356 RELATING TO THE MATTER OF MAKING FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES IN LIEU OF TAXES ON FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY

Whereas there is now pending before the Eighty-first Congress a measure (H. R. 1356) introduced by Representative CLAIRE ENGLE of California, which said measure will make it possible for the Government of the United States to make payments to municipalities in lieu of taxes on federally owned property, or property otherwise controlled by an agency of the Federal Government; and

Whereas it is one of the duties of the municipal body corporate when federally owned property, or property otherwise controlled by an agency of the Federal Government is located within its corporate limits, to accord such property and to furnish it all of the basic public services that the municipal body corporate furnished to privately owned property, and that such rendition of such basic public services must be made and had without any remuneration or any return to the municipal body corporate for such services; and

Whereas the acquisition of public property by the Federal Government or some agency thereof appears to be steadily increasing and thus steadily reducing the tax base of this and other municipal bodies corporate similarly situated; and

Whereas while we recognize the sovereignty of the Federal Government and the necessity for yielding to its paramount structure, we think that the Federal Government should, in a commensurate manner, recognize its dependence upon its political subdivisions, for the Federal Government derives its power from the consent of the governed and its health and stability directly depends upon the well-being of the political subdivisions that comprise it, Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Superior, Wis., That we urge the support, and do memorialize the Federal Congress accordingly, of H. R. 1356, as that measure was introduced into the said Congress by Representative CLAIRE ENGLE of California, and which said measure does provide and does authorize and make possible for the Federal Government to make payments in lieu of taxes to municipal bodies corporate whenever federally owned property, or property otherwise controlled by an agency of the Federal Government, is domiciled within such a municipality's corporate limits; be it further

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Superior, Wis., That a duly certified copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted by the city clerk to the Honorable JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Senator from Wisconsin, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, Senator from Wisconsin, and to the Honorable ALVIN O'KONSKI, Representative from Wisconsin's Tenth District.

Passed and adopted this 19th day of April 1949.

Approved this 20th day of April 1949.

GEORGE ERICKSON,
President of the Council.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2023. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 309).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1720. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the School Board of Klamath County, Oreg., for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school facilities in Klamath County, Oreg., to be available to all Indian and non-Indian children without discrimination; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1721. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1948 (Public Law 897) entitled the "Agricultural Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1722. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure by contract in the open market and in the manner common among businessmen, the services of engineers, engineering associations or organizations, needed or required in connection with the acquisition or construction of public works; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1723. A bill for the relief of John K. Sipos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1724. A bill to provide for the education of children residing on certain nonsupporting federally owned property, and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. 1725. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; and

S. 1726. A bill to provide protection of persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1727. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 1728. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1729. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department;

S. 1730. A bill to authorize the purchase of additional farming land for Leavenworth Penitentiary; and

S. 1731 (by request). A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1732. A bill to create a National Cemetery Commission for the consolidation of national cemetery activities within one civilian commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY OPERATION OF CERTAIN NONSUBSIDIZED AIR-COACH AIR LINES

Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that nonsubsidized air-coach air lines which have filed applications with the Civil Aeronautics Board for certificates of public convenience and necessity for air-coach service should be permitted by the Board to continue in operation to the extent to which they are presently operating pending determination by the Board whether or not certificates (either temporary or permanent) shall be granted upon such applications.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH OF SCHOOL CHILDREN—AMENDMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN R. ABERNATHY AT FUNERAL OF FORMER SENATOR GORE OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorial address delivered by Dr. John R. Abernathy at the funeral services for former Senator Thomas Pryor Gore of Oklahoma, at Oklahoma City, Okla., on March 18, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MARYLAND'S PROGRAM OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION—ADDRESS BY TASKER G. LOWNDES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "High Lights of Maryland's Program of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1929–48," delivered by Mr. Tasker G. Lowndes, president of the Maryland State Board of Education, at the twentieth anniversary dinner, at Baltimore, Md., on April 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISLOYAL UTTERANCES BY PAUL ROBESON—LETTERS TO BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several letters to the editor of the Baltimore Evening Sun regarding statements by Paul Robeson, which appear in the Appendix.]

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL FROM CINCINNATI ENQUIRER

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gloomy Reality," published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHO PAYS FEDERAL AID?—EDITORIAL BY JOE LEE

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Pays Federal Aid?" by Joe Lee, editorial writer of the Topeka State Journal, of Topeka, Kans., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who has been called to the White House pursuant to an appointment, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point, the twelfth of a series of articles published in the Baltimore Sun, on what the American public would pay—one trillion two hundred fifty billion dollars—and what it would receive of Congress approved all of President Truman's social-welfare proposals.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—UNITED STATES WOULD TAKE OVER UNEMPLOYMENT SYSTEM

(This is the twelfth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—One of the major social-security changes proposed by the Truman administration calls for the nationalization of the unemployment-insurance system.

It has been recommended that the existing Federal-State jobless-insurance program be supplanted by a uniform federally operated system with uniform rates, uniform benefits and virtually universal coverage.

Like old-age and survivor insurance, the federalized unemployment system would require joint contributions by employers and employees. Under existing law, only employers contribute.

President Truman also wishes the system enlarged and the rate of benefits increased.

And instead of the existing diversity of rates among States and among employers in States, Mr. Truman desires one standard rate.

In place of the nominal 3 percent pay-roll tax rate named in the present social-security law, which allows varying levies in different States, the administration wants a 2-percent pay-roll tax uniformly administered.

The States also now have their own benefit scales, so that workers in one State may receive far less benefits than those in an adjoining State.

For example, in Maryland the weekly benefit rate for total unemployment ranges from a minimum of $6 to a maximum of $25.

In California it ranges from $10 to $25.

In Delaware it is $7 a week to $18, but in New York $10 to $26, and in Michigan $7 to $28.

THIRTY DOLLARS MAXIMUM PROPOSED

The administration favors a maximum of $30 a week for a single man—although a few States have a high of $25 and the national average is $19.

In his message to Congress in January the President said:

"My proposal to strengthen the unemployment compensation system contemplates that coverage will extend to workers in small establishments, Federal employees, and other workers not now insured."

In 22 States unemployment insurance is limited to employers of 8 or more persons. In 16 States the program extends to all employers of 1 or more persons.

In a few States the size of an employer's pay roll is a determining factor in whether his workers are covered by unemployment insurance or not.

Nearly all State laws also exclude agricultural workers, domestic employees, public employees, and employees of nonprofit agencies and institutions.

While the administration bill has not yet been sent to Congress—and may not be until the second session of the Eighty-first Congress—it is understood that it will propose practically universal coverage.

Also, the administration favors a shorter waiting period for workers to start drawing benefit checks. In many States they have to wait 2 weeks.

The President's plan is to establish a uniform 1-week period for a jobless man to wait before he can start drawing his checks.

Some of the administration advisers favor allowing striking workers to draw unemployment benefits.

NO QUICK ACTION EXPECTED

But no legislation on unemployment insurance is expected at this session because the Congress is already loaded down with other social-security proposals and will be fortunate if it can dispose of them before it adjourns.

In his annual budget the President estimated his unemployment proposals would lift contributions to the trust funds about $230,000,000 a year.

Employers' contributions—under the existing diversity of rates among States—average out about 1.2 percent on a Nation-wide basis.

Under a 2-percent rate equally divided between worker and employer, it is believed by experts that the yield might be about $500,000,000 a year higher on the broader coverage.

With unemployment this spring much higher than had been anticipated when the autumn budget forecasts were made, it is now believed that benefit costs this year may run $500,000 more than forecast.

In the 1950 budget, the President estimated State unemployment and railroad unemployment benefits for fiscal 1950 at $1,150,000,000. But present forecasts put the total at about $1,500,000,000—and some authorities insist it may run to $2,000,000,000.

At the end of January, the unemployment trust fund stood at $7,498,000,000.

That is approximately 9½ percent of aggregate taxable wages for the preceding 12 months.

At the present average employer contribution rate of 1.2 percent it represents 8 years of collections.

DEPRESSION EFFECTS STUDIED

What sort of a dent a prolonged and deep unemployment might make on the fund has been a matter of considerable speculation in congressional circles.

The very existence of jobless benefits, some authorities assert, like the existence of old-age and survivor benefits, has a sustaining effect on the economy.

It helps to prevent unemployment from spiraling and developing into a full-scale impact on the trust fund, they declare.

But last year, in a year of high employment, many States paid out more in benefits than they collected in unemployment taxes. This included Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, California, and the District of Columbia.

In the first 7 months of this fiscal year, deposits in the fund were $572,000,000—a decrease of 3 percent under a year ago.

Withdrawals for benefits in the same period were $519,000,000—an increase of 23 percent.

On an average, 31,300,000 workers were insured under the unemployment system last year.

In Maryland, the average number of covered employees was 550,900 in October and benefit payments were $548,638.

The average weekly payment was $19.44.

A study made by the Federal Security Agency showed that the average weekly payment last year was more than $20 in eight States but less than $15 in thirteen. The other States ranged in between these figures.

On the average, newly insured claimants were entitled to 21.5 weeks of benefits, the FSA study showed.

FUND HELD ADEQUATE

While the Government is not unaware of the somewhat increased demand on the fund under the recent expanded unemployment, it holds that the fund is adequate for all probable needs which will arise.

In a recent report the Federal Security Agency said:

"The $7,400,000,000 available in the 51 State reserves on June 30, 1948, can meet any contingency in the foreseeable future.

"In most States, even liberalization of the benefit formulas and substantial withdrawals to help finance temporary disability insurance would not endanger the solvency of the reserve."

The agency noted, in its statement, that the interest earned by the State unemployment accounts in the trust fund between January and June 1948 could have financed more than 18 percent of their jobless payments in the period.

The low existing 1.2 percent contribution rate reflects chiefly the effect of the so-called experience-rating device.

Under this system, the fewer the benefits paid out to workers in a given plant the lower is the employer's contribution rate.

The administration has recommended that the experience-rating system be abandoned.

Actually the rating plan results in some employers with high-employment records paying contributions of less than 1 percent. In fact, in the last year three out of five had less than 1 percent.

MORE STABLE SYSTEM CLAIMED

The administration believes that a more stable system would result from nationalizing jobless insurance and enforcing a uniform rate. It would result in a bigger trust fund and a better break for jobless workers, they say.

As for nationalizing the whole system, the administration argues that this would benefit employers as well as workers.

As it is, actually two taxes are collected—three-tenths of 1 percent by the Federal Government, and whatever the particular State

rate happens to be. The States deposit their collections with the Federal Government in a single trust fund.

And the whole costs of administration for all the States are paid by the Federal Government. This totals about $135,000,000 a year.

In view of the fact that it pays for administration, the Government believes it would make for a better system if it handled the whole business—collections, payments of benefits, and administration.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to report from the Committee on the Armed Services a promotion in the Marine Corps, namely, the nomination of Maj. Gen. LeRoy P. Hunt to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, and certain routine promotions in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified. I ask that the nominations be confirmed, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand, that this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Armed Services. Is not that true?

Mr. TYDINGS. The nominations are reported unanimously from the Committee on Armed Services. No objections have been filed in the committee to any of the promotions. The Army nominations are all in minor grades, anyway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 20, line 12.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about this amendment. Feeling deeply and earnestly as I do that we should move as fast as technical knowledge and skill will permit in these fields, it is always difficult for me to know just what to seek from the Congress. The committee has labored very diligently over this question. Yesterday the Senate was very considerate and generous in respect to two other items which we brought up, relating to cancer and heart research. I believe that the results which will flow from what the Senate did yesterday, if it can be retained in conference with the House, will be of inestimable service in the prolongation of life and the prevention of human suffering.

However strongly I feel on this question, I do not believe that we should appear to ask too much of the Senate. I know that the able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ] is extremely sympathetic toward these programs. If he will insist upon our action of yesterday with the House, and will show House Members the strength of sentiment in the Senate in behalf of those items, and demonstrate to them that we are trying to be reasonable in our requests, I am disposed at the present time not to press an amendment in the mental-health field. I hope that we can bring that subject up as a point of emphasis when we next come to consider the problem.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I feel confident that the conferees, whoever they may be, will try to carry out in good faith the action of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at the present time I shall not further press an amendment to this item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 20, line 12, to strike out the figures "$11,387,000" and insert "$11,612,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment in line 13, to strike out the figures "$2,663,000" and insert "$2,888,000" is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 44, between lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 502. (a) The Secretary of Labor, with respect to appropriations made in title I of this act, and the Federal Security Administrator, with respect to appropriations made in title II of this act, are authorized and directed, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions in the amounts to be expended from the appropriations made in each such title as will in the aggregate equal at least 5 percent of the total amounts so appropriated therein (less in the case of title II amounts appropriated for grants under titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act, and grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment—services administration), except that appropriations for grants under titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act, grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment—services administration shall not be reduced. The Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator shall certify the reduction in each appropriation account to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. The amounts so certified shall not be expended but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

(b) Such reduction shall be made in a manner calculated to bring about the greatest economy in expenditure consistent with the efficiency of the service.

(c) No item of appropriation contained in either of such titles shall be reduced more than 20 percent.

(d) A statement of each reduction hereunder, including the amount thereof, shall be included in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there has been filed, under the rule, a notice that a motion will be made to suspend the rule. I make the motion at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice of motion to suspend the rule will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following notice in writing:

"In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely."

Being the amendment just read.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the intention of the amendment, under the notice of motion to suspend the rule, is to require the two agencies, the Federal Security Agency and the Department of Labor, to reduce the amount of certain appropriations in the bill by at least 5 percent.

This is not an attempt to place in the hands of those two agencies the right to appropriate. It is merely a provision that, after the money is appropriated, they shall use it in a certain way; that is, they shall use a certain proportion of it, and at least 5 percent shall be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator kindly state exactly what items are affected by the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to do so, by pointing out the exceptions. The reduction contemplated in this amendment would amount to approximately $15,497,888. Appropriations under titles 3 and 4 of the bill, for the National Mediation Board and the Railroad Retirement Board, are not subject to the specified 5 percent reduction. The latter in effect is paid into the Treasury of the United States by certain individuals and/or corporations. Therefore, no attempt or request is made to reduce that particular item.

It may be well to state for the RECORD at this time, however, that what in effect happens in such a case is that the funds placed in the Board's hands are, in effect, collected from individuals, placed in the Treasury of the United States, and at times are expended. Then the Congress is required to appropriate money to replenish those particular funds.

Also exempted are certain mandatory funds under title 2. First are the grants for public assistance. There is $1,058,000,000 in this particular fund which would not be subject to the reduction. There is another item, that for maternal and child welfare, of $22,000,000. Those are funds matched by the States.

Therefore, no attempt is made by this amendment to reduce those amounts. The item under title 2 for the United States Employment Service is $135,000,000—in other words, the unemployment-compensation money that is paid into the Treasury.

In short, Mr. President, the reductions contemplated are in the administrative expenses of the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

This bill is the first of the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1950 to come before the Senate. The proposed amendment would here undertake, with this bill, a systematic reduction of expenditures through reasonable economies in administrative expenses.

Mr. President, at first glance, it might appear that this may be the wrong bill in connection with which to make this attempt. At first glance it might appear that it is an attempt to cut in some way the social-security programs or the Department of Labor programs for mediation or railroad retirement. That is not the purpose of the amendment at all. The purpose is for the Congress to inaugurate in some way a method of logically and reasonably arriving at a reduction of expenditures, so that the Congress and the administration may avoid a new tax bill which would impose additional and heavier taxes on the general public.

I feel, and I know there are other Senators who feel the same way, that something must be done along the line of reducing expenditures; that we must cut expenditures, or else we shall have to pass a new tax bill.

From day to day, as I sit in the Appropriations Committee, I realize how difficult it is—and many say it is impossible—to reduce governmental expenses. This is so because of the lack of knowledge on our part as to the details regarding the expenditure of moneys in such large volume. Oftentimes, therefore, it would seem impossible for the Congress to say just where reductions in expenditures should be made. However, I should like to state one case which was presented to us in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question along that line?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will not the Senator's amendment also affect the administration of the Federal Security Act in the States?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, there would be a cut of 5 percent, extending down into the States, for the administration within the States. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan that although I am in sympathy with his over-all purpose of balancing the budget, yet it is my intention at the general ending of this Congress, if no other Senator does so, and if we do not have a new tax bill by that time, to offer an amendment, in the form of a resolution, to cut all appropriations so as to bring the budget into balance.

I do not think we can best handle the matter now on the basis of proposing a 5-percent reduction in the appropriations carried by these bills; but I think if we find at the end of the session that we have not had new taxes and are not likely to have them, then, after we have passed all the appropriation bills, the more orderly way to carry out the purpose the Senator has in mind would be, at that time, for those of us who wish to reduce the expenditures of the Government to sponsor a proposal which would cut each appropriation x dollars or x percentage points so as to bring the appropriations and the income of the Government within balance, with a certain elasticity in certain places, so that there would not be a stoppage of essential functions.

If we could take the Senator's idea and apply it later on in the session, when we have the whole picture of appropriations and governmental income, I would support the Senator's proposition. However, I do not believe this is the time to advance it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I have in mind that if the reduction we seek cannot be accomplished in this way, then we intend to do exactly what the able Senator from Maryland has just mentioned, and certainly we would join him in the attempt to do so, because in the opinion of the Senators who submit this amendment, the result we have in mind must be accomplished.

We desire to bring the matter before the Senate at this time, realizing that our proposal does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, and realizing that because of that fact we must obtain a two-thirds vote to suspend the rule, but realizing also that the object we have in mind is something we must be thinking about and trying to accomplish as we go along, in order that we may avoid a tax increase.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue at all with the objective the Senator has in mind; I was simply suggesting other mechanics.

Let me say to him that if we find, when we reach the end of the session, that new taxes have not been imposed and that we are faced with a deficit, I hope some of us who are like-minded will join together on such a resolution, and will try to perfect it so that, while it will produce the desired result, it will still permit of sufficient elasticity so as not to be too rigid in cases where it should not be.

Let me also say that I have been trying to accomplish this general objective through the medium of a constitutional amendment, as the Senator from Michigan well knows, and for which he has expressed considerable sympathy for some time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, and I joined with the Senator from Maryland in it.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct, and I am grateful to the Senator for his support.

I do not say that proposal is perfect, but I say it is within the realm where, by means of the advice and experience of the Senate Judiciary Committee, it could be perfected, if defects are found in it. If we could do that, we certainly would make a terrific contribution to the financial solvency of our Government, a matter to which we have not given the attention it merits.

I hope the Senator from Michigan, who is an able member of the committee dealing with judicial proceedings, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], whom I see also in the Chamber at this time, and who is also an able member of that committee, will, with the assistance of the able chairman of that committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], help to perfect that amendment so that we can eliminate the situation which the Senator from Michigan and others of us wish to avoid in the future.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I should certainly support the Senator's ultimate proposal; and it seems to me, on the whole, if we are going to take action of this kind, we might as well begin now and do it in connection with every bill. Elasticity is provided by the amendment, in that the injunction is that 5 percent shall be cut altogether and that not more than 20 percent shall be taken from any particular appropriation. That principle, if applied to all appropriation bills at one time, would give almost too wide power to the President. He could absolutely cut one whole department 20 percent, let us say, a department with whose work he may not be in sympathy. If we are to do it at all, it seems to me we might just as well begin now and, as I see it, we might as well try it on every bill. Under the proposal, there is complete equality, it seems to me, as to every department. Every department would be subject to the same rule. I suggest therefore to the Senator from Maryland that while I shall vote for his amendment, I hope also that he may vote for this amendment, and we may start the ball rolling along the lines which both of us are anxious ultimately to attain.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am very much persuaded by the argument of the Senator from Ohio. One of the reasons I do not accept his kind invitation with more alacrity is due to the fact that I do not know what the Congress is going to do in the realm of, say, health insurance. I do not know what the Congress is going to do in the realm of education. What I am afraid of is that we may not write a uniform standard at the end, by taking this piecemeal procedure, worthy though it is.

It occurs to me that when the whole pattern of expenditures has been carved out, and we know that the Government's

income is insufficient to meet those expenditures, and that the Committee on Finance has brought forward a tax bill which meets, we will say, only half the tentative deficit, then is the appropriate time to scale down all appropriations sufficiently to make income plus new taxes equal the expenditures. Until I can see that tapestry in all its colors and designs, I do not feel I am as wise as I should like to be, worthy though this objective is, when the question arises of adopting the particular mechanics which are offered at the moment to accomplish the objective.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me, replying to the Senator from Maryland and adding to what the Senator from Ohio has said, that there is a reason for taking such action with respect to each appropriation bill. The Senator from Maryland will note that the amendment omits certain items. As we take up each bill, it seems to me that it will make for clarity and ease of administration to specify in each bill the items which must be omitted from such a cut. We do not want to cut the grants to States. We do not want to cut certain other items which are fundamental, such, for instance, as interest on the public debt. If there is an over-all or a catch-all reduction after all appropriation bills are passed, it seems to me it will be much more difficult to designate in each bill the items which should be excluded from a general percentage reduction. I associate myself with the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire in the procedure suggested, which I hope will be followed in connection with each appropriation bill. I think that only in this way can we ultimately cut the Federal budget.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not saying there is not merit in the position expressed by the three able Senators on the other side who have discussed the proposal. I may join with them; I am not closing the door by saying I shall not. But if I should not, I want them to know it is through no lack of sympathy with what the Senators are attempting, but that perhaps I think another approach would be wiser.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan can yield only for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I can yield for a question only, and I should like to complete my remarks.

Mr. LANGER. In that event, I shall speak in my own time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the able Senators from Ohio, Maryland, and Massachusetts. I think the able Senators from Massachusetts and Ohio have brought out the point, which to the Senator from Michigan is very vital, that we should take the action suggested when the Senate has an appropriation bill under consideration prior to its enactment. Each of the items in the bill has only recently been before the committee, which consists of 21 members. All the aspects of the legislation are familiar to them. They are familiar with the items which cannot be cut, by reason of some situation of a mandatory nature, such as the matching of funds by the States, other items of appropriation which I previously mentioned. But it is very vital that a reduction be accomplished.

An example will indicate what the committee finds itself actually unable to accomplish, but which can be accomplished through the pending amendment. Let us take the case of military surpluses. The evidence was clear that there would be about $6,000,000 a month in surpluses of the Military Establishment, which the schools of the Nation might obtain free of charge. In a year that would represent a total of $72,000,000 in military surpluses, which it is desired to distribute to schools. The Federal Security Agency, through its Office of Education, comes to the committee and says, "It is true that such surpluses are available, but we are short of help and cannot undertake the distribution." The committee inquires, "Well, how much help do you need?" The reply is, "We think we will need, so far as we can see, 39 employees." How can the committee, no matter how careful it may be, handle a proposition of that kind? The committee wants to be careful. Members of the committee are sincere men who sit in the committee nearly every day and are also on the floor every day. To them it is a serious matter to appropriate money to be paid for by the taxes of the people. But we are trying to perform the task without sufficient help, without sufficient knowledge, and therefore we find ourselves unable to cope with the situation. Appropriations go through with little debate, by reason of the lack of knowledge as to how to debate them. Merely to talk against an appropriation, without being specific, is of little assistance.

It is planned during the present session to authorize an expenditure by the Military Establishment of about $16,000,000,000, for what may be called domestic defense items. That amount is more than twice the assessed value of the State of Michigan. There may be a request involving 7,000 tanks. Can the committee go into the item of whether they have 7,000 tanks? No, because the inventory is not made in that form. As shown by the proceedings in the House, a request was made for $30,000,000 for about 105 tanks which did not even exist. The Senator from Michigan is informed that about 7,000 tanks cannot be located today. As to how 7,000 tanks could disappear, no one seems to know. But the lack of inventory, the lack of knowledge, makes it practically impossible intelligently to perform this task.

But we do know that if we continue to spend, if we continue to appropriate, the country must face either a tax increase or deficit spending. This amendment represents an attempt, a desire, a hope, and a prayer to avoid either a tax increase or deficit spending, because if we do not have a strong America, financially, physically, and socially, we shall be unable to help the world, no matter how much we tell other nations we shall appropriate this year or next year or some other year in the future. We are trying to do something which is not merely wishful thinking. We are trying to do something to help the Government itself.

Let us, for the moment, consider ourselves as Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, or let us say we have the job of the Secretary of Labor. We know how difficult those positions are, because we are dealing with some of their work daily in our problems on the Senate floor. But, Mr. President, we want to help. We say, "Here is an appropriation of almost $1,000,000,000—that is a thousand million dollars—to be used for expenses and salaries." There is no desire to cut salaries. We are saying to those two administrators, those two public officials, "Because of the financial condition of the Nation, because of the amount of money we are spending for government and the amount we can raise by taxes, we must reduce the amount appropriated or used, or else resort to deficit spending or provide an increase of taxes. Therefore, reduce your expenditures at least 5 percent."

But, Mr. President, we also say, "There are some items you cannot cut. Therefore, you can, in your discretion, go up to 20 percent. You have charge of the Department, and you may cut a particular item by as much as 20 percent." We are simply asking Government officials to economize 5 percent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has served on the Appropriations Committee for several years. Will he not agree with me that it is utterly impossible for the members of the Appropriations Committee, from listening to the testimony, to reach an exact determination as to how many employees should be in a given division, or how much should be the cost of necessary paper or other equipment, and must we not assume that all administrators are patriotic American citizens who understand the problem facing the Government as we understand it today? So, are there not two assumptions in the Senator's mind: First, that the administrators will, when they can, eliminate unneeded services, and second, that there is an utter inability on the part of Members of Congress to determine, down to the last penny, what is necessary in any one department?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has stated the proposition more ably than the Senator from Michigan could have stated it. That exactly is what we are facing. That is

why we leave the Senate at night worried about our ability to do this job. We do not want to do it arbitrarily. I stood on the Senate floor and spoke and voted against a 10-percent reduction in the amount of ECA funds before the matter went to the Appropriations Committee. I wanted to hear the facts elucidated in order to determine what should be done.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt whatever that an agency of the Government which receives funds in millions of dollars can cut expenditures, retain efficiency, and save 5 percent. I think it can be done and will be done, if we pass the necessary legislation. But it will not be done without legislation. This is the most scientific and the best approach I know of in connection with what we are attempting to do. Our purpose is to avoid two things: Deficit spending, which is one of the greatest curses which can afflict any nation, no matter whether it be rich America or poor Ethiopia or Greece; and a tax increase, involving an assessment against the people of America, placing a greater burden on them than they are bearing today. We can avoid those alternatives, Mr. President, by efficiency in Government. This is how we are attempting to do it. We say to administrators, "Cut expenditures at least 5 percent."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is there not one other element, namely, that we are trying to place upon the various secretaries and administrators a definite responsibility, to give them a thorough understanding that the job is up to them to do, where they can do it?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; Mr. President, that is very vital. We are putting it up to the administrators to try to do something along the line of governmental economy. They have the necessary knowledge to do it; we would hereby impose the responsibility to do it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I am one Senator, among others, who is very much interested in the Senator's proposal, but I should like to know more about how the Senator from Michigan and his coauthors arrived at the figure of 5 percent. I am reminded that during the course of the ECA debate a number of us supported a proposed reduction of 10 percent. Any thinking which the Senator might care to express on the subject of how he has more or less scientifically arrived at the figure of 5 percent will be appreciated.

Mr. FERGUSON. The figure was arrived at by considering the over-all prospective budget of $42,000,000,000. It was anticipated that the amendment would bring about a reduction of $2,000,000,000. So far as we can anticipate at this time, that amount would approximately eliminate any possibility of a deficit. That is the reason for taking an arbitrary figure of 5 percent.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as we all know, from time to time, indeed almost daily, we are passing legislation. We have very little knowledge as to what the cost of the legislation will be. Yesterday we considered an item in the railroad retirement section of the pending bill, which amounted to $166,000,000. It was necessary because some time ago we passed a bill which provided that while a railroad worker served in the Army we would pay his premiums as if he were still employed by the railroad company, so that when he came out of the Army and returned to his railroad work he would have lost nothing so far as the retirement fund was concerned.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan that there is one more amendment on the desk. I should like to have it agreed to, and then it would be more in line to go ahead and discuss the proposed 5-percent cut.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection, if the proceedings are placed at the end of my remarks. I think it would be well to ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment long enough to act on the amendment which the Senator from South Carolina has in mind. I think the Senator should wait, however, until the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], returns to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I did not notice the Senator's absence.

Mr. FERGUSON. He stepped from the floor a moment ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to state that I also have an amendment which I should like to have considered, but I intend to withhold consideration of it until the chairman of the subcommittee shall return.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was citing the Railroad Retirement Act as an example of what the Committee on Appropriations faces, what the Congress faces, what America faces. This one appropriation alone involves $166,000,000. The authorizing legislation was reported by the committee, and was passed by the Senate without any real knowledge on the part of the Senate of what it would cost in dollars and cents. So I think the time has come when it should be required that every bill reported to the Senate shall have attached to it an estimate from the Director of the Budget as to its probable cost, as near as possible, for the first 5 years of its operation if enacted, so that Congress may determine what the ultimate cost will be if Congress shall pass the legislation.

Mr. President, I think the same thing is true when the President of the United States sends a message to Congress. When he asks the Congress to pass certain legislation he should say that attached to his message is an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget as to what it will cost the people of the United States in the next 5 years, what it will cost the first, the second, the third, the fourth, and the fifth year. Then we will be dealing intelligently with the great problem of taxation, which is merely the means of obtaining the money which is appropriated.

Mr. President, we do not have such a system today. We thought we were doing something along that line when we passed the reorganization bill. In section 138 of the reorganization act, being the legislative budget provision, we were trying to do something about that situation. It provides:

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $."

Mr. President, that was an attempt to arrive at an intelligent understanding of our fiscal situation. We would look at what revenue we were able to raise, what we anticipated we could raise under existing tax laws, so that when we passed the regular appropriation bills, or deficiency bills later, we would know whether we were going into the red. To avoid deficit spending, it was provided that if we should spend more than what we anticipated we could raise, we would then state the fact. The provision was:

It is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts.

We could say that we were going to have to levy new taxes, or we would go into deficit spending, as the act provided, and we would know exactly how many millions or billions of dollars we were going into deficit spending.

Mr. President, why has not that law worked? The law has not worked because the Congress of the United States did not see fit to obtain a staff of employees sufficient to make it work.

What do we face now? On February 10 of this year there was presented on the

floor of the Senate a measure providing for suspension of that law. A statement of the legislative budget was due 5 days later. We passed the law; then a majority of the Members of Congress said, "We are within 5 days of the time when we have required ourselves to do something, but we are going to suspend the law."

What an example to the public. What an example to the man back home who is required to do something, and is facing a deadline, and has not the power to vote in the Senate or the House of Representatives, and therefore cannot suspend the law.

Mr. President, in that suspension measure we fixed a new date, May 1. What has happened? Here we are on April 28. May 1 is coming upon us, and we are thinking about either repealing the law, when we face the deadline, or of again suspending it and saying, "Oh, no, we don't want to do that."

We all argue that the law is fine in principle. If we had wanted to do it, we would have had a staff sufficient to enable us to carry it out. It would have saved the people of the United States millions and billions of dollars if we had staffed ourselves, under the law, and it would still save money if we would staff ourselves today and perform our duty, just as it will save us money if we adopt the resolution now before the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In connection with what the Senator has just said regarding the budget procedure and the inability to carry it out, is not one of the difficulties that faces the Committee on Appropriations today the lack in the system of Federal bookkeeping of provision for one over-all appropriation bill, or one method by which we can determine what the ordinary expenditures involved in running the Government may be?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator hits the other item on the head. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has introduced, and the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Massachusetts, I am sure, heartily endorse the idea that we should have one appropriation bill. Many appropriation bills have already come to the Senate after having been passed by the House. Every day subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee are holding hearings upon the appropriation bills. Finally the bills reach the Senate floor. Amounts for individual items are increased by the Senate. We do not have any idea what the final total appropriation is going to be, because we have neither acted under section 138 of the reorganization bill, nor have we passed one regular department appropriation bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. What prevents the Congress of the United States from staffing itself sufficiently so as to achieve the objective the Senator is speaking of?

Mr. FERGUSON. My answer would probably be a criticism of Congress as a whole. What prevents Congress from doing so is lack of a sustained interest in the question of taxation and the question of appropriations. Members of Congress have an interest in the matter for a time, but we do not have a sustained interest. In order to obtain a sufficient staff and use it properly we must make a continual fight. The Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the House Appropriations Committee obtain a staff, and they themselves vote the money to pay the staff. There is no impediment whatever in the way of that being done.

We have conferred upon the General Accounting Office certain functions. That Office has not carried out those functions. Why? Because it has not obtained a sufficient staff to carry out the functions. Why is that? Because the General Accounting Office is dependent upon the Congress, and we have not furnished that Office with a sufficient staff, nor have we compelled that Office to obtain the staff itself. If such a staff were obtained it would result in a considerable cut in expenses.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Why should we not be sufficiently realistic to come to the point of demanding that we ourselves do that, in view of the terrific spending program we shall be compelled to face, not only in the present session of Congress but in the sessions to come.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is simply due to lack of initiative on the part of the Congress itself.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I had previously endeavored to have action taken upon an amendment, but the chairman of the subcommittee was not present at the time. I now again offer my amendment, and ask for its consideration. My amendment is on page 17, line 11, to strike out "$16,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$17,200,000." The latter amount is the amount Congress appropriated for the present fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$16,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$17,200,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say that the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee, has agreed to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to keep the record straight, I wish to say that I have consulted with several other members of the subcommittee, and they agreed that we would accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what has just happened is typical of what frequently happens in connection with appropriation bills in the Senate. The amount involved in the amendment just agreed to is a little more than $1,000,000. The amendment will be taken to conference. In conference there will be no testimony heard from outside. There will be a difference expressed between the Senate and House conferees on the item. The probable result will be a compromise, a meeting half way, and $500,000 will be appropriated. That is typical.

Since I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I believe it would not be amiss to spend a few moments of time in discussing how the committee functions. That is not a secret. The job we have to perform is becoming almost impossible to perform. An appropriation bill is offered in the House. I have never agreed with the contention that the House must act first, but the House contends it has the right to act first on appropriation bills, and it has done so for many years. The Constitution says the House must act first on revenue-raising measures, which are tax bills.

All appropriation bills are first offered in the House, and a budget estimate is submitted with each bill. The House Appropriations Committee holds extended hearings on the bills. What I now say is no criticism of the House. The hearings are extended, but they are held in secret. Then the bill is reported out, and reaches the floor of the House, and the evidence taken before the committee becomes public. A certain amount is appropriated to each particular agency. Just as soon as the bill reaches the floor of the House the various agencies involved know whether the estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget has been cut. If a cut has been made respecting an agency, it endeavors to have adopted an amendment which would raise the amount, but is very seldom successful in having that done.

The House passes the appropriation bill and it comes to the Senate. It contains thousands of items on which the House has ruled. The Senate Committee on Appropriations does not go into the millions and the billions of dollars in expenditures which the House has approved. I do not think I have ever known of a bill in connection with which we have gone into an investigation in the way the House does, of the billions of dollars that are called for. Consider the particular bill before us. The House allowed $2,210,694,085. The Senate Appropriations Committee does not go into that figure at all. What do we go into? We go into the items the agencies want increased, or that private citizens back home want increased.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Are there not two other reasons why we do not go into those items which we could go into and reduce the amounts? One is lack of time, and the other is that Senators who are members of the Appropriations Committee, like other citizens, cannot obtain the evidence of the hearings held before the House Appropriations Committee before the hearings are made public on the floor of the House, and therefore the members

of the Senate committee have really not had an opportunity to study the hearings until that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. It becomes an impossibility for the Senate committee to go into the various items of appropriation in the same way the House committee does.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Massachusetts have hit the nail exactly on the head. At the time the Senate subcommittee began its hearings on the pending bill, I notified both the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency that because of the fact that we did not have as much time as we would like to spend on hearings, we were going to conduct them in the old way, that is, simply to look at the increases the agencies asked for, but I stated that it was my hope that next year, when a similar bill came before our subcommittee, we would look into every item that had been examined by the House. I think we might discover something if we adopted that procedure. I hope Senators who are members of that subcommittee will join me in taking such action the next time we have a similar bill before us.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his statement. The question we are discussing is not partisan in any sense. We are trying to solve a difficult problem. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I believe he also has hit the nail right on the head.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, the fact that I feel as I do concerning appropriation bills in general does not at all indicate that I am in favor of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. While he may not approve of the technical procedure by which the Senator from Michigan submits his amendment, he approves of the principle behind the amendment; does he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I approve of any principle that will reduce expenses in an intelligent way. There is such a thing as cutting down an appropriation bill in such a manner as to waste more money than is saved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator also agree that it is impossible for the Senate Appropriations Committee to have sufficient time to go into the subject in such a way that it can know definitely that the number of dollars appropriated is exactly the number of dollars needed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will tell the Senator from Massachusetts how the Senator from New Mexico feels about all appropriation bills. I repeat that this does not mean that I agree with the suggestion made by the Senator from Michigan in his amendment to this particular bill. However, in appropriating moneys for any department we have a one-sided proposition, generally speaking. What are the mechanics? We get the bill from the House. Every item that has not been cut by the House is forgotten. We take it as a matter of course. Then we receive evidence only from those who want appropriations increased. The committee never receives any information from anyone who might say: "Yes, this is fine. The appropriation should be increased, but for this reason it must not be increased." In other words, we do not get the taxpayers' side. That is partly because of lack of time and partly because we do not get any information on the subject.

I believe that many things could be done, not to eliminate appropriations which are necessary in order that the Government may properly function, but to stop waste, duplication, and bad administration. I would go along with any Senator in doing things of that kind. But I do not want to make any reduction in any appropriations which would interfere with good government, or the carrying out of a function imposed upon an agency or department of the Government by the Congress itself.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the Senator's amendment presents an over-all reduction of 5 percent?

Mr. FERGUSON. At least 5 percent on certain items in the bill. The reduction would amount to approximately $15,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would leave with the heads of the departments the right to abolish entirely a given division.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The head of a department could make a reduction only up to 20 percent. He could make no cut of more than 20 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In a certain division he could make a reduction up to 20 percent, and no reduction in some other division.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So it is proposed to give him a large measure of discretion and control.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his remarks, because he has clarified some of these questions. What do we do in the Senate Committee on Appropriations? We consider only requests for increases. It has been suggested that is the reason the Senate is sometimes called the "Upper House"—because we only "up" appropriations.

But, Mr. President, we do not go into the question of the $2,000,000,000, which the House approved in the pending bill. We go into the question of a requested increase of $350,000,000, for example. The Senator from New Mexico stated it concisely. I do not recall ever having heard a witness appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with one of these items tell us that we had allowed too much. We do not have members of the general public coming before us and saying, "This department can be run for so much money." We have representatives of the Government agency, after its request has been disallowed in the House, saying, "We want more money." They always make out a case. When they come before us the witnesses are fully prepared with figures and arguments. They deal with such large amounts that we are overwhelmed with the amount of the evidence before us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want to be fair with the Senator from Michigan, but we must keep the record straight.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. We do not want to place any wrong figures in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When we are talking about $2,000,000,000, we must bear in mind that in this bill 86 percent of the total is contained in three appropriations. There is $1,058,000,000 for public assistance.

Mr. FERGUSON. I referred to that item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Michigan would go along with us on that item?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is $882,741,000 for railroad-retirement obligations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I specified that item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And there is $135,000,000 for unemployment compensation and employment-service grants. So after taking into consideration the figure of $1,058,000,000, and the other figures, representing 86 percent of the total amount of the appropriation, there is not much left that we have not looked into.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is why the cut of 5 percent, which we propose, amounts in this instance to only about $15,000,000.

I shall never forget that when I first became a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations I wanted to try to do as good a job as I could. Testimony was being taken before the House Committee on Appropriations. I suggested to a Member of the House that I might get a copy of it and read it, so that I could have some advance knowledge, and when the witnesses appeared before the Senate committee I would not have to cram all night to learn something about the subject. The House Member advised me that the testimony was all secret. He said, "Even though you are a Member of the Senate, we cannot tell you anything about it."

Another subject about which we know very little is supplemental or deficiency appropriations. Do Senators realize that in the last session we received more than a thousand requests for supplemental appropriations? Governmental agencies wanted more money than we had given them in the original bills, and they made requests for more than a thousand supplemental or deficiency appropriations.

We had an example last week, in connection with appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. The House of Representatives was about to adjourn for 10 days. The President rushed up to the House of Representatives a bill providing for an appropriation of $595,000,000—a little more than half a billion dollars. He said, "You cannot go home. If you are gone for 10 days, this agency will be out of money. You cannot leave this item stranded here for 10 days." So the bill was immediately sent to the committee and reported back to the House, which passed it. Then it was rushed over to the Senate for action. It had to go to conference and be approved by the President before the House of Representatives adjourned.

We had to hurry. We had to set a special meeting at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, when we were supposed to be in the Senate Chamber. We were dealing with only a little more than half a billion dollars. We had to pass the bill that day, because if we had not, the agency would have been out of funds.

Think what such a system means. Think what would happen to a private business if it operated under such a system. The Veterans' Administration needed half a billion dollars; and if it did not get it, it would have to close down. That is the way we are doing business.

Mr. President, we lack knowledge on the greatest peacetime appropriations we have ever had. A few years ago we would never have dreamed of appropriations in such amounts. Now we go staggering along, appropriating and expending. Today, as we did on February 10, we face the deadline of May 1 for the determination of the legislative budget. What did we do in February, Mr. President? At that time the majority of the Senate said, "We shall suspend the law, and shall not have a legislative budget at this time."

Mr. President, what are we going to do between today, April 28, and the first day of May, so far as arriving at a legislative budget is concerned? I should hate to prophesy what the Senate might do, but I think those in control of the Senate will have enough votes to suspend that law again, or perhaps repeal it entirely.

Mr. President, what are we trying to do by the amendment I am submitting? We are asking these administrators to add efficiency to their departments to the extent of at least 5 percent. On an over-all basis for this bill, it will amount to only a little better than 1 percent, and the administrators are dealing with millions and billions of dollars. We acknowledge here that we do not have sufficient knowledge to be able to cut the individual appropriations. We do not have sufficient knowledge to be able to cut delicately the individual appropriations so as not to injure particular programs. But we assume that the administrators have such knowledge, and we would impose upon them an obligation to exercise it.

Mr. President, how well I know what happened at one time when we did cut an appropriation for the Post Office Department. Other Senators may recall instances similar to what was done in Flint, Mich., at that time. The postal authorities stopped the first delivery of mail to the post offices in Flint. How my telephone rang as a result. Hundreds of persons wanted to know why that delivery of mail had been stopped. The postal authorities knew that if they would apply the reduction of appropriations at that vital spot, everyone in Flint and a lot of others in Michigan would be calling on the Senator from Michigan, because he was a member of the Appropriations Committee, and they would tell him that he was ruining the post-office service in the United States.

Mr. President, what else was done at that time? The authorities removed all patrol officers from the Detroit River. As a result, thousands of telegrams and telephone calls came to us here, crying, "The hordes are coming from Canada. The Canadians will send into our country almost everything they have, and there will not be any duties; so we are facing free trade, because you cut an appropriation."

Mr. President, I say that if we adopt this amendment there will be no excuse for such sabotage—for that is what it was. We shall expect efficient administration of the reduction. I am confident it can be done, and I know that if we can do that we shall have better governmental administration and we shall save millions upon millions of dollars. The result will be, not to cripple the Government, but to save money for the taxpayers. The gains which will be made under the amendment may appear to be small individually, but collectively they will amount to billions of dollars.

So, Mr. President, a point of order has been raised against the amendment, and the Chair has ruled the point of order to be well taken, the amendment being legislation on an appropriation bill—for that is the only way the matter can be submitted at this time. A two-thirds vote is required, under the point of order. I hope that each Senator will see fit to cast his vote in favor of this method of trying to save America by protecting its fiscal solidity. I hope we shall receive not only the necessary two-thirds vote, but a great many more votes of Senators, as an overwhelming demonstration of our determination to put a definite check on the spending of the Federal Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Langer
Anderson	Gillette	Lodge
Baldwin	Hayden	Long
Brewster	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Bridges	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Butler	Hill	McFarland
Cain	Hoey	McGrath
Chapman	Holland	McMahon
Chavez	Humphrey	Magnuson
Connally	Ives	Malone
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Martin
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Maybank
Ecton	Kefauver	Millikin
Ferguson	Kem	Mundt
Flanders	Kerr	Murray
Frear	Knowland	Myers
Neely	Sparkman	Tydings
O'Conor	Taylor	Watkins
Saltonstall	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Schoeppel	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Smith, Maine	Thye	Young

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to suspend the rules.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment being offered here today has the practical effect of reducing those appropriation items in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill capable of reduction by an aggregate of 5 percent. The amendment further provides that no single appropriation item may be reduced by more than 20 percent, to insure that no program or activity will be entirely eliminated if this amendment is adopted.

I am joining the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in submitting the amendment, with the full knowledge that most of the items in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill for 1950 are mandatory in nature and must be paid, and are not capable of reduction in any respect.

I am doing this because I believe that the Congress has been far too liberal in providing appropriations for both the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency. I am doing it also, because I sincerely believe that a start—no matter how modest—must be made in the direction of economizing in the expenditure of Federal funds.

The fiscal situation we face today is not a pleasant one. The President's own budget contains a deficit and a promise of greater taxation for the American people and for American business and industry. Our tax receipts are not sufficient to cover expenditures contemplated, and I believe it is the height of folly to grant appropriations beyond our revenue resources to meet them.

It is my contention that the amendment, as drawn and offered for passage, will have the practical effect of eliminating $15,497,888, and the elimination of that sum will have absolutely no harmful effect on either of the agencies affected by the amendment.

This is a short step in the direction of establishing the general principle that we must live within our income. It is a step that must be taken if we are ever to achieve that proper kind of economy in our Government which will enable us to have at all times a balanced budget, an equitable and adequate tax system, and a regularized reduction of the national debt.

Mr. President, when we have discussed appropriations in the past there has been a fundamental objection to a straight acoss-the-board cut, or to what

is called a meat-ax approach to a reduction in appropriations. Always in the past, as the distinguished Presiding Officer and other Members of the Senate know, I have fought and bled for economy. I believed that Federal expenditures could be reduced to a substantial degree. It is, however, increasingly evident that to reduce them piece by piece is an uphill fight, but we intend to continue, in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, to approach individual items in various appropriation bills with the idea of further reduction, and also to oppose general increases, though they may be suggested in the committee and on the floor of the Senate.

But we cannot stop there, Mr. President. I realize that in the bill there are very substantial items which are in the form of grants to States, which are established by law, and which we probably cannot reduce; but there is an area in this appropriation bill, as there is in all appropriation bills, in which we can make reductions.

Mr. President, let us consider the bill which comes before the Senate containing an item for the payment of interest on the national debt. Of course we cannot touch that by a reduction approach of this kind. There are many other items which it would not be wise, sound, or in the interest of good government to undertake to reduce; but by and large, an absorption of 5 cents on the dollar, 5 cents out of every 100 cents, can be made. Any good administrator or executive could so rearrange the program in his particular department that such an amount could be absorbed without affecting the efficiency of the service or the quality of the work. Five cents on the dollar is a small item in the aggregate, but when we consider the overall budget of the United States and the over-all proposal of expenditures, it is a start in the right direction. Many Members of this body have proposed a cut of 10 percent on most items.

I should hate to see a substantial cut made in the amount appropriated for the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purpose of enabling that Bureau to collect taxes, because I believe as the income of the country as a whole decreases, we must make a more determined effort than ever before to collect taxes. I do not want to see the Bureau of Internal Revenue handicapped by lack of proper personnel to make such collections. But, by and large, I think reductions can be achieved and can be brought about very fairly.

This is a very simple amendment. No one could misunderstand it. I do not believe any Senator can stand on the floor of the Senate and argue legitimately that, outside certain rather sacred items, such as the interest on the national debt, we cannot afford a 5 percent reduction in appropriations for a department or agency.

That is the principle involved in the amendment, Mr. President. It is very simple. I do not see any great object in prolonging the discussion, because I think it can be as well understood now as later. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment may be brought to as early a vote as is possible.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BALDWIN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, all of us in this body received with commingled thoughts and emotions the information that one of our number would leave us and go on the bench. The information we received was that the Senator who would leave this body was the able and distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who, at the moment, presides over this session of the Senate. I think our first emotion was one of regret that an able, outstanding, progressive, and cooperative Member of this body was eventually, of his own volition, to seek service in another field; and, commingled with our regret at losing him as a Member of this body, there was also the comforting thought that perhaps for reasons best known to himself and his family, in the vicissitudes of life, the decision he had made was one which would meet with greatest promise for the future with respect to the ideas the Senator had in mind.

I have had the privilege and the pleasure, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and before that, as a member of that committee, to serve with the junior Senator from Connecticut. We have considered a multitude—I use the word advisedly—of bills dealing with the security and safety of our country. During the years we have served on the committee together, and particularly since I have been the chairman of the committee, I think I would be unappreciative of the fine cooperation, the counsel, the constructive suggestions, and the unselfish devotion which the junior Senator from Connecticut has shown to his country in the deliberations of that committee, if I did not publicly say that I am very sorry that his new field will take him from this body and that I shall lose him as a valuable member of the Armed Services Committee. I say, and I know I voice the universal sentiment of this body, that we shall see him go with deep regret, realizing we shall have lost one of our great and influential sources of progress in this body, but our regrets are accompanied by sincere and profound respect, good will, and the hope that he may find happiness and further opportunities to serve his State and his people in the new field which he will enter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Chair thanks the Senator from Maryland for his very generous sentiments.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment presented by the junior Senator from Michigan. As I understand it, the amendment proposed is to decrease the appropriations in the bill 5 percent. If I thought as the Senator from Michigan thinks about the impossibility of the Senate acting properly on these appropriations, I would, indeed, feel badly. For nearly 8 years we have heard the same cry upon the floor of the Senate.

How well I remember the former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, when he spoke in favor of the La Follette-Monroney bill, saying substantially: "We have to increase the salaries of Senators. Each Senator should have an administrative assistant and pay him $10,000 a year. Each of us will get a man who is expert in his line. A member of the Committee on Appropriations will get an expert in finance." Then the various committees were created, and they were given almost unlimited help, especially the Committee on Appropriations, which got more help, with one exception, than any other committee.

Mr. President, we were told that if we would only vote the necessary money and pass the La Follette-Monroney bill, there would be set up a staff of experts in the Committee on Appropriations so that at long last we would not have to depend upon what some of the folks in the various departments said. We passed the La Follette-Monroney bill, and we took the money of the taxpayers. But that is not all. The Senator from Wisconsin received a prize from Colliers as having been the outstanding Senator in the entire Senate, chiefly because of the fact that he advocated the La Follette-Monroney bill. Yet today we have the spectacle of the Senator from Michigan rising and saying the members of the committee do not know enough about the appropriations; that they cannot depend upon any information they get, because only those who want appropriations increased appear to testify about them.

I ask, Mr. President, where is the staff of the Committee on Appropriations? What are we paying men $10,000 a year apiece for? With that staff of technical assistants, why, as the Senator from Michigan says, are they absolutely helpless? He said the Senators have not sufficient time. I do not criticize any one for his social activities; it is none of my business; I criticize no other Senator; but all we have to do is to get the newspapers, read them, and follow the social doings, and there we will find out for ourselves what goes on.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and to that committee are referred about one-third of all the bills which are introduced. We do not have any trouble keeping up with the work. We turn the work over to our staff.

When the distinguished Senator from Michigan comes along and says he is going to take a meat ax and cut off 5 percent, it reminds me of last year, in the Eightieth Congress, when we had before us the rural electrification bill, which meant so much to the women and the little children on the farms. It meant the difference between their having refrigerators, and meat that was not spoiled, and not having them. What happened? One of these 5-percent or 10-percent cuts, or whatever it was, was presented, and at one fell swoop $600,000 was struck

off from the administrative expenses of the REA. That set REA back in the United States one whole year. Before an REA line can be built an engineer has to pass upon every foot of the line. An engineer has to decide where every single pole goes, and a blueprint is made. Not a dollar can be borrowed from the REA until the blueprint is completed. But with the $600,000 reduction, more than a hundred engineers were discharged because there was not sufficient money available for administrative expenses. We got the amount increased another $100,000,000. The Eightieth Congress appropriated more for REA than had ever been appropriated before, $400,000,000. But the administrative expenses, the very item sought to be affected here, were cut down, and there was one engineer left for the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota—one solitary engineer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think that by any chance we have too few administrative officials in the country?

Mr. LANGER. We may have and may not have—I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations—but I do know what happened when $600,000 was taken from the REA appropriation last year. I know what happened, because I visited North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota, and saw what happened.

Mr. BRIDGES. If there are over 2,100,000 civil employees in the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, does not the Senator feel that we could cut those in the aggregate 5 percent without impairing the efficiency of the Government?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very happy the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire asked me that question. I came to the Senate fresh from the prairies of the Northwest, and I was going to cut down the number of employees, the number of assistants. So one day in a committee meeting presided over by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and attended by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and some others, I made a motion, and made it in good faith, that we dismiss 30 percent, take a meat ax and cut off 30 percent. It was the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who first taught me the fallacy of the argument I was making. When he got the bill through, as the Senator from New Mexico will bear me out, we found we had adopted the Langer-Byrd amendment, which provided that every 3 months the Bureau of the Budget had to remove a certain definite number of employees. We did a scientific job.

I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the number was reduced from 3,100,000 down to a little more than 2,225,000. Then what happened? The Senate passed a bill, for example, affecting the Veterans' Administration, and provided, "No matter how much help you dismiss, this amendment shall not apply to veterans," and there are nearly 300,000 employees now in the Veterans' Administration. Then came the Marshall plan, and when the Congress passed the law it provided, "The Langer-Byrd amendment shall not apply to the Marshall plan."

If the distinguished Senator will take the trouble to go into the matter, as the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Virginia, and the Senator from North Dakota did, he will find, in comparison with the number of employees we used to have before we got into World War II, that we have cut down very much, but that the Congress came along after World War II, particularly in the matter of the Air Force and the Veterans' Administration, and took them out from under the provisions of the Langer-Byrd amendment. That is why there are today, as the Senator says, two and a half million employees on the Federal pay roll. The new agencies were exempted from the Langer-Byrd amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. At one time, since the Senator came to Washington in the capacity of a United States Senator, he believed we could cut 30 percent off with a meat ax.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly he can in all good conscience favor a 5-percent scientific cut, left to the administrative agencies to administer.

Mr. LANGER. There is nothing scientific about taking a meat ax and cutting off 5 percent. That is not scientific.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are not taking a meat ax. We are making this approach so as to avoid the issue of a meat-ax cut.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is saying we are going to cut off 5 percent. For all the Senator knows, in some of the departments an increase of 5 percent may be needed in order to bring about efficiency, rather than a decrease of 5 percent. The Senator says we are going to save much money by decreasing the appropriation 5 percent, when as a matter of fact some departments, as I have stated before, may, because of the slight consideration given by the Appropriations Committee, need an increase in appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator name a few departments which have not received enough money, whose appropriations should be increased?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. The Rural Electrification Administration for one. The REA does not have money enough to function properly. The Reclamation Service does not receive a sufficient appropriation. Dams which should have been built years and years ago have been held up because of lack of administrative appropriations by Congress. Congress has not appropriated sufficient money to eradicate barberry bushes, which cause rust to spread over the wheat fields of the Great Plains. Due to insufficient appropriations there are not enough employees in the Extension Service and in the agricultural colleges.

Mr. President, in certain foreign countries the greatest honor that can come to a man is not to be made a general or to be made an admiral but to be known as a great agriculturalist. He is the man who receives the highest honors in some countries. I may say to my distinguished friend the Senator from New Hampshire that in the matter of agricultural development the United States has fallen back and fallen back. Today, in some other countries, there is wheat grown, for example, that does not have to be seeded each year. It is perennial. We do not have such wheat in the United States, and cannot get it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In spite of the fact that we have fallen back and fallen back, in the words of the Senator from North Dakota, we are feeding not only ourselves, but half the people of the world.

Mr. LANGER. That proves nothing. At one time North Dakota was the breadbasket of the world. Yet there came a time when we had seven successive crop failures, and there was not enough feed to be found on an entire section of land to feed one cow. There was a time when more than half the people of our State were on relief. In some counties, such as Burke and Divide, 90 percent of our people were on relief. The fact that some foreign countries last year had a great abundance of crops proves nothing. The Senator from New Hampshire is not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but if he were to take the trouble to investigate the subject he would find that what I have told him is the truth, and, compared with other countries, in the matter of agriculture we have fallen back.

Take forestry. We are far behind some other countries in the matter of reforestation.

I may say one thing further in connection with the matter of promiscuously dismissing Government employees. When I became chairman of the Committee on Civil Service I believed, as I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire now honestly believes, that some of the Government employees were loafing on the job. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] was the ranking minority member of the committee at that time. We agreed to make an investigation of that subject, and hired two persons in whom we had absolute confidence. One of those we hired did not need a job; as a matter of fact she took it because we begged her to take it. They went, for example, into the Pentagon Building and made an examination. They saw for themselves what the Government employees were doing there. They went into the Internal Revenue offices in New York City and some other cities to check up and see whether the girls were knitting when they should be working, and whether the men were sitting with their feet on the desks reading newspapers.

They found there was not one word of truth in the assertions that Government workers were loafing on the job. As a matter of fact, all during the war Government employees rendered faithful service, and certainly after the war, when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and I had the investigators make the examination, they found, and reported to us, that the Government workers were rendering good, efficient, honest service, and were doing an honest day's work for their pay.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from North Dakota is certainly making a very novel approach to the problem of Federal efficiency when he stands here and says that Department after Department does not have sufficient help.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. I sincerely believe the Senator from North Dakota is as wrong in that statement as in any statement he has ever made.

Mr. LANGER. It is immaterial to me whether the Senator from New Hampshire believes I am right or wrong. That does not concern me. I happen to know I am right. I make the statement after my experience of 8 years as a Member of the Senate Civil Service Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators have talked a great deal about economy. Where were they when a few years ago we were trying to cut out the graft in connection with war contracts. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I both delivered addresses and furnished proof on the Senate floor in connection with graft in war contracts. For example, in Kansas there were what were known as the Sunflower cases. Contractors were engaged in building houses on a cost-plus basis. One contract called for the building of 3,400 houses. To show the graft connected with that work, the builders built one house, but immediately tore it down. They rebuilt it according to the same plans and specifications, and when it was completed tore it down. They rebuilt it a third time, and again tore it down, and finally rebuilt it a fourth time. They were paid for that work.

At that time I made the claim that a contractor had bought 1,000,000 lead pencils, to be used in connection with a contract he had with the Government. I was corrected, and told that the number was only 885,000 lead pencils—all on cost-plus. He paid 9 cents a piece for them. The Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Michigan or I could have gone out and bought those pencils two for a nickel.

During that time one company buried 20 tons of brand new steel, which was afterwards discovered—but for which they had charged the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from North Dakota knows that the Senator from Michigan did all he could to assist the Senator from North Dakota in bringing those facts to light.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. A few moments ago I stated that the Senator from Michigan made a splendid speech on the floor of the Senate on that very subject.

Mr. President, at the time of the Civil War a law was passed, known as the Abraham Lincoln statute. The Senator from Michigan is as familiar with the history of that law as I am. President Lincoln during the war advertised for horses. Instead of getting good, fine horses, to be used in connection with the Civil War, a great number of old spavined crowbaits were furnished. The Government advertised for guns, and instead of obtaining good muskets, was furnished with miserable guns which were not any good. So the then Senator from Michigan, and the then Senator form Pennsylvania, Mr. Eaton, drew up a bill, which was passed, which provided for payment of double the amount lost to the Government, and that if any one of these crooks who had furnished poor material to the Government informed on the others, the informer could receive one-half the amount recovered, which meant that the Government would not lose anything, but the man who informed would receive, for example, $100,000, if the Government recovered $200,000. In addition the Government would receive as fine $2,000 for every count under which there was a conviction. That was what was known as the Abraham Lincoln statute. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I sought to retain that statute on the books, but it was repealed here on the floor of the Senate.

That is not all. We made another marvellous discovery. In the State of Pennsylvania a bunch of crooks got together and made identical bids on some electrical machinery. A taxpayer there brought suit against them for collusion. He could not get anywhere until he finally hired a lawyer named Charles Mariglotti, former attorney general of Pennsylvania. He went into court and obtained a judgment against these crooks in the sum of $300,000. What happened? The crooks appealed and, believe it or not, when the appeal was heard attorneys for the United States Government intervened and said that the so-called Abraham Lincoln statute had been repealed by implication. The Federal court decided against the taxpayer who had brought that action, and he had to go to the Supreme Court of the United States, where finally the judgment in the sum of $300,000 was reinstated. When that case came before the Supreme Court of the United States Mr. Justice Jackson disqualified himself on the ground that some time in the dim and distant past he had been an attorney general of the United States. At the time the repeal bill came up there were 34 cases pending in the United States courts. Senator Van Nuys, who was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, stated that the amount involved, the amount of which the Government had apparently been robbed, was $1,000,000,000.

The Senator from Michigan and I pleaded on this floor not to repeal that act. Nevertheless, it was repealed. The amount was $1,000,000,000, or whether it might all have been recovered or not is problematical. In some of the cases which were brought there would have been recoveries. That statute was repealed. It still applies, I understand, in connection with the matter of bringing in jewelry from foreign countries. It still is the law in regard to customs. But it was the Congress which repealed it, with its eyes wide open.

I certainly join in what the Senator from Michigan said earlier, that any time the Congress wishes to do so it can get enough experts to figure out these appropriation bills, so that instead of taking the advice of the heads of Government agencies Congress can itself determine just how much the appropriations ought to be. If the La Follette-Monroney Act does not provide enough help, we have the power to double or treble the amount of help until we get sufficient help.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator overlooks just one thing in the La Follette-Monroney Act with regard to help for the Appropriations Committee or any other committee, and that is probably partly his responsibility and partly mine. I objected at the time, but probably not forcibly enough. I believe that in the La Follette-Monroney Act, or the Reorganization Act, it was intended, with respect to the professional help assigned to each committee, that so many should be assigned to the majority and so many to the minority, and that those assigned to the minority should be appointed by the minority and be responsible to it and work for it. As it is now, we have a general group whose loyalty is to the party in power, of necessity, in order to protect their jobs. The situation is unfortunate. In all fairness, I believe that one of the things we should do, regardless of the party in power, is to correct that difficulty. That would partly answer our problem.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that he has entirely misread the La Follette-Monroney Act. There is nothing in that act which compels the committee to assign anyone to the minority. It is merely advisory. A committee can do so, but it does not have to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. What I am saying to the Senator is that such a provision should be in the law, so that there would be no question about it. For example, in connection with any committee, a certain group should be appointed by the ranking minority member, with the approval of the other minority members, and that group should be responsible to the minority. It should be free, without influence or embarrassment, to work to present the viewpoint of the minority. It might be done, but what I am saying is that we get away from it by statute.

Mr. LANGER. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that, so far as the committees of which I am a member

are concerned, there has never been any difficulty on that score. The proper number of assistants has always been assigned to the minority, whether the committee was under Democratic or Republican control.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is very fortunate if he has no problem in that respect.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that I honestly believe that this method of arbitrarily reducing an appropriation 5 percent is wrong.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator must appreciate that the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from New Hampshire, and other Senators have acted in committee to reduce specific appropriations by certain amounts, whenever we could get the facts and figures. However, as I previously stated, we need more help. This amendment suggests a method by which we can avoid either a tax increase or deficit spending, and add efficiency to Government.

Mr. LANGER. Has not the Committee on Appropriations full authority to subpena anyone it wishes to subpena?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. There is not a single department of Government whose representatives cannot be placed on the stand and asked about the minutest details of appropriations, how much money they are spending, and for what they are spending it. In addition, the Committee on Appropriations has a staff which is larger than the average staff assigned to a committee. For example, it is larger than the staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. If it is not large enough, all the committee has to do, in my judgment, is to make application to the Committee on Rules and Administration and show the necessity for an increase in the size of the staff. I believe that if such a showing were made, the Committee on Rules and Administration would do what it did for the Committee on the Judiciary. It gave us two extra staff members. I think it would do as much for the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee would need a staff about as large as that of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LANGER. My understanding of the La Follette-Monroney Act is that the Appropriations Committee could get whatever help it needed. That is what we said in the debates. We said that at last the time was coming when Senators could have efficient staffs, so that they would not have to depend upon the heads of Government agencies. If we have not sufficient help on our staffs, I suggest that we get more.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator will appreciate, by looking at the size of the record of hearings, which is on the desk beside him, that much work was done. Inquiry was made by all Senators who are members of the committee to try to get the facts. However, because of the amounts involved, and the number of items, in my opinion we must use the facilities of the departments. That is the method which we are proposing by this amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to address a remark to the Senator from North Dakota. I came through the Chamber just as he was concluding his observations. I feel that they are very pertinent.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is intended to serve a very useful purpose. It is just another example of the degree to which the concentration of our economy and of our Government is proceeding. Scarcely a week goes by that we do not have illustrations of this kind.

The most striking and dramatic illustration, which I think has been completely overlooked by the press and the radio, is the resolution which created the Hoover Commission to make recommendations on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, a highly desirable and necessary thing to do. It was tried by President Hoover when he was President. It was tried by President Roosevelt during his regime. It was tried by President Truman under the original authority which was granted; and here we are considering whether to try it again. It is intended to do away with overlapping bureaus and commissions; a highly desirable objective. It is intended to reduce the expenditures and the costs of Government, another highly desirable objective. But we seek to do that by delegating away the power of the Congress. The Hoover report cannot possibly be carried out unless the Congress of the United States passes a bill saying to the President, "You do it; we do not have the time."

This amendment suggests another example of the same thing. The amendment directs and instructs the Secretary of Labor and the head of the Federal Security Agency to make a 5-percent reduction in expenditures, because we cannot do it; we cannot take the time, and we do not have the staff.

I do not criticize the sponsors of the amendment. I rise merely to point out that the conditions under which we live have produced this result. What is the reason why we have these great departments and bureaus, and these expensive commissions and boards? I ask that question particularly because I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with the independent offices appropriations. Presently we shall be holding hearings. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], one of the sponsors of this amendment, is a member of that committee. Where are we going to find time to go into the details of these appropriations? That is the problem which has confronted the committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Michigan desire to cut governmental expenditures; but because we cannot do so in the legislative body which has control of the purse strings, we are saying in this amendment, "Let the Executive do it."

Mr. President, this problem poses the dilemma of our times. It cannot be solved by any of the customary methods. It must be solved by a new approach, in my judgment, to the basic reason for this growing Government establishment, and that is the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few units in almost every industry upon which the life of the American people depends.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very, very fine contribution; and I yield the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Under this amendment, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has discussed it with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I assume that the Senator from Wyoming is aware of what we tried to do; but if he is not aware of it, let me call it to his attention at this time. We tried to draft this amendment so as to avoid the delegation of the appropriating power. In other words, we appropriate the money, and then we instruct the Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They would be instructed to make a blanket 5-percent cut, for the sake of efficiency.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; under the amendment, they would be instructed to cut the expenditures 5 percent. We tried to draw that distinction as against the delegation of the appropriating authority.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I see precisely what the sponsors of the amendment were trying to do.

Nevertheless, the amendment represents a delegation of power because we would be saying to the heads of those two agencies, "We do not have time to say where the cuts can be made or where they should be made; so we direct you to use your best judgment in trimming the expenditures wherever you please in order to bring about this net result, namely, a 5-percent over-all reduction in expenditures."

That is merely an illustration of what happens when concentration is permitted to continue.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to this amendment, which I think is one of the most constructive proposals we have had in many years.

I was particularly interested in the discussion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who has had experience as chief executive of one of our States, and in the discussion of the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who similarly has had experience as Governor of one of our States

This problem is one with which I was faced after the First World War. In about the same period following the close of the First World War—some 4 or 5 years afterward—I became chief executive of Maine. In Maine we had been spending very lavishly during that war; and in the postwar period the budget had been running out of balance by a million or two million dollars, which was a very substantial amount in the State of Maine at that time. Meanwhile, Calvin Coolidge was President; and General Lord, who, I am proud to say, was also a Maine man, had succeeded General Dawes as Director of the Budget. At that time the budgetary problem here in Washington was a very serious one, in liquidating the enormous expenditures incident to the war.

It is out of that experience that I would address myself to this precise solution which, of all the proposals made following the close of the war, seems to me to be the most direct and most constructive one, since it is based on the universal experience of mankind with governmental activities, and particularly with the functioning of bureaus. Mr. President, here I speak in no way reflecting upon bureaus; they simply are inevitably calculated to grow. They grow more and more lush; whenever a bureau is headed by a man who is particularly devoted to its purposes, he draws up designs for improving its functioning; and in order to do so, he needs more personnel and more money. So it goes on, and we see the vast bureaucracy burgeoning to such an extent that, more and more, it becomes the Old Man of the Sea around the necks of the people of the country. How to stop it is a problem.

As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] said a while ago, at various times in the past the members of the Appropriations Committee have tried their best to make cuts in the appropriations, but most ingeniously and almost devilishly the authorities in charge of the various departments or Government bureaus then made the cuts in ways which would bring an almost overwhelming protest from the people of the country.

Such experience inevitably shows that the only practical way by which cuts can be made in governmental expenditures is by the action of the administrators of the bureaus and departments themselves. Calvin Coolidge succeeded by the very practical device—and I trust that it will be seriously considered by the present Chief Executive in his endeavors to balance our budget—under the very practical advice and direction of General Lord, following the close of the Congress, of cutting the appropriations generally. President Calvin Coolidge then directed that every appropriation, with certain exceptions, should be reduced by 10 percent, and that the money thus saved should be placed in a contingent reserve; that the balance of the appropriation—the remaining 90 percent—should then be allocated or divided into four equal parts, one for each quarter; and that if any department proposed to use more than one-quarter of that 90 percent in any given 3-month period, it must come to the Bureau of the Budget, and perhaps eventually to the President, to obtain clearance.

Inspired by what I learned here in Washington at that time, the same device was adopted in the State of Maine. I do not think there is any question as to the power of the President at this time to use that device under present circumstances.

Two years ago, following the very careful considerations of the Appropriations Committees and the presentations of the various departments and the Bureau of the Budget, as I recall, within a month after the adjournment of Congress, the President himself exercised his discretionary power to cut certain of those appropriations by more than $2,000,000,000. Some of those cuts were made in appropriations for defense purposes, I believe. The President then stipulated that the $2,000,000,000 set aside for that account could not be touched or used without his specific authority.

Only this morning the former chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee pointed out that there can be no doubt as to the authority and power of the executive department automatically to make such cuts; that the President is not compelled, unless in certain specific cases, to expend the money that is appropriated by Congress. In fact, it probably is the duty of the President not to expend all of it.

One thing we always find is that in May and June of each year, a very determined effort is made—and this is true of every government and every bureaucracy—to expend whatever appropriations remain unexpended, so that when those agencies go before the Appropriations Committees in the succeeding session, they will not have to show any balances carried over, inasmuch as if they were to show balances carried over, cuts probably would be made in their appropriations. Of course that is an almost universal practice, and, of course, the Bureau of the Budget has sought to meet that situation.

As a result of that experience, the practice I have mentioned was adopted in the State of Maine in 1925, following the First World War. At the end of the first year following the adoption of that practice, not only had all the functioning of the various agencies of the government of Maine, in my own judgment and in the judgment of the people of Maine, been improved, but there had been accumulated, instead of a deficit of $1,000,000, a surplus of $1,000,000.

That illustrates the fundamental human truth that the only way the bureaus can be persuaded to make reductions in their expenditures is by the exercise of a restraint of this character, imposing upon the departments specifically concerned with the responsibility for making the cuts. After all, they know where cuts can be made.

I think all human experience, from the days of the Pharaohs and the days of Greece and Rome, down to modern times in Britain and in our own country, and including the experience of the two world wars, demonstrates beyond doubt that this is the practical and the accurate way.

If I were to propose it, I would make it 10 percent instead of 5 percent, because in my judgment it would be entirely practical to achieve, and there would be practically no difference in the functioning of our Government. We have had it cited by the Hoover Commission that the inability to take care of the relief of civil-service employees is one of the great difficulties. If the positions are reduced or abolished, that automatically will solve the problem. They could then eliminate the deadwood, which has so inevitably accumulated. This is the only way we can proceed, until there is a firmer hand exercised, toward the goal that I think we must all recognize as essential if the solvency of the Government and of the Nation is to be preserved.

I have one illustration as to what, it seems to me, is the somewhat irresponsible manner in which the heads even of our highest departments approach the question. I venture to suggest it, though it is a matter that I discussed here the other day. It is a perfect illustration of the failure of those in authority to exercise the right sort of accounting responsibility, unless they are compelled to the action. The Senator from Maine recently discussed the proposed farm legislation in its relation to the potato program. The Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly and publicly expatiated upon the cost of the current program for retiring potatoes for the current year as being around $225,000,000. He has then gone on to state that he expects that the cost for the current year crop, in 1949, will be approximately the same. I pointed out the other day that it was utterly beyond the powers even of the Secretary of Agriculture or any of his associates to tell what would be involved in potato production in the current year. I was astounded that he should even suggest such a thing, when I looked at the records and reports, and particularly at the reduction of 7 percent of the potato acreage expected this year, as recorded by the Department or Agriculture.

But assuming for the purpose of discussion that we are going to have a crop of potatoes equal to that of last year, in spite of the 7-percent reduction in acreage, and in spite of a 60-percent instead of a 90-percent support program, how is it possible for any man in his right senses to suggest or expect that a potato crop of 446,000,000 bushels, which is the third record crop for all time, which is what the 1948 crop ran to, with the 7-percent reduction in acreage, will be exceeded? How is it possible for any man in his right senses to suggest that the cost of the surplus support program on potatoes will cost as much at 60 percent as it did at 90? In my arithmetic, 60 is two-thirds of 90, and if the current crop has cost $225,000,000 at 90 percent of parity, then it must, by all the laws of mathematics, certainly be true that at 60 percent of parity it will be two-thirds of that amount, or $150,000,000. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture has gone out in an attempt to sell his potato program with the utterly unwarranted statement that

under the existing program for 1949, which is the first time that the Aiken Act has had its impact, as the item of potatoes was the only item in the entire program of the new parity concept of a flexible parity, fixed this year by the Secretary of Agriculture at 60 percent, is being applied. Yet he is telling us that we must abandon the program which he himself last year advocated, and which has never had a chance to be tried except as it is being tried in 1949, in the current crop year, that it shall be abandoned before it is even tried, on the basis that 60 percent is equal to 90 percent. That shows, as it seems to me, the irresponsible character of representations that all too frequently are made. I have no question whatever that if the very modest 5-percent reduction here proposed were put into effect, so that we could start to prune the bureaucratic tree before it is too late, it would be altogether conducive to far more efficient functioning in the stimulus it would give to those who are desirous of demonstrating their efficiency, rather than hanging limply upon the lush tree we have too long, ere now, grown.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. From the Senator's remarks, I gather he is not concerned with the doubt raised on the floor of the Senate today, that by providing a 5-percent cut in the pending bill, or in other appropriation bills, we would interfere with the efficiency of operation of certain agencies as the result of not having enough help.

Mr. BREWSTER. There would be far more efficient functioning, because if 5 percent of the jobs are abolished, the people who remained would want to demonstrate their efficiency. We have seen that in many fields, in our own experience. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire from his experience as a chief executive could testify very effectively to the truth of that statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator believes that this very modest cut of 5 cents of each dollar——

Mr. BREWSTER. Five percent is too modest, in my judgment.

Mr. BRIDGES. In saying that it is too modest, the Senator does not have any doubt in his mind, does he, that any efficient, competent head of a Government department or agency could adjust the work and the services of the department or agency so the reduction could be absorbed without impairing the efficiency of the agency?

Mr. BREWSTER. There could be no question. I myself would go as far as the Senator from Georgia, who suggested a 15-percent cut, which in my judgment, in view of the crisis we face, would be much more warranted.

Following World War I President Coolidge used 10 percent. That was found entirely practical and effective, and it is the way in which the finances of the Government were put back upon a sound basis.

It worked very well in the State of Maine. It would work very well here. So I think either 10 or 15 percent would be entirely warranted and wise. The 5 percent cut certainly is justified. It is very moderate.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Maine, who was governor of the great State of Maine not long after World War I, in the middle and late twenties, I remember, did a very distinguished and outstanding job of putting the State of Maine on a pay-as-you-go basis, maintaining the top fiscal condition of the State.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. He did that, as I recall, partially by pruning some of the services and personnel.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was done in each of the Departments. I left it to them. We simply put into effect a 10 percent reserve order, as did President Coolidge. The money was set aside in every appropriation, and before any department could use more than its quarterly allotment, one-fourth of 90 percent, it had to come to the budget director, and then to the governor, to justify its action. When we ended the year, we had not only the 10 percent reserve still in hand, but we had some additional thing. The Departments had discovered how desirable it was to demonstrate their efficiency and their capacity to carry on. There was never the slightest criticism from the people regarding the functioning of that procedure, and a great gratification at the restoration of the financial solvency of the State.

Mr. BRIDGES. Actually, what the Senator is telling us is that the cut which he placed in effect as governor of Maine, when he was attempting to achieve the same results as we are attempting today to achieve in the national Government, instead of impairing efficiency, increased it. Is that not true?

Mr. BREWSTER. Absolutely, in its effect upon department heads and upon all of the employees. They realized that there is a God in Israel interested in this thing, and when that happens, there is in my judgment the human nature that will cooperate in the achievement of that objective, both for the selfish reason of demonstrating their own interest and capacity, and for the broader reason that they do after all have some concern. But as long as it is let alone, inevitably like the baser metal which drives out the finer coinage, the more efficient, if they can get along without serving efficiently, immediately tend to corrupt the entire group. That is why it becomes necessary to impose restrictions and restraints of this character, if we are ever to achieve the objective which I am sure we all have in view.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With respect to the effort to impose restrictions, which the Senator has in mind, should not Congress do it, and not leave it up to the department heads, who at best, will not do it? Is it not the responsibility of those who do the appropriating? If they want to save money. Why not take the responsibility and do it here? Why pass it over to someone else?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think we make it very clear that that is precisely what we are attempting to do, but we also recognize that, with a $40,000,000,000 budget—forty thousand million dollars—and with two or three million Government employees, it is utterly impossible for any committee to cope with the situation except by what, in my judgment, is this very practical and very conservative approach. I am not questioning the sincerity with which all the department heads sought the funds. I am assuming they are all honest and honorable persons who desire to achieve what they believe is public service; but they must recognize the superior authority of the Congress which has the major objective to prune the tree of the Federal budget until we shall get back to some sort of sanity, recognizing that the recession which is now confronting us may well leave us with greatly depleted revenue. We are responsible for preventing the situation and saying to them, "Boys, what you have prevented was perhaps what you thought was necessary, but in the interest of the greater good of the Nation you must get along with 5 percent less." I am very sure there is not a department head who will not cooperate with us in the execution of that directive.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in my humble opinion, and with all due respect to the ECA program, the pending North Atlantic Pact, and every other vital question which may be before us or may come before us, the immediate matter of this amendment is of as great concern to the Congress and to the people of the United States as will be any matter that may possibly arise during the present session of the Congress.

I think the time has come when we must recognize that we are faced with a diminishing national income, and that unless we can turn the tide from the direction in which our governmental expenditures have been going, our country is faced with economic disaster. I very much fear, sir, that if we should meet with economic disaster, it will mean political disaster, insofar as our form of Government may be concerned. I think the time has come when we must face the situation as it is, not as we might desire it to be, not as we possibly might imagine it to be.

I see no other course, sir, than to take the course which is proposed in this amendment. I have listened to various discussions this afternoon with a great deal of interest and with some slight understanding. I have listened to the presentation made by those Senators who say that the responsibility for the particular cut in each particular instance rests with the Congress. Mr. President, that type of cutting is impossible, insofar as satisfactory results are concerned. I have seen it tried in one of the great States of the Union—New York. New York State, if the Members of the Senate will pardon my referring to it in this connection, has a fairly sizable budget.

This year it is approximately a billion dollars. It was not that large when I was a member of its legislature. New York State has had a line-item budget. In line with some of the statements which have been made this afternoon in the Senate, the legislature could have cut very easily. All it had to do was to take out so many jobs. Presumably, if we had carried out the theory presented this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and had utilized the type of staff he indicated, the legislature should have been able to act intelligently. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, that is exactly what the legislature attempted to do. It had a large staff, and it did cut, but when it got through, it had not accomplished exactly what was intended. It made a large over-all cut, but in some instances specific cuts were not made in the right way, because, after all, sir, the Congress of the United States and the legislature of the States, those great instrumentalities of government, are legislative bodies, not executive bodies.

It is not the function of a legislative body to indicate in detail how funds shall be used or how they shall be administered in the final analysis. Legislative bodies have a policy-making function, primarily.

So, Mr. President, when it is so easily stated on the floor of the Senate that all we have to do is to indicate where the cuts should be made, I want to point out that, much as we might try to do so, never would we be able successfully or effectively to do so. The only way in which it can be properly done, and the only way in which it was successfully done in the State of New York, is by overall percentage slashing. That is the way to handle it. That is the way which is proposed here. In the case of the State of New York we had to turn to the lump-sum appropriations. That is what we are largely dealing with here. Thus we can cut by percentage in such manner that administrators can carry out the cuts without damage to administration or to the Government.

Mr. President, I commend the approach by which this 5-percent cut is contemplated. Yes, it might be more, but I think the very moderation of the proposed cut is in itself one of the best things about it. It enables us to find out without risk how such a type of approach would work at the present time. There is a limitation beyond which the cuts cannot be made—20 percent. There are also whole areas in this particular proposal which cannot be touched and should not be touched. This is the way to go at it.

Mr. President, I would point out that I know it will be maintained by some that, if we have reached the point at which we must turn the cost of Government definitely downward and for a protracted period of time, we should not be undertaking new ventures. We should not undertake things such as public housing and slum clearance. We should not initiate programs such as Federal aid to education. It will be insisted by some that none of these things should be attempted under present conditions.

But, Mr. President, I do not agree with that attitude. I do not agree that we should cease our efforts to improve our society, even when we are faced with a diminishing income. The answer is a very simple one. We can undertake these things; we can undertake all of the things which are desirable for the improvement of our society; but the American people, if they demand them, must remember we cannot have all of these things in full amount at one time.

Somewhere we must begin to cut; somewhere we should begin to do it on a percentage basis, even as we undertake new and broad programs of the kind contemplated.

Mr. President, what is suggested is the sound way of approach; this is the way of approach, insofar as every single appropriation is concerned, with the exception of appropriations to pay interest on the public debt and a few other types of appropriations which, for constitutional or other reasons, cannot be touched, which can bring our Federal budgeting under control and reduce the cost of our Federal establishment. I am very glad, indeed, to stand here today in support of the amendment.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SECRETARY OF WAR KENNETH C. ROYALL

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I rise to pay sincere tribute to a soldier and a statesman, the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, who yesterday retired as Secretary of the Army.

Kenneth Royall was born at Goldsboro, N. C., on July 24, 1894. He is a graduate of the University of North Carolina—bachelor of arts, 1914—and of Harvard University Law School—bachelor of laws, 1917. His service to our country will long be remembered as capably done. He has at all times shown unusual courage and sincerity of purpose.

In May 1917 he enlisted in the Army and was assigned to the first officers' training camp at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in Field Artillery Reserve on August 15, 1917, and was assigned to the Three Hundred and Seventeenth Field Artillery, with which he served during the war. He served in France from August 1918 to January 1919, and upon his return to the United States he was honorably discharged on February 25, 1919.

In 1921 he served as a captain in the North Carolina National Guard, during which year he organized Battery A, Field Artillery, North Carolina National Guard, at Goldsboro, N. C.

He was admitted to the North Carolina bar in 1916, and subsequently practiced law in that State in Raleigh and in Goldsboro. He served in North Carolina State Senate in 1927 and was chairman of the banking committee. Secretary of the Army Royall has received a number of honorary degrees of doctor of laws, including degrees from the University of North Carolina, Baylor University, and Xavier University. At one time he was president of the Bar Association of North Carolina.

On June 5, 1942, he was commissioned a colonel (temporary) in the Army of the United States and named Chief of the Legal Section, Fiscal Division, Headquarters, Services of Supply (redesignated Army Service Forces) in Washington, D. C. In July and August 1942 by appointment of President Roosevelt, he defended the German saboteurs captured and tried in this country, and presented habeas corpus in their behalf to a special session of the United States Supreme Court.

In May 1943 he was made Deputy Fiscal Director, Army Service Forces, Army Service Forces, Washington, D. C., and was promoted to brigadier general (temporary) on November 3, 1943. He served overseas in 1944. In April 1945 he became Special Assistant to the Secretary of War. In November 1945 Mr. Royall was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his service as Deputy Fiscal Director and as Special Assistant to the Secretary of War.

On November 9, 1945, he doffed his wartime military uniform upon taking the oath of office as Under Secretary of War.

Kenneth Royall was appointed Secretary of War on July 18, 1947, and, by operation of the National Security Act of 1947, he became on September 19, 1947, the Nation's first Secretary of the Army.

During his tenure as Army Secretary, Kenneth Royall has been an active exponent of interservice cooperation in the interests of national defense. His frankness and integrity and willingness to put the interests of the United States ahead of personal considerations have won him the admiration of his service associates as well as that of congressional Members with whom he has worked .

Beginning next week, Hon. Kenneth Royall will join the New York law firm of Dwight, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, with offices at 100 Broadway, New York City. The name of the firm will later be changed to Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey. We wish him well in his return to private life.

During his long career of public service to his country, Mr. Royall has exhibited outstanding qualities of fortitude, sacrifice, courage, resolution, patience, and patriotism. Mr. Royall is a big man—physically as well as in his heart and soul. Let us be thankful that this is the case, for it took a big man—big in every way—to perform creditably the many complex duties which he encountered in a world torn asunder by war, by posthostilities adjustments, and by the increasing burdens brought about by our Nation's new role of world leadership.

May God continue to favor the United States of America with more courageous public servants of the stature of Kenneth Claiborne Royall.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in behalf of the pending amendment, and with regard to the gen-

eral situation we face today. The expenses contained in the budget for 1950, the pending measure being the first appropriation bill, are estimated at $41,800,000,000. That is an increase in 2 years of $8,000,000,000.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Ecton	Kem	Sparkman
Ellender	Kerr	Stennis
Ferguson	Kilgore	Taft
Flanders	Knowland	Taylor
Frear	Long	Thomas, Utah
George	McClellan	Thye
Gurney	McKellar	Vandenberg
Hayden	Magnuson	Wherry
Hendrickson	Martin	Williams
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hoey	Millikin	

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise in behalf of the pending amendment, which would make an over-all cut of 5 percent in the first appropriation bill dealing with the 1950 budget. I assume that Senators who are offering the proposal intend to do the same with all the appropriation bills as they come along, recognizing very clearly that the Appropriations Committee itself is not in a position to say exactly where these cuts shall be made, is not in a position to examine the detailed executive administration of every department or bureau, and is justified in saying to the departments and bureaus, "We will prescribe the general pattern. You must make some further cut in order that all the expenses of the Government may be reduced."

The necessity for that reduction today, Mr. President, seems to me to be overwhelming. In the fiscal year 1948, which ended last July 1, we had expenses in this Government of $33,800,000,000. In the budget which has been presented for 1950 it is proposed to spend $41,800,000,000—an increase of $8,000,000,000 in 2 years in the expenditures of the Federal Government.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] estimates that, taking into account expenses which are practically certain—I think perhaps including the provision for arms for Europe—the expenses, instead of being $41,800,000,000, will be $44,200,000,000.

On that basis the Senator from Virginia estimates a deficit in the next fiscal year, if there are no new taxes, of $3,200,000,000. The President himself estimated the deficit to be $800,000,000.

When we consider, in addition, that we should actually have a surplus of about two and a half billion dollars in order to pay 1 percent of the national debt every year, we see that we are at least three and a half billion dollars short of what we should have, and probably close to $5,000,000,000.

Incidentally, Mr. President, those estimates are based on the present revenues of the Government, and with some falling off in business no one is certain that those present revenues of the Government will actually continue.

I think it is interesting at this time to point out that in spite of the tax reduction made last year, the net taxes estimated to be collected for the fiscal year 1950, will be greater than those collected in the fiscal year 1948. The total figures for 1948 were a collection of $39,300,000,000, less $2,300,000,000 refunds, or $37,000,000,000 net collected in taxes. The figures for 1949 are $38,700,000,000, with refunds of $2,700,000,000, or $36,000,000,000 collected in taxes.

It is estimated that in 1950 the taxes collected will be $39,300,000,000, less $2,100,000,000 in refunds, or altogether $37,200,000,000. The falling off in total revenues results from a falling off in sales of surplus property and some other miscellaneous receipts. But in spite of the tax reduction made last year we are actually collecting more taxes, or going to collect more taxes, unless there is a falling off in business in the fiscal year 1950, than we did collect in the fiscal year 1948.

Our difficulty arises solely from the tremendous increase in Government expenses, expenses which go far beyond anything we conceived to be possible at the end of the war, and far more than anyone has contemplated as a reasonable burden for the people of the United States.

Of the total expenses of $42,000,000,000, roughly speaking, one-half is covered by the expenses of the armed forces and the cost of aid to foreign countries—about $21,000,000,000 for those two items. It is reasonable to hope that they may not be permanent expenses of the Government. If the world can be restored to anything like a peaceful status, it seems to me that we can count on a reduction of 10 or 11 billion dollars over-all in that total expense. International assistance should get down to within $1,000,000,000, perhaps, and the expense of the defense forces could be cut two or three billion dollars, certainly, and we could still maintain a very powerful defense force.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator feel about a cut in appropriations for ECA at this time? I do not mean to rehash any arguments, but in view of the fact that prices have still further leveled off, is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Ohio that when the ECA program comes before us a similar pattern might be adopted in reducing its appropriations?

Mr. TAFT. I was coming to that point. I fully agree with the Senator. I think we should reduce all the expenses at least 10 percent. In the $42,000,000,000 there are, of course, a good many expenses that cannot be cut; but assuming that approximately $30,000,000,000 would be susceptible to a reduction, if a 10 percent reduction were made it would result in a total saving of about $3,000,000,000, which might save us the necessity of a further tax increase. My only criticism of the pending amendment is the same as that made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I wish it could be 10 percent instead of 5 percent. I certainly would be delighted to vote for such an over-all cut.

The tax burden of this country is a serious threat to the welfare and freedom of the country and the freedom of the economy of the country. If we add to the $41,000,000,000 collected by the Federal Government about $14,000,000,000 for the State and local governments, we get a total of $55,000,000,000. The national income in 1948—and it probably will not be so high in 1949—was $228,000,000,000. In other words, we are taking 24 percent of the national income for taxes. If we add $4,000,000,000 more for taxes, as requested by the President, we shall be taking 26 percent of the national income in taxes. That is a very heavy burden on any economy. Unless we stop, it will grow very much heavier.

That burden alone is enough to destroy a system of free enterprise if it becomes too heavy. I do not know at what point it may become too heavy. I do not know at what point the economy would be upset and turned into a system in which the Government must do everything for everybody, in which the free-enterprise system which produces the taxes can no longer bear the burden of carrying the weight of government. If we insist upon these expenses, we must turn to a socialistic form of government.

This burden alone deprives the people of a large amount of their freedom. It means, broadly speaking, that we are taking away 25 percent of their income from all the citizens of the country. We are saying to them, "You no longer have the freedom to spend the money you have earned. You no longer have the freedom to select the things you want to spend for. The Government is going to take 25 percent away from you, and is going to spend it for the things which it thinks you ought to have, but which perhaps do not reach you at all. It is going to spend for things in which you may not be interested. It is going to spend for services which you may not want. It is going to take away your freedom to spend the money which you have earned by your labor, and it is going to determine how that particular money is to be spent."

In effect the tax burden, when it reaches this point, if it is further increased, is bound to be a tax on the people of the country from the lowest income group to the highest income group, because these taxes are bound to be passed on into the price of the products

which are bought by every consumer. There is no choice. We have the higher rates up to the point where they take most of the income of the upper-bracket people. So far as corporation profits are concerned, those profits could be taxed somewhat more highly, although that, I think, would destroy incentive. But, roughly speaking, the additional taxes sought today are bound to be taxes which will be reflected in increased prices to all the people of the United States.

Take the $6,000,000,000 which may be necessary if we adopt a national compulsory health-insurance program. Most of it comes out of pay-roll taxes. Social Security relies on pay-roll taxes. They are taxes which become a burden on every pay roll. In effect, the people who earn it, think in terms of take-home pay. They insist on money that they can take home. Even salaries today are largely based upon a net payment after the deduction of pay-roll taxes; and the taxes become simply a part of the cost of manufacture, part of the cost of doing business, because they cover all the operators in every industry. They are simply passed on in the price of the products which business is engaged in manufacturing or servicing. The same thing is true largely of income taxes which are deducted from pay rolls. They become simply expenses of the business, which again are passed on to those who buy the products of the business.

Take the farm plan. I do not guarantee the figures. We do not know what it will call for; but we propose to pay the farmer high prices for all his products. At the same time we propose to give the consumer of those products the cheap prices which he wants. In other words, we are going to subsidize all the farmers and all the consumers—and that is all the people of the United States—and there is no place to get the money except out of taxes paid by the consumer and the farmer. We fool ourselves if we think we are going to get those taxes out of thin air or from some rich people that we have not yet found. Such taxes are bound to come as a burden on the general economy, and again increase the prices we are trying to reduce to the consumer. They absolutely nullify the whole process. We can successfully subsidize a small group, if it is necessary. We can subsidize one industry at the expense of others, which pay therefore increased taxes. However, a plan which undertakes to subsidize everyone in the United States simply deceives the people into thinking that they are getting something. They are bound to pay for the subsidy in increased prices, and the same people will have to pay those increased taxes, or the increased prices resulting from increased taxes.

It is proposed to increase the corporation tax from 38 percent of net profits to 50 percent of net profits. The effect of that is to discourage people from going into business. If a man is about to start a new business, and we tell him before he starts that we are going to take 50 percent of everything he makes, and that he will have to stand whatever losses he may incur, it certainly is not a very encouraging prospect. As a matter of fact, there is very little new money today going into equity capital, going into risk enterprise, going into things that build up the Nation. Very little of such money is available, because such enterprises do not pay. They are too much of a chance. There are a few people who enjoy taking a chance. They like to gamble. But they do not constitute a very large proportion of the total number of people who ought to be taking chances.

If corporation taxes become higher and higher, it will not pay anyone to go into business. We have found very little equity capital. If we had not had a period in which there was a seller's market and corporations made abnormal profits and put those profits into expansion of plants, today we would be very short of investment capital for the expansion of plants, the building of new plants, and the acquisition of new machinery. Fortunately we have had those things for the time being; but there is very clear evidence that as a buyer's market develops those profits will disappear. We have a tax system which very greatly discourages any further investment of private capital. Such investment is the only way our system can be kept going. There must be a constant expansion in the tools which create more jobs, in the tools which enable men to become more productive and attain a higher standard of living.

So I certainly should hesitate greatly to undertake to increase the tax on corporation profits. Those profits may be excessive at the moment; but over long periods they are very seldom excessive. They tend to average up. In 1932 we got down to a point where they were minus, where the corporations lost more than they made. And therefore, so far as our records show, during all the 1930's there was almost no increase in the productive plant of the United States. In 1939 we still had 10,000,000 persons unemployed, because we had not invested sufficient money in capital enterprises.

Certainly today our tax system has reached a point where we cannot further increase taxes, which today are a very serious handicap upon the development of the United States.

So far as I am concerned, I agree with the Senator from New York; I do not know why we should cut out any basic necessity, regardless of whether we have provided for it in past years. I do think we should cut every appropriation. I am perfectly willing to cut anything in which I am engaged, no matter how important I think it is; I am perfectly willing to cut it 10 percent—anywhere from 5 to 10 to 15 percent, which would average approximately 10 percent.

It seems to me that we should go back and cut the ECA funds, when the ECA appropriation comes before us.

I hope very strongly that we may cut every appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio answered the question I have in mind when I was not on the floor; but question arose as to whether Congress would be yielding any of its constitutional prerogatives by adopting an amendment of this character to an appropriation bill. Will the Senator comment briefly on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I see no reason to believe that by adopting the amendment we shall be yielding any of our constitutional authority. Constitutionally, the Congress has appropriated lump sums to the executive—very large sums, in fact—and has left complete discretion to the Executive as to how they are to be allocated.

What we propose to do in this case is, in effect, to say, "Here is an outside limit for the entire Department, and here are also a number of little inside limits, which total more than the outside limit. It is up to you to reduce the inside appropriations so that they come within the outside limit."

I see no possible basis for the claim that such a provision constitutes any possible delegation of congressional authority to the Executive.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator from Ohio agree with the Senator from Massachusetts when he says that an amendment of this character, adopted at a time like this, in a situation such as the one the Senator from Ohio has so well described, will sharpen the efficiency and imagination and the energetic effort of an administrator, and help him to be a good administrator and to get the same services out of his department at a reduced cost; in other words, that such an amendment will be a help, rather than a hurt or hindrance?

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not think I could state the point as effectively as it was stated by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who spoke here a while ago, and who had the actual experience of doing what the amendment proposes when he was Governor of Maine, and who found that it resulted in increased efficiency in his government—exactly as the Senator from Massachusetts has described.

Mr. President, I merely wish to make one further statement about the legislative budget under the Reorganization Act. Personally, I am not in favor of suspending or repealing that provision. I think it could be properly amended.

I do not think the provision that after the establishment of a legislative budget, Congress be required to approve it at once, is so good—in other words, a provision that the House and the Senate pass a resolution approving the legislative budget—for I think that is asking us to do something in advance of the time when we are ready to do it.

But I think that provision should be amended so that there will be an over-all committee which will consider the executive budget and then will undertake to draft a legislative budget and will recommend it to the Congress, so that the Congress will have before it not only the President's budget but also the legislative budget. Then, of course, finally the House and the Senate will do as they please in regard to that matter. But I think some group in the Congress should sit in an over-all position, and should be able to say, "Here is our total situation. This is all the money we shall have. In some way we shall

have to keep our expenditures within that amount of money."

Mr. President, I think we shall have to do that, because we have reached that very point. It seems to me that we have reached the point where we are taxing the country as much as the country can be taxed without doing serious further damage and without serious danger in the future. I believe we should make our expenditures conform to that limit or that burden; and unless we have a committee such as the one that is contemplated in connection with the legislative budget provision, I do not see how we shall proceed. Otherwise we shall simply take each appropriation bill and each tax bill as it comes along.

Yesterday in the Finance Committee we seriously considered a proposal to reduce taxes by approximately $600,000,000, at a time when obviously we shall have to increase taxes somewhere else. Such a proposal should not be considered by itself, no matter what its merits may be; but it should be considered in relation to the entire picture. We should have a congressional committee recommending to us an over-all picture, showing how the budget may be balanced and showing how the necessary taxes may be levied. Of course, thereafter it would be entirely within the discretion of Congress to decide whether to choose to follow such a recommendation.

But I think we would be materially assisted by having the four chairman referred to—the chairmen of the two Appropriations Committees and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee—examine the entire situation and recommend the best possible solution to the very serious problem which confronts us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from Ohio agree that the necessity for such a committee certainly is obvious at this time, not only because of the attempt which is to be made to balance the budget, but also because of the necessity of attempting to clear the authorization legislation which comes to us, and which, if passed, would require the making of appropriations somewhat on the basis of appropriating in the blind; in short, authorizations which would require appropriations in the blind, and would thus result in putting the budget out of balance with the result not only of incurring deficits, but of requiring additional taxation?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think we should require it to be cleared, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I do not mean in the sense of having a steering committee.

However, today we have no other clearance device or no other committee serving such a purpose. We were supposed to adopt a legislative budget on the 1st of February, and now the date has been changed to the 1st of May. In a sense that would accomplish what I have in mind. But in the absence of such an arrangement, it seems to me the committee the Senator from Ohio has mentioned not only should be required to make an effort to balance the budget, but should consider the authorization legislation which might be presented following the report which that committee would make.

Mr. TAFT. My idea of the functioning of the committee would be that it would analyze the President's proposals, would criticize them, and would present its idea of what the budget should be. Then, so far as additional matters might be concerned, I think the committee might add, "And if you wish to authorize this, it will cost so much, and will involve an additional tax or will require us to save money some other place."

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I would not think the committee would pass on the wisdom of other legislation; I think that would be beyond its scope. But I think it could well call attention to the way in which its legislative budget might be upset or might have to be changed if certain other things were added to the budget.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I do not believe there is any task before this Congress more important than that of meeting the financial problem presently confronting us. It seems to me the amendment now under discussion is an effective, practical method of beginning this job. It will be only a beginning, of course. If it is successful here, it should be applied to the other appropriation bills. When we get through, we may even have to do what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] propose, namely, finally pass an over-all resolution calling for certain further cuts to be made in the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I simply wish to answer the question which has been asked as to whether it is the intention of the sponsors to introduce such a resolution in regard to each one of the bills. It is the intention of the sponsors to do so.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Michigan a question: If this 5-percent-reduction proposal is acted upon favorably, will that cut extend to any of the so-called fixed charges or funds which should not be touched?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been working on the Appropriations Committee, and I am a member of the subcommittee on this particular appropriation bill. I think the Senator from Michigan knows that I am just as anxious as he is, as one of the sponsors of this amendment, to make a reduction in governmental expenditures all the way along the line. But I ask the Senator from Michigan whether, in preparing the amendment, he has gone into the figures and can now say that an over-all cut of 5 percent will not have the effect of taking money away from fixed charges, such, for example, as social-security payments.

Mr. FERGUSON. The appropriations under titles III and IV of the bill for the National Mediation Board and for the Railroad Retirement Board are not subject to the specified 5-percent reduction. Likewise there are exempted from the proposed reduction grants for public assistance in the amount of $1,058,000,000; maternal and child-health services, $22,000,000; the appropriations for USES, and $135,000,000 under title II, which includes appropriations for the Security Agency. The amendment would not affect those appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question, in order that I may be absolutely clear?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I expect to support the amendment, in the interest of the pattern which I had hoped to have established in connection with ECA. I could see no reason, when we passed the ECA authorization, why a cut could not have been made in that figure. That is why I voted against the ECA authorization. I thought the figure would be very difficult to cut when it came to appropriating the money. I thought that was the proper time to set the pattern. This, I take it, is an attempt by the Senator from Michigan to establish a pattern. If the cut is made all the way down the line, it may make a difference in respect to the increase of taxes, making it possible to leave the tax structure where it is, without deficit spending.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in full accord with the motives of the Senator and of other Senators who are supporting the amendment. I am unable to see how any Senator can be otherwise than in accord with such an amendment. But I should like to know whether the appropriations which are to be cut, in the event the amendment is adopted, are those it is feasible to cut, those which do not represent fixed charges, and whether the cut will run into what the Appropriations Committee calls the untouchables.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct. It does not apply to those. I specified that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Baldwin	Holland	Millikin
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bricker	Hunt	Murray
Bridges	Ives	Myers
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cordon	Kefauver	Reed
Douglas	Kem	Russell
Downey	Kerr	Schoeppel
Ecton	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ellender	Knowland	Stennis
Ferguson	Long	Taft
Frear	McClellan	Taylor
George	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McGrath	Thye
Gurney	McKellar	Wherry
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Williams
Hill	Martin	Young

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRICKER obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it has been very difficult for me, during the consideration of this appropriation bill, to understand the lack of interest on the part of the public generally in the amount of money being appropriated by the Congress. It has seemed very difficult to bring home to the people the tremendous burden which the Government is coming to be on the citizens of the country. It is estimated that the budget this year will be approximately $42,000,000,000 for the support of the Federal Government. This is a staggering sum. It is beyond the comprehension of most people. The individual citizen can understand thousands of dollars, or perhaps millions of dollars, but it is very difficult to comprehend the magnitude of $42,000,000,000. I do not know of any better proof of that lack of comprehension than is the fact that while we appropriate money to the extent of billions of dollars, yet I have received very little correspondence in my office in regard to those large appropriations. But when it comes to the question of increasing the postage rate, letters come in from my State actually by the thousands. That question goes directly to the individual, and he comprehends the meaning of it, while an appropriation of $1,000,000,000 exceeds by many times the cost of the postage which any concern in this country would have to pay. There seems to be an utter lack of realization of the importance of the billions of dollars which we appropriate. So I have attempted to bring it home to the citizens of my State. I realize full well that we do not here represent alone our individual States, but we must be conscious of the States in the Federal program.

The $42,000,000,000 will take from my home State approximately $2,442,000,000. There was collected in Federal taxes in my State last year $2,712,000,000, of which approximately one-half came from personal-income taxes. The remainder was collected in the form of corporation-income taxes, excise taxes, and various other Federal levies. The $2,442,000,000 referred to, which my State will have to bear, is approximately 6 percent of the total cost of the Federal Government.

It is interesting to note in connection with this levy on our people that the total cost of State and local governments in Ohio amounts this year to a little more than $663,000,000. That means that the money collected in Ohio for the operation of the Federal Government will be more than four times the total amount of money which the citizens of my State will have to pay for State and local government, including municipal, county, township, and school-board costs.

It is also interesting to compare it with the appraised value of property in the State of Ohio. We have what is called in our constitution an assessment of property at a fair value. The total amount of money collected in Ohio this year for the operating budget of the Federal Government will amount to approximately 25 percent of the total appraised value of all the real and personal property in my State. That means that if a farmer has a 100-acre farm, his share of the cost of Federal Government on a pro rata basis for 1 year will be equal to 25 acres out of every hundred acres he owns. If a man has a small business in which he has invested $25,000, one-fourth of it will be taken this year out of his material resources and labor for the cost of the Federal Government alone. Bringing it down to the individual, it means that every man, woman, and child, in my State this year—and it is comparable to the other States of the Union—will have to carry a burden of $300 for the cost of the Federal Government for 1 year alone. It also means that every family in the State will have to pay $1,200 for the support of the Federal Government. That amount in the aggregate is equal to three times the total appraised value of property in the city of Cleveland. It is equal to five times the total appraised value of property in my home city. It is equal to the total appraised value in all the larger cities of the State, with the exception of Cleveland. It is equal to the total value of all the appraised property, personal and real, in the combined cities of Akron, Canton, Cincinnati, Columbus, and Dayton.

We can break it down further and show what the cost is in each county of the State, and I anticipate doing that so as to inform the taxpayer himself of the actual burden he bears when it comes to carrying the costs of the Federal Government. I know of no other way in which we can bring to the consciousness of the individual citizen information as to the amount of money he is paying for the costs of his Government.

I have thought time and time again it would be a very practical thing and a very effective thing if we could in some way bring the taxes directly to the individual, if we could take away the withholding tax and the indirect taxes and say to the citizen, "Your share of your Government's cost is $300, and you have to rake that up somehow"; or say to the individual family, "You have to pay $1,200, and you have to rake that money up." It would not be taken necessarily in indirect taxes, or be withheld by the employer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the fact that under some of the statutes the Government prohibits the payer of a tax mentioning to a customer who is buying something that the tax is included in the sale price.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct. I know of that.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that the Government attempts to conceal taxes as much as it can.

Mr. BRICKER. I know that recently complaints have been made to various departments that transportation companies have been putting stickers on their tickets to show the proportion of the cost of tickets which goes to Federal taxes. I think that is a very salutary thing. I think the knowledge should be brought home to the people, not concealed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The gasoline tax furnishes a good example. If, as the Senator has said, a family pays a tax of $1,200, the gasoline tax is in addition to that. The indirect taxes the consumer pays would all have to be added to the $1,200, if the Senator is to give a complete over-all tax picture of what a family pays, the result, in many cases, of provisions of Federal statutes. Is not that true?

Mr. BRICKER. The $1,200 figure is not over-all, not inclusive of all taxes collected.

Mr. WHERRY. To that would be added the hidden taxes, which are considerable.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes, taxes which they do not pay directly to the Treasury. I have served in executive office long enough to know that there is no department of government which cannot with efficiency cut its operating costs 5 percent. If we have not at the head of our departments in the Federal Government men who have the ability properly to administer their departments and save 5 percent of the appropriations made to them we should change the heads of the departments. I know that money can be saved in government. I know it can be saved with additional efficiency if attention is given to it.

A loose administration has developed in the Federal Government. The administration puts the budget as high as it possibly can, and comes to the Congress and says, "We cannot take a cut of any kind. It would deprive the people of the country of services we have been rendering." Then groups throughout the country who have been the beneficiaries of the services rendered are called upon to make their pressure felt upon the Congress.

Mr. President, I want to bring back to the taxpayers a realization of what the Government is spending, how much of their money is being taken out of their pockets, how much of their labor, and how much of their property is actually being taken for the support and upkeep of the Government. If we do that, and if the taxpayers become conscious of the fact that this is their Government, that they have to pay the costs of the Government, then the questions of economy in government and efficient administration will be brought to the attention of the Congress.

I know of no better way to start than to say to the heads of the various departments, bureaus, boards, and agencies that Congress has at last become conscious of the responsibility it has to the taxpayers and the officials of the Government must likewise realize their responsibility. That is the place to start.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have spoken on a number of occasions before the Senate in the last 60 days with respect to reducing expenditures. My personal opinion is that the budget should be cut, not 5 percent, but 20 percent.

I cannot quite understand why we do not reduce the budget in direct proportion to the loss in revenue to the Government, for instance to what the Government, in my personal opinion, will lose during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. I have repeatedly said—though there may be those who wish to question my statement—that the total Federal revenues in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, will not exceed $35,000,000,000. I may well be wrong; I hope I am. Let us say they will amount to thirty-seven, thirty-eight, or even forty billion dollars. We are going to appropriate somewhere between forty-two and forty-six or forty-seven billion dollars. I do not believe we can maintain a sound economy if the Government is to spend more money each year than it receives in revenue. I do not believe an individual or company, an institution or a government, can remain solvent and strong very long if it spends more money each year than it takes in.

I cannot see how the revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, can be as great as it will be in the year ending June 30, 1949, or as it was in the year ending June 30, 1948, because prices are falling. They have been too high. The income of our people is going to be reduced. Yet we in the Congress will appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, more money than we appropriated and spent last year.

My opinion is that every budget which comes before the Senate should be reduced 20 percent. Twenty percent of $42,000,000,000 is a little more than $8,000,000,000. That would bring the expenditures down to about $34,000,000,000. I felt very strongly that the ECA budget should have been reduced to $3,000,000,000. There were those who disagreed, and the Senate granted the amount asked for, namely, $5,580,000,000. I remember it was stated at the time that it could not be cut one single penny. I remember we tried to cut it 5 percent or 10 percent. Yet a few days ago the President of the United States asked the House to cut it by $177,000,000.

Why is it that when we consider an appropriation it cannot be cut one penny, yet after the bill is passed in many instances the President or someone else says it can be cut? The responsibility is ours. Under the Reorganization Act, if I understand it correctly, we are supposed to make up a legislative budget. I understand that to mean that we are supposed to ascertain as best we can what the Federal income will be and to figure a budget which we think will keep within the Federal income, then appropriate only that amount of money.

I listened to the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] a few days ago speak about a bill he says he has introduced for a number of years which would give the President of the United States the right to reduce appropriations and keep them in line with the Federal revenues. I am in favor of that; I think it would be a splendid thing. But my observation is that the request for appropriations comes from the administration, from the President of the United States. Requests for appropriations are submitted, and then if we try to make a cut of one penny the departments protest and say the cut should not be made.

I again ask the question which I have asked many, many times: When are we going to reduce governmental expenditures? When are we going to live within the Nation's income? How long can a nation exist which spends more money each year than it takes in? How large a debt can the United States endure? The debt is now up to $252,000,000,000. We are going to run into an $800,000,000 deficit during the fiscal year ending June 30. It is anticipated by many that the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, will amount to between three and five billion dollars. That estimate is made on the basis that taxes are not increased and if the Federal revenues—and Senators will notice that I use the word "if"—if the Federal revenues continue in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, to be as large as they are in the present fiscal year. If I am correct in my belief that the revenues are going to drop from about $41,000,000,000 to $35,000,000,000, we might well have a $10,000,000,000 deficit.

When are we going to balance the budget? What is the greatest debt under which our Nation can exist? When are we ourselves going to accept the responsibility, which is certainly ours, of taking action to balance the budget?

I receive letters from my constituents, and in conversation with them I hear the same thing—that they have just heard from Department So-and-so of the Government which has said to them, "We are sorry we cannot do thus and so for you, because the Congress has cut our appropriation, has cut our budget."

We are now appropriating and have heretofore appropriated $40,000,000,000 or more a year. We have been operating under a deficit almost every year. Yet those in charge of departments of the Government, when they want to impress Members of the Congress of the United States, through their constituents, say to the constituents, "We are sorry, but we cannot do what you ask us to do because Congress has cut our budget."

Mr. President, the responsibility rests on Congress. We should accept it. We should realize that our country will eventually get into trouble unless we balance the budget and live within our income. I strongly urge that we take to ourselves the courage to do the thing we all know should be done. I say there is no better time to do it than now. We will find the same excuses offered a year from now that are offered today.

Before I take my seat I wish to say, let us accept the responsibility and reduce the Government's expenditures in line with our revenue and for 1 year at least let us not spend more than our national revenue.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], but before the Senate proceeds to vote I should like to state exactly what would be the result if the motion were carried, and the amendment agreed to.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan directs the Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator to reduce by at least 5 percent the appropriations made to those agencies.

We all remember how the Department of Labor in recent years has been reduced by transferring out of the Department the Conciliation Service and the Employment Service, and by reductions in amounts for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other needed services rendered by the Department. Now, to take 5 percent from their appropriation of $16,766,200—there are some bureaus and agencies provided for in the bill for whom the Bureau of the Budget has estimated amounts 10 times as great as the Department of Labor would receive—would mean a still further reduction in their funds of $838,310, and this amount is almost four times the increase recommended to the Senate of $216,200 for the Department.

Exceptions are made in the Federal Security Agency under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan for grants to States for public assistance, for maternal and child welfare, and for the unemployment compensation and employment-service administration. The amounts so excepted are $1,058,000,000 for public assistance, $22,000,000 for maternal and child welfare, and $135,000,000 for unemployment compensation and employment-service administration, for a total of $1,215,000,000. These exceptions leave only $12,271,300 in the Social Security Administration as subject to the 5-percent reduction.

But that does not tell the whole story. Other units of the Federal Security Agency which are not so exempted from the 5-percent reduction are as follows:

Grant funds to the American Printing House for the Blind of $115,000. Senators will recall the general agreement on Tuesday when the Senate turned down a committee amendment to place a limitation on their funds, and now this proposal would take $5,750 away from those grants.

Payments to the Employees' Compensation Fund would be reduced by $650,000 from the amount provided of $13,000,000.

The Food and Drug Administration program would be reduced by $240,000 from the amount provided of $4,802,500.

Grants for vocational education would be reduced by $1,500,000.

Grants for vocational rehabilitation would be reduced by $1,000,000.

The entire Public Health Service is subject to the 5-percent reduction, which would mean a decrease of over $8,500,000, to be taken from grants for health services of all kinds, from hospital construction, and even from liquidation of contract authorizations for construction.

Operation of hospitals and educational institutions are also affected.

I have given these figures to the Senate so it will be informed on the subject involved, and so it can better form judgment as to how to vote on the pending motion. The committee is opposed to the motion and is opposed to the amendment. I hope the Senate will sustain the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing the amendment previously indicated by him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to the amendment, because I very strongly favor its adoption, and because it seems to me it is proposed in the right way, and at the right time for the Senate to indicate its desire to economize to the millions of taxpayers and citizens throughout the country who are tremendously concerned about the mounting costs of Government and tremendously concerned with the knowledge that the revenues from sources already tapped are not going to be sufficient to keep our budget in the black, if we go ahead without making some real hard effort toward economy.

It seems to me the amendment gives us the chance to show to the people what I think they are very anxious to see, namely, that we are willing to cut, and even to cut in some particulars where cuts are difficult. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that some of the cuts that would be effected, if the amendment is adopted, are cuts that none of us would want to see made, but yet they would afford an earnest showing of the Senate's determination to take action even in fields that are difficult.

Mr. President, without addressing myself at great length to this subject, I want to call to the attention of the Senate that if we wait until all the appropriations are made we are going to be in a much more difficult position than we would be if we announced the purpose of the Senate in the beginning to insist upon making some reductions, even though they will hurt.

Mr. President, this is the appropriate time for action. In the case of each of the general appropriation bills, just as is true of certain subject matters covered by this bill, there will be specific items with respect to which no cut can be made because of the essential nature of items involved. For example, in this bill, as has already been stated to the Senate, there are items having to do with meeting commitments which I think every Senator would regard as sacred—for example, commitments to dependent children, commitments to the blind and aged, and commitments to the States, which must put up comparable amounts in order that actual benefits may be paid to dependent children, to the aged, and to the blind. We cannot make reductions in such activities. To do so would not only breach our agreements with the States, but even of greater importance, I think, would defeat the carrying out of our commitments to citizens who are upon the rolls of the aged, the blind, or dependent children. No one would want to reduce that sort of appropriation. There is no time like the time when we are considering the very field covered by the appropriations to single out and make sure that we have exempted from any general approach items which are in the nature of fixed commitments. I think all of us would use even stronger language. The commitments which I have mentioned in connection with this particular measure are almost sacred commitments.

Mr. President, I strongly favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. My position in supporting it is by no means a criticism of the committee, which I think has done a very fine job. I have read a great deal of the hearings. I am impressed with the care with which the committee has gone into the various items. I have shown how I feel toward the committee, because on at least two occasions yesterday I stood with the committee and against the increase of items which strongly appeal to the sympathies of every Senator and every other citizen of the Nation. I believed—and I still believe—that the committee gave much more careful consideration to those items in the field of public health than we could give in general discussion on the floor of the Senate. I felt that the judgment of the committee should be sustained as to the maximum amounts which could be allowed under the budget and as to the maximum amounts which could be reasonably expended in the approaching fiscal year in those highly meritorious fields which command such general sympathy.

Mr. President, the principle involved in this amendment is in no sense a reflection upon the committee. Instead, it deals with a consideration of general policy on the part of the Senate. Admitting that the committee has given proper attention to all the comparative needs and demands of the services which we have created and for which we are responsible, and has fairly and fully reported what is necessary to continue those activities, nevertheless, the determination of the committee must be subject to a determination by the Senate based upon policy, which no committee can determine, but which must be determined not only by the membership of the Senate while this question is before us for consideration, but also by the House of Representatives and by the President, who, of course, must approve any measures which we pass.

Having in mind the difficult fiscal situation under which we are laboring, I think that now is the time, when the first general appropriation measure is before us, and when we have before us the various items in that measure and can segregate those which are necessitous and should not be touched, from those which can be reduced, for the Senate to go on record, if it intends to go on record at all, in favor of a reduction—not a harmful reduction, not such a reduction as would destroy any activity, but a reduction all the way across in the items which can be reduced. We should make a declaration of our willingness—nay, our insistence—that such an approach shall be followed. I think we would be following the correct course to place in the hands of the administrators of agencies who supervise the conduct of the activities covered by this appropriation bill the task of making reductions between the point of no reduction in some cases and a maximum reduction of 20 percent in other cases, so as to bring about a reduction on the whole of 5 percent in the items which are not entirely excluded from cuts of any sort.

Many Senators have had broader executive experience than has the junior Senator from Florida; but he has had some executive experience. He had it at a time when the income of his State, which for the time being he was serving as chief executive, was heavily reduced by reason of the war. I suspect that most Senators know that my State operates in large part upon excise taxes imposed upon the things which people do when they are trying to have a good time, but which they can get by without doing. That kind of revenue was, of course, very largely cut off during the war. We had to reduce our budgets and our expenditures. I have found that it is always possible to reduce somewhere. I do not believe that anyone is in as good a position to know where the reduction can be made as is the man who is responsible for continuing to operate the particular piece of governmental machinery which he heads. He can make a little cut here and a larger cut there, always shooting at the figure of 5 percent reduction all the way through in the fields over which he has jurisdiction. In my humble judgment that can be done without gravely injuring any single branch of our Government.

So as a matter of principle and as a matter of policy, I think it is incumbent upon the Senate to give its approval to an approach which will give some encouragement to the taxpayers and citizens of our Nation to believe that we are willing to reduce Government expenditures. Many people have the impression—and I refer Senators to their own mail, because I believe there is no Senator who has not had ample expression of that feeling—that we are willing to appropriate for everything, but not so willing to figure out where the money is coming from or, to levy taxes. No one wants us to levy additional taxes just now.

Before I conclude, let me say that I stand unequivocally with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. GEORGE] in his intention, as announced from time to time on the floor of the Senate and in other public ways, not to recommend at this time additional revenue bills for consideration by the Senate. He has not been at all slow in letting the people understand that until it is definitely shown that the Nation cannot continue without additional revenues he does not propose to recommend

an increase in taxes. I believe that most Senators—perhaps all—approve that attitude on the part of the distinguished chairman and the members of the Committee on Finance.

It is fine for us to say that we approve that attitude; but the acid test is, are we ready to take a position which shows that we are willing to restrict somewhat the ability to operate of the various pieces of the great machinery of the Federal Government, which must operate with appropriations made by Congress?

It seems to me that as this first general appropriation bill is considered by the United States Senate, and as we have an opportunity to pick out the items which cannot be cut, and place in another classification the items which can be cut, we should announce a principle and make it applicable to the entire field of public expenditures. Then, if we wish to be consistent, as we take up other bills we should do the same thing when they come before us. I do not know any better way to do it. Other ways have been suggested. An able Senator suggested today, during the debate, that we wait until all the appropriation bills have been passed, and then provide for a general reduction in the amounts carried in all those measures. In the first place, Mr. President, I think that would be a much more difficult job, because we would have to go again over the subject matter of each of the appropriation bills, to see what items, if any, might properly be subject to reduction.

Mr. President, if it is thought to apply horizontal cuts, as one of the distinguished Senators mentioned, I wish to say that I do not believe that is at all the way to go about the matter, because we know that the various functions of the Government are not of equal importance, and that one agency can very much more easily sustain a heavy cut than another can, and that it is impossible properly to approach this matter by means of horizontal cuts.

Now we have a chance to provide a mandate for reducing the expenditures which can be reduced at all by a total of 5 percent, but with leeway all the way from no cut to a 20-percent cut at the maximum. I think that is a very sensible and wholesome approach. I thoroughly approve of the objectives of those who have offered the motion for the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing the amendment previously indicated by him.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. A two-thirds vote in favor of the motion is required in order that it be carried, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I shall vote against this proposal. I cannot see the sense of cutting the appropriations for civilian agencies, for things which will help our people and make their lives better, when we are throwing money around in appropriations for armaments and for foreign countries, appropriating money for them almost in the way that drunken sailors throw money around, as the old saying goes.

Frankly, I do not believe the American people approve of appropriating money with a lavish hand for guns and for foreign countries, and then cutting down on essential and necessary services here at home. At least, the people in Idaho from whom I hear do not approve of it, and I do not approve of it. Therefore, I shall vote against this proposal.

Whenever Congress sees fit to make cuts across the board in foreign expenditures and in expenditures for armaments, then perhaps I shall go along in voting to cut some of the appropriations for reclamation and for various of the other civilian functions of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing the amendment previously indicated by him.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on official business in a meeting of a committee of the Senate. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. If present and voting, the senior and junior Senators from Virginia would vote "yea", and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay".

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] would vote "yea".

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is absent on official business, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who also is absent on official business, are paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea", and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay".

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea".

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Gurney	Mundt
Baldwin	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Schoeppel
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Thye
Douglas	Lodge	Vandenberg
Eastland	McClellan	Watkins
Ecton	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Martin	Williams
George	Millikin	Young

NAYS—35

Anderson	Kefauver	Murray
Chapman	Kerr	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	Neely
Downey	Langer	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Long	Pepper
Gillette	McCarran	Sparkman
Hayden	McFarland	Stennis
Hill	McGrath	Taylor
Humphrey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hunt	Magnuson	Tydings
Johnson, Tex	Maybank	Withers
Johnston, S. C.	Miller	

NOT VOTING—16

Byrd	Green	Smith, Maine
Connally	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Lucas	Tobey
Flanders	McCarthy	Wagner
Fulbright	Morse	
Graham	Robertson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in favor thereof, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the bill (H. R. 3333) be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back to the Senate with amendments providing for a reduction equivalent to that provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], ruled out of order.

Mr. President, it seems to me very clear that if a majority of the Senate want to make the cut, we ought to find a way by which the desire of the majority can be carried into effect.

The motion I make is very similar to a number of motions made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in 1932 with reference to appropriation bills. I want to read the motion which he made on March 22, 1932, with reference to the bill (H. R. 9349), making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor. He moved:

That the pending bill * * * be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the Senate with amendments providing the

aggregate reduction of 10 percent in the amount of the appropriations contained in the bill as received from the House of Representatives.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee made that motion repeatedly in the Seventy-first Congress, on each of the bills as they came up, and the bill, in each case, I think, was referred back to the Committee on Appropriations. The committee then reported the bills with the reductions which were covered by the instructions.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that is a very clear precedent for action of the kind I propose, and for this kind of motion. Certainly it is reasonable that if 45 Senators desire to make this cut, we should find a way by which it can be done. If the motion is agreed to, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and they can report either direct cuts in the appropriations or the same kind of amendment as that proposed by the Senators from Michigan and New Hampshire; or, if they can find some better way in which this over-all cut can be made, they will be free to follow it. The instructions simply are that the committee come back with a bill making a cut equivalent to that proposed in the amendment suggested by the distinguished Senators from Michigan and New Hampshire, which has been ruled out of order by the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. In the event the bill is recommitted and later reported back to the Senate, will it still be subject to amendment? I merely desire to have that made clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will still be subject to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I request the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that the Senate should be free in its deliberations and decisions. The committee has acted in the best of faith. It has worked diligently on the bill. Apparently Senators, especially those on this side of the aisle, think they do not want to follow the committee action, but want to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee, in order to carry out the suggestions made by the Senator from Ohio. That is agreeable to me. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Baldwin	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brieker	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bridges	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Kem	Taft
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Langer	Vandenberg
Donnell	Lodge	Watkins
Douglas	Long	Wherry
Eastland	McClellan	Wiley
Ecton	McMahon	Williams
Ferguson	Malone	Young
George	Martin	

NAYS—37

Anderson	Kefauver	O'Conor
Chapman	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McFarland	Sparkman
Gillette	McGrath	Stennis
Hayden	McKellar	Taylor
Hill	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Humphrey	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Hunt	Miller	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Withers
Johnson, Tex.	Myers	
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	

NOT VOTING—15

Byrd	Graham	Morse
Connally	Green	Robertson
Flanders	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lucas	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wagner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 44, the nays, 37. The motion is agreed to, and the bill (H. R. 3333) is recommitted, with the instructions embodied in the motion.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 61)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered to be printed, and, with the charter and memorandum from the Secretary of State, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, the Charter for an International Trade Organization, prepared by a conference of the United Nations which met in Habana in 1948, together with a memorandum from the Secretary of State.

The charter is designed to do two things: to establish a code of international conduct to guide nations in dealing with the fundamental problems of world trade, and to create an agency, within the framework of the United Nations, to help implement this code.

We have learned through bitter experience how necessary it is for nations to approach jointly the task of improving the conditions of world trade.

During the 1930's many nations acted independently, each attempting to gain advantage at the expense of others. The result was a vicious circle—with restrictions by one nation provoking more serious restrictions by other nations in retaliation. The end result was a tremendous drop in the volume of international trade which made the general depression worse and injured all countries.

Since the recent war, though some nations have again acted unilaterally, there has been a general resolve to prevent the vicious circle of restrictions and to achieve progressively freer trade. To gain this objective, action by many nations is necessary. No one nation alone, and no small group of nations, can have enough impact on the network of obstructions that has been built up.

The United States program for reciprocal trade agreement has been a shining beacon of cooperative action to reduce tariff barriers, and it is vitally necessary that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be extended in full force.

But it is clear that trade agreements alone are not enough. These agreements do not touch certain important obstacles to the expansion of world trade. Subsidies, cartels, and many other devices have important effects in limiting trade or creating disadvantages for one country as compared with another. What is needed is cooperative action to attack the whole range of obstacles that stand in the way of broadening international trade.

The Habana charter is a major step toward achieving that objective. It was agreed upon by the representatives of

54 nations after more than 2 years of preparatory study and negotiation.

The charter establishes an international organization, which is essential to continuous and effective international cooperation in the field of trade. The nations accepting membership in the International Trade Organization commit themselves to abide by fair and liberal principles of trade. They agree to take no action which may injure another nation without first making a genuine effort to reach a constructive solution through consultation either directly between themselves or through the Organization. They agree to work together continuously to achieve progressively greater trade and to settle differences with respect to national policies that affect the flow of international commerce.

The charter is the most comprehensive international economic agreement in history. It goes beyond vague generalities and deals with the real nature of the problems confronting us in the present world situation. While it does not include every detail desired by this Nation's representatives, it does provide a practical, realistic method for progressive action toward the goal of expanding world trade.

The United States can be proud of its leadership in this constructive action to help the nations of the world work their way out of the morass of restriction and discrimination that has gripped international trade ever since the First World War. The alternative to the charter is economic conflict and shrinking international trade.

This charter is an integral part of the larger program of international economic reconstruction and development. The great objectives of the European recovery program will be only partially realized unless we achieve a vigorous world trading system. The economic advancement of underdeveloped areas likewise depends very largely upon increasing the international exchange of goods and services. Thus the charter is an effective step toward improved standards of living throughout the world, toward the growth of production, and toward the maintenance of employment and economic stability. It is fundamental to the progressive, expanding world economy so vital to the increasing welfare and prosperity of the people of the United States.

The great structure of international cooperation that is being erected through the United Nations must rest upon a solid foundation of continuous cooperation in economic affairs. The charter for an International Trade Organization is a necessary part of that foundation, along with the special arrangements that have been made in the fields of money and credit, transportation and communications, food and agriculture, labor and health.

As an essential forward step in our foreign policy, I recommend that the Congress authorize the United States to accept membership in the International Trade Organization.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 1949.*

PROMOTION OF HEALTH OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions.

JANUARY 1949 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 88)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to present the views of the minority of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on the January 1949 Economic Report of the President. The majority report has already been printed, and I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be printed in equal numbers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to read the summary of the views of the minority:

SUMMARY OF THE MINORITY REPORT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

We reject the basic philosophy of the President's Economic Report which, in effect, recommends that we set up in this country a planned and controlled economy and increase taxation for that purpose. The President's report ignores the broad powers already existing in the hands of the President, particularly in the control of credit and the determination of fiscal policy, and carries on a crusade for more executive power, which we consider unjustified and dangerous.

The report of the majority of this committee accepts without criticism or reservation the philosophy of the President's report and his legislative proposals. We feel that under the Employment Act of 1946, our committee should have subjected the President's report to a detailed and discriminating criticism.

The President's economic reports threaten to become political propaganda rather than a scientific analysis. They deal in generalities and lay down economic principles without recognizing the possibility of sincere differences of opinion. They seek remedy in broad grants of legislative power, whereas we believe that Congress should only consider specific grants of power aimed at abuses or distortions which may arise in the economic structure of the Nation if they are supported by clear evidence of their necessity. The present economic report reads in many respects like a political argument. We see no reason why it should not be confined to economic discussions without entering into controversial political fields, or why it should not state the arguments on both sides where the economic issues are inextricably involved in politics. We believe the principal attention of this particular committee should be devoted primarily to solving the problem of full and continuous employment and not be diverted too much by social and political issues.

We disagree with some of the basic economic assumptions of the report. The chief argument advanced for added controls in the President's report is the need to combat further inflation. We see no justification for the claim that there now exists any serious danger of inflation. We believe that the economy has very largely adjusted itself through natural processes to a point where there is a reasonable balance between prices and wages, industrial prices and farm prices, savings and investment, consumption goods and capital goods. We believe that while business and profits and investment are perhaps somewhat out of proportion, they will both be rapidly adjusted downward as the buyers' market takes effect.

We believe existing powers of controlling credit and Government fiscal policy are the best methods of preventing depression, but even these must be cautiously used only when dangerous trends have clearly developed because of the difficulty of forecasting economic conditions. The record of the President's Council of Economic Advisers in making predictions is no better than that of other Government economists.

We disagree with the President's report in one of its basic conclusions, namely, that the gross national product is divided in such a manner as to invite a depression because consumer expenditures are too low, corporation profits are too high, and private capital expenditures are too high—in short, that there is a lack of balance between production and consumption, and that too such purchasing power is going into investment and not enough into consumer goods. The evidence before our committee tends to show that while capital investment may be slightly more than may be permanently maintained, there is more danger in the long run of underinvestment so long as our present tax structure remains in effect than there is in overinvestment. We believe corporation profits are likely to fall rapidly as the volume of business decreases, and that it will then be much more difficult to secure sufficient capital investment. In fact, we feel that the greatest threat to the stability of our economy and the prosperity of the United States lies in the constantly increasing burden of Government taxation and the difficulty of securing capital for the steady maintenance of employment in the capital-goods industries so there may be a continued increase in consumption.

We recommend:

1. The reduction of Government expenditures so that there may be no necessity for an increase in taxation, and that there may be a reduction in the tremendous burden of taxation if the international situation improves. While subscribing completely to the idea that we should balance the budget and have something left to apply to reducing the national debt in 1950, the possibilities of doing this by expense reduction rather than entirely by tax increases should be more strongly commended.

2. That the Government continue its control of general banking and credit policies through the Federal Reserve Board in such a manner as to check tendencies which have developed toward inflation or deflation.

3. We recommend that the public works program be varied also in relationship to the general economic situation, expanded if there appears to be too great a deflation, and restrained if other construction appears to be normal.

4. We see no need at the moment for further selective controls, but if any such need arises it should be dealt with by Congress in specific and limited fields with the greatest protection of liberty.

5. The Government should be constantly on the alert to prevent monopoly and the collusive fixing of prices. We are prepared to support additional antimonopoly measures if a careful study shows them to be necessary.

6. We still consider that a support-price program for farm prices is highly desirable to prevent the development of a depression through a complete collapse in agricultural prices. The administration of this program

should be directed not as a relief measure or a guaranteed income equality for individuals, but as a major weapon against distortion between urban and rural incomes which could bring collapse to the entire Nation.

7. We renew our recommendation that the Government take an active interest in the development of housing, particularly in the stability of the housing industry and the reduction in cost.

8. We believe that within a short time American industry will face the problem of increasing imports at steadily decreasing prices which may interfere with full employment in the United States. The whole problem of exports and imports and their effect on a stable economy during the next 2 or 3 years is a serious one, and our committee should proceed immediately to the consideration of that subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I desire to make a few comments on the statement just read by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that I read simply a summary of a longer report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that. Just before the Senator from Ohio took the floor I succeeded in obtaining a copy, and I desire to make one or two comments at this point. Does the Senator from California desire to make a speech in his own right?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I do. I shall speak for about 15 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to allow me to take about 5 minutes of the Senator's time at this point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Ohio has just said by way of reading from the summary of the minority views of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. It seems to me that it presents a very graphic picture of the confusion which exists in the minds of many persons in government and outside of government with respect to the economic problem which confronts us. Our good friends of the minority accuse the President of advocating in his economic report a planned and controlled economy. I submit, Mr. President, that there is absolutely nothing in what the President has said and in what he has done to lend any support whatsoever to that statement. The President does believe that we should plan, but he does not ask for control in the sense suggested by the minority. Of course he is for regulation of the economy. We can avoid it only by drifting. That way lies disaster.

My own conclusion is that the minority who have accused the Council of Economic Advisers and the majority of having indulged in political comment have themselves fallen into that error. A vote was taken upon the floor just a few moments ago with respect to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit the Labor-Federal Security bill for a blanket cut of appropriations. That motion came from one of the sponsors of the bill which is now the unfinished business, namely, the Federal-aid-to-education bill, which will add new expenditures to the Federal Government. The author of these minority views is himself a sponsor of the measure providing for Federal public housing, a measure which adds new responsibilities of Federal expenditure to the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Those expenditures are all included in the President's budget. I call attention to that fact.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that, but what I am saying to the Senate is that our friends of the minority are wholly for expenditures when those expenditures meet the objectives of our minority friends. They are against them when they can make a political argument about them.

In these minority views there is a condemnation of what is called Federal spending, as though such spending were undertaken merely for the purpose of throwing the money of the taxpayers out of the window, whereas everyone who knows a thing in the world about what is going on in government today here in Washington and throughout the world knows that the preservation of a free economy depends fully and entirely upon the capacity of the people of America to promote economic rehabilitation of the world. We are compelled to defend ourselves, we are compelled to promote the economy of other governments.

So the talk about a blanket cut of expenditures for the purpose of making a fine headline in the newspapers, for the purpose of gaining comment upon the radio, is utterly and completely absurd in the face of the fact that the House of Representatives, just a few days ago, passed the national defense appropriation bill, carrying almost $16,000,000,000, and the vote was 277 to 1. Not a single member of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives voted against that appropriation. And why not? Because, Mr. President, it was essential in the defense of our country that we maintain the Army and the Navy and the Air Force. Of course, it was understood that those expenditures are great. They are so great that no one can imagine what they amount to. Let me say that $16,000,000,000 which is recommended and appropriated for by the measure which was passed by the House and which has come to the Senate for consideration, is four times as great as the total annual expenditure of the Federal Government during the years before we were involved in the war.

Mr. President, this is not a question of Government spending. This is a question of the great Republic of the Western World utilizing its resources to save free government in a world in which totalitarianism is rising. I submit that the consideration of the problem of preserving a free economy here in the United States and in the world deserves a much more constructive point of view than that which is expressed in the minority views just now submitted by the Senator from Ohio and ordered to be published by unanimous consent of the Senate. I was glad to give my consent, but I cannot let this day pass without pointing out the anomalies and contradictions contained in its minority views and their total and complete ignoring of what the President of the United States has tried to do in the budget which he has submitted. The President has reduced expenditures. The President has reduced his budget estimates. The increased expenditures with which Congress is faced are expenditures which have had to be undertaken because of the tremendous problems which the American people must solve and in which they are taking the leadership.

It was only a few days ago that the Senate of the United States passed the Economic Cooperation Administration authorization bill. That was a measure calling for expenditures in excess of $5,000,000,000. When the vote upon that measure was taken I heard then no attack upon Federal spending. Oh, during the course of the debate there was, certainly. For 2 weeks, perhaps, we debated the Economic Cooperation Administration authorization bill. That whole debate, however, waged around whether or not the authorization should be cut 5 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent. It was only a question of degree. But the fundamental authorization of more than $5,000,000,000 was made, not because the President of the United States or the Department of State or the majority party in the United States enjoy authorizing expenditures of that kind, but because we know that unless those expenditures are made another generation of young men will go to war. It is political criticism, Mr. President. When the roll was called scores of votes were cast in favor of the $5,000,000,000 authorization for Federal spending by those who during the 10 days of debate were criticizing the proposal.

Now we are presented with a minority report which blows hot and cold. It is a "yes and no" report, as the language which the Senator from Ohio has just read very clearly demonstrates. I have discussed the first recommendation, for the reduction of Government expenditures. I turn now to recommendation No. 2:

That the Government continue its control of general banking and credit policies through the Federal Reserve Board in such a manner as to check tendencies which have developed toward inflation or deflation.

Every recommendation which the President has made in his economic report since this law was established for the prevention of inflation or deflation was for the utilization of such powers. So there is no disagreement there. There is no politics there. Now we come to recommendation No. 3:

We recommend that the public-works program be varied also in relationship to the general economic situation, expanded if there appears to be too great a deflation, and restrained if other construction appears to be normal.

It will be "yes" or it will be "no." Where does the minority stand? It is all things to all men. It has no constructive policy. Its recommendation is a recommendation that we drift in a time

which requires, if ever a time did require, sturdy and courageous action.

I come next to recommendation No. 4:

We see no need at the moment for further selective controls—

Mr. President, many of us have been blind and have not seen the necessity until it was too late to act. The use of the three words "at the moment" in this recommendation is an explicit recognition that times are not altogether as rosy as some might have thought. It is not altogether certain that inflation has in fact run its course.

We see no need at the moment for further selective controls, but if any such need arises it should be dealt with by Congress in specific and limited fields with the greatest protection of liberty.

Those are generous and well-rounded phrases—

It should be dealt with by Congress in specific limited fields—

This recommendation is submitted in the Senate on the very day when the minority leaders offered an amendment to delegate to the Secretary of Labor and to the head of the Federal Security Agency the power to cut the expenditures of the agencies covered in the labor and Federal security bill. That amendment plainly confesses that Congress is unable to act. Therefore, say its sponsors, "Let us have the Executive act." Now, within scarcely half an hour, the great and able Senator from Ohio says, "Let Congress at some time in the future take the action which may be necessary to avoid the perils of inflation or deflation."

It may be too late, Mr. President, if inflation should be resumed—and prices have risen in some fields after a decline of 4 months. If Congress cannot undertake to do its job in advance of the crisis, how can it expect to do that job when the crisis is at hand? If it be true—and it might conceivably be true, though I think there is no reasonable probability that it is true—that a period of deflation had set in, then, Mr. President, the philosophy of the minority report is the philosophy of relief. The philosophy of the majority report is a philosophy of constructive, courageous action. It is an invitation to Congress to see conditions as they are and to act accordingly.

Mr. President, I think it would be difficult indeed to overestimate the gravity of the situation which confronts us. We all know that we must undertake national defense. We must be prepared. We all know that we must support the recovery program abroad. We know that we are compelled by forces beyond our own control to make these expenditures.

It so happens that I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which will handle the appropriation bill for the independent offices and agencies of Government. One of those agencies is the Atomic Energy Commission. The House of Representatives has recommended an appropriation of more than $1,000,000,000 for that Commission. Mr. President, there never was a time in the entire history of this Government prior to the beginning of World War I, with the exception of 1 year during the Civil War, when the Government of the United States ever expended $1,000,000,000 for all its activities. Now we are confronted with the necessity of spending approximately $1,000,000,000 for atomic energy.

Would any Senator or any Member of the House say, "Demobilize the Atomic Energy Commission and forget it. Save the money of the taxpayers, so that we shall not have to increase taxes"? There is a great place to save a billion dollars. But it cannot be saved. We must spend it, because in the advance of science and the failure of mankind to adjust itself to the advance of science so as to preserve human liberty, atomic energy has been revealed to us. We are the custodians of a great power which could be used to destroy civilization itself; and our friends come forward with a minority report, as though we were not living in the greatest crisis that mankind has ever faced.

We cannot solve this economic problem by postponement and delay, by saying, as the minority report says:

If any such need arises it should be dealt with by Congress in specific and limited fields with the greatest protection of liberty.

We have about us examples in the actions of our various committees and the actions which we take upon the floor of the Senate. For example, yesterday Members of this body who today voted to recommit this bill, were voting for vastly increased expenditures for public health and cancer control. They talk about saving the money of the taxpayers, but when the vote was taken on amendments, which arouse a feeling of human sympathy for vastly increased expenditures for public health, then our friends lost all their thought about Government economy, and voted for increased and unbudgeted expenditures.

Mr. President, I say to the Senate that the economic issues before this country and the world are the most profound with which parliamentary government has ever dealt. They will not be solved by the filing of reports of this kind. They will not be solved by pointing the finger of wasteful expenditure at the President of the United States, in face of the fact that his budget estimates have cut down expenditures all through the domestic program, in face of the fact that we ourselves vote for appropriations which seem to us to be desirable, and put ourselves in the position of seeking Government spending where it may be helpful to our constituents, in the short range view, but preserve a determined attitude against producing the revenue, through taxation, without which the Government cannot carry on its affairs.

Mr. President, I cannot take my seat without adding another word to make clear that clipping a little 10 percent from this appropriation bill or that appropriation bill will do nothing to solve our basic problem. The interest upon the national debt is $5,000,000,000. Who knows what $5,000,000,000 is? But I will tell the Senate that $5,000,000,000, which we must appropriate to pay the interest upon the national debt, is more than twice as much as the entire cost of Congress, of all the United States courts, of the White House and all its activities, and of all the civilian departments and agencies of the Government—$5,000,000,000. There never was a time in the entire history of our Government prior to World War I when we ever expended $5,000,000,000 in a single year. But now we have to spend that much to pay the interest on the national debt.

I say to my colleagues that the system of free competitive enterprise, the system of independent capitalism, cannot be preserved unless we take off these political blinders, and look at the facts as they are. There is nothing to be gained for the people of the United States when Senators arise on the floor of the Senate or go on the radio and say, "If the President of the United States recommends a program, it must be bad, and we must oppose it."

Mr. President, the time has come for the good sense of Congress to assert itself, and for Congress to look at the situation which confronts the Nation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate what the Senator from Wyoming has said, namely, that because the President proposes a program, it is not necessarily bad. Unquestionably, the Senator would also agree that it is not necessarily good.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. I have never hesitated to disagree with the President who is the head of my party; but I submit that my record will show that I have never indulged in purely political criticism, and when I use the words, "purely political criticism," I mean partisan criticism.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure everyone will profoundly appreciate the purity of the Senator's motive, and I am sure he will ascribe a similar purity to the motives of those who disagree.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am talking about a report which says both "yes" and "no" on the vital economic issues of this hour.

I believe that every word of criticism I have uttered with respect to that report is well-founded, because I believe—and a reading of the recommendations contained in the report will show—that the report offers no constructive program to solve the greatest economic problem the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress have ever confronted.

AMERICAN POLICY IN CHINA AND THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on April 21 I introduced Senate concurrent resolution 30 providing for the establishment of a joint committee on the investigation of United States foreign policy in the Far East, to be composed of five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives. The resolution provides that three from each House shall be from the majority party and two from the minority party.

On April 23, I addressed the following communication to Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: Attached is a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30 which I introduced April 21, 1949, and which provides for a joint committee on the investigation of United States foreign policy in the Far East.

In view of the rapid deterioration of the situation in China, it does not seem to me that this country can any longer postpone the establishment of a constructive policy with respect to the Far East. If we continue our "wait until the dust settles" or our "take the Communists into your government" policies which we have been following in China, we are apt to find that communism will be in a position to take over all of Asia, and then to concentrate its efforts on Europe. So that all the facts may be developed, I request that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hold hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30 as soon as possible. The time for an affirmative policy in support of a free, independent non-Communist China has arrived.

With best personal regards, I am

Yours very truly.

Mr. President, by reference, I wish to include here certain prior material, so that I shall not have to repeat it in these remarks; I now refer to some statements I made on the floor of the Senate with respect to our Chinese and far eastern policy, beginning on page 3765 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, on page 4599 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, on page 4862 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21, and on page 4914 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 22.

Mr. President, the New York Times for Sunday, April 24, 1949, carried an editorial under the general heading "The Challenge of China." I wish to read one paragraph from the editorial, and thereafter I shall ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The part of the editorial which I shall read is as follows:

At present, in respect to China, we are in a period of confusion and dismay. What is worse, we are in a period of moral retreat. We have been obliged to compromise with our consciences in the name of expediency. The brave words that we have uttered about resisting the flood of communism and of helping free peoples to remain free have given way to an embarrassed silence when the freedom of China is at stake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CHINA

A relative lull, lasting almost 3 months, was broken by the decisive political and military movements in China during the past week. The exploration of a ground for compromise and peace that had occupied the ruling circles in the Government party since the retirement of President Chiang Kai-shek was rudely ended in a Communist ultimatum demanding abject surrender and then blown to bits by the violent crossing of the Yangtze.

Nanking fell swiftly, but still there was no compromise, no surrender and no peace. There is, instead, an attempt by the Government to effect some sort of retreat to defense positions farther south coupled with the stern declaration that the Chinese Republic is ready to fight to the end. Thus the search for peace has again proved futile and China's destiny will again be determined by force of arms.

This period of peace seeking was obviously more advantageous to the Communists than to the Government. While Acting President Li Tsung-jen and his followers were absorbed in chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of Communist cooperation, the Communists were busily massing their full strength for the Yangtze crossing. This period was disadvantageous to the Government, also, because it deprived China of the leadership of the one man personally strong enough to lead, President Chiang. But those three months were most damaging, perhaps, because they revealed clearly that the United States was not disposed to come to the assistance of China.

Many reasons, some good and some specious, have been assigned for our policy, or lack of policy, in respect to the Far East in general and China in particular. One very important reason is seldom mentioned. As a people, and as a government representing that people, we are essentially Europe minded, not Far East minded. That is quite natural, fully understandable. The vast bulk of our population is European in origin and in cultural background. For example, when we think or speak of a person's having a "second language" we think automatically of French or German, or possibly Italian or Spanish. It would never occur to us to think of Cantonese or Tagalog or Middle Malay.

Similarly, we feel quite at home with the atmospheres and emotions and problems of Western Europe. We feel that we are dealing with codes of ethics and patterns of behavior that are essentially our own. No one thinks of Denmark or Belgium as "exotic" or of the United Kingdom as "distant." European proper names, Machiavelli, Napoleon, Freud, Nietzsche, Milton, Lister, call up an instant and wide body of connotation and association that would certainly not be suggested by Lao-tze, Rizal, Hideyoshi, Takugawa or even Gautama Buddha.

Thus in a time of stress and strife it is only natural that our first concern should go out to that part of the world that seems closest to us. What happens to France or to western Germany looms as very close and overpoweringly important. As to what happens to China a typically American response might be: "Well, there are so many Chinese in China and they are so far away, and it is so hard to get the facts straight, and they've always been that way, we suppose; and besides, if we did try to do anything, would it do any good?" In that way at least a part of our thinking about the Far East falls into a vague impersonality. In that impersonality many problems are viewed, if not in a vacuum, at least in an academic abstraction.

The time seems near when those attitudes may be changed by the hard logic of violent events. It took us quite a while to learn that we could not be alien to what was happening to our culture-cousins in Europe. It may take longer to learn that we cannot be alien to what happens to our human cousins in Asia. Eventually, however, it will be forced upon us that what happens to persons everywhere is happening also to us.

At present, in respect to China, we are in a period of confusion and dismay. What is worse, we are in a period of moral retreat. We have been obliged to compromise with our consciences in the name of expediency. The brave words that we have uttered about resisting the flood of communism and of helping free peoples to remain free have given way to an embarrassed silence when the freedom of China is at stake.

But that silence cannot remain forever unbroken. The Communist victories on the Yangtze, and the threat of the extinction of the Chinese Republic, are forcing us to decide what we will condone and what we will condemn. We can wait and see only up to a point. The Communist ultimatum forced the Government of China to make its hard decision. Each further Communist gain will bring closer the forcing of a similar decision upon us.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, about 3 days ago the newspapers carried an Associated Press dispatch coming from Nanking, to the effect that Communist Chinese soldiers had invaded the residence of the American Ambassador to China, Ambassador J. Leighton Stuart, and had searched the premises. Mr. President, upon my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, I say that I believe that in effect the American Ambassador since that time has been held in what amounts to protective custody, unable to leave the compound. I should like to have the State Department indicate to the American people whether there is any other embassador from any other of the great powers or from any of the lesser powers who is in the same situation. Since the Communist forces reached Nanking have the representatives of any other nation been treated as the American Ambassador in Nanking has been treated?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from California familiar with the attitude and the action of Ambassador Bullitt in Paris when the Germans demanded entrance to the American Embassy there at the time of their capture of Paris, when Mr. Bullitt, with two guns, planted himself at the door and told them they would have to come in over his dead body?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, as the Senator from Maine realizes, the premises of the American Ambassador at Nanking apparently were invaded in the early hours of the morning, before the Ambassador was out of bed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I cited the example of Mr. Bullitt merely as illustrative of the sacred character of the Embassy, which is American property. A violation of it, under universal diplomatic usage, is the equivalent of an invasion of United States territory, and demands the same attitude and action on our part we would adopt in case of such invasion, does it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is no question about it.

Mr. President, we have had for some time now a policy in Europe which the American people can understand. I refer to the European recovery program, aid to Greece and Turkey, and the North Atlantic Pact, which is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I have supported the executive branch of the Government, as have Members of both Houses of Congress, on the several times bills have been before the Congress for carrying out these policies. Even those of our colleagues who voted in opposition at least felt that they knew what our objectives were and what the cost would be, and they had sufficient

information available so that they could vote against the bills with full knowledge of the facts at hand.

Such has not been the case with our far eastern policy. Mr. President, it just would not make sense for a businessman who had been threatened with gangsters to place a burglar alarm and a guard on his front door while at the back entrance he did not have either a guard, a lock, or a door.

We have been quite properly concerned with the implications to the peace of the world and our own national security with the threat to take some 200,000,000 Europeans behind the iron curtain.

The official policy under which the executive branch of this Government is now operating seems to be that we are not too concerned about 450,000,000 Chinese going behind the same iron curtain. Every Member of the Senate must fully realize that a Communist China may ultimately lead to a Communist French Indochina, Siam, Burma, India, and Japan. Not only would this throw great natural resources into the Soviet orbit, but it would place over a billion more people at the disposal of the Communist axis.

How can any Member of this Chamber be complacent at this prospect? How can any nation which believes in a free world of free men sit idly by while the prelude to this potential catastrophe is taking place?

I do not underestimate the complexities of the problem, nor do I fail to realize the fact that at this late date whatever we do may not be enough. No prudent man would claim that there is not a calculated risk in any move we make in the world today.

But is the risk greater than that entailed in our Greek and Turkish policy? I think not. Is it greater than that involved in the European recovery program? The answer I believe is clearly "No." Is it greater than the unprecedented move we are about to consider of a North Atlantic Treaty? The answer is emphatically "No."

The United States of America has had an historic friendship with the people of China, though we may have seemed to stray from it at times. The record is clear that this Government's long-established policy has been to support a free and independent China and to cause others "to respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China."

The problems faced by the people and the Government of China have been tremendous. A people with a civilization far older than ours were faced with problems growing out of the industrial and political changes of the nineteenth and twentieth century which the Western World had moved into gradually but which they were forced to meet abruptly. The chain reaction which was set off led to a simultaneous industrial and political revolution, which, due to the great area of the country and the size of the population, extended itself for a long period of years and is still going on.

While we may properly be critical of things that have been done or left undone by the Government of China we must not overlook the problems which confronted them nor ignore the fact that some of our policies must seem to them as unintelligible as some of theirs seem to us.

Prior to Pearl Harbor considerable shipments of scrap iron and oil were permitted by the Government of the United States to be shipped to Japan though it was clearly apparent that it was to be used to destroy the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China which we had agreed to maintain at the time of the Nine Power Conference in 1922, and which was only a prolonging of a policy this Government had followed since the turn of the century.

When on the morning of December 7 we were catapulted into World War II our armed forces and our military equipment was so limited that we could not spare in the early days sufficient men or resources to prevent us and our allies from being driven off the coast of China, out of the Philippines, the Dutch Indies, and Guam, and out of some of our Alaskan Aleutian islands.

Our ally, the National Government of China, was driven inland by the Japanese war machine. At the high tide of Tojo's victories, the Government of China controlled far less territory than it does today, despite the great encroachments made by Communist forces in that country.

Besides the United States the four countries constituting the so-called "Big Five" of the United Nations are Great Britain, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, France, and China.

Because so much misinformation has been spread about the amount of aid China has received and what has been done with it, I believe that it would serve a useful purpose to review the facts of the situation.

The Twenty-seventh Report of Operations Under Lend-lease (81st Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. No. 75) shows that the cumulative lend-lease aid through March 31, 1948, by the United States to the other four countries constituting the Big Five was as follows:

1. Great Britain	$31,287,217,540.80
2. U. S. S. R.	11,057,949,464.60
3. France (and possessions)	3,270,586,532.92
4. China	1,627,042,984.81

At that time we were all allies together in the common effort to win the war. The American people provided $50,205,229,788.16 for lend-lease through March 31, 1948. Of that amount $47,242,796,523.13 went to the four nations I have just mentioned.

Certainly the amount received by China was relatively small when compared to the total or when compared to any of the other three great powers.

On October 15, 1947, the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures issued, in the Eightieth Congress, first session, a Senate committee report showing United States postwar foreign assistance. On pages 7, 9, and 10 of that report it showed that in the period following the close of hostilities, up to June 30, 1947, we authorized for China $1,155,200,000. During the same period we supplied to the U. S. S. R. and the eight other countries of eastern Europe a total of $1,643,900,000.

This was not the lend-lease aid needed during the war to win a common victory. According to the report of the committee which I have mentioned, it was for the postwar period, and the record clearly shows, Mr. President, that the amount we supplied to Russia and her satellite powers was greater than that which we had supplied to our ally, China, up to that time.

On March 21, 1949, the Department of State issued a mimeographed release under the title of "United States Government Economic, Financial, and Military Aid to China Since 1937." Page 4 of that release shows that the total post-VJ-day aid in grants and credits to China, both economic and military, amounts to $2,009,300,000. Of that sum the military aid in grants and credits amounts to $1,000,300,000.

Recently apparently inspired reports have been allowed to get out to the general effect that it does not do much good to give military aid to China because 90 percent or more of the aid has fallen into the hands of the Communists. On its face this would seem to mean that of the postwar military aid of, roughly, $1,000,000,000, $900,000,000 fell into the hands of the Communists.

Such, of course, is not the fact. Let us examine the State Department release. In the first place charged into the billion dollars is $694,700,000 of lend-lease military aid. Of that sum $300,000,000 was a charge by our Government for the cost of transporting Chinese troops to various areas in north China and Manchuria in order to accomplish the surrender of these Japanese forces. Obviously that $300,000,000 service charge could not have fallen into the hands of Communists.

Included in the item is $142,900,000 for the transfer of United States Navy vessels. I have reliable information to the effect that few, if any, of these vessels have fallen into the hands of Communists, and, therefore, that item must be deducted.

Included also in the total is the $125,000,000 grant under the China Aid Act of 1948. Senators will recall that this item was added to the bill by the Congress without any assistance from the administration. I am informed that with the possible exception of a relatively small part of the cargo of one ship, none of this aid has fallen into the hands of Communists.

This reduces the billion dollars of post-VJ-day military aid which might have been subject to Communist capture down to $437,400,000. It is my judgment that the Department of State cannot demonstrate with reliable facts that even a majority of this last named item was subject to any 90 percent loss. It is just one example, however, of the loose manner in which the attempt to aid the Government of China has been sabotaged by those who should know better.

What is the situation relative to the shipment of Military supplies under title 4 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress? Title 4 was known as the China Aid Act of 1948. This section of the law was

added primarily at the insistence of Congress. It was certainly without encouragement from the Department of State, and I believe it is fair to state that it met objections from representatives of that Department. This law was approved on April 3, 1948.

Section 404 b provided that $125,000,000 would be available for additional aid to China, which could be military in character. It was not until November 1948 that the first shipment arrived in China. Of the total amount available, the latest figures show that $74,722,998.80 has been delivered and an additional $49,599,555 has been obligated but not delivered. This accounts for $124,322,555. Of the $125,000,000 there is an unobligated balance of less than $700,000.

With their backs to the wall the Government of non-Communist China will need additional aid if it is to preserve a part of the country free from Communist domination.

The question which we must ask and answer is whether it is in the best interests of maintaining this world as one of free men and in the best interests of the future security of this Nation to permit 450,000,000 Chinese to be taken behind the iron curtain while we wait for the smoke to clear.

Before Pearl Harbor, over the protest of many individuals and newspapers, on the Pacific coast and elsewhere, this Government permitted the shipment of scrap iron and oil to Japan. This was done despite the fact that everyone knew it was to be used by Japan against China, and it was also ultimately used against us, beginning the morning of December 7, 1941.

Subsequent to Pearl Harbor, for a considerable period of time, we were forced by lack of adequate supplies of equipment to treat the Pacific theater as secondary to the conflict in Europe. The aid we were able to give China was restricted and was far below the aid we gave to western Europe or to Russia.

However, the Republic of China had every reason to believe that if it refused to surrender to Japan or to make a deal with the Japanese war lords, ultimately Allied victory would result in a restored territorial integrity for it in line with our historic policy.

Of course, China had no way of knowing that wartime allies would agree at Yalta, without its knowledge and consent, to impair its territorial integrity and sovereignty in Manchuria. This was the price demanded by Stalin for coming into the war against Japan a few days in advance of surrender. It was paid by the Governments of the United States and Britain at the expense of China.

Gen. George C. Marshall informed Congress a year ago that the United States position in southern Korea would be untenable if Manchuria were lost to the Communists.

Manchuria has been lost to the Chinese Communist forces.

Congress was also informed that if the Communists controlled north China, the United States position in Japan would be extremely serious.

North China has been lost to the Chinese Communists, and, in spite of this fact, the additional troops requested by our military commander in Japan have not been supplied.

In the fall of 1948 Gen. Douglas MacArthur warned our national defense establishment that if the Chinese Communists should take the lower Yangtze Valley, the American military bastion on Okinawa would be outflanked and that his position in Japan would be as exposed and untenable as was his position in the Philippines in 1941.

The Chinese Communists are now on the move into the lower Yangtze Valley, and the ultimate fall of Shanghai is in the offing.

The Department of State has erected an iron curtain of its own with relation to our Chinese policy. I have been informed that no member of the Foreign Relations Committee has had a copy of the Wedemeyer report to read, though some of the members of that committee were briefed as to its contents. The Wedemeyer report itself should be made available not only to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, but to all Members of the Senate.

So far as I have been able to find out, no Member of either House of Congress has seen the report made by the then Vice President, Henry Wallace, upon his return from his mission to China in 1944, where he was sent by the late President Franklin Roosevelt. Officials of the State Department have told me that no copy of the report is in their files. Does a file on the subject exist at Hyde Park with the Roosevelt papers? The Senate is entitled to have made available to it the correspondence leading up to that mission and the reports made concerning it. How much influence did the Wallace recommendations have on our Chinese policy?

General Marshall was sent to China with a directive under which he urged the Government of the Republic of China to take Communists into a coalition. This was recommended despite the fact that Communists, once in a government, work to take it over in toto. Poland and Czechoslovakia are exhibits A and B. The Congress is entitled to know just who were the policymakers responsible for such a directive.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a very able article written by Mr. James Reston, published in the New York Times last Sunday. Mr. Reston is generally acknowledged to be one of the outstanding Washington correspondents, and is a man who has very close contacts, I believe, with the Department of State. In my opinion in this article Mr. Reston has pretty well outlined the present do-nothing policy now being followed by this Government in relation to the rapidly developing situation which may be so tragic in China.

There being no objection, the article was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES WILL NOW FOLLOW HANDS-OFF POLICY IN CHINA—WE SEE CHANCE THAT COMMUNISTS MAY BOG DOWN IN STRATEGIC MORASS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—The civil war in China is now reaching its climax. The Communists this week took over the ports and cities along the southern Yangtze almost at will. In the process, they attacked the warships of Britain and defied the protests of London. Yet the United States Government, committed to the Truman doctrine of containing the spread of communism, did nothing and explained nothing.

What is behind this apparent paradox? What is the official estimate of the military and political situation in China? And how is this likely to influence the situation along the periphery of China: in Indochina, Burma, Malaya, Japan, and the East Indies Archipelago?

The administration does have an explanation of this situation. It believes in the truth of its explanation as firmly as its critics believe that the United States is partly responsible for the collapse of the Nationalist Government. It is not making that explanation, however, because that explanation is a violent condemnation of the Chinese Nationalists, and the State Department does not want to embarrass that Government at the height of the crisis.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS

Nevertheless, the State Department's views are understood to be as follows:

(1) The triumph of the Communists in China is almost as spectacular as the success of United States policy in western Europe. Events in China mark a failure of profound and historic importance; but it is primarily a failure, not of the United States, but of the Chinese Nationalists, who have lost the confidence of their people, squandered the aid that we have given them and displayed an administrative and military incompetence unequaled in modern history.

(2) United States aid given to the Chinese Nationalists since the start of hostilities between China and Japan in 1937 has amounted to $3,475,000,000, of which $2,424,000,000 was given outright and $1,051,000,000 as credits. Sixty percent of this total, or $2,009,300,000, was authorized since VJ-day, $1,589,300,000 as grants and $411,000,000 on credit.

In addition to this aid, Army surplus property procured at a cost of $1,078,100,000 was allocated to the Chinese Nationalists at a cost of $232,000,000, of which $95,000,000 was to be repaid and the rest given as a grant.

(3) This post-VJ-day assistance was designed to help the Nationalists in their struggle with the Communists, to help that government repatriate the Japanese troops and reoccupy the liberated areas, to meet some of China's urgent relief and rehabilitation needs and to encourage the adoption of effective self-help measures on the part of the Chinese Government.

(4) With this financial and military assistance, supported by United States military advisers, the Nationalists put into the field armies equal in manpower and superior in equipment to the Chinese Communists, but during the last 6 months more than 1,000,000 Chinese Nationalist troops and all their equipment have been surrendered to the Communists.

It is the contention of the United States Government that not a single military engagement was lost to the Communists through lack of equipment; that most of it was lost without any large-scale military battle, through defections of troops who lost confidence in their government and their commanders and lacked the will to resist; and that, through incompetence and corruption in high places, through poor leadership in the field and through defiance of all our military advice, more than 90 percent of the equipment we have made available to them has been lost to the Communists.

(5) It is the further contention of our officials that even in the present dire extremity of non-Communist China, there is no unity, no effective leadership, nothing on which we can rely. It is said by our officials, for example, that the present government

wanted to defend the line of the Yangtze, but that Chiang Kai-shek, who made a gesture of retiring some time ago, still controls a large part of the Nationalist army, and ordered 300,000 troops to withdraw from the Yangtze, which they did.

CHIANG'S ACTIONS

Moreover, our official information is that Chiang ordered what is left of the Nationalist air force to withdraw to Formosa, that he likewise ordered the Nationalist warships to retreat to that island and that when he himself went south into retirement, he took with him a large part of the gold and silver reserves of the Government.

(6) In this situation, the view of our Government is that it would be wasteful and useless to pour more money and equipment into Nationalist China. The defeat of that government, as seen by our officials, is complete and irretrievable.

It started as a revolutionary force that ministered to the desires of the people for land reform and a better standard of life, but through war, disunity, incompetence, disloyalty and selfishness, lost that support and cannot be saved.

After some years now of trying to help other governments to help themselves, this Administration has reached certain basic conclusions, which it is applying to the Chinese situation. First, our officials say, there is a limit to what can be done by a Nation's foreign policy.

One nation, they observe, can render valuable and even decisive assistance to another nation, but at most that assistance can only be marginal. If the nation to be assisted has the will to resist attack and the competence to administer its affairs, there is the possibility that outside assistance can furnish just enough power to get a recovery project off the ground.

But if that will to resist does not exist; if the fabric of organized society is broken; if its officials are disunited, incompetent, and corrupt, it cannot be helped effectively. It can only be replaced, and the United States Government is not prepared to depart from the doctrine of marginal assistance and to adopt full responsibility for running the Chinese Government and the Chinese Army.

JUDICIOUS LEAVING ALONE

The United States is following in China a policy of what Rudyard Kipling called "judicious leaving alone." It believes that the dam has broken and it is waiting for the waters to recede. It does not say that this policy will succeed. It does not declare that some other policy at some time in the past might not have been better. It frankly admits that the policy of the past has failed.

But it insists that the failure is not primarily ours, and it flatly rejects the suggestions that the situation can be saved now by a billion dollars or two or by the intervention of some heroic United States military figure.

What, then, of the future? The State Department believes that the Communists can conquer Southern China when and if they choose. It believes that this will be an additional reverse, which will encourage the Communists in Indochina, Burma, Malaya, and the Dutch East Indies. But it does not believe that the situation is hopeless.

For China, as the Administration here sees it, is not a strategic springboard but a strategic morass. It cannot be conquered, in the opinion of our officials, as the Communists have conquered some nations of eastern Europe. It is a vast, unconnected, poorly organized continent of a country, populated by undernourished, highly individualistic people.

If our official information is correct, the Communists do not have the administrative personnel to deal effectively with the economic problems of the country. Winning the war, the State Department feels, will be easy for the Communists; running the country will be extremely difficult, and probably cannot be done without enlisting legions of non-Communist officials, who may very well, in the long run, prevent the effective communization of the area.

Some of our officials believe that the Communists will thus not only get bogged down in the strategic morass, but that Mao Tze-tung and the other Communist leaders will rapidly show signs of Titoism once they are in control.

The top officials of the Department think that the Communists will get caught in the morass, all right, but they are discouraging the idea that the Chinese Communists are good-hearted agrarians who will defy Moscow and introduce their own native brand of Titoism.

CHINA'S ANCIENT PROBLEMS

This, they concede, might happen, but it would be wishful thinking to bank on it. Secretary of State Dean Acheson will give a certain amount of dollars for relief (there is still $34,000,000 left in the aid-to-China kitty), but after the ancient problems of China catch up with China's new war lords, the United States Government will deal with their economic problems in sharp and realistic terms.

Meanwhile, official Washington is trying to learn the lessons of China elsewhere. It is convinced that the Japanese wartime slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics" struck home all over Asia and its myriad islands. It observes that, in the long run, freedom is the tie that binds.

Therefore, the State Department is trying to persuade the French and the Dutch to give the widest possible range of freedom to the peoples of Indochina and the East Indies. Where the native peoples are ready for independence, or approaching that point, the United States Government is urging its allies to adopt liberal policies.

Where they are not ready for independence, as in Malaya, we are adopting a more conservative policy; but elsewhere, as in Korea, we are arguing that the only way to deal with the rising tide of nationalism and self-determination in the Far East is to follow the policy adopted by the United States in the Philippines.

In China, however, events have overrun the normal bounds of foreign policy, in the opinion of our officials. Therefore, Mr. Acheson, like Mr. Kipling, is following the policy of "judicious leaving alone."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also wish to have printed in the RECORD the caption under a photograph which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, April 26. I know, of course, that under the rules of the Senate the picture itself cannot be printed, but I read the caption:

New York—Communists fly China's flag—Paul Crosbie, treasurer of the New York State Communist Party, is pictured as he hung the flag of China from a window of the party headquarters yesterday. Leaders said capture of Nanking, the Chinese capital, was "a milestone in the liberation of the Far East from its foreign and native oppressors." The statement, issued by National Chairman William Z. Foster and General Secretary Eugene Dennis, further said: "The imperialists' attempt by military, financial, and political dictation to harness 450,000,000 Chinese to their war chariot has been repulsed. Their dreams of dominating China and converting it into a huge war base from which to attack the Soviet Union and to throttle the national-freedom movements of all Asia has been blasted."

Mr. President, I shall not repeat here today, because I made reference to it on April 3 of this year, that the Communist leader, Mao Tze-tung, issued a statement which was broadcast over the Communist Chinese radio, which will be found printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1949, on page 4602. First, he attacked the North Atlantic Pact and then clearly indicated that in the event of any show-down between the free nations of the west and Soviet Russia Communist China would be lined up with the Communist Axis.

Certainly, even though there may be some in high places in the United States who do not realize the significance of what is going on, who have nothing to offer but a desire to wait until the smoke clears, the Communist Party in the United States and in every other section of the world clearly realizes what the situation is.

Mr. President, it is my judgment, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, that if the Soviet Union is able to consolidate its position by getting all of Asia behind the iron curtain it will so upset the equilibrium, so upset the general balance of power, that instead of talking about a $15,000,000,000 budget for the armed services and a possible reduction in that amount, the American people, along with the people of western Europe, are going to be face to face with the problem of how to put our defenses in order, and put them in order very soon.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 29, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1955, vice William Ward Smith.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be Federal Works Administrator, vice Philip B. Fleming.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be War Assets Administrator, vice Jess Larson.

Maj. Gen. Roy Charles Lemach Graham, O4971, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as assistant to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, under the provisions of section 9, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of commander subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy:

James L. Abbot, Jr.
Benjamin E. Adams, Jr.
Dudley H. Adams
Paul G. Adams, Jr.
Howard P. Ady, Jr.
William T. Alford
Neal Almgren
Fernald P. Anderson
John B. Anderson
John L. Arrington II
Nathan F. Asher
John P. Aymond
Noel R. Bacon
Clayton W. Bailey
Wayne D. Baker
John B. Balch
Charles A. Baldwin
Robert D. Ballantyne, Jr.
Carl J. Ballinger, Jr.
Frank W. Bampton
Albert R. Barbee, Jr.
Robert C. Barnes
Capers G. Barr, Jr.
Richard F. Barry, Jr.
Edward L. Beach, Jr.
Clarence E. Bell, Jr.
Wendell W. Bemis
Rafael C. Benitez
Thomas M. Bennett
Winfred E. Berg
Max A. Berns, Jr.
James C. Bidwell
David S. Bill, Jr.
John R. Blackburn
Louis K. Bliss
Edward C. Blonts, Jr.
Sigmund A. Bobczynski
Emmett P. Bonner
William D. Bonvillian
Robert L. Border
George W. Bowdey
Henry J. Brantingham
Roy E. Breen, Jr.
William W. Brehm
Robert Brent
Frederick W. Brown, Jr.
Charles L. Browning
Robert M. Brownlie
Robert M. Bruning, Jr.
David G. Bryce
Russell H. Buckley
Charles Bulfinch
Glen B. Butler
Sam J. Caldwell, Jr.
John V. Cameron
Harold W. Campbell, Jr.
William J. Carey, Jr.
Earl E. Carlsten
Harold L. Carpenter
Daniel J. Carrison
Charles M. Cassel, Jr.
Herbert A. Cassidy, Jr.
George B. Cattermole
John M. Cease
Charles R. Chandler
Kenan C. Childers, Jr.
Charles R. Clark, Jr.
Francis E. Clark
Marion R. Clark
Robert W. Clark
Fredric "B" Clarke
John C. Clarke
Marlin D. Clausner
James P. Coleman
Gene Collison
Almer P. Colvin
Emmett M. Compton
Davis Cone
Robert J. Connell
Robert W. Conrad
James S. Cooley
Lemuel D. Cooke
Francis T. Cooper, Jr.
Frank J. Coulter
Partee W. Crouch, Jr.
Robert B. Crowell
James H. Curran
Charles W. Cushman
Andreas R. Czerwonky
Peter V. Dabbieri
Charles A. Dancy, Jr.
James A. Dare
Edward L. Dashiell, Jr.
Robert H. Dasteel
Harry E. Davey, Jr.
Edmonds David
Landon L. Davis, Jr.
Warren J. Davis, Jr.
George E. Dawson
William S. Dawson
Donald C. Deane
William R. DeLoach, Jr
William Denton, Jr.
Vincent P. DePoix
Irving D. Dewey
John R. Dinsmore
John W. Dolan, Jr.
Andrew R. Drea
Richard J. Dressling
John B. Dudley
George C. Duncan
James M. Dunford
Ernest H. Dunlap, Jr.
William R. Dunne
Robert J. Duryea
Thomas R. Eddy
James H. Elsom
Robert K. Etnire
Richard T. Fahy
Eugene G. Fairfax
Frederic C. Fallon
William B. Fargo
Claude S. Farmer
John A. Fidel
Chester H. Fink
Arthur F. Fischer, Jr.
Ellis J. Fisher
John C. Fisher
Francis J. Fitzpatrick
Edward J. Foote
George W. Forbes, Jr.
Blake S. Forrest
Murray B. Frazee, Jr.
Donald Furlong
Saxe P. Gantz
Harold W. Gehman.
Lawrence R. Geis
William W. Gentry
Bernard J. Germershausen
George D. Ghesquiere
Edward I. Gibson
Paul W. Gill
Robert C. Gillette
James G. Glaes
Paul E. Glenn
Lee D. Goolsby
Richard K. Gould
Richard Gray
Howard J. Greene
Robert R. Green
John B. Guerry, Jr.
Robert A. Gulick, Jr.
Robert L. Gurnee
Ira S. Hardman, Jr.
Donald J. Hardy
Neil E. Harkleroad
Leroy E. Harris
Arthur G. Harrison
Charles W. Harrison, Jr.
James E. Hartung
Harry L. Harty, Jr.
Harry D. Helfrich, Jr.
Charles N. G. Hendrix
Eugene B. Henry, Jr.
Wayne Harkness II
Elmore F. Higgins, Jr.
Alfred H. Higgs
James M. Hill
Stanley E. Hindman
James M. Hingson
Gerald G. Hinman
DeVon M. Hizer
John D. P. Hodapp, Jr.
Arthur T. Hodges
Paul A. Holmberg
Alan J. Holmes
Charles Holovak
Valentine G. Holzapfel
Robert H. Hoolhorst
Frederic A. Hooper
Posey A. Hooper
Jack W. Hough
Willard Y. Howell
John B. Howland
Lester E. Hubbell
Joseph W. Hughes
Overton D. Hughlett
William C. Hushing
Kenneth B. Hysong
Charles A. Iarrobine
Glen Jacobsen
Benjamin C. Jarvis
Charles W. Jenkins
Luther R. Johnson
Charles H. Johnson, Jr.
Stephen L. Johnson
Dave Johnston, Jr.
James F. B. Johnston
Means Johnston, Jr.
John C. Jolly
Theron R. Jordan
John B. Kaye
Thomas D. Keegan
William J. Keim
Leonard Kenny
Stanley W. Kerkering
Frederic W. Kinsley
Loren H. Kiser
Fred W. Kittler
Raymond P. Kline
Elton L. Knapp
Herbert Kriloff
William E. Kuntz
Richard H. Lachman
Horace C. Laird, Jr.
William R. Laird, Jr.
Charles A. Lamborn
Robert V. Laney
Harold C. Lank
George J. Largess
Harvey L. Lasell
Clement T. Latimer
John C. Lawrence
Robert E. Lawrence
Leon G. Lehrer
Charles F. Leigh
James M. Leroy
Donald R. Levy
Orville O. Liebschner
Elbert C. Lindon
Joseph D. Linehan
Henry F. Lloyd
Ralph F. Locke
Paul E. Loustaunau
Chester Lovell
Marcus L. Lowe, Jr.
John R. Maclachlan
Brainard T. Macomber
Jacob J. Maechtlen, Jr.
William J. Manning
Lincoln Marcy
Robert L. Mastin
John C. Mathews
William B. Matney
James L. May
Leo J. Meads
Corwin G. Mendenhall, Jr.
Robert G. Merritt
Charles K. Miller
Harold C. Miller
Jim D. Miller
John F. Miller, Jr.
Walter B. Miller
Floyd E. Moan
Waller C. Moore, Jr.
John J. Munson
Thomas W. Murphy
James A. McAllister
Charles D. McCall
John R. McCants
John C. McCarthy
James W. McConnaughhay
Jesse W. McCoy
James W. McCrocklin
George T. McDaniel, Jr.
Richard S. McElroy, Jr.
Harry W. McElwain
Walter A. McGuinness
John A. McKeon
Charles D. Nace
Albert G. Neal
Dwight O. Ness
Gerald S. Norton
Marvin D. Norton, Jr.
Harvey R. Nylund
James C. Oldfield
Donald J. O'Meara
John T. T. O'Neill
Stephen C. O'Rourke
Daniel Osburg
Allyn B. Ostroski
Robert E. Paige
Roger W. Paine, Jr.
John E. Parks
Clyde H. Parmelee
DeWitt M. Patterson
Oliver H. Payne
John F. Pear
Clarence L. Pearson
Reuben N. Perley, Jr.
Frank C. Perry
Carl F. Pfeifer
Richard W. Phillips
Chester F. Pinkerton
William L. Poindexter
Lucien C. Powell, Jr.
Ivan D. Quillin
John F. Quinn, Jr.
Frederick M. Radel
Frank M. Ralston
James D. Ramage
John Ramee
Clay H. Raney
Ralph W. Rawson
Henry G. Reaves, Jr.
Edwin G. Reed, Jr.
Marion J. Reed
Paul R. Reed
Allen B. Register
John M. Reigart
James D. Reilly
John N. Renfro
Jonathan F. Rice
William P. Riesenberg
Frank H. Rile, Jr.
William M. Ringness
John B. Ritch, Jr.
James M. Robertson
Leslie S. Robinson
Louis H. Roddis, Jr.
George V. Rogers
Herbert F. Rommel, Jr.
Paul C. Rooney
Joseph C. Roper
Clayton Ross, Jr.
Eli B. Roth
Walter J. Rountree
Thomas J. Rudden, Jr.
William J. Ruhe
Frederick N. Russell
Edward F. Rye
Onofrio F. Salvia
Robert B. Satterford
Thomas F. Saunders, Jr.
William L. Savidge
William T. Sawyer
Russell J. Schmidt
Paul R. Schratz
Ernest F. Schreiter
Roland W. Schumann, Jr.
Ernest L. Schwab, Jr.
George W. Scott, Jr.
John P. Seifert
Edward H. Seiler, Jr.
Harry A. Seymour
Preston N. Shamer
George F. Sharp
John A. Sharpe, Jr.
William M. Shiflette
Gene T. Shirley
Norman S. Short
Peter Shumway
Theodore C. Siegmund
George C. Simmons, Jr.
George S. Simmons III
Eugene H. Simpson
Charles F. Skuzinski
Robert J. Slagle
Gordon W. Smith
James H. Smith, Jr.
Robert H. Smith
Louis P. Spear
John C. Spencer
Edwin O. Standish
Charles R. Stapler
Will P. Starnes
Robert R. Startzell
Egil T. Steen
Edward T. Steigelman
Ralph S. Stevens, Jr.
Walter K. Stow, Jr.
Albert R. Strow
Ronald F. Stultz
Irving J. Superfine
Francis E. Swiderski
Douglas N. Syverson
Frederick L. Taeusch
Edward A. Taylor
Charles S. Thomas, Jr.
Howard A. Thompson
William L. Thompson
Alfred J. Toulon, Jr.
Robert J. Trauger
Robert C. Truax
Frederick B. Tucker
Richard M. Tunnell
Marshall E. Turnbaugh
Theodore M. Ustick
Vadym V. Utgoff
William J. Valentine
Jacob J. Vandergrift, Jr.
Charles A. VanDusen, Jr.
Frank W. Vannoy
Lloyd R. Vasey
Stanley W. Vejtasa
Curtis F. Vossler
Robert F. Wadsworth
Alton L. C. Waldron
Lester S. Wall, Jr.
James B. Wallace
Marion C. Walley
Thomas J. Walker III
John R. Wallingford
Elmar S. Waring, Jr.
Rex W. Warner
David W. Watkins, Jr.
John C. Weatherwax
Herold J. Weiler, Jr.
John P. Weinel
Daniel K. Weitzenfeld
Francis M. Welch
Frederick Welden
Harold A. Wells
Wade C. Wells
Joseph M. West
John B. Williams, Jr.
Thomas C. Williamson
Wilbur S. Wills, Jr.
John V. Wilson
Gustav A. Wolf
Robert B. Wood
Wilson G. Wright III
Jack C. Young
Alphonse V. Zeis
Raphael A. Zoeller
John R. Zullinger

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Stephens H. Tolins

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Henry P. Adams
Louis J. Barta
Thomas H. Bell
Henry W. Brandow
Conrad T. Budny
William J. Bush
John D. Carson
Jerome Cherry
Charles M. Christensen
Preston R. Clark
Ralph W. Clark, Jr.
Jesse S. Claypoole, Jr.
William A. Cochran
Frederic W. Corle
Robert C. Dexter, Jr.
Edward T. Dobbyn, Jr.
William B. Durant, Jr.
Philip P. Finn
Allan J. Fisher
Phillip H. Fox
John M. Gore
Caesar M. Grassino
Francis B. Grubb
Charles B. Heck
Writner Hostetter
Harold H. Hunt
Nathaniel W. James III
Richard P. Jeffrey
Albert B. Johnson
Edward R. Joshua, Jr.
George A. Kelley, Jr.
Robert J. Kliese
Robert H. Kuppers
James L. Lambrecht
Robert G. Lavenson
John R. Lewis
Daniel F. Logan
Charles L. Loring
Lawrence Lovig, Jr.
Leslie T. Maiman
Samuel J. Major
George E. Moore II
Glen C. Moore
Crandall T. Nefzger
George W. Netts
Charles S. Osborne, Jr.
Thomas W. Ragland
Frank J. Roberts
Donald T. Rohde
Herman Spector
Eben M. Standish
Maynard G. Stokes
William L. A. Strawbridge
Wesley J. Stuessi
Harmon S. Tolbert
William G. Tonner, Jr.
William A. Twitchell
Harold L. Usher, Jr.
Howard N. Walling
James G. Walsh
Arthur L. Walters
Charles T. E. Warriner
Robert L. Watson
Kenneth R. Wheeler
Enos H. Willis
Earl W. Wood

The following-named officers for temporary appointement in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John M. Kleckner
John H. Shilling

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Millard H. Aubey	Albert C. Morris
William R. Boyer	Richard T. Pratt
Arthur B. Chilton, Jr.	Luther S. Reynolds
William M. Heaman	Paul E. Seufer

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Irvin R. Barker	Bill J. Harris
Edward V. Barth	Max W. Kleinman
Leo E. Brenning	Wendell J. Schwoerer
Robert F. Burnett	Robert H. Secrest
Angelo B. Costa	Norman B. Shipley
Wilbert M. Dierker	Cyrus D. Smith
Martin J. Gelb	John T. Sorensen
Samuel Goldhaber	

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Manila D. Barber	Rosalia Jorgenson
Mary L. Benner	Sylvia M. Koller
Mary F. Bosco	Ouida A. McCoy
Helen C. Cavin	Margarete A. Orr
Jessie E. Crump	Nellie M. Hayes
Winnie Gibson	Clyde B. Pennington
Ethel P. Himes	

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary appointment to the grade of commander subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Warren F. Anderson	Harry K. Leventen
Peter Bertelli	Edwin G. Moorhead
Arthur A. Charlson	Edgar R. Mumford
Charles O. Deaner	George N. Musser
Sterling T. Dibrell	Thomas W. McConville
Thomas B. Dupree	Walter F. McLallen, Jr.
Samuel D. I. Emerson	Earle F. Plank
Joseph L. Gadberry	James J. Robinson
Harvey F. Garrigues	Ellis Schiller
Robert W. Greene, Sr.	Howard B. Shaw, Jr.
Lawrence W. Harrell	Stewart L. Smith
Charles R. Hartnett	Martin E. Solotar
Henry H. Heine	Lloyd A. Straits
Ralph L. Hildebrand	Charles J. Swain, Jr.
Harry J. Huester	Ronald L. White
Vernon B. Johnson	Harold E. Wilcox
James F. Kennedy	Paul J. Williams
William S. Kimball	Linton R. Wilson
Bradner W. Lee, Jr.	Richard Winn

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Robert A. Donald, Jr.	David F. McKenney
Albert E. Edwards	Cleaveland F. Milair
Lyon H. Fowler	Adrian L. Muldoon
Kenneth J. Gustin	Leslie W. Parker
Chester R. Kimball	Lawrence P. Roney
Francis T. Lobbett	Jay F. Skipper
James P. McClelland	George A. Taylor

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Chaplain Corps of the Naval Reserve:

John T. McLaughlin
George W. Thompson

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Halbert Z. Baker

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Dental Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Forrest A. Barnes

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Mary E. Sims, Boothton, Ala., in place of A. N. Nabors, retired.

Lewis R. Nail, Calera, Ala., in place of H. E. Williams, resigned.

Jack Winfred Miller, Joppa, Ala., in place of B. R. Roberts, resigned.

Helen A. Pollard, Newbern, Ala., in place of M. D. True, deceased.

Seth Berry Stalcup, Phil Campbell, Ala., in place of A. C. Blacklidge, transferred.

William Britton, Spruce Pine, Ala., in place of W. W. Blacklidge, retired.

ALASKA

Ruth L. Nelson, Mount Edgecumbe, Alaska. Office established September 1, 1947.

Mary M. Hayes, Whittier, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

ARIZONA

Lee N. Clayton, Bullhead City, Ariz. Office established May 16, 1946.

Allan Baker, Clifton, Ariz., in place of G. C. Wright, removed.

Warren D. Judd, Fredonia, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Maudy M. Looney, Ganado, Ariz., in place of B. H. Goodman, resigned.

Ralph S. Spotts, Laveen, Ariz., in place of A. D. Cheatham, retired.

Lloyd K. Basteen, Oracle, Ariz., in place of T. N. Clark, resigned.

Glen G. Goodman, St. David, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Wallace E. Bryce, Safford, Ariz., in place of J. M. Owens, removed.

Frankie F. Tanner, Sedona, Ariz., in place of E. M. Schnebly, resigned.

Edith E. Barnhill, Window Rock, Ariz., in place of W. H. Daley, retired.

ARKANSAS

John W. Story, Griffithville, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leonard B. Hurley, Hector, Ark., in place of M. K. Churchill, retired.

Elza R. Tucker, Lowell, Ark., in place of C. E. Smith, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Paul K. Ihrig, Acton, Calif., in place of C. G. Rush, resigned.

Everett R. Stanford, Alhambra, Calif., in place of W. J. Beadle, removed.

Philip G. Hall, Alpine, Calif., in place of A. E. Simmons, resigned.

Ethel B. Beckman, Armona, Calif., in place of Bertie Poore, resigned.

Louis W. Pellegrini, Asti, Calif., in place of Enrico Prati, resigned.

Nora L. Passadori, Ballico, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edward Edwards, Bass Lake, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Harold W. Crandall, Belmont, Calif., in place of F. P. O'Brien, deceased.

Luther A. Dunlap, Berkeley, Calif., in place of F. M. Whiting, retired.

Orville A. Eddy, Blythe, Calif., in place of P. D. McIntyre, retired.

Joseph G. Koehler, Bonsall, Calif., in place of S. K. Morris, retired.

John Joseph Broderick, Burlingame, Calif., in place of J. V. Gaffey, resigned.

Myra E. Aten, Cabazon, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Ella Boyd, Calpella, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Della C. Newburn, Carlsbad, Calif., in place of A. D. Newburn, resigned.

Rosa M. Maupin, Castaic, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Albert C. Specht, China Lake, Calif. Office established January 16, 1948.

Buena L. Phillips, Chino, Calif., in place of E. G. Eckels, resigned.

Marjorie L. Woods, Citrus Heights, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Henry M. Brandenberger, Cornell, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Clarence G. McCarn, Covina, Calif., in place of C. C. Toland, resigned.

Helen M. Heitman, Crannell, Calif., in place of M. E. Stover, deceased.

Gladys M. Krug, Del Rosa, Calif., in place of H. J. Krug, deceased.

Forrest S. McNabb, Durham, Calif., in place of N. N. Ramos, resigned.

Mary V. N. Flick, Edison, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Evelyn S. Smith, East Nicolaus, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

James C. Wallace, Garden Grove, Calif., in place of Gladys Head, resigned.

Lawrence E. Watts, Half Moon Bay, Calif., in place of C. A. Cavalli, resigned.

Doris M. Alexander, Highland, Calif., in place of R. A. Ascot, resigned.

Walter J. Reynolds, Holtville, Calif., in place of G. L. Harris, resigned.

Norma C. Hollar, Hood, Calif., in place of L. K. Brown, retired.

Martin G. Murray, Huntington Beach, Calif., in place of J. E. Huston, retired.

Thelma W. Zitlau, Irvine, Calif., in place of L. E. Munger, resigned.

Thomas Soloman Dunning, Jacumba, Calif., in place of H. P. Haines, resigned.

Charles J. Shumaker, Jamul, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

James A. Elliott, Malibu, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Wilbern C. Kluck, Miranda, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edward L. Tompkins, Monolith, Calif., in place of A. R. White, resigned.

Andrew J. O'Sullivan, Monterey Park, Calif., in place of J. J. Britt, deceased.

Harry L. Fox, Norwalk, Calif., in place of L. L. Burke, retired.

Mae Edna Whitehead, Oakhurst, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Zelda A. Kunkle, Oak View, Calif. Office established Nov. 16, 1947.

John B. Heintz, Orland, Calif., in place of J. N. Tibessart, retired.

Kalidas Le Page, Pearblossom, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Minnie Tyler, Puente, Calif., in place of J. L. Hamilton, resigned.

Florence M. Raub, Ramona, Calif., in place of P. M. Shadel, resigned.

Kathryne E. Minnick, Red Mountain, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Blanche B. Denton, Represa, Calif., in place of Josephine Purcell, retired.

Katherine Spengler, Richardson Grove, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Leah M. Corporon, Riverbank, Calif., in place of C. D. Golvin, resigned.

George Perry, San Leandro, Calif., in place of M. E. Neish, resigned.

John O. Findlay, San Marcos, Calif., in place of S. L. Diaz, resigned.

Charles W. Gartrell, Santa Barbara, Calif., in place of R. T. Ambrose, resigned.

Lloyd H. Skiles, Springville, Calif., in place of D. M. Lyon, resigned.

Maxwell Carr Salladay, Terra Bella, Calif., in place of O. W. Holland, resigned.

Ables B. Dickinson, Tomales, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Gertrude R. Hellwig, Victor, Calif., in place of M. E. Zimmerman, resigned.

Robert S. Sleeth, Jr., Walteria, Calif., in place of M. A. Trippit, resigned.

Otto G. Niemann, Woodland, Calif., in place of E. I. Leake, retired.

Lyman C. Mason, Wrightwood, Calif., in place of G. E. Richardson, retired.

Hilda J. Hardesty, Yucca Valley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

COLORADO

Charles E. Morris, Jr., Canon City, Colo., in place of E. E. Graham, deceased.

Lela C. Keen, Cedaredge, Colo., in place of R. P. James, retired.

Earnest E. Sullivan, Craig, Colo., in place of L. W. Failing, resigned.

Albert A. Dwiggins, Evans, Colo., in place of R. E. Stocks, retired.

Wade Ernest Gore, Fruita, Colo., in place of M. E. Arbuckle, resigned.

Lou M. Rector, Glen Haven, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Florence M. Graham, Hillrose, Colo., in place of H. E. Hagler, resigned.

A. J. Anderson, Kim, Colo., in place of D. C. Smith, deceased.

Lucille Stewart, Louviers, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Wilber W. Carrothers, Monument, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William Graham Mills, Olathe, Colo., in place of H. C. Showalter, deceased.

Thomas W. Chambers, Pagosa Springs, Colo., in place of M. E. Harman, resigned.

Raymond R. Iacovetto, Phippsburg, Colo., in place of R. E. Schurman, resigned.

Charlie P. Stewart, Sedalia, Colo., in place of A. W. Manhart, retired.

Elizabeth A. Bartolo, Somerset, Colo., in place of Charlotte Johnson, resigned.

Timothy C. Devlin, Wray, Colo., in place of J. G. Evans, resigned.

Richard E. Shoup, Yampa, Colo., in place of M. S. Cole, resigned.

Paul L. Kohlmeier, Yuma, Colo., in place of O. E. Stallings, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Sadie G. Turshen, Amston, Conn., in place of C. J. Schmid, retired.

Austin M. Ackerman, Durham Center, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Domenic Sebben, East Canaan, Conn., in place of N. E. Stratton, retired.

Meta D. Neusse, Hanover, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lionel E. Boucher, Jewett City, Conn., in place of E. J. Jodoin, removed.

Vincent P. Kelley, Lebanon, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Angela E. Murphy, New Milford, Conn., in place of T. S. White, deceased.

Charles A. O'Connell, Niantic, Conn., in place of W. G. Barker, deceased.

Mehitable Baker, Oronoque, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

George L. Rockwell, Jr., Ridgefield, Conn., in place of J. L. Walker, deceased.

Edward J. Connors, Rockville, Conn., in place of S. L. Peizer, resigned.

Murial S. O'Neil, Taconic, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

James J. Morway, Thompson, Conn., in place of D. W. Sherry, Jr., deceased.

Robert C. Burrill, Wapping, Conn., in place of C. B. Snow, retired.

Rhea M. Brouillard, Wauregan, Conn., in place of M. P. Beauregard, resigned.

William K. Bell, West Redding, Conn., in place of J. B. Sanford, retired.

DELAWARE

Anna May Upright, Winterthur, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Grover C. Gregg, Jr., Yorklyn, Del., in place of E. J. Touhey, removed.

HAWAII

Shuji Seki, Honokohau, T. H., in place of D. T. Fleming, retired.

Josephine Makaiwi, Hoolehua, Hawaii. Office become Presidential July 1, 1948.

Eva Lindsey, Kamuela, T. H., in place of C. M. Keala, resigned.

Joseph M. Mihal, Kekaha, Hawaii, in place of Antone Fernandez, resigned.

Howard S. Green, Lanikai, T. H., in place of Francis Hughes, resigned.

Emil W. Balthazar, Makawao, T. H., in place of E. A. Willey, declined.

IDAHO

Henry W. Daven, Burley, Idaho, in place of William Schlick, removed.

Oliver R. Acheson, Craigmont, Idaho, in place of C. I. Bartlett, transferred.

Vance Joines, Emmett, Idaho, in place of C. G. Zimmerman, transferred.

Joseph Miles Flanigan, Grangeville, Idaho, in place of F. L. Shaffer, resigned.

George E. Johnson, Headquarters, Idaho, in place of D. E. Springer, resigned.

Nell G. Andrews, Leadore, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Letitia H. Erb, Lewiston, Idaho, in place of C. J. Breier, Jr., resigned.

J. D. Petty, Meridian, Idaho, in place of J. P. Cato, deceased.

Francis L. Mackey, Naples, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lillian Ruth Nail, Riggins, Idaho, in place of J. H. Clay, retired.

Samuel R. Walker, St. Maries, Idaho, in place of M. H. Moshinsky, resigned.

Horace Thales Leavitt, Shelley, Idaho, in place of W. H. Hanson, resigned.

John J. Delo, Soda Springs, Idaho, in place of H. W. Woodall, deceased.

James R. Fenwick, Sun Valley, Idaho. Office became Presidential January 1, 1947.

Wilford W. Frantz, Twin Falls, Idaho, in place of M. A. Stronk, retired.

Ostella A. Brown, Wilder, Idaho, in place of H. B. Jones, deceased.

ILLINOIS

James Kenneth Dolan, Albany, Ill., in place of C. E. Olds, retired.

Rollie N. Hammel, Alta, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John L. Baumunk, Bardolph, Ill., in place of E. E. Young, resigned.

Meredith L. Hull, Barry, Ill., in place of Floyd Wells, retired.

Ralph H. Watermann, Bartlett, Ill., in place of H. F. Mayer, deceased.

Agnes M. Coomes, Bristol, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Virgil J. Brown, Carbondale, Ill., in place of C. A. Etherton, resigned.

Robert E. Balk, Chadwick, Ill., in place of E. A. Cook, resigned.

Cecelia G. Missal, Chenoa, Ill., in place of J. E. Jontry, transferred.

Catherine M. Hulen, Coatsburg, Ill., in place of A. E. Shanholtzer, removed.

Charles H. Lawler, Cortland, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Viola T. Johnson, Danforth, Ill., in place of A. G. Eimen, transferred.

Alice Gisy, Dow, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Israel Victor Hill, Edinburg, Ill., in place of F. A. McCarty, transferred.

William P. Lipe, Elkville, Ill., in place of L. M. Robinson, resigned.

Ruby G. Forman, Elliott, Ill., in place of A. F. Hill, resigned.

Peter J. Roth, El Paso, Ill., in place of J. J. McGuire, resigned.

Robert E. Duncan, Eureka, Ill., in place of E. S. Sharp, resigned.

William H. Neece, Jr., Franklin, Ill., in place of G. E. Brown, retired.

Margery A. Howard, Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of C. E. Kelley, deceased.

Gerhard R. Bunting, Gifford, Ill., in place of P. D. Schenck, resigned.

Hugh R. Ganey, Gillespie, Ill., in place of E. L. Cameron, deceased.

Leo Pickrel, Gilson, Ill., in place of F. W. Nash, deceased.

William L. Smith, Golconda, Ill., in place of E. R. Randolph, deceased.

Louise Tevis, Goodfield, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Abraham F. Weece, Grand Chain, Ill., in place of Grace Reichert, transferred.

Andrew S. Fitzgerald, Greenview, Ill., in place of H. F. DuQuoin, resigned.

James H. Wilson, Highland, Ill., in place of A. H. Winter, deceased.

Hugh Fleming, Johnston City, Ill., in place of Michael Shannon, transferred.

Loretta Lanan, Kingston Mines, Ill., in place of Kathryn Kingsley, resigned.

Morris W. Dunn, Lacon, Ill., in place of P. H. McKeone, resigned.

Joseph D. Martin, Ladd, Ill., in place of Henry Dwyer, resigned.

Ned C. Dollinger, Lanark, Ill., in place of G. H. Wales, resigned.

Sidney M. Phillips, Lena, Ill., in place of G. A. Boeke, resigned.

Floyd Durst, Lincoln, Ill., in place of R. L. Davis, resigned.

James A. Krecek, Lyons, Ill., in place of J. W. Hruby, transferred.

Melvin R. Beckett, Macon, Ill., in place of H. C. Mowen, removed.

Daisy E. Miller, Mahomet, Ill., in place of G. A. Brown, resigned.

John W. Scamahorn, Maunie, Ill., in place of M. P. McCluskey, resigned.

William S. Shipley, Mazon, Ill., in place of A. O. Murray, resigned.

Charles L. Quindry, Mill Shoals, Ill., in place of S. V. Simpson, transferred.

Donald L. Besander, Mount Prospect, Ill., in place of L. E. Hodges, transferred.

Monroe Jones, New Holland, Ill., in place of P. H. Ryan, resigned.

John E. Nichols, Newton, Ill., in place of P. B. Laugel, deceased.

Jerry Volny, Jr., Northfield, Ill., in place of Elizabeth Romer, resigned.

Edwin A. Luczaj, Oakdale, Ill., in place of D. L. Rohde, Jr., transferred.

George A. Garrison, Pearl, Ill., in place of G. B. Garrison, resigned.

Merlyn M. Dirksen, Pecatonica, Ill., in place of C. M. Stevens, transferred.

Francis M. Guest, Reddick, Ill., in place of M. C. Guest, retired.

Edward Charles Henninger, Savanna, Ill., in place of J. R. Slater, resigned.

Edwin H. Criswell, Seaton, Ill., in place of R. S. Tary, deceased.

William G. Strode, Smithfield, Ill., in place of L. L. Manuel, resigned.

Mabel L. Reinert, South Elgin, Ill., in place of G. K. Martin, resigned.

William J. LeMar, Tallula, Ill., in place of P. E. Cogdal, retired.

Willis Hance McColly, Thornton, Ill., in place of T. P. Wadett, resigned.

Louis J. Dobrich, Toluca, Ill., in place of J. W. Foster, deceased.

Arnitz E. M. Watson, Tower Hill, Ill., in place of O. C. Maze, retired.

Terence J. Henry, Trenton, Ill., in place of J. H. Zitzmann, removed.

Daniel J. Hallissey, Venice, Ill., in place of Agnes Clifford, resigned.

Floyd H. Weihler, Viola, Ill., in place of Grove Harrison, deceased.

Robert E. Cline, West Union, Ill., in place of M. H. Prevo, resigned.

Cellia E. Skerbinek, Willow Springs, Ill., in place of J. V. Husch, resigned.

Lyle A. Thurman, Yates City, Ill., in place of F. T. Johnson, resigned.

INDIANA

Francis E. Sheller, Albany, Ind., in place of O. A. Saunder, deceased.

Paul L. Hayden, Butlerville, Ind., in place of Lawrence Callaway, resigned.

Harmon G. Carbiener, Bremen, Ind., in place of L. C. Leman, resigned.

Charles Peffley, Bridgeton, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Claude T. Linn, Camden, Ind., in place of E. M. Cripe, deceased.

Jay B. Williams, Colfax, Ind., in place of R. L. Jones, transferred.

Arthur B. Newman, Coatesville, Ind., in place of Frank Ellett, deceased.

Frederick M. Griffith, Dupont, Ind., in place of C. T. Custer, retired.

Malcolm E. Wade, Fillmore, Ind., in place of Madelyn Kelley, removed.

Charles D. Walts, Georgetown, Ind., in place of L. G. Tyler, transferred.

Edward G. Velk, Hanna, Ind., in place of M. M. Kneisley, resigned.

George J. Ress, Indianapolis, Ind., in place of Adolph Seidensticker, retired.

Charles Calvin Apple, McCordsville, Ind., in place of J. O. Chandler, retired.

Frederick J. O'Laughlin, New Carlisle, Ind., in place of G. B. Casaday, transferred.

Ernest B. Bower, New Washington, Ind., in place of E. B. Connor, resigned.

John A. Young, Osgood, Ind., in place of Peter Holzer, resigned.

William C. Drof, Petersburg, Ind., in place of E. H. Scales, resigned.

Gilbert L. Thomas, Richland, Ind., in place of J. H. Nunn, removed.

Ruby J. Butler, Straughn, Ind., in place of L. W. Butler, transferred.

Elbert S. Reinke, Santa Claus, Ind., in place of O. L. Philips, deceased.

George H. Heckman, Sr., Wadesville, Ind., in place of Louis Kolb, retired.

Levern C. Fortin, Whiting, Ind., in place of J. P. Sullivan, resigned.

IOWA

Daryl W. Pearson, Ainsworth, Iowa, in place of A. P. Miller, resigned.

Donald E. Castle, Alta, Iowa, in place of N. A. Christensen, removed.

Harold R. Rammelsberg, Atkins, Iowa, in place of George Lieb, deceased.

Joseph C. Brady, Belmond, Iowa, in place of C. N. Hildebrand, resigned.

Arlo W. Mugge, Calumet, Iowa, in place of E. P. Shade, resigned.

Peter H. F. Sievers, Charter Oak, Iowa, in place of B. G. Rammes, transferred.

Ronald V. Clark, Corwith, Iowa, in place of J. J. Bonnstetter, retired.

Ben H. Swegle, Corydon, Iowa, in place of W. S. Richard, retired.

Myrtle A. Hansen, Coulter, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Nellie M. Easton, Curlew, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Aloysius J. Dotzler, Defiance, Iowa, in place of E. G. Goeser, transferred.

Clarence A. Buss, Dumont, Iowa, in place of K. D. Finn, resigned.

Earle Eldon Cox, Gilmore City, Iowa, in place of L. L. Maher, transferred.

Anna M. Unruh, Gooselake, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Aloysius L. Jenn, Hills, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Dale W. Stover, Hospers, Iowa, in place of William Stover, resigned.

Timon Roetman, Hull, Iowa, in place of Henry Dahl, resigned.

Theodore E. Murphy, Ida Grove, Iowa, in place of H. E. Liming, resigned.

Robert E. Keller, Janesville, Iowa, in place of C. W. Taylor, deceased.

Otto O. Ostby, Kensett, Iowa, in place of F. H. Schulte, transferred.

Franklin G. Kluckhohn, Klemme, Iowa, in place of J. N. Day, retired.

Anna M. Gade, Low Moor, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Willie D. Davis, Mapleton, Iowa, in place of W. H. Thompson, deceased.

Eva F. Sult, Marble Rock, Iowa, in place of A. L. Staudt, resigned.

Carl William Hergert, Middle, Iowa, in place of Jacob Ruedy, retired.

Edith M. Wehrle, Middletown, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Nellie M. Delaney, Milford, Iowa, in place of N. C. Burk, resigned.

George R. Patterson, Jr., Minden, Iowa, in place of H. F. Patterson, resigned.

Gerald J. Carroll, Monona, Iowa, in place of P. H. English, resigned.

Don T. Pettibone, Moravia, Iowa, in place of J. D. Minnes, retired.

Clarence F. Wunnenberg, Morning Sun, Iowa, in place of Bert McKinley, retired.

Richard F. Babcock, Moville, Iowa, in place of P. M. Bartels, removed.

Bill R. Klinzman, New Sharon, Iowa, in place of N. B. Richards, transferred.

Claude C. McCarl, Newton, Iowa, in place of J. H. Gribben, resigned.

Ladislav C. Peckosh, Oxford Junction, Iowa, in place of F. H. Peckosh, retired.

Daniel P. McCarty, Parnell, Iowa, in place of Mollie Daley, retired.

Ida E. Heffernen, Peosta, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Marie C. McMillen, Quasqueton, Iowa, in place of G. B. Garrison, retired.

Carl H. Wright, Russell, Iowa, in place of G. J. Mettlin, transferred.

Albert H. Kuennen, St. Lucas, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

William A. Keenan, Schaller, Iowa, in place of U. G. Pedersen, resigned.

Chester L. Kious, Scranton, Iowa, in place of O. L. Goodrich, resigned.

Pearl R. Ormsby, Stockton, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mae H. DeBeer, Stout, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edwin F. Borcherding, Sumner, Iowa, in place of H. B. Heyer, resigned.

John L. Weatherhead, Tabor, Iowa, in place of G. P. Weatherhead, transferred.

Robert M. Klingman, Wadena, Iowa, in place of C. S. Flower, resigned.

Vivian B. Christen, Walford, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

George E. Brubaker, Winthrop, Iowa, in place of B. R. Shine, deceased.

KANSAS

James B. Robson, Abilene, Kans., in place of P. W. Heath, deceased.

Leo N. Williams, Baldwin City, Kans., in place of B. H. Stewart, resigned.

James D. Grisham, Basehor, Kans., in place of E. E. Eberth, resigned.

Earl W. Wittmer, Bern, Kans., in place of I. R. Cordill, transferred.

LaVerne P. Marks, Bluff City, Kans., in place of T. L. Sturdevant, retired.

Gordon L. Smith, Bucklin, Kans., in place of C. H. Johnson, transferred.

Wilton D. Mathews, Centerville, Kans., in place of K. L. Kincheloe, transferred.

Joseph G. Donahoe, Clyde, Kans., in place of C. F. Danielson, resigned.

Helen M. Erickson, Courtland, Kans., in place of O. E. McMullen, transferred.

Paul T. Welter, Dresden, Kans., in place of B. W. Wernette, retired.

J. L. Ketchum, Elkhart, Kans., in place of V. V. McClung, resigned.

Esther E. Weiss, Fort Dodge, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Albert L. Davis, Glen Elder, Kans., in place of J. R. Neifert, resigned.

Robert K. Baird, Hunter, Kans., in place of R. M. Rees, transferred.

Edna M. Kortz, Ingalls, Kans., in place of C. B. Barton, deceased.

Elmer Dale Thompson, Isabel, Kans., in place of R. E. Pierson, resigned.

Harold Jay Keazer, Marion, Kans., in place of A. T. Campbell, deceased.

Clay W. Ellis, Mound City., Kans., in place of O. J. Strong, resigned.

Arthur E. Schafer, Norton, Kans., in place of M. M. Browne, resigned.

William E. Berry, Offerle, Kans., in place of Carl Eickholt, resigned.

Carrie U. Kinnett, Ozawkie, Kans., in place of A. D. Quiett, resigned.

John Henry Anderson, Ramona, Kans., in place of N. S. Applegate, transferred.

Forest H. Olsen, Severy, Kans., in place of C. J. Hart, resigned.

Ruby M. Smith, Stark, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lucile Foley, Wathena, Kans., in place of M. J. Meidinger, resigned.

Eula F. Arnspiger, Wellington, Kans., in place of A. A. Belsley, retired.

KENTUCKY

Aubrey E. Chesnut, Jr., Barbourville, Ky., in place of G. W. Tye, retired.

Francis L. Cecil, Bardstown, Ky., in place of T. A. Spalding, retired.

Addy M. Boyd, Betsey Layne, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

David Odus McDowell, Bonnieville, Ky., in place of Gertrude Stuteville, retired.

Fieldon Woosley, Caneyville, Ky., in place of Roy Willis, removed.

Sylvia H. Newman, Hi Hat, Ky., in place of A. O. Stephens, resigned.

Vernon Hall, McDowell, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mary Celeste McCue, Maple Mount, Ky., in place of Basil Pike, deceased.

Charles S. Johnson, Masonic Home, Ky., in place of J. C. Morris, resigned.

William C. Broadwater, Middlesboro, Ky., in place of P. T. Colgan, retired.

Belva C. B. Chamberlain, North Middletown, Ky., in place of B. Bates, resigned.

Park L. Taylor, Pathfork, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

William Grady Conley, Salyersville, Ky., in place of J. W. Higgins, resigned.

Herman H. Clark, Stamping Ground, Ky., in place of E. T. Breen, transferred.

Gilmore Blair, Waynesburg, Ky., in place of Leonard Horton, resigned.

Haskell Hall, Weeksbury, Ky., in place of R. M. Chafin, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Mary S. Hymel, Convent, La., in place of A. B. Subra, removed.

Elizabeth H. Landry, Grand Isle, La., in place of J. A. Ludwig, transferred.

MAINE

Albert D. Lacasse, Berwick, Maine, in place of W. E. Hurd, resigned.

Stanley Gordon Farrar, Bryant Pond, Maine, in place of L. M. Rowe, resigned.

William John Furlong, Eagle Lake, Maine, in place of E. S. Dow, resigned.

Ernest G. Labbee, Fort Kent, Maine, in place of Irenee Cyr, retired.

Raymond W. Fish, Hallowell, Maine, in place of W. H. Albee, deceased.

Lynne W. Greene, Hartland, Maine, in place of J. D. Randlett, resigned.

Ellis Franklin Smith, Jonesboro, Maine, in place of D. C. Bridgham, declined.

Cyril F. Hopper, Lincolnville, Maine, in place of H. H. Hurd, retired.

Mildred M. Miller, North Edgecomb, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Byron R. Adams, Ogunquit, Maine, in place of F. R. Brewster, retired.

Kenneth T. Pinkham, Southport, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

MARYLAND

Margaret W. Conroy, Barton, Md., in place of P. E. Conroy, resigned.

Joseph Edward Walter, Cambridge, Md., in place of T. B. T. Radcliffe, retired.

William E. Roe 3d, Centerville, Md., in place of F. E. Thomas, transferred.

Orem A. Gardner, Chester, Md., in place of S. A. Sewell, resigned.

Harry C. Coleman, Jr., Chestertown, Md., in place of J. D. Hadaway, resigned.

Walter B. Mills, Clear Spring, Md., in place of J. L. Downs, transferred.

James O. C. Shank, College Park, Md., in place of M. T. Johnson, retired.

Dale N. Broadwater, Cresaptown, Md., in place of K. L. Toohey, resigned.

Herbert S. Hyatt, Damascus, Md., in place of J. W. Hager, retired.

Charles E. Simpkins, Ellerslie, Md., in place of B. J. Porter, deceased.

Thomas R. Freeman, Greenbelt, Md., in place of G. W. Bryant, deceased.

Emma P. Jones, Henderson, Md. Office became Presidential October 1, 1948.

Louise C. Messick, Lexington Park, Md., in place of B. F. Aud, retired.

Mabel L. Carter, Lime Kiln, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Nettie M. Ford, Lothian, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Sadie E. Raley, Saint Inigoes, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Donald J. Gardner, State Sanatorium, Md., in place of V. F. Cullen, retired.

Earl Kennard Jones, Still Pond, Md., in place of W. H. Davis, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Howard F. Davis, Bedford, Mass., in place of J. E. Mansfield, deceased.

Horace D. Moore, Boxford, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Cornelius T. O'Neil, Chicopee, Mass., in place of J. F. Kennedy, deceased.

John F. Colbert, Dedham, Mass., in place of J. R. Delaney, retired.

Fred J. Maher, Dennis, Mass., in place of C. L. Goodspeed, retired.

Edith M. B. Formhals, Erving, Mass., in place of A. J. Formhals, retired.

Arthur E. Sherman, Lanesboro, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Paul Callahan, Marshfield, Mass., in place of A. S. Barstow, retired.

Elizabeth Agnes Murray, Mill River, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lewis H. Wood, Mount Hermon, Mass., in place of C. D. Streeter, retired.

Joseph Elliott, North Egremont, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Charles G. Starratt, Ocean Bluff, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John T. McManus, Otis, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Martin J. McDonagh, Plympton, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Daniel E. Prado, Raynham Center, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Maurice D. Bessom, South Orleans, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Samuel Warren Forrest, Topsfield, Mass., in place of J. R. Walsh, removed.

Irving I. Peltonen, West Barnstable, Mass., in place of S. H. Jones, retired.

Leo J. Connell, Westford, Mass., in place of J. H. Fletcher, retired.

Pearl K. Gibbs, West Wareham, Mass., in place of E. F. Peck, retired.

Alexander B. Chase, West Yarmouth, Mass., in place of L. L. Lewis, retired.

Helen D. Rogers, White Horse Beach, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

MICHIGAN

Grace V. Hamilton, Alger, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

F. Willard Kime, Bangor, Mich., in place of Nora Donovan, resigned.

Lucille Ledger, Belding, Mich., in place of L. E. Ledger, deceased.

Raymond F. Michalski, Biteley, Mich., in place of C. F. Greenlease, retired.

Wayne B. Cassada, Breedsville, Mich., in place of H. H. Sibole, retired.

Edwin T. Stone, Burr Oak, Mich., in place of T. R. Bradford, retired.

James W. Quinn, Caseville, Mich., in place of Sadie Curran, retired.

Louis B. Schimmel, Center Line, Mich., in place of Edward Kott, transferred.

Howard E. C. Rogers, Charlotte, Mich., in place of Samuel Robinson, deceased.

Howard K. Snook, Colon, Mich., in place of S. R. Wattles, transferred.

Orville Fader, Jr., Columbiaville, Mich., in place of G. T. Deline, retired.

Eseler J. Hanna, Custer, Mich., in place of S. G. Howard, retired.

George M. Jacoby, Deford, Mich., in place of C. I. Lewis, retired.

George A. Stahl, Dowagiac, Mich., in place of J. K. Torrey, resigned.

Ottis O. Gardner, Edwardsburg, Mich., in place of C. G. Smith, resigned.

Signe F. Kangas, Ewen, Mich., in place of J. A. Campbell, resigned.

Effa L. Knepp, Fairview, Mich., in place of R. H. Kolb, deceased.

Mary M. Hunter, Gagetown, Mich., in place of T. C. Hunter, resigned.

Laura A. Wauchek, Gobles, Mich., in place of E. S. Treend, resigned.

Jacob Louwenaar, Grandville, Mich., in place of P. J. Debri, removed.

O. William Tornquist, Harbert, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Winifred M. Fanning, Harrison, Mich., in place of C. C. Brown, resigned.

Walter K. Peters, Houghton Lake, Mich., in place of N. B. McIntosh, retired.

Gerald T. Hughes, Howell, Mich., in place of L. E. Fay, transferred.

Alfred H. Thompson, Hubbard Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John R. Magney, Ionia, Mich., in place of A. A. Baxter, resigned.

Duane M. Gray, Lake Odessa, Mich., in place of L. T. Gilson, resigned.

Paul A. Walkup, Litchfield, Mich., in place of H. W. Denham, retired.

George Albert Hale, Lowell, Mich., in place of F. J. Hosley, resigned.

Henry A. Davis, Maple City, Mich., in place of B. L. Jankowski, transferred.

Earle R. Thompson, Montague, Mich., in place of G. D. Mason, retired.

Harold T. Haas, New Hudson, Mich., in place of J. P. Shear, deceased.

Harold W. Sweet, North Street, Mich., in place of R. F. Allen, resigned.

Robert H. Rainey, Onsted, Mich., in place of B. A. Onsted, resigned.

Albert P. Verderbar, Oshtemo, Mich., in place of E. M. Clapp, deceased.

Claude F. Julian, Osseo, Mich., in place of F. E. Maloney, transferred.

Mary E. Harrington, Painesdale, Mich., in place of J. J. Harrington, deceased.

Calvert John Winters, Perry, Mich., in place of Morton Rann, deceased.

Alexander W. Worden, Petoskey, Mich., in place of R. D. Tripp, retired.

Violet M. Whisler, Portage, Mich., in place of Jacob Dykstra, retired.

Clifford Bates, Jr., Sebewaing, Mich., in place of F. J. Lange, resigned.

Alexander H. Shaw, South Lyon, Mich., in place of J. B. Comiskey, resigned.

Elmer E. Lehman, Stockbridge, Mich., in place of S. E. Pinckney, transferred.

Edward Thompson, Sunfield, Mich., in place of A. M. Stinchcomb, resigned.

Schuyler D. Wade, Swartz Creek, Mich., in place of A. M. Lewis, resigned.

Sherwood E. Shaver, Troy, Mich., in place of J. S. Davis, resigned.

Robert S. Mason, Waldron, Mich., in place of M. E. Wilson, resigned.

J. C. Hummel, Webberville, Mich., in place of F. R. White, transferred.

Robert J. Trierweiler, Westphalia, Mich., in place of A. L. Martin, retired.

Donald Basford, White Cloud, Mich., in place of J. F. Lyons, removed.

Orley R. Frank, White Pigeon, Mich., in place of W. H. Stickel, resigned.

Frances Sikorski, Whittaker, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Norma E. Sifton, Woodland, Mich., in place of L. G. C. Finefrock, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Leo C. Roerig, Adrian, Minn., in place of T. J. Murphy, deceased.

Marshall E. Gibson, Beaver Creek, Minn., in place of H. M. Eleeson, resigned.

William G. Swanson, Benson, Minn., in place of J. C. McGowan, resigned.

Melvin J. Peterson, Big Falls, Minn., in place of A. R. Dickson, resigned.

Alton L. Nelson, Chokio, Minn., in place of Mae Kirwin, retired.

George W. Keller, Jr., Climax, Minn., in place of E. K. Bakke, resigned.

Beatrice V. Martinson, Conger, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lyle A. Mattke, Danube, Minn., in place of P. E. Kopacek, deceased.

Fred E. Colberg, Dassel, Minn., in place of D. E. Murphy, retired.

Charles F. LaCroix, Deer River, Minn., in place of H. J. Peck, retired.

Arnold F. Bolluyt, Edgerton, Minn., in place of H. T. Cate, transferred.

Ward A. Olson, Fosston, Minn., in place of M. S. Hillestad, resigned.

Paul P. Wade, Frazee, Minn., in place of J. J. Daly, retired.

Harland E. Estensen, Hancock, Minn., in place of L. C. Blackmun, deceased.

Kenneth R. Busch, Hardwick, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James H. Rustad, Hendrum, Minn., in place of E. A. Marsden, retired.

Paul J. Kochaver, Hibbing, Minn., in place of M. T. Haley, deceased.

Frank J. Klabechek, Iron, Minn., in place of Emanuel Moline, retired.

Dwight M. Curo, Jenkins, Minn., in place of D. E. Abbott, resigned.

Lester V. Borneman, Karlstad, Minn., in place of S. C. Olson, resigned.

Leo C. Locken, Lake Bronson, Minn., in place of Alfred Erickson, deceased.

Gladys M. Holmberg, Lawler, Minn., in place of M. H. Sawyer, resigned.

George H. Otterson, McGrath, Minn., in place of E. J. Garrity, resigned.

Norman A. Moe, Madison, Minn., in place of J. G. Bauer, deceased.

Thomas E. McGowan, Millville, Minn., in place of M. H. Wadley, deceased.

Charles J. Tomasek, Milroy, Minn., in place of F. L. Dolan, transferred.

Margaret J. Bjork, Minnetonka Beach, Minn., in place of Clarence Huntsberger, resigned.

Emil M. Paulson, Nielsville, Minn., in place of S. J. Bakke, resigned.

Kenneth M. Haaven, Plummer, Minn., in place of F. J. Mack, resigned.

Lottie M. Just, Rapidan, Minn., in place of O. C. Kunkel, retired.

Esther B. Pound, Remer, Minn., in place of R. E. Wittwer, resigned.

Andrew J. Weinzierl, Jr., Saint Bonifacius, Minn., in place of F. B. Klein, retired.

Robert P. Fritzke, Saint Clair, Minn., in place of M. E. Rohrer, resigned.

Fred W. Lange, Sargeant, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Myron G. Sidlo, Sebeka, Minn., in place of W. R. Kleven, deceased.

Gene A. Landwehr, Sedan, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Ernest O. Ellingson, Spring Grove, Minn., in place of A. R. Krogh, removed.

Cecelia W. Hoagland, Tofte, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Floyd J. Lepper, Verndale, Minn., in place of M. A. Bradford, retired.

Kenneth Y. Koetke, Walters, Minn., in place of O. H. Koetke, retired.

Andrew J. Johnson, Wolf Lake, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

MISSOURI

Richard J. Burger, Billings, Mo., in place of A. L. Dreier, transferred.

Winifred M. Hunter, Bowling Green, Mo., in place of C. O. Pool, removed.

Robley H. Hogue, Sr., Bragg City, Mo., in place of R. H. Hogue, Jr., transferred.

Roy Junior Haley, Browning, Mo., in place of J. D. Burwell, deceased.

Louis A. Jones, Cabool, Mo., in place of O. D. Kirkman, removed.

Harry M. Groves, Cameron, Mo., in place of C. M. Murray, deceased.

Edward C. Allen, Conception Junction, Mo., in place of O. R. Proctor, resigned.

William M. Riley, Corder, Mo., in place of B. L. See, resigned.

Andrew L. Schatz, Ellisville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Daphne D. Howerton, Elmer, Mo., in place of W. D. Dale, deceased.

Max L. Newkirk, Everton, Mo., in place of L. A. Newkirk, deceased.

Jesse V. Moore, Forsyth, Mo., in place of Marietta Boswell, deceased.

Walter R. Cumings, Grant City, Mo., in place of R. R. Kier, removed.

Vivian R. Thornhill, Gray Summit, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert G. Simpson, Herculaneum, Mo., in place of G. S. Manning, resigned.

Wilma Mae Posson, Ionia, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Cynthia M. Scheperle, Lohman, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Neal R. Dawson, Maysville, Mo., in place of J. Y. Glasscock, resigned.

Roy Southern, Newburg, Mo., in place of W. E. Duncan, retired.

Goldie D. Pence, Osceola, Mo., in place of E. H. Bond, transferred.

Robert M. Kirkpatrick, Prairie Home, Mo., in place of F. L. Schilb, retired.

Harold W. Harter, Purdy, Mo., in place of W. I. McDougall, transferred.

Nelson J. Holt, Reeds Spring, Mo., in place of V. H. Gracey, deceased.

Edgar E. McMullin, Rivermines, Mo., in place of M. E. B. Black, retired.

Stuart G. Greene, Sparta, Mo., in place of G. H. Rozell, transferred.

Joe M. Bilbrey, Summersville, Mo., in place of E. T. Craig, transferred.

MONTANA

Grace V. Fenlon, Belfry, Mont., in place of O. L. Henry, retired.

Mildred H. Johnson, Fairview, Mont., in place of W. L. Thompson, transferred.

Robert J. Culbertson, Fort Benton, Mont., in place of A. P. Bartley, resigned.

Bernard G. Clemo, Geraldine, Mont., in place of W. C. MacCallum, resigned.

James J. Grogan, Grassrange, Mont., in place of O. M. Griffith, resigned.

Myrtle M. Barta, Lavina, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Clarence D. Tichenor, Opheim, Mont., in place of Ben Wholf, deceased.

Jennie E. Oliver, Park City, Mont., in place of G. H. Fry, retired.

Rollin N. Baggenstoss, Power, Mont., in place of Keith Hane, resigned.

Mildred B. Ramsbacher, Richland, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Bertha M. Sullivan, Seeley Lake, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Howard F. Lemm, Twin Bridges, Mont., in place of L. D. Knight, retired.

James H. Lindsay, Warmsprings, Mont., in place of E. E. Dickerson, resigned.

Orris M. Anderson, Westby, Mont., in place of T. F. Holst, resigned.

Mary F. DeBree, Willow Creek, Mont., in place of A. K. Bradbury, deceased.

Minnie E. Jacobson, Wolf Creek, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

NEBRASKA

Alvin L. Daily, Anselmo, Nebr., in place of P. F. Leonard, deceased.

Paul C. Geis, Beaver Crossing, Nebr., in place of L. G. Gake, resigned.

Jesse U. Malick, Bloomington, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dale W. Jones, Byron, Nebr., in place of O. E. Swartz, transferred.

Donald C. McGill, Center, Nebr., in place of J. F. McGill, retired.

Donald B. Douglas, Clarks, Nebr., in place of G. L. Jordan, resigned.

Gustav D. Maline, Cozad, Nebr., in place of H. G. Andersen, transferred.

Mary M. Mutchie, Eddyville, Nebr., in place of L. R. Conroy, transferred.

Edward D. Booth, Ericson, Nebr., in place of E. M. Zuhlke, resigned.

Arthur R. Montgomery, Eustis, Nebr., in place of J. M. Timmons, transferred.

Frank M. Leibee, Exeter, Nebr., in place of Frank Ainsworth, deceased.

Angus K. Halcomb, Filley, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edna M. Suing, Fordyce, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Fred H. Walters, Gering, Nebr., in place of R. E. Sheffer, deceased.

Anna Hansen, Goehner, Nebr. Office become Presidential July 1, 1948.

Kenneth C. Pedersen, Hardy, Nebr., in place of G. B. McDowell, resigned.

Carl Kruse, Hildreth, Nebr., in place of C. E. Lantz, resigned.

Carroll C. Colbert, Imperial, Nebr., in place of C. L. Bonner, removed.

Rex E. Scott, McCook, Nebr., in place of R. B. Somerville, transferred.

Donald E. Wilsey, Milford, Nebr., in place of Herman Stahly, resigned.

Margaret L. Brendel, Murray, Nebr., in place of C. D. Spangler, resigned.

Lawrence O. Wohleb, Naponee, Nebr., in place of M. R. Hale, resigned.

Eileen V. Anderson, Newport, Nebr., in place of H. G. Butler, transferred.

Vernon J. Christ, Plymouth, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Amanda H. Banning, Union, Nebr., in place of D. W. Karnopp, resigned.

Paul Richard Geiger, Utica, Nebr., in place of Clyd Calder, transferred.

Edwin B. Gustafson, Wakefield, Nebr., in place of Eric Fredrickson, deceased.

Muriel L. Holley, Waverly, Nebr., in place of M. M. Holley, deceased.

NEVADA

Vera L. Wood, Crystal Bay, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Deloris A. Graham, Davis Dam, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1 1947.

Darrell G. Hooper, Ely, Nev., in place of D. S. Shaver, resigned.

Sue Smith, Fernley, Nev., in place of A. B. Jackson, resigned.

Dixie G. Bonham, Lovelock, Nev., in place of A. L. Gottschalk, resigned.

Elizabeth M. Pruitt, Montello, Nev., in place of J. E. Whipple, resigned.

Katie Reilly, Sparks, Nev., in place of G. E. Huyck, resigned.

Edward R. Slavin, Tonopah, Nev., in place of R. H. Burdick, retired.

Altha R. Augustus, Tungsten, Nev., in place of W. D. Daoust, resigned.

James W. Kinney, Winnemucca, Nev., in place of H. E. Haviland, resigned.

Gloria B. Wylie, Zephyr Cove, Nev., in place of C. F. Wylie, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

William L. Wright, Bretton Woods, N. H., in place of J. P. Wright, deceased.

Mertie L. McAllister, Center Barnstead, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Roger P. Clark, Francestown, N. H., in place of C. F. Clark, deceased.

Russell A. Rolston, Greenland, N. H., in place of Irving Rolston, retired.

Dennis Paul St. Germain, Hooksett, N. H., in place of Georgia DuDevoir, deceased.

Roger Louis Boucher, Hudson, N. H., in place of P. A. Richard, transferred.

Frank C. Blanchard, Mont Vernon, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Oliver E. Andrews, New Boston, N. H., in place of B. H. Dodge, retired.

Marion J. Atwood, Pelham, N. H., in place of H. H. Atwood, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Theodore S. Cawley, Asbury, N. J., in place of H. M. Riddle, Jr., resigned.

Herbert W. Posten, Atlantic Highlands, N. J., in place of J. R. Snedeker, resigned.

Margaret E. Erny, Beach Haven Terrace, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Victoria E. Wise, Blackwood Terrace, N. J., in place of Frances McLaughlin, resigned.

William M. Ritchie, Jr., Boonton, N. J., in place of J. P. Carey, retired.

Martin Luther Dunn, Bordentown, N. J., in place of J. D. Magee, deceased.

Elmer S. Kletzing, Jr., Bridgeport, N. J., in place of A. C. Goff, retired.

Frank A. Caracciolo, Cliffwood, N. J., in place of T. H. Ryan, Jr., deceased.

Barbara A. Grosskreuz, Crosswicks, N. J., in place of G. V. Willards, resigned.

Verna B. Brader, Delaware, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Helen Steele Price, Eatontown, N. J., in place of F. B. Price, resigned.

Grace K. Harrison, Edgewater Park, N. J., in place of F. N. Watson, retired.

Mary L. Callaghan, Essex Falls, N. J., in place of Elizabeth MacBrair, retired.

Roderick A. MacKenzie, Jr., Flanders, N. J., in place of H. H. King, transferred.

Marie Saulter, Flatbrookville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lillian M. McIntyre, Gibbsboro, N. J., in place of E. M. McIntyre, deceased.

John Calvin Semler, Haddonfield, N. J., in place of B. S. Irving, deceased.

Marion C. Murphy, Hamilton Square, N. J., in place of L. A. Cubberley, resigned.

Barbara Wissing, Haworth, N. J., in place of M. A. Mahony, resigned.

Raymond D. Caufield, Hudson Heights, N. J., in place of F. G. Leiser, removed.

Anthony C. Collura, Jamesburg, N. J., in place of Joseph Corse, resigned.

John Frank Bird, Kenvil, N. J., in place of J. V. Lynch, deceased.

Evelyn J. McGann, Laurelton, N. J. Office made Presidential July 1, 1948.

Martin Gerard Kennedy, Locust, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Clarence Frone, Long Valley, N. J., in place of J. D. Bunn, deceased.

Walter F. Janusz, Manville, N. J., in place of P. J. Whelan, retired.

Owen Vincent McNany, Maplewood, N. J. Office established November 1, 1947.

Roland P. Buccialia, Marlton, N. J., in place of E. J. Wagner, resigned.

Charles J. Hasemann, Matawan, N. J., in place of R. C. Devlin, resigned.

John William Comiskey, Menlo Park, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lillian F. Slover, Morganville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Marie A. Rossiter, National Park, N. J., in place of R. T. Lentz, retired.

Owen F. Moore, New Egypt, N. J., in place of L. F. Nash, deceased.

Anna Parcell, North Branch, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Rhoda B. Downam, Ocean View, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Thomas F. Hardiman, Oxford, N. J., in place of J. J. Odsted, deceased.

Benjamin L. Card, Peapack, N. J., in place of R. F. Ballentine, resigned.

Vincent J. McCall, Ramsey, N. J., in place of L. P. Eichorn, deceased.

Paul F. Shedoff, Salem, N. J., in place of J. S. Sickler. Incumbent's commission expired June 15, 1947.

Charles L. Skinner, Schooleys Mountain, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Harold Wilson, Sussex, N. J., in place of Lebbeus Potter, retired.

Samuel B. Pierce, Toms River, N. J., in place of C. F. Elwell, removed.

Jule A. Douglass, Union, N. J., in place of I. D. Harris, deceased.

Pearl O. Bonnell, Waretown, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Maynard C. Rosenfeld, Woodbine, N. J., in place of C. K. Spindel, resigned.

Mary A. Kiely, West Norwood, N. J., in place of M. F. Kiely, deceased.

NEW YORK

Nellie C. Van Orden, Acra, N. Y., in place of Marian Chadderdon, retired.

Glenn O. Robinson, Adams, N. Y., in place of J. W. Cain, retired.

William T. Burnash, Adams Center, N. Y., in place of Harry Averill, retired.

Charles M. Soplop, Allegany, N. Y., in place of J. T. Norton, retired.

Antoinette Rieger, Amawalk, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Joseph V. Mahony, Baldwin, N. Y., in place of E. T. Morrissey, resigned.

Vincent R. Callahan, Batavia, N. Y., in place of L. J. Burns, retired.

Guy S. Castrilli, Bath, N. Y., in place of Walter Longwell, resigned.

Edna M. Davis, Bernards Bay, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Martin H. Crippen, Bible School Park, N. Y., in place of J. R. Clements, deceased.

Thomas W. Ryan, Binghamton, N. Y., in place of C. W. Craig, retired.

Margaret A. Fox, Bridgeport, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John E. Bell, Bullville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John F. Pappas, Buskirk, N. Y., in place of C. E. Moston, resigned.

Lloyd P. Jones, Chenango Forks, N. Y., in place of H. N. Prentice, retired.

Helen Bennett, Chichester, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John M. Bowman, Clinton Corners, N. Y., in place of O. D. Robinson, resigned.

Elizabeth A. Otto, Cornwall Landing, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Arthur L. Rennie, Cornwallville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Leo C. Woodward, De Kalb Junction, N. Y., in place of G. F. Green, deceased.

William Joseph Duvelow, Deansboro, N. Y., in place of N. R. McNamara, resigned.

Raymond L. Liddington, Dryden, N. Y., in place of V. C. Moore, deceased.

Laurence S. Strayline, Dundee, N. Y., in place of L. M. Sullivan, resigned.

Daniel P. Scannell, Dunkirk, N. Y., in place of W. L. Koch, resigned.

Seth E. Morgan, Earlville, N. Y., in place of C. I. Burch, deceased.

Henri F. Cormier, East Norwich, N. Y., in place of P. L. Eschrich, deceased.

Leola M. Feldman, Eddyville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

James E. Gilleran, Ellenville, N. Y., in place of T. R. McDowell, resigned.

Daniel H. Yacobucci, Elma, N. Y., in place of E. J. Hotwes, resigned.

Charles W. Morgan, Fosterdale, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Frank E. Miller, Friendship, N. Y., in place of J. V. Kelly, removed.

Earl T. Martin, Gabriels, N. Y., in place of M. V. Desmond, resigned.

Salvator M. Dahlia, Garrison, N. Y., in place of A. H. Walsh, resigned.

Lyman R. Wood, Gorham, N. Y., in place of Margaret Carroll, resigned.

Mason H. Hollenbeck, Greene, N. Y., in place of W. B. Jaynes, resigned.

Edwin A. Spencer, Hannacroix, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Charlotte R. Sisson, Holcomb, N. Y., in place of H. C. O'Neill, transferred.

Walter E. Pinski, Holland, N. Y., in place of J. E. Savage, retired.

Thomas P. Burns, Homer, N. Y., in place of K. C. Newton, resigned.

Wallace H. Sykes, Hubbardsville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Fred Churchill, Hughsonville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Harriet E. Space, Huguenot, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Agnes M. Barbuscia, Island Park, N. Y., in place of T. V. O'Connell, retired.

Vincent F. Briggs, Jordanville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Francis P. Russell, Keene, N. Y., in place of M. A. Russell, resigned.

Noel E. Harding, Lodi, N. Y., in place of G. B. Nivison, removed.

Walter James Finnegan, Madrid, N. Y., in place of H. F. McCall, retired.

James J. Maines, Malden-on-Hudson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Velma G. Banner, Maryland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Kenneth E. Hardenburg, Mayville, N. Y., in place of M. S. Smith, deceased.

Ruth C. Tuttle, McConnellsville, N. Y., in place of G. L. Harden, resigned.

Wilson Sherman, McDonough, N. Y., in place of L. D. Tucker, deceased.

David M. Welch, Mechanicville, N. Y., in place of E. M. Hickey, deceased.

Matthew A. Jannelli, Milton, N. Y., in place of M. F. Conroy, deceased.

William Murtagh, Mongaup Valley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Benjamin S. Ketcham, Mountainville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Roland H. Tonnesen, Mount Marion, N. Y., in place of A. M. Bevier, resigned.

Lorin M. Albrecht, Mount Upton, N. Y., in place of C. B. Isbell, retired.

Joseph P. Hetzler, Mount Vision, N. Y., in place of M. B. Engelmann, resigned.

Lyle A. Simser, Natural Bridge, N. Y., in place of M. M. Rice, deceased.

Edward O. Bodge, Nelsonville, N. Y., in place of Osborn Mekeel, retired.

Ida Mae H. DeGouff, Newton Falls, N. Y., in place of W. D. Cheney, deceased.

Gladys L. Crausway, Niverville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Dominic W. Zappia, Norfolk, N. Y., in place of J. S. VanKennen, deceased.

Dennis F. Pollutro, North Collins, N. Y., in place of J. V. Collard, resigned.

Melinda Germeroth, North Greece, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Marian S. Welsh, North Salem, N. Y., in place of E. P. Hoyt, resigned.

Elizabeth Bennett, Oliverea, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mary R. D. Clark, Oswegatchie, N. Y., in place of M. M. Humble, resigned.

Lynn R. Wagner, Panama, N. Y., in place of C. J. Culver, resigned.

Joseph W. Harrison, Patchogue, N. Y., in place of E. M. Mapes, retired.

James F. Cudebec, Phelps, N. Y., in place of J. P. Hewitt, resigned.

Garret V. Cochrane, Jr., Putnam Valley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Otto Heisig, Quaker Street, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Roland A'Brial, Red Hook, N. Y., in place of A. P. Saulpaugh, transferred.

Washington Irving Goldrich, Richfield Springs, N. Y., in place of H. M. Curtis, retired.

Pearl L. Rice, Rock Hill, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Florence H. Stape, Rushville, N. Y., in place of Fred Schweickhard, retired.

William E. Roder, Salt Point, N. Y., in place of Charles De LaVergne, retired.

John T. Bryant, Sr., Saratoga Springs, N. Y., in place of J. M. Corey, retired.

Charles E. Griffin, Shandaken, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Harry E. Coogan, Sheridan, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mary R. Bellport, Shoreham, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Herman T. A. Kruse, Shushan, N. Y., in place of Albert Prindle, resigned.

Leslie Van Aller, Sloansville, N. Y., in place of B. K. Best, resigned.

Roland C. McLaren, South Cairo, N. Y., Office became Presidential, July 1, 1948.

Elizabeth L. Schaupp, Spring Glen, N. Y., in place of E. A. Smith, deceased.

David M. Loeb, Thompsonville, N. Y. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1948.

Lula M. Oliver, Treadwell, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Gail G. McLymond, Union Hill, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Loretta H. Grover, Varysburg, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

William A. Day, Vestal, N. Y., in place of Walter Rossen, removed.

Thelma H. McNamara, Waterville, N. Y., in place of G. F. McNamara, deceased.

Oscar L. Schlenker, West Camp, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Margaret Ely, West Henrietta, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edward N. Kslonzyk, Windsor, N. Y., in place of M. M. Freeman, resigned.

John L. Lusardi, Woodbury, N. Y., in place of B. M. Velsor, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ronald L. Hanson, Ambrose, N. Dak., in place of O. I. Oleson, resigned.

Kenneth M. Narum, Amidon, N. Dak., in place of B. E. Knudson, resigned.

Arthur J. Irwin, Big Bend, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Esther F. Klokonos, Butte, N. Dak., in place of William Stewart, retired.

Jerome G. Martin, Enderlin, N. Dak., in place of Elizabeth Moriarty, resigned.

Peter J. Karp, Epping, N. Dak., in place of E. S. Karp, deceased.

Otto Bollinger, Forbes, N. Dak., in place of A. B. Waddell, resigned.

Herbert Herman, Gackle, N. Dak., in place of N. T. Connery, resigned.

Ernest E. Parrow, Havana, N. Dak., in place of F. W. Powers, deceased.

Algie H. Simpkins, Hazelton, N. Dak., in place of L. M. Rott, transferred.

Jennie C. Brown, Heaton, N. Dak., in place of J. R. Brown, deceased.

Agnes Dettmann, Judson, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Richard S. Rhoades, Killdeer, N. Dak., in place of Fred Hollingsworth, resigned.

Donald J. Baggenstoss, Lansford, N. Dak., in place of L. L. Davis, retired.

Grace M. Dahlin, Max, N. Dak., in place of D. B. Whiting, transferred.

Fred W. Gebhardt, Merricourt, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Eleanor M. Robbins, Milton, N. Dak., in place of W. G. McBride, retired.

Vernon C. Douville, Neche, N. Dak., in place of E. E. Morin, resigned.

Leonard I. Aamold, Portland, N. Dak., in place of J. G. Kringlie, transferred.

Howard J. Kuhn, Richardton, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Pfeifer, resigned.

Alice G. Kelly, Rogers, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Arda J. Roy, Saint John, N. Dak., in place of J. E. DeMers, resigned.

Clarence R. Schultz, Tappen, N. Dak., in place of G. J. Schultz, resigned.

Ethel J. G. Griffin, Tower City, N. Dak., in place of G. C. Wheeler, retired.

Donald L. Scott, Underwood, N. Dak., in place of C. W. Gannon, resigned.

Arnold M. Hanson, Walcott, N. Dak., in place of A. W. Hendrickson, transferred.

Melvin C. Rude, Watford City, N. Dak., in place of Mae Scollard, resigned.

Clara M. Rossing, Werner, N. Dak., in place of H. W. Miller, deceased.

Josephine M. Ganon, Wyndmere, N. Dak., in place of Bernhard Ottis, retired.

OHIO

Darrell L. West, Albany, Ohio, in place of H. M. Stanley, resigned.

Lydia M. Crawford, Arcadia, Ohio, in place of C. W. Blake, retired.

Wiley K. Connor, Belle Center, Ohio, in place of W. P. Ziegler, transferred.

Kathryn W. Moore, Bellefontaine, Ohio, in place of R. H. Kerns, resigned.

Lee A. Andrews, Birmingham, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1948.

Elmer C. Marburger, Bolivar, Ohio, in place of M. M. Helwick, resigned.

Jerald J. Leiber, Brookville, Ohio, in place of J. L. Keener, resigned.

Helen M. Murphy, Centerville, Ohio, in place of M. E. Puterbaugh, resigned.

Alta C. Singer, Jr., Chesapeake, Ohio, in place of Clarence Hicks, deceased.

Charles H. Steinhauser, Clarksburg, Ohio, in place of E. D. Morris, resigned.

Helen Milner, Clarksville, Ohio, in place of S. G. Cleaver, removed.

Howard H. Kirkendall, Continental, Ohio, in place of L. E. Treece, transferred.

Clinton R. Schafer, Darrowville, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1948.

Francis Wayne Roof, Delroy, Ohio, in place of Alverda Wells, resigned.

Andrew T. Kalis, Fairpoint, Ohio, in place of E. B. Morgan, deceased.

Evelyn R. Brunson, Grand River, Ohio, in place of W. E. Curren, resigned.

John O. Jackson, Harrison, Ohio, in place of V. J. J. Meade, deceased.

Ernest P. Wise, Jefferson, Ohio, in place of John Jones, deceased.

John S. Southard, Linworth, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1948.

Curtis L. Ford, Mansfield, Ohio, in place of Frank Cave, resigned.

James M. Cligrow, Mechanicsburg, Ohio, in place of H. F. Mohr, transferred.

Harry E. Dickerson, Milan, Ohio, in place of J. P. Lavey, resigned.

James E. Brake, Milford Center, Ohio, in place of R. M. Connolly, transferred.

Robert A. Mitchell, New Madison, Ohio, in place of S. F. Kimmel, resigned.

Helen M. Rodocker, Mount Eaton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John H. McCarthy, North Lawrence, Ohio, in place of A. W. Dawson, resigned.

Donald W. Wilson, Ostrander, Ohio, in place of E. B. Euverard, resigned.

Helen M. Riley, Payne, Ohio, in place of P. A. Elick, removed.

Robert A. Clark, Phalanx Station, Ohio, in place of B. J. Mentzer, resigned.

Helen T. McCall, Rogers, Ohio, in place of L. C. Murphy, resigned.

Frank B. Shuffelton, Saint Marys, Ohio, in place of W. H. Uetrecht, transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Jesse D. Walker, Broken Arrow, Okla., in place of J. L. Greene, deceased.

Velma M. Becker, Cardin, Okla., in place of C. M. Masters, resigned.

Arthur B. Mullen, Inola, Okla., in place of G. M. Jeffers, resigned.

Lester R. Rhoades, Mannford, Okla., in place of A. M. Thompson, retired.

Etta M. Morrison, Ochelata, Okla., in place of S. S. Stringer, retired.

Esther H. Perrin, Tryon, Okla., in place of Loyd Barclay, transferred.

OREGON

Harriet A. Fleischhauer, Aurora, Oreg., in place of T. A. Fleischhauer, deceased.

Rose Mabel Haskell, Bates, Oreg., in place of E. M. Easley, resigned.

Wannie M. Osborn, Culver, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lucile S. Weber, Dexter, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Cornelius C. Fosback, Dillard, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Ruth F. St. Clair, Dorena, Oreg., in place of A. R. Twing, retired.

James A. Wallis, Eagle Point, Oreg., in place of G. B. Holmes, resigned.

Lenn D. Allen, Elgin, Oreg., in place of A. C. Allen, resigned.

Hazel L. Strand, Empire, Oreg., in place of D. R. Muth, resigned.

Ethan L. Newman, Eugene, Oreg., in place of F. L. Armitage, retired.

Russell I. Avrit, Foster, Oreg., in place of L. L. Rice, resigned.

Ruby I. Smallwood, Gilchrist, Oreg., in place of F. N. McCormick, resigned.

Minnie G. Miltenberger, Lapine, Oreg., in place of W. F. Petersen, transferred.

Eleanor L. Ray, Mohler, Oreg., in place of Pearl Adamscheck, resigned.

Leland C. Gove, Mosier, Oreg., in place of Lenora Hunter, retired.

Leonard A. Ficker, Mount Angel, Oreg., in place of G. D. Ebner, retired.

Melvin J. Tufford, Newberg, Oreg., in place of George Larkin, retired.

Theodore C. Arnoldus, North Powder, Oreg., in place of F. A. Parker, resigned.

Leon L. McFarlane, Oregon City, Oreg., in place of P. P. Caufield, deceased.

John J. Clark, Saint Benedict, Oreg., in place of G. E. Travis, retired.

Fern Miles, Scotts Mills, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mary V. Sullivan, Seaside, Oreg., in place of F. H. Laighton, deceased.

Frances T. Burr, Selma, Oreg., in place of H. L. Hundley, resigned.

Eugene N. Mee, Shady Cove, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Madge L. Herron, Shevlin, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Sidney V. Ward, Springfield, Oreg., in place of H. M. Stewart, deceased.

Albert R. Hammer, Terrebonne, Oreg., in place of W. E. Hickok, resigned.

E. Cleone Blaisdell, Valsetz, Oreg., in place of A. B. Kelsey, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

LeRoy A. Starr, Adamsdale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John H. Neese, Adamsville, Pa. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1948.

Robert N. Lankard, Alexandria, Pa., in place of Frank K. Myers, deceased.

Franklin G. Spohn, Breinigsville, Pa., in place of W. D. Butz, deceased.

Walter W. Petrick, Bridgeville, Pa., in place of F. X. Harmuth, deceased.

Harland H. Hardesty, Bruceton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edward W. Sulek, California, Pa., in place of H. C. Cowen, resigned.

Roy P. Rentschler, Centerport, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Peter T. Keenan, Cheltenham, Pa., in place of George Ramsey, deceased.

Joseph F. Moran, Chinchilla, Pa., in place of J. F. Moran, deceased.

William E. Sheridan, Clarion, Pa., in place of C. B. Orr, resigned.

Kenneth C. Hart, Cochranton, Pa., in place of E. W. Coley, resigned.

Bessie S. Robinson, Concordville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John N. Chernick, Cornwall, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Donald C. Fitzsimmons, Corsica, Pa., in place of J. H. McKee, retired.

George E. Myers, Cowansville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

George H. Gartland, Curryville, Pa., in place of L. D. Richey, transferred.

William T. Peters, Davisville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Robert B. Jewart, Dayton, Pa., in place of J. C. Ellenberger, retired.

Anna L. Leonard, Delmont, Pa., in place of V. G. Livengood, resigned.

Joseph Jollick, Denbo, Pa., in place of Mary Gaster, resigned.

Norman L. Pennington, Dilliner, Pa., in place of E. D. West, retired.

Roy K. Hartman, Dillsburg, Pa., in place of J. R. McClure, retired.

Anthony E. Ott, Duncansville, Pa., in place of E. G. Bergantz, resigned.

Karl H. Sitler, East Prospect, Pa., in place of J. F. Zuch, retired.

Anthony P. Mazanek, East Vandergrift, Pa., in place of A. T. Ofsonka, declined.

Catherine E. Henderson, Eddington, Pa., in place of M. M. Wink, resigned.

Steve Bogdewic, Jr., Ellsworth, Pa., P. W. Koblarchick, resigned.

Homer R. Jacobs, Emlenton, Pa., in place of L. A. Edinger, resigned.

Earl G. Watt, Enon Valley, Pa., in place of H. W. Marshall, transferred.

Hall Krone, Etters, Pa., in place of S. H. Brinton, retired.

Francis E. Hellerick, Fountainville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Paul Silberman, Hallowell, Pa., in place of Anna Shanken, retired.

Marie J. Suain, Hazel Hurst, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Arthur H. Christy, Hollidaysburg, Pa., in place of H. W. McIntosh, retired.

Cort Paul Specht, Jacobs Creek, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mary C. DeCurtis, Jamison, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Roy M. Hoffman, Jeannette, Pa., in place of D. H. Shaffer, deceased.

Edna M. Albright, Kempton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

George M. Lehr, Kintnersville, Pa., in place of F. C. Gutekunst, retired.

Frank R. Hammond, Lancaster, Pa., in place of C. M. Howell, deceased.

William H. Stewart, Merion Station, Pa., in place of K. M. Sherlock, resigned.

Ruth M. Tritch, Middletown, Pa., in place of J. C. Tritch. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen E. Wheeler, Millerton, Pa., in place of G. C. Miller, resigned.

Lawrence H. McCarty, Monongahela, Pa., in place of B. C. Anderson, deceased.

J. Elizabeth Chapman, Montgomeryville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Donald B. Taylor, Morwood, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Harry S. Welsh, Murrysville, Pa., in place of William McWilliams, retired.

Irene B. Rubis, Muse, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Michael A. Rechichar, Nemacolin, Pa., in place of I. D. Atcheson, resigned.

Robert S. Burns, Newtown, Pa., in place of H. H. Cornell, resigned.

David W. Wilson, New Wilmington, Pa., in place of E. M. Newton, retired.

Stewart R. Stauffer, Palm, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edward C. Maholtz, Penfield, Pa., in place of C. E. Robacker, retired.

Clarence E. Nicholson, Perryopolis, Pa., in place of R. H. Galley, resigned.

George W. Lauck, Pine Grove Mills, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Wilmer Swartz, Pipersville, Pa., in place of Anna Bissey, resigned.

Arthur H. Miller, Point Marion, Pa., in place of S. B. Flickner, resigned.

Pansy L. Williams, Port Matilda, Pa., in place of J. S. Williams, deceased.

Charles Ferry, Jr., Port Trevorton, Pa., in place of J. M. Herrold, transferred.

John F. Joyce, Prospect Park, Pa., in place of J. W. Connelly, retired.

Frances R. Hoover, Railroad, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Clifford H. Good, Reamstown, Pa., in place of J. C. Reddig, retired.

Elizabeth Morris, Republic, Pa., in place of Frank Canistra, resigned.

Nancy P. Phillips, Revloc, Pa., in place of Samuel Bankin, resigned.

Jessie E. Benedict, Rohrerstown, Pa., in place of J. N. Snavely, retired.

Clyde L. Dewald, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., in place of J. H. Brownmiller, deceased.

Minnie M. Ritter, Shamokin Dam, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Bertha M. Davis, Solebury, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Florence M. Bittinger, Springs, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Fred H. Rhodes, Stroudsburg, Pa., in place of C. D. Kohl, resigned.

Rose A. Ganly, Tower City, Pa., in place of J. R. Ganly, deceased.

Ethel P. Eastburn, Unionville, Pa., in place of H. C. Wheatman, resigned.

James A. Reilly, Uniontown, Pa., in place of W. N. Carr, retired.

Anna Nock Kristofect, United, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Playford W. Reed, West Leisenring, Pa., in place of D. F. Reed, resigned.

Earl C. Sterner, West Newton, Pa., in place of G. C. Rohland. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1941.

PUERTO RICO

Agapito Davila, Comerio, P. R., in place of G. P. de Leon, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

George H. Carr, Adamsville, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Walter I. Burroughs, Allenton, R. I., in place of W. B. Kingsley, deceased.

Anne E. Fowkes, Alton, R. I., in place of Laura Pellett, resigned.

Becky W. Burdick, Carolina, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Phebe P. Bentley, Coventry, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Joseph O. Blanchard, Harrisville, R. I., in place of P. L. Creighton, deceased.

James W. Breckenridge, Hope Valley, R. I., in place of R. E. Bitgood, resigned.

Helen Handell, Saunderstown, R. I., in place of F. P. Tefft, removed.

Cecil S. Holding, Tiverton, R. I., in place of D. J. Dennis, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

James H. Witherspoon, Barnwell, S. C., in place of R. A. Deason, retired.

John M. Creech, Blackville, S. C., in place of A. V. Collum, Jr., transferred.

Robert J. Berry, Jr., Bowman, S. C., in place of G. B. Patrick, resigned.

Samuel W. Gardner, Jr., Dalzell, S. C., in place of P. P. Gaillard, resigned.

Robertine M. McCracken, Hopkins, S. C., in place of L. C. Clayton, resigned.

Francis W. Davis, Lykesland, S. C., in place of S. R. Trotter, resigned.

Edna Wilkinson, State Park, S. C., in place of M. G. Jenerette, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ruth Austin, Bancroft, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Vincent L. Geise, Clark, S. Dak., in place of G. B. Brown, deceased.

Ralph A. Phillips, Corona, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

William O. Jones, Delmont, S. Dak., in place of I. H. Maxwell, transferred.

Faith L. Thomson, Faith, S. Dak., in place of R. W. Pitsor, deceased.

George Lehnert, Glenham, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Wilbur L. Connell, Hot Springs, S. Dak., in place of D. K. Batchelor, retired.

Math Rauscher, Jr., Kaylor, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Edward J. Green, Lead, S. Dak., in place of John Krambeck, retired.

Karl Meier, Longlake, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dona E. Linehan, Oglala, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Howard J. Hagel, Pine Ridge, S. Dak., in place of Vernon Morgan, declined.

Edward T. Pischke, Sanator, S. Dak., in place of I. M. Bruner, resigned.

Oscar G. Kasperson, Sinai, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Myhre, retired.

Mary E. Saunders, Stratford, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Anna M. Hahne, Trail City, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Elmer E. Haraden, Watertown, S. Dak., in place of L. F. Craney, deceased.

Jake D. Ulmer, Wentworth, S. Dak., in place of N. W. Tobin, deceased.

Edward D. Siemens, Wolsey, S. Dak., in place of F. A. Allen, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Hale B. Crow, Charlotte, Tenn., in place of E. D. Corlew, retired.

Raymond Earl Culberson, College Grove, Tenn., in place of M. S. Wilson, resigned.

William E. Dougherty, Cumberland City, Tenn., in place of J. W. McCracken, transferred.

Forrest H. Pollard, Daisy, Tenn., in place of H. D. Richie, resigned.

Roy D. Holsclaw, Etowah, Tenn., in place of D. B. Todd, retired.

Cloy R. Irvin, Fordtown, Tenn., in place of S. P. Gammon, transferred.

Clyde W. Gray, Graysville, Tenn., in place of W. H. Fox, retired.

Neva K. Kubik, Indian Mound, Tenn., in place of E. M. Peacher, transferred.

Iva M. Godwin, Jefferson City, Tenn., in place of R. K. Godwin, deceased.

Homer H. Hackney, Jellico, Tenn., in place of A. T. Jones, transferred.

Fred C. Vowell, Martin, Tenn., in place of J. H. Smith, transferred.

Gains T. Sharp, Maynardville, Tenn., in place of E. M. Smith, resigned.

Atwell L. Moreland, Memphis, Tenn., in place of H. C. McKellar, retired.

John W. Pearson, Morrison, Tenn., in place of J. J. Darnell, retired.

James G. Muse, Mountain City, Tenn., in place of E. L. McDade, retired.

Zirkle M. Cooper, Rockwood, Tenn., in place of H. L. Hicks, deceased.

William J. Dougherty, Russellville, Tenn., in place of C. J. Mahan, transferred.

TEXAS

Felix S. Braden, Beaumont, Tex., in place of Tobe Hahn, retired.

Daphne P. Birdwell, Boston, Tex., in place of Elizabeth Wilson, retired.

Cecil N. Latimer, Detroit, Tex., in place of W. E. Holloway, retired.

Eugene E. McMillian, Jr., Douglassville, Tex., in place of H. S. Granberry, transferred.

Walter A. Calloway, Howe, Tex., in place of C. M. Yeury, transferred.

Grover T. Sharbutt, Kirbyville, Tex., in place of W. P. Dowling, resigned.

Ferman C. Toups, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of W. S. Martin, deceased.

Carl F. Webster, Vidor, Tex., in place of M. B. Clark, removed.

Grady W. Hodges, Whitesboro, Tex., in place of G. W. Hodges, transferred.

Colon A. Barge, Jr., Zavalla, Tex., in place of E. R. Miles, retired.

UTAH

Nathan J. Barney, Elsinore, Utah, in place of J. C. Hill, retired.

Florence S. Seely, Greenriver, Utah, in place of G. W. French, transferred.

Eddis Reid Betts, North Salt Lake, Utah, in place of D. S. Betts, retired.

Frank K. Richards, Panguitch, Utah, in place of Rudolph Church, resigned.

LaPreal Richards, Spring Canyon, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Ferne L. F. Barker, Wellington, Utah, in place of H. W. Curtis, retired.

VERMONT

Conrad H. Laperle, Beecher Falls, Vt., in place of W. H. Lang, retired.

Clara E. Wright, Colchester, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Donat J. Scott, Concord, Vt., in place of M. H. Walsh, retired.

Lou B. Maginn, East Fairfield, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Adrian J. Carbonneau, Graniteville, Vt., in place of M. B. Bixby, resigned.

Dayton J. Wakefield, Morrisville, Vt., in place of J. E. Stewart, deceased.

Stacy M. Hicks, North Ferrisburg, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Bryan J. Branon, North Troy, Vt., in place of A. G. Sheehan, resigned.

Arthur M. Kelton, Peru, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lilah M. Prescott, Randolph Center, Vt., in place of M. G. Kibby, retired.

Alfred W. Armstrong, Rupert, Vt., in place of M. R. Turner, deceased.

Edward T. Sevee, Shelburne, Vt., in place of Isabel Neary, retired.

Susie H. Bellefeuille, Tunbridge, Vt., in place of R. M. Stewart, deceased.

Julia S. Thompson, Westminster, Vt., in place of O. E. Fullam, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Margaret C. Smith, Amboy, Wash., in place of William Norris, resigned.

Wilbert P. Quake, Arlington, Wash., in place of J. A. Dowdle, transferred.

Marion W. Newkirk, Belfair, Wash., in place of B. M. LeMier, resigned.

Clio P. Rebmen, Buena, Wash., in place of A. C. Presson, retired.

Norval F. Reeder, Camas, Wash., in place of F. B. Collins, resigned.

Lester J. Ott, Carson, Wash., in place of W. G. Meneice, deceased.

Donald C. Adams, Cowiche, Wash., in place of Edythe Pottratz, resigned.

Clifton H. McCauley, Dayton, Wash., in place of M. G. Elwell, resigned.

Jack P. Nims, Deming, Wash., in place of M. C. Hitchcock, resigned.

Charles W. Allbritton, Goldendale, Wash., in place of H. H. Hartley, resigned.

Jack H. Petit, Jr., Ilwaco, Wash., in place of Harry Lynehan, transferred.

Walter A. Woehler, Kennewick, Wash., in place of F. H. Lincoln, resigned.

George D. Scofield, Klickitat, Wash., in place of R. A. Landgraf, resigned.

Katherine A. Hand, Malott, Wash., in place of M. M. Gavin, resigned.

Norman W. Thompson, Mead, Wash., in place of B. B. McKenzie, retired.

Janet E. Gillespie, Menlo, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Dorothy L. Fager, Metaline, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Howard M. Mildon, Milton, Wash., in place of B. M. Simmons, resigned.

George S. Cartier, Moxee City, Wash., in place of R. F. Walters, resigned.

Noah E. Petry, Oroville, Wash., in place of W. A. Grube, retired.

Edward K. Godfrey, Pateros, Wash., in place of I. W. Littlejohn, retired.

Pauline T. Iwersen, Point Roberts, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Eula L. Phelps, Prescott, Wash., in place of B. H. Welsh, resigned.

Jack L. Olson, Rockford, Wash., in place of W. H. Gihring, transferred.

May S. Falk, Saint John, Wash., in place of W. W. Lindley, transferred.

Signy A. Udd, Sappho, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Jack Henry Meyer, Snohomish, Wash., in place of R. C. Cochran, deceased.

Caleb A. Hughes, Sunnyside, Wash., in place of J. M. Severyns, resigned.

John P. McMonagle, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.

Lloyd S. Hale, Tekoa, Wash., in place of W. D. Codd, resigned.

Provit D. Wilson, Toppenish, Wash., in place of W. T. Davis, deceased.

Clifford P. Albright, Trentwood, Wash. Office became Presidential October 1, 1947.

Margaret M. Aldahl, Troutlake, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Nora L. Roe, Vader, Wash., in place of M. R. Creech, resigned.

Egbert B. Ward, White Swan, Wash., in place of Ray Freeland, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Marie K. Brown, Bridgeport, W. Va., in place of M. V. Brown, retired.

Dallas R. Toney, Chapmanville, W. Va., in place of Maude Langdon, resigned.

Howard C. Howell, Colliers, W. Va., in place of S. L. Carter, retired.

William M. Miller, Davis, W. Va., in place of N. F. Golightly, resigned.

Sarah Jane Lively, Edwight, W. Va., in place of J. R. McClure, resigned.

Opal Stowers, Griffithsville, W. Va., in place of W. B. Linkous, resigned.

Van B. Stith, Highcoal, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Roy Lewis, Huntington, W. Va., in place of J. W. Dingess, deceased.

Miriam A. Hamblin, Institute, W. Va., in place of S. G. James, resigned.

Chester A. Shomo, Junior, W. Va., in place of G. F. Row, retired.

Willard Carson Browning, Jr., Logan, W. Va., in place of D. B. Browning, resigned.

Newman Merritt, Lundale, W. Va., in place of C. O. Shafer, Sr., deceased.

Bertha S. Watts, McComas, W. Va., in place of W. I. Gulley, transferred.

Virgil L. Farley, Matoaka, W. Va., in place of F. M. Robertson, resigned.

Ernest D. McGraw, Meadow Bridge, W. Va., in place of E. K. Jacobson, resigned.

William J. Teets, Moorefield, W. Va., in place of J. W. Fisher, resigned.

Jessie Kincaid, Nellis, W. Va., in place of E. B. Keenan, retired.

Frances E. Poore, Raleigh, W. Va., in place of R. B. Holmes, retired.

Glenn R. Holmes, Reedsville, W. Va., in place of W. W. Smith, transferred.

Pete P. Scarnati, Spelter, W. Va., in place of H. H. Thompson, resigned.

Marjorie S. Sharousky, Vivian, W. Va., in place of F. J. Williams, resigned.

Roy L. Coleman, Wilcoo, W. Va., in place of J. C. Coleman, removed.

Carrie L. Kirtley, Winfield, W. Va., in place of M. S. Lanier, declined.

WISCONSIN

Arthur N. Yousten, Almena, Wis., in place of J. A. Kumhera, transferred.

Anton R. Paul, Bailey's Harbor, Wis., in place of E. R. Hanson, removed.

Stephen O. Odenbrett, Benet Lake, Wis. Office established November 16, 1945.

Elmer A. Koerner, Birnamwood, Wis., in place of D. J. Cannon, transferred.

Harland S. Emerson, Blue Mounds, Wis., in place of Mayme Deneen, resigned.

Calvern K. Smith, Boyceville, Wis., in place of B. G. Schramske, transferred.

Joseph J. Ecker, Brillion, Wis., in place of M. P. Becker, resigned.

Roger L. Miller, Brussels, Wis., in place of J. G. Pierre, retired.

David A. Dugal, Cadott, Wis., in place of John Agnew, deceased.

Willard F. Ehrhardt, Caledonia, Wis., in place of H. D. Kemper, retired.

Francis H. Kartman, Cassville, Wis., in place of Chris Kartman, resigned.

Jerome A. Moore, Catawba, Wis., in place of C. K. Peisker, resigned.

Eugene C. Loos, Elkhart Lake, Wis., in place of A. J. Zorn, transferred.

Elliott M. Hodgins, Fish Creek, Wis., in place of C. E. Seiler, transferred.

Eugene P. Naze, Forestville, Wis., in place of J. H. Poh transferred.

Albert S. Mravik, Gilman, Wis., in place of B. L. Slota, resigned.

Kathryn E. Leib, Greenvalley, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

John M. Ross, Hammond, Wis., in place of Edward Snoeyenbos, deceased.

Stanley F. Hamilton, Hancock, Wis., in place of N. L. Adams, deceased.

Clarence P. Gehl, Hilbert, Wis., in place of C. H. Eldridge, transferred.

George A. Schickert, Hubertus, Wis., in place of Andrew Schickert, retired.

Eugene A. Taylor, Iola, Wis., in place of H. G. Hanson, resigned.

Leonard B. Kitowski, Junction City, Wis., in place of E. H. Joosten, transferred.

Vincent J. Adomaitis, Kennan, Wis., in place of C. L. Peck, retired.

Norbert G. Vanevenhoven, Kimberly, Wis., in place of G. A. Sauter, deceased.

Edward W. Rantala, Maple, Wis., in place of W. C. Orville, resigned.

Winfield Fred Coffey, Marinette, Wis., in place of J. D. Cook, removed.

Floyd H. Brandenburg, Marion, Wis., in place of M. T. Foley, resigned.

Rodney O. Helbling, Merrillan, Wis., in place of O. M. Rickard, resigned.

Martin C. Weber, Jr., Merton, Wis., in place of H. E. Beckman, retired.

William H. Ruppert, Mukwonago, Wis., in place of J. C. Harland, resigned.

Albert F. Czarnecki, Muskego, Wis., in place of O. R. Horn, resigned.

Clarence W. Sauld, Niagara, Wis., in place of A. T. Green, resigned.

Mary A. Reichl, Newburg, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Joseph T. Daley, North Lake, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Joseph W. Wilson, Osceola, Wis., in place of C. E. McCarty, retired.

Hildred S. Cory, Palmyra, Wis., in place of J. P. Phillips, declined.

Edward E. Donovan, Phillips, Wis., in place of R. I. Baumann, resigned.

Harry P. Walker, Jr., Plainfield, Wis., in place of H. P. Walker, retired.

George J. Sterling, Plover, Wis., in place of B. P. Lampman, resigned.

August G. Buehler, Port Edwards, Wis., in place of R. J. Reiland, resigned.

William J. Gallagher, Reedsburg, Wis., in place of L. H. Schultz, resigned.

Lester M. Byrns, Rhinelander, Wis., in place of J. W. Kelley, deceased.

Irving S. Lund, Rock Falls, Wis., in place of E. R. Helgoe, transferred.

Dennis J. Wanserski, Rosholt, Wis., in place of E. P. Johnson, transferred.

Harold A. Stromberg, Sarona, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jerome R. Morris, Seneca, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Roman N. Bowser, Sheboygan Falls, Wis., in place of C. F. Heald, resigned.

William L. Hanley, Stanley, Wis., in place of G. T. Pace, deceased.

Ruth W. Walker, Sturtevant, Wis., in place of R. E. Lingsweiler, resigned.

Norbert G. Lamoureux, Tony, Wis., in place of L. J. Velten, transferred.

Roy M. Hopkins, Troy Center, Wis., in place of W. I. Hopkins, retired.

Raymond R. Behling, Vesper, Wis., in place of A. A. Conklin, deceased.

Robert W. Lueck, Jr., Watertown, Wis., in place of H. P. Bowen, deceased.

John C. O'Connell, Waupun, Wis., in place of A. H. Bernhard, deceased.

Chester J. Bush, Weyerhauser, Wis., in place of Stanley Jasicki, transferred.

Robert J. Kiernan, Whitewater, Wis., in place of J. N. Thiele, resigned.

Elona M. Sarbacker, Wilmot, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Ruth E. Andrews, Wyocena, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WYOMING

Hugh Coffman, Cheyenne, Wyo., in place of W. G. Haas, retired.

Florence B. Patrick, Manderson, Wyo. Office become Presidential July 1, 1948.

Mabel E. Nolan, Mills, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Lyle A. Millard, Riverton, Wyo., in place of J. E. Smith, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of David S. Evans et al. for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.) and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 20, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of David S. Evans, appearing on page 4829, and ending with the name of Paul S. Zobrist, which appears on page 4830.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. LeRoy P. Hunt to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John C. Buthman, D. D., Grace Methodist Church, Sioux City, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Our heavenly Father, conscious that all that we have and are cometh from Thee, we come to Thee in this hour to thank Thee for all of Thy goodness, and to invoke Thy blessings upon this day's activity. We thank Thee for the opportunities of service that are ours; also for the responsibilities which Thou hast laid upon us. We pray Thy special blessing upon the deliberations of this House of Representatives this day, as it shall face the great legislative problems of today. Help these Representatives not to lean too heavily upon their own understanding and upon the wisdom of other men, but to seek guidance and help from Thee. Help them not to mistake the shadows for the substance, or to prostitute their knowledge of what is right for either fear or favor. Give all the courage of their convictions at all times, and may they know that they are not living and serving only for today, but for future years to come. To this end guide and direct this legislative branch of our Government and our President. Bless our great United States of America to the end that our country may continue to prosper in all things and to lead our world to greater moral and spiritual heights, to an era of universal peace and brotherhood. Forgive us all our shortcomings and sins and guide us ever in Thy service. We ask it all in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MARINE AND NAVAL AVIATION

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was handed by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson the following memorandum to which I invite the attention of all Members of the House in view of current statements in the press and elsewhere. I hope this will clear the atmosphere.

APRIL 28, 1949.

Chairman VINSON: I have been hearing the rumors about the transfer of the marines and naval aviation to some other branch of the service.

1. Under the law this cannot be done.

2. It has not been under contemplation, and from time to time numerous statements have been made by me to that effect.

3. There are no such studies being carried on in the National Military Establishment. Further, I want you to know that before any step of this kind would be seriously considered, I should ask permission to discuss the matter before the committees of both Houses of the Congress.

LOUIS JOHNSON.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I think the Members ought to hear these 1-minute speeches. We get more out of them than we do out of the whole debate.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 81]

Bennett, Mich.	Byrne, N. Y.	Granger
Bland	Case, N. J.	Hall,
Bolton, Ohio	Clevenger	Edwin Arthur
Bulwinkle	Gilmer	Hobbs

Holifield	Shafer	Thomas, N. J.
Macy	Short	Walsh
Murphy	Smith, Ohio	White, Idaho

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 409 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] may proceed for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'TOOLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by H. E. Aklilou Abte-Wold. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $243.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two prize-winning essays by students of Durango School, Colorado.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CROOK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the executive vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Winston-Salem Journal.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Typographical Union Journal on the right to work.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times of April 25.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

MARINE CORPS AVIATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson. I have greater respect for the United States Marine Corps, which has done a tremendous job of defending this country for some 175 years. I was, therefore, shocked to read in this morning's Washington Post that it is the intention of the Secretary of Defense to take the air arm away from the United States Marines. I cannot help but feel that those American citizens, those marines, who stormed the shores of Iwo Jima, Guadalcanal, and Saipan, would not look happily on the thought that their air support which kept the skies cleared of enemy planes, and strafed and bombed the enemy at low altitudes, was to be no more. The marines are specialists at amphibious warfare. It is an exacting occupation calling for split-second timing and precision flying. Ground marines and flying marines have and should train together and as one. I suggest, therefore, that Mr. Johnson proceed with the utmost caution and consideration before taking any such drastic step, that would vitally affect the defense of our great country.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MARINE CORPS AVIATION

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the Members of the House who did not hear my chairman of the Committee on Armed Services advise the House that he had received a memorandum from the present Secretary of Defense assuring the Nation that he has no intention and that there are no movements on foot or investigations being held whereby the Marine air arm or the Navy air arm or the Marine Corps is to be disturbed.

I congratulate my chairman for his usual alertness in seeing to it that this bad information will not gain force and go abroad. At the same time I would like to advise my good friend from Florida that our chairman has obtained that information because I know he has been very active and very much disturbed about it. I agree with him. Our chairman has just put that in the RECORD for everyone to read. It has been a terrible thing that such information has been disseminated to disturb the morale of these great fighting arms of our armed services.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENKINS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of satisfaction that many of us heard the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. We were all concerned, especially those of us who had the pleasure and privilege of serving in the Marine Corps, over the reports which were current yesterday concerning the transfer of the Marine air arm. However, as long as the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has taken positive action to determine the truth of those statements and has given adequate assurance that no such step is contemplated, I

think possibly that that ghost has been laid for the time being. However, that is not to say that those of us who have a keen and continuing interest in the Marine Corps will not be on the alert at all times watching not only the front door of the Military Establishment but the back door as well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is one point which it seems to me should always be kept in mind in considering the status of the Marine Corps. This is an air age. Sometimes international situations require prompt treatment, and it is my understanding that the marines are the one arm of the national-defense establishment which may be landed in foreign territory under the direction of the President without a violation of national sovereignty.

Mr. JACKSON of California. That is my understanding. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning the Berlin airlift.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news letter.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article about Si Rosenthal, the great baseball player, and his son.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New London (Conn.) Day on the social-security system.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business of the day and any other special orders, on Tuesday, May 3, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper release.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SADLAK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although I was simply an ordinary foot soldier in the last war, I rise to echo the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. It would be a tragedy if those in charge of our Military Establishment did not recognize the great contribution which the Marine Corps has made to the security of our country, or if anything were done to make it less effective in performing its recognized mission. Within the limits of an adequate national defense, every effort must be made to eliminate waste and inefficiency.

Of course, the matter must be studied. But decisions should be reached, not in a haphazard or spectacular fashion, but only after thorough study and with a full realization of the proper role of each branch of the service. Certainly the Marine Corps, whose valiant achievements comprise one of the brilliant pages in our military history, deserves and should receive every consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE FREDERIC C. WALCOTT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the Members of this body that Frederic C. Walcott, former Senator from Connecticut, died at Stamford, Conn., yesterday.

Senator Walcott lived a long and useful life and when finally he retired he was rich with the honors which he had earned in the service of his State and country.

Senator Walcott achieved international prominence in politics, in conservation, and in foreign affairs. During his life he also won recognition in the fields of manufacturing, banking and investments, writing, painting, music, and public affairs.

In 1915 when Senator Walcott was in Europe negotiating loans for the embattled Governments of France and Italy, he joined Herbert Hoover, who was then investigating foods and other needs in Belgium. He directed relief efforts in Poland and elsewhere until the United States entered the war in 1917.

When Mr. Hoover was made Federal Food Administrator he appointed Senator Walcott as his aide. In this position, Senator Walcott served without salary until 1919. In order to perform this service he relinquished, with admirable selflessness, all his many activities in the business world.

Subsequently President Woodrow Wilson sent him to the Paris Peace Conference as an expert on Polish relief needs. For his distinguished war work, Senator Walcott was made a chevalier of the French Legion of Honor and was decorated with the Officers' Cross by Poland.

Entering public life as State fish and game commissioner in Connecticut in 1923 he served for 5 years. From 1925 to 1928 he was also chairman of the State water commission. Senator Walcott served two terms in the Connecticut State Senate in 1925 and 1927 and was raised to the position of temporary president of the senate in the latter year. In 1928 he was elected United States Senator from Connecticut in which body he served with distinction as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. He was the principal author of the bill creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He headed the Senate Conservation Committee. In 1934 he became State welfare commissioner in Connecticut in which capacity he served until 1939.

He was on the executive committee of the Carnegie Institute of Washington and the advisory committee of the human welfare group of Yale. He was a trustee of Trinity College, Connecticut College and the Bethune-Cookman College for Negroes of Florida. He was also president of the American Wildlife Foundation.

From the time in his early youth when he joined hunting and exploration expeditions to Singapore, Japan, North Africa, India, Chile, and Bolivia to the more recent years Senator Walcott's life was one of splendid achievement, achievements which are an endorsement to responsible citizenship and to the cause of good government.

He was a credit to his State and to the Nation. He will be widely mourned. I extend my deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. SADLAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. I want to join in the gentleman's eulogy of former United States Senator Frederic C. Walcott, who died yesterday. It was my opportunity to meet Senator Walcott for the first time here in Washington in 1928 when I was a student at Georgetown University. I met him on several occasions subsequently and have heard him speak at meetings in Connecticut. I know that his accomplishments in behalf of the people of our great State of Connecticut, of our Nation, as well as the peoples in other lands, particularly along humanitarian lines for which he has been signally

honored, made Senator Walcott an outstanding citizen of our State and an extremely good servant of his constituency and a great friend of all those who enjoy outdoor life and outdoor sports. My sympathy to the bereaved family is also joined to that of the gentleman.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all other Members of the Connecticut delegation may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Knoxville Express and two memorials from the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the New Hampshire State Legislature.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SAVING ON THE DEFENSE BUDGET

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I find that I am impelled, in view of some of the statements that have been made this morning, to say a word about appropriations and programs for our armed forces. I wish to assure Mr. Johnson, Secretary of National Defense, that there is one Member of this House who does not wring her hands and weep tears if she learns that maybe there is going to be some economy made in the armed forces; that maybe a few dollars will be cut from the $16,000,000,000 appropriation that we passed in this House. The extravagance of the armed forces is well known. The Hoover Commission is very clear on this point. There is one Member of this House who applauds the Secretary of National Defense.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JUDD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LATE MRS. MANUEL QUEZON

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were shocked and horrified today to learn of the assassination of Mrs. Manuel Quezon, the widow of our former colleague and the late President of the Philippine Government. She and her family were well known by many Members of this body. The word received by us is to the effect that Mrs. Quezon, her charming daughter, and a party of constabulary escort were on their way to Tayabas Province, where Mrs. Quezon planned to dedicate a hospital. She was on a mission of charity when the party was ambushed by "Huks" who have for many months carried on revolutionary campaigns against the legally constituted government of the Philippine Islands. We are informed that both Mrs. Quezon, her daughter, and six other members of the party were killed, and several members of the party badly wounded.

Although the full details of this horrible and overt act are lacking at this early date, it is certain that it indicates the fast advance of communism and war against legal and orderly government. The "Huks" in the Philippine Islands, according to my information, are Communist-inspired and Communist-directed. In view of the fast advance of communism in China and over many parts of the Far East, this terrible act in the Philippine Islands should put the people of the United States on notice that our mission against communism in the Far East is not at an end. The arm of the Philippine Government should be immediately strengthened by the United States if the call should come for aid from that Government. Every sympathetic action should be taken by this Government to strengthen the Philippine Government. The Philippine Islands are still the important outpost of humanity against communism. I know that I speak the sentiment of our distinguished Speaker and Members of this House when I say that we transmit our heartfelt sympathy to the members of the Quezon family and to the people of the Philippine Islands in this hour of their present sorrow.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by the dispatch which refers to the tragic death of the accomplished and saintly widow of the first President and patriot of the Philippine Republic, Mrs. Manuel Quezon, and of her lovely and brilliant daughter, Maria Aurora, and her son-in-law, Felipe Buencamino III.

It has been my pleasure to have known the Quezon family for many, many years. I can hardly contain myself when I contemplate the tragedy which was visited upon the surviving members of the family and befell the good people of the Philippine Islands.

It seems to me that this is a cue that the time has come for a thorough cleaning up of the Philippine Islands. I suggest if needs be the calling out of the entire Philippine Army to quell the Communist bandits. I call upon the Government of the United States to lend every cooperation and such assistance as might be requested by the duly constituted authorities of the Philippine Republic. The Communist horde has run wild, it has run amuck to spill the innocent blood of the finest people in the paradise of the Pacific. It is high time that communism be suppressed, that its bandit practices be entirely wiped out in this glorious island domain, and that the fair name of the Philippine Republic be vindicated.

It is beyond reason to determine the basis for the fiendish philosophy which prompted the outrage except its sinful and godless Communist code which has for its basic purpose the destruction of Christian civilization.

May God bring consolation and lasting peace to the Filipino people and eternal rest to fallen victims.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PATRONAGE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received some very important information which I am sure will be of interest to the membership of this body. I am informed that the President of the United States at his press conference this morning officially placed the patronage purchasing tag on your vote on the pending legislation today. He was asked whether the way the Members of the House voted today would have any effect on the distribution of patronage—I am sure this is very important to the Democratic side—and he replied in the affirmative, in effect that the vote would be watched today, and how you voted would determine whether you would get any jobs or not. So the proposition is very clear that your vote is for sale for a job or jobs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JONATHAN DANIELS

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the President, at the press conference to which my distinguished colleague from Louisiana referred, likewise made this observation, that he had under consideration for appointment as Secretary of the Department of the Navy, the Honorable Jonathan Daniels, editor of the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C. I am quite sure if this appointment is made, it will mean that the Department of the Navy will be represented by one of the outstanding men of the South. I certainly trust that the President will name Mr. Daniels, whose distingushed father, the late Hon. Josephus Daniels, served as Secretary of the Navy during the Wilson administration.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sure that even though pleased at the prospect of a fellow North Carolinian getting the appointment, the gentleman views with regret the resignation of John Sullivan from that post.

Mr. DEANE. I certainly do.

PATRONAGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] took the floor and made the remarks he did, because it compels me to take public notice of a situation that I had hoped I would not have to ever take public notice of. The gentleman has made a statement which is not consistent with my understanding as to what the situation is, but it comes from a gentleman who, if he had had his way, would have made possible that we would not have a Democratic majority today in the House, and we would not have a Democrat elected as President of the United States. I am very sorry the gentleman took the floor, because he should have remained silent, because he actively and openly supported a splinter party of the Democratic Party, and if many of us had our way in the caucus, and if we had not suspended our judgment, action might have been taken that such men who openly and actively supported either Thurmond or Wallace might not have been treated with the privileges of a Democratic Member of the House.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the fact that I mentioned the gentleman's name, I yield to him.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think the gentleman's remarks come rather ill advised at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be the gentleman's opinion, but not my opinion.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I finish making my statement?

Mr. McCORMACK. Go ahead.

Mr. HÉBERT. Because the House certainly knows what was done in my particular case when I was removed from a committee because I had exercised my right to vote as I pleased.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman supported Thurmond last November, did he not?

Mr. HEBERT. I supported the Democratic candidate of the State of Louisiana, and I have no apologies to make.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman supported Thurmond, did he not? That means that only through tolerance is he sitting here as a member of the Democratic Party. If I supported any party other than the Democratic Party, I would not expect any privileges here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PATRONAGE IN MICHIGAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some of my Republican political masterminds over here told me to sit down and keep my mouth shut and not get into this Democratic patronage fight.

Mr. JUDD. Good advice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Good advice, says the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. We have straw bosses and dictators over here on our side—as it is said you, on the Democratic side, have a boss in the White House—or would-be bosses I should say on our side, but they over here do not make it stick; that is the only difference. The only thing I want to say is, I am sure the Republicans are not very much interested, at least, until after the next election, in this question of patronage. But I do want to express the hope that as long as these jobs are all at the command of the President that he will change the administration policy and select Americans without any Red tendencies.

I also should like to say that over on our side, at least there are a few of us who think that a man should, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, have the right to express his own views and represent his own constituency.

Do not be too much concerned about these jobs, you Democrats, because in Michigan and ultimately in the Nation these jobs are not going to be given to Democrats; they are going to the people named by the CIO boys, regular CIO members. You on your side may find when you get further along that being members of the Democratic Party will not be the real test for a job, but rather whether or not you go along with the CIO. You Democrats will find yourselves all out, because it is going to be the CIO which will get the jobs from now on, if they have their way, and sometime the Democrats may find the CIO has taken over their party organization and limits jobholders and public officials to CIO members in good standing.

ATTEMPTS OF INTIMIDATION BY THREATS OF PATRONAGE REPRISALS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include three clippings from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with roll calls.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be the first victim of that conspiracy to which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] referred.

This attempt to browbeat Members of Congress into changing their votes on pending legislation by threats of patronage reprisals is one of the most contemptible movements I have ever known. So far as I am concerned, they might know by this time that I am not to be bluffed or intimidated. I stand by my convictions.

In order to show you how they are carrying this program out, there was a vacancy in the post office at Columbus, Miss., caused by the death of the postmaster. There was a man in line for it who had been one of the most efficient assistant postmasters I have ever known. He was an applicant for the place, and there were some ex-servicemen among the applicants.

But the national executive committee, headed by a man from Rhode Island, I believe, selected a man without consulting me, or the people of Columbus, or the Senators from Mississippi, and gave him the temporary appointment.

I resent these attempts to browbeat Members of Congress into voting against their convictions by threats of patronage reprisals.

I resent all these lobbyists crowding in here and attempting to intimidate Members into changing their votes on the labor-relations law, commonly referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act.

When this legislation was before the House 2 years ago, a motion was made to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor, and here is roll call No. 35 showing how each Member voted on that motion:

ROLL NO. 35

Yeas, 122: Albert; Angell; Bates, Ky.; Battle; Beckworth; Bishop; Blatnik; Bloom; Boggs, La.; Brophy; Buchanan; Buckley;

Butler; Byrne, N. Y.; Canfield; Cannon; Carroll; Celler; Clark; Combs; Cooley; Crosser; D'Alesandro; Dawson, Ill.; Deane; Delaney; Dingell; Donohue; Douglas; Durham; Eberharter; Elsaesser; Engel, Mich.; Fenton; Flannagan; Fogarty; Folger; Foote; Forand; Fulton; Gordon; Gorski; Granger; Hagen; Hardy; Harless, Ariz.; Hart; Havenner; Hays; Hedrick; Heffernan; Hendricks; Holifield; Huber; Jackson, Wash.; Javits; Jenkins, Pa.; Johnson, Okla.; Jones, Wash.; Karsten, Mo.; Kee; Kefauver; Kelley; Kennedy; Keogh; King; Kirwan; Klein; Lane; Lanham; Lemke; Lesinski; Lodge; Lusk; Lyle; Lynch; McCormack; Madden; Mansfield, Mont.; Marcantonio; Meade, Ky.; Miller, Calif.; Monroney; Morgan; Morris; Murdock; Norman; Norton; O'Brien; O'Toole; Patman; Patterson; Peterson; Pfeifer; Philbin; Phillips, Tenn.; Powell; Price, Ill.; Priest; Rabin; Rayburn; Rayfiel; Redden; Rogers, Fla.; Rooney; Sabath; Sadowski; Scoblick; Sheppard; Sikes; Smathers; Snyder; Somers; Spence; Stigler; Thomas, Tex.; Thomason; Tollefson; Trimble; Twyman; Walter, Welch.

Nays, 291: Abernethy; Allen, Calif.; Allen, Ill.; Allen, La.; Almond; Andersen, H. Carl; Anderson, Calif.; Andresen, August H.; Andrews, Ala.; Andrews, N. Y.; Arends; Arnold; Auchincloss; Bakewell; Banta; Barden; Barrett; Bates, Mass.; Beall; Bell; Bender; Bennett, Mich.; Bennett, Mo.; Blackney; Boggs, Del.; Bolton; Bonner; Boykin; Bradley, Calif; Bradley, Mich.; Bramblett; Brehm; Brooks; Brown, Ga.; Brown, Ohio; Bryson; Buck; Buffett; Bulwinkle; Burke; Burleson; Busbey; Byrnes, Wis.; Camp; Carson; Case, N. J.; Case, S. Dak; Chadwick; Chapman; Chelf; Chenoweth; Chiperfield; Church; Clason; Clevenger; Clippinger; Coffin; Cole, Kans.; Cole, Mo.; Cole, N. Y.; Colmer; Cooper; Corbett; Cotton; Coudert; Courtney; Crawford; Crow; Cunningham; Curtis; Dague; Davis, Ga.; Dawson, Utah; Devitt; D'Ewart; Dirksen; Dolliver; Domengeaux; Dondero; Dorn; Doughton; Drewry; Eaton; Elliott; Ellis; Ellsworth; Elston; Engle, Calif.; Evins; Fallon; Fellows; Fernandez; Fisher; Fletcher; Gallagher; Gamble; Gary; Gathings; Gavin; Gearhart; Gillette; Gillie; Goff; Goodwin; Gore; Gossett; Graham; Grant, Ala.; Grant, Ind.; Gregory; Griffiths; Gross; Gwinn, N. Y.; Gwynne, Iowa; Hale; Hall, Edwin Arthur; Hall, Leonard W.; Halleck; Hand; Harness, Ind.; Harris; Harrison; Hartley; Hébert; Herter; Heselton; Hess; Hinshaw; Hobbs; Hoeven; Hoffman; Holmes; Hope; Horan; Howell; Jackson, Calif.; Jarman; Jenison; Jenkins, Ohio; Jennings; Jensen; Johnson, Calif.; Johnson, Ill.; Johnson, Ind.; Johnson, Tex.; Jones, Ala.; Jones, N. C.; Jones, Ohio; Jonkman; Judd; Kearney; Kearns; Keating; Keefe; Kerr; Kersten, Wis.; Kilburn; Kilday; Knutson; Kunkel; Landis; Larcade; Latham; Lea; LeCompte; LeFevre; Lewis; Love; Lucas; McConnell; McCowen; McDonough; McDowell; McGarvey; McGregor; McMahon; McMillan, S. C.; McMillen, Ill.; MacKinnon; Macy; Mahon; Maloney; Manasco; Martin, Iowa; Mason; Mathews; Meade, Md.; Merrow; Meyer; Michener; Miller, Conn.; Miller, Md.; Miller, Nebr.; Mills; Mitchell; Morton; Muhlenberg; Mundt; Murray, Tenn.; Murray, Wis.; Nixon; Nodar; Norblad; Norrell; O'Hara; O'Konski; Owens; Passman; Peden; Phillips, Calif.; Pickett; Ploeser; Plumley; Poage; Potts; Preston; Price, Fla.; Rains; Ramey; Rankin; Reed, Ill.; Reed, N. Y.; Rees; Reeves; Rich; Richards; Riehlman; Riley; Rivers; Rizley; Robertson; Robsion; Rockwell; Rogers, Mass.; Rohrbough; Ross; Russell; Sadlak; St. George; Sanborn; Sarbacher; Sasscer; Schwabe, Mo.; Schwabe, Okla.; Scott, Hardie; Scott, Hugh D., Jr.; Scrivner; Seely-Brown; Shafer; Short; Simpson, Ill.; Simpson, Pa.; Smith, Kans.; Smith, Maine; Smith, Ohio; Smith, Wis.; Springer; Stanley; Stefan; Stevenson; Stockman; Stratton; Sundstrom; Tabor; Talle; Taylor; Teague; Thomas, N. J.; Tibbott; Towe; Vail; Van Zandt; Vinson; Vorys; Vursell; Wadsworth; Weichel; West; Wheeler; Whitten; Whittington; Wigglesworth; Williams; Wilson, Ind.; Wilson, Tex.; Winstead; Wolcott; Wolverton; Woodruff; Youngblood; Zimmerman.

Not voting, 19: Bland; Clements; Cox; Cravens; Davis, Tenn.; Feighan; Fuller; Gerlach; Gifford; Hill; Hull; Kean; Mansfield, Tex.; Morrison; Pace; Poulson; Smith, Va.; Wood; Worley.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clements for, with Mr. Pace against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Cox against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Gifford against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Hill with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Wood.

Mr. McDonough changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

And here is roll call No. 36 on final passage of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill:

ROLL NO. 36

Yeas, 308: Abernethy; Allen, Calif.; Allen, Ill.; Allen, La.; Almond; Andersen, H. Carl; Anderson, Calif.; Andresen, August H.; Andrews, Ala.; Andrews, N. Y.; Arends; Arnold; Auchincloss; Bakewell; Banta; Barden; Barrett; Bates, Mass.; Battle; Beall; Beckworth; Bell; Bender; Bennett, Mich.; Bennett, Mo.; Blackney; Boggs, Del.; Bolton; Bonner; Boykin; Bradley, Calif.; Bradley, Mich.; Bramblett; Brehm; Brooks; Brown, Ga.; Brown, Ohio; Bryson; Buck; Buffett; Bulwinkle; Burke; Burleson; Busbey; Byrnes, Wis.; Camp; Carson; Case, N. J.; Case, S. Dak.; Chadwick; Chapman; Chelf; Chenoweth; Chiperfield; Church; Clark; Clason; Clevenger; Clippinger; Coffin; Cole, Kans.; Cole, Mo.; Cole, N. Y.; Colmer; Cooper; Corbett; Cotton; Coudert; Courtney; Cravens; Crawford; Crow; Cunningham; Curtis; Dague; Davis, Ga.; Davis, Tenn.; Dawson, Utah; Deane; Devitt; D'Ewart; Dirksen; Dolliver; Domengeaux; Dondero; Dorn; Doughton; Drewry; Durham; Eaton; Elliott; Ellis; Ellsworth; Elston; Engle, Calif.; Evins; Fallon; Fellows; Fernandez; Fisher; Fletcher; Foote; Fulton; Gallagher; Gamble; Gary; Gathings; Gavin; Gearhart; Gillette; Gillie; Goff; Goodwin; Gore; Gossett; Graham; Grant, Ala.; Grant, Ind.; Gregory; Griffiths; Gross; Gwinn, N. Y.; Gwynne, Iowa; Hagen; Hale; Hall, Edwin Arthur; Hall, Leonard W.; Halleck; Hand; Hardy; Harness, Ind.; Harris; Harrison; Hartley; Hébert; Hendricks; Herter; Heselton; Hess; Hinshaw; Hobbs; Hoeven; Hoffman; Holmes; Hope; Horan; Howell; Jackson, Calif.; Jarman; Jenison; Jenkins, Ohio; Jennings; Jensen; Johnson, Calif.; Johnson, Ill.; Johnson, Ind.; Johnson, Tex.; Jones, N. C.; Jones, Ohio; Jonkman; Judd; Kearney; Kearns; Keating; Keefe; Kerr; Kersten, Wis.; Kilburn; Kilday; Knutson; Kunkel; Landis; Larcade; Latham; Lea; LeCompte; LeFevre; Lewis; Lodge; Love; Lucas; Lusk; Lyle; McConnell; McCowen; McDonough; McDowell; McGarvey; McGregor; McMahon; McMillan, S. C.; McMillen, Ill.; MacKinnon; Macy; Mahon; Maloney; Martin, Iowa; Mason; Mathews; Meade, Md.; Merrow; Meyer; Michener; Miller, Conn.; Miller, Md.; Miller, Nebr.; Mills; Mitchell; Morton; Muhlenberg; Mundt; Murray, Tenn.; Murray, Wis.; Nixon; Nodar; Norblad; Norman; Norrell; O'Hara; O'Konski; Owens; Passman; Patman; Peden; Peterson; Phillips, Calif.; Ploeser; Plumley; Poage; Potts; Preston; Price, Fla.; Priest; Ramey; Rankin; Redden; Reed, Ill.; Reed, N. Y.; Rees; Reeves; Rich; Richards; Riehlman; Riley; Rivers; Rizley; Robertson; Robsion; Rockwell; Rogers, Fla.; Rogers, Mass.; Rohrbough; Ross; Sadlak; St. George; Sanborn; Sarbacher; Sasscer; Schwabe, Mo.; Schwabe, Okla.; Scott, Hardie; Scott, Hugh D., Jr.; Scrivner; Seely-Brown; Shafer; Short; Sikes; Simpson, Ill.; Simpson, Pa.; Smith, Kans.; Smith, Maine; Smith, Wis.; Springer; Stanley; Stefan; Stevenson; Stockman; Stratton; Sundstrom; Taber; Talle; Taylor; Teague; Thomas, N. J.; Tibbott; Towe; Trimble; Vail; Van Zandt; Vinson; Vorys; Vursell, Wadsworth; Weichel; West; Wheeler; Whitten; Whittington; Wigglesworth; Williams; Wilson, Ind.; Wilson, Tex.; Winstead; Wolcott; Wolverton; Woodruff; Youngblood; Zimmerman.

Nays, 107: Albert; Angell; Bates, Ky.; Bishop; Blatnik; Bloom; Boggs, La.; Brophy; Buchanan; Buckley; Butler; Byrne, N. Y.; Canfield; Cannon; Carroll; Celler; Combs; Cooley; Crosser; D'Alesandro; Dawson, Ill.; Delaney; Dingell; Donohue; Douglas; Eberharter; Elsaesser; Engel, Mich.; Fenton; Flannagan; Fogarty; Folger; Forand; Gordon; Gorski; Granger; Harless, Ariz.; Hart; Havenner; Hays; Hedrick; Heffernan; Holifield; Huber; Jackson, Wash.; Javits; Jenkins, Pa.; Johnson, Okla.; Jones, Ala.; Jones, Wash.; Karsten, Mo.; Kee; Kefauver; Kelley; Kennedy; Keogh; King; Kirwan; Klein; Lane; Lanham; Lemke; Lesinski; Lynch; McCormack; Madden; Manasco; Mansfield, Mont.; Marcantonio; Meade, Ky.; Miller, Calif.; Monroney; Morgan; Morris; Murdock; Norton; O'Brien; O'Toole; Patterson; Pfeifer; Philbin; Phillips, Tenn.; Pickett; Powell; Price, Ill.; Rabin; Rains; Rayburn; Rayfiel; Rooney; Russell; Sabath; Sadowski; Scoblick; Sheppard; Smathers; Smith, Ohio; Snyder; Somers; Spence; Stigler; Thomas, Tex.; Thomason; Tollefson; Twyman; Walter; Welch.

Not voting, 17: Bland; Clements; Cox; Feighan; Fuller; Gerlach; Gifford; Hill; Hull; Kean; Mansfield, Tex.; Morrison; Pace; Poulson; Smith, Va.; Wood; Worley.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Clements against.

You will note that it passed by approximately 3 to 1.

President Truman vetoed the measure, and the House overrode the veto by a vote of 331 to 83. Here is the vote on the veto, roll call No. 85:

ROLL NO. 85

Yeas, 331: Abernethy; Albert; Allen, Calif.; Allen, Ill.; Allen, La.; Almond; Andersen, H. Carl; Anderson, Calif.; Andresen, August H.; Andrews, Ala.; Andrews, N. Y.; Arends; Arnold; Auchincloss; Bakewell; Banta; Barden; Barrett; Bates, Mass.; Battle; Beall; Beckworth; Bell; Bender; Bennett, Mo.; Blackney; Bland; Boggs, Del.; Boggs, La.; Bolton; Bonner; Boykin; Bradley; Bramblett; Brehm; Brooks; Brown, Ga.; Brown, Ohio; Bryson; Buck; Buffett; Bulwinkle; Burke; Burleson; Busbey; Byrnes, Wis.; Camp; Canfield; Carson; Case, N. J.; Case, S. Dak.; Chadwick; Chapman; Chelf; Chenoweth; Chiperfield; Church; Clark; Clason; Clevenger; Clippinger; Coffin; Cole, Kans.; Cole, Mo.; Cole, N. Y.; Colmer; Cooley; Cooper; Corbett; Cotton; Coudert; Courtney; Cox; Cravens; Crawford; Crow; Cunningham; Curtis; Dague; Davis, Ga.; Davis, Tenn.; Davis, Wis.; Dawson, Utah; Deane; Devitt; D'Ewart; Dirksen; Domengeaux; Dondero; Dorn; Doughton; Drewry; Durham; Eaton; Elliott; Ellis; Ellsworth; Elsaesser; Elston; Engel, Mich.; Engle, Calif.; Evins; Fallon; Fellows; Fenton; Fernandez; Fisher; Fletcher; Foote; Fulton; Gallagher; Gamble; Gary; Gathings; Gavin; Gearhart; Gillette; Gillie; Goff; Goodwin; Gore; Gossett; Graham; Grant, Ala.; Grant, Ind.; Gregory; Griffiths; Gross; Gwinn, N. Y.; Gwynne, Iowa; Hagen; Hale; Hall, Edwin Arthur; Hall, Leonard W.; Halleck; Hand; Hardy; Harness, Ind.; Harris; Harrison; Hartley; Hays; Hébert; Hendricks; Herter; Heselton; Hess; Hill; Hinshaw; Hobbs; Hoeven;

Hoffman; Holmes; Hope; Horan; Howell; Jackson, Calif.; Jarman; Jenison; Jenkins, Ohio; Jenkins, Pa.; Jennings; Jensen; Johnson, Calif.; Johnson, Ill.; Johnson, Ind.; Johnson, Tex.; Jones, Ala.; Jones, N. C.; Jones, Ohio; Jonkman; Judd; Kean, Kearney; Kearns; Keating; Keefe; Kerr; Kersten, Wis.; Kilburn; Kilday; Knutson; Kunkel; Landis, Larcade; Latham; Lea; LeCompte; LeFevre; Lewis; Lodge; Love; Lucas; Lyle; McConnell; McCowen; McDonough; McDowell; McGarvey; McGregor; McMahon; McMillen, Ill.; MacKinnon; Macy; Mahon; Maloney; Manasco; Martin, Iowa; Mason; Mathews; Meade, Ky.; Meade, Md.; Merrow; Meyer; Michener; Miller, Conn.; Miller, Md.; Miller, Nebr.; Mills; Mitchell; Monroney; Morton; Muhlenberg; Mundt; Murray, Tenn.; Murray, Wis.; Nixon; Nodar; Norblad; Norrell; O'Hara; O'Konski; Owens; Pace; Passman; Patterson; Peden; Peterson; Phillips, Calif.; Pickett; Ploeser; Plumley; Poage; Potts; Poulson; Preston; Price, Fla.; Priest; Rains; Ramey; Rankin; Redden; Reed, Ill.; Reed, N. Y.; Rees; Reeves; Rich; Richards; Riehlman; Riley; Rivers; Rizley; Robertson; Robsion; Rockwell; Rogers, Fla.; Rogers, Mass.; Rohrbough; Ross; Russell; Sadlak; St. George; Sanborn; Sarbacher; Sasscer; Schwabe, Mo.; Schwabe, Okla.; Scoblick; Scott, Hardie; Scott, Hugh D., Jr.; Scrivner; Seely-Brown; Shafer; Short; Sikes; Simpson, Ill.; Simpson, Pa.; Smathers; Smith, Kans.; Smith, Maine; Smith, Va.; Smith, Wis.; Snyder; Springer; Stanley; Stefan; Stevenson; Stigler; Stockman; Stratton; Sundstrom; Taber; Talle; Taylor; Teague; Thomas, N. J.; Tibbott; Towe; Trimble; Twyman; Vail; Vinson; Vorys; Vursell; Wadsworth; Weichel; West; Wheeler; Whitten; Whittington; Wigglesworth; Williams; Wilson, Ind.; Wilson, Tex.; Wolcott; Wolverton; Wood; Woodruff; Worley; Youngblood; Zimmerman.

Nays, 83: Angell; Bates, Ky.; Bishop; Blatnik; Bloom; Brophy; Buchanan; Buckley; Butler; Byrne, N. Y.; Cannon; Carroll; Celler; Clements; Crosser; Dawson, Ill.; Delaney; Dingell; Donohue; Douglas; Eberharter; Feighan; Flannagan; Fogarty; Folger; Forand; Gordon; Gorski; Granger; Harless, Ariz.; Hart; Havenner; Hedrick; Heffernan; Holifield; Huber; Hull; Jackson, Wash.; Javits; Johnson, Okla.; Jones, Wash.; Karsten, Mo.; Kee; Kennedy; Keogh; King; Kirwan; Klein; Lane; Lanham; Lemke; Lesinski; Lynch; McCormack; Madden; Mansfield, Mont.; Marcantonio; Miller, Calif.; Morgan; Morris; Morrison; Murdock; Norton; O'Brien; O'Toole; Pfeifer; Philbin; Phillips, Tenn.; Price, Ill.; Rabin; Rayburn; Rayfiel; Rooney; Sabath; Sadowski; Sheppard; Somers; Spence; Thomas, Tex.; Thomason; Tollefson; Walter; Welch.

Not voting, 15: Bennett, Mich.; Combs; Dolliver; Fuller; Gifford; Kefauver; Kelley; Lusk; McMillan, S. C.; Mansfield, Tex.; Patman; Powell; Smith, Ohio; Van Zandt; Winstead.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Zandt and Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Gifford and Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Kelley against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mrs. Lusk.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

So you will see that not only two-thirds of the membership voted to override the veto, but that it only lacked one vote of passing over the veto by 4 to 1.

I hope every Member who was here at that time will check this roll call carefully, and that none of them will be intimidated by the threats of patronage reprisals.

The welfare of our country is at stake.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2032, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Will the bill be read title by title, section by section, or paragraph by paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read by section.

At the close of the session on yesterday, all general debate had expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Labor Relations Act of 1949."

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD: Mr. WOOD moves to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949.'

"(b) Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and above all recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

"It is the purpose and policy of this act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to define and proscribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare, and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce.

"TITLE I

"REPEAL OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AND REENACTMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT WITH CERTAIN AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 101. The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby repealed. The National Labor Relations Act, as it existed prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"'FINDINGS AND POLICIES

"'SEC. 1. The denial by some employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by some employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest, which have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by (a) impairing the efficiency, safety, or operation of the instrumentalities of commerce; (b) occurring in the current of commerce; (c) materially affecting, restraining, or controlling the flow of raw materials or manufactured or processed goods from or into the channels of commerce, or the prices of such materials or goods in commerce; or (d) causing diminution of employment and wages in such volume as substantially to impair or disrupt the market for goods flowing from or into the channels of commerce.

"'The inequality of bargaining power between employees who do not possess full freedom of association or actual liberty of contract, and employers who are organized in the corporate or other forms of ownership association substantially burdens and affects the flow of commerce, and tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions, by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners in industry and by preventing the stabilization of competitive wage rates and working conditions within and between industries.

"'Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

"'Experience has further demonstrated that certain practices by some labor organizations, their officers, and members have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by preventing the free flow of goods in such commerce through strikes and other forms of industrial unrest or through concerted activities which impair the interest of the public in the free flow of such commerce. The elimination of such practices is a necessary condition to the assurance of the rights herein guaranteed.

"'It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

"'DEFINITIONS

"'SEC. 2. When used in this act—

"'(1) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

"'(2) The term "employer" includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporations, or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private

shareholder or individual, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

"'(3) The term "employee" shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute or because of any unfair labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse, or any individual having the status of an independent contractor, or any individual employed as a supervisor, or any individual employed by an employer subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or by any other person who is not an employer as herein defined.

"'(4) The term "representatives" includes any individual or labor organization.

"'(5) The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, or dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"'(6) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

"'(7) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"'(8) The term "unfair labor practice" means any unfair labor practice listed in section 8.

"'(9) The term "labor dispute" includes any controversy concerning terms, tenure or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee.

"'(10) The term "National Labor Relations Board" means the National Labor Relations Board provided for in section 3 of this act.

"'(11) The term "supervisor" means any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibly to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment.

"'(12) The term "professional employee" means—

"'(a) any employee engaged in work (i) predominantly intellectual and varied in character as opposed to routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work; (ii) involving the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance; (iii) of such a character that the output produced or the result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time; (iv) requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning or a hospital, as distinguished from a general academic education or from an apprenticeship or from training in the performance of routine mental, manual, or physical processes; or

"'(b) any employee, who (i) has completed the courses of specialized intellectual instruction and study described in clause (iv) of paragraph (a), and (ii) is performing related work under the supervision of a professional person to qualify himself to become a professional employee as defined in paragraph (a).

"'(13) In determining whether any person is acting as an "agent" of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling.

"'NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"'SEC. 3. (a) The National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter called the "Board"), consisting of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949, the terms of office of the members of the Board in office on the date of the enactment of such act shall expire as provided by law at the time of their appointment. Their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, excepting that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"'(b) The Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers which it may itself exercise. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board, and three members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum of the Board, except that two members shall constitute a quorum of any group designated pursuant to the first sentence hereof. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"'(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

"'(d) There shall be a General Counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949, the term of office of the General Counsel in office on the date of the enactment of such act shall expire as provided by law at the time of his appointment. The General Counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law.

"'SEC. 4. (a) Each member of the Board and the General Counsel of the Board shall receive a salary of $12,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties. The Board may not employ any attorneys for the purpose of reviewing transcripts of hearings or preparing drafts of opinions except that any attorney employed for assignment as a legal assistant to any Board member may for such Board member review such transcripts and prepare such drafts. No trial examiner's report shall be reviewed, either before or after its publication, by any person other than a member of the Board or his legal assistant, and no trial examiner shall advise or consult with the Board with respect to exceptions taken to his findings, rulings, or recommendations. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Board, appear for and represent the Board in any case in court. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Board to appoint individuals for the purpose of conciliation or mediation, or for economic analysis.

"'(b) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"'SEC. 5. The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. A member who participates in such inquiry shall not be disqualified from subsequently participating in a decision of the Board in the same case.

"'SEC. 6. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"'RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

"'SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 8 (a) (3).

"'UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"'SEC. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

"'(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7;

"'(2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it: *Provided*, That subject to rules and regulations made and published by the Board pursuant to section 6, an employer shall not be prohibited from permitting em-

ployees to confer with him during working hours without loss of time or pay;

"'(3) by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization: *Provided*, That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice) to require as a condition of employment membership therein on or after the 30th day following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of such agreement, whichever is the later, (i) if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9 (a), in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made and has complied with all the requirements imposed by sections 9 (f), (g), and (h); and (ii) if, in case an election has been held under section 9 (e) (1) within 1 year preceding the effective date of such agreement, the Board shall not have certified that at least a majority of the employees eligible to vote in such election have voted to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make such an agreement: *Provided further*, That no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, or (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than (1) the employee's failure to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (2) the employee's participation in, or encouragement of other employees to engage in, a strike or concerted activity in violation of the collective-bargaining agreement between such labor organization and the employer, or (3) the employee's membership or affiliation with the Communist Party or his support thereof, or his membership in, affiliation with, or support of any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or any illegal or unconstitutional methods: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall make it an unfair labor practice for an employer merely to notify a labor organization of opportunities for employment;

"'(4) to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this act;

"'(5) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a).

"'(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

"'(1) to restrain or coerce (A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein; or (B) an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances;

"'(2) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of subsection (a) (3) or to discriminate against an employee with respect to whom membership in such organization has been denied or terminated on some ground other than (1) the employee's failure to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (2) the employee's participation in, or encouragement of other employees to engage in, a strike or concerted activity in violation of the collective-bargaining agreement between such labor organization and the employer, or (3) the employee's membership or affiliation with the Communist Party or his support thereof, or his membership in, affiliation with, or support of any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or any illegal or unconstitutional methods;

"'(3) to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, provided it is the representative of his employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a);

"'(4) to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is: (A) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person; unless such strike or concerted refusal is authorized by a clause or stipulation in a collective-bargaining contract permitting employees covered by such contract to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose employees, who would normally perform such work, are engaged in a lawful strike approved or ratified by their representative whom such employer is required to recognize under this act, if such representative is the same local labor organization which is a party to such collective-bargaining contract; (B) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (C) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (D) forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class, unless such employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under this act;

"'(5) to require of employees covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a) (3) the payment, as a condition precedent to becoming a member of such organization, of a fee in an amount which the Board finds excessive or discriminatory under all the circumstances. In making such a finding, the Board shall consider, among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organizations in the particular industry, and the wages currently paid to the employees affected;

"'(6) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed or not to be performed; and

"'(c) The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

"'(d) For the purposes of this section, to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligations of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession: *Provided*, That where there is in effect a collective-bargaining contract covering employees in an industry affecting commerce, the duty to bargain collectively shall also mean that no party to such contract shall terminate or modify such contract, unless the party desiring such termination or modification—

"'(1) serves a written notice upon the other party to the contract of the proposed termination or modification 60 days prior to the expiration date thereof, or in the event such contract contains no expiration date, or such contract contains reopening provisions for purposes of modification, 60 days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification;

"'(2) offers to meet and confer with the other party for the purpose of negotiating a new contract or a contract containing the proposed modifications;

"'(3) notifies the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service within 30 days after such notice of the existence of a dispute, and simultaneously therewith notifies any State or Territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or Territory where the dispute occurred, provided no agreement has been reached by that time; and

"'(4) continues in full force and effect, without resorting to strike or lock-out, all the terms and conditions of the existing contract for a period of 60 days after such notice is given:

The duties imposed upon employers, employees, and labor organizations by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall become inapplicable upon an intervening certification of the Board, under which the labor organization or individual, which is a party to the contract, has been superseded as or ceased to be the representative of the employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a), and the duties so imposed shall not be construed as requiring either party to discuss or agree to any modification of the terms and conditions contained in a contract for a fixed period, if such modification is to become effective before such terms and conditions can be reopened under the provisions of the contract.

"'REPRESENTATIVES AND ELECTIONS

"'SEC. 9. (a) Representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment: *Provided*, That any individual employee or a group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer and to have such grievances adjusted, without the

intervention of the bargaining representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining contract or agreement then in effect: *Provided further*, That the bargaining representative has been given opportunity to be present at such adjustment.

"'(b) The Board shall decide in each case whether, in order to assure to employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this act, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof: *Provided*, That the Board shall not (1) decide that any unit is appropriate for such purposes if such unit includes both professional employees and employees who are not professional employees unless a majority of such professional employees vote for inclusion in such unit; or (2) decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purposes on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination, unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation or (3) decide that any unit is appropriate for such purposes if it includes, together with other employees, any individual employed as a guard to enforce against employees and other persons rules to protect property of the employer or to protect the safety of persons on the employer's premises; but no labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

"'(c) (1) Whenever a petition shall have been filed, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Board—

"'(A) by an employee or group of employees or any individual or labor organization acting in their behalf alleging that a substantial number of employees (i) wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their employer declines to recognize their representative as the representative defined in section 9 (a), or (ii) assert that the individual or labor organization, which has been certified or as being currently recognized by their employer as the bargaining representative, is no longer a representative as defined in section 9 (a); or

"'(B) by an employer, alleging that one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim to be recognized as the representative defined in section 9 (a);

the Board shall investigate such petition and if it has reasonable cause to believe that a question of representation affecting commerce exists shall provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice. Such hearing may be conducted by an officer or employee of the regional office, who shall not make any recommendations with respect thereto. If the Board finds upon the record of such hearing that such a question of representation exists, it shall direct an election by secret ballot and shall certify the results thereof.

"'(2) In determining whether or not a question of representation affecting commerce exists, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of the identity of the persons filing the petition or the kind of relief sought and in no case shall the Board deny a labor organization a place on the ballot by reason of an order with respect to such labor organization or its predecessor not issued in conformity with section 10 (c).

"'(3) No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held. An employee on strike shall be eligible to vote (A) if he is entitled to reinstatement, or (B) even though he is not entitled to reinstatement, if his place has not been validly filled by a permanent replacement for 90 days or more preceding the date of the election. In any election where none of the choices on the ballot receives a majority, a run-off shall be conducted, the ballot providing for a selection between the two choices receiving the largest and second largest number of valid votes cast in the election.

"'(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the waiving of hearings by stipulation for the purpose of a consent election in conformity with regulations and rules of decision of the Board.

"'(5) In determining whether a unit is appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b), the extent to which the employees have organized shall not be controlling.

"'(d) Whenever an order of the Board made pursuant to section 10 (c) is based in whole or in part upon facts certified following an investigation pursuant to subsection (c) of this section and there is a petition for the enforcement or review of such order, such certification and the record of such investigation shall be included in the transcript of the entire record required to be filed under section 10 (e) or 10 (f), and thereupon the decree of the court enforcing, modifying, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board shall be made and entered upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript.

"'(e) (1) Upon the filing with the Board by 30 percent or more of the employees in an appropriate collective-bargaining unit of whom a labor organization is the representative as provided in section 9 (a), of a petition alleging that they desire to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make an agreement with the employer of such employees requiring membership in such labor organization as a condition of employment in such unit, the Board shall take a secret ballot of the employees in such unit and shall certify the results thereof to such labor organization and to the employer.

"'(2) No election shall be conducted pursuant to this subsection in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held.

"'(f) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, unless such labor organization and any national or international labor organization of which such labor organization is an affiliate or constituent unit (A) shall have prior thereto filed with the Secretary of Labor copies of its constitution and bylaws and a report, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, showing—

"'(1) the name of such labor organization and the address of its principal place of business;

"'(2) the names, titles, and compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and of any of its other officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the preceding year exceeded $5,000, and the amount of the compensation and allowances paid to each such officer or agent during such year;

"'(3) the manner in which the officers and agents referred to in clause (2) were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected;

"'(4) the initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay on becoming members of such labor organization;

"'(5) the regular dues or fees which members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing of such labor organization;

"'(6) a detailed statement of, or reference to provisions of its constitution and bylaws showing the procedure followed with respect to, (a) qualification for or restrictions on membership, (b) election of officers and stewards, (c) calling of regular and special meetings, (d) levying of assessments, (e) imposition of fines, (f) authorization for bargaining demands, (g) ratification of contract terms, (h) authorization for strikes, (i) authorization for disbursement of union funds, (j) audit of union financial transactions, (k) participation in insurance or other benefit plans, and (l) expulsion of members and the grounds therefor;

and (B) can show that prior thereto it has—

"'(1) filed with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, a report showing all of (a) its receipts of any kind and the sources of such receipts, (b) its total assets and liabilities as of the end of its last fiscal year, (c) the disbursements made by it during such fiscal year, including the purposes for which made, which report shall be filed within 120 days of the end of such fiscal year; and

"'(2) furnished to all of the members of such labor organization copies of the financial report required by paragraph (1) hereof to be filed with the Secretary of Labor.

"'(g) It shall be the obligation of all labor organizations to file annually with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, reports bringing up to date the information required to be supplied in the initial filing by subsection (f) (A) of this section, and to file with the Secretary of Labor, and furnish to its members annually financial reports in the form and manner prescribed in subsection (f) (B). No labor organization shall be eligible for certification under this section as the representative of any employees, and no complaint shall issue under section 10 with respect to a charge filed by a labor organization unless it can show that it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit has complied with its obligation under this subsection.

"'(h) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees under subsection (c) of this section raised by, and no complaint shall be issued under subsection (b) of section 10, pursuant to a charge made by—

"'(i) a labor organization unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by each officer of such labor organization and the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit; or

"'(ii) an employer, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by such employer, if a natural person or persons, or each officer of such employer—

stating that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of, or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 35A of the Criminal Code shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits.

"'PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"'SEC. 10. (a) The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in sec. 8) affecting commerce. This power shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry (other than mining, manufacturing,

communications, and transportation except where predominantly local in character) even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce, unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

"'(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect, and containing a notice of hearing before the Board or a member thereof, or before a designated agent or agency, at a place therein fixed, not less than 5 days after the serving of said complaint: *Provided,* That no complaint shall issue based upon any unfair labor practice occurring more than 6 months prior to the filing of the charge with the Board and the service of a copy thereof upon the person against whom such charge is made, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the armed forces, in which event the 6-month period shall be computed from the day of his discharge. Any such complaint may be amended by the member, agent, or agency, conducting the hearing or the Board in its discretion at any time prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to the original or amended complaint and to appear in person or otherwise and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint. In the discretion of the member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or the Board, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the said proceeding and to present testimony. Any such proceeding shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure for the district courts of the United States, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (U. S. C., title 28, secs 723–B, 723–C).

"'(c) The testimony taken by such member, agent, or agency or the Board shall be reduced to writing and filed with the Board. Thereafter, in its discretion, the Board upon notice may take further testimony or hear argument. If upon the preponderance of the testimony taken the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act: *Provided,* That where an order directs reinstatement of an employee, back pay may be required of the employer or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination suffered by him: *And provided further,* That in determining whether a complaint shall issue alleging a violation of section 8 (a) (1) or section 8 (a) (2), and in deciding such cases, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of whether or not the labor organization affected is affiliated with a labor organization national or international in scope. Such order may further require such person to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If upon the preponderance of the testimony taken the Board shall not be of the opinion that the person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint. No order of the Board shall require the reinstatement of any individual as an employee who has been suspended or discharged, or the payment to him of any back pay, if such individual was suspended or discharged for cause. In case the evidence is presented before a member of the Board, or before an examiner or examiners thereof, such member, or such examiner or examiners, as the case may be, shall issue and cause to be served on the parties to the proceeding a proposed report, together with a recommended order, which shall be filed with the Board, and if no exceptions are filed within 20 days after service thereof upon such parties, or within such further period as the Board may authorize, such recommended order shall become the order of the Board and become effective as therein prescribed.

"'(d) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the Board may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"'(e) The Board shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia), or if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application may be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia), within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair labor practice in question occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceedings, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board. No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board, its members, agent, or agency, and to be made a part of the transcript. The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals if application was made to the district court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

"'(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Board granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, including the pleading and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered, and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Board under subsection (e), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Board such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board; the findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall in like manner be conclusive.

"'(g) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (e) or (f) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Board's order.

"'(h) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order on the Board, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 29, secs. 101–115).

"'(i) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously, and if possible within 10 days after they have been docketed.

"'(j) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice under this act, the General Counsel may petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter. Upon the filing of any such petition the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further,* That no temporary restraining order shall be issued without notice unless a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party will be unavoidable and such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and will become void at the expiration

of such period. Upon filing of any such petition the courts shall cause notice thereof to be served upon any person involved in the charge and such person, including the charging party, shall be given an opportunity to appear by counsel and present any relevant testimony: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this subsection district courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of an employer or a labor organization (1) in the district in which such employer or labor organization, as the case may be, maintains its principal office, or (2) in any district in which (in the case of an employer) the employer transacts business, or (in the case of a labor organization) in which the labor organization's authorized officers or agents are engaged in promoting or protecting the interests of employee members, and in the case of a labor organization the service of legal process upon such an authorized officer or agent shall constitute service upon the labor organization and make such organization a party to the suit.

"'INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"'SEC. 11. For the purpose of all hearings and investigations, which, in the opinion of the Board, are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by section 9 and section 10—

"'(1) The Board, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. The Board, or any member thereof, shall upon application of any party to such proceedings, forthwith issue to such party subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such proceeding or investigation requested in such application. Within 5 days after the service of a subpena on any person requiring the production of any evidence in his possession or under his control, such person may petition the Board to revoke, and the Board shall revoke, such subpena if in its opinion the evidence whose production is required does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if in its opinion such subpena does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence whose production is required. Any member of the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"'(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Board shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

"'(3) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"'(4) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Board, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph, or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"'(5) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"'(6) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

"'SEC. 12. Any person, who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Board or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"'LIMITATIONS

"'SEC. 13. Nothing in this act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.

"'SEC. 14. (a) Nothing herein shall prohibit any individual employed as a supervisor from becoming or remaining a member of a labor organization, but no employer subject to this act shall be compelled to deem individuals defined herein as supervisors as employees for the purpose of any law, either national or local, relating to collective bargaining.

"'(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

"'SEC. 15. Wherever the application of the provisions of section 272 of chapter 10 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (U. S. C., title 11, sec. 672), conflicts with the application of the provisions of this act, this act shall prevail: *Provided,* That in any situation where the provisions of this act cannot be validly enforced, the provisions of such other acts shall remain in full force and effect.

"'SEC. 16. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"'SEC. 17. This act may be cited as the "National Labor Relations Act."'

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 102. No proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board shall abate, and no order or certification of the Board in effect on the date of the enactment of this act shall be invalidated, by reason of any of the provisions of this act or of the amendments made by this act, but such proceeding shall be continued, and such orders and certifications continue in effect, as if this act had not been enacted; and no provision of this act shall prevent the Board from entertaining, processing, making, or enforcing any petition, charge, complaint, or order with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this act; except that the Board shall not, in any of the above cases, entertain, process, make, or enforce any petition, charge, complaint, or order with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this act unless such petition, charge, complaint, or order could be entertained, processed, made, or enforced by the Board with respect to a like act or omission occurring after the date of the enactment of this act.

"TITLE II—CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES IN INDUSTRIES AFFECTING COMMERCE; NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 201. It is the policy of the United States that—

"(a) sound and stable industrial peace and the advancement of the general welfare, health, and safety of the Nation and of the best interests of employers and employees can most satisfactorily be secured by the settlement of issues between employers and employees through the processes of conference and collective bargaining between employers and the representatives of their employees;

"(b) the settlement of issues between employers and employees through collective bargaining may be advanced by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, and to make all reasonable efforts to settle their differences by mutual agreement reached through conferences and collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes; and

"(c) certain controversies which arise between parties to collective-bargaining agreements may be avoided or minimized by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for furnishing assistance to employers and the representatives of their employees in formulating for inclusion within such agreements provision for adequate notice of any proposed changes in the terms of such agreements, for the final adjustment of grievances or questions regarding the application or interpretation of such agreements, and other provisions designed to prevent the subsequent arising of such controversies.

"SEC. 202. (a) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 101 of this act, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is hereby continued as an independent agency of the United States. The Service shall be under the direction of a Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director (hereinafter referred to as the 'Director'), appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but section 101 of this act shall not have the effect of vacating or abolishing the office of Director in office on the date of the enactment of this act. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The Director

shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

"(b) The Director is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to appoint such clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the execution of the functions of the Service, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and may, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such conciliators and mediators as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Service. The Director is authorized to make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as he deems necessary. Such expenditures shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Director or by any employee designated by him for that purpose.

"(c) The principal office of the Service shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Director may establish regional offices convenient to localities in which labor controversies are likely to arise. The Director may by order, subject to revocation at any time, delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him by this act to any regional director, or other officer or employee of the Service. The Director may establish suitable procedures for cooperation with State and local mediation agencies. The Director shall make an annual report in writing to Congress at the end of the fiscal year.

"(d) All mediation and conciliation functions vested, prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the Secretary of Labor or the United States Conciliation Service under section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to create a Department of Labor,' approved March 4, 1913 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 51), and all functions vested prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the United States Conciliation Service under any other law shall continue as functions of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The Director and the Service shall not be subject in any way to the jurisdiction or authority of the Secretary of Labor or any official or division of the Department of Labor.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE SERVICE

"SEC. 203. (a) It shall be the duty of the Service, in order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, to assist parties to labor disputes in industries affecting commerce to settle such disputes through conciliation and mediation.

"(b) The Service may proffer its services in any labor dispute in any industry affecting commerce, either upon its own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute, whenever in its judgment such dispute threatens to cause a substantial interruption of commerce. The Director and the Service are directed to avoid attempting to mediate disputes which would have only a minor effect on interstate commerce if State or other conciliation services are available to the parties. Whenever the Service does proffer its services in any dispute, it shall be the duty of the Service promptly to put itself in communication with the parties and to use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement.

"(c) If the Director is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation within a reasonable time, he shall seek to induce the parties voluntarily to seek other means of settling the dispute without resort to strike, lock-out, or other coercion. The failure or refusal of either party to agree to any procedure suggested by the Director shall not be deemed a violation of any duty or obligation imposed by this act.

"(d) Final adjustment by a method agreed upon by the parties is hereby declared to be the desirable method for settlement of grievance disputes arising over the application or interpretation of an existing collective-bargaining agreement. The Service is directed to make its conciliation and mediation services available in the settlement of such grievance disputes only as a last resort and in exceptional cases.

"SEC. 204. (a) In order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, employers and employees and their representatives, in any industry affecting commerce, shall—

"(1) exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, including provision for adequate notice of any proposed change in the terms of such agreements;

"(2) whenever a dispute arises over the terms or application of a collective-bargaining agreement and a conference is requested by a party or prospective party thereto, arrange promptly for such a conference to be held and endeavor in such conference to settle such dispute expeditiously; and

"(3) in case such dispute is not settled by conference, participate fully and promptly in such meetings as may be undertaken by the Service under this act for the purpose of aiding in a settlement of the dispute.

"SEC. 205. (a) There shall be a National Labor-Management Panel which shall be composed of 12 members appointed by the President, six of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of management and six of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of labor. Each member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, four at the end of the first year, four at the end of the second year, and four at the end of the third year after the date of appointment. Notwithstanding section 101 of this act, the terms of office of the members in office on the date of the enactment of this act shall expire as provided by law at the time of their appointment. Members of the panel, when serving on business of the panel, shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the panel, at the request of the Director, to advise in the avoidance of industrial controversies and the manner in which mediation and voluntary adjustment shall be administered, particularly with reference to controversies affecting the general welfare of the country.

"NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 206. (a) Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof, and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out—

"(i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and

"(ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

"(b) In any case, the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' shall not be applicable.

"(c) The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 346 and 347).

"SEC. 207. (a) Whenever a district court has issued an order under section 206 enjoining acts or practices which imperil or threaten to imperil the national health or safety, it shall be the duty of the parties to the labor dispute giving rise to such order to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, with the assistance of the Service created by this act. Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any proposal of settlement made by the Service.

"(b) Upon the issuance of such an order, the President shall appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the disputes, including each party's statement of its position but shall not contain any recommendations. The President shall file a copy of such report with the Service and shall make its contents available to the public.

"(c) At the end of an 80-day period after the issuance of any order by a district court (unless the dispute has been settled by that time), the board of inquiry shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement, and shall include a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. The President shall make such report available to the public.

"SEC. 208. Upon the expiration of such 80-day period or upon a settlement being reached, whichever happens sooner, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged. When such motion is granted, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, including the findings of the board of inquiry, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action.

"SEC. 209. (a) A board of inquiry shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(b) Members of a board of inquiry shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(c) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. 19, title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"COMPILATION OF COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS, AND SO FORTH

"SEC. 210. (a) For the guidance and information of interested representatives of employers, employees, and the general public, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor shall maintain a file of copies of all available collective-bargaining agreements and other available agreements and actions thereunder settling or adjusting labor disputes. Such file shall be open to inspection under appropriate conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, except that no specific information submitted in confidence shall be disclosed.

"(b) The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor is authorized to furnish upon request of the Service, or employers, employees, or their representatives, all available data and factual information which may aid in the settlement of any labor dispute, except that no specific information submitted in confidence shall be disclosed.

"EXEMPTION OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

"SEC. 211. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time.

"TITLE III

"SUITS BY AND AGAINST LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 301. (a) Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this act, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties.

"(b) Any labor organization which represents employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this act and any employer whose activities affect commerce as defined in this act shall be bound by the acts of its agents. Any such labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity and in behalf of the employees whom it represents in the courts of the United States. Any money judgment against a labor organization in a district court of the United States shall be enforceable only against the organization as an entity and against its assets, and shall not be enforceable against any individual member or his assets.

"(c) For the purposes of actions and proceedings by or against labor organizations in the district courts of the United States, district courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of a labor organization (1) in the district in which such organization maintains its principal office, or (2) in any district in which its duly authorized officers or agents are engaged in representing or acting for employee members.

"(d) The service of summons, subpena, or other legal process of any court of the United States upon an officer or agent of a labor organization, in his capacity as such, shall constitute service upon the labor organization.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, in determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling.

"RESTRICTIONS ON PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 302. (a) It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of his employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any representative of any employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce to receive or accept or to agree to receive or accept, from the employer of such employees any money or other thing of value.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable (1) with respect to any money or other thing of value payable by an employer to any representative who is an employee or former employee of such employer, as compensation for, or by reason of, his services as an employee of such employer; (2) with respect to the payment or delivery of any money or other thing of value in satisfaction of a judgment of any court or a decision or award of an arbitrator or impartial chairman or in compromise, adjustment, settlement, or release of any claim, complaint, grievance, or dispute in the absence of fraud or duress, (3) with respect to the sale or purchase of an article or commodity at the prevailing market price in the regular course of business; (4) with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization: *Provided*, That the employer has received from each employee, on whose account such deductions are made, a written assignment which by its terms is not effective beyond whichever of the following dates first occurs (1) one year from the date of its execution or (ii) the termination date of the applicable collective bargaining agreement; or (5) with respect to money or other thing of value paid to a trust fund established by such representative, for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents): *Provided*, That (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or unemployment benefits or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; (B) the detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer, and employees and employers are equally represented in the administration of such fund, together with such neutral persons as the representatives of the employees and the representatives of the employers may agree upon and in the event the employer and employee groups deadlock on the administration of such fund and there are no neutral persons empowered to break such deadlock, such agreement provides that the two groups shall agree on an impartial umpire to decide such dispute, or in event of their failure to agree within a reasonable length of time, an impartial umpire to decide such dispute shall, on petition of either group, be appointed by the district court of the United States for the district where the trust fund has its principal office, and shall also contain provisions for an annual audit of the trust fund, a statement of the results of which shall be available for inspection by interested persons at the principal office of the trust fund and at such other places as may be designated in such written agreement; and (C) such payments as are intended to be used for the purpose of providing pensions or annuities for employees are made to a separate trust which provides that the funds held therein cannot be used for any purpose other than paying such pensions or annuities.

"(d) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(e) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the territories and possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain violations of this section, without regard to the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of such act of October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 17, and title 29, sec. 52), and the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

"(f) Compliance with the restrictions contained in subsection (c) (5) (B) upon contributions to trust funds, otherwise lawful, shall not be applicable to contributions to such trust funds established by collective agreement prior to January 1, 1946, nor shall subsection (c) (5) (A) be construed as prohibiting contributions to such trust funds if prior to January 1, 1947, such funds contained provisions for pooled vacation benefits.

"BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

"SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section only, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is—

"(1) Forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person, unless such strike or concerted refusal is authorized by a clause or stipulation in a collective-bargaining contract permitting employees covered by such contract to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose employees, who would normally perform such work, are engaged in a lawful strike approved or ratified by their representative who such employer is required to recognize under this act, if such representative is the same local labor organization which is a party to such collective-bargaining contract;

"(2) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act;

"(3) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act;

"(4) forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a

strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act.

"(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of the suit.

"RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 304. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 2, sec. 251; Supp. V, title 50, App., sec. 1509), is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress, are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.'

"STRIKES BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 305. It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the United States or any agency thereof including wholly owned Government corporations to participate in any strike. Any individual employed by the United States or by any such agency who strikes shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil-service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for reemployment for 3 years by the United States or any such agency.

"TITLE IV

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 401. When used in this act—

"(1) The term 'industry affecting commerce' means any industry or activity in commerce or in which a labor dispute would burden or obstruct commerce or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(2) The term 'strike' includes any strike or other concerted stoppage of work by employees (including a stoppage by reason of the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) and any concerted slow-down or other concerted interruption of operations by employees.

"(3) The terms 'commerce,' 'labor disputes,' 'employer,' 'employee,' 'labor organization,' 'representative,' 'person,' and 'supervisor,' shall have the same meaning as when used in the National Labor Relations Act as amended by this act.

"SAVING PROVISION

"SEC. 402. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent; nor shall the quitting of labor by an employee or employees in good faith because of abnormally dangerous conditions for work at the place of employment of such employee or employees be deemed a strike under this act.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 403. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. KELLEY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, that the amendment be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the amendment is the bill H. R. 4290?

Mr. KELLEY. That is correct.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if the substitute amendment, after being read, will be subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be open to amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether we could not have, as part of the unanimous-consent request a request that amendments may be addressed to the substitute by reference to the page and line numbers of the bill H. R. 4290?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would consider that the proper way to offer amendments.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, the Thomas-Lesinski bill will return the country to the chaotic conditions which existed under the Wagner Act when the CIO and AFL fought like hungry wolves over the carcass of business left lifeless by a labor board which admitted that it was partial to unions and under the law could not be otherwise.

The Taft-Hartley Act, from its inception, has been maligned and berated by union leaders through propaganda methods equalled only by Hitler. Congress must, therefore, write a new labor law.

This substitute retains the protections for individual employees and the public which were so sorely needed from 1935 to 1947, and at the same time it modifies the Taft-Hartley law to take care of every justifiable criticism made to the committees of Congress by unions.

There is absolutely no truth to the charge that the proposed substitute is more restrictive to labor than the Taft-Hartley law. To the contrary it is less restrictive. Indeed, this bill contains freedoms for the workingman—it merely places responsibilities upon labor unions and their leaders commensurate with their privileges.

The proposed substitute modifies the present law in conformity with the factually supported criticisms of unions as follows:

First. Under the proposed substitute the Labor Board general counsel is not required to seek an injunction against anyone at any time. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, application for injunction was mandatory in certain cases against unions. The substitute eliminates that requirement.

The general counsel is, however, permitted to seek injunctions against both unions and employers for just and proper relief. This is the kind of injunctions which unions have frequently requested, and which was granted against General Motors on the charge of the CIO United Automobile Workers.

Second. Strikers will not lose their employee status because of strikes in violation of contracts—section 8 (d).

Third. The right of economic strikers to vote is protected even beyond that required by the Supreme Court's Mackay Radio decision under the Wagner Act—section 9 (c) (3).

Fourth. No election is necessary to make a union-shop contract—section 9 (e) (1)—and employees may be discharged at the union's request for Communist activity and wildcat strikes, as well as for nonpayment of dues—section 8 (a) (3) (B). This was urged by union witnesses.

Fifth. It is not illegal for an employer to notify a union of job openings—section 8 (a) (3) (B).

Sixth. Strikes during the term of a contract will be permitted under certain conditions—section 8 (d) (1).

Seventh. Employers as well as unions must sign non-Communist affidavits.

Eighth. The jurisdictional-dispute hearing procedure, which has been frequently criticized by unions, is eliminated. However, it is still an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in a jurisdictional strike—sections 10 (k), 8 (b) (4) (a).

Ninth. The President may—he is not required to—ask for an injunction in case of a strike which he believes imperils the national health and safety, without waiting for a preliminary report from a fact-finding board. Also, the last-offer elections are eliminated. This change in no way increases the injunctive power of the President under the present law. It merely removes the requirement that he first appoint a board and receive its preliminary report.

The Lesinski bill relies entirely upon a Presidential proclamation and the force of public opinion in such cases.

Tenth. The authorization of an employee for his employer to check off union dues from his wages cannot be

effective for longer than 1 year without renewal.

Eleventh. The substitute legalizes struck-work clauses in labor contracts. This permits an agreement whereby employees may refuse to work on goods coming from a plant where there is a legitimate strike being conducted by the contracting union.

The above represent all changes this substitute makes to the present law. Thus, the propaganda that this substitute is worse than the Taft-Hartley law for unions is without any foundation of fact. There is absolutely no basis for the charge that the injunctive provisions, or any others, for that matter, are more objectionable. The mandatory injunction has been the most severely criticized, and that is eliminated entirely.

We who have framed this bill have done so because we believe that a majority of the Congress wishes to vote for a new labor bill that removes the justifiable objections of organized labor to the Taft-Hartley Act, but that they cannot in good conscience vote to return to the discredited Wagner Act with three or four minor and relatively insignificant substantive amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to ask the gentleman if the substitute amendment is the bill H. R. 4290, introduced by him on April 14, 1949, as printed and as is available to the membership of the House.

Mr. WOOD. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] might as well have substituted his name for the names of TAFT and Hartley and let the Taft-Hartley bill alone.

Mr. Chairman, at the expense of being repetitious, I wish to impress upon the membership of this House the primary reason I oppose the Wood bill; it is because the Democratic platform specifically called for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reenactment of the original Wagner Act with certain amendments. Those certain amendments are in the Lesinski bill, and we have it before the House. The President in his campaign referred to it continually; Members of Congress on this side of the aisle campaigned on that platform; they promised the people of this country that that would be one of the first objectives of the Democratic Congress when it convened the first of the year. Now we find certain Members on our side of the aisle who are offering a substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act. That is not keeping faith with the American people; that is not keeping faith with the Democratic platform. If we are to be honest with ourselves, if the party wants to be honest with the people, there is nothing to do except to oppose this kind of amendment. Let us do exactly what we said we were going to do. I remember that was one of the first things in the Democratic platform, and it was pointed out very clearly yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] when he said that the Eightieth Congress came here and said there ought to be some sort of labor legislation and then pulled something nebulous out of the air and finally termed it the Taft-Hartley bill. They said they had a mandate from the people, and as a result wrote the Taft-Hartley bill.

What is the situation now? And what was the situation before the last election? The Democratic platform stated that we were going to repeal it, that we were going to reenact the Wagner Act with certain amendments, which is the present Lesinski bill. The people said that is what they wanted, that they did not want the Taft-Hartley bill. There is nothing else for this Congress to do, especially those on the Democratic side of the House. Are you going to honor the Democratic platform or not?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Georgia said that the Wagner Act had to be repealed because the Board was partial to labor. What will happen under the Wood bill if the general counsel is partial to the employer? What will happen to labor unions?

Mr. KELLEY. They will be destroyed, as they would be under the Taft-Hartley Act; because in the year and a half the Taft-Hartley Act has been in effect the enemies of labor have used that act to destroy labor unions, and one union in the West was almost destroyed as a result of the procedure of employers under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the chairman of the subcommittee inform the House under what conditions, if any, we shall be permitted to offer amendments to H. R. 2032, the Lesinski bill? Shall we have a chance to offer amendments to the Lesinski bill?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; if you vote down the Wood bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, we must first vote down the Wood bill?

M. KELLEY. Yes; I am sorry to say we must proceed that way when we ought to be working on the Lesinski bill.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Referring to the record of the debate yesterday I put the question to the gentleman from Pennsylvania if the gentleman will indicate so we might know just where we stood, what amendments the leadership on that side has agreed to; and the gentleman's answer is quoted: "I know of no amendments; I have agreed to nothing."

In order for the Members of the House to know just what amendments the gentleman has already agreed to and conceded on H. R. 2032, will the gentleman now indicate what amendments he will or will not support to the bill H. R. 3032?

Mr. KELLEY. I shall reply to the gentleman in this fashion: I have not been taken into the confidence of the leadership on this or the other side of the House in regard to amendments. I have stated in my present address that being chairman of the subcommittee that voted out the present Lesinski bill which conforms to the promises of the Democratic platform and the campaign promises of the Democratic Members of this House, I will support the Lesinski bill.

Mr. NIXON. As it is?

Mr. KELLEY. As it is; I will, personally.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wood substitute for many reasons. The main reason is that by no stretch of the imagination is this a substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act. It is a far worse bill than the Taft-Hartley Act. It is unfortunate and unthinkable that a bill as important as this bill, a bill which will affect the lives of the vast majority of the people of America, can even come before this body without any consideration at all in committee. It is almost beyond the realm of the probable that Members of this House would consider a bill of 67 pages without any hearings, without having read it, without, therefore, knowing what is in it.

I would like to reemphasize that the Wood substitute is not a substitute at all. It is worse than the Taft-Hartley Act for many reasons; the main one is that the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board under the Wood substitute will be able to file a suit for injunction in Federal courts merely on the filing of charges alleging that a union has committed an unfair labor practice. In other words, an injunction can be obtained merely on the allegation that a union is performing an unfair labor practice. No facts are necessary, no investigation is necessary, just someone alleging, and the general counsel can get an injunction. The courts will have no standards and the unions no protection. If that is not the second step down the road to fascism I do not know what is. The first step was the Taft-Hartley Act.

Here in America we are taking the working people, if this bill becomes law, and allowing anyone to get an injunction against them, not on the basis of fact, not on the basis of investigation, but on the basis of an allegation. I do not think that anyone in this House, regardless of how biased he may be toward labor, would be in favor of such a law. In this land of the free, in this democracy, it would mean that the masses of the people can be shackled without investigation and without facts. That is what the Wood substitute is.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. Apparently the gentleman has no confidence in the courts to make an investigation and check before issuing an injunction?

Mr. POWELL. There is no necessity for the courts to make an investigation under this bill, only to hand down an injunction. There are absolutely no standards for the courts.

Mr. McCONNELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. POWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. McCONNELL. The courts must make an investigation before issuing an injunction.

Mr. POWELL. There is no need for investigation when evidence and facts are not even considered.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I assume even he will not deny that the injunction procedure under the Wood bill completely wipes out whatever protection labor has obtained under the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that experience has taught us that invariably the employer would select a judge friendly to the corporation or employer and would disregard any appeal on the part of organized labor and would grant an injunction without any evidence whatsoever?

Mr. POWELL. That is right; and that judge will have no standards to govern his actions.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. I think we should have an understanding of what the injunctive procedure in the present law is. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said that the present law wipes out the Norris-LaGuardia Act restrictions on the use of injunctions in labor disputes. The gentleman from New York, who is a very accomplished lawyer, well knows that the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed for the purpose of denying to private employers the use of injunctions in labor disputes. Under the Wood substitute and under the present law only the Government can get an injunction in a labor dispute.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct but under the Wood bill through filing of charges of allegation.

Mr. NIXON. The Norris-LaGuardia law restriction on injunctions is retained so far as private employers are concerned.

Mr. POWELL. The Government can get an injunction simply when it is alleged there are unfair labor practices. There is no investigation, no facts needed. Am I right on that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Wood substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I think that any sensible analysis of the Wood substitute will lead to the conclusion that it is virtually a reenactment of the Taft-Hartley law. I oppose it and shall vote against it.

I direct my remarks in opposition to the Wood bill to what I read this morning in the New York times, and if this is true, then we have a most shocking situation before us. We will become dupes in a deal, to vote down the Wood substitute as a whole and then adopt the provisions of the Wood substitute piecemeal by accepting various amendments. The only honest course for the real friends of labor to pursue is to vote down the Wood substitute and then vote down every amendment to the Lesinski bill. I now read from the New York Times, April 28, 1949:

> The administration is ready to throw its strength behind five amendments to the Lesinski bill repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. The decision was reached today with the acquiescence of labor leaders.
>
> The consensus of a conference was that the Wood substitute bill, which a North-South coalition is backing, could be defeated in the House, but that the Lesinski bill might go down, too, unless it was made more appealing to those holding a middle ground between the two opposing forces. A final vote in the House on Friday appears probable.
>
> The amendments to the administration bill would do these things:
>
> Strengthen the national emergency strike section by permitting Government seizure of plants for a limited period while an emergency board studied the dispute.
>
> Provide more explicit free-speech guaranties for employers.
>
> Require a loyalty pledge by union officers and employers alike, renouncing all forms of totalitarianism and overthrow of the Government by force and violence.
>
> Make it an unfair labor practice for unions to refuse to bargain in good faith.
>
> Require unions to file financial reports in order to use the services of the National Labor Relations Board.
>
> A conference leading to the decision to offer amendments was held in the office of the Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin, who later went to see Speaker SAM RAYBURN at the Capitol. Mr. RAYBURN, in turn, was reported to have called on some House Members in their offices to bring his persuasive powers to bear.
>
> Present at the Labor Department conference with the Secretary were William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; George M. Harrison, president of the AFL railway clerks; Arthur Goldberg, counsel for the Congress of Industrial Organizations; John Gibson, Assistant Secretary of Labor, and William Tyson, solicitor of the Department of Labor.

Now, what is the situation here, ladies and gentlemen. These amendments are not compromise. These amendments constitute a surrender which is abject and nauseous. Mr. Truman went to the country last fall and said, "Elect me and elect a Democratic Congress, and we will repeal the Taft-Hartley law, and we will reinstate the Wagner Act." Again, what is the situation now? If these reported amendments are agreed to, according to the deal, you are practically reinserting the Wood bill as the Taft-Hartley law provision by provision. The main features of the Wood bill as the Taft-Hartley law are contained in these five amendments recited in the New York Times.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Does the gentleman believe everything he reads in the newspaper?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The charges in this article in the New York Times are so grave that they require a reply from the Democratic leadership of the House. I think that this article requires a statement here from the majority leadership to say whether or not this agreement was entered into at this conference, whether or not this conference took place, whether or not the administration leadership of this House supports this deal. This deal in effect repeals Taft-Hartley in one sentence and then reenacts Taft-Hartley over again with these amendments. If this deal is true, I say not only is it a betrayal of the Democratic Party's campaign promises, but it is a betrayal of the working people of this country. Even though this deal may have the blessings of some titular leaders of labor, it will have the condemnation of the men and women who toil in the mines, the mills, and the factories of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the bill H. R. 4290, which has been offered as a substitute for the Lesinski bill. May I say parenthetically that my opposition does not stem from any pressure by virtue of a threat to pull any patronage out from under me, because I am just not interested in patronage. I am not in favor of the Wood bill, either, because of any threat or talk from the well of this House that anyone who opposes the Wood bill is some sort of a political sycophant. My opposition stems from what the Wood bill contains.

As has been stated before by other speakers, the Wood bill is the Taft-Hartley Act all over again. It contains the same two basic weaknesses of the Taft-Hartley Act. Those weaknesses are as follows:

First, it is filled with collateral provisions that have nothing whatever to do with the stated attempts and purposes of the act. Those collateral provisions have to do with the organizational structure of the unions and in some cases, although I have not been able to find it, the corporations, whose rights to free collective bargaining are proposed to be protected under this bill.

The second weakness is that the bill proposes to write into law the terms and conditions of those things that are properly the result of collective bargaining.

Many of the other weaknesses will be pointed out and have been pointed out by the speakers, weaknesses as far as the injunctions and matters of that sort are

concerned. Any law that is so constructed with its veritable labyrinth and maze of legal provisions which hamper rather than make more facile the stated intents and purposes of the act is not, in my opinion, a proper law.

Let us go back to the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act both have the same stated intents and purposes. That was a legal guaranty of an inherent right of the free exercise of the right to organize and bargain collectively. The Taft-Hartley Act had the same stated intent and purpose. But the Taft-Hartley Act defeated its own stated intent and purpose by the legal maze and labyrinth that it set up as a series of hazards and obstacles for the unions which were to operate under it.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Is it not a fact that when you compare the Taft-Hartley law and the Wood amendment, they are almost identical, word for word, and that it is the same law?

Mr. BURKE. That is right, with the exception of a few, what I consider to be, minor changes.

Mr. TAURIELLO. They are minor changes, however?

Mr. BURKE. Yes.

So that in the final analysis, what we are considering here now is merely a rehash of the Taft-Hartley law, although this bill purports to change or repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. To me it repeals it in name only, and reenacts it with very few and very minor amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I am a member of the committee. I am not in favor of the injunction or any of these other so-called administration amendments that have been blowing around here in the air this afternoon. I do not know anything about any deal. I want to voice my opposition to the Wood bill in the few moments that I have.

It was very interesting yesterday when the gentleman on the left refused to yield and we were unable to find out just who wrote the Wood bill. The Wood bill is nothing but the Taft-Hartley law. They say they believe in collective bargaining, in free collective bargaining—yet Mr. Hartley, himself, in his book, stated that one of the main objections by Members of Congress to the passage of the Taft-Hartley law was that it put the Government at the bargaining table—that it gave the Government a seat at the bargaining table; and he stated in this book that the Government did take a seat at the bargaining table on the effective date of the Taft-Hartley Act.

If the Taft-Hartley law does that, as claimed by one of the authors, the Wood bill certainly does the same thing. If you will notice and compare the two bills, you will see that the Taft-Hartley bill in the short title and declaration of policy is the same, verbatim. It contains the same language, except that 1949 is inserted instead of 1947.

Section 1 on findings and policies is taken verbatim from the Taft-Hartley Act.

The definitions are substantially the same.

Section 3 (a) concerning the National Labor Relations Board is taken verbatim, or in substance.

Section 3 (b) (c) is taken verbatim.

Section 3 (d) is in substance.

Sections 4, 5, and 6 are verbatim.

Mr. Chairman, 75 percent of the sections of this Wood bill are identical with the Taft-Hartley bill. It is not a Democratic bill. It is a Republican bill. We do not want to go back to the dark days of 1932 when they had the injunction. That is what this bill does. How many unions in this country had a voice in writing a single contract under Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover? They want to go back to the days of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and set labor back 20 years by trying to bring this Wood bill in as a disguise, and putting it over in this House. It is not a bill of the Democratic Party, it is a bill of the Republican Party all the way through.

When we undertook yesterday to ask the so-called author about the injunction, he declined to yield at any time. The bill provides that you can go into court before a judge who is given discretionary authority and the court can issue an injunction in an ex parte proceeding by general counsel merely stating that irreparable injury will result and that there is no adequate remedy at law. That is certainly unfair to labor. It gives them that right in any unfair labor practice case. That is your Wood bill, straight up and down.

I feel confident that the Democratic Members of this House, as I stated the other day, will not permit these gentlemen, who have so diligently for the last 3 months tried to swap us a name and give us the same law, to make that bargain here on the floor this afternoon. We do not make bargains like that. We all understand this law sufficiently to know that it is just the Taft-Hartley law all over again.

I want to ask all members of this Committee to vote it down this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has just published a magnificent study on the economic and social status of wage earners in the United States entitled "The Gift of Freedom."

At this time, when this House is considering whether it should permit labor unions to exercise the gift of freedom, which is the heritage of all Americans, I believe portions of the introduction of that volume to be singularly appropriate. It reads:

Walt Whitman, the great American poet of democracy, better than any other person has proclaimed the conscience, character, quality, and destiny of the American worker.

"In the labor of engines and trades and the labor of fields
I find the developments,
And find the eternal meanings."

In the neuter statistical concept economists drably term "labor force," he saw the protoplasm of democracy and pondered the skills, temperament, and aspirations of men, seeking the dynamic principle which made America great.

"You may read in many languages, yet read nothing about it,
You may read the President's message and read nothing about it there,
Nothing in the reports from the State Department or Treasury Department, or in the daily papers or weekly papers,
Or in the census or revenue returns, prices current, or any accounts of stock."

He envisioned America, some 70 years ago, as an inheritor and protector of world liberty. This responsibility he regarded as both fearsome and sacred, to be accepted in the spirit of humility. This gift of freedom American democracy held only in trust.

The bailment on the gift of freedom has run out, and we in America, by precept to be sure, but no less by other means as well, must make good on our obligation. What objective tests can measure our ability to do so: Have wage earners prospered in a manner commensurate with the productive capacity of the American economy? Is the system flexible enough to permit workers full freedom of movement, choice, conscience, and opportunity? Has the lot of the worker in terms of status and influence progressively improved?

An affirmative answer need not imply more than that it is possible for the American wage earner to enjoy certain political rights, to attain certain economic desires, and to secure certain social tenets. A negative answer means that such achievements are impossible within the American system and that the gift of freedom has been dissipated.

In America today there is the combination of circumstances—free labor, free unions, social consciousness and social conscience, sacred regard for individual human dignity, and economic capacity—necessary to virile democratic leadership and reconstruction. Americans—and especially American labor—want to exercise that leadership and assistance, not as a largesse but in the spirit of comradeship. We want to share our material treasure, certainly; but we want to share our common political treasures even more, those free institutions of freemen which are imbedded in the very marrow of any democratic social structure. That indeed is the gift of freedom.

Which of the bills before us will permit the exercise of our free institutions? Will it be the Lesinski bill or the Wood bill?

There has been so much misunderstanding and misconception created about the Wagner Act, the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood bill—much of it deliberate—in an almost unprecedented atmosphere of heat and flushed emotionalism, that I wonder whether the Congress can reach a fair solution of the labor-management relations problem. The floodgates of propaganda have been opened. I have been deluged by literally tons of written arguments and questionnaires, just as I know every Member of Congress has. As a new Member of Congress, I have been amazed at the breadth and variety of the attack; letters, telegrams, telephone calls, personal visits, radio programs—all have pointed toward

influencing my emotions, if not my reasoning. I can now realize what Senator AIKEN had in mind when he stated in 1947, at the time passage of the Taft-Hartley Act was being considered:

> I do not refer to the propaganda campaign of labor unions, although I hold no brief for that. I refer to a propaganda campaign which has cost well into the millions of dollars. I should not be surprised if the total amount spent in this campaign would amount to $100,000,000. I told the Senate last spring that the single March advertising campaign in the newspapers against labor by the National Association of Manufacturers cost $2,000,000, and that statement has not been contradicted as yet, although made a year ago.

Frankly, I have enjoyed discussing the proposed legislation with most of the people who came to my office. They were genuinely concerned with specific problems and we were able to speak about the legislation in a reasonable manner. But I wonder whether much of the public has not been hoodwinked by radio commentators and large corporations, who in the guise of seeking the achievement of justice in labor relations, resort to half-truths and unrealistic propaganda to further muddy and becloud already troubled waters. The slick statements and questionnaires which have been foisted upon an unsuspecting public have done much to impose a belief that the Taft-Hartley Act truly contains the beautiful principles published and that reenactment of the Wagner Act would create chaos and industrial destruction in this country. Now the Wood bill has been thrown into the arena by Taft-Hartley proponents to continue their concept of beneficent labor-management relations.

Certainly, we who have the task of rewriting the legislation must be wary of the effect of such action and attempt to look for answers in an objective and reasonable manner. We cannot propose to champion entirely either the cause of labor unions or management, although we are concerned with their views, of course. We must keep constantly in mind that the public welfare is paramount.

It seems to me that we must start with the assumption that trade unions are desirable and necessary in our industrialized society. Even the Taft-Hartley Act recognizes this by stating that—

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce * * * by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining.

This is as it should be, for the individual worker, as an individual, is an unheard voice in the wilderness of industry. Only when he joins with his fellow workers in collective action to discuss their mutual problems and working conditions can he be reckoned as a force. The labor union is the tool by which he makes himself and his views known to his employer.

The second point which I think is susceptible to general acceptance is that the workingman has a constitutional right to strike. No man in our free society can be compelled to work against his will and this is true whether he acts individually or collectively as part of a union.

The Taft-Hartley Act, and now the Wood bill, in spite of pious protestations, however, consider the trade unions of our country not as recognized institutions which should be encouraged and fostered in their development but as necessary evils to be curbed in their activities. They regard them as instruments for abuse, which should be tolerated. These bills regard the fact that some abuses exist as justifying not only the elimination of the abuses but the entire trade-union movement as well. The full use of collective bargaining is actually opposed.

Now the question we have to determine once and for all is whether we shall continue to discourage collective bargaining in accordance with the concept of the present act and turn the clock back to the days of individual bargaining, or return to true collective bargaining. I am impressed with the need for achieving that delicate balance which, while recognizing the necessity and desirability of collective bargaining, at the same time permits the retention of the rights of the individual worker. That is one of the goals we must look for. But as one who believes that the individual worker gains most through collective bargaining, I want a labor-management relations act which will be based upon the concept that collective bargaining must be encouraged and allowed free play.

In support of my position, let me say that the Taft-Hartley Act flatly prohibits the closed shop under the theory that some unions had abused their power by acting arbitrarily against individual workers, both union and nonunion members. Instead of trying to correct such abuses the Taft-Hartley Act prohibited the closed shop in its entirety, without regard to the question as to whether it was necessary in any conceivable circumstance. For example, the International Typographical Union, a union which for many years has enjoyed an esteemed reputation both among other unions and management, had operated under closed-shop agreements with its employers for many years prior to the Wagner Act. Both management and the union had built up a very fine relationship, both recognizing that the closed shop was necessary to work out their mutual problems. The Taft-Hartley Act was passed and prevented the ITU and its employers from entering into a closed-shop agreement and, as a result, the union was compelled to go out on strike. It has been striking almost since passage of the Taft-Hartley law.

Furthermore, the hiring hall, which is certainly one form of the closed shop, has been recognized by the maritime unions and management as being an institution necessary to the maritime industry. In spite of the ban of the Taft-Hartley Act, the hiring hall has been continued and I am told that in many other industries sub-rosa closed-shop agreements have been made.

I believe, also, that outlawing the closed shop has eliminated the possibility of achieving that which most employers seek, namely, responsibility in labor unions. Without the closed shop I cannot see that a labor union can maintain discipline over its members and cannot be held to be responsible for acts of its individual members which are violative of contracts with management. It encourages wildcat strikes and disputes for the union lacks control of its men.

Moreover, the closed shop is popular. The secret ballot proposed by the Taft-Hartley Act assumed that the rank-and-file workers would vote against the closed shop in any form. Yet the results of almost all elections that have been held have been in favor of the only form of closed shop which is permitted under the Taft-Hartley law, the modified union shop, and I am sure that if those workers had had an opportunity to express themselves as favoring the closed shop, they would have done so.

I could go on almost indefinitely to cite instances of where the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have been injurious to the labor movement and to the cause of trade-unionism, as for instance the Act's provisions for numerous elections which keep employer-employee relations in a constantly unsettled condition; the outlawing of peaceful picketing in many situations; the denial of the right to vote to strikers even though there is just cause for the strike; the indiscriminate outlawing of all secondary boycotts whether justifiable or not; the special emphasis placed by the act on the use of injunctions to settle labor disputes rather than permitting such disputes to be worked out through collective bargaining and this is particularly true of the Wood bill—the examples are legion, but I do not want to take too much time before this committee. Suffice it to say that I consider the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood bill to be ill-conceived and inoperative, and that they should be rejected.

Favoring collective bargaining between the employer and the union, I believe the Government should participate in such bargaining only in limited instances. I think the new Labor Act should contain a clause imposing an obligation on labor as well as management to bargain collectively, because I would want to remove arbitrariness on the part of either of the parties. The Lesinski bill which restores the Wagner Act, with some desirable changes, should be approved because it permits full and fair collective bargaining.

I think further, that we should constantly look toward making the path of labor-management relations smoother, and in that respect I certainly believe we should take advantage of the experience of such men as Mr. W. H. Davis, former Chairman of the War Labor Board, Mr. William Leiserson, former Chairman of the Railway Mediation Board; Prof. Nathan Feinsinger, nationally known expert in the field and professor of labor law at the University of Wisconsin; and Prof. Walter V. Schaeffer, of the faculty of Northwestern University, who was one of the arbitrators in the recent packing-house workers' strike in the city of Chicago. A commission comprised of these men—of recognized stature and impartiality—to study, for example, the

problem of strikes which directly affect the public welfare, about which there is so much argument, and the means of protecting individual workers under closed-shop arrangements against arbitrary action by the union, could accomplish much in the field. Such a commission could meet with representatives of labor and management to assure complete consideration being given to their views and to find ways of encouraging labor-management cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, by no stretch of the imagination can even the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law, or now the Wood bill, claim that their legislation offers hope or freedom to the workingman. We seek the goal now of a mutual trust and partnership in production between labor and management, a goal which has already been attained in some industries, such as the clothing industry, where union-management cooperation between the employers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of CIO and the International Ladies Garment Workers of the A. F. of L. has made major contributions. Labor does not want to cripple management. Labor does not want to jeopardize its source of living. It is foolish to believe labor wants to take over management's function.

I do not believe that we can take the attitude of Congressman Hartley as stated in his book, Our New National Labor Policy:

> The Government group wants to make all the money it can for the stockholders. * * *
>
> The labor group wants to make all the money it can for its members.
>
> Result: Labor-management conflict, strife, and strikes.

This is a cynical philosophy. It is the philosophy of the Taft-Hartley law and the Wood bill. We want cooperation, not combat. We must work toward an appreciation of the fact that labor and management have mutual problems to be solved together, so that one community, to which both owe an obligation, may be benefited. Recognition of their mutual problems can only be brought out where the collective bargaining process is permitted to have free play. This is the underlying theory of the Lesinski bill.

With such cooperation, with such a feeling of partnership in production, the business enterprise in which both are engaged can achieve maximum production at minimum cost to the public. This is true maturity of the gift of freedom to labor and management in our democracy.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a considerable effort is being made in this House to make it appear that the Wood bill is a much softened version of the Taft-Hartley law. I gather from the efforts the gentlemen make to bring about that belief upon your part that it is a confession that the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law were unfair and could not pass this House. I think it is in order, therefore, to make a comparison of the principal objections to the Taft-Hartley law with related provisions of the Wood bill.

Let us take that particular "gimmick" in the Taft-Hartley law which Life magazine, Fortune magazine, Business Week, and Senator TAFT have all admitted was unfair. I am not talking about something, Mr. Chairman, that there has been recent argument about; I am talking about something that these business publications and the senior Senator from Ohio admitted was unfair. What changes does the Wood bill make in that regard? It makes two changes: First, it grants a reprieve of 90 days—in other words, it is 90 days before the "gimmick" can be put into full operation. I mean by that—what? Because the striking union when decertified is denied the right even to go to you and to me and to say: "Look, my friend, you took my job and cut under my wage scale; why don't you join me?" Why, Mr. Chairman, that was legal 75 years ago when the yellow-dog contract was upheld as a sacred obligation in the courts. The only thing the Wood bill does in that regard is to grant a reprieve of 90 days.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. For a question only.

Mr. HALLECK. How long a time does the gentleman believe would be reasonable, if 90 days is too short, for the position of the striking employee to be preserved?

Mr. JACOBS. If the gentleman and I were in an economic contest does the gentleman think the Government should come in and tell us when we should quit? Does the gentleman think the Government should come in and say that we should quit at the end of the first day or the second day? Should the Government take part in an economic contest? Do not the parties know when they are defeated?

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACOBS. I do not yield further; I am sorry. I believe it has never been considered to be the function of Government to take any part in an economic contest. It is not proper for the Government to say that an employer may not hire replacements. It has always been the law that the employer could hire replacements to take the place of a striker. Why? Because this is a free economy, and the employer has the right to employ replacements. Then why should the Government come forward and say that at the end of 90 days, or at the end of any period, the man who is striking for higher wages cannot go and say to this gentleman: "Look, you cut under my wage scale. You are a laborer the same as I am. So why do you not join me and be on my side?" He can be enjoined from doing so and without the benefit of trial by jury sent to jail if he persists.

Let the gentlemen over on the Republican side speak. They have been silent so far. Yet I saw them in a huddle with the author and sponsors of this bill before the committee went in session. Come on, boys, you talk about it and do not take my time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. No.

Mr. HALLECK. Is the gentleman afraid to hear us talk?

Mr. JACOBS. No. You can take your own time. I have only 5 minutes.

Now, let us examine this one step further. Of course, they took out section 10 (1), the mandatory injunction, but they kept Denham.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out that no one on this side has spoken on this proposition. I should like to remind him, and the Chair, very courteously that so many members of the committee have been standing seeking recognition on that side that the Chair has no chance to recognize anyone on this side who is not a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman in favor of repealing all the labor legislation now on the books?

Mr. JACOBS. No; and the administration bill does not do that. I am glad the gentleman asked the question and I am going to answer him.

The administration bill deals with substantially the same legitimate legislative matters as the Taft-Hartley law does. The Taft-Hartley Act went into the regulation of the internal affairs of unions, which I think should be regulated, and I so stated to labor and everybody else when I was a candidate for office. But we do not regulate corporations in labor-management relations law and we should not regulate unions either. There is a very good reason for that—because each side will then be pulling and tugging to try to get some advantage in the type of regulations that are written. I will talk about that later.

We legislate upon the secondary boycott, the jurisdictional strike, the emergency or critical strike, in this bill. That is not a complete repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. But we do not adopt the gimmicks in the Taft-Hartley law and I will be very glad to discuss those gimmicks at any time I have time on this floor.

I spoke yesterday—in regard to the so-called free-speech clause of the Taft-Hartley law. Why, that matter has been blown up into something that might cause you to think has destroyed the first amendment to the Constitution. There is nothing to it at all. I still have my right as an employer that I had under the Wagner Act to say what I please, but I do not have an immunity against hearing my words quoted against me in court. There is no man who believes in free speech and who has the courage to say what he thinks that is going to go crawling and try to get the Government to

pass a law that his words cannot be quoted. Free speech does not mean immunity against repetition of what you said in court or anywhere else. To come on down, we have other provisions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman not say that he objected to interference by the Government in economic contests between employer and employee?

Mr. JACOBS. Only to the extent of keeping law and order should the Government interfere with an economic contest.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the Government strengthen the hands of organized labor when it passed the Wagner Act?

Mr. JACOBS. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, and I am going to answer it. At common law every man who was forced to sign a contract under duress was relieved of that contract by law, save and except a labor contract.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman asked me a question. Does he want an answer, or does he want to talk?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to have an answer to the question.

Mr. JACOBS. I am answering the question, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; the gentleman is not.

Mr. JACOBS. All right. I will choose the words by which I will answer that question, my dear friend. It will be my answer and not the gentleman's.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I say, thank God for that. But give us the answer.

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, sir; and I am pretty grateful myself.

Every contract that was obtained by duress at common law was relievable at law except a labor contract. But, an employer could tell an employee, or an applicant for a job, "You sign the contract not to join the union, or else you do not get the job." And, the courts upheld those contracts, and the employer could discharge an employee because he did join a union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. JACOBS. No; I will not yield. I am trying to accommodate the gentleman with an answer to his question. The gentleman is going to exhaust my 5 minutes, and I will not get a chance to answer his question in which I know he was very serious. I may have to tell him after the session is over, and I will be glad to do it.

But, finally the Norris-LaGuardia Act outlawed the yellow-dog contract, and then the Wagner Act came along and said two things: It said that you could not fire your employee because of union activities, and it said that if you were an employer, a corporation, and you had a united front at the bargaining table, that the employee had the same right to a united front at the bargaining table, and he had a right to bargain without you using your economic force against him. In short, what the Wagner Act said was that "no man can serve two masters," and the employees could select their own bargaining agent. But the bargaining was left to the parties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes. This is the most intelligent discussion we have had.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are other Members who wish to discuss this bill.

Mr. CARROLL. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 25, line 10, strike out "90 days" and insert in lieu thereof "6 months."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to H. R. 4290 is for the specific and sole purpose of giving practical and vitally necessary assistance to the economic striker. This particular problem under the Taft-Hartley Act has been brought to my attention on numerous occasions, and rightly so, by the labor leaders in my district.

May I say that as far as the gentleman from Indiana is concerned, he and I see somewhat alike on this problem, but instead of making a general derogatory statement of the Wood bill I am trying to make some constructive criticism and thereafter change it.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act some of the rights of the worker who went on strike over the issue of wages or some other comparable issue were not adequately protected. I refer specifically to the disenfranchisement or loss of voting rights by the worker who is on an authorized strike. H. R. 4290 in this particular instance takes a step in the right direction. This bill makes an attempt to protect the economic striker, but it fails to go far enough for any practical result. To achieve the desired objective, I am submitting this amendment.

For a better understanding of the problem, let us take a specific example. For illustration, we will assume union X was duly certified as the bargaining agent by the NLRB over 2 years before the union members went on strike on the issue of wages. The strike was solely a legitimate difference between management and the union over the question of wages. After the strike had been in progress for a few weeks, the employer, as he is allowed to do, began to hire replacements for those on strike. Shortly thereafter union Y, a second or new union, petitioned for an election for a new determination of bargaining representation. Under the Taft-Hartley Act the newly employed workers could vote in the new election, while those who were on a legitimate strike could not vote. In my estimation, this is unfair.

The Wood bill states that a striker in this situation can vote if his job has not been filled within 90 days of the election. Under the factual, procedural condition in the NLRB today, at this time a 90-day limitation is inadequate.

For further illustration, we must assume the election petition was filed by union Y on January 1, 1949. It takes about 30 days before an original hearing is held by a Board attorney on the issue of representation. It must be determined at this hearing that there was a bona fide question of representation. The hearing attorney's report and the transcript of the testimony are then forwarded to Washington for consideration by the NLRB. The Board normally takes at least 90 days before an election is ordered. In many instances the time lag is longer. If an election is ordered by the Board, it takes at least another 30 days before the election is conducted.

These simple facts illustrate the need for an extension from 90 days to 6 months if we really want to protect the voting rights of the economic striker. Ninety days will give little or no relief, while a 6-month period will give the striker equal rights with his replacement. This is important. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. If it has been admitted by those who have had experience with this section under the Taft-Hartley Act that it is wrong, then what is the difference whether it says 90 days or 6 months insofar as the status of the strike is concerned, or the status of an election, as the gentleman proposes?

Mr. FORD. I have pointed out that the provision I am suggesting will permit all workers in 99 cases out of 100 who have gone on strike to participate in an election, as they should.

Mr. WIER. Then, may I ask the gentleman this further question. It has been on many occasions the position of the employer that if he could hold out for 90 days, he would have a right under the Taft-Hartley Act, and under your amendment, 6 months, to replace all of the employees and start anew where another union comes in to take over the rights of those employees who have been on strike.

Mr. FORD. I have no consideration or sympathy for the employer who tries to delay unnecessarily the Board procedure. My amendment to H. R. 4290 simply gives the Board an opportunity to go through its proper procedural channels in order to take care of the situation that you are complaining of and a situation which I believe is wrong and handled improperly under the Taft-Hartley Act and the revised Wood bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an apparent attempt to soften up the Wood bill. The Federal Government has no right to enter into the question of replacements.

I hope that the Membership will vote the amendment down.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those on the Democratic side who perhaps ought to be charitable toward the actions of the Eightieth Congress in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act because I owe my presence in this Chamber today, as a Member of this honorable body, almost entirely to just one issue in the Third Minnesota Congressional District, and that is the legislation which is now before this committee. It was not only the major issue in my district, but it was the major issue in the State of Minnesota and its was the issue in the senatorial field between ex-Senator Ball and the present Senator HUMPHREY. So I come here today as the result, perhaps, of a mistake on the part of the voters, or of a mistake on the part of the Eightieth Congress.

I can say that if the Wood bill in its present form was to be enacted into law, I presume it would insure my re-election because I do not know of anything that I would have to change in the campaign of 1950, if the Wood bill were in effect.

In my opinion, the Lesinski bill is an honest attempt to carry out the wishes of the American people as expressed in the 1948 elections. The results of those elections, both for executive and congressional offices, provided a clear and unmistakable mandate for the prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the substitution of a new law which would be fair to both management and labor, while safeguarding the interests of the public.

But the surviving elements of the reactionary groups in both parties whose policies in the Eightieth Congress were so overwhelmingly repudiated by the voters in 1948, are unwilling to permit a showdown vote on this major issue. They have rallied their scattered and defeated forces into a tight coalition for opposing repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act by every device, maneuver, and strategy in the complicated book of legislative procedure.

The coalition's first weapon is confusion. In an attempt to mislead and confuse Members of Congress, the coalition forces have trotted out a so-called compromise measure, known as the Wood bill and have arranged to force a vote on it before the provisions of the Lesinski bill can be considered and voted upon by the House of Representatives.

What is this Wood bill? I venture to say that not one out of a hundred Americans have ever heard of it. It was never even given a public inspection before a congressional committee. Thus, Members of Congress are not too familiar with its provisions. Its sponsor, the gentleman from Georgia, Representative JOHN S. WOOD, calls it a Taft-Hartley substitute which, he says, is fair and evenly balanced between labor and management and contains many changes, all of a liberalizing nature.

Unfortunately, the record tells another story. It reveals, first of all, that the gentleman from Georgia, Representative WOOD, originally introduced a bill which was a duplicate of, instead of a substitute for, the Taft-Hartley Act. It reveals, further, that when the coalition forces discovered that this Congress would not find Taft-Hartleyism attractive even under another name, they tried to give the Wood bill a "new look" by hasty revision of a few of its provisions.

When this new-look Wood bill is carefully scrutinized, it becomes apparent that it is coming apart at the seams and that the old Taft-Hartley slip is showing its ugly colors all over again. In other words, the Wood bill is a transparent disguise for Taft-Hartleyism at its worst.

For instance, the evil of injunctions which was restored by the Taft-Hartley law, is enlarged, strengthened, and made even more repugnant to free American workers by the Wood bill.

Under Taft-Hartley, if charges were filed accusing a union of committing unfair labor practices, the general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board was directed to conduct a preliminary investigation of the charges and if he found there was real basis for them, it was his duty to apply to the Federal courts for an injunction restraining such practices.

However, the Wood bill has streamlined that procedure considerably. It permits the general counsel for the NLRB to ask for injunctions the moment charges against a union are filed, without even bothering to check up on the accusations.

The abuses that such procedure would lead to and the opportunities it offers a few unfriendly employers or officials to harass and destroy established unions of American workers are so obvious that I cannot conceive of any fair-minded Congressman voting for such a bill.

As bad as it is, the Taft-Hartley law does contain a few safeguards against the issuance of indiscriminate injunctions in cases involving jurisdictional disputes. These safeguards are eliminated entirely by the Wood bill. The National Labor Relations Board and the courts are given complete discretionary authority to issue restraints against jurisdictional strikes without even affording the parties an opportunity to settle the dispute themselves.

Now let us examine some of the liberalizing changes in the bill of which the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman WOOD, boasts. One of these deals with secondary boycotts against which the Taft-Hartley law lays down a sweeping prohibition. The Wood bill, however, does legalize one type of secondary boycott, if the work in a factory on strike is farmed out to another plant, if the workers in the second factory are members of the same local union as the first, and if the local union has a contract with the second factory providing that its members may refuse to work on struck goods. When all those if's in the Wood bill are added together, the result is that not one boycott in a hundred thousand would ever be held legal.

One would imagine from the attitude of both the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood bill that secondary boycotts are an evil that should be eliminated. On the contrary, history shows that the boycott has been the most powerful weapon available to unions in their fight to eliminate sweatshop conditions and to raise American standards of living to their present high level. The Lesinski bill recognizes this truth by providing that secondary boycotts should be held illegal only when they are invoked in furtherance of a jurisdictional dispute or when a losing union in an official election at a plant attempts to boycott in retaliation for its defeat.

There are two other changes in the Wood bill that deserve brief comment. Under Taft-Hartley, the closed shop was banned in future contracts, but provisions in existing agreements between labor and management were allowed to remain in force for the duration of the contract. The Wood bill goes one step further in making even those prior contracts illegal.

The Taft-Hartley law set up a mechanism for employee elections to determine whether they preferred a union shop. No union-security provision could be included in a labor-management contract without such direct and advance authority from a majority of the workers themselves. Well, in the thousands of such elections which have been held since the Taft-Hartley law became effective, the union shop has won in more than 99 percent of the cases. So now the Wood bill eliminates the elections altogether. Apparently, some employers found it more difficult to refuse to grant a union shop after their workers had voted overwhelmingly for it.

As against these changes, which go even beyond the Taft-Hartley Act in their vicious and malicious attacks against organized labor, the Wood bill throws the Nation's workers a sop by providing that employers as well as union officials will henceforth be required to sign non-Communist affidavits. The American Federation of Labor does not object to this change, but it fails to see any great boon that it confers on the workers of our country.

So far I have dealt only with the changes, or the new look in the Wood bill. Now let us see what it keeps from the old look, what it picks up word for word from the Taft-Hartley law.

The Taft-Hartley proviso permitting employers to abuse free speech in attacks against unions is retained in full.

Unions are still left subject to the danger of damage suits in the Federal courts.

Restrictions against welfare funds, which have brought relief to unemployed and injured workers and have come to the rescue of the families of many other workers killed on the job, are kept just as tight and as cruel as before.

The Taft-Hartley law's attempts to suppress and bottle up political activities by unions remains unchanged.

The tricky and precedent-shattering paragraph making State laws paramount to the Federal law when their restrictions against union-security provisions are more sweeping than the Federal law, stays as it was.

Exclusion of so-called supervisory employees from union protection against employer discrimination or refusal to bargain, stands identical with the Taft-Hartley law.

The whole Taft-Hartley list of prefabricated unfair practices imposed against unions in an effort to weaken and regulate them to the point of ineffectiveness is reincorporated in the Wood bill.

Thus, it becomes obvious that the new look in the Wood bill is an utter sham.

In some respects, indeed, the Wood bill is far more dangerous and repressive than Taft-Hartley and in not a single respect does it offer any hope of substantial improvement.

Within 2 years time, the Taft-Hartley Act has become thoroughly discredited. The last election proved that support of Taft-Hartleyism is political poison. Not even Senator TAFT himself favors keeping his own legislative monstrosity unchanged.

Therefore, the American Federation of Labor considers it necessary at this time to point out bluntly and emphatically to all Members of Congress that labor will regard a vote for the Wood bill as a vote to retain Taft-Hartleyism. We urge all members of the House of Representatives to defeat the Wood bill overwhelmingly and to approve the well considered, fair, and honest Lesinski bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. First, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his constructive action in proposing this amendment.

I was glad to hear him say that he was not just complaining about something but that he was here doing what he thought was right, in a constructive way, to try to write good legislation. Contrast that, if you please, with the attitude expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and certainly nothing that I say has any personal reference at all, because he and I are good friends and I value his friendship. But the gentleman says this is an attempt to soften up the Wood bill. He said that in opposition to the amendment. I trust he will not think ill of me if I venture to suggest that we have got a job to do here in the writing of this legislation. Every one of us as individuals ought to be voting on amendments as they are proposed, with a view to working out the best bill that we can.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] read from the New York Times of this morning, and he complains of what he said was a deal downtown between the administration leaders and certain titular heads of labor, he called them—a deal which he does not like, because, he says, if carried through, it involves a violation of commitments made in the last campaign.

Well, I have a little different attitude about that matter down there, and I mention it now only because I think it ties in with what is going to be done about this amendment, namely, are you going to vote against it, those of you who feel that the substitute that is here proposed is too strong or too rigid? Are you going to vote against the amendment because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] says it is designed to soften up the substitute?

Now, having reference to that, for myself, if there has been a deal made downtown to write certain amendments into this legislation that are to be rubberstamped by the majority of the Members of this body just because that deal has been made and those amendments have been sent down here, I say I want no part of it.

I have an obligation to the people who sent me to Congress, to the people of my district, and of my State and Nation, to vote on measures coming before the House of Representatives as my good judgment dictates, tempered always by their representations to me.

That is the reason, as representatives of organized labor for my State and district have come to see me, that I have been glad to see them. My door is open; I welcome them and their ideas and suggestions. I welcome what they have to say along with what other people to whom I am responsible have to say; and then, after that I shall exercise my best judgment.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. I wish to say in regard to the bill what I said to the distinguished gentleman from California this morning and on yesterday, that I, personally, know of no deal that has been made; I certainly have not been told of any.

Mr. HALLECK. Neither have I, I may say to the gentleman. On that particular score I know only what I read in the papers, but the newspapers carried it "flat" and I rather assumed that they knew what they were talking about.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, some of us have been sitting around here all the time—and we are not complaining about that—but is there going to be a disposition on the part of the leadership on either side to close debate, or are we going to have a chance to talk?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. In respect to this amendment. Yesterday, in the course of general debate, I made something of a statement about certain of the problems as I saw them, and in the course of that statement I suggested that when the 1947 act was passed, so far as I knew no one claimed it was perfect. As a matter of fact, by setting up the so-called watchdog committee we recognized that experience might determine weaknesses, might indicate the necessity for change.

I also said that when the substitute was offered it would be open for amendment. It undoubtedly is the only vehicle that is available as a basis on which what I am sure is the clear majority of the House of Representatives can work its will and write good legislation. In the course of those remarks I referred to this particular amendment, about which I had heard.

Let us understand what the situation is: Under the 1947 act, which is presently the law, there was no provision to reserve to a man on an economic strike, a legitimate strike, the right to vote in a representation election that might be called while the strike was still in effect. In other words, you would have this sort of situation: The men go out on strike, other men come in to work in the plant; then they could petition for an election and they might have in mind voting for a labor organization to represent them other than the labor organization of the men who were on strike. So the leaders of organized labor said that that was a strike-busting device and that in times of surplus labor men could go on strike, their places could be filled immediately, an election immediately called, and a new union voted in and the old union broken.

Well, a lot of people saw a good deal of merit in that suggestion, and I am one of them. When the Wood substitute was drafted, it undertook to cure that deficiency, that inequity, by saying that for 90 days, even though they have been replaced in the plant, the men on strike are still entitled to vote. The gentleman from Michigan has concluded, I think rightly, that 90 days is not a sufficient time. You have the matter of ordering an election and holding the election. So he has offered an amendment to extend this to 6 months.

Someone has raised the question as to why have any time limitation at all? It is all right to talk here loudly and with nicely turned phrases about these things. But, after all, there is a sense, a logic and a reason to all of it. Probably the 6 months' time will be just about like no limit at all because there are not many strikes that go beyond that.

But let me suggest this to you: Assume that the strike does go on for over 6 months and replacements have been hired, the men are in the plant working; do you not think that after some reasonable period they ought to have a right to select a union of their own choice? That is all that is involved?

Why, of course, it is a relaxation of a provision contained in the Taft-Hartley Act. Again may I say that it is one of a dozen or 15 definitely relaxing amendments included in the substitute, relaxing amendments that have been requested by the leaders of organized labor.

I know why you people over here just want the administration bill that, again must I say, was sent down here from uptown, written before the hearings were ever held, never read for amendment. You are afraid, first, that a pretty good bill has been written here as a substitute; and it is now apparent that the suggestions heard in the cloakrooms for days are true—that you are not going to support any amendment to the substitute, no matter how good it may be, no matter how much the men in organized labor may want it, just because you know that the substitute, if further

improved, will surely beat the bill that has been sent here from uptown.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the 6-months amendment for the same reason that I oppose the 90-day amendment. This provision carries over that part of the Taft-Hartley Act that was criticized by no less than Life magazine, Business Week, Fortune, and Senator TAFT himself. The reason I am not for 90 days, the reason I am not for 6 months, the reason I am not for the provision at all, is simply this: We will take a situation where a corporation has a veritable multitude of plants throughout the country. The employees in one of its small plants call a strike, an authorized economic strike. The corporation can hold out for 90 days or 6 months with ease, with no attempt whatsoever to settle the strike, employ replacements, strikebreakers I call them, and at the end of 6 months call for a decertification election. The whole procedure was criticized by those various national magazines. The senior author of the Taft-Hartley Act himself criticized it. So the same procedure starts all over again, and we have the same net end result.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I realize that the gentleman has had considerable experience in the field of labor, and I respect his views as a Congressman. Therefore, I would like to ask him this question: Should there not be some termination date in connection with this matter?

Mr. BURKE. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe that the Government is not properly in its place in this particular type of issue, in effect, assisting in the breaking of a strike, no matter when the time is, whether it is today, 90 days from now, or 6 months from now.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. It is my understanding that under the Wagner Act the Board had discretion on these matters. Now, would that not be bringing the Government into this particular proposition?

Mr. BURKE. The Board had discretion after a hearing, and after a determination for the collective-bargaining unit, who is eligible to vote, and so on, or a break-off of negotiations, or whatever the particular case might be. The Board then had the right to order an election in that case even though replacements were made in an economic strike; that is true.

Mr. McCONNELL. In other words, the Government was in it prior to this under the Wagner Act.

Mr. BURKE. At that point, and after hearing of the specific issue, or the conditions surrounding that particular case. But here, as is done in the Taft-Hartley Act, in this provision we attempt to set out by law a certain limited time with practically no consideration of the conditions surrounding any particular or specific situation that might arise.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. So that I can get the gentleman's position clear, does he think that 6 months is better than 3 months?

Mr. BURKE. No.

Mr. NIXON. Or does he think that 3 months is better than 6 months?

Mr. BURKE. No.

Mr. NIXON. I am just trying to find out why the gentleman is opposing this amendment.

Mr. BURKE. I am opposing this specific amendment which calls for the substitution of 6 months for 90 days, because I oppose the whole section as it is written in the Wood bill. I oppose any time limitation. I would much prefer to go back to a hearing under the discretion of the Board; a hearing of the issues and the specific points involved and the conditions surrounding the specific happening or the situation as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I will answer the question of the gentleman from California before I start. I think, of course, 6 months is a relaxing amendment. I would not deny that for a moment. If you make it long enough, of course, it would have the effect of no limit at all.

I disagree with the gentleman from Indiana that 6 months would be tantamount to no limitation. So, we get that out of the way first.

Now, we will consider what this amendment actually means. I think the gentleman from Michigan was attempting to soften up the Wood bill and that he is in good faith; I do not think there is any question about that. Maybe that is the object of it. It is a good deal like the little boy who met a friend of his and said, "I made $50,000 yesterday." The friend said, "How did you do that?" He said, "Well, I was out with my dog." I think he meant his watchdog—not a watchdog committee. And he said, "He got a couple of his legs broke, so I traded him off for a couple of $25,000 cats." That is about the size of it. They came out first with the bill that was written in accordance with the watchdog committee report. Then they came out with this second Wood bill, and they find that it is so tough that it probably will not pass, so they are now trying to soften it further.

Actually, what do we get to? It is not so much to preserve the right to vote. That is not the end object we are thinking about. The end object is to preserve the right to bargain. Taking away from the worker the right to vote only implements section 8 (b) (4) (A), (B), (C), and (D). It implements those amendments so that the workers can be enjoined from doing what? Exactly what I told you earlier on this floor, going to Bill Jones and saying, "Look, you took my job and you cut under my wage scale. I want you to join me and try to make this fellow pay a decent wage scale."

We can talk round and round about a lot of things, but let us stay with the point, and that is the point.

The gentleman from Indiana says, "Why shouldn't there be a limit?" I should like to suggest just one thing. I do not know just where the Government should come into an economic dispute, and it is an economic dispute. Why should the Government come in at any time and tell me that I am licked or tell you that you are licked? Most people have sense enough to know when they are licked. I have had a lot of experience with getting licked, so I can always figure when I am licked. Most people know. Why should the Government come in and tell you when you are licked?

The gentleman says that sometime—sometime they should be entitled to select a bargaining agent. At the end of 6 months?

If it is 12 months in that case, why should it not be 12 months in this case?

But after all, why should the Government come in at any time and tell one side of an economic dispute when it is licked? That is the whole point that is in this amendment.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. As the gentleman well knows, the reason he himself has objected to the present provision of the law, which denies the economic striker the right to vote in an election, is that a decertification election might be called at which the new employees would come in and vote out the economic strikers. The gentleman also knows when he spoke of the 1-year limitation on certification elections that in the case of a decertification election that restriction does not apply.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman is right. But it is a year in one case then 90 then 180 days.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, this union-busting device about which the gentleman has been talking is cured by the 6-month provision set up by this amendment.

Mr. JACOBS. I do not think it is.

Mr. NIXON. It is substantially cured, is it not?

Mr. JACOBS. I doubt if it is substantially cured. It would cure in a great many cases, I grant that, but I do not think it necessarily would in the majority of cases.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. That provision also gave the employer a longer time to replace employees.

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, that would be true. It would amount to a longer period of time in which the employer could seek replacements.

That is true. It is nevertheless a softening amendment, but it is only a delay of the gross unfairness of the Wood bill and Taft-Hartley-law provisions.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the discussion thus far. This is a very important subject which we are considering today. I feel rather encouraged by the turn of events. I feel rather encouraged in the respect that we are beginning to consider various provisions of labor-management relationships on the floor of the House. For a while I was afraid the debate would degenerate into name-calling and the use of various expressions which would cover up the real search for light. I like to see Members offer amendments. We do not know what amendments will be offered. One has just been offered. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan, in his effort to improve this bill. We are trying to evolve a good law, favorable to all sides.

Now I will give you the background of what I am leading up to. It became very obvious to us in committee that we would not be able to approach this subject in a sound manner in committee. The Taft-Hartley bill, passed in the Eightieth Congress, after 2,000,000 words of testimony had been received by the committee concerning labor-management relationships. It has been in operation for over a year and a half. We have had a chance to learn how various sections of that law operate; what they do and do not do. It was the hope and expectation of many of us that we would start with the Taft-Hartley law, or a bill of some similar nature, and consider it provision by provision; then, by majority vote, change the various provisions if necessary. In the end we felt that in that way we would come out with a bill which eventually would result in a law generally favorable to all segments of society. That is our duty here today.

I favor this particular amendment. I do not see what is so disgraceful about the idea of liberalizing or changing existing provisions if mature judgment shows that they are in need of change. This is a dynamic problem. We do not know from day to day what changes may be necessary as we are drawing up a bill to bring to the floor of the House. I think it is very fine. I think it is correct that the various Members of the House should feel free, not only to offer amendments, but to support them and justify them in debate. I see no disgrace in offering something that liberalizes any bill; that makes the bill more workable. Therefore I think the proposition which the gentleman has offered is proper and I rise in support of it.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Let me ask you this question on this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan: Going back to the Wagner Act, where many similar circumstances arose, what objection do you find—you were a member of the Labor Committee then—that brought about this limitation of 90 days or 6 months or 8 months? What is the object of it?

Mr. McCONNELL. The object or the objection?

Mr. WIER. The object. I got the objection.

Mr. McCONNELL. In considering this problem of employees on strike being able to vote, there is no question that they are entitled to reinstatement, if they are out because of an unfair labor practice, and therefore eligible to vote. But a man goes out on an economic strike. There is a certain risk involved when he goes out. The problem then confronting the employer, if he replaces him, is who he is going to recognize as his bargaining agent; who he is going to have in his plant with whom he can discuss wages and the problems of labor. Is it the man outside who is recognized as a bargaining agent or is it the group inside?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCONNELL. When employees are out on an economic strike and have been replaced, a condition may exist where men may be out for a year or a year and a half and still be able to vote. Since a "current labor dispute" is the phrase used in the Wagner Act, you can have a situation where there is a group inside and a group outside; men may have other jobs and still be eligible to vote in the struck plant as long as the strike is considered a current dispute.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I have heard time and time again from this Congress against any provision of the right of a man or woman to strike, but in this case in the Taft-Hartley Act you said they had a right to strike but you put a limitation on how long you can do it. Is that correct?

Mr. McCONNELL. Oh, no, no. I do not understand it that way at all. We are trying to clarify for how long a period they shall have a right to vote. I think it is only correct that we decide on some limitation of the time within which they can vote in a plant when they have struck. In many cases they already have jobs outside. If they have a job elsewhere, should they still be eligible to vote in the plant they left? You are leaving an intolerable situation for the employer. I think it is only fair that we try to clarify this by setting some limitation on it.

Mr. WIER. Then, will you, as minority leader on this committee, agree to leave to the discretion of the National Labor Relations Board when a strike ceases to be in existence, rather than to put it into the law?

Mr. McCONNELL. At the present time we continue to give the right to the National Labor Relations Board to decide eligibility, but I think there should be written into the law some time limitation for protection, and so we can have it definite. How long is a current labor dispute to go on? A few pickets may circle around a plant for a year and a half or 2 years, and under the reasoning of the Wagner Act it is still a current labor dispute and then, even though these men may be scattered throughout the country, they still have the right to vote.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Is it not a fact that circumstances alter cases many times? Suppose we have this situation, where a corporation is a nation-wide corporation with a multiplicity of plants, and one of the smaller plants is on strike and they replace the employees. They can hold out for 6 months or so. By that sort of chain action they can break the union in all the other plants. In that case should we not go back to the procedure under the Wagner Act, have a hearing on the issues involved? Because certain circumstances may actually alter conditions.

Mr. McCONNELL. That would be all right if we could be sure just what the Board would do within reason; but when you get to 2-year strikes with no decision made I think it is high time that some limitation be written into the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, on November 12 of last year, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican Senator from the State of Oregon, in a speech at the University of Pennsylvania, made the following statement:

> Believe me when some Republican leaders tried to sell the bill of goods that it was only the labor leaders who didn't like the Taft-Hartley law they got the answer in the form of millions of votes against the Republican Party by the workers of the country on November 2, 1948.

No truer words were spoken by a Republican, or for that matter, by a Democrat.

The people of this country gave the Democratic Party a mandate on that day to wipe from the records a law whose intent it was to turn the clock back to the days of "ragged" individualism.

I hold up the conscience of a Republican Senator as evidence that it is not only the Democratic Party which interprets the election as a mandate from the American people to wipe out the evil Taft-Hartley Act. I must concede that some of our political opponents are astute gentlemen also.

Businessmen—and I am one too—are acquainted with the confidential opinion the ultraconservative Business Week magazine gave its readers a few days before the Eighty-first Congress went into session. It said, and I quote:

> Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion * * * and the Taft-Hartley Act would wreck the labor movement.

Business Week was honest. It gave up the ghost once it saw the composition

of the Eighty-first Congress. It saw no further need to camouflage the intent of the act.

Today Congress is considering what to do about the Taft-Hartley Act. It is also considering measures to better housing, health, care for the aged and the unemployed, and to raise the minimum wage. These are also included in the people's mandate.

The people are watching their Congress to see that their elected representatives will be guided by principles and not by practical political considerations in acting on these issues.

But primarily, the people will be watching to see what Congress will do about the Taft-Hartley Act. The Democratic Party will not fail the people.

One hundred and three Congressmen and 18 Senators who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 are no longer Members of Congress. The people knew what they wanted then and they know what they want now. Back in 1947, the tumult in the halls of the Capitol by selfish special interests to pass this un-American antilabor legislation, was a national disgrace. Today Congress is acting with dignity and, I hope, with speed to undo this evil.

I should like to quote from another Republican Senator to describe the propaganda effort to pass the Taft-Hartley Act. It shows how blind are the unenlightened to the advantages of mutual trust and confidence between management and labor. This is Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, on the floor of the Senate on May 12, 1947. He said:

> We have been subjected to the most intensive, expensive, and vicious propaganda campaign that any Congress has ever been subjected to. I should not be surprised if the total amount spent in this campaign would amount to $100,000,000. I told the Senate last spring that the single March advertising campaign in the newspapers against labor by the National Association of Manufacturers cost $2,000,000 and that statement has not been contradicted as yet.

This will give you some idea how important this Taft-Hartley Act is to some people—a small minority of people who do not believe in the give and take of American democracy, a small minority of people who would cast aside industrial peace and industrial development in order to dominate the majority of the people. This is the group that works so hard to impress upon Congress that it is more important on election day than the people. The activities of this selfish special-interest force to make hay with the Eightieth Congress is best illustrated by the fact that it finally got on the nerves of the Chaplain of the Senate, the late Dr. Peter Marshall. Dr. Marshall was known as a calm man but things got so bad that finally one day, in desperation, he opened the Senate day with the following unique prayer:

> Lord, we are ashamed that money and position speak to us more loudly than does the simple compassion of the human heart. Help us to care, as thou dost care, for the little people who have no lobbyists, for the minority groups who sorely need justice. May it be the glory of our Government that not only the strong are heard, but also the weak; not only the powerful, but also the helpless; not only those with influence, but also those who have nothing but a case and an appeal.

The Eightieth Congress turned a deaf ear to Dr. Marshall's plea. For the record, I should like to say that today those who have nothing but a case and an appeal will be helped.

So much has been said about the Taft-Hartley Act—in the papers, on the air, in Congress—that I should like to confine my remarks about that act itself to a short analysis of the intent of the act, to its operation, to its effect if it remained the law of the land, and to what is proposed in its stead.

When the Wagner Act was passed, Congress intended it to make possible the development of a free and democratic labor movement. The act succeeded admirably. Union membership rose from 4,000,000 to over 14,000,000. It became an unfair labor practice for an employer to discriminate against a worker because he was a member of a union. The act also set the foundation for collective bargaining by making it mandatory for an employer to bargain with a union representing the majority of the workers. Just the opposite, the Taft-Hartley Act was intended to make it safer for a worker not to join a union than to join one and to destroy collective bargaining between management and labor.

The objective of the Eighty-first Congress is simply to get back to collective bargaining. The claims made for the Taft-Hartley Act were many. The National Association of Manufacturers said its heart bled for the freedom of the individual worker. Big Steel said that it would place management and labor on a par as to their bargaining power. Senator TAFT said it would bring peace to industrial relations. The United States Chamber of Commerce said the act made paramount the interest of the general public over that of any minority group. But then Business Week magazine had to open its mouth and tell the truth, that the act was intended to wreck the American labor movement. That the act did not wreck the American labor movement in the year and a half it has been in operation can be credited to several factors.

The most important reason is that we have been in a period of relative full employment. Management was unwilling to break unions in a period of high profits. Most concerns for the sake of continuing high production pretended the act did not exist. There would be plenty of time later, they thought. Another important reason was that its first real year of operation fell in an election year. We are all acquainted with the sudden change of heart of some politicians when they face their constituents at election time.

In this instance, big business hoped that by doing little to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act, their congressional supporters could say to their constituents, "The act is a good act. Those who opposed it claimed all sorts of bad things would happen. But nothing bad happened. So now vote for us."

But the people were too smart. They saw through this shabby trick. They knew what the act contained. They knew what it could do anytime the steam was turned on.

The act abolished the closed shop. The International Typographical Union had the closed shop as long as the oldest of us can remember. The act made it possible to end the union shop. When elections were held for union shops, those employees who did not vote, for any reason, were to be listed as voting against the union shop.

The act said that where the State labor law was more restrictive than the Taft-Hartley Act, the State law would have precedence. Where the Taft-Hartley law was more severe than the State law, it would apply. The act said that unions could not practice restraint or coercion. These terms were nowhere defined and could at any time be made to fit any labor difficulty. The act permits turmoil in union affairs by allowing an employer to ask for an election among his employees upon the statement of a single employee that he represents the majority of the workers. Given some unemployment, an employer would be able to break his union if it went out on strike. He would be permitted to hire scabs and ask the NLRB for an election, from which the employees out on strike would be barred. Once the election was won by the scabs, the striking union would then be striking unlawfully under the act.

And this is hailed as an act bringing industrial peace.

The act also permits the use of the injunction against unions and bars all secondary boycotts no matter how valid. Workers would lose their freedom to remain away from the job.

These are some of the things that could be done under the Taft-Hartley Act and which the courts of this country would have to enforce.

That they have not to date been put into widespread use does not support the views of those who want to save the act—that the act is not harmful to free collective bargaining. A potential danger is always a menace.

Many Republicans have available all sorts of statistics to prove that the Taft-Hartley Act has been beneficial. The number of strikes did not increase in the year after the act went into effect. They credit this to the act. They can prove that the number of union members increased during that year also. They credit this to the act too. The cost of living went up during that year. Do they credit this to the act too? There are statisticians who spend all their time proving a point with nonrelated statistics.

Actually, even though the supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act carried on a "go-slow" campaign and "we will speed things up after the election," trends harmful to labor did make their appearance.

The campaign to unionize workers in the South was slowed down to a walk by the act. Workers suddenly became afraid of what might happen to their jobs if they joined a union. The union rolls would be much higher than the present 15,000,000 if the act were not in effect.

As to the claim that the number of strikes actually decreased, this is true. But the real reason for this was the de-

sire of employers to grant wage increases to employees in order to keep their plants going full blast and keep their profit levels at their highest in history. In some cases, corporations did not heed the general strategy laid down for them, but went ahead with programs to break their unions.

Remington-Rand, Caterpillar Tractor, and Colt Arms refused to recognize their established unions because their leaders did not sign non-Communist affidavits.

This was the handiest excuse available to do the job. But in general, union-breaking was something to be reserved for after the election. Let us thank the wisdom of the American people that this will not take place.

A major claim of the Taft-Hartley supporters was that the act brought equal restrictions to bear on employers as well as employees. Let us look at the record.

It is an unfair labor practice for employees to featherbed, or slow down yet there is nothing in the act which makes it an unfair employer practice to cut his production or turn out inferior products. Union officials must sign non-Communist affidavits, but employers do not have to. The implication, obviously, is that all employers are good Americans, while union leaders are questionable.

Under the act, management is not responsible for the acts of foremen, yet unions are responsible for all members in a strike. Under the act, sympathetic strikes and boycotts are forbidden. Yet no restrictions are placed upon an employer who talks other employers into cracking down on their unions. The act gives the general counsel of the NLRB the right to ask the courts for injunctions against management as well as labor.

Check to see how often he has asked for injunctions against unions since the act has been in practice and how seldom he has asked for injunctions against management. Labor disputes are not that one-sided.

The House of Representatives is considering at this time H. R. 2032 which would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact in general the Wagner Act of 1935.

The main purpose of this act is to bring about a return to free collective bargaining. It would restore labor to equal partnership in the going concern of America. It would remove the doubts regarding the direction we are moving. It would show we are back on the track with the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who recognized a mandate from the people and acted with courage and bravery in their behalf. We have no greater honor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Charman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], if I understood him correctly, objected to any interference by Government in what he termed economic warfare; that is, he does not want the Government to interfere in any way when there is a controversy between a labor union and an employer, and yet he is inconsistent in that he wants the Wagner Act back on the books. That act put Government into labor disputes, into economic contest, between unions and management. Of course, that act regulates the economic warfare, so-called between employee and employer.

Then he referred to the "yellow dog" contracts, which were most unjust and contrary to the American way of doing business. Those contracts were outlawed by the United States Supreme Court and an act created by Congress. Those contracts, as he stated, provided that a man could not obtain a job if he belonged to a union, that he could not retain his job if he retained his membership in the union. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] said that was all wrong. I think we all agree with him. But what does he propose to do? He is in favor of the closed or the union security shop. There is no practical difference between the closed shop and the union shop. Under the the terms of the Wagner Act, and to a more limited extent under the terms of the Taft-Hartley Act, the reverse of a "yellow dog" contract is retained.

If we object to the one, why not be fair? Why not be consistent and object to the other? Why not leave the individual free to strike, to strike when he wants to, any time he desires, and to continue on strike just as long as he desires? But why permit employees to prevent the employer rehiring someone else sometime. Take the situation where you have a strike in an industry or a business the nonoperation of which injuriously affects the public health, safety, and welfare. I will go along and say that the employees in that industry may strike. I will also go along with the proposition that they may strike just as long as they choose to remain out of work. But I cannot go along with the proposition that having exercised their right to strike they may then say that no one else may be employed to do the work they were doing. I would like to ask the gentlemen on the other side, in their own time, however, to answer the proposition that if a man goes on strike he may by coercion prevent another from working, and if so, for how long?

Where do you find the moral or the legal right for any individual or any group of individuals to tie up, let us say, the transportation system in the city of Washington, to turn off the electric lights in the city of Washington, to shut off the water or the food supply of the city, and so endanger the public health, the safety, the very life functions of the Federal Government, and to continue out on strike and say, "No one else shall work as long as I do not want to work?"

Take this amendment. It is all right to have some limitation, perhaps, but for how long? As the gentleman from Pennsylvania tried to explain—I go out on strike; I am still an employee for a certain time, a limited time; how long may I be an employee and remain off the job? I may remain on strike just as long as I want to, 1 year, 10 years if I wish, but should I retain my status as an employee? Retain my right to vote for a bargaining unit? Perhaps, as he said, I had gone away; I have another job; I am working in another industry. Maybe I have traveled across the continent, and I am out of a job because of a strike in New York, in which I joined. I have a new job in San Francisco, should I be permitted for 6 months or 12 months or indefinitely to vote in this election to be held in New York as to whether or not the strike up there should continue and as to whether or not those on strike should receive benefits from the union to which they or I belong? Or as to who should be on a bargaining unit in a plant where I am not working? There must be some limit somewhere. There must be some reason in our legislation.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said in opening this debate on the rule, all too long the Congress of the United States and the people, to a certain extent, have had in their minds the idea that legislation should be written with only the interest of organized labor and of management in mind. We have ignored here in Congress the question of how the legislation we write, as it is interpreted and administered, affects the great body of the people. Today there are more than 140,000,000 people in the United States. How does the proposed legislation affect them?

I reiterate, our attitude should be to write legislation which is for the good of the people of the country and not for any special group. That has been my position on labor legislation—that was and is the purpose of the Taft-Hartley bill—that is the purpose of the Wood bill for which I shall vote.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is a little amusing that Michigan has to take the floor so often to defend its employees. It is more amusing when you find the opposition sugar-coating their words but with the intention to wreck every union in the country.

My good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], knows of the strike in his territory at the Shakespeare Co. They have a contract with the union with a 90-day clause of apprenticeship at 40 cents an hour, but when it came to the regular pay of 70 cents, under the contract they had with the union they laid the people off and got an apprentice. If they have someone on the pay roll at 70 cents an hour who does not produce so many articles per hour, then they pay only 40 cents an hour. How do you expect any employee in the State of Michigan to live on 40 cents an hour? Is any one of you worth a thousand dollars a year?

I was in Kalamazoo for 2 days on the picket line with the State police hanging around with machine guns. That is what they did in Michigan. They had the State police out, with mounted machine guns. And who are the pickets? Women 40, 45, 50, and 60 years old. They had machine guns there to wipe out the women of the world. That is what they did over there, and that is what the Taft-Hartley Act permits, because that employer would never dare to do what he did unless under the Taft-Hartley Act he was permitted to do that.

I happen to be a member of that joint committee and I know positively the

words used. Mr. TAFT said to Mr. Stroyer and Mr. Reilly, "You had better tell the Board not to enforce this law until after November 2." The effect of November 2 is the bill that is on the floor of the House today.

You are trying to wreck every union in the country. Nobody can deny that. It is absolutely a fact. In other words, you want to bring in here a dictatorship of the same quality and kind that Hitler had in Germany, and of course our friend Joe Stalin, who ought to be hung on the first limb for what he is doing to labor in Russia. Yet that is what you are trying to do here. I have also heard statements made on the floor that I acted as a dictator in the committee. I leave it to the members of the committe. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] moved to strike out all after the enacting clause and made it the present clean bill that you have here, and then moved the previous question, I told him, in fairness to the Republicans, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] had asked me to permit him to take the floor. I ruled the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] out and gave the floor to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL]. He is the man who presented the first Wood bill in the committee. It was voted down 13 to 10. Then I permitted the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] to move the previous question. We voted on the bill and the bill was reported out of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old adage "Discretion is the better part of valor" and "Only fools rush in where angels fear to tread." Reluctantly do I speak again. I admire the earnestness, the enthusiasm, the warmth and the vehemence of the gentlemen who have just spoken, and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania whom I had, only yesterday, the honor to meet. I am only sorry that their talents and genius are misguided and misdirected. I wish they would turn into other channels. I am not a member of a union, although I have some brothers and brothers-in-law who are. I do know what it means to work. I have worked since I was 8 years old. I say this for my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. Nothing has ever been given to me. I have contributed to a big family—tried to. I know what it means to shine shoes and sell papers, fire furnaces, drive jennies, mow lawns, juggle luggage, and handle cakes of ice bigger than I was—they slide. I know what it is to look at the south end of a mule going north down a corn row all day long, BOB DOUGHTON; I have shoveled manure out of the stables and I have scattered it over the fields, and the scent was much cleaner and more wholesome and rejuvenating than the smell of some people I meet, even in Washington. I hope no one will be shocked at those remarks. That is Lincolnesque language. It is the speech of Mark Twain, who was from my State. But, gentlemen, do you know anybody in this country who wants to move to a foreign land? Have you traveled, as I have, many times all over this world—with the exception of South Africa, New Zealand, and Tibet? Do you not know that there are millions who are hungry and eager to come into America? Those who are not already here want to get here. We are not too bad. You have charged that this Taft-Hartley law will wipe out labor unions. Do not be silly. Do not be idiotic. Do not be dishonest. There are more members of unions today than ever before in our history. Laboring men in this country are drawing higher wages than they ever have drawn. More of them are at work.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. No; I cannot yield to the Abraham Lincoln from Indianapolis. That is a compliment.

More members of unions are drawing higher pay and living under better conditions than ever before in our history.

Oh, it has been said of the boys who are not back here that they were defeated because they voted for the Taft-Hartley bill. Let me tell you, those of us who voted to override the President's veto, we are back. The ones who pussyfooted, side-stepped, straddled, carried water on both shoulders, and compromised were left at home. And a lot of you who vote to restore the Wagner bill are going to be left at home. You still have a majority in both Houses of Congress, who voted to override the President's veto after weeks of hearings and hours of debate on both floors of the two Houses of Congress. Let us be true to our convictions. Let us not be overcome by minority pressures. Let us stand up like men in the face of political threats and vote to keep America strong. Vote for the Wood substitute bill and forever bury the Wagner Act.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I do not consider either the Lesinski bill or the Wood bill as now written to constitute satisfactory labor-management legislation.

On yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] explained to us just what went on in the committee while this legislation was before it. The failure of the committee to consider any amendments is most unfortunate and whenever such high-handed procedure is followed by a legislative committee, I consider that committee to have failed to perform its major function. It is most difficult to perfect intricate and controversial measures on the House floor, and when a bill comes to us in this manner, we are likely to approve legislation which is not best for the economic segments of people affected. Under the situation now confronting us the bill will have to be substantially rewritten here on the floor.

I believe that the Lesinski bill is a more desirable starting point for proper labor-management legislation than is the Wood bill, but unless the Lesinski bill is amended in many important respects I shall be unable to support it when the final vote is taken. I believe many of my colleagues share views similar to mine.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, and my illustrious colleague from Missouri: I invite you all to look at another Missourian who has looked for long hours at the north end of that southbound mule. I have been farming 75 miles south of Kansas City as long as I have been old enough and big enough to farm. I have watched not only agriculture but labor as well. How easy it would be to forget about all these things that are worrying us today and go back to the good old days that we used to have and that some folks profess to want to go back to, when we did not have any regulation of anything or anybody, where the strongest and the fittest survived; where it was dog eat dog, and the devil take the one who got behind. We could do that so easily. You know, we followed that course from 1920 to 1932. The dogs ate the dogs, and in 1932 there were lots of them.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I have only a very few minutes.

Mr. IRVING. I just wanted to ask you if you could tell me why there are so many more north ends than there are south ends.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Well, it is just the difference in the way they want to travel. That is all.

You know, the reason I am opposed to this Wood bill is because I found out in my youth by experience that a polecat by any other name would smell just as bad. Therefore, I do not like substitutions. The Wood bill is a substitute for the Taft-Hartley bill.

Let me make just a little comparison before my time expires. You know, this House wastes more time than any place I was ever in in my life, and yet it is harder to get a little of it here than anywhere else I know of. You know, Mr. Chairman, in 1932, after we had had no regulation, we had not had any Wagner Act from 1920 to 1932; there was not any Wagner Act, and labor came to the Democratic Party, and it came jobless, without money, without pay, without credit, and in rags; and it said, "Do something for us." We gave labor the Wagner Act, and now labor, after being for years under the provisions of the Wagner Act and Social Security Act, and the Democratic minimum-wage law, is so well off that they can live like American citizens ought to live. The Republican Party made the mistake 2 years ago of passing the Taft-Hartley Act, and this mistake defeated the party. If we do not repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, it will defeat us. Take it or leave it.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat the words of my illustrious colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I probably may be foolish to follow such gifted speakers as he and the other gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER],

for I feel it would be quite a chore to compete with them oratorically. Yet I wish to have the privilege of following them at this time because I do feel I have a message.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] said something about angels and about fools, but all too little about the basic issues before us. In earlier days every court had its jester, and I think perhaps there may be some here who aspire to such a position.

Several gentleman from the Republican side of the aisle have admitted that they had taken a shotgun blast at the entire problem of labor relations when they passed the Taft-Hartley Act.

The strategy at the start of this debate was to do the same thing again by seeking passage of the Wood bill, aiming at the entire problem through another broom shot. Since the proponents of the vicious Wood bill see that such an attack cannot win, they propose a whole series of regular shots, rifle shots well aimed, in the form of individual amendments. It is essential, therefore, that each of those shots be deflected by their overwhelming rejection on the floor of the House.

I, too, Mr. Chairman, am not minimizing the stature and dignity of the agricultural workers of this country when I admit to being a "weed leaper," or an "apple knocker" myself, if you wish to use those terms. I have raked hay by hand with a barley fork on a farm of 200 acres, perhaps to get 20 tons. I know how it is to work. I have worked for a railroad and as a newsboy. I admire people who come up that way. So I have the utmost admiration for my two friends from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to both the amendment offered here by the gentleman from Michigan, and the Wood substitute.

Some of you who know little of the problems of labor may think I come from the wrong side of the tracks vocationally, because I am a labor leader. But I think it is high time that we have some people in this House of Representatives who know something about the day-to-day problems of management and labor which we have to deal with. I do not mean any disrespect to the profession of law because many of my best friends are lawyers, but I believe we have too many lawyers in the House of Representatives to get the best job done. Too often their training has left them with the inclination to delay, to ask for continuances and to find ways to draft laws that nobody except themselves can understand. I would feel the same way about it if the membership of the House was as preponderantly dominated by any other profession or segment of our society, whether from agriculture, labor, or business. I think we need more Members from other walks of life like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], who is a farmer, in order to do a better job than has been done in the Eightieth Congress.

May I say further that I am not under pressure from labor. I promised labor nothing that I did not promise any other group, which is a fair deal and a just representation for all. I am perhaps the only candidate from labor and one of the few candidates in this House who did not make the Taft-Hartley law an issue in the campaign, although I knew it was an important issue raised by others. So I am not biased and I am not under pressure from anyone. My promises were only that I would oppose what I thought was wrong and that I would stand for what I thought was right. I have no other formula for voting in this House and will never change that position.

I make no apology for my position in supporting the Lesinski bill and opposing these amendments nor for supporting the subcommittee in its procedure so far as the handling of this legislation is concerned. I assure the Members of this House that I am no rubber stamp and do not consider any member of our party as such just because they may support our leaders and live up to our party platform and our party's promise to the people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who were not here yesterday to hear my remarks and partial analysis of the Lesinski bill, I call attention to page 5183 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I again want to state that in my opinion the above-mentioned bill, arrived at through necessary compromises made by our leaders, is a much tougher bill than most of the Members of this House and the public, including labor and labor leaders, may realize. I should be capable and qualified to judge because I conducted a union under the Taft-Hartley Act before I became a Member of this House. I am satisfied that this bill is generally more fair to both labor and management because many of its provisions are more definite and clear than those in the Taft-Hartley Act. I can say that the boycott and jurisdictional dispute provisions are adequate, practicable, and also workable. Again I reiterate that I feel the public health and welfare section is amply strong to care for any national emergency which may arise and which rightly causes alarm among all of us.

Further, I would like to again call your attention to the record of our great President in handling our national emergencies in the past. He has never dodged one critical situation; he has not backslid. He has had that fortitude which many did not have. Political expediency was never considered by him on any of those occasions. His strict adherence to his duty to all of the people of this great Nation of ours has been outstanding, for which he deserves all credit and honor.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. Briefly, because I would like to finish.

Mr. SHORT. I just wonder if the gentleman would favor the drafting of men from the railroads and putting them into the Army? Would the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. IRVING. It would have to be, indeed, a terribly serious situation before I would even consider that or any other such drastic measure. Certainly I would never premeditatedly act, as the Republicans did, to bury the rights and hopes of labor through such a law as the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. SHORT. Since the gentleman is a strong labor leader, can he name one union, just one union, that the Taft-Hartley law has destroyed?

Mr. IRVING. If the gentleman will read the testimony——

Mr. SHORT. I want the gentleman to name one.

Mr. IRVING. The Oil Pipe Line Workers Union, in California, according to the testimony. Many others have been badly weakened. The testimony also indicated that the total effects had not been felt because the act's full power has not been invoked.

Let me get back on the track. The President, by his past actions, proved that he would not lend his support to any legislation that did not contain full power to deal effectively with all our labor-management problems when the public's welfare is at stake. I would disagree with the gentleman from New York about the effect of the amendments he referred to as disclosed in the New York Times article. The boycott and the decertification provisions are two of the most vicious provisions of both the Taft-Hartley law and the Wood substitute. Both would weaken and destroy unions, actually nullifying the recognized right of workers to organize for their own protection.

I would like to concur in the statement or observation made yesterday by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, that many who felt they had to vote in 1947 for some labor legislation but did not care to vote for the Taft-Hartley law, would have voted for the Lesinski bill then, if it was up for action. They certainly can do so now with good grace.

I call your attention again to a statement in my speech yesterday about the philosophies of the two parties so you may fully understand what I was trying to get across. To emphasize my remarks of yesterday I would ask your indulgence while I refer to Mr. Hartley's book, Our New National Labor Policy, which admits on page 193 that the Republican strategy would be to do away with soil conservation, bank-deposit insurance, social security, TVA, and all New Deal legislation by the same process that the Republicans and their allies used in emasculating the rights of labor through enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act. The very words to which I refer are contained in two short paragraphs on that page and read:

> Once we accept the concept of the Taft-Hartley Act as a model to begin an interim period leading to complete elimination of the governmental labor relations agencies, we can apply that concept to other areas of governmental activity.
>
> I am well aware of the political difficulties of eliminating the New Deal social legislation. It cannot be repealed at a single stroke.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there is no politics involved in this discussion today. Oh, no! And I am not interested nor disturbed about the so-called patronage question, because I come from a State where, in 1936, we were ruled out of the Union because of our quaint political notions, and the people of Maine and Vermont exchanged visits to see how the other half of the world lived. I was here to vote for the Taft-Hartley law, and I voted to override the President's veto, and I am supporting the Wood amendment.

Between 1920 and 1930, great captains of industry arose in this country and arrogated to themselves power. We found that they believed they had more power than the Government; that they were above the law itself. Then Congress stepped in and made appropriate regulations.

That pendulum has swung, as all pendulums do, and we find that in our country other great captains have arisen—captains of labor. They took unto themselves power which placed them, they thought, above law. They failed to recognize in many instances the sanctity of contracts and the public welfare. So Congress stepped in and passed the Taft-Hartley law.

It was found that many of these great labor leaders threatened the safety and security of this country and the existence of the Government. Where did I get that idea? I will show you. In 1946, on May 25, the President of the United States addressed a gathering here in this Hall—a joint session, if you please. At that time there was a great strike, a railroad strike. He stood here and asked the Congress to give him authority to draft into the Army of the United States the men and women who worked for the railroads. That is where I got my idea about the power of certain labor leaders. Listen, and I quote the President of the United States, who favors a return now to the law then in force:

> The action which I have already taken, and the action which I shall ask you to take, are necessary for the preservation of our Government. That action is also necessary to save the great and mighty masses of working men and women from the dangerous effects of the ill-advised and misguided acts of some of their own leaders.
>
> This particular crisis has been brought about by the obstinate arrogance of two men. They are Mr. Alvanley Johnston, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

Further, the President said, and I quote:

> I am here not only to urge speedy action to meet the immediate crisis but also deliberate and weighty consideration of any legislation which might affect the rights of labor.

Listen. I still quote:

> However, what we are dealing with here is not labor as a whole.
>
> We are dealing with a handful of men who are striking against their own Government and against every one of their fellow citizens.

So that is where I got the idea that labor leaders can arrogate to themselves power and fail to recognize the sanctity of contract, the supremacy of law, and the public good.

It is a strange thing, but they say that this horrible thing called the injunctive process is something we should not have in management-labor relationships. I think we should where the public interest, health, and welfare is involved. And who agrees, or did agree? Listen. The President of the United States on May 25, 1946, used the following words in asking Congress for power to protect the public and the Government itself:

> (a) Authorize the institution of injunctive or mandatory proceedings against any union leader forbidding him from encouraging or inciting members of the union to leave their work or to refuse to return to work.

Further, and I am still quoting the President:

> As part of this temporary emergency legislation I request the Congress immediately to authorize the President to draft into the armed forces of the United States all workers who are on strike against their Government.

That is where I got my idea—from the highest authority in the land—the President of the United States, who, after he had vetoed the Taft-Hartley law, and the veto had been overridden, exercised that power of injunction, I believe, seven times under the so-called "slave-labor law."

Did he believe what he said? Listen to this, quoting further from the President's message:

> The stoppage of work in many industries has brought about a decline in production which has caused great pressure on price levels. We must protect the workers.

Then he said—and remember we had the Wagner Act at that time:

> I believe that the time has come to adopt a comprehensive labor policy which will tend to reduce the number of stoppages of work and other acts which injure labor, capital, and the whole population.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder what disposition there is to cut off debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding is that there is no inclination to cut off debate this afternoon, and I am quite sure that the gentleman will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. WITHROW. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman mentioned the names of several men and said that they were arrogant.

Mr. FELLOWS. I did not say that, the President did.

Mr. WITHROW. All right, then, the President did. He said that they were arrogant and were calling this strike, taking it upon themselves as leaders of labor. I would like to have you know, with reference to this particular strike, that you have referred to, by the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, that that strike was authorized by a referendum vote relative to the strike, and that the vote in both organizations was by 96 percent of the men working on the engines and trains to go out on strike, and that Mr. Whitney and Mr. Alvanley Johnston did not arrogantly take upon themselves the authority to call that strike.

Mr. FELLOWS. I am just quoting the President of the United States.

Mr. WITHROW. It was by and with a demand on the part of the employees.

Mr. FELLOWS. All right. So what of it? I am not talking about that. I am quoting the President of the United States. He said that certain labor leaders could arrogate to themselves power which they considered to be above the power of the State itself. So I am talking about one thing, and the distinguished gentleman is talking about another. Admitting what the gentleman says, I am saying to you that men are so constructed and human nature is so constituted—and the President agrees with me, that men will reach out for power. They always have, and some regulation is necessary. I am simply saying that these men should not complain if their segment of the society which they represent faces regulation, just as every other segment of society does. I know I am what they call an economic royalist. I do not have anything and I will divide it with anybody. My forebears were stonecutters without unions or subsidies. I come from a country where the soil is thin; I am proud of my district. My people believe that a man, I do not care whether he is an industrialist or labor leader, must conform to reasonable law and reasonable regulations, and they further believe that there are two sides to every contract.

Mr. Chairman, I have gotten my ideas from a very high authority. Men will do these things, and they did threaten the very existence of the Government—according to our President. He demanded the so-called vicious injunctive process. And speaking of general conditions in this country, he called for an over-all policy when he had a law that he is seeking to go back to today. No, I got my ideas from what is held by the gentleman on my right to be the highest authority—the President of the United States, who comes from Missouri. I have great respect for our President. He told me these things, and, of course, I believe him.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, under the broad rule that has been adopted, we have an opportunity to vote for the Wood bill, with amendments, or we have an opportunity to vote for the committee bill, with amendments.

I had looked upon the Wood bill as the Taft-Hartley bill with a southern accent, but I find that I was wrong. The Wood bill is the Republican Massachusetts-

Indiana bill. After listening to my colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] speak with such great authority on this Wood bill, I am beginning to wonder whether he is not, in fact, the author of the Wood bill.

After listening to the debate for the last 3 days, I was shocked and amazed, and I did not know what to make of this article which appeared in the Labor magazine which came out this morning. By the way, this is a weekly paper which is put out by the 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations and is their official Washington weekly newspaper. Here is the article:

MAGAZINE BARES CONSPIRACY TO PREVENT REPEAL OF T-H ACT—SCHEME DEVISED BY MARTIN AND HALLECK, USING WOOD, OF GEORGIA, AS STOOGE, SAYS NEWSWEEK

Debate got under way in the House this week on the most important issue facing this session of Congress—repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

When Labor went to press Wednesday progressives in the House were waging a gallant fight to put over the administration's repeal bill and to defeat the so-called Wood bill, a vicious substitute sponsored by a coalition of reactionary northern Republicans and stand-pat southern Democrats.

Perhaps more significant than the debate, however, was a sensational story carried in the magazine Newsweek on the origin of the Wood bill.

Newsweek is an ultra-conservative magazine which has close contact with the Tories of both parties on Capitol Hill. In its April 25 issue the magazine really let the cat out of the bag.

MARTIN AND HALLECK

It wasn't Congressman JOHN S. WOOD, Democrat, Georgia, who drafted the bill bearing his name. The job was done, according to Newsweek, by the GOP's two top figures in the House—JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, now minority floor leader, who was Speaker in the House at the last session, and CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, who served as floor leader when MARTIN was Speaker.

Others were in on the conspiracy, and the magazine even gave the room—F-18 at the Capitol—where the plot was hatched at a "highly secret 3-hour meeting."

Actually there were two Wood bills. The first one bearing the Georgian's name was so much more drastic than Taft-Hartley that the Republican leaders decided they couldn't put it over, Newsweek pointed out.

So they prepared a new one, ostensibly milder. Before doing so, Newsweek said, "MARTIN and HALLECK obtained a pledge of support from southern Democratic leaders and conferred with Senators TAFT, of Ohio, and IVES, of New York, on features to be incorporated in the new substitute."

At the secret meeting in room F-18, the magazine explained, members of the GOP policy committee and the party's members on the House Labor Committee, "unanimously agreed to to go along with the Martin-Halleck strategy."

"Core of the strategy," the magazine stressed, "was this: The new Wood bill would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act on paper but in reality would retain many of the key Taft-Hartley provisions."

Also, Congressman SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Representative of Pennsylvania, "passed the word along to Cox of Georgia, SMITH of Virginia, and BARDEN of North Carolina, who in turn lined up their fellow southern Democrats."

"The secret was so well guarded," the magazine declared, "that WOOD himself, who had not been in Washington for 2 weeks, had never seen his new bill and had little idea of what was in it."

By getting WOOD to "front for them," the magazine added, "Republicans succeeded in dividing censure" with southern Democrats.

Old-timers on Capitol Hill, when they finally heard of the scheme, were shocked. They said that never in the Capital's history had any such cold-blooded conspiracy been hatched by reactionaries of the two major parties nor in such a subterranean manner.

I do not know whether this article is true or not, but if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Massachuetts [Mr. MARTIN], are the authors of the Wood bill, why do they not take full credit for it? Why not come out and say so? If I had authored that bill, I would have. Why be so secretive about it? Let us have an answer to it; let us find out who are the fathers of this child.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, after hearing the remarks of my friend from Missouri about the members of the legal profession, I rise with some hesitancy to confess to being a member of the bar. One of a lawyer's faults is that sometimes he sticks rather closely to the issue before him. We are required to do that in the courts, and I am asking the membership to bear with me for a couple of minutes while I discuss the precise problem before us, as presented by the amendment under consideration offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

One of the objections to the Taft-Hartley law which we have heard from union leaders is that when a man is out on strike he is not permitted to vote in a representation election. It is stated that this provision could be seized upon by an employer to bust a union or by a competing union for raiding purposes. On page 25 is that section of the Wood bill where an effort is made to meet that objection. This states that if the striking employee has not been replaced by a permanent substitute who has worked on the job for 90 days, the striking employee shall be entitled to vote in an election. The gentleman from Michigan thinks, and after study I agree with him, that 90 days is too short a period, that a replacement should not be able to vote and that the man out on strike should vote, unless the replacement has been on the job 6 months instead of 90 days.

It seems curious to me—I suppose it is perhaps naive—but it seems curious to me that we find those who are supposed to be and, so far as I know, are true and loyal friends of labor, objecting to this attempt to meet one of the criticisms of the Wood bill made by the leaders of organized labor. I had prepared, and was ready to offer this very amendment in an effort to deal with the first point raised in a section-by-section analysis of the Wood bill submitted by the counsel for the American Federation of Labor. The issue before us, as the opponents of this amendment state it, is whether we shall accept this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, or go back to the Wagner Act provision which would allow the National Labor Relations Board to determine who shall vote dependent on the question how long a current labor controversy has existed. That is not the issue at all. I say in all sincerity that I do not know how I would resolve that issue. It might be that the position which they have stated is correct, but that question will come when we decide, after all amendments are considered, whether to substitute the Wood bill as it is then, not now worded, for the Lesinski bill. The issue before us now is whether we should provide in the Wood bill for a 90-day or a 180-day period within which a man out on strike can still vote.

Mr. Chairman, all of the Members of this House are sincere, both those who have, and those who have not yet decided how they should cast their votes. But there is a group on both sides of the aisle, the Members of which are in some doubt as to what we should do with labor legislation. I wish this important subject could be lifted out of the realm of partisanship. Commendably, we have in the field of foreign affairs what we call a nonpartisan or bipartisan approach. Certainly, in matters affecting labor and management which, in turn, directly or indirectly touch the lives of every person in the land, we ought to try to reach a solution, with our thoughts fixed not on the goal of political preferment, but the achievement of fairness, harmony, and prosperity for all.

It is our desire to try to write here on the floor of the House the best piece of labor legislation that we can possibly devise. It is to that end, in my judgment, that the gentleman from Michigan, with whom I have conferred and who is in the utmost sincerity in his efforts to help in developing here a constructive measure, has introduced this amendment. It seems to me it deserves the support of all Members and particularly those who seek vigilantly to see that no step is taken which will adversely affect the legitimate activities of organized labor or thwart in any way the further strengthening of the great labor-union movement which is recognized as having made such a significant contribution to the improvement of conditions in industry for so many working men and women in many sections of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to address my remarks to the comment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] in which he has quoted the President of the United States at the time that the President appeared before this body and asked the Congress to draft into the armed forces men out on strike. That was an instance in the history of this Nation when the President exceeded his constitutional powers.

The President has since learned his lesson. The President has since acquired wisdom. It is unfortunate that the Republican leadership never forgets and seldom learns. May I say to you that merely because the President of the United States stands before this body or any other body asking this group or the group on the other side of the Hill to violate the Constitution is no excuse for

us to acquiesce in his demands. The obligation of our oath to support the Constitution of the United States transcends political party affiliations or Presidential demands. It is basic to our great democracy that under a system of checks and balances it is the supreme duty of the Congress to resist any action which is in violation of the Constitution.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has stated that many of us are sincere and that we are in doubt; that we do not know what to do about the solution of labor-management problems. Why are we in doubt? All of us are sincerely in doubt because we do not want to undermine the pillars of a free democracy. That is why we do not know exactly where to draw the line in connection with legislation affecting labor-management relations.

Why, in the Taft-Hartley bill itself the injunctive process is not permanent. Why is it not permanent? Because when we have a permanent injunctive process we necessarily march into the field of compulsory arbitration. Management does not want that any more than labor wants it. The reason is quite simple. As and when compulsory arbitration becomes an instrument in the hands of Government it may readily develop into a club to be used either against management or labor, depending upon the political philosophy of those in charge of the Government. As a matter of fact, the antilabor attitude of the Eightieth Congress manifested itself in the adoption of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act. The antilabor forces of the Eightieth Congress, by the passage of this act, sought to impose a legal strait-jacket upon the desires and hopes and the ambitions of millions of American working men and women. Such an act, legislated and passed in such a hostile political climate, could not help but arouse intense bitterness. That bitterness grew into such proportions that on November 2, 1948, most, but not all—and may I add not enough of the antilabor forces were thrown out of office.

Mr. Chairman, I have watched fascism in Italy, I have watched the development and the growth of nazism and socialism in Germany. We have got to remember that there is a fundamental philosophical conflict confronting this body today. In resolving that conflict we must always keep uppermost in our mind that a free trade-union movement is of vital necessity to democracy. In every case where people have lost their freedom, the dictator has first moved to destroy or to control the trade-union movement.

Now, the Taft-Hartley bill, I must be frank with you, does not on the surface permit permanent injunctions, but there are a series of provisions contained in the Taft-Hartley bill which were designed to destroy trade-unionism.

Mr. Chairman, I have had no opportunity to speak on this measure, so I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes in order to develop this point further.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. In 1947, I remember when Mr. Hartley stated in the well of this House that one of the most important provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act was the prohibition against industry-wide bargaining. That bill passed through this House with an overwhelming majority. I debated, worked, and voted against it with all of my vigor. Nevertheless, it went to the other body of Congress, and after a bitter debate it was defeated by 1 vote, by a vote of 44 to 43. Can you not understand why the working people of this Nation look upon the Taft-Hartley Act as being contrary to their best interest? What did the House intend by prohibiting "industry-wide bargaining?"

As the gentlewoman from California said yesterday in the well of this House, we have a great and growing monopoly in this Nation. Every Republican and Democrat who has been devoting time to the protection of small business knows that the forces of monopoly are growing in this Nation. We are going through a period of tremendous concentration of economic wealth. I have forgotten the number, but some 113 giant corporations control over 50 percent of the plant facilities of the Nation.

Now, let us see what has happened. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], a new Member, coming fresh from the people, coming with a fresh viewpoint, a man who owes no obligation to labor, has told you many things today. He has given in simple terms, hitting the nail on the head every time, the history, growth, and development of trade-unionism. He discussed the yellow-dog contract, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner bill, and in simple and in humble terms he said, "What did the Wagner Act design to do for the people? It merely said to the working men and women of the Nation 'You have the right to organize and to bargain collectively.'"

In this industry-wide bargaining prohibition that this body passed, what did you do? You attempted to isolate, you attempted to segregate, you attempted to break down the bargaining power of the trade-union movement, but you left uncontrolled the concentrated economic wealth in the hands of the giant corporations. Now, ladies and gentlemen, that is not good for our great democracy.

I say to you that I am aware that many times a few labor leaders abuse their powers; a few labor leaders become arrogant. Well, that is to be expected in a great society. There is no perfection within this body; there is no perfection in society itself. Of course, we are bound to have these conflicts.

Gentlemen, I do not know whether the leadership on the Republican side conspired with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], but I say that the birth of his bill is delivered under suspicious circumstances. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] said yesterday that he had consulted with his brethren. Well, the committee members of the Committee on Labor and Education say that he had no consultation with them. Who were his brethren? I am constrained to say to you that I suspect it is those antilabor forces in this body who do not have in their hearts the good of the working people. Now, it is that simple.

There is a fundamental, philosophical conflict here. If you are on the side of management, if you look upon labor as a commodity, then you ought to vote for the Wood bill, and you ought to vote for retention of the Taft-Hartley bill. But if you believe in the right of free people to organize to protect themselves, not to arrogate to themselves powers that may destroy them, but simply to have the right to organize and bargain collectively, you will vote against both the Wood bill and the retention of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Let me say just a few words more. There is no serious problem with respect to the pending amendment. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is very sincere, but I remember the testimony of Senator TAFT. I remember the testimony of Paul Herzog, who is Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. Paul Herzog said, in substance, "You don't need any 3-month rule, you don't need any 6-month rule. What you need to do in a case like this is have men on the National Labor Relations Board who look upon themselves as the trustees of the problems of labor and management."

He said, "We can determine these things in the light of the circumstances surrounding each transaction." He said, "We can apply the rule of reason."

I remember Senator TAFT in his comment calling attention to some case that arose in California. It was a garbled, isolated case. There was no justification for that case, just as there is no justification for many of the excesses and abuses brought about by a few labor leaders who do not also understand that the public interest must also be served. But you cannot condemn millions of people, you cannot condemn the whole trade-union movement by some isolated case all the circumstances of which no law could possibly cover.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I have so little time that I cannot yield. If I could get more time, I should be very happy to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes in order that I may yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. I want to compliment the gentleman on his speech. I think he is making an excellent talk. Is it not true, however, that under the Wagner Act certain labor leaders, particularly the CIO, found great fault with the Board because they were not fair in their decisions?

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] yesterday gave an accurate statement of that situation. In 1938, 1939, and 1940 the American Federation of Labor was much disturbed, and he said that President Green and General Counsel Padway were much disturbed because they felt the Board membership as it was then con-

stituted was playing too much with the CIO. But since 1939 and 1940 and since the change in the membership of the Board the American Federation of Labor has completely changed its position, and they say today they want the Taft-Hartley Act repealed, and they want that Board to be given the powers originally vested in it upon the passage of the Wagner Act.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is an able lawyer. Does he not concede that the issue before us on this amendment is whether the period to give a man out on strike the right to vote shall be 90 days or 6 months, not whether it shall be for any length of time or be left with the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. CARROLL. I said that I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman from New York. That is not the issue, and I will tell the gentleman why it is not the issue. It is because you are attempting—and I say "you" collectively—to bring in a Wood bill which is a watered-down version of the Taft-Hartley Act. Now you are trying to build up and to implement the Wood bill to make it more palatable. I say to you that either in the Wood bill or in the Lesinski bill it is not necessary, applying Chairman Herzog's interpretation. He says, "We shall apply the rule of reason." So I say if it is not good for the Lesinski bill, I think our position is good here to resist it in the Wood bill. I think that is the issue.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I was much interested in what the gentleman said with respect to the position of the A. F. of L. after 1940. I served on the Smith committee that investigated the Labor Board. That investigation, I think it is probably fair to say, had at least something to do with the fact that there was the change in the Board to which the gentleman refers. I think also the different attitude of the A. F. of L. after that time was the result of the fact that on the floor of the House of Representatives in connection with the amendments that were proposed by that committee a provision was written into the law which gives definite protection to the craft-unit type of organization which is found in the A. F. of L. I may say also that that provision is carried over in the existing law.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman is taking up my time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado be permitted to proceed for one additional minute, because I certainly want to be courteous, as the gentleman always is.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. You see the difficulty. The A. F. of L. in the formative years under the Wagner Act, was having a little tug of war with the CIO. Of course, to sustain their position, they fought to make certain changes. Today the question is not what happened 9 years ago. The question is where are we going today. The A. F. of L., the CIO, and the railroad brotherhoods, and all of organized and unorganized labor all over the Nation is saying to you, "Do not shackle the trade-union movement." That is what they are saying to you. It is not a question of being a Democrat or a Republican. You represent the American people. They are saying, "Do not put the shackle upon us." The gentleman from Michigan said that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] stated that there should be no law concerning labor-management conflicts. Mr. Chairman, I was district attorney of Denver many years ago. I discovered that we had ample laws to insure law and order. There are now ample laws in all States to give protection to the public. There are ample State laws that will take care of picketing, where it involves force and violence. There are ample laws that can take care of coercive action.

Now, let me tell you what you have done by the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. You have reached in, through the general counsel, penetrating State authority. Under the Wagner Act there was a great reluctance on the part of the Federal Government to insert itself into labor-management disputes unless affected with a vital national interest. As I read the RECORD, the general counsel, by virtue of his independent authority, given under the Taft-Hartley Act, has been invading the field heretofore treated by State governments. It is the announced policy of the present general counsel under the present law to insinuate himself into these State controversies as the Federal Government broadens the scope of its power. I cannot give you the exact figure, except to say that scores upon scores of new cases are being treated by the general counsel at the State level. May I say, in these closing seconds, that the general counsel has had twice the staff to enforce the Taft-Hartley law as compared to the staff that you previously gave the National Labor Relations Board under the Wagner Act. Why? Because you did not want that act to succeed. But when you weighted the law in favor of management, you gave them twice the employees to carry out the powerful provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in order to break the back of the trade-union movement.

I call upon every sincere Member of this body, Democrat and Republican, to reject the unholy alliance which has fathered the Wood bill. Such a coalition is not good for our system of government for the reason that it denies the principle upon which this great democracy was founded—that of majority rule. Whether we like it or not, the people of America have spoken. In this great democracy, the sovereign power rests in and with the people. I repeat, any coalition which thwarts or obstructs the people of this Nation in working their will upon the Congress is a denial of democracy itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SEIZURE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 2032

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, reference is made to my remarks in the general debate at page 5141 of yesterday's RECORD and to my intention to propose at the proper time an amendment authorizing the President to seize a struck or locked-out utility, and to operate it to the minimum extent required by the national health or security, in the event that the national health or security is threatened or imperiled.

The proposed amendment would not replace the provision for a cooling-off period now in the bill, H. R. 2032, but would authorize a procedure to follow that period if the serious nature of an emergency required it.

The text of the amendment follows, so that Members may consider it in advance:

Whenever the President, having acted pursuant to this section 302 and to section 301, finds after investigation and proclaims that a labor dispute has resulted in, or imminently threatens to result in the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in an industry essential to the national health or security, of sufficient magnitude to imperial or imminently threaten to imperil the national health or security, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to preserve and protect the national health or security, the President is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto, and by order to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or facility, the subject of such labor dispute, and to use and to operate such plant, mine, or facility in the interests of the United States: *Provided, however,* That (1) such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of the United States and while operated in its interests, shall be operated only to the minimum extent which seems to the President necessary to protect the national health or security of the United States, or of a material part of the territory or population thereof; and (2) the wages and other terms of employment in the plant, mine, or facility so taken, during the period of Government possession and operation shall be as prescribed by the President pursuant to the applicable provisions of law, and to the findings of a board appointed for the purpose by the President, which wages and other terms of employment shall be not less than those prevailing for similar work in the area of such plant, mine, or facility by private business; and (3) such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 30 days after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or facility, that the possession and operation, thereof, by the United States, or in its interests, is no longer necessary to insure the minimum operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the national health or security; and (4) the President may by order confer authority upon any Government department or officer to take possession of, to operate, or to exercise any other of the powers herein granted to the President with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility; and (5) fair and just compensation shall be paid to the employer

for the period of such possession and operation by the United States, or in its interests, as follows:

(A) The President shall determine the amount of the compensation to be paid as rental for the use of such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of or operated by the United States, or in its interests, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder.

(B) If the employer is unwilling to accept as a fair and just compensation for the use of the property taken hereunder by the United States and as full and complete compensation therefor, the amount so determined by the President, the employer shall be paid 50 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided by sections 24 (20) and 145 of the judicial code (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 41 and 250), for an additional amount which when added to the amount so paid shall be equal to the total sum which the employer considers to be fair and just compensation for the use of the property so taken by the United States.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4152) to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; as I understand it, this matter has been cleared with the minority members of the committee?

Mr. PETERSON. It has been cleared with minority and majority members and with the objectors on both sides as well. It was reported out unanimously by the committee itself.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill restricted to the project the gentleman mentioned, as contained in the bill?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; it is limited to the projects named in the bill itself.

Mr. JENSEN. Would you name those projects again?

Mr. PETERSON. The projects are the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman explain the bill in a few words?

Mr. PETERSON. This bill is the result of the study which has been made of the regular Reclamation Act, which revamped the provision with reference to payments in the light of changed conditions over a period of time.

Mr. JENSEN. For how many years does this bill extend the repayment period?

Mr. PETERSON. It varies in the different districts, depending upon the study made in the different districts.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman say approximately?

Mr. PETERSON. I would have to take them one by one because it varies as a result of the study made of the land situation and the type of production in the different districts.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] has one most largely affected in his district. It is the result of a consistent study based upon production in each district.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. In some cases the formula that is adopted here would increase the speed of repayment; is that not true?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes. In some cases it would increase it and in some cases extend it.

Mr. JENSEN. Just take one of them and tell us how long the time is extended—the pay-out time. I do not like to leave this up in the air. I think the Congress should know whether there is any pay-out time or if this thing is cut loose and this is just a way to get the camel's nose under the tent and then carry on all the rest of the projects in the Nation under the same kind of a bill. It is just one of those things that I think deserves more consideration and enlightenment of the Congress than has been given.

Mr. PETERSON. The Uncompahgre is 34 years.

Mr. JENSEN. In addition to the time they already have?

Mr. PETERSON. No. That is the repayment period as reestimated.

Mr. JENSEN. How many more years did that project have to carry on until it was paid out under the former contract?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not recall. That is in the report.

Mr. JENSEN. There has been a great deal of discussion about this pay-out schedule.

Mr. PETERSON. I know the gentleman's views generally on irrigation and reclamation projects. I will state for the record that this is not intended to be a part of the general policy. It is purely as the result of a study and the contracts made in those particular districts based on that study and concerning those contracts.

Mr. JENSEN. Did you conduct hearings on all these different projects?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes. There were individual bills introduced affecting the various districts themselves. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] then introduced an omnibus bill, bringing them all in.

Mr. JENSEN. And they were all considered before the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, sir; and unanimously reported.

Mr. JENSEN. Unanimously reported both by the subcommittee that considered them, and the full committee?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. And they come to the floor under a unanimous report?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right. So the gentleman need not be worried about future projects based on these districts.

Mr. JENSEN. I simply want it understood that this is not a precedent for all the other projects in America to come in and get legislation.

Mr. PETERSON. I will state that for the record.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has referred to the Uncompahgre project. It was my understanding that that project and the Belle Fourche project, and two or three others, were included among those which were being studied under the authority of the 1939 act, and where new contracts had been drawn on the basis of studies of the situations in those particular projects. If there is going to be a record that this will not be considered as establishing a precedent for the consideration of like projects in like circumstances, which have been studied under the same act of 1939, then certainly I do not want the record to stop at this point, and I will be obliged to object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. PETERSON. When a study is made each project will stand on its own feet, based on all of the facts, production, ability to pay in each particular case, and so on.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the chairman state that if the Belle Fourche project, for example, is found to be on all fours in its problems with the Uncompahgre project in Colorado, and a new contract is submitted under the survey authorized by the act of 1939, it will receive the same favorable consideration?

Mr. PETERSON. It would receive consideration and study; in other words, the 4 projects here are not on all fours with the others; they require a different solution based on the facts in each case.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can the chairman state whether or not the Bureau of Reclamation in its report on these particular projects made any reference to the Bell Fourche project?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not believe I can answer the gentleman specifically.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that there are several other projects now under study. I am not sure that the one the gentleman mentions has been, but the picture included several.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was told by representatives of the Bureau that there were four projects particu-

larly in the country which merited revision or a rewriting of the contracts. They were some of the very early projects. They stated that in the light of developments the contracts should be rewritten to conform to the later projects, Uncompahgre, and Belle Fourche, and two others whose names I do not recall.

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is exactly correct. It was their recommendation that those contracts be rewritten.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that one reason we were unable to let this bill remain on the calendar until the next call of the Consent Calendar was that if this legislation is enacted before May 1 one of these projects will pay $60,000 into the fund and another will pay $10,000. If the legislation is delayed, that repayment, of course, will not take place.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Can anyone state whether or not these projects that are incorporated in the bill involve any major cancellation on the part of the United States Government?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure they do not involve any cancellations. The rewriting of the contracts puts them on a sounder basis so that there is no question about their paying out in a specified time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With the understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and the Subcommittee on Irrigation will assure similar consideration for like bills affecting these other projects to which I have referred, I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes. The Bureau of the Budget approved these. That is the first question I asked.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Do these projects come under the rehabilitation and betterment program of the Bureau of Reclamation which was designed some 2 years ago to take care of a number of projects that were in bad condition under which we appropriated some money for rehabilitation and betterment. Do these projects come within that category?

Mr. MURDOCK. These are those that come in that category, and there are some others on which negotiations have not yet been carried out.

Mr. JENSEN. Just one more question. Did the people who will pay this bill in all these different projects agree to carry on and pay the bill as set out in this legislation?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right; that is exactly true.

Mr. JENSEN. There has been no opposition on the part of the water users and the people who will have to pay the bill?

Mr. PETERSON. Not at all; they agree to it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The contracts are by mutual consent and agreement.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the contracts referred to in sections 2 to 7, inclusive, of this act, which have been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior and reported on as provided in subsections (a) and (c) of section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), are hereby approved and the Secretary is hereby authorized to execute them on behalf of the United States.

BITTER ROOT PROJECT, MONTANA

SEC. 2. The contract dated September 16, 1948, with the Bitter Root irrigation district.

(a) The act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 852), entitled "An act for the rehabilitation of the Bitter Root irrigation project, Montana," and the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 799), amending that act, are hereby repealed.

KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON

SEC. 3. The contract dated August 20, 1948, with the Shasta View irrigation district.

OKANOGAN PROJECT, WASHINGTON

SEC. 4. The contract dated September 20, 1948, with the Okanogan irrigation district.

(a) The act of May 25, 1928 (45 Stat. 739), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated," is hereby repealed.

SHOSHONE PROJECT, WYOMING

SEC. 5. The contract with the Willwood irrigation district which was approved by the electors of said district on December 18, 1948.

(a) The construction charge obligation in the amount of $9,843 on account of 85.83 acres of land classified in a paying class under the act of December 5, 1924, and found to be permanently unproductive under the reclassification of lands to be approved under said contract shall be deducted from the contractual obligation of said Willwood irrigation district.

(b) The construction charge obligation on account of 236.85 acres of land classified under the act of December 5, 1924, as productive and found to be of insufficient productive power to be continued in a paying class under the reclassification of lands to be approved under said contract shall be suspended until the Secretary of the Interior shall declare them to be of sufficient productive power properly to be placed in the paying class. While said lands are so classified as temporarily unproductive and the construction charge obligation on account of them is suspended, water for irrigation purposes may be furnished upon payment of the usual operation and maintenance charges or such other charges as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, the advance payment of which may be required in the discretion of the said Secretary. Should said lands temporarily classified as unproductive, or any of them in the future, be found by the Secretary of the Interior to be permanently unproductive, the construction charge obligation on account of them shall be charged off as a permanent loss to the reclamation fund at the per acre rates originally announced for the tracts, including any such lands in the public orders affecting such tracts.

UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO

SEC. 6. The contract dated December 13, 1948, with the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association.

(a) The June 1948 report of the Secretary of the Interior on the reclassification of the land of the Uncompahgre project, made in accordance with the provisions of section 43 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636), as amended by the act of April 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 249), and of section 8 of the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), is approved.

(b) The provisions of the act of May 16, 1930 (46 Stat. 367), are hereby extended to authorize the sale of vacant public lands as reclassified and listed in the report on the reclassification approved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to cancel, modify, or take such other action as he deems appropriate with respect to water-right applications now or hereafter executed and approved on the Uncompahgre project.

(d) All costs and expenses incurred by the United States in making the land reclassification, in negotiating and completing the said contract and in making all studies and investigations in connection therewith, are hereby made nonreimbursable.

YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

SEC. 7. The contract dated January 20, 1949, with the Kittitas reclamation district.

(a) The Secretary's reclassification of the lands of the Kittitas division, Yakima project, in the following classes: Paying classes (classes 1, 2, and 3), temporarily unproductive (class 5), and permanently unproductive (class 6), all as more fully described by the report entitled "Land Classification, 1944 (as amended in 1948)—Kittitas Division, Yakima Project," is approved.

(b) Subject to the limitations of the said contract as it may be hereafter amended, the Secretary is hereby authorized to make from time to time the following further classifications and reclassifications of the lands of the Kittitas division on the basis of the classification standards outlined in the report referred to in (a) of this section:

(1) To reclassify class 5 land as paying land or as class 6 land.

(2) To classify lands not heretofore placed in any of the established classifications.

No classifications or reclassifications of any of the lands of the Kittitas division by or under the authority of this act shall be construed, however, as affecting or authorizing any reduction in the district's construction-charge obligation as defined in the said contract.

(c) All except the first sentence of the paragraph under the subheading "Yakima project (Kittitas division), Washington," under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1141, 1170), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as these are defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on May 3, 2 hours may be set aside to commemorate the founding of the Polish Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mrs. Paul Robeson last night.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 29, 1949, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

569. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a request by the Connecticut Nautical Cadets, of Hartford, Conn., for the transfer of a small craft for the use of their organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

570. A letter from the Acting Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of the United States of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., for use in connection with the United States penitentiary at Terre Haute"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

571. A letter from the Acting Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., to supplement the farm lands required for the United States prison system"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4080. A bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice; with amendments (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUELIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4421. A bill to establish a national lottery, the proceeds from which are to be used for the benefit of veterans and for the construction of veterans' hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4422. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C. A. sec. 1001) so as to define the meaning of the words "clean content"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4423. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, to provide for the making of payments in lieu of State and local taxation of certain property transferred to service departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4424. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4425. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to credit for past service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 4426. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4427. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a channel across Santa Rosa Island in the general area of the Sound Bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 4428. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4429. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the world's skiing championships to be held at Lake Placid, N. Y., and Aspen, Colo., in 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4430. A bill to exempt Engelmann spruce lumber from the import tax imposed by section 3424 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 4431. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4432. A bill to encourage expansion of business by allowing a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of certain capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4433. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 4434. A bill to amend title I of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 4435. A bill to encourage construction of rental housing on or near military installations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4436. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 4437. A bill to provide that contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies shall be deductible for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Res. 197. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4080, a bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to their House Joint Memorial 10, stating that a durable peace among nations is dependent upon their uniting in permanent membership through revision of the United Nations Charter, in a world federal government with such limited powers as are adequate to maintain world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States endorsing equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to remove Federal excise taxes on admissions to semiprofessional baseball games and all public and private school athletic events and social activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4438. A bill to readmit Mrs. Angelina Damiano Di Pietro to United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards, owner of the Bozarth Nursing Home, Toppenish, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Edna Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Leopold Czihal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

694. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of the Worcester County Medical Society, Ocean City, Md., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

695. Also, resolution of the Cecil County Medical Society, Cecil County, Md., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

696. Also, resolution of the Talbot County Medical Society, Easton, Md., in favor of voluntary forms of health insurance and against any compulsory form of health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

697. By Mr. WHITE of California: Memorial of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, requesting the Congress to enact legislation providing for a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

698. Also, memorial of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, requesting

the enactment of legislation to reimburse the counties for the loss of revenue caused by Federal ownership of land within counties where federally owned lands occupy a substantial part of the total land area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

699. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Jennie Edmundson Memorial Hospital, Council Bluffs, Iowa, expressing its emphatic opposition to compulsory health insurance, considering it a menace to public health and an abuse of the individual freedom of choice; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

700. Also, petition of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, San Francisco, Calif., stating opposition to any amendment to the 1924 Immigration Act that would increase immigration from any source, and to the Celler bill, H. R. 1344, which provides for the admission of 400,000 displaced persons in excess of the legal quotas, which, in the opinion of the society, would aggravate the crime and housing problems of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

701. Also, petition of I. C. Ellis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

702. Also, petition of Jeff M. Herrington and others, Pensacola, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

703. Also, petition of Henry Clay Curtis and others, Townsend Club No. 1, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

704. Also, petition of Jennie Arnold and others, New Port Richey, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

705. Also petition of T. J. Langford and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

706. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

707. Also, petition of Manuel Mendez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

708. Also, petition of Wayne B. Albers and others, Cassadaga, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

709. Also, petition of Mrs. T. J. Langford and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, creator and preserver of all mankind, giver of all spiritual grace, as we come in the golden glory of the risen earth we would that the blossoms of the divine grace of meekness, gentleness, charity, and forgiveness might make the barren wastes of our own lives to bloom as the garden of the Lord. In a blasted earth where evil still stalks in hideous forms, we thank Thee for the lovely things that are as indestructible as sunbeams, the tender ministries of human love, the lilting laughter and clinging trust of little children, and the holy ties of devoted homes. Beset by perplexing problems may we keep our hearts pure, our spirits courageous, as with hopeful faces toward the goal of human brotherhood we never turn our backs but march breast forward. In the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4152) to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Humphrey	Murray
Baldwin	Hunt	Myers
Brewster	Ives	Neely
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Butler	Kem	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Kerr	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Robertson
Cordon	Knowland	Russell
Douglas	Langer	Saltonstall
Eastland	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ecton	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	McCarthy	Smith, N.J.
Frear	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Taft
Gillette	McGrath	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Thomas,Okla.
Gurney	McMahon	Thye
Hayden	Malone	Watkins
Hendrickson	Martin	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Wiley
Hill	Miller	Williams
Hoey	Millikin	Withers
Holland	Mundt	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and insert matters in the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] may be excused from attending the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have been invited to attend and address sessions of the Reclamation Association at McCook, Nebr., next Tuesday and Wednesday. I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate until Thursday of next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the session of the Senate on Tuesday next, because of official business.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from

attendance upon sessions of the Senate in order that I may attend the hearings now in progress before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] be excused from the attendance upon the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to hold a hearing this afternoon in connection with the investigation of the Malmedy massacre.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent for that committee to hold hearings in connection with its aviation investigation during sessions of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that for today, or indefinitely?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Colorado did not limit it. The hearings are in progress. He left it indefinite, so I will leave it in that form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The Vice President laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred, as indicated:

REVISED ESTIMATE, NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 62)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation involving an increase of $1,500,000 for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, fiscal year 1949, in the form of an amendment to the attachment to his submission of March 2, 1949 (House Document 93) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Cecil County (Md.) Medical Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., attached to the Hospital for the Women of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing socialized medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, relating to the proper use of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Baltimore (Md.) Lodge, No. 7, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1103, providing an increase in certain postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"Whereas war is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization, because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no defense; and

"Whereas experience makes it increasingly plain that the United Nations, despite its many advances in the field of cooperation, must be basically strengthened if it is to succeed in preserving world peace; and

"Whereas the Charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in article 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the Charter; and

"Whereas all history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and law and order are the product of government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring therein)

"That a durable peace among nations is dependent upon their uniting in permanent membership, through revision of the United Nations Charter, in a world federal government with such limited powers as are adequate to maintain world peace.

"That the elements of a world government which are indispensable to its success are as follows:

"1. A legislative body empowered to enact supplementary laws or regulations to carry out the provisions of the Charter.

"2. A system of courts to decide all cases arising under world law.

"3. A body of specific law set forth in a world charter or constitution.

"4. An executive department which has the duty and power and the necessary inspection, police and military forces to enforce world law promptly and effectively without being subject to any veto.

"That the President and the Congress of the United States are urged—

"1. To declare that a basic objective of American foreign policy is to participate in strengthening the UN Charter so that the UN may be able to enact, interpret and enforce world law adequate to preserve peace.

"2. To support the initiation of discussions with the nations of the world for the purpose of both arriving at a just settlement of world problems which threaten the peace and of developing support for UN Charter revision.

"PAT MAGILL, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate."

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the Secretary of Defense brought into being in 1947, the committee on civilian components, commonly known as the Gray Board, which committee was directed by the Secretary of Defense to make a comprehensive, objective, and impartial study of the armed forces; and

"Whereas said committee on civilian components on June 30, 1948, in its report to the Secretary of Defense, recommended, among other things, that national security required that all services have one Federal reserve force, which should be accomplished:

"(a) By establishing the Reserve forces of the Army under the 'Army clause' of the Constitution;

"(b) By similarly establishing the Reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate legal authority;

"(c) By incorporating the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps into the Army Reserve force under the name of 'The National Guard of the United States';

"(d) By incorporating the Air National Guard and Air Reserve into the Air Force Reserve under the name of the 'United States Air Force Reserve'; and

"Whereas on December 15, 1948, the Secretary of Defense recommended to the President of the United States, among other things, the federalization of the Air National Guard and greater Federal control over the personnel, equipment, facilities, and allocation of money to the States; and

"Whereas the National Guard performed in a highly creditable manner in World Wars I and II; and

"Whereas the several States have need for the National Guard as a military force to cope with disaster therein, and for the internal security thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate concurring), That the Congress and the President of the United States hereby are memorialized, unless the very security of the Nation otherwise require, to retain intact the National Guard of the United States, ground and air, as it now is organized under the militia clauses of the Constitution of the United States and thus reserve to the States the controls provided by the Constitution in time of peace and ensure that the National Guard will be at the disposal of the respective States in time of peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution forthwith be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the chairman of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress and the Members of the Oregon delegation in the Congress."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with relation to certain cosmetic tax exemptions upon oils, powders, creams, and lotions in preparations for babies and small children

"Whereas cosmetic preparations expressly designed for babies and very small children, such as baby oils, powders, creams, and lotions, should rightly be considered essential for the health and comfort of babies and small children and not regarded as beauticians' commodities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are hereby earnestly requested to use every effort to have the present legislation amended so that baby oils, powders, creams, and lotions expressly prepared for the health and comfort of babies and very small children shall be exempt from cosmetic taxes, and the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to remove Federal excise taxes on admissions to semiprofessional baseball games and all public and private school athletic events and social activities

"Whereas the Federal Government has heretofore enacted legislation providing for excise taxes on admissions to semiprofessional baseball games and all public and private school athletic events and social activities; and

"Whereas the continuance of these activities is recognized to be highly beneficial to the activities of every community throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas it has been evident that constructive and active steps should be taken to promote and maintain these activities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That the President of the United States is hereby memorialized and the Congress of the United States at its present session is hereby urgently petitioned and requested to enact such legislation as will accomplish the removal of Federal excise taxes on admissions of these activities throughout the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be directed to forward a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved April 25, 1949.
"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

Mr. THYE presented a resolution of the house of representatives of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an excellent resolution adopted by the legislature of the State of Minnesota, endorsing equal rights for women.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the constitution of the United States of America, endorsing equal rights for women

Whereas the women of America have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices incident to the building of this Nation; and

Whereas they have shared equally in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American Republic and ideals of free government against the aggression of tyrants and have participated, and are today participating, in the battles precipitated by the enemies of freedom; and

Whereas this Nation was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and such declaration has no actual or implied limitation on equality before the law by reason of sex; and

Whereas the rights of women before the law are much abridged in many States and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their livelihood, and is a source of irritation to many thousands of others who recognize this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women, which they have reached by their achievements in other fields of human endeavor; and

Whereas there are today more women than men in this country and women have served this country in time of war as well as in peace equally well with men in every field of work; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the senate and house of representatives pass the following resolution and the amendment as follows:

"EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have the power within the respective jurisdictions, to endorse this article by appropriate legislation. This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification." Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of Minnesota.

JOHN A. HARTLE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Approved April 25, 1949:
LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY LABOR LAW—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF GILBERT, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Gilbert, Minn., recommending that the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law be immediately repealed, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act is in effect the most vicious antilabor legislation if enacted, which aims at the ultimate defeat of labor organizations in their pursuit of bargaining freedom; and

Whereas under the Wagner Act, millions of workers did organize into strong unions, thereby providing the instrument necessary to protect their interests; and

Whereas the workers in America, through their unions, were able to hold up their heads in the knowledge that for the first time in history they were freemen, proving this by their great production record during the terrible years of the past global war; and

Whereas President Truman in his preelection tour of the United States brought the issue of the Taft-Hartley Act to the people, making it the major issue of the day, and the result was that the people voted supporting his stand in this matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Gilbert, St. Louis County, Minn., recommends that the Taft-Hartley Act be immediately repealed and the Thomas-Lesinski bill (S. 249–H. R. 2032), which have the approval of the Senate Labor Committee be enacted as law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and to Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK.

COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON STATE GRANGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from Morton Tompkins, master of the Oregon State Grange, Portland, Oreg., transmitting resolutions adopted by the Evergreen Grange, No. 460, of Douglas County; Pleasant Grove Grange, No. 475; Skyline Grange, No. 894, of Multnomah County; and the Big Bend Grange, No. 686, all in the State of Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter together with the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, Oreg., April 22, 1949.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed are copies of original resolutions favoring the principles of a Columbia Valley Authority which are similar in character to those which I sent you under date of April 18. The original of all of these resolutions have been sent directly to the President.

Sincerely,

MORTON TOMPKINS,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority taking into account the needs of the region, and the interests of all parts of the executive branch; and

Whereas the Columbia Valley is experiencing its most critical power shortage in its history because of the lack of river developments and the people of the Columbia Valley have in the past year had a devastating flood which claimed the lives of over 40 people, and caused more than $1,000,000 in property damage; and

Whereas the requirements for industrial development and the urgent need for employment opportunities are being denied because of this power shortage, also the need of rapid development of phosphates for farmers in the Columbia Valley and the Nation are becoming more depressing daily; and

Whereas there is no unified program for the reclaiming and conserving of range lands, land and forest conservation and development of the regions resources can best be provided through a regional development program; and

Whereas such full development cannot be fulfilled with the existing conflicting bureaus which have no regional and local control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the full development of the water and other resources of the Columbia Valley, including such benefits as flood control,

navigation, irrigation, industrial and domestic water supply, and electric power.

Adopted by Evergreen Grange, No. 460, at a regular meeting of its members this 25th day of March 1949.

CHARLES A. MCCORD,
Master.
BESSE V. LOUNDSBURY,
Secretary.
EMERY E. BAKER,
MILFORD P. LITTLE,
GEORGE A. DOWELL,
Executive Committee.

(Evergreen Grange, No. 460, Douglas County, Oreg.; number of members, 118.)

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas there is an acute power shortage throughout the Columbia River area, and also a vital need for flood control and soil conservation; and

Whereas the full development of the potential resources of this area cannot be speedily and efficiently developed with the now existing conflicting and overlapping agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Pleasant Grove Grange, No. 475, in regular session assembled this 2d day of April 1948, That the Congress enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the agencies for the full development of the Columbia drainage area.

HUGH E. HULSE,
Master.
FLORA BELLE BOOTH,
Secretary.

(Pleasant Grove Grange, No. 475; number of members, 129.)

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Whereas there is a serious power shortage in this rapidly growing area, due to insufficient river development; and

Whereas a serious flood last year caused tremendous damage and some loss of life; and

Whereas the existing bureaus are not adequately handling other present needs of this district such as protecting the fish industry and land and forest conservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the full development of the water power and other resources of the Columbia Valley.

Adopted by Skyline Grange No. 894 at a regular meeting of its members this 4th day of April 1949.

JULIA GARDNER,
Secretary.
ROBERT L. HODGSON,
Master.
S. LUETHE,
E. C. KALLOWAY,
C. L. HALE,
Executive Committee.

(Skyline Grange, No. 894, Multnomah County; number of members, 89.)

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas President Truman has recommended to the Eighty-first Congress that a Columbia Valley Authority be established; and

Whereas there is an increasing need of power and lack of power due to the fact that there is no coordinated river development plan; and

Whereas the past year has seen a devastating flood within the Columbia River Valley which caused the deaths of 40 persons and more than $100,000,000 damages; and

Whereas there is an increasing need of phosphates for the farms of the Northwest and the rest of the Nation: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority to coordinate the full development of power, flood control, and production of fertilizers.

Adopted by Big Bend Grange No. 686 at a regular meeting of its members this 15th day of February 1949.

CHAS. E. WITTY,
Secretary.
W. M. TETER,
Master.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Winooski, Vt., memorializing the Congress to approve and the President to sign legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day" for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Winooski and State of Vermont:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Vermont.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference three resolutions from Pennsylvania communities urging that October 11 of each year be designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day in commemoration of the distinguished service of Brigadier General Pulaski and his heroic death on October 11, 1779.

These resolutions are from the City Council of Uniontown, the City Council of York, and the Borough Council of Ambridge, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

They are identical in text and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the record the resolution as adopted by the City Council of Uniontown, Pa., and approved by Mayor E. L. Sittler, Jr.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, without objection, the resolution from the City Council of Uniontown, Pa., will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolution 60

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Uniontown:

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland. Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania.

E. L. SITTLER, Jr.,
Mayor.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF OMAHA (NEBR.) BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Omaha Bar Association, concerning the national health program, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare on Tuesday, April 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are several bills now pending in the United States Congress calling for an expanded national health program; and

Whereas some of the bills propose a compulsory health-insurance tax; and

Whereas, such proposal, if enacted, would necessitate the setting up of a vast bureaucracy which would require the addition of hundreds of thousands of Federal employees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we endorse a program that will provide the necessities of good health, including medical care, administered at local levels, but oppose any system of compulsory health-insurance tax; and

tional bureaucratic control; be it further

Resolved, That each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska be advised of this action.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3083. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 310).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 441. A bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements; without amendment (Rept. No. 311).

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 2440. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; with an amendment (Rep No. 312).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1733. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Bagianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HUMPHREY introduced Senate bill 1734, to establish a Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1735. A bill for the relief of Carl H. Manhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1736. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Malitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1737. A bill for the relief of George M. Vaughan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1738. A bill to provide for the transfer of the temporary housing project known as Harvard Court, Nebraska–25066, to the city of Harvard, Clay County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1739, to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1740. A bill to provide for interservice transfer of commissioned personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 1741. A bill to extend the unemployment allowance benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 for a period of 2 years; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1742. A bill removing certain restrictions imposed by the act of March 8, 1888, on certain lands authorized by such act to be conveyed to the trustees of Porter Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1743, to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 1744. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide for a minimum wage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1745. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., to supplement the farmlands required for the United States prison system; and

S. 1746. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of the United States of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., for use in connection with the United States penitentiary at Terre Haute; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 84, requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of June 1949 as National Dairy Month, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me together with a digest of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and digest presented by the Senator from Minnesota will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1734) to establish a Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement and digest presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY SENATOR HUMPHREY IN INTRODUCING FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION ACT

On February 2, of last year, President Truman presented to the Congress a message containing recommendations for legislation to secure the essential human rights necessary to strengthen our democracy and improve the welfare of our people. The first of the President's 10 recommendations included the enactment by Congress of legislation establishing a permanent commission on civil rights.

Those of us who have been greatly interested in enhancing our country's democratic tradition have seen the great need to alleviate and eventually eliminate the situation where a significant part of our population is not accorded the civil rights due them as human beings. We have felt that it is urgently necessary to enact the civil-rights legislation recommended by the President for many reasons: First, to fulfill the realization that men are endowed with certain inalienable rights by virtue of their birth; second, to realize a truly representative government; third, to make our democracy invulnerable to totalitarian propaganda; fourth, to assure due process of law to all citizens; fifth, to provide that kind of experience in which people can realize their full potentialities.

Our efforts to prepare the way for comprehensive legislation securing civil rights were met with great resistance and temporary, but yet tragic, defeat. The change in the rules of this body, as every one of us knows, patently proscribed enactment of comprehensive civil-rights legislation. We are told by our colleagues who sponsored that rules change, that the new rule will indeed enable us to advance on the civil-rights program and that necessary legislation will have their support.

It is my pleasure to introduce a bill which would establish a permanent Federal Commission on Civil Rights whose work would enlarge the area of our freedoms. In good faith, I ask the support of all my colleagues in the consideration of this bill. The Federal Commission on Civil Rights would be empowered—

1. To conduct such studies, investigations, and research as it deems necessary to enable it effectively to prevent abridgment or denial of civil rights;

2. To investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government, to determine what changes are necessary to prevent abridgment or denial of civil rights therein;

3. To assist States, counties, municipalities, and private agencies in conducting studies to prevent the abridgment or denial of civil rights;

4. To conduct a hearing, any time not less than 10 days after published notice thereof, whenever a written complaint supported by probable evidence alleges that civil rights are being denied or abridged; and

5. To recommend to Congress legislation necessary to safeguard our civil rights.

The proposed Commission would consist of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, with a term of office of 4 years. The bill contains enforcement provisions to assist the Commission in the execution of its duties.

The Commission should be ready to aid in preventing conflicts and in the solution of problems involving civil rights. It should act, in other words, as a conciliatory service. It should be prepared to offer recommendations for the improvement of civil-rights practices on a local level and on the State and National level. It should act as a barometer of civil rights and should call attention to emerging problems on the national and international level, and it should consult with State and local and private agencies working in the civil-rights area and assist these agencies. Finally, it should seek to improve the civil-rights practices of governmental agencies and make reports to the President.

It is my conviction that such a Federal Commission on Civil Rights would provide a constructive and factual approach to a problem which is torn with emotionalism. It is in fact a preliminary step that must be taken to bridge the gap between divergent opinions.

My conviction that a comprehensive civil-rights program is imperative and urgent compels me to propose this initial step, from which I feel certain a greater understanding of the problem will develop. I do not regard such a Commission as a substitute for a comprehensive program. I shall continue to devote my efforts to enactment of the full program. Nor do I believe that such a Commission mitigates the need for prompt enactment of civil-rights legislation. Should our efforts to enact that legislation in the near future be successful, the Commission's functions would be no less valid. It would serve to enhance the democracy we will have won, to conduct studies, investigations, and research to safeguard that democracy, to investigate the departments and subdivisions of the executive branch of the Government to ascertain the status of civil rights, to assist States, counties, municipalities, and private agencies in preventing denial of civil rights, to conduct hearings upon complaint, and to recommend further legislation that may be necessary to safeguard the civil rights we will have won.

I propose a Federal Commission on Civil Rights in the hope that my proposal will be given unanimous support in this body and in the hope that we may then proceed with the assurance that we have opened every available door to human rights.

DIGEST OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION ACT INTRODUCED BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Section 1: Findings and declaration of policy.

Section 2: To secure the enforcement of civil rights a Commission of Civil Rights shall be formed consisting of three full-time members appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate to serve for a period of 4 years.

Section 3: Personnel of the Commission under civil-service laws.

Section 4: Commission may conduct hearings and inquiries in any part of the United States.

Section 5: The Commission shall have the power—

(a) To conduct such studies, investigations, and research as it deems necessary to enable it effectively to prevent abridgment or denial of civil rights;

(b) To investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government, to determine what changes are necessary to prevent abridgment or denial of civil rights therein;

(c) To assist States, counties, municipalities, and private agencies in conducting studies to prevent the abridgment or denial of civil rights;

(d) To conduct a hearing, any time not less than 10 days after published notice thereof, whenever a written complaint supported by probable evidence alleges that civil rights are being denied or abridged; and

(e) To recommend to Congress legislation necessary to safeguard our civil rights.

Section 6: The Commission shall have the power to issue subpenas.

Section 7: Interference with the performance of duties of the Commission shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by not more than 1 year imprisonment.

Section 8: The Commission shall make an annual report to the Congress and the President reviewing its activities, making suggestions as to the means of alleviating discrimination and recommending civil-rights legslation.

Section 9: Appropriation authorization.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter of explanation from Peyton Ford, assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice, addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, dated April 12, 1949, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received, appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter of explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1743) to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, April 12, 1949.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Department of Justice recommends the amendment of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (56 Stat. 248, 22 U. S. C. 611 et seq.).

In its present form, section 2 of the act provides for registration with the Attorney General of all persons acting as agents for foreign principals. However, as the section presently reads there is room for doubt as to whether the statute of limitations against prosecution of an agent for failure to comply with the registration provisions of the act commences to run from the date on which he was first required to register or from the last day on which such unregistered agent has acted. Doubt has also arisen as to the liability of an agent to file a registration statement for the period during which he was acting as an agent of a foreign principal if he has since ceased such activity. This Department has encountered several instances of an unregistered agent's resisting registration on the ground that his agency had terminated prior to the time when the Department was demanding his registration. Clarification of the intendment of the section on these questions is considered desirable.

Section 7 of the act relates to the liability of officers, directors, or persons performing the functions of officers or directors, of an agent of a foreign principal to cause the filing of registration statements. It is believed that the act would be considerably strengthened by amending this section to provide that the dissolution or other attempted reorganization of an agent which is not an individual shall not avoid the liability of the persons performing the functions of officers or directors to file registration statements.

A proposed bill designed to effectuate the desired purposes is submitted for your consideration.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

ACQUIREMENT BY PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF COPIES OF PATENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am delighted to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit public libraries to acquire back copies of United States patents. This bill was considered during the Eightieth Congress, and identified as H. R. 3366. This bill was reported from the House Judiciary Committee in Report No. 1275.

Under present law, the Commissioner of Patents may supply public libraries of the United States with copies of patents as published for $50 a year. This provision, however, is restricted to the supply of current patents and is not applicable insofar as furnishing libraries with copies of patents for previous years.

Thus, under this new bill, which is a perfected version of H. R. 3366 of the last Congress, an institution like for example the Milwaukee Public Library would be enabled to purchase back numbers of patent copies now missing from its collection. If the library had to pay for these at the rate of 25 cents per copy, neither it nor many another library could possibly afford to buy these back numbers.

I invite attention to the fact that the bill is limited only to public libraries and that under my amendment only those libraries which were receiving copies as of January 1949 could request back copies.

There is just one further word that I should like to mention about this bill. It is with natural pride that I mention that the Milwaukee Patent Law Association was very instrumental in the drafting and sponsorship of H. R. 3366. This Milwaukee patent-law group has proven itself to be one of the ablest bodies of men in the patent-law profession, as attested by its record of splendid contributions in the field of strengthening the American patent system. I do not for one moment, of course, detract from the other splendid patent-law-association chapters in other areas of the Nation, but I think that those folks who are familiar with the situation will agree that the Milwaukee group yields to none in its enterprise, its industry, and its forward-looking suggestions for improvement in the patent-law system.

The bill (S. 1739) to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DAIRY MONTH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution requesting the President to

proclaim the month of June 1949, as Dairy Month in honor of the American dairy industry. I have prepared a statement dealing with the joint resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 84) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of June 1949, as National Dairy Month, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION FOR PROCLAMATION OF DAIRY MONTH

I am introducing today a Senate joint resolution asking the President to proclaim June 1949, as Dairy Month in honor of the American Dairy Industry. In past years, it has been customary for the Governors of the respective States to issue separate proclamations in honor of Dairy Month. But this year, in view of the unparalleled problems facing American dairying, we feel that it would only be fair and just that the Congress suggest to the President that he in turn proclaim this national observance.

In so doing we will be pursuing simultaneously the following objectives:

IMPORTANCE OF HEALTHFUL DAIRY PRODUCTS

1. We will be impressing upon the American people the importance of the purchase of adequate, nutritious, wholesome dairy products, particularly for the Nation's youngsters. Unfortunately, in the past, even when our people have had sufficient money to spend for food, they have not always invested it as wisely as they should in nutritious products. Dietitians have pointed out that the American people could stand a lot of improvement in their eating habits. Particularly, they should drink more milk, eat more butter, more cheese, and other products so essential for health.

2. Another purpose of Dairy Month would, of course, be to honor the 5,000,000 folks engaged in dairying—the largest single segment of American agriculture.

IMPORTANCE OF COWS AS FERTILIZING AGENT

3. Still a third purpose would be to point up one of the major roles of the dairy cow as the greatest fertilizing agent available. This is too often forgotten, particularly by city folks to whom the word "fertilizer" is more of a joke than a concept of crucial importance to our society. Anyone who has been in Europe or particularly to the Far East (who has seen the results of lack of fertilizer on the land, and of overuse of the land for centuries) knows the importance of fertilizer, and the milk cow is of course indispensable for that purpose.

4. A fourth purpose of Dairy Month will be to call attention to the critical problems faced by the dairy industry. During all this recent discussion of Secretary Brannan's agricultural program, of the Aiken law, the Steagall law, some folks have erroneously assumed that the farmer is in a wonderfully prosperous condition, that he has no worries. But anyone taking a close look at the dairy industry knows that prices have disastrously fallen, particularly in those milksheds not close to metropolitan centers. Unfortunately, in the past we have lumped together the comparatively high price which the farmer receives in, let us say, the New York milksheds (close to a major metropolitan center) for fluid milk and the low price in the northern Wisconsin area where the farmers do not have available a major city consuming population readily at hand and where milk is used for manufactured dairy products. Obviously, segregation of parity for fluid milk as against manufactured milk is necessary.

WISCONSIN MILK CHECKS SKIDDING BADLY

Right now, the purchasing power of the Wisconsin farm dollar is even lower than during 1910 to 1914, the so-called parity years. Wisconsin's milk checks are off around a quarter from those of a year ago, amounting to a grand total of around $125,000,000 decline.

Farm prices as such are, to be sure, somewhat higher now than during parity years, but they do not buy any more. We recall the days back in the early thirties when farmers were receiving from 75 to 80 cents per hundredweight for milk which cost them (and cost me on my farm) around $1.80 to produce. During the war period milk prices rose and hit their peak at around $4.43 a hundredweight in July of 1948. Now, however, that sum has dropped to around $2.75 per hundredweight with the flush season just around the corner.

It is important to remember that farmers still have to pay terrifically high prices for feed and machinery. Farmers in northern Wisconsin, suffering from a drought, have had to truck in hay at $40 to $42 a ton. The wages paid to hired men are far higher than they were in the prewar period, although they have declined somewhat recently. In 1940 a Wisconsin farmer paid $30 a month and keep for a hired man. Now the State averages farm wages at around $106 per month.

We must remember, too, that dairy exports have been skidding. In 1945 exports took 5.6 percent of dairy supplies. In 1948 it was 2.3 percent and this year it will be even lower.

WE MUST DEFEAT HOUSE VERSION OF OLEO BILL

5. There is a fifth and final reason why we should observe Dairy Month, and that is, of course, in connection with the pending oleomargarine bill, H. R. 2023. I do not for one moment underestimate the importance of cotton and soybean production for those areas of the Nation which depend upon such crops. However, it has been statistically proven that even in the cotton and soya centers dairying actually accounts for a greater proportion of the farmer's income than the two former items.

In the amendment which I have cosponsored with 25 Senators to H. R. 2023, we do not ask any unfair advantage over oleomargarine. On the contrary we seek repeal of the Federal taxes on oleo and simply ask that artificial oleo not be given an unfair advantage over butter. In not wanting the House's version of the oleo bill passed we have at heart the interests of American agriculture, the interest of soil fertility, and the interests of American consumers. Passage by the Senate of the House version would mean a death warrant being signed for 2,000,000 head of dairy cattle. Ours is a States' rights amendment. It permits those States that want yellow-colored oleo sold within their borders to do so. It bans, however, interstate shipment of yellow-colored oleo.

CONCLUSION

This, therefore, is not just another commemorative day or month designed to honor some particular local hero or some local event. This is a month of national, yes, international significance. I hope that the resolution will be promptly passed by the Senate and that it in turn will be passed promptly by the House of Representatives.

WE MUST PREVENT DEPRESSION IN DAIRYING

It has been proven that every major American depression has invariably started by declining farm prices, the building up of so-called farm surpluses. We don't want to be catapulted into another depression by seeing the American dairy industry hurt. I believe that by intelligent and thorough observance of Dairy Month and all that it means, by increasing our consumption of dairy products, we can help insure the prosperity of this vital segment of American agriculture.

PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHO SERVED IN MORO PROVINCE, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALDWIN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1421) to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4152) to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE BEFORE NEW YORK YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Republican Opportunities in the Eighty-first Congress," delivered by him at the annual meeting of the New York Young Republican Club in New York City on April 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE THREAT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT TO THE ECONOMY OF MARYLAND AND EAST COAST PORT AREAS—ADDRESS BY CARROLL B. HUNTRESS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the threat posed by the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project to the economy of the State of Maryland and of east coast port areas generally, delivered by Carroll B. Huntress, chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, at the twenty-fifth anniversary meeting of the Maryland Utilities' Association at Baltimore, Md., on April 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS BY PAUL ROBESON—EDITORIAL FROM OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Artist's Grave Mistake," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun carries today the thirteenth of a series of articles on the cost of President Truman's social welfare programs. In this series it is stated that

official estimates put the cost of the programs over a 50-year period at one trillion, two hundred and fifty billion dollars. I ask unanimous consent for insertion of today's article in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY—HOW ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS WOULD SOAR

(This is the thirteenth of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—The cost of social-welfare schemes does not consist simply of payments made to the beneficiaries.

It includes the salaries and expenses of the jobholders who are hired to run the vast program.

Under the present law it is costing the Federal Government more than $250,000,000 a year to administer its health, welfare, and social-security programs.

Under President Truman's new proposals the operating costs for fiscal 1950—salaries and expenses of running the program—would rise to more than $325,000,000.

These figures are not mere guesses. They are compiled from Government budget requests and the estimates worked out by official Government agencies.

By 1960 the administrative costs of the social-insurance and welfare programs would range between $500,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 a year.

OFFICIAL COST ESTIMATES

Here are the officially estimated administrative costs of the proposed social-welfare program for 1960:

	Low-cost estimate	High-cost estimate
1. Old-age and survivors insurance and extended disability [1]	$113,000,000	$189,000,000
2. Unemployment insurance and cost of employment service [2]	130,000,000	150,000,000
3. Temporary disability insurance [3]	100,000,000	150,000,000
4. Health insurance [4]	120,000,000	180,000,000
5. General health, welfare, and security programs [5]	75,000,000	100,000,000
6. Railroad retirement	6,000,000	7,000,000
7. Civil-service retirement	2,000,000	3,000,000
Total estimated administration costs	546,000,000	779,000,000

[1] Official forecast by Federal Security Agency and Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. Includes estimated costs of collecting taxes as well as administration of benefits.

[2] Based on the assumption of high-level employment and that administrative costs a decade from now will be no higher than for fiscal 1950. The plan is to put this program entirely on a Federal basis.

[3] Based on estimate by Social Security Administration spokesmen that temporary disability insurance administrative costs may run 10 percent of revenues. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner, estimated for the Ways and Means Committee that temporary disability may run 1 percent of pay roll. The above figure is 10 percent of the estimated $1,000,000,000 cost expected for the program in its early years. The high estimate is what some insurance executives claim the cost will be.

[4] This figure is based on the Budget Bureau estimate that the health program when fully established will require some 5,000 additional Federal employees, and 30,000 to 40,000 new employees at the State level. Pay roll is based on $3,000 average salary of Federal workers, and other costs were estimated on the basis of ratio of general expense to pay-roll costs now prevailing in the Federal Security Administration.

[5] This figure covers costs of operating the Federal Security Administration bureaus, including public-health activities, the Children's Bureau, and the Bureau of Education.

These figures cover only the costs of administration—that is, the job-holders' salaries and expenses of running the proposed social-welfare system.

PREDICTIONS CALLED TOO LOW

Insurance-company officials who have testified before Congress have stated that some of the Government's official high estimates are too low.

For instance, insurance-company actuaries predicted the administrative costs of the temporary-disability program will be three or four times higher than what the Government estimates. This would raise the cost to $1,000,000,000.

In addition to these administrative costs, benefits to be paid out by the program in 1960 are estimated at more than $15,000,000,000 a year.

Here are the estimated operating costs for all the welfare programs for 1950, based on budget requests now before the Congress:

Fiscal 1950

UNDER EXISTING LAW

1. Old-age and survivors insurance	$56,465,500
2. Federal Security Administration, including Public Health, Children's Bureau, Office of Education, etc	60,000,000
3. Grants to States for administrative costs of unemployment insurance and Employment Service offices	135,000,000
4. Federal Government costs of the employment programs	4,500,000
5. Railroad Retirement Administration	5,000,000
6. Civil Service Retirement Administration	1,600,000
7. Public assistance (Federal costs only)	1,350,000
Total operating expenses under existing law	264,015,500

UNDER PROPOSED LEGISLATION

1. Health insurance	$15,000,000
2. Estimated higher costs of old-age and survivors program, and temporary-disability insurance	50,000,000
Total administrative expenses under existing and proposed legislation	329,015,500

The proposed health program and temporary-disability insurance will add only a very modest amount to costs in the coming fiscal year if Congress approves them.

But when both are fully operative, estimated additional costs for the two programs range between $200,000,000 and $300,000,000 a year.

WILL CONTINUE TO RISE

Regardless of any extension of the program the existing old-age and survivors program will show higher operating costs each year for many years.

"Our increasing work loads and increasing requirements from year to year" the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance told the House Appropriations Committee on February 9, "reflect the natural growth of a long-range program which is still far from maturity."

Here was the actual cost of administering the old-age and survivors insurance program during the fiscal year ended last June 30, 1948:

1. Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Bureau	$33,700,000
2. Payment to Treasury out of trust fund for expenses of collecting OASI taxes	10,000,000
3. Payment to Treasury for writing checks for OASI beneficiaries	2,100,000
4. Payment to Treasury for managing trust fund	200,000
5. Social Security Administrator's Office	900,000
6. Federal Security Administrator's Office expenses for account of OASI	400,000
Total administrative expenses of OASI	47,300,000

(Due to rounding, figures do not add to exact total.)

Each year the work load of the Bureau has increased and, according to testimony given the House Appropriations Committee, will continue to rise for 30 years "regardless of any extension of the program."

FORECAST OF FUTURE COSTS

An official forecast of what old-age and survivors insurance will cost in future years if Congress approves the President's enlarged program was given to the House Ways and Means Committee by Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner.

Estimate of old-age and survivors insurance and permanent disability administrative costs on basis of pending legislation

	Low-cost estimate	High-cost estimate
1960	$113,000,000	$189,000,000
1970	162,000,000	263,000,000
1980	204,000,000	337,000,000
1990	240,000,000	406,000,000
2000	260,000,000	450,000,000

These figures, prepared by the Social Security Administration actuaries, includes only old-age and survivor insurance and extended disability costs.

No official estimates have been presented to Congress of the probable cost of the temporary-disability insurance administration.

Federal Security officials have estimated that, on the basis of the forecast by Mr. Altmeyer, temporary-disability operations may cost 1 percent of taxable pay rolls. This would yield about $1,000,000,000 a year, of which administrative expenses may take $100,000,000 a year.

On present pay rolls the total cost of temporary disability has been calculated at about $1,000,000,000.

NO ACCURATE PREDICTION GIVEN

Life-insurance executives who have testified before Congress have stated that this estimate is too low and that the operating expenses will be higher than 10 percent.

No accurate estimates of the probable administrative costs of the new health-insurance program have as yet been produced by the administration.

The Budget Bureau has made the following official estimate of the additional Federal employees needed to operate the various programs proposed in the President's program:

1. Between 15,000 and 20,000 additional employees for the Federal Security Agency and Internal Revenue Bureau for administration of the enlarged old-age and survivors insurance program.

2. An additional 5,000 Federal employees to run the health program in Washington.

3. Ultimately 30,000 to 40,000 Federal and/or State employees to run the health program at the State level.

In fiscal 1948 the Federal Security Agency has an average of 35,718 employees with a total pay roll of $79,223,249 for all its constituent branches and $20,658,256 total operating expenses.

Between 5,500 and 6,800 of the new employees would be needed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for collecting the addi-

tional taxes and the remainder by the Old-Age and Survivors Bureau.

WOULD ADD TO PAY-ROLL COSTS

The additional employees would add roughly $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 additional pay-roll costs for the old-age program alone.

For the proposed health program the additional pay-roll costs for the Federal and State administration would run somewhere between $85,000,000 and $115,000,000 a year.

No reliable estimates of costs other than for probable additional pay rolls are at present available for the proposed temporary disability and health programs.

The additional costs of collecting taxes if coverage is extended to farm labor and to domestic workers will depend upon whether a stamp-book plan is adopted or some other reporting method, the Internal Revenue Commissioner has told Congress.

Even though costs are rising and will rise still higher if the President's proposals are adopted, social-security officials have told Congress that their administrative costs are considerably below "those of comparable private insurance organizations in this country."

In fiscal 1948 the cost of administering old-age and survivors insurance was about 2.9 percent of contributions and 9.3 percent of benefits paid, Mr. Altmeyer recently told the Ways and Means Committee.

HAD 12,889 EMPLOYEES IN 1948

On June 30, 1948, the Social Security Administration alone had 12,889 employees on its pay roll, of whom 6,187 were in department offices—including the accounting staff in Baltimore—and 6,702 were in 475 field offices throughout the country.

To administer the Federal end of public assistance—which is a program of grants to the States for the needy—requires only 268 employees and costs $1,350,000 a year.

The administrative expenses—salaries and operating costs—of the other organizations under the Federal Security Agency are given in the budget as follows:

Bureau of Employment Compensation	$1,466,000
Food and Drug Administration	4,802,500
Office of Education	2,009,800
Water-pollution program	1,200,000
Administrative expenses of hospital construction	1,200,000
National cancer health operations (including administrative expenses not specified separately)	21,650,000
National institutes of health operations (including administration not separately specified)	12,075,000
National Heart Institute operations (including administrative cost not separately specified)	16,392,000
Children's Bureau	1,466,000
Columbia Institute of Deaf	315,000
Freedmen's Hospital	2,443,000
Howard University	2,335,000
Vocational rehabilitation	685,000
Public Health Service	6,050,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital	1,820,000

HOW MUCH IS IT WORTH TO BE AN AMERICAN?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter written by Mr. L. C. Walling, of O'Neill, Nebr., to an employee of the Consumers Public Power District, Miss Bonnie Jean Harmon, pointing out in language which is understandable to any American young man or young woman what he considers are the values of our American citizenship and our American way of life.

Mr. Walling is a division manager for the Consumers Public Power District, and probably his fellow townsmen would describe him as a "typically good citizen, a good neighbor, who does not lay claim to either wealth or fame, but has a deep sense of appreciation for the life we are privileged to live in a free country."

The thoughts he has set down for Bonnie Jean Harmon are so typical of the faith and the hopes of millions of Americans that I submit them here just as he wrote them in his letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'NEILL, NEBR., *February 1, 1949.*

BONNIE JEAN HARMON,
O'Neill.

HOW MUCH IS IT WORTH TO BE AN AMERICAN?

For how much would you sell your American citizenship? Is there enough money in the world to buy from you your right to live in the United States of America and call yourself an American citizen?

For most of us we are sure our American heritage is beyond purchase. We would not exchange it for all the gold ever dug—even not for life itself. Less than 4 years ago Americans were giving their lives, mothers their sons, to protect this American heritage of ours in all its meaning. It was protected magnificently. Taking added value from these sacrifices, it is more precious today than ever before.

Remember always that none of the material things we possess approach in worth the justice, freedom, and democracy we enjoy as American citizens. Remember, too, that should we lose the latter, everything else would quickly be lost to us. We will retain the full value of our American citizenship only as long as we protect it. When we think we are getting something for nothing in this world, we are headed for a bitter awakening. Not for nothing can we long enjoy all the rights and privileges which America confers on its citizens. We cannot buy our way with dollars.

Our free-enterprise system has, as a whole, produced the highest wages, actually and relatively, the world has ever known. We have the highest standards of living for the greatest number of people and a productivity far exceeding that of any other system in the world.

Truly we have much for which to be thankful in this country of ours. Let us have confidence in our free-enterprise system. And that at some point on the upgrade we can eliminate much of the radical thought that exists. Built as we have been by individual effort and association, we should never in the final analysis be required to submit to complete socialism, or worse yet, communism.

Today sweet praises are sung by the Communist praising our country as a democracy. Democracy in its truest sense is pure socialism. We are not a democracy, but a republic operating under a democratic capitalistic system. We must retain our free-enterprise system and each one of you is an integral part of this effort.

You decide how much your American citizenship is worth to you, then weigh what you are giving of yourself against the value of being an American.

May we thank you for your past efforts and assure you of our continued interest in the destinies of our country and of our employees.

L. C. WALLING.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM AND EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the subject of the extension of the ECA, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] consistently brought to our attention the importance of the political unification of Europe. As we all know, he has advocated the setting up of a United States of Europe as one of the steps toward an over-all European recovery program. I can say on my own part that I have always been very sympathetic with this objective of his, and hope we will see it brought about at the earliest possible date. However, I have shared the views of my associates on the Foreign Relations Committee that it would be inappropriate to make the political unification of Europe a condition of further ECA aid.

A friend of mine who is very much interested in this subject sent me a memorandum written by a gentleman named R. W. G. MacKay, of New York City, which deals with this matter, and which urges that the ECA should make its aid dependent upon the political unification of Europe.

Upon receipt of this communication and memorandum, and in the absence of Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, I wrote to Mr. Howard Bruce, the Deputy Administrator, under date of April 5, enclosing the MacKay memorandum, and asking him if he would advise me of the attitude of the ECA on this important subject. Under date of April 14, I received a reply from Mr. Bruce which seems to me so effectively to answer the arguments made by the MacKay memorandum and so clearly states the position of the ECA that it should be a matter of record.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that in connection with these remarks of mine, Mr. MacKay's memorandum in full may be inserted in the RECORD, followed by my letter of April 5 to Mr. Howard Bruce, the Deputy Administrator, and followed in turn by Mr. Bruce's reply to me of April 14, above referred to.

There being no objection, the memorandum and letters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM AND EUROPEAN POLITICAL UNION

(By R. W. MacKay)

1. AIM OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

It is impossible to overstate the assistance given by the recovery program to the states of western Europe, without which the standard of living of all the European countries would fall considerably. But unfortunately in our relief at having the program and in our desire to be appreciative of that which is being done, we completely overlook the fundamental question which is the necessity to create the conditions of recovery among the European states themselves. This is not being done, and the necessary steps are not being taken. Each country is using Marshall aid to get itself economically independent of the Western Hemisphere and of the other European countries. Yet the essence of the problem, and the only way in which it will

be solved, is when the 17 countries of western Europe pool their resources and organize their economic recovery as one country. If the United States does nothing but give money to Europe without insisting on Europe creating for itself a real union of Europe, it is throwing money down the drain, and that is what is happening at the present time. No conditions have been imposed on the European states to secure any kind of political union. Nevertheless Europe cannot put her economic house in order and make herself independent of American relief unless some kind of political authority is created—a federation of western Europe—as the framework for the necessary economic development.

2. THE OEEC

The basic fault in this machinery is the fact that the OEEC and Marshall aid is covered by treaties between the United States and each of the 16 countries separately. If there had been one treaty, a joint machinery would have been necessary. It can be argued that the OEEC is a piece of joint machinery, but people who think that put their heads in the sand and do not face the realities. It sounds all right to say that by creating such an organization we are bringing the peoples of Europe together and getting European union, but in fact it means no such thing. The OEEC, despite the important work which it is doing, is not a sovereign body. There is no reality in it and it lacks the power to enforce its decisions. Compliance depends upon the pleasure of the 17 separate states. Although charged with the administration of ERP, it can neither demand anything of any state nor interfere with the trade between states. Its attitude toward the individual states is that of a man, cap in hand, recommending, advising, imploring, and usually speaking to deaf ears. Without political power, call it sovereignty if you like, European union is merely a figure of speech.

3. EUROPEAN RECOVERY

This can all be translated into simple language from an examination of the ERP and the plan put up by the different countries. Each is trying to make itself independent of the others and of the Western Hemisphere, but the period between the World Wars shows how hollow is the economic independence of the different European states. Thus today we see the following:

(a) While imports to Europe from America have increased in 1948 over what they were in 1938, the interstate trade of Europe in 1948 is only half of what it was in 1938.

(b) German exports to Europe, on which the whole of the European economy was based in prewar days, are not one-third of what they were in 1938.

(c) Britain, which normally was a large importer from Europe, has had to buy from America the imports she requires and which formerly came to her from Europe.

(d) All the previous statements result from fear of German industrial recovery, from the present barriers to trade due to customs licenses and quotas, and from the many different currencies in Europe, all of which prevent the full and proper development of European trade.

(e) Belgium has surplus steel, but the other countries of Europe cannot buy it for shortage of currency. Britain has a surplus of textiles, but Sweden cannot buy them because of import licenses and shortage of currency.

(f) The transport of Europe is finding great shortage, but the barges in the Rhine and in Holland cannot be put to general European use. Italy is overproduced in vegetables and other foodstuffs which the other countries of Europe cannot buy.

(g) The European recovery program provides for the manufacture of rolling stock which could be made in Sweden or in Italy or in Britain, but if it were made in these countries, none of the other countries of Europe could buy it.

(h) Turkey and Greece have a surplus of tobacco, which again the European countries are getting from America under ERP but which they cannot buy from Turkey and Greece. Italy and France before the war produced more wheat each than Canada, which today they are not producing, so that we are buying wheat from America under the European recovery program.

4. WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

One could continue this list of economic anomalies ad infinitum. But what is to be done? How can they be removed? What steps must be taken so that trade and population in Europe can move as freely as they do in the United States of America? If the currency problem is to be solved there must be a European Minister of Finance who can create a European note issue, a European currency, and a European bank; and those three steps can only be taken when there is a European Government to take them. This means a European Parliament and legislation to create the bank and note issue. The agricultural development of Europe, the solutions of the wheat problem, the improvement of dairy production in different countries, etc., will only be determined when there is a Minister for Agriculture with power to insist on production levels in different countries and with power to withhold grants to those states unless they bring their production up to a certain level. And the same is true of transport, of industrial production and everything else. The appointment of a Minister of Customs who could within 6 months introduce one customs tariff for Europe as a whole and bring to an end all the import barriers between the different states of Europe would in itself stimulate interstate trade to an enormous extent. But no commission or ad hoc body working on the lines of a customs union, nothing short of a government with power, will be able to take the steps that are necessary if this is to be brought about. A large amount of planning for Europe has to be carried out in agriculture, in coal, in steel, in industrial production, and in transport. Whichever problem you look at, steps have to be taken by one authority which will be distasteful to many of the states of Europe.

5. THE COMPARISON WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The prosperity of the United States comes not primarily from her large resources or the intelligence of her population, but from her large markets. Europe has comparable resources if the 17 states receiving Marshall aid were taken as one area and not as 17 independent states. There is plenty of skill in the European population of 275,000,000 people. If there were a common currency for Europe—a European ducat or a European dollar—instead of the 17 currencies which exist today, trade in Europe would be much freer and would inevitably increase. Likewise, if the present import barriers, quotas, and customs were removed, trade could flow freely as it does in the United States of America from the north of Scotland and Scandinavia to the south of Italy and to Greece and Turkey. In that event it would develop and increase. The whole problem is one of increasing production and trade in the European states. If this is to happen there must be a big market for European production without any barriers, for this is one of the secrets of American success. But there are not such big markets in an area where there are 275,000,000 people divided into 17 states, each trying to keep out the goods of the others. It takes 10 hours' work to purchase a pair of shoes in the United States and Canada. In no European country is this true. It takes 32 hours in Belgium and France, 26 hours in Holland, and 24 hours in Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. This example could be multiplied a thousand times. Only one big market with the consequential mass demand can make Europe similar to the United States of America.

6. THE CUSTOMS UNION IDEA

Anyone who studies the talks which have taken place between the Belgians and the Dutch for a customs union, or the French and Italians, will realize how important a political union is if any effective economic improvement is to take place in Europe. A customs union in itself between Belgium and Holland will just do nothing, because what affects the trade between Belgium and Holland are the customs barriers least of all. Excise duties, sales taxation, or purchase taxes and the shortage of currency leading to import quotas and things of that kind are the real barriers to trade. If you had the same currency for Holland and Belgium and the same taxing authority, so that you had the same taxation over the whole area, you would begin to get some kind of economic union. Holland has been an agricultural country and Britain needs her agriculture, but in order to become independent in the world as it is today the Dutch are increasing their industrial production at the expense of their agricultural production, and this is true of most countries of Europe. As between France and Italy, the French need the Italian workers, the Italians need the French skill. Before the war France and Italy each produced more wheat than Canada, but they are not doing it today. Only the abolition of all barriers between the states will be effective.

7. UNION NECESSARY FOR RECOVERY

If a person whose suit is too tight goes to the tailor, the tailor does not tell him that he must cut off part of his body. He alters the suit. Likewise, political institutions must always be altered to accord with prevailing economic conditions. The political institutions of western Europe, i. e., 17 independent, separate governments, parliaments, states, do not fit the present economic conditions of western Europe, which demand a free market, with one large area for production, distribution, and exchange. In short, a United States of Western Europe is a condition precedent to economic recovery. No preparation of far-seeing plans, no acceptance of American aid, none of the eyewash which is put out today, changes this essential fact. As things are, at the end of 1952 there will be no greater political union in Europe than there is today. The states of Europe, if they have the will—and this applies to Great Britain more than any other state—could call a convention tomorrow and settle the constitution for a federation of western Europe—a United States of Europe. Before 1949 is out you could have a Parliament with a Minister of Finance, a Minister of Defense, a Minister of Customs, a Minister of Agriculture, and a Minister of Commerce. Within 3 months there could be a new currency for Europe which would bring to an end sterling, francs, guilders, liras, and so forth, and put a European ducat or a dollar in their place. Within 3 months you could remove all barriers to trade in western Europe, be they customs barriers, tax barriers, or quotas of different kinds. These two steps would do more to stimulate production and inter-European trade than any others. No one will deny that without ERP the prospect of 1952 would be bleak for Europe, but equally the recovery effort will have been wasted if it does not make as a condition of the aid the political unification of western Europe. This is necessary for European economic recovery. It is necessary for European defense. Finally, with a strong government in western Europe and an alliance with the United States, it would ensure world peace for the next 25 years at least.

8. EUROPE'S POLITICAL SYSTEM OUT OF DATE

The plain fact today is that Europe's system of government is no longer tolerable; that Europe possesses a system of divided administration which is quite incapable of organizing Europe as a whole; and finally that each individual government in Europe as part of the Marshall program has assumed responsibilities that it can only discharge with damage to the European community as a whole. In short, Marshall aid is being used by each of the 17 countries to put itself on its own feet again at the expense of the other countries. It is not being used to create one common economic and political structure for Europe as a whole, a free trade market for Europe as a whole; nor is it being used to remove the barriers of licenses, customs, currency, trade practices, and sales taxes which prevent the free flow of goods from Edinburgh to Rome, or from Stockholm to Venice.

9. WHY IS NOTHING DONE?

You may ask why is it that the recovery program is being used in this way, when almost every responsible statesman in Europe has said that Europe must federate or perish; when Winston Churchill has been proclaiming European unity and Mr. Bevin even western union. The answer is that very few of these responsible statesmen have seriously contemplated the implication of what they have said. It is true that the Parliaments of Italy, France, Holland, and Belgium have all passed resolutions for a European federation. Even the House of Commons have debated a resolution on it, and the Government have admitted the need for it and the necessity of surrendering some part of their sovereignty to it. But nothing is done. Moreover, even so modest a proposal as a European assembly without legislative power or authority is watered down and modified by the British Government.

10. BRITISH OBJECTIONS

Why do the British Government object to a European Federation now? The answer is a simple one. The British Government still regards Britain as a first-class power and not as a state of Europe. It has managed its own affairs fairly well in the last few years and does not want to put the control of British economy in the hands of Frenchmen and Italians. The British Government regards the present economic troubles of Europe as temporary. It still believes in "recovery" and that once the effects of the war are overcome Britain—with American aid—will be back on the map as it was before the Second World War. This of course is utter nonsense. Britain will never have the share of world trade in manufactures that she had. For world trade in manufactures over the last 20 years has greatly diminished. The whole of Europe has shrunk. The two great inventions of the twentieth century, mass production and standardization, can only be applied in a large market such as is to be found in the United States, and the only hope that Europe can increase her efficiency and get better tools for the work she has to do is if a big European market is created so there will be a demand for mass-produced goods. The obstacle at the present time is the British Government, and the only question is how to overcome this obstacle. It is not a question of public opinion. British and European public opinion would accept a federation of western Europe tomorrow. It is not a question of the other governments of Europe. With the exception of one, perhaps two, of the Scandinavian countries, the present governments of western Europe would join a European federation if Britain would give the lead. Despite the many difficulties such as race and language, it is not a question of working out a constitution. That would be drawn up in a matter of weeks.

11. THE TWO GOVERNMENTS OF BRITAIN AND AMERICA

In short, the position now rests entirely at a government level and on two governments—the United States and the British. Someone has got to give the British a push. The continental countries cannot do it because each of them is so dependent on her. The American Government can. The British Cabinet is made up of a number of people, none of whom will disregard what is said by the American President and his Government. So far the attitude of the United States Government and Congress has been to say in effect that they must not interfere in European affairs. But this is an ostrich-like policy in effect. In point of fact it is interfering. The American Government is giving billions of dollars in Marshall aid to secure European unity, but nothing is being done to bring about that unity. Therefore it is the job of the American Government to bring pressure on the British Government to see that it does take the necessary steps to bring about a European union. If it does not, the whole of Marshall aid will be wasted. Europe will not be made into a strong economic area and a great chance will be lost of building a strong defense in Europe against the U. S. S. R.

12. WHAT IS TO BE DONE NOW?

Finally, while it does come down to a question of interference or of pressure, it need not be put in that way. What matters in this world is not what you do, but the way that you do it. The State Department can make its representations to the British Government in such a way that it is asking Britain to take the lead in Europe, and if it were done in that way the British would be flattered. The whole question could be dealt with as part of the Atlantic Pact. Obviously it would have been better if the original arrangement for ERP had been contained in one agreement with the United States Government of the one part and the 17 countries of the other part. Likewise, the Atlantic Pact would be much stronger if it were a pact between the United States Government on the one hand and the United States of Europe on the other. Surely the time has arrived when a new Secretary of State could review the whole of this position with the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain and the British Cabinet. If the American Government were to stand firm in its demands for a political union of Europe, the British Government would give way. The present Belgian Prime Minister, Monsieur Spaak, once said that Europe would only be united by pressure. We had the pressure in the last war from Hitler, but the opportunity was not seized. The economic plight of Europe and Marshall aid give us another opportunity. The pressure is there and so is the opportunity, but whether the opportunity is going to be wasted again or not rests really with the State Department, with Congress, and with the American President. If they will insist on the union of Europe in 1949 as a condition of the continuance of aid in 1950 we may see a union of Europe this year. If they don't we may never see it.

APRIL 5, 1949.

Hon. HOWARD BRUCE,
Deputy Administrator,
Economic Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOWARD:

* * * * *

I am enclosing a memorandum which was sent to me by a friend of mine, and which was written by a man by the name of MacKay, whom I do not know. He makes out a pretty strong case for the Fulbright thesis for trying to press for the political union of European states at this time while we are giving our ECA aid. Up to date, I have supported Senator VANDENBERG's position, which has been that, desirable as political union may be, we should not use the trading position of the ECA to force political action by our beneficiaries—the participating countries.

In spite of this position of ours, I am inclined to feel MacKay is right when he says we will not be much further ahead in 1952 with sound European recovery unless these countries have made real progress in the area of removing tariff barriers, and other trade restrictions, and in stabilizing their currency. Certainly the European area, especially if it could develop a reasonable and safe trade between eastern and western Europe, should be pretty nearly self-sustaining.

* * * * *

I shall be glad to have your personal reactions to this memorandum of Mr. MacKay's.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

APRIL 14, 1949.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate.

DEAR ALEX: Thanks for your letter of April 5, enclosing Mr. MacKay's memorandum on the European recovery program and European political union. I have read MacKay's piece and do not believe that he adds much to what has already been said on the subject.

There is no disagreement between you and me—or indeed among most of those concerned with the problem in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government—as to the desirability of political union in Europe. I fear, however, that making the political unification of western Europe a condition precedent to the continuation of the European recovery plan would eventually boomerang and prove shortsighted.

It is easy to talk glibly, as MacKay does, of immediate political union. The fact remains that the economic adjustments which must be made if political union is to be successful are tremendous. With different wage scales and standards of living, tremendous variations in efficiency, in both industrial and agricultural production, immediate union would necessarily result in serious maladjustments and retard the over-all western European recovery which is the aim of the European recovery program. Deep-rooted differences in governmental organization and social institutions cannot be wiped out overnight. Continuing modifications in the economic, political, and social patterns of the ERP countries in order to reduce to a workable minimum the dislocations necessarily accompanying political union must be the forerunners if solid, lasting union is to be achieved. Through the OEEC and with the aid and encouragement of our Government, the western European countries are advancing steadily on the road to economic recovery. The resurgence in production and trade, introduction of currency reforms and other financial measures, reduction of inflationary pressures, and other stabilizing accomplishments are the steps which are the necessary groundwork for any successful political union of the ERP nations. The economic recovery which is being made possible by Marshall plan aid is the most important factor in readying Europe for actual economic and political union; to make such aid contingent on political union would be to put the cart before the horse.

You mention that you are inclined to feel that MacKay is right when he says we will not be much further ahead in 1952 with sound European recovery, unless the ERP countries have made real progress in the area of removing tariff barriers and other trade restrictions, and in stabilizing their currency. We in ECA heartily agree; and so do the OEEC and the individual participating countries, each of which realizes that the accomplishment of these ends is the only road to true economic recovery and to

closer political ties in western Europe. Considerable progress has been made during the past year. The cooperative efforts of the western European countries along both political and economic lines have been noteworthy. The Brussels Pact, the establishment of the OEEC, and the Council for Europe are all important measures. I am certain that the coming year will see still further acceleration in economic recovery and still closer association among the western European countries.

In this connection, brief mention of some of MacKay's statements will serve to point up the progress being made in western Europe. As is so often the case in arguing controversial causes, MacKay overstates his case and has fallen into several inaccuracies. For example, he states that various commodities such as Belgian steel and Turkish and Greek tobacco have not been moving to other ERP countries because of currency shortages. This is simply not the case. The intra-European payments plan, evolved by the OEEC last year, has made available to ERP countries needed European currencies. The plan has given great impetus to and infused new life in European trade, which had been threatened with sharp curtailment at the start of the Marshall plan.

MacKay deprecates the importance of the OEEC. The OEEC may not have sovereign powers, but its achievements, in a continent where intensely nationalistic attitudes have been prevalent for many hundreds of years, have been remarkable. The OEEC representatives are working as Europeans rather than as agents of their individual states and I doubt if the economy of western Europe has ever before been subjected to such searching over-all scrutiny. Closely intertwined with MacKay's evaluation of the OEEC is his claim that each country is using ERP aid to make itself economically independent of the other ERP countries and the Western Hemisphere. This thesis is not supported by the facts. Through the OEEC they are working on joint plans for recovery based not on isolated self-sufficiency but on a pattern of vigorous, friendly trade throughout Europe and with the rest of the world.

MacKay also evinces disdain for what he calls "the custom union idea." Unfortunately, he has his facts a bit garbled. The Belgians and the Dutch are not, as MacKay suggests, now talking about a customs union. They instituted one in January 1948. The Benelux countries realize that a customs union is no complete solution to their economic problems. They have been actively working toward a complete economic union, with a common currency and tax system and withdrawal of all economic barriers. This economic integration of the Benelux countries is scheduled to become effective in July 1950. The countries had set earlier target dates for its introduction, but the numerous problems I have alluded to earlier slowed the consummation of the union. In over-simplified terms, the major obstacle to the union has been the over-all lower standard of economic and financial stability in the Netherlands as compared with Belgium and Luxemburg. With ECA assistance, the gap is being narrowed, making possible the realization of the union.

The actual experience with the Benelux project—which is succeeding after years of effort and close cooperation among the three countries involved—illustrate my difficulty with the MacKay position. There is no magic short-cut to lasting political union. It can be accomplished only by hard work and continued mutual assistance among the ERP countries. The United States can help by the advice and assistance of the ECA, State Department, and other agencies of our Government. I have every reason to believe that this course, diligently pursued, will succeed.

Even if making political union a flat condition of further aid, either for the current year or, say, for 1950, could conceivably coerce the western European countries into a single political organization, I cannot believe that European union could be so achieved without permanent and serious harm to our country's prestige.

The European recovery program has been administered in a manner to insure that ECA funds make a full contribution to European recovery and are not dissipated. Our Government has, however, wisely refused to take the position that extending ERP assistance gives us the right to impose our will upon the free peoples of Europe and to tell them what form of government they are to have. Our policy has borne fruit. Never has our Nation's reputation ridden so high and secure in western Europe. Although Communists have shrilled that the Marshall plan is American imperialism designed to enslave Europe and make it an American colony, their charges have made no real headway in the ERP countries. For it is all too clear to the people of western Europe that United States aid has been extended in a spirit of cooperation to assist the free and democratic peoples of western Europe along the road to economic recovery. Marshall plan assistance has not been tied with the imposition of onerous conditions.

To now condition ERP assistance on the political unification of western Europe would be to play into the Communist hands, and give them ammunition for their attack on the European recovery program. And if the United States were woodenly to impose such conditions, I fear the Russian claims would not fall on deaf ears. The people of the ERP countries are deeply appreciative of United States Government assistance, but they feel, and rightly so, that proposed modifications in their governmental organization are matters which should properly originate in the countries themselves.

I feel quite strongly that imposing a requirement of immediate political unification on the ERP countries would deal a shattering blow to the high esteem in which our Nation is presently held in western Europe. It is also my belief that any shotgun union of the ERP countries could not have solid enough foundations to stand in times of world stress, when the United States interest in a strong united Europe would be of the greatest moment. As Averell Harriman said in the course of his testimony before the House:

"If you refer to conditions, I think you are treading in a very dangerous field. These are mature and sovereign nations with widely different types of organization, economic organizations and systems, and I do not believe we could accomplish what ought to be accomplished if there are any conditions to our aid in this field. Suggestions, advice; yes. Discussions and arguments, yes; but not conditions. There must be a will on the part of the nations and the people of the nations, and progress must be based on conviction that each step that they take is wise and sound."

* * * * *

Sincerely,

HOWARD BRUCE,
Deputy Administrator.

BASING-POINT PRICING

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on Monday last the Supreme Court announced that it had divided 4 to 4, with Justice Jackson not voting, on the appeal by manufacturers of rigid steel conduit from the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals holding these manufacturers to be in violation of the antitrust laws for the manner in which they had absorbed freight in their pricing policies.

This stalemate on the part of the high Court was indeed disappointing because it prevented the Court from clarifying the decision and dicta in the Cement case of last year. Thus the issue of freight absorption and basing-point pricing is still a much unsettled one.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, just an hour or so before the Supreme Court announced that it had split 4–4 over the Rigid Steel Conduit case decision, reported favorably, with amendments, my bill, S. 1008, to provide a moratorium on antitrust prosecutions for good faith, independent, noncollusive freight absorption pricing methods.

In view of the Supreme Court split on the issue, the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court is now the controlling decision in the Rigid Steel Conduit case. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee on S. 1008 and also the full text of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals opinion in the Rigid Steel Conduit case be printed at this point in the RECORD for the information of the many Members of Congress and of the business community who are deeply interested in this issue.

There being no objection, the report (No. 305) and decision were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1008) to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

AMENDMENTS

Amendments proposed by the committee are shown in detail in the committee print of the bill which accompanies this report. The net result of the committee amendments is to make the bill read as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That until July 1, 1950, the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, shall not be construed as depriving individual companies, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, of the right to independently quote and sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith in any and all markets.

"SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect any proceeding pending in any Federal court of the United States on the date of approval of this act. The provisions of this act shall be operative with respect to any activities engaged in between the date of approval of this act and July 1, 1950, but shall not otherwise affect the enforcement of any order which was entered on or before the date of approval of this act."

The committee also proposes amendment of the title so as to read: "A bill to confirm the right of individual companies to use certain pricing practices during a specified period for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith."

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill has been generally referred to as a "moratorium." The duration of this "moratorium" would be, under the committee amendments, from the time of approval of the act until July 1, 1950. During this period of time, the bill would operate as a temporary clarifying amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, guaranteeing

the right of individual companies, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, to independently quote and sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith.

While such clarification has, in the opinion of the committee, been made necessary by the very confusion of legal thinking on the subject of pricing practices as affected by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 683), it definitely is not intended, by approval of this "moratorium" bill, to hold or imply that the particular pricing practices named are now, or hereafter are to be, illegal. The primary purpose of this legislation is to safeguard the legitimate interests both of consumer and supplier and end confusion during a period within which the Congress may give further study to the whole question with a view to determining the need for permanent legislation in this field.

At the same time, it must be clearly recognized, as the sponsor of S. 1008 testified during hearings before the committee, that enactment of this legislation will not and does not commit the Congress to any predetermined course of action, either with respect to the nature of permanent legislation to be enacted, or with respect to the enactment of any permanent legislation at all.

DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

In eliminating section 1 of the bill as introduced, the committee have sought to avoid controversial language as well as to avoid language which might be interpreted as permanently committing the Congress with respect to any issue here involved.

In changing the expiration date of the "moratorium" period to July 1, 1950, the committee have chosen a date which marks both the close of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, and therefore the end of the period within which the Eighty-first Congress might act on permanent legislation.

Substitution of the phrase "quote and sell at delivered prices" for the phrase "use delivered price systems," in section 2, is intended to eliminate any possible contention that the Congress intends to legalize, even during the period of the moratorium, the systematic use of basing-point pricing, which proponents of the bill have testified is not an objective.

Use of the phrase "for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith" in place of the phrase "to meet competition" is for the purpose of providing greater flexibility in the standard for independent action during the moratorium period. As witnesses pointed out, in order to compete, it might be necessary not merely to meet the price of a competitor, but actually to sell at a lower price, especially in the case of an unknown brand competing with a nationally advertised brand. Furthermore, competition in good faith might embrace coming close to a competitor's price without actually meeting it. Under the language proposed, the criterion will be engaging in competition in good faith, rather than the resulting price.

Fixing the beginning of the moratorium period as "the date of approval of this act," instead of an arbitrary date named in the act, with respect to pending proceedings in court, and orders already entered, is proposed in order to insure that, first, there will be nothing retroactive in the provisions of this section, and, second, that there will be no period of hiatus between the date of approval and the applicability of the act to proceedings begun thereafter.

The committee version of the final section of the bill is designed to give freedom of action, during the period of the "moratorium," even to those companies against whom orders have been issued, while at the same time making it clear that the Congress is not attempting to extend a blanket pardon for any violations of such orders which may have occurred before the date of approval of the act. Under this language it is contemplated that any company will have the right to quote and sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight, for the purpose of engaging in competition in good faith, during the period of the moratorium, but that no inducement will be held out to reopen cases which have been adjudicated or to seek modification of orders already issued. This is accomplished by making the moratorium apply to any activities engaged in after the date of approval of the act and before July 1, 1950, but making the provisions of the act otherwise inapplicable with respect to enforcement of orders entered before the date of approval of the act.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 1008

Careful consideration has been given by the committee to the question of the constitutionality of this bill. As an aid in its consideration of this question, the committee sought and secured an opinion from the Federal Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, in which the committee counsel and two other members of the committee's professional staff concurred. A brief memorandum of this opinion, holding S. 1008 to be a constitutional exercise of congressional power, is printed hereafter as appendix A of this report.

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM RE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 1008

It is undeniable that the construction of a statute is a judicial prerogative (*Elmendorf* v. *Taylor* (1825), 10 Wheat, 152; *Bank of Hamilton* v. *Dudley's Lessee* (1829), 2 Peters 495), and that Congress may not constitutionally impose upon the courts an arbitrary rule of decision (*U. S.* v. *Klein* (1872), 13 Wall, 128; Harris, the Judicial Power of the United States (1940), 78).

S. 1008, however, does not impose an arbitrary rule of determination upon the courts. Instead, the bill in effect proposes an amendment to the existing law and creates new circumstances by which the activity involved is to be tested. In a number of decisions, beginning with *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Co.* (1855) (18 How. 421), the Supreme Court has upheld the rights of Congress, in the exercise of its plenary power over interstate commerce, to enact legislation overriding or reversing previous court decisions construing particular matters. (See *Prudential Ins. Co.* v. *Benjamin* (1946), 328 U. S. 408, and cases cited at n. 28.) In each instance, the Supreme Court "has given effect to the congressional judgment contradicting its own previous one." (Ibid.) As stated in *In re Rahrer* (1891) (140 U. S. 545, 562), "No reason is perceived why, if Congress chooses to provide that certain designated subjects of interstate commerce shall be governed by a rule which divests them of that character at an earlier period of time than would otherwise be the case, it is not within its competency to do so." And the fact that the statute involved uses the words "shall be construed," or words of similar import, apparently has not been regarded as creating an unconstitutional infringement of the judicial power. (See the McCarran Act of March 9, 1945, 59 Stat. 33, 15 U. S. C. secs. 1011–1015, upheld in *Prudential Ins. Co.* v. *Benjamin, supra;* see particularly nn. 32, 33, 34, and 39 of the opinion.)

In this connection, also, the language of the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *Klein, supra,* is enlightening. In that case, the Court declared that Congress could not impose on the courts rules of decision which would determine controversies before them, and then said:

"* * * we do not at all question what was decided in the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Wheeling Bridge Company.* In that case, after a decree in this Court that the bridge, in the then state of the law, was a nuisance and must be abated as such, Congress passed an act legalizing the structure and making it a post road; and the Court, on a motion for process to enforce the decree, held that the bridge had ceased to be a nuisance by the exercise of the constitutional powers of Congress, and denied the motion. No arbitrary rule of decision was prescribed in that case, but the Court was left to apply its ordinary rules to the new circumstances created by the act. In the case before us no new circumstances have been created by legislation. But the Court is forbidden to give the effect to evidence which, in its own judgment, such evidence should have, and is directed to give it an effect precisely contrary."

It is believed that S. 1008 is distinguishable upon a like basis and thus is a constitutional exercise of congressional power.

[From the Federal Reporter, vol. 168 F. (2d)]

(Before Sparks, Kerner, and Minton, circuit judges)

Kerner, circuit judge.

Petitioners, 14 corporate manufacturers of rigid steel conduit and 5 representatives of these corporations, ask us to review and set aside a cease and desist order of the Federal Trade Commission, upon a complaint in 2 counts, charging that petitioners collectively have violated section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U. S. C. A., section 45, which declares unlawful "unfair methods of competition in commerce." Each of the corporate petitioners except Spang Chalfant was a member of Rigid Steel Conduit Association. That association was a respondent in the proceedings before the Commissioner, but is not a petitioner here. Each of the five individual petitioners was not only an official of one of the corporate petitioners but also served in an official capacity in directing the affairs of Rigid Steel Conduit Association.

In substance the first count alleged the existence and continuance of a conspiracy for the purpose and with the effect of substantially restricting and suppressing actual and potential competition in the distribution and sale of rigid steel conduit in commerce, effectuated by the adoption and use of a basing-point method of quoting prices for rigid steel conduit. The second count did not rest upon an agreement or combination. It charged that each corporate petitioner and others violated section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act "through their concurrent use of a formula method of making delivered price quotations with the knowledge that each did likewise, with the result that price competition between and among them was unreasonably restrained." It alleged that nearby customers were deprived of price advantages which they would have naturally enjoyed by reason of their proximity to points of production, and that such course of action created in said conduit sellers a monopolistic control over price in the sale and distribution of rigid steel conduit.

Petitioners answered the complaint. They denied any agreement or combination. After extensive hearings before a trial examiner, the Commission made its findings of fact and conclusions of law therefrom. It found the charges to be fully substantiated by the evidence.

Rigid steel conduit is a steel pipe used primarily in the roughing-in stage of building construction where electrical wiring is necessary in order to furnish a continuous channel or container for the wiring. It is made from standard steel pipe and is produced in two types differing only in the nature of the

coating applied to it. It is a standard commodity. It was first manufactured in America in 1897, in or near Pittsburgh, Pa., and originally was sold at delivered prices. The reason why delivered prices were used lay in the relative importance of transportation charges in the sale of the product. Points of production include Cohoes, N. Y., and various places in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, and Ohio. Various means were used to facilitate the calculation of delivered prices, but Youngstown was the first manufacturer to prepare a freight-rate bulletin specially applicable to conduit sales. Similar bulletins were prepared by other manufacturers and later such bulletins were procured by some manufacturers from a traffic expert.

In addition to freight-rate bulletins, another aid in computing delivered prices was the use of delivery-charge tables, which were designed to simplify the procedure of figuring the delivered prices, and each petitioner refrained from publishing price quotations f. o. b. point of production or shipment, but used the practice and method of quoting price sheets, which it termed price cards, in which it designated base prices f. o. b. Pittsburgh, Pa., and f. o. b. Chicago, Ill. About 1912 one manufacturer began announcing quotations of prices, based on Pittsburgh as a basing point, through the use of price cards which listed Pittsburgh basing discounts under which the discount was decreased—and the net price thereby increased—in proportion to the freight rate from Pittsburgh to the point of delivery. The practice thus established was followed by other manufacturers then in existence, and since then, up to 1930, by other manufacturers as they have entered the conduit business.

In 1930, petitioner, National Electric shifted from the list and discount form of delivered price quotation to a quotation which specified the net base prices, with freight to be added, and during the next year or so other manufacturers likewise changed to the quotation of net base prices plus freight. In 1924, conduit began to be sold at prices based on Gary, Ind., as a basing point. During that year petitioner Youngstown began to manufacture conduit at Evanston, Ill., and inaugurated the practice of quoting and selling conduit at delivered prices based on Evanston, as well as Pittsburgh, as a basing point, the base price at Evanston being $4 above the current published price at Pittsburgh. Clayton Mark, during the period (1924–30), had quoted conduit prices upon a Chicago base. Since freight rates from Chicago and Evanston were the same, Evanston ceased to be a basing point shortly after 1934. Other manufacturers followed the practices inaugurated by Youngstown and Clayton Mark.

It also appears that instead of petitioner conduit sellers using an absolute Pittsburgh plus system for all designations in their price quotations, they collectively discussed and considered the matter of maintaining and utilizing Chicago as a basing point, with its differential over Pittsburgh, and that until 1930 they followed a method of calculating delivered price quotations which provided for discounting from the Pittsburgh or Chicago base price, depending upon which base price and accompanying discount produced the lower figure at the customer's destination, and that during 1930 representatives of petitioners at a meeting of the Rigid Steel Conduit section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association determined upon a change from that method to the one they now use. Accordingly, at the time of the hearings each of the petitioner conduit sellers quoted delivered prices for conduit based on Chicago as well as on Pittsburgh as basing points and sold at that base price.

There was testimony that the system thus used was an effective means of matching bids and price quotations, and that the quotations made by each conduit seller, irrespective of whether it had a manufacturing plant located at or near Pittsburgh or Chicago, enabled them to match their price quotations. It also appears that at times it was difficult to exactly determine the railroad tariff rate and that mistakes by some conduit sellers in the selection of a particular tariff rate to be used in a particular instance were a fruitful source of differences in the delivered prices quoted, thereby preventing a matching of such quotations. To prevent such errors, petitioners, acting through Rigid Steel Conduit Association, employed one Donley, who prepared a compilation of freight-rate applicators containing the freight factor applicable from Pittsburgh to various destinations in the United States and, on a differential of $4 per ton above the Pittsburgh base price, the freight applicable from Chicago. These compilations became important adjuncts to petitioners' plans and methods in matching delivered-price quotations. They were intended by petitioners to be used as their common-price factors.

The findings upon which the order of the Commission is based are lengthy and of a comprehensive nature. In these findings the petitioners are identified by name in connection with the particular activities engaged in by them as part of their general plan of suppressing price competition through the combination charged. Essentially the findings are, that there was collective consideration of pricing policies on the part of representatives of petitioners in 1930 and collective considerations by such representatives of those matters through November 1939; that by petitioners' adherence to their formula or system of pricing, their matching of bids under seal and the matching of their delivered-price quotations was made effective, and a combination and conspiracy was maintained by petitioners to deprive purchasers of conduit of the benefits of competition in price, to maintain artificial and monopolistic methods and prices in the sale and distribution of conduit, to prepare and maintain common rate factors or freight adders used and useful in determining and establishing price quotations and prices for conduit, to classify customers of conduit and determine the treatment to be accorded them, to establish and maintain uniform discounts, terms and conditions of sale, to determine and control the use of warehouses in the distribution of conduit, to prepare, adopt, and use for the purpose of aiding in price maintenance and control, uniform contracts for distributors and for contractors buying for specific projects, and to enforce the terms of such contracts through investigations and reports thereon, to support and maintain their price structure through the conduct of investigations of sales and offers to sell, and the circulation of reports thereon; and that the acts and practices performed thereunder and in connection therewith, hindered, lessened, and suppressed competition among sellers in the sale and distribution of conduit in interstate commerce.

These ultimate findings of fact are based upon subsidiary findings. It will not be necessary in this opinion to set forth these findings, as they appear in 38 Federal Trade Commission Decisions, 534–551. Upon these findings of fact the Commission concluded that these acts and practices constituted unfair methods of competition in commerce within the meaning of section 5 of the act, and directed petitioners, other than General Electric Supply Corp. and Spang Chalfant, to cease and desist from entering into, continuing in, or carrying out any planned common course of action, understanding, agreement, combination, or conspiracy between any two or more of petitioners, or between any one or more of petitioners and others not parties hereto, to do or perform any of the things specifically set forth in the order. For the injunctive paragraphs covering the specific activities, see 38 F. T. C. Decisions, 593.

Petitioners assert that no finding was made as to when the conspiracy was instituted, how long it continued, and which respondents (petitioners) were members thereof. They insist that the Commission has failed to make a finding as to the conspiracy charged, together with findings which would disclose how and in what manner each of the petitioners became a member thereof.

In support of their contention, petitioners argue that the finding: "Paragraph 19: (a) Pursuant to count I of the complaint herein the Commission concludes from the evidence of record and therefore finds that the capacity tendency and effect of the combination and conspiracy maintained by the respondents (petitioners) named therein in the manner aforesaid, and the acts and practices performed thereunder and in connection therewith * * * has been, and is, to hinder, lessen, restrain, and suppress competition in the sale and distribution of conduit * * *," is wholly insufficient in law, because, so they say, the finding is only a description of the "capacity tendency, and effect" of the conspiracy.

[1–3] In considering this contention, it is well to remember that findings are to be construed liberally in support of a judgment or order, *Rank* v. *Kuhn* (236 Iowa 854, 20 N. W. 2d 72). Whenever, from facts found, other facts may be inferred which will support the judgment, such inferences will be deemed to have been drawn, *Clyde Equipment Co.* v. *Fiorito* (9 Cir, 16 F. 2d 106, 107), and any words which fairly import a concerted action for a conniving together to restrain trade, are sufficient to charge conspiracy, *American Tobacco Co.* v. *United States* (6 Cir., 147 F 2d 93, 117).

[4–9] Pertinent and akin to the question we are now discussing are the words of Mr. Justice Douglas in his concurring opinion in the case of *United States* v. *Line Material Co.* (68 S. Ct. 550, 566, in which case, after stating that the Sherman Act, 15 U. S. C. A. secs. 1–1, 15 note), outlaws price-fixing combinations, he said: "Price fixing in any form is perhaps the most powerful of all inducements for abandonment of competition. * * * It is therefore one of the most effective devices to regiment whole industries and exact a monopoly price from the public. The benefits of the competition disappear." And in the case of *United States* v. *United States Gypsum Co.* (68 S. Ct. 525), the court said that price fixing without authorizing statutes, is illegal, per se. See also *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *John D. Park & Sons Co.* (220 U. S. 373, 31 S. Ct. 376, 55 L. Ed. 502); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Pacific States Paper Trade Association* (273 U. S. 52, 47 S. Ct. 255, 71 L. Ed. 534); *United States* v. *Trenton Potteries Co.* (273 U. S. 392, 47 S. Ct. 377, 71 L. Ed. 700, 50 A. L. R. 989). Any combination which tampers with price structures is engaged in an unlawful activity. *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (310 U. S. 150, 221, 60 S. Ct. 811, 84 L. Ed. 1129). And the existence of a plan or method which equalizes the delivered costs or prices of competitors having widely different freight costs to given destinations constitutes strong evidence in itself of an agreement to use such plan or system. *Milk & Ice Cream Can Institute* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (7 Cir., 152 F. 2d 478); *Fort Howard Paper Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (7 Cir., 146 F. 2d 899). And price uniformity especially if accompanied by an artificial price level not related to the supply and demand of a given commodity may be evidence from which an agreement or understanding, or some concerted action of sellers operating to restrain commerce, may be inferred. *Cement Manufacturers' Protective Association* v. *United States* (268 U. S. 588, 606, 45 S. Ct. 586, 69

L. Ed. 1104); *Eugene Dietzen Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (7 Cir., 142 F. 2d 321). The fixing of prices by one member of a group, pursuant to express delegation, acquiescence, or understanding, is just as illegal as the fixing of prices by direct, joint action. *United States v. Masonite Corp.* (316 U. S. 265, 276, 62 S. Ct. 1070, 86 L. Ed. 1461). Moreover, the question we are now discussing was considered and decided in the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* (68 S. Ct. 793, 809). In disposing of the identical question, the court solved our problem. It said:

"It seems impossible to conceive that anyone reading these findings in their entirety could doubt that the Commission found that respondents, collectively maintained a multiple basing-point delivered price system for the purpose of suppressing competition in cement sales. The findings are sufficient. The contention that they are not is without substance."

[10] Petitioners also stress the point that the use of the basing-point method of pricing does not have any adverse effect on competition and is not oppressive. They contend that in the event we should hold that the Commission made a finding that there was a price-fixing conspiracy, such a finding is not supported by the evidence.

The argument is that there is no direct evidence of any conspiracy; that if the Commission made such a finding, it is based upon a series of inferences; and that the general use of the basing-point method of pricing and the uniformity of prices does not justify an inference of conspiracy. We think there was direct proof of the conspiracy, but whether there was or was not, in determining if such a finding is supported, it is not necessary that there be direct proof of an agreement. Such an agreement may be shown by circumstantial evidence. *Milk and Ice Cream Can Institute* v. *Federal Trade Commission, supra* (152 F. 2d at page 480).

[11, 12] In this case there was evidence showing collective action to eliminate the Evanston basing point, and collective activities in promoting the general use of the formula presently to be noted. The record clearly establishes the fact that conduit manufacturers controlling 93 percent of the industry use a system under which they quote only delivered prices, which are determined in accordance with a formula consisting of a base price at Pittsburgh or Chicago plus rail freight, depending upon which basing-point price controls at any particular destination or in any particular section of the United States; that as a result of using that formula the conduit producers were enabled to match their delivered price quotations, and purchasers everywhere were unable to find price advantages anywhere; and that purchasers at or near a place of production could not buy more cheaply from their nearby producer than from producers located at greater distances, and producers located at great distances from any given purchaser quoted as low a delivered price as that quoted by the nearest producer.

An example of an instance where petitioners have matched their bids appears where the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, United States Navy Department, requested bids under seal for the furnishing of 1,000,000 feet of conduit for delivery at the Navy Yards in Philadelphia, Pa., Norfolk and Sewell's Point, Va. Seven of the petitioners submitted bids and matched their price quotations in terms of dollars per foot down to the fourth decimal point. Of course, there were other instances in the record showing identity of bids. Not only did petitioners match their bids when submitted under seal to agencies of public bodies, but each, with the knowledge of the others, did likewise—used the formula for the purpose of presenting to prospective private purchasers conditions of matched price quotations.

In this state of the record it will be enough to say that Congress has left to the Commission the determination of the facts, *Federal Trade Commission* v. *A. E. Staley Mfg. Co.*, (324 U. S. 746, 65 S. Ct. 971, 89 L. Ed. 1338), and the weight to be attributed to the facts proved and the inferences to be drawn from them, *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 726, 739, 65 S. Ct. 961, 89 L. Ed. 1320. See also *United States Malsters Ass'n.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (7 Cir., 152 F. 2d 161); *Milk & Ice Cream Can Institute* v. *Federal Trade Commission, supra; Fort Howard Paper Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission, supra;* and *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute, supra.* Our study of this record and of the applicable law has convinced us that the Commission was justified in drawing the inference that the petitioners acted in concert in a price-fixing conspiracy.

[13] We now turn to consider petitioners' contention that the individual use of the basing-point method, with knowledge that other sellers use it, does not constitute an unfair method of competition. This contention embodies the theory of the second count of the complaint and of that part of the order to cease and desist that is directed against each of the corporate petitioners.

Briefly, the argument is that individual freight absorption is not illegal per se, and that the Commission's order is a denial of the right to meet competition. More specifically, petitioners say that conduit is a homogeneous product; that no buyer will pay more for the product of one seller than he will for that of another; that the buyer is not interested in the seller's cost of transportation or in any other factor of the seller's cost; that effective competition requires that traders have large freedom of action when conducting their own affairs; that in any particular market, the seller must adjust his own price to meet the market price or retire from that market altogether; that it has always been the custom of merchants to send their goods to distant markets to be sold at the prices there prevailing; that there is no lessening of competition, or injury to competitors, when a seller absorbs freight traffic to meet lawful competition; and that it is for the court to decide as a matter of law what constitutes an unfair method of competition under § 5 of the act. (*Federal Trade Commission* v. *Gratz* (253 U. S. 421, 40 S. Ct. 572, 64 L. Ed. 993.))

On the other hand, the commission contends that unfair methods of competition include not only methods that involve deception, bad faith, and fraud, but methods that involve oppression or such as are against public policy because of their dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition or create monopoly.

As already noted, each conduit seller knows that each of the other sellers is using the basing-point formula; each knows that by using it he will be able to quote identical delivered prices and thus present a condition of matched prices under which purchasers are isolated and deprived of choice among sellers so far as price advantage is concerned. Each seller must systematically increase or decrease his mill net price for customers at numerous destinations in order to match the delivered prices of his competitors. Each seller consciously intends not to attempt the exclusion of any competition from his natural freight advantage territory by reducing the price, and in effect invites the others to share the available business at matched prices in his natural market in return for a reciprocal invitation.

In this situation, and indeed all parties to these proceedings agree, the legal question presented is identical with the one the Supreme Court considered in the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* case, supra. In that case, after stating that the Commission has jurisdiction to declare what conduct is an unfair method of competition, the Court said:" * * * individual conduct, * * * which falls short of being a Sherman Act violation may as a matter of law constitute an 'unfair method of competition' prohibited by the Trade Commission Act. A major purpose of that act * * * was to enable the Commission to restrain practices as 'unfair' which, although not yet having grown into Sherman Act dimensions would most likely do so if left unrestrained. The Commission and the courts were to determine what conduct, even though it might then be short of a Sherman Act violation, was an 'unfair method of competition.' This general language was deliberately left to the 'Commission and the courts' for definition because it was thought that 'There is no limit to human inventiveness in this field'; that consequently, a definition that fitted practices known to lead towards an unlawful restraint of trade today would not fit tomorrow's new inventions in the field; and that for Congress to try to keep its precise definitions abreast of this course of conduct would be an 'endless task.'"

In the light of that opinion, we cannot say that the Commission was wrong in concluding that the individual use of the basing-point method as here used does constitute an unfair method of competition.

In their briefs and upon oral argument, petitioners have raised additional points. These, too, have been examined and considered by the Supreme Court in the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* case, supra, and were found lacking in merit. Hence they need not be discussed by us.

The Commission's order is affirmed and an enforcement decree will be entered. It is so ordered.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. In view of the very important matter to which the Senator has referred, I ask him whether it might be possible, at a reasonably early date, to give consideration to the question, in the light of the fact that by reason of the Supreme Court's decision there is great confusion in regard to this important subject matter.

Mr. MYERS. In view of the decision, it is more important than ever that we obtain early consideration of that legislation. It is my hope that we may be able to list that bill for reasonably early consideration by the Senate.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the unfinished business now pending, Senate bill 1411, generally known as the child health bill, which provides Federal aid to the States for the development of school health services for all children in the States, was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee

on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], on behalf of all the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, and also on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who was the author of a similar bill in the last Congress.

The bill was reported to the Senate by the distinguished chairman of the committee, and it was his intention and plan to be here today to present the bill to the Senate. It so happens, however, that several days ago the State Department urged him to go on a mission of great importance to our international affairs, and he is temporarily absent on that mission, but will be present later in the day. In his absence as chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the bill and reported it to the full committee I shall present the statement on the bill.

This bill is the product of considerable deliberation and discussion in the committee. Rather extensive hearings were held at the last session of Congress on the Saltonstall bill.

I wish to say that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] took a lead in bringing a bill for child-health purposes before the committee. He deserves much credit for having this bill before the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, in recommending this bill to the Senate for approval, the committee endorses the idea that basic school health services should go hand in hand with the education of the child. It is apparent that when needed health services are available to children during the years of their growth and development, they are better able to progress and ultimately to realize more fully their potential capacities as adults and as citizens of our country. It is a fact that the discovery and correction of physical and mental defects when they are in their early stages, and more easily correctable, are basic to the growth, development, and the educational progress of the child. Also, Mr. President, it is clear that the early discovery and correction of defects is basic to the preventive approach to good health, which is so vitally necessary if we are to have a healthy Nation.

No one in this Chamber, Mr. President, I am sure, can fail to recall the shockingly large numbers of our young men who were rejected as unfit for military service during the last great war. The selective-service statistics show that approximately 5,000,000 men were physically or mentally or emotionally unable to meet the service standards established by the armed forces. This was more than 30 percent of the total number of individuals examined under selective service. Many of the rejections for medical reasons did not stem from the fact that medical care had not been available to the rejectees. There can be no doubt, however, about the fact that the earlier any defect is discovered and remedial action taken, the greater is the likelihood of eliminating or reducing the degree of defect. It is not unlikely at all that a very minimum of 15 to 20 percent of the selective-service rejections could have been avoided if the respective rejectees had had the benefit of early diagnosis and treatment of physical conditions.

From various sources of data estimates have been made of the number of certain kinds of conditions which handicap the children of the Nation. It has been estimated that today there are 4,000,000 children with visual defects, 1,000,000 with hearing defects, 500,000 with orthopedic and spastic defects, 500,000 with rheumatic fever, and 200,000 with epilepsy. The number with diseased tonsils or adenoids is not accurately known, but it appears to be substantial, possibly as many as from one-fifth to one-fourth of all the children in the country. The hearing of many of these children is impaired because the basic condition is not treated. It has been estimated from various dental studies that 75 percent of all school children need some kind of dental care; and on the average, the children beginning school have six teeth already involved in the decay process.

It appears essential to further progress in the field of health services that an examination of each child be made at least once every 3 years. Then, after the examination is made, children should obtain the services they are found to need.

There are several studies which show that care generally is not now being provided for conditions as they are discovered. In one situation involving more than 200,000 children who were found to have dental defects, only a little more than 40,000 children had had corrective action taken by the time of the next examination; there were 36,000 children with visual defects, and slightly less than 7,500 corrections; there were 8,500 children who had speech defects, but only 500 of those children had corrections.

Another study indicated that about 5 percent of the children found to have diseased tonsils had received remedial treatment by the time of the next examination. Even after the third examination of the same children, only 14 percent were corrected. This study also indicated that only 12.5 percent of visual defects were corrected between examination periods, although if parents were present at the examination, 20 percent of the visual defects were corrected. Mr. President, this is a most interesting fact. The bill recommended by the committee does not, in effect, create something entirely new. Approximately three-fourths of the States now provide for some kind of periodic physical examinations or inspections of their school children. But, Mr. President, although a majority of the States have recognized the problem, the actual provision of school health services varies with regard to the thoroughness and adequacy of the systems in operation. Lack of financial support has worked to retard the development of such services in most of the States. In many areas, particularly those with relatively low per capita incomes and those having relatively large numbers of children in the school ages, the prevailing school health programs, if there be any at all, are grossly inadequate.

It is absolutely essential to further progress in this field, Mr. President, that States go forward with better health examinations and better follow-up care.

This bill recognizes the problem by encouraging the States, through grants-in-aid, with authorizations of appropriations in the amount of $35,000,000 annually, to take positive action to remedy the deficiencies of existing school health programs. It is based on the principle that the States shall develop a comprehensive plan to provide examinations in all schools, where it can be done at anything like reasonable cost, and then to provide treatment for physical and mental defects and conditions shown by such examinations whenever the parents of such children are unable financially to provide for such treatment. The program takes in all children in all schools in the States. It must be in full operation in a State by October 1, 1952, if the State is to continue to receive Federal funds. This date will give full opportunity for enactment of the State legislation required to make the program fully effective.

The State's program may provide for the prevention and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions shown by the examination for all school children, including those whose parents are able to provide for such treatment. Of course this field of treatment depends upon the financial condition of the State and upon how far the State wishes to go. Some States already supply such service, at least for minor defects; but others may find it difficult with their own funds and those provided by the Federal Government to do more than provide for the minimum program required as a condition of Federal aid. Many of the defects found will be treated under other health programs applicable to special types of diseases or to families in their homes. A major purpose of the present bill is to lay the basis for all other treatment by a complete, efficient, and satisfactory school health examination program.

In providing for essential school health services, the bill, as recommended unanimously by the committee, is a sound step in the health field. Adequate school health services would supply an essential part of the mechanism which local communities need in developing their overall health programs aimed at prevention and reduction of the incidence of disease and handicapping conditions. At the same time, these needed services would give us assurance that, insofar as possible, no child will be denied an opportunity to advance his growth, his development, and his education because of physical or mental conditions that otherwise would go unnoticed and unattended.

Mr. President, the committee strongly urges the enactment of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD some brief explanatory data; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the answers made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. THOMAS of Utah] to two questions concerning his views as to the administration of Senate bill 1411.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL (S. 1411)

The purpose of the bill is to assist the States in developing health services for school children for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions of such children, with special reference to the correction of defects and conditions likely to interfere with the normal growth, development, and educational progress of children.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Section 3 authorizes, for the purposes of the bill, an annual appropriation of $35,000,000, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary to pay the costs of administering the act, including studies and demonstrations to develop more effective methods for carrying out the provisions of this act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Section 4 indicates the method by which Federal funds are allotted to the States. The formula is objective and has been used successfully in the Hill-Burton Act making allotments for hospital construction. The allotment to each State is proportional to the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, in the State and also to the State's allotment percentage squared. The State's allotment percentage (defined in sec. 5) is computed on a basis which recognizes the relative financial need of the State. Accordingly, the allotment procedure is one that makes funds available to the States in accordance with their relative financial need and the relative size of their respective child populations. Each State receives an allotment percentage (defined in sec. 5) based on the relation of its per capita income to the per capita income of the United States, but in no case less than 33⅓ percent for the wealthiest States or more than 75 percent for the poorest States. The allotment to each State is that sum bearing the same ratio to the total sum appropriated as the product of (1) the number of children in the State between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, and (2) the square of its allotment percentage bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the State.

Subsection (b) provides for the certification by the Federal Security Administrator and payments in quarterly installments through the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts due each State. Payments are made to the treasurer or corresponding official of the State. It is intended that such State official pay out such funds on requisition of the State agency or agencies designated by the State to administer the program provided by this bill.

Subsection (c) provides that if, in any State, the treasurer or corresponding official of such State is not permitted by law to disburse any of the funds authorized under this bill for providing such health services to children attending nonpublic schools, the Federal Security Administrator shall withhold from the allotment to such State an amount which bears the same ratio to such allotment as the number of children in average daily attendance at nonpublic schools within such State bears to the total number of children in average daily attendance in all schools within such State. The Federal Security Administrator shall, with the funds withheld, make provision for such services to children attending nonpublic schools within such State, subject to the same conditions and requirements with respect to the disbursement of funds for such purposes for children attending public schools within the State.

With respect to this subsection, the committee has found no evidence that there exists in any State a situation wherein all State agencies are prohibited from dealing with health matters affecting children, regardless of whether they attend public or nonpublic schools. The committee is confident that in most States either the health agency or the education agency or both, whichever is designated by the State in accordance with the provisions of this bill, will administer the program or disburse the funds appropriated for all children regardless of whether they attend public or nonpublic schools. It may develop, however, that the barriers to such disbursement do exist in a few States. To guard against this possibility the withholding provision, which is similar to that used for the administration of the school-lunch program, has been included. It is clearly the intent of this bill to develop the school health services therein provided for all school children in both public and nonpublic schools.

Section 5 defines the State allotment percentage used in the allotment formula. The allotment percentage for any State is 100 percent less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of that State bears to the per capita income of the United States. The minimum allotment percentage is 33⅓ percent and the maximum is 75 percent. Within this range the allotment percentages vary among the States—above and below 50 percent. For the Territories and other outlying jurisdictions, the allotment percentage is 50 percent for Hawaii and 75 percent for Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and Guam.

Subsection (b) provides that the Federal Security Administrator shall determine the allotment percentages biennially. Per capita incomes used in the computations are to be derived from data compiled by the Department of Commerce and are to represent the average of the per capita incomes of the States, and the continental United States, for the three most recent consecutive years for which data are available prior to each promulgation of the allotment percentages.

Subsection (c) requires that the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, as used in the allotment formula, be determined on the basis of the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce.

STATE ACCEPTANCE PROVISIONS

Section 6 provides that a State, if it desires to qualify for receiving funds appropriated pursuant to the provisions of this bill, shall, through its legislature, accept the provisions of the act and shall submit a plan governing administration of the act. Until the legislature meets the governor may act in lieu of the legislature. In case the governor acts in lieu of the legislature, it is intended that the legislature shall comply with respect to accepting the provisions of this act prior to the adjournment of the first regular session of such legislature following such action by the governor.

The State plan must be prepared jointly by the State education agency and the State health agency and submitted through the governor to the Federal Security Administrator. Each State plan must:

1. Provide a school health program which shall provide for medical and dental examinations at periodic intervals for all school children in the State, insofar as practicable at the schools which they attend, including nonpublic as well as public schools, and for treatment of such children for physical and mental defects and conditions shown by such examinations whenever the parents of such children are unable to provide for such treatment. It is intended that every school child receive periodic medical and dental health examinations, on an equitable basis, without regard to race, creed, color, or nationality, or the location or character of the school in which such examinations are given. It is intended that such examinations be given in the schools the children attend insofar as possible. It is recognized, however, that in sparsely settled areas and in other areas where specialized clinical facilities are now being used for examinations in existing school health programs, it may be practicable to continue existing procedures or to adopt procedures designed to meet the local situation. At the option of the State, the State plan may provide for the prevention and treatment of physical and mental defects for all school children. The committee understands that certain preventive and treatment services are given all school children under some of the existing school health programs and it is not intended through this act to reduce and restrict programs that have developed through local experience;

2. Provide the method by which the plan shall be administered and must specify either the State health agency or the State education agency, or both, as the administering body, and indicate the division of powers and responsibilities between such agencies if there is more than one. This provision takes into account the administrative arrangements which now exist in the various States and will permit continuation of such arrangements if the State so elects and such arrangements comply with the provisions of this act;

3. Provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official in the State shall receive the funds paid to the State under this act and shall report annually to the Federal Security Administrator as to the receipt and disbursement of such funds;

4. Provide for an annual audit of the expenditure of funds received under this act;

5. Provide for the expenditure of State and local funds to match Federal money. Such matching expenditure shall not be less than the State percentage of the total sum to be spent in the State for the health services provided in this act nor less than the total of such funds actually spent for such purposes in the fiscal year ended in 1949, whichever is greater. The State percentage is defined in section 9 (g) as that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of the State bears to the per capita income of the United States. But in no case is it more than 50 percent or less than 25 percent. The State percentage for Hawaii is 50 percent and for the other outlying jurisdictions, 25 percent. In short, the wealthiest States generally will have to provide State and local funds equal to Federal money received, while the States with lowest per capita incomes will have to provide a sum equal to one-third of the Federal funds, and other States must provide varying amounts between these limits. The aggregate amount of State participation required fully to take up the $35,000,000 authorized by this act is approximately $25,000,000. This total is less than the Federal amount primarily because of the limitation of the 50-percent maximum on State matching percentages. If such percentages were not so limited, still larger contributions would be required of States having high per capita incomes. States containing school-health programs for which expenditures in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, exceeded the amounts required from State and local funds under the matching formula of this act are required to contribute not less than the sums spent in fiscal year 1949. The intent of this provision is to prevent a substitution of Federal funds for those expenditures customarily being made from State and local sources for the services provided in this act. It is intended that the funds provided under this act be used for the initiation of new programs and services and the extension and improvement of existing programs;

6. Provide that the administering State agency or agencies will make such reports as required by the Federal Security Administrator in conjunction with the administration of this act;

7. Provide for the designation of a State advisory committee to advise the administering agency or agencies concerning operation of the plan;

8. Provide that the school health services developed in accordance with this act shall utilize the qualified health, medical, dental, hospital, and other related facilities already established in the State. It is expected that plans for the provision of treatment services under this act will be developed by the State health authorities in cooperation with medical, dental, nursing, public health, educational, and other professional and lay groups concerned in each State. With regard to the actual treatment of defects and conditions shown by the health examinations, it is intended that appropriate referral procedures be developed, utilizing the existing qualified facilities and services, with due regard to the utilization of the services of family physicians and dentists, in a practicable manner designed to accomplish the purposes of this act;

9. Provide for cooperation with medical, dental, health, and other organizations concerned, and, where necessary, for working agreements with State or local public agencies having authority for the care of children or for other necessary health services; and

10. Provide that the State shall set standards for services and programs under this act. It is required that the same good quality of health services be made available to children without regard to race, color, creed or nationality. It is expected that all personnel rendering health services will be properly qualified and will be supervised by qualified members of their own profession.

Subsection (b) provides that the Federal Security Administrator shall approve any State plan which complies with the requirements for such plans as provided in subsection (a).

OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

Section 7 provides that the Federal Security Administrator shall, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, withhold certification of payments under this act to any State in which he finds failure to comply substantially with any provision governing State plans as required by this act. This section also provides that State plans under this act must be in full operation not later than October 1, 1952.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

Section 8 gives the States the right to appeal the Federal Security Administrator's action with respect to the approval of State plans or the withholding of certification of payments. Such appeal is to the United States court of appeals and the judgment of the court is subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States.

DEFINITIONS

Section 9 contains certain essential definitions of terms used in the act.

SEPARABILITY

Section 10 is a separability clause providing that provisions of the act held invalid to any State, person, or circumstance, does not affect the application of such provisions to other States or persons or the application of other provisions of the act.

APPROXIMATE ALLOTMENTS TO STATES AND STATE MATCHING REQUIREMENTS

The following table contains a State distribution of the $35,000,000, authorized to be appropriated in this bill, in accordance with the allotment formula provided therein. The table also indicates the amount of State and local funds required for matching purposes, assuming that each State fully utilizes its Federal allotment. The table shows the allotment percentages, and per capita income data for the 3-year period 1944–46, based upon the latest available computations.

States ranked by per capita income 1944–46	Per capita income 1944–46	Allotment percentage	State allotment of Federal funds		State contribution necessary to take up allotment
			Percent	Amount	
United States	$1,174	50.0	100.0	$35,000,000	$24,637,523
New York	1,576	33.3	3.1	1,069,942	1,069,942
California	1,530	34.8	2.4	838,627	838,627
Nevada	1,530	34.8	(1)	12,428	12,428
New Jersey	1,477	37.1	1.2	425,237	425,237
Connecticut	1,469	37.4	.5	186,595	186,595
Delaware	1,463	37.7	.1	32,591	32,591
Washington	1,429	39.1	.8	276,443	276,443
Illinois	1,423	39.4	2.6	920,247	920,247
District of Columbia	1,416	39.7	.2	75,011	75,011
Rhode Island	1,342	42.8	.3	96,452	96,452
Massachusetts	1,336	43.1	1.8	615,347	615,347
Ohio	1,312	44.1	3.3	1,147,867	1,147,867
Maryland	1,304	44.5	.9	329,815	329,815
Montana	1,263	46.2	.3	100,247	100,247
Michigan	1,246	46.9	3.2	1,113,801	1,113,801
Oregon	1,225	47.8	.8	262,135	262,135
Pennsylvania	1,219	48.1	5.4	1,881,426	1,881,426
Wisconsin	1,158	50.7	2.0	690,722	671,663
Indiana	1,150	51.0	2.3	803,866	772,338
Wyoming	1,150	51.0	.2	60,947	58,555
Colorado	1,141	51.4	.7	264,609	250,193
Idaho	1,123	52.2	.4	137,413	125,810
South Dakota	1,122	52.2	.4	157,200	143,926
North Dakota	1,118	52.4	.4	160,046	145,370
Nebraska	1,102	53.1	.8	297,467	262,734
Kansas	1,079	54.0	1.3	443,731	377,982
Missouri	1,070	54.4	2.6	906,796	760,106
Utah	1,063	54.7	.6	194,557	161,132
Maine	1,059	54.9	.7	229,920	188,879
Iowa	1,036	55.9	1.9	662,007	522,276
Florida	1,024	56.4	1.7	607,907	469,921
Vermont	1,019	56.6	.3	100,877	77,339
Minnesota	1,003	57.3	2.2	774,169	576,920
Arizona	993	57.7	.6	208,605	152,915
New Hampshire	975	58.5	.4	139,604	99,019
Texas	959	59.2	6.5	2,273,174	1,566,638
Virginia	956	59.3	2.8	963,120	661,009
West Virginia	861	63.3	2.3	800,608	464,182
New Mexico	854	63.6	.7	253,082	144,836
Oklahoma	853	63.7	2.5	879,508	501,194
Tennessee	835	64.4	.6	1,254,581	693,524
Louisiana	810	65.5	3.0	1,064,571	560,729
Georgia	796	66.1	4.1	1,427,058	731,867
North Carolina	755	67.8	5.1	1,801,484	855,588
Kentucky	739	68.5	3.8	1,334,426	613,652
Alabama	729	68.9	4.2	1,451,324	655,090
South Carolina	690	70.6	3.1	1,096,919	456,788
Arkansas	653	72.2	3.0	1,052,826	405,380
Mississippi	557	75.0	3.8	1,324,281	441,425
Alaska	------	75.0	.1	45,508	15,175
American Samoa	------	75.0	(1)	10,322	3,450
Canal Zone	------	75.0	.1	21,501	7,175
Guam	------	75.0	(1)	16,894	5,625
Hawaii	------	50.0	.4	127,309	127,309
Puerto Rico	------	75.0	4.5	1,560,922	520,300
Virgin Islands	------	75.0	(1)	15,928	5,300

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.

Source: Federal Security Agency.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Question: What is there in this bill which would permit the Federal Government to raise a question with a State as to whether there is a proper and efficient operation of the funds and to take steps to assure it? Other grant-in-aid legislation has a specific requirement for proper and efficient operation, and this has been used constructively in many instances as a base for working with the States on the most effective methods of giving the services. In a few situations where there has been really inefficient operation, it has been possible with this requirement to insist that the States take steps to eliminate uneconomical and sometimes wasteful practices. This does not happen very often, but when it does there ought to be something the Federal Government can do about it, as a protection to the children of the United States.

Answer: In my opinion the Federal Security Administrator certainly ought to be able to raise questions with the States about proper and efficient operation, and I think this can be done under the terms of this act. A State must submit a plan of operation, and this plan will be evaluated to see if it is set up so that satisfactory services will actually get to children. If the plan doesn't look as if it could be reasonably expected that this will happen, it certainly ought not to be approved until the proposed methods are acceptable. The State is required to set standards for the services to be given, and if they are so low that there is no assurance that a good quality of service will be given, that ought to be taken up with the State. The State is required to make reports, so it will be possible for the Federal agency to know what is being done in the State. And finally, if the State does not carry out its own plan, it is possible to have a hearing, and even withhold funds. It is not the intention of this act that the Federal Government shall dictate to the States, but at the same time the school children of this country need good quality of services, and it is not our intention that the act shall be so loosely drawn that it isn't possible to take the steps needed to hold the State responsible for what is done with the money.

Question: Why is the Federal Security Administrator named in the bill rather than the unit of the Federal Security Agency which will be responsible for administering the funds?

Answer: These programs are, of course, most closely related to the maternal and child-health programs and the crippled children's services, and the act directs that they be coordinated with those programs. The Children's Bureau is now administering these programs and would certainly have to be given the primary responsibility for administration of these funds, but there are also other program relationships that have to be worked out. The Office of Education needs to be involved to make sure that the health services fit into the health-instruction programs of the schools. The communicable disease division of the Public Health Service might be involved too, and there would have to be coordination with the dental programs and the mental-health programs which are now being administered by the Public Health Service. By naming the Federal Security Administrator, he can set up the coordinating machinery that is needed to get these three units of the Agency together in the administration of the funds.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to inquire whether there is any provision of the bill which would prevent optometrists conducting investigations for visual defects of children in the schools?

Mr. HILL. Not at all. On the contrary, the Senator will note that the bill, in section 6, on page 8 in subparagraph 8, expressly provides—

That the school health services developed in accordance with the purposes of this act shall utilize and develop the qualified health.

I emphasize the word "qualified," and the word "health" is really very broad and encompassing—

qualified health, medical, dental, hospital, and other related facilities already established in the State.

I may say in that connection the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will offer an amendment on page 8, in line 17, after the word "facilities," to in-

sert the words "and personnel," and insofar as lies within my power to do so, I shall accept that amendment. I think it is a good amendment. We want to make use of all the personnel and all the facilities available for the program.

Mr. MURRAY. I think that should be done. I was going to say, in view of the shortage of doctors it would seem to me perfectly proper to take advantage of the profession of optometry. Optometrists are licensed and qualified for the purpose of inspecting children with reference to their visual defects.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator that the programs, as the Senator well knows, are left to the States. But, so far as the Federal act is concerned, we give every encouragement to making use of every possible facility and all possible personnel.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Alabama has suggested that I intend to offer an amendment on page 8, in line 17 of the bill, after the word "facilities", to add the words "and personnel". He has referred to the amendment. The Senator from Montana has also referred to it, and since the bill is open to amendment, I should like at this time to offer the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I had not yielded the floor, but if the Senator from Massachusetts has no question to ask, I shall be glad to yield to him, so that he may offer his amendment at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, in line 17, after the word "facilities" it is proposed to insert the words "and personnel."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator want the amendment to be adopted at once?

Mr. HILL. I am in no haste about adopting the amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to explain the amendment, if we are going to vote on it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose of the amendment is to permit the school health services to develop "qualified health, medical, dental, hospital, and other related facilities and personnel." In other words, it is to permit the school-health services to assist in developing doctors in the States. The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that personnel is included.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not know exactly what the purpose of the amendment is, but, as applied, it does not seem to me to make sense. Which section is it that is proposed to be amended.

Mr. HILL. It is subsection (8), page 8, line 17, after the word "facilities."

Mr. TAFT. Note what it says—"develop the qualified health, medical, dental, hospital, and other related facilities and personnel already established in the State." How is it possible to develop personnel "already established"? What does the amendment mean?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to have the words inserted at any point the Senator from Ohio may indicate. The amendment was suggested to me by the American Pediatric Society, with the statement that the important thing to do in connection with the promotion of school health is to make it possible to develop doctors as well as facilities. The words "and other facilities" are not sufficiently clear. It is a catch-all expression. It is not sufficiently clear that under it personnel can be developed, also, in connection with school health.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think the bill is intended to increase the number of doctors. That is covered in an entirely different section and in various health bills. It presents a very considerable problem in itself. It seems to me the purpose of the bill is to train doctors. The section is primarily concerned with integrating existing services under the school health bill, and if the Senator means that it is desired to utilize existing personnel, very well. And if it is to give doctors now in practice some special training for this particular work, I think that is all right, too. If the Senator will withdraw the amendment, or rather, not press it for immediate consideration, I think perhaps we may work out a little more definitely what is intended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to withhold the amendment and not press for immediate action. I think we are all in accord. We are trying to improve health facilities. I may say very frankly the amendment was suggested to me this morning by the American Pediatric Society, in order to make certain that its personnel shall be included in subparagraph 8, as well as the facilities mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts withdraw his amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I shall not withdraw the amendment, but I do not press it at this time.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator, if he will, that he temporarily withdraw it, for the reason that we might complicate the parliamentary situation by having too many amendments pending at one time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator will yield, I shall be glad to withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts withdraws his amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, which I ask to have read and considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 16, after the word "children", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That no plan shall be disapproved because the State excepts from the application of the program children whose parents are unwilling, on account of their religious beliefs, to have them included in such a program."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the interest of clarification, I have several questions I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama, if he will be willing to attempt to answer them for me.

Mr. HILL. I shall be delighted to answer them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say that last year I introduced a bill similar to the one now pending. I am heartily in favor of the bill which is now under consideration. The questions I wish to ask are simply for the purpose of clarification. First, I should like to ask the Senator, assuming a State does not take up all the money to which it would be entitled under the formula set forth, what happens to the funds, let us say, which might be allotted to Massachusetts or Alabama, if the State does not take them all at once ?

Mr. HILL. They would not be used, but would remain in the Treasury of the United States. A State can get all the funds to which it is entitled or any portion thereof which it is prepared to use and to match. But if a State does not match any of the funds available to it, those funds simply remain in the Treasury and are not used.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They would not in that case go to another State. Is that correct ?

Mr. HILL. They would not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My next question is one which I think was perhaps clarified by the amendment which the Senator has just offered. The examinations which are to be given, of course, and all the other work which is to be done, as contemplated by the bill are purely voluntary, there is nothing compulsory about it. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. It is purely voluntary. There is no compulsion whatever, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The third question is this: When a similar bill was introduced last year there was some doubt whether State departments of health or departments of education would be admitted to the benefits of the legislation. As I remember, it is left entirely to the States and is not restricted in any way. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The Federal Government does not attempt

to dictate to the States what agencies they shall use. It is left to the States to make their own choice and decision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And this aid is to go to every boy and girl in the States, regardless of whether he or she is attending a public, private, or any other type of school.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I will say it follows the pattern of the school-lunch program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is on the theory of need rather than on any other theory, is it not?

Mr. HILL. It is on the theory of need, and the number of children. Those two factors are involved—need and the number of children.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Alabama does not object, I should like to offer another amendment with which the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was in accord yesterday. The amendment is printed and is lying on the desk.

Mr. HILL. It has to do with the declaration of policy, has it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It is on page 2, line 11, after the word "community," to insert the following: "and, if no State law forbids, with special reference to utilizing the services of the family physician."

In other words, the purpose is to make it possible, in the first instance, if it is so desired and no State law forbids, to acquaint the family physician with the needs of the children and to get his assistance.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts discussed his amendment with the Senator from Utah, and it was acceptable to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was. He suggested adding the words "if no State law forbids."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator offer his amendment at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, after the word "community" it is proposed to insert the following: "and, if no State law forbids, with special reference to utilizing the services of the family physician."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Alabama and the committee for bringing forth this bill. Its purpose, as I understand, is to try to make it possible to find out and recognize the defects of our children when they are in school and to afford opportunity to cure the defect so that they may become healthier and, therefore, more useful citizens, to their own benefit and the advantage of our country. I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts. It is the bill which he introduced during the Eightieth Congress, on which the committee held rather extensive hearings. It not only challenged the attention of the committee and the Congress, but it challenged the interest of the country. He rendered a very distinct service by introducing it. The pending measure is a bill substantially in accord with the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts in the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to offer the amendment which I suggested a little while ago. I do not want to encumber the bill with amendments or to injure the chance of its passing, and I shall not offer the amendment if the Senator from Ohio objects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that if he would have his amendment say "including personnel already established," it would be better.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with the approval of the Senator from Alabama, I shall be glad to so modify my amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I approve the amendment as modified, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I offer the amendment in that form, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment, as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 17, after the word "facilities," it is proposed to insert "including personnel."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if there is an amendment dealing with Christian Science?

Mr. HILL. It has already been adopted, I will say to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I assisted in preparing this bill, and I think it is, in every essential feature, comparable to every economic feature of the health program. So far as I know this provision is included in the very general bill which has been introduced providing Federal aid for health. I think everyone agrees that the inspection of the health of school children at periodic intervals, probably once a year, is one of the most essential and desirable preventives of the development of more serious disease. It is based on the experience of the selective service statistics showing that many boys examined at the ages of from 17 to 22 had defects. The question is, How far those defects might have been remedied if they had been discovered earlier. It is a question of degree. I think the larger figures which are presented, indicating that 30 or 40 percent of those examined had defects which might be cured, are an exaggeration. Nevertheless, there were a great many boys examined and rejected for the Army who, if they had had this sort of an examination, would in all probability have been able to eliminate the defects found.

The bill leaves entirely to the States the actual carrying out of the program. In other words, it is a State-aid bill. Its administration is to be entirely by the States. One difficulty arises by reason of the fact that the various States treat the question in different ways. This particular inspection service for children is fairly general throughout the country. It is not, however, by any means universal. In some States it is not done at all. In other States it is done in part. Some States do it through their departments of education. Some States do it through the State department of health or the local departments of health. In some States the work is divided between them, and they cooperate.

It was urged upon us that it would be more logical to treat it entirely as a health matter and turn it over to the health departments to administer. I would have preferred that myself, but it would force a great many States to change their system. In general, we have felt we should leave to the States the matter of working out their own administration of the program. So we have provided that the actual job shall be carried out according to the laws and plans of each particular State. Both the State department of education and the State department of health must join in submitting a plan and must show the method by which the plan is to be administered. It may be that there will be difficulty in some States in having the plan agreed upon. There may be a battle between the two departments, but certainly the governor and the legislature of each State should be able to knock their heads together in some way and work out a plan by which the State can compose the differences, arrive at an acceptable plan for universal service, and receive Federal money to carry it out.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the Senator a question along the line of his discussion. In States which already have State boards of public health, cooperating constantly with the Public Health Service, and where other programs of health in the States are exercised through the Public Health Service, why is the Federal Security Administrator made the administrator of the act?

Mr. TAFT. I will say that the Federal Security Administrator is the superior officer of the Public Health Service, and, presumably, he would have the Public Health Service do this work.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Public Health Service is directly under the Administrator of the Federal Security Administration.

There are also two or three other agencies in the Federal Security Administration, such as the Children's Bureau. Under our social-security law the Children's Bureau has certain functions with reference to crippled children, infant and

maternal care, and that sort of thing. The Bureau of Education, which is a part of the Federal Security Administration, might be called in at some time in connection with the program, if only in an advisory way. It was felt best to place in charge a man who is at the top and who is really in command not only of the Public Health Service but of the allied agencies as well.

Mr. HUNT. Then, as I understand the Senator from Ohio, there will be no material change from the present method of handling the health programs in the States.

Mr. TAFT. No. If the State desires to have the State health agency administer the plan, as presumably is done in Wyoming, there will be no difference, so far as I know, in the distribution of State aid for the program we are discussing, and in the distribution of State aid for some existing health program now provided for in the statutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio has well said, there would be no difference. The question of what agency a particular State shall use is left to the State. If the State of Wyoming today is using its public-health agency, and wishes to continue to use that agency to administer the funds, the State of Wyoming will absolutely have that right under the bill.

Mr. HUNT. I ask the Senator from Ohio if he will explain to me a little more in detail section 5, on page 4, relating to the formula for arriving at the distribution of the funds.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator asks me to do something which would take a little time to work out. The formula is the same formula as that used in the so-called hospital construction law. I shall not attempt to explain it exactly.

Mr. HUNT. If it is the same as the Hospital Construction Act, I am familiar with that.

Mr. TAFT. It is the same as the Hospital Construction Act, but when we come to the question of matching, the State is required, under the Hospital Construction Act, to pay 33⅓ percent of the total. That is found rather burdensome in particular States, and a bill has been introduced changing the Hospital Construction Act so that the matching provisions are made correct. So far as the allotment of money to the States is concerned, it is the same as under the Hospital Construction Act.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to say that I am heartily in accord with the bill, and very much in accord with the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I am pleased to see that there is nothing of a compulsory nature in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I might refer to one further matter in which I have been interested. In general, the bill requires that any plan submitted shall reach all children in school. It is confined to children in school, because it is believed to be economical to restrict the inspection in that way. If we tried to look after children from the time they were born until they became of age, and look out for them in their homes, it would be exceedingly expensive. The plan proposed is comparatively simple. A complete inspection can be given once a year at a very reasonable expense, because it is conducted by one man examining a great many children in a single day. I think, therefore, it should be definitely tied to the school program.

In the second place, the condition of Federal aid is that it be extended to all schools, private schools, parochial schools, wherever children are in school, so that there is no distinction whatever, and the coverage is complete. In many States the difficulty up to date has been that the inspection is not complete. The States have not had the money to conduct the inspections, or where there are comparative demands for State money, those conducting the inspections are left behind.

I have here a letter from the director of education of the State of Ohio which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OHIO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Columbus, March 4, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: This is in reply to your telegram requesting me to "write you fully with regard to the inspection of the health of school children in Ohio, and medical care both in the public schools and nonpublic schools."

We interpret this telegram to mean the physical inspection and examination of school children in Ohio, and hereby submit such a report.

There are three main sections of the General Code of Ohio under which this program operates: Section 4838-6 permits the Board of Education of each city, exempted village and local school district to appoint school physicians, dentists, and nurses to conduct physical examinations and diagnoses of school children; section 4838-8 states more specifically what such examinations shall include, and gives recommendations for the follow-up program, and the keeping of records; section 4838-9 permits Boards of Education to enter into a contract with a health district for the purpose of providing the services as provided by law of a school physician, dentist, or nurse.

These aforementioned sections of the General Code are permissible, not mandatory. Section 4838-10 states that where boards of education do not employ a school physician, the board of health shall conduct the examination of all school children in the health district. For your information and reference, I am enclosing a copy of the sections of Ohio law pertaining to this problem.

The State Department of Education and the Ohio Department of Health cooperate and coordinate the services of the two State departments in the development of activities and functional programs of health education. Local health departments are responsible for health services which require specialized personnel such as physicians, dentists, nurses, sanitarians, and laboratory technicians. The educational aspect of a health service program is the responsibility of the local school districts. It is, therefore, essential to coordinate these activities to avoid overlapping and duplication of effort. Responsibility for making provision for the physical examination of school children rests with the local boards of education. These examinations follow one of three patterns of administration:

1. Examinations given by school physicians and other health personnel employed by the board of education.

2. Examinations given by the pupil's own family physician.

3. Examinations given in cooperation with the city or county health commissioner.

The plan adopted by a local board of education is dependent upon many factors, such as finances, personnel, facilities, educational philosophy of school administrators, and other prevailing circumstances.

The Ohio Department of Health reports the following statistics concerning the physical examination and inspection of school children for the year 1948:

Examinations by physicians	255,423
Examinations by physicians with parents present	17,250
Inspections by dentists	60,389

These figures represent only those communities where the school health services are rendered to local school districts by the county health authorities. Dr. J. D. Porterfield, director, Ohio Department of Health, estimates that about 80 percent of the schools of Ohio obtain their school health services from the board of health. This report does not include 44 cities in Ohio. There are 312,535 pupils in these 44 cities, which represents 26.84 percent of the total school population in Ohio. A large number, if not all, of these cities have some form of a health-service program, with physical examinations that range from a superficial inspection to a very detailed physical examination.

A recent survey of health programs in Ohio schools conducted by our division of health, physical education, recreation, and safety in the State department of education revealed that—

1. Thirty-five percent of the schools have no physical examination of any kind.

2. Twenty percent stated that the physical examination was far from satisfactory.

3. Thirty percent of the schools in this survey indicated that a physical examination was given once a year, but only to the boys participating in the interscholastic athletic program. Such a group represents a very small percentage of the total school population.

4. Two percent of the schools reported a physical examination once every 2 years.

5. Ten percent reported physical examinations once every 3 years.

6. Three percent reported physical examinations less frequently.

We are exceedingly sorry that the lack of finances, facilities, and personnel in our own department of education and the department of health makes it difficult for the two departments to carry on an adequate survey program which would enable us to have more detailed records and information on the health-service program in the State.

For your information, I am enclosing some material pertaining to the school health-service program. The suggested policies are significant because they represent a report of the joint committee on health problems in education of the National Education Association and the American Medical Association. The report indicates a sincere effort on the part of educational authorities and medical authorities to join forces in the solution of common problems important to the health and welfare of our youth.

If Federal aid becomes a part of the program of health inspection of school children, we feel that the aid should be channeled through the State department of education. The health of school children is a part of the entire educational program and should not be divorced from that program. Since the

departments of health are primarily concerned with the physical aspects of the program, they should coordinate their work with the departments of education so that all health services are educational.

I trust this is the desired information you requested and that it will be helpful to you in considering the problem of Federal aid in this program.

Very truly yours,

CLYDE HISSONG.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall read the important matter stated by the director of Ohio in the letter. I think Ohio is in about the same general condition which prevails in the wealthier States. The director says:

1. Thirty-five percent of the schools have no physical examination of any kind.
2. Twenty percent stated that the physical examination was far from satisfactory.
3. Thirty percent of the schools in this survey indicated that a physical examination was given once a year but only to the boys participating in the interscholastic athletic program. Such a group represents a very small percentage of the total school population.
4. Two percent of the schools reported a physical examination once every 2 years.
5. Ten percent reported physical examinations once every 3 years.
6. Three percent reported physical examinations less frequently.

So that in Ohio, roughly speaking, the examination is satisfactory in only about 35 percent of the schools, and in 45 percent of the schools, which I think are public schools only, there is no examination at all.

In my opinion, the program is necessary. I do not believe the States today have the funds with which to extend the service as it should be extended, and therefore I believe very strongly that there should be provided from the Federal Government the assistance afforded by the bill.

In addition to inspection, the bill provides that the plan shall provide for treatment of such children for physical and mental defects and conditions shown by such examinations whenever the parents of such children are unable to provide such treatment.

Mr. President, that is a compulsory part of the plan. They must provide for treatment of those children whose parents cannot pay for it.

Under subdivision (C) the plan "may provide for the prevention and treatment of such physical and mental defects and conditions for all school children," whether the parents of such children can pay for it or not. That is the practice in some States. It is the practice, for instance, in Pittsburgh, where I happened to have occasion to look into the matter a month or two ago.

We do not care in any way to interfere with such plans, although I do not believe that the Federal Government has any primary obligation to provide free medical care for those who can otherwise pay for it. However, the treatment would be related to the conditions found in the examinations, and in many cases where the children can be treated right at the schools, it seems to me to be very wise to have the treatment continued.

In the case of the most serious defects which are found, the children will be referred to other agencies which look after health. If a child has tuberculosis, he will be turned over to the health authorities dealing with tuberculosis, and that is not further covered by the program. Many other defects which may be found simply will be referred to other services. The actual expenses of the treatment, under the bill, will not be very great.

We provide for free dental services for children in the District of Columbia, if dental defects are found on the examination. It may be done generally, or under this provision it shall be done, for those whose parents are unable to pay for it. That is the rule in the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia, a child can receive dental care if the principal of the school certifies that his parents are unable to pay for such care. Of course, that is a rather loose provision, and probably is stretched a little beyond those who actually are unable to pay for the care. In general Mr. President, I think the bill conforms to the principles of State aid which we have heretofore adhered to on many occasions. I think the bill is necessary for a very essential service, and I hope very much that it will be passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the provision of the bill in detail, but I should like to say that I think it is one of the finest measures which the Senate will have the privilege—and I emphasize the word "privilege"—of acting upon at this session. I base this opinion not only upon my experience as head of a State Government for 4 years, during which I had the opportunity to observe conditions in the schools, but also upon my experience as a school director of my home town for a considerable period of time, and also upon my experience as a pupil in a one-room rural school in the early years of my life.

During the 15-year period when I was director of schools in my home town we were fortunate in having the advantages of a private fund which had been left for the purpose of conducting annual health inspections in our schools. It was an inadequate fund, but it was supplemented by contributions from the local doctors in the town. We joined with several other towns in the program—I think there were ten in all. Through the cooperation of the local doctors, the local dentists, the local optometrists and others we were able, in my State, to do what I think was a remarkable work of pioneering in health inspection in schools. At the present time I think more than half the State has such inspection.

The things which were found out by reason of an annual inspection of the health of school children were little short of amazing. We found that certain pupils who had reputations for being bad boys or girls, or of never passing their examinations, simply were not responsible for the condition they were in. Some pupils were found to be bad students because they could not see the print and the figures on the pages they were supposed to read. Their eyes were not good. Others would lie awake all night howling with a toothache. I have done that myself. I presume the present occupant of the chair perhaps has had the same experience in his early days in New England.

Cases of truancy were found to be due to physical defects of the school children, which had not been determined. Those children were simply set down as bad boys who ran away from school. They ran away from school because they could not stay in school by reason of the fact that they suffered from some remedial physical defects which were not discernible to the general public. The remedial physical defects with which the school children were afflicted they carried with them through life. They would cause them to quit school at an early age. They would make it more difficult for them to make a living after they left school.

Mr. President, we learned a great deal from the depression through which we passed in the early thirties. We found that the extent to which persons went on relief was almost exactly in proportion to the amount of education they had received in their earlier years.

When we spend the modest amount of Federal funds provided by the bill, and encourage the States to match those funds with their own money, to provide inspection services among our school children to determine whether they have physical defects which are curable, we are making an investment which will return to us enormous dividends in the form of a healthier and more prosperous nation.

I certainly hope that the bill will have the unanimous approval of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. I should like to inquire how much the States are spending at the present time in dealing with the question of the health of school children. Does the Senator have such figures?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that there are no Nation-wide figures on the subject. Some school districts are spending some money for the purpose, and some towns and cities and most of the States are spending some money for the purpose, but there are not available the over-all figures of the amounts spent by the school districts, by towns, cities, and States.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, there were no figures available on the subject?

Mr. HILL. That is true, I will say to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1411) was passed.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which Senate bill 1411 was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia that the vote by which Senate bill 1411 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 246, Calendar No. 138, known as the Federal-aid-to-education bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum-foundation-education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum-foundation-education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Ives	Murray
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chapman	Kem	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Donnell	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Ferguson	Long	Stennis
George	McClellan	Taft
Gillette	McFarland	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Thye
Gurney	McMahon	Vandenberg
Hayden	Magnuson	Watkins
Hendrickson	Malone	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Martin	Wiley
Hill	Maybank	Williams
Hoey	Millikin	Withers
Holland	Morse	Young
Humphrey	Mundt	

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Federal aid to education was approved by the Senate during the last Congress by a vote of 58 to 22. The bill passed by the Senate at that time by such a substantial majority was, with one or two very minor perfecting changes, exactly the same bill as the one now before the Senate. Unfortunately, the bill the Senate passed during the last Congress was killed in the House of Representatives.

As we again take up Federal aid to education, the Senate seems as determined as ever to pass the bill. The House is much more favorable toward the measure, and the President is strongly behind it.

I believe this Congress will—at long last—pass the education bill and give the States the Federal aid they need and must have to provide adequate education programs, to give our teachers the recognition and the salaries they so richly deserve, and to place a floor under educational opportunity for every American child.

As one of those who have worked through the years for Federal aid to education in season and out of season, and as one of the authors of the bill, I can tell you it is deeply gratifying to see the bill at last on the threshold of becoming law.

It has been no easy road—this struggle for Federal aid to education. When I first came to Congress many years ago, the chief interest in Federal aid was how to kill it. Its friends were few; its foes were many. Even among educators there was widespread opposition. In those days we had to educate many of the school people themselves to the need for Federal aid to education.

Today the cause of Federal aid to education, which began with so few friends, has won the overwhelming support of the entire Nation. Parents and teachers, workers and farmers, State officials and civic leaders now see the need and the fundamental justice of Federal aid for education.

Federal aid to education is long overdue. Three years ago one of the Nation's educational authorities in a survey for the New York Times declared that although the schools of America did not suffer a single air raid, neglect of education was wrecking the schools as surely as though they had been blasted by heavy bombers.

Since then the crisis in American education has grown worse, not better. A break-down is threatened at the very time the schools are called on to meet new and greater responsibilities.

An average of a million additional pupils each year are marching into already crowded classrooms. They will continue to enroll at this rate until the school population reaches a peak of 34,000,000 by 1958. Buildings and equipment are in poorer condition than they were in 1941, and at present there is little prospect of adequate funds for new construction.

The school teacher is the central figure in the education process. We entrust the minds and the characters of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher for many hours in the day. We look to the teacher to mold the child for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood. Inevitably the qualities and influence of the teacher are woven into the character of the entire Nation.

Yet we are guilty of shocking neglect of our teachers.

We have never given them the recognition, the appreciation and the financial rewards they deserve. In three-fourths of the States minimum teachers' salaries are still below $2,000 a year even for teachers with 4 years of college preparation. Janitors and charwomen in public buildings are paid more. There have been some pay increases. But the teachers are no better off financially than they were in 1941. The average salaries paid teachers today buy no more food and clothing and shelter—allow no more for additional study or recreation—than the average salary of $1,470 a year paid teachers in 1941.

The public school teacher is the Vanishing American.

The colleges report that the number of students preparing for the teaching profession is approximately 7 percent of total enrollment, compared to 22 percent in 1920. Eighty-four thousand teachers retire or drop out each year. Next September the schools will need 160,000 new teachers, but our colleges will graduate only 54,000 trained for teaching. We still have nearly 100,000 teachers with emergency certificates. It looks like a chronic emergency.

The public schools are normally staffed by about 850,000 teachers. During the war more than 350,000 teachers abandoned their chosen profession, and the turn-over is still 100,000 teachers a year. One class in an Arkansas school had five different teachers in a single year.

No good businessman would try to operate a business or industry with such starvation financing, such inadequate equipment, and such a turn-over of employees. He would soon wreck his business. A school system cannot go bankrupt. It can only reveal, years from now, that the children it professed to train are educationally bankrupt.

We can be gratefuly that so many teachers have stayed on the job. To them we pay tribute. But we cannot expect the teachers to stay on and on in the classroom simply out of their fine loyalty to their profession and to their country, and out of devotion to the children they teach.

In 1946 in an address to the Alabama Education Association at Birmingham, Ala., I demanded a bill of rights for the teacher.

I call again for a bill of rights for the teacher.

It must be a bill of rights guaranteeing a salary which will enable the teacher to enjoy a good standard of living, permit recreation and travel, continued study and educational growth, and insure security in old age.

This bill of rights must go further. It must recognize the essential worth and dignity of the teacher and assure him full opportunity to take part in the life of the community—free of petty restraints and interferences with his personal life.

Teaching has for a long time been called a profession. We must make it a profession in fact—appreciated and honored in the community, adequately

paid, and acclaimed for devoted public service.

We cannot leave upon the States alone the burden of correcting the plight of the schools. Many of the States already are making strenuous efforts to meet their educational needs. But the disparities in education—growing more instead of less—make imperative the need for Federal action.

Through the years the low-income States as a group have spent more of their available income on education and have made a greater effort to educate their children than the wealthier States.

But the low-income States simply do not have the taxable wealth, the sources of revenue from which to provide adequate education for all their children.

My own State of Alabama spends 2.40 percent of her income and ranks eighth among the 48 States in her efforts to educate her children. New York spends only 1.56 percent of her income for education and ranks forty-second in effort. Yet Alabama's effort yields only $87 for each school child, while New York, with less effort, spends $213 per child.

Not only do the Southern States have less income from which to finance adequate education programs; they have far more children to be educated.

My neighbor State of Georgia, for example, has 118 children for each 100 adult workers. New York has only 78 children for each 100 working adults. At the same time, the per capita income in Georgia is about half the per capita income for New York. This means that the working adults of Georgia must support and educate more dependents on far less income than the people of New York.

South Carolina and Mississippi have some 280 children per thousand population. California, Connecticut, and New Jersey have 170 children per thousand.

However we state the problem, the answer comes out the same: The low-income States have a bigger job to do and less money with which to do the job.

The bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with the votes both of Democrats and Republicans, recognizes these inequalities in State resources by giving the greatest assistance to the States most in need. Funds are allocated on the basis of per capita income and the number of children to be educated. The bill recognizes also that there are inequalities in educational opportunity within the States. Some school districts spend 60 times as much as other districts. The bill puts a floor under education programs by assuring that educational expenditures shall not be less than $55 per school child in daily attendance.

Education today is a national concern requiring national action. Each of the 48 States has a stake in seeing that educational levels are raised in the low-income States—in seeing that equal opportunity for a good education is provided every child in every State.

We know that education and earning power go hand in hand. The persons with the highest education earn the highest incomes. Good education means jobs, rising incomes, and greater purchasing power.

Mass production requires mass consumption. The economic strength of the whole country depends on the economic strength of each section of the country. If some States lag behind, they drag down the rest of the States.

In the South, still predominantly agricultural, we buy plows and tractors and automobiles made in Illinois or Michigan, we buy shoes made in New England, clothing made in New York or Pennsylvania, and manufactured goods of all kinds made outside the South.

The prosperity of the manufacturer and the businessman in Portland, or Chicago, or Detroit depends on the goods and products he and others like him can sell in Alabama, Mississippi, New Mexico, and all over the country. When education helps give the people of my State more purchasing power to buy more goods and commodities, it helps create jobs and pay rolls for the workers, profits for the businessman, and markets for the farmers of other States.

It is not only a matter of exchanging goods and commodities. Our States exchange their citizens as well. One out of every four Americans resides in a State other than the State of his birth. New Jersey has a concern for the education of a boy or girl down in Mississippi. If these future citizens are well educated, they take with them—from one State to another—their talents and their abilities. If they are poorly educated, they take with them the problems of health, crime, and economic insecurity that always go with illiteracy.

The strength and security of America against aggression is bound inexorably to education. In an age of total war, the backbone of military strength is the industrial and agricultural productivity of the home front. No better measure of the value of popular education and technical training can be found than the wartime production record of American industry, American workers, and American farmers—a production greater than the rest of the world combined.

In this age of scientific warfare, the soldier must be a skilled technician, a specialist trained to operate complicated weapons and machines—radar, jet planes, equipment for blind flying, atomic missiles, and the ever-changing weapons of tomorrow.

The experience of the last war demonstrated the wastefulness of poor education. Selective Service was forced to reject hundreds of thousands of men for educational deficiencies—almost as many as we deployed in combat divisions in the entire Pacific war. More than 2,000,000 additional men were rejected for deficiencies which for the most part could have been prevented through adequately supported public school programs.

We face the same waste of manpower in any future emergency if the education system is not geared to meet the steadily rising requirements of national security.

The first line of defense is in the scientific research laboratory. America's position of world leadership may well depend upon the latent Comptons, Ureys, and Einsteins of tomorrow whom our education must seek out and train.

Dr. James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard University, testifying last year on the need for discovering and developing the scientific talents of our children, declared:

> I feel quite sure from the facts available at present that we are not developing in many sections of the country all the latent talent that we should. * * * If you place the 48 States in order of the amount of money spent per child in attendance in the schools, and then take the first 12 States in that order, which spend on an average of $171, you find that there are 6 scientists per 1,000,000 of the population.
>
> If you take the lowest 12 States—
>
> Continued Dr. Conant—
>
> which spend about $70, you find there are only a fourth as many scientists (per million population).

In other words, the States which are able to afford their children good and adequate education produce for America, for America's security, for America's future welfare, strength, and happiness, four times as many scientists as do the low-income States which cannot provide such education for their children.

War, economic depression, ignorance—these recognize no State lines. But we still hear arguments against Federal aid to education. They are the threadbare old arguments that have always been used against progress. They have a hollow sound in the vastness of the atomic world. We must remember that in the early days there was opposition to the whole idea of public education. Some called it radical and dangerous.

We hear today that America cannot afford Federal aid to the schools.

That is gagging at the gnat after we have swallowed the camel. That is saying we cannot afford to spend $300,000,000—less than 1 percent of a budget of some $40,000,000,000—to keep clear and flowing the very wellspring of our democracy, the public-school system. The blunt fact is that we cannot afford not to give Federal aid to education.

We are told that Federal aid to education will replace State effort.

This bill requires that the State expend a minimum percentage of their income for education and at least continue education expenditures at the rate current when Federal aid becomes effective. The bill provides incentives for State effort and denies Federal aid if the States slacken their efforts for education.

And finally we are confronted with that old bugaboo—Federal control. We are told that Federal aid to the schools means Federal control of the schools. There is no such danger under the bill. In its express language in section 2 the bill specifically, directly, absolutely prohibits and inhibits any Federal control.

The truth is, Mr. President, that we have Federal aid to education at this moment, and have had it for years in our land-grant colleges. That great college, the Iowa State College of Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts, at Ames, Iowa, one of the most famous institutions in all the world, came into being by virtue of an act of Congress, by virtue of the Morrill Act, the Land Grant Act. Perhaps no center in all the world has contributed so much to agriculture, and to the progress and welfare and happiness of farmers, as has that great institution.

I may say to the Senate that when the land-grant act passed the first time. President Buchanan was President of the United States, and he proceeded to veto it, and in his veto message he set fourth just about the same arguments we hear today against Federal aid to education. Abraham Lincoln became President of the United States, Congress passed the act again, and Abraham Lincoln, signed the bill, it became the law, and out of that act came all our great land-grant colleges in the different States of the Union.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. The learned Senator from Alabama has made a very convincing argument with reference to the national responsibility for the education of the youth of the Nation. He just referred to the concern which many people express as to the possibility of Federal control following Federal participation.

I was interested in the eminent Senator's statement that the bill as drafted and reported makes us absolutely secure from any possibility of Federal control and direction of our local school systems. I should like to have the Senator give that assurance again, and explicitly.

Mr. HILL. I do give it. The bill makes it just as certain and sure as the language of a law can make anything sure or certain.

While I speak of that, let me say that those who refer to Federal control, in my opinion, do not accord full justice to the intelligence of the people of the several States, to their love of their local institutions, and their jealous regard for their right to continue to control and administer their local institutions. The people are the sovereigns in this country, and the Senator well knows that when Congress acts, it acts only as a servant of the people of the United States. Of course, whether we pass the pending bill or do not pass it, if the people in their sovereignty see fit to have the Federal Government operate the school systems they have a right to do that, but that is not the history of our country.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has just anticipated my question, and answered it very clearly. Of course, it is true that neither the committee nor the Senate can change the Constitution, or bind future Congresses. But an attempt has been made to make it as clear as the present language can make it that the local school system is secure.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right. Section 2, on page 2 of the bill, was carefully considered many times by the committee, and it was considered most thoroughly and carefully by the Senate when the bill was under consideration in the last Congress. It is as airtight, it is as 100 percent a job, as can be done in an act of Congress, I will say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Iowa.

Not only did the Federal Government, through the Land Grant Act, bring into being the great land-grant colleges, not only has the Federal Government year after year provided Federal aid for those colleges, and made possible so many of the great programs and so much of the fine work carried on by those colleges, but as Senators of course recall, for a good many years, some 35 years, the Federal Government has provided Federal aid for vocational schools, for vocational courses in the high schools throughout the United States, and there is Federal aid in the GI educational programs, and many State educational enterprises. From its earliest days the American Republic has aided and encouraged education. Senators will recall that the form of Federal aid in early days was land grants. Take the great State of Ohio, for instance. It received many thousands of acres of land for aid to education. As we know, practically all the States received great land grants from the Federal Government.

But, in addition to all the land grants, Congress has passed more than 150 laws giving aid to schools and colleges. We find no evidence that this aid has meant Federal control of the school systems, and I can say that we find no evidence that this aid has even meant any attempt at Federal control of the school systems.

As I have said, the bill is supported by both Democrats and Republicans. Senators will no doubt be impressed, if they will examine the title of the bill, to see how many Democrats and Republicans joined in introducing it. As I have said, it comes with a unanimous report from the committee, with the favorable support of all the Democrats and all the Republicans on the committee.

The committee is satisfied that the bill in its express language provides the most thorough safeguards against Federal interference. Under the bill, control and administration of the State school systems remain where they have always been, in the hands of the States and the people of the local communities. The bill does not experiment with any new system in the field of education. It does strengthen, through Federal aid, the traditional State systems of American education.

Senators know, of course, that Federal aid to the States has taken many forms in our history without Federal control—aid for health, housing, roads, and waterways, assistance to the unemployed, the aged, crippled and blind. The United States Public Health Service has worked for years with the State and local health departments without interference in the authority of the States.

As coauthor of the Hospital and Health Center Construction Act, I have been in close touch with the program under which the States and their communities are engaged in the building of hundreds of hospitals, health centers, and other medical facilities, with the assistance of the Federal Government. I have yet to hear any claim that the authority of the States is being violated or that there is any Federal control under this program.

The supreme task of our time is the building of the peace of the world. Step by step, stone upon stone, we have gone about the building of the peace—through the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact. But we know that final and lasting peace will not be built alone of pacts and treaties and economic agreements.

There are limits to material resources and economic strength. There are even limits to the power of atomic might. The final battle for peace must be won in the minds and the hearts of men—through knowledge and understanding and reasoning together.

Education is no guarantee of peace. But education is the bedrock upon which men can build the foundations of peaceful living upon this earth. Educated people can have jobs and security and happiness. Educated people can sift truth from false counsel and alien doctrines. Educated people can, to use the language of Thomas Jefferson, "understand what is going on in the world and keep their part of it going right."

Through education the people can have wisdom. For the minds of men grow to the end of time and the wisdom of men is an oak—its roots in the eternal past and its branches in infinity.

Let us nourish the wisdom of America at its roots. Let us pass this bill to give the schools of America the aid they must have. The cost is so small, the rewards so great. We cannot, in good conscience, longer delay.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Neely
Baldwin	Holland	O'Conor
Brewster	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McFarland	Thye
George	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gillette	McMahon	Watkins
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers
Hendrickson	Miller	Young
Hickenlooper	Millikin	
Hill	Mundt	

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts desires to discuss his amendments. That being the case, perhaps he would like to offer them. I wonder if the Senator would let us first dispose of the committee amendments, which are merely perfecting amendments. The committee amendments only bring the bill passed in the Senate in the last Congress up to date, and carry out the intent and purpose of the Senate as registered during the last Congress. They are simply perfecting in nature.

Mr. LODGE. That is agreeable to me. I think it would be in the interest of orderly procedure to dispose of the committee amendments first, and then let me offer my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was, in section 4, on page 3, line 12, after "Sec. 4" to strike out "Ninety-eight" and insert "Ninety-seven"; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$45" and insert "$50"; on page 4, line 15, after the word "State" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "or" and insert "and"; in line 22, after the words "less than" to insert "2.25 for the first 2 years, thereafter"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "or" and insert "and"; in line 8, after the word "year" to insert "next preceding the year"; in line 16, after the numerals "2.0", to strike out "such State shall be ineligible to receive any part of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this act for such fiscal year, unless the estimated current expenditures under clause (a) of this paragraph is an amount equal to or greater than $120 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance for such fiscal year as determined on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose. Any State thus determined to be ineligible shall remain ineligible until such time as revised estimates, determined as provided under this paragraph produce a percentage ratio equal to or greater than 2.0, or an amount equal to or greater than $120 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance" and insert "the Federal allotment for such fiscal year shall be $5 multiplied by the number of children in such State from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, as determined under paragraph A"; on page 6, line 7, after the word "event" to strike out "98" and insert "97"; in line 14, after the word "as", to strike out "98" and insert "97"; and in line 16, after the word "From", to strike out "2" and insert "3", so as to make the section read:

APPORTIONMENT

SEC. 4. Ninety-seven percent of the funds appropriated under section 3 of this act for each fiscal year shall be distributed among the States, excluding those enumerated in paragraph (G) of this section, in the following manner:

(A) Multiply (a) the number of children from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, in each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third calendar year next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made by (b) $50.

(B) Multiply (a) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh calendar years next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made by (b) 1 percent.

(C) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, the amount of the Federal allotment for any State shall be (a) the amount, if any, by which the amount calculated under paragraph (A) exceeds the amount calculated under paragraph (B) with respect to such State, or (b) $5 multiplied by the number of children in such State from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, as determined under paragraph (A), whichever is greater.

(D) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) the amount spent in each State from revenues derived from State and local sources for current expenditures for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the third fiscal year next preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined under paragraph (B) of this section. When the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.25 for the first 2 years, thereafter 2.5, the amount of the Federal allotment to such State, as computed under paragraph (C), shall be proportionately reduced; except that in no case shall the amount of the Federal allotment for any State be less than $5 multiplied by the number of children in such State from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, as determined under paragraph (A).

(E) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) current expenditures in each State from revenues derived from State and local sources for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the year next preceding the year for which the computation is made, as estimated on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the three most recent calendar years for which annual income data are available. When for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1953, the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.0, the Federal allotment for such fiscal year shall be $5 multiplied by the number of children in such State from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, as determined under paragraph A.

(F) In the event 97 percent of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this act is insufficient to pay to all eligible States the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State, computed in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount to be paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State as 97 percent of such appropriation bears to the sum of the Federal allotments to all eligible States.

(G) From 3 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this act, such sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner to Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam according to their respective needs for additional funds for public elementary and public secondary schools upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective State educational authorities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 7, in line 4, after the word "State" to strike out "that has" and insert "which is"; and in line 16, after the word "authority" and the period, to insert "Any amount so certified to the State during any fiscal year not expended or obligated by the State at the close of the fiscal year, for purposes specified in section 6, shall be deducted from the State's allotment for the succeeding fiscal year", so as to make the section read:

CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 5. The United States Commissioner of Education shall certify for each fiscal year the amounts to be paid under this Act to each State which is qualified under section 7 of this Act to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount certified for such fiscal year in four equal installments, as soon after the first day of each quarter as may be feasible, beginning with the first quarter of the fiscal year for which appropriations made under the authorization of this Act are available. Such treasurer or corresponding official shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority. Any amount so certified in the State during any fiscal year not expended or obligated by the State at the close of the fiscal year, for purposes specified in section 6, shall be deducted from the State's allotment for the succeeding fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, on page 9, in line 4, after the word "make," to strike out "reports to the Commissioner with respect to the progress of education, on forms to be provided by the Commissioner", and insert "such reports in such form and containing such information concerning the administration of this act as the Commissioner may reasonably require and give him upon request access to the records on which such report are based."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the amendment just stated is the one on page 9; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the Senator in charge of the bill, the reason for the amendment.

Mr. HILL. The only reason is to make the language of the bill conform to the standard or usual language which is used when Federal aid is extended and when reports are to be made on it.

As I recall, this language is taken verbatim from the Social Security Act.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that one of the great criticisms made against the proposed legislation is that there may be the possibility of an invasion of local control of our school systems, it seems to me this amendment presents some question. This provision would call for reports to be made to the Commissioner, and later language would obligate the Commissioner to transmit such reports to the Congress. Thus it would be provided that the Commissioner or anyone acting for him would have access to local school records, of course after a reasonable time has elapsed, as provided in the bill, but it would give the Commissioner or anyone representing him the right to go into a local school jurisdiction and examine the records.

It seems to me such a provision lays the bill open to the charge of an invasion

of the rights of local school jurisdictions by the Federal Government; and I doubt whether such a provision is necessary.

I do not wish to make a point of this matter, but in view of the criticisms which have been made, I believe that this amendment would simply open the door for criticism.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Iowa did me the honor to hear most of my remarks on this bill. He knows that I sought to emphasize the fact that there would be and could be no Federal interference. Of course, he recognizes that when the Federal Government gives millions of dollars to the States, there should be some report on the money thus given, and perhaps we should go further and should provide that someone representing the Federal Government should see the records which are the basis for the expenditure of such funds. That was the point of view of the committee. As I have said, this language was taken verbatim from the Social Security Act.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will agree to let the amendment be adopted now, inasmuch as the bill will not be passed at this time, later I shall obtain more data on this point, and perhaps we can reconsider the amendment later, if that is desired.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to agree to that course. I do not wish to present any sort of obstacle; I raised this question simply because of the possible criticism as to the possibility of invasion of local control of our school systems.

I am glad to have the course suggested by the Senator from Alabama adopted.

Mr. HILL. I am glad the Senator is willing to agree to the amendment at this time. Of course, if he later desires to move to have the amendment reconsidered, there will be no objection to doing so.

Mr. GILLETTE. That procedure is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, beginning in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, in section 7, on page 9 in line 20, after the word "State," to strike out "or" and insert "and"; on page 10, in line 20, after the word "than" to strike out "$50" and insert "$55"; in line 24, after the words "ratio to", to strike out "$50" and insert "$55"; in line 25, after the word "as", to strike out "98" and insert "97"; and on page 12, in line 2, after the word "State," to insert "and local", so as to make the section read:

STATE ACCEPTANCE PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (A) In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act a State—

(1) through its legislature, shall (a) accept the provisions of this act and provide for the administration of funds to be received; (b) provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official in the State shall receive the funds paid to that State under this act and shall be required to submit to the United States Commissioner of Education, on or before the 1st day of November of each year, for transmisison to the Congress, a detailed statement of the amount so received for the preceding fiscal year and of its disbursement; (c) provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of funds received; (d) provide for an annual audit, and for the submission of a copy thereof to the Commissioner, of the expenditure of funds received under this act, and for a system of reports from local public-school jurisdictions and other State public-education agencies to the State educational authority; (e) provide that the State educational authority shall make such reports in such form and containing such information concerning the administration of this act as the Commissioner may reasonably require and give him upon request access to the records on which such reports are based, which reports the Commissioner shall transmit to the Congress with recommendations for such revisions of this act as in his judgment the Congress should consider, with particular reference to recommendations, arising from changing conditions in our national economy; (f) in States where separate public schools are maintained for minority races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds to public schools maintained for minority races, without reduction of the proportion of revenues, derived from State and local sources, expended for educational purposes during the fiscal year ended in 1949 for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education of minority races: *Provided,* That, until the end of the fiscal year in which occurs the adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of any State, which convenes after the enactment of this act, or until such legislature takes the action required under this section to qualify for receiving funds, whichever first occurs, such State shall be deemed to qualify for receiving such funds if the chief executive of such State takes the action required under this section to so qualify;

(2) through its legislature, shall provide that the State educational authority shall formulate and effectuate, for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1953, a plan for the apportionment of amounts paid to such State from funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this act for such fiscal year under which (a) there will be available from all sources to each local public-school jurisdiction or other State public-education agency, for current expenditures for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education, an amount per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools within such local public-school jurisdiction, or under the jurisdiction of such State public-education agency, not less than $55 or, in any fiscal year for which the amount to be paid to a State is less by reason of the provisions of paragraph (F) of section 4 than the amount of the Federal allotment to such State, an amount which bears the same ratio to $55 as 97 percent of the funds appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to section 3 bears to the sum of all Federal allotments under section 4; and (b) in States where separate schools are maintained for minority races, there will be available from all sources to each local public-school jurisdiction or other State public-education agency for current expenditures for the schools maintained within such local public-school jurisdiction, or under the jurisdiction of other State public-education agency, for such races an amount per pupil in average daily attendance in such schools not less than the amount per pupil required under clause (a) to be made available with respect to all schools within such local public-school jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of such other State public-education agency.

(3) shall transmit through its State educational authority to the United States Commissioner of Education notice of acceptance and certified copies of the legislative enactments and the regulations that may be issued by the State educational authority in connection with such funds. Any amendment of such enactments and revisions of regulations shall in like manner be transmitted to said Commissioner.

(B) The funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this Act shall be paid only to those States which, during the preceding fiscal year, have provided from revenues derived from State and local sources for all public elementary-school and public secondary-school purposes an amount equivalent to at least one of the following: (1) The total amount actually spent for such purposes from such sources in the fiscal year ended in 1949, or (2) the amount per pupil in average daily attendance actually spent for such purposes from such sources in the fiscal year ended in 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in section 8, on page 13, in line 2 after the word "the" to strike out "statements and other evidence presented by the State educational authority to the Commissioner" and insert "record made before the Commissioner, including a copy of the Commissioner's ruling"; in line 6, after the word "as", to strike out "the court in its discretion deems proper," and insert "shall be relevant and material"; and in line 8, after the word "require" and the period, to insert "The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States, upon certiorari or certification as provided in the United States Code, title 28, section 1254", so as to make the section read:

RIGHT OF APPEAL

SEC. 8. In the event a State educational authority is dissatisfied with any action by the United States Commissioner of Education taken with respect to such State pursuant to this act, or with his failure to take any action with respect to such State pursuant to this act, such authority shall have a right to appeal to the Commissioner to change the action he has taken or to take the action he has failed to take, and to present to him in support of such appeal such statements and other evidence as such authority may deem appropriate. If the action taken by the Commissioner on such appeal is not satisfactory to the State educational authority, or if he fails to act thereon within 90 days after he receives such appeal, such authority shall have a right to appeal to the United States district court for any district in which any part of such State is located. The court shall receive in evidence a copy of the record made before the Commissioner, including a copy of the Commissioner's ruling, and such further evidence as shall be relevant and material; and shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment as the facts and the law may require. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States, upon certiorari or certification as provided in the United States Code, title 28, section 1254.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, on page 14, in line 20 after the word "service," to strike out "and capital outlay" and insert "or capital outlay, nor does it include expenditures for health

services for the prevention, diagnosis, or treatment of physical or mental defects or conditions," so as to make the section read:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. As used in this act—

(A) The term "State" shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(B) The term "legislature" means the State or Territorial legislature or other comparable body, except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa and the Virgin Islands it shall mean the Governor.

(C) The term 'minority race" shall mean any race or racial group that constitutes a minority of the population of the continental United States.

(D) A just and equitable apportionment of the funds provided under this act for the benefit of public schools maintained for minority races in a State which maintains by law separate public schools for minority races, means any plan of distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority race of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that such minority race in such State bears to the total population of that State.

(E) The term "State educational authority" means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, it shall mean the Governor.

(F) The term "current expenditures" does not include expenditures for interest, debt service, or capital outlay, nor does it include expenditures for health services for the prevention, diagnosis, or treatment of physical or mental defects or conditions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

APPROVAL OF REPAYMENT CONTRACTS WITH BITTER ROOT IRRIGATION DISTRICT AND OTHERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise to request unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to consider a bill which was passed yesterday by the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote. The bill is identical in all respects with the measure which was unanimously reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, being Senate bill 1477, which is now on the calendar as Calendar No. 287.

The bill will, I am certain, not cause any debate. I have consulted the leadership on both sides of the aisle about this matter and have secured consent.

Therefore, with the understanding that consideration of the bill will not interrupt for more than a few minutes the consideration of the aid-to-education bill, I ask unanimous consent that the Federal-aid-to-education bill may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate may proceed immediately to the consideration of House bill 4152.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether there was any objection to this measure in the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was no objection whatever; there was unanimous consent. The bill was reported with approval by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, after a hearing with full attendance of members of the committee. The bill has the support of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and, in fact, all members of both the minority and the majority on the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Then I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4152) to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me briefly explain the situation regarding this measure: In compliance with a statute passed several years ago—in 1939, to be exact—the Bureau of Reclamation held prolonged negotiations with the water users on six reclamation projects, and has entered into modifications of the repayment contracts. The renegotiated repayment contracts, to be effective, must be approved by the Congress, granted very speedily, because if they are approved before the 1st of May, that will mean an additional sum of money to be collected by the Government of the United States.

Six irrigation districts are affected in the States of Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, and Colorado. The Senators from all five States are supporting the legislation and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously recommended passage. The repayment contracts here approved have all been voted upon favorably by the water users in the districts affected and the Secretary of the Interior has reported favorably.

There is no objection of any kind, and I hope the bill may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1477 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much for his courtesy in this matter.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "B," and ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point, without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment proposed by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

On page 3, beginning with line 11, strike out down through line 24 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"APPORTIONMENT

"SEC. 4. Ninety-seven percent of the funds appropriated under section 3 of this act for each fiscal year shall be distributed among the States, excluding those enumerated in paragraph (F) of this section, in the following manner:

"(A) Multiply (a) the number of pupils in average daily attendance in each State at public elementary and public secondary schools, as determined on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose, for the third calendar year next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made by (b) $10.

"(B) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, the amount of the Federal allotment for any State shall be the amount calculated under paragraph (A).

"(C) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) the amount spent in each State from revenues derived from State and local sources for current expenditures for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the third fiscal year next preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce for the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh calendar years next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made. When the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.25 for the first 2 years, thereafter 2.5, the amount of the Federal allotment to such State, as computed under paragraph (B), shall be proportionately reduced; except that in no case shall the amount of the Federal allotment for any State be less than $5 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance in such State at public elementary and public secondary schools, as determined under paragraph (A).

"(D) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) current expenditures in each State from revenues derived from State and local sources for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the year next preceding the year for which the computation is made, as estimated on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the three most recent calendar years for which annual income data are available. When for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1953, the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.0, the Federal allotment for such fiscal year shall be $5 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance in such State at public elementary and public secondary schools as determined under paragraph (A).

"(E) In the event 97 percent of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this act is insufficient to

pay to all eligible States the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State, computed in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount to be paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State as 97 percent of such appropriation bears to the sum of the Federal allotments to all eligible States.

"(F) From 3 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this act, such sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner to Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, according to their respective needs for additional funds for public elementary and public secondary schools upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective State educational authorities."

On page 10, line 22, strike out "(F)" and insert in lieu thereof "(E)."

On page 14, after line 24, insert the following new subsections:

"( ) The term 'number of pupils in average daily attendance at public elementary and public secondary schools' means the aggregate days of attendance by pupils regularly enrolled in such schools during the school year divided by 175.

"( ) The term 'public elementary and public secondary schools' means tax-supported elementary and high schools at least 90 percent of whose pupils are in full-time attendance, and, in the case of secondary schools, at least 50 percent of whose graduates are at least 18 years of age at the time of graduation, and which are under the control and direction of the State or local subdivision thereof."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to discuss this amendment, which is lettered "B." I have a statement approximately 30 pages long. At about every tenth page there occurs a natural stopping place, where I shall have completed one of the points of my argument: and at such places I shall be glad to yield for questions. But I would rather not yield before I reach those points, because it would interrupt the continuity of the thought I am trying to convey.

Let me also say that I readily agree with those who contend that the national interest requires the existence of minimum educational opportunities for all American youth, and that there is a need for Federal financial assistance to secure such an opportunity. I intend to vote for the pending bill, but I also believe that whatever Federal financial assistance is provided must be set up on a just basis.

The amendment which I propose has one purpose only, and that is to improve the formula now in the committee bill by which aid-to-education funds are allocated to the States. I shall try to show two things: (1) That the formula in the bill is gravely defective, and (2) that the formula which I propose is clearly superior.

There will be placed on the desks of Senators a table which shows how Federal funds will be distributed under the arrangement which I propose in the amendment. This table also shows for each State the net amount of increase and decrease which would result if the amendment were incorporated in the bill. It also contains other information about each State, including its order of rank based on the size of its allotment, both under the formula now in the bill and under the one proposed in the amendment. It shows each State's order of rank relative to the amount of money collected in Federal internal-revenue taxes in 1948. The far right-hand column shows each State's relative order of rank under the latest official census.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Amount per child 5 to 17 years under S. 246 (1)	Total allotment to State under S. 246 (2)	Total allotment to State under Lodge formula (3)	Difference between S. 246 and Lodge formula (4)	Relative position as to total allotment S. 246 (5)	Relative position as to total allotment Lodge formula (6)	Relative position as to total 1948 tax contribution (7)	Relative position as to population 1940 census (8)
Alabama	$23.00	$17,390,000	$5,451,000	−$11,939,000	2	11	31	17
Arizona	9.68	1,500,000	1,051,000	−449,000	33	37	39	43
Arkansas	25.96	12,980,000	3,359,000	−9,621,000	8	27	36	24
California	5.00	8,435,000	13,291,000	+4,866,000	14	3	4	5
Colorado	5.00	1,240,000	1,812,000	+572,000	36	34	30	33
Connecticut	5.00	1,685,000	2,262,000	+577,000	32	31	18	31
Delaware	5.00	280,000	372,000	+92,000	48	48	25	46
District of Columbia	5.00	580,000	809,000	+229,000	44	43		
Florida	5.00	2,365,000	3,516,000	+1,151,000	28	26	24	27
Georgia	19.63	15,860,000	5,796,000	−10,040,000	4	9	21	14
Idaho	5.00	625,000	896,000	+271,000	42	41	41	42
Illinois	5.00	7,490,000	9,808,000	+2,318,000	16	6	2	3
Indiana	5.00	3,825,000	5,436,000	+1,611,000	22	12	13	12
Iowa	5.00	2,625,000	3,956,000	+1,331,000	27	22	20	20
Kansas	5.00	1,880,000	2,762,000	+882,000	31	29	22	29
Kentucky	21.58	15,190,000	4,466,000	−10,724,000	5	18	15	16
Louisiana	16.89	10,370,000	3,751,000	−6,619,000	11	24	26	21
Maine	5.00	945,000	1,357,000	+412,000	39	35	35	35
Maryland	5.00	2,010,000	2,585,000	+575,000	30	30	12	28
Massachusetts	5.00	4,115,000	5,177,000	+1,062,000	20	14	7	8
Michigan	5.00	6,235,000	8,858,000	+2,623,000	18	7	6	7
Minnesota	5.00	2,920,000	3,979,000	+1,059,000	26	21	17	18
Mississippi	29.18	16,980,000	4,581,000	−12,399,000	3	17	37	23
Missouri	5.00	3,790,000	5,165,000	+1,375,000	23	15	11	10
Montana	5.00	585,000	812,000	+227,000	43	42	40	39
Nebraska	5.00	1,305,000	1,985,000	+680,000	34	32	28	32
Nevada	5.00	125,000	230,000	+105,000	49	49	47	48
New Hampshire	5.00	505,000	604,000	+99,000	45	45	42	44
New Jersey	5.00	3,840,000	5,468,000	+1,628,000	21	10	9	9
New Mexico	20.19	3,130,000	1,040,000	−2,090,000	25	39	45	41
New York	5.00	11,925,000	15,957,000	+4,662,000	10	1	1	1
North Carolina	21.74	21,070,000	7,343,000	−13,727,000	1	7	10	11
North Dakota	5.97	860,000	1,024,000	+164,000	40	38	44	38
Ohio	5.00	7,320,000	10,263,000	+2,943,000	17	5	5	4
Oklahoma	15.58	8,350,000	4,057,000	−4,293,000	15	20	23	22
Oregon	5.00	1,410,000	1,936,000	+526,000	35	33	27	34
Pennsylvania	5.00	10,120,000	13,533,000	+3,413,000	12	2	3	2
Rhode Island	5.00	645,000	807,000	+162,000	41	44	33	36
South Carolina	25.65	13,980,000	3,727,000	−10,253,000	6	25	34	26
South Dakota	7.55	1,080,000	995,000	−85,000	38	40	43	37
Tennessee	17.67	13,220,000	5,236,000	−9,493,000	8	13	25	15
Texas	7.87	12,640,000	10,596,000	−2,044,000	9	4	8	6
Utah	7.27	1,170,000	1,299,000	+129,000	37	36	38	40
Vermont	5.38	420,000	523,000	+103,000	46	46	46	45
Virginia	7.61	5,150,000	4,892,000	−258,000	19	16	16	19
Washington	5.00	2,250,000	3,134,000	+884,000	29	28	19	30
West Virginia	18.95	9,360,000	3,764,000	−5,596,000	13	23	32	25
Wisconsin	5.00	3,325,000	4,326,000	+1,001,000	24	19	14	13
Wyoming	5.00	290,000	437,000	+147,000	47	47	48	47
Total		275,390,000	204,484,000					

1. Lodge amendment represents a net decrease of $70,906,000.
2. Lodge amendment increases allotments in 32 States and the District of Columbia; it decreases allotments in 16 States.
3. Figures in columns (2) and (3) do not show penalty amounts which would be deducted under sec. 4 (D) of S. 246.

Mr. LODGE. At the outset, I shall discuss briefly the mechanics of the formula now in the bill and the formula which is proposed in this amendment.

The formula in the committee bill is admittedly based on the so-called "rich State-poor State" concept. The original allotment to each State is either (1) the amount by which $50, multiplied by the number of children from 5 to 17 years of age in the State, exceeds a sum equaling 1 percent of a 5-year average of aggregate individual income for that State; or, alternatively, (2) a flat amount of $5 per child from 5 to 17 years old—whichever is greater.

Under the formula embodied in the proposed amendment, the arrangement is far simpler. Each State will receive an initial allotment equal to $10 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance at public elementary and public secondary schools in that State. This amendment retains the provisions of the committee bill requiring a reduction to any State which is not spending from State and local revenues at a percentage rate of its income as much as the average throughout the United States for the decade immediately preceding World War II.

Senators will observe that the States which would gain from the formula proposed in this amendment, as compared with the formula now in the committee bill, are 32 in number, as follows: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and the District of Columbia.

These are the States which would be much less discriminated against under the proposed amendment than would be the case under the committee bill. But under the amendment which I propose, all States would get help for their schools.

And Senators should also note that even though net increases result in these 32 States which I have just named, nevertheless the method of distribution which is here proposed effects an over-all net saving of over $70,000,000—about a 30-percent reduction in funds over what is estimated in the committee report as the yearly expenditure for S. 246. Not only does this approach to the problem, therefore, seek a more realistic and equitable allotment of funds, but it is in a very real sense of the word a true economy measure—certainly no negligible factor in these days of massive spending, record budgets, and predicted Federal deficits.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to have printed in the RECORD a table published in April 1949, by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, which purports to show what each State gets and what each State will pay under Senate bill 246.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What each State gets and what each State pays under S. 246

	What each State would receive [1]	What each State's taxpayers would pay toward the program [2]	Net gain (+) or loss (−)
Alabama	$14,451,000	$3,056,000	+$11,395,000
Arizona	1,500,000	911,000	+589,000
Arkansas	11,708,000	1,716,000	+9,992,000
California	8,435,000	22,304,000	−13,869,000
Colorado	1,240,000	2,171,000	−931,000
Connecticut	1,685,000	4,638,000	−2,953,000
Delaware	280,000	1,072,000	−792,000
Florida	2,365,000	3,458,000	−1,093,000
Georgia	14,163,000	3,780,000	+10,383,000
Idaho	625,000	804,000	−179,000
Illinois	7,490,000	21,125,000	−13,635,000
Indiana	3,825,000	5,978,000	−2,153,000
Iowa	2,625,000	3,968,000	−1,343,000
Kansas	1,880,000	3,110,000	−1,230,000
Kentucky	13,367,000	3,137,000	+10,230,000
Louisiana	10,370,000	3,003,000	+7,367,000
Maine	945,000	1,206,000	−261,000
Maryland	2,010,000	4,557,000	−2,547,000
Massachusetts	4,115,000	9,571,000	−5,456,000
Michigan	6,235,000	12,546,000	−6,311,000
Minnesota	2,920,000	4,960,000	−2,040,000
Mississippi	15,469,000	1,743,000	+13,726,000
Missouri	3,790,000	6,890,000	−3,100,000
Montana	585,000	858,000	−273,000
Nebraska	1,305,000	2,359,000	−1,054,000
Nevada	125,000	349,000	−224,000
New Hampshire	505,000	777,000	−272,000
New Jersey	3,840,000	8,713,000	−4,873,000
New Mexico	3,130,000	697,000	+2,433,000
New York	11,925,000	41,499,000	−29,574,000
North Carolina	21,070,000	4,209,000	+16,861,000
North Dakota	860,000	911,000	−51,000
Ohio	7,320,000	15,629,000	−8,309,000
Oklahoma	8,350,000	2,868,000	+5,482,000
Oregon	1,410,000	2,708,000	−1,298,000
Pennsylvania	10,120,000	20,803,000	−10,683,000
Rhode Island	645,000	1,555,000	−910,000
South Carolina	13,365,000	1,930,000	+11,435,000
South Dakota	1,080,000	885,000	+195,000
Tennessee	10,629,000	3,565,000	+7,064,000
Texas	10,845,000	10,804,000	+$41,000
Utah	1,170,000	885,000	+285,000
Vermont	390,000	483,000	−93,000
Virginia	4,074,000	3,968,000	+106,000
Washington	2,250,000	4,236,000	−1,986,000
West Virginia	9,360,000	2,305,000	+7,055,000
Wisconsin	3,325,000	5,522,000	−2,197,000
Wyoming	290,000	429,000	−139,000
District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, etc.	8,622,000	3,432,000	+5,190,000
Total	268,083,000	268,083,000	

[1] Based on data prepared by the National Education Association in conformity with provisions of S. 246 (as amended Feb. 4, 1949). This differs somewhat from table 2 shown in the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee report, which fails to show the penalty amounts deducted in the case of 10 States under sec. 4 (D) of the bill.

[2] Based on tax distribution formula used in Spending Facts Bulletin No. 36.

Mr. LODGE. There are three principal reasons why I think the formula in the bill is gravely defective. Briefly, they may be summarized as follows:

First. It propounds an economically unrealistic, artificial concept of relative State wealth—the so-called "rich State-poor State" classification based on what the individual residents in each State receive by way of salary, property income, social-security benefits, pensions, and the like.

Second. This formula, therefore, yields some strange and wonderful results—as, for example, the classification of Texas as a poor State.

Third. This formula rests upon the misconceived theory that relative need among the several States for educational assistance bears a direct relationship to the total amount of income which the individuals residing in that State have received averaged over a given period of time. Reliable evidence indicates that this approach does not accurately reflect the status of education and the need for Federal aid. Let me elaborate.

FORMULA IS ARTIFICIAL

First, the individual-average-income concept is artificial.

It uses one standard only—namely, income payments to individuals residing in the State—as the sole basis for determining whether that State is rich or poor.

You can perhaps take an individual man or woman and by matching his income against somebody else's income arrive with some degree of accuracy at the conclusion of whether he is rich or poor. But even so, economists agree that you do not necessarily have a complete picture of his comparative wealth. He may have assets which yield him no income at all, but which make him quite wealthy in terms of capital wealth. He may have an untapped or dormant source of earning capacity which he does not use, but which makes him potentially a rich man. He may have long-term investments which yield him nothing now but which mark him as very well off indeed in terms of future income. He may own many holdings in securities, personal property, or real estate which may yield him a very small return or no return at all, but which, because they are capable of ready liquidation, classify him as being far wealthier than his net income would indicate. He may have perhaps realized substantial profits on capital transactions; as I understand the term "individual income" as used in the committee bill, these capital gains are not included thereunder.

He may have many business, professional, family, or charitable responsibilities which make his income of less comparable value than his neighbor across the street with the same income, but with less burdensome obligations.

He may have gone into debt in the past, to the discharge of which debt much of current income is obligated.

He may have many more dependents to support or taxes to pay than a man earning exactly the same salary in another part of the country. A citizen in California, for example, has to pay a 3-percent retail sales tax—and California, according to the committee report, is one of the richest States—while a citizen in Texas need pay no sales tax at all on anything except playing cards, radios, cosmetics, and cement. If you buy a package of 20 cigarettes in Pennsylvania—a so-called rich State—you have to pay a State tax of 4 cents, but if you purchase the same pack of cigarettes in West Virginia—a so-called poor State—you pay only a 1-cent State tax. A man who fills the tank of his automobile in Florida—a so-called rich State—with 20 gallons of gasoline must pay $1.40 in State taxes, while the man who puts the same amount of gas into his car in Texas—a so-called poor State—pays 80 cents in State taxes.

A man registering an automobile in Missouri—a so-called rich State—may have to pay as much as $37.50 to the

State, while a man registering the same car in Georgia—a so-called poor State—need pay but $1.50 in tax to the State.

Likewise citizens in different States with identical incomes have vastly different State income tax obligations—certainly a very substantial factor in measing a man's comparative wealth. In three of the so-called poor States—Arkansas, Mississippi, and New Mexico—a resident with a $2,000 income pays only a 1-percent income-tax rate. In Massachusetts, the rate is 6 percent on interest from securities; in Pennsylvania, the rate is 4 percent on income—and both of these are so-called rich States. On the other hand, citizens living in Texas, which the committee report classifies as a poor State, need pay no income tax at all.

Again, a man who owns a home in a city like Haverhill, Mass., has to pay local property taxes at a very high rate—$55 per $1,000 valuation in 1948. His fellow citizen, having the same income and owning a home in Cincinnati, Ohio, pays property taxes at a substantially lower rate, as I am informed, $12.18 per $1,000 valuation in 1948. Or he may own a home in an area where there are no local property taxes at all.

These are all significant factors which certainly enter into any determination of an individual's relative wealth and which are not reflected at all in the one factor of the income payments he may receive. But consider some other factors——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I was going to yield a little later, after I had concluded this point.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the income is gross income and has no relation to taxes. It is the same concept as the concept of national income, and it is the same on all the incomes of all the individuals in the State before any deductions are made for any purpose.

Mr. LODGE. I shall come to that. That is why I did not want to yield until I reached the end of my first point, because I shall cover it.

To continue my prepared statement, a man may live in a part of the country where it is cheaper to live because there are no cold winters, and hence no need for coal or oil to keep his house warm. He may not have to buy chains or antifreeze solutions for his car; he may not have to pay in taxes for having the road to his farm kept open during the winter; he may not have to spend money and effort to dig a cellar in his house, or have warmer and more expensive clothes for himself and his family, or wood for his fireplace.

He may live in a section of the country where insurance rates are high. He may live in an area where power rates for the electricity in his home are 60 to 80 percent higher than in the rest of the country—as, for example, in the New England States, according to the figures of the Federal Power Commission. One can multiply examples.

I now come to the point to which allusion has been made.

If it is somewhat difficult accurately to evaluate an individual's relative wealth in terms of annual income, how much more difficult it is to expect a true or accurate picture of a State's net wealth by simply averaging the annual income payments of all the individuals residing in that State over a period of years. True, this may constitute one factor in measuring any given State's "wealth," but it seems to me wholly indefensible and unsound to use this single factor as the one and only yardstick. It is somewhat like trying to divide all people in the world into "good" and "bad" categories simply on the basis of whether they contribute to some charity which one may regard as worthy.

I have very serious doubts whether it is at all possible to determine realistically in comprehensible, down-to-earth terms whether or not a State is "rich" or "poor." I have searched for but have never discovered any statistics, for example, which indicate the political courage which may exist in the State legislature or the local government which will enable it to impose taxes on interests that are ruthless and influential. I have sought but have never found any means by which cost of living can be accurately adjusted to prevailing climatic conditions. There are no tables of figures that I have ever seen which determine the exact degree of the desire to work and produce that may be found in the human breast.

If there is any one clue to a State's comparative wealth which is at all reliable, I believe it can be found in the total of its tax contribution to the Federal Treasury as related to its total population—and even so, this is not entirely indicative of the Federal tax burden of any given State since the taxes may eventually be borne by persons in other States. But Federal taxes do constitute a denominator common to all 48 States and because the total tax recepits include not only taxes on individual income, but also corporation and profits taxes, employment taxes, carriers' taxes, and other miscellaneous internal-revenue collections, I believe it to be one reasonable criterion of comparative State wealth.

A few examples will serve to illustrate my point. The two States in the Union making the smallest total Federal tax contribution in 1948 were Nevada and Wyoming. Note that these two States are, by the same token, the two smallest States in terms of population under the 1940 census. The three largest States in the Union, in terms of population, are New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania; these three States likewise contribute the three largest internal revenue tax receipts to the Federal Treasury. In most cases, a comparison between a State's order of rank in population and its rank in size of total internal-revenue contribution discloses a fairly close relationship: for example, Idaho is forty-second in population and forty-first in size of Federal tax receipts; Maine is thirty-fifth both in population and taxes; Iowa is twentieth in both; Kentucky is sixteenth in population and fifteenth in taxes; Oklahoma is twenty-second in population, while ranking twenty-third in the relative size of internal-revenue collections.

GROTESQUE RESULTS

I spoke of strange and wonderful results which flow from the individual average income formula. Let me illustrate.

Take two particular States: North Carolina and Missouri. Missouri is tenth in population and North Carolina eleventh. In order of relative Federal tax contributions, North Carolina is tenth and Missouri is eleventh. In other words, North Carolina with a population of three and one-half million contributed more in 1948 to the Federal Treasury than did Missouri, which has a population of some three and three-fourths millions.

But measured in terms of average annual income, we find North Carolina in eighteenth place, and Missouri in eleventh. Yet according to figures compiled by the Department of Commerce and the Labor Department, North Carolina ranks ahead of Missouri not only in the size of its Federal tax contribution, but also in the value of its industries—$1,421,000,000 in 1940—and in the number of people employed in manufacture—North Carolina 372,000 in 1947; Missouri 358,000 in 1947. North Carolina, it should also be noted, has a higher corporate State income tax rate, 6 percent, than does Missouri, 2 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the relatively higher volume of taxes paid by North Carolina in comparison with its total and per capita income due to the internal-revenue taxes on cigarettes produced in North Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that by far the major portion of those cigarettes are not consumed in North Carolina, but are distributed over the country as a whole, and, therefore, the relative tax paid by North Carolina into the Federal Treasury is not an indication of the income or ability of the people of North Carolina to pay.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. Those taxes do reflect that particular item.

I do not claim that these statistics prove necessarily that North Carolina is richer than Missouri, even though North Carolina has the smaller population. What I do maintain is that these figures are probably a far less inaccurate barometer of relative State wealth than the single factor of individual income payment, as used in the committee formula.

This somewhat confusing term "individual income payment" is really quite narrow in its scope. The Department of Commerce, upon whose definition of the term the committee bill rests, states,

in its periodical Current Business, that "income payments to individuals is a measure of the income received by residents from each State from business establishments and governmental agencies." In more detail, it further explains the term as comprising the following:

First, wages and salaries, after deduction of employees' contributions to social security, railroad retirement, railroad unemployment insurance, and Government retirement programs; second, proprietors' incomes, representing the net income of unincorporated establishments—including farms—before owners' withdrawals; third, property income, consisting of dividends, interest, and net rents and royalties; and fourth, "other" income, which includes public assistance and other direct relief; labor-income items such as work relief, Government retirement payments, veterans' pensions and benefits, workmen's compensation, and social-insurance benefits; mustering-out payments to discharged servicemen; family-allowance payments and voluntary allotments of pay to dependents of military personnel; enlisted men's cash terminal-leave payments and redemptions of terminal-leave bonds; and State government bonuses to veterans of World War II.

Yet the whole theory of the committee allocation formula rests on this one factor alone. It multiplies the total average income payments, as just defined, over a 5-year period times 1 percent and subtracts this figure from $50 multiplied by the number of children in the State aged 5 to 17 years. If the result of this subtraction is more than $5 per child, that is the State's slice of the Federal pie. In other words, the smaller the average of individual income payments, the larger is the Federal allocation. If the average individual income payments, multiplied by 1 percent is greater than $50 times the number of children—and you cannot therefore subtract—then the State is classified as a "rich" State and gets $5 per child.

Under this procedure, North Carolina with a smaller population than Missouri, but a larger Federal tax contribution, a larger business valuation, a greater number of people employed in industry, and a far bigger corporate State tax rate, gets a Federal allotment for aid to education of $21.74 per child as against Missouri's $5 per child—over four times as much.

I do not single out North Carolina and Missouri for any particular purpose except to illustrate how two States, standing next to each other in population and Federal tax burden, come out on an entirely different basis when the unrealistic and artificial formula proposed in the committee bill is applied. For the life of me I utterly fail to understand why a State's need for education funds should be related to individual income payments. If it could be shown with any reasonable degree of accuracy that North Carolina is more in need of Federal funds to aid education, I would be the last to begrudge North Carolina her corresponding relative share. Under the formula I propose, which Senators will remember is $10 per number of pupils in average daily attendance at tax-supported schools, North Carolina still receives more than Missouri—$7,343,000 to Missouri's $5,165,000—and this is as it should be, because the Bureau of Education's 1946–47 statistics show that North Carolina has more pupils at public schools than Missouri. But what puzzles me so about the "rich State-poor State" formula in the committee bill is that North Carolina, which makes more than half of all the cigarettes smoked in this country; which has a substantial and enviable output from its clothing factories and cotton mills; which has a fine agricultural crop of corn, cotton, hay, peanuts, and fruit; which, to quote John Kieran's 1949 Information Please Almanac, "leads the field in many economic and social reforms," which has the second highest State corporation income tax in the United States; which, although it has fewer school children than seven other States, nevertheless transports more children to school and back in busses operated by certified drivers than any other State in the Union; which has the largest red spruce stand in the United States as a source of a rising furniture business; which has many streams and falls and therefore a high potential for hydroelectric power; and which has an extensive resort business both at its lovely ocean and mountain spots and a temperate climate—this fine State, under the extraordinary "rich State-poor State" formula, gets a Federal allotment bigger than any other State in the Union.

I could continue to give many other examples where this unrealistic formula works strange and wonderful results. But perhaps none is so strange and so wonderful as the result which classifies Texas, of all States, as a relatively "poor" State. Believe it or not, that is true. If Senators will look it up, they can see it for themselves. Let them look at the last page, if they will, of the committee report. There the States are grouped in order of amount per school child as determined under the committee individual income payments. Look where Texas stands—only 13 States are supposedly "poorer," and therefore in greater need of Federal assistance.

Mr. President, think of it. Texas is classified as a poor State, that vast empire, teeming with natural resources, filled with an active and enterprising population, some of whom have even been known on occasion to speak with pride of the greatness of their State, now is asked to masquerade in the rags of pretended poverty. What will the boosters of Texas say to that?

Mr. President, I have lived and traveled in Texas on many different occasions in my life. I have visited its great cities: Houston, Dallas, Austin, and El Paso. I have been in Alpine and Orange, Jasper and Big Spring, Longview, Terlingua, Marfa and Galveston. I venture to say that there are spots in Texas where I have been where even some distinguished citizens of that State have never set foot.

Because I have been so much in Texas I enjoy reading about it. I was interested to note in John Kieran's "1949 Information Please Almanac" that "Big, sprawling, vigorous Texas, comprising one-twelfth of the entire area of the United States, is the richest political subdivision in the world." That is what he says.

I was fascinated with an article which I read in the April 1948 issue of Fortune magazine called "The Land of the Big Rich." It told me new and thrilling things about the Southwest and, when I saw Texas and Oklahoma listed away down among the "poor" States on the back page of the committee report, I reread this Fortune article again to make sure that I had not imagined it. But it is all still there, sentences like these:

> While millionaires have long been common in Texas and Oklahoma, they are now so abundant that the owner of $5,000,000 fortune is referred to there as a "Flash Boy." It is only when a man has accumulated $30,000,000 or so that he is recognized as "Big Rich."
>
> For 7 fat years the citizens of the land of rich rewards—an area roughly contained within Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado—have been getting and spending with a speed and an ease that are quite unrelated to anything going on in the rest of the capitalistic world.
>
> A haul of $100,000 has been as possible from a single crop of watermelon seeds as it has from one of wheat or cattle.
>
> There is no way to estimate what all this wealth, big and little amounts to. Some indication appears in such statistics as show that in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado income-tax receipts since 1941 have gone from $134,000,000 to $1,595,000,000 and bank deposits have nearly tripled, totaling $8,500,000,000 last year. In the same year the combined income-tax receipts in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio have increased less than three-quarters as much as they have in the Southwestern States, while bank deposits, far from tripling, have gone up only 50 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may seem strange that a Senator from the North should rise in defense of the Southern States——

Mr. LODGE. I am not attacking anyone. I congratulate Texas. I think it is wonderful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that along with the great fortunes made from oil in Oklahoma and Texas there is also great poverty among the rural population? The able Senator from Massachusetts, who is well acquainted with the literature of the country, undoubtedly read Mr. John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which described, I think quite accurately, the poverty of the tenant farmers in Oklahoma in the early thirties. While conditions have improved since then, it is still true, I believe, that Oklahoma has approximately the largest percentage of farm tenantry in the country, and that the farm tenants there are on a very low standard of living. The same condition is true of many sections of Texas. Therefore these States have great extremes, some of their citizens having made enormous fortunes, and large multitudes living in poverty; and the large numbers who live in poverty naturally pull the average down.

Mr. LODGE. I realize, of course, that there is poverty in these States. There also is poverty in Massachusetts and there is poverty in New York, and as the Sen-

ator well knows, there is poverty in the District of Columbia. As the Senator also knows, in Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York there is legislation on the books providing for taxes on the people, so that the States do something substantial for the poor people within their borders. Texas, of course, has no income tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to interfere with the very able address of the Senator from Massachusetts, but is it not also true that, on the whole, the Southern States spend as large a proportion of their incomes for the purposes of education as the average for the country as a whole? That is, if we accept the income figures, do not the Southern States assess themselves approximately as much as the country-wide average, or even more, although they are only able to spend a relatively small absolute amount for education because their income is relatively small?

Mr. LODGE. That is where I think the Senator and I will differ. In the first place, I do not classify the Southwest in the same category with the South. I do not think the income of the Southwest is small. I think that Texas is richer than New York; and I say that measuring my words. I think it is easier to get rich there, that there are more very rich people there, that there are greater opportunities to make money and keep it, and not be bothered by local governments, than in New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Lest I be misunderstood, let me say to my friends from Texas that I hope they will enact a State income-tax law.

Mr. LODGE. I congratulate my friends from Texas. I have not said a word, as the record will prove, that is not in admiration of all they have accomplished. I think it is very fine. I do not think it is confined to just a few people.

I was in Dallas in last November, and saw the great department store of Neiman-Marcus. I am told by those who understand about such things that there are more luxurious goods on sale in that department store than will be found in the smartest shops in New York City. When there is a great department store, full of articles of luxury, and it is full of people from the surrounding country spending money on jewelry and other things, it indicates that a good deal of money is floating around, and that it is not in the hands of a few people.

Mr. President, I continue reading from Fortune magazine:

> Quite simply, the Southwest has grown rich on the enormous world demand for its products—especially for its oil, wheat, and beef. Prices and profits have gone up accordingly.
>
> The real-estate market in Houston, Tex., has become frenetic; a downtown corner at Main and McKinney Streets sold in 1940 for $1,150,000 but was bought by Woolworth last year for $3,050,000—or at the rate of $2,000 per front inch.
>
> The Cadillac dealer in Dallas last year sold 1,250 cars, an entirely creditable showing for a town of some 450,000. However, the backlog of orders early this year had reached a total of 11,000—or enough to supply a Cadillac for every 11 families in Dallas.

That does not look as if this money was in the hands of a few people.

> Jewelers in Houston do not regard a $20,000 sale as at all unusual.

Other portions of the Fortune article which especially interested me were:

> The fact is that there are some spots in Texas and Oklahoma where a farmer might actually make as much on a crop as he could on one-eighth of the oil taken from his ground. Along rich river-bottom lands in Oklahoma, for instance, many have cleared well over $200 an acre on alfalfa. On a 169-acre plot this would mean an annual income of $32,000—or about as much as a landowner might expect to get from his share of three oil wells producing 300 barrels a day.
>
> Farms in the old Dust Bowl—

The Steinbeck country—

> are sitting right on top of some of the richest United States soil. Recent research has shown that if only 6 inches of moisture a year are properly trapped into this subsoil, crops will flourish right through a drought. By summer fallowing their land, farmers have frequently doubled their yield, getting up to 55 bushels of wheat an acre. Many farmers now believe that the miracle of summer fallowing has converted the Dust Bowl into a permanent Gold Bowl. And in some places the discovery of gas and oil wells has created a superboom, as wheat and oil profits mounted together.

Writing in the New York Times on April 7, 1949, Arthur Krock recorded these impressions and predictions regarding the great city of Houston and the Texas Gulf coast:

> Private industry, and the common carriers by land and water, will invest sums here compared with which our own public investment will appear infinitesimal, and before the children of today have become the representative men of tomorrow every foot of frontage from Main Street to the Gulf of Mexico will be in use, not because of the efforts of any man, but because of the natural movement, growth, and progress of civilization.
>
> In 35 major industrial areas of the United States, accounting for 45 percent of industrial expansion since VJ-day, the Houston area's new construction plans call for expenditures of $110,000,000 as compared with $86,600,000 for New York's tri-State metropolitan region and $79,600,000 for Pittsburgh and Chicago, respectively. In the value of new industrial investment Texas stands first with $323,000,000.

How can we ignore those figures?

> The depression fears elsewhere, the price-cuts worrying the national administration which so recently was calling for lower prices, seem to be as distant from this city as if they were disturbances in the moon.
>
> The millionaires of Houston come in battalions, which encourages the hope that, when they have expressed themselves to the utmost in towering concrete and splendid houses in River Oaks, they will set out to zone and otherwise beautify this lusty, sprawling, industrial capital of the Southwest. The time for this is overdue.

I read all these wonderful things about Texas and Oklahoma, Mr. President, and wonder still more at this formula in the pending bill which still insists that Texas and Oklahoma are poor States. Somebody must be wrong, Mr. President.

Then I remember reading in Life magazine last year—the April 5, 1948, issue—where a feature picture article proclaimed in capital letters: "The land is good and taxes are favorable to southwestern rich," and where it showed a picture of a $19,500 Rolls-Royce which a gentleman in Dallas purchased for his wife because she said "it goes with my blue hat." I recall a photograph of a hotel lobby in Midland, Tex., where $50,000,000 worth of business is done every year. I remember one sentence in this article which stated:

> The Southwest has showered its wealth on the big-business man and the druggist, the flamboyant and the humble. * * * The money goes easy but it comes easier.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the very able Senator from Massachusetts, in reminding us of the wealth of Texas because there are so many automobiles there, also read the articles dealing with the large number of highly expensive automobiles that King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia has. I believe he has Cadillacs to the number of from 150 to 200. Would the Senator from Massachusetts conclude from that fact that the average resident of Arabia lived on a very high standard of living? If he did, he would be mistaken. One should not mistake the plumage of the peacock for the condition of the barnyard hen.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, certainly not, certainly not. The Senator from Illinois is quite right. His point is so well presented that it would be completely convincing if it were not founded on a fallacy. The fallacy is, of course, that Ibn-Saud has a very small number of automobiles, nothing at all comparable to 1 Cadillac for every 11 families in the city of Dallas. As my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] points out, there are a lot of pheasants as well as hens. There are many other differences between Texas and Arabia, and I think all the comparisons are in favor of Texas, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts does not agree with the remark which was once attributed to General Sherman about Texas.

Mr. LODGE. No, the Senator from Illinois will never find me saying or thinking or even inferring anything about Texas that is not of the most complimentary nature. I have spent much time there. I have many friends there. I admire the people of that State for what they have accomplished, and I have enough liking for the State to feel a little bit miffed when I see the committee trying to classify Texas as a poor State. Texas deserves better treatment than that.

And not long ago I read about the opening of a new hotel in Houston, called the Shamrock—a nice name. The article described trees of orchids and of shamrocks flown from Ireland; newsboys in evening clothes hawking papers; $42 a plate dinners; chartered Super Chiefs; and people to whom a $21,000,000 investment is "hardly worth losing any sleep over."

I read about all these things and saw the wonderful photographs, and then was brought down to earth again when

I saw the committee report on the education bill with Texas listed as one of our poorest States. How could this be, Mr. President?

The committee report set me wondering about a formula which says, in effect, "We have found a magic system for divining whether a State is rich or poor. We pay no attention to wealth or to Federal tax collections or to whether schools are good or bad or to natural resources or bank deposits or general prosperity. We just multiply schoolchildren times dollars and then we match this up against an average of income payments. We are not interested in comparative costs of living or in how much a State seeks to raise its own funds by local taxation or how much money the people make on capital transactions." Let us not overlook that. That is the great source of the new rich today. We are not interested in those things. We just look at total individual income; what the little fellow gets on GI terminal leave, and what the little fellow gets on a salary, and so forth, and that tells us the whole story.

Mr. President, in all seriousness I submit that any formula which holds that States like Texas are poor States and allocates funds on that basis invites very grave doubts as to its fundamental soundness. Such results simply do not make sense.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that my State of Louisiana, although much smaller in area than Texas, produces as much oil per acre as Texas does, but our experience is that about 75 percent or 80 percent of the money derived from that oil goes to the Senator's section of the country, to the East and North Central States. I suggest that possibly that wealth does not go so much to the benefit of the local people as it goes to the benefit of somebody somewhere else. Possibly it might be better that we look at the actual money made by the people of those States rather than the wealth beneath their soil.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure the Senator will find that whenever an attempt has been made to put some real taxation into effect in the States referred to, it has yielded great results.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The picture which the able Senator from Massachusetts has been painting of Texas pretty nearly answers the question, does it not?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think the money is being kept down there. There was a time in the development of the West and the Southwest when it could be said that much of the returns from these economic activities came back to Wall Street, but I think we have got to be up with the times here in that connection. We cannot go along with a lot of out-worn, antiquarian notions that may have been applicable 50 years ago. We have to see things as they are. I believe it is very much to the credit of the people down there that they are keeping the rewards of their own enterprise themselves. I do not think it can be said that the rewards from what they do are all drifting back to New York City. That may have been true once, but it is no longer true.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Massachusetts is not suggesting, is he, that the capital stock of the Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana is owned by Louisianians?

Mr. LODGE. I cannot answer such specific questions, but I was advised when I was in Dallas last year that a great part of the clientele of the great department stores there came from Shreveport, so I guess somebody in Louisiana is making some money.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the Senator from Louisiana by his remarks would indicate, by implication, that the great bulk of the stock of the General Electric Co., which has its main plant in the State of New York, is owned by New Yorkers?

Mr. LODGE. I think not. Although a great plant of the General Electric Co. is located at Schenectady, N. Y., I do not believe anyone would say that the great bulk of the stock is owned in Schenectady.

I will say to my friend from Louisiana that about a year ago I was in New Orleans, which is a marvelous city, of which I am very fond, and where I have received most wonderful hospitality, for which I am delighted to express my thanks. We took a boat ride and saw the port development. What has been accomplished is wonderful. I honor the State of Louisiana for it. I cannot see why any Member of the Senate should deny tribute to the State of Louisiana. It has built a vast amount of improvements.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that even though during the war period and since the South has come forward substantially, nevertheless, the facts and figures show that the income in the South is far below the average for the entire Nation?

Mr. LODGE. I have just been reading figures from Fortune magazine, which is an authoritative publication. I have been reading what John Kieran says in the Information Please Almanac. I have been reading from Arthur Krock. These are all authoritative figures on the immense fortunes being made in that section of the country. I speak of it in admiration. I am not criticizing anyone. All I say is that a formula which rests on the theory that Texas is a poor State is an unsound formula, because obviously it is not a poor State. Obviously it is one of the, if not the, richest States in the Union.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that many facts are overlooked by people like John Kieran and others? For example, even though Texas may be a rich State, many poor people in Texas work their way into Louisiana to get into Louisiana charity hospitals, because Texas has very few facilities of that type to offer.

Mr. LODGE. The record would also show, if there were a record—in the case of this bill we have had no hearings—that a great many poor people in other parts of the country are trying to get into charity hospitals. No part of the country has a monopoly on poverty.

Mr. LONG. On what basis is the Senator asserting that the figures of the Department of Commerce are wrong? Does he believe that they overlook all the items of income, or does he believe that the figures showing general income are substantially correct?

Mr. LODGE. I think they overlook capital gains, for one thing.

Mr. LONG. Probably all of them do.

Mr. LODGE. I think the figures in Fortune magazine, from which I am quoting, came from the Department of Commerce, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that there were no hearings on the proposed legislation?

Mr. LODGE. I know of no record made this year. Usually when hearings are held, the record of the hearings is placed on the desks of Senators. I did not see any such record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that a substantial record had previously been made in the committee on this proposal. If my memory serves me correctly, it passed the Senate in the Eightieth Congress. At that time there were exhaustive and comprehensive hearings. Testimony was taken during the period from April 9 to May 1, 1947. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts was a Member of the Senate at that time, was he not?

Mr. LODGE. I suppose the Senator will now tell me that that was the worst Congress in history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed not.

Mr. LODGE. And that therefore its findings are not worthy of much consideration. I am surprised that the Senator did not insist that hearings be held this year, and that some real demonstration be made of the fact that Texas is a poor State.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota was extremely well pleased with the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress in reference to Federal aid to education. Perhaps I should have said the Senate of the Eightieth Congress. I brought that point out only as a matter of clarification of the record. I think it ought to be crystal clear that the Eightieth Congress was not the first Congress to take testimony upon the subject of Federal aid to education.

Mr. LODGE. Of course that is true. This is not the first time since I have been here that the question has been before the Senate. But when it is said that because hearings were held

once, therefore it is not necessary ever to hold them again, we should bear in mind the fact that the entire membership of the House of Representatives is elected every 2 years. The Senator from Minnesota is very eloquent and splendid proof that a third of the Senate is changed every 2 years, in order to make the Government completely responsive to the demands of the people and the needs of the hour. It seems to me that in connection with important subjects like this a great deal could be said for holding hearings and making a record, in the light of all the things that have happened since then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to state to the Senator from Massachusetts that I trust his comments to the junior Senator from Minnesota are not in the spirit of assumption that I am entirely opposed to what the able Senator from Massachusetts is saying. As a matter of fact, the persuasiveness of his argument was almost making a convert of me until just a moment ago. Now I am beginning to wonder whether I should not go back to the original fold whence the bill emanated.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not be dissuaded by what I am saying. I am working very hard, and I have been trying to make an argument particularly directed to the Senator this afternoon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is this the first time that such information has been given to the Senate and to the public relative to the incomes in the various States, as shown upon the chart which has been placed upon the desks of Senators?

Mr. LODGE. This is the first time I know of that this particular formula has been presented in the way I present it, and the first time, to my knowledge, that all the various facts have been integrated in a table in the way in which I have done it. The facts themselves have been available for a long time.

Mr. THYE. So far as I know, this is the first time such concrete, clear information relative to the actual wealth and incomes of the various States has been made available. In view of that fact, I was compelled to ask the question.

I should like to ask a further question. In view of the information which the Senator has laid upon our desks, would it not be well for us to go further in the study of the income of the respective States with relation to one another? I have tried to follow the question of Federal aid to education. I voted for the measure a year ago. I am sincerely concerned about it. I have much criticism of the fact that no public hearings have been held in the Eighty-first Congress on this very vital and important question. In view of the information which the Senator has laid before us, I wonder if it would not be well to go further in the study of the wealth and income of the States in respect to one another.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think the last word has been spoken on this subject. I certainly do not believe that I have spoken it. I am only one student of this problem. I think it is an exceedingly important question, because it not only underlies Federal aid to education, but it underlies the whole question of the relationship of the Federal Government to the States. We are certainly going to increase rather than decrease programs of Federal-State cooperation.

Moreover, it also underlies the entire question of States' rights, about which we hear so much. How can we have States' rights if we do not have States' duties? How can Senators talk about States' rights if their individual States are not willing to assume the same kind of obligation that all other States assume?

Mr. THYE. The State of Minnesota, for example, may appear to be a wealthy State today, while we are mining our iron ore; it may appear to be an exceedingly wealthy State; but eventually those deposits will be depleted. It appeared to be a very wealthy State in years past, while we were harvesting the white pine of the northern half of the State. That pine is exhausted, and there will not be another such harvest in any year to come. While the State may have appeared relatively prosperous in relation to many other States in the Union, yet we shall exhaust our prosperity. So far as produce and agricultural commodities are concerned, we are an exporting State. We are mining the fertility of our land, and eventually we shall not have the resources or the wealth within the confines of our State which we may be reported to have as of today.

Are not those questions worthy of further study, in the light of the able presentation which the Senator is making before the Senate, and the excellent chart which he has had placed upon the desks of Senators?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, this subject has not been studied as thoroughly as it should be studied. In the case of a State such as Minnesota, which has great iron ore reserves which may some day be exhausted, if there is a formula in the law which is based on the time when the iron ore was not exhausted, and conditions later change and the iron ore becomes exhausted, the Senator knows very well that, as a practical matter, legislatively speaking, it will be almost impossible to have that formula changed here in order to reflect that adjustment. That is why I say we have not given the thought and study which need to be given to the question of what constitutes a rich State and what constitutes a poor State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Massachusetts refer to the very excellent chart he has presented to the Senate; and after referring to it, will he not say that the State of Texas is a very poor illustration for his argument, in view of the fact that for Texas the change from the total allotment to it under Senate bill 246 to the total allotment to it under the Lodge formula is a change from $12,640,000 to $10,596,000?

Mr. LODGE. That is because the readjustment is slight, insofar as Texas is concerned, because of the number of school children, since Texas has a large population.

Mr. LONG. But the Senator from Massachusetts realizes that the change from approximately $12,000,000 to approximately $10,000,000 is a very slight change, insofar as Texas is concerned.

Mr. LODGE. The figures given in the first column are the ones which Senators should examine in order to arrive at the real basis of comparison.

Mr. LONG. In order to show what the Lodge formula would do, let us examine the figures for Mississippi, which I understand taxes its population more heavily than does any other State for education, and of course Mississippi is a State which has a heavy migration of its population to other States. I ask Senators to note from the table that the Lodge formula would reduce the allotment to Mississippi from $16,980,000 to $4,581,000—in other words, a reduction by three-fourths. Why does not the Senator from Massachusetts direct his attention to the situation under his amendment as it would affect Mississippi?

Furthermore, let me ask the Senator whether he will consider the situation insofar as Louisiana is concerned? Louisiana taxes its population perhaps as heavily as does any other State in the Union for education; and yet we find that under the Lodge formula the allotment for Louisiana would be reduced from $10,370,000 to $3,751,000—or a reduction of two-thirds.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Later I shall make my own argument in my own time, but I ask the Senator to yield to me at this time in order to permit me to answer the Senator from Massachusetts concerning the study which has been made. It has been a continuous one; hearings were held over a period of years, not just this year. Hearings on the question of Federal aid to education have been held over a period of 14 years. The formula has been changed slightly from year to year; but at last we have reached the point where we have some definite information and some factors which remain constant every year, which make it possible for us to construct a formula on the basis of a lasting set of factors and comparisons.

In order to provide the proposed aid on a just basis, the plan must be built upon known considerations. Everyone knows that in more States than one the wealth under the ground is tremendous. Everyone knows that in some States the wealth remaining in the ground is greater than the wealth which has been dissipated and wasted. Probably, as has been pointed out, in some States, such as perhaps Minnesota, the iron-ore resources which remain are not so great as they have been in the past. But we know what the people of the various States pay in taxes and we know how many children there are between certain ages

in the various States, and we know how many pupils there are in the various States, and we know the per capita income of the various States. Those factors do not make it possible to establish a formula for the allotment of funds from now until doomsday, but they do make it possible to establish a formula for the granting of funds for this year and next year, inasmuch as in arriving at the formula we are dealing entirely with absolute knows, and not with unknown factors.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I have tried to follow the reports on the studies which have been made and the general reports on the subject of Federal aid to education. I have never seen anything quite so comprehensive or quite so well developed as the report which has been submitted to the Senate today by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I have voted for Federal aid to education, and I have declared that I am in favor of it; and I wish to be in favor of it in the future. However, I desire to approach the question in a very intelligent manner; and I realize, as the Senator has so ably stated, that there are constant changes.

It was only a comparatively few years ago that the cigarette-making industry of the world moved to North Carolina, coming from Paris, because of the war clouds which swept over the Continent. That industry moved from Paris to North Carolina, and because of research which had been conducted it was discovered that flax tow could be used in the process of the manufacture of cigarette papers. Up until 8 years ago Minnesota produced more than 50 percent of the flax straw produced in the United States. The war period changed that situation slightly, but Minnesota furnishes the great part of the raw materials needed for the cigarette-paper industries in North Carolina. In other words, we have mined the soils of Minnesota and have given the benefit to another State, in respect to the finished product or the end product, let us say.

So, Mr. President, the fact that the chart which has been laid upon our desks by the able Senator from Massachusetts conveys such enlightenment to us on a very important question prompts me again to ask whether this question has been explored before, or whether this factor is a new one in respect to education.

I have tried to follow all the reports on Federal aid to education, but I have never before seen any report which has given me quite the enlightenment as that given by the report which the Senator from Massachusetts has presented to us today.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in my own time, I shall analyze the report the Senator from Massachusetts has presented, and we shall try to show, if we can, its imperfections as well as its perfections.

Of course, although no Senator asks all other Senators to listen to him when he speaks on the floor of the Senate, nevertheless, I would say to the Senator that the formula is one which has been given consideration, and we shall present our reply to it.

I compliment the Senator from Massachusetts for his great zeal in studying Fortune magazine and one or two other books.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think we shall get anywhere by being sarcastic.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I was not sarcastic. At one time I actually paid for a subscription to Fortune magazine.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the Senator from Utah was being sarcastic in his reference to Fortune magazine. Certainly there is no harm in reading that magazine, and also there is nothing to be gained by indulging in innuendoes that Fortune magazine is the only publication on which I have based my presentation. Certainly there is no use in making cracks at other Senators in connection with this matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to answer the senior Senator from Utah on the question which has been raised. Some very enlightened college presidents in Minnesota took it upon themselves to make a rather extensive study of the question of wealth and earnings and the opportunities of the people in some of the Southern States. They have given me reports earlier this year that are somewhat as enlightening, although not on as broad a scale as the report submitted to us today by the Senator from Massachusetts. In respect to individual States, they show very conclusively that the junior Senator from Massachusetts is opening new pages, so to speak, in regard to the incomes of the people and the over-all wealth of States that are listed in the tabulation as low-income States, and also are listed as receiving greater benefits from Federal aid to education measures than other States in the Union would receive. It is for that reason that I had concerned myself so very carefully with the report and with the whole program of Federal aid to education.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say that if my proposal has been studied in the committee there is no record to show it. Let me also say in response to the point which has been made by the Senator from Louisiana that if the committee formula is unsatisfactory, insofar as Texas is concerned, and satisfactory, insofar as Louisiana is concerned, we should not be obliged to do something unsatisfactory to Texas in order to get something beneficial for Louisiana. There ought to be enough brains around here to get a formula that will work well as a general proposition.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to answer the Senator's question completely, and in my own words.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LODGE. I cannot answer the Senator in his words; I shall have to answer him in my own words. The Senator then said that Louisiana and Mississippi, I think, spent more on their school children than any other States in the Union——

Mr. LONG. No, no; I did not say that.

Mr. LODGE. Although they are not especially wealthy. Mr. President, I do not think that taxes are the true test of local support of education. Taxes that are specifically proposed——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Just a minute. I decline to yield until I finish this little statement. It will only be about 50 words long, and I want to finish it. I do not think the true test of local support of education is the amount of taxes levied specifically for education. I think the test is the amount expended per pupil.

I have in my hand a publication entitled "The Facts—On Federal Aid for Schools," published by the National Education Association of the United States. On page 13 there appears table 7, "Average (mean) current expenditure per pupil for public education from State and local sources, 1945–46." It shows an average of $134 for the whole United States. Montana is the highest State, with $214. The lowest State is Mississippi, with $45. I am sorry to say Louisiana is well toward the bottom, with $95. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average (mean) current expenditure per pupil for public education from State and local sources, 1945–46

United States	$134
District of Columbia	172
Montana	214
New Jersey	210
New York	209
Massachusetts	179
Illinois	174
Connecticut	174
Washington	173
California	166
Rhode Island	159
Oregon	157
Nevada	157
Minnesota	157
South Dakota	152
Wyoming	151
Delaware	150
Wisconsin	146
Ohio	145
Michigan	144
Pennsylvania	144
Indiana	144
Iowa	143
Nebraska	141
Kansas	140
North Dakota	137
Missouri	136
Arizona	135
Colorado	135
New Hampshire	134
New Mexico	133
Utah	125
Maryland	124
Vermont	121
Texas	117
Idaho	116
Oklahoma	109
Maine	108
Florida	101
West Virginia	101
Louisiana	95
Virginia	91
Kentucky	83
North Carolina	76
Tennessee	75

Average (mean) current expenditure per pupil for public education from State and local sources, 1945–46—Continued

South Carolina	$73
Alabama	66
Arkansas	63
Georgia	60
Mississippi	45

Mr. LODGE. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana, if he wants me to.

Mr. LONG. The point I had in mind is, as I stated, that Louisiana and Mississippi in view of their ability to pay, are taxing themselves more heavily, for the purpose of educating their children than are any other States in the Union. After all, when it is seen how far the States are taxing themselves in order to educate their children, it is possible to measure the effort they are making, and, even though those States are Southern States, they are making the greatest effort to educate their children. Because they are poor States, they are not failing to do that. What I had in mind related to this: If the Senator wanted to select an illustration for the argument he is making, I do not see why he should pick on Texas, which under the Senator's amendment would be reduced from $12,000,000 plus to $10,000,000 plus. Why should the Senator pick that State, to slash $2,000,000 from what they were supposed to get, or a State such as Arkansas, which as the Senator knows is willing to tax itself without regard to its ability to pay, which would be slashed from $12,000,000 plus to $3,000,000 plus? Why does not the Senator take Mississippi, which I understand is taxing itself more heavily with regard to its ability to pay than any other State in the Nation, so far as education is concerned? Mississippi would be reduced from about $17,000,000 to $4,500,000.

It is my understanding that "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer." The whole idea of the bill is to help the poor States educate their children who are migrating out of those States to States like the one which the junior Senator from Massachusetts has the honor to represent.

Mr. LODGE. No, no. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana would be hard put to prove that there is any migration from Louisiana to Massachusetts. I think if there were I probably would have heard of it. Moreover, I do not consider that there is any single, official factual, tenable standard by which one can gage the extent to which a State taxes itself insofar as its ability to pay is concerned. Those figures are more useful for purposes of oratory than they are for scientific determinations. The real thing that counts is the amount spent on the child, which I think is best shown by the tables I have asked to have included in the RECORD.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I take it from what the able Senator from Massachusetts has stated, he does not agree completely with the idea that in the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, and perhaps in some other States, there is greater need for aid to education than there is in some other States, such as Texas. As I understand, the question has arisen whether Texas should have the same amount of aid, upon the same basis as that provided in the bill, as that which is given to Louisiana, under conditions which would appear to be somewhat unjustified.

In this connection I should like to ask the able Senator from Massachusetts this question: I assume the Senator is not opposed in principle to a graduated scale of Federal aid, or aid to be given to the States on the basis of a capacity to pay on their part, as is contemplated in the bill. The only thing I assume the Senator is disturbed about is the working out of a formula which will be equitable and in line with what he is advocating. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I am not opposed in principle to the idea of incorporating the State's capacity to pay. But I do not now know how to do it. I am very sure that the formula contained in the bill definitely does not do it, and in fact, goes in the opposite direction in many cases.

Mr. IVES. Then, Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question: The position taken by the able Senator from Massachusetts is that, the formula proposed in the bill not being accurate in any sense of the word, and not even being justified by the facts as they exist, as the Senator has pointed out, we should then begin this undertaking with a flat per capita allotment; is that the idea? Is it the Senator's idea to end it there?

Mr. LODGE. No, no. My idea is that we cannot go wrong when the money is distributed on the basis of the number of children in the public schools. We certainly cannot go wrong when we do that. Perhaps that is not going to solve the whole problem. Senators are going to be here quite a few years more and we can take this thing in several bites. I suggest this formula as a start, and then, as discussion develops and as more light is thrown on the problem and we get rid of some of the shibboleths which have been cluttering up our thinking, we may be able to develop some kind of standard that will enable us to get a really accurate idea of a good formula. I should like to see that done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask a question. The bill, as the Senator pointed out, and as I agreed, was before the Eightieth Congress. The Senate in that Congress approved a Federal aid-for-education bill. Did the Senator from Massachusetts support that bill, or did he oppose it?

Mr. LODGE. I voted against that bill. I intend to vote for this one. I voted against that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator voted against that bill, did he not?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. And I intend to vote for this one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator intends to vote for the bill as presented by the committee, does he?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I hope to amend it. I hope to improve it, but I shall probably vote for it anyway.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is very welcome.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator concede that the figures upon which he relies in support of his amendment show that they have no relationship whatever to the needs of the individual States or of the individual students, but merely relate to a flat grant of so much per head?

Mr. LODGE. Let them come forward and prove the relative need. I see nothing in the record to prove it.

Mr. LONG. In other words, even though the Senator may disagree, at least Senate bill 246 attempts to take into account the needs of the individual States and the relative needs for education in those States, while the Senator's formula would take into account only so much per capita for each student; would it not?

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator, it may be that the formula in the committee bill attempts to take this into consideration, but it certainly fails when it comes to carrying the attempts into practice and getting results on it, because the formula in the committee bill, as I have been demonstrating for the last hour, contains some absolutely flagrant absurdities——

Mr. LONG. The bill does not even attempt to take it into consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not finished my sentence. When I have finished my sentence, I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I was saying "the preposterousness of which every schoolboy in the United States can readily appreciate."

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator concede that his formula does not even take individuals into account?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; it takes into account the number of children in the public schools. I cannot rid myself of the notion that the number of children in the public schools is a very fundamental factor in determining how much money we must distribute.

Mr. LONG. The Senator would give the same amount for the education of each child, no matter how much has been spent for that purpose?

Mr. LODGE. I would get rid of the committee formula, and then I would make a distribution of funds on the basis of the school child population, retaining a perfectly open mind in connection with introducing some further formula if a good one can be found.

Mr. LONG. With regard to such States as Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, will the Senator indicate on what basis those States are rich States?

Mr. LODGE. I have not classified any States. I am not in the business of classifying States. I have not done that. I do say that the States, the names

of which the Senator from Louisiana has recited, will be better off if my formula goes into effect than they would be if no legislation were enacted at all, because it would result in money being distributed to those States which they would not otherwise receive.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator believe that in a State such as Texas, where the amount would be reduced by one-fifth, the children would be better off than would be the children in a State such as Mississippi, where the amount would be reduced one-fourth?

Mr. LODGE. No one is getting anything yet.

Mr. LONG. But assume they should get it.

Mr. LODGE. I do not assume that at all. I am assuming that we are trying to do the right thing and will try to get a formula which makes sense.

As I have said, I propose a flat $10 per public school child formula. True, the formula which I propose is not perfect either. I admit myself incapable of formulating a standard whereby it can be accurately determined how much each State needs for aid to education in relation to the other States. Lacking a thorough comparative survey, I doubt very much whether any such formula could be worked out.

We do not resort to this "rich State—poor State" concept, based on certain income payments to individuals, in other legislation. While we have formulas in other laws, the only near precedent for this "rich State—poor State" idea of which I am aware is in the Hospital Construction Act. When Federal aid to States for the construction of highways is authorized, we do not multiply the number of automobiles by some amount of money and then subtract this from the average of individual income payments in the States. When authorizing money for river and harbor construction, we do not multiply boats times dollars and then seek to relate this to some concept of individual income receipts. When authorizing funds for a National Science Foundation, we do not multiply scientists by dollars and attempt to match this against some concept of individual income payments. Our usual procedure is to determine the cost and the need, and then appropriate on the basis of merit. If we have no reasonably accurate way of determining need or of appraising comparative need, then let us be honest about it and say so frankly and not monkey around with complicated formulas which say that Texas is poorer than Maine, or New Hampshire is richer than Oklahoma, or that Nebraska is much richer than Louisiana or that North Carolina is poorer than Missouri. Let us not waste Federal funds on an absurd, unproved scheme as this.

Let us just say: Our State school systems need help from the Government. We shall give each State so much per child to spend as it will on education. If any one State feels it needs relatively more than any other State, then let it come before the Congress and prove its case. Let us save Federal money, distribute it equitably and not put our stamp of approval on any scheme that tells us Texas is poorer than Vermont.

Let me concur most heartily with an observation which the senior Senator from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, made during the hearings on the education bill:

> There is one thing that I, for one, would like to do and that is to not have the slightest taint of a relief problem connected with our schools. I think it is a duty and not a relief problem.

SCHOOL CONDITIONS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY

So far, my chief quarrel has been with the assumption implicit in the pending bill's formula that it is possible to classify States as to comparative wealth simply on the basis of one factor alone.

Turning to another aspect of the theory of distribution in this bill, let us assume that it is possible accurately to fit each State into a pigeonhole on the basis of its over-all wealth. Let us assume further that the conclusions which the bill's formula reaches are accurate—that Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, North Carolina and others are truly poor States, while Vermont, Massachusetts, Oregon, Florida and so forth are all properly classified as rich.

Making these assumptions for the purpose of argument only, does it necessarily follow that the assumed poor States need Federal aid to education any more than do the rich States? In other words, assuming the classification to be correct—which I cannot do—would this alone be reliable indication of the status of its educational facilities? I think not.

My attention was directed not long ago to a most interesting study prepared by Mr. Raymond M. Hughes, professor of vocational education at Iowa State College and published last year in a volume entitled "Education—America's Magic" by the Iowa State College Press.

Professor Hughes used the following criteria in formulating his ranking of the 48 States in order of over-all educational performance:

1. Its educational accomplishment as determined by its average achievement of five arbitrarily chosen, yet apparently attainable goals.
2. Its ability to support education as indicated by its income per child. This refers of course, to the income which the State government receives per child and not to the individual citizen's average income per child—as does the committee bill.
3. The degree in which its accomplishment is commensurate with its ability, as determined by comparison of its actual accomplishment with that which normally would be expected in view of its known ability.
4. Its educational effort, as indicated by the percentage of its income devoted to the support of education.
5. Its efficiency in the expenditure of school funds, as found by comparing its accomplishment with that which normally would result from its actual expenditures per child for education.
6. The educational level of the adult population, as determined by the average number of years of school completed by all persons 25 years of age or older.

Using this standard, here are the nine States which the author listed as the lowest: New Jersey, Alabama, Virginia, Arkansas, Rhode Island, Florida, Delaware, Maryland, and Georgia.

When I saw this, Mr. President, my confidence in the committee bill formula suffered still another set-back. Note that five of these nine States with the lowest educational performance, according to Professor Hughes' extensive study, are States classified under the S. 246 formula as rich States and therefore ipso facto have supposedly better educational facilities and performance. This as almost as bad, in my humble judgment, as saying that Texas is a poor State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understand that in my absence the Senator from Massachusetts has been making a speech in which he denounced my State.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no, Senator. The Senator has been entirely misinformed. There has not been one word I have said which has not been in wholehearted and sincere praise. If the Senator from Texas will read my speech in the RECORD he will see that is a fact. Whoever has told the Senator that I was denouncing his State has stated a complete untruth.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was using my State as a horrible example, was he not?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, not at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very glad to say to the Senator from Texas that the Senator from Massachusetts said only the kindest things about the State of Texas. He did say that the State of Texas was a wealthy State, but he praised the State highly. I was defending the State of Texas and trying to get more money for it by trying to show that there are poor people as well as millionaires in Texas. I am very glad to have reinforcement on that point. But the Senator from Massachusetts was very cordial and generous in his references to the State of Texas.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that after listening to the able Senator from Massachusetts when he made such fine references to the State of Texas, the State of New York, and I, as a representative of New York, are very envious of Texas. We have always been envious of it, but now we are especially so.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Texas for coming from such a wonderful and beautiful State.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from New York for his generous comments. I thank him especially, because I know that by reason of his surroundings and background he is in position to know what wealth, plenty, and happiness contribute to human life.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am glad we have that point cleared up. [Laughter.] I will say to the Senator from Texas that as long as he and I live he will never hear me say a word about Texas that is not friendly and complimentary and full of admiration. I have been in his State many times. I have many friends from Texas. I think it is a wonderful State, which is why I was a little surprised to see it classified as a poor State in the committee formula, because the people there have worked hard, they are builders, they have imagination and energy, and deserve a little better than the committee formula gives them.

Mr. President, I had referred to the conclusions of Professor Hughes, and he is not alone in his conclusions. Dr. Paul R. Mort, of the Teachers College, Columbia University, described by the New York Times as one of the greatest school authorities in the field, made an exhaustive report on New York City schools a little over a year ago. Sponsored by the Public Education Association, this report literally blasted New York City's educational system. Grave charges were leveled against the school buildings. I realize that it is planned to deal with school buildings in a separate bill, and I do not suggest that aid for school buildings be included here. But it does seem pertinent to speak of buildings in connection with Federal aid to education, because school buildings are certainly one index of a community's enthusiasm for education.

Dr. Mort, speaking of New York City schools, described them as being wholly obsolete and in need of drastic overhauling. One-third of the city schools, built before 1900, are described as being in wretched condition. Many schools constructed before the Civil War are still in use. Two hundred and eighty-seven out of the eight hundred school buildings are nonfireproof, according to this report. Nearly as many lack adequate plumbing facilities. In his book Our Children Are Cheated, Benjamin Fine, the educational expert of the New York Times, cites this example:

> In 1923 the city police moved from an old building in New York City. The building was obsolete and undesirable for further police headquarters service. It had only one entrance or exit. The interior was of wood construction and not fireproof. The windows were small and poorly placed, which made the interior gloomy. Nevertheless the board of education took the building on a temporary basis. Yet in 1947, after 24 years, the old police headquarters is still being used. Fifteen classes, from kindergarten through the sixth grade, are squeezed into its 13 rooms. Five hundred children attend.

The situation in New York is, of course, typical of that which obtains in many, if not most, of our large cities. The fact that the big cities are so frequently just as badly off as rural areas illustrates how often we take it for granted that prosperity smiles upon urban dwellers, while people who live in the country are somehow always less well off.

This may be attributable to the fact, as the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] recently stated on the floor of the Senate, that "the States in many cases, are jealous of the cities." Discussing the home-rule features of the rent-control bill, the Senator from Illinois pointed out:

> There is the fact, which I pointed out in committee many times, that cities in industrial States, with 60 percent of the population, had only 25 percent of the members of the State legislatures, and that just as the industrial States are underrepresented here in the United States Senate, so are the cities underrepresented in the various State legislatures.

It is a fact, as the Senator from Illinois so ably points out, that cities in many States are discriminated against when it comes to sharing in the distribution of benefits, and that this condition exists because of underrepresentation in the State legislature.

School conditions in large metropolitan areas can be just as appalling, as the facts which I have just recited prove, as they are in rural districts.

This is not to say, of course, that disgraceful school conditions do not exist outside of the cities. Using the State of New York again as an example, let me refer to an interview which the New York Times printed last fall. This interview was with Dr. Francis T. Spaulding, New York State Commissioner of Education. He described conditions in up-State New York. Dr. Spaulding, warning that a great many children would receive a substandard education unless assistance were forthcoming, pointed out that "in some instances many up-State community children are attending classes in makeshift quarters. In some instances," he continued, "elementary pupils meet in converted paint shops, church basements, lodge halls, school bus garages, and other nonschool buildings." High school children in one community, he pointed out, have their classes in a public garage. In another town the children are scattered throughout the area in seven different makeshift locations. "These are not unusual instances," Dr. Spaulding concluded, "but are altogether too typical of the unprecedented building shortage that exists in many parts of the State. Danger to both the health and educational standards of the child is apparent."

Mr. President, I cite these examples of educational deficiencies in New York City and the rural areas of New York State not for the purpose of singling out New York for criticism, but to emphasize the point that the need for educational assistance is as great in New York—a so-called rich State, according to the committee report—as it is admittedly in other States which are classified as poor States.

The arbitrary classification really means nothing when we are talking about educational needs. Last fall Kiplinger magazine published a challenging article entitled "Our Poor Schools." The author, after analyzing the substantial and constant increase in the number of children in this country, observed:

> On the basis of these national statistics, you can think of the oncoming children as a wave, a very high wave that will sweep through the schools until it runs itself out in the 1960's.
>
> Of course, there will be exceptions—places where there will be scarcely a ripple. In many sections of the South, in the Dakotas, and other parts of the country which have lost population, the schools may not experience much of a rise in enrollment. Extra children born in such districts will only replace those lost by migration. There will be no jamming of the schools.
>
> On the other hand, on the west coast, in the Great Lakes region, and in other places where people have moved in great numbers, the flood of children will be overpowering.

Does this formula take that change into account? It does not.

I recognize that the committee bill has provisions in it which proportionately reduce the amount of Federal aid in the event a State spends less than 2.25 percent of its annual income for schools. This is a good provision, and I have, as mentioned earlier, retained that provision in my amendment. This proviso, in the words of the committee report, is "to discourage any tendency of Federal funds to replace State effort in support of public schools." I have also retained in my amendment other provisions which further tend to discourage a substituting of Federal aid for local effort.

But what of States which have already taken the initiative in local effort to correct educational deficiencies? I have seen many statements that the so-called poor States cannot afford to contribute their fair share to the school budget.

Let us consider Utah, the State of the chairman of the committee which reports the bill. The committee report shows this State to be among the so-called poorer States. Yet I recently saw a report that the Utah State Legislature had provided for the expenditure of $3,300 per classroom a year. This is most commendable indeed—and at the same time constitutes further evidence against the manifest absurdity of the "rich State—poor State" concept of distributing Federal education funds.

Here is a so-called poor State, and the people said to themselves, "Where there is a will, there is a way. We believe in doing something for our children, and even if we are a poor State, we are going to dig down and do it." And they did it, and I honor them for it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. How does the Senator feel toward a State like Mississippi, which is absolutely scratching the bottom of the barrel, and still does not have enough to educate the children of the State? Those are the people the Senator is going to slash.

Mr. LODGE. No, I am not going to slash them.

Mr. LONG. The Senator would cut the allotment of the people of that State from $16,980,000 to $4,451,000.

Mr. LODGE. First, under the formula which I propose, Mississippi would get a great deal more than she would get without new legislation, because without new legislation she would get nothing. So under the formula I propose she would make a gain far greater than she would get otherwise.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Just a moment. The Senator from Louisiana asks me a complicated and high-powered question, and then does not want me to answer it.

Secondly—and I have said it many times in the course of this speech—I believe that any State which can come here and make a convincing showing of need ought, of course, to receive treatment on the basis of such showing. But, of course, that has not been done. We have simply taken this arbitrary formula and have been trying to fasten it onto the American people. It is a Procrustean bed. Is not that the classic illustration, I will ask the distinguished and learned Senator from Illinois? Was not the bed of Procrustes a bed into which short and long men were fitted; the short men were pulled out to make them fit the bed, and if the tall men were too long, their feet were cut off so as to make them fit the bed?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the classical story to illustrate the point.

Mr. LODGE. That is what is being done in this case. An endeavor is made to fit all the States arbitrarily into the program without regard to individual requirements.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Massachusetts deny the fact that the people of States like Alabama, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Mississippi, on the whole, have only about one-half the average income of the people in other parts of the United States? Are not those the poorest States in the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is very hard to be sure. When the Senator talks about income, is he talking about dollar income? A great part of the income of people who live a rural life is not necessarily in the form of cash.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would invite the Senator from Massachusetts, who I know is a very charming companion, to take a trip with me to Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and other Southern States and go through the farming sections and the tenant sections, and see the low living standards of the people. It would not only be below the level of Back Bay, but it would be below the average level of Massachusetts. In view of that fact, since we are brothers one of another, do not we of the more prosperous States owe an obligation to help the children of the less prosperous States?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that under the formula which I propose we would help the States to which he has reference, and we would help them to a very substantial degree. I will also say to the Senator from Illinois that I would enjoy very much traveling with him through the South, but I do not have to accept his invitation in order to see the South, because I have been there many times myself. I have been in Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Florida, the Carolinas on many occasions, and I know that there is poverty in the South, and I have never denied it. What I am saying is that this formula is not the way to get at it. I say there is poverty in New York, I say there is poverty in Boston, I say there is grinding poverty in Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is.

Mr. LODGE. We have got to do better than this sledge-hammer way of doing things; we have got to do something better than this meat-ax way of dealing with the matter. We ought to do something that is smart, and that fits the conditions, and makes sense, and adds up to something. We ought not to do this thing which rests on the preposterous notion that Texas is a poor State, and that North Carolina is a poor State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator think that Missisippi, Arkansas and Alabama are poor States?

Mr. LODGE. I am not prepared to say what is poor and what is rich when I see what is provided in the bill. But I say that we are not on the horns of the dilemma of either doing nothing or else doing the wrong thing. We are not on the horns of that dilemma. The present situation is similar to one with which we seem to be reproached here all the time, either you want to do a thing that is absurd or else you have no humanitarianism or vision and in that case you must do nothing. I think it is not that way. I think we face the challenge of doing the thing that is smart, the thing that is constructive, the thing that is going to be of real help, and I think my amendment is the first step toward that kind of solution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with the very able argument of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. It is not very able.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But is it not true that the children in these States need more than $10 per pupil, as compared to the children in the North? Should they not have a greater degree of educational opportunity than they can attain from purely local income?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator may have that impression; I may have that impression; but there is nothing in the record to prove it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has just said there is nothing in the record to prove it. Is not the Senator familiar with the fact—which I am sure he is—that in the Eightieth Congress there were very extensive hearings on this subject, and it was brought out that the poorer States have more children, and have less ability to pay, and even though they are taxing themselves more heavily than the average of the entire Nation, they are not able to provide adequately for the education of their children?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to have that evidence furnished to me.

Mr. LONG. It was not brought out during the present Congress, but in the previous one.

Mr. LODGE. Go back into antiquity, if the Senator wants to. I will be interested in seeing it.

Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University, pointed out during the course of his testimony on the education bill 2 years ago:

> Under either formula, one cannot dodge the question that the wealthy States are spending more in proportion for this aid than those in the poorer States.

I stress the words "in proportion."

I will not occupy the time of the Senate with a State-by-State analysis of educational needs. The New York Times published on January 10, 1949, a factual survey of the whole country in terms of teacher shortages and teacher salaries as an indicia of general public-school conditions. This survey is in comparison with a similar one conducted a year ago.

Let me just take the nine richest States according to the committee report and see if this classification is in harmony with the committee's implication that these States are in less need of public-school assistance than other States.

First. Nevada: Here, according to the New York Times, is what this State reports:

> Nevada, which this year is spending $6,000,000 for State education, an increase of $350,000 over 1947–48, reports that it needs an adequate system of finance, an expanded building program, and a revised curriculum.

Second. New York: I have already referred to conditions in this State.

Third. Connecticut: This is what the Times survey reports:

> CONNECTICUT SHORTAGE ACUTE
>
> With 450 teachers still employed on emergency certificates, Connecticut faces a severe shortage of elementary teachers. In a number of communities it has become necessary to overcrowd schools because additional building facilities are not available.

Fourth. California: The survey, referring both to California and Oregon, the latter also a so-called rich State and therefore supposedly less in need of Federal aid, states:

> Faced with a rising birth rate and a rapidly increasing school enrollment, the schools of the Far West report a great need for more and better teachers and for additional facilities. This year 250,000 pupils in the area will receive impaired schooling.
>
> In both Oregon and California there is a ned for elementary teachers, while in Washington the need exists for teachers of all levels. California, which has 20,000 of its almost 54,000 teachers on emergency certificates—an increase of almost 4,000 over last year—discloses that 100,000 children will suffer impaired education because of the lack of teachers. Oregon reveals all schools opened last fall but are overcrowded.

Fifth. New Jersey: The survey shows:

> The neighboring State of New Jersey indicates that conditions are not improving as rapidly as had been expected. The total number of teachers has dropped a little, going from 26,376 a year ago to 26,121 today. Officials estimate that 50,000 children will suffer an impairment in their schooling. A considerably larger number of teachers is serving on emergency or substandard permits. The State issued 1,464 such licenses a year ago, and 1,967 this year. It is impossible to get enough adequately trained elementary or high-school teachers. New Jersey estimates that it can use 1,466 elementary and 824 qualified high school teachers.

Sixth. Rhode Island: Rhode Island furnishes a more encouraging report:

> Conditions have improved in Rhode Island during the year, Dr. Michael F. Walsh, State director of education, reports. The most pressing need for the State, he says, is a more widespread and more thoroughly established guidance program. This would mean a revision of the secondary school curriculum to make it meet the needs of

the majority of the boys and girls who do not intend to go to college. In addition the State could use more adequately trained elementary teachers.

Seventh. Illinois: The Times reports that in this State—

The elementary teacher shortage is acute. Illinois reports that it could use 2,800 additional qualified elementary teachers and 400 high school teachers. The State would like enough per capita, per child, to insure at least a foundation program of education. Higher minimum wage schedule for teachers would help reduce the elementary shortage.

Eighth. Delaware: Conditions here, according to the Times, indicate that—

The most pressing need, the State finds, is for additional school plant space to house the increasing enrollment.

Ninth. Massachusetts: My own personal observations, confirmed by conversations, letters and resolutions adopted by local governing agencies, indicate, as does the Times survey, that—

The State stresses the immediate need for more school buildings as well as for more elementary school teachers.

This is in Massachusetts, Mr. President. Massachusetts where many people are getting heartily sick and tired of being treated as Lady Bountiful for sections of the country which, by any fair standard, are richer than we.

Mr. President, educational facilities all over the country are generally substandard. We deplore this condition. There must be intelligent, common-sense assistance to the States. Conditions in some areas of the country are undoubtedly worse than in others, but I do not believe that this need necessarily respects States' lines or that it can be comparatively evaluated with any such yardstick as is proposed in the Committee bill's individual income payment formula. Note that almost all the States in the Middle West are grouped in the committee report as comparatively "rich" States. Ponder this and then ponder the following quotation from Benjamin Fine's book, "Our Children Are Cheated" which tells us more in one graphic illustration than all the statistics and individual average income payment formulas in the world. Mr. Fine, let me say, is no harebrained alarmist. He is the New York Times expert on education. He writes:

In a town in the Middle West, 20 miles from a large city, I visited a small, three-room rural school, containing 103 children. A seedy-looking man of 45 served as principal. He disclosed that about 25 years ago he had finished high school but had not gone beyond. During the war he worked as a tool-and-die cutter in one of the factories. When the war ended, he became weary of machine-shop work. He heard that teachers were needed, and so:

"I saw the county superintendent and he hired me. I've been here a couple months now. Never taught a day before in my life. It was hard at first, not knowing how to make out a schedule and such things, but I figured out what to do. I done the whole thing without any help."

The ex-mechanic hushed his noisy children—he had 34 of them in grades 6, 7, and 8. The room was a mess. Apple cores and dirty milk bottles were strewn over the floor. A pot-bellied stove gave off acrid smoke that brought tears to one's eyes.

"Quiet down there, keep quiet," he barked.

Then he continued: "I wasn't showed one thing how to conduct a school. But it just came natural to me as if I had taught all my life."

"Any discipline problems?" I asked.

"None at all," he boasted. "I use a stick. See it in the corner? Cut 'em up now and then. I try to appeal to their intellect. If I can't, I wham 'em. They don't fight back. I see to that."

The principal, who is on an emergency substandard license, continued:

"Sure, sometimes I have to be rough. I handled one guy, he's fourteen, kind of tough yesterday. I had to wrastle with him and bang him up a bit. He's not at school today."

During this time the pupils were restive and began throwing chalk at each other. Barking at his students again, the principal remarked: "This is a tough section. Some of the kids get into trouble. I sent a 15-year-old girl home last week. She's going to have a baby."

Mr. President, I have attacked the distribution-of-funds formula on the principal grounds that the formula is unrealistic and economically fallacious, that it leads to results in some cases which approach utter absurdity, and that a rich-State, poor-State formula is no basis for dealing with a problem Nation-wide in character and degree.

Let me summarize my arguments in concise form:

First. The committee formula should be rejected for five principal reasons:

(a) Because it does not reflect accurately the comparative wealth of the several States;

(b) Because it yields incongruous and manifestly absurd results;

(c) Because the rich-State, poor-State formula is an inappropriate and artificial yardstick for measuring the educational status of any given States.

Second. The amendment which I propose as a substitute for the committee formula justifies itself for the following reasons:

(a) It provides for a more equitable, simple, and reasonable distribution of Federal funds based entirely on school-child population rather than on an artificial relationship between two unrelated factors, as in the committee bill.

(b) It greatly reduces a manifest discrimination against 32 States which stand in great need of education assistance.

(c) While increasing the amounts which 32 of the States will receive, it nevertheless effects a 30 percent over-all reduction in the total estimated authorized expenditure called for in the committee bill:

(d) While recognizing that the need for aid-to-education may be more pressing in some sections of the country than others, it does not pretend to evaluate that relative need in the absence of any authoritative comprehensive survey showing definitely which States need the most help. It seeks, rather, to be fair to all the States rather than overgenerous with some and overniggardly with others.

I submit that there is more at stake here than the mere mechanics of Federal aid to education.

When we ask whether States now requesting Federal aid should not at least raise their own taxes to the level of the most highly taxed States in the Union, we ask a question of simple justice.

We may well be setting in this bill a precedent for future schemes for Federal-State spending, for it seems to me certain that these schemes are going to increase rather than decrease. These schemes, moreover, must not be encouraged by any action of ours to get started on a distorted basis.

There has been a revival of serious discussion lately on the Federal-State relationship. There are many factors which make effective State action seem more urgent than ever. Note these words of the Hoover Commission:

Federal grants-in-aid retard and repress the initiative of the States in financing the growing needs of State and local government, because such grants frequently result in rewarding those States which avoid their responsibility and in penalizing those which accept it.

Everyone will agree that the States should handle all problems which they are able to handle, leaving to the Federal Government only those subjects which are beyond the grasp of the States. Every Senator will agree that these Federal problems are enough to keep Congress busy.

But, Mr. President, we cannot speak of States' rights without speaking of States' duties. How—we must ask—can the States claim any rights against Federal encroachment if they do not make their own fullest effort to raise tax money and do their duty, thereby proving that their desire for independence is a reality and not a mere oratorical pose?

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the very able Senator from Massachusetts some questions?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator upon his address, which was brilliantly delivered, although I think it is fundamentally fallacious. However, it has certainly been a very able performance.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it is not true that the Southern States, on the whole, are now spending for education a somewhat larger share of their average income receipts than the country as a whole. I invite his attention to pages 14 and 15 of the committee report, where the average for the country as a whole is given as 1.88 percent. I should like to point out that in the State of Alabama the average is approximately the same as the average for the country. The figure for Alabama is 1.87 percent. In the State of Arkansas it is above the average, being 2.03. In the State of Georgia it is 2.01. In the State of Mississippi it is 2.05. In the State of North Carolina it is 2.40. In the State of Oklahoma it is 2.40. In the State of South Carolina it is 2.15. No one can deny that on the whole the Southern States are poorer than the average for the country as a whole; and yet out of their poverty they are contributing a larger fraction of their income for the maintenance of their schools than on the average is the remainder

of the country. Therefore, the inadequate educational opportunities of the South cannot be charged to a lack of willingness on the part of the South to pay. It can instead be primarily charged to the poverty of the South. What would the Senator from Massachusetts say to that point?

Mr. LODGE. There is a great deal that can be said to that. First, I do not believe that the individual income figure on which the figures which the Senator from Illinois cites are based, is a scientific, fair, just, or sensible criterion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator interrupts me, let me try to answer one of his questions at a time. It seems to me that the real test of what a State is doing for the education of its children is the amount which it spends per child from State and local sources. I have placed a table in the RECORD—I presume it has gone to the printer by this time—which shows what all the States do in that way, and which shows, as I recall, that the Southern States are by no means all on one footing so far as that figure is concerned. Some States do differently than others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are those figures per child?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Naturally, the figures per child are low in the South, because the income of those States is low; but in proportion to their income they are actually above the country-wide average.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator's determination of income is a fallacious determination, because it does not take into account the potential, and the amount of will to produce which may exist, the amount of political courage in the legislature to tax ruthless interests, and to do all the other things that need to be done. That has been the burden of my entire speech.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. If the Senator will kindly look at the table to which the Senator from Illinois is referring, he will note that the percentage of income paid per capita—that is, the percentage of current expenditures to average income payments—in the State of Iowa is 2.71; in the State of Minnesota, 2.57; in the State of Montana, 2.84—which, in those instances, is substantially higher than the corresponding percentage figures for a number of the States which presumably are going to receive above and beyond the $5 provided as a minimum under the pending bill, although not one of these three particular States is to receive more than the $5 minimum.

So it seems to me that the variation to which I have referred is at least one indication of the inequitable basis on which the formula of the bill seems to have been established.

I wish to say here and now that my name is on this bill; in fact, as I recall, the able Senator from Utah invited me to become associated with this proposed legislation because of my interest in this matter last year and because of my support of the proposed legislation on this subject last year. However, when I received that invitation from the able Senator from Utah I pointed out that I had not been satisfied with the formula—I think the able Senator from Utah will remember that—and I said I wished to reserve the right, if I could find something more to my satisfaction, to support it, in lieu of the formula provided in the bill.

The particular percentages to which I have referred and the remarks made by the able Senator from Massachusetts in referring to Texas and Oklahoma, particularly Texas, point to one of the things about the formula with which I am not satisfied. I do not think the real formula has yet been found.

Mr. President, do not misunderstand me; I am in no way opposed to Federal aid for education. But I am pointing out that I do not think the formula contained in the bill is the actual formula which should be adopted; and I am turning more and more to the idea that a flat per capita basis for distribution, while this matter is being worked out, may be a sounder approach than the one now proposed in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am much obliged to the Senator from New York for the statement he has made, which I think states the problem very well.

I simply do not think we have arrived at a final solution to this matter, and I believe we should proceed by stages until we reach the final solution.

I should like to make a further response to the question the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] raised: To wit, that the so-called poorer States were making a greater proportionate effort to educate their children than were the so-called richer States. In addition to the figures the Senator from New York furnished, I should like to point out to the Senator from Illinois the statement of Dr. Conant, the president of Harvard University, who in the course of his testimony on the education bill 2 years ago said:

> One cannot dodge the question that the wealthy States are spending more in proportion for this aid than are the poorer States.

The assertion is made all the time that there are certain States that need this aid much more than other States. Like anything else that is repeated many times, that statement has been repeated so often that many persons are beginning to believe it. I think it is true that there are areas of the country which need such help more than other areas. Whether the boundaries of those areas correspond to State lines, I do not know; but I do not believe we have arrived at a really satisfactory criterion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to fatigue the Senator by keeping him on his feet too long, for he has been speaking for some time already.

Mr. LODGE. That is quite all right; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois for a further question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me inquire as to the general position of Dr. Conant. Was he in favor of the Federal aid to education bill?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; he was.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should now like to say that while I do not like to question so eminent an authority as the president of Harvard University, nevertheless, facts are facts; and I should like to point out that according to these figures in our committee report in the State of New York the average proportion of income spent for educational purposes was 1.75, as compared to a country-wide average of 1.88—or somewhat below the general average; and in the State of Massachusetts, where the institution to which the able Senator from Massachusetts owes his academic allegiance is located and over which President Conant presides, the average percentage spent was 1.68, or somewhat below the national standard or average.

So we see that the educational opportunities given to children in those States are not the result of these States assessing themselves at a greater rate of taxation than does the country as a whole, but simply are the result of their being endowed with much more money income than the average.

I may say that we in the Middle West are sometimes satirized as belonging to the Grain Belt or the Corn Belt; yet on the Atlantic seaboard, from Washington to Boston, there is a section of the United States which really is the "money belt" of the country. Since the people in that area have such large quantities of money income in their States, the same rate of taxation enables them to give much greater opportunities to the children of their States than would be the case in most States.

We who favor this bill believe there is a national responsibility for education, and that the wealthier areas should help to contribute to the support of the children in the less-favored areas.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has said a number of things, some of which I believe upon reflection he will wish he had not said. I do not think it is fair to single out any one section of the country; I certainly would never do so——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me say, if the Senator will yield, that whatever I said was said in a Pickwickian sense. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. That is very reassuring, because I know the Senator from Illinois has been in the eastern part of the United States a great deal; and when we consider the part of the United States from Boston to Baltimore, which I believe is the part to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, certainly anyone who knows that part of the country knows it is not a "money belt." Actually, it is a part of the country which is full of working people, of people who are trying to do the best they can. When the Senator from Illinois says we in the East are lucky because we are rich, and when he says the great empires in the Southwest are poor, he deliberately ignores all the data relative to the different rates of taxation which I placed in the RECORD during the last few hours; and he has not pointed out a single State which has a 6 percent tax on se-

curities, similar to that which exists in Massachusetts, for example. He has ignored all the facts I placed in the RECORD today about the way States such as Pennsylvania tax themselves. He simply ignores all those matters, but he constantly repeats his statements in advocacy of the formula contained in the committee report, which is based on the individual-income-payment concept, although I have devoted 2 hours this afternoon to demonstrating that it is invalid because it ignores some of the principal sources of wealth.

The Senator from Illinois is a very skillful debater, Mr. President; he has a beautiful command of the English language; and he knows that if a person repeats a statement over and over and over again, some persons will begin to believe it. So he goes back and back and back to the formula or table presented by the committee; but I believe the fundamental philosophy of that table is demonstrably false and fallacious.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I like the Senator from Massachusetts so much—although I do not know him very well—that I am reluctant to keep him on his feet any longer.

Mr. LODGE. That is quite all right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But I should like to ask him a question: What formula would the Senator from Massachusetts propose for measuring the relative financial ability of the various States, if he does not use a formula based on personal incomes?

Mr. LODGE. I have given an entire speech this afternoon in trying to suggest some important considerations in that connection. I think a comprehensive study which goes into this entire matter should be made, and that this matter should not be treated in somewhat of a left-handed manner, as seems to me to have been done in this case. I think we should go into the matter of capital gains—which apparently are what, in large measure, enable the people in the Southwest to get rich and stay rich, no matter what tax bills the Congress passes—and also into the matter of bank deposits—all the things that are completely ignored by the individual-income formula, which simply takes into consideration the salaries and GI terminal leave and social security payments and certain other similarly obvious things. I say this is just a sort of sophomoric job. It is a half-baked job, and I think if the Senator were once again a professor at the University of Illinois and one of his students came up with a formula like this, he would give him a big fat U for unsatisfactory.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Quite the contrary, I may say to the Senator, I think it is a very good formula.

Mr. LODGE. It looks to me as if the Senator from Illinois and I, while we have agreed on many things, and I hope shall agree on many more, will not agree on this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is merely one more question, then I, too, shall sit down. Is it not true that the Southern States, which the Senator has singled out for getting the greatest cuts, are also the States which have high native birth rates, and from which we find the greatest migration of young people going to the North and to the West. I refer to the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, North Carolina, Georgia, and South Carolina, all of which have high birth rates; but the children do not find opportunities there, and they go North in large numbers. If they go North, we inherit them, and, on the other hand, we are asking the South to put itself to the expense of training these children who will go North, whom we will get. Is it not proper, since a very large fraction of them do come North, that we of the North, in shouldering national responsibilities, should help to raise the level of education in the South and help to pay for the education of children whom we will later receive?

Mr. LODGE. No. I may say to the Senator I think he is completely misinformed when he says that the birth rate is higher in the South than it is in the North. A little while ago I read an excerpt from Kiplinger's magazine, an article entitled "Our Poor Schools," which is an analysis of official statistics. I will read it. He said:

> On the basis of these national statistics, you can think of the oncoming children as a wave, a very high wave that will sweep through the schools until it runs itself out in the 1960's. Of course there will be exceptions, places where there will be scarcely a ripple, in many sections of the South, in the Dakotas and other parts of the country, which have lost populations, the schools may not experience much of a rise in enrollment. Migratory children, born in such districts, will only replace those lost by migration. There will be no jamming of the schools. On the other hand, on the west coast, in the Great Lakes region—

Where the Senator from Illinois comes from—

> and in every place where the people have moved in great numbers, the flood of children will be overpowering.

I think if the argument is going to be based on school-child population, I am very glad to make the argument on that basis, because it is on the basis of school-child populations that I propose my formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course the figures the Senator has quoted are based on wartime migration. But it is certainly true that the areas which have been losing population are Arkansas, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Alabama, the mountain regions of Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, and so forth, and there is migration from those areas. What I am trying to ask the Senator is this, Is there not a national responsibility, since we inherit a considerable portion of the young people who grow up in those regions, for us to help raise the level of education there?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Should we throw the burden completely upon them?

Mr. LODGE. No. There is a national responsibility; I admit it. I said so at the beginning of my remarks. I think this formula which I propose will be an important step toward discharging that national responsibility. I think the formula contained in the committee bill would in the end prove to be an injustice and a backward step.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LODGE. I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield that I may put something in the RECORD?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for an insertion in the RECORD, under unanimous consent that I do not thereby lose the floor.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk, to lie on the table and be printed, a proposed amendment, in behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, to House bill 3083, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. The amendment proposes that section 402 (a) be placed at the end of the bill. I ask that the entire amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON, for himself and Mr. BRIDGES, is as follows:

> At the end of the bill to insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury, with respect to appropriations made in title I of this act, and the Postmaster General, with respect to appropriations made in title II of this act, are authorized and directed, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions in the amounts to be expended from the appropriations made in each such title as will in the aggregate equal at least 5 percent of the total amounts so appropriated therein. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General shall each certify the reduction in each appropriation account to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The amounts so certified shall not be expended but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.
>
> "(b) Such reduction shall be made in a manner calculated to bring about the greatest economy in expenditure consistent with the efficiency of the service.
>
> "(c) No item of appropriation contained in either of such titles shall be reduced more than 20 percent.
>
> "(d) A statement of each reduction hereunder, including the amount thereof, shall be included in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1951."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I could not hear the first part of the Senator's statement. Is this amendment somewhat similar to the one the Senator offered to the Labor and Federal Security bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should merely like to ask the able Senator from Michigan, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, whether he does not think there might be some merit in the Senate's expediting and acting upon the various deficiency bills which will come before the Senate, because they deal with the current fiscal year, but in the case of the regular supply bills to do what the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes in the resolution he has submitted and which is now pending before the Rules and Administration Committee? The resolution contemplates a single appropriation bill. Obviously, such a change could not be brought about this year because it is so late in the session. But would there not be considerable merit in accumulating the general supply bills so that we could have an over-all picture of what the total expenditures of the Government are going to be for the next fiscal year? Then, instead of having an appropriation bill, carrying literally billions of dollars, acted upon on the floor of the Senate, sometimes with half a dozen or so Senators present, we could devote a week, or several days, to considering the bulk of the appropriation bills, and at that time the Senate could be afforded a complete picture of what governmental costs are going to be. Obviously, we would then be faced with a situation wherein we would have to make reductions in the supply bills, or, as an alternative, either vote new taxes of some $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000, or resort to deficit financing. Why would not that give the Senate a more complete picture than it will get on this piecemeal basis?

Mr. FERGUSON. I can agree with the Senator, if he has in mind that the appropriation bills themselves would be held up and not passed until later, and would be taken up all at one time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I should like to insist on my rights, if Senators intend to engage in a running debate. I yielded merely for an insertion to be made in the RECORD. I do not mind a question or two being asked, but I should like to make a speech, which will not be very long.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not the intention of the Senator from Michigan to make a long speech. I was merely replying to the suggestion made by the Senator from California. I think it is a very good suggestion, but there is grave doubt that it can be followed, because the bill to which my amendment relates will be reported and brought to the floor in the near future. Under the rule, it is necessary to give notice in writing of a motion to suspend the rule one day in advance of the possible taking up of the bill. That is why this action is being taken at this hour.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, without jeopardizing the rights of the Senator from Louisiana to the floor, if I may ask one additional question of the Senator from Michigan. Would it not be possible, under the suggestion I have made, for the Appropriations Committee to report such bills to the calendar, and then to get an over-all picture of what the cost to the Government is going to be for the next fiscal year? As the able Senator from Michigan I am sure knows, up to the present time the general supply bills and deficiency bills which have been passed by the House of Representatives are more than $4,000,000,000 greater than the same bills were for the present fiscal year. I do not know whether the Senate Appropriations Committee will increase that amount or will decrease it. If we deal with the situation piecemeal, we are likely to get toward the end of the session and find ourselves with a deficiency of four or five billion dollars with which to deal.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is wholeheartedly in agreement that it would be much preferable to have the bills on the calendar so that the respective Members could be studying them and could realize the amount of the total appropriations than to take them up one at a time. But if that is not possible, then the method followed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan is the only one left.

Now, Mr. President, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is our intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury, with respect to appropriations made in title I of this act, and the Postmaster General, with respect to appropriations made in title II of this act, are authorized and directed, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions in the amounts to be expended from the appropriations made in each such title as will in the aggregate equal at least 5 percent of the total amounts so appropriated therein. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General shall each certify the reduction in each appropriation account to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The amounts so certified shall not be expended but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

(b) Such reduction shall be made in a manner calculated to bring about the greatest economy in expenditure consistent with the efficiency of the service.

(c) No item of appropriation contained in either of such titles shall be reduced more than 20 percent.

(d) A statement of each reduction hereunder, including the amount thereof, shall be included in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan the purpose of his proposed amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is for the purpose of asking the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General to make reductions in the amounts to be expended under the appropriations made in each of the two titles, title I and title II, which is 5 percent of the total amount appropriated; that such reductions shall be made in a manner calculated to bring about the greatest economy in expenditures consistent with the efficiency of the service; that no one item of the appropriations contained in either of the titles I and II shall be reduced more than 20 percent, that the statement of each reduction be sent to the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Secretary of the Treasury, and that the amount so reduced be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. MYERS. I understand it to be a motion of the nature of that which the Senator made in connection with the last appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. In fact, it is identical.

Mr. MYERS. And the purpose is that if a point of order is made, there will be a motion to suspend the rules; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reply.

Mr. LONG. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, all I want to say is that after days of hearings before a subcommittee we reported unanimously to the full committee, 2 days ago, the Treasury-Post Office Department appropriation bill. Today the full committee met and agreed to the report of the subcommittee, with one exception, a $100,000 item which was added to the Treasury bill upon motion made by the chairman of the subcommittee.

I want the RECORD to show clearly that we reduced, as best we could, all of the items that could be reduced. The main increases in the bill are those for additional revenue agents in the field for collecting the billions of dollars we have been led to believe are owed to the Government of the United States by taxpayers who have been negligent in paying their taxes.

Another consequential increase in the Treasury bill is one of approximately $3,000,000, under Public Law 678, which calls for an additional amount for the Coast Guard which the law requires to be appropriated to maintain weather service, to maintain 15 new vessels which Congress authorized to be built and manned in order to put the Coast Guard up to the strength which Congress authorized.

The Senator from Michigan asked me earlier with reference to the matter, and the full committee was polled. I thought the Senator from Michigan had every right to poll the committee and to suggest his amendment, even after we had written up the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the poll placed in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have waited 20 minutes, and I should like to

speak very briefly in relation to the bill which is before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to insert the poll in the RECORD——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I shall yield for an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is no reflection on the committee. The committee has done as able a job as it is possible to do under the circumstances. It was stated on the floor yesterday that we believed the respective agencies can do a better job and add to their efficiency.

That is all I want to say at this time. I shall make a more complete reply later.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the poll in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nays	13
Yeas	4
Not voting	2
Not polled	2
Total	21

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to address myself a moment or two to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I reserve my right to speak on the merits of Senate bill 246 and for the moment confine myself to the merits of the amendment.

The entire purpose of Senate bill 246 is to take care of the great need for equalizing educational opportunities throughout the country and to assist the educational system generally. Some provision is made to assist education over the entire United States, but underlying that is the more important purpose to help the States which are not able to help themselves to provide adequate education for their children.

Here we have a system carefully worked out, not only in this Congress, but in the Eightieth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, providing aid to education for the States, attempting to determine how much the States can help themselves, and then assisting those States with their problem, recognizing that despite every conceivable effort on their part they are unable to give their children an adequate education.

The proposed amendment picks 16 States most in need of Federal aid to education, the 16 States which are making the greatest effort to educate their children, but because of their poverty are unable to do so, and makes a reduction of $110,552,000 in their allotments.

The States to which I refer are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

We find that in those States a great effort is being made to educate the children, and those States are in need of additional educational opportunities. We find that under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts those 16 States will suffer a reduction of $110,552,000 of proposed Federal aid to education.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the greatest justification for the bill is that the poor States, most of which are Southern States, are greatly in need of additional Federal aid, and they are the States which are making the greatest efforts to assist themselves. They are the States which would lose $110,552,000 proposed to be spent in their behalf by Senate bill 246.

Mr. President, who is to receive that money? It will be done by head. Each child in each State will get a certain amount of money, without regard to the need of the child, without regard to the amount already being spent on the child, and without regard to the efforts that the State is making to provide for his education.

So we see that under this formula the 32 States which have the least need for Federal aid to education would be the States which will gain the most by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts. On the other hand, the 16 States which need it the most would be the States which would be deprived of $110,552,000. I submit that that undermines the entire theory and the high purpose of S. 246.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator no doubt is aware of the fact that the reason for calling them poor States is not necessarily that the States are poor in wealth, but that they are poor in tax returns, because the property in them is largely owned by people living in a number of other States, and the income is siphoned out of those States into the other States, where it contributes to the welfare of the big States to the detriment of the other States.

Mr. LONG. I very much appreciate that fact, and thank the Senator for his contribution.

As a matter of fact, while the Senator from Massachusetts was making his speech I called his attention to the fact that even though my State produces a great amount of oil, most of the income from that oil goes into the pockets of stockholders in northern States. In my State we are especially fortunate, because there is a great deal of oil produced in the State and taxes are heavy, and they furnish much of the money for the education of our children. Therefore, I think we are more fortunate than some of the other States. Nevertheless, our State is in need.

The Senator from Massachusetts picked an example to illustrate the logic of his amendment. What State did he pick as a poor State that was going to be reduced, according to the terms of his amendment? He picked the State of Texas, and said Texas had been improperly selected as a poor State. The State of Texas is much better off than the average Southern State, but the State of Texas is much below the national average.

We see that the State of Texas is going to get, according to the formula in S. 246, $12,640,000, of which amount the Senator from Massachusetts would recommend a reduction of $2,044,000. Is that a fair illustration? Why did he not pick the State of Mississippi? Mississippi is only about one-fifth the size of the State of Texas, yet the State of Mississippi is going to get $16,980,000, from which amount he would make a reduction of $12,399,000. That is a fine example of what the amendment would actually do.

Mississippi is truly a poor State, standing right at the bottom of the list in the entire Nation. We find that in the State of Mississippi, with limited natural resources, a State making the greatest effort to educate its children, the amount would be reduced so that it would get so much per head, rather than get an amount that would enable the Mississippi educational system to be put on a par with those of the other States of the Nation.

One other important item was overlooked by the Senator from Massachusetts. He started out by saying that there were certain items which should have been included in the income. He said that when we consider the incomes of people all over the Nation we should consider the capital gains income. I believe that was left out for only one reason, namely, that the capital gains statistics were not readily available to the committee from the Department of Commerce figures, while all the other income-tax figures were available.

Let me suggest one item which the Senator from Massachusetts should have considered. He failed to consider the illiteracy figures. It is the Southern States which are suffering more than any other part of the Nation from illiteracy. Let us consider the State of California. That is a State which would benefit under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts. It would be benefited to the extent of $4,866,000 more under his amendment than California would get under Senate bill 246.

The State of California is well able to educate its children today, but we find that the State of California is suffering probably more than any other State in the Nation because other States were not able to educate their children. As Senators know, an enormous number of people have migrated to the State of California, many of them from my part of the country, the deep South, and those migrating from the deep South to California have not had proper educations.

It would have benefited the State of California if many years ago some contribution to education generally in the United States had been made, in order that the enormous population which is now moving into California would have had proper educations before they moved there.

The figures which have been presented in the committee hearings in Congress after Congress have pretty well established the fact that the Southern States have the highest birth rate, and the Southern States are those from which the greatest migration has taken place over a period of time. Those are the States which have the greatest illiteracy. They are the ones making the greatest effort to do something about it, and they are the States most in need of Federal aid to education.

I submit in all fairness, and fully appreciating the good intentions of the Senator from Massachusetts, that the formula he proposes is completely selfish, that it would benefit 32 States which have least need for Federal aid, at the expense of the 16 States which have the most crying need for Federal aid. On that basis I submit that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely unsound, and in my opinion the formula in S. 246 is the formula upon which Federal aid to education should be distributed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself entirely with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. Because I think there is one factor which has not been sufficiently discussed, either by the Senator from Massachusetts in his speech or the Senator from Louisiana, I should like at this time to ask that table 3, which appears on page 16 of the report of the committee on the pending bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Estimated income, and Federal allotment under S. 246, per child, 5–17 years, by States*[1]

State	Income per child, 5–17 years	Federal allotment per child, 5–17 years
(1)	(2)	(3)
Continental United States	$5,509	
District of Columbia	10,905	$5.00
Nevada	8,960	5.00
New York	8,808	5.00
Connecticut	8,418	5.00
California	8,383	5.00
New Jersey	8,113	5.00
Rhode Island	7,744	5.00
Illinois	7,485	5.00
Delaware	7,446	5.00
Massachusetts	7,111	5.00
Maryland	6,955	5.00
Washington	6,916	5.00
Ohio	6,460	5.00
Oregon	6,050	5.00
Michigan	5,918	5.00
Pennsylvania	5,916	5.00
Indiana	5,514	5.00
Kansas	5,423	5.00
Wisconsin	5,371	5.00
Colorado	5,359	5.00
Wyoming	5,259	5.00
Nebraska	5,257	5.00
Montana	5,248	5.00
Missouri	5,222	5.00
Florida	5,042	5.00
Iowa	4,851	5.00
New Hampshire	4,792	5.00
Minnesota	$4,750	$5.00
Maine	4,741	5.00
Idaho	4,576	5.00
Vermont	4,462	5.38
North Dakota	4,403	5.97
Utah	4,273	7.27
South Dakota	4,245	7.55
Virginia	4,239	7.61
Texas	4,213	7.87
Arizona	4,032	9.68
Oklahoma	3,442	15.58
Louisiana	3,311	16.89
Tennessee	3,233	17.67
West Virginia	3,105	18.95
Georgia	3,037	19.63
New Mexico	2,981	20.19
Kentucky	2,842	21.58
North Carolina	2,826	21.74
Alabama	2,700	23.00
South Carolina	2,435	25.65
Arkansas	2,404	25.96
Mississippi	2,082	29.18

[1] Derived from tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated income, and Federal allotment under S. 246, per child, 5–17 years, by States*—Continued

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have asked that this table be printed in the RECORD because it can be seen, by reference to this table, that a complete death blow would be given to the salutary purpose and objective of the pending measure by adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. Table 3 is based upon a comparison of the allotments made under S. 246, the bill for Federal aid to education, with the income per child from 5 to 17 years of age in all the States of the Nation and in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the States and the District of Columbia are arranged in the list from top to bottom, the District of Columbia coming first, the State of Mississippi coming last, on the basis of the amount of income per school child in each of the States as shown by the table.

I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that beginning with an annual income per child in the District of Columbia of $10,905 a year, the various States below that figure come down at the last to the State of Mississippi, which has an average income per child from 5 to 17 years of age, the school age, of only $2,082. In other words, the income of the entire State of Mississippi, when averaged out against the entire number of children of school age, shows a total of $2,082 per annum per child in the State of Mississippi, as against the average of $10,905 per year per child in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, if Senators will take that list, beginning with the District of Columbia, and going down to the State of Mississippi, they will find that the proposal made by the Senator from Massachusetts actually is aimed against the school children of the 16 lowest-ranking States in the matter of income—the States of South Dakota, Virginia, Texas, Arizona, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Tennessee, West Virginia, Georgia, New Mexico, Kentucky, North Carolina, Alabama, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Mississippi.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that the Senator's great State enjoys the distinction, among the Southern States, of not being one of the low-income States? I wanted to emphasize that, for the reason that I was afraid that because the Senator's State is right in the very heart of the South, some people might think he was speaking because his State was one of the low-income States. The Senator's State is certainly about the average in the matter of income. Is that not true? So the Senator this afternoon is not speaking with any particular reference to his own State. He is speaking for the cause involved here. Is that not true?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I commend the Senator. He is always so able in his presentations, and he now has put his finger on the very thing that is involved in the controversy now before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I conclude briefly my remarks. I hope that every Senator will find occasion to look at this list. He will here see how completely this fine objective contained in the Federal aid to education measure would be emasculated and defeated by the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

To go back to the 16 States which are the ones which would be harmed by the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that those are the States whose incomes per school child range from $2,082 per child at the lowest, to $4,245 per child at the highest. That includes the group of States from Mississippi to South Dakota which I mentioned a moment ago.

I am glad the Senator from Alabama mentioned the fact—because it is a fact—that my own State happens to be so fortunate as to have a relatively high standard of income. This particular list shows that in the State of Florida we have an income per school child of $5,042. By no means are we among the wealthier States of the Union, Mr. President, but we are proud and happy over the fact that under the proposed Federal aid to education measure we would not be one of the States which would receive any financial aid except the minimum payment of $5 per child, which, of course, is of very small assistance.

I am happy to say that we are not one of the States that would be adversely affected by the proposed amendment, but that, to the contrary, we would be greatly helped insofar as the allotment made to Florida under the proposed amendment is concerned, because under that amendment the State of Florida would find its allotment raised from a total of $2,365,000 a year to $3,516,000 a year.

Mr. President, we are quite content to take our place along with the States which would receive the minimum payment of $5 per year per child, and we are strongly behind the objectives of the

bill, which are to give help where help is needed.

Mr. President, anyone who looks at the list which I have placed in the RECORD—and I placed it there not at all in derogation of the fine people who are to be found in all of these 16 States that are mentioned, but simply as showing the facts as calculated by the department of Government from which the list comes—will find that these 16 States which would be hit by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts are the States which have the smallest income per child, the States where the children cannot possibly have standard educational advantages, even though the people of those States as a rule have done more than other States in proportion to their income, and vastly more when we consider the percentage of their total tax revenue, which they devote to the subject of public education.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Actually, when the Senator considers what is proposed to be done under the Lodge amendment, would he not find the effect of it to be to slash off about $110,637,000 which was meant to go to the 16 poorer States of the Nation, and to distribute about $40,000,000 of that amount to all the richer States in the Nation as a new method of distribution?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. President, as a Senator from one of the States which would be helped under the distribution proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, rather than hurt, I want to repudiate any idea that I would support that kind of an approach, because as I understand this whole effort, it is designed to give greater help to the school children in those States which, because of their own essential economy, are unable to give a proper American standard of education to their own school children.

Mr. President, I hope with all my heart that the Senate will not for a moment consider the adoption of the proposed amendment, which would do nothing in the world but make the distribution of so-called Federal aid on a strict per-child basis which by no manner of means meets this particular problem, and insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned he would oppose the measure entirely and he would oppose it strongly if it were placed upon any such basis. The whole objective behind the bill, and I think it is a highly worthy objective, is to give an adequate opportunity for education to all the children in our Nation by recognizing the fact that a considerable number, some millions of the children of school age in this Nation, are children living in those States which through their own means cannot give to their public school systems the financial support which would enable their children to enjoy a reasonable standard of education.

Mr. President, I will conclude in just a moment. I do want to call attention to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts not only seeks to strike at the 16 States which need aid the most, but it does not do the logical thing of bringing the damage up to the average State because the average income throughout all the States per school child is $5,509. No, if that were done there would not be enough Senators coming from the States which would be aided by the amendment to make it at all possible to adopt this particular amendment.

So, Mr. President, this particular effort is aimed at 16 States which are in the worst educational and economic position, and aimed at the chance and opportunity for education of the children from those States in whose behalf the bill was largely designed. So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned he would feel that such action as is proposed to be taken by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would completely destroy the purposes and objectives of the bill, and would utterly defeat those purposes before we pass it. The Senator from Florida hopes that every Senator will oppose the amendment, which is designed to strike out the chance to give added opportunity to children in those States who are not receiving reasonable educational opportunities now.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] asked me to announce that he had intended to reply at length and in some detail to the address of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. However, because of the lateness of the hour he has asked me to announce that instead of making that reply this afternoon he intends to make it when the Senate convenes on Monday.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be War Assets Administrator, vice Jess Larson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell P. Smith to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of De Graff Austin to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 25, with headquarters at San Diego, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Boyce A. Williams to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. MYERS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Russell P. Smith, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

De Graff Austin to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 25, with headquarters at San Diego, Calif. (Existing vacancy.)

Boyce A. Williams to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

John F. Kelley	John W. Cherry
Jay P. Dayton	Charles J. Hanks
Edwin W. Coleman	Neale O. Westfall

To be lieutenant commander, with date of rank June 3, 1943

Frank J. Fegan

To be ensign

John H. Speckin

To be ensigns, to rank from June 3, 1949

William Talmadge Adams II
Ernest Brenton Altekruse

Norman Brown Binns
Charles Lincoln Blaha
Gordon Warner Brockway
George Kenderdine Burkman
Charles Yardley Chittick, Jr.
John Marshall Clark
William Edward Clark
Henry Anthony Cretella
Richard Sargent Dolliver
Jules Berthold DuPeza
William Royde Fearn
John Aberle Flynn
Anthony Francis Fugaro
James Steele Gracey
Robert Walton Hampton
Herbert Maurice Hartlove
Thomas Edward Hawkins
Laurence John Hoch
Collins Stewart Hyers
Nicholas Ivanovsky
Herbert Adolph Johnson
Jack Mgum Jones
Harry Hexamer Keller, Jr.
Charles Earll Larkin, Jr.
David Francis Lauth
Royce Almon Lewis
Gordon Kendall Loftin
Richard John Mayer
Paul Wayne Meyer
Herbert Hyland Mulvany
Lee Charles Nehrt
Irwin Russell Pahl
Harold Arthur Paulsen, Jr.
Richard Thurman Penn, Jr.
Karl Fairbank Peterson
Reginald Winfield Raynor, Jr.
Donald Bruce Russell
George Melville Rynick III
Norman Marshall Sawyer
Robert Schuerch, Jr.
William Sheldon Schwob, Jr.
Robert Curtis Sedwick
Wilfred Hubert Shaw
William Hollis Shaw, Jr.
Frank Lawlor Shelley
Arne Johan Soreng
Kenneth Roger Spreen
William Hart Stewart
Clarence Henry Tannel
Ernest Ray Tindle
Sidney Arthur Wallace
Joseph William Eckley Ward
John Ellsworth Wesler
Neal Earl Williams, Jr.
Albert David Young, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

DELAWARE

Warren Francis Comstock, Farnhurst.

ILLINOIS

Mabel H. Green, Alvin.
Marie Little, Dallas City.

PENNSYLVANIA

Eugene W. Collins, Atglen.
Claude B. Maurer, Colmar.
Robert A. McNaul, Curwensville.
Ruth B. Nyquist, Dagus Mines.
Leonard R. Devilbiss, Fawn Grove.
Douglas James McHenry, Fort Washington.
Herbert C. Klinger, Herndon.
Harry T. Ritchey, Hyndman.
Clarence R. Miller, Mont Clare.
Luther E. Kunkle, Mount Wolf.
George L. Strausbaugh, Seven Valleys.
Willis C. Latshaw, Spring City.
Grant M. Barrall, Wapwallopen.
Eaton A. Hartman, Windsor.
Thurlow C. Brenneman, York Haven.

WASHINGTON

Rival S. Moore, Long Beach.

WISCONSIN

Gordon J. Hansen, Oregon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1949

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Charles H. McKenna, O. P., chaplain of Providence College, Providence, R. I., offered the following prayer:

O Sovereign Lord, author of life, eternal destiny of all men, we acknowledge our complete dependence upon Thee. With profound gratitude we recognize that whatever of good is in us, whatever achievements have been ours, whatever greatness has been attained by our Nation with its abundant resources, all are manifestations of divine favor and bounty.

We beg continued blessing on these United States, our leaders, our lawmakers, and all here present. Enlighten our thinking so that we may see Thy holy will, ennoble our hearts with a true spirit of charity toward all men, engender in us a sense of righteousness, of personal responsibility, an awareness of individual duty. Give us confidence and courage in our actions, and may we ever reflect the image of God impressed on our souls.

Bestow, we implore Thee, on our country a generous measure of prosperity and success, preserve us from harm, and may the world soon experience the end of discord and conflict. Finally, may all peoples be brought to the full and deep meaning of Thy Son's promise of peace to men of good will. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Bennett, Mich.	Dawson	Miles
Bland	DeGraffenried	Norrell
Bolton, Md.	Fulton	O'Konski
Bolton, Ohio	Gilmer	Regan
Bulwinkle	Gordon	Rhodes
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Short
Celler	Hobbs	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Kruse	Thomas, N. J.
Cox	McDonough	White, Idaho
Cunningham	Mack, Ill.	Withrow
Davies, N. Y.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 168)

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

(For message of the President, see p. 5234 of the Senate proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1949.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. This ideal charter which is referred to deals with tariffs; it also is in line with reciprocal trade agreements which the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction of. I do not see why this matter should now go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think it should be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and I make that point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair certainly cannot entertain a point of order like that, because he has already referred the message. The Chair will say to the gentleman from New York that the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate have to do with all legislation affecting the United Nations and related matters. The Chair, in conjunction with the Parliamentarian, went into this matter very thoroughly, and the Chair thinks that the jurisdiction clearly lies with the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, I have a right to differ with the opinion of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. When a bill is introduced dealing with tariffs to implement this message, of course, the Chair will take that into consideration.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2032, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that when the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 25, line 10, strike out "90 days" and insert in lieu thereof "6 months."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the Wood substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the Wood substitute offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Strike out all the language after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby repealed.

"SEC 2. The National Labor Relations Act, as enacted by the Congress July 5, 1935, is hereby reenacted."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But first, Mr. Chairman, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the Wood amendment was offered as a substitute amendment, and that the gentleman from New York may not offer a substitute for the substitute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is necessary for me to argue that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Wood amendment is an original amendment in that it seeks to strike out and insert. The pending amendment is offered as a substitute for the Wood amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, that was the point which I was endeavoring to establish by asking permission to make a parliamentary inquiry because the answer to the inquiry would have established whether or not the Wood amendment was offered as a substitute or whether it was in the nature of an original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is an original amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My time is short, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire as to the situation on the voting order of these amendments. The Ford amendment was pending at the time this amendment was offered. Will the vote come first on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York, and then be followed by the vote on the Ford amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will first come on the Ford amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the substitute that I have offered brings before the House for the first time the culmination of the campaign issue with respect to labor legislation. The issue was clearly drawn in the campaign. The Democratic Party, as well as my party, came out for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The President, as the leading candidate of the Democratic Party, stated: "Elect me and elect a Democratic Congress and the Taft-Hartley law will be repealed and the Wagner Act will be reinstated." Many, many Members, on the Democratic side in particular, campaigned and stated "Elect me and I shall do everything I can to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reinstate the Wagner Act."

We come here to the Congress and find that the issue before us is no longer outright repeal, but repeal with amendments, which reinstate that which you said you were going to repeal. I stated yesterday and I am happy to see the majority leader here in the Chamber, or rather I recited from an article in the New York Times to the effect that the administration's House leadership had agreed to certain amendments which were outlined in the New York Times. To date there have been no denials or any reply made. I think the House is entitled to know, and I believe the country is entitled to know—and I do not mean anything personal by this, as I have nothing but the greatest feeling of personal affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, and the Speaker of the House—but I think this issue is so fundamental that the people of this country are entitled to know whether or not the Democratic leadership of the House has agreed to certain amendments. If so, then what are those amendments? I submit that any agreement to any amendments is running away from the iron-bound commitment that the Democratic Party made to the working people of the United States. American labor went to the polls and supported your candidate for President, and elected you ladies and gentlemen, most of whom stated that if elected you would come here and do everything you could to bring about the outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and reinstate the Wagner Act. I say that you are not keeping that promise when you come here and instead of repealing Taft-Hartley outright, you are substituting amendments which reinstate into the law the very core of the Taft-Hartley law. You cannot get away from that. I want to repeat that, because it is so important. You are not repealing Taft-Hartley, you are not keeping your sacred pledge when you come here and instead of repealing Taft-Hartley outright, reinstate, by means of certain amendments, the very heart and core of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Further, let me remind you of certain legislative facts of life. First, my amendment is now offered as a substitute not to the Lesinski bill, but to the Wood substitute. Therefore, in voting against my amendment you vote a preference for the Wood bill over the Wagner Act. Second, if you defeat my amendment, and then if the Wood substitute is adopted, remember, you will never have another chance to vote for my amendment or any other similar amendment. Think of this, those of you who profess friendship for labor, when your party leadership tells you to vote against my amendment. The responsibility will be yours and it will be a terrible one.

My amendment is the only real test as to whether or not you intend to keep your campaign promises. My amendment calls for the outright repeal of Taft-Hartley and brings us back to the Wagner Act.

Was that not your promise? Was that not what you used to bring voters to the Democratic Party? Was that not the proposition that you took away from our platform? This is it. The American working men and women want to know how you vote on this proposition. Anything else is confusion, and if that story in the New York Times is true, anything else is surrender and indecent betrayal. A vote for my amendment is a vote in keeping with your campaign promises. You are either for outright repeal or you are not. If you vote against this amendment you are weaseling on your campaign promises.

I hope that all honest friends of labor will stand up in the House as they stood up on the public platform in the election campaign and support my amendment. This is it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as often and as vehemently as I have disagreed with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who has just preceded me, I always admire his forthrightness. You never have to ask where he stands. You can always find out by asking him or find out by his speeches on this floor.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for the first time in this debate has brought to this House the real issue—the issue whether you shall go forward with the Taft-Hartley Act and its principles, or whether this House is going to be a reactionary House and go back to all the evils and all the abuses and all the communistic control that was involved in the whole administration of the National Labor Relations Act.

Gentlemen, he has presented to you the issue. It is the only issue. It is a fair issue, and it is the issue upon which courageous Members of this House ought to be willing, ready, able, and anxious to stand up and be counted.

If the Marcantonio substitute prevails, then you come down to one direct proposition. Are you for standing with the progressive legislation that you took in the matter of labor relations 2 years ago or are you going back to 15 years ago when this Congress put onto the American people a law which 75 percent

of the people, in every public poll that was ever taken, said needed amendment? Do not some of you Members remember in 1940, if you were here, when the National Labor Relations Board by its administration of the act was cutting the throat of the great American Federation of Labor? Do you not remember when the amendments were brought into the National Labor Relations Act, pursuant to a committee that was appointed to investigate that subject, that I read on this floor a letter from Mr. William Green endorsing every one of those amendments? Do you not know that the whole administration of the old labor act in those days was under the joint control and domination of the Communists and the CIO? Everybody knows that who knows anything about labor relations.

Now, let us meet the issue fairly and squarely, I am ready to meet it. Do you want to go back to the National Labor Relations Act or do you want to stand on the Taft-Hartley Act? All right; let us have the Marcantonio motion, and let the question come before this House, which is the real question, and which was the real question in that Democratic platform. They say, "You ought to follow the platform." All right; stand up and be counted, boys; stand up and be counted. Vote for the old National Labor Relations Act if you want to, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], has presented to you the square issue, the fair issue, and the only issue. Now, stand up and be counted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that it would be of much help in expediting business if the Committee clearly understood the parliamentary situation. I wonder if the Chair would state for us exactly what the parliamentary situation is. My understanding is that the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would be voted upon before the Marcantonio substitute; and that if other amendments were then offered they would be voted upon before the Marcantonio substitute. But suppose no further amendments were to be presented immediately and the vote came first upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and then upon the Marcantonio substitute, and the Marcantonio substitute should be defeated: Could amendments then be offered? Or must other amendments be offered before the substitute is voted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. Amendments may be offered to the Wood amendment if the Marcantonio substitute is voted down.

The Chair might state that appearing on page 6 of Cannon's Procedure is a diagram which has always been very helpful to the Chair on this question. It will be observed from that diagram that to the text of the pending bill you may have an amendment, which is the instance here of the Wood amendment; you may also have a substitute, which is true here of the Marcantonio substitute; you may have an amendment to the amendment; you may also have an amendment to the substitute. All four amendments may be pending at the same time. But when it comes to voting, the vote first comes on the amendment to the amendment; the vote next comes on the amendment to the substitute; then the vote comes on the substitute; then, of course, the vote will come last on the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the instant case that means the vote will come first on the Ford amendment and then on the Marcantonio amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. In the instant case the vote will first come on the Ford amendment to the Wood amendment; then, if there should be an amendment to the Marcantonio substitute the vote would next come on the amendment to the substitute; and, of course, after any amendment is disposed of either to the amendment or to the substitute, further amendments could be offered to the amendment, also to the substitute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, after we act on the Ford amendment would another newly offered amendment be in order before acting on the Marcantonio substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be; in other words, the theory is to perfect the amendment, then to perfect the substitute; that gives a clear choice between the amendment and the substitute for the amendment.

The Chair wishes also to state that in an effort to be fair, the Chair thinks it possible to alternate between the two sides in recognition.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not usually take the floor to speak on subjects that do not come within the province of the committees upon which I serve, but I feel impelled to take the floor on this occasion. First, I want to state that I agree with the gentleman from Virginia in his position and attitude toward the gentleman from New York. I very seldom, if ever, agree with the gentleman from New York. I do on this occasion, and I have always admired him for his forthrightness, because if there is anything this Nation needs today it is forthrightness on matters that involve the welfare of the Nation.

With that preliminary statement, may I say that I have been home during the Easter recess, like a great many of the Members of this House. While home I was buttonholed by a good many labor leaders urging me to reverse my attitude upon the Taft-Hartley Act. I told those labor leaders that they knew me well enough to know that I was not the kind to march up the hill one year and march down the hill the next year. I said, "So far as I am concerned, I am voting to preserve as much of the Taft-Hartley Act as we can possibly preserve."

Then I spoke to some of the members of labor unions, the rank and file, men I have known ever since I was a boy, and they told me: "We are not greatly excited about the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act like our leaders say we are." Further, they said, "Of course, there are some things in it that we are opposed to. We think there are some things in it that should be changed. We believe those things will be changed in time, perhaps this Congress will change them, but, so far as outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and its provisions are concerned, we know many of those provisions have worked in our favor."

Mr. Chairman, I am reporting what these rank-and-file members told me, and I am also reporting the attitude that I told them I would take. I said, "I am at this present moment for the Wood bill, because it preserves most of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and it does eliminate some of the things that should be eliminated." I said further, "When the time comes for a vote, I am going to vote to hold on to as much of the heart of the Taft-Hartley bill as possible."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those terrible southern Democrats and I am also a lawyer. Having made that statement, and in view of the attacks on lawyers made on the floor of this House on yesterday, I am sure you might think I am beginning to sprout horns, but he who runs may easily see that nothing like that is taking place. Having said I am a southern Democrat, I want to say in addition that I am proud of the fact that I am a southern Democrat.

But, I am also an administration Democrat and I do not think that the two positions are irreconcilable. I say I am an administration Democrat, because during my short period of service in this House I have voted with the Democratic Party whenever I could do so conscientiously.

In addition to that, I supported Mr. Truman down in Georgia last year when it was not a very popular thing to do. Now, I did that in spite of the fact that I do not agree with Mr. Truman on many of the stands he has taken. Naturally, I do not agree with him on the civil-rights program, but I am not going to discuss that this morning. I think it is the wrong approach to a real problem that can be solved. But, what I want to say to you this morning is that while I supported Mr. Truman and am happy that the Democratic Party was reelected, because I think it can best serve the interests of our country, nevertheless, I am not bound by any promises that Mr. Truman made. Mr. Truman made a courageous and remarkable campaign and I admire him for it, yet really did not help elect me in Georgia. I am a modest man, as you folks know. I have not occupied very much time in the well of this House. As I say, I am a modest man, but I think maybe I did have something to do with helping carry Georgia for Mr. Truman. Now, where is the obligation?

In another respect I am an administration Democrat. I am not a Republican, and probably the Republicans are

proud of that just as I said I was proud of being an administration Democrat. But I have many friends on the Republican side, and I have voted with them on occasion, on the few occasions when I thought they were right.

I voted against the Taft-Hartley Act 2 years ago when that was a very popular thing to do in my State; it was unpopular in my district. There are union organizations in only 4 of my 14 counties. Moreover, we have the county-unit system in Georgia, so that the labor organizations in these four counties are not able to elect one Representative. So I voted against the Taft-Hartley Act, not for any political reasons, but because I was convinced that whatever its purpose, its effect would be just what its effect has been, and that is to hamper and discourage union organization, especially in the South.

There are many factories and mills in my district where union organization is not needed; where there is such an enlightened attitude on the part of management and such cordial relationships between management and labor that union organization is not necessary.

I want to say in passing that we have in the South the finest labor in America; the finest group of labor in America, because it is homogeneous, because it is Anglo-Saxon. They do not take to union organization as readily as they do in some other sections of the country. But there are conditions in the South that only union organization can remedy. I foresaw what has actually happened—that the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act would discourage union organization in the South.

When I was at home a young man who worked in a textile mill came to my office. He was not an educated man. He said, "Mr. LANHAM, I do not know anything about law, but I do know the effect the Taft-Hartley Act has had upon conditions in the mill in which I work. We knew it the next morning. There was a different attitude on the part of management." And he said further, "The restrictions on union security have reduced our union from a membership of 170 to 27."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Whatever you may say about what has happened to the unions in other sections of the country, there is no question but that in the South it has had the effect of restricting union organization and actually of destroying unions that were already in existence.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Then do I correctly understand that the gentleman is for the Marcantonio amendment?

Mr. LANHAM. I certainly am not. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question because, in my opinion, the question here is not as stated by the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Illinois or my distinguished colleague from Virginia. The question that is presented to me as an independent Member of this Congress, bound to no one by promises of any kind—the question that is presented to you and me is, Are we going to correct the defects in the Wagner Act; are we going to correct the defects in the Taft-Hartley Act; and are we going to enact a Labor-Management Relations Act that will be fair to labor, that will be fair to management, and that at the same time, and most important of all, will protect the American public?

So I am going to vote, if you are interested in that, against the Wood amendment, because it is too much like the Taft-Hartley bill. I have the utmost respect and admiration for my colleague from Georgia who has offered it. I am sure his motives are of the best. Neither do I impugn the motives of anyone who believes the Wood amendment should be adopted instead of the Lesinski bill.

While I oppose the Wood bill, I am going to support certain amendments to the Lesinski bill. As a matter of fact, I have prepared and will offer, if the Wood amendment is defeated, an amendment that will restore to the President the right to control crippling Nation-wide strikes. I feel that I would be recreant to my trust and would not be doing my duty by the American people, especially in the face of the threat that faces us right now in the coal fields, if I voted for the Lesinski bill as it is now.

As eager as I am to remove the restrictions that bind and hinder union organization and to promote the welfare of the working people of the South, I am more concerned about what may happen to the American public unless we do give the President the right in some way to control Nation-wide strikes.

I am going to offer an amendment to insert in the Lesinski bill the provisions that now apply in the Taft-Hartley Act with reference to Nation-wide strikes. I just hope that the people who really want to see something done for the working people of America and for the protection of the public, at the same time being fair to management, will support that amendment. There probably will be other amendments to handle this problem, which it seems to me is the problem we should be most concerned about in this legislation. I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will probably offer an amendment to provide for the seizure of the mines, for the seizure of the railroads, or the seizure of any other plant, the cessation of operation of which may have a Nation-wide effect. But it seems to me that the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, while not strong enough, nevertheless have been used by the President in emergencies, and should be retained. I believe he ought to have the right to use these provisions in emergencies. So I hope that when I offer that amendment you will support it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Is the gentleman in a position where he can support amendments to the so-called Wood substitute to perfect it?

Mr. LANHAM. I shall do that, too, and am glad to do so.

Mr. ARENDS. In view of the gentleman's attitude toward labor in the South, what is his position on the 75-cent minimum-wage bill?

Mr. LANHAM. I will cross that bridge when I come to it.

If I may complete my answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I am going to support the Ford amendment. I am going to do that because I believe that if the Wood amendment should be adopted we ought to get it in as good shape as possible. It may be adopted.

May I say just one more word before I close. If you want to kill the Wood bill, the best way to do it is to soften it up. After all, a boxer always softens up his opponent before giving him the knock-out blow. So I am going to vote for all amendments which will perfect the Wood bill and then I am going to vote against it, unless its objectionable features are eliminated by these amendments. There are other amendments to the Lesinski bill which I shall support. Among them are the provisions that would require non-Communist affidavits of both management and labor leaders, and that would require both parties to a labor dispute to bargain in good faith.

In conclusion, I challenge each of you to forget your political obligations if they conflict with your obligation to act for the welfare of the country as a whole.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the glory of the victory and the inauguration are over. The shouting and the applause have ceased. We are now confronted with serious problems and headaches. There are lobbyists and pressure groups galore, but the best interests of the Nation and of the world now demand sober thinking rather than political oratory.

Let us reason together, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, or Dixiecrats, or any other faction, but just as plain citizens of the United States of America. We are threatened—that is, you on this side—with patronage.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to correct the gentleman. There is no such thing as a Dixiecrat. We are southern Democrats.

Mr. LEMKE. I stand corrected. I say to my southern Democratic friends, I have always admired them and on most issues, except oleo, they support real farm legislation, as well as hydroelectric energy. I take my hat off to them.

However, I know that they are threatened with patronage, and I say that anybody who threatens you with patronage is mistaken and you ought to tell them to go to the place that never gets cold. On the other side, we also are threatened that somebody is going to check us to see how we vote today.

I want to relieve anyone of that anxiety and say that I shall vote for amendments which will improve either of the bills, which will be just to labor and to

management on every occasion that I get the opportunity to do so. Then I shall vote against the Wood substitute, not because it comes from a southern Democrat, but because I am opposed to it. It looks to me too much like the Taft-Hartley bill even after the amendments.

The public is told that the Taft-Hartley Act is up for debate. That is a mistake because the Taft-Hartley Act died last November 2. The bills up for debate and consideration are the Lesinski and Wood bills. Each of these is intended as a substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act—a repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of another act. Now we also have the Marcantonio substitute. There may be so many that we will all get confused before we get through. Each of those is intended as a substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act and therefore, a repeal of it.

I want to say that when my Democratic friends try to make a Republican bill out of the Wood bill, I do not blame them. It is something that they do not want to assume responsibility for. But I want to ask my good friends who made that remark yesterday whether they also want to tell us that the Smith-Connnally bill was a Republican bill. I had the opportunity and the pleasure of voting against that, and I am proud of it.

Then, I want to ask them whether they also want to make us believe that the May bill, the draft-or-fight bill, sponsored by F. D. R., was a Republican bill. I also had the honor and privilege of voting against that, and the Senate failed to act on it.

Then later on we had the Case-Smith bill. The best we can say for that, it was kind of a half-breed; it had two daddies in place of one; one a Democrat and the other a Republican. I find no fault with either one of the individuals. They had a perfect right to offer that bill. It passed, not with my consent but in spite of my opposition, and it may be that I was mistaken, but I do not believe so.

Then next we had the railroad bill. I am not particularly proud of that bill but it was passed by the House, and again it was lost in the shuffle in the Senate. It shows that we over here sometimes do not deliberate enough; that we should have a little more time to think before we vote on many of these measures.

The Lesinski bill, as originally drafted and to some extent as now submitted, represents the viewpoints of the extremists in labor. It is the demand of a segment of labor that the victorious party now make good its platform pledges. Among them was the pledge that the Taft-Hartley Act would be repealed. It should be repealed. It should never have been passed.

With no apologies to its authors, the Taft-Hartley Act was an insult to the laboring man. It was dictated by large industrialists and was passed in a "labor be damned" spirit. The election on November 2 should be an eye opener to those who unwittingly fell into the trap of a few clever corporation lawyers. The price that we Republicans paid for that blunder came too high.

From my viewpoint the original Wood bill represents the extremists in industry. It was simply a dolled-up Taft-Hartley bill. I have not had time to read the new Wood bill. There is undoubtedly plenty of room for improvements in both bills.

The facts are that for the best interest of this Nation this legislation should have been disposed of long ago. As a result of the delay, the Nation has been whipped into a fury by extravagant and false propaganda on both sides. One would think that the only legislation before the Eighty-first Congress were these two bills whereas there are at least a thousand bills that more vitally affect our Nation than either one of these bills.

It is about time that we use a little more common sense—a little more tolerance—that we refuse to become worked up by false propaganda regardless of the source from which it originates. It is about time that industry realize that labor as a whole is just as patriotic as the rest of us, thinks just as much of our Government as we do, and also has just as much to say about the Government under which we and they live as we have.

It is also time that the extremists in labor realize that industry is still the life of this Nation, that without industry we could not enjoy many of the comforts of life that we now have, that without employers there would be no employees.

It is time for both industry and labor to realize that the public will not much longer tolerate or endure strikes that affect the very life of the Nation or a community. It is time that we all realize that violence has no place in America.

The abuse is not all on one side. I know the industrialists have practiced arrogance, intolerance, shut-outs, and violence in the past. I know that during the railway shopmen's strike in the twenties, the railroads hired men at St. Paul to take the strikers' place, put them into a bull pen and refused to permit anyone to talk to them. They did not even allow pickets. Later they put them on a train with an armed guard at the door that would not let any of them get off until they reached their destination.

I know that they employed strike-breakers—roughnecks, pugilists, and armed guards—to beat up the strikers. I also know that they acquired firearms from Government agencies to quell the strikes. At least they stipulated to that fact in open court. I know that they used faked and manipulated photographs. These things all came out in a trial where I happened to represent a client who was illegally and wantonly shot by one of the railroads' guards. Let us hope that this is past history.

I also know that some laboring groups have defied law and order. I know that they resorted to force and violence. I am satisfied, however, that the public has reached the end of its patience. I am confident that the people in the various States from now on will demand that the governors and the courts of the various States do their duty, and assume their responsibility to see to it that these wrongdoers are brought to justice without fear or hesitation. There is ample law in every State in the Union to stop violence. If it is permitted, it is because of the dereliction of the local and State officials.

I know personally that the great majority of labor unions and labor officials are opposed to this violence. I also know that a great majority of the industrialists are opposed to violence or abuse on their part. It is with minorities that we should be dealing here and not condemn all because of the illegal actions of a few.

Frankly speaking, if this legislation had been acted upon long ago it would have saved a great deal of wasted hot air and energy. It would not have given the masters of extravagant propaganda on both sides the opportunity to clutter the mails and the air with erroneous assertions.

It would have prevented a few of the industrialists from beclouding the issues by sending out cleverly worded questionnaires with request that they be answered "yes" or "no" and sent to Members of Congress, thus cluttering up the mails and filling the already overburdened wastebaskets. These questionnaires did not give the background or all of the facts essential for an intelligent "yes" or "no."

The Eightieth Congress missed a great opportunity. It could have passed a good efficient labor law—one that most of the leaders of labor would have agreed to—a law that would have been just to labor, management and last but not least the public. It could have passed a law that would have prevented strikes. The Taft-Hartley Act did nothing of the kind. It created bitterness and hatred.

After the 1946 election, some of the leaders of labor were willing to assist in drafting legislation under which any industry that seriously affected the Nation or any community would continue in operation during a labor dispute. They were willing to assist in writing into a law the terms and conditions under which this could be accomplished. That accomplishment alone would have been worth a hundred Taft-Hartley Acts.

These same leaders were willing to accept the responsibility, if we gave them the authority, to stop violence whenever the governor of any State failed to do so. They were willing also to assume the responsibility, if we gave them the authority, of getting rid of the Communists that have infiltrated into some locals.

If I may digress for a minute, I may suggest that it is not only labor unions that the Communists have infiltrated, but they have infiltrated into some of our colleges, parent-teachers associations and some religious and charitable organizations. They have even penetrated the silk-stocking crowd. This by sailing under false colors and covering up their objectives.

Unfortunately the Eightieth Congress slapped all organized labor in the face with the Taft-Hartley Act. Of course, there are some good provisions in that act, and there are some bad ones. Because of Congress' arbitrary action and the bitterness that action created, we are confronted with this legislation.

The Nation, however, will live in spite of these bills. There will be a better understanding between labor and management. Calmer and better judgment will,

in the end, prevail. I am satisfied that labor and management will learn how to settle most of their difficulties through negotiations rather than wasteful strikes. Henry Ford II was right when he said that these labor disputes, after all, are largely the problems of labor and management rather than that of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] has expired.

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here in the Halls of Congress before you today as a free American and as a Member of the greatest lawmaking body in the world for the express purpose of giving you my views on why the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], stated that he was back home for the Easter vacation. I want to say that I, too, was back home in Illinois for the Easter vacation and talked to many, many members of various local unions. I have yet to find the first one who did not tell me to vote to kill every part of the Taft-Hartley law.

Now, so much has been said about the great amount of money that has been paid to organized labor in the last 2 years. I want to say that the most fantastic profits that were ever made in the history of this great country were made by our industries. In many cases it has been said that labor is inefficient and that it has slowed up. Where did all this profit come from if not from the sweat of efficient labor? I take my hat off to the American laborer. He is the most efficient of any man in any country in the world.

At this time I believe we are here to try to enact a law that will bring about peace and harmony between labor and management.

I am a laboring man myself. The larger part of my livelihood to date has been derived from the representation of small wage earners and not a small part of my time has more recently been spent in connection with union activities arising from labor disputes and grievances. I stand here in the well of this House today as a man who has seen the Taft-Hartley law in operation, as a man who has seen what the Taft-Hartley law has done to the laboring man of this great Nation. Having worked with laboring men all my life and having been actively engaged as a president of a local union for some two and one-half years, I believe myself to be a true friend of labor, and I think I can say, without disloyalty of any kind to any of my good labor friends, that I do not believe there is any fundamental difference between industrialists and the laboring men of this great Nation as to their interests in the welfare of this great country.

Labor understands the problems of industry and its management. Labor has educated its leaders and its members with reference to the complex and difficult problems confronting industry and management. On the surface of things, it seems strange that there should be so much tension in the field of labor relationships at this time. The profits of all the large corporations of our country are at an all-time high. Yet, despite this, and notwithstanding this apparently happy state of affairs on the part of industry, there persists strong distrust and lack of confidence between some employers and employees. What is the reason for this distrust and lack of confidence? Is it labor who has brought this about?

Is it labor who says give us everything and you take nothing for your investment? Is it labor and its leaders who are trying to direct their efforts in such a way that industry shall derive no profits from its investments and efforts? The answer to all these questions is obviously in the negative. Labor would indeed be foolish to even possess the slightest desire to bring about chaotic conditions in the industry which employs them, well knowing that that particular industry is their mainstay and support. Naturally, the laboring man is interested in securing higher wages. Naturally, he is interested in securing safer working conditions. He knows that without an arm or leg his means of contributing to the support and well-being of his family will be lessened. Therefore, we find labor constantly striving for better and safer working conditions. The laboring man realizes first and always that his health is of paramount importance, for without good health he will be unable to support and maintain his family. Is it strange or beyond comprehension therefore that the laboring man today is constantly striving for better working conditions, for the elimination of health hazards, and for an increase in the earnings which he takes home for the support and maintenance of his family? To me this is not strange; but if the laboring man of today did not show enough interest to want to better his condition to help him to better support his family, it would exhibit a great weakness of character on his part, and I am sure that the production records of these days would reflect a different score.

In the past there have been many and various shortcomings on the part of both labor and capital, and the labor movement in this country has such a brief history that those shortcomings and abuses are well remembered by men who are still actively engaged in forming the policies of labor unions and employing companies. As I said before, labor has sought to inform and educate itself as to the problems of industry and the management of the same. Might I suggest here that it is high time for industry to educate itself with reference to the problems and the needs of labor. Cannot labor and capital obliterate from their memories the acts of the past and walk together hand in hand with the idea of looking at the facts and circumstances as they exist today, and do the things that would be for the mutual benefit of both? Labor is not desirous of taking over industry and I do not think industry is desirous of taking over labor; but labor is desirous of having cordial and happy relationships with industry. Cannot industry exhibit to labor its desire to have cordial and happy relationships with labor?

We are all human beings, and life is indeed short compared with the age of the world. Is this question so serious and is this problem so great that men cannot gather around the conference table with a free, unprejudiced mind and work out their problems, as has many times been done in the past? This great union of States which we represent here today, the United States of America, the greatest freedom-loving country in the world, where liberty may be had for the asking and where people in all stations of life reach down to help their fellow citizens, was founded upon the principle of mutual cooperation and benefit for all.

That is the only purpose, my friends, why men band together, for in mutual cooperation they find strength and security for all. Cannot capital say to labor, "You are the producers of our great country, and for producing the wealth of this great country, we will fight to see that you get your fair share of the profits by reason of your efforts in our behalf?" As I said before, I served as president of a local union in the Chicago area, and while I served as president of that local union, we were successful in obtaining all our objectives without resorting to strikes or boycotts of any kind. I feel that this is a matter to be proud of. I feel that the membership of that local union which I served is to be congratulated, and let me say here and now that the reason we were without need or threat of strike during that period of time was because industry agreed to cooperate, because industry understood their problems and did not close its eyes to the needs of the members of that union.

From my experience as a labor leader and as I view the question today as a Member of this legislative body, there is only one difference between labor and capital, and that is: capital refuses to recognize labor at all in many instances; capital refuses in many instances to consider, wholly or in part, many of the problems affecting the daily routine life of the laboring man; and last but not least, capital refuses in many instances to give the credit to the laboring man which he most rightfully deserves. In all instances, labor and capital have walked down the road of success together only where capital has recognized labor for its productive efforts. Is it so hard for capital to recognize labor for what it actually is, and upon recognizing labor for what it is and for what it deserves, to say to them, "We want you to have a decent living wage. We want you to have security in your old age. We want you to be able to support and maintain your families. We want you to raise your sons and daughters, the future citizens of this great Nation, respectably and thereby prepare them to be good citizens." Is it so hard for industry to say all these things? That is the only problem facing industry and labor today, and in my opinion, that is the only problem that has even confronted labor and industry. Labor has laid its cards on the table. Labor has sought peaceful relations with industry.

The voters in the last election were asked to choose between the principles

set forth in the Wagner Act of 1935 and those of the Taft-Hartley law passed by the Eightieth Congress in 1947. I made that issue clear-cut in my campaign, as did other Members of this body here today. I believe that labor can work better with industry under the principles embodied in the Wagner Act of 1935 than they can with those of the Taft-Hartley law of 1947. I believe in a free, unfettered, democratic way of life. I believe that the laboring man of this country should enjoy the freedom and the privileges accorded other groups in other fields of endeavor. I believe the laboring man should have the right to bargain collectively with industry without legislative impediments thrown in the path of negotiations such as those set forth in the Taft-Hartley law. Much is being said at this time by many to confuse the people concerning the Taft-Hartley law, which we seek to repeal. These issues, however, are in fact very simple.

The Wagner Act was predicated upon the premise that the average, ordinary working man in the United States could not protect himself against unscrupulous employers as regards wages, hours of work, job security, and other conditions of employment when he dealt individually with his employer. The Wagner Act was based on the assumption that men would find greater freedom and more security in these matters if they dealt collectively with employers through their unions and representatives of their own choosing. This conception in the Wagner Act was based upon recognition of the fact that the main and most important reason unions were weak was because most men were afraid to join a union. The average workingmen in industry saw their coworkers participating in union activities, fired and blacklisted, so that they were unable to find employment elsewhere. Therefore, we find the laboring man in a position where he could exercise his right to join a union only at the expense of losing his job.

For two decades prior to 1933, it became a common practice for many employers to impose upon their employees the "yellow-dog" contract. Under the "yellow-dog" contract, men were given jobs only on the condition that they would not join a union or even talk with a union organizer or one who was in any way connected with union activities. The laboring man was forced to sign these "yellow-dog" contracts because it was necessary for him to obtain money with which to support and maintain his family.

In the days before the Wagner Act, the courts enforced the "yellow-dog" contracts and held as unconstitutional any State or Federal statute which attempted to outlaw them. The courts even went so far as to issue injunctions which restrained unions from approaching a man who had been coerced into signing a "yellow-dog" contract. The passage of the Wagner Act attempted to remedy this. In the first place, it was, under the Wagner Act, an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge or discriminate against a worker because of his membership or activity in a labor union. If workers were discharged for union activity, and after investigation it was found that they had been discharged for that reason, they were reinstated on the job and the employers were directed to give them their back wages. With the coming of the new era, the workmen all over the country by the thousands joined unions for the purpose of bargaining collectively with their respective employers. As a result of this, the Wagner Act further declared that if a majority of workers, voting in a free and fair election, chose a given union to represent them, it was then the duty of management, under the law, to negotiate with the chosen representatives of the workmen and to bargain collectively with them and at least make some effort to reach an amicable agreement. The act did not coerce or force the workers to bargain collectively; there was no obligation upon them to do so, and, on the other hand, there was no obligation on the part of the employer to agree to the demands made upon them by the union. Under the Wagner Act, no one, either employer or employee, was forced to do anything, and under the principles of this act, union membership increased to nearly 15,000,000.

Many employers cooperated with various unions in carrying out the principles of collective bargaining as set forth in the act. Many employers agreed with the principles embodied in the act, and the act enabled them to negotiate by reason of dealing with union representatives for the mutual benefit of all concerned. It is true that abuses did develop in the administration of the Wagner Act, but this is not an exception to the rule, as we all know, in dealing in human relationships. The act did protect the large class of working people in this country against the unscrupulous exercise of power by large employers.

Many employers never tried to make the act work. They refused to adjust themselves to the terms of this law and to realize that it was their duty to at least attempt to negotiate freely and bargain collectively with the representative of the union in their particular industry.

In 1946 those large employers made their views heard in the Halls of this Congress. They procured, obtained and passed the Taft-Hartley Law, forbidding the so-called closed shop, even though both employers and employees mutually agreed to it. It prevented the employees from asking for the union shop unless they had won an election permitting them to do so. It provided other restrictions which tend to hurt labor, and where an interpretation of the law would have been in favor of labor in one instance, it was so interpreted as to affect labor adversely in all instances. The Taft-Hartley Law made it possible for industry to break unions and destroy the very principles upon which it was predicated, that is: free collective bargaining between employers and employees. This part of the law was the vindictive part of industry coming to the fore. This was the part of the law which allowed industry to retaliate against labor. The National Labor Relations Board under the Taft-Hartley law began and is the sounding board of industry.

The Taft-Hartley law, by outlawing all forms of secondary boycotts, compels members of a union to work on goods coming from a plant where members are on strike, and it makes illegal the right of unions to practice restraint or coercion without specifically defining the meaning of those terms. It permits picketing, but in effect the act says, "Do not go near the plant, but stay in your own back yard," thereby attempting to make any kind of picketing ineffective.

These are only a few of the very serious weaknesses of the Taft-Hartley law. Under the Lesinski bill now under consideration by this House, we want to restore the practice of collective bargaining as we knew it under the Wagner Act of 1935. The fewer the rules and regulations, the better labor and industry will get along. Our aim is to restore the right to collective bargaining and to encourage parties to settle disputes between themselves aided by Government machinery. The Taft-Hartley law has brought chaos and confusion to labor and management.

The Lesinski bill will bring light from the field of darkness, cooperation and accord from chaos and confusion. I believe the principles I speak of and upon which I stand are correct. I believe, as a former union leader, I know whereof I speak. I believe, as a man who has worked with laboring men and at the conference table seeking to bargain collectively with industry, that the Taft-Hartley law has done nothing for industry and labor but to bring discord, and menace peaceful labor relations at all times. Let us make our labor force a free one. Let that force be free of economic reprisals which are a menace to us as freedom-loving people. Let us pass new legislation and wipe out memories of the Taft-Hartley law and all of its abuses.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is a wonderful thing that we are having this debate because it gives us an opportunity to hear from all the splendid new Members who have come to the Eighty-first Congress and get their ideas and give the country the benefit of their ideas. That is all for the good.

I have been listening to this debate. I listened to my good friend who just left the floor, for whom I have great admiration. But I do not follow his argument.

He started out to tell of his active participation in the conduct of labor-management relation negotiations as he represented them and he told how wonderfully he had acted on behalf of the unions he represented and what great contracts they got. I was wondering what the Taft-Hartley Act had to do with preventing him from sitting down at the table with his employer and getting those wonderful contracts worked out. It would have been a little better if particularities were pointed out wherein the Taft-Hartley law operated

to prevent him from achieving those fine contracts.

Mr. Chairman, let us be fair about this thing. He said that this is a fight between management and labor and giving rights to labor. I do not think there is a person I know of at least who does not realize that we cannot have a decent, prosperous country without decent, prosperous labor and decent, prosperous agriculture. Bear in mind that agriculture had something to do with producing the food that won the recent war also.

But have you forgotten what was taking place back in 1943? You are seeking to have amicable relationships between management and labor. What about the relationship that grew up between the two great labor organizations and between them and independent unions? Oh, I have not forgotten that. I happen to have been a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that handled appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board in 1943. My good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] was on that committee at that time and he will recall what I am going to tell you.

When that appropriation bill was before that subcommittee I was absolutely thunderstruck and stunned when Mr. William Frye, a member of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor and president of its metal trades section, came before that subcommittee on the 29th of May 1943. You may read his testimony beginning at page 416 of the hearings on that bill of that year. What did he ask this committee to do? He told the most pitiful story you have ever heard of the fight between the A. F. of L. and the CIO and the partisanship of the National Labor Relations Board that was destroying the American Federation of Labor—not a fight between management and labor. He was not complaining about that. He was complaining of the fight that had developed on the Pacific coast and all over this country where the CIO was attempting to pirate away the membership of his union and were asking for elections to take over the union in the metal trades division out on the Pacific coast, taking it away from the A. F. of L.

He said, when he came before the committee, and this appears in the RECORD for you to read: "I speak for Mr. William Green and for the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor in the statement that I am about to make." The gentleman from Texas will corroborate what I am saying. He made the most unusual request that you have ever heard. He asked that that Subcommittee on Appropriations cut the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board 90 or 95 percent so as to put that agency out of business.

Well, now, what would you have done? Here is the great American Federation of Labor coming before this committee asking you to vote to do away with the National Labor Relations Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. When was that?

Mr. KEEFE. March 29, 1943, was the day that he appeared and anybody who wants to can get those hearings and read them. It was a very illuminating statement he made before the committee.

Now, I sat on that committee. If you had been on that committee what would you have done under those circumstances? Was I antilabor because I refused, as a member of that committee, to vote to do away with the National Labor Relations Board? Here was the great American Federation of Labor demanding that we so curtail its funds that they could not function. Was I antilabor because I refused to respond to the request of one segment of organized labor? Here was the CIO, on the other hand, demanding that we give more funds to the National Labor Relations Board. Frye and Green, Padway and all the rest of them were contending that the NLRB was so prejudiced and so partial in its administration of the Wagner Act that they were putting the American Federation of Labor and its craft unions out of business.

Well, it looks to me, my friends, as though it is somewhat a question as to whose ox is being gored and at what particular time the goring takes place.

Now, that Congress, which was a Democratic Congress, and that committee, which was a Democratic committee, with some very able men on it at that time, took that matter under consideration—and you gentlemen in the labor movement, perhaps, remember it—and Congress adopted what was called the Frye amendment and wrote an amendment onto that appropriation bill which prohibited the National Labor Relations Board from spending any money to conduct an election in a case where an existing contract had been in force or the fact that it had been duly certified by the NLRB, and that settled the situation throughout the country and stopped the pirating that was going on by the A. F. of L. in the Gulf coast territory and stopped the pirating that was going on on the west coast by the CIO and permitted the people to go to work and produce ships that were needed for carrying on the war effort. The CIO and the A. F. of L. were both guilty of pirating at that particular time. It was a fight between them.

So, I want to say to you, when these great leaders come to you with a proposal and say that unless you do so and so you are antilabor, try and reconcile that position with the state of facts that I have just stated. I was accused of being antilabor because I refused to cut the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board and put it out of business because the A. F. of L. asked for it as against the CIO. Then I was accused of being antilabor by the CIO because I voted with the Democratic majority and wrote into the appropriation bill the so-called Frye amendment. I will tell you, if there is anyone of you who believes that you can satisfy down the line all of the demands that are put upon you by organized pressure groups, including labor, you are just better than I am, and I do not think that it can be done. The fact of the matter is, I am willing to vote, as I told the people in my district, for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law that would make it more equitable and effective in the interests of the public, and make it work. But I am not going to stand up here and abstractly just follow a demand which says, "I demand that you vote to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and vote for the Lesinski bill without amendment." Those are the words that have come to me from organized groups in my district, "We demand that you vote for the Lesinski bill without amendment." Now your party is proposing to amend the Lesinski bill. I just wonder what you will have to say to labor when you carry out that conspiracy that has been so well described here on this floor.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as being in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act in its entirety and the immediate reenactment of the Wagner Act without any amendments which would be detrimental to labor or public interest.

In the last election the voters of the Nation expressed their opinion of the actions of the Eightieth Congress with regard to legislation covering labor-management-public relations. The Taft-Hartley Act aroused labor politically, caused industrial unrest, and raised the barriers between management and labor.

It is interesting to compare the economic conditions in the country at the time various labor laws were in existence. Immediately after World War I there were industrial disputes involving bloodshed and loss of life and property. During this period, union labor and the wage earners were unsuccessful in making any progress. The deplorable depression of 1929–33 was the result of hampered production caused by low wages, poor working conditions, chaos and bitterness. History repeated itself after World War II when big business, with the assistance of the Republican Party, engaged in another drive to break labor unions by the enactment, upon their first control of Congress in 15 years, of the Taft-Hartley Act. On November 2, 1948, the American people indicated their desire to progress with the years and to avoid a repetition of the sufferings of that last post-war Republican regime. I therefore feel it my duty to carry out the mandate of the people by voting against the Taft-Hartley Act or any similar legislation with a different title.

The outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the passage of the Lesinski bill (H. R. 2032) will protect the basic rights of labor to organize and will promote free collective bargaining between

employer and employees. This is the most effective contribution the Federal Government can make toward friendly and stable labor relations. Since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, peaceful collective bargaining received a serious setback; it has failed to provide constructive solutions to labor-industry problems. The Lesinski bill will eliminate the evils and shortcomings of the present labor legislation.

The Congress is now being offered a disguised version of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Wood bill, which is publicized as eliminating or changing some Taft-Hartley provisions. Actually the Wood bill includes additional anti-labor prohibitions and I therefore feel that a vote in favor of this bill would be a vote against labor and against the public interest.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, following the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is quite a difficult task. He is a man of great ability. But I have heard the gentleman for about 8 or 9 years, and he has been thunderstruck so many times that I wonder how he maintains his great powers of oratory.

We Democrats have a demonstration here this morning, one that I have been laboring with all the time I have been in Congress. We have the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] attempting to lead and direct the Democratic Party, and on the other hand we have a gentleman agreeing with him who, to my knowledge, has been identified with that group which has been sniping at the heels of labor ever since I have been here.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman should point out that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] agreed that this is the issue, but that he took a position diametrically opposite to that presented by my amendment.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman can fight that out with the gentleman from Virginia.

It seems to me the issue here is clear cut. There is no more reason for a southern Democrat's being antilabor than there is for my being antilabor. His district is no more agricultural than mine. But I think it is only fair that we look at the whole Democratic platform. If we are to single out this one plank in the Democratic platform and say we are not going to conform to it, that is not a mandate of the people, then we can in all good faith say we do not believe in any other plank in the platform.

We are going to have an agricultural bill to consider before long. That was one of the key issues in the campaign. The President on many occasions when I heard him, both criticized and damned the Taft-Hartley Act and the Aiken agricultural bill. Those were the two issues which were very prominent before the American people during the recent campaign. On those issues we were elected to the Congress of the United States. It is not a question of whether we elected the President, or the President elected us. It is a question of the position that nearly every Democratic Member of Congress, on the majority side, took on one of those two issues, at least. I took a position on both of them. I told my constituents that I was going to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I did not say anything about how it was to be amended. I also told them I was in favor of a bill which would take out of operation the flexible provisions concerning farm parity and that I was going to fight to preserve the 90-percent-of-parity provision. That is what the American people were told.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. In his statement, the gentleman said that he had promised to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and that he did not consider amendments. Are we to understand from that, that the gentleman is supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, that is, the substitute amendment?

Mr. GRANGER. I well could support his amendment, if I chose to do so, but I do not choose to do so, because the President emphatically said that he was for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, with amendments, to the National Labor Relations Act, the Wagner Act.

Mr. WERDEL. Then the gentleman is supporting the Lesinski bill, is that correct?

Mr. GRANGER. I am supporting the Lesinski bill and I am opposed to all these amendments to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard much criticism of the attitude of various Members during the discussion on this legislation as to whether a man belonged to a labor union and whether he was a lawyer or held some other position or station in life before coming to Congress. I have always been in the manufacturing business. I have been an employer of labor. I question whether I should talk about this legislation, because of the fact that many people would say "Well, he is a manufacturer, and all he has to think about is what he can do to exploit labor." I have always tried during my lifetime to be honest, fair, and square to everybody. I wrote out a little statement regarding this legislation, and I hope that I will be able to act in this manner. This legislation should be considered with the idea that management and labor should, could, and would work together in peace and harmony, with the idea of live and let live. "Do unto others as ye would that men should do unto you." I hope that the elected Representatives to Congress will think of that Golden Rule in our consideration of this bill. It is only with that spirit and ideal that we can pass proper and appropriate legislation. A bill which is drawn to force and coerce people will react to our detriment and reflect on our ability as legislators. Americans as a whole should be our first consideration in all legislation. Only with those principles will we meet the test. It is not a question of what meets the political situation at the moment. It is a question of what is right for all and what is good and best for the American people. I hope the Congress will so govern itself in writing this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] issued a statement which I quote:

> I will guarantee you that if the southerners and the Republicans get their coalition working against the Taft-Hartley repeal bill, then about 100 administration Democrats will be ready to fight every bill affecting the South that gets to the House floor. I am not sure how (the fight on the labor bill) will come out, but of this you can be sure—the House will get an opportunity to vote directly on repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. And if it refuses to carry out that pledge of the Democratic platform, then the war with the southerners will be on.

Mr. Chairman, is this the kind of statesmanship that is productive of good laws? Is it tolerance for an honest difference of opinion? Would the gentleman deny freemen the right to think and act in accordance with the dictates of conscience? Would he wage war upon them for the courage of their convictions? The gentleman guarantees war, but how are we to evaluate his guaranty? Does he speak for himself only? Does he assume to speak for the 100 administration Democrats? Does he and do they intend really to fight every bill affecting the South?

Mr. Chairman, is this the kind of statesmanship that has delineated or characterized the real leadership of this Republic from the beginning? Does it reflect the leadership that made possible the compromises of the Constitution? Does it reflect the spirit of conciliation that has animated almost every great legislative proposal to come before this body in the 160 years of its existence? Does it indicate a statesmanlike consideration for the regional diversities of the Nation? Does the gentleman from the great State of California not know that but for the votes of southerners, upon whom he now would make war, the once arid lands of the Southwest might still be without the blessing of the waters that flow gently through its fertile valleys and across its bountiful fields?

Does the gentleman not know that it is these regional diversities that make America a land of opportunity—a land of varied climes and customs and traditions and institutions and cultures and economies? Would he reduce us all to the deadening level of economic monotony or bind us in the strait-jacket of relentless legislation?

Does the gentleman from beautiful California, whose fields never have been laid waste by the relentlessness of war, express officially the policy of himself and his kindred warriors to renew war

upon southerners? Would he have the South in the status of servility? Would he and his hundred kindred warriors wage war against the continuing concepts of political liberty which this Nation has inherited from illustrious southern statesmen?

Does the gentleman mistake the spirit of the South? Is he engaged—he and his kindred hundred—in a program of revenge? Is he spurred by frustration?

Does the gentleman contend that the mandate of the recent political victory is a program of malice, of arbitrary, capricious legislation to be enacted into law by war upon southerners? Has the gentleman a modern force bill ready for introduction?

The gentleman's statement is a bristling declaration of war—of war upon the South and southerners. May I not at this blessed season of Easter, from whose observance we have but returned, remind him of the tolerance and forbearance expressed by the gentle Saviour upon the Mount:

> Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good for them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you and persecute you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may be allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman and his kindred warriors: The South is not your enemy, it does not curse you, it does not hate you, it does not despitefully use you, it does not persecute you. It does not wage war upon you. But neither by intimidation, by bribe, nor by entreaty will it surrender that which God has given it—a brave heart, an honest mind, and the will to render right to all men.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Ford amendment to the Wood bill, and then support the Wood bill, H. R. 4290, to increase the time from 90 days to 6 months in which an employee on strike may vote.

It has always been my conception of the duty and responsibility of a Member of Congress that he consider legislation from the national viewpoint and its effect upon the country as a whole. When we stand in our places on this floor of the House and raise our right hand toward heaven at the beginning of each Congress and take a solemn oath I believe it involves the express obligation to legislate for the common welfare. We are not here to favor one group over another or some special interest over some other interest. The discussion and debate on the legislation before us has degenerated into a wrangle over paying political debts to one special group regardless of its effect on the country at large.

In 1946 this Nation witnessed a wave of strikes, work stoppages, and labor strife which was no credit to labor unions and a serious threat to a free economy in a free land. The fault may not have been all on one side. This unfortunate condition arose while the one-sided Wagner Act was in effect. Labor suffered as much or more than management and the American people certainly as much as both. They demanded that the conditions be remedied. The Taft-Hartley Act was passed to bring about a better relationship between industry and labor, a reasonable balance of power between them, and stability in our productive forces. It may not be a perfect law but it did reduce strikes, the wage earner has had steadier employment with better pay and less trouble. Let any injustices of the law be shown, any unworkable provision be indicated, or any part of the act be specified, and I will be one of the first to correct what can be shown to be wrong.

The Wood bill contains such corrections, included to carry out our American tradition and principle of a square deal and equal justice for all.

The issue in the pending consideration of labor bills seems to be an effort to obtain more power on the part of some labor leaders. Many laboring men have expressed themselves favorably to me with most of the present labor law. Certainly their welfare should be considered.

It is very difficult for me to understand why anyone, unless he be a determined reactionary, wants to go back to the days of strikes and idleness under the Wagner labor bill by supporting the Lesinski bill. That bill is more hostile to our economic welfare than the Wagner Act. It is a threat to industrial peace and an invitation to economic warfare. Responsible union leaders should mark well such a step.

The Michigan farm bureau is apprehensive of the effect of the proposed Lesinski bill if enacted as it relates to the authority or want of authority over strikes which jeopardize the national welfare, also jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. The bureau urges control of such subjects in pending legislation. I certainly believe they refer to the provisions of control as provided in the Wood bill.

Some union men in my district ask that an amendment be added to permit a majority of the men in any plant to vote on whether or not they want to strike instead of a majority of those who vote in any bargaining unit to make such determination. Union representatives who have discussed this point with me said this change would be unworkable. Let us ever hold before us our Nation's welfare in this debate and do our duty without fear or favor to anyone.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I appreciate the kindliness with which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has spoken to this group; and I would say further that most of the criticism, or the questions which he asked me would have been well justified had I made the statement attributed to me.

I was handed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] a sheet of material which he picked up in the aisle yesterday and which purported to be a statement by me. It bears a date but there is no indication of the origin of the statement. It purported to be the article to which the gentleman from Georgia referred. I am sorry that the gentleman did not come to me first and ask me if I had made the statement. He did not, and, therefore, I realize——

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If I have done the gentleman a wrong, I apologize to him.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I accept the gentleman's apology.

Mr. COX. I saw the statement. It was handed to me in a printed document, which I hold in my hand, Governmental Affairs, and I assumed it to be correct. I regret that I did not approach the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I accept the gentleman's apology.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yesterday afternoon I saw this piece of paper lying here on the floor. I picked it up, and saw the gentleman's name on it. I did not know where it came from. I came down and handed it to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman did, and I thanked him for his courtesy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I refuse to yield further at this point, for I want to use a little of my time.

From the time that I received these papers from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I sought every occasion to secure recognition, but was unsuccessful until this minute. I do not say this as any criticism of the Chair because he is one of the fairest men in the House; I say it only to show that I used every effort to speak about it.

It was also called to my attention that one of our new Members, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM], had a similar article. I went to him and spoke to him about the matter and told him that I had been misquoted—that I had made no such statement. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM], for whom I have a great deal of respect, and who I believe will be a fine Member of this House, probably did not know the custom of courtesy due a Member or did not take at face value my statement, because he thereafter inserted an article in the RECORD which included part of this statement and some

humorous remarks of his own. You will find it in the Appendix of the RECORD. In that extension the gentleman developed the theme of me carrying on the war of General Sherman against the South. I appreciate the gentleman's humor and I feel kindly toward him, but I would like to tell the gentleman that I was born in the district in Kentucky represented by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY]. My great-grandfather was a slave owner in Kentucky; my grandfather fought in the Civil War in the cavalry of the Confederacy. My uncle at the present time is assistant attorney general of the State of Kentucky. He has the respect of every Kentucky Member of this House. I married a girl from Missouri, who lived in the district represented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]. As I said, I was born in Mayfield, Ky., but spent my boyhood in the districts represented by the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. Chairman, I think I understand the South. I think I understand their problems. In the 7 years I have been a Member of the House, have I ever taken the floor and berated the South? Have I ever condemned them for their ideas on civil rights or on labor legislation? I do not always agree with the gentlemen from the South, but I spent most of my boyhood in the South and I believe I understand their problems.

I moved out to California—out into a country whose people think differently. Many of my southern neighbors who formerly lived in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Kentucky, and other States in the South have moved into my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with my friends from the South on some of their positions, but I do not question their motives or their honesty. I intend to wage no war against the South, but I will say to my friends from the South that there are 75 to 100—as long as the number has been used by the gentleman from Georgia—Democrats in this House who are from the cities, who have peculiar problems that pertain to the cities of our Nation, to the welfare of the inhabitants of the cities, and we are concerned with those problems. We are also concerned with the cheapness of agricultural products, with the cheapness of peanuts, with the cheapness of cotton textiles, with the cheapness of agricultural products which are raised in the South and in other parts of the Nation. Now, if we should vote sectionally, and I am speaking of the 75 to 100 Democratic Members of the House from the cities, if we voted from the sectional or from the selfish standpoint, we would vote to take away the parity prices on agricultural products, we would vote against many of the measures that have obtained for the benefit chiefly of the people of the South.

What has been the record of myself and these other men who came to Congress? As I said, I have been here 7 years. I have voted to sustain every agricultural program that had to do with the South and from the standpoint of sectional selfishness these votes may have penalized the people of my district, the wage earners of my district.

I felt seriously on the subject of rent control. Why? Because I knew that if the rent controls were taken off in my industrial district the rents would go up, the amount those wage earners would have to pay for rent would be increased, thereby reducing their purchasing power so far as agricultural products are concerned for that portion of their earning power which went into increased rents would be denied for the purchase of food that they need on their tables.

I think I voted for the best interest of agriculture when I voted to retain reasonable controls on rents, because I believe it would have given to the purchasing power of city wage earners, had that vote been sustained, a greater purchasing power for agricultural products. I do not think we are so far apart, Mr. Chairman, I think that there is an area where the southern Democrats, the western, and northern Democrats can get together.

I recognize that there is a philosophical and an ideological area where we cannot get together. I ask you not to criticize me because I vote a certain way; neither will I criticize you for voting a certain way which you feel to be the honest motive in your heart. I have never questioned the motive of any man from the well of this House, and neither do I do it today.

I want to say this, I think this controversy could have been avoided had my friends come to me and asked me about this matter.

Now I want to say in conclusion that while I differ with my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, on many occasions from an ideological standpoint, I do appreciate the kindliness with which he approached this matter, and there is not a human being in this House whose motives I wish to criticize.

I want to extend at this time—and this is sincerely from my heart—my best wishes to the gentleman from Georgia, and my sympathy for the loss which he has had recently, and which every man in this House, whether they vote with GENE COX from Georgia or not, extends a sincere and deep sympathy to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I ask the gentleman to yield in order that I might thank him for that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

THE MANDATE

Mr. Chairman, the debate on the proposed legislation was opened with the assertion which has run all through the discussion that the 1948 November election was a mandate, that is, an order, from the people to this Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. The reason for that conclusion is that, while more than two-thirds of the Members of the Congress voted for the bill, the President vetoed it, during his campaign advocated its repeal and he was reelected.

The conclusion that it was the will of the people that the law should be repealed is not justified for the reasons, among others, that a majority of the people did not vote for President Truman, that there were other issues involved in the campaign and that a majority of those who voted for the Taft-Hartley bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President, were reelected.

Moreover, the issue before the people in November last was not a single one. The issue before the people was, all things considered, did they prefer Mr. Truman or Mr. Dewey as their President during the coming 4 years.

Again, many Members of Congress during their campaigns for reelection, openly and vigorously advocated the retention of the Taft-Hartley Act and were reelected.

If you will excuse a reference to my own situation, and it was similar to that of many other candidates for Congress in 1948, my position as an advocate of the Taft-Hartley Act was very well known. Some union leaders, and the district from a practical standpoint is completely organized, opposed the Taft-Hartley Act. The election returns disclosed that I received 69 percent of the vote. It would be absurd to contend that every one of those who voted for me was in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act, just as it is equally absurd to contend that all who voted for President Truman voted for the repeal of that act. If a mandate—an order—was issued to me, it was to support the Taft-Hartley Act.

THE REAL ISSUE

The real issue before the House at this time is whether we shall continue in force a law which was written after weeks of hearings and careful study, a law which, for the first time in the history of national labor legislation, makes a sincere attempt to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, and the welfare of the individual worker—the man, the woman who actually does the work and for whose survival a job with adequate compensation is necessary.

We are now asked to reverse our decision of 2 years ago, a decision which, after long debate and careful consideration, was concurred in by more than two-thirds of the Members of each House.

We are now told that we were either frightened into voting for the Taft-Hartley Act or that we did not know what was in it.

My argument is not that we should not correct a mistake if a mistake was made. My assertion is that our decision, when we overruled the President's veto on the Taft-Hartley Act was the right decision, and that we should not be now trapped into conceding either our ignorance or our lack of courage when we adopted it.

The Republican masters of political strategy—in their wisdom—and it may be because they wish to placate and appease some of the politically powerful

labor leaders—have seen fit to scrap the label on the bottle, that is, to consent to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act if the provisions of the act can be retained under the name of the Thomas-Wood act. While personally that sort of procedure does not appeal to me, I nevertheless, realize that legislation is always the result of a compromise, and if we can give the country the kind of labor legislation it should have, then it would seem to be foolish to quibble over the label on the bottle—the contents remaining either the same or being improved.

The issue before the House has been discussed at length by able Members of the House, and there is no reason to assume that every Member of the House who desires to be advised is not at least fairly well informed as to the issue before the House, as to the merit or lack of merit in the Wood bill and the Lesinski bill.

Unfortunately, whatever may be the information possessed by the individual Members, it is extremely difficult for the House, sitting in Committee of the Whole, to write a bill which expresses the desires of the majority. Nevertheless, here we are, and so let us do the job to the best of our ability.

The statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in substance and to the effect that overlong the Congress and the people have been considering legislation while having in mind only the interest and the demands of organized labor and of employers, unfortunately was all too true. The Taft-Hartley Act was written because, and in my opinion, only because, at long last, the people were insisting that we have labor legislation designed to protect the interests of the people as a whole. The Taft-Hartley Act made an attempt—a very, very feeble attempt—to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. It was also an effort, and it did that more successfully, to protect the union and nonunion employees against coercion from any source.

In my humble opinion, it did not go far enough to adequately protect the public health, safety, and welfare or to protect the nonunion worker. The Taft-Hartley Act retained the closed shop under the name of the union shop or union security, giving to the nonunion employees a 30-day reprieve from the order of the union and the employer to pay up and join.

Though my time is limited and I was unable to secure any time during the 8 hours general debate on the bill, I cannot refrain from one comment on the union or union-security shop.

Prior to 1935, it was a practice of some employers to refuse to hire a man if he belonged to a union, or if he joined a union after he was hired, to discharge him. Those provisions were written into contracts which became known as "yellow dog" contracts. Those contracts were so unfair, so contrary to our system of Government, that they were outlawed by the Congress and the courts. Today, the unions which condemned, and rightly condemned, the "yellow dog" contracts, are insisting upon the reverse of the principle written therein. The unions then objected to the principle that a man could not obtain or hold a job if he was a union man. They now insist upon the reverse proposition that a man cannot obtain or hold a job unless he is a union man. In a free America, their demands should not receive even thoughtful consideration.

In a free America, there should be no monopoly of labor, any more than there should be a monopoly of a commodity. Yet, John L. Lewis seeks and to a large degree has obtained a monopoly of labor in the mines. Walter Reuther and his organization have a monopoly which controls the workers in the automotive industry. Philip Murray and his cohorts control labor in the steel industry. Other illustrations might be cited if time permitted.

As previously stated, the issues before us have been thoroughly discussed. Words rather than reasons or arguments for the retention of the essential provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act would be added by a further lengthy discussion. As to the bill itself, permit this brief statement:

I am familiar with the Wagner Act, as are many Members of the House, for I was here when it was written. Attended most of the hearings held by a special congressional committee — the Judge Smith committee—which investigated its interpretation and administration. I attended the 7-week hearings preceding the writing of the Taft-Hartley Act, and assisted in writing that act, both in committee and in conference.

In the main, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act come nearer to protecting the public, individual employees, and union organizations than any prior legislation. No one so far has cited any of its provisions which impair the rights of the worker.

As is always the case, there are some provisions in that law which should be amended, as, for example, the one which requires the officials of unions to sign anti-Communist affidavits, which should be broadened to cover employers and the officers of corporation employers.

The Taft-Hartley Act is an effort—

First, to protect the public health, safety, and welfare when threatened by labor disputes or strikes.

Does anyone contend that is wrong?

Second, to protect the individual employee, whether union or nonunion, from coercion from any source—from coercion on the part of the employer, the union, or the union official.

Third, to give equal privileges, such as free speech, to employees, to union officials, and to employers.

Fourth, to impose upon employers, employees, and unions equal obligations to carry out the agreements which they have entered into freely and after due consideration.

Fifth, to give the individual the right to join or not to join a union—to work or not to work at any available job.

Sixth, to make certain, insofar as possible, that union policies shall be determined by the members of the union, rather than by union or international union officers.

The act does curb the arbitrary power of union and international union officials. That is justified on the ground that men and women who must work for a livelihood, who are dependent upon a pay check, should have restored to them the right to determine when, in view of the last offer of an employer, they should or should not go on strike.

I cannot leave the subject wthout calling attention to some of the statements made during the debate. On Wednesday the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], called attention to a unanimous report of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, made on May 26, 1948, and which was later approved by the full committee. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], filed, not a dissenting opinion, but, and I quote: "Accompanying views of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK." It was the gentleman's claim that by the report the committee condemned the Taft-Hartley Act. That contention is not sound—the condemnation was of the bureaucratic practice of misinterpreting and maladministering legislation.

The sophistry of the argument advanced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is apparent when the issue before the full committee and the subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is understood. The subcommittee had before it a proposal by Mr. R. N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, to so construe the term "affecting commerce," as carried in the Taft-Hartley Act, that it would bring under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board practically every businessman and every employee in the United States.

Note Mr. Denham's testimony. He was asked by the chairman:

Well, there is no business, then, that you would not have jurisdiction over?

Under his interpretation of the term "affecting commerce."

Mr. DENHAM. I can conceive of very few businesses over which there is not at least technical jurisdiction.

An examination of the hearings, which were short, and of the report shows conclusively that for some reason best known to himself, Mr. Denham was seeking to give the National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction over practically every businessman, every employee in the United States—a jurisdiction which had never been exerted under the Wagner Act.

The gentleman from Massachusetts argues that the Taft-Hartley Act was the reason—the cause—of this action of Mr. Denham. The truth, however, is that the definition of the term "affecting commerce," as carried in the Taft-Hartley Act, is identical, word for word and punctuation mark for punctuation mark, with that carried in the Wagner Act.

The pertinent section of the Wagner Act, Public, No. 198, Seventy-fourth Congress—S. 1958—defining the term "commerce" and the term "affecting commerce," on page 2, reads as follows:

(6) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or

other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(7) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

The terms "commerce" and "affecting commerce" are defined in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act, Public Law, No. 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session—H. R. 3020—page 3, in exactly the same words, and for comparison, I quote:

(6) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(7) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

What Mr. Denham was seeking to do was just what so many administrative officers have, throughout recent history, attempted to do and all too successfully brought about—that is, their own idea of what the law should be rather than their acceptance of what the Congress wrote into the law.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1949, on page 5135—quoted from the findings as follows:

Your subcommittee is certain it was not the intention of Congress to include in the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board every small, local business which drew a small portion of its supplies or merchandise from beyond the borders of the State or Territory.

And he stated, and again I quote:

The Taft-Hartley Act did that, but the Wagner Act did not.

The gentleman was in error. As just stated, the definition of the term "affecting commerce" carried in the Taft-Hartley Act was exactly the same as the definition of the term carried in the Wagner Act. Mr. Denham is the gentleman who was attempting to extend the jurisdiction of the Board. The gentleman from Massachusetts quoted further from the findings, as follows:

Members of the subcommittee are of the opinion that any attempt on the part of either the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or the Board itself to enlarge upon its own jurisdiction by interpretation is not in keeping with the will or the intent of Congress.

The members of the subcommittee are further of the opinion, after due consideration of the testimony, that the term, used in both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, "affecting commerce" is too general.

Furthermore—

The word "furthermore" is not carried in the report—

the subcommittee is of the opinion that this new interpretation proposed by the general counsel of the Board to be placed upon the term "affecting commerce" is not warranted either by the previous history of interpretation and administration of the Wagner Act, by the debates on the bill, or by the terms of the act itself; that such interpretation is not necessary to effectuate the purpose of the act.

In my humble opinion, every Member of this House who is familiar with this legislation will agree with the subcommittee and the committee making that report.

The argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was that the Taft-Hartley Act compelled Mr. Denham to put this new interpretation upon the law, but that argument is not sound for, as stated, the definition of the term "affecting commerce" was the same in both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Those hearings and the report demonstrate, not as contended by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the Taft-Hartley Act was wrong—but that Mr. Denham was taking it upon himself, as is the custom of altogether too many administrative bureaucrats, to rewrite the laws enacted by Congress, by a process of interpretation and maladministration.

The committee was of the opinion that to avoid the misinterpretation which Mr. Denham was seeking to apply to the Taft-Hartley Act, it would be necessary to redefine the terms "commerce" and "affecting commerce" so as to make it impossible for administrative officers like Mr. Denham to give legislation enacted by Congress a meaning which was never intended.

The gentleman from Massachusetts neglected to quote from the subcommittee's findings the following paragraph:

The members of the subcommittee are further of the opinion, after due consideration of the testimony, that the term, used in both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, "affecting commerce," is too general and will, in the future, be subject to conflicting interpretations, will lead to confusion, so that many businessmen and labor organizations will be uncertain whether they are or are not under the act.

The committee's report, to which the gentleman refers, contains the following recommendations:

In order to restrict and limit the confusion that will result from this proposed interpretation, we recommend that the House Committee on Education and Labor, which is charged with initiating legislation affecting labor and industry, or the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is charged with initiating legislation affecting interstate commerce, or any other appropriate committee, redefine the terms 'interstate commerce" and "affecting commerce," and, by bill, submit a proposed definition of "interstate commerce" and "affecting commerce" to the Congress.

We further recommend that, until Congress has an opportunity to act, the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and the Board withhold any new interpretation of the term "affecting commerce".

In the accompanying views—not a dissenting opinion—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], said that he made—and I quote—"no objection to the two recommendations made by the subcommittees."

The committee's report that the definition of the term "commerce" and of the term "affecting commerce" be rewritten and made more definite was made because and only because of the persistent and determined efforts of the bureaucrats, of administrative officers in the executive departments, to thwart the plainly expressed intent of Congress and to write into the laws enacted by Congress, their own ideas of what legislation Congress should have adopted.

As was stated by an Assistant Attorney General some years ago, and the statement was put into the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], that, while in other years, it was the purpose of those charged with administering the law to ascertain and carry out the will of Congress, the more recent practice was to interpret the laws enacted by the Congress so as to carry out the will of the executive departments. That was the evil at which the subcommittee and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was striking when the report to which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred was written.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], on Wednesday made two other statements which I cannot permit to pass unchallenged. He said, and I quote:

Furthermore, few Members really knew what was contained in the Taft-Hartley bill or what it meant.

That statement is a reflection, an unintentional one I know, either upon the intelligence or the courage of the Members of the House. It is my contention that the Members of the House knew what they were doing when they voted—more than two-thirds of the Members—that the Taft-Hartley bill should be the law of the land, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

The gentleman further stated, and again I quote:

So I know of no one today who is defending the Taft-Hartley Act in this Chamber.

Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that, though I stand alone—and I know that I do not—I am defending the Taft-Hartley Act. Let me say that I defended it during the campaign in 1948 and let me repeat—I was reelected as were many other Members of this House who voted for the act, who defended it during the campaign and who were elected and who are sitting in this Congress today, despite the campaign promises of Mr. Truman, despite the concerted efforts of certain leaders of organized labor.

No one contends that the act is letter-perfect. No one contends that it should not be amended and perfected, but a majority of those who voted for it 2 years

ago are today sitting in Congress and I for one know of no reason why, at the demand of certain pressure groups, of certain politically minded representatives of labor unions, we should abdicate our functions and now repeal a law which I again say, for the first time in the history of labor legislation, seeks to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public and especially of the workers of America.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of participating further in this debate until such time as I proposed the national seizure amendment which has been referred to this morning and referred to before on other occasions, but one of the senior members of our committee has an expression which I like. He says, "Sometimes you feel an inner compulsion to speak, and if you do, you should generally follow it. That is your duty as a Member." And, I feel that way this morning, and I feel it for this reason: We heard something this morning about forthrightness of the left, and we heard something this morning about forthrightness of the right, but we heard nothing this morning about forthrightness of the middle, and I assure you there is a forthrightness of the middle and I would like to evaluate for a few minutes what it is.

First, we have a proposal known as the Wood substitute, and that is brought forward by those who believe in the fundamental philosophy of the Taft-Hartley law, and those Members are now about the business of amending or changing that substitute in order to satisfy certain of those who fall within the purview of that philosophy and to whom undoubtedly the substitute would be more acceptable if it was somewhat amended; that is understandable. They go ahead in order to get the maximum support for the Wood substitute. Personally, I intend to vote against the Wood substitute. My present intention is not to offer to amend it, because I feel that the Members who are for that substitute will not amend it in such a way as to make it that repeal of the philosophy of the Taft-Hartley Act to which I am pledged and which I believe is essential to the best interests of the country. On the other hand, this morning we are faced with a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York, which proposes to restore the Wagner Labor Relations Act in its original form. I say nothing whatever about the design with which that substitute is put forth. I am assuming that it is with good intent. But the purport of that substitute is to fractionalize the supporters of real repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; the purport of that substitute is to seek to create dissatisfaction and antagonism in certain labor quarters so that Members may be made to feel concern that they will be accused, because they did not stand up and vote for this substitute, of not honoring their pledges for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. That just is not so.

Our duty is to endeavor to repeal the Taft-Hartley law in the light of conditions as they exist in this House today, and, in the light of such conditions, the soundest expectation for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law is the bill which is before the House reported out by the committee, H. R. 2032.

There is one other effort which is being made and which in a sense echoes what occurred here between the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from California, and that is an effort to take all those people with whom one disagrees and put them in one category—they are reactionary, or they are on the right, or they are against labor—and to take all the other people and say, "These are the only saintly ones, these are the only good ones, these are the only people who believe in the welfare and the dignity and the advancement of the common people." That is a tactic with which we are becoming all too familiar in the world. It is the hallmark of democracy that there are no such blacks and whites, but it is the hallmark of totalitarianism and its greatest propaganda technique that everything must be made, whether it is or not, all black or all white.

No, Mr. Chairman, before the American people questions are not a totality of black and white, reactionary or liberal, left or right. Men are taken for what they are on the specific issues which come before the people according to the specific ways in which those men act.

I hope that when it comes time to vote those who really support the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law will not permit themselves to be panicked by the substitute which has been offered by the gentleman from New York this morning.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman campaigned in the city of New York, and I saw his campaign literature and read his speeches. Is it not a fact that the gentleman came out for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and did not say anything about his plant-seizure amendment? Is it not a fact that the gentleman came out not only for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act but for the reinstatement of the Wagner Act, as in my amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot agree with the gentleman, that what I am advocating here today is anything but completely consistent with the position I took during the last campaign. On the contrary, what the gentleman from New York advocates in his substitute will, if carried, result in the defeat of any hope of adequate Taft-Hartley law repeal in the House in this Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is not fair to say that during the last campaign, and certainly yet as to some people, the extreme position of one side is that all the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed and the Wagner Act reinstated without any change, and on the other side there are people who may be in slightly different camps? The Lesinski bill has certain parts of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is now said in the press that additional parts of the Taft-Hartley Act have been agreed upon by the administration and are to be proposed and accepted by the administration. So is it not finally this, that the original position taken by some for complete repeal and reenactment has been abandoned by about everybody and that at the same time there are a lot of people who are earnestly striving to write good, fair, decent, and equitable labor-management relations legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that I do not subscribe to the proposition that there is not a fundamental difference in philosophy between those who wish repeal of the essential philosophy of the Taft-Hartley law and those who do not. I see the alinement on that difference in philosophy between those who support the Wood substitute, and those who are opposed to it as I am.

The points I was trying to make are that, however we may differ on particular issues when those issues come up, that does not put those men and those women in any specific class, and further, that there is an honest attempt here on the part of those who support the bill H. R. 2032 to bring about repeal of the Taft-Hartley law in accordance with the basic intent with which campaigns were waged for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. HALLECK. I commend the gentleman for making it quite clear that this business of trying to put labels on people and divide them into camps which one might call antilabor or anything else is an unfair operation.

Mr. JAVITS. Pinning a label on people has never been popular in American public life and I hope it never becomes popular.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I take it from the gentleman's statement that he is trying to reach some common ground one way or another. Is the gentleman going to support loosening amendments to the Wood bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I will not, because I do not believe that the sponsors of the Wood substitute will finally accept those amendments which will make it, in my view, a proper repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2032—the Thomas-Lesinski bill.

I well recall the great hue and cry which arose on the other side of the House back in 1947, when the Taft-Hartley bill was under discussion. At that time the claim was made that the good people of this country, through their action in the 1946 election, had given the Republican Party a mandate to legislate against labor unions. "Labor has become too strong. It has forgotten its proper status in society. Labor must be taught its place." These and similar statements were repeated over and over again—in the apparent hope that repetition would convince the Nation of their righteousness.

And so—in a setting of the most vicious antilabor feeling seen in many a day—the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. This law was not intended to correct abuses in the field of labor relations but, rather, was designed to cripple and destroy the organizations of working men and women in America. It returned the workingman to the dark days of the hated labor injunction and the yellow-dog contract. Section after section—68 pages in all—were devoted to applying restrictions to the laborer and his organization—all in the guise of freeing him from the domination of his leaders. And mind you—all this as the result of a mandate from the people themselves.

Well—we, the people, spoke on the matter last November. In no uncertain terms the electorate of this country stated that—far from intending that any such mandate be given—it was their definite desire and decision that labor should retain the gains and advancements it had made under the Wagner Act. Apparently the American people had not been taken in by the tremendous propaganda campaign that had been unleashed. They appeared to still hold to the great principle that the laboring man did have a certain dignity—a principle which the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law obviously consider both naive and un-American.

But did these NAM statesmen learn anything from the recent election? On the contrary, through some form of twisted reasoning they have come to the conclusion that the American people were opposed to the name of the Taft-Hartley Act but not to its contents. And with that fixed idea in their mind they have written another bill which changes the name to the Wood bill and which adds further restrictions to the laborer and his organization. H. R. 4290, the latest Wood bill, purports to repeal the discredited Taft-Hartley law and to reenact the Wagner Act with amendments. Actually, the proposed amendments reenact the corresponding sections of the Taft-Hartley law and strengthen certain antilabor features of it. The bill broadens the use of the injunction in several respects and is really more antilabor than the Taft-Hartley Act, itself—if that is at all possible.

What the Wood bill does is to enlarge and strengthen the most objectionable features of the Taft-Hartley Act. It permits the issuance of an injunction merely upon the filing of charges and without investigation or issuance of a complaint—a procedure not presently permitted even under Taft-Hartley. It forbids an economic striker the right to vote in an election if he has been replaced for 90 days. It more tightly prohibits jurisdictional disputes—regardless of cause or justification of them. It continues the ban on the closed shop and more closely defines the manner in which a union shop may be authorized. It provides that stricter State laws shall supersede the Federal law. In brief, it is more vicious and more oppressive to labor than its parent the Taft-Hartley law. It pretends to lessen the restrictions imposed by the Taft-Hartley law but it is noted that such easings are found in the less objectionable phases of the Taft-Hartley Act—whereas the most objectionable provisions of that law are considerably strengthened.

I have long been an advocate of the theory that the less Government restriction we have in collective bargaining the better off the country will be. I believe that the Taft-Hartley Act has failed because it had as its primary purpose the unfair restriction of legitimate union activities. It was a political law and had as its main goal the tearing down of labor unions rather than the establishment of labor peace. Under such conditions—how could anyone expect the laboring people to accept it? How could anyone expect that with its passage labor unrest would cease?

And the Wood bill follows the same error. Rather than mediate differences it would raise new barriers between labor and management. The principles underlying this bill provide interference by Government in the daily affairs of free trade unions and business and are a serious threat to the traditions of a free people.

It seems to me that a law of the type of the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be made better by amendment. Its restrictive provisions are so ambiguous and complicated that even its sponsors are not agreed on interpretations. It seems obvious that the only remedy is to repeal the act completely and thus restore balance to the bargaining table. For this reason I strongly advocate passage of H. R. 2032, in the sincere belief that it contains the best solution to the Nation's labor-management problems.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to clarify some statements which have been made as to the Democratic Party platform pledges of 1948. I want to call the attention of the committee to statements relative to those positions of the Democratic Party platform pledge of 1948, the President's statement on the state of the Union, with respect to those platform pledges, and the statement of the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. On January 5 of this year, the President, in his message on the state of the Union, said that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. I quote from his speech directly:

> The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable sceondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedom, means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

There are no weasel words in that statement. It is direct, positive and right to the point. Yesterday afternoon, President Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, issued the following statement. I quote from that statement:

> That the Congress of Industrial Organizations stands solidly with President Truman and the administration in support of the Thomas-Lesinski bill. This was the CIO's position when the Thomas-Lesinski bill was introduced. It is the CIO's position today, and it will continue to be our position. I make this statement merely because of unfounded newspaper reports and rumors that the Congress of Industrial Organizations has altered its stand on the type of legislation that should be enacted to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Chairman, those two statements, I believe, are crystal clear and focus the issue. I do not believe we want to further take up the time of the Members of the House. I believe we want to come to the point and get to the real issue and vote. I represent a district in the western part of Pennsylvania, which I consider to be one of the largest steel-producing areas in the country. I call your attention to that statement of the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the time has come when we should have a statement from the House leadership of the gentleman's party as to whether or not certain amendments to the Lesinski bill have been agreed to, and whether or not they are going to receive the support of the House Democratic leadership. This is the third time I have propounded that inquiry. I think the Members of the House and the people of the Nation are entitled to an answer.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for clarifying the issue. The gentleman has stated that the President in 1947 addressed the Congress by a message.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I quoted from his state of the Union message of this year, 1949.

Mr. CARROLL. But he addressed the Congress in 1947.

Mr. BUCHANAN. He stated approximately the same language 2 years ago.

Mr. CARROLL. In 1947 the President addressed the Congress, when it was passing the Taft-Hartley Act. He mentioned then, jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts. Of course, that is his record. That is the record upon which the Democratic Party stands.

That is the record upon which the Democratic Party fought in the last campaign. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has offered

an amendment which is premature. There may come a time when there are so many amendments that the Lesinski bill will be shot full of holes and then we will consider his amendment, but at this time it is premature.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I refuse to yield further.

I would like to make this statement in conclusion, that the Committee on Education and Labor has fought this thing out and has come to this particular conclusion, that the proposed Lesinski-administration bill does just the things that were stated in the platform and the things that the President reiterated. I believe now is the time that this body wants to vote upon this measure. Let us get into action now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well for me to review what occurred in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, in order to clarify the record.

The committee was proceeding on a so-called two-package plan. Our subcommittee voted out to the full committee a recommendation as follows:

Be it resolved by this committee, That the Taft-Hartley law be repealed and that the National Labor Relations Act, known as the Wagner Act, be restored as it existed at the time of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, and that H. R. 237 repealing the Taft-Hartley law and restoring the Wagner Act be reported to the House forthwith.

But it also added:

And be it further resolved, That hearings begin immediately on amendments to the Wagner Act, consistent with the proposal made by the President, and that said hearings be closed at such time as this subcommittee may deem wise.

The full committee refused to accept that, and it gave the subcommittee instructions to go back and proceed on the so-called one-package plan, which is the present Lesinski bill. That is what the subcommittee did. We came back to the full committee and reported that bill as is, without any amendments, except the amendments that are in the bill.

So I think that should clarify the record. The subcommittee was turned down by the full committee on this proposal. The amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] offers is not the same as was proposed by the subcommittee. It does not go far enough.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. The proposal of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is identical with the proposal that you and your subcommittee brought to the full committee.

Mr. KELLEY. No; it is not, because the proposal goes further and says the subcommittee shall proceed immediately with hearings on amendments proposed by the President.

Mr. BARDEN. But you proposed to the full committee and recommended the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. KELLEY. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. And the reinstatement of the National Labor Relations Act as it was. And then later you were going ahead with hearings.

Mr. KELLEY. Proceed immediately with hearings.

Mr. BARDEN. Is that not exactly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said?

Mr. KELLEY. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. As a matter of fact, my amendment was offered in the form of a bill, last January, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] also introduced a similar bill.

Mr. KELLEY. That is right; H. R. 237.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You will find that in the gentleman's bill there are just two provisions: one repealing the Taft-Hartley law and, two, reinstating the Wagner Act. Is that not correct?

Mr. KELLEY. That is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is all my amendment does.

Mr. KELLEY. And the subcommittee also said——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not care anything about the subcommittee.

Mr. KELLEY. But the procedure was that H. R. 237 should be accepted and that then the subcommittee would proceed with hearings on amendments as proposed by the President.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But I am referring to your bill. Your bill is identical with my amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. Yes. But it does not go far enough.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, there is no difference at all, not even in the language.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I wish to say to the gentleman handling the debate on the other side, that being a member of the subcommittee I recall that what he has just stated is substantially correct. It was my understanding that the gentleman was in favor of repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the reenactment of the Wagner Act as is; and then it was his thought that sometime after that we would consider amendments to the Wagner Act. In view of that background, therefore, I am wondering if the gentleman is now in favor of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. KELLEY. No; because the committee proceeded with hearings on the Lesinski bill. We are supporting the Lesinski bill. While we did not agree that that should be the procedure, we were instructed to follow that procedure by the full committee. We hammered out a bill and we are going to support that bill here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has expired.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and when the Committee rises I shall also ask consent to include articles from two magazines.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may extend his own remarks. Requests to include extraneous matter will have to be secured in the House, not in the Committee of the Whole.

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, my position in reference to this entire matter is that I was in favor of the 2-package approach which would have called for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reinstatement of the Wagner Act with some amendments. I was for that approach because I felt it was the best method for working out a fair labor-management bill for it would have returned us to the original position held before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act thereby clearing the atmosphere and providing a decent vehicle for those amendments.

This position was sustained by the action of the subcommittee but not by the full committee. Therefore, I felt justified in supporting the Lesinski bill which was the compromise agreed upon by the contending members of the majority of the committee.

There has been much said here today by our lawyer colleagues in a half-apologetic vein just because they happen to be members of that honorable profession. When I spoke yesterday I had in mind much the same thing as Mr. W. Willard Wirtz has written in his article titled "Lawyers in Industrial Relations" to which the magazine Fortune of April 1949 added the following subtitle, "Not now indispensable, they will gain in value as they and their clients master the field's special aspects." Mr. Wirtz' article reads as follows:

LAWYERS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

NOT NOW INDISPENSABLE, THEY WILL GAIN IN VALUE AS THEY AND THEIR CLIENTS MASTER THE FIELD'S SPECIAL ASPECTS

(By W. Willard Wirtz)

Blanketed by the clamor attending passage of successive Federal labor-management relations acts, over 6,000 new labor laws quietly go into effect in the United States every month. During 1949 over 75,000 establishments will adopt or amend private laws in the form of collective-bargaining agreements, fixing wages. hours, job rights, and working conditions for 15,000,000 employees. In United States factories perhaps more convincingly than in either Washington or Lake Success, it is being proved that law can substitute for force even where it is groups rather than individuals whose interest confict.

A significant feature of private labor laws is that they are written and administered largely by laymen. Employers and employees have expressed strong doubt regarding the lawyer's value in this field. Recent reflections of that feeling are the A. F. of L. teamsters' current demand that lawyers be excluded from contract negotiations, and the provision in an agreement between the electrical workers and one manufacturer that "no legal adviser of either party is to serve on any grievance committee."

The objection extends to "lawyer courts." These private contracts provide that disputes as to interpretation are not to be referred to judges in black robes sitting on raised benches and hearing formalistic arguments. Provision is made, instead, for "umpires" to come to plants, watch men and machines at

work, sit down at tables, ask what's the matter, and then listen to anything anyone wants to say. In short, the law has been told to leave its frock coats at the plant gates and to put on overalls.

Few deny the legal profession's failure to sense adequately industry's need for contract laws written in plain English, adjudicative processes stripped of vestigial formalisms, law that is neither master nor mystery to the common man. Too few lawyers have realized the inapplicability of traditional common-law concepts and courtroom conventions to labor agreements, which are much more than ordinary contracts, and to arbitration proceedings, which are less than trials. The tendency has been to make the mistake the March Hare made when he used butter, "the best butter, you know," to lubricate the Mad Hatter's watch.

Significantly, however, most mistakes considered typical of lawyers persist in plants liberated from them. Many employers and unions, having only recently accepted the collective-bargaining principle, are themselves still groping to codify a dynamic relationship without making it brittle. There has been a widespread tendency on the part of both parties to consider the contract a higher law that can be served separately from the values it was designed to protect. It has been mistakenly assumed that rights and duties spelled out by the agreement can be enforced without regard to mutual interests of which they are only derivatives.

When legal counsel has been retained, the parties' own misconceptions as to the function of an agreement have often restricted the lawyers to narrow, technical, and inevitably abortive assignments. Both parties have used legal service like patent medicines. At least part of the fault attributed to the lawyer in labor relations has resulted from his being called on to prescribe contract phrases and to argue arbitration cases under circumstances that preclude his appreciation either of the real nature of the problem or of the probable consequences of his ministrations. Consideration of illustrative steps in the collective-bargaining process reveals the basic problem here as a misunderstanding by both counsel and client of the relative function of law in labor relations.

The initial phase of the process of industrial government is formulating contract laws. Determination of plant rules by bargaining between company and union involves nothing for which general legal experience would seem particularly to qualify. Yet an essential part of this legislative job is to find language that people who took no part in negotiations will read only as was intended. Many negotiators lack the ability to reduce a good agreement in principle to one workable in fact. A fair percentage of the thousands of grievance cases that go to arbitration each year are the consequence of a mistaken assumption that to write contracts in simple language is any reasonable man's job.

To make language watertight is an art that defies mastery but is practiced by most lawyers with more than average courts. He knows the advantage of describing an incriminating incident in his own way instead of in answer to a charge from across the table or in response to the arbitrator's prodding. He senses which points are so obvious that belaboring weakens them.

These advantages may, of course, be neutralized by a lawyer's insistence on acting in arbitration as he would in a court. In much ordinary litigation two adversaries who will never again have anything to do with each other are intent only upon slicing up a former relationship. But a grievance case constitutes no more than an incident in the continuing affairs of company and union. In 9 arbitration cases out of 10, the money claim involves an amount substantially smaller than the costs of the proceeding. The real purpose is to eliminate a source of misunderstanding and annoyance in a plant.

This is no occasion for argument based on refined technicalities that may lead to an equally technical award, leaving the point of irritation to fester. To invoke a formalistic rule of evidence instead of pointing out its common-sense equivalent produces distrust of proceedings that depend for efficacy on the confidence of both parties. In court the lawyer can afford to bolster a weak case by establishing the stupidity and unreliability of opposing witnesses. He can assert his own dignity, should it totter, by reminding a witness who is asking the questions and who is answering them. There is a different price on such tactics when the victims are men with whom his client will deal the next day and every day for months to come. The lawyer who wins a case at the expense of some vital element in the plant relationship may leave his principal feeling that one more such victory, and we are uttely undone.

There is involved here much more than the adaptation of traditional legal techniques to new demands. The acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining has not eliminated the adversary element from this relationship. On the contrary, adding the written contract and the formal grievance procedure has created, along with the advantages of orderliness, a danger that latent antagonisms will find too easy expression. The basic problem for lawyers and clients alike is to evolve rules as sinews of the employment relationship rather than new sources of irritation.

Unfortunately, the lawyer's role in this new governing process has become identified primarily with phases of apparent conflict. His services are most frequently sought where one party seeks or exploits advantage over the other. He becomes an agent of opposition in an area where cooperation is essential. A regrettable feeling has developed that in this field a lawyer must be either a management lawyer or a union lawyer. So long as lawyers and these particular groups of clients view the value of legal services as lying in writing favorable contract clauses and in winning cases, little that is worth while can come from professional participation.

Exaggerated emphasis on assumed peculiarities of the labor-law field has complicated this problem. There are here, as in international law, two special factors: at least one party to the relationship is a group rather than an individual, and the power of each party remains greater than that of the "government" both create. But the need for specialized professional services is neither greater nor less in connection with the collective-bargaining process than in any other situation where men adopt rules to govern their relationship and substitute arbitrament for force as a method of settling disputes. Nor is it a peculiarity of employers and employees that they want laws written plainly and adjudicative processes in which merits can be explored without recourse to rules that lawyers alone can understand. It is essential that industrial codes be devised and administered in the light of plant realities and not according to concepts borrowed from other fields. Yet the integration of written rules with operating realities is no more important in labor relations than in any of a hundred other areas that today make up economic society. The broad implication of the collective-bargaining experience is that in the effective administration of modern economic affairs there is no such thing as an independent legal function—of either law or lawyers.

Mr. Chairman, while some of the anti-labor propagandists have been waging unceasing warfare against those of us who happen to feel there should be changes made in the existing labor laws to make them more fair to labor, management, and the public, it has been heartening to note again the article written by Mr. Nathan J. Paulson, assistant general counsel for the Investors League, in which he spoke in complimentary terms about the membership of the Congress. That article appeared in the magazine Forbes Survey of August 15, 1948, and reads as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

(By Nathan J. Paulson, assistant general counsel, Investors League)

(Debunking many popular misconceptions about United States Congressmen, the author digs into the facts to produce some surprising conclusions.)

Members of Congress have been vilified, pilloried, and jeered at for as long as most people can remember. Cartoons have depicted them as "potbellied" politicians, and Senator Claghorn is not unknown among the electorate. Unfortunately, too many citizens have too little knowledge of the type of individuals who represent them. A review of these Representatives' backgrounds, plus personal contact, should disabuse people of the thought that the average Congressman is only a political "hack" with little education, interested above all in remaining on the Nation's pay roll. Instead, it will show that the average legislator is well above the general average of our citizenry.

Four main items—age, education, experience, armed service—when added to other facts provide a fair conception of our lawmakers.

AGE

Although individual ages vary in the Senate from 34 to over 80, the average age is approximately 56. Length of service varies from 1 to 31 years, with the average 8. In the House, ages vary from 29 to over 80, with the average 51. The "baby" is Congressman SARBACHER, of Pennsylvania; the dean, Congressman SABATH, of Illinois.

The group might be shown as follows:

Age	House	Senate
20 to 30 years	1	0
30 to 39 years	49	3
40 to 49 years	124	19
50 to 59 years	138	37
60 to 69 years	76	21
70 to 79 years	15	11
80 to 89 years	2	2

Congressmen do not keep feeding at the public trough perpetually. In the present House of Representatives approximately 25 percent of the members were elected for the first time, 10 percent were reelected for a second time, 15 percent are third-termers. Therefore, fully 50 percent have not served longer than 6 years. Although 15 percent have served 8 terms or more, 35 percent served between 4 and 7 terms. Of these latter 2 groups, it is interesting to note that 20 percent of the 8-termers or more than 12 percent of the 4-termers or more did not serve their terms consecutively, having been defeated once or twice. Those who have served the longest, such as Senators MCKELLAR and CAPPER and Congressmen SABATH, DOUGHTON, KNUTSON, and RAYBURN, have been elected from districts which have always been politically safe for the parties they represent.

In the Senate, 50 percent of the membership are one-terms, 30 percent are in their second term. The balance varies from 3 terms to Senator MCKELLAR, who has been in office since 1917. Of those elected to the Senate for 2 terms or more only 14 out of 44 are from the South. Of those who have been reelected for more than 4 terms in the House, only 86 out of 231 are from the South.

There are no women Senators, but the House is graced by seven of the fair sex.

It is expected, however, that the next Congress will have a woman Senator from Maine.

EDUCATION

This is the forte of the Nation's legislators. Eighty percent are college graduates, while many who are not have attended an institution of higher learning. Only a very few did not complete a high school course, but their success in the business world indicates marked ability. A prime example is Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, who left school at 15, but went on to become a successful publisher, farmer, and apple grower, as well as Governor of his State.

Similarly, Congressman MANSFIELD, of Montana, never attended high school but in maturity became professor of Latin American and far eastern history at the University of Montana.

Almost 10 percent of the members are recipients of masters degrees, while others have done post graduate work. Many hold doctors degrees in law, and 41 have received an honorary LL.D. There are 5 doctors of medicine, 1 dentist, 4 engineers of various types, 2 pharmacists, 1 veterinary, 1 minister, 2 stage and screen stars, and several accountants.

A majority of the lawmakers were trained in the law. Some 295 were admitted to the bar of their native States and most of them have been admitted to the bar of the United States Supreme Court.

Twenty-one Members have been honored by the highest educational honorary fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa. Others have won similar honors in professional school societies. Three are Rhodes Scholars: Congressmen CLASON and ALBERT, of Massachusetts and Oklahoma, respectively, and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

EXPERIENCE

The second largest group after the law, consists of those who are farmers and those whose lives are intermingled with agriculture. In this group there are many who operated farms before becoming lawyers, small-town bankers, and congressmen. These men represent approximately 11 percent of the Congress.

The teaching profession is next represented by 10 percent. There is an overlap in this group, with many legislators having worked as teachers for several years in order to earn funds to continue other professional studies. Despite this overlap, 15 were school principals or school superintendents. Other experience along these lines covers the gamut from one-room country schools to presidents of colleges and universities. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, was dean of the University of Oregon Law School; Senator FULBRIGHT was president of the University of Arkansas; Congressman ROHRBOUGH was vice president of Fairmont State College as well as president of Glenville State College.

Forty-three of our legislators are editors, publishers or have been reporters. Twenty-one have been small-town bankers or have been associated with banking and investments. And 70 have been owners of businesses ranging from insurance to carpets. Only 10 have been employees, in the strict sense of the term.

Congressman FOGARTY is listed as president of Bricklayers Union No. 1 of Rhode Island. Thirty-six have been in government employ the major part of their lives and have made politics or public service their careers. Four are graduates of our naval or military academies.

Approximately 15 percent held office as prosecuting, district or State attorneys in their native States before coming to Washington, and 10 percent served as members of the judiciary in almost every kind of court in the Nation.

Ten Senators were formerly Members of the House, and a similar number who had been congressional secretaries were later elected to Congress.

About 10 Members participate in Bible classes each Sunday in churches of various denominations. Senator BUTLER was for a time State moderator of the Nebraska Congregational Churches.

ARMED SERVICES

Fully 45 percent of the Members of Congress have served in the country's armed forces at one time or another. There are veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I and World War II. There is sufficient experience and background in veterans' affairs to dispel any idea that Congress is not equipped to provide for those who sacrificed so much for their country. Eleven Members of Congress died during the session.

All in all, the Members of Congress represent a true cross section of America, and they are more above the average in education and experience than any group of citizens selected at random throughout the country. Perhaps there should be less ridiculing of Congress and more effort made by the American voter to do everything possible to insure the defeat of those candidates for Congress who by their records, have proved themselves unworthy for office.

Mr. Chairman, it was information of this nature that I referred to yesterday when I mentioned that I wished there were more men in Congress who had had experience in the field of labor relations, either from the side of labor or management, because I felt it would be so much easier for us to reach fair and just conclusions to our work here. I do have confidence in the good judgment of the Members of this House to act much more favorably to labor and the general public than the Eightieth Congress did.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to agree with my Republican friends, because I like them. When I had a measure here that involved the life or death of my city I did not lose a single Republican vote, and I appreciate it. But you would not have any respect for me as a member of your party if you knew the facts and circumstances surrounding the labor situation in North Dakota. A Member of the Eightieth Congress was a candidate against me last time and raised the issue that if BURDICK were elected to Congress he would vote for labor just the way he did in the last 10 years he was in Congress. He raised the issue. I met that issue and labor in North Dakota knows that I will support a program to repeal the act passed at the last session of Congress known as the Taft-Hartley Act; I am committed to vote to repeal it, but I am not committed to leave it up in the air and leave nothing in its place.

I have great admiration for the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]; he always brings out the issue before us, but the issue that he brought before us this morning I cannot subscribe to. He says: "Vote either one way or the other; vote to keep either the Taft-Hartley law or the Wagner Act of 1935." That is not the issue with me at all. What I have to answer for is the repeal of the law which I believe is bad, and which the labor forces of North Dakota and a great many farmers, too, think is bad; but we want to leave something in its place. Experience in the last 15 years under the Wagner Act has shown that we should amend it in certain respects. I do not like to agree with Democrats; I have a lot of times, but I agree with them only when forced to; I agree with them when they are right, and once in a while they are right. They are right this time, although I did not support the President of the United States. I did not find anybody for him except the people. I did not see any Democrats running around saying they were for him. I think that is the reason he got such a good vote.

If I were a Democrat, it appears to me that the bill your committee has brought before you, which has the sanction of the President, should be passed. He made a campaign on that issue, and, Lord, the votes he got where he should not have gotten any. It reminds me of Roosevelt whom I supported for President three or four times. He died before I had a chance to support him the fifth time. He said, "I can win these elections because I can always depend on the mistakes of the Republican Party."

The Republican Party made a mistake in tampering with agricultural prices, the Republican Party made a mistake in passing this labor law. Truman had no more right, if you had run your business the way you should have, of being President of the United States than I have of being the Pope of Rome, and my dad was an Orangeman. But do not do the same thing again. I would like to be on the majority side some time. I cannot be here 30 years more. I would like to win once in that period.

I will tell you what I am going to do. I have never been charged with being evasive at home, although I have heard some of you say that you do not know where I stand. I am going to vote to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act in spite of anything you do. You can bring on substitutes, amendments to the substitute, and all that until you get dizzy, but I am going to hang on long enough to know that I am voting for repeal of that law and I am going to vote to put in its place the provisions of the bill that have been brought before this House by your committee, the bill known as the Lesinski bill. I will oppose any amendments to the Lesinski bill that attempt to put back into it the life and the heart of the Taft-Hartley Act.

No Republican could think me honorable if I did not carry out the promises I made in the last election.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to refrain from participating in the debate on the issues now under consideration by this body. But after giving careful consideration to the arguments made during the past 2 days, I am impelled to present my views and observation. Like my fellow Missourian and distinguished colleague, Mr. CHRISTOPHER, I, too, represent a district wherein agriculture is the predominant occupation and organized labor is a small minority. It is not in a spirit of boasting

that I say that, like my colleague from Georgia, I am a lawyer and was serving as judge of the Eighteenth Judicial District of Missouri at the time when I was elected as a Member of Congress, but it is for the purpose of indicating my pride of the legal profession as a lawyer and the training, experience, and practice of analyzing and judging issues fairly, without bias or prejudice. Many statements have been made during argument which clouds the issue.

Yesterday and today the President of the United States was erroneously quoted and falsely charged with making threats to withhold party patronage from Members who did not vote for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. What he actually did say, according to the Washington Post, was, in effect, "that he would consider votes on the Taft-Hartley repeal to be one of the tests of party loyalty." You and the people of the United States will recall that the President conducted a valiant, fearless, and courageous campaign against terrific odds at the last general election. He had strong opposition within and outside of his political party. He had vicious opposition from metropolitan newspapers, radio commentators, intrenched wealth and millions of dollars being expended by the Republican vested interests to defeat his election. He led the Democratic Party and its candidates to a glorious victory. Now, at this time, as the official recognized leader of the Democratic Party, and as the successful candidate for the office of President of the United States, elected on the Democratic ticket and platform, calling for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, it was his justifiable right and privilege to make such a statement, and those, if any, who claim to be offended by this statement made by the President, are merely seeking assuage for their own personal guilty conscience and to distort and use the President's statement to save their faces as a petty excuse and explanation to their constituents for voting as they already intended to vote on the Taft-Hartley repeal, prior to the statement made by the President. I contend and I firmly believe that a majority of reasonable minds will concur that the President was justified in making that statement, and if he does not have that right, I do not know who does.

Every Member of this great law-making body claims his or her statesmanship by alleging that he or she, at all times, first considers and holds the general welfare of our country above party politics, and that, I believe each Member does seriously strive to do—however we should not be too facetious in our conduct, because such "holier than thou" attitude too often sounds as pure political argument fishing for favorable reaction.

First, we should clearly understand the issue now under consideration. The sole question now being present for your decision does not involve the merits or demerits of the Taft-Hartley Act, because both bills—the Lesinski bill clearly and intentionally provides for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the so-called Wood bill purports to provide for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Therefore, only one question is now involved at this stage of the proceedings—it is simply a procedural question. Shall we accept the Lesinski bill in our proceedings to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to adopt a fair labor law, or shall we accept the Wood bill for such action.

Do you want to consider and work by amendments for the perfection of the bill favorably reported by the majority of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, after it has held extensive hearings thereon and to which hearings you were invited and had the opportunity to attend and be heard, or do you want to consider and work on the perfection of the Taft-Hartley-Halleck-Martin bill bearing the name of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, JOHN S. WOOD, which is also referred to as the Wood substitute bill, and upon which no hearings whatsoever were held, and which substitute bill, according to statements made and not yet denied on the floor of this House, was drafted in a secret meeting called by the Republican leaders of the House in room No. 18F. If that method is approved in violation of the traditional efficient and democratic committee procedure, long ago adopted and followed by this House, then the work which you perform as chairman and as a member of your committee is useless and futile.

The proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act have, in fact and in truth, introduced another Taft-Hartley bill disguised under the name of the Wood bill and they now offer numerous amendments to confuse the real issue and to divert your attention from their real objective. Why do they use this strategy instead of presenting the bill with the proposed amendments already as a part of the bill as originally drafted? Because they desire to detract your attention from the Taft-Hartley Act. Their strategy is to offer amendments for your consideration to arouse your interest with hope that if such amendments are presented and adopted you will then favor the acceptance of their bill as a substitute of the Lesinski bill. That is the reason why they did not include the amendments in the bill when it was originally drafted in room No. 18F. They want you to feel that you have a part in drafting their Taft-Hartley bill.

We should promptly reject the amendments now offered to mislead us.

I assume that this Committee of the Whole House intends to consider a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; if so, we should be honest and straightforward in our endeavor to do so—we are morally bound to meet that issue squarely. Certainly we should not ride and beat around the bush on the Taft-Hartley-Halleck-Martin-Wood bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Ford amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Does this motion apply to the Marcantonio substitute for the Wood amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not. It applies only to the Ford amendment.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KLEIN. I intend to speak on the Marcantonio substitute. Under this limitation, must I take my time within the 15 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can speak on the Marcantonio substitute after the Ford amendment is disposed of.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened in the last few days to the words of some on the floor who claim to have the interest of organized labor at heart, but if we examine their voting record over the past years we will learn they have always found a reason to oppose any legislation that in any way advances the cause of the laboring man.

In the campaign of 1948, I spoke on many occasions for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and I feel there were few in my district who did not know my position in this regard. I am still opposed to the Taft-Hartley law and shall vote for its repeal when the opportunity presents itself, and for very definite reasons.

In 1935 Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act, the so-called Wagner Labor Relations Act, its purpose being to lessen the cause of labor disputes in interstate and foreign commerce. This act gave the laboring man the opportunity to organize unions for the definite purpose of collective bargaining. It also defined unfair labor practices on the part of employers and also provided a National Labor Relations Board.

This legislation continued in effect until the advent of the Republican Eightieth Congress, when they misconstrued the vote of the people in that election to mean a mandate to withdraw the gains labor had made since 1935, and passed the harshest piece of legislation directed at organized labor ever enacted by any Congress. This legislation has been discredited to such an extent that in order to fool the people, they have brought forth a new bill, the Wood bill, which is in fact the Taft-Hartley Act without any basic change other than to make it more complicated.

There is very small difference between the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wood bill on collective bargaining, whereas the Lesinski bill restores the principles of collective bargaining contained in the Wagner Act.

The Wood bill retains all of the provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act pertaining to injunctions, whereas the Lesinski bill restores the Norris-LaGuardia and Clayton Acts to the original status.

On picketing, the Wood bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act. The Lesinski bill, on the other hand, would not prohibit picketing which would

be governed by local and State laws as in the past.

The Conciliation Service provisions of the Wood bill are the same as the Taft-Hartley Act, whereas the Lesinski bill reestablishes the United States Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, thus conferring on the Government mediation and conciliation machinery to aid in the settlement of disputes the prestige of cabinet rank; it directs the improvement of relations between employers and employees through conferences and other appropriate methods so as to avoid disputes and work stoppages; thus the service would once more be able to bring the technical assistance of departmental experts to bear upon solving the differences between management and labor in the various stages of dispute. The Lesinski bill further declares it to be the public policy of the United States that collective-bargaining agreements should provide for referral of disputes under existing agreements to final and binding arbitration. The service is directed to assist parties in this connection; and upon their request to cooperate in formulating agreements for arbitration of disputes, in selecting arbitrators and in making other necessary arrangements. The service is given appropriate discretion in entering disputes without restrictions based upon the interstate character of the industry, but would not interfere with the operation of State mediation agencies.

The Wood bill contains the same so-called free speech provision as the Taft-Hartley Act, which in practical effect does not operate; whereas the Lesinski bill preserves the constitutional right of free speech by employers, but provides that any implication of threat or coercion can be fully examined in the light of the attendant circumstances.

The Wood bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act on impractical and unnecessary elections required among employees, except that under the Wood bill labor organizations are permitted to enter union-shop agreements with employers without the authorization of an election and there is no provision authorizing a secret ballot on the employer's last offer in national emergency disputes; whereas the Lesinski bill eliminates the series of disruptive, impractical and unnecessary elections required by the Taft-Hartley Act, and under this bill elections would be held only where a labor organization or other employee representatives seek to be certified as the bargaining agent or where an employer alleges in a petition that two or more labor organizations present conflicting claims of representatives.

The Wood bill contains the same provisions as the Taft-Hartley Act in singling out labor organizations as the only type of voluntary association made subject to the restriction, under criminal offense liability, in making contributions or expenditures in connection with political activity; whereas the Lesinski bill restores the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to its original form—section 402—thus leaving the question of corrupt practices in Federal elections to congressional consideration outside of a labor bill.

I could go on and on, and show that each provision of the Wood bill with but few exceptions is the same as the Taft-Hartley Act.

Why do we see so many men and women in Washington at the present time listening anxiously to the debate on this labor-management question? They are concerned with their future. They realize that if this important question were left to certain people in the Congress we would return to the days before 1935 when the Wagner Act was enacted when in some industries workers, through fear of the loss of their jobs, could not join unions.

That is why I shall vote for the Lesinski bill, because it gives the worker the freedom to which every American workman is entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that I make my position clear at this time, so that there can be no misunderstanding as to where I stand on this controversial legislation. I appreciate all that has been said by the Members for and against the various amendments. I think I understand the reasons that prompt some of the amendments which have been offered. I intend to support the Lesinski bill as presented by the committee. I intend to oppose the Wood substitute amendment and the Marcantonio substitute amendment. That is in accordance with the Democratic platform. That is in accordance with my campaign pledges made throughout both of my campaigns. I happen to be in a peculiar position. I am one of the few Members of the House who had the Republican nomination in the last election as well as the Democratic nomination. I accepted the Republican nomination on the distinct understanding that wherever there was a difference in the two platforms, I would support the Democratic platform. I made it particularly clear that we did differ on the question of repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and that I would support and work for its repeal and the reenactment of the Wagner Act, with such improvements as would be consistent with our platform and the recommendations of President Truman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. First of all, my substitute is offered for the Wood substitute, so that in voting on that, you are deciding whether you are in favor of my substitute in preference to the Wood substitute.

Secondly, I have the Democratic platform right here. I challenge the gentleman to show me where in the Democratic platform there is any word said about amendments such as are being proposed to the Lesinski bill or about the other amendments which are reported to have been agreed to by the Administration leadership of the House.

Mr. MULTER. Before answering the gentleman's question, let me say that if all you are looking for is hearings in the future on improvements to the Wagner Act, you will get them and you need nothing in any bill to do that. This Congress can always conduct hearings to improve legislation at any time.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who intends, I believe, to make a specific answer to your question.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge, with the exception of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I am the only Member of the House who served as a member of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention. I want to say it is my considered opinion that the Lesinski bill is in line with the platform as it was drafted by the platform committee and adopted at the Democratic National Convention. I would like to read the entire relevant part of the platform at this time, if the gentleman would yield to me for that length of time.

Mr. MULTER. I will yield, sir, then I will not have to read it to this Committee.

Mr. BIEMILLER. The platform reads as follows:

We advocate the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

In this bill, the Lesinski bill, section 101 provides:

The Labor-Management Relations Act—

The Taft-Hartley Act—

1947 (Public Law No. 101, 80th Cong.), is hereby repealed.

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is correct, and the platform goes on as follows:

We advocate the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress over the President's veto. That act was proposed with the promise that it would secure the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce. It has failed. The number of labor-management disputes has increased. The number of cases before the National Labor Relations Board has more than doubled since the act was passed, and efficient and prompt administration is becoming more and more difficult. It has encouraged litigation in labor disputes and undermined the established American policy of collective bargaining. Recent decisions by the courts prove that the act was so poorly drawn that its application is uncertain and that it is probably, in some provisions, unconstitutional. We advocate such legislation as is desirable to establish a just body of rules to assure free and effective collective bargaining, to determine, in the public interest, the rights of employees and employers, to reduce to a minimum their conflict of interests, and to enable unions to keep their membership free from Communistic influences.

I repeat that I believe the Thomas-Lesinski bill is in keeping with the party platform.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, that answers the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, which he has asked four times on the floor. If he is really acting in good faith, he should withdraw his substitute amendment for the Wood amendment.

We have been treated during the course of the debate on this bill to some cry-baby talk that is tiresome, to say the least.

Some Members complained that they did not write the Lesinski bill and the committee did not write it, and that some outside source did. Since when is that a crime? Since when is the name of the scrivener of a bill or the name of the author of a bill any criterion of whether the bill is sound. Even a Communist may come up with a good idea occasionally. Scrutinize it more carefully because of its source, but do not reject it when you find it otherwise good.

Then we heard accusations of bribery for votes for the Lesinski bill and about dire threats of reprisal for votes against it. Stop trying to kid the public. Appointments to public office of members of his party do not become bribes because made by the leader of the dominant party.

Party regularity has always been and always will be determined by support or nonsupport of your party platform. Any man who cannot support the majority will of his party should leave it. That does not mean he should not work within the party to make his view prevail. But until he does, as long as he remains in the party, the democratic process demands that he bow to the majority will.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has challenged my good faith, and in all fairness he should yield.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the question of good faith has been raised. I have asked three times, and I ask for the fourth time: Does the House Democratic leadership subscribe to these five amendments which were described in the New York Times? If it does, then, are those five amendments in keeping with the Democratic Party platform. That is the issue here. Everything else is just plain baloney and malarky to confuse the working people of this country.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I will yield to the gentleman, if he will please keep his answer short.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] seemed to be pointing at me. Of course, I am not a leader.

Mr. NIXON. I am very interested in the answer to that question. So if the gentleman will elaborate upon it I will appreciate it.

Mr. CARROLL. I can give my own opinion. I must say to you that I am not in conference with the leadership. The leadership has never said to me anything about these amendments. As for my personal position, I shall resist any such amendments, but I want to call to the gentleman's attention that in section 102 of the Thomas-Lesinski bill we reenact the Wagner Act and we specifically say, "It is hereby reenacted."

Mr. NIXON. Now, since my time is limited I must refuse to yield further.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I do not yield further.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It seems I am the only one in this House who is in conference with his leadership.

Mr. NIXON. I think this colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] indicates the complete confusion which exists among administration leaders on the most important piece of legislation which the Eighty-first Congress will act upon. On several occasions during this debate I have asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] who is steering the administration bill through the House, what amendments, if any, to the administration bill he was going to support. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has consistently said he was going to oppose all amendments to the administration bill. I again ask him what kind of a deal, if any, has been made on amendments to the Lesinski bill.

Mr. KELLEY. I will repeat a third time that I know of no deal that has been made for amendments to the Lesinski bill. I repeat also that I personally will oppose any amendments to the Lesinksi bill.

Mr. NIXON. The issue then is clear. The leadership on that side of the aisle, as represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is steering the bill through the House for the leadership, will not support any amendments to the Lesinski bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Pardon me. I said I personally would oppose any amendments.

Mr. NIXON. You, as representative of the leadership, will oppose amendments. Now, I cannot yield further at this time because I want to discuss the amendment before the House.

The Ford amendment is a very simple one. I think the members of the committee should vote for this amendment, regardless of your individual positions on the Wood bill or the Thomas-Lesinski bill. I say that for this reason: This amendment is one which will improve a bill which may eventually be adopted by this House. Bear in mind that the Wood bill has a chance of being the bill which will be adopted by the House. If that should happen those of you who claim to be prolabor and who vote against this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be responsible for defeating an amendment which cannot be described in any other way than one which is prolabor. Why do I say that? This amendment simply provides that economic strikers, strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement, shall still have the right to vote in representation elections, and they shall have that right to vote not for a period of 90 days, which is the provision in the present Wood bill, but for a period of 6 months after they have been out on strike.

There cannot be any question as to the issue. If you oppose this amendment, as you go through the aisle on a teller vote, you should bear in mind that you are voting for a 90-day-limitation period on voting rights for economic strikers and voting against a 6-month period. If you vote for it you are voting for a provision which, without question, has the support, on its merits, of the representatives of organized labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, just before we take this first vote on the Ford amendment to the Wood bill, lengthening the period from 90 days to 6 months, may I say that there is not a single member on the Democratic side of the House Committee on Education and Labor who has a single amendment to propose to the Lesinski bill. We have met together, and there has been no deal made whatsoever. When the gentleman from California charges on this floor that there has been, we know nothing about it. He questioned our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania told him for the third time in the course of 2 days that there were no deals nor amendments from our side. The gentleman from California was not correct when he stated that there would be no amendments offered by the Democratic side. We are only the Democratic members of the committee; there may be scores of others on this side who may offer amendments, but we who are members of the committee have no amendments to offer.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Does the gentleman mean that the deal is——

Mr. POWELL. There is no deal.

Mr. NIXON. Does the gentleman mean that the understanding is——

Mr. POWELL. There is no understanding.

Mr. NIXON. That members of the committee will vote against the amendments? That amendments will be offered by others than members of the committee?

Mr. POWELL. I am sure the gentleman from California cannot speak for each Member of the Republican delegation. There are 13 of us on our side of the House who are members of the committee. We can speak only for ourselves. We cannot speak for the other Members of the House; that is an individual matter with them. There are only 13 of us on our side on the committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman wants to be fair. The gentleman, of course, is not talking for the leadership of his party.

Mr. POWELL. As far as I know, there is no communication from the leadership of the party on this matter; we have no agreement with them on this matter.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. Is it fair to say that the Republican Party had a caucus just about 2 days ago, but the Democratic Party has had no caucus within the last 3 days?

Mr. POWELL. The Democratic Party has had no caucus at all on this bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Republican Party in the House holds no caucuses; it holds only conferences, and Members are not bound therein.

Mr. POWELL. That is fine; it is mutual on both sides, then.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. It seems to me that the gentleman from California is very much concerned about a deal on the Democratic side. I should like to know what kind of deal the Republican membership and the Republican leadership of the House has nade on the Wood bill.

Mr. POWELL. That is a very fine question.

Mr. GREEN. The charge was made here yesterday that the Wood bill was written by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. They have had plenty of opportunity to get on the floor and explain or answer that question, if no deals have been made by Members on the Republican side.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California, to reply.

Mr. NIXON. I appreciate the action of the gentleman from New York in allowing me to answer the charge that has been made. As far as the legislation which is before this committee today is concerned, whether it be the Lesinski bill, which is supported by the administration without any change, as I understand it, or whether it be the Wood bill, which has been offered as a substitute for that bill by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], my position, and I think the position of the majority of those on this side, is that what we should do is to take each and every provision of the bills before us, consider those provisions on the merits and write the final bill not on the basis of name calling but on the basis of whether or not those provisions are fair to labor, fair to management, and protect the interests of the general public. If this Committee does that we shall be able to pass a fair and equitable piece of labor legislation. In no other way shall we be able to accomplish the purpose.

Mr. POWELL. Obviously, the gentleman from California has not answered the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I notice that when the gentleman from California asks questions of our side of the aisle he always demands categorical answers, but that when he gives an answer for his own side he always says, "I think I speak," always qualifies it.

Mr. POWELL. That is very obvious.

Mr. Chairman, we are asking that this amendment be defeated and that all amendments to the Wood bill be defeated, as well as the bill itself, so that we can proceed with consideration of the Lesinski bill. May we work hard now and get this over with so that we can have a vote on the Wood substitute some time today.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the Ford amendment reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Ford amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Ford amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 167, noes 131.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FORD and Mr. KELLEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 202, noes 158.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCONNELL. My understanding is that after this amendment is disposed of one way or the other we may offer additional amendments to the so-called Wood bill, if it is so desired. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, is it not correct that my substitute amendment is offered as a substitute to the Wood bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York so offered it, as the Chair understands.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the Wood substitute offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Strike out all the language after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The National Labor Relations Act, as enacted by the Congress July 5, 1935, is hereby reenacted."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment which is offered as a substitute for the Wood bill should carry, is it not true that since it strikes out all after the enacting clause of the Wood bill, that then there would be no further amendments in order to the Wood bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct; if this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the Marcantonio amendment is adopted, would the Wagner Act, as such, be subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No, it would not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if this is merely an amendment in the nature of an original amendment to the Lesinski bill, and merely amends the first section of the Lesinski bill, would not then the remaining sections of the Lesinski bill be open to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Would not amendments to the Wood amendment be in order at this time, before the vote on the substitute is had?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; other amendments to the Wood bill are now in order.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, does that mean that the vote comes now on the Marcantonio substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry. I have not had an opportunity to speak. When I asked the Chair whether I was estopped from speaking during the debate that we previously had on the Ford amendment, I was advised by the Chair that I could wait until that was out of the way and could speak on the Marcantonio substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman is entitled to recognition.

THE ISSUE IS SIMPLE

Mr. KLEIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Marcantonio substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Marcantonio substitute. I think the issue is very simple. You all heard the colloquy between the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], and other Members, and it was agreed that the Democratic platform was in favor of outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Pursuant to that thought, and to indicate that it was the intention of the House leadership to carry out that plank in the platform, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] introduced his bill, which is similar to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. He said, in fact, that his subcommittee reported to the full committee a simple repealer of the Taft-Hartley law, with the suggestion that further hearings then be held on amendments to the original Wagner Labor Relations Act.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY. I want to correct the gentleman. The gentleman said that the leadership of the House insisted upon this H. R. 237.

Mr. KLEIN. I did not use the word "insist."

Mr. KELLEY. You said that the leadership proposed it or encouraged it, or whatever you will. The leadership had nothing to do with it.

Mr. KLEIN. Perhaps I should not have used that word. I meant, then, that the leadership, as personified by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is chairman of the subcommittee, introduced such a bill, and, as a matter of fact, the bill was reported to the full committee, at which time it was turned down. Then, after hearings, the Lesinski bill was brought out. I am one of those who believe there should be some amendments to the Wagner Labor Relations Act. I think that possibly we should outlaw jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. My point is that those of us who made such campaign promises should live up to our pledge to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. If we do that—and we can by voting for this substitute—then the Wagner Labor Relations Act is reinstated; and we can then have hearings to see whether it should be amended. It does not have to be done on the floor, but that is what we should do if we want outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act without crippling amendments.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. The Lesinski bill does just exactly that. It does repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. KLEIN. I dislike to differ with the charming lady from New Jersey, but I must in this instance. Let me make my position clear. I am opposed to the Wood substitute, and I will vote for the Lesinski bill in the event that this substitute is voted down; but I think the better procedure is to adopt the Marcantonio substitute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The parliamentary situation is that my substitute is a substitute for the Wood bill.

Mr. KLEIN. That is correct. Then you have a choice which is crystal clear. Do you want to repeal the Taft-Hartley law? If you do, you should vote for this substitute. If you want the Taft-Hartley law under another name, you should vote for the Wood bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman said if the Marcantonio amendment was adopted we could proceed with amendments to the Lesinski bill.

Mr. KLEIN. Not on the floor here, but in the Labor Committee.

Mr. KELLEY. But that was rejected by the committee. That is why I spoke on that matter a while ago.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman appreciates the admiration and regard I have for him, but this would not be the first time that a bill was reported to the floor by a committee and we did not follow the committee. We ought to make up our own minds and not let some committee decide for us. We must vote as we think best for our constituents and for the country. I repeat that the issue is very clear. If you want repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, you can get it in this fashion. I have nothing to say against the Lesinski bill. I think it is good, but it does not go far enough. It is an illustration of the fact that sometimes we have to take less than we actually want or need, because we cannot get any better. We have done that in the rent-control law. We have done it time and time again—sometimes compromising principle for expediency—but let us meet the issue squarely in this case. If you want repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, vote for the substitute amendment.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. I take it from what the gentleman has said that he is agreed that we as individuals have a duty to pass reasonable legislation, whether it be labor laws or on any other subject.

Mr. KLEIN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. WERDEL. Does the gentleman feel that the mere fact that the Democratic platform, which has been read into the RECORD, after it said it would repeal the Taft-Hartley law, went on with generalities, that they would then pass reasonable labor legislation. Do you think from that platform that there is any man in this House who is bound either to the Lesinski bill or the Wood substitute?

Mr. KLEIN. I would place the emphasis, or the binding, if you will, on the individual Member who may have made such pledges to his constituents in running for election. If he advocated repeal at that time, he should vote for this substitute.

DO WE INTEND TO REPEAL TAFT-HARTLEY?

Again I say, the whole question boils down to this: Do we intend to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act with all its anti-union bias and its discrimination in favor of vested economic interest, or do we intend to vote for some imitation of an imitation of a decent labor-management relations law?

If we want to carry out our campaign pledges, then we vote for the Marcantonio substitute for the so-called Wood bill; and if that is voted down then we vote for the Lesinski bill.

But I do not see how any professed Democrat, elected on the party platform of 1948, committed to an enlightened and progressive America, can possibly vote for the Wood bill.

There is no fundamental difference between the Wood bill and the Taft-Hartley Act. I am speaking without reference to personalities. I do not know by what legerdemain the big-business lobby obtained consent of a gentleman who is a lifelong and professed Democrat for the use of his name on a measure which goes contrary to administration thinking and administration commitments; that is not relevant to the question before us.

WE OPPOSE AUTHORITARIANISM

What is relevant and germane is our duty to the people of the United States—not just to the union people, not just to the laboring people, not just to the liberals, but to all the people. Either we have a Government of the people, by the people, for the people, or we do not; and if we do not have that kind of a Government, then we are very likely to have a Government of the people by big business for big business.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is a form of fascism. That is a form of authoritarianism.

We have fought a bitter and costly war to save the world from one kind of authoritarianism; we are prepared to fight another war, if necessary, to save the world from another kind of authoritarianism. But, Mr. Chairman, I beg of you and of this House, let us not surrender to any kind of authoritarianism in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Marcantonio substitute be closed in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BARDEN. Reserving the right to object, would there be some way of finding out how many desire to speak on this, in order that we may know whether there will be any time for those who desire to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes probably five or six gentlemen standing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the Chair state the unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Marcantonio amendment close in not to exceed 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized.

Mr. MICHENER. For how long?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how any Member who has promised his constituents to vote for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law can honestly vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. Be it remembered that the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032, is now before this Committee for consideration. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] has offered an amendment to the Lesinski bill, which in effect is a substitute for the Lesinski bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has offered a substitute for the Wood amendment. Therefore, the question on which the Committee will next vote is: Shall the Marcantonio amendment be substituted for the Wood amendment?

In short, the next vote will be between the Wood amendment and the Marcantonio amendment. Either amendment would nomially repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. As a practical matter, the salient provisions in the Wood amendment are at present in the Taft-Hartley Act. The Wood amendment does eliminate certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. On the other hand, the Marcantonio substitute repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and restores in substance the Wagner Act; that is, I repeat, the vote will be between the Wood amendment and the Marcantonio amendment. The Lesinski bill will not be passed upon in that vote. If the Marcantonio substitute prevails, then the vote will be between the Marcantonio substitute and the Lesinski bill. The Wood amendment will be killed.

I impress upon the membership that in voting for the Marcantonio amendment you are expressing a preference for the Marcantonio substitute as against the Wood amendment. You are not voting on the Lesinski bill. That will come later. Putting it another way, a vote against the Marcantonio substitute is a vote for the Wood amendment in its present form. I shall not vote for the Marcantonio substitute because I favor the Wood amendment.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. If all the Members on the Republican side who applauded the speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will vote with him, his motion will carry.

Mr. MICHENER. Many of us do not agree with the political philosophy of the gentleman from New York. I seldom vote with him, but I admire his ability and his fearlessness to say what he thinks and his integrity in doing what he says he will do. He is an extreme liberal or, as many would say, a radical. He was elected on the promise that he would seek the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and that is just what his substitute does in fact. It carries out the pledge of the Democratic platform. No pretense is made that the Lesinski bill does repeal each and every provision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to vote to repeal the Taft-Hartley law in toto, and I shall support the Wood amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, rather than attempt to say what I have to say in 2 minutes, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks extended in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the two remaining proposed amendments and particularly to oppose the first amendment—the Wood bill, H. R. 4290, as a potential substitute for the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032.

The amendment of the Representative from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is neither proper nor realistic. Labor laws in the United States are not like those in a certain country I could name. They need to be brought up to date from time to time. Law must be progressive and not stationary or retrogressive in the United States and wrong laws should be corrected and perfected. The Wagner Act with its imperfections should not be reenacted and no Democrat that I know of during the last campaign pledged himself to do that. I opposed the Taft-Hartley Act in the campaign because to me it exemplified the golden rule of present day bad big business: "Do others before they do you."

It is an old saying that no one can spoil a rotten egg, and I presume that it is equally true that you cannot make a rotten egg good again, no matter what you may do to, or for, that rotten egg. The Wood bill in my opinion, and in the opinion of persons both inside and outside of organized labor, is a prime rotten egg, the blue-ribbon rotten egg of this legislative egg-laying season, and in fact for all past egg-laying seasons within legislative memory.

In the thought of Oliver Wendell Holmes, as borrowed from the lips of the Autocrat of the Breakfast Table, we should in order to convince ourselves of its real condition like a thrifty housewife hold this Wood or deadwood-on-labor bill—as I prefer to call it—this legislative egg up to the light, after giving it an intellectual shake, and determine for ourselves thereafter whether it contains any life either actual or potential, or whether it contains but lifeless and befouled albumen.

I think that a detailed analysis of the Wood bill, or deadwood-on-labor bill, is in order. In view of the fact that exactly 67 pages of printed matter are taken up in order to present this bill to the House of Representatives, and such short advance time was given Members of this House to examine this proposed bill in detail, we all, I am sure, realize the utter futility of trying to evaluate correctly its provisions by our own efforts. Therefore I feel that we are almost compelled to rely, for a proper analysis of same, upon the work done by experts in the field, employed by those whose interests are vitally and presently involved.

I shall now present to the membership of this Committee a detailed and succinct analysis of the Wood bill as prepared and presented to me, and perhaps other House Members, by the Labor League for Political Education of the American Federation of Labor:

ANALYSIS OF THE WOOD LABOR BILL

The legislative conference of the American Federation of Labor in session April 20, 1949, adopted a resolution denouncing the Wood bill (H. R. 4290) after considering an analysis of the measure prepared by Woll, Glenn & Thatcher, counsel for the A. F. of L.

There is little to choose between the Wood bill and the Taft-Hartley Act, as the following analysis of the bill shows:

"In several important respects the Wood bill is worse. While it does throw several sops in labor's direction, in reality the bill enlarges and strengthens the most objectionable feature of the Taft-Hartley Act, namely, the use of injunctions against alleged union unfair labor practices and in connection with so-called national emergency strikes.

"The new bill permits the General Counsel for the NLRB to file suit for injunction in the Federal courts merely upon the filing of charges alleging the union has committed any unfair labor practice, and without further investigation, and the courts are empowered to issue injunctions in such cases in their complete discretion and without any standards to guide them or safeguards to protect against indiscriminate or arbitrary orders. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the General Counsel can seek an injunction merely upon filing charges only where violations of section 8 (b) (4), relating to secondary boycotts, are charged, and then only after a full investigation has shown the existence of facts making it reasonably certain that the charges are true. Furthermore, in respect to the national emergency injunctions, the new bill permits the President to apply for an injunction immediately upon the threat of strike and without the requirement that a board of inquiry be assembled to investigate the dispute and make findings prior to the issuance of the injunction as is required under the Taft-Hartley Act.

"The few safeguards on the issuance of injunctions in cases involving jurisdictional strikes that are contained in the Taft-Hartley Act are eliminated under the new Wood bill, and under that bill either the Board or the court has complete discretion to issue orders respecting jurisdictional strikes without even affording the parties to the dispute an opportunity to settle the jurisdictional dispute for themselves, as was permitted under Taft-Hartley.

"The following is a provision-by-provision comparison of the new Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, showing what, if any, changes are made in respect to each of the various provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act. The analysis follows the same form as that followed when the Thomas bill was compared with the Taft-Hartley Act in a previous analysis made by this office. The following provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are retained, strengthened, or modified by the Wood bill as indicated:

"1. Disenfranchisement of economic strikers—modified so as to permit an economic striker to vote in a representation election but only if he has not been permanently replaced for a period of 90 days prior to the election. In other words, if the economic striker has been replaced for 90 days, he cannot vote.

"2. Blanket prohibitions on restraint or coercion by unions—retained and strengthened by permitting injunctions merely upon the filing of charges and without investigation or issuance of complaint as required under Taft-Hartley.

"3. Broad prohibitions on secondary boycotting—retained completely, with the very slight exception that union employees engaged in a lawful primary strike may induce other union employees to assist them in the following limited situation: where these other employees are employed to work on

products ordinarily made at the struck plant, as in a case where such products have been jobbed or contracted out, but even then only if these other employees are members of the same local union as the employees on strike and have a contract with their employer permitting them not to work on struck goods. As can readily be seen, cases where the employer has agreed that his employees need not work on struck goods, and where the employees engaged in the primary dispute are members of the same local union as employees making or working on products for the struck plant, will be very few and far between, so in practical effect the so-called broadening provision is meaningless.

"4. Prohibition against jurisdictional disputes—retained and strengthened against unions by eliminating opportunity for parties to settle their own dispute and by permitting court injunction merely upon filing of charges and without issuing of complaint or other investigation.

"5. Ban on closed shop and restriction on union shop—retained in most respects, strengthened in others, and modified in some. Under the Wood bill, all closed-shop agreements requiring membership in a union earlier than 30 days after employment are outlawed, and this even includes agreements which might have been valid under the Taft-Hartley Act, such as those entered into prior to the passage of that act made effective for a period of years. While the Wood bill does eliminate the useless union-shop election prerequisite, it permits employees in a bargaining unit to rescind the authority of a union to enter into a union-shop agreement by majority vote. The bill further permits the employer to discharge an employee under a union-shop agreement for two reasons in addition to failure to pay dues and initiation fees, namely, where the employee was expelled from the union for engaging in a wildcat strike or for being a Communist or for being affiliated with a Communist or similar organization. Further, the employer is permitted to notify a union of opportunities for employment, but since the prohibitions on the making and use of union-shop agreements are very specific, it is impossible to see any material benefit whatsoever which could be derived from this provision. In all other respects the prohibitions on closed-shop agreements and the restrictions on union-shop agreements are identical with those under Taft-Hartley, including the provision making the hodgepodge of State anti-closed-shop laws paramount to the Federal law.

"6. Exclusion of supervisors from all protection against employer discrimination and refusal to bargain—retained.

"7. Proviso permitting employer to use free speech to abuse unions if no threat of reprisal—retained.

"8. Non-Communist affidavit and other filing requirements—retained as to unions and extended to include employers.

"9. Restrictions on excessive initiation fees—retained.

"10. Restrictions on featherbedding—retained.

"11. Definition of good-faith bargaining—retained.

"12. Employer petitions and decertification provisions—retained.

"13. Opening of Federal courts to damage suits for breaches of contracts and for violation of secondary boycott provisions—retained, with slight limitation discussed under secondary boycott paragraph (No. 3) above.

"14. Restrictions on welfare funds and check-off—retained and strengthened by making check-off authorization automatically noneffective at the expiration of 1 year from the date of its execution, thus eliminating automatic renewal and making it necessary to procure new authorizations each year.

"15. Craft unit proviso—retained.

"16. Provision for 60-day notice of termination or modification of existing agreement—retained, except that an employee striking in violation of the 60-day clause does not lose his status as an employee.

"17. Separate conciliation service—retained.

"18. Provision for enjoining strikes in emergency situation, 80-day cooling-off period and last-offer election strengthened by permitting injunction at any time a dispute is threatened without investigation or fact-finding by Presidential board. However, useless last-offer election is eliminated. Under the Wood bill, the safeguards inherent in an investigation by a board appointed by the President, which makes an investigation and issues findings of fact prior to the issuance of an injunction, are entirely eliminated. The board now functions only after the injunction is obtained. Thus, the Wood bill makes it impossible for the President even to attempt to settle the threatened national emergency by the appointment of a board of inquiry without first obtaining an injunction. Under the injunction the court can order the parties to the dispute to use their best efforts to settle it, under threat of contempt of court if they fail to do so. The Wood bill, therefore, would arouse all the antagonisms that are automatically induced by the issuance of any injunction in a later dispute before the President is empowered to even try to bring about conciliation or settlement of the issues.

"19. Restrictions on political contributions by labor organizations—retained.

"20. Separation of powers as between Board and General Counsel—retained, and powers of General Counsel greatly expanded by giving him absolute discretion to seek injunction in any case where charges may have been filed.

"CONCLUSION

"From the foregoing section-by-section comparison of the Wood bill with the Taft-Hartley Act, it can be readily seen that, if anything, the Wood bill is more vicious and more oppressive than the Taft-Hartley Act and should be as strenuously opposed. Wherever the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act are loosened, it is for the most part in unimportant respects, and, on the other hand, the most objectionable of the Taft-Hartley Act provisions—those dealing with injunctions against labor organizations—are considerably strengthened. If the foregoing analysis is compared with the analysis of the Thomas-Lesinski bill, it can be seen that the Wood bill could not, under any circumstances, be considered in any way an adequate substitute."

Why should we administration Democrats take political advice from reactionary Republicans and Democrats and from the sole member of an alleged Farm-Labor Party? We should beware of the present-day fused and distorted ideas of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, and Lenin dished out to us in one package.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO] is recognized.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] definitely made it plain that the issue was clear cut, and that the line of demarcation has been drawn as to whether we are for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act or for any other repeal.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the Marcantonio substitute amendment because last fall I ran on that platform, for the outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; and I defeated my predecessor who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act and who voted to override the President's veto. When they redistricted my district, the Republicans did a perfect job of gerrymandering the district so as to make it solidly Republican. Because of the emphatic answer the people gave last fall when they voted to send me to Congress, and I ran on that platform, I feel obliged today to vote to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. If you want to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act you must vote for the Marcantonio substitute amendment, because in that way we can reenact the Wagner Act, and then if you want to amend the Wagner Act you can do so.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAURIELLO. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I voted against the Taft-Hartley bill in 1947. I voted against the proposition which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] suggested in the committee. I feel that those of us who were against the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 have a satisfactory alternative in the Lesinski bill of 1949.

Mr. TAURIELLO. I am for the Lesinski bill too, but if we can find a short cut to repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act this afternoon, let us stand up and be counted right here.

The reelection of President Truman last November 2 and the repudiation of the Republican Eightieth Congress was definitely a mandate from the American voters to repeal the Taft-Hartley Labor Act. There were many things to criticize in the Eightieth Congress, but nothing so antagonized the voters, and especially the working-class voters, as the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act. It will not do to merely change the name of that act; we must change the whole philosophy underlying it.

The joint authors of this bill, Senator TAFT and Congressman Hartley, have admitted that the act is defective in quite a number of respects. The Republican Congress that enacted the law appointed a special committee to study the operation of the law, and that committee also recommended changes in the Taft-Hartley Act.

But minor changes will not suffice. The law requires a major operation. The Wood bill is not the answer because it is the Taft-Hartley Act verbatim, only with a new name. We must get back to the basic principle of the Wagner Act, which encouraged free collective bargaining. The Taft-Hartley Act in many of its provisions seriously hampers collective bargaining.

The Taft-Hartley Act paid lip service to the principle of collective bargaining, but the law is filled with legal technicalities, each one of which is an obstacle to the policy of free collective bargaining.

Sound labor-management relations rest upon the principle of voluntary action. The Taft-Hartley Act, on the other hand, confers upon the Government and Government agents wide powers in the determination of labor-management policies.

To enforce the Government edicts, the Taft-Hartley Act relies on criminal penalties, injunctions, civil penalties, cease-

and-desist orders, and the loss of rights by unions and individual workers.

The wide use of injunctions and the abuse in the issuance of injunctions under the Taft-Hartley Act is one of the most vicious features of this law, and turns back the hands of the clock two decades. It took several decades to enact the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act in 1932. The Taft-Hartley Act wiped out that splendid law and subjected the unions again to the archaic system of the widespread use of injunction in labor disputes. The court injunction was a deadly weapon to prevent the formation of unions and to break up labor organizations.

The Taft-Hartley labor law even went so far as to deny to labor organizations the right of freedom of speech and freedom of the labor press. That act sought to make illegal the publication in the labor papers of news of organized labor when it was directed against Members of Congress. The Taft-Hartley Act not only sought to wipe out freedom of the press for the workers, but sought to make illegal financial contributions by labor organizations in political campaigns.

The Taft-Hartley Labor Act was a body blow against organized labor. We must wipe it off the statute books and replace it with a law which embodies the principles of the Wagner Act, with perfecting amendments to that splendid basic law which President Roosevelt once said was the Magna Carta of the American labor movement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House may well differ as to what particular features should be in the labor law of the land, but I am convinced that a majority of the Members of this House want to keep that provision in the Taft-Hartley Act which requires the leadership of labor organizations to state whether or not they are members of the Communist Party. Many of us think that should be extended also to include the other side in the bargaining proposition.

If we are permitted to vote on the Wood substitute we will have an opportunity to retain that and also to add the other feature I have mentioned.

Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York seeks "simple, outright repeal" of the Taft-Hartley Act and with it the discard of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which call for an affidavit on the communistic affiliations of the leaders of labor organizations.

Just this week the Committee on Un-American Activities had an important hearing.

It has not all been made public yet, but when the record comes out it will show that a man suspected of espionage activities in connection with an atomic energy installation refused to say whether or not he was a Communist. When he was asked as to whether or not he had ever disagreed with the Communist Party line he declined to state an answer or could not remember. But, he said that he would state some propositions where he was in favor of the Communist Party program.

So, I asked him to name two things where he favored the Communist program. His No. 1 was repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Draw your own conclusions as to why he wanted that "simple outright repeal" of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes is a short time for a fellow with a southern drawl to say much. I will say, however, that there has been a lot of talk about the Democratic platform. I just want to reread one paragraph that the gentleman says he helped put in there:

> We advocate such legislation as is desirable to establish a just body of rules to assure free and effective collective bargaining, to determine in the public interest the rights of employees and employers, to reduce to a minimum their conflict of interests and to enable unions to keep their membership free from communistic influences.

I do not know anyone in this House who is opposed to that principle. Certainly I am not. I embrace it wholeheartedly. But who was to write that legislation? Why, the Congress of the United States. I say to you without any fear of contradiction that no committee of this House has written one single word of the Lesinski bill. No one can deny that. It was not read, it was not amended, and there has not been a word of it written by a committee. I take this Democratic platform to mean that the framers of it intended for the Congress of the United States to provide the answer and that is what I am trying to do. In my opinion, the Wood bill is in perfect accord with the Democratic platform.

Now, let me call your attention to the last line of this statement in the platform, and I quote:

> Enable unions to keep their memberships free from communistic influences.

There is no anti-Communist affidavit required or provided for in the Lesinski bill either on the part of labor or on the part of management. I do not think it is a very difficult problem to interpret this platform to mean that some attention be given to the writing of protective provisions in any labor legislation written. In the Wood bill anti-Communist affidavits are required of both union officials and employers alike, and I want to say right here we had better give some thought to the security of our Nation, especially in such plants as the atomic-bomb plants, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, first I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for reading that paragraph of the Democratic platform, for that is the first thing that I intended to do when I rose.

I rise to speak in opposition to the Marcantonio amendment and I do so because our platform, upon which we were elected, stated that we were to enact a just body of laws that would determine in the public interest the rights of employees and employers and reduce to a minimum their conflict of interests and enable unions to keep their memberships free of communistic influences.

There has been a lot of talk about whether amendments are to be offered here in this House to the Lesinski bill. I will say this to you that so far as I know there is no agreement on our side as to any amendment. I will go farther and say to you that in my candid judgment the Lesinski bill fulfills all of these platform pledges, save and except the one in regard to communistic influences. I know that there is going to be an amendment offered to the Lesinski bill when it comes on the floor, if it is not voted down. If it is an amendment with the same provision as the Taft-Hartley law, I will be against it, but I am going to have a substitute which I think is a whole lot sounder and a whole lot more effective. I do not mind disclosing to the Members of this House at this time what I have in mind. I have in mind that a man should be ousted from an office that he holds in either a union or a corporation upon proof that he has violated certain specified statutes of the United States. I am not in favor of shelling the woods and I am not in favor of a witch hunt, but if a man has violated a statute that specifically condemns disloyal conduct, I am in favor of him being ousted from his office, whether it be union or whether it be corporate. I am also in favor of ousting those persons who violate laws condemning international cartels, and antitrust laws, because such is also collectivism, and it is as dangerous to free society and free enterprise as communism.

I have the substitute prepared, and I say to you that if you vote down the Marcantonio amendment, which is not in keeping with the Democratic platform, and if you vote down the Wood amendment when the administration bill comes upon the floor, you can offer such an amendment. As I understand, if you vote in the Marcantonio amendment, you cannot offer any amendment to it, and thus you are forced to choose between the Taft-Hartley law which is on the books today and which the people said they did not want at the last election, or the Wagner Act, which my party was pledged to amend, and which this Lesinski bill does amend. In my judgment we have played political shuttlecock in this Chamber long enough. What we ought to do is vote them both down and bring up the administration bill, start reading it, and have a test of strength at those points where someone thinks there should be amendments. That is the orderly way to do it. But any man who walks through this aisle between the tellers and votes for the Marcantonio amendment is voting in practical effect to retain the Taft-Hartley law, because that is the effect it is going to have, unless there is a majority of this House that would vote for the Wagner Act as

against the Taft-Hartley law. I do not known how you will divide, but it will be either the Wagner Act or the Taft-Hartley law.

In short this is an effort to avoid a direct vote upon the administration bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In the event my amendment is voted down, and then the Wood amendment is voted up, there would be no further opportunity to offer an amendment along the lines of the amendment I have offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KELLEY and Mr. MARCANTONIO.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 37, noes 275.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE to the Wood substitute: On page 16, between lines 8 and 9, insert a new paragraph (6) to read as follows:

"(6) to discharge or to refuse to hire or to maintain employment because of race, color, or religion."

On page 19, line 25, strike out the conjunction "and" and insert at the end of said page a new paragraph to be followed by a colon and the conjunction "and", as follows:

"(7) to refuse membership to any person because of race, color, or religion: and".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that I have been faithfully since last Tuesday at noon sitting in my seat doing without lunch until closing time of these sessions, and listening to everybody talk, I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time that I may be allowed to continue for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. There will be other objections made, too.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an amendment that is directly in line with the avowed pledges and promises of both political parties.

Let me read to you the Republican pledge in the Republican platform:

One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and is embodied in the Constitution of the United States. It was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic. We favor the abolition of the poll tax as a requisite to voting. We are opposed to the idea of racial segregation in the armed services of the United States.

You Democratic brethren of the South should take note with whom you have formed a coalition.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. No; nobody yielded to me, and they objected when I asked for further time.

In the Sun-Star of April 17, we have this headline: "Democrats delay humane bills in fear of defeat, Scott says."

As I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., is chairman of the Republican National Committee. Mr. SCOTT took occasion to say that the administrations' performance on civil rights thus far has been "the most shameless and brazen exhibition of signal disregard for the party's pledged word in all American history."

Well, Mr. SCOTT, now is your opportunity to say where you stand on that.

Mr. Chairman, this proposition of civil rights can be readily divided into three categories. First, the one that deals with political civil rights; second, the one that deals with social civil rights; and, third, the one that deals with economic civil rights. Of all three, the one that deals with economic civil rights of citizens of this country, regardless of race, color, or religion, is the one that should be considered in any legislation that deals with the economic status of Americans. The Wood substitute does deal with the economic status of that section of American labor that is concerned with civil rights. This amendment is, therefore, proper and timely. Here is where it belongs, not in a FEPC, but right here in this bill, in this legislation. I, personally, do not believe we need a FEPC in this United States on this subject of economic civil rights if my amendment is adopted. We have not passed any in order to protect other minority races in industries of our country. My amendment will apply equally to all Americans. It belongs here in this bill. Here is where it should be in order to insure the economic status of all citizens who are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, without regard to race, color, or religion. This amendment applies equally to management and to labor. It provides that management may not discharge, may not refuse to hire or refuse to maintain employment because of race, color, or religion. It also imposes the same restriction on unions: They may not defeat membership because of race, color, or religion.

Mr. Chairman, 3 days of debate on this measure has not added much to our knowledge of the subject matter in this Wood substitute. The greater portion of the remarks has been in the nature of criticism leveled at the committee that reported the measure.

The tenor of this criticism indicates that the enemies of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law were not successful in forcing the committee into holding long, tedious, and unnecessary public hearings. This subject of labor-management relations has been a major issue in this House for the past 16 years. It has been the theme of boundless tides of headlines and columns in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and writings of all types. It has been the topic of comment and discussion by radio news analysts and commentators. It has been the question of debate at town hall, high school, college, and unnumbered gatherings of management and of labor. It was the keystone of debate in the Eightieth Congress and the last Republican National Convention at Philadelphia. It was the crucial issue of the 1948 national election in all industrialized areas of this land. In short, has not the pro and con of this subject been continuously on the mind and tongue of statesman, politician, management, labor, and representatives of all walks of life, for the past 18 years? The people who still need public hearings to inform themselves on this subject and that of civil rights have been either blind, deaf, or asleep during these past years. And if this latter is not true, then demagoguery or mental dishonesty is in our midst.

This Wood substitute is a peculiar creature. Its head is hidden ostrich-like in the Democratic sand on this side of the House. Its posterior, however, plainly outlined as a familiar pachyderm, rises like a mountain on the Republican side of the House. It has NAM legs and a Taft-Hartley tail. The last time we saw its head it was definitely that of the discarded Democratic rooster. Surely, gentlemen, we are not going to turn loose upon American labor this frightful creature with the head of a rooster, the body of an elephant, the legs of NAM, and a Taft-Hartley tail?

My amendment is just a little of the legislative surgery that is necessary to make this Wood substitute a little less frightful to look upon.

If this amendment is adopted and the Wood substitute is defeated, I shall offer the same amendment to the Lesinski bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for many reasons. I am not at all impugning the sincerity of the gentleman who offers this amendment.

My mind goes back to my first term in this Congress, in March of 1945, when there came down from the White House a plea to pass a work-or-fight bill. At that time a former Member of this House, whose sincerity I do not now impugn, offered an amendment similar to that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It was my first speech and a very difficult speech for me to make as a Negro. I rose in opposition to that amendment then, in March of 1945. I rise in opposition to this amendment now because, whether the gentleman introduced it sincerely or

not—that is not my business, but I do know what the effect will be: the effect will be that he hopes by this amendment to get enough Republicans and liberals to support it so that when the final vote comes the Members from the South will not be able to vote for the Wood bill, and the Wood bill will be defeated. I would like the Wood bill defeated, too, but I do not believe that now or at any time we should play political football with such a serious question as the civil rights of people, my people or any other people.

It so happens that when this came before our committee a representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Clarence Mitchell, testified and asked that these amendments be put in the Lesinski bill. I told him—I have the hearings before me—that I would put these amendments into the Lesinski bill in committee or on the floor unless hearings were set up for the fair employment practices bill. You will find that statement on page 807 of the hearings on the National Labor Relations Act of 1949. Now those hearings on FEPC have been established; the committee has been set up; it is a good committee: The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. BURKE and Mr. BREHM], and the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON]—that is the committee. We begin hearings on Tuesday. I hold in my hand the administration FEPC bill, which I now put in the hopper of the House. We start holding hearings on this bill beginning Tuesday morning.

I resent, because I am an American, any type of a political maneuver with a question as deep and vital as the civil rights of a people, whether they are Negro people, Jewish people, Catholics, or what not.

This whole question will come before us in full hearing beginning Tuesday. Let the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE], let the gentlemen from the Republican side, stand up then and be counted. May I ask now publicly the support of my fellow Members on the Republican side and on the Democratic side who are members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House, so that we may report this bill out on the floor. Then let us discuss it, not in the kind of atmosphere we heard earlier today but in an atmosphere in which we, north of the Mason and Dixon's line, understand your problems of the South, and you, south of the Mason and Dixon's line, can understand ours. Let us have an honest American discussion on this matter, a forthright one. Let us bring the FEPC subject up at the hearings beginning on next Tuesday. I am chairman of that committee, and I invite you all to bring in your testimony. I will give you full and adequate opportunity to present your testimony, whether for or against.

This is not the time to bring up civil rights as a political football, as much as I would like to see the Wood bill defeated. I will not introduce it as an amendment to the Lesinski bill either, and I challenge anyone to introduce those amendments to that bill. If you do introduce them, you will be playing football again with a question that goes to the heart of the life and of the peace and security of the Negro people and other minority people in this country.

Let us stop this business of playing political football in the consideration of labor-management relations. Let us begin our consideration of the FEPC on Tuesday next. Then if that does not get consideration on this floor, we will pin a civil-rights amendment on every bill that comes before us.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Wood substitute and all amendments thereto close at 3: 10 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, what was the request of the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his request again?

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Wood substitute and all amendments thereto close not later than 10 minutes after 3 this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman and to my colleagues in the House that many of us have insisted that the substitute now before us is the only vehicle upon which the House can competently and efficiently work its will in the writing of sound labor-management-relations legislation. I know there are Members on both sides of the aisle who have amendments to be proposed to the substitute now before us, a number of those amendments being in direct response to the request of the leaders of organized labor.

In view of that fact and in view of the tremendous importance of this legislation and the high desirability of the House of Representatives acting wisely and well on this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to ask the author of the pending amendment one or two questions. If the Wood amendment to which his amendment is offered should be defeated, then when the Lesinski bill is before us for consideration and amendment, is it the gentleman's intention to offer the same amendment to the Lesinski bill?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. May I state to the gentleman that I have offered these amendments in order to call them to the attention of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman please answer the question?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. This is the law that should be amended and this proposition put in it.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman answer the question, please? If the Wood amendment should be defeated, then we would take up the Lesinski bill for amendment. Would the gentleman then offer his amendments to the Lesinski bill?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Well, it depends upon whether or not amendments——

Mr. JUDD. Cannot the gentleman answer "Yes" or "No"? I think such an answer would give us a clear indication of whether, as the gentleman from New York has suggested, this amendment is merely an attempt to develop opposition to the Wood bill, and therefore is, as he has just said, making a political football of the extremely delicate and important civil-rights issue; or whether the amendment is a bona fide effort to deal with the problem. Does the gentleman intend to offer it to the Lesinski bill?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. It is going to depend upon what other amendments are going to be offered to the Lesinski bill.

Mr. JUDD. I am disappointed in the gentleman's answer, but I think it makes the real situation clear to all.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Cavalcante amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are here today considering a very important piece of legislation. I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] earlier in the day.

In my consideration of legislation which will replace the Taft-Hartley Act, I have attempted to be guided by what I feel will result in the greatest benefits to and which will afford the maximum protection to those two largest segments of our population which will be affected by the bill which will be approved by this Congress. I am referring to those working members of organized labor, and to the general public which is not directly employed by industries which will be directly affected by any act.

In listening to the general debate during the last 3 days and in reading the RECORD wherein the proponents of both the Lesinski bill and the Wood bill have discussed the basis for and the approach to the legislation which we are considering today, I have been impressed with the fact that, in my opinion, apparently very little effort was expended in attempting to arrive at a permanent solution of what is perhaps the most serious problem confronting this Nation today.

In considering the approach to this problem, I have been impressed with the logic of an article by David Lawrence which appears in the current issue of the United States News wherein he stresses the need for reason. While I would not place myself in the position of following Mr. Lawrence and more often than not find myself in disagreement with him, I would commend to you the soundness of his statement that—

> Real progress can be made if labor and management groups will sit down together and reach compromise on new legislation.

While I realize that many of you have read Mr. Lawrence's editorial, the Need for Reason, I would like to indulge on your time by reading a few paragraphs from this article which I endorse:

> Agreeing on principles: We may not like to admit our shortcomings. But isn't it true

that we fight each other on the economic front with all the propaganda of misrepresentation and the distortion of truth which the Communists use on the political front? Do not the newspaper photographs show that strikes are often conducted with violence? What shall we say of the future capacity of nations to settle their disputes without coercion when we apparently do not know how to use reason inside our own country?

The task of writing a new labor law is at best a technical problem. It cannot be performed in the midst of passionate debate. It can be done only when there is first a basic agreement on principles.

No such agreement has as yet been reached. No substantial progress can ever be made by Congress until the labor and management groups themselves can agree on what are the minimum requirements of a satisfactory labor-management relationship.

It is significant that the most successful piece of labor legislation written in the last half century—and it is still on the statute books—was not drafted in the committees or on the floor of either House of Congress. The Railway Labor Act of 1926, which applies to the railroads and other common carriers and does for them what the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act have tried unsuccessfully to do for the rest of industry, was written after many conferences between the unions and the railroad executives.

When the bill came to Congress, it was satisfactory to both sides. The debate was relatively brief. The vote in favor was overwhelming.

The present railway labor law, to be sure, has its defects and since the date of original passage it has been amended. Serious strikes on the Nation's railroads, however, have been prevented. Such threats to industrial peace as have arisen have not been the fault of the law. They have come when politics entered the picture as a President of the United States went beyond the fact-finding boards or when a union sought unsuccessfully to have an award changed by using Presidential influence.

So far as is humanly possible, the Railway Labor Act preserves the equities of both sides and offers a machinery for the settlement of railway disputes.

Why is it that the same principles and same approach cannot be applied to the Taft-Hartley Act? Why cannot labor and management—without the intervention or political influence of Government—sit down together and work out a compromise?

Certainly both sides know what are the extreme limits and what it means to press an advantage that may prove only temporary.

If the President called such a conference, he would immediately be charged with weakening on the so-called administration bill. If either the labor unions or the employer groups took the initiative, the same charge might be made against them, respectively.

But surely inside the American Federation of Labor and the CIO and inside the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and inside the National Association of Manufacturers are sensible men who can overcome embarrassments in taking the initiative and arrange meetings of small groups in such a way as not to raise the issue of who started what conference.

By the admission of Members on this floor, I think it can be said that no one will deny that the Lesinski bill represents the demands of the leaders of union labor and that the action of the committee, or rather a bare majority of the committee, in refusing to even consider any amendments to what has been called the administration bill, is prima facie evidence that those who are conscious of the rights of the employer and those who believe that the public is entitled to consideration in the adoption of a national labor relations act were denied the opportunity of a compromise.

On the opposite side, it appears that the Wood bill, while it recognizes some of the gains which have been made by labor, was drafted by those who have been and still are considered unfriendly to organized labor, and for that reason cannot be considered the result of open and free discussion between the representatives of labor and management.

I pause at this time to say that I do not intend to vote for the Wood substitute, neither will I vote for the Lesinski bill unless it is amended. I think that if there have been agreements made for the adoption of amendments on the floor of this House, that bill should be referred back to the committee, where it can have proper deliberation so that a bill can be brought out in a form that will be satisfactory to a majority.

All legislation, to merit public acceptance, if not universal approval, must, in my opinion, be the result of open and free discussion with each side, both labor and management, being willing to recognize and accept the rights as well as the obligations of the other side. Might does not make right, and the fact that either side has sufficient votes to pass either of these bills without amendment through both Houses of Congress would not insure the passage of a law which would be either fair or workable. Unfortunately, in my opinion, too many members have adopted the position of voting for or against one of these bills as a matter of political expediency, looking to the effect on their own political candidacy 2 years hence, rather than to what should be a permanent solution of this pressing problem.

My observation has been that too many Members are more interested in writing their own political record on the floor of the House than they are in writing a bill which would serve the purposes for which it was intended. I know that all of us realize how impractical it is to attempt to amend on the floor either of these bills to incorporate all of the provisions that most of us feel are desirable in a bill which should be fair to both sides. Coming from the district that I represent where organized labor is still in a minority but which nevertheless is entitled to the same consideration and the same fair treatment as those who are employed in a preponderantly industrial district, I realize that I have not had the pressure exerted on me either by labor or management that some Members of Congress have. For this reason I believe that I am in a position to consider the problem with deliberation and with sanity.

Only last Saturday I had the opportunity of meeting with a small group of labor representatives. This group of between 25 and 30 men and women, while small in number, did represent most of the organized labor in southeast Missouri exclusive of the railway brotherhoods. While they may not have been typical of the labor leaders in the more highly industrialized centers, I believe they are typical of the rank and file of laboring people who, while sincere in their demands, are nevertheless considerate of the rights of the public and conscious of their obligation to management. They expressed themselves as recognizing the desirability of accepting amendments to the Lesinski bill, and I am confident they would have little trouble in reaching an agreement if given the opportunity to sit down with management in working out a bill such as we are attempting to pass here today.

While I realize the futility of making such a suggestion, I feel that everyone concerned, including labor, management and the public in general, would be better served if this bill could be recommitted to the committee with instructions that it was the desire of this House for the committee to bring forth a compromise bill, recognized as such, which could have the endorsement and approval of an overwhelming majority of the committee. To those who would say that this is impossible, I would only remind you that until both labor and management realize that there is a common ground of decency and fairness upon which we can all stand and work together that this Nation is doomed to provide a fertile field in which can be sown the seeds of communism.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I am thankful for this opportunity to go on record as urging the complete repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the reinstatement of the original Wagner Act in letter and principle.

However, I must confess that I am somewhat disappointed with this compromise bill, H. R. 2032, because it repeals only part of the Taft-Hartley law—because it retains certain antilabor provisions found in the Taft-Hartley law as amendments to the Wagner Act.

Two years ago the reactionary and now-repudiated Republican majority steamrollered the Taft-Hartley law through the Congress in an atmosphere of lynch-labor hysteria. This was done for the admitted purpose of shackling and eventually destroying the American labor movement, and the bill had been drafted by corporation and NAM lawyers in a most ingenious fashion to achieve that objective.

It is unnecessary for me to waste the few minutes at my disposal to discuss the evil nature of the Taft-Hartley law. I can summarize by saying that the Taft-Hartley law has become a symbol of tyranny to every working man and woman—a repressive law which epitomizes the era of brute force, the use of machine guns and strikebreakers in an industrial jungle. It is symbolic of the court injunction as a strikebreaking technique, of the open shop, of the use of government as an instrument of the enemies of labor to depress wages in favor of ever-increasing corporate profits.

The Taft-Hartley law violated every fundamental right of labor, and labor's answer to this violation was a determined political offensive in the last Presidential campaign. During the 1948 campaign the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law became a major issue. Labor demanded complete repeal of this law

and a return to the Wagner Act, and the Democratic Party pledged itself to this program. Labor voted for a complete repeal of the NAM-sponsored Taft-Hartley Act, and the Democratic Party received a clear mandate from the people for such action.

After the Eighty-first Congress convened, the friends of labor directed their efforts toward carrying out this pledge made to labor and the people. But they have been hamstrung in their efforts at every turn. Hidden pressures, stalling tactics, and the philosophy of compromise have all combined to produce this bill, H. R. 2032, which received a favorable report from the House Committee on Education and Labor. This compromise bill is not the bill that labor voted for in November—there are certain provisions such as those relating to jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, and 30-day cooling-off periods which were not a part of labor's program.

So, although labor voted for complete Taft-Hartley repeal, its representatives have leaned over backward to be reasonable. They have agreed to support H. R. 2032, even though by so doing they gave up part of the victory won at the polls in November 1948. But even so, the enemies of labor are not satisfied. Now they come forward with this substitute measure, H. R. 2032, which is Taft-Hartleyism under another name.

Mr. Chairman, this Wood bill is just as bad—perhaps worse—than the present Taft-Hartley labor-management relations law. It represents nothing more than a change of title—a refinement of the same cruel and oppressive provisions now on the lawbooks. It must be defeated at all costs.

I want to say also that I am deeply disturbed about yesterday's New York Times news story that four new amendments may be added to the administration bill, H. R 2032. As I said before, I am not enthusiastic about certain provisions of the measure as it now stands. It does not completely repeal the Taft-Hartley law. It is not what labor voted for, but it does represent a compromise between what labor wants and deserves, and the present law. The Democratic Party must not compromise any further on this issue, and on its pledges to labor. Organized labor has been short-changed by compromises already made, and to make further concessions to the enemy by accepting new antilabor amendments will amount to a sell-out.

Congress has a clear mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, and I call upon the House to reject this and all other NAM-inspired amendments and to vote to wipe this evil measure from the statute books.

I am not going to repeat the many arguments that have been made in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I opposed the measure when it was first brought up, and I voted against it. I pledged myself in the recent campaign to vote for its complete and utter repeal. The intent of those who sponsored that legislation and who had it drawn up by the corporation attorneys, as was brought out here on the floor of the House, was to handicap and hamstring labor. Eventually, through that law, if it were enforced, they could destroy labor.

During the committee meetings in both the House and Senate, the customary tactics of the opponents of labor, or the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law, were to point again and again to detailed specific provision of this vast, long, complicated and intricate legal measure. They would point out a provision, for example, and say "Do you not agree that this provision is all right?" They would refer, for example, to the proposition that a union should be financially responsible. Of course, they should be financially responsible, as they are financially responsible in most instances and as they are today.

Then they would point to some other provision and say "Do you not agree that this provision is all right?" Of course, there are bound to be some harmless things in such a complicated and involved law.

As the gentleman from Indiana pointed out, there are also at least a dozen gimmicks, which I call monkey-wrenches, inserted deliberately in this lengthy piece of legislation. These provisions were inserted to gum up any opportunity to set up effective labor-management relations machinery.

When I came before the House committee, I refused to argue on such a premise. I merely said, "Gentlemen, what you are trying to tell me, brings to mind this analogy. Let us assume that you come to me with a glass of milk and you put honey in it. You say that honey is good for me and cream is good for me. Of course, cream is good for me and honey is good for me. Then you put in a little pinch of arsenic, and try to convince me to drink it. But I will not drink it because it is going to kill me."

That is exactly your method in trying to sell the Taft-Hartley law to the people and to labor. You are not fooling anyone.

To labor it is a question of their lives and their very existence, if the Taft-Hartley law remains on the books. Up to now, many of the provisions of this vicious law have never been enforced. Now, we are offered the Wood substitute, which is nothing more nor less than the Taft-Hartley law in disguise. Instead of arsenic in this mixture of cream and honey, they put a little strychnine in it and say "this will really fix you up." Actually, it is a deadly mixture. I ask you to turn this amendment down.

I ask you Members on my own side of the aisle to live up to your pledge—I am confident you will—to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. That pledge is in our party platform. We campaigned on it, and the President campaigned on that promise. We were elected and decisively elected on that basis. I do not know what the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle stand for. I have gone over their plank on labor in their party platform. In some sort of way they say that they are friendly to labor. But let us see some manifestation of their professed friendship for labor here when the vote comes on this substitute and on the final passage of the Lesinski bill.

Briefly, there is no escaping this one fact. We will have and must have strong labor, free labor, coexisting side by side with free management and strong management, in order that our way of life may endure.

One of the finest analytical, objective, and impartial analysis of the whole problem of labor-management relations that I have run across is the speech given by E. Wight Bakke, director of Yale University labor and management center, a little over a year ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has expired.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute to complete my point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Bakke listed several points to which I wholeheartedly subscribe. He said:

> I believe that labor-management peace can be achieved in America within the framework of free private enterprise and democratic life. I believe that the survival of private enterprise and democracy depend upon establishing a working peace between management and union leadership.

Then he continues:

> The task of eliminating * * * obstacles to labor-management peace is hard but not impossible. The chances for success are reflected in the satisfactory relations of thousands of managements and unions over the country. But whether or not they develop the will and the skill to succeed is not a matter of choice for union and management leaders who desire the survival of both free unions and free management. For the result of failure to work out the means of mutual survival will not be the elimination of one by the other, but the elimination of both as free institutions by public regimentation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to inquire if there are any amendments on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised there are four amendments pending on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think some of the gentlemen should offer their amendments, because we ought to dispose of the Wood amendment one way or the other, as it may be amended, today. I am serving notice that in about 20 minutes a motion to close debate may be made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the minority side has not had recognition. We have a number who

are ready to offer amendments when they are recognized.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not seen any Member standing seeking recognition.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would serve notice that we will resist closing debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would expect you would resist, but I had in mind somewhere around 5 o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, we will see how the amendments go. We are not going to prevent orderly discussion of amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, you would oppose closing debate at 5 o'clock?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes. I would oppose closing debate at any time.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, as my friend said earlier, this will be going on for 10 days or 2 weeks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, if it is properly discussed. It is a big bill and the people of the country ought to have it properly discussed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, in about 20 minutes you can expect some kind of a motion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORTON to the Wood substitute: On page 18, line 10, after the word "Act" in line 10, strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 11 and 12, through the word "contract."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, during the general debate I discussed the question of secondary strikes and boycotts. Most fair-minded persons agree that the present law, the Taft-Hartley law, precluded what most of us believed to be a fair secondary strike. I will review a situation with a concrete example. Suppose that manufacturer A has need for certain parts, let us say ax handles. He lets a contract for ax handles to manufacturer B.

Manufacturer B's employees then become engaged in a legitimate economic strike. Under the construction that has been given to the Taft-Hartley law, manufacturer B can then subcontract that business whether or not he makes a profit on it, and the employees of the firm receiving the subcontract—we will call them company C—cannot strike or refuse to work on that business. The Wood substitute attempts to correct that situation; it permits employees to refuse to accept farmed-out work from a struck plant, but it requires them to be in the same local. I believe that position does not go far enough. By eliminating the language beginning with the last two words on line 10 and going through the word "contract" in line 12, I merely eliminate the restriction to the local unit, and in effect prohibit the farming out of work to a plant in the same local or a plant anywhere else in the country.

Let me make it abundantly clear that this is to stop management in a struck plant from farming out the work. If you have given me the job for ax handles and my plant strikes I cannot farm it out if it is a legitimate strike, but you are free to go ahead and place the contract elsewhere; and it would then, under the terms of the Wood provision, be an unfair labor practice for the employees of that plant to refuse to work on these goods because the management or the company where the strike is occurring is in no way a party to that action.

In my opinion, the liberalizing of present law obtained under the Wood bill does not go far enough. My amendment merely extends that area.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know what is going to be the law; many of us have different opinions on what this Congress will finally do, but here is an amendment that does have the support of labor, and even if you are opposed to every form of Wood bill or any form of the Taft-Hartley Act you surely can support a liberalizing amendment, because none of us know what the law ultimately will be.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. IRVING. Is is not true that the situation is adequately taken care of in the Lesinski bill?

Mr. MORTON. I do not deny that in the Lesinski bill it is adequately taken care of, but the trouble is, as I pointed out in general debate, that in the Lesinski bill you have made very few secondary boycotts or secondary strikes unfair labor practices and have not set up the adequate machinery to do away with them. You condemn them, yes; but you do nothing to correct this situation or jurisdictional disputes except after 18 months or 2 years, and that is too late to take care of the situation.

Our first action is on the pending amendment, certainly you must recognize the fact that it does liberalize the Wood substitute. You cannot afford not to vote for any amendment liberalizing the Wood substitute, because you do not know what this Congress is finally going to do. If you did you would have the power of clairvoyance, and if you have I wish you would tell me who is going to win the great race that will take place in my fair district one week from tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this statement, no doubt, is offered in good faith, but I point out that there are so many points at issue in the so-called Wood amendment, which is in effect a 67-page bill, that we could probably spend a month's time trying to fix up these points that are contained in the Wood substitute.

Last November the people of the United States expressed their dissatisfaction with the Taft-Hartley Act and all the vicious antilabor provisions it contains. One of the most effective union-busting provisions in that act, the secondary boycott ban, which it is hereby proposed to continue, is one thing the people want to get rid of, and get rid of quickly and effectively because they know it cuts into the very soul of the labor movement. One does not have to be a very smart employer, under Taft-Hartley, to know that if a local union calls a strike, all the employer has to do is arrange with a member of his trade association to take care of his orders while he leisurely goes about dictating his own terms to the powerless local union. If an employer did this 70 years ago—and ever since, up to the date of Taft-Hartley—he would have found that transferring his strike-bound production to an associate producer might have resulted in another strike at the other plant. He would have realized that he had to bargain collectively with his local union for one very good reason: It was organized in a national, cooperating union and might frustrate his attempts to obtain a bargaining advantage by keeping his employees on a picket line for a very long time and having his work done elsewhere.

Taft-Hartley, for the first time in our history, gave the employer the secondary boycott ban and struck a serious blow at the national organization of unions. The Wood amendment, which permits secondary boycotts by members of the same local union only is a meaningless and deceptive attempt to grant the people's demand for an elimination of the Taft-Hartley ban on this type of activity. Local unions are usually organized on a plant-wide, or city-wide basis at most and often cover only one craft within the city. It is only an infinitesimal change from Taft-Hartley to permit unions to conduct city-wide or craft-wide—within the city—secondary boycotts. This means only that an employer, whose workers strike for a legitimate objective, would simply have to farm out his work to an associate who is outside the city. This is not a very difficult thing to do. And the evil it does lies in the deception it practices, for it does lip service to the people's demand that the Taft-Hartley secondary boycott ban be lifted and at the same time fails effectively to lift that ban. This betrays the trust our constituents placed in us and should not be permitted to pass.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk to those who claim their hearts are bleeding for employees, and to be more specific, to those who claim they represent the employees in Detroit, Wayne County, and that vicinity; those who speak for the employees in the automotive industry.

The situation is this: Last week there was a strike called in the Bendix plant down at South Bend, Ind. The Bendix people make parts for various assemblers or manufacturers of motor vehicles. When that strike was called the local blockaded the railroad tracks and prevented the shipment of finished products to the factories in Michigan; not only that, but Bendix has the dies, owned, for example, by the Hudson Motor Co. They use them to make parts for the Hudson people; brakes, in particular.

Now, the Hudson people obtained an injunction preventing the holding up of their material, ordering the local to release the dies, but nevertheless, the CIO

in South Bend, the CIO, is holding the tools of the Hudson people which were being used by Bendix to make brakes for Hudson which is located and which gives employment in Michigan; holding the finished material—and note this—Hudson's dies. And now we have a wire, and many Members of Congress have it, that 25,000 employees of the Hudson people are out of jobs. The wire reads as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *April 28, 1949.*
The Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In view of pending labor legislation you will be interested to know that the Hudson Motor Car Co. is about to close indefinitely throwing its 25,000 employees out of work, because of a strike at Bendix Co., South Bend, Ind., which is our sole source of brakes. In defiance of court order, the Bendix local and the international UAW-CIO have refused to permit Hudson-owned tools to be removed. This action taken in spite of the fact that they have permitted the removal of tools belonging to other automobile manufacturers.

This defiance of law and order and discrimination against our company most serious. Sent following wire to Walter Reuther, president UAW-CIO without result:

"Bendix UAW-CIO local in refusing to permit Hudson-owned dies to be removed in spite of court order is in defiance of law and order and is also engaging in serious discrimination against this company, having permitted removal of dies belonging to other manufacturers. We ask that you immediately exercise your authority as president of the UAW-CIO and permit our property to be removed and advise us."

STUART G. BAITS,
Executive Vice President, Hudson Motor Car Co.

Now, just for whom are you gentlemen who are opposing this secondary boycott provision speaking? Are you speaking for one particular little section of the union? Are you speaking today, for example, for the local CIO in South Bend or are you speaking for the 25,000 workers in the Hudson plant in Michigan who cannot work and who cannot get pay checks because down in South Bend that local is defying the law, the orders of the courts, unlawfully withholding not only the manufactured products, but the dies of the Hudson people.

This is nothing new, this situation. I recall very distinctly that more than 10 years ago a report was filed in this Congress by the then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Edison, in which he stated that in Detroit, in the Bohn Aluminum Co., the local CIO for 42 days was withholding possession of plans and specifications belonging to the Navy which were necessary for the construction of parts that the Navy needed in preparation for the war. How can you gentlemen pretend to be, or who really are in your own minds anyway, speaking for these employees, to go along and support legislation which enables one little group—and in the coal strike it was 54,000 railroad men that Lewis threw out of their jobs—how can you talk for that little fraction when you know that under the Wagner Act that thing is possible and that that is the practice—the repeated practice of some of these unions and by their action deprive other employees who have no interest in the strike of their jobs. Why not give those who want to work an opportunity to continue at their jobs when they have no dispute with their employer?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If there has been an injunction granted and the union defies the injunction, where is the protection for the public under such a procedure?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is no adequate remedy, because of the political power of the unions. The law is not in many cases enforced, and right down here during the war, at Johnstown, I think it was, where they manufactured the Corsair planes, some of the men there took their orders from the unions, and when they were convicted and sentenced to prison for interfering with production for war, what happened? The Secretary of the Navy caused them to be released from prison, and they were not punished. That is the record.

Why not protect all employees rather than just a few?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, I look upon it solely as an American with one thought: What is best for our land? Partisanship should never be gained at the exploitation of the men and women of America earning their livelihood by the sweat of their brows.

No nation is stronger than the people who make it up. No piece of legislation can ever work unless it is for the common good and unless the people believe it is for the common good.

The Taft-Hartley law has failed for the reason, first, that it was conceived in the minds of its sponsors as a punitive measure to punish labor, not to aid it. Its authors were not the names that appeared on the measure but the high-pressure, enormous-salaried lawyers for industry that drew up the act in obedience to the voice of their dollar master. Such a beginning could only lead to disaster. In the drawing of the bill behind the closed doors, no representative of labor took part.

Conceived in such an atmosphere, is there any wonder that from its very conception the bill was met with doubts, mistrust, and suspicion? The proponents of the existing Taft-Hartley law will point to what they claim as one or two alleged good features but they are silent as to its original intent and many anti-labor provisions.

Since the bill has met with almost universal disapproval, and I point to its prominence in the past campaign where an aroused citizenry returned to private life most of the men who voted for the bill, since it has accomplished no good and only stirred up animosity and hatred on the labor front, would it not be good legislative procedure to abolish entirely this measure?

I believe the American people will never be satisfied until the Taft-Hartley law is repealed and the Wagner Act is re-established. This has been my position before the campaign, during the campaign, and will ever remain my position.

Great has been the contribution of labor to the world, particularly here in America. Its growth, its development, its strength is a lasting tribute to the men and women in organized labor. They have struggled through the days of 16 hours of labor per day. Many of them in the early days never saw their families during the daylight hours. Seven days of labor a week was accepted as they struggled through with a mere pittance for wages. And still they carried on with the constant fear and threat ever with them, "You're fired" by some unscrupulous boss. Economic security was a wild far-off dream. That was the plight for many years of those who gave their strength to make this land. But they fought on and on until they rectified the abuses of capital and today they take their place, not below, not above, but as an absolute equal of management. They have earned their rights. There may have been some very small abuses but never, never to the excess of the abuses of capital in the days gone by.

This is a new era, an era of fair deal for both the worker and the employer. The only thing that mars this fair deal is the unfair act of the Taft-Hartley law. With justice now vindicated, let us at once definitely and clearly repeal the Taft-Hartley law so that labor and management can go forth on an equal footing both working, both striving to continue the onward march of the most blessed land in the world. Labor asks no more. Labor will take no less.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in 1947 this country departed from a sound national labor policy. That policy was to encourage free collective bargaining between labor and management. I propose that we return to that policy. I propose that we again give full backing to the industrial self-government which can be effectively practiced only by free management and free trade-unions. To return to that policy, Mr. Chairman, we must repeal the inequitable, one-sided Taft-Hartley Act and pass the Lesinski bill now before us. I urge the House to do just that—keeping in mind the words of the President in his state of the Union message:

> The strength of our Nation must continue to be used in the interests of all our people rather than a privileged few.

This principle stated by the President is most important in the field of legislation for the welfare of the working men and women of this country. The Taft-Hartley Act was written at the urging of a few. It discriminates against the millions of organized and unorganized workers in this country. It is class legislation at its worst.

We all remember the circumstances under which this act was passed. It was passed by the Congress not in the judicious atmosphere of legislative objectivity but in a spirit of anger, hostility, and unreasoning prejudice. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that even if this were a good bill, which it is certainly not, it could not have contributed toward stable labor-management relationships because it was inevitable that it would stimulate similar sentiments in the minds of working men and women as were present in those out to fight them. We who were Members of that Eightieth Congress recall very vividly that this was only one step made during those 2 years to hamstring or destroy the great economic and social gains of the past 16 years.

Let us recall, too, economic controls had been taken off; the plain people were left at the mercy of a spiraling inflation. The cost of living went up much faster than the hourly earnings of our millions of workers. Labor struck for better wages, and the emotional atmosphere became ripe for those who had never given up in their fight to get labor, for those who never had given anything but lip service to the right of working men and women to organize in their own interests; for those who would reduce labor's fair slice of the economic pie. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we had kept those economic controls until the danger of inflation had passed, the Congress might not have been faced with the psychological conditions which allowed these individuals to pressure to passage this restrictive law.

But that is all in the past. We have the opportunity—today—to reaffirm our faith and belief in the cardinal American principle of free labor. We can make this reaffirmation by passing the Lesinski bill, and by shutting off any crippling amendments whose only purpose is to keep as much of the Taft-Hartley Act as possible.

We all know what is wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act. But let me list some of its worst features—for the benefit of any Member who is still in doubt:

First, the Taft-Hartley Act places great reliance on the use of injunctions in labor disputes—and always against unions. In not a single case is the NLRB required to seek an injunction against an employer.

Second, by prohibiting the closed shop, the union hiring hall, and other well-established union practices, the act has outlawed many collective-bargaining agreements freely arrived at and recognized by industry. It has put needless restrictions on union-shop agreements.

Third, by calling for so many different elections the act keeps relations between unions and employers continually unsettled. These have proven to be superfluous, meaningless, and very costly.

Fourth, it offers unscrupulous employers an excellent chance to break a union by giving the vote in representation elections to strikebreakers but not to strikers. It has been many long years since scabs held such an exalted position in this country.

Fifth, another union-busting provision allows the employer to decide the best time—from his standpoint—to call for an election in his plant.

Sixth, it makes law violators of those employers and workers who agree through free collective bargaining to set up worker welfare funds—unless they adhere to rigid and restrictive rules whose intent is simply to destroy the value of these funds.

Seventh, the act further snarls up collective bargaining by making the courts decide many matters which the parties ought to decide themselves, unfairly prohibits free discussion and publication of political issues and candidates by labor unions, discriminates in the application of sanctions against unfair labor practices in favor of employers, and sets up elaborate and inflexible governmental procedures which provide only a bonanza for the legal profession.

And as if all this were not enough, the act says that if any State can pass a worse law than this, the State law prevails.

Now how does the Lesinski bill repair all this damage? It repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and restores the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 with improvements to bring it up to date. It restores industrial democracy. It places back in the hands of free labor and free management the responsibility of working out their own relations, with ample protection for the public interest.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the Wood amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4:15 o'clock.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KELLEY) there were—ayes 119, noes 201.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTSEN: On page 38, strike out lines 10 through 18 and substitute therefor the following:

"(j) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice under this act, an investigation has been conducted, and a complaint has been issued thereon by the general counsel, if irreparable injury to the charging party is unavoidable and it is in the public interest, the general counsel may petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we heard Members who were supporting the Lesinski bill raise objection to that phase of the Wood bill which would allow the general counsel of the Labor Board to sue for an injunction before an investigation was made. I think their objection to it is a legitimate one. I believe there are several Members of the House, including myself, who are not particularly satisfied with the Wood bill or the Lesinski bill, and in the public interest feel, not representing either management or labor, that certain amendments should be made. In that spirit I have offered this amendment.

The effect of this amendment is to insure that four separate conditions must be met before the Labor Board general counsel is authorized to apply for an injunction.

First, an investigation must be made of the charges by the agents of the Labor Board.

Second, a complaint must have been issued on the basis of the investigation.

Third, it must be unavoidable that irreparable injury will result; and

Fourth, injunctive relief must be in the public interest.

Those amongst you who are lawyers realize that a request for an injunction is a rather serious legal procedure, and therefore I believe that these safeguards are necessary.

This amendment retains the power of the Government to apply for an injunction in an unfair-labor-practice case against either employer or the union, but it establishes adequate safeguards to prevent abuse of that authority. The authority to request a Federal court to issue an injunction is desirable for those unusual situations such as existed in the General Motors Corp. case.

The General Motors Co. was about to change the group-insurance plan affecting its 250,000 employees, without first bargaining with the union, as was required to do under the Taft-Hartley Act. Upon a charge filed by the CIO United Automobile Workers Union, and at its request, the general counsel applied for and obtained an injunction to prevent the company from changing the plan until it had first bargained with the union. In that kind of case an order by the Board several months after the old insurance policies had been canceled and new ones had been issued, would have been ineffective; so immediate action was imperative to prevent frustration of the bargaining processes. The result in that case was a retention of the status quo pending the decision of the Board, which was issued about 10 months later.

It will be noted that the facts in the General Motors case met the requirements of the injunction section in the Wood bill as it will read if this proposed amendment is adopted.

This injunction section as it is proposed with this amendment answers the arguments and furnishes all of the safeguards proposed by the unions. It should not be forgotten, too, that this bill provides authority for the Government to seek an injunction, under appropriate circumstances, against either a union or an employer. Moreover, there is no requirement that an injunction be sought in any case under the provisions of the Wood bill. It is purely a discretionary authority and not mandatory.

Therefore, since occasions do arise when the quick relief or retention of the status quo, which only an injunction will afford, is essential to prevent the cir-

cumvention of the purposes of the law, since the discretion to use the injunctive power is adequately proscribed, and since the authorization applies equally to both management and labor, it is submitted that this amendment should be adopted to the bill and that it should be substituted for that part of the Wood bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. Where does the gentleman's amendment end on page 38?

Mr. BENTSEN. The amendment strikes out lines 10 through 18 on page 38, and substitutes the language read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt that the gentlemen are sincere and honest in offering amendments, but I want to repeat that amendments like this are merely designed to soften up the Wood bill, to make it more palatable, so that the membership will take it. That means that what we shall have in our hands will be the Taft-Hartley bill.

I want to say to the leadership on the other side that while they refuse to go along on limiting debate, we are willing to stay all night, if need be, so we do not get the Taft-Hartley bill back under the name of the Wood bill.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested and very pleased to hear so many Members in the House today say they have mandates. It, therefore, suddenly occurred to me that I, too, have a mandate, and that it is my privilege to speak about it. That mandate is from my people in the Twenty-ninth District of the great State of New York. They sent me here primarily because I voted for the Taft-Hartley labor bill. I received a petition from that district this morning urging me to do all I can to retain the good provisions of that act and also, if possible, to strengthen it. That is my mandate from my people. For that reason I rise in support of this amendment.

The pending amendment does a great deal to remove a very objectionable feature in the Wood amendment which has been objected to, and I think rightly so, by organized labor. The Wood bill also does something in this section that seems to be in direct contravention of our idea of law in that it does not presuppose innocence before the party is proved guilty, and that is a very essential part of our legal dealings with all of our people. This amendment corrects this fault; it also corrects the mandatory injunction. This has also been, quite rightly objected to.

I should like to add that in many instances provisions of that terrific slave labor law, the Taft-Hartley law, have been restored. There are many other good provisions in the Taft-Hartley law that can rightfully be restored and are being restored in the Wood amendment. Why do we have to object all of a sudden to amending legislation on the floor of the House of Representatives? Surely, that is a very new angle; surely, we are stepping away from our heritage, from the traditions of our country when we deny Members of Congress, representatives of the people who sent us here to be their advocates, the right to get up on the floor of this House and speak for amending legislation and if necessary, yes, rewriting it on the floor of this House even if it takes all night. This amendment is going to help the Wood amendment; this amendment is going to make it fairer and better for union labor; and for that reason I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a perfect illustration of the value of the proper consideration of a bill either by the House or by a committee. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for introducing the amendment. It has good wording and it is a very appropriate amendment.

The power to issue an injunction is a rather serious matter and should be safeguarded in every way possible; at the same time, it is very necessary and very important that the public interest be protected. In this amendment that is done.

The amendment embraces the fundamental principles of equity, and we cannot avoid that. When we find here that irrreparable injury to the charging party is unavoidable and it is then in the public interest, the general counsel may petition any district court of the United States, including the District Court for the District of Columbia, in any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Briefly.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask the gentleman what is the difference in the language used in that amendment and in the present Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. BARDEN. I cannot tell the gentleman what the exact language is in the present Taft-Hartley law. I expect he is as familiar with it as I am and I am only familiar with it in a general way. As I recall, it did not have these safeguards in it. You gentlemen, I am afraid, have been given a lot of erroneous impressions about the so-called Labor Relations Act. You know, you have injunctions in that act, too. The only trouble about your injunctions are the way they are spelled out they are of very little benefit to anyone and a general nuisance to everybody.

Mr. PERKINS. I will ask the gentleman if those are not practically the identical provisions that are now in the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. BARDEN. I cannot tell the gentleman, but if they are good, what difference does it make? If they are good now, what difference does it make?

Now, let us talk about this. The gentleman better cease calling names and join in with the majority of the Members of this House in trying to write one of the most important pieces of legislation that has ever come before this body. So far as I am concerned, I am not dealing in names or in antis or pros. I am doing the best I can to help write what I regard as one of the most important pieces of legislation that has ever come before this House and I want to use every possible safeguard. I think this amendment is a fine piece of legislation, it contains ample safeguards, even further safeguarding provisions in providing for an injunction than is in either the National Labor Relations Act or the present law. That is why I am perfectly justified in reaching the conclusion that it is O. K.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, while I am for you so far as your efforts are involved to make this group mind their business and stop talking and listen to something that is worth while, which I am about to offer, nevertheless I want to say this, that there is not a man in this House on either side of the aisle who already does not know how he is going to vote. I just want to tell some of you young Members that after my 16 years' experience in this Congress of the United States, you come up here to talk in this microphone, sticking out your neck and getting yourselves all riled up to commit political suicide by talking too much about which you know too little as you speak too long.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to make it clear that I did not intend to insinuate that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has ever been derelict in any duty in the halls of the United States Congress or elsewhere. He is recognized as being a man with honest convictions and integrity. I personally have the utmost confidence in the gentleman from North Carolina and wish to state that from my experience with him on the Education and Labor Committee that he has always been a gentleman in every respect.

Gerald Morgan and Gerard Reilly came before the Committee on Education and Labor and attempted to defend the present Taft-Hartley law. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the other day defended Gerald Morgan on the floor, and I agreed with him that I thought Mr. Morgan told the whole truth about the writing of the Taft-Hartley law. Mr. Morgan said that the gentleman from Indiana was the policy maker of the Hartley law, as I recall the evidence. Now we have the so-called Wood bill here.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know the gentleman now addressing the House would not care to leave a wrong impression. I attended the hearings and heard no such statement from Mr. Morgan.

Mr. PERKINS. If I recall the evidence correctly, Mr. Morgan stated that the gentleman from Indiana, Representative HALLECK, dictated the policies for the House bill; that was the Hartley bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. No, I think the gentleman is incorrect on that.

Mr. PERKINS. The record will show that.

Mr. McCONNELL. I wish the gentleman would get the record.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to make this correction and refer to the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, and refer the Members to the testimony of Mr. Gerald D. Morgan. On page 1161, Mr. Morgan, in detailing how the Hartley bill in 1947 was drafted, made this statement:

In the early part of 1947, I was requested by Mr. Hartley, then chairman of this committee, to serve as special counsel to the majority members of the committee in the drafting of the intended labor bill. Mr. HALLECK, who at that time was majority leader of the House, had previously talked with me at some length about the same matter and had suggested that, pending conferences with Mr. Hartley, I get something started in the draft form for purposes of preliminary discussion. Pursuant to this suggestion, I had taken the Smith committee amendments to the Wagner Act that had passed the House in 1940 and the vetoed Case bill that had passed both Houses in 1946, combined the two into one document for working purposes, and had incorporated therein a number of additional ideas that Mr. HALLECK thought would be appropriate for the preliminary discussions.

On page 1162 Mr. Morgan stated:

From the time of the first discussions that I had with Mr. HALLECK about the intended labor legislation, until the bill was reported by the committee, my work in connection with the bill was virtually continuous. And by "continuous" I mean morning, noon, and night.

During this period I not only needed, but I sought, expert technical assistance in connection with numerous legal, administrative, and practical problems that were involved in the various policies being considered. I sought this technical assistance almost exclusively from two men, both outstanding experts in the field of labor law—Gerard Reilly, formerly a member of the National Labor Relations Board, who during most of the period that I worked on the bill was acting as special counsel to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and Theodore Iserman, an attorney with an extensive labor-law practice, whose writings on labor-law problems had received wide circulation, not only within the legal profession itself but outside it as well, and who is presently, I understand, vice chairman of the labor-law section of the American Bar Association.

On page 1179, when Mr. Morgan was being cross-examined by the Congressman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] he was asked this question:

Who made the recommendations for the material in the Taft-Hartley bill?

Mr. Morgan answered:

As I said, the original recommendations, the things that were to go in, were outlined to me by Mr. HALLECK at the first meetings that were held, as I said before——

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. No, I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes after my time has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining of his original time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. PERKINS. No; I do not have the time.

The evidence before the committee showed that Gerard D. Reilly, the ex-Labor Department solicitor and a former member of the National Labor Relations Board, admitted that he was paid $3,000 a month by one client, beside the income from his other corporate clients.

Now, in regard to the injunction, this Wood amendment grants broad authority to the general counsel to secure court injunctions in any unfair-labor-practice case, even before complaint has been issued and before any hearing or other action has been taken by the National Labor Relations Board upon the mere allegation that irreparable injury will result unless the injunction issues.

The difference between this amendment and the Wood bill is that the Wood amendment provides that the injunction shall be issued before the investigation. In my judgment, the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Texas goes right back to the Taft-Hartley law and keeps virtually the same language we now have in the Taft-Hartley law, so there is very little softening up.

As to the national emergency feature in the Wood amendment, that provides that the President must get an injunction before he can take any steps such as mediation, conciliation, or fact finding to settle the dispute.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first I have asked for time in this debate, and I will be very brief. I think the question is not who sired the Taft-Hartley bill or whether it is legitimate or illegitimate. The question is, What can we do to get the best legislation which will remove some of the present friction engendered by labor's reaction to the present law?

I do want to say this in regard to how the original Taft-Hartley bill was written, and I am speaking with authority because I was a member of the committee. The leadership on this side of the House came to me as a member of the committee and said, "Undoubtedly you have some ideas pertaining to the type of labor bill that should be written. You get your ideas together, and we will see if they cannot be drafted along with other ideas into the main bill." I assume that they made the same suggestion to other Republican members of the committee.

I welcomed that opportunity because, not being a lawyer, I did not possess the legal requirements to draft my ideas into proper legislative form. I had two or three ideas which were my own ideas. They were not given me by management or by anybody. Having started out shining shoes and selling newspapers as a youngster, and having worked in the steel mills and the rubber factories and the oil fields and the brick yards and a few other places, I felt I had some ideas which might fit into an over-all labor bill. Personally, I do feel that I am responsible for certain parts of the Taft-Hartley law. It was my amendment which changed the name from the National Labor Relations Act to the Labor-Management Relations Act and I am also responsible for having the railroad brotherhoods exempted from the provisions of the act. I also claim that my actions prevented certain other provisions being included in the act which would have been more resented by labor than some of the present provisions. That was my reason for seeking membership on the Committee on Education and Labor. I thought perhaps I might be able to contribute something. So, a couple of things in the Taft-Hartley law are my ideas. I advanced them, and then Mr. Morgan, who says that he is a registered Democrat, who was formerly employed by the Committee on Education and Labor in the previous Democratic Congress, took my ideas along with other ideas and drafted them into a bill.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I have asked this question before and I would like to ask it again. Has the leadership on your side taken you into their confidence with regard to the meeting that was held in room F-18? Did the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] draw up the Wood bill?

Mr. BREHM. Oh, sir, I have not the least idea who drew up the Wood bill. I am simply trying to explain how ideas were secured and then drafted into a bill by an experienced legislative attorney.

Mr. GREEN. I have asked that question a couple of times. Everybody is present, but nobody seems to answer. I am trying to discover who drew up the Wood bill.

Mr. BREHM. If the gentleman will permit me to answer his question, I will say to him that I have no idea as to the origin of the Wood bill. I never heard of room F-18. I know nothing about the Wood bill. I am not interested in the Wood bill in its present form, nor am I interested in retaining Taft-Hartley in its present form.

Mr. GREEN. Was there a secret meeting?

Mr. BREHM. How in the world would I know that? Many things occur in Washington without my knowledge.

Mr. GREEN. Has the leadership on your side of the House taken you into their confidence? I would like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to answer that, if he will.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it is always easy to use smear tactics. So far as I know, the bill was originally introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD]. I know nothing of the drafting of that bill and had nothing to do with it.

Many of us thought that the Committee on Education and Labor, after it had held hearings, would proceed to the consideration of the bill and amendment thereto. Numerous members on the Democratic side have stated that they

were in favor of certain amendments. The committee refused to accept any amendments or even consider any amendments.

At that time the ranking Republican member on the committee, as he has already said in debate—and if some of you people were a little more interested in getting at the facts than in challenging the motives of other people, you might have understood it—when that snap action was taken in the committee—I was not there, of course, but I was told about it—the gentleman from Pennsylvania offered the bill that had been theretofore introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD]. As he has said, that was the only measure that had been introduced, other than the administration bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] offered it in the committee with certain amendments which he was permitted to explain.

After all, we are here as men and women representing constituencies of upwards of a quarter of a million people. Each one of us has a responsibility to those people and to our conscience to try to write good legislation. The sort of thing that has been going on here does not help very much.

After that proposal by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. MCCONNELL] was made, which was a perfectly proper and legitimate thing, it was turned down by the committee without consideration. Then the Republicans in the House of Representatives, acting as a responsible minority in this body, called a meeting of our policy committee and of the Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor. You call it a secret meeting, as though it were something sinister. We did not invite you to that meeting, of course. We did not have any Democrats there. We discussed the measure. We went over it line by line. The collective judgment there was that certain amendments should be offered to perfect the bill to make it better, a bill which it would be possible for the House of Representatives to use in writing good labor legislation.

Those amendments were discussed with other Members of the House. I did not talk to Mr. WOOD. Some of those amendments were subsequently written into the bill which was introduced by him. Some which were suggested were not written in.

Some of them are here being written in, offered by individual Members. Now, that is the story. What do you want to make of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM] has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I only want to claim the attention of the House for a minute. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has talked about the ambition of all of us to write good legislation. I want to know how he could support, as he did, the original Hartley bill—not the Taft-Hartley bill but the original Hartley bill, which he did support on this floor, which forbade the closed shop, the union shop, health and welfare plans, industry-wide bargaining, and provided for treble damages for employees who committed unfair labor practices. Certainly, that was not a good labor bill. How could he defend that?

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman want me to answer that question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. I shall be glad to. The Taft-Hartley Act, as the gentleman knows, is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am talking about the original Hartley bill now. It was an entirely different bill.

Mr. HALLECK. It was introduced by Mr. Hartley, that is true. He was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. That committee, in executive session, I am told—and again I was not present—adopted some 29 amendments to the bill as it was originally introduced by Mr. Hartley. Is that true?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not know anything about amendments that were adopted that materially affected the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, as to my own personal situation. I say frankly to the gentleman that every individual provision in the Taft-Hartley Act as it was originally passed in the House, even as it was subsequently enacted, did not suit me personally. But along with the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, 331, to be exact, I voted for the bill.

I recall very well that the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, made the final speech against the bill at the time that bill was on the floor. I made a speech for the bill, and I recall, as though it were yesterday, that I said then that every provision of the bill probably did not suit every Member; that each Member would differ with certain provisions, but I said:

> This is the beginning, the initiation of a legislative process which shall be carried on in another body and then go to conference, and then the Congress will have spoken its will.

Mr. KENNEDY. How anyone in this House could have supported the original Hartley bill, anyone who was really interested in passing good labor legislation, is difficult to understand. The Hartley bill, let me repeat, forbade the closed shop, the union shop, industry-wide bargaining, health and welfare plans, and provided for treble damages for any employee who committed an unfair labor practice. I do not see how anyone in this House who was interested in providing good legislation, providing a sane bill, could have supported the Hartley bill, whether it was the beginning of legislation or not.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I just want to comment on what the gentleman from Indiana said about impugning the motives of people. It seems to me it all depends on whose ox is gored. I remember very well that on the rent bill, when the gentleman from Indiana took the well of the House, he took out a newspaper and impugned the motives of the Democratic Members of this House by saying that there was a secret agreement, a secret meeting. Now, when Newsweek carries an article that you and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] were the authors of the Wood bill, and not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], is there anything wrong with me as a Member from Pennsylvania, asking you and getting a direct answer, Are you or are you not the author of the Wood bill?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. First may I say that if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] inquires really sincerely as to why any Member of the House should have voted for the Hartley bill on its original passage, let me say this. As I recall, over 300 Members of the 435 Members of this House voted for it, including, I believe, more than half of the Democratic Members. So if a mistake was made, a lot of Members made the mistake. Now, as to authorship of the Wood bill, of course I am not the author. I have told of the meeting of our Republican policy committee with our members of the Labor Committee. That is perfectly proper, yes, necessary action, by members of a responsible party. Incidentally, if anybody is interested, we almost always hold such meetings in room F-18 here in the Capitol.

Mr. KENNEDY. One of the major reasons why we became the majority party was not the Taft-Hartley bill but the original Hartley bill. Certainly the Taft-Hartley bill was no slave act as has been said on this floor, but if any legislation came near destroying unions it was the Hartley bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman say that the Taft-Hartley Act was not a slave act?

Mr. KENNEDY. It is obviously not.

Mr. HALLECK. Splendid. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that the Taft-Hartley Act was not a slave act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who wrote the Taft-Hartley bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not know who did, but I was opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Wood amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:15, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KELLEY) there were—ayes 143, noes 169.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KELLEY and Mr. MCCONNELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 158, noes 189.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House in their sovereign capacity as the Representatives of their respective districts and the people of this country are now engaged in the consideration of a measure that affects not only the working people of this country but the management of our business enterprises and all the people.

Let us now consider this measure calmly and deliberately, just as those of us who are lawyers and those of us who are businessmen, those who are from the various other vocations from which we came when we came here as lawmakers, would consider a measure of like importance if we were acting as private individuals. Certainly the consideration of this measure deserves the careful and thoughtful consideration of every Member of this House.

Let us now review the background and the facts out of which this legislation grows. I first call your attention to the address of the President of the United States delivered to the joint session of Congress on January 5 of this year, in which he said:

> Certain improvements which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago are needed.

He was speaking of the Labor Relations Act.

> Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for setting up machinery for preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

By these statements the President went on record against—

First. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts.

He said that—

Second. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the existing contracts should be prevented.

He also in plain language said that—

Third. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for setting up machinery for preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

Surely, the President by this plain language meant what he said. On subjects so vitally affecting the national safety and the health of our people, I would not assume for 1 minute he did not mean what he said. He meant, if he meant anything, that there should be adequate laws, and appropriate law enforcement agencies to protect the working people against unfair labor practices by their employers, and on the other hand that management and the public should be protected against illegal conduct on the part of labor.

What is the purpose of law? It is to make it as easy as possible for people to do right and as hard as possible for people to do wrong. Just what did the President have in mind? What can we reasonably conclude he had in mind when he said that machinery should be set up for preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public safety and the public health? Let us look to what the President publicly said on these questions. About 30 days after the President made that speech to Congress on February 3, he was interviewed by the representatives of the press at the White House here in Washington. Here is what he said, and I quote from the New York Times. The report was made by Louis Stark of that paper. So far as I know, the President has never retracted what he said on that occasion.

Here is what occurred on that occasion:

> [From a press conference, February 3, 1949, reported in the New York Times by Louis Stark, February 4, 1949]
>
> When Mr. Truman was asked by a reporter whether he intended to reserve for the administration the right to employ the injunction in labor disputes of a national character, he replied that he had been told the President's powers were sufficient to meet such emergencies.
>
> The question was then raised as to why the power had not been inserted in the labor bill.
>
> This was not necessary, the Chief Executive said, since the Attorney General had advised him that the President had constitutional and implied powers.
>
> While he would not inform his inquirer what these powers were, he advised him to look at the Constitution. Washington and Jackson used them and Lincoln utilized them repeatedly, he added.
>
> Asked whether he meant that he could use such powers as President and as Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman said that his authority was a combination of both powers. In time of emergency he felt that the President had immense power to do what was right for the country. He did not believe his powers had to be spelled out in the proposed law. He said that he would have no objection to that but it was unnecessary.

Let us see what the President evidently meant by what he thus put in plain English. He, in effect, said that in the time of an emergency he would use his power as the Commander in Chief of the armed forces and these other undisclosed powers, which he said the Attorney General had advised him he had.

I have always understood that ours is a government of enumerated, delegated, and limited powers. No President has any power to do anything not expressly delegated to him by the Constitution, the supreme law of the land.

Let us go a step further. Let us look at the record. The President came before the Congress on May 25, 1946, when a railroad strike was in existence. This is what he said, speaking about that strike and its effects:

> The disaster will spare no one. It will bear equally upon businessmen, workers, farmers, and upon every citizen of the United States. Food, raw materials, fuel, shipping, housing, the public health, the public safety—all will be dangerously affected. Hundreds of thousands of liberated people of Europe and Asia will die who could be saved if the railroads were not now tied up.

Then he went on further to say:

> The action which I have already taken, and the action which I shall ask you to take are necessary for the preservation of our Government. That action is also necessary to save the great and mighty masses of working men and women from the dangerous effects of the ill-advised and misguided acts of some of their own leaders.

Then he, in scathing language, denounced the presidents of a couple of the railroad brotherhoods: Here is what he said about these two labor leaders:

> This particular crisis has been brought about by the obstinate arrogance of two men. They were Mr. Alvanley Johnston, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. Eighteen other unions and all of the railroad companies of the Nation are ready to run the railroads. These two men have tried to stop them.

The President then continued and set out his request for powers no other President had before asked of Congress:

> I can well appreciate the attitude of those Members of the Congress and those citizens of the United States outside of the Congress who would seek to take vengeance for the unpatriotic acts of these two men. However, I am sure that none of us wishes to take any action which will injure labor.
>
> • • • • •
>
> We are dealing with a handful of men who are striking against their own Government and against every one of their fellow citizens.
>
> We are dealing with a handful of men who have it within their power to cripple the entire economy of the Nation.
>
> I request temporary legislation to take care of this immediate crisis. I request permanent legislation leading to the formulation of a long-range labor policy designed to prevent the recurrence of such crises and generally to reduce stoppages of work in all industries for the future.
>
> I request that the temporary legislation be effective only for a period of 6 months after the declaration by the President or by the Congress of the termination of hostilities. It should be applicable only to those few industries in which the President by proclamation declares that an emergency has arisen which affects the entire economy of the United States. It should be effective only in those situations where the President of the United States has taken over the operation of the industry. In such situations where the President has requested the men either to remain at work or to return to work and where such a request is ignored, the legislation should:
>
> (a) Authorize the institution of injunctive or mandatory proceedings against any union leader forbidding him from encouraging or inciting members of the union to leave their work or to refuse to return to work; subjecting him to contempt proceedings for failure to obey any order of the court made in such proceedings;
>
> (b) Deprive workers of their seniority rights who, without good cause, persist in striking against the Government.
>
> (c) Provide criminal penalties against employers and union leaders who violate the provisions of the act.

He further said:

> The legislation should provide that after the Government has taken over an industry and has directed the men to remain at work or return to work, the wage scale be fixed either by negotiation or by arbitrators appointed by the President, and when so fixed it shall be retroactive.
>
> This legislation must be used in a way that is fair to capital and labor alike. The President will not permit either side—industry or workers—to use it to further their own selfish interest, or to foist upon the Government the carrying out of their selfish aims.

Net profits of Government operation, if any, should go to the Treasury of the United States.

As a part of this temporary emergency legislation, I request the Congress immediately to authorize the President to draft into the armed forces of the United States all workers who are on strike against their Government.

A messenger entered the Chamber, and handed the President a slip of red paper which the President read as a part of his address as follows:

Word has just been received that the rail strike has been settled on terms proposed by the President.

These measures may appear to you to be drastic. They are. I repeat that I recommend them only as temporary emergency expedients and only in cases where workers are striking against the Government.

After the conclusion of the President's speech on this occasion, a distinguished and powerful Member of this body arose and was recognized by the Speaker. And I now quote from the House RECORD of May 25, 1946, page 5754:

TEMPORARY INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES SETTLEMENT ACT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6578) to provide on a temporary basis during the present period of emergency for the prompt settlement of industrial disputes vitally affecting the national economy in the transition from war to peace.

The Clerk of the House then read the bill conferring upon President Truman powers more far reaching than ever before sought by a President of the United States. It recited the powers the President then had to take over a railroad or a coal mine. It empowered him, after having issued a proclamation stating the seizure of a struck plant, to call upon all employees and all officers and executives of such plant to return to their posts of duty on or before the finally effective date of the proclamation. It made it the duty of such employees, officers and executives of the seized plant or railroad to operate such plant and to desist from any strike, lock-out, slowdown or interruption of the operation of such plant or railroad. It made the failure to obey such proclamation an unlawful act punishable by fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

Section 5 of said bill, empowered the Attorney General of the United States to petition any district court of the United States which had jurisdiction of the parties for an injunction commanding them to comply with the terms of this act and of the President's proclamation. It provided that such petitions for an injunction should be heard with all possible expedition.

Section 6 of this bill provides that any employee who fails to return to work as commanded by the President's proclamation, or any officer of any company engaged in any lock-out, who fails to desist therefrom, shall not be regarded as an employee of the owner or operators of the seized properties for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, nor of the Railway Labor Act as amended, unless he is reemployed, and if he is so reemployed that he shall be deemed a new employee for purposes of seniority rights.

Section 7 of this bill provides that any person subject thereto "who has failed or refused, without the permission of the President, to return to work within 24 hours after the finally effective date of his proclamation issued under section 2 hereof, shall be inducted into the Army of the United States at such time, in such manner—with or without an oath—and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the President, as being necessary in his judgment to provide for the emergency."

The Democratic leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], spoke in favor of this measure. And I quote his speech which occurs on page 5759 of the RECORD of May 25, 1946:

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the important fact that overshadows and dominates our minds is that a democracy must serve under normal conditions and must also serve when a crisis exists. There is an additional fact in this case, and that is that this legislation is born of necessity. That necessity was not brought about by the great majority of American citizens, but by a small group of men having control and dominating a situation, as a result of which there was being produced economic paralysis. In consequence of that, there was a feeling of uncertainty on the part of our Government itself. This legislation is the product of necessity. It is just as important for the United States of America that the Congress of the United States legislate for our best interests in time of peace when an emergency exists as it is necessary for the Congress of the United States to legislate in time of war.

An emergency confronts us, an emergency where the national interests of the United States and of our people are involved. In that emergency a great majority of the American people take the position, and I know a great majority of the Members of this House will take the position, that the best interests of the people and of our Government are paramount to the selfish interests of any individual or of any group.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. If the President and the Congress had not taken this action, would not confidence in this Government have been destroyed?

Mr. MCCORMACK. It would have been impaired, in any event.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of us like to vote for this legislation. We all regret that circumstances exist which require it. We cannot let conditions exist that will bring about confusion and chaos. The railroad strike is over, and we are all glad for that, but we have 33 or 34 days of a coal strike. That coal strike may occur again. If that strike comes along the national interest of the country is involved and certainly the national interest of the country will be adversely affected. The issue is clear, that of the interests of a group conflicting with the national interest of the country comes foremost, and this legislation is aimed to protect it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

It is thus seen the President, Mr. Truman, asked for these powers in the bill which was presented to the Congress for the first time that day. He asked for the power to seek an injunction in a United States district court through the Attorney General of the United States, commanding any person in charge of a Nation-wide industry who was guilty of a lockout to desist; and commanding any labor leader or any employee of such company to go back to work under the mandates of the injunction. The President asked for these dictatorial powers.

Then he further asked for this additional power; that in the event any employee of such railroad or any official of such railroad failed to comply with the proclamation of the President within 24 hours after it was issued that he, the President, should have the right to induct that worker or that official into the armed services of the United States.

And that is not all. After the President had completed his speech, an eminent Member of this House, a distinguished member of the majority party who was then majority leader, Mr. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, rose and moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill that carried in it those drastic and far-reaching provisions.

Now, what do we want in this country? Legislation under emergency conditions, in which power is asked for a mandatory injunction without any hearings? The power to draft workers and put them to work at the point of a bayonet? That is what the President asked on May 25, 1946. In his interview with the press on February 3, he said that he had no objection to the inclusion in the labor bill of provisions for the seeking of an injunction such as is contained in the Taft-Hartley law. And he said he had the power to obtain an injunction as Commander in Chief of the armed forces and under his implied powers; that his authority was a combination of both powers, and that he proposed to act under his powers as Commander in Chief of the armed forces and under the powers the Attorney General had advised him he had.

Do you want dictatorship in this country? Do you want tyranny in this country? Do you want coercion by armed might in the settlement of a labor dispute? I, for one, do not. I stand for due process of law, and the Bill of Rights which covers the citizen all over with the armor of the laws. Under the Wood bill, if it is amended as is proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], providing the grounds and steps necessary to be taken to obtain an injunction by the Federal authorities in a strike in a Nation-wide industry affecting the health and safety of the people of this country, the rights of the employees can be and will be protected. Such a proceeding will be far better for all concerned than such a course as Mr. Truman followed in 1946 in the railroad strike.

I do not subscribe to the hateful demagogic doctrine that management and the owners of industrial enterprise in this country are the enemies of the men and women who work for them. Nor do I believe that the men and women who work in the enterprises of this country are the enemies of their employers. Employers and their employees are all Americans. We are seeking as an American Congress to pass a law that is fair and just to all of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this body, and as the representative who succeeded Mr. Fred Hartley, who was one of the cosponsors, I feel a particular responsibility in considering legislation to replace a law which in less than 2 years has become so questionable that even its defenders are eager to change its name.

I want to be sure that we do a good job, a fair job, a thorough job. The welfare and freedom of working people depend on it. The same is true for employers and for farmers. To balance the power of great corporations, to protect and improve the buying power and the markets for manufactured goods and for the products of our farms, we need unions. We need collective bargaining. We need fair contracts.

In studying this matter, I have read analyses, summaries, and interpretations by the United States Chamber of Commerce, by something called the American Enterprise Association, by the General Electric Co., and by many other willing helpers.

Mr. Chairman, let us in considering the merits of this legislation do what Al Smith used to do—to "look at the record."

At page 5058 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 26, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in defining the terms of this debate, talked cold turkey. Referring to the fact that the "so-called Wood bill"—his words, not mine—would be offered as a substitute for the Lesinski bill, he said:

> That is going to give the Members * * * the opportunity to vote on the two philosophies of labor legislation. The Wood bill is based upon the theory of the Taft-Hartley Act.

You cannot get it straighter than that. "The Wood bill is based upon the theory of the Taft-Hartley, Act," and never mind the eye-wash in its firse section about repealing the Taft-Hartley Act.

Now, what is the theory of the Taft-Hartley Act? Let us look at the record. Let us look at the words of the cosponsor and part-author of the Taft-Hartley Act. On page 193 of his recent book, Our New Labor Policy, in a chapter headed "The long-term goal," Mr. Hartley says:

> Once we accept—

As the gentleman from Virginia urges us to do—

> the concept of the Taft-Hartley Act as a model to begin an interim period leading to complete elimination of governmental labor relations agencies, we can apply the concept to other areas of Government activity. I am well aware—

Says Mr. Hartley—

> of the political difficulty of eliminating the New Deal social legislation. It cannot be repealed at a single stroke—all legislation of this type requires interim treatment.

Elsewhere in his book, Mr. Hartley said that after the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, leaders of his party in Congress decided that "no more legislation to which labor could possibly object" would be passed until after the 1948 elections. That is the record, that is the intent, that is the plan. And all of us are indebted to the gentleman from Virginia for bringing it up to date by stating frankly, at the outset of this debate, that the Wood bill is based upon the theory of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It is being said, that this substitute bill is simply Taft-Hartley dressed up in Wood's clothing.

Well, Mr. Hartley does not work here anymore, but I wonder if some of the gentlemen across the aisle have not persuaded the gentleman from Georgia to take up the interim job where my predecessor left off.

What would this sort of interim legislation lead to?

Mr. Hartley says to less government, less expense, less interference, and lower taxes. But his interim legislation has led to more government, to a bigger NLRB, to more interference, more expense, and to break-down of enforcement, except in summary injunctions against unions. What are on his list for elimination? The Fair Labor Standards Act, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, innumerable Federal agencies dealing with housing, probably social-security agencies, and other legislation which has been a boon to the people. The real theory behind the Taft-Hartley Act and the so-called Wood bill is nothing less than the blocking of the Fair Deal and the repeal of the New Deal, step by step and piece by piece.

That is the real issue, and no amendments to clean up the Wood bill can obscure it. Basically it is Taft-Hartley and basically it is bad. I earnestly warn my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and particularly those who fought for freedom only a few years ago, this bill is against the American tradition of fairness and justice and there is no future in it for anyone except a future of injustice, discord, division, and defeat of democracy itself.

I charge that the Taft-Hartley law has in fact promoted the closed shop—though it sought to ban it. It has so promoted it that it shut some of them up for keeps. Their doors are now closed and nobody works there anymore. Let us look at an actual case—the CIO Auto Workers representing 200 employees of the Harnishfeger Corp. of Newark. You may find this case on page 13 of the printed hearings on the Lesinski bill. Let me read it to you:

> In a flagrant display of what I think are dictatorial tactics, the company informed the local union that it would not bargain unless the union's president had been replaced. This attempt to dictate not only wages and conditions for the workers, but also to hand-pick suitable union representatives was a typical maneuver of the company. The action becomes even more odious when it is realized that the company's objection to the president of the local was predicated solely upon the fact that he was a Negro.
>
> The union president offered to resign in his desire to avoid a disastrous strike. However, the local's members stood shoulder to shoulder in a masterful display of union solidarity and insisted that the democratically elected officers of the union be permitted to carry out the functions for which they were chosen.
>
> On the basis of the company's refusal to bargain with the Negro president, the union was forced to call a strike. The company, intent upon breaking the union, invoked the Taft-Hartley law, and succeeded in securing an injunction restraining the union from picketing. The intention of the injunction soon became obvious. An advertisement was placed in a newspaper from a nearby town offering employment to veterans at attractive rates of pay, but specifically ignoring all mention o the labor dispute.
>
> The company picked up the veterans at a central point, herded them into cars, drove them to the plant and then attempted to spirit them past the token picket line. It is obvious to my mind that the company employed the injunction restricting picketing to facilitate the transportation of strikebreakers into the plant.
>
> I would like to add here, however, with a justifiable feeling of pride, that when the veterans came upon the scene, and realized that they had been unwittingly drawn into a strike situation as prospective strikebreakers, they refused to take any part in the proceedings and returned to their homes.
>
> Today the plant is closed and the 200 workers have been forced to seek employment elsewhere. The case is just another example where the Taft-Hartley law has served to thwart the processes of collective bargaining and has resulted in a demise of the local union.

Mr. Chairman, you will find that this, in truth, is the fascism in action to which the gentlewoman from California referred in her remarks last Wednesday. It has already happened here. Let us stop it now.

Let us go back to the true American system of fair play—of bargaining across the table—of talking pros and cons in good faith. Let this system prevail—and we will find that the end we seek—fair labor-management relations will have been realized for the good of all of us.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, some of the Members who have gone into the well to speak are to be congratulated for not trying to tarnish someone else's halo in order to brighten their own.

I believe it would be instructive to all of us if we took a look at section 10 (j) of the proposed Wood substitute bill, which section has to do with injunctions. As lawyers we should then examine its purpose. Some of the gentlemen to my right have made disparaging remarks about Members of the House who have studied law enough to be licensed to sell their services. Yet, all of us must be lawyers in this House, at least to the extent of considering the proposed legislation.

Let us take a look at the subject of injunctions. Even if we go back as far as 500 B. C., the plebeians of Rome found it necessary to elect annually two tribunes with extraordinary power to curb political and economic oppression of the plebeians. The person of the tribunes was inviolable. It was a capital offense to touch them or interfere with their decisions. These tribunes had the power of saying, "I forbid," if appealed to in judicial or legislative proceedings. With

the fall of the republic and the establishment of the Roman Empire, the institution of the tribunes was abolished, but other Government agencies held similar powers.

The mention of the word "injunction" brings to mind courts of equity and its writs. Although the history of injunctions is fragmentary, the institution was, even in its earliest period, intended and purposed as a shield for the weak and poor and not as a weapon for the mighty and rich.

Whether there were individuals with similar power among the continental Saxons is a matter of doubt. It seems reasonably certain, however, that with the rule of British and Saxon kings an official exercising equity power existed in England. This was at a time when serfdom was the condition of the masses and when the terms "master" and "servant" had an entirely different meaning than they have today.

It appears that the kings of England had chancellors as early as the beginning of the tenth century. But this office was definitely established by Edward the Confessor, about 1041. Up to this time—in the absence of constitutional law—the only recourse open to disputants in property rights was to the king, who decided all such matters brought before him by virtue of his regal power and according to his "conscience." In his domain the king was the only person, who in cases of encroachments on the rights of others by the nobles, could say "I forbid" and enforce his injunction.

With the creation of the office of lord chancellor this official became the keeper of "the king's conscience." As he was also the keeper of the great seal used to authenticate the king's grants of land and other prerogatives, he soon became a most prominent and powerful factor of the government.

For many centuries, almost to Queen Elizabeth's time, the majority of the lord chancellors were clergymen, one of the most famous being Cardinal Wolsey during the reign of Henry VIII. Wolsey's successor was the first lord chancellor not a clergyman and not a noble by birth. It was Thomas More, the first great Utopian, not only one of the most lovable and unselfish, but also one of the most ingenious figures in the history of mankind. A true friend of the common people, he died by decapitation.

As the keeper of the great seal with authority to issue mandatory writs or commissions it was natural that the lord chancellor should gradually assume the functions and character of a judge holding distinct and independent court from the courts of common or statutory law.

By the time of Edward III, the court of chancellory appears as a separate and well-established tribunal for affording relief in cases which were not to be remedied by the ordinary method and procedure in the courts of law.

The interdict of the Roman law resembles, in many respects, our injunction. It was used in three distinct but cognate senses. First. It was applied to signify the edicts made by the praetor, declaratory of his intention to preserve or to restore possession; this interdict was called edictal: Edictale, quod praetorii edictis proponitur, ut scient omnes ea forma posse implorari. Second. It was used to signify his order or decree, applying the remedy in the given case before him, and was then called decretal: Decretale, quod praetor re nata implorantibus decrevit. It is this which bears a strong resemblance to the injunction of a court of equity. Third. It was used, in the last place, to signify the very remedy sought in the suit commenced under the praetor's edict; and thus it became the denomination of the action itself.

If it can be said that the injunction has its roots in the civil law, then one must look to the praetor urbanus of the period of the republic in the history of Rome and his interdict, mentioned above. It has been set out that the historical background and foundation for this formula according to which the praetor ordered or forbade anything to be done in a cause concerning true or quasi possession until it should be decided definitely who had the right to possession. Like the injunction, the interdict was personal in its effects, and it had also another similarity being either temporary or perpetual.

The political history of Rome is divided into the period of the kings, the period of the republic, and the period of the emperors. Its legal history corresponds with these political periods.

In the period of the kings, the administration of justice was in the royal hands. The law was at that epoch very much a matter of the royal discretion. During the period of the republic, the administration of justice was in the hands of the consuls, praetors, and inferior magistrates. It was during the epoch of the republic that most of the fundamental rules for the regulation of private rights and peaceful pursuits were introduced in Roman law. The law was gradually developed by the peculiar modes of administering justice. In the later days of the republic the praetor urbanus was the magistrate chiefly concerned in the administration of justice. But neither he nor any other Roman judicial magistrate ever decided directly the matter brought before him. He only allowed the action upon a statement made by the plaintiff, and regulated the proceedings to a point in which the matter in dispute was reduced to a proper form for investigation and decision. The case thus prepared was then referred by him, with directions, to a judex, chosen by the parties themselves from amongst their fellow-citizens, whose function it was to investigate the facts and pronounce judgment upon the issue. This judicial reference and direction by the praetor to the judex was called an edict. It contained a statement, in a certain formula, of the matter in dispute and the general rules of law applicable to it, with a direction to the judex to make his decision conform to the facts as he might find them. The ownership of land was excepted from this mode of trial. It was decided by the court of 100 men.

The praetor urbanus was elected annually. It was the working of his jurisdiction that chiefly developed Roman law. The old forms of action, contained in the 12 tables, required every suitor to bring his case within their strict terms; else he was without remedy, no matter how just was his complaint. These forms, so narrow and technical, were, in the course of progress, abolished, so as to enlarge legal remedies. There was given to the praetor urbanus authority to devise new rules and orders applicable to special cases which might be brought before him. If a person complained of an injury for which the old law afforded no remedy, the praetor urbanus could, upon a statement of facts by the party, allow him an action, and put the facts, with the proper judgment upon them, into a certain formula, for the direction of the judex to whom he referred the matter. In this way, through the jurisdiction of the praetor urbanus, new actions, enforcing claims not before recognized by the law, and new rules of law applicable to the changing wants of society, were established. But the new remedies were made to take the form of those which had been long observed; and thus progress was made to conform to the Roman spirit of conservatism. Customs, as they grew up in the various new business and changing conditions of society, were allowed as law in these new actions.

It was the custom for praetors, on entering upon their office, to publish an edict, declaring the principles upon which they intended to administer justice during the year of their praetorship. This was called a continuous edict. By this practice, the praetor would appear to the suitors to be governed by preestablished general rules, and not to be influenced by the special interests of any particular case. His administration would, therefore, be felt as more impartial and just. The praetor also passed special edicts, as cases not anticipated in the continuous edicts were brought before him. These continuous edicts had authority only during the year of the praetor who declared them. But in time, successive praetors came to adopt, in their own edicts, the rules declared by their predecessors. In this way, a body of edictal law became as well established and as authoritative as if it had received the express sanction of positive legislation. As the edicts of the praetors embraced new usages and customs, as well as any special rules that might occur to the minds of the respective praetors, which grew up in the changing business of a progressive society like that of Rome, the edictal law was the purest sort of legislation, springing from the spontaneous acts and opinions of the people. Society, in the modes of its working, declared the rules of its actions; and the praetors gave them juridical sanction, and thereby made them law.

The edictal direction to the judex was not the only mode in which the praetor discharged the function of justice. He also, in certain cases, passed edicts, ordering specific things to be produced or restitution of them to be made. And he also sometimes, by interdict, forbade certain things to be done. These acts of the praetor might be final, or merely preliminary to further proceedings, in which the rights of the parties would be settled.

Much of the controversy surrounding the use of equity to protect the public interest has focused on labor disputes. One writer on the subject, arguing against such use, states:

> Courts of equity can in no event be made to replace permanently an able and honest administration of its duties by the executive department of the Government. The attempt to do so may seem to achieve a temporary success, but ultimately will result either in a lowering of the standard of the judiciary or a disregard of its decrees. To those who recall the lawlessness prevailing in Chicago during the strikes in 1894 the conception of a court of equity guarding by power of injunction the vast railroad properties in the city will seem almost grotesque and not far removed from the parallel suggested by counsel for Debs of issuing an injunction during the Civil War to stop the advance of Lee's invading army.

Without entering into a prolonged discussion of the inherent power of the President or the existence of residual powers to protect the Union where the interests of the Government or the general welfare are sufficiently imperiled, attention should be given to the key decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which are pertinent to the subject.

Just prior to the turn of the century two law students in California stood before the bench of the State supreme court to be licensed to practice law in that State. The chief justice asked Mr. Terry if he believed the United States tariff law to be constitutional. Mr. Terry was a Democrat and said "No". The chief justice then turned to Mr. Field and asked him the same question. Mr. Field was a Republican and replied that the tariff was constitutional. The supreme court decided that there was room for difference of opinion and licensed both men to practice law. The events of their respective lives brought them together continually and a great animosity developed between them, which finally culminated in the death of Mr. Terry by pistol shots fired in a small California town by the bodyguard of Mr. Field, who was then a United States Supreme Court Justice.

In the famous case of *In re Neagle* ((1890) 135 U. S. 1), the issue was whether the President, without any express authorization, could order a United States marshal to act as bodyguard on circuit for Justice Field, whose life had been threatened. After an extended discussion of the question, the Supreme Court held that by virtue of the duty faithfully to execute the laws, the President is empowered to take reasonable steps to protect the interests of the United States without specific authorization therefor. The Court also ruled that "there is a peace of the United States," which the executive, through his ministerial officers, may act to preserve.

But assuming that a residual power thus exists, does it enable the President to seek an injunction in a national emergency created by a labor controversy? The broad doctrine of the right of the Government, as parens patriae, to protect the interests of the public from injury through the use of the injunctive remedy has been uniformly sustained.

In the case of *In re Debs* ((1895) 158 U. S. 564), the situation grew out of a strike of railway unions which was alleged to interfere with the transmission of the mails and the carrying-on of interstate commerce. The center of the controversy was at Chicago, and there the United States district attorney, at the order of Attorney General Olney upon authorization by President Cleveland, obtained an injunction from the United States circuit court against the strikers. When the court, after issuing the injunction, acknowledged its inability to enforce the decree, President Cleveland dispatched troops to the city. The question before the Supreme Court was whether this injunction, for violation of which Debs had been jailed for contempt of court, had been granted with jurisdiction. The court conceded in effect that there was no statutory or other express basis for the injunction, but nevertheless sustained it on the following broad grounds:

> It is obvious * * * that while it is not the province of the Government to interfere in any mere matter of private controversy between individuals, or to use its great powers to enforce the rights of one against another, yet, whenever the wrongs complained of are such as affect the public at large, and are in respect of matters which by the Constitution are entrusted to the care of the Nation, and concerning which the Nation owes the duty to all the citizens of securing to them their common rights, then the mere fact that the Government has no pecuniary interest in the controversy is not sufficient to exclude it from the courts, or prevent it from taking measures therein to fully discharge those constitutional duties.

Taken in conjunction with the doctrine of the Neagle case, that there is "a peace of the United States," the broad principles stated in the Debs case have been interpreted "as signifying that the National Executive may seek an injunction in the national courts in any case 'involving a widespread public interest.'"

Where an injunction is sought, however, the further question may arise whether an injunction can be issued by the court in favor of the United States in the face of the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U. S. C. §§ 101–115), dealing with and restricting the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. In *U. S.* v. *United Mine Workers of America* ((1947) 330 U. S. 258), the Supreme Court held that the act did not prevent the Government from seeking injunctive relief against its own employees in a labor controversy. The Court, however, suggested that the act was intended among other things to prevent the United States from intervening by injunction "in purely private labor disputes." Nevertheless, the Court indicated, the Government thus was not foreclosed from obtaining injunctiye relief when that was "necessary for the functioning of the Government" or in order "to carry out the purpose of the Government." Such a situation was presented, the Court ruled, when the employees in effect were working for the Government. Accordingly, it is a possible construction that where a labor controversy is of such magnitude that the very functioning or purposes of the Government are impaired thereby, the United States may secure injunctive relief, even though the dispute itself involves private parties. That this is a possible construction is indicated not only by the words of the Court itself in the Mine Workers' case, but also by the discussion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who concurred generally but did not agree with this proposition. But there may be considerable question whether this proposition would be sustained by the whole Court if presented directly to it, unless the Norris-LaGuardia Act were amended. Compare the concurring opinions in *U. S.* v. *United Mine Workers of America, supra,* of Justices Jackson and Frankfurter, the partly concurring partly dissenting opinions of Justices Douglas and Black, and the dissenting opinions of Justices Murphy and Rutledge, suggesting a possible majority of the Court opposed to such a construction. However, until the Supreme Court has spoken on issues directly presented, it is at least arguable that a majority of the Court might support the issuance of an injunction in the circumstances stated.

The above situation, of course, does not arise where specific statutory authority is granted to the President or the executive department or agency to seek injunctive assistance of the courts in matters affecting the public interest. Such authority is exemplified by section 208 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 136, 155) which authorized the President to direct the Attorney General to petition a district court for an injunction in certain instances where strikes imperil the national health or safety. Perusal of the index to the United States Code will establish the numerous other variations in the authority granted to obtain injunctive assistance for specified purposes. Without a doubt it could be argued that many of these grants are for the primary purpose of protecting the public interest. As distinguished from the Lesinski bill, the Wood substitute will expressly continue use of the injunction for public interest.

Before entering into a discussion of statutory injunctions, it might be well to examine the nature of these grants of power. Caldwell, Injunctions Against Crime, 26 Illinois Law Review 259, discusses this aspect of injunctive power as follows:

> When a criminal act which would cause irreparable injury to an individual is threatened, he need not wait until it has been committed; he may go into a court of equity and secure an injunction against the doing of the act as a means of protecting his rights. The equity court is in no way concerned with the enforcement of the criminal law or the prevention of crime. It is concerned, however, with protecting the rights of the individual from irreparable injury, and so it grants an injunction against the act which would cause such injury even though it may happen in a particular case that the act enjoined is criminal.
>
> The interests of individuals or other private persons are not the only interests which may be protected by equity. Certain interests of the State as well as certain social interests of its inhabitants have long been a subject matter of equity's jurisdiction. When these public or social interests are threatened with irreparable injury, equity

stands ready to give protection by enjoining the doing of those acts which threaten them. Acts of this character are generally criminal, but equity neither grants relief nor refuses it because of this. Equity acts in these cases for the sole purpose of giving more adequate protection to the interests of the State or of the public at large than can be given by the prohibitions of the criminal law and the activities of those charged with its enforcement. It necessarily happens, however, that courts of equity frequently issue injunctions against acts that are crimes. In cases in which such injunctions are issued for the protection of public or social interests, they are issued in suits instituted by the State. It is not surprising, therefore, that courts of equity are frequently charged with enforcing the criminal laws by injunction. * * *

The earliest American case of importance in this field is *Attorney General* v. *Utica Insurance Co.*, decided by Chancellor Kent in 1817. An information had been filed by the attorney general of New York against the Utica Insurance Co. to restrain the carrying on of unauthorized banking operations. An injunction was denied. One theory on which an injunction had been sought was that the carrying on of unauthorized banking operations in violation of law was a public nuisance and as such came within the jurisdiction of a court of equity. The court held that such did not constitute a public nuisance, but said by way of dictum that even if it did, it was not that sort of nuisance which a court of equity could restrain because it did not interfere with property right.

We thus find the important cases in this field limiting equity jurisdictions in suits brought by the State to the protection of property interests of some kind.

Caldwell then reviews the English cases which Chancellor Kent regarded as authorities for the limitation he enunciated, and states:

The decision of a judge so distinguished as Chancellor Kent has naturally exerted a tremendous influence on later American courts. Where the public nuisance interferes with property belonging to the State, injunctions have been freely granted. Thus equity will, at the suit of the State, enjoin the obstruction of public roads and streets, navigable streams; restrain a defendant from taking phosphate rock from the bed of a navigable river, prevent the destruction of fish in the streams of the State; prevent a corporation from wasting natural gas by allowing it to escape from the ground into the air. Likewise the State may maintain a suit to enjoin a public nuisance which interferes with the property rights of any considerable number of its citizens. The State is here acting to protect interests of the community at large, or social interests, as distinguished from interests of the State itself. The State's position as guardian of the social interests entitles it to seek protection for them in the courts.

The foregoing cases indicate that courts of equity are tending more and more towards a complete recognition of their power to protect the health and morals of the public as well as its property, and to prevent threatened interferences with the security and general welfare of the community as well as intereferences with its tangible substance. The greater need of the public for protection is calling forth the exercise of a jurisdiction which affords it. As our social system becomes more complex, new sources of danger to the public are constantly perceived. As our changing economic order makes each class of persons more and more dependent upon other classes for even the necessities of life, the need for governmental regulation increases, and likewise the need for means to coerce obedience to these regulations. Courts of equity have not been heedless to the demands made of them. In the language of Lord Cottenham, they have recognized that it is the duty of a court of equity "to adapt its practice and course of proceedings, as far as possible, to the existing state of society, and to apply its jurisdiction to all those new cases which, from the progress daily making in the affairs of men, must continually arise, and not, from too strict an adherence to forms and rules established under very different circumstances, decline to administer justice, and to enforce rights for which there is no other remedy."

Federal statutes regulating business have created a widespread category of "white-collar crimes," such as failure to pay minimum wages or violation of brokerage requirements, which seldom incur the taint of moral depravity normally attached to criminal activity. A jury may hesitate to find that even intentional failure to comply with statutory wage standards makes a criminal of a businessman whom they know as a pillar of the community and Chairman of the local Red Cross. Since criminal prosecution may often be unsuccessful or inappropriate against such offenses, alternative sanctions are necessary to enforce regulatory statutes fairly and effectively.

As a preventive weapon, the traditional injunction might be well fitted, if available, to cope with violations lacking the nefarious quality that administrative officials euphemistically refer to as the sex appeal necessary to secure criminal conviction. Historically, however, equity will not enjoin commission of a crime, since an alleged criminal could then be tried for contempt without a jury. Although this prohibition has been so whittled away that the Government can obtain such an injunction to protect the general welfare, the remedy's applicability within this category has still been limited by the host of aphorisms which embody the prerequisites of equitable relief. But legislative provision for an injunction liberates the remedy from many of the bonds of equity by satisfying of itself conditions which the chancellor would otherwise require to be established in each case. The result is a statutory injunction which provides the same temporary or permanent relief as its unrevamped counterpart yet is granted more freely by the courts.

With increasing frequency during the past 15 years, Congress has authorized administrative agencies to seek this sanction against violators of the statutes that these agencies enforce. Provisions therefor have been included in acts such as those establishing the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Wage and Hour Division, and the Office of Price Administration. Amendments to their original statutes also furnished the weapon to the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Security Administrator, and the National Labor Relations Board. At first glance the threat of a mere judicial order of compliance, without penalties for past violations, might not seem likely to return many potential violators to the paths of righteousness. But the statutory injunction has proved extremely useful to administrative agencies; it provides a sanction which is commensurate with all but flagrant violations and may be applied without depriving the defendant of his essential protections. Necessary to an understanding of this weapon's increasing importance and of the problems raised by its modification of equity principles is evaluation of the crucial characteristics of availability and effectiveness which shape its role in the enforcement arsenal.

Major advantages of the statutory injunction as an enforcement weapon are the ease and speed with which it may be obtained. Judicial criteria for its issuance, which have been strikingly parallel for all agencies despite extensive differences in the various grants of authority, are sufficiently flexible to render the injunction more readily available than most other sanctions at the agency's disposal.

One early authorization for a statutory injunction was granted in 1851 with regard to lands in California. The act provided that all lands in California, to which claims had not been established, should be considered as part of the public domain. It then authorized the district judge of the United States to issue injunctions pending decisions on titles. These restraining orders, of course, related to property interests, but considering the period of California history involved, they were authorized, no doubt, in the public interest.

The Interstate Commerce Act of February 4, 1887—24 Statutes 379, 385—authorized the use of the injunction to restrain carriers from continuing to violate or disobey orders of the newly created Interstate Commerce Commission.

In 1919 Congress authorized the use of the injunction to abate common nuisances; that is, places where intoxicating liquor was illegally manufactured or sold, for the enforcement of the Volstead Act.

The act of February 11, 1903, gave precedence, under certain circumstances, to the equity suits arising under the Sherman Antitrust and the Interstate Commerce Acts. Injunctions have been authorized: against brokers under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; against carriers by water under the Interstate Commerce Acts; against coal-mine operators to force compliance with certain safety measures; against dealing in imported goods bearing trade-marks owned by citizens; against stockyard owners, market agencies, or dealers failing to obey an order of the Secretary of Agriculture issued under the authority of Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921; against farmers' organizations engaging in monopolistic practices; against false advertising under the Federal Trade Commission Act; against violations

under Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; against illegal landing of cables; against violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act; against security issues in violation of the Securities Act of 1933; against violation of the Federal Power Act; against violation of the Natural Gas Act; against violation of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; and against violation of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

It is to be noted that the injunction has always been used on behalf of the weak against the strong. Its use has always been opposed by the strong for the reason that they would be happy to win through the weakness of the opposition. The injunction was accepted as part of the common law so that the weak who could not stand the pressure of long-drawn-out trials in the King's court might have an order pending those trials that everything remain in status quo until a decision was reached.

Any discussion of injunctive powers under the National Labor-Management Relations Act should note the injunctions for four different purposes now in the law. These are:

First. A mandatory requirement—title 1, section 10 (1), Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947—that the National Labor Relations Board seek an injunction whenever preliminary investigations of a secondary boycott charge discloses reasonable grounds for the issuance of a formal complaint. This provision was designed to prevent irreparable damage resulting from secondary boycotts before the normal Board processes could function. Those processes take from 1 year to 18 months. General Counsel Denham, in his testimony before the Senate committee, indicated he would prefer a discretionary authority to decide whether or not immediate injunctions should be requested. This mandatory injunction is eliminated by the language now in H. R. 4290, the substitute Wood bill.

Second. An injunction—title 1, section 10 (j), Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947—at the discretion of the general counsel whereby both management and labor organizations involved in unfair labor practice cases before the Board could be enjoined to maintain the status quo pending final determination of the dispute by the Board.

Third. An injunction during national emergencies—title 10, section 208, IMRA 1947—which enjoin either a strike or a lock-out during an 80-day cooling-off period required by title 2 of the present law. This language is retained in the substitute Wood bill.

Fourth. An enforcement injunction which is common to both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, whereby a cease-and-desist order issued by the Board is enforceable through the judicial authority of the courts.

I want to refer you to page 3 of House Report 245 of the Eightieth Congress, in a discussion entitled "Necessity of Legislation" where the subject of injunctions is discussed.

The subject of injunctions is a difficult one. The labor unions make no secret of their extreme dislike of having to comply with judicial orders. For example, the mere mention of injunctive authority to A. F. of L. President Green by members of the Senate Labor Committee, was sufficient to bring forth a tirade. On the other hand, any legislation designed to regulate or restrict the activities of either labor or management under Government auspices must in the final analysis rest on judicial authority for its enforcement.

As I have previously indicated, orders of the National Labor Relations Board, issued during the Wagner Act period, were enforceable by the Federal courts. Consequently, the controversy over the use or nonuse of injunctions is no longer in dispute. Injunctions have been and will continue to be used to enforce orders of the National Labor Relations Board even under the Lesinski bill.

The real controversy arises as to whether or not injunctions shall be granted by Federal courts at the request of Government officials when a sufficient showing is made to the judge that activities designated by Congress as being unfair labor practices are being used in an industrial dispute and that irreparable damage will result to employees or employer before the National Labor Relations Board can hear the matter and grant its cease-and-desist order.

It should be particularly noted that the injunction provided for in the Wood substitute bill cannot be granted at the request of private parties, but must be requested by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. The Wood substitute bill provides for the safeguards as just mentioned before a judge may grant the order.

The amendment of the gentleman from Texas to the Wood substitute bill also requires that the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board—who is the man that must grant the complaint—must also believe that the safeguarding conditions exist before he makes the request of the judge.

I want to state again that the injunction to enforce orders already rendered have always been used under the Wagner Act and will continue to be used under even the Lesinski bill or the Wood substitute.

I also want to state again that the use of injunctions in connection with national emergency strikes are available to the President of the United States under the Wood substitute bill.

If the gentlemen of the House are of the opinion that we should continue to use the injunction to protect the weak and innocent against the strong, pending final determination in litigation in labor-dispute matters, then we should give our attention to what Congress defines as its intent in establishing unfair labor practices of unions as set forth in the subsections of section 8 (b) of the Wood substitute bill.

In closing, I will merely remind you that injunctions can be used against unfair labor practices of employers and are proposed to be used in the Wood bill as they are now used in the present law to enforce unfair labor practices of the unions. Those union unfair labor practices set out in section 8 (b) of the Wood substitute bill deal with interference by unions with the right of employees to organize or not organize as set out in subsection 1 of section 8 (b). This subject also deals with mass picketing.

Other subjects covered by section 8 (b) are: Denial of union membership for matters other than nonpayment of dues, engaging in Communist activities, or wildcate strikes (this, in effect, prohibits union firing of an employer's employees who are otherwise objectionable to the union); the refusal of a union to bargain collectively; the prohibition against secondary boycotts; and jurisdictional strikes.

It should be remembered in this connection that the Wood bill, as amended by the gentleman from Kentucky, now allows a secondary boycott where a struck employer attempts to farm his work out to another employer in order to break his strike.

It has been said in debate that the Wood substitute provides for issuing temporary restraining orders without notice and thus does away with the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This is not true. Section 7 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act says that the Federal courts may issue temporary restraining orders without notice provided the complaint alleges substantial and irreparable injury, and provided that the temporary restraining order shall become void at the end of 5 days. This is exactly what the Wood substitute says in paragraph 10 (j). A reading of section 10 (j) will disclose that the court can grant an ex parte restraining order for a period of 5 days upon a showing by the General Counsel that substantial and irreparable injury is unavoidable, but such ex parte order cannot continue for longer than 5 days unless the party against whom the injunction is issued is given an opportunity of hearing and the General Counsel fails to demonstrate that the continuance of the injunction is necessary. The section clearly sets out that in no event will an injunction, pending final determination by the National Labor Relations Board, be issued unless at a hearing before a Federal judge, with both parties having an opportunity to be heard, it is established that the injunction is necessary to avoid substantial and irreparable injury pending the hearing.

It should also be pointed out that section 10 (j) does not apply only to unfair labor practices of unions. It has been exercised by the general counsel against the General Motors Corp. and the Bolling Aircraft Co.

One of the strongest objections to the use of injunctions by organized labor is that the Taft-Hartley Act provided for a mandatory injunction against secondary boycotts pending final adjudication by the Board. The unions have said that this subsection of the existing law is unfair and amounts to disparity of treatment as between unions and employers. They contend that since only labor organizations can violate the clauses against secondary boycotts, the effect of this subsection is to afford prompt and mandatory injunctive relief upon charges of employers of such unfair labor practices, while union charges against employers fall within the discretionary power of the general counsel under the existing law. The Wood substitute bill does away with this disparity of treat-

ment. It does away with all the priority features and with all the mandatory features in connection with the issuance of injunctions, but it retains the safeguards against the abuses of the injunctive process contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

We must also remember that the Wood substitute bill goes even further than the Norris-LaGuardia Act in protecting against abuses of the injunctive process. The Norris-LaGuardia Act does not completely deny to private parties access to the courts for injunctive relief. Even under the Norris-LaGuardia Act employers may still obtain temporary restraining orders and injunctions where unlawful acts have been committed or threatened. Section 10 (j) of the Wood substitute bill, however, permits no private parties to seek injunctive relief. The moving party must be a Government official—the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. He has complete discretion to seek or to refuse to seek relief on charges either by labor organizations or by employers.

The only respect in which the injunction provision of the Wood substitute bill could be said to grant greater authority than was granted in the Taft-Hartley Act is the provision authorizing the discretion to apply for injunction after a charge is filed, but before a complaint is issued. It is difficult to see how this difference can be regarded as one of major significance, since the power to issue complaints and to decide when they shall be issued is entirely within the control of the general counsel, and he is the same person who is given authority to apply for an injunction. The amendment to section 10 (j), already accepted as offered by the gentleman from Texas, removes this discretion from the general counsel and places the duty on him to determine that substantial and irreparable injury will result to innocent parties before he makes the request for the injunction of the judge of the Federal court. He, of course, must demonstrate to the court that all customary requirements for the use of an injunction pending trial are present before the injunction will issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KENNEDY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with intense interest and with a deepening appreciation of the sincerity as well as the ability of my colleagues, I have listened to these days of debate. It had not been my intention to participate, appreciating the propriety of one new in this body to remain silent except on those occasions when matters considered by his committee were under discussion.

But, my colleagues, 36 years ago, when my hair was very long and very black, I was the chairman of a legislative committee that investigated the wages paid to working women. That investigation attracted national attention to the extent that in the year of 1913, nine State minimum-wage laws were enacted, and the wages of millions of American working girls were raised much nearer the bread line, in part through the voluntary action of employers whose consciences responded to a new concept of right and wrong industrial relations superior to the old and hard law of supply and demand.

I am thinking back, my colleagues, to the conditions that obtained in the year 1913. The investigation, which I as a very young man conducted, brought to the national attention the conditions of girls working in department stores and in factories and being paid as low as $1.50, $1.75, and $2 a week, when their employers testified that they knew at that time, from their own investigation, that no girl could live on less than $8 a week. That was back in 1913. At that time the highest paid workmen were in the steel factories, and they received an average of $1.87 a day. That was 36 years ago.

I have here in my hand a volume of 979 pages. It is the report of that investigation which I headed in 1913. It contains the testimony in full of the many department-store presidents, industrialists, bankers, and mail-order presidents which was carried throughout the Nation as first-page news of major prominence. If you will go to any library and consult the old newspaper files of 1913 you may get some idea of how profoundly the conscience of America was moved.

To the very young and black-haired chairman of that committee it seemed important that the worker at the end of the week's toil should receive enough at least to meet the minimum requirements of existence. To him it seemed a contradiction, cruel and impossible of justification, certainly not adjustable to the teachings of a religion of brotherhood, that when the employer had established to his satisfaction that $8 a week was the least upon which one could live he with good conscience could go to bed on the night of a pay day upon which in any worker's envelope not at least $8, but $1.50 or $2, had been left as full pay for a full week's toil. To the employer it seemed important that he should conform to the established and accepted rule that in business there was no sentiment and that the wages and working conditions of the toilers must be governed by the law of supply and demand, however harshly and unfairly operating in an overstocked and unorganized labor market.

In this book of 979 pages is the industrial picture of 1913—in the testimony of the large employers—and the philosophy of an industry which was based upon a law of supply and demand which took advantage of human need and as sound business policy usurped priority over human rights.

In this book is the testimony which startled the American people from their complacency. I think it played a large part in the crystallization of a new concept which today is in its broader outlines generally accepted and in its more particularized and challenging phases forms the credo of the liberal groups and individuals of the Nation.

One of the largest employers of the period was on the stand. He was a man of philanthropy and of natural good heart. He admitted that in the last fiscal year his company had made a profit of approximately $7,500,000. He admitted that a large percentage of his women employees were paid less than a minimum living wage, some $2 and less a week. This he said he personally regretted, but could do nothing about it because of the law of supply and demand. I requested him to take out a pencil and figure with me. We took every worker's wage and raised it from below up to the bread line; that is, the minimum living wage as established by this employer. The total was approximately $500,000.

"How then," was the question, "does the law of supply and demand operate to deny the human needs of these workers when during the last fiscal year if every worker of your company had been paid at least a living wage your profits for the year would have been $7,000,000, and not $7,500,000?"

The question was carried in every large newspaper in America. It planted itself in honest minds everywhere and became permanently lodged. Nine States immediately enacted minimum-wage laws. Employers the Nation over announced wage increases. The long-established law of supply and demand as sole and arbitrary dictator of the wage and working conditions of human beings was exploded as a fallacy.

But it became apparent to the workers, and was grasped by the common sense of the American people, that such law, fallacy though it were proven, would continue to operate against the human needs of workers and the welfare of the Nation as long as the unorganized workers were left hopelessly to bargain in their weakness as individuals.

That was 36 years ago. Humanity since then in our America has been marching steadily out of the darkness of the wilderness. Every advance into the sunlight—every advance in attaining for the men and women who work for a living a fair wage and decent working conditions—has come from organized labor. Make no mistake on that. I think of John Fitzpatrick, Ed Nockels, and Victor Olander—that great and incomparable trio of the immortals of my Chicago—and of their service in pure self-abnegation to the help of the hopeless through the gaining of strength in union. I think of John Walker, Margaret Haley, Agnes Nestor, Hugh Brady, and Duffy O'Brien of the Typographical Union—so many, many others who worked so nobly and so unselfishly for the advancement of the national weal, the contentment of men and women generally and the establishment of wage and working conditions on a basis of equity. They have been succeeded by another generation, men and women who carry on with the same fine spirit.

I have known many men and women in all the stations of poverty, of prosperity, of humble callings, and of high positions. I have never known any who as

a class are more devoted to the public welfare and regulate their conduct by a greater sense of fairness than those that I have known in the labor movement.

Yesterday and today I have seen my colleagues on the left, sincere, of course, speaking as they see the light, battling as did their prototypes 36 years ago to hold back the working girl from getting at least enough to live on and the workingman from getting a fair wage. They were sincere back in those years, just as you are, but would any of them, if he were here today to see the progress the world has made and that humanity has made, not be honest enough to stand here in this Chamber in our presence and admit that 36 years ago he was wrong?

To my Democratic colleagues who come from the land that gave the immortal Jackson to us and the great philosophy and the great democracy of Jefferson, the land that in the Rooseveltian golden era gave us so many liberal leaders, may I say that the greatest thrill I received in this Congress was that day when the Power Trust was seeking to stop the progress of democratic ideals in the West, and there was a division and a united democracy stood every man on his feet. What an army for right and humanity, for democracy and for God we are, when we stand together.

I hope that at this crisis in our democratic affairs, when we of the Democratic Party are asked to make good our pledge to the people again we will stand together in support of labor's bill of rights, the Lesinski bill, and in opposition to the substitute thereto and to all crippling amendments.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the required number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN]. As I understand the meaning of this amendment it is this: Under the Taft-Hartley Act there are discretionary injunctions for unfair labor practices, and mandatory injunctions for secondary boycotts. What has been done in the Wood bill is to provide only for discretionary injunctions for unfair labor practices in the following language:

> Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice under this act, the general counsel may petition any district court of the United States—

And so on. Objections have been raised that no provision has been made for investigation by the General Counsel or the issuance of complaints prior to the application for an injunction. The Bentsen amendment, as I understand it, spells that out and requires that the general counsel before he applies for an injunction in connection with unfair labor practices must conduct an investigation and issue a complaint.

I think this amendment can be classified as definitely liberalizing the Taft-Hartley Act. Furthermore it serves to meet the objection of various opponents of the Wood bill who have stated that this provision of the bill does not spell out the requirement that the general counsel must investigate the facts concerning an unfair-labor-practice charge, and issue a complaint before applying for an injunction if he thinks the facts warrant such application. Although, in some respects, it is an academic question, however I think it is wise to spell it out. I think it is an improvement over the Wood bill and I ask for a favorable vote on this amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, newspapers are, to the adult population of our great Nation, what schoolbooks are to children. They keep us adults educated from day to day to a large extent about our daily affairs. The newspapers generally speaking have just kept hammering away and hammering away every time a strike occurs, that labor is the cause of it, until they have miseducated the American people and have led so many of our good people to believe that it is only the little fellow who causes the trouble. The real truth of the matter is that in almost every case where strikes have occurred—and if you want to check it, you can check it and see if I am not correct—there has been a final admission on the part of the big fellow that the little fellow was right in his original request. That is what usually results. After all the dramatic headlines are read by everybody they finally wind up by admitting that the cause of the strike was a just cause. I will admit, of course, that that is not true in 100 percent of the cases, but in most instances, it is true as I verily believe the record will show.

I have very few big industries of any kind in my district. I represent a district which is largely agricultural. There are some oil fields there and some good ranches and so on, but the labor question presents no big problem in my district like some districts and never has. Perhaps it never will. But I take this position so that the record will show that some of us who are anxious to have better government and a better set-up in this country, even though we are not so directly and vitally affected by labor problems as some others are, yet realize that we have been miseducated. I deplore strikes as much as anyone. I want to see some provision written into the law, if you please, to prevent strikes against the public interest. I am in favor of that. I think the President does have the inherent right to stop a strike which which would endanger our common weal. I have no objection that that be written into the law.

But let me just show you where that philosophy that the little fellow is always causing the trouble has led us under the Taft-Hartley law. Here were two forces, here were two groups being dealt with by the Taft-Hartley law. One was the so-called laboring group and the other the manufacturers, or management. Let me ask you this significant question, my friends. Is there any difference at all—any difference—between the laborers and the manufacturers or the Congressmen? I mean of course any fundamental difference as human beings—are not we all just the same? We are all Americans. Why should we designate labor as something different from us just because we do a different kind of work.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Committee. Whether you agree with me or not, I certainly do not impugn anyone's motives. I take it that all of you are just as sincere in your views as I am in mine about this matter. Yes, I am afraid so many have been educated to believe that the laborers are something apart from us. God bless them, with their hands, with the work of their hands, by the sweat of their brows, and the ache of their muscles, they labor for us and produce for us coal and light and clothing and food, and so forth. They are just as good as we are; no better, but just as good. I have no prejudice against rich men. Some of them are great benefactors and great philanthropists. We need such men and I bless them. But the laboring man is as good and patriotic as the rich man. "A man's a man for a' that." If he is a man. And they are not groups fundamentally different. Let us not treat them as groups apart. We did in the Taft-Hartley law. I voted against the Taft-Hartley law for several reasons, one of which was that it said to the labor leader alone: "You must sign an anti-Communist affidavit." It did not say that to the manufacturer. Why not? Why not make it apply to both of them? That is one of the things in the Taft-Hartley law which shows that the philosophy of the act was that the laborer was not quite as good, not quite as patriotic as the other fellow. That philosophy is not true for he is as a rule and an average, of course, just as good and patriotic as the employer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, this is what I believe, sincerely and honestly. Even though you may disagree with me I do not impugn your motives nor your intellect. Now, as to the Wood amendment, may I use this illustration: If you want to win a race, if you have an important race to run you will not try to win that race with a mule. You know that you just cannot do it. You must have a thoroughbred in order to win. I do not impugn the motives of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], who is the author of the Wood bill, or at least I suppose he is. His name is attached to it. But his bill is a mule in an important race. We cannot trim him up, trim his mane or tail or even his ears and win a race with him. We cannot do that. So let us not fool with that mule. Let us get a thoroughbred, like the committee bill. We can do some trimming, some amending of the committee bill, the Lesinski bill. Let us take that committee bill and do some amending on it and win the race and give a

good law to the people of our land, a law that will be fair to both management and labor and fair to the great American public. Let us not ever on any occasion be cowed by the President on the threat of patronage. I doubt seriously if our great President made some of the statements that are attributed to him. I do not believe that he desires to try to force anyone to do something against his will, but let us not be cowed by that, whether true or only alleged. Let us not be swayed by demands of any labor group. None have tried to intimidate me and I doubt if they have anyone else. Let us be swayed only by our conscience and only by what we think is right whether any labor groups have tried to intimidate or not. Let us write a law that will be fair to management and labor, treating them as equals, treating them both as Americans and American groups, and be fair to the great American commonwealth. When we do that I think we will take the Lesinski bill, the committee bill, and amend it in a few places, and we will have a good law along that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] has again expired.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that all afternoon we have been getting pretty far afield. I want to say to this Committee that I have the eyes that God gave me and such little education as I was able to get in the hills of southern Indiana. I read a bill to see what is in it, and I do not care particularly who wrote the bill; I might examine it a little more carefully if I knew one man wrote it than I would if I knew another man wrote it, but ultimately I am considering what is in the bill. We are going to adjourn after a while, and I want to plead with every Member of this House to take time over the week end to read the Wood bill and the administration bill, read them, and study them over again; I want to ask you to keep in mind when you read them what it is you want in a labor-management relations law. I will guarantee that if you do, if you approach that question fairly and squarely you will find that in the Wood bill, sections 8, 9, and 10, which are the heart of this legislation, you will find that it is not possible to amend these sections and get fair provisions without tearing them all out and rewriting them. You will discover that in the administration bill it is possible to make amendments, if indeed it is not satisfactory to you.

We start out with these two bills; the question is going to come up as to whether we accept the Wood substitute or the administration bill as a basis upon which to frame labor legislation. I think it has been confessed time and again in this House that the Taft-Hartley law was not what the American people wanted. If I had 40 minutes I could tell you why the American people rejected the Taft-Hartley law; they rejected it upon its provisions, not upon its authorship but upon its provisions.

I hold in my hand an analysis which was sent to me through the mails from the National Small Businessmen's Association. The second Wood bill, the one that you are going to be asked to vote upon, is compared with the Taft-Hartley law. I have no doubt every one of you received one of these. If you have, look at it. In 47 different instances the Small Businessmen's Association comparing provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and the second Wood bill say these three words: "The same as." "The same as" 47 different times. In seven different places it says "Substantially the same as." In two places it gives substantial differences. Remember, the second Wood bill is quite a different version from the first Wood bill; but now we come upon the floor here and we have adopted certain amendments. I am not going to stand in the well of this House and tell you anything I do not believe; I am going to tell you what I honestly believe. I think every one of these amendments, including the one offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], are amendments that do take away a little of the unjust philosophy of the Wood bill. I grant that; I would not stultify myself by telling you something that I did not believe. But we have adopted now the Ford amendment; and, remember, when we adopted the Ford amendment we softened it a little. Then we came to the Morton amendment. I think the intentions of the gentleman from Kentucky as well as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] were good, I think they intended to improve the Wood bill, and I agree that they did do away with some of the injustice of the bill.

There is one thing we did not discuss here. I somehow did not get the floor at that time and the vote was taken on the Morton amendment. I refer to the boycott which is permitted by workers outside of one local union. You have got to get the employer's consent for such a boycott before you can conduct it under the second Wood bill. Am I not right about that? It still has to be in the contract before you can conduct such a boycott against an employer who is processing struck work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I must say that a little while ago when the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, was discussing this matter, making an intelligent, fair analysis of the injunctive provisions, his time was limited to 5 minutes. I am not going to object to the gentleman's request, but I do think what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander.

Mr. JACOBS. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that, of course, I did not object. As a matter of fact, I voted against the first motion to cut off debate because I believe in every man having the opportunity to speak his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, we should lay aside our emotions and our partisan feeling in this matter; we should realize that these amendments that have been offered, while they do soften the Wood bill in spots, we are going to be called upon to vote as between the Wood bill and the administration bill at a time when we have these three or four softening amendments in our minds, but many, many other unfair provisions of the Wood bill are not brought into clear present focus. I say to you candidly and honestly I do not believe you can amend some of those provisions except by tearing them out and rewriting them entirely. That is exactly what the administration bill does.

I want to tell you of one instance in which the administration bill deals with a problem that the Wood bill does not cover at all. I refer to the jurisdictional strike in the craft trades. That is one of the most difficult problems we have confronting us in labor-relations legislation. I do not say that the administration bill is fair or perfect on this point; I do not even say that it will work out, but the problem has been considered and we tried to make fair provisions regarding it. We are trying to set up provisions whereby there can be established a body of jurisprudence that will settle jurisdiction disputes in craft trades; where men work intermittently and where disputes may arise on the spur of the moment. You cannot always get them settled promptly and they are usually over with before you can ever get to the Board and have a hearing. Perhaps we can, in time, adopt a set of rules and develop a body of jurisprudence that will help settle these jurisdictional disputes in the crafts.

The Taft-Hartley law I do not think gave sufficient consideration to that problem. There was only one provision that even attempted to make a settlement in jurisdictional disputes in the crafts, and that was section 10 (k), which was taken out of the Wood bill because the other side of the question was never approached and studied. But in our bill we do have a provision whereby we are trying to set up a body of jurisprudence to settle that type of dispute.

I say to you with all the candor that I have I want you to study these two measures over the week end. I want you gentlemen to make up your minds which one you want, make up your minds as to what you think is fair labor legislation before you come back. I may say to you very frankly that I have some ideas myself which are somewhat different than the administration bill. I am not wedded to it. When I was a candidate I told labor in my district exactly where I stood on the emergency strike situation. I am chairman of a subcommittee to investigate and recommend legislation to require democracy in our labor unions, and I intend to discharge my duty in good faith in that regard.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I had understood, reading the press, that the gentleman was going to offer those amendments in

the Committee in the hope that they would be adopted. I wonder why the gentleman did not proceed with that action.

Mr. JACOBS. Well, in the first place, of course, I will have to correct the gentleman's misapprehension. As the gentleman knows, both of us being from the same State, there are lots of things in the press about me that are not so. I never said that.

I will say this to the gentleman that I would not favor a provision in a labor-management relations bill that said that a corporation in its internal affairs should be regulated in a certain way; for example, if it performed ultra vires acts, that penalties should be provided, or if it failed to file corporate reports of its existence with the secretary of state. It has no place in a labor-management relations bill, and the regulation of the internal affairs of the union has no place in a labor-management relations bill. Each side would have a tug of war to phrase such provisions so as to gain for itself an advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct the inaccurate impressions and gross misunderstandings that my colleague from Missouri, [Mr. JONES], apparently has in regard to the actions of the committee. Evidently he has not read the hearings nor is he cognizant of the fact that the record of the hearings show plainly the terrific amount of work done by this subcommittee. It is certain that he knows nothing of the problems, difficulties and handicaps under which the subcommittee worked. One of those was the fact that the Republican members of the subcommittee didn't even attend the meetings with any degree of regularity, indicating they were like so many Members of the House in that they had their minds made up before ever hearing all the testimony of the witnesses.

It appears evident to me during these debates that many members will vote their preconceived notions about this legislation for even many who are not too well informed are not too attentive to the debates and are not too regular in their attendance here on the floor.

Last Tuesday when I spoke I mentioned some of these difficulties we had in the subcommittee and in the full committee because I felt that the Members of the House were entitled to know all the facts. Other members of the committee did the same thing on Monday and Tuesday during general debate. The story has been told but apparently my colleague from Missouri, who admits he knows little of labor-management problems, apparently did not pay too close attention to the debates those days.

If I may do so without appearing to be boasting because of my own membership on the subcommittee, I do wish to say that the majority members of the subcommittee were as hard working, sincere, conscientious, well qualified and capable a group of men as ever sat on a committee.

I am convinced that they felt, as I did, that by doing their jobs well they would be playing vital parts in carrying out the promises made by our Democratic Party to the people last year. I regret to say that I fear some of my colleagues merely ran on the Democratic ticket, accepting its bounties but recognizing no obligations to carry on to redeem the party's pledges.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Bentsen amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KELLEY) there were—ayes 166, noes 117.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include certain extraneous matter and portions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he recently made.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for Monday and the rest of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. The pending bill will be brought up on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Whatever is done on Monday, the labor bill will not be called up until Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Private Calendar may be called on Monday, following the call of the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thereafter, House Resolution 114 will be called up, which is the ordinary resolution giving powers of investigation to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Last Monday, Mr. Speaker, was District day. I understood there were several bills out of the District Committee which were noncontroversial, but on account of the unfortunate death of our colleague from Pennsylvania, the business in order on that day was dispensed with when we adjourned out of respect for our colleague.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the consent calendars and private calendars are dispensed with, and after the consideration of House Resolution 114, it may be in order to consider District of Columbia bills for the remainder of Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us what the District of Columbia bills are?

Mr. McCORMACK. Five bills have been scheduled for consideration as follows: H. R. 2799, retent of contracts; H. R. 2104, regulating orders to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in District of Columbia banks; H. R. 2056, regulating the practice of healing art; H. R. 2886, providing for the starling extermination program; and H. R. 3967, to continue nursery schools and day-care centers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are any of these bills highly controversial?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that they are not. As a matter of fact, I was told that it is expected to dispose of them within an hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I will make the announcement now that there will be no business on Saturday. Whatever business will be transacted on Friday will be very light, if any, because a number of Members have accepted an invitation to make a trip to New York. Therefore, whatever program there is on Friday, will be light and noncontroversial.

Of course, the labor bill will be continued. Upon completion of the labor bill, the following bills may be brought up for consideration, H. R. 2682, amending the Commodity Credit Corporation Act;

and H. R. 165, the American River Basin Development.

If there is any further program, I will announce it later, so that the Members may have plenty of opportunity to arrange their schedules accordingly. I doubt very much if there will be any further program, but I want to make that slight reservation. Of course, any conference report may be brought up at any time, except I will say definitely that no conference report will be called up on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman is referring to the coming Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a press release.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the President and labor disputes from the Journal of Politics of the University of Cornell. I have been advised by the Public Printer that this will require an additional expenditure of $262.50. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, because of official business downtown today I was delayed during the roll call this morning, and therefore was unable to answer "present."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IRVING asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter, two articles from Fortune and Forbes Survey magazines.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an announcement by the Economic Cooperation Administration in connection with the new policy regarding procurement of lumber and plywood.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the executive vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America. I have received word from the Public Printer that it will cover approximately two and one-half pages and will cost $187.50. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the remarks of Hon. H. F. Harridge, of the Canadian House of Commons. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will exceed the two pages allowed and will cost $168.75. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. R. C. O'Hair, of Chicago.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article, The Right to Choose.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter and a statement.

THE ABOLISHMENT OF THE SUPER-AIRCRAFT CARRIER

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a long-time member and a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I hope it may not seem presumptuous and preposterous for one who has spent at least 10 years studying the possibilities and potentialities of and for a super aircraft carrier for defense, with appropriations of money involved to cover the construction of the same, to disagree with the great military minds who first conceived the notion, later insisted a committee should listen to their argument, and now are so interested in the unification of all the armed services as obviously to be willing to sacrifice the American people on the altar of the accomplishment of their unification desideratum. It is not right.

Anybody who can read and write knows that Russia or any other potential enemy has already marked our land bases for early attack and destruction in the event of war.

It is conceded by the dumbest of the military minds that Russia or any other power will, if it attacks first, destroy these bases within 7 days of the beginning of any war to be declared. To save ourselves, therefore, as against the loss of land bases, we need an aircraft carrier such as is proposed and as has been argued for and of the necessity for which we have been convinced, from which to launch, undiscovered, and to liberate therefrom planes loaded with atom bombs sufficient to carry out the vital duty obligatory upon some base or other on which we rely for defense.

And there will be no other bases on which we may or can depend if any powerful enemy is as precautious or is as well advised with respect to our bases as we are in regard to theirs as of today.

It was a discussion of these potentialities which convinced me of the necessity for the expense involved in the construction of this big aircraft carrier, from which undiscovered and unlocated, from some sea or other, we could save ourselves from ignominious defeat by reason of the fact that though our land bases were destroyed as of a certain day we could on that very day from this super-aircraft carrier—whose location would be unidentified and undefined—launch a sufficient number of airplanes carrying bombs to bring an end to the war, thereby the aircraft carrier would have served its purpose, discharged its load, but might be an open target, but who would care.

Even so, it would have saved what we might have left, if anything, after a repetition of a second Pearl Harbor on our boasted land bases by an enemy attack.

We are playing with dynamite, and to our own destruction, when we disregard the potentialities and the powers inherent in an unlocated, undefined base of defense in the water of some ocean.

As it is we are just as vulnerable as is a chicken pie at a church sociable without the superaircraft carrier, unlocatable, until it has its mission accomplished.

Anyway, I have come to that decision after years of study.

The discontinuance of the completion of the carrier is in itself a tragedy. A positive threat to our perpetuity, for on that weapon we have a right alone to depend in ultimatum for assurance of the possibility of opportunity both for defense and attack after our land bases are destroyed—as they will be—or coincident with the destruction of these bases, before we could ever take off from land.

That is the crux of the situation. We are not out to attack anybody unless and until we are attacked. Then our land bases will have been destroyed. You must give credit to our enemies for the use of common sense, and we—American like—have given them, a complete program as to how and when and where to attack us.

As and when the American people realize the extent to which their future welfare is jeopardized by the action of the Secretary of National Defense, necessarily so, by the ending of the construction of the super aircraft carrier—meaning he was ordered to do it by the President—the repercussion will be an earthquake of protest. The American people love liberty and security. The act of the Secretary of National Defense deprives them of both.

The people had already spoken through their representatives, and the President had twice approved the program. To discontinue completion of this aircraft carrier is to invite a Hiroshima for New York, Baltimore, and Washing-

ton, together with all our alleged bases for defense. They will be useless, if and when destroyed—as they will be at once—should a second Pearl Harbor be the beginning—and will be the end—of the next war, because of our stupidity.

Such joint staff military strategy and logistics as any power will use if and when it uses any, will spell terrific desolation and very complete destruction of the sources on which we propose to defend ourselves, and without the aircraft carrier bases at sea, we will be helpless, licked before we get our breath or even try to start to defend ourselves. Now comes along one who arrogates to himself by main strength the questionable authority, which, so far as I have found, is nowhere in any law justified; assuming the prerogatives of Congress, taking over the executive department, overriding the legislative branches of Government. To what ends have we so soon come, so disastrously? It is time for Congress to stop, to look and to listen, or the Secretary of National Defense will assume indirectly, the veto power which should not and must not be tolerated.

His act in the premises is a deliberate affront to Congress. Moreover, the action he has taken in the premises is desperately ill-advised militarily and dangerous. It is a supererogation on the part of the Secretary of National Defense. His act in the premises is unjustified by law and is in complete opposition to the will of the people heretofore expressed by them through their lawfully constituted representatives, and approved by the President more than once. Who is he to put us in such jeopardy?

Common respect for one's position as a Member of Congress challenges the right of any appointive officer to disregard, to override and/or to make futile the laws enacted by Congress, signed by the President. Need I tell you such action should not be permitted; such presumption should be checked now. It should not be allowed to go unchallenged.

Such order in the premises should not legally be considered by the Congress as effective without authority in law for it, for which there is none. It was an unwarranted trespass upon the prerogatives of Congress.

Congress should assert itself now to preserve its self-respect. Something should be done by Congress to conserve and preserve its rights and powers, now. Some way and in some manner the order should be retracted, as should any order made without authority, in direct violation of established law, contrary to legislative procedure and enactment, and in contravention of our established order of government.

Congress should not tolerate, nor permit such a direct violation of the rights of the legislative department of the Government by the executive end of the Government, without making at least an effort to ascertain how vicious and how vital the establishment of such a precedent may come to be. It spells the beginning of the end of representative government for Democrats, Dixiecrats, and Republicans. I say so, I mean it. It raises an issue that must be met now. Think it over.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

572. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the thirteenth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

573. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for the refund of the taxes deducted pursuant to the provisions of subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code from the wages of Mexican railroad workers employed in the United States under the agreement of April 29, 1943, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4419. A bill for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4442. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., to supplement the farm lands required for the United States prison system; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 4443. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4444. A bill to extend the period of entitlement to educational benefits under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) in the case of certain totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4445. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate a century of railroad operations out of Chicago, Ill., and to commemorate the Chicago Railroad Fair of 1948–49; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4446. A bill to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 4447. A bill providing for the right of hearing and appeal by classified civil-service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

H. R. 4448. A bill to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Merchant Marine Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4449. A bill to provide for certain adjustments on the promotion list of the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4450. A bill to extend the requirements for fixing the minimum number of deck officers on steam vessels to certain additional vessels of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4451. A bill to amend section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4452. A bill to provide that United States commissioners shall be paid an annual salary to be fixed by the Judicial Conference of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4453. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 4454. A bill to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed in Syracuse, N. Y., as the Robert H. McCard Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4455. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of the United States of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., for use in connection with the United States penitentiary at Terre Haute; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4456. A bill relating to actions in the District of Columbia for breach of promise to marry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4457. A bill to amend section 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to special taxes on the sale of liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4458. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of Oscar Austin Lofgren; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 198. Resolution directing the United States Tariff Commission to transmit information to the House with respect to certain pending legislation which will affect the woolen and worsted manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 199. Resolution directing the Secretary of Labor to transmit to the House certain information with respect to unemployment in the woolen and worsted manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. Res. 200. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the

House information relating to the internal revenue which may be derived from the woolen and worsted manufacturing industry of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING (by request):

H. R. 4459. A bill for the relief of the Commerce Trust Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4460. A bill for the relief of R. L. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

710. By Mr. ASPINALL: Resolution of the State Legislature of Colorado for a procedure to review and alter the Charter of the United Nations in order to basically strengthen the Charter so that it may succeed in preserving world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

711. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution passed by both branches of the City Council of the City of Woonsocket, R. I., supporting immediate passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1949 (H. R. 3190), to raise the present minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

712. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, urging Congress to support the Ickes plan for a Federal educational trust to be administered in behalf of Federal aid to State education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

713. By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the State of Colorado, memorializing the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation concerning the granting of loans to members of the fur-farming industry in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

714. Also, memorial of the State of Colorado, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law S. 529, which provides for the establishment of a veterans' employment and national economic development corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

715. Also, memorial of the State of Colorado, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 1549, which provides aid and assistance for veterans in the settlement of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

716. Also, memorial of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to making a full and thorough investigation of the possibilities of obtaining for the State of Colorado a liquid-fuel plant or plants; to the Committee on Public Lands.

717. By Mr. WHITE of California: Memorial of the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, requesting that section 313 of the Lanham Act be amended to extend the removal date with respect to temporary veterans' housing from January 1, 1950, to January 31, 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

718. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John Glenn and others, Oneonta, N. Y., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

719. Also, petition of C. L. Hildebrand and others, Lake Worth, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

720. Also, petition of John A. Wall and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

721. Also, petition of Verna Payne and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

722. Also, petition of Anna C. Finch and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

723. Also, petition of J. C. Michael and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

724. Also, petition of Grace Davis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

725. Also, petition of Olive Stahl and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

726. Also, petition of John O. Tracy and others, Orlo Vista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

727. Also, petition of Frank Nutting and others, Boynton Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

728. Also, petition of B. W. Kellogg and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

729. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of David P. Steel, druggist, and other citizens of Cincinnati, Iowa, urging repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on all toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

730. By Mr. WHITE of California: Petition signed by 38 citizens of Fresno and vicinity, submitted Mr. Peter Bedrosian, druggist, protesting the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods and requesting its repeal as quickly as possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world filled with the clamor of those whose trust is in violence and with the boasting of those who reckon not with the ultimate supremacy of forces unseen and eternal, we come seeking fortitude and stability, knowing that still stands Thine ancient sacrifice, a humble and a contrite heart. In these days of crisis for our Nation and for the world, direct our steps, guard us from error, save us from false judgments, deliver us from all evil; make us faithful ministers of this stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 29, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4152) to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Myers
Anderson	Holland	Neely
Baldwin	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taft
Flanders	Long	Taylor
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
George	McGrath	Thye
Gillette	McKellar	Tydings
Green	McMahon	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Young
Hill	Murray	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are excused by the Senate

for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which is holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and insert matters in the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as a member of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise Committee, to fill an existing vacancy.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILL RELATING TO EXCLUSION AND DEPORTATION OF SUBVERSIVE ALIENS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that hearings have been scheduled beginning Tuesday, May 10, 1949, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1694, relating to exclusion and deportation of subversive aliens. The first such hearing will be public but some of the hearings will be in executive session. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the clerk of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary immediately so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN AIRPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate and maintain public airports in certain areas and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN AIRPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the request of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake certain projects for the development of class IV and larger airports during the fiscal year 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIC ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734, 7 U. S. C. 429) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL PICKET BOAT TO CONNECTICUT NAUTICAL CADETS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Connecticut Nautical Cadets, of Hartford, Connecticut, had requested the Navy Department to transfer to that organization a small craft for its use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

VOLUNTARY PLANS FOR THE ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for the requirements of Federal Aeronautical Agencies, together with a copy of the request for compliance by the Secretary of Commerce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Voluntary Plan for the Allocation of Steel Products for Baseboard Radiation, together with the request for compliance by the Secretary of Commerce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 25

"To the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in nineteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas section 9 of the Organic Act of Alaska (act of August 24, 1912) prohibits the courts of the Territory from granting any divorce unless the applicant therefor shall have resided in the Territory for 2 years immediately preceding the application; and

"Whereas said restriction is out of date and only serves to work hardship in many instances where relief is called for that the court is unable to grant in a timely manner; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Alaska presently in nineteenth session is well qualified to prescribe the details for the conduct of such affairs of the people of Alaska as are local and domestic in character;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urges that the restriction of the Organic Act of Alaska which fixes 2 years as the residence period required for court jurisdiction in divorce cases be deleted by an appropriate amendment to the organic act so that the Alaska Legislature may establish suitable statutory provisions on said subject.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Memorial 3

"To the Congress of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

"Your memorialist, the Senate of the Alaska Legislature in nineteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas prospecting for and the discovery of placer gold was one of the most important factors in bringing people to and settling in Alaska; and

"Whereas this type of citizens were individualists with initiative, courage, and human kindness of the highest order; and

"Whereas through prospecting under the most rigorous conditions a stupendous source of precious and base materials have been discovered; and

"Whereas many of these base minerals are associated with gold; and

"Whereas under natural conditions the gold content of these minerals would pay for the operations of said deposits; and

"Whereas, by regulatory order, gold has been withdrawn as a commodity and cannot be traded in except in its free state; and

"Whereas should gold be allowed to be bought and sold on a free market, it would immediately tend to induce the flow of capital to investigate and open up some of the already known deposits and be of inestimable benefit to the Territory in every line of trade and occupation in the Territory;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the senate of the nineteenth session of the Alaska Legislature, earnestly requests that the Congress of the United States, through the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately take steps to allow the free and unrestricted sale of gold.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Three resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 17

"To the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate from Alaska, and the Congress of the United States:

"Whereas there is now pending before the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, a bill No. H. R. 1140, entitled 'To protect and conserve the salmon fisheries of Alaska'; and

"Whereas such bill proposes to amend the 1906 Alaska fishery law in the following particulars:

"1. Abolition of the privilege of taking salmon by hand rod, spear or gaff for any purpose from the streams and rivers of Alaska;

"2. Abolition of the privilege of taking salmon for 'local food requirements' and

permitting such taking only for 'necessary personal use';

"3. Regulation by the Secretary of the Interior of the taking of salmon for personal use;

"4. Prohibition of taking salmon during closed periods by hand rod, spear, or gaff for personal use; and

"Whereas such bill, if enacted, will seriously and unnecessarily cut down the food supply of many white people and a majority of the Alaska Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos, who subsist in substantial part on salmon; and

"Whereas the taking of salmon which the bill seeks to prohibit has not been a substantial cause for the depletion of salmon; and since the salmon runs have been meager of late years, and thereby the income of many Alaskans has been greatly diminished, making it all the more necessary that such income be supplemented by the taking of food in kind; and

"Whereas such abuses of the aforesaid privileges have occurred, still they have not been substantial in number; and the proposed prohibitions would cause immensely greater damage to Alaskans than such abuses; and

"Whereas, the said bill is reputedly designed as a police regulatory measure, and it would be better policy to extend the period of policing rather than enact the proposed prohibition;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alaska, respectfully pray that H. R. 1140 be amended to provide protection for those in southeastern Alaska dependent upon fish for food.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"House Memorial 20

"To the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the legislature of the Territory of Alaska in nineteenth session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas section 6 of the Organic Act of Alaska (Act of August 24, 1912) as amended by the act of April 18, 1940, limits the Alaska legislature to one regular session of only 60 days duration in each biennium; and

"Whereas, the rapid growth of the Territory has increased the volume of legislative work manyfold since said section was first enacted; and

"Whereas, the legislature was substantially enlarged by the amendment of section 4 of the Organic Act approved November 13, 1942, thereby engendering the introduction of a greater number of bills; and

"Whereas, the calendar of the present legislature is so crowded that it has been necessary to hold many arduous night sessions which are a hardship upon the members;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist urges that section 6 of the Alaska Organic Act, above cited, be amended to allow regular biennial sessions of the Alaska legislature of not more than 90 days rather than only 60 days as at present.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"House Memorial 23

"To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress for the Territory of Alaska and to the Honorable Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the legislature of Alaska, respectfully represents:

"H. R. No. 4059 introduced in the Eightieth Congress, commonly known as the Lemke bill, for the purpose of authorizing the homesteading of lands in Alaska, was opposed and condemned by the overwhelming majority of Alaskan residents for many reasons which have been presented to the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives, United States Congress; and

"Senate Bill No. 533 introduced in the Eighty-first Congress is even more objectionable and has been condemned by civic and veteran's organization throughout Alaska; and

"Whereas, your memorialist finds the enactment of Senate bill No. 533 would be an unwise departure from the historic land policies of the United States, retard the economic development of Alaska, preclude the orderly utilization of the resources of Alaska, make it almost impossible for any pulp or paper industry to become established in Alaska and would not accomplish the purposes expressed therein;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges that Senate Bill No. 533, Eighty-first Congress not be enacted into law and that no consideration be given thereto without public hearings being held.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Oregon, relating to the National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MORSE on April 29, 1949, p. 5288, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Colorado, relating to a World Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLIKIN on April 29, 1949, p. 5288, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THYE on April 29, 1949, p. 5289, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, relating to excise taxes on admissions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See text of resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY on April 29, 1949, p. 5289, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the federalization of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY on April 27, 1949, p. 5090, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY on April 27, 1949, p. 5089, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the establishment of a national cemetery at Birch Coulee Battlefield in Renville County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See text of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY on April 27, 1949, p. 5090, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the California Department Commanders Council, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 1324, the Veterans' Home Loan Act of 1949; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Jewish War Veterans, United States of America, of New York, N. Y., relating to the North Atlantic Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Council of the City of York, and the Common Council of the City of Farrell, both in the State of Pennsylvania, and the Common Council of the City of Winooski, Vt., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the California Society, Sons of the American Revolution, relating to House bill 1344, providing for the admission of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the board of trustees of Gibson General Hospital, of Princeton, Ind., and the board of trustees of the Jennie Edmundson Memorial Hospital, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the committee on public health legislation of the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, of Pittsburgh, Pa., signed by C. L. Palmer, chairman, relating to socialized medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by members of the Pike County (Ky.) fiscal court, relating to the canalization of the Big Sandy River and the Tug Fork of that river; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the fourteenth national convention of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, of Camden, N. J., relating to the appointment of Senator GRAHAM of North Carolina as a Member of the Senate; ordered to lie on the table.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF YORK, PA.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of York, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929; to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of York and State of Pennsylvania:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and our Representative from Pennsylvania.

PICK-SLOAN PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—RESOLUTION OF COMMUNITY CLUB OF CHAMBERLAIN, S. DAK.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Community Club of Chamberlain, S. Dak., relating to the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is becoming more apparent every day to the residents and citizens of Chamberlain that the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin—

1. Provides inadequate safeguards for our health in that the Hoover Commission reports that they have failed to consider the unsanitary conditions that may prevail in the portions uncovered at low levels.

2. Threatens our only adequate natural recreational facilities in this section of the State in that the soil and vegetation on American Island cannot be duplicated in this area.

3. Threatens to lower property valuation of that property alongside future muddy and unhealthy areas, without compensation therefor when the land is not condemned.

4. Appeals to provide safeguards for land in States to the south at a sacrifice of our richest agricultural land in this sector of the State.

5. Fails to provide for water transportation to the area of possible manganese developments and in fact will cut off any possible water transportation to our State except for the extreme southeast corner.

6. Will, by virtue of the high head dam effect a removal of much of the property on the tax lists at the present time with an increased burden cast on the other property within the county.

7. Appears in general to be an over-all detriment and not a benefit to this section of the State; and

Whereas the attitude of cooperation on the part of the present agencies has incurred the displeasure of the landowners and the other property owners in this area and has been poorly displayed and the community's attempts to secure modifications of the present plans; and

Whereas the press and various organizations within this State have indicated that there is little demand for a change in the present plans or in support of the MVA;

We, the Community Club of the City of Chamberlain, S. Dak., do hereby resolve to express our unified opposition to the continuance of any plan for development which will continue the seven objections in the first paragraph hereof and will permit a fluctuation of as great an amount as 65 feet in the water level which at high stage will flood a sizable portion of our city and at low level permit the vast expanse of mud and disease-producing putrid pools which appears the natural result of a continuation of the Pick-Sloan plan.

We ask specifically that further development of the basin as a whole as distinguished from individual construction projects be removed from the control of the Army engineers.

We hereby place ourselves on record as a group as resolved in favor of an MVA as being the only feasible alternative presented for the Pick-Sloan plan to date; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the two Senators and the two Members of Congress from South Dakota, a copy to the Senators from Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming and that a copy be sent to the President of the United States with the express wish that a low-head dam be established in lieu of the present one planned at Fort Randall and, that at the very least, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the improvement of the present plan be adopted immediately.

GLEN GRIFFITH,
President.
LAUREL E. PEASE,
Secretary.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF BELLIN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, GREEN BAY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's mail brought to me a resolution which I feel represents grass roots thinking in many of our hospitals and in the medical profession throughout the Nation. John Evans, secretary, and H. W. Gochnauer, president, of the Bellin Memorial Hospital of Green Bay, Wis., sent this resolution in opposition to Federal compulsory health insurance; that is, socialized medicine.

I endorse emphatically the text of this resolution and ask unaimous consent that it be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States now enjoy the highest standard of health care through the combined efforts of the several health professions; and

Whereas political control of these professions would stifle initiative, limit treatment, and progressively nullify the great achievements accomplished under a system of free enterprise; and

Whereas passage of compulsory health insurance legislation will cause impairment of national health due to deterioration of medical care and institutional facilities, which history teaches is the inevitable result of socialization of medicine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of the Bellin Memorial Hospital expresses its emphatic opposition to compulsory health insurance, considering it a menace to the public health and an abuse of the individual freedom of choice, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from Wisconsin, and to the National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association at One North La Salle Street, Chicago 2, Ill.

BELLIN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
H. W. GOCHNAUER, *President,*
JOHN EVANS, *Secretary.*

Dated this 26th day of April 1949, Green Bay, Wis.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference three petitions signed by 43 citizens of Wilmington, 74 citizens of Delmar, and 84 citizens of Laurel, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of House bill 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverages over the radio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT—MEMORIAL OF FLORIDA LEGISLATURE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was transmitted to myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], by R. A. Gray, secretary of state, in advocacy and support of Senate bill 614, to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of the Seventy-ninth Congress, together with the amendment offered by my colleague and myself.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Memorial 104

Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting that the provisions of Senate bill 614 of the Eighty-first Congress be enacted into law with the amendments dated March 1 proposed jointly by the two United States Senators from Florida

Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress, through the provisions of the Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act, established a national program to assist the several States to inventory their existing hospitals, define their hospital needs, and formulate State plans for the construction of needed new hospitals; and

Whereas through this program grants have been approved for one-third of the cost of planning, constructing, and equipping 15 hospital projects and 1 health center in the State of Florida, a construction program of approximately $14,000,000; and

Whereas one hospital project has been completed and nine hospital projects totaling expenditures of over $11,000,000 are now under construction in the State of Florida; and

Whereas Senate bill 614, recently introduced into the Eighty-first Congress would amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of the Seventy-ninth Congress by—

1. Increasing the contractual obligation authority of the Surgeon General for hospital-construction grants from the presently

approved $75,000,000 annually to $150,000,000 annually;

2. Extending the duration of the act 4 years;

3. Making the grants in each State equivalent to the State's allotment percentage (the allotment percentage of Florida being 57.49) for all projects approved on or after January 1, 1949, in lieu of the presently required national allotment of one-third of the project cost;

4. Requiring each State to provide annually for State administrative purposes not less than $15,000 or 2 percent, whichever is higher, of the construction funds involved annually in the program;

5. Providing grants in aid to make possible research, experiments, and demonstrations to determine the possibility of coordinating the services of hospitals; and

Whereas with the knowledge and approval of our entire congressional delegation our two Florida Senators have jointly proposed amendments to Senate bill 614 which in effect would—

1. Make the increased grants proposed by Senate bill 614 for projects approved after January 1, 1949, applicable to projects approved before January 1 in order that all communities constructing hospitals under this program might share equally in the benefits of the program;

2. Authorize the appropriation of sufficient funds to pay the difference between the presently approved grants of 33⅓ percent and the increased grants based on each State's allotment percentage for all projects approved before January 1, 1949;

3. Reduce the required State appropriation for administrative purposes from 2 percent to 1 percent of construction costs involved annually in the program; and

Whereas Senate bill 614, with amendments proposed by our two Florida Senators, has been approved by the board of trustees of the Florida Hospital Association, the board of governors of the Florida Medical Association, and the hospital division of the Florida State Improvement Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned and memorialized to enact into law the provisions of Senate bill 614, with amendments proposed by our two Florida Senators; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be commended for their efforts in the interest of our Florida hospital-construction program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded as soon as adopted to each of our United States Senators and to each Member of the National House of Representatives from the State of Florida in order that each might know that the members of this legislature are cognizant of the good work of our congressional delegation in the interest of Florida hospitals and that our congressional delegation may be reassured in their further efforts by the knowledge that the membership of this legislature considers the adoption of the provisions of Senate bill 614, with amendments proposed by our United States Senators, necessary to the continued fair and harmonious development of our Florida hospital-construction program.

Approved by the governor April 18, 1949.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 878. A bill to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948; with amendments (Rept. No. 316); and

S. 1459. A bill to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 315).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; without amendment (Rept. No. 314).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 259. A bill to discontinue divisions of the court in the district of Kansas; without amendment (Rept. No. 318);

S. 275. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Jones; with an amendment (Rept. No. 320);

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff; with an amendment (Rept. No. 321);

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Theodore Papachristopoulos; with an amendment (Rept. No. 322);

H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of John C. Nunes; without amendment (Rept. No. 319); and

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States, with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 323); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 317) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 34) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-9606359, Andresen, Ole Arnt, or Ole Art Andesen.

A-6296097, Arey, Eugenia (nee Eugenia Szynarewski or Szynarewska).

A-4227948, Banse, William Otto (alias Willi Otto Banse or Willy Banse).

A-1019559, Borst, Isabelle Helen.

A-3139019, Bravo, John.

A-1705789, Cameron, Marion Elizabeth (nee Sutherland).

A-4832240, Chabrian, Jacob or Jakov, or Jack Chabrian.

A-1798152, Damson, William Joseph.

A-2372212, De Garza, Inez Gutierrez.

A-6296064, Delfino, Adriano Garcia.

A-6766826, De Soto, Jessie Lopez, or Jesus Lopez de Soto.

A-5385346, De Torres, Josefina Cazares.

A-2442178, Dickson, Jacob Wlue.

A-2445513, Fendez, Peter Angel, or Pedro Jose Mercedes Fernandez.

A-5530855, Fonda, John George, or Giovanni Fonda.

A-6072721, Garcia, Antonio Saad.

A-4747745, Ginsberg, Henry, or Chaim Ginsberg.

A-6199198, Goetz, Abelina Felicitas.

A-5754758, Gordon, Kate Mary, or Mary Kate Pieschuk.

A-4022531, Gutierrez-Garza Urbano.

A-2372213, Garza, Gutierrez, Ismael.

A-6251138, Harken, Johannes Theodoor.

A-3491071, Henn, Georg Rudolf.

A-5980869, Hine, Margaret Regina (nee Moffitt alias Mrs. Ivan M. Hine alias Ina Black alias Mrs. William John Black alias Lizzie Walker).

A-4669655, Kern, George Warden (alias George Washington Kern).

A-7687721, Mar, Beatrice Castro.

A-2506746, Mar, Francis.

A-2525130, Mejia, Lopez Fidel, or Fidel Mejia-Lopez.

A-6009711, Munroe, John Charles.

A-5056185, Paveglio, Pietro, or Peter Paveglio.

A-3874152, Ranier, Romeo, or Romeo Zagievich.

A-2934175, Schwartz, Bessie.

A-1602923, Smith, Harold Hilgrove, or Harold Smith or Harold H. Smith.

A-5210469, Uong, Li Lai (nee Chu).

A-4635148, Vallee, Arthur Joseph, or Arthur Valley (alias Arthur Joseph Valley alias Albert J. Valley alias Phillip Trottier alias Henry Trottier).

A-5961272, Wriedt, Adolf Wilhelm.

A-6508363, Xantheas, George Panagiotis.

A-6074143, Orozco-Ybarra, Jose.

PRINTING OF FIFTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 53, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], on February 3, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 313) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the fifth semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission and that 500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may say that the total cost will be $720.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND OTHER PURPOSES"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 70, submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], on February 10, 1949, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the Senate document room 1,000 additional copies of House Document No. 643, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Comprehensive Report on Central and Southern Florida for Flood Control and Other Purposes."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may say that the total cost will be $318.56.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

MORATORIUM WITH RESPECT TO APPLICATION OF CERTAIN ANTITRUST LAWS—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 305)

Mr. LANGER, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted minority views on the bill (S. 1008) to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith, delivered-price systems and freight-absorption practices, which were ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of Lynn R. Edminster, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1955, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Philip J. Finnegan, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice William M. Sparks, retired;

Joseph Earl Cooper, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska, vice Raymond E. Plummer;

Dennis E. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire;

Scott M. Matheson, of Utah, to be United States attorney for the District of Utah, vice Dan B. Shields, retired;

Vernon P. Burns, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama, vice Roulhac Gewin, deceased;

Paul C. Herring, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska, vice James H. Patterson; and

John J. Wein, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1747. A bill to require the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Northern Division, to sit during a part of its term at Flint, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1748. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lasagna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1749. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to combat the citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale; and

S. 1750. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize loans through national farm loan associations in Puerto Rico; to modify the limitations on Federal land bank loans to any one borrower; to repeal provisions for subscriptions to paid-in surplus of Federal land banks and cover the entire amount appropriated therefor into the surplus fund of the Treasury; to effect certain economies in reporting and recording payments on mortgages deposited with the registrars as bond collateral, and canceling the mortgage and satisfying and discharging the lien of record; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also introduced Senate bill 1751, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1752. A bill to make it an offense against the United States to use the flag of the United States for advertising purposes, or to mutilate, defile, or cast contempt upon the flag of the United States; and

S. 1753. A bill for the relief of Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1754. A bill to provide for further contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1755. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanatory statement of the bill, which was prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1751) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

ADDITIONAL COMMODITIES

The proposed bill (sec. 1 (a)), by amendment of the definition of "commodity," extends the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act to futures trading in 11 commodities not now covered by the act. These are: Wool, hides, rubber, cocoa beans, coffee, sugar, apples, onions, pepper, cheese, and eggs (frozen, dried, or otherwise processed). Sections 1 (a) and 11 of the proposed bill further extend the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act to any other agricultural or forest product or byproduct that the Secretary of Agriculture, after hearing, shall find is the subject of futures trading on a commodity exchange under conditions requiring regulation.

MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

Margin requirements on commodity futures transactions, as distinguished from securities transactions, are not subject to regulation by any governmental agency. While it is customary for commodity exchanges to establish minimum margins, such requirements are regarded by the exchanges as a means of protecting member firms against loss and not as a curb on excessive speculation.

For the purpose of diminishing, eliminating, or preventing excessive speculation on the commodity exchanges, the Secretary of Agriculture would be empowered by section 7 of the proposed bill to fix minimum margin requirements on speculative transactions in commodity futures. The Secretary would be authorized to fix both minimum initial margins and maintenance margins. Margin requirements on hedging transactions would be exempt from governmental regulation.

COMMODITY TRADING ADVISERS AND POOL OPERATORS

The Investment Advisers Act and the Investment Company Act, respectively, require the registration and provide for the regulation of investment counselors offering advisory services concerning the purchase or sale of securities and investment companies engaged in the business of investing or trading in securities. There is no comparable regulation, however, of commodity trading advisers and commodity pool operators, whose activities substantially affect commodity futures transactions on the commodity exchanges.

Section 7 of the proposed bill would remedy the lack of governmental regulation in this field by adding sections 4k–4n to the Commodity Exchange Act, requiring the annual registration of commodity trading advisory services and commodity pool operators and providing for regulation of their activities by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the proposed provisions the Secretary of Agriculture would be empowered to deny registration to or suspend or revoke registration of commodity trading advisers and commodity pool operators if they have been convicted or enjoined because of misconduct in commodity or security transactions or have made willfully false statements in their applications or reports filed under the act. The proposed provisions would also make it unlawful for such advisers and operators to engage in practices constituting fraud or deceit.

MULTIPLE DELIVERY POINTS

Section 8 of the proposed bill adds to section 5a of the Commodity Exchange Act the requirement that contract markets permit the delivery of commodities on futures contracts at such delivery points as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate. Provision for delivery at more than one delivery point, known as the multiple-delivery-point system, has been in effect for years on many contract markets and tends to diminish market congestion and erratic price movements during delivery periods. Deliveries on futures contracts at points other than contract-market centers also tends to prevent uneconomic movement of commodities by making unnecessary their diversion from normal channels of distribution.

DEFINITIONS: "MANIPULATION," "HEDGING"

Section 1 (b) of the proposed bill adds to section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act definitions of the terms "commodity trading adviser," "commodity pool operator," and "manipulate." It also amends the statutory definition of "hedging." The amended definition remedies a deficiency in the present definition (in section 4a (3) of the act), whereby futures transactions in a product of a commodity are precluded from qualifying as a hedge of the price risk inherent in the ownership of or commitments for the purchase or sale of the source commodity. The amended definition also closes a loophole in the present definition, which permits the extension of the hedging classification to futures transactions in connection with the apparent price risks which actually are nonexistent.

PURCHASES OF FUTURES BY PROCESSORS AND MANUFACTURERS

Section 3 of the proposed bill amends section 4a (3) of the act to reflect the proposed insertion in section 2 (a) of the act of the revised definition of hedging. It also adds to section 4a (3) a provision whereby processors and manufacturers who customarily accumulate inventories of agricultural commodities in advance of firm sales commitments will be enabled, under terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, to purchase commodity futures, without regard to limits on speculative positions, preliminary to their purchase of cash commodities for processing.

COMPETITIVE EXECUTION OF ORDERS

Section 5 of the proposed bill amends a provision of section 4b of the Commodity Exchange Act, expressly relating to the execution of buying and selling orders for cotton, directly between principals. The proposed amendment requires that orders for the purchase or sale of any commodity for future delivery be executed on contract markets by bidding and offering openly and competitively. Appropriate provision is made, however, for specified types of transactions and for execution by contract-market members of buying and selling orders directly between principals, in conformity with regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture and in accordance with rules of contract markets.

REGISTRANTS

Section 6 of the proposed bill extends the applicability of section 4g of the act (relating to suspension or revocation of registrations) to commodity trading advisers and commodity pool operators and also provides that registrants may, for violation of the act or regulations be suspended or expelled by the Secretary of Agriculture from membership in contract markets.

Section 11 amends section 8a of the act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to: (1) deny registration as futures commission merchant to applicants found unable to meet reasonable standards of financial solvency, and (2) establishes suspension or expulsion from contract-market membership by the Secretary of Agriculture as an additional cause for denial of registration under the act.

Section 11 also clarifies the intent and broadens the scope of section 8a (3) so as to authorize the suspension or revocation of futures commission-merchant registration of registrants who accept orders for the purchase or sale of or carry positions in commodities for persons denied trading privileges on contract markets.

VIOLATION OF DENIAL OF TRADING ORDERS; FALSE STATEMENTS

Section 12 of the proposed bill adds a new section 8 (b) to the act, making it unlawful willfully to make any untrue statement or omission of a material fact in registration applications or reports filed under the act, or for any person to trade on a contract market in violation of an order of the Secretary of Agriculture denying trading privileges thereon.

ADMINISTRATIVE, PROCEDURAL, AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS

Section 9 of the proposed bill amends section 6 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act to conform with analogous provisions of other regulatory statutes in requiring that disciplinary orders issued under the act be supported by "substantial evidence" rather than by "the weight of the evidence." A similar revision is also made in section 6 (b) of the act by section 10.

Section 10 of the proposed bill reenacts in amended form section 6 (b) of the act. It deletes therefrom specific reference to manipulation and attempted manipulation of commodity prices. These are included in the offenses made unlawful by section 9 of the act, and specific reference in section 6 (b) to these particular types of violations is, therefore, unnecessary and confusing. Section 6 (b) is further amended to facilitate enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act by providing for the denial of trading privileges on contract markets and the suspension of expulsion of contract market members, by order of the Secretary of Agriculture, in respect of persons found, after notice and hearing, to have violated the provisions of the act or the regulations thereunder. Section 10 of the proposed bill also amends section 6 (b) of the act by incorporating therein the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to the attendance, testimony, and immunity of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, in connection with investigations as well as administrative proceedings under the act.

Sections 2 and 4 of the proposed bill, respectively, clarify the present language of section 4a (2) (B) of the act relating to limits on speculative positions and adopt a long-established administrative interpretation governing the computation of transactions and commitments of traders under common control.

Section 13 of the proposed bill inserts in the penal section (sec. 9) of the Commodity Exchange Act citations of the proposed new sections of the act (secs. 4j, 4l, 4m, 4n, and 8b), the violation of which is made unlawful.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 246, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REGULATION OF OLEOMARGARINE—AMENDMENT

Mr. FREAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COUNSEL FOR IMPOVERISHED DEFENDANTS IN CERTAIN CRIMINAL CASES—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 734) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRODUCTION OF SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6) to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

INAUGURATION ADDRESS OF THE VERY REVEREND HUNTER GUTHRIE, S. J., PRESIDENT OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inauguration address delivered by the Very Reverend Hunter Guthrie, S. J., thirty-fifth president of Georgetown University, on May 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. ROLAND J. STEINLE AT DEDICATION OF MONUMENT TO FATHER STEPHEN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Roland J. Steinle, judge of the circuit court of Milwaukee County, at the dedication of the monument to Father Stephen, at St. Benedict the Moor Mission, Milwaukee, Wis., on April 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIG MUDDY—ARTICLE FROM FARM POLICY FORUM

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Big Muddy," condensed from the Big Missouri, published in the April issue of the Farm Policy Forum, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND SENATOR TAFT—ARTICLE BY M. M. OPPEGARD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the caption "It seems to me," written by M. M. Oppegard and published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of April 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MIDDLE BORDER PIONEER DAY—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF SOUTH DAKOTA

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation by the Governor of South Dakota designating the second Monday of May to be Middle Border Pioneer Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREEK PEOPLE'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM—LETTER FROM SOTERIOS NICHOLSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the fight of the Greek people for freedom, addressed by Soterios Nicholson to the Washington Evening Star on April 18, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPENDING BUDGET

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun of yesterday carried the fourteenth and last of a series of articles detailing how President Truman's social-welfare programs, as submitted to Congress, would cost one trillion two hundred fifty billion dollars over a period of 50 years. This is said to be a conservative estimate based upon official testimony. The last article says the outer rim of estimates by officials puts the cost at upward of one trillion six hundred billion dollars.

I now ask unanimous consent for insertion of the last article of the informative series in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY: A SUMMARY—THE GIVE AND TAKE—HOW MUCH OF EACH

(This is the fourteenth and last of a series of articles on what the American public would pay, and what it would get, if Congress approves President Truman's social-welfare proposals. The series is not intended to deal with the merits of the proposals, but simply with the costs and monetary benefits. Figures used are compilations of official Government estimates.)

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Thirteen separate articles have set forth in detail the proposed benefits and prospective costs of President Truman's relief and social-welfare programs now before Congress.

To summarize, these major facts have been established:

1. The old-age and survivor insurance program, now 13 years old, would be hugely expanded.

To the 35,000,000 or 40,000,000 workers now insured would be added some 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 additional workers heretofore uninsured.

New workers to be blanketed into the system would include farmers and other self-employed persons such as doctors, lawyers, dentists, architects, etc.

Coverage would be extended to farm laborers, domestic servants, employees of nonprofit institutions, members of the armed services and State and local government employees under voluntary agreements.

2. Benefit payments now being made to retired workers or survivors of insured workers at a rate of about $700,000,000 a year in 1950 would rise at once to about $2,500,000,000 a year.

For old-age and survivor insurance alone this would be the beginning of a climb which in a decade would carry total annual payments to somewhere between $4,500,000,000 and $7,000,000,000.

In 50 years the total annual benefit payments would rise to between $13,000,000,000 and $20,000,000,000.

BENEFITS LIBERALIZED

3. Individual scales of benefits under the administration bill, now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, would be greatly liberalized.

Minimum benefits would be raised from $10 a month to $25.

Maximum family benefits would be raised from $85 to $150.

Monthly checks for retired workers would be increased up to 115 percent.

For surviving widows with children monthly benefits would be raised 63 to 91 percent.

4. It would be made much easier for an insured worker to qualify for benefits. The period of time in which a man or woman has to work in order to be eligible to retire would be cut in half.

The retirement age for women would be lowered from 65 to 60 years.

A more liberal formula for calculating benefits would be enacted and average monthly wages, on which retirement benefits are based, would be figured from the best 5 years of a worker's life instead of the entire working lifetime.

PAY-ROLL TAXES DOUBLED

5. Pay-roll taxes for workers who are now covered would double by next January 1.

The automatic jump of the pay-roll tax from 1 percent to 1½ percent, which would occur under existing law on January 1, would be moved up to July 1 under the President's bill.

Moreover, it would be applied to the first $4,800 of a worker's wages instead of the first $3,000.

Thus, a man now paying the maximum of $30 a year, on July 1 would pay $72 a year if his earnings were equal to $4,800. Employers would contribute the same sum.

But on January 1, next, the rate would rise to 2 percent for each—making a maximum of $96 for a worker, and a similar sum for his employer.

Social welfare program costs

Programs	1950	And in 50 years—	
		Low estimate	High estimate
Old-age and survivors insurance, railroad and civil-service retirement	$3,050,000,000	$14,500,000,000	$22,100,000,000
Temporary disability	500,000,000	1,660,000,000	1,870,000,000
Public assistance	1,050,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000
Compulsory health insurance, and general welfare	615,000,000	10,500,000,000	11,500,000,000
Unemployment compensation	1,500,000,000	2,000,000,000	4,000,000,000

Cost in 1950	$6,725,000,000
Cost 50 years from now (low estimate)	29,160,000,000
Cost 50 years from now (high estimate)	39,970,000,000
Accumulative cost in 50 years (low estimate)	1,250,000,000,000
Accumulative cost in 50 years (high estimate)	[1] 1,600,000,000,000

[1] One trillion six hundred billion dollars.

In addition to this visible cost of 2 percent on his pay check an individual would pay, there are hidden taxes that may raise these visible costs as much as 423 percent.

These hidden taxes include the employers' taxes and expenses which are passed on to the consumer.

6. Disability insurance. The social-security program would be expanded to provide protection against disability as well as old age and death.

Two forms of disability insurance would be provided under the administration program:

For temporary disabilities, lasting for more than 1 week but not more than 26 weeks, weekly benefits amounting to about 50 percent of a worker's wages up to a maximum of $30 for a single man, and $45 for a married man.

For permanent, or extended disabilities, lasting for more than 26 weeks, monthly cash benefits equivalent to old-age retirement pay for any worker regardless of age who cannot engage in any substantially gainful work.

DISABILITY-PLAN EXPENSES

7. The cost of the permanent-disability program has been estimated at $430,000,000 to $1,150,000,000 a year by 1960.

Temporary disabilities on the other hand, would run much higher—probably $1,000,000,000 a year from the start, or about 1 percent of taxable pay rolls.

8. Relief for needy persons now provided in a joint Federal-State program would be expanded under a special public-welfare bill also pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

The President has asked that in addition to making Federal grants to States to aid the needy aged, the needy blind, and dependent children, the Government also gives aid to all needy persons.

The Federal cost of this program for fiscal 1950 has been estimated in the President's budget at $1,064,000,000.

9. Medical expansion and compulsory health insurance. An omnibus bill, calling for establishment of a Nation-wide system of prepaid medical insurance, and for Federal grants to educate doctors, dentists, and nurses, build hospitals, and expand public health services has just been introduced in Congress.

Its stated purpose is to provide medical and hospital service for 85 percent of the population.

The compulsory health program would be financed by a 3- or 4-percent pay-roll tax shared equally by workers and employers.

BASED ON FIRST $4,800

It would be based on the first $4,800 of earnings as in the case of old-age and survivors insurance proposals.

The administration says that doctors would be free to join or remain out of the insurance program, and that patients would remain free to choose, and change their own doctors.

Doctors' fees would be based on schedules agreed upon in each local community among the doctors in agreement with the health organization.

10. The total cost of the medical and hospital insurance program alone would run about $6,000,000,000 a year from the start, with the General Treasury contributing about $1,500,000,000.

The medical education, grants for hospital construction, and other features of the health program would cost probably $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 the first year and rise in a few years to about $3,000,000,000 a year.

Ultimately, the entire health program would cost between $10,000,000,000 and $13,000,000,000 a year.

11. Plans to federalize the unemployment-insurance system now operated at the State level have been held in abeyance because of the pressure of work in Congress.

12. Total costs of the entire series of Government social-welfare programs including old-age and survivor insurance, railroad retirement, civil-service retirement, aid to the needy and public health will run around $6,500,000,000 for 1950.

WOULD RUN $16,000,000,000

By 1960 the combined social security, health and welfare outlays will run $16,000,000,000 and $22,000,000,000 a year.

In 50 years they will be from $29,000,000,000 to $39,000,000,000 a year.

And the aggregate outlays for 50 years of the social-welfare plan would amount to $1,250,000,000,000—one trillion two hundred and fifty billion dollars.

That is only the low-cost estimate.

If the high-cost estimates made by Government experts should prevail through 50 years of the proposed social-welfare program, the cumulative cost would be $1,600,000,000,000.

That is—one trillion six hundred billion dollars.

Estimate of total cost of social security, health, and welfare for 50 years, 1950–2000, on basis of administration proposals (assuming high-level employment throughout period)

	Old-age and survivors insurance [1]	Railroad retirement [2]	Civil-service benefits and retirement [3]	Health insurance [4]	Public assistance [5]	General health and welfare [6]	Temporary disability [7]	Unemployment insurance [8]	Total annual cost
1950—									
Low	$2,300,000,000	$500,000,000	$250,000,000	$15,000,000	$1,060,000,000	$600,000,000	$500,000,000	$1,500,000,000	$6,725,000,000
High	2,300,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000	15,000,000	1,060,000,000	600,000,000	500,000,000	2,000,000,000	7,225,000,000
1960—									
Low	4,700,000,000	750,000,000	300,000,000	3,600,000,000	900,000,000	2,300,000,000	1,450,000,000	2,000,000,000	16,000,000,000
High	7,100,000,000	950,000,000	300,000,000	6,000,000,000	900,000,000	2,300,000,000	1,460,000,000	4,000,000,000	22,000,000,000
1970—									
Low	7,600,000,000	800,000,000	350,000,000	6,000,000,000	800,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,560,000,000	2,000,000,000	20,600,000,000
High	10,900,000,000	950,000,000	350,000,000	6,500,000,000	800,000,000	2,500,000,000	1,570,000,000	4,000,000,000	27,500,000,000
1980—									
Low	10,100,000,000	800,000,000	400,000,000	6,500,000,000	700,000,000	2,000,000,000	1,620,000,000	2,000,000,000	23,110,000,000
High	14,700,000,000	950,000,000	400,000,000	7,000,000,000	700,000,000	3,000,000,000	1,650,000,000	4,000,000,000	32,400,000,000
1990—									
Low	12,150,000,000	900,000,000	450,000,000	7,000,000,000	600,000,000	2,500,000,000	1,660,000,000	2,000,000,000	27,260,000,000
High	18,200,000,000	1,000,000,000	450,000,000	7,500,000,000	600,000,000	3,500,000,000	1,750,000,000	4,000,000,000	37,000,000,000
2000—									
Low	13,100,000,000	900,000,000	500,000,000	7,500,000,000	500,000,000	3,000,000,000	1,660,000,000	2,000,000,000	29,200,000,000
High	20,600,000,000	1,000,000,000	500,000,000	8,000,000,000	500,000,000	3,500,000,000	1,870,000,000	4,000,000,000	39,900,000,000

[1] Includes extended, or permanent disability.

Estimates of old-age and survivor insurance costs were prepared by Robert J. Meyers and E. A. Rasor, actuaries for the Federal Security Agency.

They were submitted Mar. 24 to the House Ways and Means Committee by Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Commissioner, under the title "Actuarial Study No. 28."

As such, they are the official forecasts of the possible high and low costs of old-age and survivors insurance under proposals of the administration bill, H. R. 2893, now pending before the House of Representatives.

Both the highs and lows assume a constant high level of employment.

[2] Railroad retirement figures are estimates based on the system's report of rate of benefit payments in January 1949.

In that month retirement benefits for railroad workers were $285,000,000; railroad unemployment, $50,000,000; and sickness benefits, $30,000,000.

Retirements in this system, as in old-age and survivors insurance, are expected to accelerate in the next 10 years and probably reach a peak soon after 1960.

[3] Estimates in this column are based on figures supplied by Civil Service Commission. Government employee retirement benefits, death claims, and refunds to employees leaving the service last year amounted to $241,000,000.

Estimates for future years assume no larger Federal pay roll than the present, but an accelerated rate of retirements.

Public Law 426, 80th Cong., liberalized retirement benefits for Government workers, who now contribute 6 percent to the fund.

The independent offices appropriation bill now before Congress carries $295,553,700 of Government appropriations to the civil-service fund, this being an increase of $71,553,700 over a year ago.

[4] Health insurance includes the estimated costs of what the President refers to as prepaid medical insurance—that is, the costs of doctors, hospitals, nurses, medicines—which the Government would administer similar to the system of health insurance now in effect in Great Britain.

An official administration health bill has just been introduced in Congress by the administration.

[5] The 1950 figure is the estimate set forth in President Truman's January budget.

The public assistance bill is still before the House Ways and Means committee. President Truman's proposal that assistance be extended to "all needy persons" has not yet been approved by the committee.

The declining trend of grants to States for public assistance in future years is based on the assumption that Congress will broaden old-age and survivor insurance and thus, as Mr. Altmeyer has forecast, will progressively lessen the need for public welfare.

These figures include aid to the needy aged, needy blind, and dependent children.

[6] These costs represent general health, welfare, and security costs, paid from the General Treasury.

They do not include the health-insurance program of the President which appears in a separate column above.

These general costs include grants to States for hospital construction and maintenance and are based on a forecast made by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, in a special report to the President last September.

[7] If benefits can be started Jan. 1, as the administration hopes, the first year of tooling up would not cost more than $500,000,000, according to official estimates.

Temporary disability costs, according to Mr. Altmeyer, would be 1 percent of taxable pay rolls under the administration proposals.

Under the expanded coverage proposed by the President, the taxable pay roll would be about $100,000,000,000 at present employment levels and disability benefits about $1,000,000,000 a year.

Figures for future years are 1 percent of the estimated high and low pay-roll forecasts made by the FSA actuaries and submitted to the Ways and Means Committee Mar. 24.

[8] These unemployment figures are merely minimum guesses based on the fact that at the present high level of employment outlays for unemployment benefits are running in excess of a billion dollars a year.

The Federal Security Administration says that "no man on earth can foretell" the possible costs of unemployment in future years because there is no way to forecast the economic cycles.

Officials agree that in event of a business depression of any magnitude the figures above would be "gross underestimates."

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate on Thursday last recommitted, with instructions to the Committee on Appropriations, the bill H. R. 3333, being appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. I may add that I regret I was forced to be absent at the time the vote was taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], by way of a substitute for section 4 of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of Senate bill 246, providing for Federal aid to primary- and secondary-school education through the State governments, and in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which proposes a different formula of distribution among the States than that now contained in the bill.

I think there can be no question about the need for providing some Federal aid for education in many of the States where the income of the people is so low that they are unable to provide a minimum decent education for all the children in those States. I think the result has shown that children in many of the States have not been educated, and that there is a wide illiteracy still existing in the United States.

Under the selective-service law, about 12 percent of the young men who applied were rejected because of educational deficiencies. That condition has not changed today. When I was in Germany I talked with General Huebner, the general commanding the American armies in Germany. General Huebner told me that many of the men who came to him, either under the draft or under the volunteer system, were unable to read and write, to such an extent that he had established in Germany a school to teach those boys how to read and write. I have before me a copy of his letter, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. This letter was written in reply to a letter which I wrote him asking for information in detail regarding facts which he had told me in conversation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: In reply to your letter of January 24, 1949, we do have an excessive number of illiterates among our troops. Our latest reports, those for January 1949, list a total of 3,838 illiterates, 1,607 of which are undergoing instruction.

A recent survey of illiterates, showing number by State and Territory, is enclosed. This is a partial survey of those attending school. We do not have data on the remainder. I hope the list will be of some value to you.

Graduation from the fifth grade is our standard for literacy. All men who have an Army general classification test score of 69 or less are required to take a placement test. Those who fail must go to our literacy schools. In those schools we give periodic tests and as soon as a man passes he goes back to duty. Those who show that they cannot pass the test with a reasonable amount of training are sent back to their

units and steps are taken to eliminate them from the service.

We have no data on reasons why so many men are illiterate. Our education people list many causes. Despite our excellent school systems in many States and the compulsory attendance requirements, the war years saw many withdrawals from school prior to finishing the fifth grade. Many of the soldiers we get now were only 9 or 10 years old in 1939. The abnormal breaking up of our family life by war demands both for soldiers and for factory workers resulted in failure to supervise youngsters in some cases.

Other causes for failure to obtain schooling are poverty, family trouble between father and mother, and, in some cases lack of opportunity as in some backwoods or mountain country.

I regret that I cannot furnish complete data on causes but we have been more concerned with qualifying the men after they get to us rather than with correcting the deficiency before we get them. In the latter case we have no power to act other than bringing it to the attention of the proper authorities.

The Army-Air Force Troop Information and Education Division, Department of the Army, Washington 25, D. C., may have studies on this subject. I am quite sure that Dr. Barrow, who is the education liaison officer between that division and the National Education Administration, can give you much valuable information.

Sincerely,

C. R. HUEBNER,
Lieutenant General, United States Army, Deputy Commander in Chief.

Partial survey of illiterates by States

State	White	Negro
Alabama	30	26
Arizona	4	
Arkansas	29	23
California	21	3
Colorado	9	
Connecticut	2	1
Delaware	2	
District of Columbia	1	1
Florida	25	11
Georgia	50	33
Hawaii	1	1
Illinois	18	21
Indiana	10	2
Iowa		1
Kansas	1	2
Kentucky	45	6
Louisiana	45	36
Maine	1	
Maryland	4	21
Massachusetts	13	
Michigan	12	7
Minnesota	13	
Mississippi	18	29
Missouri	12	5
Montana	1	
Nebraska	2	2
Nevada	1	1
New Hampshire	3	
New Jersey	4	6
New Mexico	3	1
New York	15	10
North Carolina	30	21
North Dakota	4	
Ohio	12	6
Oklahoma	22	8
Oregon	1	
Pennsylvania	32	13
Puerto Rico	1	
Rhode Island	1	
South Carolina	20	33
South Dakota	2	
Tennessee	29	14
Texas	60	48
Virginia	16	9
Washington	2	
West Virginia	17	6
Wisconsin	2	
Total	646	407

Mr. TAFT. General Huebner says:

Our latest reports, those for January 1949, list a total of 3,888 illiterates, 1,607 of whom are undergoing instruction today.

He gives a list by States, showing where these illiterates come from. They come from most of the States of the Union, but the great majority of them come from the States which would receive the highest amount of aid under this bill. So there is no question that we have illiteracy. I believe that so long as we have boys and girls under our system who do not learn to read and write, we have a national interest in looking into that situation and seeing why it is that they have not learned to read and write. Is it their own fault? Is it the fault of the States, or is it a condition which the States themselves cannot remedy without Federal aid?

Today the States are spending about $3,000,000,000 on primary and secondary education. We provide in this bill about $260,000,000, under the formula as it would operate at the present time.

The $3,000,000,000 is not all the States spend on education. That does not include the various State aids to colleges, or a great deal of incidental aid to education which is not covered in primary and secondary schools. As a matter of fact, the States are spending altogether perhaps about a third of their income on education. It is one of the primary State concerns, and I am inclined to think that most of the States are able to look after their educational requirements. Most of the State tax systems have been built up to take care of education. They have undertaken the job for the past 100 years, and in general they have done a good job.

In my experience in the State legislature, additional income for education usually had priority over most of the other demands of the State government. It was supported by the people. As a general thing, the States have done a good job, and have had more adequate revenues for education than for other activities.

I believe that on the whole the States can do the job of providing teachers and providing additional buildings. They have always done it in the past—not as adequately as they should, but they have done it. Conditions are not fundamentally different today. The States have had a very difficult temporary job. Because of the rapid increase in wages, their tax incomes have not kept up with their expenses, with the higher salaries they have had to pay, and with the greater cost of buildings. During the war they fell behind in buildings because they could not use their money for that purpose. However, today, as the States gradually build up their tax income relative to their total income, I see no reason why the States cannot do the fundamental job of education as they have undertaken to do it in the past.

Education is not exactly like either health or housing. Those are new demands which came in on top of a heavily burdened tax situation. Education is the concern of every State in its tax laws, and is assumed by the States as probably their most important single function. I believe that in the Legislature of Ohio we spent more time on schools than on everything else put together. Schools and roads were our main interest, but it seemed to me that schools had the greater emotional influence, and people were more willing to assume their responsibility in connection with schools.

In 1944, when a bill of this kind first came up, I opposed Federal aid on the ground that the States themselves were able to look after education. Basically I think that is still true. There is an objection on the ground of possible Federal control, and there are other objections. There is the appeal that we have a heavily overburdened budget. At that time I opposed Federal aid to education on the theory that the States could do the job. However, in the development of that job, and in the study of the figures which were evolved, we found that some of the States were entirely different from other States. Some of the States had an income so low that they were not able to do their educational job, no matter how much they might desire to do it.

I have had placed on the desks of Senators a small table. I am sorry that I did not have time to list all the States on the table. I calculated the figures for some of the typical States, and for some of the States which were discussed here on Friday. They include Alabama, Arkansas, North Carolina, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, Texas, Missouri, and California.

It will be seen that today the State of Mississippi is spending $54 per child, as compared to $230 per child in the State of New York. In the State of Ohio we are spending $151 per child, as compared to $70 in the State of Alabama.

It may be said that the people in the States spending the larger amounts for education per child are more willing to educate their children than are the people in the States spending smaller amounts for education; but in the second column of the table is shown the percentage of their income which those States are spending for education. It will be seen that the national average for money spent on schools is 1.88 percent of the total income of all the people of the United States. In Alabama almost exactly the national average is being spent for education, and yet Alabama is able to spend only $70 per child, which is less than half the national average.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say in that connection that I have more recent figures; Alabama's expenditures for education have been increased since the figures the Senator from Ohio has presented were compiled.

Mr. TAFT. I realize that the figures I have presented have to be assumed as being more or less arbitrary. I do not think the relative position of the States will be very different, however, even if we take figures for different years. Of course, there has been a rapidly changing situation, in that every year all the States have been increasing the percentage of their incomes they spend for education and increasing the salaries of their teachers and generally improving their educational situation, and also there has been a rapidly changing basis of total national income. But, relatively speaking, I think it can be said that the figures I have presented are generally accurate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think what the Senator from Ohio has stated is true, namely, that the figures he has presented will show the relative situation in regard to the various States. However, as a Senator from Alabama, I felt that I should say that in Alabama we are making an even greater effort to provide education for our children than we were as of the time for which the figures the Senator from Ohio has presented were prepared. It is true that today we are making an even greater effort.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that.

Mr. President, from the table it will be seen that the State of Mississippi, which spends the least amount for education per child, is actually spending 2.05 percent of its income, or more than the national average, as compared to other States.

The third column of the table shows the amount that will be added by this bill to the amount which each State now spends for education per child, and the total that will be available to these States after the bill goes into effect. In that connection, Mr. President, it will be found that even after this bill goes into effect, the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and North Carolina, which will receive substantial aid under the bill, will still be spending a very considerably smaller amount than will the other States that are listed in this table.

I think those facts picture the condition we have to face. A State such as Mississippi, spending $54 per child and making more than the national effort, in terms of income, in order to do that, is unable to provide a minimum decent education for the children of that State. The purpose of this bill is to say to the States, "If you are in a situation where you cannot provide what is regarded as the minimum education, we shall provide sufficient Federal aid so that you can provide at least $55 per child for every school in your State"—which includes the lowest graded school in the State, and of course there is wide variation between urban and rural districts in every State. Under this bill we would say to the States, "You must provide a minimum of $55 per child, and then you will have available half of your income to make that amount larger than $55 per child, because we are taking into account only the first half of the 2 percent of your income, or 1 percent. If 1 percent of your total income payments, or roughly speaking, about half of what you are spending on education, is not enough to permit you to provide $55 per child, we shall make up the difference, so that half of your income—the 1 percent—plus the Federal aid will give you $55 per child, and then you will have the other half of your income to increase that amount in such manner as you customarily would do."

Mr. President, unless we were to allow some such leeway, we would be in the position of saying to the State of Louisiana, for instance, "You must have a $55 minimum," and then Louisiana would have to cut down on the amount now being spent for education in the city of New Orleans and in various other urban districts, in order to increase the amount of money available to the rural schools of the State—which today provide practically no education at all, in the States which spend much less than the minimum of $55 per child.

As I recall, the smallest amount paid for education in any district in the country is approximately $8 per child, and there are many districts spending much less than $55 per child. Fifty-five dollars per child is a low minimum; it should be higher than that. However, in any event the schools cannot be reformed completely overnight. If we can bring the schools up to the basis of a minimum of $55 per child, I think we shall at least be able to see to it that every child receives a minimum education; and that is my interest in this matter. I think the national interest is that if we are going to have anything like equality of opportunity in the United States, we must see to it that every child is educated at least to the point of being able to know what his opportunities are, so that it will be possible for someone to say, "This is an intelligent boy who can go further."

So my interest in the bill has always been to see to it that a minimum educational opportunity is provided for every child. I think the figures and the facts show very clearly that there is such a necessity. I do not understand that there is much dispute of that matter.

I noticed that on Friday the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said that he readily agrees with those who contend that the national interest requires the existence of minimum educational opportunities for all American youth and that there is need for Federal financial assistance to secure such an opportunity. There is no opposition to the general basic proposal, as I see it, in connection with that desire. The Senator from Massachusetts merely thinks we have chosen an incorrect method of trying to meet the problem which has arisen.

I wish to say one thing about the basis of the bill, in providing complete State and local administration. The principal objection, which has always been made to bills on this subject, is that if the Federal Government once puts up any money for this purpose, it will control the education of the children. I agree that that is a danger. I agree that it is a serious threat to any country. Just as Hitler by getting control of education in Germany was able to turn the children into Nazis, so it is that if in the United States we had a Federal bureau directing all education in the United States, it would be affected by this theory or that theory, and that would affect the entire country at one time. The theories affecting such a Federal bureau might be either sound or unsound, or of one kind or another, or of one particular ideology or another; but there would be the attempt to impose a uniform system upon the entire United States. However, I think it is vitally important that each State determine the type of education of its own children. If we are going to put that principle into effect, I believe we must not interefere with the State's administration of its own affairs.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator would inform me whether there has been published a table showing the percentage of children, as compared to the total population of the States.

Mr. TAFT. Those figures have been published, but I do not believe I have them in the material I have prepared for this speech.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I recall, they were published last year.

The Senator from Ohio has spoken of the larger allotments for education to children in certain States. Does that situation arise because of the larger proportion of children in those States?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is one of the elements affecting that situation, and the other element is the amount of income in the State allotted for education per child. In other words, the basic question is how much income is allotted in a State for education per child. That question is affected, first, by the amount of the total income of the State and, second, by the total number of children.

Mr. MAYBANK. In States where there are more children proportionately, the income of the State has to be spread thinner, in terms of education.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct, but I do not have that table here. I shall be glad to supply it to the Senator, if he wishes to have it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator like to have that table presented at this time?

Mr. TAFT. I should be glad to have it placed in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield for that purpose, then I shall ask to have that done.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table of figures for school-age children per 100,000 of total population, as of 1946, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

School-age children per 1,000 total population, 1946

United States	207
District of Columbia	134
New Jersey	159
New York	170
California	171
Connecticut	174
Rhode Island	177
Nevada	181
Massachusetts	181
Illinois	183
Oregon	185
Maryland	188
Washington	189
Ohio	194
New Hampshire	194
Pennsylvania	194

School-age children per 1,000 total population, 1946—Continued

Delaware	196
Missouri	197
Kansas	198
Indiana	201
Florida	205
Minnesota	205
Iowa	205
Nebraska	208
Wisconsin	209
Michigan	216
Colorado	216
Vermont	218
Maine	218
Virginia	227
Wyoming	227
Texas	228
Oklahoma	238
Louisiana	240
Idaho	242
Montana	244
Tennessee	245
Arizona	249
Kentucky	255
South Dakota	256
Utah	256
Georgia	259
Arkansas	262
North Carolina	265
West Virginia	268
Alabama	270
North Dakota	274
Mississippi	281
South Carolina	282
New Mexico	295

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think the principle can be compromised. I feel very strongly that it ought to stand, not only with respect to the type of education that is given the children, but it ought also to stand with respect to the type of administration the State wants to have. It ought to stand with respect to the actual operation of the system. The Federal Government ought not to interfere in any way. That is why I have been opposed to an amendment which would attempt to force the Southern States, as a condition precedent, to put the colored students and the white students into one school. That is why I have been opposed to various provisions to the effect that a certain amount should go to teachers' salaries, or that a certain amount should go for school buildings. All such attempts on the part of the Federal Government to tell the States what to do with the money necessarily involve administration and control by the States; in other words, the self-government of the States.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. In other words, as I understand the Senator's argument, it is that for the Federal Government to dominate or to influence in any regard the education of the young people of the country would result in a very grave evil. On the other hand, the Senator points out that we have another evil, namely, about 4,000,000 children, I think the number is, that do not have any schooling at all. As I understand, the Senator's argument is that he feels something should be done for these 4,000,000 children.

Mr. TAFT. I would say 2,000,000, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us say 2,000,000. Let us say the 4,000,000 includes 2,000,000, who receive insufficient education, and 2,000,000 who receive none at all.

Mr. TAFT. The 4,000,000 includes children whose ages run from 5 to 17. That means that the number of those who go to kindergarten is not included. I do not think that is so important. Perhaps there may be some who have to drop out before the final year in high school. But I think about 2,000,000 children are not being educated.

Mr. McMAHON. In other words, we have an actually existing evil on one hand, with a possible evil on the other hand. I understand, then, it is the Senator's point of view that we must attack the existing evil, and at the same time be on guard against infringement by the Federal Government of the rights of the States and localities to control their own educational systems.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Under the bill the only thing the Federal Government does is to send an auditor, first, to see that the money is used for primary and secondary education; second, to see that every school in the State gets at least $55 per child to conduct that education. That is merely a matter of audit. It involves no discretion in the Federal Government in this field. At least, I think we can trust the States to have a sincere interest in providing the best education they can, and to spend the money properly for education. There may be some fields in which we may have to impose more definite standards than in education, but in this field I do not believe it is necessary. I think the audit control is all we need and all we ought to have. So I opposed, last year, and I would oppose again, various efforts to affect tax conditions, which might enter into the problem and interfere with the State's ability to decide what kind of education it wants. It is an easy thing for us to say, "No school can get this money unless American history is taught for 1 year." That is a fine thing. Senators would be more or less likely to vote for that. But, if we start with that, the tendency is to extend it to the point where, by conditioning grants of Federal money, it would be possible to control every feature of State and local administration. I think we should stand on the principle laid down in the pending bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I may ask the Senator how he would determine when the State has expended the amount of money it can afford to spend? In other words, how is it possible to determine whether the State is endeavoring to proceed to its full ability, or whether it is waiting for the Federal Government to come forward and assist it?

Mr. TAFT. Under the formula the bill provides we take the income of all the people of the State; the States are given 4 years to get their incomes up, if they are below the standard. Unless the State spends 2 percent of the total income of all its people on education—the present average is 1.88 percent—the State will not get any Federal aid at all; or, I think, under the pending bill the State would get $5 as a minimum. Within 2 years, if the State wants to get the full amount of Federal aid, it must apply to education 2.25 percent of the total income of the people of the State. Finally, if the State does not want to be docked in the matter of Federal aid, it must apply to education 2.5 percent of the total income of the people of the State. That is away above the national average. In other words, we are saying that we are willing to help, but the State not only has to do something equivalent to the average of the rest of the country, but it must do something better than what is done by the rest of the country if it is to receive the aid provided by the pending bill.

I may say that is based on the concept of the State's wealth being determined by the total income of its people. That was attacked yesterday by the Senator from Massachusetts. I intend to deal with it in the remainder of my remarks.

Mr. THYE. How would the Federal Government check upon the action of the State to determine whether there was an equal distribution of the Federal aid throughout the entire school system in the State? How would that be determined?

Mr. TAFT. We have not determined that beyond saying that every district must get $55 per child as a minimum. Of course it is impossible to provide for the same amount in every school. A rural school simply does not have the facilities or the teachers, it does not have the extensive program that many urban schools have. That is a problem which certainly is a matter of education, a program of education which is being conducted very vigorously by the rural population in each State. It is a matter of appeal to the legislatures of the States to secure perhaps a better distribution within the States. There are a good many ways in which the State systems can be improved. There is a constant effort to improve them. I think we can leave that to the States. I do not have so much concern about the exact type of education given in the State of Ohio, for instance. We are giving the children of Ohio an education that is a good education. Any child who wants to get good education can do so in any district in the State. Primarily I think that is the job of the people of the State, who must work out their own problems. They must approve their educational system. There may be 48 different kinds of education in the United States. Perhaps some think one is better, some think another is better. There is no standard in such a thing as that. It is not only a matter of money, it is a question of how the schools are conducted, what kind of teacher's education there is—all kinds of things that we cannot interfere with. So that, it seems to me, is a matter for the State. I am interested only in figures showing that the State, making all the effort we can expect it to make, is unable to do the job. Then I think the

Federal Government ought to come in and give the State the money so the job can be done. In the long run, if the States are able to do the job, I think they will do it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Would Federal aid to education be handled in any manner comparable to the Federal aid to State highway systems? We have an excellent record in that field. It has fulfilled every hope we had when we first conceived the idea of Federal aid to States for highway construction. In that field, there is a specific formula. In other words, the highway aid of the Federal Government determines what type of turnpike shall be built and what shall be done by the States. Would the educational program be in any manner comparable to that?

Mr. TAFT. No. Federal highway control is very much greater, for there is no other basis upon which the job can be done.

Mr. THYE. I perhaps should not have brought up the subject of the highway system.

Mr. TAFT. No, that is perfectly proper. But in the case of highways the Federal Government went into the States upon the theory that highways affect interstate commerce.

Mr. THYE. There were also post roads.

Mr. TAFT. Post roads were built from the very beginning of the Government. Naturally, where the Federal Government is concerned, as it is with rivers, it largely dictates what is to be done. No; this is a State-aid proposition, based on what I have already explained. It is left entirely to the States, except that the requirement is that we give them enough money to provide at least $55 per child, and that must be done in every school district, which means, if done, that the average will have to be approximately $100 per child.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, is it not a fact that the Federal aid is given as a supplement to the State's ability, and depending upon how it provides for the educational use of the money in the State or community?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Once the aid is granted, the Federal Government does not dictate the manner of the conduct of the school district.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is entirely correct. It may be said that some of the money may be misused. Of course, some of it may be misused. But my experience with Federal programs, in which the Federal Government does a big job, such as the WPA program, has been that the Federal money is at least as likely to be misused as it would be if left up to the States.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Does the able Senator from Ohio think this bill, in its present form, if it shall be enacted, will adequately protect all the States against encroachment by the Federal Government in the field of education?

Mr. TAFT. I think it absolutely will, if we do not amend it. I think the bill actually protects them. I recognize the danger. I have always been frank to say that once we have Federal aid established, it may be possible for someone to attach conditions to it resulting in more Federal control. That is one reason I think the amount going to all the States in the Union is not sufficient bribe to cause such control. It is a sufficiently minor part of Federal expenditures so that probably they can do without it if the Federal Government should try to balk the States. I would not want to see it more than $5 in any event.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from Ohio feel we should contribute millions and possibly billions of dollars to States or their subdivisions without some control?

Mr. TAFT. I think in this particular field we are perfectly safe. I think the educational systems of the States have been most sincere. They have been, in nearly every instance, free of politics. They have done a good job. I should just as soon give discretion to the States as to some Federal officer in Washington, even though confirmed by the Senate, to spend the money in Alabama or in some other State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The last observation made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, in answer to my question, is the very basis upon which my next question is to be asked, and that is this: There is absolutely no guaranty which can be given by this Congress or any other Congress that the provisions of the act will remain exactly as the Senator from Ohio says they are, so that no additional control over education in the States will be given to the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, is it not a fact, if the Senator will permit me another question, that the real danger in the whole proposition is that this is the first authorization and the first appropriation, and it is difficut to know just how far future Congresses might go, or how far even this Congress might go, in enlarging the authorization and enlarging the appropriations.

Mr. TAFT. I think that is quite true. However, there is this to be said, that if, as a matter of fact, we succeed in improving education, I think it will raise the wealth of the States. I myself am convinced that lack of education is one of the great deterrents in the development of various nations. It is not mineral resources; it is, to a large extent, the education of the people themselves. The state of Denmark is perhaps one of the wealthiest nations. Yet it has not a natural resource except the soil. Wealth depends largely on the intelligence of the people. I think education increases the intelligence of the people and will, therefore, increase the income of the people. If that be true, as the income rises toward the average income of the Nation, under this formula, the amount spent for Federal aid should grow constantly less. Once the amount everywhere is up to $55 per child, I would not object to trying to peg it a little bit higher with Federal aid, if it has worked well up to that point. That might involve some increase, but, in the long run, if it works as it should work under this formula, I believe there will finally be a steady decrease in the amount of Federal aid.

With regard to Puerto Rico, I am convinced that the difficulty we have there today largely arose out of lack of education. We did a great deal for the Puerto Ricans, except in that one field, in which I think we failed. Incidentally, this bill increases the amount of aid for Puerto Rico. I think the present low income of the Puerto Rican people is largely due to our failure to provide a sufficiently comprehensive program of education for the Puerto Ricans. I think this bill will largely result in curing the condition which has existed and the relative differences in income which are still existent in the United States today.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask another question, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I stated a year ago, I think the provisions which the distinguished Senator has written into the bill to divorce Federal control from State school systems are as effective as is possible, but I should like to ask the distinguished Senator this question: It is necessary that audits be made, and is it not true that, while the basic law establishes a provision that $50 must be provided by the States in order to receive aid, the first control really comes in by permitting an auditor of the Federal Government to go into all the school districts and make audits?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. How far can he go?

Mr. TAFT. He can simply ask for their receipts, how much money they received, and how much they spent.

Mr. WHERRY. Does he have to ascertain for what the money was spent?

Mr. TAFT. It has to be spent for education. I think Federal control must determine whether the money has been used for the purpose for which it was given. It must be used for primary and secondary education. That is inevitable in any Federal-aid formula, and to that extent there may be an interference, but it hardly seems to me to be an interference with the administration of the State school systems.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to comment on the matter of audits. Do I correctly understand that an auditor would go to every school district? If that be correct, then I think we are erroneously thinking about the organizations of the school systems in the States and their respective districts. There is a complete

educational system in the States, and at any time one of the State governmental bodies certifies to the Federal Government what it is actually doing in the respective school districts, with regard to the amount of money spent per child, that should be sufficient information on which to base an audit of the school district.

Mr. TAFT. I will say to the Senator that I think that would be the over-all job of the Federal Bureau of Education, as to how far it might think it necessary to audit each district. Whether they would be willing to examine the distribution of money at the Government source or accept reports sent in by the school districts, I think would be up to the Commissioner of Education, who would have to determine, first, that the money has been spent for education, and, second, that every school district is receiving $55 per child a year. I have referred to it as an audit. I do not mean that it is an audit in the sense that a man's books would be audited to ascertain whether he had stolen some money. I meant only a calculation of figures compared with a definite expenditure. It is not an interference with the manner in which a school is operated. It is not a suggestion that the State do it in some other way, and it is not a criticism of the school, but there is some concern that the money be used for education.

If I were the Federal Office of Education, I think I would check with the State bureau of education to ascertain what their figures were, and then check a couple of school districts to see that they really got the money and were spending it for education. It seems to me that would perhaps be a reasonable way in which the program might be administered.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator well knows that is not the way a Federal bureau works in Washington. Is not that correct?

Mr. TAFT. There must, of course, be adopted in Washington an auditing system like that in the Comptroller General's Office, but it would not be quite such a detailed system.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it not be an exceptional bureau if it spent less money and had fewer people running around than any other bureau in Washington?

Mr. TAFT. It might be. The record of the Federal Office of Education has been very good. It has relied almost entirely on State boards of education. It has a history of not interfering in any way with their administration, and of conducting a very simple operation. It is not one of the bureaus which has been charged with the various things to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take the case of the State of Nebraska, where we lose approximately $1,500,000 in this calculation of paying school taxes. Does not the Senator feel that if we could by State law provide an appropriation, we could manage the system locally just as efficiently as by the Federal aid we would get from Washington, if not more so?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the State of Nebraska is contributing $1,500,000, necessarily. Recourse is had to national income, the money being taken out of the National Treasury. If the State of Nebraska attempted to figure the amount of money it was paying for the Army, and relief to Europe—if it figured out expenditures on that basis, I think it would make a staggering sum. Its contribution under the proposed program would be a very minor contribution, not a contribution to another State, but a part of the general burden. The proposal is to meet a national problem, just as the support of the Army is a national problem, just as ECA is a national problem. The theory of it being a matter of taking money from one State and giving it to another, I think, is wrong.

Mr. WHERRY. I referred to contributions made to the National Government. I realize the Senator's point. We are not taking the money from Nebraska and giving it to Alabama, we are taking it out of the taxpayers' pockets, however.

My question is this, if by law in Nebraska the State could improve the school system through added taxes, through a law, does not the Senator feel it could be done more efficiently in the State of Nebraska locally than to have a Federal bureau administer funds out of Washington?

Mr. TAFT. In general, I think the State could do a better job; yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have two questions I should like to propound. First, from the facts before the commitee, what was the lowest sum per child the committee found was being spent on education?

Mr. TAFT. The lowest amount paid in any district of which I know is about $8, and the Senator will not find many like that. I think he would find quite a number paying around $25. The lowest average is in the State of Mississippi, $54. That was the figure given. I think it is probably somewhat higher now.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, this all refers to public education, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. Primary and secondary education.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the highest being spent by any State?

Mr. TAFT. The State of New York is spending $230 per child.

Mr. FERGUSON. The next question is, $55 would be the average amount paid for each child's education, would it?

Mr. TAFT. No; that is the minimum. There must be $55 for each child. Roughly speaking, in the State where the minimum is $55 they will probably have an average payment of about $100. The table shows that with Federal aid Mississippi would have $84.50, and within a few years they would have to get their 2.05 percent up to 2.50 percent. My recollection is they would be spending on an average about $100 a child.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a table showing the national average and what certain States now contribute and would contribute under Senate bill 246.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	What each State now spends per child	Percentage of income paid for education by State and local communities	Federal aid per child	Total after Federal aid under S. 246
National average	$148.00	1.88	$13.50	$161.50
Alabama	70.00	1.87	23.00	93.00
Arkansas	72.50	2.01	26.00	98.50
North Carolina	89.00	2.40	21.74	110.74
Mississippi	54.32	2.05	29.18	84.50
New York	230.00	1.75	5.00	235.00
Ohio	151.00	1.64	5.00	156.00
Texas	123.00	1.93	7.87	130.87
Missouri	136.00	1.77	5.00	141.00
California	180.00	1.68	5.00	185.00

Mr. FERGUSON. One other question. Is capital included in the cost of education?

Mr. TAFT. No; capital is not included. The Senator will find the definition in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume transportation would be to and from the school?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Current expenditures only are considered, and they are defined on page 14 of the bill as not including "expenditures for interest, debt service, or capital outlay, nor does it include expenditures for health services." They include everything else.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was interested in the colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska in regard to the amount of money which would be paid by the State of Nebraska into the Federal Treasury and the amount which would come back. The inference seemed to be that it might be just as well for a State to make up the money itself and carry on its own school activities, and provide better schools for the State. One reason why the States, and particularly the farming States, have not been able to do more toward improving their school systems is that the burden of the expense for education has fallen on real estate; particularly on the farm land in the States. In many cases the limit of taxes on real estate has just about been reached.

The Federal aid proposal would take some of that burden from real estate in the farming States and put it upon the general income tax, Federal income tax, corporation tax, excise tax, and other taxes so it would be spread out more and relieve real estate from any further pressure. I do not know what the situation is in Nebraska, but I know that in some of the Western States the school systems are supported almost wholly from taxes on real estate, which means on the farming population of the States, and those taxes cannot go any higher.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like now to deal with the proposal of the

Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts would strike out the apportionment plan which we have in our bill. That apportionment plan was in the bill passed in the Senate last year. I think it was in most of the recent bills which have been under consideration.

In general, the plan has received the approval of the school officials, it has received the general approval of statisticians and economists, and I myself do not think it can be improved upon at the present time. I can see various faults in it, various defects, which with further statistical knowledge we might cure, but as a practical matter I do not think there would be very much difference in the ultimate result, admitting what we are trying to do. I feel very strongly that our plan is the best possible formula we can now hope to adopt.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the formula proposed in the bill provides for two courses of action. Which one is used in the calculation of the figures of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Both. They are alternative. That is to say, we figure on the formula I have described; and if that results in less than $5 a child, there is a minimum of $5 a child.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, children between the ages of 5 and 17?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to say that generally it did not make much difference; that it was about the same in each State; that it would not make much difference how the formula was figured. Would not the alternative formula provide about the same result as the first one?

Mr. TAFT. There is only one formula in the bill. The provision is that if that formula does not give the State $5 per child, the State receives $5 per child as a minimum.

Mr. WHERRY. The question I wish answered is: Under the formula, how many States would have to go to the alternative, and receive $5 per child between the ages of 5 and 17?

Mr. TAFT. It appears in the report of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not see it. Does the Senator mean it appears in the committee report?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; on the last page of the committee report, page 16. It refers to the $5, and the amount going to each State.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any objection to using the alternative in all the States under the provision—$5 a head for all children between the ages of 5 and 17?

Mr. TAFT. That is exactly what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is proposing to do, except he is proposing that the amount be $10 a child. Of course, there is an objection to that proposal, because it absolutely strikes out the very basis of the bill. It does not accomplish what we are trying to accomplish. It does not give any child an equal opportunity in the States where the need exists. It furnishes no relief whatever on the basis of the need existing in the particular State. That is the question I want to discuss, if I may, perhaps from a little more fundamental viewpoint.

The formula proposed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts gives every State $10 a child. If Senators will refer to the table I have had prepared they will see what then happens. In New York the amount would be raised from $230 per child to $240 per child. In Ohio the amount would be raised from $151 to $171. In Mississippi the amount would be raised from $54 to $64. In Alabama it would be raised from $70 to $80. In Arkansas it would be raised from $72.50 to $82.50. It would result in improving slightly the conditions in the schools of those States, but it would still leave them just as far behind New York and just as far behind Ohio as they are today.

Under the bill my State would not receive an increased amount. We are furnishing the money ourselves. I did not introduce the bill. Recently I conferred with some Ohio teachers, who said, "We do not care if Ohio does not receive a cent from the bill. We still think we have the basic problem of education and illiteracy to meet in the United States, and we are willing to have a bill under which Ohio does not receive any money." That statement came from the teaching profession itself, because the members of that profession realize the seriousness of the illiteracy problem in the poorer States.

I do not understand that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts thinks that all States are equal or that such a problem does not exist. He says such a problem does exist. But he says that his formula, which proposes to give $10 to every child, meets the problem. I do not think it does meet the problem on its face. It approaches the problem simply as a hand-out to every State, not quite in accordance with the population, but in accordance with the number of children.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that my amendment meets the problem. I said that my amendment did recognize the capacity to pay as among the several States and did furnish the basis upon which we could proceed.

Mr. TAFT. How does it recognize the capacity to pay?

Mr. LODGE. Because States like Alabama, Arkansas, and Mississippi, for example, would receive under my formula probably three and four times as much as they put in in Federal income-tax payments which can be credited to education. All I said was that the formula in the bill is grossly defective, in that while it very properly considers the rural poor it gives no consideration whatever to the poor in our cities; and that while we are developing a more perfect formula we could go ahead with the very basic proposal which I suggest.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, I maintain that the formula offered by the bill is the only effective formula which can possibly determine the relative wealth of States. There is no other formula that I know of, nor do I think one can find a very much better formula. What is the formula? The formula is based on the concept to which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts objects. It is that we take all the income of all the people of the States; we take Mr. A's income and we add it to Mr. B's income and to Mr. C's income, and we take the rich and the poor and add their income all together, and that is the total income of the State. For instance, in Massachusetts the per capita income is approximately $600, whereas in New York and Connecticut it is approximately $2,200 or $2,300. What better basis is there for determining what the ability of that State is to pay its taxes for education? Taxes cannot be paid out of property; taxes must be paid out of income. If it should come to the point that farmers were not making any income, all the farmers would stop paying taxes. Everyone recognizes that taxes cannot be paid out of forests until cash is derived from the forests. Taxes cannot be paid out of natural resources until cash is obtained from the natural resources and an income received therefrom.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator from Ohio think that capital gains constitute a very real source of wealth?

Mr. TAFT. No, I do not. If one man has a capital gain another man has a corresponding capital loss. If one man sells something to another, the other pays just as much as is the value of the thing transferred. In fact, personally I do not think we ought to levy income taxes on capital gains. In England they do not levy income taxes on capital gains. It is a purely ephemeral value. Incidentally, if all the capital gains were added together they would amount to but a very small percentage of the total income of the people. It would represent an insignificant factor in determining wealth.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator think that depletion allowance is a factor in determining wealth?

Mr. TAFT. There is only one criticism I can make of all the Senator says. I wish to take up the Senator's objections to this particular formula. In the first place, I say this particular formula is recognized by nearly all the economists. It is recognized by Mr. Harvey Lutz. Everyone I know of who discusses the subject of relative wealth of States uses this formula. It is printed every month in the Survey of Current Business of the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce, so to speak, guarantees its accuracy. The last survey appeared in January. It is entitled "Total Income Payments to Individuals by States and Regions." As I have said, it is the only available formula as to relative wealth, and its seems to me to be a perfectly reasonble formula.

The Senator from Massachusetts suggests that in the first place some property ought to be counted in. There may be some property around. I have said

that I do not think property is a very effective means of obtaining taxes. Current taxes are obtained from current income. There is no other place from which to get them. We do not have a capital levy in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the Senator from Ohio taken into consideration the fact that many of the States which are benefiting under this program are not taxing their current income? For instance, on the chart which the Senator has had placed on the desks of the Senators, the first four States to which the Senator calls attention are Alabama, Arkansas, North Carolina, and Mississippi. Three of those States levy no inheritance tax comparable to that levied in either Ohio or Delaware.

Mr. TAFT. That does not make any difference. There is an income tax on all the people of those States. As a matter of fact, a Federal inheritance tax is levied in those States. A Federal inheritance tax is levied in every State throughout the United States. The Federal inheritance tax is the basis for all inheritance taxes. If there is any State which fails to take its share under that tax, I would be very much surprised. I cannot answer that directly, however, because I do not have the figures. The fact remains, however, that for years a Federal inheritance tax has been levied throughout the country. Every State in the Union can have a certain portion of that total tax.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that I am not speaking of a Federal inheritance tax. I understand that that is collected into the Federal Treasury. I am speaking of a State inheritance tax. According to the Library of Congress Alabama, Arkansas, and Mississippi, three of the four States listed on the Senator's chart, levy no State inheritance tax.

Mr. TAFT. Then they levy a State estate tax. I am willing to venture the assertion that there is not a State in the Union which does not take advantage of the Federal set-off, so that the State can take the State tax to which it is entitled out of the total levy by the Federal Government on inheritances. There are a few States which have State inheritance taxes perhaps a little larger than the credit on the Federal tax, but they are very few. If a few States do not have it, it is a very minor source of income.

Mr. WILLIAMS. According to the Library of Congress there are 18 States which have no State income tax, and 12 States which have no State inheritance tax.

Mr. TAFT. What difference does it make how the State raises its taxes? The question is, What percentage of its total wealth, wherever it gets it, is spent on education? That is the only question. It does not make any difference whether the State has an inheritance tax or sales tax. If it does not spend for education 2 percent of its total income payments, which is more than the national average, we will not give it any Federal aid. But it can raise it by any kind of tax it wishes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is not the Senator from Ohio aware of the fact that many citizens of his own State and other Northern States which are levying such taxes are taking up residence in the Southern States in order to avoid taxes?

Mr. TAFT. What difference does it make?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It makes a big difference.

Mr. TAFT. It does not make any difference. If a poor State spends a percentage of its income higher than the national average, what difference does it make how it gets the money? It may be able to get the money by a gasoline tax, as does Florida. It may be able to get it by a sales tax. There may be one kind of a tax in one State, and another kind in another State. That is not the question. The question is, Are they raising by taxation of any kind enough money so that they are contributing to education a share of the total income of their people in excess of the national average, and amounting, under the formula of this bill, to 2 percent, and for full participation, 2½ percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator from Ohio agree with me that each time one of the residents of Ohio, Delaware, or any other State, moves south to avoid these taxes, or when an industry moves south because it can enjoy tax-exemption in the Southern States, those who remain in the Northern States are compelled to take up the additional load?

Mr. TAFT. I think that may well be. However, the income is counted in the income of the Southern States. The Southern States have to raise that much more in taxes to comply with the bill. Whether they raise it by an income tax or some other method such as a sales tax or gasoline tax, makes absolutely no difference to the Federal Government.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is speaking entirely on the basis of the per capita income within the State, and not upon the basis of the per capita levy of tax, or tax revenues per capita, is he not?

Mr. TAFT. I am talking about both. The point is this: The relative wealth of the States is determined by the total income of all the people of the State. So far as I am concerned, I think it is the only just method. If the total income of all the people of the State is $100,000,000, the State must spend $2,000,000 on education. I do not care whether it gets the money by a sales tax, or how it gets it. It must spend $2,000,000 of its own money on education before it can get any Federal money. So it seems to me that the concept is perfectly clear. The Senator has attacked the basis of the determination of income. However, the concept is perfectly clear. We used the same method in connection with the hospital construction bill. We did it the other day in connection with the bill which we passed dealing with school health. It is an accepted formula, and, so far as I know, it is the only sound formula for determining the relative wealth of the various States. I cannot see any better method of doing it. It seems to me absolutely fair to say to a State, "Your income is so much. The country as a whole is spending about 1.87 percent of all the income of all its people on education. Before you can get the rest of the country to come to your assistance you must spend 2 percent of the income of your people on education, and if you want full participation after 3 or 4 years, you must spend 2½ percent, which is above the national average. If you want to get the full amount of Federal aid proposed, you must spend 2½ percent."

It seems to me that that is perfectly fair. It protects the Federal Government against malingering on the part of the States, or failure to tax on the part of the States. Whether they have inheritance taxes or income taxes, or whether they use some other form of taxation seems to me to make very little difference.

It is probably easier for a wealthy State to raise 2 percent of its income in taxation than it is for a poor State to do so. The reason one State is wealthier than another is that there are more people in the upper brackets ready to pay taxes, whereas a poor State is not likely to have so many people in those brackets and the people at the bottom must be taxed. That is always a harder job. So when we lay down that formula, I think we are imposing a pretty stiff formula.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that many of the Southern States do not have as many citizens with higher incomes as have some of the Northern States. But does not the Senator agree with me that a millionaire in the State of Texas should pay just as much toward the support of the school system in Texas as a millionaire in the State of Ohio pays toward the support of the school system of Ohio before seeking Federal aid?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not agree to anything of the kind. That is entirely up to the State. That is a matter of State tax policy, with which we have no concern. Our interest is only in seeing that they apply their own money to education. Whether they get it from millionaires or not does not make any difference. Millionaires do not amount to much. If a man has an income of $1,000,000, the Federal Government takes about $850,000 of it, and he does not have much of the million left. But the entire $1,000,000 is counted when we compute income payments in the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that it would not be any of our business how the States raise their revenue, until such time as they come to the Federal Treasury and ask us to pay a contribution to their school system, which is exactly what we are doing in Federal aid to education. When they do that it is our business how they tax themselves.

Mr. TAFT. I absolutely dispute the Senator's contention. I do not think we are concerned with how the States raise their taxes. We are concerned that they do raise taxes somehow. They can do it by any method they choose. I would be the last to try to tell the States, "You must have this kind of tax, or that kind of tax." They would deeply resent it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I find a great deal of argument for States' rights until it comes to assuming State responsibilities. However, I do say that we have a right to say to any State which is to benefit under the terms of this bill that it should first tax its citizens on a basis comparable to ours before it asks for a Federal contribution.

Mr. TAFT. That is exactly what the bill does. The Senator complains because certain States do not have a particular kind of tax. The bill does exactly what the Senator wants. It says to the States, "You must raise by taxation 2 percent of all the income of your people and apply it to education." We do not care how they raise it, so long as they raise it. That is the only interest of the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Ohio is considering the question on the broad over-all basis, and overlooking the fact that certain States are not taxing their wealthier citizens, am I to assume that we are going to place in this bill a rider which provides that the money must be spent on each citizen on the same basis? Are we going to tell the Southern States how to spend it, as between white and colored children? Under the formula all the colored children are counted tto pull their average down. Are we going to write into the bill a provision that the money must be spent on the colored children to bring them up to a basis comparable with the white children?

Mr. TAFT. We write into the bill the provision that every school, white and colored, must spend at least $55 per child, or it does not receive any Federal money. That is the extent to which we have gone.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, we do not go so far as to require equal education, yet that is the basis of the formula under which certain States receive their large allotments. Besides it is my contention that the only way to give real Federal aid is to reduce the cost of government. A mere 5-percent reduction in our expenditures would mean a saving of over $2,000,000,000. That is real State aid and actually reduces Federal control. I agree with you we do not have equal education in any of our States.

Mr. TAFT. No, because that is an almost impossible matter. There is no equality of education in the State of Ohio or in the State of Delaware. One school district gives one kind of education, and another school district gives another kind of education. Education varies considerably within the States, of course. In effect, most States have established an equalization fund, in order to have sufficient money available for education; and with that money they take care of education in the districts having smaller amounts of revenue.

In this bill we are establishing really what amounts to an equalization fund, in order that there may be a fair distribution of money to be spent for education, and in order that at least a minimum may be provided in the poorer States. As I have pointed out, in some States the minimum will still be far below the amount of money that is spent for education in other States. For instance, after this bill goes into effect, Alabama will be spending $93 per child for education, whereas Ohio will be spending $156; and Mississippi will be spending $84.50, whereas Missouri will be spending $141 per child.

So under this bill we shall not bring the States up to anything like the standard of education in the States which are spending larger amounts per child for education; even with the assistance given by this bill, we shall not be able to bring all the States up to the same level of education. I do not think the Senator can say that we are asking the rest of the country to do anything unreasonable or unfair or out of line with the proportional wealth the rest of the country has.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my own State for a number of years we operated on the principle of having all State income taxes used to operate our school system. If the States which today spend very small amounts of money for education were to levy taxes on their citizens on a basis comparable to the taxes imposed in some of the Northern States, and were to use that money for their school systems, does not the Senator from Ohio agree with me that there would be a great improvement in the school systems of the States which today provide very small amounts of money for education per child?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not. I have no knowledge of the situation in those States. I do not know whether such a tax would be effective in the way the Senator suggests. Furthermore, those States collect as State inheritance taxes a sum which is a certain proportion of the total Federal inheritance tax; and in all those States, a considerable revenue will be found to come from inheritance taxes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat that if those States would levy an additional State tax on inheritances plus a State income tax comparable to ours in Delaware to be used in those States for education, they would not need Federal aid.

Mr. TAFT. That would be a rather small total amount. However, that would be for the States themselves to determine. If they prefer to devote to school purposes taxes which they levy on inheritances or gasoline taxes or sales taxes, that will be for them to determine.

The State of Mississippi, as I remember, was the first State to levy a sales tax, doing so because it found that the other sources of taxation were not sufficiently lucrative and did not provide enough money. So they had to levy a sales tax in order to obtain sufficient funds to be able to provide even the very minimum necessary for State and local operations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator from Ohio has said in regard to taxation in the several States for the purpose of raising money to be used under the formula provided in this bill is absolutely correct.

So far as the Senator from Delaware is concerned, I wish to correct the record by saying that the State of Alabama has an inheritance and estate tax, and we have an income tax and a sales tax, which are levied, as the Senator from Ohio has suggested, because we found we had to do so in order to obtain sufficient revenue to be able to provide funds for our schools. We are doing that today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will further yield, let me say that I did not say that Alabama does not have a sales tax, although in the World Almanac the State of Alabama is listed as not having an inheritance tax.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall say that the State of Alabama will have to increase its allotment of funds for education, in order to come under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio has stated that additional taxes will have to be levied, in order somehow or other to raise from the citizens of the various States the necessary additional funds for use in connection with this bill; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In my State, which has no income tax and no provision for a State sales tax, we would have to levy additional taxes on the same basis on which we now raise revenues; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator from Nebraska was referring to Federal taxes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am talking about the necessity for the State to levy taxes of its own in order to increase the amount it spends for education, so as to be able to come under the provisions of this proposed Federal law and receive the benefits proposed to be paid under it.

Mr. TAFT. That is not necessarily so, for Nebraska already uses for education 2.33 percent of its total income.

Mr. WHERRY. And Nebraska's income is obtained from taxes on real estate, not from income taxes or sales taxes.

Mr. TAFT. Under this bill, Nebraska will not have to levy additional taxes or obtain additional money.

Mr. WHERRY. But if additional money must be obtained, it will be necessary to levy heavier taxes, and this bill will require the people of Nebraska to contribute more of their funds as Federal income. That will work a great hardship upon those who already pay taxes, for they will be required to pay additional taxes, and still will have to maintain State and local governments, although in our State we raise all taxes

without the benefit of a State sales tax or a State income tax.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Nebraska is merely stating over again the argument for economy in government, with which I agree. He is only stating over again that the more money the Federal Congress appropriates, the more the people must pay in taxes, and with that I agree.

However, my feeling is that the particular problem of illiteracy of children in the United States is, so far as I am concerned, more important than ECA or than $16,000,000,000 for the Army, for instance, although I do not wish to make odious comparisons. Funds for this purpose are included in the President's budget; and although I am perfectly willing to have a reduction made in the funds to be provided for this purpose, in line with a general reduction in appropriations, yet I do not think the argument about additional taxes is any more to be applied against this proposal than against anything else the Senate has done since January. The fact that more taxes are required is certainly an argument for general economy, but I do not think it is an argument for the elimination or defeat of this particular bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask a further question, but I do not wish to detain the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I am delighted to be detained.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought the Senator wished to leave.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; then I wish to ask some questions about sales taxes and estate taxes.

In connection with this bill, there is an authorization of $300,000,000; and when those funds are appropriated, the money will have to come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country. In my State, the only way we raise additional funds for public use is by taking more money from the incomes of our citizens. Inasmuch as we have no State sales tax or no State income tax, the money must come from an increased property tax, which will be, of course, an increased burden on the people of the State.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Nebraska is getting his Federal taxes and his State taxes mixed up, I fear. This bill would not require the levying of additional taxes in Nebraska. The Senator from Nebraska is quite correct when he says that we must find some means of obtaining from Federal taxes the money which will have to be paid under this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and some of that will have to come from Nebraska, of course.

Mr. TAFT. But the Federal Government cannot levy property taxes on the farms in Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator, technically. However, when we take from the pockets of the people of Nebraska $1,700,000, in the form of an additional income tax, that means it will be just that much more difficult for them to pay the taxes which now are imposed upon them. In Nebraska we do not have a State income tax. At one time we were hopeful of attracting many industries to our State. We wanted to have a State which did not tax its people to death, so we do not have a State income tax or a sales tax. We are operating our State government on a pay-as-you-go basis. Of course, the more Federal taxes that are taken out of the pockets of the people, the greater is the burden which will have to be borne by the people at home.

Mr. TAFT. Then let me give the Senator from Nebraska some advice, namely, to follow what we have done in Ohio. We established a limitation on the rate of taxation which can be imposed on property. We have imposed a strict limitation on property taxes, and thereby we have forced the legislature to impose, first, a sales tax, and, then, a gasoline tax, in order to raise the necessary funds. Certainly the property taxes on farms are too heavy; but the way to proceed is to apply other taxes.

Mr. WHERRY. And then Nebraska would be forced to impose a sales tax and a State income tax, in order to obtain more tax revenues.

Mr. TAFT. But Ohio did that 20 years ago; in Ohio, in order to obtain additional revenue, but without increasing the property taxes, a sales tax and a gasoline tax were imposed. I suggest that Nebraska follow suit.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's advice.

So, Mr. President, here we have the Federal Government proposing the enactment of a measure which, under its requirement for funds, would force the States to do things they would not otherwise do. In other words, this bill would require Nebraska to take almost $1,250,000 of additional taxes out of the pockets of its people.

Mr. TAFT. Not Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. And at the same time the people of Nebraska would have to maintain the school system presently being maintained there.

Mr. TAFT. The State of Nebraska has nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Then would the Senator agree that Nebraska be exempted from the payment of the additional taxes which it is said must be paid in order to provide funds to be used in connection with this bill?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, in the long run additional Federal taxes will have to be paid, for the purpose of this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course.

Mr. TAFT. I do not dispute that. I affirm it. It cannot be helped. If the Senator from Nebraska wishes to cut the appropriation to $260,000,000—and, as a matter of fact, this bill will cost only $260,000,000 under this formula, for the first year——

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, for the first year.

Mr. TAFT. So if he wants to cut the authorization, I am perfectly willing to be consistent in all these programs, and take a 10 percent cut on everything, as I have tried to make plain. I wish the Senator had proposed a reduction of 10 percent instead of 5 on the bill recently before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for that statement. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Since we understand what Nebraska is to pay, I should like to ask the second question. It is this: In the report, as the Senator has said, the formula used in the bill is to multiply the average of the annual income payments for each State. There has been a great deal of colloquy about that this morning. Personally I am not clear concerning it. How does the Government arrive at the income of each and every individual in the United States? From what sources? I suppose the Department of Commerce is consulted. But how does the Department of Commerce know what the individual makes from all sources?

Mr. TAFT. I am not a statistician.

Mr. WHERRY. How do they do it?

Mr. TAFT. There has long been published in the United States the national income of the people of the United States. Of course no one goes around to ask 140,000,000 people how much income they have, or anything like that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how it is done?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know how it is done. There are various methods of working back from all kinds of statistical information that is available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. There is published, under the sponsorship of the President's economic advisers and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], a monthly economic report showing the national income, and there are also figures as to personal income. These figures for the States are a breakdown of the personal income figure which the Department of Commerce, with whose representatives I talked this morning, assures me they feel is accurate. They consider that the information on which it is based is exact. The break-down by States is not issued every month; in fact, only once a year. But I have no question, and I think nobody can successfully dispute the fact that, while there may be mistakes in the calculations, they are substantially correct. Practically, the relation between the wealth of the different States is the same under this formula as it would be under any formula attempting to find out the relative income, if it is admitted that income is a fair test of wealth. The Senator from Massachusetts contends property is a fair test. Taxes are paid out of income, not out of property. Relatively I think it is current income that counts. There may be undeveloped water power worth millions of dollars, but until it is harnessed and some income derived from it, it is impossible to pay school taxes out of it. I think the use of property, even by the States, under general property taxes, is a mistaken form of taxation. The Federal Government does not levy one cent of tax on property. We raise $42,000,000,000 entirely on income, or on sales, which represent gross income. We do not raise a cent by taxes on property. We do not recognize property as any element in the ability to pay, except when we come

solely to the question of inheritance taxes, which operate somewhat differently than on the uniform basis which the Federal Government generally applies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the formula proposed in the committee bill, unless we understand how the Department of Commerce arrives at the individual income of each and every citizen, might be erroneous. That is the reason I asked the distinguished Senator where he got the figures.

Mr. TAFT. As to how the Department gets the figures, I do not know. I may say to the Senator, it is perfectly clear they include all the income I receive and all the Senator receives, from every other source there is, so far as I know.

Mr. WHERRY. How do they get the figures? I understand they are obtained first from the income taxes paid the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. No doubt, those figures are used.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me, if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is correct in his criticism, if there is a fallacy, it is in the way the committee bill arrives at what the individual income of each citizen is, and thereupon makes it the basis for determining what each State should contribute further in connection with Federal aid to education.

Mr. TAFT. The income of people generally is made up of a few definite items. It is made up of compensation to employees. I suppose there is a very careful check on that. There is a very careful method by which pay-roll taxes are determined and paid. Returns are made. An allowance is made for cases that are not covered. There are perhaps arbitrary assumptions made. There is also proprietors' and rental income, which is calculated, which can be determined rather accurately from income-tax returns. There is the item of dividends and interest, which can be obtained from corporations. There is social security, and there are GI payments, which can be obtained from the Government, and, once a year, the figures are broken down and allotted as between the States. Before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 18, Mr. Denison, acting assistant director of the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce, testified. He was asked the question, and he gave in detail the exact method by which they make the computation. If the Senator wants to read it, I shall be glad to give it to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I should be glad to have that inserted in the RECORD. It is not in the committee report. If the bill is to be passed and is to become the law, it seems to me the formula should be made as nearly perfect as possible. My feeling is that the Department of Commerce relies primarily upon the Internal Revenue Bureau for income statistics. The States have income data and sources of information like that, for use in arriving at the average income.

Mr. TAFT. That is the only possible way, the intelligent way, of doing it.

Mr. WHERRY. Many States have no income taxes.

Mr. TAFT. There are Federal returns from all the States. They have to calculate the income of people who do not pay taxes. Roughly speaking, of course, there may be criticisms of it, but I would affirm without any question that the Department of Commerce return is a fair estimate of the income of the people of the States, relatively to each other. That is the main proposition. It is a fair index of the income, the taxpaying ability, and the wealth, the real wealth of the people of the States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator insert in the RECORD the statement of how the figures are arrived at?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be very glad to do so. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, other criticisms were made of this formula. It was said that taxes are different, that some States tax more than other States, or some States tax more income than other States. But of course this calculation is before the payment of taxes. This is gross income, out of which taxes are paid. So it does not make any difference what taxes are paid, so long as enough taxes are paid and devoted to education to meet the requirement of the bill, namely, 2 percent of all income.

It was said yesterday that some people may have debts or responsibilities. Of course they may have debts and responsibilities, but they are debts and responsibilities to somebody else, and I cannot see that it in any way changes the taxpaying ability. The fact that some people may have debts and responsibilities, so far as I can see does not in any way challenge the concept of total income. As a matter of fact, if debts are to be taken into consideration, the chances are that the people in poorer States owe money to the people in the richer States as a whole, rather than the converse. It is almost certain that people have gone into the poorer States and invested their money, and if debts are to be taken into account, if debts are to be deducted, we shall probably have to deduct more from the income of the people of the poorer States than from the people of the richer States.

It is said, and correctly so, that it may be cheaper to live in some States, and so the dollar income is not a fair comparison. I think there may be something in that contention. The laboring people, however, do not admit the justice of a wage differential, and the difference in cost of living is not a superabundant difference. Even if it were as much as 10 or 15 percent, it is small compared to the discrepancy that exists, and in comparison to what happens after we get through. As the record shows, after all has been taken into account, even after we have taken into account Federal aid, when we get through, it will still be found that there is but $98 in Arkansas, $93 in Alabama, $110 in North Carolina, and $84.50 in Mississippi. There is still only that much money per child to spend, as compared with the national average of $160 per child. After that money is distributed, there is still only approximately 50 or 60 percent of the States involved, so that we cannot possibly, in my opinion, be overdoing the job simply on the theory that we go further with the southern States than with the northern States.

Mr. President, there is one item of national income which might properly be criticized. The so-called national income includes corporation savings, which are not included in the personal-income figures. The personal-income figures used in the bill include only dividends and interest actually distributed to individuals. The trouble with including corporation surplus is that it is very difficult to allocate it to any particular State. Corporation surplus is in the form of deposits or in the form of working capital, and it is owned, as a rule, by the owners of the corporation, scattered throughout other States, as much as it is owned by the people of the particular State in which the corporation may be operating. As I say, it is a very difficult thing to allocate. I do not see that it necessarily changes the relative wealth of the different States. The Department of Commerce finds that it is impossible to distribute on that particular concept. There are two concepts of national income, one including corporation net profits, and the other including social security and similar payments which are not included in national income. The net result, using one or the other method, I think will be negligible and of practically no importance, certainly, in the relative wealth of various States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator tell me why gross income, rather than net income, was taken?

Mr. TAFT. What is the whole concept of national income? It is the income of all the people. The concept of national income is that we take all the gross income and out of that we pay operating expenses, taxes, expenses of every kind. Some persons may have to pay more of one than of another for purposes of Federal taxation. There is a concept of net income, and we are changing every year what can be deducted and what cannot be deducted. There is no such thing as a concept of net income except as we write it into the Federal income-tax laws in one way or another.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I recognize the point which the able Senator from Ohio has just made with respect to there being no formal or final concept of net income, and yet

there is a general one which is accepted. It has always seemed to me that net income represents far more clearly the income of the individual. Apparently the Senator is not including corporations. So far as being unfair is concerned, I see no difficulty there, because net income in one part of the country would be, presumably, on the same basis as net income in another part of the country.

Mr. TAFT. What is net income? What we are trying to determine is how much money there is out of which the States should pay education taxes of 2 percent. It cannot be deducted after taxes. Let us say that the income of a certain State is $100,000,000, and we say, "You must spend $2,000,000 on education." The State says, "No; we want to deduct $2,000,000 taxes for education." It does not make sense. They may spend their money for chewing-gum or for something else they like, or they may use it to pay debts. We say, "We do not care, but you have that much income, and you must put up 2 percent of it for educational purposes."

Mr. IVES. I understand; but I should like to point out that they must take out taxes, and we should not pay any attention to that, but there is a problem involved which more definitely reflects the condition of the individual than would any taxes which the individual might pay. Interest definitely is a deduction from gross income. The Senator says taxes would be paid anyway. So would interest.

Mr. TAFT. Interest amounts to approximately 1 percent of the total personal income. It is not a factor which makes much difference. With reference to the question of debt, if we consider the States as a whole, I should be willing to wager with the Senator from New York that the poorer States pay more interest per person than do the richer States. In other words, a great many of the properties which make income in the poorer States are owned in the North, and the people owe money to the North and a number of the wealthier States. I would venture to say, in considering interest, we would find that the poorer States should take a bigger deduction for interest than should the wealthier States.

Mr. IVES. Perhaps they should, and perhaps they should not. That is a mere matter of speculation. I think there is a great deal of personal indebtedness in some of the wealthier States. I think we should have an established formula.

Mr. TAFT. We have an established formula. This is the only one which has been used; it is the only one in existence which determines accurately and by statistical methods the relative wealth or income of different States. That is why we use it. Of course, it may have some defects, but they cannot be such, in my opinion, as to make it materially different as between the various States, from some other formula that someone might conceivably develop. It is a practical formula. It has been used for 4 years. It was used in the school-aid bill which was passed day before yesterday. It is an accepted method of determining the relative wealth and tax-paying ability of the different States.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the able Senator from Ohio think that merely because it has been used and because it is the only formula which has been devised up to the present time, it is the only one that can be devised?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. If the Senator can bring forward a practical formula, I shall be glad to examine it. But if the Lodge amendment is adopted, I shall urge the Senate to defeat the bill. I shall vote against the bill myself and shall urge the Senate to defeat it, because, in my opinion, that amendment would destroy the basic purpose of the bill, which is to give aid to those children whose condition has been such, by reason of their surroundings, that they have been unable to obtain even a basic education, or to learn to read and write.

Mr. IVES. I am not talking about the Lodge amendment. I am merely asking questions, which are bothering me, regarding this formula. I do not think the formula is what it should be. I think it can be improved. I think the net-income method is a far more sound method by which to approach what we are trying to attain than is the gross-income method. That is my point.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me the perfectly fair thing to consider is what is the actual gross income of everyone. When an individual receives money, no matter for what he receives it, it counts as income. No matter what he pays it out for, we say that he must take $2 out of every $100 he receives and help pay for education in his State, if the State is to receive any Federal aid.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair.) Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is any weight given in the bill to the different costs of educating pupils in the various States? For instances, in a Northern State, because of the extensive cold, there must be more expensive school buildings and higher salaries for teachers; it is necessary to transport the children long distances, and it is necessary to heat the school buildings 8 months out of the 9. Is any weight given in the bill to the different costs in the various States, or is it assumed that the Government will give each State the same amount?

Mr. TAFT. No; I would not say that. A State in which the educational facilities are far below the standard, sets $55 per child as the minimum. No special weight is given to the costs of operating in different States. I do not think we have gotten anywhere near the point where we will have to worry about that.

Mr. YOUNG. I think there is a major weakness in the bill in that $5 across the board is given to each State. I think anyone who has made a study of school problems will recognize that it costs much more to educate a pupil in the Northern States than in the Southern States.

Mr. TAFT. In the Northern States income is much greater than the 2 percent provided in the bill. As I have said, in Ohio we levy only 1.64 percent on the total income, and that gives us $151 per child, as compared with the $55 minimum, and the $70 in Alabama.

Mr. YOUNG. It is a little different for me to figure out the difference between the costs in some of the States. For instance, I understand Texas has no sales tax, and possibly no income tax, although I am not sure about the latter. It has no sales tax.

Mr. TAFT. The State of Texas must raise 2 percent of the total income of the people, under any kind of tax it chooses by which to raise the money. I do not care how they raise it, if they raise the necessary amount and put it into education.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if it is not a fact that the $5 per child contribution in all States does work to the advantage of the Northern States, where costs concededly are a little bit high? If we had gone on with the formula as originally proposed, then there would have been a still greater percentage of contribution to the Southern States. Is not that a fact?

Mr. TAFT. That is true.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio would enlighten me on a point I have in mind. I notice on the chart that the contribution in the State of Iowa will be $5 a pupil. I notice also in the report that the State of Iowa spends a higher percentage of its income for education than any other State in the Union, that it spends 2.71 percent of its income on education, and that, according to the chart on page 14 of the report, is the highest among all the States of the Union.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Incidentally, there is in Iowa the smallest percentage of illiteracy among all the States in the Union. Iowa has accomplished a fine result in education.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to hear the Senator from Ohio concede that, because I have been preaching it for a long time. Many have disputed me, but I know that to be true. I think we have done splendidly with our educational system. Then why should we be penalized in the bill because we do spend a higher percentage of our income for education than any other State of the Union? We get only $5, which is the minimum.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think Iowa is penalized. The children there get a better education than do children anywhere else in the country. I do not think that should necessarily result in Iowa being relieved from attacking the national problem, dealing with situations where the income is such that the people cannot

provide even a minimum education for many of their children.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question I wanted cleared up in my mind is this, Why should my State spend 2.71 percent of its income—which, without doubt, we will continue to do, and we will spend more next year than this year—when other States which spend only 1.87 percent, let us say, of their income for education, get tremendous amounts from the proposed program in comparison with my State? Why should they not be required to raise the percentage of their taxation up to the proper point?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, we do require them to raise it to about 2.50. The national average is 1.88 percent. We require that they get it up to 2 percent, then to 2¼, then to 2½, in order to get the full advantage of the Federal aid to education. But Iowa is so far above the average that we could not very well undertake to put the other States that high. States like Ohio, New York, and others, have found it impossible to go that high.

In the list of boys shown in the survey by General Huebner, to which I referred, covering the illiterates by States, Iowa was almost the only State which had no white illiterates whatever in a list of 646 boys. It had 1 Negro among 407 Negroes, and he probably came from the South. So that it is true that Iowa has done very well, and has chosen education as the one important activity on which to spend its money. Iowa has given extra emphasis to it over other things. Its percentage is far above the national average, not only of the South, but the people of Iowa have decided that they want so much better education than we have in Ohio, for instance, that they are willing to spend their money on it. I do not think we could require other States to come up to the Iowa average before they would get national aid.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have a motto in our State that "Of all that is good, Iowa affords the best." What I was going to suggest was this question: Should we not expect some relief in the matter of our 2.7 percent expenditure, so that we might get down to the point where we were spending only 2½ percent, which would be the normal expenditure required in other States?

Mr. TAFT. Because Iowa wants to afford better education than any other State in the Union, should the Federal Government be asked to contribute so that it could do that? I do not think that is the Federal obligation. The Federal obligation is brought into account only to meet a condition where a State cannot do what we think is the absolute minimum, costing one-fourth of what is spent in Iowa per child.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Whether there is equality among educational systems is always subject to dispute. We believe we have a good system in our State. We spend a great deal of money on education in the secondary and other schools. I call attention to the fact that we do not have the money to spend per pupil which many other States have. Frankly, I do not believe we spend much more per pupil than does the State of Ohio, if we spend as much. I do not have the figures here, but certainly we do not spend nearly the amount per pupil the State of New York and the State of New Jersey spend. There are many things in our school system we would like to improve. We would like to improve the equipment, and we certainly would appreciate better consideration from the Federal Government than to be put on the $5 per pupil basis, when we are already spending the highest amount, comparatively, among the States of the Union.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that Iowa is spending about $175 per child, which is more than Ohio is spending, but not so much as New York is spending.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator from Louisiana will permit, I should like to ask one more question. I wonder why the Senator from Ohio cannot agree that we should have some consideration of our thought that our 2.71 percent should be brought down to the normal 2½ percent, which should be the general minimum percentage which the States would be required to spend of their income.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator presents a very complicated proposal. I would say that there might be some additional formula worked out to take care of States which spend much in excess of the 2½ percent which is required in the bill, but I do not think that is the primary purpose of the bill, or the primary purpose of Federal aid to education, or a very good reason for the Federal Government giving money to the State of Iowa.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Speaking of the State of Iowa, I wonder if the Senator from Ohio is familiar with the fact that the 1947 Yearbook of the Encyclopedia Americana says that—

> The percentage of adults functionally illiterate varies greatly among the States, ranging from only 4.1 in Iowa to 35.7 in Louisiana.

In other words, according to that statement Iowa would probably be in less need of aid to her educational system than any other State of the Union.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator be so kind as to define rather specifically the use of the word "minimum" in the title of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. The State cannot receive aid unless it allots out of Federal and State funds at least $55 per child to every school in the State, white school, colored school, every other school. That is the minimum. That does not mean an average. In a State where the minimum in its lowest district is $55 probably the average would run close to $100.

Mr. CAIN. But it is true, is it not, that every State in the Union is going to benefit from appropriations in this bill?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Many of the wealthier States also have districts under $55. They should not have. They should really have allotted the amount themselves, but the $5 can be used to bring up those poor districts in the wealthier States.

Mr. CAIN. May I express one fear I have, and I think a number of other Senators share it, that we are actually saying in this bill that there is no longer any State in the Union which is qualified to support a minimum educational program for its State. I wonder if the Senator shares that feeling.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's objection, as I take it, is just the opposite of the objection presented by the Senator from Massachusetts. He is suggesting that we do not give a flat $5 to the States which are able to run their own school districts. I would say that when I introduced the bill last year I did not have the $5 minimum provision in it. It was put in by the committee. It is a compromise, in a way, between those who believe in one method of distribution and those who believe in another. I have to admit that. The $5 is not my idea; but since the committee has twice approved it, I am perfectly willing to stand by it as a compromise between these different points of view. I am not willing to swing over to the full $10 proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, wiping out the equalization provision altogether, which is four-fifths of the whole bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder why we ought to provide any Federal moneys of any kind to those States which presently are able to provide for their own minimum educational requirements.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As chairman of the subcommittee I should like to say that we held hearings on this type of legislation for 2 weeks or more, and we came to the conclusion that inasmuch as 60 percent of the people of this country move out of the States where they are born, it therefore falls upon the States to which they go, and I refer particularly to the State of the Senator from Washington, to take up the education of these children who perhaps had a poor start. We felt that there should be some contribution made to those States which would recompense them for the additional expense to which they have been put. We are a moving Nation. The latest figures I have show that about 60 percent of the people of the country now reside in States other than those in which they were born or raised.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Does that méan, in the opinion of the committee, that there are no longer any States which are qualified—and this is a very important point—to do a competent, adequate educational job from within their own tax revenues?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. It would probably be possible for several of the States to do a good job, although I know of no State whatever that is not seeking additional funds for the support of its schools. But we also found, and it was pointed out very clearly by witnesses, that there is no State in the Union that does not have substandard schools as compared with what they would like to have or need at the present time, even New York, California and similar States.

Mr. TAFT. My personal opinion is that there are many States that could handle the matter themselves without Federal support.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator if he has the compilation of States on his desk handy so I could address a question to him about it?

Mr. TAFT. I have in my hand the compilation to which the Senator refers.

Mr. TYDINGS. What States would be aided under the bill if the Federal $5 contribution were eliminated? Can the Senator give me that information by looking at the compilation?

Mr. TAFT. No, I cannot. The Senator will find on the back of the committee report, a list of the States which would receive $5. A number of those States would receive something under our formula. I do not know how many of those States which would receive $5 would be entirely eliminated. I can secure that information for the Senator, and will do so later this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. One reason the Senator from Maryland is asking the question is this: He is not a member of the committee. He knows that the Senator from Ohio has given a great deal of time and thought to the matter. The Senator from Maryland can see how the educational program might be desirable in some States to bring up the national level. Personally I do not believe the State of Maryland would need this assistance. The Governor of my State, I understand, wrote to the House Committee on Education and asked him that Maryland not be included; that Maryland did not need the assistance. We know that many States have paid large bonuses to their returned soldiers and have surpluses in their treasuries. They are in pretty strong financial condition, at least when it comes to educating their own children. So my interrogatory is primarily directed to the thought that it might be very wise to help States whose economic income per capita is far below the average of the whole country, and which obviously cannot raise by taxes the revenues to support the kind of an educational system which they and we would like to have. It would be wise to help them, and give them more money, as a matter of fact, rather than help States that are already able to provide pretty fair educational facilities. If we did that we would do more to wipe out illiteracy and to raise the whole standard of education than by any other means. I should like the Senator from Ohio to guide me a little bit in the formulation of a proper amendment to accomplish the desired result implied in my statement.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the Senator from Maryland had better go back and look at the bill I introduced a year ago. It did not contain the provision for $5. That is the only advice I can give the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we eliminate the $5, would not the net effect of such a procedure be to give the Federal aid to the States that are the worst off?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct; yes. About half the States would get some money. I find that 24 of the States would get money under the equalization formula. Roughly speaking, those States that are below the national average would receive some aid under the equalization formula. The other 24 States would not receive the $5.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the 24 States that would receive the aid would be the 24 States whose educational standard was what we might call below the average.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to clarify this situation a little by saying that that number of States varies from year to year. I think that the year before there were 28 States that would have benefited under the formula, and only about 20 States that would have received a flat $5 had the proposal been in effect at that time. There is a considerable variation from year to year. A State which may qualify for a payment of $5 plus this year may qualify for only $5 the next year, or vice versa.

Mr. TAFT. The question was raised as to the reason for this formula. It has been asked whether it is a recognized formula. I think I can answer that question in a way. On Friday the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] quoted Prof. Raymond M. Hughes, professor of vocational education at Iowa State College, in his book, Education—America's Magic. The distinguished Senator stated that Professor Hughes used the following criterion in formulating his ranking of the 48 States in order of over-all educational performance:

> 2. Its ability to support education as indicated by its income per child. This refers, of course, to the income which the State Government receives per child and not to the individual citizen's average income per child.

Unfortunately the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is mistaken. Professor Hughes does rely exactly on the same formula that we are using in this bill, because it is the only test of relative income. I have before me Professor Hughes' book Education—America's Magic. On page 54, he says:

> The ability of a State to support education adequately depends on two factors: (1) The total income of the State, and (2) the percentage of the population that is of public school age, considered here as 5 to 17. Our measure of "ability" is taken as the income per child of school age.
>
> The income of all the people in a State is determined largely by the prevailing occupation.

On page 56 he gives the formula. The income per child equals the total income paid to all individuals of the State divided by the total number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 years. That is exactly the formula we use. Professor Hughes and everyone else who deals with public education, in considering the relative ability of States to pay, relies upon the Department of Commerce estimate of the total income of the people of all the States as compared to the total income of the people of each State.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator name a single State which is unable to educate its children in accordance with its ability to pay, if it were willing to assess the taxes to do it?

Mr. TAFT. Take the State of Arkansas, or the State of Mississippi, which is the most extreme example. After levying 2.5 percent of its income in taxes for the support of education, it can pay only $54 per child, which is below the minimum we establish in this bill. In Arkansas the figure is $7,250. Arkansas levies 2.1 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator believe that no State can pay more than 2 percent of its gross income to educate its children?

Mr. TAFT. It can go a little higher. The State of Iowa has gone up to 2.70, which is the highest, but it must sacrifice other things. Roughly speaking, as the Senator knows, the total taxes levied by all the States—and they certainly have scrambled and scrabbled to get it—amount to about $14,000,000,000 a year. With a national income of $225,000,000,000 a year, that represents about 6 percent. The States are raising about 6 percent of the national income for all State purposes. I think that is about all the States can raise, considering the limitations of taxation. Except in the most extraordinary cases, all the money that a State can raise for State taxes will not be substantially in excess of 6 percent of the total income of its people. As the Senator knows, the Federal Government is raising about 18 percent of the income of all the people in taxes. So the two together are taking today 24 percent of the national income, and I think that is a dangerously high figure. Considering the tax system, I believe that 6 percent is probably the limit the States can raise. When we consider the other essential activities of government, the roads which must be built, the expense of the courts, the city expenses, fire and police protection, and all the other things that must be done, if a State spends for education a third of all the taxes it can raise, I think that is about as far as it can go. The State of Iowa may sacrifice something else and put it into education. I do not know for what purposes it spends the rest of its taxes, but I question whether it raises in State taxes more than 6 percent of the total income.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator how far the Federal Government can continue to increase taxes. All we are doing in this case is transferring the burden from the States to the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. We are not transferring anything. Every State must levy just as much as it has done before. We are increasing the total amount of money to be spent for education. That is true. I admitted that. I quite agree that it is undesirable to increase any expenses of the Federal Government; but I do not see why we should ignore the illiteracy problem altogether, and say that other things are more important merely because we have been doing them. I do not think they are. If we could cut everything in the President's budget by 10 percent all the way down the line, we would not require any more taxes than 18 percent of the national income.

Mr. BYRD. I have great confidence in the judgment of the Senator from Ohio. I regard him as probably the best-qualified Member of the Senate to speak on a subject of this kind.

As a matter of fact, the Federal Government is collecting more than 18 percent of the national income. It is collecting about 21 percent, if we include social-security taxes. We are collecting this year about $44,000,000,000 out of a national income estimated at $210,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe that taxes run quite that high. I think the Senator is including a good many miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. BYRD. As the Senator well knows, the figures representing receipts of the Government, as issued by the Bureau of the Budget, do not include social-security taxes.

Mr. TAFT. The last figure we have for national-income payments is $215,000,000,000. Roughly, I figure that the Federal Government takes approximately $41,000,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. That does not include social-security payments. If the Senator will look at the table in the budget—

Mr. TAFT. However, it does not include a number of miscellaneous receipts which are not taxes. Suppose we say $42,000,000,000. That would mean that the Federal Government is raising 20 percent of the national income in taxes, if we count Federal security taxes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator says that a State cannot raise much more than 6 percent of the income of the people in taxes.

Mr. TAFT. I say that the ordinary State cannot stand much more than 6 percent and succeed in collecting the money. If it were not for the Federal Government, presumably a State could raise 20 percent of the income of its people in taxes. But the Federal Government takes that away. The State is limited constitutionally. It cannot really levy a successful tax on incomes. There are only a few dabs of State income taxes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator will agree, will he not, that all the money comes from the citizens of the States? It does not come from the Federal Government. The Federal Government only has the money collected from its citizens who reside in the 48 States.

Mr. TAFT. It comes from the people.

Mr. BYRD. It must all be collected from the citizens of the States.

Mr. TAFT. It must come from the people who live in the States. It does not come from the States. It comes from the people who live in the States, who are citizens of the Federal Government.

Mr. BYRD. By reason of increased Federal taxation, the State may be taxed far in excess of the 6 percent the Senator states it is able to pay.

Mr. TAFT. I did not refer to the State's ability to pay. I stated that as a practical matter, under our present tax system, I do not believe that a State can successfully manage to raise in State taxes more than 6 percent of the total income of the people, because of the limitations on the power of the State to tax. It cannot reach the lucrative sources of taxation. It cannot reach corporate income. It cannot reach individual incomes, except in a very minor degree. Even interstate sales taxes are beyond the power of the State. So the State is limited to a great extent in its power to tax. On the broad basis, I do not believe that it can successfully raise much more than 6 percent in State taxes. A little can be added here or a little there, but I do not believe that a State can succeed in collecting more than 6 percent. That is largely because the Federal Government is collecting 18 or 20 percent.

Mr. BYRD. After all, the taxes come from the States.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree to that at all.

Mr. BYRD. The people residing in the States pay the Federal taxes.

Mr. TAFT. The people pay Federal taxes as national citizens. The citizens of Ohio pay Federal taxes because they are citizens of the United States. Federal taxes have nothing to do with Ohio. However, the people of Ohio have an interest in the national question of eliminating illiteracy in the Southern States.

Mr. BYRD. If they live in Arkansas, they pay Federal taxes; do they not?

Mr. TAFT. Of course.

Mr. BYRD. Therefore they will have to pay the amount required by this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. There is no question that the people of the States have to pay taxes to support the Federal Government. But my point is that in my opinion there is no difference between the importance of paying from Federal taxes, derived from all the States, money to prevent illiteracy, and the importance of paying taxes from all the States to pay for the Army of the United States. It is not a transfer of the educational money from one State to another State, but it is a tax on the Nation as a whole, to meet a national problem.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Ohio is aware, is he not, of the fact that this $300,000,000 will be a deficit expenditure, because in this fiscal year we shall have a deficit of approximately $800,000,000 or $900,000,000, and in the next fiscal year there will be a deficit of at least $3,500,000,000; and in the fiscal year 1951, beginning July 1, 1950, there will be a deficit of $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. If I had my way about the matter—and of course I realize we must solve this problem gradually—there would be no deficit, and yet we would have Federal aid to education.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but the Senator from Ohio here is advocating a proposition which would open up a Pandora's box, as he said in a statement he made about a year ago, and it was the most magnificent statement I have ever read in opposition to Federal aid to education. He said this proposal would be only a beginning, the entering wedge, and would amount to millions and even billions of dollars in the years to come. Yet here the Senator is proposing such a bill.

Mr. TAFT. I have decided that we must provide this aid, and I am willing to take my chances in regard to the future cost of the proposal, rather than to resist it to too great an extent.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Ohio knows that although a short time ago the Senate voted a reduction of $21,000,000 on one appropriation, yet at this session of Congress many hundreds of millions of dollars have been added to the total of new governmental expenditures, and more will be added before this session ends.

As I have said, just recently the Senate voted to make a reduction of $21,000,000 in one item, and the Senator from Ohio made the motion to do that. But now, in virtually the next breath, he proposes to add $300,000,000 in additional expenditures, which is certain to greatly increase, as the years go by, because once this movement starts, the demand from the States for new funds will be made without limit.

Mr. TAFT. I think that demand can be resisted. I do not think we should say that we refuse to give one cent for this purpose, merely because perhaps some day we shall be asked to give more. That seems to me to be a very illogical argument.

As to the relative importance of various needs, of course, I think some things are more important than others. However, as I have said, my idea has been that we can provide for what is set forth in the President's budget—and this matter is set forth in it—and we can make a proportionate reduction in appropriations all the way down the line, on everything, and thus keep within our income. That is why I voted for the amendment the other day. That is why I voted for a 10 percent cut on ECA funds, and that is why I shall vote for a 10 percent cut in the funds for the purpose of this bill. If such a cut or reduction is applied to all appropriations, I think we shall be able to accomplish everything which needs to be accomplished. I think we can do all that we propose to do, without imposing additional taxes, if we make cuts all the way down the line.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio think the cut the Senate made the other day will stand? I will bet him a good dinner that the 5 percent cut which was made the other day by the Senate—and which was very justly acclaimed all over the country—will not stick when final action is taken.

Mr. TAFT. That may well be, but that does not mean that I think it should not

stick, and that therefore I should withdraw every other proposal in which I have an interest for the expenditure of money. No doubt the Senator from Virginia himself will defend some reasonable and proper improvements in the State of Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I say to the Senator from Ohio that since I have been in the Senate I have never requested an appropriation on the floor of the Senate for the State of Virginia.

Mr. TAFT. No doubt the Senator from Virginia would say, "I am perfectly willing to have cuts made in the items for Virginia, if other items are cut."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Ohio, I have never offered an amendment for an appropriation for the State of Virginia. I do not mean that I would not do so but I would not do so if we faced deficit spending or new taxes.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why the Senator should not do so.

Mr. BYRD. But I think all Senators must consider the picture as a whole. If we favor the appropriations in which we are interested, and oppose the appropriations in which we are not interested, certainly we shall never have any retrenchment in Federal expenditures, either under this Congress or under any other.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my position is that I think we can do the things we have set out to do. Here is a problem which I think is just as important as any other. The only argument against it is that we have never worked in this field before. However, I do not think that is a sound argument against it.

As I have said, I favor cutting all appropriations 10 percent, right down the line, and perhaps cutting some appropriations more than that. I might even prefer to eliminate some of the other appropriations, but I must recognize that other Senators favor making them. But at least all Senators can recognize that all appropriations can be cut. I think that is a perfectly sound and consistent position to take.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. If, in order to have us keep within our income, the Senate is obliged to choose between equipping the nationalist governments of Europe with the most modern arms for warfare or giving the children of the United States an adequate education, which one, in the opinion of the Senator from Ohio, would be of the greatest value to the United States?

Mr. TAFT. As the Senator from Vermont knows, my inclination is against spending $1,450,000,000 for arms. I would far rather spend $260,000,000 to try to eliminate illiteracy in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Ohio think it would be interesting if, in the case of Members of the Senate who oppose Federal aid to education, we were to compare their votes either directly against this proposal or by way of favoring amendments which would have the effect of killing Federal aid to education, with their votes on the proposal to rearm the nationalist governments of Europe?

Mr. TAFT. I feel confident that the Senator from Virginia will be consistent. There may be other Senators who will not be consistent.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not referring to the Senator from Virginia. I feel that he will be consistent. I am simply wondering whether all the rest of our colleagues will be equally consistent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to conclude, if I may, my remarks on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator from Massachusetts has not attempted to substitute a different measure of wealth, but he simply proposes to hand $10 to someone for every child in average daily attendance in schools. I think such a proposal attacks the very basic principle of this bill. The Senator from Massachusetts suggests—I do not think he actually proposes it—that a better formula for measuring wealth might be derived from the taxes paid to the Federal Government from the various States. However, Mr. President, I think that probably would be the most unsound method of determining the relative wealth of the States which could possibly be devised.

On Friday the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts compared the taxes paid by the State of Missouri to the taxes paid by the State of North Carolina. Mr. President, the State of Missouri now is paying $136 for each child educated in its schools. The State of North Carolina, even with all the improvement it has made—and it has made a tremendous improvement—is paying only $89 per child for education, because the income of the people of North Carolina is far less than the income of the people of Missouri. However, they pay about the same in Federal taxes.

The State of Missouri paid, in 1948, $1,113,000,000. The State of North Carolina paid $1,137,000,000. But how was that divided? In individual income taxes the State of Missouri paid $525,000,000; the State of North Carolina paid $228,000,000, or less than half of what Missouri paid.

In the case of corporation income taxes the State of Missouri paid $320,000,000; the State of North Carolina paid $187,000,000.

So, Mr. President, on the basis of income taxes, which might be taken as a reasonable basis of comparison, the State of Missouri paid $845,000,000, and the State of North Carolina paid $415,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. Let me first complete this statement. On pay-roll taxes the State if Missouri paid $78,000,000, and the State of North Carolina paid $34,000,000, but on miscellaneous taxes, on excise taxes, the State of Missouri paid $190,000,000, and the State of North Carolina paid $788,000,000—four times what the State of Missouri paid. Of course, most of the cigarette taxes are paid in the State of North Carolina and so they are credited to North Carolina, though nobody in North Carolina has the slightest thing to do with paying any of those taxes; they are paid by the people all over the United States who buy cigarettes. It has no relation whatever to the relative wealth or the relative ability to pay for education, of the State of North Carolina. So that, whereas in income taxes the State of Missouri has twice the income taxes of the State of North Carolina—and roughly speaking, that is about the comparison, I think, on the relative amount per child—one may not say that because North Carolina is a nice State and has made a great deal of progress it therefore must be a richer State than Missouri. According to our formula, according to the Department of Commerce figures, the State of Missouri is very much wealthier than the State of North Carolina. According to the income tax payments to the Federal Government, which are a test if anything would be a test of relative income, the State of Missouri is twice as wealthy as the State of North Carolina. Simply because of this purely artificial fact that excise taxes are collected at the tobacco factory by the State of North Carolina, the total amount paid by North Carolina is more than is paid by the State of Missouri. There simply is absolutely no basis of comparison whatever, in total Federal income taxes paid, and we may just as well dismiss it from our consideration in trying to determine the relative wealth of the States.

Mr. BYRD and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. In what he has just said, the Senator, was not answering the question with respect to the basis of comparison of the relative wealth of the States, was he?

Mr. TAFT. I was answering the argument made here that the total Federal payments are a better criterion than the total income payments calculated by the Department of Commerce, according to their statistical methods.

Mr. BYRD. I have not been able to understand yet the basis that the Senator takes for the distribution of funds. As I understand, he entirely excludes the value of land and taxable property of all kinds.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly, because the ability of anybody to pay taxes is based on income, it is not based on capital value. The moment a farm does not produce income, the farmer stops paying taxes; which happened in the thirties. It is a tax on property, but actually it is paid out of income. We reduced it in the State of Ohio by putting a very strict tax limitation on the total tax that could be levied. The Senator knows that the Federal Government practically does not levy a tax on property. I dealt with this situation somewhat at length in connection with the matter of taxes on property. I have tried to point out that property is not a test of taxpaying ability. There may be in the ground vast resources of copper, but until the copper is mined, nobody can pay taxes on receipts from the production of copper.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator is arguing against a tax on land and tangible

property. Every local government taxes land. In Virginia we derive nearly all our local revenue for schools from the local taxation of lands and tangible property.

Mr. TAFT. There is no legitimate justification for a tax system which taxes property, in my opinion, without relation to its income-producing ability.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator should then revise the whole tax system of this country. There is not a community that does not depend on land and other tangible property to bring in a revenue.

Mr. TAFT. With respect to a rural community, in effect what they do is this: They say, "We have got to have so much money, and we are going to divide the payment of the money among the people of this community, according to the number of acres of land they have." That is the way the thing started. It is an unsound method of taxation. Taxation ought to be based on income. Land is not a fair measure of wealth or of tax-paying ability. The same thing is true of other property. In Ohio we had a tax of 2 percent. The original idea was a tax on property. We had a uniform rule. We had a tax on securities of 2 percent. If a person had a bond bringing in 1¾ percent, and if it was taxed at 2 percent, it is perfectly obvious that taxation of that kind was inequitable, and it was simply avoided; nobody would pay taxes of that kind. Finally we changed the whole basis. We limited very strictly the rate which could be levied on real estate, which as I say is rather a matter of a community getting money and uniting to pay the expenses of the particular community on some basis as between themselves, and we eliminated the property tax on securities. Instead of that, we levied a tax on income from securities at a flat 5 percent rate. I think, Mr. President, it is a completely fair and just comparison between the wealth of two States, the income of all the people of one State in a given year is compared with the income of all the people of the other States in the same year. I do not think it is possible to get a better test of relative tax-paying ability or of relative wealth, so far as that is concerned, because certain property, like mines and undeveloped waterpower, may hold a promise of future wealth, but it certainly is not real wealth until somebody uses it, and until it is developed.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator knows this, with respect to the farming business: A man can put his money back on his farm. He can fertilize it. He can build it up, and he pays no taxes on it; yet his increment and his enhancement of value is a tremendous factor. If we take property next to the cities, that is often enormously enhanced in value.

Mr. TAFT. He cannot afford to do it, unless he is an agriculturalist, not a farmer.

Mr. BYRD. I do not agree with the Senator on that. If the Senator will come up in the valley of Virginia, he will see some of the finest farms in this whole country, which are built up in just the way I have said. Many of these farmers came from Pennsylvania—fine farmers from that State, Dunkards and Mennonites.

Mr. TAFT. But where is wealth? Wealth is created when that improved farm begins to produce more income. Then taxes are collected. The State gets its share of the income; and while the farmer is building it up, he cannot afford to pay the taxes, for he has no income, but only an outlay. During that period, I say there is no real money out of which taxes can properly be paid.

Mr. BYRD. But they are paid, are they not?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, they are paid.

Mr. BYRD. The State and localities collect in taxes from $14,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 annually.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Those figures may be a little high, but are approximately correct.

Mr. TAFT. Fourteen billion dollars in State taxes, and the property taxes today are very much less than 50 percent of the State taxes.

Mr. BYRD. I do not agree with that. I am speaking of local taxes.

Mr. TAFT. I am speaking locally, too. I was speaking locally.

Mr. BYRD. Most of the local taxes, county and city, come from land and tangible personal property, a good part of them, in many States.

Mr. TAFT. But in the long run, how do they value that property? They value the property on the basis of what the property will produce, and in the long run from year to year it is producing a certain income. The property value is the result always of the income, either present or future. Property value is simply a result of income. Income is the basic wealth, and income is the basis of all taxpaying, in my opinion. I am not saying whether there should or should not be a tax on this or that thing, but I say a formula which compares the relative wealth of the States, based on income alone, is the best, the fairest, and the most accurate method of determining the relative wealth of two States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I merely want to ask the Senator one question, after which I shall not disturb him further. I am trying to ascertain the basis the Senator uses when he speaks of income.

Mr. TAFT. I mean the gross incomes of all individuals in a State.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is not speaking of taxable income, is he?

Mr. TAFT. No. As I have explained, this concept is an old one. It is the only formula that I know of for use in determining the relative wealth of States. It is accepted by practically all statisticians as the method of determining it. It is published every year by the Department of Commerce and is defended vigorously by them. I called the Department of Commerce about it this morning. I asked them about it. I put in the record testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in relation to the bearing of the question on social-security taxes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the $6,000,000,000 include both State and local taxes?

Mr. TAFT. I said 6 percent of the gross income. I estimate—and it is a very rough and casual estimate—that the States and localities together levy approximately $14,000,000,000 of taxes, which would be approximately 6 percent of the national income.

Mr. MARTIN. That is both local and State?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I have lumped them. The figures which separate them are not reliable, because in some States all the money is raised and distributed, and in other localities that is not the case. We have to lump them in order to arrive at a figure of any value.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the distinguished Senator from Ohio taken into consideration the families in the United States engaged in farming and those engaged, in the small towns, in industrial work, who earn a portion of their living from production of the soil, which does not get into the general over-all income?

Mr. TAFT. I could not tell the Senator from Pennsylvania offhand whether, in estimating total income, that is included. I think products of the farm, which are consumed on the farm, are included. That is my impression.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Products of the farm, consumed on the farm, are included, as are other advantages which accrue to the farmer, in estimating total farm income.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I know it is not the proper procedure, but maybe the distinguished Senator from Vermont could answer this question: We have in America a very fine group of persons who work in mills. There is another group working in the marginal oil fields and also doing a little farming. They raise a part of their own meat; they produce their own milk and butter. Are such things as that included in the total over-all income?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The production of the farm would be included as farm income, and the other as industrial income. The two added together would make up the total income. I shall have to confess that I do not know where the dividing line is. I believe that if a man lives on a farm of three acres he is classed as a farmer for the purpose of taking a rural census. We have a great many of them in my own State. As I say, I do not know just where the dividing line is that makes either farmers or industrial workers. I would suspect it would be the source from which they derived the majority of their income.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to make this comment: I have had the good fortune in my work as a soldier of being very close to the people who live on the land in several States. There are many men who work in industry and in the marginal oil fields, who have small pieces of land. They develop into marvelous citizens. I was wondering whether that sort of income is included in the over-all income, because, if it is not, there is no way of calculating any tax on that income at all.

Mr. TAFT. I understand it is included.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say except that I hope the Senate will reject the Lodge formula. I think it would destroy the basic purpose of the bill. I think it would not assist to any material extent the children who have been unable to receive even a minimum education. I think it would not assist men who failed in their selective-service test because of illiteracy, or those in Germany to whom I have referred. I think it would simply distribute money broadcast—if $10, why not $20? If $20, why not $50? It is simply a desire to come to the aid of all the States. I think the States can work out gradually, with the development of their systems of taxation, a proper solution of their educational problems. I do not think a State, with an income so low that when it does its utmost it can provide, on an average, less than $100 per child per year, can give in all the dfistricts of that State even a minimum basic education. That is the principal purpose of this bill.

I do not think I want to discuss the details of the Lodge formula. It has a number of other things in it. It proposes to distribute, on the basis of average daily attendance, which is certainly a very difficult thing to do. It proposes that 50 percent of all those who graduate from high school must be 18 years of age at graduation.

In the city of Cincinnati, alone, 83 percent of those who graduate from high school are under 18 years of age. So I do not understand the reason for such a provision. There must be 90 percent of them in full-time attendance. That is a difficult thing to calculate, because there is a great deal of part-time attendance, particularly among children who are handicapped in any way.

There are other factors which I could criticize. But I am opposed to it because of the basic fact that it discards entirely the equalization idea. That is the main reason why I was against the education bill 3 years ago. It discarded the equalization idea. At that time money was to be distributed on the basis of $200 for each teacher in the United States. The Lodge amendment would distribute $10 to each child who attends school. It is simply a broadcast distribution without any discrimination or without any application of the money toward the problem which seems to me is the principal, if not the only, Federal interest.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope very strongly that the Senate will reject the amendment and will accept the principle of the aid-to-education bill.

Mr. LONG, Mr. LODGE, Mr. DONNELL, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem to the Senator that some consideration should actually be given to illiteracy in various States? The same authority from which I quoted a few moments ago, the American Encyclopedia, states that as of 1940 the greatest functional illiteracy was 35.7, in Louisiana; in South Carolina, 34.7; in Mississippi, 30.2; in Georgia, 30.1; in Alabama, 28.9; in New Mexico, 27.3.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see how any formula could be based on the amount of illiteracy in a particular State. That raises many different questions. All we can do is to say, "You must provide a minimum education for all children, if you want this money." The Senator from Massachusetts, on Friday, talked about the over-all educational performance and mentioned certain tests made by experts who said that some States were better than others, and said the lowest were New Jersey, Alabama, Virginia, Arkansas, Delaware, Maryland, and Georgia. They may be the lowest. The money is not the only consideration, I quite agree. But it seems to me that so far as a State's improving its own condition is concerned, that is up to the State. It should be able to do it. The reason for Federal intervention is because a State cannot, because of its poverty, do the job. I think the contribution should be based fundamentally on that principle, and not on which State has the highest illiteracy and which has not. A State may spend $200 per child and still give the child a very poor education. There is no way in which we can test that. No one in Washington can make the situation any better or change it in any way, so far as I can see. So, answering the Senator from Louisiana, I should be inclined to be opposed to any formula based on illiteracy, just as I would be opposed to any other test of whether a State has or has not a good school system, or what kind of a system it has.

Mr. LONG. Would not the figures pretty well indicate that illiteracy and poverty go hand in hand?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is true. Where States have not the income, it is more than likely there will be more illiterates than otherwise. By giving good educational opportunities they may reduce the number of illiterates. Undoubtedly, broadly speaking, lack of income is likely to produce more illiteracy.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator know that in the six States I have named, which, according to the Americana Encyclopedia, are suffering the worst from illiteracy, Federal aid would be reduced by the Lodge amendment from approximately $95,000,000 to approximately $32,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is true.

EXHIBIT 1

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Edward F. Denison, Economic Assistant, Department of Commerce.

Mr. Denison, will you please identify yourself by giving the reporter your name and address and the position which you hold?

STATEMENT OF EDWARD F. DENISON, ACTING ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, ACCOMPANIED BY CHARLES F. SCHWARTZ, OF THE NATIONAL INCOME DIVISION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1949

Mr. DENISON. I am Edward F. Denison, Acting Assistant Director of the Office of Business Economics in the Department of Commerce. I live in Alexandria, Va. I have with me Mr. Charles Schwartz, of the National Income Division of the Department of Commerce, who will assist me.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Denison, some members of the committee, especially Mr. REED, have thought that you perhaps could give us some information that would be helpful to the committee in connection with tax matters under social-security legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Did you have a statement you wanted to make before we ask you questions?

Mr. DENISON. I have here a brief description of the definition and methodology which we follow in preparing our estimates, which I shall be very glad to present.

Mr. COOPER. I did not quite understand you. Did you have a statement you desired to make before members ask you questions, or do you want to proceed to answer questions now?

Mr. DENISON. I have with me a brief description of the definitions and methodology followed in our estimates of income payments by States; and if it is agreeable to the committee, I shall be very glad to read that.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask you this question, Mr. Denison: Are you familiar with section 1411 of this social-security bill H. R. 2892?

Mr. DENISON. I just had a chance to read it today. I think I understand it although I have not worked through any calculation to see how it would work out for any particular State.

Mr. REED. You have not been called upon by the Social Security Board to work out details and formulas provided here in section 1411.

Mr. DENISON. No sir, I have not.

Mr. REED. Very well. We will now listen to your statement.

Mr. DENISON. Our estimates of per capita income payments by States are obtained by dividing estimates of total income received by individuals in each State which we prepare by the estimates of population of each State as prepared by the Bureau of the Census.

"Income payments to individuals" is a measure of the income received by residents of each State from business establishments and governmental agencies. It comprises income received by individuals in the form of (1) wages and salaries, after deduction of employees' contributions to social security, railroad retirement, railroad unemployment insurance, and Government retirement program; (2) proprietors' incomes, representing the net income of unincorporated establishments—including farms—before owners' withdrawals; (3) property income, consisting of dividends, interest, and net rents and royalties; and (4) other income, which includes public assistance and other direct relief; labor-income items such as work relief, Government retirement payments, veterans' pensions and benefits, workmen's compensation, and social insurance benefits; mustering-out payments to discharged servicemen; family-allowance payments, and

voluntary allotments of pay to dependents of military personnel; enlisted men's cash terminal-leave payments and redemptions of terminal-leave bonds; and State government bonuses to veterans of World War II. Income payments are distributed among the States on a where-received basis. Only payments made to residents are included in the estimates for the continental United States and the individual States.

Per capita income payments are derived by division of total income payments by total population in each State.

For the years 1929–43 and 1947, population data used in the derivation of per capita income are the midyear estimates of the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce. For the years 1944–46, population totals used are the sum of the civilian population from the Bureau of the Census and military personnel, as compiled from monthly or quarterly data from the Departments of the Army and Navy.

Next, I should like to describe the principal sources of data used in compiling the income estimates.

Estimates of total income payments to individuals for each State are derived as the summation of a very large number of separately estimated components. This statement necessarily omits considerable detail but I think it will give a very fair summary of the entire picture.

Wages and salaries, which for the Nation are more than three-fifths of all income, are among the types of income for which data are most complete and reliable. They are estimated by States in considerable industrial detail. For most industries they are derived from reports of the Bureau of the Census and of the Social Security Administration.

In the preparation of estimates for 1939 and subsequent years, which are the ones of course most relevant, heavy reliance was placed on wage data compiled by the Social Security Administration from tabulations by the State unemployment compensation agencies of reports received from all covered employers. For each State these tabulations include a summary of the total amount of wages, classified by detailed industry groups, actually paid out by establishments located in the State.

The unemployment-compensation wage data were supplemented by special tabulations of the Social Security Administration furnishing data on wages in the very small-sized firms excluded from unemployment insurance coverage by the varying size-of-firm provisions of the State laws. These tabulations were compiled from wage data filed by employers under the old-age and survivors insurance program, which includes all-sized establishments within "covered" employment. Supplementation of the unemployment-compensation wage data by the old-age and survivors insurance wage data yields a complete measure of wages and salaries paid out by all establishments in "covered" industries.

On a Nation-wide basis, wages and salaries in covered industries in 1947 constituted four-fifths of all wages and salaries and one-half of all income payments to individuals.

State estimates of wages and salaries are prepared for each of the several industries, or types of employment, not covered by social-security laws. These include agriculture; Federal, State, and local government agencies; railroads; domestic service; and nonprofit religious, charitable, scientific, and educational agencies. Data used in the formulation of estimates for these categories are obtained, for the most part, from Federal agencies.

For example, estimates of wages paid to hired farm laborers are secured from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. Wage and salary payments by governmental agencies are based on data supplied by the Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, Bureau of the Census, Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency, and the Departments of the Army and Navy.

Estimates of Government wages and salaries are made separately for the executive, judicial, legislative, and military branches of the Federal Government, and for the school and nonschool groups of employees of State and local governments. Pay of the armed forces, net of their contributions to allowances and allotments going to their dependents, is allocated by States in terms of their State of duty. These allocations are made separately for each of the four military services and are based on monthly or quarterly data by States on numbers of officers and of enlisted personnel stationed in each State and on average rates of pay for the two groups of personnel.

Proprietors' income may be divided for purposes of this discussion into net income of farm operators and net income of nonfarm proprietors. State estimates of the net income of farm operators are derived by deducting from farmers' gross income during the calendar year their total expenses of production.

Mr. CURTIS. Where do you get the gross income for farmers?

Mr. DENISON. The data come from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. CURTIS. Where did they get it?

Mr. DENISON. I want to say just a little more on that, if I may.

Mr. CURTIS. Go right ahead.

Mr. DENISON. Gross income includes cash income from marketings of crops and livestock, Government payments, the value of products consumed on the farm, and the value, positive or negative, of the change in inventories of crops and livestock. The total of production expenses is a summation of 34 separately estimated items. Data on which the income and expenditures data are based are those of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The value of change in inventories, it should be noted, is included in farm proprietors' income in order to secure a measure of the income from current production.

Also to be noted is that products consumed on farms are valued at farm prices.

Mr. REED. How are they valued?

Mr. DENISON. Products consumed on farms are valued at farm prices, not retail prices. By farm price is meant the price at which they would be sold in that market if they were sold.

Mr. REED. Value at wholesale?

Mr. DENISON. That is correct.

Mr. REED. How about the cities, the food supplies there? How do they run?

Mr. DENISON. In the cities there is no necessity to value the item as such, but of course what is implied is retail prices.

Mr. REED. That would make quite a difference, would it not?

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman yield just a moment? We missed the opportunity of hearing whom the gentleman represents. Are there copies of his testimony?

Mr. REED. He was brought in here at my request this morning to try to find out how they worked out this question of national income, and this gentleman is from the Depart of Commerce. They are the ones on whom the Social Security Board relies to look after this formula under which we are going to distribute the money to the States under section 1411. He is giving us the details of how they arrive at this question of national income and per capita income for the States.

Mr. CARROLL. I would suggest to the witness that he speak up a little bit because it is a very interesting subject and we would like to hear what he has to say.

Mr. DENISON. Let me interject at this moment that the difference between wholesale and retail valuation of home consumption on farms seems to amount to about $2,000,000,000 nationally. That is out of a $190,000,000,000 national aggregate. It is true, of course, that it would be somewhat more important in some States than in others.

Mr. REED. That is what I was getting at.

Mr. DENISON. The total net income of proprietors in nonagricultural industries is prepared by States for each major industry division. The geographic distribution of these components of total income payments is based mainly on reports of the Bureau of the Census, including reports of both the industrial and population censuses. Pending the availability of more complete information from census enumerations, year-to-year alterations of the State distributions derived for the census year 1939 were based for each industry on a relevant measure, such as volume of sales or wage and salary payments.

National estimates of dividends, interest, and net rents and royalties are distributed by States largely on the basis of tabulations by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the amount of these items reported by individuals on Federal income-tax returns.

There are, however, several important exceptions to this general procedure. Estimated as separate components are Federal interest payments to individuals (for recent years from State data on series E individuals' bond holdings, furnished by the Treasury Department) and a number of other types of property income. Agricultural net rents received by farmer landlords are also estimated as a separate component, from data furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

For most of the numerous individual components of the category of other income payments, State and national data represent actual disbursements, as reported by Federal agencies. Types of income for which data on disbursements by States are available from official reports include public assistance and other relief, retirement, and unemployment-insurance benefits under the social security and railroad retirement and railroad unemployment-insurance programs; benefit payments from State cash sickness compensation funds; and veterans' pensions and benefits.

For two other items of this category—workmen's compensation and retirement payment by State and local governments—estimates are supplied by the Social Security Administration as a product of its studies of social insurance and related payments.

Data on State bonus payments to veterans of World War II were furnished by the individual State governments. State data on veterans' redemptions of terminal-leave bonds were obtained from the Treasury Department.

The Departments of the Army and Navy report disbursements for the country as a whole for mustering-out payments, military allowances, and enlisted men's cash terminal-leave payments. Additionally, they supply requisite data for estimating the amounts of these disbursements received by residents of the various States. Such data include a tabulation by the War Department of the actual amount of family allowance payments received in each State during June 1944, annual data on military separations by State of residence, and annual data on the number of military personnel according to State of residence.

Thus, as you can see, the procedure for estimating income by State is a very detailed one which makes use of all available information. We have followed this procedure of detailed estimates because it produces more

reliable estimates than could be obtained by any more general or summary procedures.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that we utilize uniform procedures for all States, uniform sources, and that the procedures are continuous and are not changed from one year to the next.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. REED. There was no request on the part of the Social Security Board, with reference to this particular bill, for you to work out any distribution of funds under this formula?

Mr. DENISON. That is correct. But I would point out that since our estimates for recent years are all published they have no trouble doing it themselves, based on published data.

Mr. REED. Now, one reason for calling you up here was because I was not capable of working that thing out myself. I just wondered where we were going here, if we were going to distribute wealth by some such plan as this proposed in the bill and also because I came in possession of a document here that asks, "What Is National Income?" by Mr. Leon S. Wellstone.

Do you know who Mr. Wellstone is?

Mr. DENISON. No, sir.

Mr. REED. I do not know who he is either but evidently he was with the Department of Commerce, at least up to 1942. That is the notation on here, and that is all I know.

Mr. DENISON. That I do not know.

Mr. REED. I may have to consume just a little time here, but I feel the record should be clear on this. It speaks of the "present emergency," which was during the war. This was prepared along about 1942. It says:

"In the present emergency, studies of the national income will prove to be of definite value, which will be enhanced by the research, now being made by the Department of Commerce, into the composition of the 'final product.' This is so because the Government is engaged today in the responsible and urgent task of making our economy produce the maximum of military goods and also enough of civilian goods to maintain health and civilian morale.

"The job involved is one of studying the pattern of our national economy and discovering where the necessary transition from civilian to military production can be effected with best results and least disturbances to essential civilian needs. National-income studies, if sufficiently complete, will aid us in understanding this pattern and in making the logical changes.

"COMPREHENSIVE STUDIES AID IN PLANNING

"Fortunately, in this Nation the problem is one of reorientation, not of drastic reduction of the standard of living. The immense plant, the enormous resources, and the large manpower of the United States are capable of extraordinary production. Our economic potential has never been put to a test. We do know, however, that this potential is great, and that no nation possesses comparable mechanical ingenuity for 'passing miracles' of production when necessity compels.

"To the Government economists conning both the immediate and the long-range public needs, comprehensive studies of national income will serve both as a blueprint and as an X-ray for efficient and enlightened planning in war and in peace.

"NATIONAL INCOME IS A YARDSTICK

"What is 'national income'?

"National income is a yardstick. It measures what a nation, with its people variously at work during a given period of time, produces in commodities and services. That measure is expressed in dollars in this country, it is expressed in pounds sterling in Britain, and so on.

"THE UNIT OF MEASURE

"National income need not necessarily be expressed in terms of money. We could, imaginably, use other measures, and could thus express it in bushels of wheat, tons of steel, number of automobiles, and so forth. It is obvious, however, that such a list would be extremely long and cumbersome. As money is our medium of exchange and measure of value, the national income is expressed in money.

"But let us remember at all times to think of national income not as mere money, but as something quite real and dynamic; for it reflects the work, energy, and imagination which the Nation exerts in order to live and thrive.

"COMMODITY AND SERVICE DEFINED

"We said national income is a measure of the value of commodities and services produced. Then the question arises, 'What is a commodity'? It is something tangible that we can use and are willing to pay for. An apple, for example, or a pair of shoes is a commodity.

"A 'service,' too, is something we want and are willing to pay for. A dentist who fixes our teeth renders a service and receives, say, $10 for it. That $10 is a drop in the vast flow of national income, which runs into billions of dollars. (Currently it is going at the rate of about $95,000,000,000 per annum.)

"Charlie Chaplin makes us laugh and gets paid for it, since amusement is a service. What he produces is a part of the national income.

"HOW INCOME IS CREATED

"Before we go deeper into the subject, a complete example of how national income is created may be amiss. Suppose a dozen men find themselves, Crusoe-like, on a deserted island with some cash in their pockets. If they merely land and lounge on the island, doing nothing, they will starve, in spite of the cash they may have tucked away. You can't eat gold or currency. This shows what national income is not.

"It is not money in everybody's pockets. That money is merely a ticket of admission. It means you have worked and that you have become entitled to certain of the things that you have helped produce. Money enables you to get some of them for your own uses.

"The first earmark of national income, therefore, is that it measures things that have economic worth. The creation of these things springs from the efforts of men to survive and, beyond that, to prosper and enjoy life.

"THE ILLUSTRATION CONTINUED

"Now, suppose that among the hapless men on the island there are a dentist, a carpenter, and a hunter. One man in the company suffers from a toothache; the dentist extracts a bad tooth and receives $5 for his service. (These men, we assume, are all hopeful of returning one day to civilization, where money counts.) That $5 is the first item in the island's national income, and is its total national income to date.

"Suppose the carpenter chops down a tree and another man buys the lumber for $10, in the hope of rigging up a canoe. That lumber sale is item No. 2 in the island's national income, which now totals $15. Suppose the hunter kills a pheasant and sells it to a cook in the party for $5. That is item No. 3 in the island's national income, which now totals $20.

"We can thus see the real nature of national income. It arises from the application of man's skill in making or fetching commodities necessary for life or doing things for one another. Scatter a few seeds on fertile soil, and there will spring up a growth. Apply human skill and ingenuity to natural riches, and there will be, so long as people want to survive, national income.

"IT IS THE NET SUM

"The example of the island is of value to us in another sense. For economists say that national income is not merely the sum, expressed in dollars, of commodities and services, but the net sum.

"What do they mean by that? They mean that the hunter, in selling the pheasant for $5, took account of the fact that he used up several cartridges; that the carpenter, in chopping down the tree and selling the lumber for $10, took account of the wear and tear on his ax—which won't last forever.

"In each case, then, when capital is used there are charges for plant and equipment, and other such items. These are deducted in advance; therefore, our figures are net. If they had not been deducted, our figures would have been gross. It is the net figures which we usually have in mind in estimating the national income.

"We are interested in what is left after we have repaired the wear and tear on our capital equipment. In a word, we try at all times to find out what we have really produced this year or that; and we can arrive at the correct total only by adding what has been produced and deducting what has been used up in the course of production.

"FINAL PRODUCT

"We remarked that the national income is the net sum of commodities and services produced. There are several ways of measuring national income. For the reader who desires a clear understanding of the national income, measuring the final product would perhaps be best.

"Economists mean by 'final product' that if a carpenter makes a table and sells it to some family for $50, he need not report separately the polished lumber and the stains and the labor that went into the making of the table. It is only necessary to deduct capital deduction, such as use of tools—his own and those in the lumber mill. The sales price less charges for capital consumption accounts for all items. This is a complete total, and no item is counted twice.

"So let us sum up what the national income is. It is the net sum of commodities and services produced. And we always add up only the values of the final product—the automobile only, not the steel that went into it; the table, not the lumber it needed.

"We measure income with dollars, since that is more convenient than measuring it with carloads, burlaps, or bottles. And this at once always measures a quart; but a dollar today isn't the same as the dollar 20 years ago. There is an adage, 'Handsome is as handsome does.' Of the dollar it may be said, 'A dollar is as a dollar buys.'

"In a word, the dollar has no constant value. As the years pass, it buys now more, now less. Therefore, it is unsound to be impressed with a big dollar sign and figure of national income unless we recognize what power the dollar has. It always has this power, more or less. Except in times of runaway inflation—which we, here, fortunately, never have had in modern times, nor do we expect to have—the dollar does have buying power. But that power fluctuates, and sometimes rather widely.

"For this reason, for example, the 1940 national income, amounting to $76,000,000,000 was better than the $83,400,000,000 national income of 1929 when, as we customarily say, prices were high—or as we might say, the value of the dollar was low.

"Consequently, to glean the real sense behind the figure of the national income, we must remember what the dollar was worth during the period in question. The Department of Commerce for the first time made such adjustment for price changes in June 1941."

I suppose you are familiar with that?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. REED (reading):

"FINAL DEFINITION

"Now let us finally sum up what national income is. This final summation may be stated thus:

"National income is the value of the net final product measured in dollars.

"With this definition in mind we can clearly see the purpose of the national-income studies. We can learn by comparing the figures of 1 year and the next—with proper adjustment for price changes—whether we are going up or down as a producing Nation."

Right there, I should like to ask you in arriving at national income whether you have considered from year to year or will consider from year to year the change in value of the dollar, the purchasing power.

Mr. DENISON. In a word, no; but I would like to expand on that very briefly.

Mr. REED. I should like to have you do that.

Mr. DENISON. What is relevant here, of course, since this bill is so drawn that it is based on relative per capita income in each State as compared to the other States, is not the change over a time insofar as price changes are uniform throughout the country. What would seem to be relevant is any differences in the price levels from one State to another or changes in that difference over time. In other words, if prices simply double in all States between 1940 and 1948, the relative position of each State would be unaffected by that phenomenon.

Now with respect to the differences between States, we simply have no data available which would permit us to make any adjustment for differences in price levels between the various States, if they exist, and have no program and no plans to prepare any such data.

Mr. REED. That was one of the questions which was puzzling me. Of course, I cannot understand why they put in that kind of formula to determine distribution of these funds between States.

I will go on for a minute and I will soon be through.

"We can figure out the national income per capita by dividing the income by the population. If we can get this figure for a number of years (always bearing in mind the inconstancy of the dollar and the necessity of price adjustment) we can arrive at a clear-cut idea of whether our standard of living is going up or down.

"There are four ways of calculating the national income. One way is called by industrial origin. Here we add up the contribution to the production of commodities and services that originates in different industries. In their entirety these industries represent the whole Nation at work—that is, the whole economic output of the Nation.

"One group of industries produces commodities. These are agriculture, mining, manufacturing, contract construction. The second group of industries distributes services or products. This group includes transportation, power and gas, retail and wholesale trade. The third group creates and distributes—communication, finance, service, and government.

"ESTIMATING DISTRIBUTIVE SHARES

"The second way of estimating the national income is by computing what economists call distributive shares.

"What are these distributive shares? They are simply money payments or accruals to the people whose labor or capital services result directly or indirectly, in the production of goods and services.

"A shoe factory manufactures 1,000 pairs of shoes, which are sold. As a consequence, workers are paid in wages; the corporation bondholders receive interest; the corporation stockholders obtain a profit; and the man who owns the storehouse the company uses receives rent. The wages, profit, interest, and rent are distributive shares. A man writes a book and receives royalties. These royalties are his distributive share.

"OTHER WAYS OF COMPUTING INCOME

"The third way of calculating the national income is by type of product. This is the final product approach. Here the shoes and the office desks and the automobiles and electrical machines are piled up, as it were, in one huge physical pile, showing what the Nation has actually produced in net amount after replacements have been made for capital consumption. Each item has a price, and the prices are added up. Necessarily, only broad categories of goods and services are tabulated.

"The fourth and final way of figuring national income is by the source of outlay. Here we catch national income on the consumption side. We add up what the people buy for consumption and what is purchased with savings—their own savings and those of the companies in which they have invested.

"WHAT HAPPENS TO WHAT WE PRODUCE?

"What happens to the national income? It is either consumed or invested.

"Clearly if all that is produced is consumed, there can be no investment. If more is consumed than produced, the Nation draws on its reserves—economists refer to such a condition as negative capital formation. If less is consumed than is produced, there are real additions—or, as economists put it, positive capital formation.

"Consumption completes the cycle of the national income. As we have seen, the cycle is set in motion by man's desire for foods and services; it is carried along because such desires persist; it is completed by consumption or investment. Actually, the operation is continuous."

I have read that in detail into the record because I cannot help feel that this formula is not a true measure. I think of New York State with its vast industrial center, then I think of a State with very, very few industries and with rather low agricultural production even. I just want to find out, if I can, what formula you use. I do not know which one of these you are using. Is it the final net product? Is that the one?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. REED, I think I had better say something at this point.

Mr. REED. I want you to; I want to know what this share-the-wealth formula is.

Mr. DENISON. There is a difference between national income and income payments. The national income, for which we also prepare estimates corresponds to the definition you have just been reading and is a measure of current production by the economy, or if you look at it from the other side, income accruing to individuals from that current production.

Now we do not have estimates by States of the national income. The series which this bill refers to, or which we would certainly interpret it as referred to, is what we call income payments to individuals. The difference between the two measures briefly is as follows:

National income measures income accruing from current production. Income payments to individuals measure total income actually received in each year by individuals regardless of why or how.

Statistically there are two principal differences between the two series. First, the national income includes income which accrues but is not actually received by individuals, and the principal item there is the difference between corporate profits and dividend payments. In other words, what goes into the series that we are now discussing is the actual dividends paid out, whereas into the national income goes the profits figure whether it is paid out or not.

On the other hand, this series of income payments to individuals includes what we call "transfer payments," which consist of payments, chiefly by governmental units but to a slight extent by business enterprises, which are not made in return for service rendered. For example, direct relief payments, social-security benefit payments and many of the military pension payments do not measure payment for service rendered currently but do represent transfer of funds to individuals, so that type of item is included in the income payments figure but is not included in national income.

What we are trying to measure in the income payments series is the income actually received during the year by individuals in the United States or in each State.

I might add this: With respect to definitions, there always has been and always will be some disagreement among economists and experts and others on precisely what the definition of national income ought to be and how it ought to be measured. With respect to income payments, there is very little, if any, disagreement. Certainly, there is none that causes people to become excited as to whether one should include this item or that. It is pretty well clear cut, since you are not trying to define production but just something that people received this year.

I do not say there is no question about any item but it is a noncontroversial sort of series. I do want to emphasize that it is not national income this bill refers to, and that we have no data on national income or the value of goods and services currently produced on a geographic basis smaller than the United States as a whole.

Mr. REED. Of course, this seems to me to be a colossal task. How many people do you have working on this all the time in order to keep this?

Mr. DENISON. In our National Income Division we have approximately 43 people at the present time.

Mr. REED. Do you have the figures down there showing the variation of the purchasing power of the dollar over the years?

Mr. DENISON. Over a time?

Mr. REED. Yes; over the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. DENISON. That depends on what you mean, Mr. Reed. Obviously, if you just want to use consumers' price indexes, or wholesale price indexes, it is very simple to do. Actually though, if you are thinking of a price index which is appropriate for the total output of the economy——

Mr. REED. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. DENISON. The answer is "No." That is a project upon which we are working very hard at the present time and we hope to have it done in 6 months but certainly not in less than that time. It is something in which there is very great interest and we are very anxious to get it done ourselves.

Mr. REED. I do not mind saying to you that it is of the utmost importance, I think, for us to try to find out just how constant this national income is as a yardstick by which to carry out the plans of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, you distinguish between national income and personal income?

Mr. DENISON. Between national income and income payments.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you class dividends received from investments as personal income and not as part of the national income?

Mr. DENISON. No, sir; the dividends would be in both series but the undistributed profits of the corporations would be part of the national income but not part of income payments because they are not paid out currently during the year.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you add together the corporation income and dividends paid out or classify them separately in determining national income?

Mr. DENISON. In national income they are both included and we show them as separate items, but the undistributed profits part is not included in the income payments series. Of course, in some years it can be negative; in some years dividends exceed profits.

The CHAIRMAN. Dividends do not directly represent production and services?

Mr. DENISON. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But indirectly they represent service, I understand?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a rather fine distinction, is it not? It is hard to understand how you determine the sum total of national income and the sum total of individual income payments. Which is the greater of the two?

Mr. DENISON. Some years one and some years the other, but in prosperous years such as we have had for the last several years the national income is the bigger aggregate. You get in a depression period and the payments exceed the profits and it goes the other way.

Mr. CURTIS. I am interested in finding out who does your estimating and where do they get the figures, not so much the theory of the division of income payments or per capita income.

Now, taking the State of Nebraska, how do you go about estimating what you term "proprietors' income?" How many people do you have in the field? Where do they get the figures, and so on?

Mr. DENISON. Speaking generally now because it is true of each of the series, the procedure is that we first get the best national figure we can.

Mr. CURTIS. Where do you get that figure?

Mr. DENISON. The reason for that is there are always, nearly always, more and better data on a national basis than there are for the several States.

Mr. CURTIS. Where do you get those data?

Mr. DENISON. The national figure for proprietors' income, unfortunately from an expositional standpoint, is one of the most complicated because it is built up as the sum of estimates in approximately 70 different industries, each of which is done separately.

Mr. CURTIS. That is 70 estimates?

Mr. DENISON. That is 70 estimates.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and you get the sum of those separate guesses and you start breaking that down into States; is that right?

Mr. DENISON. I do not like the word "guesses." The figures are far from that.

Mr. CURTIS. Estimates then.

Mr. DENISON. But that is correct.

Now I should like to make one thing clear at this point. From the standpoint of the present bill, the practical outcome of the distribution formula here is not affected very greatly by the amount of error in the estimated national totals because it is going to be proportional in each State.

In other words, if we overestimate, let us say, 5 percent in proprietors' income in retail trade, that is not all going to be concentrated in one State.

Mr. CURTIS. You come up with a figure and you say the average per capita income for Nebraska is $1,157.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Now one of your estimates in there is your proprietors' income.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. I wonder where you get the figures for your proprietors' income.

Mr. DENISON. That is what I started to say. I can only discuss it in two steps; first, is where we get national totals; and, secondly, how we break that national total down among the States, because that is the way we do it. The national total is done separately for each industry.

For example, one large part is income of professional people. Now what we do there is multiply the number of people engaged in the independent practice of their profession by their estimated average income.

Mr. CURTIS. Where do you get the estimated average income?

Mr. DENISON. That is based on questionnaire surveys which we ourselves conduct.

Mr. CURTIS. How many questionnaires do you send into a given State? We have about one and one-third million people out there. I want to know how you found out the average per capita income.

Mr. DENISON. Take lawyers, for instance; we got returns last year by survey from about 3,000 lawyers in the country as a whole, which were distributed among the States in proportion to the number of lawyers in the State.

Mr. CURTIS. We have 1 percent of the population out there, so that would be 30 lawyers in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. DENISON. I do not have the figure in mind. I might guess it is 40 or 50.

Mr. CURTIS. Did they answer under oath?

Mr. DENISON. No, sir; they did not.

Mr. CURTIS. Their questionnaires were pooled with the questionnaires from all the lawyers all over the country?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there any place that you go to get a definite figure from a State record, income-tax record, or any place else to determine how much income is received in any State?

Mr. DENISON. I assume you are still referring to proprietors' income figures?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. And I am discussing proprietors, which is a small part of a total, but obviously one of those which is more difficult to estimate. We do, of course, use all the income-tax data which are tabulated.

For example, not every year but periodically we get from the Bureau of Internal Revenue tabulations of the total gross receipts and the net income of both sole proprietorships and partnerships. We do not accept these as gospel, but rather adjust them on the basis of such other information as we can get—when we are fortunate from census—on what the total receipts should be. Then we arrive from that at the national total. This discussion refers to retail trade. Actually that is the largest single industry in the nonfarm-proprietor field.

Mr. CURTIS. You do not take the income-tax figures on that?

Mr. DENISON. We make a great deal of use of those, but we do not use them as recorded. On the basis of comparable data from other sources it appears—certainly not surprisingly—that they are not complete.

Mr. CURTIS. Then you get the lawyers' income for a given State by sending out 3,000 questionnaires to all the lawyers in the United States?

Mr. DENISON. By getting back 3,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Do you sort out those questionnaires that come from Nebraska and determine what the average income of the Nebraska lawyer is?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. You put that in the Nebraska figure?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. You do not first merge the lawyers' income with everybody else's income to get a national estimate?

Mr. DENISON. No, sir. It is the other way around. In our industry break-down legal service is an industry.

Mr. CURTIS. How do you determine how much a dentist in Nebraska makes?

Mr. DENISON. We do the same thing. We are currently making a study of dentists.

Mr. CURTIS. How do you find out what the agricultural income of the State is?

Mr. DENISON. For agricultural income, we rely entirely on the Department of Agriculture as a source. We ourselves collect no information. We simply take the data which the Department of Agriculture furnishes us, receipts and deductions.

Mr. CURTIS. How do they get it?

Mr. DENISON. Let me at this point say that I am not particularly qualified as an agricultural expert, but the starting point on gross receipts and most items——

Mr. CURTIS. Where do they get the figures on gross receipts?

Mr. DENISON. It is the census of agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. Where do they get the figures on gross receipts of the farmers in my State or any State?

Mr. DENISON. The starting point is data collected in the census of agriculture, which covers every farm in the country.

Mr. CURTIS. How often is it made?

Mr. DENISON. It has been taken every fifth year. The last was in 1944.

Mr. CURTIS. There is a question on there asking how much their income is?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir; on gross receipts.

Mr. CURTIS. On agriculture?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. How often is that made?

Mr. DENISON. Every fifth year.

Mr. CURTIS. The census makes that inquiry of every person living on the farm?

Mr. DENISON. Of someone on every farm; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. How do you find out how much farm income was consumed on the farm?

Mr. DENISON. I am informed that is also collected by the census of agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. This question does not apply to proprietors' income; but, in any of the income, what other definition do you get?

Mr. DENISON. Let me go back. Two-thirds of the total is wages and salaries.

Mr. CURTIS. Where do you get those figures?

Mr. DENISON. The wages and salaries data have an absolute minimum of error. I will repeat that. Within what we call covered industries, meaning industries covered by social security, which covers about four-fifths of the total wages and salaries.

Mr. CURTIS. You get a definite figure on that?

Mr. DENISON. That is correct. Those figures are all based on reports.

Mr. CURTIS. How do you find out the wages on uncovered?

Mr. DENISON. On that we estimate separately for each noncovered industry. The largest of those industries is the Federal Government. For some agencies we have the amount of wages and salaries paid out in each State. The Post Office Department is included among that portion. For the remainder we have data on the amount of wages and salaries paid by each agency nationally, and the number of people employed in each State, and distribute the total national pay roll by the number of persons employed.

In other words, for some fractions of that we have to assume the average earnings of people are the same in one State as another.

Mr. CURTIS. How would you get the picture for domestic employment?

Mr. DENISON. For domestic employment we rely on the Bureau of the Census population data.

Mr. CURTIS. Do people report how much they make working there?

Mr. DENISON. For their part, which is obviously the weakest in the wage and salary field, what we have is data on the number of domestic servants for the year 1940—for the year 1940 only, I should add. For the movement of that basic average earnings figure, which would be so derived, we are forced to rely on the Bureau of Labor Statistics index for the price paid for domestic service.

Mr. CURTIS. How about casual labor? A great many people make their livelihood by casual labor. Their employer pays no social-security tax. They draw their wages in cash more or less from day to day, and many of them are not in the income-tax bracket. How do you determine their income?

Mr. DENISON. I am not sure exactly what you mean by "casual labor."

Mr. CURTIS. In the social-security law casual labor is exempted from coverage. That means you hire somebody to mow your lawn. You hire somebody to trim your trees. You do not make out a social-security report. When you are through you may pay them in cash, but they are not a regular employee of any individual or any concern.

Mr. DENISON. Actually, in any quantitative sense. I think what you are referring to boils pretty much down to two groups. One is a group of persons we classify as proprietors in construction because we do not know what else to do with them.

Mr. CURTIS. In what?

Mr. DENISON. As proprietors in the construction industry, which consists of people who work here and there, chiefly for private households, who are not on the pay roll of a firm and, therefore, are not covered by social-security data.

Mr. CURTIS. How do you pick the figures from that?

Mr. DENISON. From that group we got out the number of such people in the first place from the census of population data for 1940. We have had to pretty much estimate their income without any good data or almost any data.

I should like to add that is a very unimportant part of the total.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. Coming back to your estimate of wage income. The social-security records cut off at $3,000 per individual, did they not?

Mr. DENISON. Our procedure is to start with the unemployment-compensation data. Under the unemployment-compensation laws, the employers report both taxable wages up to $3,000 and the total wages; so there is no problem there.

Mr. CURTIS. For what do you use the OASI data?

Mr. DENISON. The only thing we use the OASI data for in this connection is getting at the pay rolls of those firms which are too small to be covered by the State unemployment laws.

Mr. CURTIS. What percent of the people working for concerns are not covered by unemployment insurance? You can supply that figure later on if you do not have it now.

Mr. DENISON. I do not have that figure at hand. The pay rolls under the social-security law run slightly more than half of the total income from all sources.

Mr. CURTIS. The pay roll on unemployment compensation supplies more than half?

Mr. DENISON. The unemployment compensation would supply slightly less than half.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, you would not have the information on income over $3,000, more than half of the workers?

Mr. DENISON. Excuse me, within the area covered by social-security laws, the unemployment-compensation laws cover a very high percent, well over 90 percent.

Mr. CURTIS. I see.

(The information requested by Mr. CURTIS is as follows:)

"The State unemployment-compensation laws cover 91 percent of the employment and 93 percent of the pay rolls in all establishments covered by old-age and survivors insurance."

Mr. DENISON. The amount which has to be estimated in that area is only this very small figure, the earnings over $3,000 of those people who are covered by old-age and survivors insurance but not by unemployment compensation, and we have a satisfactory method of getting that.

Mr. CURTIS. Do you take into account the earnings of children?

Mr. DENISON. No; we do not include estimates except for newsboys and such as that.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, coming back to estimating proprietors' income, agricultural proprietors' income, is that done on a sampling basis? I understand, from your answer to my question about lawyers and dentists, that is on a sampling basis.

Mr. DENISON. That is true, but that is not true of everything.

Mr. CURTIS. Do you think you run about as accurate on an average as Dr. Gallup in making sampling estimates?

Mr. DENISON. Fortunately or unfortunately, we do not use Dr. Gallup's procedure. In some areas we might be better off if we did not.

Mr. CURTIS. Coming back to the 3,000 lawyers, where do you get the 3,000 names?

Mr. DENISON. What we do is get a list of all the lawyers in the country as well as can be determined, and the same is true of the other professional groups, and we take, say, every tenth name right down. Those lists are normally arranged first by States and then within each State by cities, and then within each city alphabetically, so that, if we want to get 10 percent of all the lawyers, we will take every tenth name in that list all the way down.

The sources, I might add, for most of those surveys are the commercial mailing-list companies which try to keep an up-to-date list of all people in particular professions.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, I am not going to detain you much longer, but here is what I would like to have you do and supply for the record when our hearings are printed up.

I would like to have you compute the per capita income for the State of Nebraska. I would like to have your mathematics set forth so much income from proprietors, so much income from agricultural proprietors, so much from wages, and so on, and I would like to have that same information for the State of Texas, the State of Nevada, the State of Iowa, and the State of Mississippi.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to have your break-down of all the figures that went into the make-up of the answers shown here in your table.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

Income payments to individuals in selected States, by type of payment and source, 1947

[Millions of dollars]

	Nebraska	Texas	Nevada	Iowa	Mississippi
Gross wages and salaries:					
Agriculture	44.3	200.9	7.0	78.4	28.4
Mining	1.0	301.4	10.3	6.4	11.2
Manufacturing	127.8	819.6	10.0	392.6	153.8
Construction	38.2	286.4	17.0	69.5	28.8
Transportation	88.4	432.6	19.7	135.8	56.3
Power and gas	3.7	64.3	1.1	18.0	7.2
Communication	14.4	62.6	2.3	20.1	8.9
Trade	175.2	948.6	31.0	315.0	83.2
Finance	36.5	159.7	2.7	48.0	14.0
Government (total)	117.0	653.8	23.7	157.9	114.1
Civil executive	45.0	239.8	10.8	42.6	45.7
Legislative and judicial	.2	1.1	.1	.2	.2
Military net pay [1]	4.2	97.5	.4	1.2	11.2
State and local, school	33.6	159.4	4.1	58.5	27.2
State and local, nonschool	34.0	156.0	8.3	55.4	29.8
Service	67.5	375.0	23.0	101.6	63.9
Miscellaneous	26.3	175.7	2.9	47.1	16.1
Less: Employee contributions to social insurance programs [2]	9.9	54.0	1.5	15.6	7.5
A. Net wages and salaries	730.4	4,426.6	149.2	1,374.8	578.4
B. Net income of proprietors [3]	615.0	2,385.8	69.0	1,129.3	569.6
Agriculture	383.9	1,236.3	25.2	707.0	365.1
Mining		35.9	.7	1.3	
Manufacturing	11.3	75.0	2.8	27.9	20.0
Construction	22.1	150.1	9.1	38.2	6.9
Transportation	6.4	21.4	1.0	16.2	2.5
Trade	141.9	597.7	14.9	248.5	122.1
Finance	6.6	31.6	.4	11.7	4.6
Service	42.8	237.8	14.9	78.5	48.4
C. Property income	153.2	639.8	26.5	283.9	91.5
Interest	64.7	184.2	7.8	112.7	37.8
Dividends	28.8	145.6	11.8	60.2	13.2
Nonagricultural rents	31.6	232.2	6.8	72.1	17.2
Farm rents accruing to farmer landlords	28.1	77.8	.1	38.9	23.3
D. Other income	90.9	561.6	11.7	174.9	142.0
Military reserve pay	1.2	6.7	.1	2.6	2.2
Adjusted service bonds	.1	.3	(4)	.1	.1
State and local retirement benefits	1.6	3.3	.1	1.4	.3
Industrial pensions	.7	3.5	.1	1.4	.4
Workmen's compensation benefits	1.5	20.8	1.4	2.9	.2
Military retirement pay	.8	7.8	.4	2.0	.8
Family-allowance payments to dependents of military personnel	3.7	27.7	.4	7.7	8.1
Allotments of pay by military personnel	3.0	23.2	.4	6.3	7.1
Mustering-out payments to discharged servicemen	1.5	8.1	.2	3.0	2.1
Military terminal-leave payments	11.3	68.8	1.4	26.6	17.6
Old age and survivors insurance benefits	2.3	11.9	.4	5.6	2.0
Railroad retirement benefits	2.6	7.4	.3	5.2	1.8
Veterans' pensions and compensation	14.7	116.7	2.4	31.8	29.1
State unemployment insurance benefits	1.1	7.0	.9	2.2	2.0
Servicemen's readjustment allowances	2.0	37.1	.6	4.9	6.6
Railroad unemployment insurance benefits	.6	1.8	.1	.4	.4
Veterans' self-employment allowances	4.3	11.8	.1	6.3	19.9
Public assistance payments	15.3	77.2	1.2	27.1	10.3
Veterans' subsistence allowances	19.1	109.5	1.2	30.1	28.3
Civil-service retirement benefits	2.5	6.1	(4)	5.3	1.4
Other	1.0	4.9	(4)	2.0	1.3
Total income payments (A+B+C+D)	1,589.5	8,013.8	256.4	2,962.9	1,381.5
Total population (thousands)	1,284	7,104	139	2,591	2,095
Per capita income (dollars)	1,238	1,128	1,842	1,144	659

[1] Includes pay of the armed forces (net of contributions to family-allowance payments and of voluntary allotments of pay to individuals) stationed in each State.
[2] Includes employees' contributions to social security, railroad retirement, railroad unemployment insurance, and Government retirement programs.
[3] Represents net income of unincorporated businesses, including farms, before owners' withdrawals.
[4] Less than $50,000.

Source: Office of Business Economics, U. S. Department of Commerce, Mar. 30, 1949.

Mr. CURTIS. Have you ever taken a State like Indiana, which has a gross-income tax, taken the total income for Indiana as shown by their gross-income tax, dividing by the number of people there and comparing with your figures?

Mr. DENISON. It is not a very meaningful figure to do that because the division of income is so different and it is a gross-receipts tax.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the whole point.

Mr. DENISON. Whereas our figures represent net income.

Mr. CURTIS. Your figure is estimated based on a lot of other estimates, is it not?

Mr. DENISON. Based on a great deal of reported data and some estimates; that is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. A lot of estimates?

Mr. DENISON. That is right.

Mr. MASON. I have one question, sir.

Mr. Denison, I understood you to say that this process of arriving at national income is a continuing process and you have made no changes in the method of arriving at that. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. DENISON. Yes and no. What I mean to say is this, that we follow the some method year after year.

Mr. MASON. You have not made any changes in those methods?

Mr. DENISON. For example, when the Social Security Act came into effect, beginning with 1939, we made a basic change in our method of estimating pay roll.

Mr. MASON. Since then you have made no changes?

Mr. DENISON. No important changes. Obviously, every once in a while some small series will disappear and we have to do something else but that is the exception by far.

Mr. MASON. That is the part I cannot understand because I have here your National Income Supplement to the Survey of Current Business for July 1947 that you get out, and on pages 11 and 12 you list 11 different changes that you have made in arriving at the national-income aggregates and I was wondering how you square that statement with this report.

Mr. DENISON. That is very simple. As I pointed out sometime earlier, we are not here talking about national-income figures but this income-payment series.

Mr. MASON. Now I get it. There is that difference. I was wondering how this squared with your statement. Your statement was on this other one and this is different.

Mr. DENISON. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Denison, I have been very much interested in your statement. I understand that from time to time you check these various estimates that you make to ascertain, if possible, how far you may be in error in your past reports. Is that right?

Mr. DENISON. That is right.

Mr. CAMP. Do you have any way of determining how accurate any of your past reports have been?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Camp, unfortunately in this field there is no absolute truth. If one could for some year get absolutely accurate data for every item, it would be wonderful and we could check our records that way. Unfortunately, that is not the case. This, however, is the case: For many of these things there are alternative methods of estimate and there are different sorts of procedures that one can follow. I think we have pretty well explored the possibilities along that line, and there are very few figures in here which have not been estimated by more than one procedure as a check on the original procedure.

Mr. CAMP. In other words, you check one method against the other, to see which might be the most accurate method of procedure.

Mr. DENISON. That is correct. I might add something else, although I hope it won't sound facetious: that the people who make these estimates obviously change from time to time, and while we think they are all highly qualified people, it is obvious that where there is some room for judgment as to which is the best procedure to follow, different people may follow different procedures. What we have found, however, is that whenever that does happen, if someone new takes over a part of the work and decides something else would be a little bit better way of doing it, it never has any appreciable effect on our totals.

Mr. CAMP. And this method Dr. Gallup refers to as scientific sampling would be just about as accurate as anything else you could use in that field in which you have no definite data?

Mr. DENISON. I would rather not comment on Dr. Gallup.

Mr. CAMP. We will just say "scientific sampling."

Mr. DENISON. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. CAMP. A method of exploring the field where you have no recorded data.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir. I don't want to overemphasize this "scientific sampling," though, with respect to these particular estimates, because it does not apply to the great bulk of the money which goes into them.

Mr. CAMP. And the figures you have given us on unemployment insurance or compensation, and also on the social security tax, are all based pretty nearly on accurate data that you have, are they not?

Mr. DENISON. That is correct.

Mr. CAMP. You have not gone into the sampling field on that.

Mr. DENISON. That is correct. That is based on 100 percent complete, or, as we say, 99.8 percent complete, recorded data.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. CAMP has made a very important point and you have answered it: That you have not gone very much into the field of speculation. I am quoting now from the Survey of Current Business of February 1949, issued by the Department of Commerce, page S–1:

"Personal income by source: The total personal income in billions of dollars is 220.8."

I have just computed that as a result of the wage and salary receipts, showing 137.3, which is 60 percent—there is no speculation about that, is there?

Mr. DENISON. Practically none. As I indicated earlier, there is a very small part of that, such as domestic servants' pay rolls.

Mr. CARROLL. Now we proceed down the line, and I note here that proprietors' and rental income is 52.2. Of that 52.2, how much has to do with agriculture, approximately?

Mr. DENISON. About 18 to 19.

Mr. CARROLL. The remainder, then, would be approximately $44,000,000,000. Is that reasonably accurate, as is the case with these others?

Mr. DENISON. We certainly believe it is reasonably accurate; quite accurate.

I might point this out: That the transfer payment item is a very accurate part of the total, both nationally and by States.

Mr. CARROLL. What item?

Mr. DENISON. The transfer payment item, which amounts to about $10,000,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL. There is no question about that.

Mr. DENISON. That figure is practically all reported completely.

Mr. CARROLL. So in the total sum you are pretty much around 80 to 85 percent, in pretty accurate statistics, before you reach your conclusion, and in the other field you are exploring every possible source of—not sampling, in the sense of Dr. Gallup, but trying to get scientific data upon which to base your conclusions and your findings?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. And this is the accredited practice, recognized by all industry?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. And insurance companies, insofar as you know?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. I just wanted to reassure the gentlemen who have been questioning you that you were basing most of this on accurate data. I can understand their doubt about this scientific sampling business. I just want to say that the gentleman from Nebraska must be reassured to understand that it was not all based on a scientific sampling proposition, and that we can go ahead and accept it as being compiled mostly from recorded data, in the bill which we have before the committee at this time.

Mr. DENISON. I would just like to say this: That I think, and the other people concerned with these data think, that they are a pretty reliable and accurate measure of total income. We don't want to make any absurd statements, and say that there is no small item within this total which couldn't be off somewhat, possibly even badly off, but we do want to say, or at least I want to say, that I have great confidence in the totals, both for the United States and for each of the several States. There is no reason to think that the estimates are biased.

That is to say, if there is error in a particular small component, so that maybe we put a little too much money in one State, there are so many components, that simply the law of averages is not going to allow that thing to accumulate, and in any event the amount of the total income to which that applies is the smaller amount.

Mr. CARROLL. Will you be kind enough to go back over, very briefly, this question of farm income? I think you have mentioned a 5-year census. Does the farmer report on gross income?

Mr. DENISON. The farmer reports on gross income and on the number of major production expense items.

Mr. CARROLL. Do you also get net income reports?

Mr. DENISON. You do not get net income reports, as such. What you get is gross income and the bulk of the production expense data. It is necessary to estimate independently of the census, some of the smaller items of production expense.

For example, my recollection is that the expenditures for commercial fertilizers are not reported as a production expense in the census. However, the Department of Agriculture receives reports from each of the companies on the amount of the sales by producers of commercial fertilizers, and where they sold them, by States, so that there is a reliable basis for filling in that particular item, and that is generally true.

I should also like to say that the Department of Agriculture is doing a great deal of work on estimating the receipts, not only for the census years, but on the amount that the farmers get for selling corn and wheat and other crops each year, and on their expenditures, and we have certainly had no reason to suppose that the figures were not accurate within a fairly small margin of error.

Mr. CARROLL. That is all.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Are you through, Mr. CARROLL?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. KEAN.

Mr. KEAN. The States which would get the greatest benefit under the proposed formula are these agricultural States. You have just said that the most important source of getting the income of these farmers is these census questions. Do you think that the average farmer will tell a census man truthfully what his income it, if he has a good income?

Mr. DENISON. I think it is fortunate, possibly, that the census doesn't ask for net in-

come, which would probably be the least reliably reported. I do think that by and large the figures collected in that way are accurate.

There again, I would like to say, that the Department of Agriculture has independent sources, both on the receipts and on some of the expenditure items, to check against the census, and that actually—this may perhaps be a qualification of something I said earlier—in a few cases, where they have a very firm figure for a particular item, they do not use the census figure.

Mr. KEAN. Take the census figure for 1940, for instance, which you have. Then, as you know, in the last few years the price of cotton or wheat or corn has gone through the roof. This year the price of corn has gone way down. How do you balance those estimated incomes, when you only receive them once every 5 years? And then, how do you add, in view of the fact that the price of the commodity has gone way up, or down?

Mr. DENISON. That is not particularly a problem, at least to us, because the Department of Agriculture directly computes—and these price data, after all, come from them—the amount farmers receive from the sale of each crop, corn, wheat, and so on and so forth, on the basis of marketing data. They similarly compute the production expense items. What the census does is to give them a check every fifth year on the level of their series, so that if they have gotten off at all, they can adjust to it. Particularly on the receipts side, when the 1940 census data became available— I know this—very little adjustment in their data was indicated. In other words, they hit it just about on the nose.

Mr. KEAN. Say farmer A in 1944 told you that he had a gross income of $10,000, and then in 1946 you know that the price of wheat went from $1.50 up to $2.50. What would you do about that, in figuring his income?

Mr. DENISON. That would be taken account of in the gross-receipts figure. This is going to be oversimplified, but what the Department of Agriculture gets is the total receipts of farmers from the sale of corn, wheat, cotton, and so on, each item, and livestock products. Those are added up, and that is the total receipts. Those receipts figures automatically take account of whatever has happened to the change of price. If prices have doubled, other things staying the same, the gross receipts will be doubled. From that, plus these other things I have just spoken of, Government payments to farmers, and so on, are deducted estimates from each of, I believe, 34 production expense items. What is left after you subtract those production expenses from the total value of the farm output is what goes into our series as the net income of the farmer.

Mr. KEAN. There is one other question I wanted to ask you. In the State of Arizona, do you include, when you figure the income of the State, the income of the Indians who live on the reservation?

Mr. DENISON. I would say that we may very well miss that. I wish I knew more about what types of income they might receive. I could answer the question better.

Mr. KEAN. Let us say there are 60,000 Indians. I will take the Navajo Reservation, for instance. They have sheep and sell blankets, and so forth. We have had a discussion here about the fact that the Indians have not been taken care of by Arizona, and I was wondering, when you figure the average income of Arizona, whether you include that income of those Indians.

Mr. DENISON. We would catch that. However, I might point out, of course, if their average income is very low, it does have the effect of reducing the per capita income.

Mr. KEAN. It is very low. But you have 60,000 people, and even though they may have an income of only $300 or $400 a year, that amounts to a considerable amount of money in a State with a comparatively low population total.

Mr. COOPER (presiding). Mr. MARTIN of Iowa will inquire.

Mr. MARTIN. Your description of arriving at the national income intrigues me a little bit.

You described the computation of farmers' income. Suppose the farmer is raising corn that is valued at a very high figure, and then he feeds it all out, as nearly all of the farmers do, to livestock, which is on a very changing market. And as most of the cattle feeders out my way have done this year, he takes a licking on it, and comes out poorer, after his efforts, than he was at the start. Do you consider that the farmer who continues to feed out corn to cattle under such circumstances is making a contribution to the total national income?

Mr. DENISON. I will answer that in this way: I think perhaps the best way to answer it is in a statistical sense, telling you exactly what would be done.

What we would get for a given year is the amounts received by the farmer from the sale of livestock, plus the amount, if any, received by him from the sale of corn as such.

Mr. MARTIN. Do you make an adjustment for the inventory value of the corn on hand?

Mr. DENISON. Plus the change from the beginning to the end of the year in the quantity of inventories of corn which he had on hand.

Suppose he had 100,000 bushels at the beginning of the year and 200,000 at the end of the year.

What would be included in gross receipts for that year would be the difference of 100,000 bushels, multiplied by the price at the end of the year, the market price.

Mr. MARTIN. Then the farmer who had a sizable quantity of corn on hand on January 1 of this year could be written off, as far as any contribution to the national income was concerned, if he has fed that corn to cattle that have caused him a loss. His April 1 rating may be a minus quantity, if you take inventory value into consideration.

Mr. DENISON. That is conceivable; yes. It is conceivable.

Mr. MARTIN. It is more than conceivable. I am talking about facts.

Mr. DENISON. Incidentally, you may be interested in noticing, with respect to Iowa, that the pattern of income change has been very, very up and down for the last 8 years, because of the 1947 poor corn crop. Although cash receipts were held up because of the liquidation of corn inventories in Iowa in 1947, by our method of measurement you got a sharp drop in farm income in 1947. But, of course, it returned in 1948.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the farmer's cash position in inventory valuation that you look at, rather than the question of whether or not he has or has not made a contribution to the total of national income in the form of finished cattle?

Mr. DENISON. I do not think that there is a real conflict there.

Mr. MARTIN. I wanted to know whether you consider a farmer who has incurred a loss in feeding out his grain, whether he is given credit for his contribution to the total national product, or whether his cash position writes him off as a contributor to the gross national income. It is a very real question right now.

Mr. DENISON. I am not positive I have the question straight, but if the question refers to the fact that the prices went down, he would not be written off as having no contribution.

Mr. MARTIN. In a State like Louisiana, where a tremendous number of the old, aged people are on old-age assistance, is the old-age-assistance payment received by those people considered a part of the income?

Mr. DENISON. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. MARTIN. And they, by receiving Federal aid, could then be considered as contributing more to the national income than the Iowa farmers, who are feeding cattle at a loss, is that correct?

Mr. DENISON. No, sir. I would come back to something I said earlier, that what we are discussing here is not what we call national income.

What we are considering here is income payments to individuals. Income payments to individuals are not intended or designed to measure the national production.

The item you were discussing just now is not included in the national income, but is included in this series of income payments to individuals.

Mr. MARTIN. In your charts here, in Survey of Current Business, showing the personal income and expenditures and then showing also the data there concerning the gross national product, do those charts include receipts from Federal payments such as old-age assistance?

Mr. DENISON. The personal income series does, but the gross national product and national income series do not include that.

Mr. MARTIN. I wanted to know that, because I can see quite a difference here in that.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further questions?

Mr. REED?

Mr. REED. I just wanted to say, Mr. Denison, that I was responsible for having you brought up here, through the kindness of the chairman, and you have made a wonderful witness here.

I again say that I cannot repeat the formula and how you arrived at it, but I want to congratulate you on the fine presentation you have made.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate very much your contribution here.

Mr. DENISON. Thank you.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to propose to the pending bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to refer to the question raised by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] a few moments ago as to what constitutes a farmer. I have received a definition from the Department of Agriculture to the effect that in the last agricultural census a person living on 3 acres or over was classed as a farmer, or if he lived on less than 3 acres and produced $250 worth or more of farm commodities he was classed as a farmer. I think it will be plainly apparent from this that a considerable part of the income credited to farmers was probably earned off farms.

Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on the pending measure, Senate bill 246. We have known for a good many years that lack of educational facilities and funds for carrying on instruction in our schools has been one of the greatest national problems. So far as I know, every State in the Union has

been looking for increased revenue with which to make its schools better. The need for this was brought home to us very acutely during the war, when we found that several hundred thousand of our young men were ineligible for important military service because of lack of education.

Although the States have made heroic efforts to improve their educational facilities and to make their schools better, a good many of them have failed materially to do so because they have simply not known which way to turn in order to get the means with which to give their boys and girls adequate minimum education. Naturally they have turned to the Federal Government, and we must admit that lack of education and of educational facilities today is a Federal problem.

There are several reasons for this. One reason which I stated a short time ago, in the time of the Senator from Ohio, is that some 60 percent of the people of this country move out of the States in which they were born.

Another reason which makes this a Federal problem is that lack of education in any State holds back progress in the Nation as a whole, and in the end costs the people of the Nation as a whole because of lack of progress.

Why should we look to the Federal Government to furnish money to help make up for this lack of the States in educational matters? Why not expect each State to pay the increased costs necessary to provide education for its own people? The fact is that in many States of the Union, such as Iowa, the costs of education, which have been referred to on the floor here today, have been borne by real estate, because that has been the principal means of supporting the schools of the towns and counties. The time has come when real estate cannot bear the burden longer, and the question arises, Why not let the people of the States pay the cost through an income tax? One reason why we should bring the Federal Government into the picture, and expect that the additional expense, or part of it, be paid out of Federal funds, is that much of the wealth created in certain States is not taxed in those States—materially, anyway—but appears in the incomes of people living in other States. This has gone on until a great deal of the wealth of this country has gravitated to a few wealthy States, regardless of where it was earned. New York pays some 22 or 23 percent of our Federal income tax, yet no one would venture to say that 22 percent of the wealth of the country was created in New York State.

We can, therefore, legitimately consider that it is perfectly proper for the Federal Government, as such, to collect tax money from the wealthy centers where it is found and redistribute it to a certain extent for a Federal purpose, a national purpose, in the States where it was created, and where it is most needed. I shall not go into the plight of the different States, because that has been set forth before the Senate many times.

The purpose of Senate bill 246 is to provide for a minimum education for the children of all the States, of all school districts, in fact. It would require every school district to spend a minimum of $55 for each child each year. In some States that would be a substantial gain. In some States there are school districts where only a few dollars per annum are being spent on the children of the district.

Under the formula in Senate bill 246 approximately half the States will receive $5 for each child of school age in the State. This means that in approximately half the States there will be, under the formula provided in the law, an additional sum granted in the poorer States. The States of Alabama, North Carolina, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Arkansas have been pointed out. My own State is almost on the dividing line this year, but inasmuch as this formula for the contribution of additional funds is based upon the per capita income of the people of the States, it means that education is almost directly related to the earning power of the people of the State. It has been found that as they become better educated, they earn more. As we contribute to the better education of the people living in the poorer States, they will become better earners, they will contribute more to the wealth of the Nation, and they will, in time, bring many of the States out of the category of poorer States and put them in the category of those which are better able to do things for themselves.

Mr. President, this means that although a State may be a recipient of funds beyond the $5 unit contribution this year, for 4 or 5 years, or perhaps 10 years would be a better length of time to take, the people of that State, having enjoyed the benefits of better education, will raise the per capita income of the States and perhaps not be eligible beyond the $5 at all. So the mere fact that one State is eligible for more than $5 per child this year does not mean that it will be 10 years from now. We may expect it to vary from year to year as time goes on.

Only 2 years ago my own State would have been eligible for an allocation of $615,000. Because of increased incomes during the last year or two I find we are now eligible for only $420,000 out of this $300,000,000. Our State is almost on the dividing line. I would much rather have the per capita income of my State raised than to receive the extra $175,000 or $180,000 we would get if the per capita income were held down. What has happened in Vermont I expect will happen in some of the other States.

In regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts—and what I say in regard to the amendment which is being discussed now by the Senate I would also say in regard to the other amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts—in my opinion either one of these amendments would have the effect of killing the bill. The amendment which would raise the contribution to each State to $10 per pupil would take money from the poorer States, money which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had intended the poorer States should receive, and give it to the richer States. It would double the allocations to the richer States and it would reduce the allocations to the poorer States from one-half to one-third. The Senator's amendment would defeat the purpose of the bill. I think it would be much fairer to come right out and say that we are against Federal aid to education and to vote against the bill than try to kill it by the offering of amendments which would have the effect of killing it.

I have no sympathy at all with those amendments. They simply offer bait to the Senators from 30 States of the Union to vote against Federal aid to education. That would mean about $100,000 a year to my State for this year. But I am not going to vote to defeat the purpose of the bill for $100,000 a year.

The bill as it came out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare represents 2 years' work or more. It represents a meeting of the minds on Federal aid to education as nearly as it is possible to effect such agreement.

The bill is the best bill it is possible to get. It is not a perfect bill. Nobody can claim it is a perfect bill. But it is a bill which will contribute tremendously to the better education of the boys and girls of the United States and to the future security and prosperity of our Nation as a whole.

I certainly hope that no devastating amendments to the bill will be approved by the Senate. If they are I do not think that any one of us can go back to our States and tell our constituents that we favored Federal aid to education, but we voted for an amendment which killed it. We cannot alibi our vote away in that manner.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I want to say at the outset that I am in hearty accord with the purposes of the bill. I know that in certain parts of the country the States themselves, because of the limitation of income and the limitation of the amount of taxable property, are in such a position that they are not financially able to maintain the standard of education we want to see maintained throughout the United States. It therefore becomes necessary that the Federal Congress give some consideration to this matter and that the Federal taxing power, which is the greatest taxing power in the land, be used and the funds thus received diverted back to the State for the purposes of support to education.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the distinguished Senator from Connecticut believe that it would be advisable to make available to the States and local governments broader opportunities of taxation so that they could take care of the construction of roads, the building of hospitals, and education?

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that that is exactly what I mean. In connection with my discussion I am going to offer an amendment which in this particular case would in effect accomplish that very purpose.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me that one of the difficulties under which the States have long labored is that they

have been preempted by the Federal Government in practically every field of taxation. In Connecticut, for example, on the local level the educational program is supported practically entirely by taxes on real estate. The burden upon real estate in our larger cities and in some of our smaller cities and towns has become practically unbearable. In every budget in Connecticut the largest single item in the local budget, the city budget, the town budget, is the support of education, and the people are glad it is that way. But to relieve that burden upon real estate in Connecticut the State of Connecticut has itself used its taxing power to raise money to give back to the towns and to the cities. Gradually as the years have rolled on we have relieved the local communities of taxes they themselves used to pay for the support of the State government so that they no longer continue those taxes, such as the so-called State-aid tax and the military tax, which were ancient taxes in Connecticut, paid by the local communities for the support of the State government. The State itself has now reversed the process and for a number of years has been giving to the communities large sums from the State treasury for the support of education locally. Only within the past 2 years in the State of Connecticut—I think it was by the general assembly of 1947—was there an entirely new tax law passed by the Connecticut General Assembly raising taxes, a great part of which were raised for the purpose of paying back to the towns money for the support of education, and to be used by the State for the support of education, so that the tremendous burden of taxation on real estate in Connecticut might be relieved. So, if we are to have an educational program in the United States that is consistent with our needs and consistent with our beliefs, Mr. President, then we must use the Federal taxing power to provide the money for that purpose.

It so happens that the State of Connecticut in this particular instance will not be a very large gainer by the bill, but I am sure that the people of the State of Connecticut, while they may be primarily interested in the educational program in their own State, nevertheless are also greatly interested in education throughout the whole United States. They want to see every girl and boy in America have an equal chance to obtain an education, because they firmly believe that the bedrock of our whole system rests upon an educated and intelligent citizenry. Democracy as it functions in our Republic can only operate successfully if its people know it and understand it, as well as love it and believe in it.

Mr. President, the principles of this bill, in the humble judgment of the junior Senator from Connecticut, are fundamentally sound and move in the right direction, the direction in which all of us should want to see them move and advance.

On the other hand, there has always been in the State of Connecticut, and I think in all the other States, a very firm conviction that in matters of education the local community and the State itself should have the sole direction and charge. We look with some fear upon the possibility of a great Federal agency centralized in the National Capital which would tell the people in every part of the land what book they should have in chemistry, what book they should use as a first-grade reader, what history books they should read, and so on, because we know from our experience in history that one of the easiest ways to seize power, to take it away from the individuals and from the States, and amass it in one place and in one man, is to educate people in that direction. Those of us who are here today have witnessed that thing happen in our very lifetime in other lands. We do not want to see it happen here. We want education to be a stimulation to thinking. We want education to bring to people facts that are true. We want education to expand the activities of the minds of our citizenry, both young and old. We not only want to teach people what is true and right and just and fair, and what is truly knowledge, but we want to stimulate them to seek greater learning, and thus expand and advance the great horizons of human knowledge. We know that we cannot do that by propaganda. We know that we can do it only by education.

The junior Senator from Connecticut is not fearful that immediately if this great appropriation is made and the administration of it is placed in the hands of a Federal agency, there will be an attempt to propagandize our people. But the junior Senator from Connecticut does believe that in every single instance possible we should leave in the hands of our local governments and in the hands of our States the administration of those affairs which are primarily of a local nature, or which can be best handled locally. The education of our citizenry is one of those great fields. It is for the purpose of keeping this purely a local concern that the junior Senator from Connecticut offers this amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the Senator state, as the result of his long experience, what effect State aid to the local districts has had in the matter of control?

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that one of the constant difficulties we have in the State of Connecticut is resolving the issue of how much control the local board of education has, as compared with the State board of education. The local board of education is very jealous of its power and authority in matters of education. That is traditional in part. Also in part it arises from the fact that the local board of education knows the parents of the youngsters who go to the schools over which they have control and they are primarily and directly interested. If there is something wrong with the toilets in our local schools, or if there is something wrong with the teacher, the board of education knows about it, and the matter is immediately taken care of. If the teacher is not living up to what should be expected from a teacher, the local people know to whom to go. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I think that has been one of the most important factors in the rapid development of education in this country. People on the local level have been tremendously interested in education, and have watched it day and night.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may have printed an amendment which I should like to have in the RECORD? Probably I shall not have an opportunity to discuss it until tomorrow.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an amendment which I submit on behalf of my colleague [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself. In effect, if adopted, it would confine Federal aid to education to those States which are below the average standard, and not give it to States which are already able to provide education above the average standard.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. TYDINGS for himself and other Senators was ordered to be printed and lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 4, line 8, strike out "(a)", and beginning with the comma in line 10 strike out down through the word "greater" in line 13.

On page 4, beginning with the semicolon in line 25, strike out over through "(A)" in line 4, page 5.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. From the Senator's experience, has he noted an inclination for the State level of government to increase its influence over the policy of education?

Mr. BALDWIN. There has been a tendency for the State level of government to increase its influence over the local educational authorities; but I will say that in our State the tendency has been a very happy one, which has led to an increasing area of understanding in that particular direction, based upon the fact that our State department of education has been wise enough to show considerable deference to the local authorities, to call upon them, and lean upon them in many particulars. Our State educational laws provide only minimum standards for local educational requirements and our State department of education adopts only the most general of policies with reference to educational procedures in the States, both as to the educational program itself and as to the construction of educational facilities such as school buildings.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the bill contains provisions which would tend to guarantee against the encroachment of Federal control, Federal direction, and Federal regulation. When a similar bill was before the Senate a year ago the junior Senator from Connecticut raised the question as to whether the Congress could make an appropriation of money to be used in the States and then say, "We will forget it. We will not do anything

about it." It does not seem to me that the Congress can do that; it does not seem to me that it should do it, because every single dollar of the taxpayers' money that is appropriated by the Federal Congress should be spent for the purposes for which it is appropriated, and it should be fairly and intelligently spent.

Under that principle, how can we avoid the Federal Government going into the States and auditing the accounts and gradually, through the years, encroaching more and more upon the States and upon the local governments in the control of education? It seems to me that we could do it very easily if we were to provide in this particular bill that the amount of money any State would be entitled to receive under the provisions of the bill and under the formula set forth in the bill, for education in the State, should never be taken out of the State, but should be left there.

So, Mr. President, I submit the following amendment, which I shall read and then briefly explain:

On page 3, line 1, after "Sec. 3" insert "(a)."

On page 3, between lines 10 and 11, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to establish on the books of the Treasury an account for each of the States, and to credit to the account of each State for each fiscal year an amount of the proceeds of Internal Revenue collections from sources within such State ascertained by the Secretary to be equal to the amounts to be paid to such State from funds appropriated under subsection (a) for such fiscal year. All amounts paid to a State from such funds shall be charged to the account established for such State under this subsection."

On page 7, beginning with the word "The" in line 2, strike out all through the word "and" in line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine for each fiscal year the amounts to be paid under this Act to each State that has qualified under section 7 of this Act, and shall, through."

On page 7, line 9, strike out the word "certified" and insert in lieu thereof the word "determined."

On page 8, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Treasury."

On page 8, strike out the word "Commissioner" when it appears in line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 9, strike out the word "Commissioner" when it appears in lines 8 and 11 and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 11, lines 17 and 18, strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Treasury."

On page 11, line 23, strike out the word "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 12, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education", and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Treasury."

On page 12, strike out the word "Commissioner" where it appears in lines 15 and 19, and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 13, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "Commissioner" and "Commissioner's" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary" and "Secretary's."

Under those circumstances, what would be the situation? We know that in the States great sums are collected each year in the form of Federal taxes, particularly income taxes, and that they go into the Federal Treasury. If the Secretary of the Treasury were to set up on the books of the United States an account showing what each State was entitled to under the terms of this bill for its use in education, then, before the money which was collected in each State ever left the internal revenue agent's office in that particular State, it could be turned over directly to the State. Then the State would have the money, collected in taxes from its own citizens through the agency of the Federal Government, which has preempted so many fields of taxation.

The money would be there, and there would be no requirement for a large Federal bureaucracy to handle it. The money would go into the State treasury, and the State government and its educational agencies would administer that fund, consistent with the provisions of the act.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the able Senator from Connesticut that without passing favorably or unfavorably on his plan, so far as I am concerned I should like to invite his attention to the fact that the very system he is advocating has been in use in Puerto Rico for a considerable number of years. There were collected alcohol taxes, income taxes, excise taxes—all Federal taxes, and they were covered back into the Puerto Rican treasury. Two years ago they amounted to approximately $58,000,000 a year, which is a large sum of money. Over the last 5 or 6 years I think they have averaged from about $30,000,000 to $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 a year.

The precise plan the Senator from Connecticut is advocating for these States in the handling of this fund is similiar to the plan which already is in effect in Puerto Rico. I point that out so that the Senator from Connecticut may know that there is a Federal precedent for the plan he has mentioned.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his contribution. I ask him whether, from his knowledge of the subject thus far, he can say that the plan has worked successfully in Puerto Rico.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to add, before answering the Senator's question, that the money which goes to Puerto Rico is not solely for education. It is for general governmental purposes, such as for health, for school purposes, and for all other governmental purposes in Puerto Rico. The plan has had to work in Puerto Rico, for the reason that Puerto Rico, having few natural resources, recently has not been able to maintain the American standard without help from the Federal Government, in view of the very dense population in that island—the densest in the Western Hemisphere. So, rather than to require Puerto Rico to apply to the Congress, each year—as had been the case in the past—for appropriations of funds which, in addition to their own funds, would enable them to live, we long ago adopted the policy of permitting them to keep nearly all Federal revenues obtained from the island, so that, in addition to their own revenues, they might have the wherewithal to run the administration of Puerto Rico. The plan has worked.

Mr. President, perhaps I should point out that in Puerto Rico there is more than one person for every acre of land. In view of the fact that a considerable part of Puerto Rico is mountainous land which is not arable, the Senator can see that in Puerto Rico the means of providing the necessities of life are very much less than the average for all the world. Therefore it is necessary to turn back to Puerto Rico some of the revenues the Federal Government receives.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator from Maryland think that is a better plan, rather than for us to bring to Washington all Federal revenues from Puerto Rico, and then subsequently transfer them back to Puerto Rico?

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I am one who is reluctant to have the Federal Government say very much about education in a country which is 33 times the size of Great Britain, 16 times the size of France, and 14 times the size of Germany. We are dealing with a continent, here; and to focus the whole educational system of that continent under one power in the city of Washington, rather than to have 48 experimental systems, all competing for educational supremacy, is a matter about which I believe we should think deeply.

For that reason, at least, the spirit of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut appeals to me, because, as I see it, the spirit of the amendment is to keep Federal control off of the State educational systems.

Mr. BALDWIN. But the amendment would have the Federal taxing power, which has preempted the States' taxing power, used to pay money into the States' educational systems, right on the State level, and right in the States where it is collected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, perhaps I would go further than the Senator from Connecticut would, for I would not have any part of this system apply to any State which does not need it. When our expenses already are so high, I think it is silly to provide money from the Federal Treasury to some State which does not need assistance in order to maintain an adequate educational standard. I would confine the use of a Federal appropriation for this purpose to the States which do not have sufficient funds to maintain adequate educational standards. Such a restriction would prohibit Maryland, I may say, which ranks about eighth or tenth in the country in terms of educational standards, from receiving even $1 of this money. I think the people of Maryland would be glad to waive their part of it, and to help the citizens of States whose economic situation does not create such an atmosphere that they can raise sufficient money to have an educational system equal to the average for the country as a whole.

I should like to see the ramifications of this bill confined entirely to the 22 or 23

States which might need the proposed assistance more than the other States of the Union do.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I think there is great wisdom and sound judgment in his proposal. In this case we are dealing, in the Congress, on a national basis, with what the governors and general assemblies of States have to deal with on a local and State basis.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am wondering whether the situation under this bill may be similar to that which sometimes develops in a State legislature, when grants to the larger communities, which do not need financial assistance, are at times proposed in order to encourage a willingness on the part of their representatives to support the making of grants to communities which really do need such financial aid.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has a point there.

Mr. BALDWIN. On the other hand, I do not think that is the entire answer to the question, because I believe some States which have educational programs of a very high level, nevertheless need the money, because of the tremendous demands made upon their treasuries in other directions—demands which do not arise in some of the other States where the educational standards are lower.

So I would not criticize the bill by saying that it is designed entirely on the basis of encouraging support from the well-to-do States by proposing grants to them, even though they do not need such grants, because I think there is some ground for saying that, in view of their larger obligations, they really need such assistance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, under this bill we are putting ourselves somewhat in the position of a father who has, let us say, five sons, three of whom are well off and are making more money, in effect, than the old gentleman is making, and two of whom have fallen upon hard times, with the result that they and their families have been ravaged by disease. For instance, in terms of the States, we might refer to the Civil War and its effects on the South. Let us assume that the flow of trade has gone by the farms on which the two sons who are not well off are located. So the father says, "I still have some money. Instead of giving what I have equally to all five sons, three of whom in effect already have more money than I have, I am going to give what few dollars I have left to my two sons who are not so well off, and then all five of them will be about on the same level. That is about the way I would like to leave my family, so that all have an equal chance to the good things of life."

In this case, instead of applying all the money proposed for this purpose to the 22 or 23 States that are badly in need of it, in order to have an equality of educational opportunity as between all the States, we propose to give more and more money to the States that already are in better circumstances in the economic and educational fields. I think the humanities of the question show that, from the Federal standpoint, we should give the money to the States that are least able to bring their educational systems up to what we might regard as the American standard.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that, human nature being what it is, I wonder whether he is thoroughly convinced that in the case he has mentioned, the three sons who would not get any money at all from the father would like it. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think we should deal with the question simply on the basis of whether they would like it.

As I view this matter, we should deal with it on the premise of doing what is best for the ultimate welfare of the country, or, if I may use a hackneyed expression in what I hope is its correct application, on the basis of doing what is right, not what is wrong. Certainly, if some States do not have the wherewithal to educate their people to a reasonable standard, I think a case has been made for having the Federal Government help them.

On the other hand, if a State has sufficient money to be able to maintain a proper educational standard for its people, it is difficult for me to see why the Federal Government, which already has a debt of $260,000,000,000, and already has a tremendous budget which may create a deficit, should say, "Notwithstanding the fact that you do not need the money, we will give it to you anyway"—whereas if we put all the money where it is badly needed, we shall serve our country best and serve the States best, even those who would not receive any funds under such a procedure.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am quite in agreement with the Senator from Maryland. We are here trying to fulfill the need; it is not our purpose merely to please someone. We are trying to do what we think is the right thing to do.

Although we have a tremendously burdensome Federal budget, nevertheless it seems to me that somewhere along the line, by reducing unnecessary or unneeded or unwise or wasteful expenditures, we can obtain the funds with which to do this work that is so vitally essential.

So, Mr. President, in closing, let me say again that the amendment I submit merely provides that the internal revenues collected in the States shall be left in the States, or shall be credited to the States under the ratio provided in this bill, so that they will not have to be covered into the Federal Treasury, but can be left in the States, to be drawn upon by them, so that they can deal with the problem of education as a local and State matter in the way they think best—in short, in the way which they usually know is the right and proper and best way to deal with it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from the course of the debate which has taken place in relation to the formula which has been worked out in the bill, and from the remarks of some who thought they had a better formula than that in the bill, it would seem that to some extent track has been lost of the basic idea underlying all Federal legislation of this character, which is the removal of inequalities which are found among the various States. We have lost the proper conception of the Federal system, and of the fact that everybody in the United States of America has a dual citizenship. The Nation, as well as the States, owes something to the citizens of the United States wherever they may reside. If our Federal system is to endure, and if at the same time there is to continue the notion of a universal United States citizenship, based upon the Constitution of the United States and upon the provision of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, we have got to be thoughtful at all times of all persons in the United States.

It is all very well to say that Federal aid to education should be provided only on the basis of need and, therefore, the rich States should not have any aid from the Federal Government. It sounds well; it is logical. But there are as many neglected citizens of the United States in the rich States, comparatively speaking, as there are in the poor States. If the rich State has a fine record in providing equality of educational opportunity, if the rich State has no illiteracy within its borders, if when the Federal Government started its selective service found all the boys from the rich State were prepared with at least a fourth-grade education, so that no boy called was disqualified because of failure to meet the educational requirement, then, Mr. President, we could say we do not owe anything to the citizen of the United States who lives in a rich State. But, sad to relate, even in the Army of the United States today, in the Army in Germany, an Army made up of volunteers, an Army made up of draftees, it is necessary to establish schools for many of those boys because they have not the ability to read an ordinary order. In spite of all the rich States may have done along educational lines, only two States in the Union were not represented in that school. Iowa, as the Senator from Ohio has said, was represented by a colored boy. He probably had gone to Iowa from some other State, because Iowa has had universal educational requirements. All the boys in those schools are citizens of the United States else they would not be accepted for service. Under any theory therefore the Federal Government owes those boys something. I am proud to say that of the two States not represented, my State happens to be one. Next year, will that be the case? It may not be. It is true that the State of Utah has compulsory education for all boys and girls through the eighteenth year. In theory, there should not be any of our boys in those schools next year, but we have isolated communities the same as every other State in the Union has, and there may be an exception.

Mr. President, in dealing with this bill and with the formula which has been worked out in connection with it, I think we should remember that the United States of America is a Federal Government, and the Federal Constitution imposes upon each person in the United States a dual citizenship. Citizenship

in and of itself imposes duties and responsibilities and obligations on the part of the citizens. But it also imposes duties, responsibilities, and obligations on the part of the State toward its citizens.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts offered an amendment to the bill. He feels that there is an injustice in the formula which the bill provides, in regard to taxation, for the purpose of providing money for the schools. The theory of the Federal Government is that it is made up of 48 sovereign States. There is no equality in those 48 States. There is no equality in size, there is no equality in ability, there is no equality in wealth, there is no equality in taxing power. But practically all the States that came into the Union, except the original thirteen, had requirements imposed upon them making it impossible for the States ever to be equal in ability with the original thirteen States. I shall not undertake to review the history of all the 48 States, but I am going to say there is no way of comparing the wealth of the various States. It is true it may be possible to find an oil well under an abandoned, worn-out farm. It is true that in my State we have more coal than there is in the State of Pennsylvania; but it is not economically feasible to mine it and sell it. It is true that the Indians had Niagara Falls, with all of its great water power, but they did not even enjoy the scenery. Even the scenery had not become economic in those days. Wealth comes from use. But the only wealth we can measure is the type of wealth which we have measured in the formula which is in this bill—the wealth that is transformed into the income of the people.

Let me speak of the formula for a moment. It has not been picked out of the clear, blue sky. It was worked out by the Department of Commerce and by the departments dealing with education. It is the best they can produce. It will not make for absolute justice or absolute equality any more than would any other formula; but it is good, it is workable, and it is built upon known available factors. That which a State receives will change from year to year, because the factors will change from year to year, though the formula will remain the same.

Much has been said regarding States not taking care of their own, not doing as much as they should do. It was pointed out a moment or two ago that in the matter of education the State of Iowa does a little bit more than the average State. But the Senator from Iowa did not look through the whole list. His State uses 2.7 percent of its taxes for education, and therefore it should be commended. But the State of New Mexico uses 3.26 percent for education, and still it cannot do what the State of Iowa does for its people. How can we ever get a formula based upon the theory which the Senator from Massachusetts used? What about a public-land State? There are States in the Union in which one can go 5 miles from any community and be on public land. Can the State tax such land? It cannot. There are States in the Union which, before the Federal Government would admit them to statehood, had to write into their constitutions that nothing under the ground would ever be taxed. This was required before the citizens could present a petition for statehood. Such States had to pass constitutional amendments with respect to their ability to tax 2 percent of the net proceeds of mines. There are States in the Union which have mines producing in dividends sufficient money to pay their entire expenses, but they cannot tax such dividends, because they are received by persons outside the State. We can go on and on and not find any sort of accurate basis to calculate comparative wealth. So we must keep in mind that we are probably taking the most just formula that could possibly be devised, a formula on which various departments of the Government worked before it was adopted, a formula which has come into existence after consideration by the committee of various others ways of handling the problem through the years.

Are we, as a Federal Government, to request the States in some way or other to bring about what has been called their taxing opportunity? Of course not. Under this bill, especially, we say not a single word to any State as to how it shall conduct its educational system.

The American Government, in general, has done very well in regard to education. It accepts, in theory, the fact that education is a State function, a church function, and a function of the home. We recognize that, and we do not want it changed. We want to keep things as they have been, because we like our Federal system and we want to work within its bounds. No one wants any kind of a bureau or a bureaucrat to come into a community and tell the people of that community what they shall do, if they do not want to do it.

There is not State control of education in all the States of the Union, and therefore we have to have a formula which will fit all the situations; and such a formula has been worked out.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. The distinguished Senator from Utah has had long governmental experience. What has been his experience as the States have increased their appropriations to local districts? Have they increased their control over the schools?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Some States have deliberately attempted to acquire State control over schools. They have tried to make the units larger all the time, so as to control them. I could not answer the Senator's question, except by saying that even if we had complete State control, the district board has certain rights and privileges, so far as education taxes are concerned and so far as hiring teachers is concerned, and in some States even the non-State schools are required to meet certain standards which the States have recognized. There is no absolute rule, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to ask another question and base it on my own State. My State has had free schools for almost a hundred years. At first they were financed by the local districts, and then, gradually, appropriations have been increased until now more than half of the money is contributed by the Commonwealth, and each year the control by the State has increased as the appropriations have increased. I am leading up to whether that has been the general drift over the Nation. The Senator's experience along that line has been greater than has my own.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is probably the general drift; but I do not think there has ever been any legislature which has found itself able to dictate in regard to education. I might go even further and say that as an administrator of Federal funds and as a receiver of Federal funds for educational purposes, I myself have never seen a time when a request made of Washington in regard to education has not been granted. As an administrator of an educational institution, I have telegraphed Washington and said, "Take away certain teachers," and they have been taken away. If the United States Government sends a person to a university as a professor of military science, where ROTC courses are in effect, he has to qualify, or else he must move on. The most interesting thing was to sit in the committee and hear General Marshall say that the reason why he was so hard up for officers of a certain caliber was that the universities and colleges of America demanded the very best officers for certain of their courses. Does that sound like Federal control? I asked him, "Do you give them?" He said, "We have to give them in order to maintain what we think is good for our country."

There is something in the American citizen, there is something in the American community, there is something in the American city, which can be translated in terms of "not liking to be pushed around." They do not. The former Governor of Pennsylvania knows they do not, the present Senator from Pennsylvania knows they do not, and the former general in the Army from Pennsylvania knows they do not.

Mr. President, in addressing myself to the amendments proposed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE,] I expect to point out what I believe to be the fallacies in the allotment procedure he is proposing. I have to do this formally, because the Senator from Massachusetts made a very long, a very good, a very fine exposition of his amendment, and I expect to answer it. I expect to answer it, and I owe it to my committee to answer it. As I said, I expect to point out what I believe to be the fallacies in the allotment procedure he is proposing. I shall also undertake again to outline and explain the allotment system contained in S. 246, which, as the Senate well knows, was adopted unanimously by the committee, only after the most extended and careful consideration had been given to this very question.

As I see it, Mr. President, and as many other Senators undoubtedly see it, the very fundamental and all-important issue at stake is whether Federal aid to education is going to be based on the

principle of bringing about greater equalization of educational opportunities throughout the Nation. That is the question, Mr. President, which the Senate answered affirmatively when last year it passed S. 472, which, as the Senate knows, contained the very same allotment procedure as that included in the bill before us today. That is the question which in and of itself brought about the need for this legislation. In view of the enormous inequalities which have been shown to exist among our educational systems in different parts of the country, I, for one, have no doubt whatever that such legislation is needed, and needed immediately.

Mr. President, a central theme of the presentation by the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in support of his proposition appears to be that some, if not all, of the States which would benefit relatively more under the provisions of S. 246 can and should raise their taxes and do this job largely themselves. I am not at all opposed to States helping themselves, and I am confident that many of them can and will extend their present efforts in support of education. In fact, S. 246 requires States to increase their efforts if they are fully to avail themselves of the Federal support authorized by the bill. But, Mr. President, even with increased effort on the part of many of our States, there would still remain serious inequalities in education which could not be overcome by the States themselves.

Here let me say, Mr. President, that no matter how long Federal aid to education shall last in our country, if it is once established—Federal aid to secondary education; we give Federal aid to all other kinds of education—it will be only a fraction of what the States pay. The secondary and primary education bill in this country is about $4,000,000,000. We will appropriate less than $300,000,000. So that, as I have said, the aid is necessary to bring about some semblance of equality.

One more matter in relation to that. I do not agree with the statement of a former President of the United States which has been quoted, that aid to a community or aid to a State causes the State or the community to sit back and take it and not do anything about it. The whole history of our country has been otherwise. When did any State cease growing because it got money from the public lands? When did any State allow its Federal land-grant college to slip back? There is not one in the whole United States that has not year after year grown, and there is not one land-grant college for which the State has not appropriated more money through the years as demands increased. Instead of causing the States to sit back and take and wait, as Mr. Hoover implied in the quotation used, the result has been what the pending bill would effect, namely, to stimulate greater effort and to cause the people to demand better and better results. The growth of the land-grant institutions proves absolutely that State aid and the matching system increase rather than decrease State activity. The whole history of the country shows it, and when anyone tries to build a theory of national economy on the basis that, if we give a fellow a dime it will make him shiftless, he is enunciating a false theory. Very few men have been made more shiftless by having an apple or a dime given them if they needed the apple or the dime.

The statement that inequalities of educational opportunity among the States are caused mainly by differences in the financial effort which the States are willing to make in support of their schools has been made repeatedly over the years. Such a statement does not, however, square with the facts. Of the 24 States with lowest current school expenditure per pupil in 1945–46, for example, 17 made efforts equal to or above the United States average. Of the 12 States making the greatest effort, only 2 were among the 12 spending the most money per pupil and 2 were also among the 12 lowest in per pupil expenditures.

The measure of effort used here is the proportion which total current school expenditure from State and local sources in 1945–46 bore to the average income payments for the period 1942 through 1946. This percentage ranged from 1.19 in Maryland to 3.24 in New Mexico, with an average of 1.82 for the Nation as a whole. In five States the school expenditure was less than 1.5 percent of average income, whereas in two States it exceeded 3 percent.

Of the 12 States ranking lowest in effort, 7 are heavily industrial and urban in character. Of the 16 Southern States, 9 made efforts equal to or above the national average.

Since these data are of interest to all the Senators, I ask consent that the full tabulation for all the States be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Percent
United States	1.82
District of Columbia	1.13
New Mexico	3.24
Montana	3.16
South Dakota	2.72
West Virginia	2.71
North Dakota	2.58
Oklahoma	2.55
Minnesota	2.49
Utah	2.49
Wyoming	2.35
Iowa	2.34
Arizona	2.28
North Carolina	2.23
Nebraska	2.22
Idaho	2.18
South Carolina	2.17
Kansas	2.14
Missouri	2.01
Texas	2.00
Indiana	2.00
Colorado	2.00
Vermont	1.99
Wisconsin	1.96
New Jersey	1.95
Kentucky	1.94
Alabama	1.90
Louisiana	1.89
Oregon	1.85
Michigan	1.82
Arkansas	1.82
New Hampshire	1.82
Mississippi	1.80
Washington	1.78
Pennsylvania	1.78
Tennessee	1.75
New York	1.72
Maine	1.71
Ohio	1.70
Massachusetts	1.69
Illinois	1.65
Virginia	1.62
Florida	1.57
California	1.54
Georgia	1.52
Nevada	1.47
Connecticut	1.46
Delaware	1.41
Rhode Island	1.36
Maryland	1.19

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I realize that the figures I have just mentioned are based on average income payments as computed by the Department of Commerce and used in the allotment procedure in S. 246. I also realize that the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] does not not feel that these figures truly reflect the economic status of the States. Nevertheless these are the best available data we have for this purpose. To my knowledge, we have no other basic national statistics which afford any better indication of the over-all economic status of the population of the States. I suppose that we could argue until doomsday about what figures to use. But the essential consideration still is whether we are going to pass a bill that is based on the principle of bringing about greater equalization of educational opportunities. That is the crux of the whole matter for each school child, for each school district, and for each State and local government.

COMMENTS ON AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY SENATOR LODGE TO S. 246

Instead of trying to improve upon the equalization principle in S. 246, the proposed amendment eliminates this basic idea and goes over to a simple flat-grant basis. The flat-grant idea has been tried for years in State school finance and because of its inequity has been steadily abandoned.

(a) The amendment proposes to use average daily attendance in spite of the fact that this is an unstandardized figure. Each State has its own specific way of calculating this figure. In fact, the procedure is not standardized even within many States. If the Federal Government attempts to define the term and its calculation, there will be created an instance of Federal interference and dictation. By use of the figures of the United States Census Bureau, all of this difficulty is avoided, for a straight enumeration of total number of school children has been standardized and is applied with technical exactness to all States.

Furthermore, the State's potential task is the number of children living within its borders. No public agency can assume that any private agency will carry part of a public function. It may not forbid private groups to have their own police but the public police department must be planned in terms of the total population. We know from experience, for example, that in times of economic recession many of the pupils in private schools will return to the public schools. The planning of public schools must be

in terms both of actual and potential load.

The amendment also provides that the average daily attendance shall be calculated for the calender year. To do so would be wholly artificial and would lead to still further variations in practice. Average daily attendance is calculated on the school year.

(b) The amount of $10 per child in average daily attendance is not proper for several reasons. In the first place, average daily attendance usually runs about 80 percent of the total enrollment figures, as reported by the United States Office of Education. If this ratio holds for present public-school enrollments, then the amendment would reduce the allotments to about $200,000,000 instead of the $300,000,000 authorized in the bill. It is estimated that the actual cost of S. 246, as recommended by the Senate committee for next year, will be about $260,000,000.

The $10 provision in the amendment would double the estimated allotments to New York and 24 other States which now do not receive equalization allotments; it would cut the allotments to the least able States by one-half to two-thirds. It, therefore, not only eliminates the idea of equalization but actually would tend to increase the present inequalities.

Furthermore, the amendment increases the financial hazard in the poorest States. For example, a recent survey shows that in Mississippi, the poorest district spent $7.94 per child in average daily attendance in the school year 1947–48; it is estimated by school officials that they will be able to spend $10.36 per child in 1948–49. Ten dollars added to these amounts means that from local and State funds there will have to be found about $35 per child to meet the specifications of $55 per child now required in section 7 of S. 246. Similarly, a recent study shows that expenditures in the poorest districts in Arkansas and Kentucky will range from about $46 to $59 per child after they receive the $10 in Federal funds.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of a school district in which next year perhaps $10 per child would be spent. Is it not true that if the Lodge amendment to the bill were adopted, and if that State or that school district could not raise the money for expenditure per child in that school district to the $55, the State would not even receive the $10 the Lodge amendment proposes to give?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course that would be true, if the amendment were to become law.

Thus, the States most in need of Federal aid would be required to place most of the funds among their poorest districts and to add additional local and State revenues which they cannot readily find. In a sense, therefore, the amendments would compel "matching" by the poorest and at the same time would be giving increased allotments to the more able States. This is an application of the "tax benefit" theory, with the added twist that those who are unable to pay shall somehow find additional funds to meet the standards set by the Federal Government. Subsections (C) and (D), combined with the proposed new (A), would merely tend to keep the noses of the poorest States near to the grindstone in order to receive the driblets of aid to which they would be entitled.

The attempt to define "average daily attendance" on page 4 of the proposed amendment settles nothing. Attendance is computed differently in the various States. The term "regularly enrolled" has almost 48 different meanings; in fact, even more than that, because in many States there are different arrangements in various counties and school districts. The use of 175 days would tend to penalize the poorest States where they average only about 170 days because it cuts down the number of pupils in average daily attendance below the actual number; it would increase the number of pupils in average daily attendance in the wealthier States where attendance is better. Also since each State now calculates its average number of pupils in attendance in terms of its own length of school year, the proposal adds another variation.

The amendment limits the funds to schools in which 90 percent of the pupils are in full-time attendance. This is ambiguous and subject to several possible interpretations. Undoubtedly, it would prevent Federal funds being used for handicapped children who often do not attend for a full school day; it would eliminate aid to continuation schools. The amendment would also involve endless red tape and record keeping; and increase the administrative load of local school systems.

The amendment also requires that secondary schools, in order to receive any aid, shall have at least 50 percent of their graduates 18 or more years of age at the time of graduation. Such a prescription is not only Federal interference but is a violation of school practice which allows children to progress in accordance with their achievements and maturity, regardless of age. On the basis of local reports available, we find that in recent years in several communities the following percents of graduating classes have been under the age of 18 years: Providence, R. I., 54 percent; Cincinnati, Ohio, 83 percent; Harlan County, Ky., 52 percent; St. Louis, Mo., 54 percent. All these and many others could not qualify under the 18-year rule.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk, and ask consent that it be incorporated in the record at this point in my remarks, a tabulation showing for each State the estimated allotments that would be made under S. 246 as reported to the Senate and under the proposed amendments, with allowance being made for application of the penalty provisions of the bill. This table shows, Mr. President, that when the penalties are added, the Federal allotments to many States are further reduced under the proposed amendment, while the over-all total is cut to approximately $173,251,000, as compared with $260,041,000 under S. 246 as reported. The table does not show the effect of applying the 18-year-graduation rule contained in the proposed amendment—because these data are not available on such short notice—which undoubtedly would reduce still further the amount of allotments under the proposed amendment.

There being no objection, the table referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated allotments to States under Senator Lodge's proposed amendment to S. 246 and under the formula in S. 246, with penalty provisions applied

State	Average daily attendance, 1946–47	Total allotment under proposed amendment (column 2×$10)	Percent current expenditure is of average income payments	Percent column 4 is of 2.25	Total amount each State would receive with penalty applied under proposed amendment	Total amount of allotment S. 246 unamended, after penalty (2.25 percent)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Continental United States	20,448,656	$204,486,560	1.88	83.6	$173,251,332	$260,041,000
Alabama	545,191	5,451,910	1.87	83.1	4,530,537	14,451,000
Arizona	105,132	1,051,320	2.58	100.0	1,051,320	1,500,000
Arkansas	335,888	3,358,880	2.03	90.2	3,029,710	11,708,000
California	1,329,066	13,290,660	1.68	74.7	9,928,123	8,435,000
Colorado	181,226	1,812,260	2.06	91.6	1,660,030	1,240,000
Connecticut	226,157	2,261,570	1.49	66.2	1,497,159	1,685,000
Delaware	37,168	371,680	1.46	64.9	241,220	280,000
District of Columbia	80,918	809,180	1.27	56.4	456,378	580,000
Florida	351,596	3,515,960	1.70	75.6	2,658,066	2,365,000
Georgia	579,618	5,796,180	2.01	89.3	5,175,989	14,163,000
Idaho	89,574	895,740	2.21	98.2	879,617	625,000
Illinois	980,818	9,808,180	1.82	80.9	7,934,818	7,490,000
Indiana	543,641	5,436,410	2.06	91.6	4,979,752	3,825,000
Iowa	395,590	3,955,900	2.71	100.0	3,955,900	2,625,000
Kansas	276,245	2,762,450	2.13	94.7	2,616,040	1,880,000
Kentucky	446,576	4,465,760	1.98	88.0	3,929,869	13,367,000
Louisiana	375,155	3,751,550	2.25	100.0	3,751,550	10,370,000
Maine	135,723	1,357,230	1.82	80.9	1,097,999	945,000
Maryland	258,496	2,584,960	1.22	54.2	1,401,048	2,010,000
Massachusetts	517,675	5,176,750	1.68	74.7	3,867,032	4,115,000
Michigan	885,780	8,857,800	1.89	84.0	7,440,552	6,235,000
Minnesota	397,891	3,978,910	2.57	100.0	3,978,910	2,920,000
Mississippi	458,147	4,581,470	2.05	91.1	4,173,719	15,469,000
Missouri	516,449	5,164,490	1.77	78.7	4,064,454	3,790,000
Montana	81,162	811,620	2.84	100.0	811,620	585,000
Nebraska	198,461	1,984,610	2.33	100.0	1,984,610	1,305,000
Nevada	22,982	229,820	1.44	64.0	147,085	125,000
New Hampshire	60,398	603,980	2.05	91.1	550,226	505,000
New Jersey	546,822	5,468,220	2.02	89.8	4,910,462	3,840,000
New Mexico	104,020	1,040,200	3.36	100.0	1,040,200	3,130,000

Estimated allotments to States under Senator Lodge's proposed amendment to S. 246 and under the formula in S. 246, with penalty provisions applied—Continued

State	Average daily attendance, 1946–47	Total allotment under proposed amendment (column 2×$10)	Percent current expenditure is of average income payments	Percent column 4 is of 2.25	Total amount each State would receive with penalty applied under proposed amendment	Total amount of allotment S. 246 unamended, after penalty (2.25 percent)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
New York	1,595,713	$15,957,130	1.75	77.8	$12,414,647	$11,925,000
North Carolina	734,327	7,343,270	2.40	100.0	7,343,270	21,070,000
North Dakota	102,395	1,023,950	2.45	100.0	1,023,950	860,000
Ohio	1,026,336	10,263,360	1.64	72.9	7,481,989	7,320,000
Oklahoma	405,667	4,056,670	2.40	100.0	4,056,670	8,350,000
Oregon	193,636	1,936,360	1.97	87.6	1,696,251	1,410,000
Pennsylvania	1,353,314	13,533,140	1.79	79.6	10,772,379	10,120,000
Rhode Island	80,739	807,390	1.43	63.6	513,500	645,000
South Carolina	372,695	3,726,950	2.15	95.6	3,562,964	13,365,000
South Dakota	99,464	994,640	2.95	100.0	994,640	1,080,000
Tennessee	523,577	5,235,770	1.81	80.4	4,209,559	10,629,000
Texas	1,059,623	10,596,230	1.93	85.8	9,091,565	10,845,000
Utah	129,854	1,298,540	2.64	100.0	1,298,540	1,170,000
Vermont	52,347	523,470	1.95	86.7	453,848	390,000
Virgina	489,242	4,892,420	1.78	79.1	3,869,904	4,074,000
Washington	313,395	3,133,950	1.88	83.6	2,619,982	2,250,000
West Virginia	376,417	3,764,170	2.48	100.0	3,764,170	9,360,000
Wisconsin	432,644	4,326,440	2.03	90.2	3,902,449	3,325,000
Wyoming	43,706	437,060	2.52	100.0	437,060	290,000

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I now turn, Mr. President, to an explanation of the allotment formula provided in S. 246 as reported by the committee. Ordinarily I would have done so in talking about the bill in the beginning. However, I do so at this point because undoubtedly when we vote upon the Lodge amendment we shall be considering the entire allotment theory. Therefore I think I should place in the RECORD at this point the description of the allotment in the bill.

The allotment formula provided in S. 246 recognizes the financial need of the States, as measured by annual income payments, and the number of children between the school ages of 5 and 17, inclusive. The basic Federal allotment to a State is either that amount by which $50 per child exceeds 1 percent of the average annual income of the State, or a flat amount of $5 per child, whichever is greater.

The bill authorizes $300,000,000 annually in Federal aid to assist the States in establishing a foundation program of public elementary and public secondary school education in quality equal to that which can be provided by a current expenditure of $50 each year per child of school age in the State.

The first step in applying the formula is to compute the cost of the $50 program. This is done for each State by multiplying the number of children 5 to 17 years of age by $50. The total cost of this foundation program for the entire Nation is $50 times the number of children 5 to 17 years of age in the 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Several years ago, when the formula now contained in S. 246 was first approved by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it was found that the cost of operating the foundation program in the 48 States and the District of Columbia approximated 1 percent of the income payments of the Nation. It was therefore logical to propose that each State should contribute 1 percent of its income payments to financing the proposed foundation school program as defined in S. 246.

Thus the second step in the formula is to compute the amount of money available for that purpose in each State by multiplying the State's income payments by 1 percent. In this instance, the average of the State's income payments for a 5-year period is used in order to safeguard the resources of our schools against sudden and violent changes in the annual income payments of their citizens.

If 1 percent of the State's income payments is less than the cost of the foundation program as computed in the first step earlier mentioned, the State gets the difference from the Federal funds authorized by S. 246; provided, however, that no State shall receive less than $5 per year per child of school age within its population.

In step one, the Federal money is apportioned to the State on a basis that takes into consideration the size of the job to be done, that is, the number of children to be educated. The funds are thus apportioned in direct ratio to the educational task faced by each State.

In step two, the money is apportioned on a basis that takes into consideration the ability of the State to finance its educational responsibilities. In proportion as the State's ability, measured by the income of its citizens, grows less, the amount of Federal aid which it is eligible to receive becomes greater. This arrangement, which has long been in effective use in the State aid plans of many States, is the principle of equalization at work. This is the great purpose of the bill we are considering.

A third step, however, is involved in the formula and to it the attention of the Senate is next invited. The States and their localities must continue to make real effort to pay for their schools from their own resources in order to remain eligible to share the Federal funds which S. 246 authorizes. If a State and its political subdivisions together spend less than 2.25 percent of their income payments during each of the first 2 years of the operation of the act, the amount of Federal aid to which the State is entitled is proportionately reduced. After the second year, the achievement effort set for the States is 2.5 percent. In the event State plus local effort falls below 2.0 percent for any fiscal year after June 30, 1952, the Federal allotment to such State shall be equal to $5 times the number of children 5 to 17 years of age in the State and to no more. The penalty which thus falls upon a State is determined by the State itself. It can, if it wishes, remain eligible for the full amount of Federal aid to which it is entitled, or it can reduce its eligibility below the full amount in whatever degree it may wish.

The 2.5 percent effort level, effective after 2 years' operation of S. 246, was set from an examination of general practice in the Nation for each alternate year during the 1929–39 decade. The 2.25 percent effort level, set for the first 2 years, reflects the purpose of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to encourage the States and their localities to adjust their school support programs on a gradual basis. Both the 2.25 and 2.5 percent levels are higher than current practice in the Nation today. But they are not so high as to require unreasonably large school expenditures on the part of the States, nor are they so low as to permit the States to lean undeservedly upon the Federal treasury for help.

I have indicated that the foundation school program to be financed through the use of Federal funds is to be equal to the kind of schooling that can be provided by an expenditure of $50 per year per child of school age in the State. Because of the fact that all school-age pupils are not yet enrolled in school, careful estimates show that the money made available under the terms of S. 246 will actually finance, with present State and local school revenues, a program involving an expenditure of $55 per annum per pupil in average daily attendance. We are therefore proposing by the terms of this act to establish a minimum in the public elementary and secondary schools in the Nation equal to that which can be procured by spending $55 per year on each boy and each girl in average daily attendance. This is not a high goal. Nevertheless it is substantial in improving the chances of millions of American children to get a basic education.

In stipulating the $55 minimum the effect of the bill is to give priority in the use of the funds to those schools in the States which are least adequately financed. The first call upon these funds will be to make every local school or school system, in which less than $55 per year per child in average daily attendance is spent, at least a $55 expenditure school or school system.

The 2.25 percent effort of the States and localities for the first 2 years of the operation of the act, thereafter 2.5 percent effort, guarantees the purpose of the Federal funds to be that of supplementing State and local school-tax dollars. That purpose is spelled out in another way in section 7 (B) which requires the States and localities, if they wish to remain eligible for Federal aid, to provide from State and local sources either (1) the total amount actually spent for current school purposes from such sources in the fiscal year ended in 1949, or (2) the amount per pupil in average daily attendance actually spent for such purposes from such sources in fiscal year, 1949.

In all of these connections, however, it is to be noted that there is no Federal compulsion upon any State to qualify for the funds authorized in S. 246. A State can qualify for its full apportionment, for a part of its apportionment, or for none of its apportionment as it may itself wish and determine. The bill is thus most carefully worded in order that State and local control of policies may be completely safeguarded.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think it should be said that the committee does not now, and never has, pretended that the formula in this bill is perfect. It is, however, the best one that could be developed; and it has been developed over a period of years, not just at this time. No doubt experience with its application may point to some desirable changes in the future. But the fact remains that the formula as presently drawn, is not static. Its base moves forward with time, and thereby gives appropriate effect to changes both in economic conditions and in populations.

Finally, for the reasons I have indicated, Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendments proposed by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and I hope the Senate will reject them when the time to vote on them arrives.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, during the years that I have been a Member of this body, I have always tried to take the national view. I think the record will show that on many occasions I have voted for all sorts of governmental activities and appropriations which not only conferred no particular benefits upon the State which I have the honor to represent in part, but which were in an immediate sense a drain on its resources. I so voted for the very obvious reason that all of us are citizens of the United States, with the emphasis upon the word "United"; and that what helps one, helps all; that to develop undeveloped parts of the United States is good for all; and that we may, by such means, improve trade between the various States, and thus bring about a return to us, real though indirect, of the money spent for such undertakings.

As regards the situation in the New England States—and I think the same situation is true of the Middle Atlantic States—I think the statistics now show that for every $2 they pay to the Federal Government, they receive $1 in return. That would not be an intolerable situation if the level of economic activity in our section of the country kept pace with economic developments in other parts of the Nation. Until recent years, it did; but I have just received figures, which I believe to be authoritative, showing that in the case of New England, the payments to the Federal Treasury in 1946, 1947, and 1948, were from five to six times as large as in the prewar period—in other words, that instead of paying $160,000,000 a year, the amount now paid by them is over $900,000,000 a year—and this is the significant part, that we have not been able to increase our gains from business transactions fast enough to compensate for what we are paying to the Federal Government. I think that here is a matter which should interest each Member of the Senate, whether he comes from a State which has a high level of economic activity or a State which has a low level of economic activity, because certainly none of us wish to kill the goose that lays the golden egg; we do not wish to carry the principle of siphoning wealth from one section of the country to another to such a point that it will defeat its own ends. It seems to me, Mr. President, that is a thought for all Senators to bear in mind.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts made any survey as to whether there is a great probability of a decrease in Federal revenues in the New England States, by reason of the falling off of war-time activities, for instance?

Mr. LODGE. I would not be surprised if that were true.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not know whether the Senator from Massachusetts had had a survey of that sort made.

Mr. LODGE. No; I did not. These figures have come to me today from a very reliable source. I present them because, of course, the entire country has a vital interest in maintaining the dynamic quality of the economic activity in these particular States.

As I have said, I take a national view. Certainly there is no Member of the Senate who objects more strongly, with every fiber of his being, to illiteracy among our youth than I do. I can well remember during the war seeing young men who could not read or write enter the military service; in fact, we had to set up schools to teach them how to read and write. Not only is such a condition a very great drawback to the national defense, thus making such young men less effective in working with their fellow citizens who come from other parts of the country—to take a very limited view of the matter—but it is also a very bad thing for citizenship generally.

Certainly I am in favor of having the Federal Government take measures which will eliminate illiteracy. Let me say in passing that I have heard this bill described as a bill to eliminate illiteracy, but I cannot find in it language which concentrates the bill upon that particular target. The fact is, Mr. President, that the bill is not specifically aimed at eliminating illiteracy, but is a bill to assist all the States and all the Territories. If the bill were limited to the particular purpose of eliminating illiteracy, then its language would be quite different.

Mr. President, I do not see any contradiction between legislating to eliminate illiteracy and appropriating money, let us say, to arm Europe. I have heard some Senators say they would prefer to vote to eliminate illiteracy rather than to vote to arm Europe or to provide funds for the Marshall plan. It seems to me that we are not on the horns of that dilemma at all. An illiterate child in any one of the States will be just as much affected if we suffer a military reverse as will a child who knows how to read and write. The foreign policy of the United States is adopted and applied just as much for the children of one State as for the children of another. If the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact are sound instruments of foreign policy—as I believe them to be—then they are sound for the illiterate as well as for the literate people of the country.

Mr. President, speaking of the Marshall plan, let me call attention to the fact that the Congress has required that the nations receiving aid under it must make their maximum efforts of self-help. We wrote such a provision into that law. Mr. Hoffman, the Administrator of ECA, has insisted that such efforts be made. I know that in France taxes have been increased, so as to make sure that the French are making their maximum efforts of self-help before they receive Marshall plan assistance from the United States. Certainly I do not put any of the States of the United States of America in the same category with the nations of Europe, in any way, shape, or manner; but I suggest that it would be a good thing for the people of States demanding Federal aid, as well as for all the people of the United States, if every State made its maximum effort. Frankly, I was a little astounded to hear the Senator from Ohio say that he could not agree that the States should be required to make their maximum efforts.

I realize that is a subject on which honest men may differ. But, as a proposition in political philosophy, it seems to me that all these States ought to make their maximum effort. They ought to levy whatever taxes they can levy. They ought to deal with the ruthless influences that may beset their State legislatures. They ought not to be required merely to put up a certain percentage. They ought to make the maximum effort of which they are capable, if they are going to talk about the rights of the States. As has been said here many times, there cannot be States' rights if the States are not willing to do their full duty. I do not speak selfishly about that. I think it would be a good thing for the people in those States if there were enough political gumption on the part of the governor and the legislature to impose the taxes that are imposed in the States of the kind from which I come.

I was glad to note that the Senator from Ohio admitted there were defects in the formula which is in the committee bill. Indeed, there are. It is full of defects and injustices and absurdities, and I have heard very little here today that has disproved that opinion. I spent 2 hours Friday in demonstrating what those absurdities are, and I shall not repeat all that now. Senators who are interested will have read it by this time. Let me say I do not blame the committee or criticize the committee adversely for having been unable to produce a formula which would reflect all the myriad variegated economic conditions that exist in America. It is a hard thing to do. It is a big job to get a formula that will really reflect our whole economy. I do know that they have not done it. I am not enough of an expert to know what is wrong about it or how they obtained some of these absurd results. Perhaps one explanation is that the formula does not

reflect capital gains. But in any case the formula in the committee bill is unjust and defective, and I submit to the Senate there ought to be enough brains in the United States Senate, with all the help that we can get and all the staff that we have, to develop a formula which will, first, help the poor people in the rural areas without, secondly, being overlavish to those who do not need it, and, in the third place, without ignoring the poor people in our cities. Yet that is what happens under the committee proposal. Educational conditions are not ideal in a great many of our big cities, Mr. President. I shall not repeat what I said on that score, but there is a great deal in the record about the schools in Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and many other big cities. There is real poverty in those areas, and we do not do ourselves or the country a favor when we overlook that fact.

The statement has been made about the amendment which I propose, and I think I am quoting correctly, that it knocks out the principle of equalization. In fact, I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] went so far as to say that it would kill the whole bill for that reason. I am sure, on more careful study, he will see that that is not the case. The question of capacity to pay is implicit, it is part of the very fabric of the amendment which I propose. These are rough figures, subject to correction as to details, but I think, broadly speaking, they are accurate: Alabama puts in $2,300,000 for education, and gets back $5,451,000 under the terms of the amendment which I propose. In other words, Alabama, under the method which I propose, gets back almost twice as much as it puts in. Arkansas puts in $1,300,000, and gets back $3,359,000. California puts in $16,700,000, and gets back $13,000,000. California gets back less than it puts in, even under the formula which I advocate. I have just figured these figures out for a few of the States, but I will read them into the RECORD. Georgia puts in $2,800,000 and gets back $5,796,000. Mississippi puts in $1,300,000, and gets back $4,581,000. There is a State that gets back four times as much as it puts in, and yet we are told that the amendment ignores the factor of capacity to pay. It obviously does no such thing. A scheme under which you get back four times as much as you put in, Mr. President, is certainly a scheme that takes into account the ability of the State to pay.

New York puts in $31,100,000, and gets back $15,900,000. North Carolina puts in $3,200,000, and gets back $7,300,000. Ohio puts in $11,700,000, and gets back $10,260,000. They break almost even. Pennsylvania puts in $15,600,000, and gets back $13,500,000. Those are the figures I have worked out. They could be worked out completely. They show that the principle of capacity to pay is implicit in the amendment, that it does not knock out the principle of equalization; that it is an amendment which perfects the bill and in no sense of the word can be described either as killing the bill or as destroying its essential purpose.

The statement was made on Friday that the States with the low per capita income made a greater proportionate expenditure, not a greater dollar expenditure but a greater proportionate expenditure for education than the States with the relatively high per capita income. I have studied the tables in the committee report, and I see that States like Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, all of them so-called rich States, make a contribution well in excess of the national average. Then I note that Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming all have a higher percentage rate than Mississippi. So the statement that was made here on Friday that the States with the lowest expenditure for education or the lowest per capita income had a higher proportional expenditure is obviously belied by the facts.

Mr. President, the bill which we confront has a very worthy object, a purpose of which I heartily approve. But it is clearly a matter that deserves further study. We cannot go wrong if we adopt this very simple formula which I propose, which does give recognition to the principle of capacity to pay, but which does not contain a sliding-scale formula of such very dubious validity as the one which the bill includes. It seems to me the part of wisdom to take this thing in several bites, to adopt the amendment which I offer, and pass the bill with that amendment. Then when we develop a formula which really makes some sense, we can add that on. For that reason, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. GEORGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been unable to be on the floor this afternoon as much as I would like to be. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator, relative to the formula he has proposed. I notice some differences in the figures in the tables with respect to the amounts which are to be collected. In some cases they are constant, but in some cases they vary by a million dollars, some by more than a million dollars, with respect to the agencies reporting. Is that based on a different time of the year at which collections are made, or is it based on different years? Why should the tables vary? For example, if the Senator will turn to the figures he submitted last Friday, he will find the figure for Kansas to be $1,880,000 given as the amount that will be allotted to the State under the committee bill. The amount which will be paid out is $3,110,000, and the amount which it will cost the State is $1,230,000. The State of Nebraska is referred to, as are several other States. I notice in the statement which the Senator has submitted that the figures for Nebraska are the same as they are in the table, the figures for Kansas are the same, but the figures for other States vary.

For example, the figure for Alabama is $17,390,000, according to the table submitted by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, while according to the table submitted by the chambers of commerce, or whatever the agencies were which gathered the figures, the figures for Alabama are given as $14,451,000. Does that indicate a different system of computing the amounts in different years? What does the Senator say about that?

Mr. LODGE. The figures in columns 2 and 3 of the formula which I inserted in the RECORD do not show the penalty deduction, and the figures which I did not compile myself, but which were compiled by the State chambers of commerce, include the penalty deduction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator's explanation is correct. There is a penalty deduction if they do not levy 2¼ percent on the income. There is a proportionate reduction in the Federal aid. I think the Senator did not take that into account.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. There is a footnote, No. 3, which indicates that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I asked the question was to determine whether it made any difference in which way the formulas were applied. The formulas would be true to form, whether one or the other is taken; is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator feel with reference to the formula suggested in the committee bill, so far as relating to actual facts regarding the income of individuals is concerned, and the amount which should be collected and the amount paid out by the States? I understand the Senator disagrees with the formula, but if it should be adopted, does he feel it would fairly accomplish what the bill attempts to do?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know that I understand the Senator's question. I do not think that per capita income or gross income as established in the committee formula is a just or effective way to deal with the question.

Mr. WHERRY. As between States, or between individuals, or in what particular phase might it become erroneous?

Mr. LODGE. I think what is wrong with it, as I have been trying to show, is that it takes States such as Oklahoma and Texas and treats them as poor States, which is an obvious absurdity. I think it probably does a very good job in helping the poor in rural sections, but it does a very niggardly job in helping the poor in the cities.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that because of the formula itself?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; because it contains what I consider to be an unsound philosophy. With regard to the proposition

of requiring each State to make a maximum effort, some Senators think the States should not be required to make a maximum effort. I think they should be so required.

Mr. WHERRY. Under the formula suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, which is $10 per capita for all students in the elementary or primary grades, does the Senator feel that would more nearly reflect what the Senator believes should be used as a basis in the provisions of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. I have never said that the formula which I propose is the last word on the subject, and I have never said it is perfect. I do not know whether we can get a formula which is perfect, but I think, inasmuch as we have embarked on the adventure of helping all the States, the formula which I propose is certainly a much sounder way to go at it than are the variables in the committee bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Under the table submitted by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts—and I again refer to my State, because I have used the figure in some of the questions I have asked—in one column there is the sum of $1,305,000. In the next column, showing the total allotments to the State under the Lodge formula, the amount is $1,985,000. There is an increase of $680,000.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. In the table submitted under the formula used in the bill, the figure changes in the third column. Applying that formula, instead of the one submitted by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as $1,185,000, under the committee formula the amount would be $2,359,000.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no. Under the committee formula the figure would be $1,305,000. Nebraska would receive $680,000 more under the formula which I propose than it would receive under the committee formula.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is talking about what Nebraska puts in.

Mr. WHERRY. First, what it puts in.

Mr. LODGE. What Nebraska puts in would be approximately $1,800,000. The table of the chambers of commerce, printed on page 5414, gives the amount the States would pay out, and when we modify that in order to have it fit the $204,000,000, it will be found that Nebraska puts in approximately $1,800,000 and gets back $1,900,000.

Mr. WHERRY. In some States, under the Senator's formula, the figure goes up, and in some States it comes down.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Why is that?

Mr. LODGE. Because it is based on the school child population.

Mr. WHERRY. That makes the difference between the formula submitted by the distingushed Senator from Massachusetts and the other formula; is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. The variables which the committee formula shows are omitted from my formula.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator's formula provides that every State must contribute 2 percent of its own revenue, or 2¼ to 2½ percent, under certain circumstances, so I do not quite understand the Senator's suggestion with regard to our formula insisting on a State's putting up a fair amount of money. It seems to me his formula makes the same requirement as a condition of Federal aid.

Mr. LODGE. I want them to do at least as well as they would under the formula suggested in the committee bill, but I should like to go further and have the States make a maximum effort to raise as much money as they can, by all the forms of taxation used in some of the States to which I have referred.

Mr. TAFT. It is true, however, that the committee bill makes that requirement of efforts the same as that which the Senator's amendment requires.

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly true.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, we have been discussing the pending amendment for 2 days, and I think the Senate is ready to vote. If that is the case, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] has been sick, as the Senate knows, since the third day he was a Member of the Senate. He is now recuperating in North Carolina, and I am sure Senators will be glad to know he is recovering and will be back soon.

Today I received from my colleague a statement expressing his views on the bill now pending. The junior Senator from North Carolina has been urgently in favor of Federal aid to education for many years. He was an educational statesman through all the years while he was president of the University of North Carolina, and has been leading the educational forces of my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD the views of my colleague on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GRAHAM IN SUPPORT OF S. 246

THE CRISIS IN AMERICA AND THE WORLD

The schools are in a crisis in America. Democracy is in a crisis in the world. The crisis of the schools is a part of the crisis of democracy. The global crisis of democracy deeply involves the precious heritage of human freedom. The national crisis of the schools deeply involves the precious hopes of our children for democracy in America and freedom in the world. Upon the Congress of the United State depends the Federal aid to the States for the schools necessary to provide more equal opportunity for all the children in all the States. Upon the children in all the schools depends the future of democracy in America. Upon democracy in America largely depends the future freedom of mankind.

THE CAUSES OF THE SCHOOL CRISIS

The school crisis has resulted from the war, from the present higher birth rate, the higher costs, the comparatively lower salaries for teachers, the fewer competent teachers, the more than a hundred thousand substandard teachers, heavier teaching loads, overcrowded school rooms, and deteriorated school buildings and equipment. The crisis in the schools reveals a deeper crisis in the American sense of values. In the year 1944–45 the American people spent $2,600,000,000 for schools, $2,700,000,000 for tobacco, and $7,100,000,000, for alcoholic beverages. The people of the United States spent for education a little over 2 percent of the national income, Britain, a little over 3 percent, and Russia, it is estimated, over 8 percent.

THE VALUES OF FEDERAL AID

Deterioration of the schools in America is a retreat of freedom in the world. Better schools in America should mean higher intelligence in government, in business management, in production, and a wider knowledge of our cultural and spiritual heritage. Higher skills in economic production and deeper appreciation of human freedom in America should mean both more self-recovery everywhere for the production of foods and goods and more security for the advance of freedom in the world. The $300,000,000 needed now for Federal aid to the States for more equal opportunity, for the higher skills, wider sympathies, and deeper insights of youth in America will be a hopeful step forward for democracy, production, freedom, and peace in the world.

THE PEOPLE ARE FOR FEDERAL AID

The need for Federal aid to the States for schools, as a fundamental American need, has long been clear to the people. The vast majority of the educational, agricultural, labor, civic, and patriotic organizations in the States and the Nation for more than a decade have been urgently petitioning the Congress for this supplementary Federal aid. In the last campaign the President carried this congressional failure directly to the people. The people are no longer to be denied their petitions in behalf of 23,000,000 school children and 800,000 school teachers in whose trust is the hope of democracy in America and freedom in the world. If we listen, above the confusion and tumult of these days, we can hear the voices of the many millions in the schools, in the homes, on the farms, in the factories, mines, stores, trains, and busses, and wherever people do their day's work, voices of the people across the continent, calling to this Congress to meet the crisis of the schools and make opportunity more equal in America and freedom more secure in the world.

The people have long been calling. The Congress has long been stalling. Powerful and sincere opponents have often locked up the Federal-aid bills in committee. Powerful groups have sincerely urged recourse to State surpluses rather than to Federal aid. Others have sounded the alarm against the danger of Federal control of the schools following Federal aid to the schools. Analysis, however, shows that the State surpluses are largely temporary accumulations of funds unspent on needed permanent improvements which have also vastly accumulated during the war and postwar years. Temporary State war surpluses will not meet the present crisis which will tend to become a permanent danger to our democracy without a long-range policy of Federal aid for more equalization of opportunity for all children.

WITHOUT FEDERAL CONTROL

The Federal aid bill itself provides Federal guaranties against Federal control of State and local school policies and gives assurances of State and local control of the selection of administrators, teachers, curricula, textbooks, general policies, and State constitutional provisions. With the adoption of this bill the States and localities would provide approximately nine-tenths and the Federal Government approximately one-tenth of the general fund for the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation—$300,000,000 out of approximately $3,000,000,000. The opponents and proponents of Federal aid for the schools, along with the overwhelming majority of the American people, are against Federal control of the schools. It is not Federal control but honest bookkeeping to require: (1) That the Federal funds supplement and not supplant present State funds; and (2) to require that since the number of school children constitute one of the grounds for the allocation of Federal funds, that every child receive his equitable share of the Federal funds apportioned to the State by counting him. To distribute the funds inequitably between the races would be a dishonest use of Federal funds appropriated and accepted on one basis and then misappropriated on another basis.

To use the Federal power to withhold Federal aid from the States, having racial segregation in the public schools as a matter of State policy, would be an exercise of Federal control of State and local schools. An amendment for such Federal sanctions against the States would result in the defeat of the Federal-aid bill; would slow down the movement for equitable distribution of State funds, which the equitable distribution of Federal funds would accelerate; would deny desperately needed additional funds to the very children who need them most; would cause a set-back rather than an advance in the recent increasingly equitable relations of the races in the South; and would give new power to the demagogues against the men and women of good will of both races who work steadfastly, intelligently, prayerfully, and progressively at this complex problem of the races in the region of its heaviest concentration anywhere in the world.

The purpose of the Federal-aid bill is not more centralization of control of the schools in the national government but more equalization of opportunity for all the children in all the States. In taking this position in opposition to Federal sanctions against the Southern States, we hold that Federal aid to the States for the schools is a next step toward the fulfillment of the historic American dream for equal opportunity, freedom, and dignity of all people. In taking this simple step for more equal opportunity we still hold on to our religious faith that all people are inherently children of God and brothers of all men whom "God has made of one blood to dwell on the face of the earth." An amendment for using Federal sanctions against the Southern States would defeat the Federal-aid bill, would block one of the next steps toward the equalization of opportunity, and increase the present crisis in the schools.

THE RURAL, REGIONAL, AND FEDERAL STRUCTURE

Beyond the immediate crisis in the schools were, are and will continue to be compelling reasons for Federal aid to the States for schools such as the urban-rural, the regional-national and the State-Federal economic, social and political structures of the United States. The rural people give birth to a proportionately larger percent of the Nation's children and receive a proportionately smaller percent of the national income. This is to say that the rural people who are gladly responsible for feeding, clothing, educating and rearing a proportionately larger percent of the Nation's children have a proportionately smaller percent of the Nation's income with which to meet their disproportionately heavy responsibility for the future of America. The southern people gave birth to 32½ percent of the Nation's children and receive 19 percent of the personal income received by the people of the Nation. That is to say that the southern people who are gladly responsible for feeding, clothing, educating and rearing 32½ percent of the children of the Nation have only 19 percent of the Nation's personal income with which to carry this heavily disproportionate responsibility for the future of America.

The rural and southern families carry the heavy loads and costs of the training of their children in their largely nonproductive years. A large proportion of these trained youths migrate from the rural areas and from the South to the industrial and financial centers. The urban and metropolitan people, who produce less children than rural and southern people, receive a large part of the net benefits of the training of the rural and southern reared youth in their later and creative years.

The only agency in a position to redress this imbalance between the larger number of children in proportion to population in rural and southern areas and the heavier concentration of wealth in the financial centers and metropolitan areas is the Federal Government, which, for its comparatively small Federal supplement can tax wealth where it is for the children where they are.

FEDERAL AID THE ONLY EFFECTIVE MEANS FOR EQUALIZATION IN THE NATION

To make sure that Federal aid means a real step in equalization of opportunity, two main principles are required for allocation of the Federal funds to the States: the number of children of school age in the State and the average annual income payments for each State. No State will receive less than $5 per child of school age. To count the children and not compute the wealth of the State is to remove one of the two pillars on which the whole structure of equalization depends. It is this very imbalance between the amount of the wealth and the number of children in a State which mainly causes the inequalities in education opportunity.

These inequalities in education opportunities are a menace to our democracy. In the year 1944–45 in one State the average annual expenditure per child was $44.80; in another State, $198.33. It required a higher tax rate to yield $50 per child in some localities than it did to yield $150 in others. In many States a tax rate above the average was required to obtain an expenditure per child below the national average. It has been estimated that if some States put their whole general fund in the public schools alone those States would still make financial provisions for the schools below the national average of expenditures per child. The children in a classroom upon which was spent $100 a year are no less American children than the privileged children in a classroom upon which was spent $6,000 a year. Since children trained in the poorer States migrate to become producers and citizens in the richer States, it is in the interest of the richer States and of all the States that the Federal Government make supplementary grants in aid to all the States in proportion to the amount of wealth and the number of children in the States. An amendment to eliminate the average annual income received by the people of the States, as one of the two main principles for apportionment of Federal funds, is to oppose equalization of educational opportunity in the United States.

Since social justice, the economic structure, the American principle of equal opportunity, and the birthright of American children, all combine to make clear that Federal aid to the States is the only effective way to meet the crisis in the schools, the only remaining barrier in the minds of some people is the question as to its constitutionality. Some sincere and patriotic citizens have insisted that Federal aid to the States for the schools is not in keeping with the American traditions, is unconstitutional and un-American.

MOST AMERICAN AND DEMOCRATIC

One of the best ways to find out the nature of the American system is an examination of the structure as designed by the framers of the American Constitution in the Philadelphia Convention. In the crucial struggle between the States with large populations and the States with small populations as to whether this Republic should be based mainly on people or mainly on States, the new Union almost split to pieces. When it appeared that the delegates from the big States might carry the day for their plan, that representation in both Houses of Congress be based on population, Gunning Bedford, of Delaware, speaking for the little States, said that Delaware would rather confederate with a foreign power than be submerged in such a Union. In this crisis the men of Philadelphia appointed a committee to save America from what might have become the Balkanization or even the recolonization of this continent. This committee rejected both the large States' plans to base representation entirely on population and the small States' plans to base representation entirely on the States. Their report based representation in the House on population and in the Senate on States. This balanced structure became a basic part of the American system. Thus the United States of America is now both a Union of 48 States and a Nation of 145,000,000 people. The public schools are training the children to be citizens of the States and citizens of the United States. It is not only not un-American but is most fundamentally American for the Federal Government to aid the States in the education of the future citizens of the States and the future citizens of the United States.

THE FRONTIER CLOSED: THE SCHOOLS MUST BE OPEN, FREE, AND EQUAL

This Federal aid bill, S. 246, if enacted, would help to keep open an equal opportunity in America. For most of our history the frontier kept open the doors of opportunity in America. The fresh springs of American freedom were continuously renewed on the moving frontier. Since the closing of the old frontier the public schools have been the chief source for the renewal of American democracy. The schools of the people must, by local and State responsibility, be kept equal within the State, and, by Federal aid, made more equal within the Nation for all the children in all the States.

TO SIGNAL TO THE WORLD DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

With democracy threatened inside America and with freedom in retreat on many fronts in the world, the Congress of the United States, by passing Senate bill 246, can signal to the children, to the teachers, and to the people everywhere that democracy is on the upward climb for freedom and peace in the human pilgrimage toward the Kingdom of God.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cain	Douglas
Anderson	Chapman	Eastland
Baldwin	Chavez	Ecton
Brewster	Connally	Ferguson
Bricker	Cordon	Flanders
Byrd	Donnell	Frear

Fulbright	Knowland	Pepper
George	Langer	Robertson
Gillette	Lodge	Russell
Green	Long	Schoeppel
Gurney	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Hayden	McClellan	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McFarland	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McGrath	Taft
Hill	McKellar	Taylor
Hoey	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Holland	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Martin	Thye
Ives	Maybank	Tydings
Jenner	Millikin	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Watkins
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Williams
Kefauver	Myers	Withers
Kem	Neely	Young
Kerr	O'Conor	
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	

By order of the Senate the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which will be stated.

The amendment was, on page 3, beginning with line 11, to strike out down to and including line 24, on page 6, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

APPORTIONMENT

SEC. 4. Ninety-seven percent of the funds appropriated under section 3 of this act for each fiscal year shall be distributed among the States, excluding those enumerated in paragraph (F) of this section, in the following manner:

(A) Multiply (a) the number of pupils in average daily attendance in each State at public elementary and public secondary schools, as determined on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose, for the third calendar year next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made by (b) $10.

(B) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, the amount of the Federal allotment for any State shall be the amount calculated under paragraph (A).

(C) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) the amount spent in each State from revenues derived from State and local sources for current expenditures for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the third fiscal year next preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce for the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh calendar years next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made. When the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.25 for the first 2 years, thereafter 2.5, the amount of the Federal allotment to such State, as computed under paragraph (B), shall be proportionately reduced; except that in no case shall the amount of the Federal allotment for any State be less than $5 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance in such State at public elementary and public secondary schools, as determined under paragraph (A).

(D) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) current expenditures in each State from revenues derived from State and local sources for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the year next preceding the year for which the computation is made, as estimated on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the three most recent calendar years for which annual income data are available. When for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1953, the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.0, the Federal allotment for such fiscal year shall be $5 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance in such State at public elementary and public secondary schools as determined under paragraph (A).

(E) In the event 97 percent of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this act is insufficient to pay to all eligible States the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State, computed in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount to be paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State as 97 percent of such appropriation bears to the sum of the Federal allotments to all eligible States.

(F) From 3 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this act, such sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner to Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam according to their respective needs for additional funds for public elementary and public secondary schools upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective State educational authorities.

On page 10, line 22, to strike out "(F)" and to insert in lieu thereof "(E)."

On page 14, after line 24, to insert the following new subsections:

( ) The term "number of pupils in average daily attendance at public elementary and public secondary schools" means the aggregate days of attendance by pupils regularly enrolled in such schools during the school year divided by 175.

( ) The term "public elementary and public secondary schools" means tax-supported elementary and high schools at least 90 percent of whose pupils are in full-time attendance, and, in the case of secondary schools, at least 50 percent of whose graduates are at least 18 years of age at the time of graduation, and which are under the control and direction of the State or local subdivision thereof.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—11

Bricker	Jenner	Schoeppel
Ecton	Kem	Wherry
Hendrickson	Lodge	Williams
Ives	Martin	

NAYS—68

Aiken	Hill	Mundt
Anderson	Hoey	Murray
Baldwin	Holland	Myers
Brewster	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Taylor
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	McMahon	Vandenberg
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Gurney	Maybank	Withers
Hayden	Millikin	Young
Hickenlooper	Morse	

NOT VOTING—17

Bridges	Hunt	Saltonstall
Butler	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	McCarthy	Tobey
Downey	Malone	Wagner
Ellender	Miller	Wiley
Graham	Reed	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, beginning with "(f)" in line 15, it is proposed to strike out down through the comma in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(f) provide that public elementary and public secondary schools shall admit all qualified pupils without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin of such pupils."

On page 10, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "(a)."

On page 11, beginning with the semicolon in line 2, it is proposed to strike out through the word "agency" in line 15.

On page 14, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 through 11, inclusive.

On page 14, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "(E)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)."

On page 14, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "(F)" and insert in lieu thereof "(D)."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1401) relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.

JOINT LONG-RANGE PROVING GROUND FOR GUIDED MISSILES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 1741, to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 10, after the word "missiles", insert "authorized by this act,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN,
CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OVERTON BROOKS,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
W. STERLING COLE,
JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, with the understanding that the amendment just offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be the pending question, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 2 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Lynn E. Edminster, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1955. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou art our Father, and Thou wilt surely hear us in our supplication. As field and woodland with their promise and brightness declare the glory of God, so will Thy spirit lighten the recesses of our souls.

We beseech Thee to keep us sensitively conscious of the stupendous fact that no nation can live without God. We pray that a holy reverence may possess and direct us, reverence for home, for family, and for Thy church. Help all parents to realize their great responsibility in rearing their children in the spirit of godliness and holy faith. By example as well as precept may they lead them in the paths of truth and righteousness, and Thine shall be the everlasting glory. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 29, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4152. An act to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1411. An act to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

APOLOGY

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, while my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] was answering a speech of my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], the gentleman from California said that the gentleman from North Carolina, referring to me, for whom he had a great deal of respect—and I appreciate this—probably did not know the custom of courtesy between Members, or did not take at face value his statement. I wish to apologize because I did not know the custom of courtesy due a Member. I showed the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] a newspaper clipping from a southern paper which included a statement attributed to him and my comments on his statement. I want to openly and quickly apologize if I have shown him any discourtesy. I took it for granted that the gentleman from the United Press who took the statement and who had the notes, correctly quoted him word for word and comma for comma, and was giving out the right information. But, in any event, I would not ever want to be discourteous and I again apologize to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a tribute to a great American, George Gordon Battle, who passed away last week.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a prize-winning editorial.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Post entitled "Maryland Solved Its Own Health Problem Without Federal Aid." This may exceed two pages of the RECORD, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include copy of an editorial appearing in a Bakersfield, Calif., paper of March 12, 1949.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article appearing in Collier's magazine, entitled "Thrill Pills Can Ruin You," writted by Norman and Madelyn Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include the text of a proposed amendment I shall offer to the Wood bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when we resume consideration of labor legislation I am planning to offer an amendment dealing with the national emergency section which in my judgment incorporates the best provisions of both the Lesinski and Wood bills. I shall include in the RECORD the terms of this proposed amendment and ask that the Members, prior to resumption of consideration of the bill tomorrow, read this amendment to see whether it does not embody a middle ground position upon which all those in favor of reasonable, fair, workable legislation would be able to agree.

This amendment, in addition to retaining the best features of both the Lesinski bill and the Wood bill, provides a method of meeting an emergency situation which is not taken care of in either of these bills, nor indeed, in the Taft-Hartley law.

It provides that in case of a national emergency arising from a threatened or actual work-stoppage, the President shall issue a proclamation calling on the parties to refrain from stopping work or to resume operations if work has actually been stopped. In this respect the amendment follows the language of the Lesinski bill, except that it requires that the President fix a time limit of not to exceed 5 days for the resumption of work.

At the same time this proclamation is issued, the President must appoint an emergency board, again as provided in the Lesinski bill, to investigate the dispute, try to get the parties together, and report within 25 days its findings and recommendations.

At the same time this board is appointed, if the President deems the situation sufficiently serious, he may direct the Attorney General to petition the court for temporary injunctive relief pending the study by the emergency board. This follows the provisions of the Wood bill, except that the injunction can only last 40 days instead of 80 days, as provided in the Wood bill.

The new feature embodied in this amendment provides that if the parties are not together within 5 days after the emergency board has reported, the President shall then transmit the entire controversy to Congress for appropriate action. In his report to Congress the President is required to include "a statement of the history of the controversy, the matters in dispute between the parties, a summary of the findings, and recommendations of the emergency board, the recommendations of the President, and such other matters as he deems necessary and appropriate to acquaint the Congress with the facts."

It is then provided that at the expiration 40 days after the temporary injunctive relief has been provided, the attorney general shall be required to discharge the injunction. This follows the wording of the Wood bill, except that it cuts the time of a possible injunction by one-half.

Under the Wood proposal and the present Taft-Hartley law, at the end of 80 days, a serious national emergency is left hanging in mid-air. Another objection to both of these bills is that their provisions do not operate soon enough to meet the crisis resulting from a widespread work stoppage in a key industry.

On the other hand, the Lesinski bill is open to the objection that it simply tells both labor and management to be good boys, but does not contain any provisions to enforce such an admonition. It is also open to the criticism that, like the other suggestions, it makes no provision for an eventual solution of the serious problem confronting the country.

Under the change I have suggested, if the situation becomes sufficiently critical and the parties have not mutually resolved their dispute, it shall become a matter of Congressional interest. If Congress is in session, the dispute can be dealt with as an emergency matter. If Congress is not in session, the President has power to summon them under the Constitution.

I believe that the possibility of Congressional action embodied in this proposal would have a salutary effect on both management and labor in bringing them together. Neither side would like to run the risk of presenting a weak case to those charged with ultimate responsibility for meeting the emergency.

The proposed amendment follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 52, line 10, strike out the remainder of page 52, all of pages 53 and 54, and on page 55 through line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 206. Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work, or if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest within a period of time to be stated in said proclamation, but not more than 5 days following its issuance.

"SEC. 207. (a) If the parties to the dispute do not refrain from a stoppage of work or do not resume work and operations, as the case may be, within the period fixed in said proclamation, the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such work stoppage or threatened work stoppage, and if the court finds that such work stoppage or threatened work stoppage

"(i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and

"(ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to grant temporary injunctive relief against such work stoppage or threatened work stoppage and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

"(b) The provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall not be applicable to a proceeding under paragraph (a) herewith.

"(c) The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 346 and 347).

"SEC. 208. (a) After issuing the proclamation provided for in section 206, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 25 days after the issuance of the proclamation, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Secretary of Labor shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute and shall be composed of such number of persons as the President may deem appropriate, none of whom shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organizations of employees or in any employer or association of employers involved in the dispute. The provisions of section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by this act (relating to the investigatory powers of the National Labor Relations Board) shall be applicable with respect to any board appointed under this section, and its members and agents, and with respect to the exercise of their functions, in the same manner that such provisions are applicable with respect to the National Labor Relations Board. Any board appointed under this section may prescribe or adopt such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to govern its functions. Members of emergency boards shall receive compensation, at rates determined by the President, when actually employed, and travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons so employed. When a board appointed under this section has been dis-

solved, its records shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

"SEC. 209. When 5 days have elapsed after the report has been made by the board appointed under section 208, if the parties to the dispute have not accepted the recommendations of the board or otherwise mutually resolved the matters in dispute, the President shall make a report to the Congress containing a statement of the history of the controversy, the matters in dispute between the parties, a summary of the findings and recommendations of the board created under section 208, the recommendations of the President, and such other matters as he deems necessary and appropriate to acquaint the Congress with the facts.

"SEC. 210. Upon the expiration of a period of not to exceed 40 days following the issuance of temporary injunctive relief provided in section 207 or upon a settlement being reached, whichever happens sooner, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged."

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you will find on the Consent Calendar, No. 66, a bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Company. This is a corporation in which the Government puts everybody in the United States in the rum business as a stockholder. I am opposed to the people of this country being in any kind of business, let alone the rum business. Only people who want to be in the business should be in it. I am calling for volunteers to knock this off the calendar. I want three Members to assist me. I want to be the first one, and I want two more to put this down first, last, and all the time. A similar bill has been before us for a good many years. It is a stench upon the American people to be compelled to go into that kind of a business, and if the people of this country are going to permit everybody to be stockholders in the rum business, we are sinking pretty low. I think we ought to do something here and just knock this rum bill clear off the calendar—off the people of the country.

Mr. REES. I think it ought to be knocked off.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman be one of them to help knock it off?

Mr. REES. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman from Mississippi be one of them?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Fine; off she goes a-whooping.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

AIR CORPS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, we have been regaled over the week end with reports about the tremendous military demonstration in Moscow by the Communists. All reports indicate great emphasis in the military display was placed on the air power, including new types of Soviet jet planes.

The emphasis over there is on air power and this confirms the view of this Congress that we should develop our own air power to a 70-group air force. The recent appropriations bill which passed the House provided money for an air power of 58 groups, raising it from the budget recommendations of 48 groups. This is still 12 groups short of the 70 required for the safety of our country. The Soviet demonstration of air power is a vital warning that we must not neglect our own air defenses.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I call your attention to an article in Look magazine of May 10, 1949. I will not tell you who wrote this article until I have finished reading it. But, I thought it was most appropriate to read this vigorous and sincere compliment to the President of the United States. It is as follows:

> There is too much of an impression that this program was promised by candidate Truman without any serious intention of President Truman to fulfill his promises. But it is unfair to the President, and I think a wholly mistaken idea, to claim that he doesn't mean to fulfill them if he can. He may not understand some of the promises or their implications. But he is a man of his word and he means to keep his promises.

The author of that statement is ROBERT A. TAFT, Senator from Ohio. It is a paragraph out of an article by Senator TAFT entitled "Why We Are Fighting Truman."

Mr. Speaker, the first sentence of the paragraph reveals a continuing bad fault of the American people as to their political candidates. Or, should I say, it again calls attention to the fact that too many people do not consider that a candidate for high public office is expected to keep his promise made in a campaign. This is bad. This is destructive of the very sinews of our two-party political system which must be sound in honesty and integrity of purpose and political platform. This means, also, that candidates for political office must only promise what they have reason to believe that they can and will really sincerely undertake to perform. Anything else, Mr. Speaker, is sounding brass.

The last sentence of this paragraph wherein this leader of the Republican Party in Congress states that President Truman is a man of his word and means to keep his promises, is the forthright appraisal of a distinguished American who is in a good position to make an accurate appraisal of the President's honesty and intentions.

And this fact should make this deserved compliment the more timely and comforting to the American people, as a Nation.

For, Mr. Speaker, Senator TAFT's statement that President Truman is a man of his word should silence the mud slinging and malassertions of lesser men and women who have not yet the stature themselves to clearly see and recognize honesty of purpose in men they disagree with.

Senator TAFT is a vigorous, vigilant, and able political opponent. The political philosophy he espouses and that which President Truman speaks for often clash. But thank God that the American who would like to have been the Republican nominee for President in 1948 puts petty things in the minds of people about our President at rest by telling the American people that the President of the United States is not only honest, but means to keep promises made to the American people.

The American people heard President Truman speak. They believed in him. They made their choice. They chose President Truman. They did so because they believed he was a true man. Senator TAFT's appraisal reinforces their appraisal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STOCKMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

PAUL ROBESON

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Paul Robeson has done the Negroes in this country a great disservice. The fine, outstanding Negroes we have in the Southland bitterly resent this disservice, and the fact that it is bitterly resented is demonstrated by an editorial by Davis Lee, who publishes the Weekly Telegram in Newark, N. J. In an editorial entitled "Traitor Paul Robeson" he points out the tremendous disservice he has rendered. In order that every Member of the House may have an

opportunity to read this editorial, I include it in my remarks at this point:

TRAITOR PAUL ROBESON

Famous Paul Robeson became internationally infamous last week as the result of one unguarded utterance when he declared at a so-called peace conference in France that the American Negroes would not go to war against Russia.

Of course singer Robeson whom America put in position to issue treasonable statements, does not speak for anyone but himself. The Negroes of this country are not only loyal to it, but they will tear Brother Stalin's kingdom down in short order if it ever becomes necessary, Paul Robeson and his statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

Robeson more than any other Negro in America should be the last one to condemn our Nation in a foreign land, and attempt to promote the virtues of a slave state over that of his native land.

America opened its heart to Paul Robeson. It permitted him to enjoy the full and unrestricted benefits of its educational system. It developed his athletic abilities and pushed him on to All American honors. Then America, not content with what it had done, by training and special coaching, developed in the husky youngster, a golden voice, and sent him on his way to fame and fortune.

Despite Robeson's glowing references to freedom and opportunity in Russia, he has not produced one Negro in any field in that country who has been permitted to distinguish himself. The United States can point with pride to thousands of Negroes who are outstanding in their sphere.

America thinks so much of the Negro that it gambled the peace of this world on the ability of Dr. Ralph Bunche to settle the Palestine issue. No greater tribute could be paid any race, and a country which gives such recognition to a minority group, must indeed be a great nation.

The thinking Negroes of America are not only opposed to such utterances against a country which has given us so much, but they regret that Robeson would attempt to label the entire race as a traitor.

We have never refused to shoulder arms in the defense of this country, and we never will even if our enemy happens to be Mr. Robeson's Russia.

THE HULBERT FLAG

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I am availing myself of this minute to ask of you and the ladies and gentlemen of the Congress unanimous consent to place in the Appendix a story about Old Glory that may not have come to the ears of many of you. With Flag Day in the offing next month, it seems more than appropriate that attention should be directed toward an emblem that means so much to us and to the whole world of today.

The flag has been an inspiration to our Nation, a Nation which has given more health, welfare, and happiness to a larger number of people than any ever yet created on the face of the globe. That is why we should turn a very deaf ear to impatient change and be very certain that when we loose our mooring ropes we know exactly where we are destined.

My brother Elks, of whom I am sure there are many in the Congress, will readily recall that it is to their benevolent and protective organization more than any other that Flag Day has been emphasized—their ceremonies being always well attended in every part of our land on June 14.

Eastern Long Island, which I have the honor to represent, with the thousand square miles that comprise Suffolk County, in agricultural and maritime pursuits is probably the largest food-producing area in the country. Not only has it harbored the notorious Captain Kidd of early days, but it also has within its confines the peace-loving Home, Sweet Home of John Howard Payne.

That Captain Hulbert from eastern Long Island should have played a part in the creation of Old Glory is interesting and I know it will be more so to those in the House with whom a descendant so ably served before he held high office in the city of New York and, subsequently, received appointment to the Federal bench, where he is still making a distinguished record in the Southern District of New York.

Judge Murray Hulbert lives part of the time in Suffolk County, where we meet not infrequently, and I know he would be as pleased as I would if unanimous consent were given to printing the story that I have just traced out, even though it may exceed the length ordinarily allowed.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix, notwithstanding the cost, papers and records relating thereto. And I hope, if granted, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, for Judge Hulbert and I are not politically affiliated, will give it their attention.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on socialized medicine.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by a veterans' organization.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an excellent statement by Mr. Walter C. Ayers on the need of more salesmen in America.

Mr. McGRATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BENNETT of Florida addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each instance to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

MOUNT HOPE CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, WATERLOO, MICH.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 1401, an act relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "released" insert: "as to the lands herein authorized to be transferred."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAPANESE BEETLES A GREATER MENACE THAN STARLINGS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I saw in the paper this morning, if I am not mistaken, a statement to the effect that the other body has passed a bill to exterminate the starlings here in Washington; and I now understand that a similar bill is pending in the House.

In my opinion, the wholesale destruction of these birds would be a terrible mistake, especially at this time. We have a far worse menace here in Washington and in the surrounding country than these starlings could possibly be, and that is the Japanese beetles that have swarmed in here in recent years and threaten the destruction of the beautiful trees, and probably the grass and shrubs here and elsewhere.

I have watched these starlings for the last few years on the Capitol grounds and the Supreme Court grounds, and in my opinion they destroy the grubs of these beetles, and in that way do infinitely more good than they could pos-

sibly do harm by swarming around the public buildings here in the District.

I am always reluctant to destroy any living thing, unless I am thoroughly convinced that it is a nuisance that does more harm than good.

When I was a boy I was sick for many years. I had malaria most of the time. There was a mill pond near our home, and I used to go there and fish almost every day. The little top-minnows would swim up to my cork and nibble at it, and in order to get rid of them I would put a small amount of bait on the point of my hook, raise it up, catch them, and throw them out on the ground to die. In that way I killed large numbers of them.

At night, when the shadows began to fall, little leather-winged bats would come flying around. I would take my fishing pole, get out in the open and wave it to and fro, and those bats would be attracted by the sound and come to it. It was just a matter of a few strokes until I would kill one or two of them.

Long after it was too late to do me any good, I learned that I was killing about the only two friends I had. Those little minnows ate up the larvae of the mosquitoes that inoculated me with malaria. Today in the fish hatcheries over the country we raise those little top-minnows and distribute them over the country for that purpose. That is a part of our public-health program.

The leather-winged bats were catching the live mosquitoes that transmitted that malaria.

By the extermination of those mosquitoes malaria has been virtually eliminated throughout the Southern States.

I was out in Hawaii a few years ago, and I saw an animal called a mongoose, in fact a large number of them, running across the road from time to time, and I asked where they came from. I was told that there are no snakes in Hawaii. The people would not let one come there; they seem to think all snakes are poisonous. The rats were almost taking the islands. Somebody told those people to send to India and get these mongooses and that they would eat the rats. They followed that advice, brought those little animals over and they multiplied by the thousands; but they run around in daytime and the rats at night. They never saw each other; but both of them eat chickens. So that, instead of getting rid of one menace, they simply added another.

I was in the Ancon Hospital in Panama a few years ago, and while I was there I read a great deal about the history of that institution.

When it was first constructed back about 1880, 1881, or 1882, there were some beautiful little tropical trees planted on the grounds, such as rubber trees, frangipani, breadfruit, mango, and so forth. There is a kind of ant in Panama they call the umbrella ant; because of the fact that they go in streams and each one carries a piece of leaf in his mouth, supposedly for the purpose of lining their nests. They look as if they are carrying umbrellas.

The matron of this hospital noticed that these ants were beginning to attack those small trees on the hospital grounds, so she had the keeper of the grounds to build a little concrete box around each one of them with a groove in it 5 or 6 inches deep, and in that groove she poured fresh water so those ants could not get to those little trees.

In that fresh water around those little trees, the stegomyia mosquitoes bred and killed hundreds of people in that hospital with yellow fever during the next 20 or 25 years.

I realize these starlings make nuisances of themselves when they swarm into these public buildings to roost; but since there is a great probability that they will be of infinite value in the years to come in exterminating the Japanese beetle, which, as I said, is one of the greatest menaces with which we have to deal, it seems to me that we had better resort to some other method of driving these birds from these public buildings without resorting to extermination.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 997) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "This subsection shall become effective as of July 1, 1945."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce the annuity or in any way to affect the rights of any person who is receiving an annuity under the provisions of the amendment to section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, made by the act approved August 8, 1946 (Public Law 638, 79th Cong.).

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 12, strike out the number "638", and insert in lieu thereof the number "688."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH and Mr. MASON objected.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3440) for the addition of certain lands to Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the last time the Consent Calendar was called this bill was passed over without prejudice at the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]. The author of the bill, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has discussed the matter with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and they have agreed upon an amendment which has cleared the Consent Calendar objection, and there will be no objection to the bill with the addition of this amendment which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands, comprising approximately 140 acres, are hereby added to Rocky Mountain National Park and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to said park:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 5 north, range 73 west, section 27, southwest quarter northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 34, west half northeast quarter northwest quarter.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands by donation or with donated funds, by purchase with Federal funds, or otherwise, in his discretion, for development of an appropriate eastern approach to the park, described as follows:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 5 north, range 73 west; those parts of the following subdivisions lying south of the south boundary of the present Highdrive Road right-of-way: Section 27, east half southwest quarter, and south half southeast quarter; section 34, northeast quarter northeast quarter; section 35, west half northwest quarter northwest quarter; those parts of the following subdivisions lying north and west of the left bank of the Big Thompson River: Section 34, north half southeast quarter northeast quarter; section 35, southwest quarter northwest quarter comprising approximately one hundred and forty-five acres; and a strip of land, comprising approximately one hundred acres, not to exceed an average of five hundred feet in width, generally paralleling the Thompson River for approximately one and six-tenths miles from near the center of section 25, township 5 north, range 73 west, to the one hundred and forty-five-acre tract described elsewhere in this section.

SEC. 3. All property acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the park, following acquisition of title thereto by the United States upon the issuance of an appropriate order or orders by the Secretary of the Interior setting forth the revised boundaries of the park, such order or orders to be effective immediately upon the expiration of 30 full calendar days after publication in the Federal Register. Lands so added to the park shall thereafter be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase or otherwise such properties within the exterior boundaries of Rocky Mountain National Park as may be deemed by him to be necessary in connecting the eastern approach road with the existing Bear Lake and Trail Ridge roads, and in developing the present governmental

residential, utility, and proposed administrative units.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have sent the amendment to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 2, line 17, after the comma, strike out "comprising approximately 100 acres,";

And in line 19, strike out "five" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2369) to authorize an appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the sponsor of this bill how much money is involved.

Mr. LEMKE. No money is involved. This is an authorization bill. It asks the Congress to authorize an appropriation of $100,000. The Canadian Government is also considering an appropriation. This peace garden was selected and located by such men as Al Smith and other prominent men of this Nation and Canada. Sixty thousand people gather there each year and there is a plaque which reads like this:

As long as man shall live we pledge ourselves not to take up arms against each other.

It has done more good for the Nation than the millions we have spent on the United Nations and other similar organizations.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. How much money have we already invested in this proposition?

Mr. LEMKE. I am speaking from memory, but I think the State and private individuals have spent about $60,000. The CCC boys did some work, and there is really an obligation on the part of the Government to complete the work that it was promised would be done by the CCC.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Our information is that the committee report is unanimous, and the Department of the Interior has no objection to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of assisting the State of North Dakota to complete, in accordance with plans heretofore approved, the International Peace Garden established in North Dakota on the international boundary line between United States and Canada for the purpose of furthering international peace among the nations of the world, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $100,000.

SEC. 2. Any funds appropriated pursuant hereto shall be expended only in accordance with the terms of an agreement to be entered into between the Secretary of the Interior and the State of North Dakota to govern such expenditures.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LICENSE TAXES IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 225), authorizing the Legislature of Alaska to alter, amend, or repeal certain laws of Alaska imposing taxes for carrying on business and trade, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of this bill a question. I would like to ask the gentleman: If this bill is passed and these taxes are eliminated in the Territory of Alaska, will it be necessary for you to come here and ask for a greater appropriation from the States in order to carry on the affairs of Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. The answer to that is in the negative. No. The Legislature of Alaska, in a session recently concluded, enacted a bill providing a substitute set of taxes which will take effect on January 1, following the passage of this bill. In other words, we want to enact our own laws with respect to taxes in Alaska on our local businesses, instead of having such taxes levied and collected by the Federal Government.

Mr. RICH. Then you will not have to come here and ask for a greater appropriation in order to carry on the affairs of Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I note the report on this bill is unanimous, and the Department of the Interior recommends the enactment of the bill and has submitted a report to the Bureau of the Budget. However, I see no report from the Bureau of the Budget with reference to its position. Will the gentleman advise us as to the position of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BARTLETT. That I cannot do. I should like to explain to the Members that before Congress authorized the Legislative Assembly for the Territory of Alaska it directed the clerks of the district courts to collect certain taxes, and that system has continued ever since the legislature was established. This bill merely seeks to give our own legislature the right to levy local taxes instead of having Federal clerks of court do that job for us.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I understand the situation in Alaska, at the present time there is no land tax outside of the limits of incorporated villages and towns, and that the passage of this bill would not increase the tax burden of the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of Alaska may alter, amend, or repeal all or any part of section 460, chapter 44, title II, of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the District of Alaska and to provide a Code of Criminal Procedure for said district" (30 Stat. 1336), as amended by the act approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provisions for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes" (31 Stat. 330).

SEC. 2. All acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 460 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1336), as amended by the acts of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 330), July 10, 1937 (50 Stat. 497), and May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 587), is hereby repealed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal section 460 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1336), as amended, providing for certain license taxes in the Territory of Alaska."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BAD RIVER BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWA INDIANS, WISCONSIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1407) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the lands and interest in lands, together with the improvements thereon and proceeds from rents and sales therefrom, which have been acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), and subsequent acts, lying and situated within the Bad River Indian Reservation, Wis. administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868, dated April 15, 1938, is hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to proclaim such lands as an addition to the Bad River Indian Reservation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING CERTAIN FEES AND CHARGES WITH RESPECT TO ELECTIONS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2387) authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this bill will require no expenditure on the part of the Federal Government; that the fees collected will be from the citizens of Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act entitled "An act providing for the election of a delegate to the House of Representatives from the Territory of Alaska," approved May 7, 1906, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. That each newspaper in Alaska authorized to publish the notice of election provided for herein, and having published the same according to law, shall be entitled to receive, for the entire publications of any one election, a sum to be established by the Governor of Alaska; that each commissioner in the Territory of Alaska is authorized to contract for the proper posting of all election notices, as provided herein, in each voting precinct created in his said election district, and a sum to be established by the Governor shall be allowed at each election for the posting of said notices in any one voting precinct in Alaska; that a sum to be established by the Governor shall be allowed at each election for the rental of a proper polling place in each voting precinct in Alaska; that each of the judges of election who shall qualify and serve as such in any precinct on said election day and each of the clerks of election in an incorporated town shall be entitled to a compensation, for all services performed, in an amount established by the governer."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "governer" and insert "governor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITH EASTERN BAND OF CHEROKEE INDIANS, NORTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2876) to effect an exchange of certain lands in the State of North Carolina between the United States and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of acquiring suitable right-of-way property for the Blue Ridge Parkway consistent with resolution numbered 33 of October 17, 1947, adopted by the tribal council of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of the said resolution and this act, all the right, title, and interest of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in and to the following-described lands, which shall hereafter constitute a part of the right-of-way of the Blue Ridge Parkway:

TRACT NO. 2—MOLLIE GAP

Beginning at an iron rod located on the boundary line between the Qualla tract of the Cherokee Indian Reservation and the lands of the Plott heirs, said iron rod being further described as being located approximately one thousand two hundred and fifty feet northwest from transit point numbered 71, a point on the Blue Ridge Parkway boundary line, and running thence the following courses and distances, to wit:

North eighty-four degrees fifty-four and one-half minutes west two hundred thirty-four and ninety-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-four degrees forty-two and one-half minutes west fifty and seventy-four one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-three degrees fifty-two and one-half minutes west fifty-two and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-two degrees eight and one-half minutes west fifty-three and eighty one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-nine dgrees twenty-nine minutes west fifty-five and twenty-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-six degrees eleven minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-two degrees thirty-nine minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-nine degrees ten and one-half minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-five degrees thirty-nine minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-two degrees ten minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

North fifty-eight degrees forty-one minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-five degrees eleven minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-one degrees forty minutes west fifty-six and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-eight degrees thirty-eight minutes west forty and twenty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-six degrees three minutes west fifty-five and forty-four one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-three degrees seven minutes west fifty-three and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-one degrees twenty-five and one-half minutes west fifty-two and twenty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty degrees thirty-three minutes west fifty and seventy-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty degrees nineteen minutes west forty-nine and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty degrees forty-four minutes west forty-eight and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

North forty-two degrees thirty-nine minutes west forty-five and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-six degrees forty-four minutes west forty-one and eighty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-one degrees twenty-eight minutes west thirty-eight and ninety-four one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-eight degrees fifty-seven and one-half minutes west thirty-six and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-six degrees twenty-six minutes west thirty-six and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-three degrees fifty-seven minutes west thirty-six and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-one degrees thirty-three and one-half minutes west twenty-one and eighty one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-six degrees twenty-five and one-half minutes west thirty-eight and forty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

South eighty-eight degrees fifty-five minutes west forty-one and eighty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; south eighty-four degrees fifty and one-half minutes west forty-five and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; south eighty-two degrees fifty-three and one-half minutes west forty-eight and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; south eighty-two degrees thirty-six minutes west forty and four one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; south eighty-two degrees forty-eight minutes west fifty-one and nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; south eighty-four degrees five and one-half minutes west fifty-three and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; south eighty-six degrees thirty-four minutes west fifty-five and forty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

North eighty-nine degrees fifty-three minutes west fifty-seven and fifty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-four degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-four degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-four degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-four degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-four degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north thirty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

North thirty-four degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north twenty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north twenty-four degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north nineteen degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fourteen degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west fifty-eight and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seven degrees twenty-seven and one-half minutes west fifteen and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north three degrees fourteen and one-half minutes west fifty-nine and eighty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north no degrees thirty-eight and one-half minutes east fifty-seven and nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north three degrees forty-three and one-half minutes east fifty-four and twenty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

North six degrees three and one-half minutes east fifty-one and forty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seven degrees forty-one and one-half minutes east fifty-two and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north nine degrees twelve minutes east fifty-two and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north ten degrees forty-two and one-half minutes east fifty-two and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north twelve degrees twelve minutes east fifty-two and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north thirteen degrees forty-three minutes east fifty-two and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifteen degrees thirteen minutes east fifty-two and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixteen degrees thirty-five minutes east forty and thirty-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventeen degrees fifty-seven and one-half minutes east fifty-one and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north

twenty degrees twenty-nine and one-half minutes east fifty-four and eighty-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

North twenty-four degrees one and one-half minutes east fifty-eight and ten one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north twenty-nine degrees twenty-six and one-half minutes east sixty-one and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north thirty-four degrees fifty-eight and one-half minutes east sixty and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty degrees fifty-five and one-half minutes east sixty and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-six degrees fifty-two and one-half minutes east sixty and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-two degrees forty-nine and one-half minutes east sixty and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-seven degrees forty-eight minutes east thirty-nine and seventy-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-two degrees fourteen minutes east fifty-nine and fourteen one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-seven degrees five minutes east fifty-six and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-nine degrees twenty-nine and one-half minutes east thirty-five and twenty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

located on the boundary line between the Qualla tract of the Cherokee Indian Reservation and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; thence with said boundary line south forty degrees nine minutes east, seventy and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet to a one-and-one-half inch iron pipe, said iron pipe being further described as a common corner between the Qualla tract of the Cherokee Indian Reservation, the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and the Plott heirs; thence with the Indian Reservation and the Plott heirs boundary line south thirty-nine degrees thirty-four minutes east eight hundred twenty-eight and fifty-four one-hundredths feet to a two-inch iron pipe; thence south thirty-nine degrees forty-two and one-half minutes east, two thousand and nine and seventy one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, and containing forty-seven and sixty-nine one-hundredths acres, more or less, of which forty-seven and eighteen one-hundredths acres are in Haywood County and fifty-one one-hundredths acre is in Swain County.

TRACT NO. 3—WOLF LAUREL GAP

Beginning at a point, a cross mark cut on a rock, on the Blue Ridge Parkway boundary line, section 2–Y, said point being further described as bearing north fifty-seven degrees one-half minute west thirty-eight and sixty-eight one-hundredths feet from transit point numbered 65 of said Parkway boundary; and running thence the following courses and distances, to wit:

North eighteen degrees twenty-two minutes east sixty and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north twenty-one degrees one minute east sixty-two and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north twenty-six degrees nineteen and one-half minutes east sixty-two and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north thirty-two degrees forty-five and one-half minutes east fifty-eight and twenty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north thirty-four degrees one minute east fifty-eight and eighteen one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-two degrees fifty-eight and one-half minutes east fifty-seven and eighty-four one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-three degrees eleven and one-half minutes east fifty-seven and forty-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-one degrees eighteen and one-half minutes east fifty-seven and seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-one degrees thirty-two minutes east fifty-six and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-eight degrees forty-nine and one-half minutes east fifty-six and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-nine degrees one and one-half minutes east fifty-six feet to an iron rod;

North sixty-five degrees twenty-nine and one-half minutes east fifty-five and sixty-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north sixty-five degrees forty-two minutes east fifty-five and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-one degrees nineteen and one-half minutes east fifty-four and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-one degrees thirty-two and one-half minutes east fifty-four and fifty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-six degrees thirty-five minutes east one hundred and eight feet to an iron rod; north eighty degrees thirty-five minuets east one hundred six and fifty-four one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-three degrees fifty-five minutes east one hundred five and nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-six degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east one hundred three and sixty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

North eighty-eight degrees four and one-half minutes east one hundred and two and sixteen one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-eight degrees fifty-two and one-half minutes east one hundred and seventy-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-nine degrees one and one-half minutes east four hundred and twenty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-eight degrees twenty-six and one-half minutes east forty-six and ninety-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-five degrees three minutes east forty and eighty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy-six degrees no minutes east thirty-four and seventy-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north seventy degrees nine and one-half minutes east twenty-eight and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north fifty-eight degrees nine and one-half minutes east twenty and fifty-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod;

located on the boundary line between the Qualla tract of the Cherokee Indian Reservation and the lands of the Plott heirs; thence with said boundary line south thirty-nine degrees forty-two and one-half minutes east two hundred ninety and eighty-three one-hundredths feet to a two-inch iron pipe; thence south thirty-nine degrees thirty-four minutes east six hundred and ninety-five and sixty-three one-hundredths feet to a cross mark cut on a rock, said cross mark being transit point numbered 71 of the Blue Ridge Parkway, section 2–Y, boundary line; thence with said parkway boundary:

South seventy-two degrees twenty-seven minutes west nine hundred twelve and eighty-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 70; south seventy-three degrees twenty-seven and one-half minutes west one hundred ninety-nine and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 69; north seventy-two degrees seven and one-half minutes west three hundred forty-four and seventy-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 68; north sixty-five degrees forty-three minutes west six hundred forty-seven and seventy-one one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 67; south eighty-four degrees twenty-seven and one-half minutes west one hundred thirty and sixteen one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 66; north eighty-one degrees five minutes west two hundred seventy-eight and two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; transit point numbered 65; north fifty-seven degrees one-half minute west thirty-eight and sixty-eight one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, and containing thirty-eight and forty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less, and lying entirely within Haywood County.

In exchange for the lands so granted to the United States, there is hereby granted to the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians the beneficial interest in the following-described lands of approximately equal value, which lands shall hereafter be excluded from the Blue Ridge Parkway:

TRACT NO. 1—BUNCHES GAP

Beginning at an iron rod, transit point numbered 43 on the Blue Ridge Parkway boundary line, section 2–Y, said point being further described as being located approximately six hundred and fifty feet northwest from Bunches Gap and approximately one hundred and thirty feet north of the Indian Service Road; running thence the following courses and distances, to wit:

South eighty-five degrees forty-four and one-half minutes east one thousand four hundred seventy-three and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 44; north sixty-four degrees twenty-nine minutes east eight hundred ninety-four and fifty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 45; south seventy-one degrees twenty-six and one-half minutes east one thousand fourteen and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 46; north three degrees thirty-two minutes east six hundred ninety-three and ninety-five one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 47; north three degrees eleven and one-half minutes west nine hundred seventy-nine and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 48; said transit point being located on the boundary line between the Qualla tract of the Cherokee Indian Reservation and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; thence with said boundary line south forty degrees twelve minutes east, one thousand sixty-nine and fifty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 49, and there leaving said National Park and Indian Reservation boundary line; thence—

South two degrees sixteen and one-half minutes east five hundred and sixty-nine and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 50; south seventeen degrees seventeen and one-half minutes west nine hundred and sixteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 51; south fifty-six degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes west four hundred and ninety-four and forty-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 52; north seventy-eight degrees twenty-nine minutes west six hundred and seventy and fifty-two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 53; north fifty-nine degrees twenty-five minutes west three hundred and eight and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 54; south forty-eight degrees thirty-four minutes west one thousand and thirty-eight and fifteen one-hundredths feet to an iron rod, transit point numbered 55;

North forty-five degrees fifty-nine minutes west nine hundred two and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north thirty-three degrees thirty minutes west three hundred twenty-four and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-two degrees fifty-one and one-half minutes west one hundred fifty-seven and forty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north forty-eight degrees forty-three minutes west forty-four and seventy one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; south eighty-two degrees forty-eight minutes east one hundred seventy-three and two one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north thirty-three degrees thirty minutes west three hundred ninety-eight and ninety-six one-hundredths feet to an iron rod; north eighty-four degrees fifteen and

one-half minutes west four hundred ninety and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, and containing eighty-one and eighty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less, and lying entirely within Swain County.

The lands last above described shall constitute a part of the Cherokee Indian Reservation in North Carolina and shall be held by the United States in trust for said band and shall be nontaxable and nonalienable as other lands of said reservation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of insuring prompt and full compliance with the conditions relating to the exchange of lands hereby affected, as set forth in the said Resolution Numbered 33 of October 17, 1947, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the Governor of the State of North Carolina which shall contain assurance that the present Indian Service road at Wolf Laurel shall remain open for Indian use without restriction; provide for the construction by the North Carolina State Highway and Public Works Commission, at its own expense, of a hard-surface access road of suitable width from Mollie Gap to the site of the proposed tourist development to be made on tribal land in the vicinity of Soco Bald; and set forth such other terms and conditions as may be mutually desirable for effectuating the purposes of the said resolution.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE TAYLOR GRAZING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2914) to amend the Taylor Grazing Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the author of the bill or a member of the Committee on Public Lands about this bill? I see that it deals with grazing. I am not very familiar with the Grazing Act, but I do know from previous experience in this Congress that it has frequently been a controversial subject. I also notice that this bill increases by many millions the number of acres that will be thrown open to public grazing in our Western States, and I am wondering if Members from Western States are thoroughly informed as to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BARING. This bill had the unanimous approval of the committee. The land takes in a portion of central Nevada. The people have already been under the act proper, but only to lease the land. This bill makes it possible for them to come in under a grazing district.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What will be the cost to the Federal Government?

Mr. BARING. I believe there is no difference in that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I notice from the report submitted to me that it has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. I wonder why.

Mr. BARING. I believe there was no contemplated change.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman states that the committee reported the bill unanimously?

Mr. BARING. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Has the gentleman received any objection from other Members interested in grazing lands in the western part of the country?

Mr. BARING. None whatever. This bill merely makes it possible for these people in central Nevada to come under a grazing district where they have already leased the land in previous years.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand some Members from one of the other Western States may be interested in this bill and would like more information about it. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. BARING. I know nothing about that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it takes in no grazing lands except in the State of Nevada?

Mr. BARING. That is correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill affects only the public domain?

Mr. BARING. That is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of section 1 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315), is further amended by striking out the words "or additions thereto and/or to modify the boundaries thereof, not exceeding in the aggregate an area of 142,000,000 acres" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", or to modify the boundaries thereof and make additions thereto,".

(b) Section 1 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1270; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315), is amended by striking out the second proviso, which reads: "*Provided, however,* That the publication of such notice shall have the effect of withdrawing all public lands within the exterior boundary of such proposed grazing districts from all forms of entry or settlement."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1270; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315a), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall make provision for the protection, administration, regulation, and improvement of grazing lands affected by the provisions of this act. He shall make such rules and regulations and establish such service, enter into such cooperative agreements, and do any and all things necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act, namely, to regulate the occupancy and use of such lands, to preserve the land and its resources from destruction or unnecessary injury, and to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range. The Secretary is authorized to continue the study of erosion and flood control and to perform such work as may be necessary amply to protect and rehabilitate the areas subject to the provisions of this act. He may use such funds as may be made available for any of the above purposes. Any willful violation of the provisions of said act or of such rules and regulations thereunder after actual notice thereof shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500."

SEC. 3. Section 8 (c) of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1272), as amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1977; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315g), is further amended by striking out the following language in the proviso of the first paragraph: "the selected lands lie in a reasonably compact body which is so located as not to interfere with the administration or value of the remaining land in such district for grazing purposes as set forth in this act," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "no State shall select public lands within or without the boundaries of a grazing district in furtherance of any exchange unless the selected lands are so located as not to interfere with the administration or the value of the public lands."

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1270), as amended by the act of August 6, 1947 (61 Stat. 790; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315j), is amended to delete the words "When appropriated by Congress."

SEC. 5. Section 2455 of the Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., sec. 1171), as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "The Secretary of the Interior may sell at public auction, for not less than the appraised value, any isolated or disconnected tract or parcel of the public domain in any State or Territory of the United States not exceeding 1,520 acres, after at least 30 days' public notice. The Secretary may sell, pursuant to this section, any legal subdivision of such lands, not exceeding 760 acres, the greater part of which is mountainous or too rough for cultivation, upon the application by the owner or owners of land or the holder of a valid entry on lands adjoining such tract even though such tract is not isolated or disconnected. The owner or owners of contiguous land sold under this section shall have a preference right at the time of sale to buy such land at the highest bid price, but in no case shall such owner or owners be required to pay more than three times the appraised price. Where two or more bidders exercise such preference right, the Secretary may make an equitable division of the land among such bidders. The proceeds accruing to the United States from the sale of lands under this section shall continue to be disposed of as provided by existing laws."

SEC. 6. The following laws are hereby repealed:

The act of April 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 457; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1171a).

The act of May 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 377; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1171b).

The act of February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1055; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1172).

The act of May 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 595; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1173).

The act of May 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 622; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1174).

The act of August 11, 1921 (42 Stat. 159; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1175).

The act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 566; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1176).

The act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1105; 43 U. S. C., sec. 1177).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "or" and insert "and" and strike out the words "and make additions thereto."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "as not to" and insert "that their selection would not."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2988) to provide for a Resident Commissioner from the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 173) to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to prevent the loss of nationality, by reason of continuous residence for 5 years in a foreign state, of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under such act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Hawaii whether this bill will cost the Government anything?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would cost the Government nothing. Under the terms of the Organic Act all the citizens of the Republic of Hawaii became citizens of the United States. The understanding of those citizens was that they were in the same legal status as natural born citizens. But the passing of time has developed the fact that they are in the status of naturalized citizens, and therefore, are compelled to comply with the provisions of the law requiring them to return at stated intervals to this country. The purpose of the bill is to preserve the citizenship of those who, because of this misunderstanding failed to meet this requirement. So far as I know, there are less than six persons, all Chinese-Americans, who are affected by this legislation and whose citizenship would be perfected by its adoption.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my attention has just been called to this bill. I am wondering why it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands rather than to the Committee on the Judiciary which really has jurisdiction over these questions?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I presume that was because this bill involves amendments to the Hawaiian Organic Act and those matters have been referred heretofore to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

INDIAN LANDS IN LAKE COUNTY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1892) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to certain Indian lands in Lake County, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, with the consent and approval of the tribal council of the Consolidated Tribes of Flathead, Kootenai, and Salish Indians, to issue to Lake County, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.: The north half of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 36, township 21 north, range 20 west, Montana principal meridian, containing five acres more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN LANDS IN DUCHESNE AND RANDLETT, UTAH, AND ADJACENT TO MYTON, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1753) to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we find out what this bill does so far as the Federal Government is concerned?

Mr. GRANGER. This bill simply allows the tribal council in the area to sell some city lots to private individuals.

Mr. RICH. Do the revenues revert to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. GRANGER. They revert to the Indian tribes.

Mr. RICH. Suppose the Indians sell that land, and the Indian population is increasing, then will they want us to buy more land for them?

Mr. GRANGER. No. The difference between this bill and the Senate bill is an amendment that protects the Government; that they shall not be reimbursed.

Mr. RICH. We are going to gain, so far as the Treasury is concerned, rather than lose?

Mr. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Thank goodness.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it not a fact that the Government originally sold this land for $600,000, and reserved certain harbor or portage rights for the mooring of their vessels?

Mr. GRANGER. No; not in this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Uintah and Ouray Tribal Business Committee of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah for and on behalf of said tribe is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, to sell and convey to any purchaser deemed satisfactory to said committee any of the lands of said tribe situated within the townsite limits of Duchesne, Randlett, and Myton, Utah, and any of the following-described lands situated adjacent to the townsite of Myton, Utah, to wit, the north half of the northwest quarter of section 29; lots 1 and 2, the east half of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of section 30; the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter or lot 4 of section 19, of township 3 south, range 1 west, of the Uintah special meridian.

All such sales shall be made upon such terms as said committee shall deem satisfactory and may be made pursuant to bids or at private sale and all funds derived from such sales shall be subject to disposition of said tribe.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the semicolon, strike out "lots 1 and 2, the east half" and insert "lot 1 and the northeast quarter."

Page 2, line 7, after the period insert the following: "Title shall be conveyed by issuance of patent in fee to the purchaser where approved surveys have been made, and, in the absence of such surveys by deed signed by the chairman and the secretary of said committee and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative."

At the end of the bill insert: "Consent by the tribal business committee to the sale or other disposal of the lands herein described shall relieve the United States of any claim or liability because of such sale or other disposition."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANCELLATION AND RELEASE OF AN AGREEMENT

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 91) to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the Port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the port of Seattle purchased and acquired by deed from the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board, certain real property located in the city of Seattle, county of King, State of Washington, and referred to as the Skinner and Eddy Site No. 2; and

Whereas at the time the deed to said property was delivered to the port of Seattle the purchase price therefor had not been paid; and

Whereas an agreement was entered into contemporaneously with the transfer of said deed, which said agreement granted to the United States of America certain privileges; and

Whereas said agreement provides that all vessels then or thereafter belonging to the United States of America or any agency or agencies of the United States of America may be moored alongside the premises conveyed pursuant to said deed free of charge; and

Whereas said agreement also provides that the port of Seattle agrees to give free dockage to all Government-owned vessels at any of the terminals belonging to or controlled by said port; and

Whereas said port is desirous of being released from the provisions of the agreement dated December 31, 1923; and

Whereas the United States of America has used a portion of the premises herein referred to for the mooring of vessels and has in addition thereto constructed pier 39 thereon and has excluded the port from any and all uses of the pier property and abutting facilities; and

Whereas the United States Government is still desirous of continuing the present use of that portion of the property upon which pier 39 is located together with certain other properties and facilities; and

Whereas the port of Seattle is willing and agrees to enter into an agreement with the United States Government with respect to

the continued use of this property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, acting on behalf of the United States, is hereby authorized to negotiate for and enter into an agreement for such period and on such terms and conditions as he deems advisable for the continuing use by the United States of the property on which pier 39 and its appurtenant facilities are located and that the Attorney General, or his duly authorized representative, acting on behalf of the United States, upon notification that such an agreement has been entered into, is hereby authorized and directed to execute the necessary document or documents to release and cancel that certain agreement entered into on the 31st day of December 1923, by and between the port of Seattle, a municipal corporation, and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board, acting by and through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States for the District of Columbia, which said agreement was recorded on the 17th day of March 1924, in the office of the King County auditor in the State of Washington under volume 54 of chattle mortgages, page 614, and volume 887 of real property mortgages, page 448, bearing file No. 1844599.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESS GRATITUDE OF HOUSE TO AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 106) to express the gratitude of the House to amateur radio operators.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this is a very meritorious bill, but I wonder if the author of it could tell me why it is limited only to radio operators. It seems to me that there are millions of our people who performed equally patriotic services during the war. Why single out a small group and give them this Congressional distinction without taking into consideration all of the others that performed such marvelous services, particularly the mothers and wives and sweethearts of the boys who served their country.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] the author of the bill, is not here today. He asked me to answer any question that might come up concerning the bill, and frankly I do not know the answer to that question.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will say to my good friend from Tennessee I think this is a laudable bill and one that should be enacted, but I hope the committee and those considering this kind of bill will take into account the many other patriotic citizens of the United States who rendered equally meritorious service, and give them some consideration in the future.

Mr. PRIEST. I agree with the gentleman that this should not be confined to just one group, and I feel certain that the reason it comes in this form is that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the subcommittee on which the gentleman from New York serves, handles communications, and because of that interest in this particular group this resolution was introduced for that group.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection the clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas amateur radio operators serve the Nation in war and peace; and

Whereas amateur radio is a hobby involving the sending and receiving of messages by code or voice without pecuniary gain; and

Whereas the right to practice that hobby is granted only to those who have passed an examination given by the Federal Communications Commission; and

Whereas such amateurs have aided in keeping the lines of communication open during floods, storms, and other disasters, and so helped in the rescue of life and property; and

Whereas amateur or ham radio has provided a reservoir of self-trained operators for national defense; and

Whereas amateur radio has through research and experimentation enriched the radio art, the products of which are enjoyed by all citizens; and

Whereas several thousand of such licensed amateurs live in the United States of America and its possessions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States, on behalf of a grateful citizenry, expresses its gratitude to radio operators of amateur standing for their service both past and present.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING TIME TO EMPLOYEES FOR FUNERALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2662) to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the author of the bill explain it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I may say the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who is the ranking minority member of the committee, is the author of the bill. However, the bill in substance provides that Federal employees who are veterans of World War I or World War II may be granted time off not to exceed 4 hours in any one day to participate as active pallbearers or as members of firing squads or guards of honor at funerals of deceased members of the armed services returned to the United States for burial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What is the time limitation?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Not more than 4 hours in 1 day.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is there any limitation as to the number of hours for a month or 2 months or 6 months?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No, there is no such limitation in the bill. As the gentleman knows, many of the bodies of these heroic men who died overseas have already been returned to this country for burial. This will not affect many permanent employees. They must serve as either pallbearers or members of the firing squad or honor guard at the funeral services of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines who are subsequently returned for burial in the United States.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I say to the gentleman that this is practically the same bill I introduced last year. Sometimes four or five bodies are returned home in the same week, and the same group of people has to go to the funerals. It works a hardship on certain branches of the community life. Here in the post office there are a great many veterans who could and should be permitted to participate in these burials.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That employees in the executive branch of the Government who are veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II may be excused from duty, without loss of pay or deduction from their annual leave, for such time as may be necessary, but not in excess of 4 hours in any one day, to enable them to participate as active pallbearers or as members of firing squads or guards of honor in funeral ceremonies for members of the armed forces of the United States who lost their lives in World War II and whose remains are returned from abroad for final interment in the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REHABILITATION OF STANDING ROCK SIOUX INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3974) to promote the rehabilitation of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like the author of the bill to advise whether or not this bill would authorize the appropriation of $10,000,000.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the report I have before me shows that it does authorize the appropriation of $10,000,000, which is to be loaned by the Secretary of the Interior and returned

to the Government in 40 years. However, under the rules of the Consent Calendar Committee, the bill authorizes too much money to be considered on the Consent Calendar, and I believe it should not be so considered, although it is a very meritorious bill.

Mr. DEANE. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman who introduced the bill [Mr. LEMKE] should explain if the information we have before us is according to the facts.

Mr. LEMKE. I may state that this bill does authorize an appropriation for loans for buying of lands and cattle for a 10-year period to make these Indians self-sustaining. It has been the policy of the Committee on Indian Affairs for the last 3 years I have been a member of it to try to make the Indians self-sustaining and to avoid making donations each year and having the Red Cross take care of the Government's wards.

The record of this tribe shows that they are just a little over 1 percent delinquent in loans made in the past. I am satisfied that if this bill is to be passed it ought to be passed promptly so that they can get started. These Indians, and especially this tribe, will be self-supporting in less than 10 years. The appropriations asked for immediately are only $500,000. That is to be simply an authorization and it is not an appropriation. They will have to justify their requests for appropriations for loans from year to year. They need this in order to become self-sustaining. I hope there will be no objection to the bill.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice, so that the committee may have further information relative to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CENSUS DATA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 142) excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of a member of the Committee on Appropriations this morning, who is interested in this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 91) to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to establish in the Post Office Department a research and development program which shall be administered by the Postmaster General through such officers and employees as he may designate.

(b) The investigations and studies under this program shall be for the purpose of improving existing equipment, supplies, methods, procedures, means, and devices used in the Postal Service and of introducing new types of equipment, supplies, methods, procedures, means, and devices for use in such service in order that the businesses of the Post Office Department may be more efficiently and economically operated.

SEC. 2. In carrying out its functions under this act, the Department is authorized, pursuant to the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1084) as amended (31 U. S. C., sec. 686), or other applicable law, to utilize the research and testing facilities of the National Bureau of Standards and to procure advice and assistance from any department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE LUCAS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3436) to amend section 3 of the Lucas Act with respect to redefinition of request for relief.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. WALTER. Under the Lucas Act, a means of presenting claims to the Government is provided. Significantly enough, neither of the departments affected have paid any of the claims because they have taken the position that the claimants were required to file their claims in a certain form. All this bill does is to remove the requirement of a formal application for relief. There is a question as to whether or not this legislation is necessary, because the Court of Claims just 2 weeks ago handed down a decision which apparently cures the situation. However, that case has not gone to the Supreme Court, and it is possible that an appeal will be taken.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 657, 79th Cong., 41 U. S. C., sec. 106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Claims for losses shall not be considered unless filed with the department or agency concerned on or before February 7, 1947, and unless a written or oral request for relief, or a demand for payment of such losses, or a statement of such losses was filed or submitted to such department or agency or to any of its subordinate offices on or before August 14, 1945; but a previous settlement under the First War Powers Act, 1941, or the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 shall not operate to preclude further relief otherwise allowable under this act. A request for relief, or a demand for payment of losses, or a statement of such losses which had been submitted to or filed with a prime Government contractor by a subcontractor, prior to August 14, 1945, shall constitute a proper and sufficient request for relief within the terms of this act. The form of the request for relief hereunder shall be immaterial, provided it informed the Government or the prime contractor that a loss was being suffered, was anticipated, or had been suffered by the contractor or subcontractor in connection with the work in question."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROADS, TRAILS, AND AIDS TO TRANSPORTATION IN ALASKA—BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3196) to authorize appropriations for roads, trails, and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] inform us as to the appropriation contemplated by this bill?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the amount can be stated at this time. That will have to be determined later on by the Committee on Appropriations. But this legislation is badly needed. The present laws relative to building roads in Alaska do not apply. If the educational and health program among the Indians in Alaska is carried out, this legislation must be passed. I am not sure whether the Delegate from Alaska is present. If he is, he may be able to give us some information as to the amount contemplated. But I do think that it cannot be stated definitely at this time as to what the exact amount will be.

If the educational and health program among the Indians in Alaska is to go forward, these roads and trails and other facilities are absolutely necessary, as I understand it. I think we can well afford to pass the authorization bill at this time and then let the proper committee determine just how big the program should be and how complete it should be by proper appropriation bill or bills.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am in perfect sympathy with the need of Alaska for better roads, trails, and highways, but the wording of this bill is such that the amount involved could run into millions of dollars, and I believe it is entirely too large to be considered on the Consent Calendar.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3111) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and section 118 thereof, and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE]?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 162) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING TITLE II OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 781), to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section, as follows:

"SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS FOR ALASKA

"SEC. 207. When appropriations for any fiscal year for the Civil Aeronautics Administration have not been made prior to the 1st day of March preceding the beginning of such fiscal year, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics may authorize such officer or officers as may be designated by him to incur obligations for the purchase and transportation of supplies and materials necessary to the proper execution of the Administration's functions in Alaska in amounts not to exceed 75 percent of the amount that had been made available for such purposes for the fiscal year then current, payments of these obligations to be made from the appropriations for the new fiscal year when they become available."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike all after the word "Alaska" and all of lines 4 and 5.

Page 2, line 7, strike out the word "new" and insert "next succeeding."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR FIELD WORK BY THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3198) to amend the act of June 18, 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is nothing contained in the bill or the information we have to show how many people will be employed in this census work or how much the cost will be to the Federal Government. It seems to me it is entirely too large and too far reaching to be considered on the Consent Calendar.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1837) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the author of the bill would explain just what he means by this bill.

Mr. KEATING. I imagine the gentleman is sincere in his request.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am.

Mr. KEATING. Although this has been the object of a little horseplay.

When this bill was passed in the last session the Senate made a mistake and put a subparagraph lettered (e) instead of (c) as it should have been in their bill. It was passed by the other side and this is to change the lettering of the subparagraph from (e) to (c).

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that part of subparagraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 324A of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1137; 8 U. S. C. 907), reading: "Section 334 (e)" is hereby amended to read: "Section 334 (c)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF APRIL 28, 1904, RELATING TO ADDITIONAL HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2753) to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of an act entitled "An act providing for second and additional homestead entries, and for other purposes," approved April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Any homestead settler who has heretofore entered, or may hereafter enter, less than one-quarter section of land, may enter other and additional land lying contiguous to the original entry which shall not, with the land first entered and occupied, exceed in the aggregate 160 acres.

"Before a patent may issue on the additional entry, the entryman must show that he has cultivated an amount equal to one-eighth of the area of the additional entry for at least 1 year after the additional entry and until the submission of final proof thereon. The cultivation required with respect to the additional entry may be performed on the original entry, the additional entry or on both, but where it is performed on the original entry, it must be in addition to that required and relied upon in making final proof on the original entry. No proof of residence shall be required with respect to the additional entry.

"The additional entry may be made before or after final proof has been made on the original entry. Final proof for the additional entry may be submitted only at the time of final proof for the original entry, or subsequent thereto, but must be submitted within 5 years after the additional entry is made.

"This section shall not apply to or for the benefit of any person who does not own and occupy the lands covered by the original entry. If the original entry should fail for any reason prior to patent, or should appear to be illegal or fraudulent, the additional entry shall not be permitted, or if having been initiated, shall be canceled."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING CERTAIN OBSOLETE LAWS IN THE SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3576) to repeal certain obsolete laws and parts of laws relating to the sale of public lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what laws are to be repealed. There are a million of them that should be repealed. We would like to know what you are doing here now. Certainly, if you would eliminate a lot of those laws, it would be for the good of the country—less expensive and more efficient.

Mr. PETERSON. This bill specifically sets forth a number of sections relating to public land laws which are obsolete. It is the result of hearings before the committee and also a study made by the department. We told the department to try to compile the public land laws, and when they found laws that were obsolete they should call them to our attention. Those have been called to our attention. For instance, the law with reference to private sales. The provisions of the act cover everything except Missouri. In Missouri there is no public land. We are repealing that. There are other provisions with reference to one treaty of 1854, location by land scrip. In order that the membership might be advised, let me say that we took each statute and compiled with the Ramseyer rule, and in the report itself the gentleman will find how the amendment affects each section in general terms. It does not change the basic law except it repeals various acts where subsequent legislation has been passed which would impliedly repeal it.

Mr. RICH. Do the various departments approve this?

Mr. PETERSON. We approved, and they assisted us in drafting this bill. We hope that from time to time we can bring in more comprehensive bills, for instance, today, under the method of acquiring a right, about 12 different statutes have to be consulted. We are trying to put those into one single statute.

Mr. RICH. Why do you not go further and repeal a lot of laws that have been passed the last 2 or 3 years? Just at the beginning of this session you passed a law to give the President $100,000 without paying any tax on it. That law never should have been passed.

Mr. PETERSON. That subject does not come before the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. RICH. The President ought to cut out that provision exempting himself for $100,000 salary and on which he pays no taxes. Let him be consistent—he says tax everybody over $4,000. If it is good for them, let him set the example and pay taxes on his $100,000; he had already a $50,000 expense account and also $100,000 salary.

Cut out a lot of laws, I say, and do it quick before we sink the ship. Here is where you can get some money. A penny saved is a penny earned.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING THE GRADE OF GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 796) to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the author of the bill if this bill establishes a Judge Advocate General for the Air Force?

Mr. VINSON. I may state to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that the purpose of this bill is to give General Arnold the right to retire as an Air Force officer. He has already retired as an officer of the Army. There was no separate establishment for the Air Force then; this merely gives him a retirement as an air officer instead of a ground officer. There is no provision of money involved.

Mr. RICH. Does he get additional compensation?

Mr. VINSON. He gets the same money; it just gives him the right to retire as an officer of the Air Force.

Mr. EVINS. It has no reference to the military justice department?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the grade of General of the Air Force.

SEC. 2. The grade of any individual transferred in the grade of General of the Army from the Regular Army to the United States Air Force, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947 (Act of July 26, 1947; 61 Stat. 695), is herewith redesignated "General of the Air Force."

SEC. 3. Nothing herein shall be construed as appointing any individual to a new or different office or to alter or prejudice the status of any individual concerned so as to deprive him of any pay or allowances, rights, benefits, or privileges to which he may be entitled under existing law.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING FEES OF WITNESSES IN THE UNITED STATES COURTS AND BEFORE UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1953) to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire about the bill. It seems to me this bill is long past due, but I should like to know how much it is going to cost the Federal Government annually.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. I do not remember the exact amount.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman tell us any approximate figure? Would it be $100,000, $500,000, or $1,000,000?

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. I think it is much less than that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman know whether the Bureau of the Budget has any objection to the bill?

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. No; there is no objection from anyone.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill, S. 635, to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States Commissioners, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1821. Per diem and mileage generally; subsistence. A witness attending in any court of the United States or before a United States commissioner or person taking his deposition pursuant to any order of a court of the United States, shall receive $4 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 7 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who are not salaried employees of the Government and who are not in custody and who attend at points so far removed from their respective residence as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $5 per day for expenses of subsistence including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance: *Provided*, That in lieu of the mileage allowance provided for herein, witnesses who are required to travel between the Territories, possessions, or to and from the continental United States, shall be entitled to the actual expenses of travel at the lowest first-class rate available at the time of reservation for passage, by means of transportation employed: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Alaska."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 1953) were laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS HELD BY LOCATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1754) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July 1945: *Provided*, That every claimant of any such mining claim in order to obtain the benefits of this act shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1, 1949, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3: Following the word "That" insert the words "to comply with."

Page 1, line 8, strike out everything following the word "year" and insert in lieu thereof "it shall be sufficient for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949, if such work or improvements are completed on or before 12 o'clock meridian October 1, 1949: *Provided*, That assessment work or improvements for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1950, may be commenced immediately following 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read, "A bill extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE PARKER DAM POWER PROJECT AND THE DAVIS DAM PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2984) to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT ACT WITH REFERENCE TO STATE LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will someone explain this bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill has reference to lands under the Columbia Basin project in eastern Washington where we have about a million acres to be irrigated from the Grand Coulee Dam. We have on the statute books certain antispeculation laws that set forth certain requirements. Some of this block of land is owned by the State of Washington. There are certain constitutional provisions existing concerning those lands.

This bill aims to bring these provisions in conformity with the Federal law so that work on the project may go forward expeditiously. The Secretary of the Interior asked that this legislation be passed so that they may proceed with the first block by next year.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would that give the State an opportunity to speculate in these lands?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; it would not. The whole tenor of the bill is to prevent speculation. What we are trying to do here is to permit dealing with the State land in such a way that it conforms with State law.

Mr. RICH. You have set up a law in order to prohibit speculators from getting these lands away from the Federal Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. RICH. This would not permit the States to speculate or give the individuals the right to speculate in those lands?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. The bill does not permit that. It does not permit speculation on the part of anyone. It merely corrects a legal difficulty involving State lands and makes progress possible without delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 7 of the Columbia Basin Project Act (Act of March 10, 1943, ch. 14, 57 Stat. 14) be amended to read as follows:

"Legislation otherwise conforming to the standards above stated in this section will meet the requirements of the section even though, by reason of limitations in the State constitution, the contracts required under subsection 2 (c) cannot be executed pursuant to such legislation as to the State's school and other public lands. As to such lands the provisions and requirements of subsection 2 (c) shall remain effective, but the period in which the required recordable contracts may be executed shall be extended: (a) As to any of such lands remaining in the ownership of the State, until 6 months after the removal of the constitutional limitations above referred to; and (b) as to any of such lands which are offered for sale by the State in accordance with such program for the offering of State lands within the project as may be agreed to between the State and the Secretary, until 6 months after the State's conveyance or contract to convey is made, whichever is earlier."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 10 OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1922) to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 77 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2770) to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 848) to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to give us a brief explanation of this bill and to answer especially if the Bureau of the Budget has given its approval?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], author of the bill, make the explanation requested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this same bill was reported by the committee last year. At that time the committee held extensive hearings at which the Department of Agriculture was represented by Mr. I. W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. Mr. Duggan endorsed the measure but stated that he had not had time to clear his statement with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DEANE. I did not see any report from the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau of the Budget, and that was the reason for my inquiry.

Mr. HOPE. The bill, as I recall, has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. It does not call for any appropriations.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct; I do not think that it was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, because we did not deem it necessary to do so. But, hearings were held on the bill, as pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas, last year, and further consideration given to it this year, and it was unanimously reported by the committee on both occasions, is my recollection.

Mr. DEANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author if this bill is intended to enable the earnings of cooperatives to replace Federal capital that has been used?

Mr. HOPE. The purpose of the bill is to help the Government get out of business. The Bank for Cooperatives was set up with Federal capital, and this bill sets up a procedure whereby the cooperative organizations that borrow from the bank can pay in extra money in addition to the interest when they take out a loan, which money will be used for the purchase of stock with the idea that eventually the Government stock may all be replaced and retired.

Mr. HARVEY. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as the Government retires this stock, then it is going to be owned by the cooperatives?

Mr. HOPE. It will be owned by the cooperatives.

Mr. RICH. Well, does the cooperative pay taxes on the amount of investment that it has the same as other corporations?

Mr. HOPE. Some cooperatives are tax exempt and some are not; it depends on the way they do business. As a matter of fact, about 50 percent of the cooperatives claim exemption, and the other 50 percent do not. But that is not a matter of any concern so far as this bill is concerned, because what we are trying to do here is to get the Government out of the lending business and to set up a system which will enable the cooperative organizations to retire the Government capital in the bank and take it over themselves.

Mr. RICH. I think that is possibly all right, but the gentleman, being one of the leading men on the Committee on Agriculture, does he not think that we ought to get the Government to receive payment in taxes from the cooperatives just the same as any other business? After you bring the other businesses down, then you have nothing left but cooperatives, and finally you will socialize this Government in the manner in which you are handling it now.

Mr. HOPE. Well, the gentleman is bringing up something now over which the Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction. We have no jurisdiction over taxes, and the gentleman should address his remarks to the Committee on Ways and Means, which will have to handle any legislation along that line.

Mr. RICH. I hope the committee will recommend that to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I notice there is a provision in the bill for

raising this money by authorizing the issuance of consolidated debentures. As I understand, those debentures will not be guaranteed by the United States Government.

Mr. HOPE. No; they will not be guaranteed by the United States Government. This provision will simply change the present law by making it possible for all of the 12 regional banks and the Central Bank for Cooperatives to join in issuing debentures with the thought that the consolidated debentures will be more acceptable to the investing public, exactly as the Federal land banks now join in issuing debentures.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The passage of the bill will not increase the obligation of the Federal Government?

Mr. HOPE. It will not. It will decrease the obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And it has the endorsement of the seven major farm organizations?

Mr. HOPE. This is one bill in which all of the farm organizations are in complete agreement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1134k), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Hereafter each regional bank for cooperatives shall have three classes of stock, namely, class A, class B, and class C. The class A stock shall be that now or hereafter issued to and held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on behalf of the United States, and such stock shall continue to be nonvoting, to have a par value of $100, and to be preferred in dissolution or liquidation of the banks. Class B stock shall be nonvoting stock of a par value of $100 and may be issued only at par and may be sold or transferred to anyone subject to the approval of the board of directors of the issuing bank. Any cooperative association as defined in section 15 (a) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1141j), owning class B stock of a par value of not less than $1,000 may purchase class C stock of a par value of $100 and thus become eligible to vote. In liquidation or dissolution class B stock shall be junior to class A, but shall be preferred over class C stock. After all class A stock has been retired, class B stock may be called for retirement at par and shall be called serially so that the oldest outstanding stock at any given time will be first retired. Any holder of class B stock whose stock has been called for retirement may elect, with the approval of the issuing bank, to leave his stock in the bank subject to its being included in the next call for retirement. After all class A stock has been retired, dividends of not to exceed 4 percent per annum may be paid on class B stock if declared by the board of directors and approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration: *Provided*, That the surpluses of the bank, after the payment of such dividends, are greater than 25 percent of its outstanding capital stock and guaranty funds.

"Class C stock shall have a par value of $1 per share. No dividends shall be paid thereon. Each holder of class C stock eligible to borrow from a bank for cooperatives shall be entitled to one vote. From time to time each regional bank for cooperatives shall obtain information concerning its class C stockholders to determine whether they continue to be eligible to borrow from the bank and any class C stockholder found by the bank to be ineligible shall not be entitled to vote until its eligibility is reestablished to the satisfaction of the bank.

"Each cooperative association borrowing from a regional bank for cooperatives shall be required to own at the time the loan is made at least 100 shares of class C stock of a total par value of $100 and the purchase price of such stock may be retained out of the loan. In addition, class C stock shall be issued at the close of each fiscal year—

"(1) for amounts paid to a regional bank for cooperatives for capital in connection with loans by a borrowing association during that fiscal year as herein provided; and

"(2) for patronage refunds that have been authorized by the board of directors of the bank and approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

"Each borrowing cooperative association shall be required to invest in the class C capital stock of the bank for cooperatives an amount equal to not less than 10 nor more than 25 percent, as provided from time to time by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration for all such banks, of the amount of interest paid by the asscciation on its loans; payments for this stock shall be made quarterly or when the regular interest payments of the association are made. Class C stock shall be issued to the association in the amount of the payments at the end of each fiscal year.

"In any case in which a cooperative association applying for a loan is not authorized under the law of the State in which it is organized, to take stock in the bank, the bank shall, in lieu thereof, require the association to pay into or have on deposit in a guaranty fund of the bank, or the bank may retain out of the amount of the loan and credit the guaranty fund with such amount, if any, as is necessary to provide the association with an interest in the guaranty fund equal to the minimum amount of class C stock of the par value of $100 which the association would otherwise be required to own at the time the loan is made. Any such association may make additional payments into the guaranty fund from time to time in lieu of the purchase of class B stock. To the extent permitted under the laws of a State in which a cooperative association is organized, the rights and status of any cooperative association making payments into the guaranty fund in lieu of either class B or class C stock shall be the same as though they were holders of class B or class C stock, respectively. In the event that it is shown to the satisfaction of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration that any cooperative association, otherwise eligible to borrow, is prohibited from taking stock in a bank for cooperatives or from making payments into its guaranty funds, such cooperative association may borrow from the bank for cooperatives on meeting such terms and conditions as may be specified by him. Each bank for cooperatives has an enforceable first lien on all stock or guaranty fund investment of cooperative associations in the bank as additional collateral for any indebtedness of any such association to the bank.

"At the end of each fiscal year, the board of directors of each bank for cooperatives shall determine the amount of class A stock that shall be retired at par by that bank, subject to the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration; but the minimum amount of class A stock that shall be retired shall be equivalent to the amount of class C stock and comparable guaranty funds issued or credited for that year, other than class C stock issued by a regional bank on account of class C stock issued to it by the Central Bank for Cooperatives: *Provided*, That, in any event, not less than $28,500,000 of class A stock shall be retired within 5 years from the effective date of this act. Funds from the retirement of class A stock shall be paid into the revolving fund authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, and shall continue to be available for purchase of stock in the banks in accordance with the applicable statutory provisions.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall apply in all respects to stock of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, except that class B and class C stock issued by the Central Bank to a borrowing association may be transferred by it only to a regional bank for cooperatives. In order to enable each regional bank for cooperatives to vote for directors in the Central Bank, it may buy class C stock in the Central Bank in the minimum amount of $100. Cooperative associations eligible to borrow from the Central Bank for Cooperatives may buy class B stock or make payments into the guaranty fund in the regional bank in the district in which the headquarters office of the borrowing cooperative is located, or in such other regional bank or banks for cooperatives as the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration may prescribe for the purpose of having any such regional bank buy an equal amount of class B stock in the Central Bank for Cooperatives; and in any case in which any buyer of class B stock in a regional bank for cooperatives so requests at the time of purchase, the regional bank for cooperatives shall purchase a corresponding amount of class B stock in the Central Bank for Cooperatives if approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

"Cooperative associations borrowing from the Central Bank shall be required to own class C stock therein or make payments into its guaranty fund as though they were borrowing of a regional bank for cooperatives; and they shall also be required to furnish capital in the same manner and form as though they were borrowing of a regional bank for cooperatives, and capital so furnished shall be evidenced by stock issued to a regional bank as prescribed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, which regional bank shall then issue class C stock or make guaranty-fund credits to the cooperative association furnishing such capital. Patronage refunds declared at the end of a fiscal year by the Central Bank for Cooperatives on account of business done by cooperative associations and by the regional banks for cooperatives with the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall be paid in class C stock which shall be issued to the regional banks for cooperatives as prescribed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and the regional banks concerned shall issue an amount of its class C stock or make guaranty-fund credits on a pro rata basis to the borrowing cooperative asscciations covering the part of the refunds made by the Central Bank for Cooperatives on account of their business. All provisions of law with respect to class A, class B, and class C stock and guaranty funds relative to the regional banks for cooperatives, including the retirement of such stock and guaranty funds and dividends thereon, and all provisions of law relative to the making of patronage refunds, shall apply to the Central Bank for Cooperatives except as they may be inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection (b)."

SEC. 2. Section 36 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C., 11341), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The central and regional banks for cooperatives shall, at the end of each fiscal year, subject to the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, apply their savings after the payment of operating expenses during the fiscal year, first, to making up any losses incurred; second, to

the restoring to par value the amount of impairment, if any, of outstanding capital stock and of the guaranty fund, as determined by its board of directors; third, to establishing adequate reserves; fourth, at least 25 percent of such savings remaining shall be used to create and maintain any surplus accounts which shall be created after the effective date of the Banks for Farmers' Cooperative Act of 1948, until the sum of these new surplus accounts and the old surplus accounts on hand as of that date equal at least 25 percent of the sum of all outstanding class A, B, and C capital stock and any guaranty funds; fifth, to paying patronage refunds if declared by the board of directors.

"The patronage refunds of each regional bank for cooperatives shall be paid in class C stock to cooperative associations that were borrowers during the fiscal year for which the refunds are declared; patronage refunds of the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall be paid in class C stock to the regional banks for cooperatives; and that part of such refunds that was derived from the business of cooperative associations shall be evidenced by class C stock issued to such cooperative associations by any such regional bank for cooperatives. All patronage refunds shall be paid in the proportion that the amount of interest paid by a borrower bears to the total interest paid by all borrowers during the fiscal year.

"When the total of new and old surpluses of any regional bank for cooperatives or the Central Bank for Cooperatives exceeds 25 percent of the unimpaired sum of all its class A, B, and C stock outstanding and guaranty fund, an amount of the new surplus equal to such excess and any reserves deemed unnecessary for reserve purposes may be distributed in class C stock or guaranty-fund credits to the associations and regional banks for cooperatives, to which they are hereby required to be allocated on a patronage basis by fiscal years, if such action is authorized by the board of directors of the bank and approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. In the making of such distributions, the oldest outstanding allocations of new surpluses and reserves shall be distributed first.

"After the retirement of all class A stock at par, class C stock may be retired at par by calling the oldest outstanding class C stock and comparable guaranty-fund credits, but class C stock that was issued for a fiscal-year period shall not be called for retirement until all class B stock that was issued during or prior to that fiscal year has been called or an offer has been made for its retirement.

"In the case of liquidation or dissolution of any bank, after the payment, first, of all liabilities; second, of all class A stock at par; third, of all class B stock at par; fourth, of all class C stock or guaranty-fund credits at par; any surpluses and reserves which were on hand as of the effective date of the Banks for Farmers' Cooperatives Act of 1948 will be paid to the holders of class A, B, and C stock and comparable holders of guaranty-fund credits as of the date of liquidation or dissolution in the same proportions as distributions were made as of that date in the retirement of capital stock, and any other remaining surpluses and reserves shall be distributed on an equitable basis to those entities to which they were allocated. If necessary to use any surplus or reserves to pay any liabilities or to retire any capital stock, new surpluses and reserves shall be exhausted first."

SEC. 3. Section 31 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1134g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The number of directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall be seven. Of this number, two shall be elected by the cooperative associations determined by the bank to be eligible to vote, two shall be elected by the board of directors of the regional banks for cooperatives from among the members of the boards of directors of the twelve farm credit districts, two shall be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and the Cooperative Bank Commissioner shall be an ex officio member and shall be chairman of the board of directors and its chief executive officer. Of the directors elected or appointed after the effective date of the Banks for Farmers' Cooperatives Act of 1948, one director in each of the three groups shall be elected or appointed for 1 year and one for 2 years, and thereafter each director shall be elected or appointed for a term of 3 years. The terms of the existing directors shall expire upon the appointment and election and qualification of directors chosen in accordance with this section. The board of directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives shall have the power to adopt bylaws subject to the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and in addition to the duties herein provided such bylaws may prescribe other duties, responsibilities, and authorities of the board of directors. No compensation shall be paid any director as a director of the corporation, but the corporation, subject to the approval of the Governor, may allow directors a reasonable per diem and expenses."

SEC. 4. Section 32 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C., 1134h), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Section 37 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1134m), is hereby amended by substituting the word "paragraph" for the word "section" in the next to the last sentence thereof and by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"Consolidated debentures may be issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives for and on behalf of itself and the regional banks for cooperatives in the manner and form and on terms and conditions approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. Such debentures shall be made payable at the Central Bank for Cooperatives and may be made payable at any Federal Reserve bank or banks designated in the face of the debentures. They shall be the joint and several obligations of the Central Bank for Cooperatives and of the regional banks for cooperatives, and each of such banks is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as is necessary, to become obligated for such debentures. They may be unsecured or secured by collateral, with power of substitution, specified by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration lodged with a custodian or custodians approved by the Governor. The total amount of such consolidated debentures which may be issued and outstanding at any time shall not exceed 10 times the capital and surplus of the central and regional banks for cooperatives. In order to furnish such consolidated debentures, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to prepare suitable debentures in such form and denominations as the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration may prescribe, such debentures when prepared to be held in the Treasury subject to delivery upon order of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. The engraved plates, dies, bed-pieces, and so forth, executed in connection therewith shall remain in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury. Any expenses incurred in the preparation, custody, and delivery of such consolidated debentures shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary shall be reimbursed for such expenditures by the central and regional banks for cooperatives. Such consolidated debentures shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States or of any officer or officers thereof."

SEC. 6. Section 80 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 638), is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee of the Farm Credit Administration or of the central or any regional bank for cooperatives designated to act as custodian of collateral securing loans made by any such bank to any cooperative association eligible to borrow therefrom may, with the approval of, and upon terms and conditions approved by the Farm Credit Administration, act at the same time as custodian of collateral securing loans made by any other lenders to any cooperative association eligible to borrow from any such bank."

SEC. 7. This act shall be known as the "Banks for Farmers' Cooperatives Act of 1948". That act shall be applicable to loans made before its effective date only from the date on which they are changed by agreement to conform thereto, otherwise such loans shall be treated as though that act had not been enacted. Any cooperative association having stock or guaranty fund credits in any bank for cooperatives on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to have such stock or credits retired as though this act had not been enacted, and any such association may have such stock, if it is found eligible to own class B or class C stock, converted in whole or in part into class B or class C stock: *Provided,* That any such stock which has not been retired or so converted within 90 days after the effective date of this act and which is not then required as the basis for an outstanding loan or loans shall then be converted to class C stock by the bank.

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect 60 days after its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 7, strike out the letter "s" in the word "funds."

Page 9, line 6, insert after the word "stock" the following: "or in guaranty fund credits."

Page 9, line 12, insert after the word "stock" the following: "or guaranty fund credits."

Page 9, line 12, insert after the word "issued" the following: "or made."

Page 12, line 17, strike out the word "Consolidated" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "When the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the Regional Banks for Cooperatives shall by resolutions consent to the same, consolidated."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CITY OF MARFA, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1158) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Marfa, Tex., of certain lands formerly owned by that city.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Assets Administrator is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Marfa, Tex., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all of those parcels of land (together with all improvements thereon) which were conveyed by the city of Marfa, Tex., to

the United States of America by deed dated March 23, 1938, and recorded on April 25, 1938, in volume 105, pages 437 and 438, of the Deed Records of Presidio County, Tex.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "land", strike out "(together with all improvements thereon)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT BROWN, BROWNSVILLE, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1338) authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is hereby authorized to accept by transfer without reimbursement or exchange of funds, and to assume permanent custody and control over, in connection with the lower Rio Grande flood-control project under the jurisdiction of said United States section, that portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, described as follows:

Tract, 1, Fort Brown.—A tract containing two hundred and forty-one and six one-hundredths acres in the Espiritu Santo grant in Cameron County, Tex., out of and a part of the Fort Brown military reservation as shown on map recorded in volume 8, page 23, of the map records of Cameron County, Tex.

Tract, 2, Borrow Area.—A tract containing seventeen and four-tenths acres in share No. 19 of the Espiritu Santo grant, Cameron County, Tex., conveyed to the United States of America by deed from Carrie M. Combe, individually and as independent executrix of the estate of Frederick J. Combe, deceased, recorded in volume 322, page 352, of the deed records of Cameron County, Tex.; both of said tracts being shown on drawing No. 4311-RC-12, San Benito, Tex., January 15, 1947, of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, United States section, designated "Flood Control Project—Lower Rio Grande, Tex.—Fort Brown Military Reservation", and on field notes attached thereto, which drawing and field notes are on file with said United States section and with the War Assets Administration, said property having heretofore been declared surplus to the War Assets Administration; and the War Assets Administration, or other Federal agency in responsible charge, is authorized and directed to transfer said property to the said United States section without reimbursement or exchange of funds.

SEC. 2. There shall likewise be transferred to said United States section, in connection with the transfer of said land, that certain building thereon situate, known and numbered as warehouse building 252.

SEC. 3. The improvements on said land, except warehouse building 252, may be sold by the War Assets Administration under its existing authority, for use on the premises where now situated, subjected to the provision that such use shall be in conformity with the terms and conditions of licenses to be issued therefor by the Secretary of State under the authority of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 906; 22 U. S. C., sec. 277e): *Provided*, That such licenses shall not be inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control and the use of said land as a floodway, as determined by the Secretary of State. Any such improvements not sold for use on the premises may be sold by the War Assets Administration for removal from the premises within 1 year from the date of sale. To the extent that any such improvements are not sold under the provisions hereof within a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act, title thereto shall remain in the United States, and jurisdiction and control thereover shall vest in the said United States section.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of State shall, in order to assure beneficial public use of this land not inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control, grant a license or licenses to the city of Brownsville, Tex., under the authority of the act of August 27, 1935, to use portions of the lands transferred to the United States section under this act for municipal parks, golf course, museums, athletic fields, including stadiums, and other public purposes not inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control and with the use of said land as a floodway, as determined by the Secretary of State and subject to such terms and conditions as may, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, be necessary to protect the interests of the United States: *Provided*, That application is made by the city of Brownsville for such license or licenses within a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act: *Provided further*, That such license or licenses shall not be inconsistent with those granted under section 3 hereof for the use of the improvements therein specified: *Provided further*, That except for this provision granting to the city of Brownsville a preferential right for 1 year to be granted a license or licenses, nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying or impairing the authority of the Secretary of State over said lands under said act of August 27, 1935.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1770) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POULSON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FOREST RESOURCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2001) to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it appears that this bill would increase the authorization for this purpose to a total of $1,000,000 per year. It is the policy of the objectors committee that bills carrying authorizations of this amount be passed over. This is a very meritorious piece of legislation, however, and I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. GRANGER. This is a very important piece of legislation, concerning which there has been a great deal of interest shown by the Members of the House. It is simply an authorization to permit an inventory to be taken of the timber resources of the United States, not only to make the initial surveys but to keep them up to date so that the country will know exactly what timber resources it has. It covers both private and public forest resources throughout the entire country. I think it is a very meritorious bill and should be passed.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is not this bill simply a business proposition?

Mr. GRANGER. Absolutely.

Mr. JENKINS. If it is not passed, business cannot be conducted properly?

Mr. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. DEANE. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the committee reported this bill unanimously?

Mr. COOLEY. The bill was unanimously approved by the committee.

Mr. GRANGER. I understood there was one objection to the bill, but it did have the very general support of the committee.

Mr. DEANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CROP INSURANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3825) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill does a great deal, a great deal which the Members of Congress should not permit at this time. This bill should first be brought up in the regular way and discussed thoroughly from A to Z. In the report you will notice it is pointed out that during the hearings on the bill a representative of the General Accounting Office appeared at the invitation of the committee and stated that the GAO recommended the enactment of the provisions in the bill relating to the cancellation of the $75,000,000 deficit of the corporation incurred prior to 1948. They have gone in the red and now they want you to cancel a $75,000,000 deficit. The bill includes a great many more agricultural products. It was set up a year or so ago for experimental purposes. But they do not want to restrict it to experimental purposes. They want to come in here now and start the ball rolling all over again and I say it is time that it was cut out.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I must object.

SURPLUS AIRPORT PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3851) to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, with respect to surplus airport property and to provide for the transfer of compliance functions with relation to such property.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if someone could not explain the object of section 1 and section 2 of this bill, in particular. If not, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2514) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes.

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

WATER-FACILITY LOANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3181) to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SWAN ISLAND ANIMAL QUARANTINE STATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3717) to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to the Swan Island animal quarantine station.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, would the author of the bill point out how the Government may retain its security in view of the fact that the lease on this particlular property expired on May 31? From my study of the report and the bill, it appears that the lease on this particular property expires on May 31. Unless it is renegotiated by that time, the Government will lose some $85,000.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the rent on that island is anywhere from $200 to $600 a year. The structures now on the island can be removed under the terms of the contract and be retained by the Government of the United States.

Mr. DEANE. The Government will protect itself so far as the monetary value is concerned.

Mr. WORLEY. The Government is fully protected.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 633), authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain on Swan Island an international animal quarantine station, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARM LABOR CAMPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2906) to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of July 31, 1947 (ch. 413, 61 Stat. 694), is hereby amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1949" wherever it appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1950."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4081) to amend section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to permit the delivery of excess peanuts to agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and to define the term "cooperator" with respect to price supports for peanuts and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], explain the bill?

It seems to be a quite comprehensive bill, and I think the membership should have a little further explanation of it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the pending bill were substantially the law prior to August 1, 1947. In the closing days of that session of Congress, an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act was before the committee hurriedly, and was reported out. At the bottom of the act, somewhat like the small print in a contract, was a provision striking subsection (b), which, frankly, was not investigated by the committee because we thought it related to the provisions of the amendment. This bill simply restores the plan that was in the law of 1941, whereby, if a producer, either intentionally or unintentionally, plants in excess of his allotted acreage, the crop on the excess acreage shall be channeled through Government agencies for control purposes and for crushing into oil.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(g) Beginning with the 1949 crop of peanuts, payment of the marketing penalty as provided in subsection (a) will not be required on any excess peanuts which are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection, producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the prevailing market value thereof for crushing for oil, less the estimated cost of storing, handling, and selling such peanuts. Any person who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty to the United States, at a rate equal to the marketing penalty prescribed in subsection (a), upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(h) For the purposes of price support with respect to the 1949 and subsequent crops of peanuts, a 'cooperator' shall be (1) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed does not exceed the farm acreage allotment or (2) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed exceeds the farm acreage allotment provided any peanuts picked or threshed in excess of the farm marketing quota are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF COAL TO OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 75) to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, so as to permit the transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., in foreign vessels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 46, sec. 883), vessels of Canadian registry shall be permitted until December 31, 1950, to transport coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., from other points in the United States on the Great Lakes, or their connecting or tributary waters.

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "Canadian" and insert the word "foreign."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE NEAR DEL RIO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1360), to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the sucessors thereof, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.," approved August 2, 1946, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The authority granted herein for construction of the bridge shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction be commenced within 5 years and completed within 7 years from August 2, 1946, unless otherwise authorized by the Congress of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED FACILITIES FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2282) to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of assuring continued operation of the facilities hereinafter described for international broadcasting as a means of achieving the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) under authority of that act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as successor to Defense Plant Corporation (or the War Assets Administration, if such property has been declared surplus), shall transfer, without regard to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") all of its right, title, and interest in and to the facilities known as Plancors 1805, 1985, and 1986 located in Butler County, Ohio, in the vicinity of Delano, Calif., and Dixon, Calif., respectively, together with the equipment and other property appurtenant thereto. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire property or rights or interests therein necessary or desirable for the operation of such facilities by purchase, lease, gift, transfer, condemnation, or otherwise.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Secretary finds that the operation of the facilities herein authorized to be transferred are no longer necessary or desirable, he shall report such fact to Congress with his recommendations for the disposition of such facilities.

SEC. 3. The Department of State shall assume all obligations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation covering operations of said facilities, equipment, and appurtenant property outstanding at the date of transfer.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MARINE BAND AT FIFTY-NINTH ANNUAL REUNION OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3341) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the fifty-ninth annual reunion of Confederate Veterans to be held in Little Rock, Ark., September 27 through September 29, 1949.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the fifty-ninth reunion of the Confederate Veterans to be held in Little Rock, Ark., September 27 through September 29, 1949.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of defraying expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such reunion there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leader and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $8 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowance to be in addition to pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT FOR DIVISION OF THE WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2566) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact, or agreement, not later than June 1, 1952, providing for an equitable division and apportionment between the States of the water supply of the Yellowstone River and of the streams tributary thereto, upon condition that one suitable person, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make a report to Congress of proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into: *Provided*, That such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall apply to any waters within or tributary to the Yellowstone National Park or shall establish any right or interest in or to any lands with the boundaries thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY DEFERMENT IN ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3754) providing for the temporary deferment in certain unavoidable contingencies of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the performance of not less than $100 worth of labor or the making of improvements aggregating such amount, which labor or improvements are required under the provisions of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to be made during each year, may be deferred by the Secretary of the Interior as to any mining claim or group of claims in the United States upon the submission by the claimant of evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that such mining claim or group of claims is surrounded by lands over which a right-of-way for the performance of such assessment work has been denied or is in litigation or is in the process of acquisition under State law or that other legal impediments exist which affect the right of the claimant to enter upon the surface of such claim or group of claims or to gain access to the boundaries thereof.

SEC. 2. The period for which said deferment may be granted shall end when the conditions justifying deferment have been removed: *Provided*, That the initial period shall not exceed 1 year but may be renewed for a further period of 1 year if justifiable conditions exist.

SEC. 3. All deferred assessment work shall be performed in the assessment year next subsequent to the removal or cessation of the causes for deferment or the expiration of any deferments granted under this act and shall be in addition to the annual assessment work required by law in such year. Within 60 days after completion of deferred assessment work the claimant shall file with the Secretary of the Interior a sworn statement itemizing said deferred work performed or improvements made.

SEC. 4. Claimant shall file or record or cause to be filed or recorded in the office where the notice or certificate of location of such claim or group of claims is filed or recorded, a notice to the public of claimant's petition to the Secretary of the Interior for deferment under this act, and of the order or decision disposing of such petition.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 14, strike out the word "in" and insert "not later than the end of."

Page 2, line 18, after the word "year.", strike out the balance of line 18, all of lines 19, 20, and 21.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4026), relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within the authorized boundaries of Acadia National Park, in the State of Maine, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of land within Acadia National Park, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, approximately 58 acres of non-Federal land within the authorized park boundaries, such land to be conveyed to the United States without cost by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Upon acceptance of title thereto by the United States, such property shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park. In exchange for the conveyance to the United States of the aforesaid property, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., or to such agency as he may designate, for purposes of the Jackson Memorial Laboratory, Bar Harbor, Maine, approximately 5 acres of federally owned land within the park adjacent to the laboratory properties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIFTEENTH AND SUBSEQUENT DECENNIAL CENSUSES

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the time H. R. 3198 was called, I asked that it be passed over without prejudice because of lack of information concerning the matter.

This information has now been furnished to me by the author of the bill. I have no objection to it, and none of the objectors on our side has any objection, and I understand none of the objectors on the other side has any objection. I therefore ask unanimous consent that we return to the consideration of H. R. 3198, No. 97 on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence in the last paragraph of section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), as amended by section 404 of the Second Reorganization Plan (53 Stat. 1436), be amended by striking out "the Fifteenth" and inserting in lieu thereof "each."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER FACILITY LOANS—LOANS TO HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar Nos. 116 and 117, H. R. 2514, and H. R. 3181.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if the Member who objected to Calendar No. 116 and asked that Calendar No. 117 be passed over without prejudice has now withdrawn objection and request?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I understand he has.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The author could explain the bill but I understand that Calendar No. 116 merely extends financial assistance to homestead entrymen; it is an aid to veterans.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What is the calendar number of the bill to which the gentleman from Idaho is referring?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Calendar No. 116, H. R. 2514.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, information has come to me that these two bills were objected to by someone not now on the floor. Under these conditions, as a member of the Consent Calendar Committee I would be forced to object to returning to them.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. DEANE. As I recall, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NOLAND] objected to one bill and asked that the other be passed over without prejudice. I understand he is on the floor. I wonder if he has withdrawn his objection and request?

Mr. NOLAND. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to returning to Calendar No. 116, the bill H. R. 2514?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2514) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make a loan or loans for any purpose authorized by and in accordance with the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or the act of August 28, 1937, as amended, to any person eligible for assistance under said acts who makes a homestead entry on public land or who contracts for the purchase of other land of the United States in a reclamation project pursuant to the applicable provisions of the homestead and reclamation laws. Any such loans required by the Secretary of Agriculture or by law to be secured by a real-estate mortgage may be secured by a mortgage contract which shall create a lien against the land in favor of the United States acting through the Secretary of Agriculture and any patent thereafter issued shall recite the existence of such lien.

SEC. 2. Any entry or purchase contract land with respect to which a loan is made under the authority of this act shall be subject to cancellation by the Secretary of the Interior as provided by existing law or upon request of the Secretary of Agriculture whenever default occurs in the terms, conditions, covenants, or obligations contained in the mortgage. After cancellation or relinquishment of an entry or purchase contract, land on which there is a mortgage lien, pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall thereafter, except as hereinafter provided, only be open to entry or resale to persons eligible for both an original entry or purchase contract and an original loan. Such entry or resale shall be subject to the outstanding balance of any amounts due the United States with respect to such land or such portion thereof as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, or their delegates, to be within the entryman's or purchaser's ability to pay on the basis of the long-time earning capacity of the land. If no entry or purchase is made within 1 year after the cancellation or relinquishment of a prior entry or purchase of land on which there is such a mortgage lien, the land shall be disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture on terms consistent with the provisions of section 43 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, for the satisfaction of the indebtedness secured by the mortgage, subject, however, to other outstanding charges on the land due the United States, and the purchaser of such land shall be entitled to the issuance of patent or deed upon the completion of all requirements with respect to the payment of such charges.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "who" insert the words "has made or."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "who" insert the words "has contracted for or."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "lien." insert "The first installment for the repayment of any such loan may be deferred for a period of not to exceed 2 years from the date of the first advance under such loan."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 117, H. R. 3181, to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we be advised as to whether or not the gentleman who asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice withdraws his request at this time?

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho to return to Calendar No. 117?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I see there is no report from the Bureau of the Budget; can the gentleman from Idaho

give us an indication of what this bill will cost the Federal Government?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. This bill is simply an authorization.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. How much will the authorization be?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It is simply an authorization to increase loans from $50,000 to $100,000 in case a feasible project is found on these desert tracts.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide for more effective accomplishment of the purposes of the act entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization," approved August 28, 1937, as amended (50 Stat. 869; 16 U. S. C. 590r-x; 54 Stat. 1124, 16 U. S. C. 590z-5), section 7 of the act relating to water conservation and utiiization projects in the Great Plains and the arid and semiarid areas of the United States approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1124; 16 U. S. C. 590z-5), is hereby amended by striking the figures "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$100,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the Private Calendar will now be called. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1121) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on September 28, 1942, when the car which he was driving was struck by a United States Army vehicle on the highway near Alamogordo, N. Mex.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from any payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN F. GALVIN

The Clerk called the bill H. R. 766) for the relief of John F. Galvin.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PEERLESS OIL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 656) for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF ROBERT A. WATSON, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1056) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim, together with interest thereon, of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, against the United States for alleged loss and damage suffered by the said Robert A. Watson arising out of certain transactions involving the purchase of 3,500 tons of sugar in the Republic of Argentina in June 1920 the importation into the United States of 1,900 tons thereof and the neglect, refusal, and failure of the Department of Justice of the United States to provide for the distribution thereof in accordance with the terms of a written agreement between claimant's decedent and said Department; and to enter such decree or judgment against the United States for such loss and damage as equity and justice shall require.

SEC. 2. In the proceedings upon such claim before the Court of Claims, the United States shall not avail itself of the defense that the Department of Justice of the United States or its officers acted without legal authority in making said agreement or fixing restrictions with regard to the importation and disposition of such sugar.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SIRVART ARSENIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3532) for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the 2-year limitation on certain suits in admiralty against the United States contained in section 5 of the Suits in Admiralty Act, approved March 9, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 745), is hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian, Fresno, Calif.; and she may sue the United States on her claim arising out of the death of her son, the late Albert A. Arsenian (who lost his life in the explosion at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, while serving as a civilian employee of the United States in the capacity of a member of the crew of the War Shipping Administration vessel *E. A. Bryan*) under the remaining provisions of such Suits in Admiralty Act, as amended, if she brings such suit within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE FONTENOT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 691) for the relief of Lawrence Fontenot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lawrence Fontenot, Oberlin, La., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lawrence Fontenot against the United States for property damage caused to his rice crop as a result of the destruction on May 25, 1943, of a partially constructed irrigation flume across the Oberlin-Oakdale Road in Allen Parish, La., by a United States Army truck, which was part of a convoy of Army vehicles.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 1, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAYMON H. MASSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1025) for the relief of Waymon H. Massey.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Waymon H. Massey, Greenville, S. C., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Waymon H. Massey against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on February 24, 1943, through the negligence

of a United States Naval Aviation Cadet, while engaged in giving flight instruction to said naval aviation cadet at Auburn, Ala., and while in the employ of the Alabama Air Service which was under contract with the Civil Aeronautics Administration to train Navy personnel for flying, the said Waymon H. Massey having been assigned to the Alabama Air Service by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Waymon H. Massey, of Greenville, S. C., for injuries sustained by him on February 24, 1943, through the negligence of a United States naval aviation cadet, while engaged in giving flight instruction to said naval aviation cadet at Auburn, Ala., and while in the employ of the Alabama Air Service which was under contract with the Civil Aeronautics Administration to train Navy personnel for flying, the said Waymon H. Massey having been assigned to the Alabama Air Service by the Civil Aeronautics Administration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLYMPIC HOTEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of the Olympic Hotel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to the Olympic Hotel (The Olympic, Inc.), Fourth Avenue and Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash., the sum of $5,647.96, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for additional compensation under contract No. WO4-193-eng.-6426, dated January 16, 1946, as modified and extended; such sum representing the difference between the value of services and accommodations extended by such hotel to repatriated American prisoners-of-war and their guests pursuant to such contract and the compensation received by such hotel under such contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOHN WAIPA WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1858) for the relief of John Waipa Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Waipa Wilson, Honolulu, T. H., the sum of $20,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John Waipa Wilson against the United States for personal injuries sustained when he was struck by a vehicle driven by personnel of the United States Army on the Island of Oahu, T. H., on February 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to" insert "the legal guardian of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of John Waipa Wilson."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK C. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2931) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Frank C. Wilson of certain lands formerly owned by him.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, without consideration, to Frank C. Wilson, of Savannah, Ga., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all that tract of land conveyed to the United States of America by the said Frank C. Wilson by deed dated June 8, 1940, and recorded on June 10, 1940, in book 89, pages 438 and 439, of the public records of Effingham County, Ga.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRTLE RUTH OSBORNE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3812) for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A Walts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Myrtle Ruth Osborne, widow of Levi Osborne, deceased, the sum of $7,000; to Marion Walts and Jessie A. Walts, father and mother of Beverly Gale Walts, deceased, the sum of $2,000; to pay to Marion Walts $1,500, and to Jessie A. Walts the sum of $1,000, all of Louisville, Ky., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Levi Osborne and Beverly Gale Walts, and for injuries sustained by Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts, as the result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck on State Highway No. 60, near Grahampton Bridge in Meade County, Ky., on November 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YELLOW CAB TRANSIT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3966) for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $9,702.87. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by claimant and in payment of all losses incurred by claimant resulting from the death of its employee, Charles Marion Overcash, driver of claimant's vehicle, which occurred in a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway 66, near Hazlegreen, Mo., on August 10, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. L. HITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3992) for the relief of J. L. Hitt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. L. Hitt, Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $3,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said J. L. Hitt against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him in a collision between the automobile in which he was riding and a United States Army vehicle on August 7, 1944, on United States Highway No. 41, about 8 miles south of Murfreesboro, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFRED A. DRUMMOND AND ADDIE G. DRUMMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2702) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond, jointly, such title as was acquired by the United States by virtue of a quitclaim deed executed on May 5, 1942, by Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond in and to all gas, oil, or other minerals, in, on, or under the following-described lands in the State of Oklahoma: The west half of southwest quarter of northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of southwest quarter of northwest quarter and the northwest quarter of southwest quarter less thirty-two one-hundredths acre for railway right-of-way, section 17, township 6 south, range 7 east, of the Indian meridian, and further identified in the files and records of the Corps of Engineers as tract K–103–7, Denison Dam and Reservoir.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FERD H. GIBLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 749) for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MARK H. POTTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 716) for the relief of Mark H. Potter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Mark H. Potter, of 362 Jefferson Street, Pomona, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and expenses incident thereto, sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Garey Avenue and Holt Avenue, Pomona, Calif., on March 3, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GROOVER O'CONNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 717) for the relief of Groover O'Connell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Groover O'Connell, Whittier, Calif., the sum of $5,455.17. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Groover O'Connell against the United States on account of property damage sustained by him on September 3, 1943, when a United States Navy airplane crashed on his stock farm on Pioneer Boulevard, Norwalk, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF AUGUST MICHELA, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of August Michela, infant.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,500 to August Michela, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Work Projects Administration vehicle at Thirty-ninth Street and Fort Hamilton Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y., on or about March 17, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$750."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to" insert "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 6, after "Michela," insert "a minor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES LINZAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1096) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,922.85, to Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay, of Forest Hill, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, James H. Linzay, who was killed as the result of an accident involving an Army truck which occurred on August 8, 1944, near Camp Claiborne, La., on State Highway No. 165, as the result of negligence of the driver of a Diamond T 4-ton Army truck No. 458850: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,922.85" and insert "$5,922.85".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE MAYFIELD

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 1123) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Florence Mayfield, Riverside, Calif., the sum of $3,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Florence Mayfield against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle near Indio, Calif., on December 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELLIS C. WAGNER AND BARBARA P. WAGNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1125) for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ellis C. Wagner and Mrs. Barbara P. Wagner, Santa Ana, Calif., the sum of $36,379.73 The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ellis C. Wagner and Mrs.

Barbara P. Wagner against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army jeep on United States Highway 101 three miles north of the city of Oceanside, Calif., on December 27, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the country notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$36,379.73" and insert "$12,463.69."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUNE C. DOLLAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1136) for the relief of June C. Dollar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to June C. Dollar, Hyattsville, Md., the sum of $25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said June C. Dollar against the District of Columbia on account of personal injuries sustained by him on February 28, 1942, when he was shot by a member of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert "funds of the District of Columbia."

Line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000."

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROSARIA CUSIMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1295) for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $10,179.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano against the United States for the loss of her dwelling house and lot situated at 1010 South Thirty-sixth Street, Lincoln, Nebr., as a result of wrongful action taken by officers and employees of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in connection with her application for a loan from such Corporation in April 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano, of Los Angeles, Calif., for the loss of her residence located at 1010 South Thirty-sixth Street, Lincoln, Nebr., in the year 1934. Such alleged loss was sustained as a result of allegedly wrongful action taken by officers and employees of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in connection with her application for a loan from such Corporation in April of 1934."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD R. AMUNDSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1592) for the relief of Howard R. Amundsen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,405 to Howard R. Amundsen, of Linden, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for balance due on account of per diem in lieu of subsistence for the period November 15, 1943, to January 31, 1944, as an employee of the Board of Economic Warfare, Office of Economic Warfare Analysis, Chungking, China, pursuant to authorization No. 4–805, dated July 29, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLYN McMILLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1981) for the relief of Carolyn McMillan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Carolyn McMillan, of Bay Minette, Ala., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and hospital and medical expenses sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle at Spanish Fort, Baldwin County, Ala., on August 5, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "appropriated" strike out the remainder of line 5 and all down to and including "1943" in line 11, and insert the following: "to V. O. McMillan, of Bay Minette, Ala., the sum of $434.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of medical and hospital expenses paid by him for the treatment of injuries sustained by his minor daughter, Carolyn McMillan, on August 5, 1943, in an accident involving an Army vehicle at Spanish Fort, Baldwin County, Ala.; and to pay to the legal guardian of the said Carolyn McMillan the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said minor in the said accident."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of V. O. McMillan and the legal guardian of Carolyn McMillan."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAMON G. HUNTER AND ARTHUR NANCETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3017) for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ramon G. Hunter, Modesto, Calif., the sum of $6,836.67, and to Arthur Nancett, Modesto, Calif., the sum of $1,906.68. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ramon G. Hunter and the said Arthur Nancett, respectively, against the United States arising out of a collision on October 27, 1944, in Stanislaus County, Calif., between the automobile owned and operated by the said Ramon G. Hunter, and in which the said Arthur Nancett was riding, and a United States Government truck operated by an employee of the War Food Administration. The said Ramon G. Hunter and the said Arthur Nancett brought suit against such employee in the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the county of Stanislaus, and obtained judgment on April 2, 1946, in the respective amounts of $6,812 and $1,882, plus court costs of $49.35, which judgment is now unsatisfied because of the inability of such employee to pay such judgment. Such sums of $6,836.67 and $1,906.68 shall be paid only upon the assignment by the said Ramon G. Hunter and the said Arthur Nancett to the United States of all their rights under such judgment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERBERT L. HUNTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4183) for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness of Herbert L. Hunter, in the amount of $944.46, arising out of the transportation of his household effects from Cleveland, Ohio, to San Juan, P. R., upon transfer of his official station, while employed by the Department of Agriculture, extension of authorization for such transportation not having been approved within the 6-month period required by the regulations of the President of the United States under authority of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105). The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Herbert L. Hunter, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amount heretofore credited to such indebtedness or refunded to the United States on account of such indebtedness. In the audit and settlement of the account of any accountable officer of the United States, the payment of the amount for such transportation expenses shall be considered to have been authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS ESPOSITO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 748) for the relief of Louis Esposito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation in the case of Louis Esposito, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Louis Esposito shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which the present outstanding proceedings rest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ELIAS STAVROPOULOS, HIS WIFE AND DAUGHTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1303) for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife Stravola, and his daughter, Tina, of Niantic, Conn. (file Nos. A-6505922, A-6505923, and A-6505924), who were admitted into the United States in visitors' visas on December 16, 1946, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of December 16, 1946, upon payment by them of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Stravola" and insert "Stavroula."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELESTE IRIS MAEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3458) for the relief of Celeste Iris Maeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703; 57 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161–162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), Celeste Iris Maeda, the fiancée of Stanley Arasim, Jr., an honorably discharged veteran of the United States armed forces, shall be deemed to be admissible to the United States for permanent residence, provided she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANZ EUGENE LAUB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3467) for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Franz Eugene Laub, a native and citizen of Germany whose wife is a citizen and resident of the United States, may be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of May 24, 1935, the date he last entered the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VASO B. BENDERACH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3497) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 850) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Vaso B. Benderach, a Yugoslav flier, who served honorably with the Fifteenth Air Force of the United States, and who died on May 7, 1948, while a patient at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3497) was laid on the table.

STONE & COOPER COAL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 227) for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,289.59, to Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc., of Augusta, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after May 18, 1942, to June 1, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, which period was not included in the regulations of the Office of Price Administration on bituminous coal from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE H. WHIKE CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4419) for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the United States Naval Institute proceedings for April.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New Orleans Item.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, District of Columbia bills are in order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

BANKING REGULATIONS ON NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 2104) relating to orders

to banks doing business in the District of Columbia to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in, or payable at, such banks, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no revocation, countermand, or stop-payment order hereafter made relating to the payment of any check or draft against an account of a depositor in any bank or trust company doing business in the District of Columbia, or relating to the payment of a note or acceptance made payable at any such bank or trust company, shall be valid unless the same be in writing specifically describing the instrument to which it relates and be delivered to the bank or trust company at the particular office, or branch, if any, on which such instrument was drawn or at which it was made payable.

SEC. 2. The delivery to one office or branch of a bank or trust company of any such revocation, countermand, or stop-payment order shall not constitute notice, actual or constructive, to any other office or branch of the same bank or trust company and shall not impair the right of such bank or trust company, acting through any such other office or branch, to be a holder in due course of the instrument.

SEC. 3. No such revocation, countermand, or stop-payment order shall remain in effect more than 6 months after delivery thereof to the bank or trust company, unless same be renewed. The first or any subsequent renewal thereof shall be in writing; shall specifically describe the instrument or the revocation, countermand, or stop-payment order to which it relates; shall be delivered to the bank or trust company at the particular office or branch, if any, on which such instrument was drawn or at which it was made payable; and shall be in effect for not more than 6 months from the date of delivery thereof. The bank or trust company to which such a revocation, countermand, or stop-payment order has been delivered may, at its option and without liability, stop the payment of such an instrument after the expiration date of the order or any renewal thereof.

SEC. 4. Any revocation, countermand, or stop-payment order existing on the date of enactment of this act in any bank or trust company doing business in the District of Columbia may be canceled by the bank or trust company after 6 months from such date, by giving notice of such cancellation to the depositor at his last known address by registered mail but such notice shall not be effective until 30 days have elapsed from the time of the mailing of such notice.

SEC. 5. Any bank or trust company that pays a check or other instrument drawn by or against the account of a depositor, the payment of which has been ordered stopped, and the order is still in effect, as herein provided, shall be responsible to the person who so ordered the payment thereof stopped for the actual loss incurred by such person because of the payment by such bank or trust company of such check or other instrument.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING THE RETENT ON CONTRACTS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 2799) to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That on all contracts made by the District of Columbia for construction work there shall be withheld, until completion and acceptance of the work, a retent of 10 percent of the total amount of any payments made thereunder as a guaranty fund that the terms of such contracts shall be strictly and faithfully performed: *Provided, however,* That whenever 50 percent of the work required under a contract for construction work has been completed and payments therefor have been made the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in their sole discretion, may authorize subsequent payments to be made to the contractor without withholding therefrom the retent required by this section, or the said Commissioners may authorize retention from such payments of less than 10 percent thereof; and the said Commissioners, in their sole discretion, may further authorize payment in full, including retained percentages, for each separate building or public work on which the price is stated separately in the contract upon completion and acceptance of such building or work."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the words "therefrom the retent" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "from such subsequent payments 10 per centum thereof as."

Page 2, line 9, insert after the word "such" the word "subsequent."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3967) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that section 4 makes $50,000 available on July 1, 1949. Has that already been appropriated?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes. We reduced it from $150,000 down to $50,000. Of course, the parents pay in a certain amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this reads July 1, 1949, may I ask whether this amount was appropriated in the bill which was passed some time ago making appropriations for the District of Columbia?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] may be able to answer the gentleman's question more in detail.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the item has not yet been appropriated. This is simply an authorization.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact that this is going into effect on July 1, 1949, and calls for an appropriation of $50,000, I would like to point out that the bill making appropriations for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1949, for the District of Columbia, has already passed the House.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Heretofore it has been the practice to bring in a deficiency appropriation for this item every year.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I would like to know, whether you are planning on requesting a deficiency for this item.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. May I make another inquiry? Under this act, it will be possible for people who have children under school age to send them to the various schools for day care. Is that correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. If they are unable to pay for that, they will be able to get the services free of charge?

Mr. ABERNETHY. If they are unable to pay, that is true, but there were very few children in the schools, but what the parents made some contribution toward the maintenance of the nurseries.

Mr. STEFAN. But, in the case of a widow who is penniless, it would be possible for her to get these services?

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is possible.

Mr. STEFAN. It would be possible for her to send her children to the day school, while she is out working, if she is unable to pay? She will be able to send her children there without being charged for it?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is possible under the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "and until June 30, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "and until June 30, 1950."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Board is authorized to make and enforce rules and regulations governing admission to and use and enjoyment of said nurseries and nursery schools, including the fixing of fees to be charged parents for care and maintenance therein of their children; which fees shall, as near as practicable, equal the expenditures of the District of Columbia for personal services, labor, food, and supplies in the operation and maintenance of such nurseries and nursery schools: *Provided,*

That the Board may, in cases where parents are unable to pay for such care waive all or part of such fees. All fees collected under the provisions of this Act shall be paid to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia and deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of an account to be known as 'Miscellaneous trust-fund deposits, District of Columbia—Day Care Nurseries', said fund to be available, in addition to appropriations made pursuant to section 4 of this Act, for expenditure for the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That such fund shall be audited and disbursed in the same manner as other trust funds are audited and disbursed by the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That any balance remaining in such trust-fund account after June 30, 1950, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, not exceeding $50,000 to carry out the purposes of this act."

SEC. 4. Section 2 of this act shall take effect July 1, 1949.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KILLING OF STARLINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker. by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up (H. R. 2886) to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of Congress entitled "An act to prohibit the killing of wild birds and wild animals in the District of Columbia," approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 808), is amended by adding after the words "the English sparrow" the words "or the starling" so that said section will read as follows:

"That no person shall at any time or at any place in the District of Columbia kill, or attempt to kill, any game bird or any other wild bird whatsoever, except the English sparrow or the starling, under a penalty of $5 or imprisonment in the workhouse for not more than 6 months, or both, for each bird killed or for each attempt as aforesaid: *Provided*, That landowners or tenants may, under special written permit from the superintendent of the Metropolitan Police, shoot or kill crows, Cooper hawks, sharp-shinned hawks, and great horned owls found destroying crops or poultry on their premises."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act is amended by adding a comma and the word "starling" after the word "sparrow" wherever such word appears in such section so that the said section will read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That no person in the District of Columbia shall kill any English sparrow, starling, or any wild animal suffering from injury or disease, by means of any gun, air gun, rifle, air rifle, parlor rifle, pistol, revolver, or other firearm, without a special written permit so to do from such official as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, by regulation or order, from time to time charge with that duty, under a penalty of $5 or imprisonment in the workhouse for not more than 30 days, or both, for each sparrow, starling, or animal so killed."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REGULATE THE PRACTICE OF THE HEALING ART IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up H. R. 2056, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I withdraw the point of order for the time being.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did the gentleman make a request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman called up a bill. It is on the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for consideration of the bill H. R. 2056 until the next call of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 114 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deemes desirable.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the ordinary investigating resolution which we have passed for other committees of the House, with this exception: It does not give them authority to go outside the United States.

I am sure there is no objection to this ordinary power which we are giving the committees.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides authorization of $25,000 for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make such investigations and studies as it may deem necessary with respect to problems dealing with Civil Service and the Post Office Department.

It is similar to a resolution approved by the Eightieth Congress. At that time the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], now a member of the Rules Committee, was a member of our committee.

I believe the expenditure of this money is worth while and under the leadership of our chairman will be expended judiciously. I believe the use of these funds will result in the saving of a good many more times the amount authorized under this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that although our committee was allowed the sum of $50,000 during the 2 years of the existence of our committee, we turned back to the Federal Treasury the sum of $19,000 of unexpended funds. We had the very splendid cooperation of Members from both parties in the use of the funds allocated to us. None of these funds were expended except with the approval of the members of the committee on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I should take this occasion to discuss a little further some of the work that was done by the committee of the Eightieth Congress under a similar resolution, being House Resolution 176.

Mr. Speaker, when the Legislative Reorganization Act combined the functions of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, the Committee on Civil Service, the Committee on the Census and the legislative responsibility concerning the Archives, it presented problems of integrating these general legislative programs. It also assigned to this committee a major responsibility as far as legislative committees are concerned.

In the Eightieth Congress, this committee was granted authority, under House Resolution 176, to make surveys and studies of the matters under the committee's jurisdiction. In my judgment, the results of these studies, which are represented by substantial savings to the Government already placed into effect and many more in process, amply justify a continuation of this authority in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is necessary to conduct studies preliminary to introduction of legislation implementing the recommendations by the Commission on Reorganization of the Government.

I might say to the Members of the House that much of the ground work has already been laid for this particular operation. In fact, as far as the reports on the Postal Service and the Federal

Civil Service are concerned, many of the suggestions made in reports to this House were later contained in the Hoover Commission reports.

I believe it will be helpful to the Members of the House in evaluating the activities which will be conducted under this resolution to review briefly the methods adopted by our committee last year.

In conducting our study of the Postal Service, we adopted the following procedure: First, we made surveys of selected post offices by subcommittees. Second, we invited users of the mails to furnish their suggestions, technical advice, and assistance. Third, at our request detailed surveys of the Philadelphia and Los Angeles Post Offices were made by the General Accounting Office. Fourth, we had a management engineering study made of the city delivery service at Cleveland, Ohio, using this as a typical city with the thought that some of the suggestions could be adopted on a national basis. And fifth, we named 15 subcommittees to examine into specific problems of the postal service.

In all, eight official reports were made to the House covering our studies of the postal service, and five were made covering the studies of the civil service.

I would like to just highlight for you some of the suggestions that were made which have been adopted or are in the process of adoption. I think from them you can gain an idea of the scope of our studies and their value—a value which certainly is many times more than the comparatively small sum spent by the committee in conducting its studies. We suggested, for example, that the mechanization of the primary and secondary mail-separation operation, particularly in the large post offices, be made the subject of an intense study. Based on this recommendation, the Congress appropriated $100,000 for such studies and earmarked $50,000 to be made available for a study by Remington Rand and $50,000 to be used by the Post Office Department. Recently, the Postmaster General has reported to the House Committee on Appropriations that they have used these funds to construct three additional machines similar to a mail-sorting machine engineered by one of its employees at the Chicago post office. Apparently, according to his report, the Postmaster General expects that savings will result from the use of these machines in the larger post offices. Remington Rand have not drawn upon the $50,000 made available to them, but spent some $20,000 of their own funds making preliminary checks on suggested machinery to be used in an alphabetical method of sorting mail to replace the scheme-sorting method now in use in the postal service. It is understood that their studies will be made available to the Post Office Department for additional development projects.

Our committee recommended to the House last year a bill which would provide a continuing program of research and development in the postal service. This was passed by the House, but action was not taken by the Senate. We have recommended similar legislation again this year, and it has come before the House today. Legislation providing for this research and development program was an outgrowth of the studies made by the committee showing a need for such a program.

In January 1948 the committee recommended that money orders and postal notes be replaced by a machine record card prepared for electrical accounting at the time of issue. Recently, in discussing postal-rate increases which he recommended, the Postmaster General pointed out he was not recommending increases for money orders because he expected to place into effect shortly a new method for handling money orders which appears to be along the lines suggested by the committee. In his judgment, the saving which would result would eliminate the approximate $20,000,000 deficit in handling money orders.

In January 1948 as a result of our studies, the committee recommended that an examination be made into the present method of paying for railway mail cars, pointing out that the present requirement of paying for railway mail cars on a round-trip basis did not appear to be in the best interests of our economy. The Postmaster General recently recommended legislation which would eliminate the requirement that payments be made to railroads on a round-trip basis. This legislation has been introduced and appears as H. R. 4271.

The committee recommended that the preparation of individual lists of special-delivery items and the obtaining of individual signature on special-delivery mail be eliminated. This particular activity has now been eliminated and it is my understanding savings of approximately a million dollars annually have resulted.

The committee recommended that air-mail subsidy be separated from air-mail pay and that such subsidies as are required by our domestic air lines be obtained by regular appropriation. The Senate Committee on Appropriations commented favorably on our recommendations to the House and the Hoover Commission Report devotes a section to this problem, arriving at the same recommendation.

As a result of studies of the post-office motor-vehicle problem, it was developed that much of the difficult in obtaining vehicles in the sellers market then existing, was lack of standard specifications meeting the specifications of commercial trucks. The Bureau of Federal Supply has reported to the committee following our recommendation, that they are working with the Post Office Department, having as an objective, the development of specifications which would meet the needs of the postal service and, at the same time, be more in line with standard commercial models.

During the last Congress the Post Office and Civil Service Committee made several surveys and studies of the Federal Civil Service. It was pointed out that the failure of the executive branch to take action with respect to the 500,000 war-service employees on the Federal pay roll in January 1948, would cause administrative difficulties in the future. This is borne out by conditions today and the fact that thousands of Federal employees with long years of service are being replaced in reductions in force.

Also, the committee made recommendation with respect to the Federal efficiency-rating system which, I am gratified to say, were put into effect. These changes, which were made by the Civil Service Commission, have contributed to a more realistic and equitable efficiency-rating system in the Government.

The committee made three studies of the organization and functions and relative costs of the personnel offices in the Federal Government. It was pointed out that annual savings of $25,000,000 could be made by a more efficient operation in the conduct of personnel management in the Government. The task force of the Hoover Commission study on Federal personnel management used the information in these reports, and several of the recommendations made by the Commission were based upon studies made by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the last Congress.

These studies which were made are only the beginning of a wider and broader study which should be made of the Federal service. I expect that the approval of the resolution under consideration will provide authority for our committee to go further into this field.

As a result of these studies, I should like to recommend to the Members of the House, a reading of the reports which were issued during the Eightieth Congress by our committee, covering these problems. The savings resulting from these studies, as I have pointed out, were many times the actual amount of money spent by the committee and, I am sure that you will receive the same benefits from our activities under the resolution you have before you.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1411. An act to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4152. An act to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bittter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and the Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

574. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the west unit of The Dalles project, Oregon (H. Doc. No. 169); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

575. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

576. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Secretary of the Air Force recommending the enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for interservice transfer of commissioned personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

577. A letter from the acting assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

578. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Acting Secretary of the Navy recommending the enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 312 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for the retention of certain officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

579. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

580. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734, 7 U. S. C. 429)", to the Committee on Agriculture.

581. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter from the city of Portland, Oreg., requesting the transfer of five landing craft for use by the harbor patrol, bureau of police, department of public safety; to the Committee on Armed Services.

582. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the nineteenth Quarterly Report on Contract Settlement, covering the period January 1 through March 31, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4106. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4461. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4462. A bill to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. R. 4463. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the city of Fort Branch, Ind.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4464. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Fort Branch, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4465. A bill to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons, and others; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4466. A bill removing certain restrictions imposed by section 2 of the act of March 8, 1888, on certain lands conveyed by such act to the trustees of Porter Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4467. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize regular appropriations for the construction of rural local roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 4468. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor of the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 4469: A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withhold certain wildlife-restoration project payments in the case of any State which unreasonably discriminates against nonresident hunters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4470. A bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4471. A bill to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 4472. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 4473. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the determination of the amount of loans and grants made for single projects serving two or more municipalities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4474. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withhold certain wildlife-restoration project payments in the case of any State which unreasonably discriminates against nonresident hunters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4475. A bill to increase the benefits granted certain World War I veterans with service-connected disability ratings; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4476. A bill to provide for a commission to determine the need for coordinated regional planning and action in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia with respect to tax legislation and other matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4477. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the determination of the amount of loans and grants made for single projects serving two or more municipalities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4478. A bill for the relief of Henry Bluestone; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 4479. A bill for the relief of Stephen A. Spilios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4480. A bill for the relief of Joseph Barraja-Frauenfelder, William Chamberlain Magee, John Henry Thomas, and Phillip P. Krug, United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

731. By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, opposing legislation designed to establish a single Federal Reserve force and urging that the National Guard as it is now organized be retained intact, thus reserving to the States the controls provided by the Constitution and insuring that the National Guard will be at the disposal of the States in time of peace; to the Committee on Armed Services.

732. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of Maine (the Senate concurring), requesting the Members of the Maine delegation in Congress to give their active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, and to give active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. By Mr. HART: Petition of the city of Newark, urging that Italy be awarded trusteeship of her former colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

734. Also, petition of the Independent Municipal League of Hoboken, Inc., of Hoboken, N. J., urging that Italy's colonies be returned to her in order to strengthen the western bloc of free democratic states of Europe against communistic infiltration, progress, and advancement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

735. Also, petition of the city of Newark, urging Congress to adopt a civil-rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

736. Also, memorial of the State of New Jersey, memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for the return of unemployment compensation funds to New Jersey and other States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

737. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of M. K. Allred, druggist, and other citizens of Corydon, Iowa, urging repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on all toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

738. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution unanimously adopted by the St. Johnsbury Lodge, No. 1343, BPOE, St. Johnsbury, Vt., opposing any material change in the postal rates on the Elks magazine, such as incorporated in H. R. 2945 and S. 1103; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

739. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Agnes G. Shankle, General Welfare Federation of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to five petitions endorsing the bill H. R. 2620, on old-age pensions, submitted by the following persons: L. W. Lewis and 39 signatures, Buffalo, N. Y.; L. W. Lewis and 20 signatures, Buffalo, N. Y.; Alice Webster Snell and 21 signatures, Warsaw, N. Y.; Mrs. Hattie Harvey and 43 signatures, Norway, Maine; John Butler and 20 signatures, Utica, N. Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

740. Also, petition of Crawford Thornton and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

741. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary Schnell and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

742. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

743. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Kellog and others, Hypoluxo, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

744. Also, petition of Mrs. Flora Seale and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

745. Also, petition of Manuel Gonzalez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

746. Also, petition of Victor Menendez and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

747. Also, petition of Mrs. Myrtle Wells and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 1235 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

748. Also, petition of W. E. Cook and others, Orlovista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

749. Also, petition of Mrs. Herbert Swezey and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

750. Also, petition of Mrs. W. E. Cook and others, Orlovista, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, bowing reverently in this hushed moment before Thee, from whom no secrets are hid, we would discard every mask and disguise of pretense which, alas, too often we wear before the face of man.

Deliver us, we pray Thee, from political policies which are symptoms of spiritual disease. Upon all who here labor with true purpose of heart for the purification of public life, for the removal of all that betrays and denies democracy, for the spread of the gospel of good will, let Thy benediction rest. Bring us to a golden tomorrow for all Thy children, when the shared plenty of the good earth shall wash the slums of the world into vague, unhappy memories.

Hear our prayer as we tread softly the altar stairs of our common humanity. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 2, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 227. An act for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.;

S. 635. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 850. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 75. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, so as to permit the transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., in foreign vessels;

H. R. 91. An act to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department;

H. R. 225. An act to repeal section 460 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1336), as amended, providing for certain license taxes in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 691. An act for the belief of Lawrence Fontenot;

H. R. 716. An act for the relief of Mark H. Potter;

H. R. 717. An act for the relief of Groover O'Connell;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Louis Esposito;

H. R. 781. An act to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 848. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 997. An act to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55;

H. R. 1025. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 1056. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay;

H. R. 1121. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman;

H. R. 1123. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield;

H. R. 1125. An act for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of June C. Dollar;

H. R. 1158. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Marfa, Tex., of certain lands formerly owned by that city;

H. R. 1295. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter;

H. R. 1338. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement;

H. R. 1360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.;

H. R. 1407. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of the Olympic Hotel;

H. R. 1592. An act for the relief of Howard R. Amendsen;

H. R. 1753. An act to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah;

H. R. 1754. An act extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock m. July 1, 1949;

H. R. 1837. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1858. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Waipa Wilson;

H. R. 1892. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to certain Indian lands in Lake County, Mont.;

H. R. 1920. An act to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands;

H. R. 1981. An act for the relief of V. O. McMillan and the legal guardian of Carolyn McMillan;

H. R. 2104. An act relating to orders to banks doing business in the District of Columbia to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in, or payable at, such banks;

H. R. 2282. An act to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2369. An act to authorize an appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections;

H. R. 2514. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2566. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

H. R. 2662. An act to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial;

H. R. 2702. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond;

H. R. 2753. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries;

H. R. 2799. An act to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906;

H. R. 2876. An act to effect an exchange of certain lands in the State of North Carolina between the United States and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2906. An act to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm-labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers;

H. R. 2914. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2931. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Frank C. Wilson of certain lands formerly owned by him;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett;

H. R. 3181. An act to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3198. An act to amend the act of June 18, 1929;

H. R. 3341. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Fifty-ninth Annual Reunion of Confederate Veterans to be held in Little Rock, Ark., September 27 through September 29, 1949;

H. R. 3436. An act to amend section 3 of the Lucas Act with respect to redefinition of request for relief;

H. R. 3440. An act for the addition of certain lands to Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3458. An act for the relief of Celeste Iris Maeda;

H. R. 3467. An act for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub;

H. R. 3532. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian;

H. R. 3717. An act to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to the Swan Island Animal Quarantine Station;

H. R. 3754. An act providing for the temporary deferment in certain unavoidable contingencies of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States;

H. R. 3812. An act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts;

H. R. 3966. An act for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City;

H. R. 3967. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950;

H. R. 3992. An act for the relief of J. L. Hitt;

H. R. 4026. An act relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within the authorized boundaries of Acadia National Park, in the State of Maine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4081. An act to amend section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to permit the delivery of excess peanuts to agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and to define the term "cooperator" with respect to price supports for peanuts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4138. An act for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter; and

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1401), relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich., and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Mundt
Baldwin	Humphrey	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Chavez	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ecton	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Lodge	Sparkman
Flanders	Long	Taylor
Frear	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Thye
Gillette	McGrath	Tydings
Green	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	Young
Hoey	Morse	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which is holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and insert matters in the RECORD, without speeches and without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGE OF DATE OF MARINE CORPS MANEUVERS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Marine Corps maneuvers, which were scheduled to be held at Quantico today, have been postponed until Monday, May 9. All Members of the Senate and their wives are invited to attend. Busses for the trip to Quantico and return will be provided.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. DOC. NO. 63)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $114,500, Department of Justice, fiscal year 1950, in the form of an amendment to

the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation, amounting to $15,075,000, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN TRANSATLANTIC CO.

A letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 265, of May 22, 1930, a certified copy of the findings of fact, conclusion of law, and opinion in the case of *American Transatlantic Company* v. *The United States* (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BOTTLENECK OPPOSITE CHESTER, ILL.—RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, requesting the Army engineers to remove the bottleneck on the Mississippi River opposite Chester, Ill., and to provide at least 5,000 feet of clearance between shores in the rebuilding of the new levee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 55

Whereas a levee on the Missouri shore of the Mississippi River opposite Chester, Randolph County, Ill., reduces the channel of the river at high water to less than 2,500 feet, thus forming a bottleneck which slows the flow of the water and, during flood stage, causes the river to overflow valuable farm lands and even towns situated upstream from the bottleneck; and

Whereas the Federal Government has authorized the construction of a new levee to be built on the exact site of the old one, thus continuing the bottleneck and endangering lives and property farther up the river: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois: That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to request the United States Corps of Army Engineers, St. Louis district, to remove the bottleneck on the Mississippi River opposite Chester, Ill., and to suspend operations under the present contract for work on the levee and that, if work is resumed, that the new levee be built in such a manner that there will be at least 5,000 feet of clearance between the Illinois and Missouri shores; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen form the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, April 20, 1949.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

THE WHEAT PROBLEM IN KANSAS—RESOLUTION OF GRAIN-STORAGE CONFERENCE AT HUTCHINSON, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at a grain-storage conference held in Hutchinson, Kans., Thursday, April 21, 1949, relating to the wheat problem in Kansas.

This conference was called by the Honorable Frank Carlson, Governor of the State of Kansas.

One hundred and thirty-five representatives of the grain trade, transportation agencies, farm organizations, and Federal agencies attended.

The resolution that I have asked to have printed in the RECORD was adopted after a general discussion of the problem facing the people of Kansas. I have been advised that if the present prospects carry through for this year's harvest, there will be serious difficulties in Kansas with the movement of the new crop.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT A CONFERENCE CALLED BY GOVERNOR CARLSON AND HELD IN HUTCHINSON, KANS., ON APRIL 21, 1949

It appearing that a serious emergency threatens the welfare of the wheat farmers, and, therefore, the people generally of the State of Kansas in connection with the movement of the new wheat crop, a conference was called by the Honorable Frank Carlson, Governor of Kansas, of persons qualified by experience and interest to consult together and advise him concerning actions which might be taken to prevent or mitigate the effects of such emergency. Pursuant to such call parties whose names appear below met in Hutchinson, Kans., in conference on April 21, 1949, the Governor presiding, and after a full discussion of the matter, all interests being heard, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas there appears in prospect a very large crop of winter wheat to be harvested in the State of Kansas in June and July; and

"Whereas by reason of the combine method of harvesting there is certain to be a very large immediate movement of wheat off the farms, either for sale or for storage subject to Government loans; and

"Whereas the largest depositories for such wheat are the terminal elevators located in the grain markets in the State of Kansas and on the Missouri River; and

"Whereas the elevators in such markets are at this time approximately three-fourths filled, with approximately 90 percent of the stocks under storage under Government loans; and

"Whereas Commodity Credit Corporation, an agency of the United States Government will, on May 1, 1949, become the owner of such stocks; and

"Whereas said corporation has announced that it has no plans for removing such stocks from said elevators, but on the other hand expects such stocks to remain there indefinitely, and moreover plans to augment such stocks with additional grain, thereby effectually blocking the practical operation of such terminal elevators and making it impossible for them to receive wheat from the new crop; and

"Whereas it appears to these parties that vacant elevator facilities to the extent of 105,000,000 bushels now exist at points east of the Mississippi River; and

"Whereas such space has been used by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the recent past for the relief of congested storage conditions in the Southwest: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That these parties request the Honorable Frank Carlson to make a demand upon Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture, and others, to prevent the emergency which can now be foreseen by undertaking the prompt removal into these other sections of the country of all stocks of wheat in the terminal elevators referred to owned by said corporation, or to be owned by them, from and after May 1, 1949; further

"*Resolved,* That these parties declare that if said stocks are not so removed and if by reason thereof the large market centers and the facilities therein are prevented from receiving wheat freely, with railroad embargoes resulting, that responsibility for such congestion is squarely that of Commodity Credit Corporation; and further

"*Resolved,* That if said corporation shall refuse and fail to remove such stocks as herein requested and the farmers of the State of Kansas are thereby prevented from accepting the loan now authorized by Federal act, any resulting deterioration of quality or failure to obtain a price equal to the amount of the loan will be chargeable directly to the refusal of Commodity Credit Corporation to clear out its stocks as suggested."

There were present a number of Federal and State government officers and other representatives.

SALE OF CERTAIN RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS—ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS REPORTED

Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported additional amendments to the bill (H. R. 2440) to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising, which were ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1756. A bill to provide for lump-sum payments to certain reserve officers assigned to duty as naval air navigators or naval air observers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1757. A bill to authorize the refunding of certain taxes paid by the Riverside Golf and Country Club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1758. A bill for the relief of Parish Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REGULATION OF OLEOMARGARINE—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a comprehensive amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes

relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes. The purpose of the amendment is to kill wartime rates on a vast number of excise taxes. The people of the United States are overwhelmingly for repeal of the nuisance excise taxes. Consumer groups, businessmen, unions, women's organizations, have written to me in the hundreds endorsing my effort for getting rid of the excises on drug items, leather goods, photographic apparatus and a myriad of other products now plagued by the wartime excises.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared to be printed in the RECORD, and as an indication of the grass roots thinking on this subject, I also request that there be printed in the RECORD, following my statement, excerpts from opinions expressed by a large segment of the people of the country in relation to nuisance taxes. I have set this up in detail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the statement and excerpts presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement and excerpts are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON SUBMISSION OF COMPREHENSIVE AMENDMENT TO OLEO BILL FOR EXCISE TAX REDUCTION

I am submitting a comprehensive amendment to the pending oleo tax repeal bill, H. R. 2023. The purpose of this amendment is to kill the wartime rates on a vast number of excise taxes now plaguing our people. It is, I believe, the most comprehensive excise tax repeal amendment offered in either House since the close of World War II.

At present, certain administration leaders seem to want to rush the Nation pell-mell into repeal of oleo taxes which they claim are inflicting a burden on housewives and others. I, for one, have no quarrel with the idea of repeal of the oleo taxes so long as our amendment is adopted so that States' rights are preserved and yellow-colored oleo is not shipped in interstate commerce, but is manufactured only within the borders of those States allowing manufacture.

I do want, however, to present the issue directly to those oleo tax repeal advocates and ask them if they are so concerned with repeal of oleo excises, why are they not equally concerned with repeal of hundreds of other excises which cause far more of a financial burden on consumers than the mere $16,000,000 of Federal taxes collected by the present oleo levies.

RELATION TO S. 1029 AND JOHNSON AMENDMENT

I had previously introduced Senate bill 1029. The purpose of that bill was to cut excises on furs, jewelry, cosmetics, baby lotions, drugs, leather goods, camera equipment, admission fees, tickets, etc. Senator JOHNSON of Colorado introduced a similar amendment to H. R. 2023. Unfortunately, Senator JOHNSON's amendment was defeated in a 7–6 vote in the Senate Finance Committee. Now, however, I believe that both of our measures should be expanded upon and should be made to cover a considerable number of excise taxes not heretofore included.

NATURE OF ITEMS ON WHICH TAX IS TO BE REMOVED

Among those excise taxes which I propose to cut back to peacetime levels (or eliminate completely if they did not exist in peacetime) are the following:

Taxes on gasoline and lubricating oils, on musical instruments, cooking appliances, sporting goods, insurance policies, safe deposit boxes, religious entertainment, trucks, busses, autos, radios, refrigerators, air-conditioners, tires, tubes, electrical energy, agricultural fairs, etc.

What man can say that the tax on so vital an item as a cooking stove is any less burdensome than for example, the tax on oleo? If a housewife is bothered by having to pay oleo taxes, she is far more bothered by having to pay a tax on her lipstick, her handbags, on lotions for her infants, so on.

TOO MANY CROCODILE TEARS BEING SHED

It is time for those who have been shedding crocodile tears for the housewife to indicate whether or not they are willing to fight all the way down the line for her and for other segments of our population burdened by taxes.

I, personally, feel that it will be completely inconsistent for any Senator to vote for oleo tax repeal, unless he is willing to repeal or cut back the tax rates on a vast number of other items now covered by nuisance excises.

I should like to make the following points regarding my amendment:

EXCISE TAX REPEAL CAN STAND ON ITS OWN MERITS

1. It is not just designed to embarrass my southern friends who are advocates of oleo tax repeal. To be sure, they may find that, as I have said, it is rather inconsistent for them to be urging the elimination of one type of nuisance taxes on oleo, and, at the same time, to be rejecting the idea of eliminating other nuisance taxes. However, completely aside from the oleo question, it is quite clear that the idea of excise tax repeal can stand on its own merits.

As I stated on February 21 when I introduced S. 1029, we made a solemn promise with the American people that when the war would be over, we would repeal wartime taxes. In addition, I pointed out that many of the taxes had been set up in wartime only to meet the then existing shortages, for example, the shortage of gas and oil, the shortage of metal, etc. Now these shortages are by and large over, and there is no reason why we should saddle these various industries with a continuing burden. Many of these industries are experiencing tough times. The cooking appliance industry, for example, has suffered a sharp drop in production and employment. Why should we continue to classify cooking stoves as luxuries requiring heavy taxation?

CUT FEDERAL EXPENSES SO TAXES WON'T BE NECESSARY

2. I am trying to get at the earliest possible moment an authoritative financial estimate of the total cost of this excise tax amendment that I am introducing. I recognize, of course, that our Federal Government has staggering financial responsibilities. We simply cannot be abolishing all taxes without giving a thought to the need of the Government for tax revenue. I, for one, despise and have always fought the idea of deficit financing. The obvious answer, however, is not to maintain burdensome taxes, but to cut Federal spending. Let me point out that the administration which is so eager to impose a 5 or 10 billion a year socialized medicine bill on the Nation screams with phony horror if we propose to cut a few billions in taxes. In other words, if the administration were so eager to keep the budget in balance why does it ask the Congress to impose more billions upon billions in taxes in entering into new fields of competition with private enterprise?

WE MUST STRAIGHTEN OUT CRAZY QUILT OF ARBITRARY TAXES

3. Anyone looking at the excise tax situation recognizes that it is a patchwork quilt which seems to lack rhyme or reason. Why should one item be taxed at 20 percent of value, another item at 10 percent, another at 15 percent or 5 percent? If you analyze the items, you can note that the taxes have been imposed almost completely arbitrarily. Many items in a given field are taxed while items in the same field are untaxed. The answer, therefore, as I see it, is a complete wiping out of existing excise taxes and then a reappraisal of the situation. We should wipe the slate clean, in other words, and then, if necessary, if we do require tax revenue, we should reinstate those taxes which may be imperatively necessary. Such a reinstatement should be on a sound, reasonable basis, rather than the arbitrary patchwork basis that our wartime excise tax structure is.

It is quite obvious, however, that unless we first wipe the slate clean, we will continue to add more patches to the patchwork quilt. We will deduct one type of tax here or cut another type of tax there in a completely isolated approach to the over-all tax picture.

EXCISE TAXES MEAN HIGH PRICES AND RECESSION

4. The administration is calling for $4,000,000,000 in additional income taxes. In addition, it wants to saddle the country with a tax on employers and employees for socialized medicine. This is the same administration which is moaning about high prices and about the danger of inflation and about the present recession. Does it not recognize that present excise taxes constitute an integral part of high prices? Does it not recognize that many consumers are completely priced out of the market, because excise taxes comprise so large a fraction of the cost of particular items?

IT IS HARD TO SAY WHICH EXCISE TAX IS WORSE THAN ANOTHER

Already in this Congress hundreds of individual excise tax repeal or reduction bills have been introduced. Who is to say that one particular bill is more meritorious than the other? That, for example, the admission tax should be killed on county fairs, but not on municipally sponsored shows or on religious shows or on some other type of charitable entertainment. I, for one, would not attempt to pass final judgment as to the merits of one isolated bill against the merits of a different bill or a different tax. What I say, therefore, is wipe out virtually all of the taxes (except taxes on liquor, tobacco, and related items) and starting with a clean slate, reevaluate the situation.

WE CAN'T JUST WAIT FOR ANOTHER STUDY

Some opponents of this idea may say, let's not wipe out the taxes first and then study the picture, let's study the picture first and then wipe out the taxes. I say that is just another strategy of stalling. I say that if we allow the administration to use that tactic, it will "study the picture" indefinitely. The administration always seems to want to set up some new type of agency, or bureau, or joint committee, which will study this or study that for the purpose of stalling. If, however, we cut taxes now, then in a relatively short time, I am sure, the administration will speedily get around toward making suggestions which we may then evaluate.

It is only fair, therefore, that the excise tax amendment which I am proposing be added to the oleo bill.

CONCLUSION

But I repeat in conclusion that the idea of excise tax repeal can stand on its own merits because our people are sick and tired of this arbitrary nuisance burden which has weighed so heavily upon them for so long and which we gave our solemn promise to lift.

EXCERPTS FROM OPINIONS

The president of a leather goods company in Milwaukee writes:

"I want to express my extreme gratitude in appreciation of the very justified stand you have taken against this unfair excise tax bill. Be rest assured that you have my fullest cooperation as well as that of my associates, and we should be at your service if we can help in this matter at all times. I would certainly appreciate a copy of your tax bill and whatever other matter you might feel is important for me to check into."

The recording secretary of an A. F. of L. union in West Bend, Wis., writes:

"I want to personally thank you for your effort to put bill you have before the United States Senate for the repeal of the tax on personal leather goods. You are on the right track for our jobs in the leather factory that I am an employee of will benefit greatly by that bill. I consider a billfold not a 'luxury' item and cannot and have not ever seen why they were taxed. The repeal of the tax I'm sure will mean a greater sale in billfolds and that is what we all want in this country—our products to be sold. That way there will be work for us and other people like ourselves connected with the leather industry and industry on a whole. I would appreciate it very much if you could send me a copy of your bill."

The president of a department store in Green Bay states:

"We wanted to advise you that we are very grateful for the interest you are taking in bringing to the attention of the legislative bodies the fact that these emergency wartime taxes on necessities still exist. It has been a matter of somewhat of amazement to us that a tax remains on these items when it is common knowledge to every retailer that sales on these items have continued to drop off because people cannot see the necessity of such tax. * * * We appreciate your fine work and assure you that this particular bill of yours is certainly one that warrants every retailer's backing."

The owner of a gift shop in Lake Geneva comments:

"We heartily approve of the repealing of the wartime excise tax and hope that your bill 1029 will be passed. As you state, the items taxed are not luxuries, particularly in the leather-goods line. From a business standpoint, we are very anxious to have it removed on leather goods and it has been a hardship to sell these items with the added tax which to begin with was and is too high. We will be glad to talk it to friends and business associates."

A druggist in Osseo writes:

"I received your letter regarding your bill, S. 1029. I presented the bill to the Osseo Commercial Club at their monthly meeting. The members are 100 percent for you and the bill. I am writing our Congressmen requesting their support of your bill."

A photographer in Port Washington seconds the motion:

"Your efforts in behalf of the removal of the excise tax meet my approval—let's keep our promise to remove it as a wartime tax measure."

The merchandise manager of a department store in Beloit writes:

"We are entirely in accord with the contents of your Senate bill, S. 1029, and trust you will be successful in getting it passed. May we congratulate you on your sincere interest regarding this important phase of our economic structure.

"There is no doubt in our minds but what retail business would be definitely stimulated by the elimination of wartime luxury taxes. In our estimation they are outmoded, and have no place in our current economic picture.

"Retailing, which is very important in our American way of living, is hampered to a large degree by the continuation of these wartime taxes. We feel reasonably sure Federal expenditure could be adjusted to the extent that our Government could operate on the black side of the ledger without many of the wartime luxury taxes, which are still in effect.

"We say without fear of contradiction, you have the whole-hearted support of every retailer in the Nation."

The manager of an athletic club in Milwaukee writes:

"I was very glad to receive the contemplated bill which you are about to introduce in the United States Senate. There is no doubt in my mind that you are on the right track.

"A promise made is a debt unpaid. Of course, you realize that many of the promises made by the legislative branch of our Government fail in fulfillment.

"Reading over your contemplated bill leaves no doubt in the mind of an interested observer that the power to tax carries with it the power to destroy.

"The electorate of our State has the right to look forward to a tax reduction, and in talking to several members they have expressed appreciation of the vigorous effort you are making to carry out this promise to the voters.

"We all are looking forward to the success that you will have in the chilly quarters of the Senate."

A pharmacist in Racine endorses the idea:

"It is with great satisfaction that we note your efforts to repeal the so-called luxury taxes. We have to swallow hard when we charge a tax on baby necessities; this is indeed unfair and unnecessary. It has been our contention that the tax should have been levied at the source and not depend upon pharmacists to collect such a tax, as it presents an opportunity to some retailers to take advantage and fail to report such collections. As these taxes were a war measure and justified then, it is high time repeal is in order if we can believe the war is at an end."

The vice president of a luggage concern in Oshkosh approves:

"Please accept our sincere gratitude to you for having introduced your bill, S. 1029, to repeal the excise tax on luggage and leather goods, effective after June 30, 1949.

"The fact that you have had the vision to introduce this bill indicates that you investigated the unjust and inequitable tax on our products, which are by no means luxury items, whereas hundreds of other strictly luxury items are not being taxed. Therefore, it makes it unnecessary for me to go into any detail."

A druggist in Centuria writes:

"I am for your Senate bill 1029, 100 percent. I wish every Senator would be for this bill. My business on jewelry and cosmetics has been cut at least 50 percent due to the fact that people will not pay this tax when they buy the merchandise. Mothers will not buy baby lotion on account of the tax, and baby lotions are essential to every baby. I never heard of a baby being a luxury."

A theater owner in Manitowoc writes:

"Thank you for your statement on the tax bill you proposed, re cutting back wartime excise-tax rates to peacetime levels. I am very much interested. It is a hardship on small businesses like ours. Anything you are doing for us in this matter is greatly appreciated, and will be kindly remembered."

The owner of a gift shop in Brodhead writes:

"I am back of you 100 percent on your bill to remove the burdensome and ruthless excise taxes. They are a headache, especially to a small shop such as mine.

"There is a very definite sales resistance to the tax, so much red tape that I am closing out every item that requires the tax. It's a shame, too, for there are many items that belong in a gift shop, but it's a headache to keep the minute and accurate records we are forced to keep, file away for 4 years in case the Government snoopers decide to investigate, one of the many soft jobs our present Government is loaded with. Go to it for all you are worth to have this tax removed. You will have my wholehearted support."

The secretary of a musicians' association local in Oshkosh comments:

"We are very happy to receive your letter of February 25 telling us of your efforts to remove wartime excise taxes. They have cost the professional entertainer a great hardship. We will be looking forward to the repeal of these taxes or a substantial reduction. Thank you."

The vice president of a leather goods firm in Madison contributes these thoughts:

"When you state that the present excise taxes are a pain in the neck, you are putting it both mildly and gentlemanly. So serious do we in the luggage and personal leather goods business, feel this situation is, that we have come to believe that the success or failure of our very businesses may depend on the success or failure of the manner in which our representatives in Washington handle this program."

The personnel director of a department store in Beloit adds these words of commendation:

"May I congratulate you on Senate bill 1029 and your efforts to eliminate wartime luxury taxes which are such a burden on the buying public. We feel this would definitely stimulate business. Besides, our Government promised removal of these taxes upon the end of the war—a promise should be kept. Be assured that management and our 150 employees are in sympathy with you and your efforts to cut down Federal expenditures so as to make it possible to eliminate these taxes and still have the Government operate in the black."

A pharmacist in Prairie du Chien writes:

"I am happy to know that you are back of the bill to cut excise taxes. As a businessman, in all times of declining business I have always had to cut expenses and do without luxuries. We all realize that our Federal Government for good reasons and bad has managed to acquire an enormous debt and we must pay it through taxation or face chaos as the only alternative. I firmly believe that the men most likely to succeed themselves in Congress will be the ones that can show their constituents at election time in the future where, during their tenure of office, they can show some concrete effort whereby they have effected a saving in the cost of government."

A worker in a leather-goods factory in West Bend states:

"You certainly deserve due congratulations for introducing the bill to repeal the 20-percent excise tax on personal leather goods. It hurts everyone here in town where there are two leather-goods factories. Personal leather goods certainly can't be considered a luxury. I hope you have a lot of luck in trying to repeal the 20-percent tax—something which is not fair."

A druggist in Neenah writes:

"I am certainly in favor of your bill to cut off the nuisance taxes. Half of the women who buy cosmetics, and nearly all of the mothers who buy baby goods storm at the tax. For years I have patiently told those women that they could have them removed if they appeared in force, as individuals, or through the national women's clubs, at the committee meetings where those bills are up for consideration. I tell them that in the past the only ones who appear are dealers like us and we are told that we are just selfish."

A jeweler in Waukesha adds these thoughts:

"We, of course, have considered the Federal excise taxes discriminatory, and thought it very unfair of Congress to extend the 20-percent rate beyond the expiration of 6 months after termination of hostilities. We looked upon it as Congress taking the course of least resistance.

"Many jewelry items are far from being luxuries—wedding rings are as essential as wedding gowns; watches, even above $65, are as essential as hand-painted ties, some of which sell for as much as $100; clocks are essential as fine pieces of decorative china. How can we explain the tax to our customers, how can you explain it to us, except by its easiness to collect? We hope you will do your part to remove these taxes which place one business in unjust and unfair competitive position."

These quotations can be added to indefinitely in the case of every single industry affected by excise taxes. I do believe, however, that the Congress must hear the voice of the people as expressed in these communications and must take action.

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NINETY-SECOND STREET YM-YWHA

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks made by the Vice President of the United States at the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Ninety-second Street YM-YWHA, together with an article by Jack Nadel, relating to the same subject, which appears in the Appendix.]

GLOBALISTS RUN UNITED STATES, SAYS SENATOR MALONE—ARTICLE BY WALTER TROHAN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Globalists Run United States, Says Senator MALONE," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the Chicago Tribune of April 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINESE RED "INVITATION"—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Chinese Red 'Invitation,'" published in the New York Times of May 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAUL ROBESON—STATEMENT BY DR. MARTIN D. JENKINS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, president of Morgan State College, respecting the views of Paul Robeson, as expressed at the Paris peace rally, published in the Baltimore Sun of May 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. PAUL JOURNAL

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Whither Are We Drifting?" by George L. Hodges, of the St. Paul Journal, of St. Paul, Kans., which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT BY WENATCHEE (WASH.) WORLD ON ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cornerstone of Our Standard of Living," published in the Wenatchee (Wash.) World for April 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARDS OF PULITZER PRIZES FOR JOURNALISM AND LETTERS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it is human nature to rejoice with our friends and associates when, for outstanding accomplishment, they receive the acclaim of their colleagues. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article appearing in today's Baltimore Sun, concerning the annual Pulitzer awards in journalism and letters, among which we note the names of members of the Senate press gallery.

The vast contribution made to the welfare of our Nation and of the world by competent reporting of the important news of the day is everywhere acknowledged by free men. Undoubtedly, the competence, honesty, and fairness with which the members of the fourth estate, not only in Washington but everywhere throughout the United States, are accustomed to record the happenings of national and world interest, have been a leading factor in the preservation and maintenance of American free institutions.

In asking that this article recording the awards made by the trustees of Columbia University be printed in the RECORD, I wish to voice my very sincere congratulations, both as a public official and as a former newspaperman, to the gentlemen thus honored. The course of events in eastern Europe, where one of the first requisites of keeping huge masses of people enslaved is that they be denied access to accurate news of what is happening in the world, impresses us most forcibly with the desirability of ever keeping our own press free. Such awards help to inspire newspapermen to the fullest exercise of the prerogatives of their profession. It is their due, as it is to our own good, that we give merited recognition to their achievements.

Among those honored are Price Day, of the Baltimore Sun, for his series of articles on the first year of India's independence; C. P. Trussell, of the New York Times, for consistent excellence in Washington correspondence, and Herbert Elliston, of the Washington Post, for distinguished editorial writing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE DAY, SUN REPORTER, WINS PULITZER PRIZE FOR INDIA ARTICLES—COLUMBIA TRUSTEES RECOGNIZE CORRESPONDENT'S WORK IN FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

NEW YORK, May 2.—Price Day, globe-girdling correspondent of the Baltimore Sun, was awarded the Pulitzer prize for distinguished reporting in the field of international affairs.

This selection by the trustees of Columbia University, who make the annual Pulitzer awards in journalism and letters, was based on a series of articles reporting the first year of India's independence, a series entitled "Experiment in Freedom."

FIVE-HUNDRED-DOLLAR AWARDS TO WINNERS

Winners of the Pulitzer awards to individuals for journalistic achievement get $500 awards under the will of the founder of the Columbia University School of Journalism.

Other winners in the several classes of competition were:

Disinterested and meritorious public service by a newspaper: The Nebraska State Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., for spotlighting issues early in the 1948 presidential campaign.

Local newspaper reporting: Malcolm Johnson, of the New York Sun, for a series of 24 articles concerning New York water-front crime.

TRUSSELL WINS AWARD

Consistent excellence in Washington correspondence: C. P. Trussell, of the New York Times. Mr. Trussell was formerly city editor of the Baltimore Sun and a member of its Washington bureau.

Distinguished editorial writing, in which the selection is based on clearness, style, sound reasoning, and influence on public opinion: John H. Crider, of the Boston Herald, and Herbert Elliston, of the Washington Post.

Cartoon: Lute Pease, of the Newark Evening News for a cartoon depicting the clash of John L. Lewis with Judge T. Alan Goldsborough. Mr. Pease, 89 years old, was described as the oldest winner in the 32-year history of the Pulitzer prize.

News photography: Nathaniel Fein, of the New York Herald Tribune, for Babe Ruth Bows Out, a photograph of the last appearance in the Yankee Stadium of the home-run slugger.

Arts and letters awards, announced simultaneously, were:

Novel of the year: James Gould Cozzens, for Guard of Honor.

Drama: Death of a Salesman, by Arthur Miller.

Musical composition: Virgil Thompson, for the music of Louisiana Story, a documentary film. The trustees said the award had never before gone to music written for a motion picture.

American biography: Robert Sherwood, for Roosevelt and Hopkins.

American history: Roy Franklin Nichols, for The Disruption of American Democracy, dealing with the political crisis preceding the Civil War.

Verse: Peter Viereck, for Terror and Decorum, the author's first collection of poetry.

Most promising and deserving art student designated by the National Academy of Design: Rudolph Franz Zallinger, of Hamden, Conn. The award is a $1,500 scholarship for study abroad.

NINTH PRIZE FOR THE SUN

Mr. Day's award was the ninth Pulitzer Prize for the Sun in 18 years. In addition, it was the third won by correspondents for that paper in the field of international affairs since that classification of competition was instituted 8 years ago.

Two years ago, the Sun won the medal for disinterested and meritorious public service by a newspaper for a series of articles by Howard Norton on abuses of the unemployment-compensation system in Maryland. Awards to individuals on the staff of the Sun have been:

Edmund Duffy, cartoons, 1931, 1934, 1940.

John W. Owens, editorials, 1937.

Dewey L. Fleming, national reporting, 1944.

Mark S. Watson, international reporting, 1945.

Paul W. Ward, international reporting, 1948.

The series by Mr. Day which won the Pulitzer accolade was published in the Sun from November 28 to December 9, last year. The articles subsequently were collected in book form.

SURVEY STARTED IN 1947

They represented part of a survey begun early in 1947 to examine and report on changes through which the British Commonwealth and Empire was passing after the war. Staff correspondents of the Sun went all over the world to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of that global association of nations and dependencies.

First published was a section by Mr. Day entitled "Crisis in South Africa." It was followed by "Retreat to the Desert," a study by Philip Potter of Britain's changed position

in the Mediterranean, East Africa, and the Middle East.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON SERIES

An announcement accompanying the publication of Mr. Day's Indian series said:

"News is not necessarily something that happened in the last 5 minutes, or today, or even yesterday.

"Sometimes it is a situation half-concealed beneath the surface of events—hinted at, perhaps, in day-to-day dispatches, but developing so slowly that its importance to the world cannot be clearly seen. Sometimes the significance of such a situation is not understood until after its accumulating consequences have made great and lasting changes in the lives of ordinary people—generations later, thousands of miles distant. Then it is no longer news. It has become history.

"The Sun believes it has a duty to report and to illuminate such situations while they are developing, even though they do not make dramatic headlines."

Mr. Day went to India when the Union Jack was being hauled down in August 1947, and the banner of India was being raised in its place. A year later he examined the changes independence had worked, and reported his findings in the series honored today.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today I made a statement before the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. My statement related to certain items covered by that bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, there are eight separate items in this bill to which I want to direct your attention. Generally speaking, the House has done a good job in recognizing, in a tangible way, the needs of agriculture in this country. I think, however, additional consideration must be given to the problems represented by the items I will mention.

INSECT INVESTIGATION—BEE CULTURE

The President estimated $2,993,000 was needed in fiscal 1950 to carry forward insect investigations. The House reduced the request by $118,600. I urge your committee to restore this cut—that you grant the Department the full budget estimate. In so doing, I request that at least $10,000 of his appropriation be set aside for laboratory work on bee culture in the Pacific Northwest. I urge further that the research work in connection with this item be conducted in cooperation with the Washington State College at Pullman.

As you know, many legumes and fruits are dependent for pollination upon bees and other insects. The intensified use of insecticides is having an adverse effect upon many insects formerly responsible for pollination. This is true also of bees. Beekeepers, as well as the fruit industry, are deeply concerned. Additional research in this field is badly needed.

At the present time the only work of this nature being done is centralized at Oregon State College, Corvallis, and the Department contributes $2,500 to the salary of one man who devotes part of his time to this work.

I reiterate, additional work is necessary. I hope the $118,600 cut by the House will be restored and that the Department will utilize at least $10,000 for research at Washington State College.

ORIENTAL FRUITFLY

Fruit growers throughout the country and in Hawaii are deeply concerned about control of the oriental fruitfly. This pest found its way into Hawaii during the war. Informed people assert it is the most destructive pest known. As yet, the pest has not made its appearance in the United States. Since it has already gained considerable headway in Hawaii and since there are innumerable opportunities in regular commerce between the Territory and the mainland for the oriental fruitfly to find its way into this country, extraordinary effort must be made to eradicate this threat to the fruit industry. The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine has allocated $50,000 to finance a program aimed at isolating the pest and another $50,000 for finding natural enemies of the fruitfly for introduction into Hawaii. Too, the Legislature of Hawaii has appropriated some funds to assist in control and eradication efforts.

Industry representatives and chambers of commerce on the west coast are urging that an appropriation of $2,000,000 be made available until expended by your committee to broaden the scope of the fight against the oriental fruitfly. I am not certain how much money the Bureau can use this year.

I hope you will explore the subject further with the Department representatives and will make adequate funds available. This is a serious problem and the time to catch it is now.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record copies of communications I have received from the State of Washington urging that funds be made available immediately for control of this pest.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tacoma, Wash., April 5, 1949.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: You may recall that last July the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce requested that you support an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture to assist the Territory of Hawaii in research toward the control of insect pests, some of which were introduced into the Territory during World War II. The Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu has again solicited our interest in this matter. In 1949 an appropriation of $50,000 was made by Congress and we have been informed that considerably greater funds are required for 1950.

As you are aware the trade between Hawaii and the Pacific Northwest is considerable. This trade has already been seriously affected by insect pests in Hawaii and we have been informed that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that such pests could be introduced into Oregon and Washington, and that they would be acclimated and thrive in our moist climate.

We, therefore, again urge your support of appropriations to carry on pest-control work in the Territory of Hawaii. For your guidance in this matter, we have requested the Chamber of Commerce in Honolulu to supply you with material concerning the control of fruitflies in Hawaii.

Cordially,

M. S. ERDAHL,
President.

YAKIMA, WASH., *April 23, 1949.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We understand Senate subcommittee is considering $2,000,000 appropriation for control of Mediterranean fruitfly now severely damaging Hawaiian pineapple industry. We are fearful this will be transmitted to Pacific Coast fruit areas through heavy commerce and travel existing. We believe eradication in present locale is warranted for future safety of Pacific Coast producing sections. Urge you lend support.

W. M. KOHAGEN,
Yakima County Horticultural Union.

YAKIMA, WASH., *April 22, 1949.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please encourage support for $2,000,000 appropriation to control Mediterranean fruitfly at present localized in Hawaiian Islands. We greatly fear introduction of this destructive insect into the United States. This matter is under consideration by Senate subcommittee today. Please contact Senator RUSSELL.

CHARLES F. MORRISON,
Chairman, Washington State Fruit Commission.

FOREST SERVICE

Management and protection of our national forests are highly important to the Nation as a whole and especially to the Western and Southern States. Timber is an indispensable resource. Mismanagement can easily result in further accelerated depletion. The Forest Service cannot do its job for the Nation unless the Congress provides adequate funds. A substantial portion of the funds appropriated for the Forest Service are in the nature of insurance and investments.

DEVELOPMENT OF ROADS AND TRAILS

I am particularly concerned over the appropriation for development of forest roads and trails. At the earliest possible date, our timber reserves and harvesting of them should be placed on sustained-yield basis. This can only be done if access to all our great bodies of timber is provided.

As this committee knows, there is a tendency to harvest timber on a fringe-cutting basis—in other words, operators cut in to a body of timber from the outside fringe. Roads are extended as cutting progresses. This means that timber most readily accessible is harvested first. Actually, what we should do is harvest first that timber which is ripe or overripe. To do this, access roads into all our timber are required.

The last 2 years, I and many other Senators have been urging the Congress to embark on a 5-year program, designed to open up on a planned basis all remaining timber reserves. So-called cutting circles and cutting rotation could then proceed on a scientific basis. The added revenue to the treasury, from stumpage over a 10-year period, would return the investment to the Federal Treasury and in addition we would have the main stem roads for perpetual use—merely having to provide maintenance funds.

This year the budget included $9,752,000 for forest development roads and trails. It is the same amount appropriated in 1949. Of this amount all but $1,602,000 will be needed for maintenance and allied activities. Only $1,602,000 will be available for construction of new roads. This amount is totally inadequate. At least $15,000,000 per year for the next 5 years should be made available.

Other Senators have appeared before you to argue the case for additional funds. I understand that present authorization is sufficient to permit an additional appropriation for this item of at least $10,000,000.

The Forest Service must have the tools with which to do its job in protecting and managing our great forest resources. We can assure that the agency has these tools only by giving it adequate funds.

I sincerely believe the investment of an additional $10,000,000 this coming year in

forest roads and trails will pay the Nation significant dividends over the years ahead.

NATIONAL FORESTS—PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT

I note, too, that the House cut by $1,500,000 the budget request for national forests protection and management activities. In so doing, the House committee devoted two pages of its report to a discussion of the need for devising measures to improve recreational facilities in our national forests and to insure against overgrazing and other practices detrimental to the forests themselves and to the watersheds they protect. There is much merit to argument the House presents; however, while the Congress and the Department are developing the type of program visualized, it is vital the Forest Service be given the funds to finance it under present methods of operation.

For timber sales, the budget called for an increase this year of some $322,000. The House committee, in cutting a million and one-half from the approximately $25,000,000 requested, states that the agency should spread this cut in such a way as to avoid injuring any particular program. Gentlemen, I do not believe a cut of this magnitude can be absorbed without injuries to some phase of the national forest protection and management activities. My personal view is that this cut should be restored.

FOREST-PEST CONTROL

This is a very important activity carried on by the Forest Service. As the committee knows, millions of feet of timber each year are destroyed by forest pests.

The President requested an appropriation of $1,000,000 to carry out the purposes of the Forest Pest Control Act. The House reduced this to $272,300, a reduction of $727,700. In taking this action the House committee states: "The control function has been appropriated for under 'Control of Emergency Outbreaks of Insects and Plant Diseases,' Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, so that the single appropriation under that head will constitute a reserve fund for meeting emergency outbreaks of insect or plant diseases, either in the forest or for other agricultural crops." From this language, one might conclude that an appropriation over the budget estimate had been allowed for control of emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases. The House, however, merely allows the budget estimates for the emergency item, $1,750,000. Anyway you look, therefore, at funds available for pest control, there is a reduction of $727,700 below the budget estimate.

The people directly affected by and interested in this matter urge that full amount of the budget estimate be restored and that work under the Forest Pest Control Act be kept separate from emergency control activities. The emergency control item and the people carrying out the work authorized by it, deal primarily with agricultural pests. The personnel engaged in forest pest control confront entirely different problems and deal with a distinctly separate clientele.

I believe, therefore, that combining these activities as suggested by the House will merely confuse the issue, will achieve no economies, and will actually result in some lost efficiency. I recommended that in addition to restoring the $727,700 reduction, your committee maintain the present separate status of these two activities.

FLOOD CONTROL

Another very vital program of the Forest Service has to do with flood control, particularly surveys of our watersheds. The Congress has adopted a farsighted policy on soil conservation generally. This year we will appropriate almost $300,000,000 for soil conservation and payments. This will encourage private land owners to adopt sound conservation practices aimed at getting the most out of our agricultural tillable lands and at the same time keep the soil in place.

I think we are inconsistent if we fail to adopt a similar program for our public lands. It is becoming increasingly apparent that protections of our watersheds is an indispensable part of flood control. We know that the 1948 Columbia River flood is assessable to the fact that snow in the mountains on the tributaries of that great river melted too fast. Burned-over, cut-over, and overgrazed lands provided no protection from the sun and no cover to hold the water in the ground.

I know you gentlemen recognize the fact and hope you will translate that recognition into an adequate appropriation.

There are two additional items in which people of the Pacific Northwest are vitally interested: first, the request of the national horticultural industry for a direct appropriation to section 32 funds of $50,000,000; and, second, appropriation for the Farmers Home Administration.

SECTION 32—$50,000,000

A few days ago I appeared before your committee with Mr. Frank Taylor, representing the Nation's citrus and deciduous fruit growers. He outlined the problems the industry confronts—problems stemming from the loss of export markets and classification under present status as so-called nonmandatory price-support commodities.

Most of you will recall the efforts of myself and many other Senators to obtain recognition and partial solution for the export phase of this problem when ECA legislation was before the Senate. I took the lead in pressing for adoption of an amendment that would have made additional funds available for section 32 for encouraging shipment of horticultural products to countries participating in the Marshall plan.

The Foreign Relations Committee rejected the amendment on the ground that this is primarily an agricultural problem and should be provided for in an agricultural bill. Senator Gordon will recall that when we appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session, all members expressed a deep interest in, and sympathy toward, the plight of this industry. I think I am justified in saying that the chief deterrent in the committee's view, was the fact that they were reluctant to run the risk of opening the door to a number of other commodities seeking special treatment and apprehensive of giving substance to the accusation that ECA is a program for handling our farm surpluses rather than a program for European recovery. I discussed our proposed amendment with many Senators who indicated they would support the proposal part of an agricultural bill, but felt they could not do so in ECA.

In view of the experience I have just encountered, I sincerely believe your committee will find very substantial support on the floor for the request Mr. Taylor has presented. I, therefore, urge you to approve the amendment he submitted on behalf of the Nation's horticulture industry.

That amendment reads as follows:

On page 49, line 15, amend the section to read as follows: "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, $50,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein made available shall be used to encourage the export or domestic consumption of any commodity which is the subject of support under sections 1 (a), 1 (b), and 1 (c) of title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948: *And provided further,* That not to exceed $500,000 of the appropriation made available by such section 32 shall be used to pay any subsidy, benefit, or indemnity to manufacturers of or dealers in insulation products."

Any perishables, including citrus and deciduous fruits, can look for no assistance in the coming year except through section 32 funds.

Prewar the horticulturist industry consciously developed foreign markets. We have already been told that over 28 percent of the Northwest apple crop and 44 percent of the winter pears found their way into support channels. At present-day prices, average exports of fruits and fruit products in the years 1934–39 averaged $177,000,000. The alternatives are either the industry must be given an opportunity to re-enter foreign markets or it must curtail production. Curtailing production means destroying orchards which cannot be replaced in less than 12 to 15 years.

The assistance requested is small in relation to the sums we are spending in support of other commodities. Assistance given now may well obviate the necessity of expending far greater sums in the years ahead.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The House committee included in this bill the following authorizations for Farmers Home Administration:

Farm-tenant loans	$15,000,000
Production and subsistence loans	85,000,000
Water-facilities loans	3,000,000

For production and subsitence loans this is $10,000,000 above the budget estimate, and for water-facilities loans, $1,490,000 above the estimate and above the amount available for 1949.

This year approximately 8,800 acres in the Columbia Basin, on what is known as the Pasco pumping unit, will be placed under water. Some 85 veterans and their families are settled on this land. In the years ahead additional acreage in this and other great western projects will be placed under water. Many of these new settlers will need access to an adequate line of credit.

Farmers Home Administration seems the appropriate agency to lend assistance, both financial and in the form of technical advice. As I see it, there is no point in starting these young people out on a farm career unless we give them a reasonable chance to succeed. Many farmers and many small businessmen fail because they are denied access to that small additional financial increment, which, added to their own resources, would have insured success.

A successful farmer is a better citizen. A relatively small investment in these new settlers, therefore, pays off in at least three ways—we help build a self-respecting American citizen with pride in his achievement, the loan is repaid with interest, and the additional wealth created brings proportionate revenue to the Federal Treasury through taxes.

I am informed by FHA that, by husbanding their funds carefully, they can handle most of the foreseeable problems in fiscal 1950, on the loan authorizations provided by the House for farm-tenant loans and production and subsistence loans. It is our considered judgment, however, that even the increased amount authorized by the House for water facilities loans will be too small to meet justifiable demands in the coming years.

Among applicants who will be unable to obtain credit for water facilities loans are many veterans who are settling on public land which have been opened recently and additional numbers who will settle on such lands in the next few years as they are opened by the Reclamation Service. Other applicants in arid and semiarid areas who have sources of water available are unable to eliminate the hazards of dry farming by converting to irrigation farming because of their inability to obtain credit for facilities necessary to bring the water to the farmstead and

fields, on terms and conditions which would permit them to repay the loan from the increased proceeds of the farm. This fiscal year the Farmers Home Administration received more than enough applications from eligible applicants in the first 7 months of the year to exhaust all funds available. With the increased demand throughout the Western States, I want to urge you to make available the sum of $6,000,000 for water facilities loans for the fiscal year 1950 in order that a more reasonable portion of eligible applicants may receive the assistance they so urgently need and deserve.

In considering the question of funds for water facilities loans it is equally important that a consideration be given to providing sufficient funds for salaries and expenses to enable the loan funds to be administered efficiently and effectively. The water facilities program to date has been one of the real constructive forces in the strengthening of the farm and home operations of those who have received such loans. This has been true because of the technical services which have been rendered in connection with those loans. Unless adequate technical services are available to determine the physical and economic feasibility of such loans the Government's investment could well be lost and the borrowers saddled with a debt from which they would have derived no benefit.

With sufficient technical services in the field of engineering and farm planning, loans can be made which will increase the economic stability of the borrower, reduce health hazards, and return to the Government the full amount of the funds advanced. It is my considered recommendation that the funds for salaries and expenses for the Farmers Home Administration be increased by $300,000 in order to provide the necessary technical services to administer at a minimum cost the $6,000,000 loan program recommended herein. On the basis of the $3,000,000 approved by the House, it is urgent that an additional $150,000 for salaries and expenses can be made available if the Farmers Home Administration is to provide services which will insure the efficient installation of the facilities to be financed from such loans and the subsequent wise use of water on the land.

I would not feel justified in arguing so strongly for this increased loan authorization and increased appropriation for administrative expenses were it not for the fact that the repayment record on this type of loan has been so outstanding. That record shows repayment of 99.45, including interest.

It has often been said that it takes three generations of farmers to develop new land, but this need not be so with our present generation if we make available to them the credit and technical guidance they need to overcome handicaps which they cannot hope to overcome unaided.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar as indicated:

H. R. 75. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, so as to permit the transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., in foreign vessels; and

H. R. 781. An act to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 91. An act to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department;

H. R. 2662. An act to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial; and

H. R. 3198. An act to amend the act of June 18, 1929; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 225. An act to repeal section 460 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1336), as amended, providing for certain license taxes in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 1407. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 1754. An act extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949;

H. R. 1892. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to certain Indian lands in Lake County, Mont.;

H. R. 1920. An act to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands;

H. R. 2369. An act to authorize an appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections;

H. R. 2566. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

H. R. 2702. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie C. Drummond;

H. R. 2753. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries;

H. R. 2876. An act to effect an exchange of certain lands in the State of North Carolina between the United States and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2914. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2931. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Frank C. Wilson of certain lands formerly owned by him;

H. R. 3181. An act to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3440. An act for the addition of certain lands to Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3754. An act providing for the temporary deferment in certain unavoidable contingencies of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; and

H. R. 4026. An act relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within the authorized boundaries of Acadia National Park, in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 691. An act for the relief of Lawrence Fontenot;

H. R. 716. An act for the relief of Mark H. Potter;

H. R. 717. An act for the relief of Groover O'Connell;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of August Michela, a minor;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Louis Esposito;

H. R. 1025. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 1056. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay;

H. R. 1121. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman;

H. R. 1123. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield;

H. R. 1125. An act for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of June C. Dollar;

H. R. 1295. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano;

H. R. 1303. An act for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of the Olympic Hotel;

H. R. 1592. An act for the relief of Howard R. Amendsen;

H. R. 1837. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1858. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Waipa Wilson;

H. R. 1981. An act for the relief of V. O. McMillan and the legal guardian of Carolyn McMillan;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett;

H. R. 3436. An act to amend section 3 of the Lucas Act with respect to redefinition of request for relief;

H. R. 3458. An act for the relief of Celeste Iris Maeda;

H. R. 3467. An act for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub;

H. R. 3532. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian;

H. R. 3812. An act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts;

H. R. 3966. An act for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City;

H. R. 3992. An act for the relief of J. L. Hitt; and

H. R. 4138. An act for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 848. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2514. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2906. An act to provide a 1-year's extension of time for the disposition of farm-labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers;

H. R. 3717. An act to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to the Swan Island Animal Quarantine Station; and

H. R. 4081. A act to amend section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to permit the delivery of excess peanuts to agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and to define the term "cooperator" with respect to price supports for peanuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 1158. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Marfa, Tex., of certain lands formerly owned by that city; and

H. R. 1338. A act authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administraton of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 2104. An act relating to orders to banks doing business in the District of Columbia to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in, or payable at, such banks;

H. R. 2799. An act to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906;

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 3967. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2282. An act to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3341. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Fifty-ninth Annual Reunion of Confederate Veterans to be held in Little Rock, Ark., September 27 through September 29, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 997. An act to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, lettered "A."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss my amendment lettered "A," which proposes to amend section 7, subsection 1, paragraph f, by striking out all the words of that subsection and providing that a State must provide that its public schools will admit all qualified pupils without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin if that State is to receive funds appropriated under the act.

This amendment, in other words, does two things. On the negative side, it strikes out the existing provisions of the bill which in effect sanction segregation in the schools. On the positive side it requires, as a condition precedent to Federal aid, that there shall be no segregation.

This amendment is requested by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In a telegram sent to me by that association they state as follows:

> Entire history of education in Southern States shows racial segregation to be device for relegation Negroes to inferior citizenship status and made-to-order vehicle for deliberate and wrongful diversion of State and Federal education funds from Negro children to white pupils. Sound Federal legislation in field of education cannot compromise with situation. S. 246 without Lodge amendment puts Federal Government in position of countenancing present inequalities and discriminations because bill in present form gives express approval to "separate public schools" for minority races.

In the Boston Herald of Wednesday, April 27, a statement is made which I think is very pertinent to this subject. I quote briefly:

> One important purpose of the measure is to enable the poorer States to raise their educational standards. No one can object to that purpose. But should we, as one of the richer States, be obligated to underwrite the inefficiency of separate schools for whites and Negroes, even if we overlook the moral implications of the practice? Up here we are zealously working to establish district high schools for several towns so as to make the most of the available money. Should we subsidize precisely the opposite trend in the South?
>
> The bill is being sold to us on the assurance that Federal control will not go along with Federal money. Yet that Federal money is from States which will not wish to see their contributions to the poorer States flagrantly misused. Even in these days of free hand-outs, we have not quite yet reached the stage of wanting to see our cash diverted into what we think are dubious educational ends. The man who pays the piper will call the tune, no matter what the education bill says.

Let me say by way of explanation that I readily agree with those who contend that the national interest requires the existence of minimum educational opportunities for all American youth and that there is a need for Federal financial assistance to secure such an opportunity. I am, therefore, in favor of Federal aid to education if it is undertaken on a proper basis, and I intend to vote for this bill. Let me say also that I am not one who seeks to stir up needless controversy and dissension in the Senate. I believe there is enough inevitable controversy here without trying to add fuel to the flames, and I have been a Member long enough to know that the amendment which I propose is one which may provoke controversy.

Much as I believe in peace and harmony, however, I have not been able to avoid the conclusion that it would be very seriously wrong to have the Federal dollar used to perpetute or to sanction segregation in education. I am not now speaking about what the States do within their own borders with their own money. But the Federal dollar is a responsibility of a United States Senator. If we allow the Federal dollar to be used to enhance and perpetuate segregation in education, how can we refuse to see it used to perpetuate segregation in other fields? If we say that it is all right to have segregation in our elementary schools, how can we say that it is not all right to have segregation in schools that teach law, medicine, or engineering? If we pass this bill as it stands, are we not setting a precedent which will result in our using the Federal dollar to prevent qualified young colored people from becoming doctors, lawyers, or engineers on the same basis as young white people?

These are grave questions, Mr. President, and I say very earnestly that until these questions are satisfactorily answered there is no use in embarking on Federal aid to education. Federal aid to education must not mean Federal aid to segregation; and that is what will happen if we use the Federal dollar as this bill contemplates.

Let me say that the position which I take is one in which I am in agreement with some very distinguished persons. For example, on May 13, 1948, the Senate rejected House Joint Resolution 334, which sought to give approval of Congress to segregated regional college education. Today we are asked to recognize—and I quote from the bill—separate public schools for what the bill describes as minority races. To me it is profoundly shocking to see such a phrase as "minority races" incorporated in the Federal statute.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights by a majority vote recommended:

> We believe that Federal funds, supplied by taxpayers all over the Nation must not be used to support or perpetuate the pattern for segregation in education, public housing, public health services and facilities generally. * * * Segregation is wrong morally and practically and must not receive financial support by the whole people.

The President's Commission on Higher Education, in its report in December 1947, uttered this conclusion:

> Segregation lessens the quality of education for the whites as well. To maintain two school systems side by side—duplicating even inadequately the buildings, equipment, and teaching personnel—means that neither can be of the quality that would be possible if all the available resources were devoted to one system, especially not when the States least able financially to support an adequate education program for their youth are the very ones that are trying to carry a duplicate load.

Nevertheless, in the light of these pronouncements, we are preparing here to approve legislation which actually sanctions—if not actually encourages—segregation in schools. I submit that this is a most unseemly action for the Senate to take, and my amendment seeks to rectify this injustice.

There is no question about the commitments which the great political parties have undertaken on the philosophy which underlies the amendment which I offer. The Republican platform says:

> One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

That is a quotation from the Republican platform; and it seems to me it hits the nail squarely on the head so far as the issue now before us is concerned.

The Democratic platform says:

> The Democratic Party commits itself to continuing its efforts to eradicate all racial, religious, and economic discrimination.
>
> We again state our belief that racial and religious minorities must have the right to live, the right to work, the right to vote, the

full and equal protection of the laws, on a basis of equality with all citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution.

We highly commend President Harry S. Truman for his courageous stand on the issue of civil rights.

That is a quotation from the Democratic platform. We do not need to look for recent authorities to give us justification for what I propose. At the very beginning of the Constitution are words which state one of its purposes—the goal to establish justice. That was one of the mandates of the founding fathers when the Republic was first instituted. That mandate is imposed on every Member of this body. How can we say that we are going to establish justice, when we pass legislation which enhances segregation in education.

Then there is the Declaration of Independence. We go back to fundamentals in this question. The Declaration of Independence says—I hardly need repeat it—that "all men are created equal." If those words mean anything—and I think they mean a great deal—they mean that people should be treated with equality from the beginning of life.

Then there is our own sense of self-interest. If our sense of social justice is not enough, if our sense of the duty imposed upon us by the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and the platforms of our two great political parties is not enough to affect us, there is our own sense of self-interest, which must show that our treatment of the civil-rights issue in the United States is the chink in our armor which impairs our whole solidarity before the nations of the world. It is our Achilles heel in the struggle with world communism. Every Senator knows that what I say is the truth.

I realize that there are those who will say that the adoption of the antisegregation amendment would lead to a filibuster against the entire Federal-aid-to-education bill. To me, this is defeatism. I say: "Let the filibuster come—and let us break the filibuster once it has come." We have a new cloture rule on the rule book of the Senate, but I happen to believe that the new rule is defective. It is certain that we shall never get a better rule until it has been proved that the present rule will not work. This is as good a time as any to test it out and see whether we can obtain cloture under it and whether we have some device which enables the Senate to meet the issues of controversy and of moment that confront the country.

If there is one rule of conduct in which I implicitly believe, it is that which tells us not to take counsel of our fears. Mr. President, there is no use running away from this question. No matter how fast we may run, we still shall not be able to run fast enough to escape it. It is present everywhere, and all the time. Let us here and now decide to meet this issue. I pledge my best efforts to Senators on both sides of the aisle not only to sit day and night, if necessary, but also to meet with like-minded Senators, regardless of party, to see whether we can make some real progress.

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Pattern of Discrimination in Education," by Leslie S. Perry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Phi Delta Kappan for April 1949]

PATTERN OF DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION

(By Leslie S. Perry, administrative assistant, Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, member of the bars of the Supreme Court of the United States and the District of Columbia)

There is general agreement that the "fundamental human rights" which the United Nations are pledged to promote for all peoples "without distinction as to race" include education, employment, housing, and health.[1] The Negro in the United States is the victim of wide deprivation of each of these rights.

Those who would continue to exploit the Negro, politically and economically, have first tried to keep his mind in shackles. They have done so by denying him equal access to the educational facilities which this Nation has and makes available to all white citizens who choose to use them.

PRACTICES VARY

In 31 States of the United States the Negro has the same legal rights to public education as do other citizens. Here it is generally poverty and discrimination due to the personal bias of school officials and teachers that hinders Negro education. And in a few States there exists more or less voluntary segregation, as, for instance, in the southern parts of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, which border closely upon the South. The situation in such parts of these States resembles that which obtains in the South. However, less than one-fourth of the total colored population reside in these 31 States.

The great majority of Negroes are concentrated in the southern section of the United States, consisting of 17 States and the District of Columbia. All Southern States require, by law, separate schools for Negro and white children. The States deepest south not only have the largest colored population, but there also is found color prejudice and discrimination in its bitterest and most rampant forms.

A REVEALING INCIDENT

The attitude of most public officials in the Deep South, and of a large part of the general population, toward education and training for Negroes is reflected in an incident which occurred early in 1944 in New Iberia, La., a town of 14,000 persons. A group of its patriotic Negro citizens asked local officials to apply to the United States Office of Education for authority and funds to set up a welding school for colored trainees. As part of a vocational-training program to remedy the acute shortage of skilled production workers in the United States, this agency was then administering a fund of more than $59,000,000 annually, and had in 1942 established a welding school in New Iberia, but only white students had been allowed to enroll. Town officials refused to cooperate in applying for training in welding for Negroes.

Thereupon, the Negro leaders negotiated directly with Federal officials in Washington, with the result that on May 7, 1944, a school was finally opened. Ten days later the four Negroes who had been active in securing the school—a teacher, a physician, a dentist, and a retired businessman—were individually accosted by policemen, driven in automobiles to lonely spots on the outskirts of town, brutally beaten, and told that if they were ever found in New Iberia again they would be killed. This forced exodus left the community without a Negro physician, and, as a consequence, the only hospital in the area which would accept Negro patients had to close.

Nine million Negroes, more than three-fourths of the colored population of the United States, live in Southern States. The New Iberia incident is by no means an isolated occurrence. In one form or another it recurs throughout the Deep South whenever Negroes seek to improve themselves.

Often discrimination takes the form of white retaliation against white public officials who seek to administer the laws fairly. Many white school authorities want to give the Negro a fair chance, but they encounter great difficulties because of the prevailing public opinion. A superintendent of education who tries to allocate public funds without discrimination because of color; who publicly favors or encourages the acquisition of schoolhouses for colored children of a size and quality and location comparable to those for white children, runs the risk of either losing his job or having his administrative power and prestige curtailed.

SEGREGATION INVITES ABUSE

The legal segregation of Negro pupils is an open invitation to abuse. White officials, interested largely in keeping Negroes in a semi-slave status, determine who shall teach them, what and how they shall learn, where and how long they shall receive training. Segregation is the vehicle for unrestrained and undisguised white domination. But it is more than that.

Segregation is also a device upon which unscrupulous public officials avidly seize to divert State and even Federal funds from Negro schools to white schools. Since States normally appropriate school funds to each county on the basis of the number of children of school age in the county, a large Negro school population in a county means a larger State appropriation. But no official in the Deep South ever permits Negro children either as much as their proportionate share no matter how small a part of the school population they constitute, or as much as one-half of the funds no matter how greatly they outnumber white children.[2] The result is that the larger the proportion of Negro children in a county, the smaller is the per capita expenditure on their education and the greater the expenditure for the white children. A survey of conditions in seven Southern States in 1930–31 disclosed that in counties where Negro children constituted less than one-eighth of the school population the expenditure level per pupil in white schools was less than twice as high as that per pupil in Negro schools. However, in counties where three-fourths of the children were Negroes, the expenditure was 13 times higher for white than for Negro pupils. The main figures are given in table I.[3]

[1] Statement of Essential Human Rights, by a committee appointed by the American Law Institute, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1946, pp. 22–24.

[2] EDITOR'S NOTE.—The editor wishes to bring to our readers the statement of the advocate; it matters that people feel so, whether or not true. The editor was taught in logic to distrust the universal negative. The editor knows some officials not correctly described in this statement.—R. L. H.

[3] Horace Mann Bond, The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order (1934), pp. 240–241.

TABLE I

Race	Number of counties	Median expenditure for teachers' salaries in counties with specified proportion of Negroes in the school population, aged 5-19, 1930-31							
		0-12.4 percent	12.5-24.9 percent	25.0-37.4 percent	37.5-49.9 percent	50.0-62.4 percent	62.5-74.9 percent	75.0-87.4 percent	87.5-99.9 percent
Negro schools	521	$8.62	$5.28	$5.56	$4.46	$3.05	$2.85	$2.12	(1)
White schools	526	14.31	16.87	21.25	21.25	22.58	26.25	28.50	(1)

[1] Only 1 county.

White and Negro school plants, 1945–46 [1]

State	Enrollment		Value of school property per pupil enrolled		Amount needed to equalize
	White	Negro	White	Negro	
Alabama	412,771	225,604	$145	$30	$25,944,460
Arkansas	297,370	95,700	161	47	10,909,800
Florida	271,360	101,817	313	61	25,657,884
Georgia	435,271	259,111	200	41	41,198,649
Kentucky	509,486	36,612	150	125	915,300
Louisiana	270,567	165,706	347	63	47,060,504
Mississippi	377,598	477,157	149	23	60,121,782
North Carolina	562,192	251,307	217	70	36,942,129
South Carolina	247,224	201,020	209	43	33,369,320
Texas	1,048,899	197,554	298	95	40,103,462
Virginia	400,282	147,699	239	100	20,530,161
Total					342,753,451

[1] Based on records of the U. S. Office of Education, except for figures for Kentucky and Mississippi which were supplied by State sources. No figures were available as of that date from Oklahoma and Tennessee.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Over the years it has been the common and notorious practice for white superintendents and other appointing officials in the public schools of the Deep South to deliberately select, when there is more than one applicant for a teaching position, the least competent and most subservient one. Most white male officials when entering Negro school buildings keep their hats on, address the teachers by her first name in the presence of the student body and show other marked insults. The textbooks in general used by Negro schools are those which have been written for white children and generally contain versions of history, science, literature and other subjects which malign the Negro.[4] Indeed, it is a rare thing for a Negro school to receive a free textbook which has not already been worn and defaced from previous use in white schools.

In general appearance school structures assigned to Negroes, especially in the small towns and rural sections of the Deep South, are dilapidated one-and-two-teacher frame shacks lacking indoor-toilet facilities.[5] To Negro teachers fall all janitorial tasks such as firing the stove, scrubbing the floor and equipment, making repairs.

The value of public-school property per Negro child in 10 Southern States has been found to be scarcely one-fifth of the corresponding figure for white.[6] This is true even though as much as one-third of the total value of Negro school property was in buildings partly financed by one large philanthropist.[7] Moreover, Negro schools are uniformly kept open for a shorter period than white schools. The average term for Negroes has been estimated to be 13 percent shorter than for whites.[8]

In terms of dollars and cents, discrimination against colored children is graphically illustrated by studies of the United States Office of Education. For the year 1943–44 current expenditures per white pupil in average daily attendance in Mississippi was 499 percent greater than those for the Negro children of that State.

The following table covering expenditures in 11 States show a small part of the price millions of children in the United States pay because their skins are black or brown.

TABLE II.—*Current expense per pupil in average daily attendance, Negro schools in 11 States* [1]

State	White	Negro	Percent cost per white pupil is greater than per Negro pupil, 1943–44
Total	$85.61	$40.56	111
Alabama	70.20	25.65	174
Arkansas	61.03	25.81	136
Florida	95.96	47.44	102
Georgia	73.79	23.63	212
Louisiana	121.32	40.25	201
Maryland	115.52	90.82	27
Mississippi	71.65	11.96	499
North Carolina	71.60	50.07	43
South Carolina	82.43	26.89	207
Texas	92.69	63.12	47
Virginia	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Source: Statistics of Education of Negroes, 1941–42 and 1943–44. U. S. Office of Education.
[2] Data not available.

SCHOOL BUS DISCRIMINATION

Part of the differential in school expenditures for Negro pupils and white pupils is accounted for by the discrimination which the former suffers in the matter of free school-bus transportation. In rural districts it is not unusual to find elementary schools from 3 to 10 miles apart. In such circumstances, every State provides free transportation in busses operated at public expense. These are seldom available for Negro children. Their parents are therefore faced with the alternative of hiring private transportation, or having children of tender age walk miles in all sorts of weather or keeping them home altogether. Current figures for State moneys spent in bus transportation are not immediately available. One source, however, estimates that in 15 Southern States and the District of Columbia the total expenditure amounts to $32,000,000 annually. At any rate, one investigator found that in 1935–36, although Negroes constituted 34 percent of the rural farm population of school age in 10 Southern States, they received only 3 percent of the total expenditures for transportation.[9]

UNDERPAID NEGRO TEACHERS

The bulk of the Negro-white differential, however, results from the fact that Negro teachers are victims of brazen and systematic salary gouges.

The democratic principle, "equal pay for equal work," has been a dead letter in the teaching profession as far as Negro teachers are concerned. Their pupil load, on an average, is one-fourth heavier than that of white. They hold identical State teaching licenses. Yet, Negro teachers in southern schools, except where the courts have intervened, are uniformly paid less than white.

Again the United States Office of Education throws some light on the character and extent of this type of discrimination. In Mississippi the average salary paid white teachers was $1,107 per year. The Negro teacher received $342 or 244 percent less.

During the year 1943–44 there were 66,553 Negro teachers in the South.[10] Through salary discrimination alone every year they lose approximately $25,000,000.

TABLE III.—*Average salary per member of instructional staff, 1943–44, in 11 States* [1]

State	Average salary per member of instructional staff, 1943–44		Percent white instructional salaries is greater than Negro instructional salaries, 1943–44
	White	Negro	
Total	$1,354	$892	74
Alabama	1,158	661	75
Arkansas	924	555	66
Florida	1,530	970	58
Georgia	1,123	515	118
Louisiana	1,683	828	103
Maryland	2,025	2,002	4
Mississippi	1,107	342	224
North Carolina	1,380	1,249	10
South Carolina	1,203	615	96
Texas	1,395	946	47
Virginia	1,364	1,129	21

[1] Statistics of Education of Negroes, 1941–42 and 1943–44. U. S. Office of Education.

DISCRIMINATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

There are approximately 1,700 public and private colleges and universities in the United States of which 118 are Negro institutions. One hundred and fourteen of these colored schools are located in the South and matriculate 85 percent of all the colored undergraduates from that section. In 1938 the income from all purposes of 96 colleges for Negroes was $14,679,712.[11] This is less than the annual income of Harvard University alone.[12] Only one-fifth of the Negro colleges of the United States was accredited even by regional associations. The Association of American Universities has accredited only 3 Negro institutions as compared with 91 white colleges in Southern States.

Instruction at the graduate, technical, and professional level at Negro institutions is practically nonexistent. Six public and private institutions offer work leading to a mas-

[4] W. E. DuBois, Black Reconstruction, 1935, p. 711.
[5] In Louisiana 65 percent of all Negro public schools are one-teacher and another 27 percent are two- and three-teacher schools. Charles S. Johnson, The Negro Public Schools, Louisiana Educational Survey (1942), p. 43.
[6] Doxey Wilkerson, Special Problems of Negro Education, (1938), p. 33.
[7] Idem., p. 33.
[8] Idem., p. 9.
[9] Gunnar Myrdal, American Dilemma, (1944), p. 947.
[10] Source: Statistics of State School Systems, 1943–44, U. S. Office of Education, p. 71.
[11] National Survey of Higher Education, Martin D. Jenkins, the Journal of Negro Education, 1942, p. 383.
[12] Harvard University during the year 1943–44 had endowments which alone amounted to $160,000,000; Yale endowments amounted to $113,000,000.

ter's degree. None offer work leading to a doctorate.

There are only 2 medical schools in the South for Negroes, both private institutions, as compared with 31 for whites. They supply four-fifths of all Negro physicians and dentists. The opportunities for legal training of Negroes in the South are similarly limited. There are only 3 law schools for Negroes in the South as compared with 33 for whites. Howard University is the only institution in the South at which a Negro can study engineering whereas there are 34 for whites.

Expenditures for education for Negroes in 17 Southern States is summed up by Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, as follows:

"In States which maintain the segregated system of education there are about $137,000,000 annually spent on higher education. Of this sum $126,541,795 (including $86,000,000 of public funds) is spent on institutions for white youth only; from these institutions Negroes are rigidly excluded. Only $10,500,000 touches Negroes in any way; in fact, as far as State-supported schools are concerned, less than $5,000,000 directly touches Negroes. In these States there are about 17 institutions undertaking to do higher education of the college grade. * * *

"The amount of money spent on higher education by the State and Federal Government for Negroes within these States is less than the budget of the University of Louisiana (in fact only 65 percent of the budget), which is maintained for a little over $1,000,000 in Louisiana.

"That is one index; but the most serious index is this: That this little money is spread over so wide an area and in such a way that in no one of these States is there anything approaching a first-class State university opportunity available to Negroes." [13]

Literacy opens the door to the accumulated knowledge of mankind and is essential to the acquisition, or conservation, of the rights and liberties of a free people. Unfettered educational opportunity is essential to the health and well-being of all persons living in a complex industrial society. The Negro in North America has been allowed to enjoy only the barest minimum regarded appropriate to his half-slave, half-free status. In a country where education counts for everything, 10 percent of all Negroes 25 years old and over have received no schooling as compared with 1.3 percent whites; 82.7 percent have had no formal schooling or have not completed more than 8 years of elementary training as against 53.1 percent whites.[14]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that any Southern State would accept Federal aid under the conditions upon which he would offer it—that is to say, that they would have to abolish segregation in all their schools? Does the Senator think any Southern State would accept aid if those were the terms to be applied to it?

Mr. LODGE. I should hope so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the floor in my own name.

Mr. LODGE. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts states that his amendment is approved by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. That may be true; I do not recall having received any communication on the subject from that organization. If it be true, I would question whether that organization is doing the colored people of America any valuable service. I would be inclined to say that it is not.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I have here a telegram from Leslie S. Perry, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question the Senator's statement to that effect; I simply reiterate that if the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is backing this amendment, then I maintain it is not doing the colored people of this country any service.

However, Mr. President, in my opinion the most ardent supporters of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts would not be found among the colored race, but would be found among the hard-shelled reactionary elements of some of our State chambers of commerce who are opposed to social progress of any kind at any price.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I say to the Senator from Vermont that I have not heard about this matter from any organization in this country except the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will review the statement I have made, he will not find that I said he had received communications from others. I did not know that he had; but I believe that the most ardent support for this amendment will come today from the source I have indicated. It will come from those persons, that element, who are opposed to Federal aid to education at all. They are simply opposed to it.

All of us know that one of our great educational problems is to be found in the inadequate facilities for educating the colored people of the Nation. We have statistics to show that in some States as little as $10 a pupil per annum is being spent for the education of children of the colored race. Senate bill 246 will raise the minimum amount to be spent for the education of each child, regardless of race, color, or creed, to $55 a year. Certainly that would give the children of the colored areas an opportunity for a minimum education, an opportunity which they have never before had. I expect that they would continue to receive that education in schools for colored children only, and that the white children would continue to receive their education in schools for white children only. But both colored and white children would be sure to receive a minimum education which would help them to earn a better living in the later years of their lives.

Mr. President, I am sure that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is approved by the Senate, regardless of the rights of the case, the Federal-aid-to-education bill will be killed; and if this amendment is approved and if the bill is killed, the colored race will not only continue to be segregated in schools in certain States, but will be denied even an opportunity for an improved education, an education which will help them to rise above the status which now prevails in some areas.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I notice the Senator's name is on this bill as one of its sponsors, and therefore I assume that he is thoroughly familiar with the details of the bill, with which I am not entirely familiar in all respects. I should like to ask him a question about it. As I understand the bill, in order that a State may receive the benefits provided by it, there must be a guaranteed minimum expenditure for every pupil in the State for educational purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The assumption the Senator from Connecticut makes is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. And in the enumeration of those pupils, are the Negro children to be counted along with the whites?

Mr. AIKEN. They certainly are.

Mr. BALDWIN. But there is no provision in the bill, is there, to make certain that the money is expended evenly as between the blacks and the whites?

Mr. AIKEN. A minimum amount must be expended in every school district.

Mr. President, let me say that I think the South is making heroic efforts to improve the education of the Negro children. I spent a few days in the South last fall. I saw new school buildings, built exclusively for children of the colored race. I did not go through the buildings, but from the outside they appeared to be the equal of the buildings built for the education of the white children.

I think the mechanization of agriculture and the increased industrialization which are taking place in the South have something to do with the developments which are occurring in education in that area. Education is necessary in the new type of economy which is sweeping over the South at this time. I noticed that in the areas where I was, the truancy laws were being enforced; and the colored children are not only not being kept from school but they are required to go to school.

I do not claim that there will not be abuses under this law. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any law of major importance which the Congress has passed which has not been or could not be circumvented or abused. But I think Senate bill 246 will be a boon to the colored race in affording colored children an opportunity for a minimum education, which they have not had up to this time. That is admitted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with every word of the remarks made by the Senator from Vermont.

The pending amendment is of the type which has been proposed in the

[13] Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., February 24, 1947, p. 145.

[14] Derived from Characteristics of Population, pt. I, United States Summary, 1943, Bureau of the Census, pp. 40–41.

past, and which has had the effect of killing aid-to-education bills. Probably the Congress could amend the constitutions and laws of the various States of the Union by way of Federal action in the fields in which the Federal Government has absolute and complete control. In such a field as that of interstate commerce a Federal act may nullify a local act. But every Senator knows that the field of education is primarily in control of the States and that it is upon the States that the people of the United States must depend for fundamental laws in regard to education. Therefore, when it is known that many States in the American Union, either in their laws or even in their constitutions, have provided for what we call segregation, I think it does not take very much of an understanding of things in order to realize that if we should attempt to impose upon States having such laws or constitutional provisions a theory to which they are opposed and which they have not accepted, our efforts would probably fail. That is true, even though Senators from such States were to vote in favor of such legislation, but everyone knows they would not.

Mr. President, I take it that the greatest contribution America has made to political thought, to political theory, and to the art of government is its Federal system. Since the establishment of this Government, practically every suggestion of an international organization for the betterment of the world has embodied some notion of federalism. It is just as necessary that the Federal Government honor the Constitution, which respects the powers and rights of the States, as it is that the various States honor it, in spite of the fact that there are some things in the theory of Federal Government which the States contest.

Mr. President, I realize that an appeal to first and necessary principles often is not respected; but as a supporter of the pending bill, as one who has worked for the bill through the years, as one who has known the devastating power of such an amendment as the one now proposed, and as one who has suffered defeat, I cannot but point out to my fellow Senators in all seriousness the great danger which lies before them.

In a practical way the question is simple. Reference has been made to a telegram from a certain propagandist organization which, in the past, has appeared before committees in support of the bill. In most of the hearings, the question of segregation or nonsegregation did not arise. Never has there been offered to the Negro of the South such a boon for advancement as that which is offered through the pending legislation. Mr. President, is opportunity to be denied to the Negro teachers, Negro pupils, Negro communities, and to all the people of the South, whose standard of living we are endeavoring to raise? Are we to deny them an opportunity to better conditions by bringing about necessary improvement in educational facilities? The proposed amendment if adopted would kill this legislation. It would make it utterly unenforceable. It would be resisted. Proud States under the circumstances would, of course, refuse Federal aid. Those are the facts, whether we like to admit them or not. We cannot change this country overnight, we cannot change the feelings of people overnight; but if once we catch the theory and uplifting ideals of such a bill as S. 246, we can over a generation change and improve conditions very greatly.

Mr. President, I talked to a Senator who a generation ago introduced in the Senate the first bill for Federal aid to education. He told me that if he had succeeded in his effort to have the bill passed at that time, conditions throughout the land would have been improved to such an extent that we would not have had to endure the shame of boys not being able to qualify under the selective service. We would not have experienced the shame of enforced migration, we would not have found ourselves in the position we are in now of realizing that the States themselves have to take care of wandering and moving populations. Eight million people in the United States have no definite State citizenship, they are moving from place to place.

Another thing I should point out is that the term "minority race" is not limited in its application merely to the Negro. There are other minority groups in the United States. In my part of the country we have them. We have attempted segregation. Chinese persons were at one time segregated. The Japanese were segregated. We, of course, did not like the Filipinos, or the Hindus. But Utah, a State which gives to the cause of education a larger part of the revenues it collects than any other State in the Union, has a minority problem. Probably it is a majority problem but it is listed as a minority problem. Within the past 6 months the Supreme Court has rendered a decision which affects its whole educational system. But that little State is not going to give up trying to solve its problems. It has segregation of a sort, based upon language, it has segregation based upon nationality; but to that State, as to every State in the South where Negro segregation constitutes the great problem, the Federal Government says, "You must treat every boy and girl alike in the use of State funds for education and welfare."

Let us review what has taken place in a practical way since we attempted to bring about Federal aid to education throughout the country, and particularly so far as the South is concerned. The Supreme Court has, since the time of their adoption, consistently upheld the theory of the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution.

Every decision it has handed down in regard to civil rights has been one more step toward equality, one more step toward the ideal of the attainment of civil rights and against discrimination of any kind. Each one of the decisions has imposed a terrifically hard economic requirement upon the States.

It is true, of course, that when schools for Negroes were started in the South they were poorer than the white schools. Everyone knows that Negro teachers were not paid as well as were white teachers. Everyone realizes that the facilities in Negro schools were not so good as were the facilities in the white schools. Everyone realizes that the advantages in textbooks, in teaching, in curriculum, in going and coming to the schools, were all in favor of the whites. But, gradually, due to court decisions, to willingness to cooperate, to willingness to spend, to help, and to be fair, great improvement has resulted. Today, in the South, if a white boy is offered a certain kind of education, and a Negro boy applies for the same kind, it is the State's duty to see that he gets it. Those problems are being worked out gradually. Instead of hindering the solution of the problems, instead of trying to stop progress, instead of seeking the absolute ideal, when we know that the ideal may never be reached, instead of talking about forcing something on our citizens when it is known that they will not permit it to be forced upon them, let us work in harmony with the spirit which the Supreme Court of the United States has shown in every decision, and attempt to bring about a raising of the standard, an equality of consideration and of opportunity.

It was said by the Senator from Massachusetts that the recognition of segregation in our American system impairs our solidarity before the nations of the world. Mr. President, I could name every country in the world, and I could ask the question, Are we criticized, except in an unjust and improper way? I know that Russia, with its 30 or 40 languages and its 30 or 40 nationalities, does not have the solidarity and unity possessed by the United States. Even in the days of the czars, a czar was not Czar of Russia; he was Czar of the Russians. I know that certain Russians criticized us because of segregation in some parts of the United States, but I know that in spite of the fact that Russia may have a theory of nonsegregation, there is not a part of Russia in which some groups do not have advantages over other groups, in spite of all the leveling concepts of communism. Those things we know. Even in a nation with only one nationality there is segregation in a social way or in an economic way—segregation by caste, segregation by causing certain persons to be out of harmony with the rest of the people.

Mr. President, we do not need to be ashamed of what foreign nations say about the United States, because we here today are trying to make it possible for the Federal Government to assure that every child in the United States shall have an equal opportunity at least to have an education to the extent that the expenditure of $55 a year per child can bring it about.

I throw that out as a challenge to any foreign critic of America, and I ask such critic to show me a country in the whole world having a problem similar to ours which is saying to all its constituent parts, "See to it that every person in your jurisdiction has $55 expended on his education every year, if he is between the ages of 7 and 17 years." When that challenge can be met I shall be frightened of foreign criticism. But I am not frightened of it at this time. Of some of it I am very proud. I realize what some of our own people are doing. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said, our own people will have a respon-

sibility in every community because of certain privileges, certain advantages, certain wealth. Some persons hate to see an equalization of wealth.

We are facing a new type of propaganda against this bill, the meanest type, a type which insults every school teacher, whether he be white or black, whether in a parochial school or in a public school. Some persons are saying, in so many words, that Federal aid to education is an attempt to communize the boys and girls of America. Some persons are supporting that idea.

There is, Mr. President, a National Council of Education in America. It is presided over by a gentleman by the name of Zook. It is the most respectable, the most high-class, the finest educational body in the United States. But there has also been organized a Council for National Education. It is presided over by a man by the name of Zoll. Its latest bulletin charges every school teacher, because the Federal Government is trying to pass an aid-to-education bill, with attempting to control and to communize all the boys and girls in America. Thoughtless readers confuse the name of Zoll with Zook, and they confuse the name "National Council of Education" with the name "Council for National Education." Some persons are frightened.

There are thousands of persons in our country who believe anything about their own neighbors, so long as the information comes to them from afar. I say that, Mr. President, because the board of education of the city of Salt Lake City adopted a formal resolution asking me to work against Federal aid to education because, under Federal aid to education, they say there will be introduced into the schools of Salt Lake City foreign ideologies; and I am supposed to fight that danger. There are some things which become so ridiculous that we should not even mention them. Here are my own people, who have known me all my life, and who must be aware that my name has been on bills identical with the pending bill for 14 years, formally adopting a resolution asking me to work against this bill so that the boys and girls of Salt Lake City will not be subjected to and corrupted by foreign ideologies, introduced by the Federal Government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator will agree, I am sure, that I have asked the Senator nothing of that kind, and that nothing I have said relates in any way to that subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, my mind was not on the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts would approve the bulletins to which I have referred. I do not think he would buy one, although they can be bought for 12½ cents. I saw a great deal of this character of propaganda when I was a member of the Committee on Civil Liberties years ago. Organizations mushroomed everywhere with the avowed object of saving the Constitution of the United States.

I remember at one time we had before us a witness who testified that he was the most patriotic man in the world because he was going to save the Constitution. I thought I would ask him a question or two about the Constitution, so I said, "Just what is the Constitution of the United States?" He stuttered. I asked, "Have you ever seen it?" He had not. I said, "Is it a long document or is it a short document?" He did not know. After I had tired myself out asking questions, I said, "Now, please tell me one word or one sentence in the Constitution." He said, "Mr. Chairman, the Constitution says that every man is created free and equal." I said, "And you are able to sell your wares?" He sold plenty of pamphlets. He had a list of subscribers page after page long. Incidentally some of the finest people in the United States paid money into that organization, to save this country and the Constitution of the United States. The latter are my words; that is not what the witness said. What he was trying to do was to keep Congress from running wild and ruining the Constitution.

Mr. President, possibly my argument has become scattered; undoubtedly it has, because the Senator from Massachusetts suggested that possibly I was hinting that he had said something like what I have referred to heretofore. No, there was nothing like that. Senators of the United States are not ignorant. If they were, they would not last a week, under the propaganda barrage which is aimed at them at all times.

Every once in a while a new dictionary is published. A new International Dictionary has come out, and it contains some 200 new words. I think a score of those 200 new words are things thought of by people to call Senators of the United States. So that we are at least helping to keep our language a growing institution.

Mr. President, as I have said, in the past, when we have had under consideration Federal-aid-to-education bills, an amendment exactly like the one now pending has been offered, and some have felt they could not vote against the amendment because they had a desire to abolish segregation. They believed in the principle of nonsegregation, and they worked for it. I have worked for it. I believe in the principle of civil liberties. Others have worked for that, and I worked for it. But, Mr. President, there are values that are worth preserving. The educational system of the United States is one of those values; the public school system is one of them; the relationship between the States and the Nation is one of them, and the Federal system is another. All these things can be marred and hurt by attempts to use force, or attempts to legislate out of existence that which cannot be legislated out of existence.

Mr. President, let us commend the States of the South for the remarkable things they have done. Let us commend them for catching the spirit which has led them to attempt to bring about the changes which are necessary. Let us condemn them whenever they fight against a ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States and say, "We will not accept it." But when the Supreme Court acts in such a way that a State has to provide finer educational facilities, has to produce equality where in the past it has not produced equality, and it accepts the decision of the Court and does the best it can, let us commend it. Let us not destroy what has been done.

I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that there is something very important in the word "united" when we say "the United States." I agree with him when he says we want a united people; but, Mr. President, the finest way to get a united people is by raising the standards of the people. Everyone knows that. There will be no submerged races, economically, if the people of present so-called submerged groups have half an economic chance. That we all know. The pending bill gives them that chance.

Mr. President, we come to a very simple proposition. We believe in a principle. We would like to see nonsegregation. Nonsegregation is growing in the country. We would do nothing to keep it from growing. Then along comes an amendment which will not help one whit, one jot or one tittle, the advancement of nonsegregation in the United States, but will hold it back. Some say they like the principle, and therefore their attitude is, "We will do an injustice to every American child, we will do an injustice to every black child, we will do an injustice to every black school teacher, we will do an injustice to every community which has accepted the theory of segregation in the schools, in order to preserve our own idea of never voting against the principle of nonsegregation."

Mr. President, there is pure logic in that, but when I say there is pure logic in it, and admit it, I cannot help saying that that type of logic, not only in western civilization, but also in eastern civilization, was invented when civilization started falling, and men became so logical that they stood by a principle instead of standing by a fact.

Oh, I appeal to my fellow Senators to stand by the principle embodied in this bill. For years and years we have worked for its attainment. Probably no stronger statement has been made in its behalf than that made by the Senator from Massachusetts that the justification of the pending bill is absolute, that everyone knows that the Federal Government should do something to aid the elementary and secondary schools of the country, to bring about equalization. Then on top of that comes an amendment which everyone knows will destroy the bill, from a parliamentary standpoint. I cannot make my appeal any stronger.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I wholly deny that the amendment will destroy the bill, and in my own time I hope to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Senate that it will do absolutely no such thing.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. All I have to do is go back and look at the votes on Federal-aid-to-education bills 3 or 4 years

ago. A similar amendment was accepted, and the supporters of the bill, not by tens, but by scores, walked out on it; the bill was lost, and we were set back a quarter of a generation thereby. That is what I mean, I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not know whether he was present or not, but I made the statement that the black man of the South has been cheated out of 3 or 4 years of decent education because one black man of the South, supported by a white man, suggested to one Senator that a fine way to kill the aid-to-education bill would be to add to it an amendment of this character.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of addressing myself to the entire bill (S. 246), and also to the amendments which have been proposed, and in particular the amendment which is now under consideration and which we are now debating.

I should like to say, however, that this is not exactly a new scene. If I recall correctly, it was only a few days ago when the Members of the United States Senate faced the same dilemma, the same very serious situation. Last week this body debated and passed a bill which will aid in providing 810,000 families the kind of homes that are fitting for a man, his wife, and his children. I remember well the great speech delivered by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in defending the bill against the same kind of amendment. On the amendments which are being advanced today in the name of civil rights, nothing more need be added to the statement of our esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois. I dare say that never on the floor of the Senate has a more pertinent argument, a more logical discussion, and a more courageous stand been taken by one whose heart literally bleeds for those who are the oppressed and who are underprivileged.

Last week then the Senate passed a bill which provides for low-income housing, slum clearance, and farm housing. We promised the American people an opportunity to live in decent homes where they and their families can, with proper effort, have better advantages than they have heretofore enjoyed. We have with the passage of that housing bill taken the first step toward building a finer new generation of men and women, by starting them out in the proper atmosphere of a decent neighborhood and a decent social environment.

Those of us who are parents know, however, that the entire spiritual and intellectual foundation of our young people is not formed in the home. Other institutions which are more specialized for certain tasks can take a hand in the better development, in the intellectual and spiritual development, of our sons and daughters. It is clear that the housing bill is only one step toward clearing away our own debris here in America, the debris we harvest every year in juvenile delinquency, crime, sorrow, and in social degradation. We must build houses, we shall build houses to provide better homes for better children. But we must also build better schools, not only the buildings for better school systems, but also better schools from the inside out—the teacher, the facilities, the general curriculum which is needed for broad education.

I do not think anyone will disagree with me on this point. I believe that no Senator would stand here today and say that we do not have to educate all our children, or that we should not worry about the state of our schools or their ability to teach young Americans to live full lives, and to govern themselves democratically. No one in this body can say that the education of our children is not the most important issue before Americans today and every day.

We talk a great deal about the education of our children, we make fine speeches about the education of our children; we say, with Edmund Burke, that education is the chief defense of our democracy; but we fail to do very much about improving the deplorable state of our education system. There is no freedom, there is no liberty, there is no emancipation without substantial, good, and equal education for all children.

We agree then that the state of our schools should occupy a constant place in our thoughts, and I hope we agree that adequate and proper provision for our schools should be a primary consideration.

What is the state of our schools? We have heard on the floor the past 2 days about the state of our schools. But as we refer to the amendment which is before the Senate, I think it is important that we talk about the whole fabric and substance of public education in the United States of America, and see how the amendments which are now being proposed, the one of yesterday which was voted down, the one of today, and the others before us, would affect the educational welfare of our people.

In May 1947 a distinguished and honored member of the newspaper profession, Mr. Benjamin Fine, who is the education editor of the New York Times, published a report called—and I think very rightly and very graphically—"Our Children Are Being Cheated." This was not written from the desk in the rear corner of the Times Building in New York. Mr. Fine made his report after he had traveled through half the States, many of our cities, and many of our rural areas. He made his report after he had spent 6 months talking to teachers, members of boards of education, parents, PTA's civic leaders, and members of each community he visited. What did Mr. Fine find?

In many respects—

He said—

what I found was shocking.

Now let us start with the heart of the school—the teacher. At the rate we are going we will soon have to go, not to the school, but to the zoo to bring our children to a teacher. And on the cage will read a sign which says:

Teacher Americanus, now nearly extinct.

I think there are real facts to back up that statement.

Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the few Senators who are now present this afternoon, and to the attention of the American public, the report which Mr. Fine presented to the American people, a report which, I may say, is shocking, and which describes the sad state of our education system which this bill fundamentally attempts to correct. The bill attempts to remove some of the abuses which are so well and aptly listed in the report. Mr. Fine in his report has this to say:

Our schools were not bombed as were European schools, but nearly 2 years after the war they are being wrecked just as surely as though they had been blasted by heavy bombers.

Then he gives us the summary of his survey, and this is what he found from kindergarten up to college:

Three hundred and fifty thousand teachers have left the American public schools since 1940.

One hundred and twenty-five thousand teachers, or one out of every seven in the profession, are serving on an emergency or substandard basis.

Seventy thousand teacher positions are unfilled because of the inability of communities to get necessary teachers.

Sixty thousand teachers in the United States have only a high-school education or less. Teachers, mind you, who are required to teach young men and women in secondary and elementary schools of this land.

Twenty percent of all teachers, or 175,000, are new to their jobs each year; twice the turn-over that existed before the war.

Fewer students are entering the teaching profession than in the past.

Twenty-two percent of all college students attended teachers' colleges in 1920, and in the year 1947 only 7 percent of all college students attended teachers' colleges where they prepared themselves for educational pursuits.

Six thousand schools will be closed because of lack of teachers.

Seventy-five thousand children will have no schools during the year.

Two million children will suffer a major impairment in their schooling because of poor teachers.

And, mind you, Mr. President, 5,000,000 American children will receive an inferior education this year because of an inadequate teacher supply.

Going through Mr. Fine's report, we gather from his splendid survey that American public education has been at the crossroads for a long time. When I say it has been at the crossroads I mean it has been standing still, and almost, at times, retreating. We have been unable to make up our mind whether we are going to go down the path of a newly developed and invigorated and properly financed program of public education, or whether we are going to be caught up in a program which will lead public education into disrepute in American life.

In his survey, Mr. Fine talked with professors and students. He found something which he said was shocking. He found that most students wanted to do something else than teach. Parents said that they wanted their sons and daughters to amount to something, and not to teach school. The result of this attitude is a crisis in our schools.

The future is no brighter than the recent past. I pointed out that Mr. Fine estimated in 1947 that this country would lose 400,000 teachers in the 5 years between 1947 and 1952. On the other side of the picture there is no more hope. We remember the flood of war brides of only a few years ago. Their children will soon enter public schools. We can say what we will about young Americans, but they are able to reproduce their kind. I remind them that we have lost faith in the future. Many of us have substantial families, and we are proud of them. I speak with a little personal interest when I say that I think it is a singular tragedy that a young man and woman in America starting family life are compelled to place their children in schools with inadequate teaching staffs, schools that are overcrowded—even here in the city of Washington, D. C., the Capital of the Nation.

We talk about slums in Washington. I submit that not only is the problem of slums in Washington a serious one, but the problem of public education in Washington is equally serious, and very little is being done to remedy the defects.

What is true of Washington is true of every other major city in America, from Boston, Mass., and New York City to Minneapolis, Minn.; Dallas, Tex.; Seattle, Wash, and Los Angeles, Calif. Large or small, there is not a single city in America today in which the school system is able to meet the requirements of modern education and uphold its hand in terms of the revenues it needs.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator consider that the formula in the pending bill will help people in the cities, as distinguished from the rural areas? Does he believe that the urban poor are going to be helped by the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota believes that the formula in the bill was arrived at after appropriate study, consultation, and advice from the best educators in America. He believes, with the overwhelming majority of the Senate—68 to 11, as evidenced by the vote yesterday—that this formula is not only the formula we ought to have, but that it is fair and equitable. At least, it is an approach toward meeting the needs of public education in America. The Senator from Minnesota surely believes that this formula is much more equitable, as I shall point out, than the formula which was advanced as of yesterday, and which, in the wisdom of this great body, was defeated by an overwhelming vote, proving at least that in the field of Federal aid to education the United States Senate is willing to recognize where the basic needs for Federal assistance exist.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to read a brief statement to the Senator and ask him for his comment. This is quotation from the official record of the Democratic National Convention, on July 14, 1948. The Senator from Minnesota was speaking:

> My friends, to those who say that we are rushing this issue of civil rights, I say to them, we are 170 years late. To those who say that this civil-rights program is an infringement on States' rights, I say this, that the time has arrived in America for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadows of States' rights and to walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human rights. People, human beings, this is the issue of the twentieth century.

I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks, after having waited 172 years, we ought to wait 173 years before we do something about civil rights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I greatly appreciate the reading of the speech which I delivered before the Democratic convention. I have not seen it since last July. I am grateful to the Senator.

I will say to the Senator that in this session of Congress—and if not in this session of the Congress, if we be delayed because of tactics which may be used to delay us, such as promoting a filibuster at this hour—then in the next session, there will be time for the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Minnesota to rise on the floor of the Senate and really fight for civil rights on the issue of civil rights, and to fight for it as it ought to be fought for, not 173 years later, but this year.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator advise me when that time will come?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be more than happy to be in the inner councils of either party at this moment to find out what the policy determination may be. Possibly I find myself in the same position as the junior Senator from Massachusetts finds himself. I am a United States Senator, sometimes not consulted by those who establish the policy, but I have a vote, and I have the right to propose legislation. The junior Senator from Minnesota has proposed legislation. He has proposed legislation in the field of civil rights, and he will see to it, to the best of his ability, that that legislation comes to the floor of the Senate, with the help of the junior Senator from Massachusetts and with the help of his other colleagues on this side and on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Permit me to say to the junior Senator from Minnesota that I shall be happy to work with him in promoting civil rights whenever there is an opportunity. I ask him this question: At what date would he like to see this question come up in the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota has never worked on the basis of a calendar or priority schedule. However, I should like to see these issues brought to the attention of the United States Senate at this session. Let me say that I have not burdened my life with prolonged vacations, nor am I desirous of an extended vacation this summer. In view of the splendid air conditioning which this fine building provides, I am more than willing to enjoy the luxuries of Washington living by staying here in the United States Senate until we finish our business; and I consider a fundamental element of that business to be the passage of basic civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, I should like to proceed with my comments pertaining to the pending bill. I submit that we cannot discuss this bill in terms of amendments. When we discuss the field of public education we discuss all of it. Those of us who are deep believers in public education recognize that the Congress of the United States has been a bit tardy in its recognition of the basic right of the American people to have an education and to be participating and understanding citizens.

The National Education Association points out that we can expect 9,000,000 more children in the public schools in 1957 than we had in the year 1948. We may have problems of production in industry, but I submit that by 1957 we shall have 9,000,000 more boys and girls in the American public schools.

Mr. Fine in his survey stated that we shall need 600,000 new qualified teachers in order to meet the needs of this increased enrollment up to 1952. If we do not do something about this problem, we may find that we shall have a new generation faced with new and greater problems without adequate instruction and without adequate consultation from an adequate teaching staff.

The sad fact is that under present conditions we are not going to attract 600,000 teachers to the public schools in the next 5 years. We shall be lucky if we attract 250,000 teachers, and find ourselves short 350,000.

I have heard about all kinds of shortages. On the floor of the Senate we have debated steel shortages. We have debated shortages of critical materials for foreign countries. We have debated shortages of skilled labor, such as plumbers and electricians. Thank goodness, at long last in the United States Senate we are now beginning to debate the real shortage in America, the shortage of trained minds to guide and counsel the young minds of our sons and daughters in the public-school system. It is a subject which certainly deserves the fullest consideration from every responsible public official.

I have mentioned in my comments that we had a certain number of teachers with emergency certificates. I should like to point out that those emergency certificates do not represent fully trained teaching personnel. They filled the gaps. In certain areas of America men and women were called in from other jobs, if they had a high-school education or better, to do the necessary teaching which was so important.

One of the real problems, however, that faces the teaching profession is the necessity for raising the salaries of teachers. That matter requires our immediate attention. This bill and the appropriation it authorizes will afford some relief in that situation. As was pointed out in the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on page 7, the

school systems are unable to compete with other occupations for competent and trained personnel, because of a lack of funds.

Mr. President, I estimate that there should be no type of occupational pursuit which could out-compete American public education for the trained personnel we need in the American educational establishment. Nothing is more important to us than to have well-trained and well-qualified teachers; but no longer are we going to be able to get them at a pittance. We shall have to pay, if we are to get them, just as we have to pay for a master craftsman, just as we have to pay for good entertainment, just as we have to pay for anything in America that is good. For anything that is worth while, we pay a fair-sized bill. It is obvious that as of today the teachers of America do not earn enough money.

What are the facts, Mr. President? While matters in this respect are somewhat better than they were in 1945 and 1946 in terms of dollar income, yet real wages are not greatly improved over what they were in 1946 and 1947. In 1947, 10,000 teachers in the United States received less than $12 a week. Another 200,000 teachers received less than $25 a week. The average for all teachers in the United States in 1947 was $40 a week.

Mr. President, I submit that baby sitters in Washington, D. C., can earn more than $40 a week. The average teacher received only $2,750 in the year 1948, or approximately $225 a month. That figure includes not only the salaries of classroom teachers, but also the salaries of principals of schools and members of the administrative staffs, who generally are better paid than are the school teachers themselves.

Mr. President, I think the case is crystal clear: American public education is drying up because of an inadequate flow of revenue. The greatest single item in the public-tax bill is the one for public education.

I now direct my remarks to the financial problem facing the local districts and counties and States. Community after community has records to show that it has increased its local tax rates; yet they have not been able to keep up with the rise in the cost of education nor have they even been able to meet the backlog of needs. State after State, including my own State of Minnesota, has made great increases in public-education revenues. I know not a single State which since 1945 has not greatly augmented and increased its education budget. As the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] so well stated yesterday, States are sometimes limited by their constitutions in that respect, and certainly the municipalities and school districts are limited by State statutes or State constitutions as to how much revenue they can raise for public-education purposes. Let no one doubt for a moment that the Federal Government has preempted field after field of taxation. The Federal Government is the only agency of government, Mr. President, which can tax equitably and uniformly.

Let me point out what I have in mind when I make this sort of a comment. I refer, for example, to the situation in a municipality or State when it imposes corporation taxes or income taxes. In that event, what happens? All too often, Mr. President, industry will leave that State or that locality and will go across the river, so to speak, into the next State or next locality where there is no corporation tax and no income tax. Sales taxes have had a similar effect. In other words, the only way by which we can have a uniform and equitable system of revenue raising for the States, in respect to a problem which is national in scope, is as has been proposed in Senate bill 246.

Today the question which I think we need to ask ourselves is whether school expenditures have increased sufficiently from 1940 to 1947 to permit the school boards to hold their own in buying schooling for children. In other words, did the States do their job; did the localities do their job; did we produce sufficient revenue to meet the rising costs of education from 1940 to 1947? What is the record, Mr. President? According to the National Education Association's bulletin—and I have yet to find anyone who would dispute the authenticity of the facts that the association presents—the situation is bad. I quote from page 1 of their bulletin entitled "Federal Aid Imperative":

> 1. In the United States as a whole, and in more than three-fourths of the States, school boards had less purchasing power per pupil in 1947 than they had in 1946.
>
> 2. While per-pupil expenditures, on the average, increased 66 percent from 1940 to 1947—

And, Mr. President, I call the attention of the junior Senator from Massachusetts to this fact, inasmuch as he has referred to increased State aid and local aid—

> indexes of economic change show that they should have gone up 86 percent to hold their own in the economic market.

So the school boards were not able to hold their own.

I read further:

> The low-expenditure school systems of 1940 are still operating at poverty levels of support, although they made relatively large percentage increases per pupil. A large percentage increase of very little is still very little. Meanwhile the high-expenditure districts have not been able in 1947 to purchase the first-rate education they were able to afford in 1940.

Mr. President, the report concludes by saying:

> The situation today is little better than it was a year ago. While some States have made further increases in school revenues, the additional amounts barely offset the continued rise in school costs. Also, the pressure of increased enrollments and the doubling of school construction costs are presenting to many school districts in most States almost insuperable financial problems.

So, Mr. President, that is the situation in which we find ourselves in respect to public education.

We could refer to report after report along the line of the one I have just mentioned. However, I think we have debated sufficiently the matter of financial costs. Certainly it is important that we recognize that poor schools are found in many areas in the Nation. They exist, not because people want them, but because of the lack of economic ability in many States and localities to finance good schools. The States which have relatively large numbers of children to educate—as a rule, the relatively low-income States—have, over a long period of time, made the greatest efforts to finance their public schools.

By the way, Mr. President, the report of the committee on the matter of financing is very interesting. Of course it was referred to previously by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Unquestionably, some of the States are poor, all the talk to the contrary notwithstanding. If their land is eroded, if their land is tenant-farmed, often their people find themselves in the lowest income groups. The records of the Census Bureau and of the Department of Agriculture and of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are clear and concise evidence as to what some of the people in the impoverished areas of the United States face. Of course, we can consider and can analyze the discussions of capital gains, as that matter is discussed on Wall Street; but I submit that in some of the areas of the United States—for instance, in the desert lands or in the blighted areas, in the eroded lands—the words "capital gains" are meaningless to the people who live there. Most of them have never heard of a capital gain. Such words are just brokerage talk, and they do not know what that is.

What we are considering now is whether such persons are to have sufficient income to pay sufficient taxes to permit them to meet the costs of education. It costs to educate a child in South Carolina, just as it does to educate a child in Minnesota. It costs to educate a child in Mississippi, just as it does in California. Of course, there are differentials because of the differences in the standard of living; but our objective is not to lower the standard of living in the United States but to raise it.

Mr. President, this bill, with all the effort that has been put behind it, guarantees but one thing to the American people, namely, a minimum of $55 per pupil a year for education. Just think of that, Mr. President—$55 per pupil a year for education, to be provided for the children in the United States. That amount of money, Mr. President, is not even good cigarette money to some persons. $55 a year! The National Education Association says the basic minimum need is $200. So I may say to those who worry about whether there will be anything left for State and local governments to do, there will be plenty. If they happen to have some capital gains which they have not taxed, I submit to them that there is a long distance between $55 and $200, which is the basic minimum of educational decency per pupil in America. They can tap every hidden resource. They can dig new coal mines and find new oil wells, and there will still be plenty of need for money to be expended for public education.

We have had such variations in the level of education in America as $100 per classroom a year, compared to $6,000 per classroom a year. Do we call that equality? Is that what we mean when we say that equal educational opportunities shall be enjoyed? There is no equal opportunity, Mr. President, when a boy and girl of a poor mother and a poor father are compelled to go to a poor school with poor facilities, and to an ill-qualified, inadequate teacher, in the hope of becoming a good, strong, substantial American when those who know about capital gains, Mr. President, can send their children to schools with well-paid teachers, in large school buildings, with modern protection, in fine cities.

That is not American equality.

I submit, as has been stated so well by the chairman of our committee, the objective of America is to raise the levels of all opportunity in the Nation, educational, social, and political. Let us not fool ourselves about the pending bill. It is but a beginning. If I were to vote against the bill it would not be because of what is in it; it would be because of what is not in it. What I think we ought to have instead of $300,000,000—and I said so in committee—is positively about $1,000,000,000, then we would be getting some place. Furthermore, I believe it would be a good investment. I think the records show clearly why it would be a good investment. Some people talk about an appropriation for education as if it were subsidy. They think we are wasting money. I have heard people talk about the money that we expend for education as if it were a loss. One would think we were buying ourselves a gun or some other noneconomic article. I think the record is crystal clear. The chambers of commerce, the National Education Association, labor groups, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, college professors—every accredited source in America will point out that an educated man is a more productive citizen. Statistics have shown that an educated man earns more than one who is not educated. He must therefore produce more. The uneducated man between 35 and 44, according to our own Government figures, earned in 1940 approximately $486 a year, while in the same year workers of the same age who had even gone through elementary school, merely elementary school, only 8 grades, earned $1,228, three times what the illiterate, the uneducated earned. The high school graduate earned on an average, $1,764 a year; the college graduate, $2,465 a year.

Mr. President, for every dollar we put into education, the record is crystal clear: We get back a minimum of $3 in American productivity. The only way we are going to pay for Marshall plans, the only way we can pay for Federal aid to education, the only way we can help build up the valleys, the CVA's and the MVA's, the only way we can pay the cost of the war debt, the only way we can meet a $41,000,000,000 or a $42,000,000,000 budget is to have educated, good American citizens who are skilled, who know how to produce, and who know how to live together. That is the way we get unity. We shall never have unity in America, Mr. President, merely by the passage of a law. We shall have unity in America when men of good will are also men of understanding and learning, and with their education and with their understanding, have learned how to live together and how to work together.

"Oh!" someone will say, "That sounds sort of utopian." It is a long-range project, to be sure. But we have made great strides. No nation in the world has done much better. At this hour we are talking and boasting about our greatness. I have heard speech after speech on the floor of the Senate about the strength of America, about how mighty we are; even rattling the saber at times, if you please, taking on all comers, pouring out our billions. By the way, I believe in Marshall plan aid; I think that is crystal clear. But we beat our chests and say, "How mighty we are." And right within America, the basic institution which has made for that might, which has provided the American people with the know-how with the knowledge, and with the skill and with the talent to produce it, is being allowed to crumble before our eyes. We are permitting public education and education of all kinds in America to be sacrificed on the altar of false economy. That is not the way to protect America. In all reverence, I thank Almighty God that for 160 years, from the days of the Articles of Confederation, and from 1785 down to 1945, the Congress of the United States has seen fit to pass Federal-aid-to-education legislation, starting with the Ordinance of 1785, down to the amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1945. Vocational education—every dollar we have ever put into it has come back a thousandfold.

I cannot for the life of me understand how some people reason. There are always those who want to fight crime by becoming detectives. They have a Dick Tracy spirit in them. There are those who like to fight disease by running around with a DDT gun. There seem to be those who enjoy talking about the slums, but do not want to do anything about them. There are those who like to talk about the American people, too. They like to talk about how intolerant they are. They like to talk sometimes about how great they are. I submit, Mr. President, that the greatest service we in the Congress can do for the American people is to provide them with opportunity. Every American is not looking for security. He perhaps wants to make his own security. He wants opportunity. He wants an opportunity to know what is going on in the world. He wants an opportunity to know what is going on in the Congress, and in the State Department. He wants an opportunity to know what is going on in business and in labor. He wants an opportunity for a job. He does not want doles; he wants a job. He wants an opportunity to elevate himself in his job. He wants an opportunity to know and understand what other people are thinking and what they are saying.

But, Mr. President, a man cannot have opportunity if he has never been given the privilege of enlightenment. He can never be free, if he is bound by his own ignorance. Here, at this critical hour of our Nation's history, when we are drinking more whisky than we have ever drunk before, when we are smoking more cigarettes than we have ever smoked before, when we are going to more ball games than we have ever attended before, and sometimes not seeing such good ones, either [laughter], when we are having more entertainment than we have ever dreamed of before, doing more things than we have ever before thought was humanly possible, with a national income that staggers the imagination—what are we doing about public education? We are arguing about it. We still go around and say, "Well, we are going to be short 350,000 teachers." Three hundred and fifty thousand teachers. I have even thought sometimes that maybe we would do something about this problem if every single teacher in America said to every father and mother, "You take care of these children all year long." That would perhaps wake somebody up, because we who call ourselves the "best parents," we who think we are so good, always plan our winters and our falls with the dear little darlings away from home a part of the time. Now, every man spends a good deal of time looking around for his wife, and every man pays the bills she brings home—if not every one, most of them. There may be a few who have mastered the situation; I am not one. Surely, if the mother of the home is important—and she surely is—surely, if the character of the home is important—and the home surely is—then, Mr. President, I submit that the other person who spends as much time with my son and my daughter as my own wife, the mother of my children, is likewise important—the teacher.

If I am worried about fire protection in my home, Mr. President, I want to be sure that we have good school buildings for the children. It does not make any difference whether they are burned at school or at home; if they are burned, they are burned. It makes no difference whether our children have the finest of parental care at home, if they have intolerant teachers at school.

Mr. President, I am so earnestly in favor of the bill that I want nothing to jeopardize it.

Now I come to the amendment which has been offered. No Senator could be more unhappy than I am at this hour. I do not believe in segregation. Not only do I not believe in it, but when I was mayor of my city I fought against it and broke up patterns of segregation. I did not call upon the Federal Government to do it. As mayor of my city, with a city council and a board of public welfare, we stepped in and broke up patterns of segregation. I wish every city in America would do that. But, as much as I detest segregation, I love education more. I believe education is the fundamental answer, in the long run, to the problem of segregation. I say, with all tolerance, and I hope I shall not be misunderstood, that segregation happens because of lack of understanding. We are all victimized by our weaknesses. We are all torn apart because of our own guilt and our own mistakes. For 300

years we have been cursed with our own guilt and our own mistakes. I submit, Mr. President, that we cannot cure that condition overnight. We can start, and there will be a program to start breaking that condition. But what about those persons who are impoverished and are persecuted? They have been persecuted; there is no question about that. There is nothing more distasteful to me, there is nothing that hurts my heart more, than to see any man, any boy, or any girl discriminated against. In our family, Mr. President, we do not believe in that.

Let us take a look at what the junior Senator from Massachusetts has had to say about this. An amendment was proposed which would have provided a new system of allotment of Federal-aid funds. That amendment was soundly defeated, by a vote of 68 to 11, proving, again, to me, the wisdom of the majority.

If that amendment had been agreed to, what would it have done for the State of Mississippi, in which there is a real problem, of their own making, by their own way of thinking. But it is a real problem. They have a problem in race relations which is not equaled by any Northern State or any Western State. What would the amendment have done? It would have given to Mississippi, with her thousands of underprivileged Negro children and her thousands of underprivileged white children—when one is poor, he is poor, be he white or black; when he is sick, he is sick, white or black, and when he is uneducated, he is uneducated, white or black—that amendment would have given to Mississippi $4,581,000, under the terms of the bill. What will Senate bill 246 do for Mississippi? The bill was brilliantly defended on the floor by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and other Senators who have spoken here. Forgive me if I have forgotten some other Senators. What would that bill have done for Mississippi? Since we are talking about rights and opportunities, let me say that Senate bill 246, if we do not fool with it, will give Mississippi and her poor people—and they have poor ones, and we have them in Minnesota, too—$16,980,000 as compared with $4,581,000, under the formula which was supposed to help them to liberate themselves. It would have reduced every State in the South. It would have helped my State; it would have given my State more money—and we need more money for education in Minnesota. But we have more resources from which to raise money for education. What is more, Mr. President, we have had a better situation over a long period of time than has been the case in some other States.

If there is a fraternity of mankind, we should have some of it in the United States. If there is a unity in this Nation, it should be exemplified by equalizing the benefits, privileges, burdens, and handicaps. I submit that ignorance breeds intolerance. Someone once said that the common man can sometimes be very uncommon. As for those who have not heard the truth, those who have not the spirit of humility and kindness in their hearts, let me say, in all reverence, as it was said on the Cross, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do."

We are out to fight for education. We are doing battle for opportunity and we are doing battle against ignorance and against inadequate opportunity.

Mr. President, that brings me to the concluding remarks I wish to make. I shall not analyze the basic principles of the bill. They have been gone over previously. But I submit that I have been personally on record, as I think all my colleagues know, for civil-rights legislation. I have never had an opportunity to say what I should like to say about some of the civil-rights legislation. To me, the most important pieces of civil-rights legislation are anti-poll-tax legislation and antilynching legislation, because when men, regardless of race, creed, or color, are given full political participation, they will themselves take care of their own problems. There was a revolution in this country once because of taxation without representation. Millions of our people are taxed today without representation. Give to every American the right to vote, and the American people, without Congress, will solve the problems of segregation. But they cannot solve them if they do not have the right to vote.

I shall be here battling for the right to vote, as I think every Senator knows. I do not want to say that in my State we have not made mistakes. We have bigotry and intolerance, just as there is in Iowa and Illinois and every other State. We have a job to do there, also, and all of us must work together to fight this evil which literally consumes us.

Civil rights are more than anti-poll-tax legislation and antilynching legislation, important as they are. Civil rights are more than fair-employment practices. I shall be before a House committee soon testifying for FEPC, and I shall vote for it if I ever get a chance, and I shall try to encourage my friends and neighbors to vote for it also. I do not believe I shall be very lucky in that, but I am working on my friends and neighbors every day. I should like them to help us a little bit once in a while, as one of my colleagues said a few days ago.

Civil rights mean something more than the fiat of Congress. We passed a school health bill a few days ago. How did it happen that the $35,000,000 which the Senate authorized for public school health did not have such an amendment attached to it? If it is the principle we are talking about, it does not make any difference whether it is $300,000,000, $35,000,000, or 35 cents. Could it have been that everybody was for the health services bill, and we did not want to muddy up the waters? I do not know. But I submit that health services are important, too, and that Federal money is important, and direct Federal money to all schools is important. Nothing was said about that.

We debated House bill 3333, which was finally sent back to the committee with an order for a 5-percent reduction. I disagreed with one of my best friends on that matter. But House bill 3333, an appropriation bill, involved the appropriation of Federal money for many purposes—over $2,000,000,000, I believe. Where was the amendment then? We could have attached a nonsegregation amendment to that bill. If it was money about which we were worried, that was the place to attach the antisegregation, nondiscrimination amendment; in other words, no money for heart research to State universities, no money for cancer research, no money for mental-health research, to anybody who practiced any type of segregation. Why was there not such an amendment attached to that bill, if it was a matter of principle?

Mr. President, it is my personal conviction that we are playing with the civil rights of some people. A distinguished Negro Member of the House of Representatives said a few days ago that he was sick and tired of having people attempt to attach civil-rights amendments to every bill that came up.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that the way to avoid the difficulty of which he just complained is to have the administration, the leadership of his party, bring up a civil-rights bill on the floor of the Senate, so that we can have an opportunity to vote on it? Is not that the way to meet that situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator could not have put the matter in a finer way. Of course, that is what the junior Senator from Minnesota believes. That is what I have long favored. But I am a junior Senator, I am a freshman Senator, and I am not on the policy committee. I point out, however, that the President of the United States, in his message to Congress, stated his position, and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee produced for the Senate, and put into what we call the committee process, a complete program of civil rights; and we have had others, too.

But I am not here attempting to excuse the Democratic leadership. I think we have made some mistakes, and I am not being asked to elucidate those mistakes. I know about mistakes. I have made more than my fair share of them. I am an expert on them. I point out to the Senator that that is not the issue we are now facing. The issue is Federal aid to education or no Federal aid.

When the Senate had under consideration the housing bill the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was asked, "Why do you oppose this amendment?"—an antisegregation amendment. He replied, "I oppose it because we will lose 30 votes if it is agreed to." That was the most courageous statement made on the floor of the Senate for many a year. If the Senator from Illinois were making this speech, it would be a better speech, and he would make the very same point, I am sure.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I gather from what the Senator from Minnesota has said that he does not favor segregation in housing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. Then the junior Senator from New York would like to raise the question with the Senator from Minnesota whether he does not think it would have been better to have fought that issue out to a conclusion when the housing bill was before the Senate, as we could have done, invoking cloture, if cloture could have been obtained, to ascertain whether or not we could have had that issue settled then and there, rather than yield finally, as was done in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to reply to the distinguished junior Senator from New York, a true and great friend of civil rights, in these words: I recall that during the consideration of the housing bill an amendment was offered to strike out title II and title IV, the public housing and farm housing titles. I recall that that amendment received 28 votes, according to the record. I also recall that on the day the vote was taken three of our distinguished colleagues were ill, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], leaving a total of 93 Senators available. Not all those Senators were present. Others likewise were detained by illness, and some on official business. It would take 64 Senators to apply cloture, and there were only 65, with everyone supposedly for the housing bill, available. I ask the Senator from New York whether he thinks we could have delivered 64 votes out of a potential 65, who were not even all present on the floor of the Senate, many of them not even available to be contacted, in order to have broken the debate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. IVES. I suggest that the Chair permit the debate to take place by unanimous consent, without the Chair being disturbed each time a question is asked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be in order.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Minnesota was raising a question with the Senator from New York, and the Senator from New York would like to reply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will not be arbitrary about the matter.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York appreciates the attitude of the Chair. In reply to the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from New York would point out that undoubtedly if it had been understood that the segregation question was to be voted on to a conclusion, the issue would not have been determined on that day. Presumably we would have been in the midst of debate for a number of days, during which time Senators whose presence would have been necessary to make it possible to bring about cloture might have arrived in Washington. If perchance they could not have arrived in Washington, if perchance 64 votes could not have been obtained, nothing whatever would have lost by the attempt. We would simply have demonstrated that on some of these questions we were determined to stand firm and not yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to reply in a spirit of charity and humility. We would have had a good fight, it is true, and I would have liked that; I like a good fight. But we got a housing program, and I like that more. We got provision for 810,000 houses, with 279,000 of those 810,000 housing units being made available, if the same proportion is followed now that was used under the act of 1937, to American Negroes, who are often denied good housing.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to point out that nothing in the procedure indicated by the Senator would in any way, shape, or manner have prevented the housing program being finally passed by the Senate. The most that could have occurred would have been a few days' delay.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator from Minnesota any doubt that if the nonsegregation amendment had been attached to the housing bill, the housing bill would have been killed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I answer my distinguished friend from Vermont by saying that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] so clearly stated the case that he has been acclaimed throughout the land for his clear argument. He has been acclaimed by all fair-minded people for the most brilliant argument on this issue that has been put into the RECORD, and I am not going to stand here and try to match that argument. I think the record is clear. The theory, the debate, the practical facts have all been demonstrated, and stand without contradiction.

I should now like to conclude.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York does not like to be interrupting the remarks of the able Senator from Minnesota, but he should make the situation clear. Does not the Senator from Minnesota feel that on some of these questions, where the matter of segregation or the matter of discrimination is at stake, and where I might point out, it properly belongs, the matter should be fought to a final conclusion to ascertain exactly how the Senate stands on these questions?

The Senator from Vermont, by the question which he raised, seemed to indicate that had the antisegregation amendment prevailed we would have had no housing legislation. The junior Senator from New York would like to point out that had such a situation ever arisen we would not have been stopped in any way, shape, or manner from having a decent housing bill such as was actually passed. Had we run into that condition, we could have abandoned the amendment and gone on ahead without it. But the test would have been made. We would have known how we stood. The Senator from New York feels very strongly that whenever any of these questions arise we should not slink away from them, we should not run away from them, but should face them head-on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may reply to our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York, by saying that there is no attempt to slink away. I submit that the issue now before the Senate is Senate bill 246, the bill to provide Federal aid to education, and I submit that the amendments which are proposed to be attached to that bill constitute the slinking away. The slinking away consists in the efforts, if you please, so to distort the legislation or so to set up blocs of resistance against it that it cannot be passed.

It is well and good to have the spirit of conjecture. I, too, like the academic life, and I like to visualize what would happen in the realm of theory. But the simple fact is, Mr. President, that those who have fought for the legislation we are now debating, and those who fought for the housing legislation which the Senate passed, felt we would be taking an undue chance if we accepted the amendments which were proposed.

Mr. President, I may say that the same type of legislation, Federal aid to education, was before the Senate in the Eightieth Congress and was passed by the Senate. The same organizations were interested in the legislation that are interested in it now.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield in a moment. In fact, we, as members of the committee, were condemned for not holding adequate hearings. In the committee in the Eightieth Congress there was no determined effort made for the amendment. There was no determined effort made on the floor for it. In fact, it was felt that it was better to get the bill passed without the amendment rather than to sacrifice passage of the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the housing bill actually provided that the States and the cities would set up local authorities to construct the housing which the Federal Government was going to aid in building, and that the actual building of the houses would be by authorities set up by the cities and the States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Minnesota has been in the South. Does he feel that in the present situation, if the housing bill had been passed containing a provision requiring elimination of segregation, the southern cities and States would set up such authorities and build such houses?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hesitate to make a statement. I doubt that they would, but I hope that they would.

Mr. LONG. I do not think the South would. I should like to ask the Senator this question: If, by the provisions of the bill, nonsegregation were required in all the southern schools, and if the white and colored children were required to go

to school and sit side by side in order to get the Federal aid, does the Senator believe any Southern State at this time would accept the aid under those conditions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the junior Senator from Louisiana what I said before. I hope they would. I think they should. But I am afraid they would not.

Therefore, Mr. President, the issue is education. If the amendment which is now before us were adopted, we would be handing a stone to the Negro who cries out for the bread of knowledge.

Mr. President, the answer to many of these social problems is not simply legislation. Many persons believe that I think the whole answer to racial inequality is Federal legislation. It is not. The answer is opportunity. The answer is education. The answer is the opportunity to be learned, to be informed. I submit to the Senate of the United States, and to the Representatives in Congress of both political parties, that we should get on with the business of this session which we pledged ourselves to transact—the enactment of anti-poll-tax legislation, antilynching legislation with teeth in it, fair employment practices legislation, the establishment of a permanent civil rights commission, and, Mr. President, the elimination of Jim Crowism in interstate commerce. Under the Constitution of the United States there is not a shadow of a doubt that Jim Crowism is not legal. That is the program we should follow. That is the legislation we should enact.

Mr. President, if we can enact that program—fair employment, personal security, political freedom, political participation—if we can adopt the kind of program, that means when a man travels on the trains, on the planes, on the buses, and when he is standing on the corner waiting for a ride, that he will be afforded his guaranteed rights, his equal rights, equal privileges, we will have made the greatest advance that humanity has ever made. That is where we ought to be concentrating our efforts. We should be trying to pass legislation which will make these things possible, and not jeopardize the passage of such legislation as that now pending.

Mr. President, I hope that when we debate health legislation in the Senate, when we debate any kind of social welfare legislation, we will not use delaying tactics but will come to grips with the problems that we will make up our minds to provide for each family a decent home, that we will provide for each American an opportunity for education, which is the right of every American, that we will make up our minds that security in old age and the care for the needy and the sick are the right of the American people.

I yield the floor.

AMERICAN POLICY IN CHINA

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may yield to me at this point, without losing his right to the floor by doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California that the Senator from Nebraska may yield to him without losing his right to the floor? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this morning Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, retired, appeared before the so-called watchdog committee of the ECA and also before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. As the Senate knows, General Chennault was formerly head of the Flying Tigers in China. He has probably had as much experience as has any American in China on the conditions that existed there during the war and that have existed there in the postwar period. I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks the statement made by General Chennault before the Committee on Armed Services, together with the appendix to that statement, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. CLAIRE L. CHENNAULT, UNITED STATES ARMY (RETIRED)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am glad to accept your invitation to testify on the Chinese civil war. Nothing happening in the world today has such a critical bearing on the welfare and security of our country as what is happening in China.

First, I want to say a word about my own position so that it will be perfectly clear to you.

What I am about to say to you I say from the depth of my conviction and with no strings attached. I have lived a full life and I have been lucky enough to have done some things which seemed worth doing. I do not deny that I have deep emotional ties to the Chinese people—to my wife who is Chinese, to our daughter, and to many personal friends and comrades in arms. But I will say that I formed those ties because I went to China in the hope of serving my own country, and that this is still my hope and wish.

Personal interests are also practical facts, which should not be ignored. I am now the head of a civilian air line operating in China. I hope you will believe me when I tell you that I care more for the future of my country than for the fate of my air line, and to this, since certain hints have already been secretly disseminated, I should like to add a further statement. If the United States adopts a positive policy in China, it is my sincerest hope that I may make myself useful in some capacity in the execution of that policy. If I can be used, then it is my intention to sever my connection with and dispose of my interests in my air line, as, for example, Mr. Acheson severed his connection with his law firm when he assumed his present high office.

Having now made my own position clear, let me turn to the matter before us.

WHAT WE FACE IN THE FAR EAST

A year ago I testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the situation in the Far East. In the unbroken series of disasters that have unrolled since then I believe I can say that practically everything I predicted in my earlier testimony has come to pass, and has done so for the reasons which I gave in my analysis at that time.

It is not my purpose, however, to be justified as a prophet of disaster. I have had my share of recriminations given and received, but this is no time for more. The mistakes of past policy have been costly ones, both for ourselves and for the Chinese. Both must bear a heavy burden of responsibility for them and pay heavily. But there is no use in dwelling upon the errors of the past except as they may shape the decisions we make now for future action.

The only constructive approach to the unparallelled gravity of the situation with which we now find ourselves confronted—like the fall of France in 1940—is to regard it afresh, as though it were a problem encountered for the first time, to analyze it coldly, and from this analysis to find a solution which will best serve our fundamental American national purposes and policies.

I don't presume to appear with any single ready-made far eastern program. There are programs of many possible sizes and prices. Our choice depends on fundamental decisions of policy, weighed against risk and cost and ability to pay. I have no judgment as to what you think you can afford to pay. All I can honestly offer is my own analysis, based upon the years I have lived and worked and fought in Asia, of what we are up against, whether there is anything we can do, and what considerations to weigh in deciding what to do.

In this unhappy situation the choice is not between a course of action which will produce ideal results and a course of action which will produce evil results. The choice is between a painful and expensive course of action, which may not immediately accomplish too much to boast about, and a painless and inexpensive inaction, which will certainly end in catastrophe.

The policy that is still being proposed and has thus far been followed in the Far East is one of inaction—like the days after Hitler marched into the Rhineland. We should be quite clear in our own minds about the price tag this policy, so anaesthetic today, will utilmately bear. When "the dust settles," we will be buried under the dust. If we understand how gigantic is the price of inaction in the Far East—as in the Rhineland—I am confident, knowing my country, that we shall act—late—but we shall act.

Let me be perfectly specific about this catastrophe—and I use the word in its exact sense—that I now foresee.

A COMMUNIST CHINA MEANS A COMMUNIST ASIA

The best part of China has been lost already by our passivity. If we do not act soon, all China will be lost. The Chinese Communist government will be on the borders of Indochina, Siam, and Burma. In Indochina, the Moscow-trained leader, Ho Chih Min, has already established his Communist regime. The French have been powerless to suppress him. With support from across the Chinese border, it is mathematically certain that Ho Chih Min will extend his rule to include most or all of Indochina. Thus, Siam will be surrounded on two sides, and will fall. Malaya, where the government is already having difficulty suppressing Communist guerrillas, may be expected to follow. The fate of disordered Burma, where there is also a powerful Communist movement, will certainly be sealed. And the rich islands of Indonesia will also find their way into these new provinces of the Soviet Union's new Asiatic empire.

In themselves, these will constitute gigantic defeats for the West in the cold war with the Soviet system. But these defeats, inevitably, will bring in their train others still more terrible. On one side Communist occupation of southeast Asia will bring grave pressure upon India and encourage the Soviets to resume their interrupted drive into the critical region of the Middle East. On the other side, still more significant to us, we have already seen the danger signals. The brutal murder of Madame Quezon and her daughter a few days ago less than 100 miles from Manila is proof enough of the continued seriousness of the Communist-led Huk insurrection in the Philippines. From Japan we have already received reports that the Com-

munist successes in China have encouraged resistance to the American occupation. This is only the little wind before a great storm.

Here I come close to the very heart of the matter, for I believe if your committee inquires closely you will find that our inaction in China has been defended and excused on a seemingly plausible theory. We shall hold in the Pacific, it has been said, and said in very high quarters, on the Japan-Okinawa line. The islands are to be our outposts. We shall defend them, and what happens on the continent of Asia may be ignored.

It is optimistic nonsense to suppose that with all of Asia in Communist hands Japan and the Philippines will remain peacefully on our side. Japan is virtually entirely dependent on trade with Asia for her continued existence. It was this very dependence that drove the Japanese militarists into their attempt to found the so-called greater East Asia coprosperity sphere. With Asia in the grip of communism, there can be only two futures for Japan. Either the United States will transform Japan into a colony, at once spending vast sums to feed her people, and stopping at nothing to repress their impulses toward independence, or Japan will ultimately join the parade and come under Communist rule like the rest of Asia. I cannot imagine my country in the role of ruthless imperialist. And so I foresee a Communist Japan at the end of the easy road we are now so comfortably following.

I do not say that all these disasters are to happen at once. It will take many months for the Chinese Communists to establish mastery of all of China, even if this country extends no helping hand to the anti-Communist forces. It will take perhaps several years before the whole process can work itself out. But you have here a situation like that which confronted the Congress when the Greek-Turkish aid bill was passed. The loss of Greece or Turkey would have started a chain reaction which could not have been stopped. Therefore, the Congress interposed, to prevent the loss of Greece and Turkey. In the same way a chain reaction menaces now in the Far East. It may take a long time before the final explosion. But once it has been allowed to start, it will continue until that final explosion occurs.

I do not voice only my personal opinion. I think I am right in saying that Gen. Douglas MacArthur believes that a communized Asia will eventually produce a communized Japan. I think I am right in saying that he has plainly warned our Government of this danger. Perhaps your committee would want to ask him about it. Meanwhile, now that I have named names, you will see why I have said this process in the Far East can result in catastrophe for us. For what will be the result? The result will be that the powerful industrial potential of a communized Japan will be added to the vast raw material resources, and the immense manpower of a communized Asia. In another form, this is exactly what we fought the last bloody, cruel, costly war in the Pacific to prevent. This will be the sacrifice, the criminal waste of all our tremendous efforts. This will be a threat to us still worse than the threat we struggled for 4 years to avert. It will be worse for a simple reason. The new greater East Asia coprosperity sphere will be the partner of the Soviet Union. From the Bering Strait to Bali, all will be under one direction, in the grip of a single power. In these circumstances, what will be the situation of Pearl Harbor and Midway and Guam and Wake, of New Zealand and Australia and the Philippines and the lesser Pacific islands? We are fools if we think we can defend the Pacific from this side of the ocean. We should have learned that lesson last time. And we are worse fools still if we think that with the Pacific imperiled, the United States will be safe. What is at stake here is simply the security of this country. That is what you are debating, gentlemen, and not the mere policy to be adopted toward a distant Oriental nation.

While national security is at stake, economic factors should not weigh too heavily. But I would also remind you that the strategic raw materials of this vast region will be denied us. And our far eastern markets will either be closed to us, or perhaps we may be allowed a carefully controlled trade, limited to supplying an implacable enemy with the means of modern warfare, with arms to be thrown back at us and our children—as the scrap we so obligingly furnished to Japan was thrown back at us at Pearl Harbor.

No one who can understand the significance of what is happening now in Asia can find much comfort in the reports that the Berlin blockade may soon be lifted. It is understandable that Russia, standing now on the brink of unlimited successes in the Far East, should be prepared to reduce temporarily its liabilities in the European area, if it can thereby buy time to consolidate these successes. But once having given them this time to consolidate at the price of a little surcease in the west, we may then expect new and redoubled pressure in Europe. Never forget that the Communists have a master plan. They may shift their emphasis from east to west and back again as it suits them but they will never give up their prime objective to beat what they consider to be the ultimate enemy of communism, that is, the United States. Did you see the significant chart in last Sunday's New York Times entitled "The Russians Talk Peace in the West and Wage War in the East," showing the interrelation of their east-west moves? I have this chart with me and would like to put it in the record.

Those of us who have dealt with communism at the closest range both in Asia and in Europe know we will be resented for dashing wishful thinking about the peace the American people want. But we have to tell the truth that any apparent lull in the cold war is no basis for dreaming that the Communists are permanently giving up their war against us in any theater.

For nearly 10 years I have lived face to face with communism in Asia and its permanent goal of world domination, whatever its temporary shifting tactics. Since I am considered an alarmist and a dangerous man for persisting in my warnings I was much encouraged to read in the Washington Times-Herald yesterday an International News Service story of the views of that other American officer who has lived the closest to Communist tactics. That is Gen. Lucius Clay, an officer whose integrity and capacity I know every member of this committee and of Congress appreciates. I have a copy here of the story which many of you may have read. As the story reads, General Clay warned that the west should be wary of any agreement with Russia because the fixed objective of communism remains world domination through revolution. The story goes on quoting General Clay verbatim:

"The next question I asked General Clay was:

" 'Have you any reason to believe that Soviet leadership has abandoned or is about to abandon the ultimate objective of achieving Communist domination of the world?'

"General Clay replied:

" 'The Communist Party and the Communist world movement has a fixed objective. That objective is world domination through revolution.

" 'It is a long-range objective. That objective will never change because if it did communism would die. However, the intensity of effort can go through many changes'."

In the face of these facts it is my fundamental premise that the United States cannot afford to allow communism to sweep Asia, and that, even if it were, regardless of the cost, we must take effective positive action now to see that its present advance is halted. The alternative cannot be faced. A fully sovietized Asia and western Pacific would represent such a decisive disturbance of the present precarious balance of strength between the Western and the Eastern Worlds and the implications of that unbalance would present such a serious immediate threat to our national security that I have no doubt in my own mind that the American people could no more accept such a position without resistance than the Communists could refrain from pressing their great advantage. The effect, therefore, would be to precipitate almost immediately a world conflict which might well destroy civilization. In the face of such a situation we would have no choice of action and policy except the instinctive reactions of survival. Today we still have a limited choice, we still have time to decide on and execute a policy of positive action which may yet avert the ultimate catastrophe.

THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS ARE EFFECTIVE PARTS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

In our analysis of Asiatic communism let us make no mistake about what we are up against. Much is being said and written today in an effort to lull the American people into a sense of false security. It is said that the Chinese Communist movement is more nationalist than it is Communist and that when the conquest is completed we will find that Mao Tze Tung has become a new and greater Tito. It is said in short that we can safely sit by and await the inevitable and mutually destructive conflict between Russian and Chinese communism to break out.

A. T. Steele and Andrew Roth, correspondents respectively for the New York Herald Tribune and the Nation, representing most divergent points of view, have both recently come out of the Communist cities of Peiping and Tientsin. As I read their dispatches, they are both agreed that the Chinese Communist leaders are Communists in the truest sense of the word, that they stand squarely and faithfully upon the foreign-policy line of the Kremlin, that they fully expect the outbreak soon of World War III and consequently regard the Western Powers, and particularly America, as their implacable enemies. Steele and Roth are also agreed that while Titoism and serious conflict with Moscow may break out at some time in the future there is absolutely no evidence that this is a factor to be seriously reckoned with for a long time to come.

The theory that the Chinese Communists may some day break with Moscow is at least interesting enough to be worth discussing. I cannot say the same for the even more prevalent theory that the Chinese Communists "never can organize China," will be "absorbed" by the Chinese, and so on. Since the time of Christ, China has been ruthlessly "organized," just to name the high spots, by the first and second Han dynasties, the T'ang dynasty, the Sung dynasty, the Yuan dynasty, the Ming dynasty, and the Manchu dynasty. Every one of these great ruling systems eventually decayed under the corrupting influence of absolute power. That is what is meant by Chinese "absorption." The average period before full decay set in was about 200 years each and in 200 years we won't be here to benefit by what happens to the Chinese Communists, who have more resources, in arms, in transport, in communication, and in experience with modern police-state techniques, to organize China than any of their imperial predecessors. The "morass" theory will not work when applied to a conqueror with modern techniques of coercion. Theoretically,

Russia was to be the morass that would destroy Hitler, but you and I know what enormous outside efforts had to be made by Russia's allies before the morass could be made to stop Hitler.

In short, I do not discount the possibility that Asiatic communism may be modified and subverted in the long run nor do I discount the long-run importance of this prospect for democracy in Asia and in the whole world. What I am saying is that it is very unlikely it will happen in time to prevent that present unsettling of the balance of world power which will precipitate world war III. That can be prevented only if we are able to halt and contain the advance of communism in Asia now. And I also say that only if we can halt and contain communism in Asia now can we set up the only conditions under which these modifying forces can operate upon it. These conditions are that there should at least exist side by side with communism on the mainland of Asia, substantial areas of insulation against its further spread, areas which will not only be focal points to rally against the Communists the hatred all Chinese have for any foreign domination but will also show the peoples of Asia that there is available to them an infinitely better alternative to communism which will satisfy their genuine and desperate needs for peace and livelihood without enslaving them.

WHAT WE CAN DO AND WHAT WE CAN WORK WITH

The next question is whether there is anything we can do, whether it is not too late to take any action, as the defeatists among us are so eager to argue. My answer to this is emphatically "Yes." There is a great deal that we can do and much that we can work with. The defeatists didn't believe that the Flying Tigers had a chance against the Japanese in 1941.

The Chinese do not like communism. It is opposed to their deepest traditions and threatens the values that they have been brought up to revere most. They recognize and hate it as a form of foreign domination. Given a chance they will fight it and fight it valiantly. I make this statement in the face of all the recent press reports of Chinese armies which have refused to fight, of mass desertions to the Communists, and of the virtually unopposed recent advances of Communist troops. These things are happening because the troops opposing the Communists in the areas of the present fighting no longer feel that they have a chance to win. For many reasons—and much of the responsibility is ours—in these areas the authority of the Central Government of China has disintegrated, and its incapacity to defend itself has become apparent to troops in the field. The situation in China, particularly central China, has so deteriorated that the Communists can in many places offer themselves as the only group with sufficient authority and power to establish order and hold out a prospect of peace. Where there is no alternative to communism it is surely not surprising to find that it enjoys apparent public support or at least public acceptance.

Where the Chinese people can see an effective alternative to communism they have shown that they will choose it and will defend it with their lives. Opposition to the Communists has been coming increasingly and is now predominantly from provincial and other local leaders. These local regimes vary in their effectiveness, strength, and the enlightenment of their government. Where they are effective, however, as for example in the territory of Marshal Yen in Shansi, there is genuine popular support for resistance to Communist conquest. When the people feel the fight is worth it, they will resist valiantly. The defense of Taiyuan, the Pittsburgh of China, is an excellent example of what I am talking about. Taiyuan was surrounded and besieged by Communist armies in July 1948. It held out against its besiegers for more than 9 months; being supplied during all that time by air-lifted supplies alone. When it finally fell on April 23, 1949, it was only after the city had been ringed with Communist artillery, had been subjected to 10 days of the most intense shelling, had been set afire, and finally had had its garrison wiped out to the last man. This last fact is what is important for us to remember. The Chinese soldier will fight Chinese Communists if he feels the fight is worth it. The defense of Taiyuan will rank among the great heroic epics of military history, comparable to the Chinese defense of Hengyang against the Japanese in 1944.

If all of China is allowed to fall to the Communists it will not be because the Chinese people want or prefer communism. It will merely be because they have been given over to the Communists by default, because they have been offered no defendable alternative to communism. We can, if we will, provide that alternative and if we do we will find that the Chinese people will choose it. There are few convictions which I hold more firmly than this.

THERE ARE STILL VITAL AREAS OF CHINA READY TO RESIST

If we determine that our national security requires us to adopt a policy of positive action in Asia with the object of halting and containing the Communist threat there, we will have much with which we can fight and work besides the dollars of American taxpayers. There is in the first place the tremendous reservoir of liking and gratitude for America and the American people much of which—all propaganda to the contrary—endures even now. There is the essential dislike of communism and abhorrence of totalitarian enslavement which we can count on to produce a genuine and vigorous resistance to communism provided that we can offer a defendable alternative. There are the local and provincial regimes along the periphery of China, areas such as Kwangtung, Hunan, Kwangsi, Yunnan, Szechuan and the Mohammedan northwest where the tradition of local autonomy has always been strong and where there are leaders determined to resist conquest.

Most of these provincial leaders and the vitally important areas they control I have visited during the past 30 days. A great deal of China and some 150,000,000 people still remain outside the iron curtain. This is substantially what was Free China during the war against the Japanese, a base adequate to liberate all China in the end. These people are willing, indeed anxious, to fight if provided with the minimum of aid, just enough to restore their confidence and provide them a reasonable hope of winning. With the proper kind of aid and support from the United States, and the kind of communication and strategy that can be given them by air, these peripheral areas can be welded into an effective union of Chinese resistance—effective enough to stop the Communists where they are and to keep the conquered parts of China unmanageable by them.

For supplies there are still available vast stock piles of arms and material lying in the Philippines and Pacific bases. With these a new Chinese resistance may yet be armed. We cannot justify our failure to defend our most vital defensive positions on the grounds that there is nothing with which we can fight. The thing lacking in China is a reasonable hope of defensive victory to give the will to resist. This we can create if we choose.

THE ANSWER TO CORRUPTION

But it will be said that there is no use in extending further assistance to China, that the Chinese are hopelessly corrupt, that the money we gave them in the past was frittered away wastefully, or diverted to the enrichment of a few corrupt leaders in high places, and that the arms we gave were lost to the Communists by surrender or capture. None of these things need be. There need be no loss of arms by surrender or capture if they are placed in the hands of men willing to fight, and we can see to it that they are. There can be no denying that there has been and is widespread corruption in China. But this is not a peculiarly Chinese phenomenon or a characteristic of the Chinese personality. There is widespread corruption everywhere in the world where the conditions permitting corruption are allowed to flourish and cannot be brought under control. This is especially true in countries like China which have been impoverished and made chaotic by constant fighting and warfare, where the authority and morale of the state has been undermined and where most of the people live on the margin of survival. We know that there has been widespread corruption in postwar France, Germany and Italy, and for the same reasons as in China. The answer is to make sure that the conditions permitting corruption are held in check.

The diversion of aid to China in recent years was due to several factors which do not need to recur in our present desperate hour. The conditions of war-borne devastation and chaos which make for corruption wherever they occur were at their very worst in postwar China, after 20 years of civil war, invasion and occupation. Against those conditions there came into operation the fact that we were giving money away to every other government on earth without strings—as naturally they preferred us to give it—and they all rationalized what they preferred with the cry that their sovereignty would be violated if conditions were imposed. China was no exception. She insisted on being treated like the rest.

A further factor was that under these conditions of the maximum incitation to corruption our officials didn't want to try to supervise the distribution of our aid for fear that the task was hopeless and that they would only get individually involved. We were so afraid of a legendary corruption in China that we preferred to give—and assuage our consciences by the act of giving—without following through to see that the gift was not wasted or diverted.

Whatever consequences that combination of circumstances brought about in the past, there is no need for it to recur now. On the Chinese side the proudest Chinese official is sufficiently aware of the desperation of the anti-Communist cause that he is willing to take any reasonable conditions of supervision to get effective aid. On our part we have from our dealings with the whole world acquired the moral courage not to give away our resources free-handedly without making our gifts subject to careful American supervision. After all, even in the United States where our ethical standards are so high I have been informed that it was the invariable practice of Mr. Jesse Jones when he made a big Government loan to send his own man along with the money to make sure how it was spent.

In any future program of aid to China our problem will simply be to see to it that there is adequate supervision by our own men to make sure that we get what we are paying for. The Chinese will not resent this or refuse to cooperate. I need cite only the period when General Wedemeyer commanded in China, from October 1944, until the end of the war. With little means, immense progress was made in that period, under General Wedemeyer's brilliant and tactful leadership. If General Wedemeyer had been enabled in peacetime to continue the work he began so well in war, I have no doubt that we should have no problem now. Yet I do not think the bitterest enemies of a positive policy in China would venture to call General Wedemeyer a friend of waste and corruption.

WHAT WE SHOULD DO

There is finally then the question of what we should do, how we should do it and what it will cost. That is basically a question of how much we want to do and what we think we can afford to pay for it. What we have to do may be less than what we want to do.

What we have to do—the very minimum objectives which will meet our requirements of security and defense—I personally regard as being the halting of the Communist advance before it engulfs all of Asia and its containment by establishing and fostering sanitary areas of effective resistance, without trying to reconquer the China already lost. And I must emphasize again that these areas of resistance must be such both in the military sense and in the sense that they offer ideological resistance and competition to communism. They must be sufficiently progressive and enlightened both politically and economically that the people of China and of all Asia can have living proof that democracy can meet their material, political, and spiritual aspirations better than can communism. In any area that we assist and work with we must insist that the necessary policies and reforms are carried out to make certain that this will be true.

I know what I do not know. I do not venture to figure the cost of this necessary defensive reconstruction and ideological work in that part of China we can still save from the military conquest. However, there are qualified men in the ECA China office who can give you these estimates.

I do venture to think I know what it would cost to hold the yet unconquered part of China against military conquest by the Communists until events are clearer as to the general course of our world struggle with communism and a more permanent Far Eastern policy.

The territory involved is essentially that part of China over which I fought for 4 years in World War II. I will not try to offer details in public testimony. But I have thought through details of a plan and I have honestly calculated that, from the military side alone, competent men in the Defense Department with Asiatic and air experience could work out adequate defense plans for the next couple of years at a cost per year not exceeding the Berlin airlift. Such a minimum program is, I am sure, well within the national purse, considering the stakes involved.

If that estimate seems low I confess I have always had to figure how to do a lot with a little—I have always had to do with less pilots, gasoline, and supplies than the tables called for. But I honestly think that, from the military side alone, this minimum amount would provide an effective holding action to keep a significant portion of China free as a beachhead for the resurgence of Chinese nationalism at an opportune time. I am aware that it has often been charged against me that I think only in terms of military operations against communism and do not appreciate the economic, political, and spiritual factors involved. I appreciate my limitations: I am only a soldier. But I do say to those who thus criticize me that they do not understand their own limitations. When you are trying to defend liberty against conquerors "on the make," particularly in Asia, there is no avoiding the necessity of using affirmative force. Mr. Churchill understood that when Mr. Chamberlain didn't. No conqueror "on the make" from Ghengis Khan to Napoleon to Hitler ever just burned out or stuck in a morass or was stopped by ideas alone. In addition to the imponderable operation of the forces of what we call truth, somebody just had to kill him. And all kinds of abilities are needed to stop this most cunning conqueror "on the make" of all time.

Beyond this minimum I have outlined we can, if we are prepared to spend more, raise our sights almost indefinitely. We could even undertake the reconquest of Communist China and Manchuria, though there can be no doubt that to do so would cost an enormous sum and would require a very long time.

But even achieving these minimum objectives depends upon our being prepared immediately to abandon a policy of passive inaction for a positive approach and attitude that is daring, flexible, and quick-footed. We are dealing with a highly fluid and rapidly changing situation and we will have to be able to take our advantages immediately and to adapt our means and methods constantly.

In conclusion I have only this to say:

First, we can only protect our security in this crisis by taking positive and decisive action. I am convinced that we will have to accomplish at least the minimum program which I have outlined today. It would be the height of folly and self-delusion to put our trust and our hopes of security in the belief that though we do nothing ourselves, we can yet be saved by the falling out of the Communist leaders among themselves or with Moscow or by the liberalizing effect of non-Communist elements.

Secondly, if we are to act at all, we must act very quickly. There is no time to be lost in developing and implementing a program for action. We have today in China a highly fluid situation in which there is room to maneuver and in which we can act to our advantage. That will not be true for long and it may cease to be true very soon. We cannot afford to wait "for the dust to settle" for, again, when the dust has settled it will have settled on us.

I am off to Louisiana for a badly needed rest and some catfishing. I have seen things much worse in China, and I have seen us turn them around and win.

And because I have solid faith in my own country's slowly stirred but ultimate wisdom, I go home with hope.

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT BY GENERAL CHENNAULT

THE POTENTIAL OF EFFECTIVE RESISTANCE TO COMMUNIST CONQUEST IN WEST AND SOUTH CHINA

On China's western and southern periphery the potential exists for creating an effective zone of resistance, to halt the advance of Communist conquest and to insulate the Communist areas from southeast Asia. The following is a brief account of these areas and their peoples and of the provincial leaders who control them. I have visited most of these leaders within the past 80 days.

At the extreme northwest of China lies Ningsia Province with an area of 106,000 square miles and a population of 724,000 people. The people are Chinese Mohammedan, Chinese Buddhist, and Mongol. Ningsia produces wool, camels hair, skins, furs, and some minerals. The Governor of Ningsia is Ma Hung-kwei, a Mohammedan. During the past 10 years, despite the war with Japan and with the Communists, Ma Hung-kwei has irrigated a considerable area of fertile land bordering the Yellow River and is now engaged in a program of reforestation and agricultural expansion. The farmers of Ningsia own the land they work. Ma has established schools and hospitals, and has built good auto roads connecting the principal towns. Despite the mixture of religions and races in Ningsia, the people dwell together in peace with equal privileges and opportunities.

Ma Hung-kwei has an excellent army composed of both Mohammedan and non-Mohammedan troops. He has kept the Japanese out of his province throughout the war with Japan and has kept the Communists out for more than 20 years. Recently the Communists occupied Paotow, the terminus of the Hopei-Suiyuan railway. Although Paotow is outside of Ningsia, Ma Hung-kwei promptly dispatched a force which drove the Communists out of the city and which still holds it. Ma Hung-kwei and his people will fight communism to the death, but they need arms and economic aid.

Bordering Ningsia on the south is the long, narrow province of Kansu, known as the gateway to the northwest from the most ancient times. Kansu has an area of 151,000 square miles and a population of 6,255,000. The Governor is General Kuo Chi-Chao, a non-Mohammedan Chinese. The people are Han, Mohammedan, Mongol, and Turki. Although the province is traversed by a highway, it can be defended easily because of the nature of the terrain. Kansu requires both military and economic aid in order to maintain its resistance to Communist penetration.

South of Kansu is high mountainous Tsinghai with an area of 269,000 square miles and a population of one and one-half million. The Mohammedan Governor, Ma Pu-fang, is one of the most liberal and progressive officials in China. Education through high school is compulsory. The population consists of Hans, Mohammedans, Tibetans, Mongols, Turks, and a number of minor tribes, but there is no discrimination anywhere because of race or religion.

Ma Pu-fang has about 150,000 troops, who are volunteers and not conscripts. The people support the army wholeheartedly. About 75,000 troops are maintained along the Kansu-Shensi border to prevent the invasion of Kansu—which would open the approach to Tsinghai. The Tsinghai troops have fought many battles with the Communists during the last 25 years and have never lost a fight. Last year they surrounded and exterminated an army of some 30,000 Communists who were approaching the southeast border of Kansu. The Tsinghai troops are rated as the best in China, and their record against both the Japanese and the Communists warrants this rating. Tsinghai has no arsenal, and Ma needs military equipment. He could easily maintain 200,000 first-class troops if provided with the minimum of arms and ammunition. Tsinghai also requires economic aid in order to increase food production and to develop its resources. Military equipment furnished Tsinghai and Ningsia will never fall into the hands of the Communists.

Southeast of Tsinghai lies the province of Szechwan with an area of 145,000 square miles and a population of 45,800,000. Szechwan is a great basin, so well protected by mountain barriers that the Japanese could never enter it. Even Kublai Khan and his Mongol warriors passed around Szechwan in their conquest of Central and Southwest China. The leading figure of Szechwan is the former Premier of China, Chang Chun. Because of its enormous population, Szechwan can furnish almost any number of troops, and it is capable of feeding them. However, it will require military aid in order to equip its troops. Because of its enormous population and agricultural resources, Szechwan alone could maintain opposition to communism indefinitely if furnished relatively small amounts of military and economic aid.

Southwest of Szechwan is Yunnan with an area of 162,000 square miles and a population of 10,900,000. Yunnan occupies a unique position in any strategic plan for the land movement of troops to the south, southwest, and west of China. It is a high plateau bordered by rough, almost trackless mountains on the north and east. It slopes down to the border of Indochina on the south, the northern border of Siam on the southwest and the northeastern border of Burma on the west. On the north, it is bordered by the high, practically impassable province of Sikang. It is the key to any movement of military forces by land to the south, southwest, and west, or, as in the war with Japan, to the northeast from Indochina, Siam, and Burma.

Yunnan was conquered last by Kublai Khan. During the war with Japan, Yunnan provided the supply line for the remainder of China; first via railway from Haiphong to Kunming; next via the Burma Road from Rangoon to Kunming and, finally, after the capture of Rangoon early in 1942, by the ATC's air supply route over the "hump," which terminated in fields built by Yunnan. Despite its importance as China's supply line, the Japanese could not conquer or neutralize the province. They approached its southeastern border by way of Nanning in 1939–40; they reached its southern border at Lao Kay after taking over Indochina in 1940–41 and in 1942 their victorious Burma army penetrated southwest Yunnan to the Salween River. There they remained until driven back into Burma in the late summer of 1944. If the Japanese had been able to overrun Yunnan at any time between 1938 and late 1944, all American aid to China would have been stopped and China might have capitulated to Japan—with far-reaching results to the war in the Pacific.

In the hands of the Communists, Yunnan would be utilized as a base and springboard for launching large-scale movements into Indochina, Siam, and Burma; movements which could not be resisted by the anti-Communist elements in these strife-torn countries. The approaches to Yunnan by land are long and difficult and a relatively small force, properly equipped, can defend the province easily. Yunnan should be given whatever aid is required to insure its defense against Communist occupation, for the defense of Yunnan is the defense of all the lands to the south and west—including, eventually, Malaya, Indonesia, and India.

East of Yunnan are Kweichow and Kwangsi. Kweichow is a high, rough province, extremely poor and with very poor land communications. It is the road to Yunnan from the east but the road is long and difficult. An invading army cannot sustain itself on the food available in Kweichow.

Kwangsi is the home of freedom-loving, warrior people. Its two great leaders are Li Tsung-jen, the Acting President of China, and Pei Chung-hsi, an able Mohammedan general. Both Li and Pei have a deep love for their native province and both are loved by their people. Li has failed to obtain an honorable peace with the Communists, but both he and Pei will fight to the death to prevent Communist conquest of the province. Li, Pei, and the present governor, Huang Shih-chu, cooperated perfectly with American troops in Kwangsi during the war with Japan. Kwangsi could easily supply a half million troops to fight communism but they would require both economic and military aid in order to feed and equip them.

East of Kwangsi are Hunan and Kwangtung provinces. Hunan is the home of people who have been noted for their fighting qualities from the most ancient times. Changsha, in north Hunan, has been the gateway to south China for many centuries. South of Changsha, Hengyang commands the lines of communication to the south and southwest. Neither Kwangsi nor Kwangtung can be invaded by land forces so long as either Changsha or Hengyang is held by the defenders. Hunan troops would require military aid in order to sustain operations against the Communists.

Kwangtung has an area of 85,500 square miles and a population of 32,300,000. Although there is widespread banditry in the province and general dissatisfaction with the National Government, there are few real Communists. The Kwangtung people or Cantonese, as they are generally known, have long been noted for their love of independence and their warlike temperament. The present governor, Gen. Hsieh Yoh, is one of China's ablest and most aggressive generals. He fought both Japanese and Communists to the bitter end during the war with Japan when he was Governor of Hunan. He is irrevocably committed to fight Communists as long as he lives and can accomplish more with less supply than any other general of south China. He is progressive and liberal and could put American aid and technical assistance to good use.

Although Hainan Island is a part of Kwangtung Province, it is administered separately under a commissioner. The present commissioner is Gen. Chen Chi-tung, former Governor of Kwangtung. Chen Chi-tung had an excellent record as a progressive liberal during his period of office as Governor of Kwangtung. He is extremely popular with the people and friendly to foreigners and foreign capital. Although Hainan Island is infested with bandits at present, Chen, during my last talk with him in late March, expressed confidence in his ability to pacify the area and restore trade. If other ports are lost to the Communists, Samoh and Yulin bays, developed by the Japanese, provide excellent harbors on the southwest tip of the island. Supplies can be flown from Samoh to Kwangsi and Yunnan very easily. Hainan is rich in undeveloped resources but requires both economic and military aid in order to develop its resources and equip its troops.

With the possible exception of Kweichow, all of the provinces which I have described in this paper either produce or can produce goods which could be used to repay much that might be spent for both economic and military aid. Ningsia exports wool, camel hair, hides, and fur. Kansu has the same export items plus bristles of fine quality and sheep casings. Tsinghai produces musk, silver, gold, wool, hides, and sheep casings. Szechwan exports tung oil, eggs, feathers, bristles, and could export mica, tea, and sugar. Yunnan has 10 to 15 percent of the world's tin resources and also produces bristles and silver. Kwangsi, Hunan, and Kwangtung have tin, antimony, wolfram, eggs, bristles, and tung oil. Hainan Island has iron in enormous quantities, valuable woods, sugar, alcohol, and fish for export. We need most of these products and except for a few minor items, they do not compete with our production. Japan also needs some of these products, particularly iron, timber, sugar, alcohol, antimony, and wolfram. In fact, Japanese industry can never be rehabilitated to the point where she becomes self-supporting without them.

This paper is necessarily limited and I have made no attempt to describe other areas of lesser importance where resistance to communism could be organized; areas such as southern Kiangsi and Fukien. Formosa I have deliberately failed to mention because if Asia is to be saved it must be saved on the mainland. Once the mainland has fallen to the Communists Formosa would be untenable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I briefly want to call a couple of paragraphs to the attention of the Senate from the volume entitled "Foreign Relations of the United States. Japan. 1931–41," volume II, issued by the Department of State. One of them begins on page 768. It is a reprint of the document which was handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador Nomura on November 26, 1941, just about a week before Pearl Harbor. At the time it was handed to the Japanese Ambassador it was labeled "Strictly confidential." The document, of course, has since been published as part of the public records.

On page 769 in section II of the note that was handed by this Government to the Government of Japan appears paragraph 4, and it says:

4. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking.

That is, the National Government of China, which was then headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

On the morning of December 7, at the time the Japanese planes were attacking Pearl Harbor, the Japanese Ambassador handed to the American Secretary of State a note which is found on page 791 of the same volume:

All the items demanded of Japan by the American Government regarding China such as wholesale evacuation of troops or unconditional application of the principle of nondiscrimination in international commerce ignored the actual conditions of China, and are calculated to destroy Japan's position as the stabilizing factor of east Asia. The attitude of the American Government in demanding Japan not to support militarily, politically, or economically any regime other than the regime of Chungking, disregarding thereby the existence of the Nanking government—

Which, parenthetically, was the Japanese puppet government at the time—

shatters the very basis of the present negotiation. This demand of the American Government falling, as it does, in line with its above-mentioned refusal to cease from aiding the Chungking regime, demonstrates clearly the intention of the American Government to obstruct the restoration of normal relations between Japan and China and the return of peace to east Asia.

As I have already pointed out, immediately following the handing of that note—as a matter of fact, coincidentally with the handing of the note—the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor. If we felt that the situation was of such moment to the national defense of the United States of America and to the ultimate peace of the world that we should have insisted upon the support of the National Government of China in 1941, then it seems to me that it is utterly inconsistent for our Government now to say that we are unconcerned if 450,000,000 people of China pass behind the Communist iron curtain.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD two additional documents. Sometimes I think our memories are very short. These have both been certified as being correct by the Adjutant General of the United States Army. The first one relates to the Distinguished Service Medal:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Commander in Chief of the Military Forces of the Republic of China, performed distinguished services from May 1943 to September 1945 by leading his beleaguered nation's fight against the onslaught of the Japanese invader. Beset by seemingly insuperable handicaps imposed by shortages of aircraft, modern weapons, and other vital material, he stood firm, inspiring the Chinese armies to contain and inflict heavy casualties upon more than a million hostile troops in the vast reaches and forbidding terrain of China. His determined attempts to drive the enemy from his native land culminated in a powerful campaign which was forcing the Japanese back when hostilities were terminated by the enemy's surrender. Through his courage, resourcefulness, statesmanship, and unassailable conviction that eventual victory would reward his suffering fellow country-

men, Generalissimo Chiang made a contribution of major proportions to the success of the United Nations.

The second document is also certified to by the Adjutant General of the United States Army. It relates to the Legion of Merit, Degree of Chief Commander. It reads as follows:

LEGION OF MERIT, DEGREE OF CHIEF COMMANDER

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Commander in Chief of Chinese Military Forces. For extraordinary fidelity and exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services while in a position of the highest responsibility as Generalissimo and Supreme Commander in Chief of the valiant military forces of the Republic of China, while engaged in a great war, as the champion of liberty and freedom against one of the common enemies of the United Nations. His noble and inspiring achievements as the military leader of his country have culminated in the unification of the Chinese people, thereby making possible their successful resistance of the enemy's onslaught and contributing in a high degree to the ultimate freedom of the world from the shackles of Japanese domination and the fear of aggression.

Mr. President, this is the same Chiang Kai-shek and the same National Government our recent policies have undermined. Let me say in conclusion—and this statement needs to be reiterated time and time again—that time is rapidly running out. A great many statements have been made as to the vast quantity of aid which the Chinese people and the Chinese Government have received. I invite the attention of the Senate to House Document No. 75, Eighty-first Congress, first session, relative to lend-lease. This document shows that during the period of time referred to the British Empire received, in round figures, $31,287,000,000; China received $1,627,000,000; France and her possessions $3,270,000,000; and the Soviet Republic $11,057,000,000.

Some people have said that some of this equipment has passed into the hands of the Chinese Communists. I have no doubt that some of the equipment has passed into the hands of the Chinese Communists, but by the same token the argument might be made that the entire $11,000,000,000 which we furnished to Russia during that time is available now to aggressive Communist forces. At that time we were all common allies. No doubt much of this Chinese and Russian lend-lease was destroyed during the war or has since worn out.

The only fair test of the situation is what has been done since VJ-day. I think the records of the State Department itself, the records of the Departments of the Army, Air Force, and the Navy, will clearly demonstrate that insofar as credits and grants from this Government to the Republic of China are concerned, since VJ-day they have amounted to a little more than $1,000,300,000. The statement which has been made, that 90 percent or more of this aid has fallen into the hands of the Communists, cannot be supported by facts. It is not, in fact, true. The testimony of General Chennault today clearly indicated that. I expect to have further remarks on the subject at a later date. I commend to the reading of every Member of the United States Senate who is interested in this tremendous problem the complete testimony of General Chennault.

FLOOD CONTROL IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is unusual for me to address the Senate on a subject other than the pending measure. Ordinarily I feel that it is necessary, in order to expedite legislation, to confine our remarks to the subject at hand. However, I wish to emphasize a problem which must be solved within the next few hours if the solution for which we asked in the Eightieth Congress is to avail anything. I am sure that it is an emergency problem which justifies the attention and consideration of Members of the Senate.

An emergency problem has arisen which justifies the attention and the intense interest of the entire membership of the Senate. It is a problem of particular concern to us who live in the Missouri Basin States. But involved are questions of policy which may well affect every area where flood-control measures are needed on agricultural and forest lands, as an important step toward the control of waters which periodically have ravaged our major waterways and their tributaries. So this policy might reach into the 48 States of the Union.

The problem to which I refer requires early attention because it relates to the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture which is currently before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, and, no doubt, will be reported out at a very early date.

Today the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which is handling agricultural appropriations is about to start to mark up the appropriation bill for the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, if the particular request I am about to make for remedial legislation in the field of flood control is to be granted, that must be done before the Appropriations Committee marks up and reports the bill, or else what the Members of the Eightieth Congress sought to accomplish relative to flood control will be denied.

As the membership of this Senate already knows, the Missouri River Basin has been harassed with repeated floods in recent years. These floods have done extensive damage both to our croplands and our urban communities. They have disrupted public utilities and transportation and have made necessary large expenditures for the repair of highway systems and railroads.

It is a matter of record that repeated loss of life has been experienced. In my own State 13 lives were lost in 1947. This situation has given rise to an urgent demand among the residents of Missouri Basin States, at least, for maximum flood-control programs.

The Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture are the three technical agencies of the Federal Government which are charged by the Congress with the responsibility of working with local interests in achieving such a program.

This spring, throughout large areas of the Missouri Basin, the unprecedented snowfall of last winter has posed new and grave threats to the safety and welfare of the residents of that great basin. Accordingly, the long-time interest of those of us in that basin in flood control is sharpened and made more acute this spring than heretofore.

Because of this situation, we had hoped the Federal Government departments would share our concern over this threat, and would grant us every possible collaboration in attacking the problem. It seems, however, that this hope is not being fulfilled in all respects.

For many years the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture have been authorized to construct flood-control facilities throughout the United States, and by means of specific appropriations from Congress they have carried full flood-control treatment to numerous streams in America. They employ small retardation dams, grassing of slopes, forestation, and other devices to permanently allay the flood menace to farm lands and urban communities. They have a remarkable record of achievement in this field. At this point in my remarks I wish to compliment them for what they have done. Their technical personnel has built up long years of experience in attacking problems of this kind.

Because of the grave flood problem in the Missouri Basin, I personally appeared in 1947 before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the agriculture appropriations bill. At that time I asked for the insertion of an item of $500,000 with which the Department of Agriculture, through its trained field personnel, could make a complete survey of the Missouri River Basin, so as to ascertain the areas where their flood-control activities could be justified under the formula regarding costs and benefits which is employed.

Conscious of the fact that Congress has adopted the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri Basin and has authorized complete development of the water and soil resources of that watershed, the Senate Appropriations Committee concurred in that proposal, and did add an item of $500,000 for such a survey.

In conference, the House committee agreed to this item, and the appropriation was made in the agricultural appropriations bill passed in July 1947. Thereafter, the trained staff people, beginning on July 1, 1948, undertook this survey of the entire Missouri Basin. Mr. President, that was last July. After the appropriations for that purpose were made at the last moment, the technical services began on July 1, 1948, to make the survey for which authorization was made in July 1947, and appropriation was made in July 1948.

Late in December 1948, a preliminary report on the survey was tendered to the governors of the 10 States in the Missouri Basin. I know that to be a fact. I understand that in each instance, the individual governors gave tentative approval to that preliminary report, and indicated an intense interest in the objectives. This tentative approval came readily, by virtue of the fact that State

officials with technical training had worked closely with the Department of Agriculture's specialists in developing the data on each State. Also, the Department of Agriculture staff had carefully collaborated with other technical agencies of the Federal Government, including the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Engineers Corps, in the development of this program. The report carried the approval of each of the other technical departments.

Mindful that during the Appropriation Committee's consideration, it was understood that the Department of Agriculture would bring a complete report of this survey back to the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service gave this project top priority for large numbers of their specially trained employees.

It was likewise gratifying to us in the Missouri Basin to note that the President's budget which was presented to Congress in January 1949 proposed an appropriation of $5,000,000 with which these flood-control projects could be undertaken, beginning July 1 of this year, in the event that this session of Congress approved the report and appropriated such funds.

However, when Department of Agriculture spokesmen appeared before the House Appropriations Committee, they did not include in their request any specific sum with which this program could be undertaken. When questioned on the subject, they stated that the report was still incomplete, despite the fact that the governors of our States had understood that such a report was complete and that construction work under the programs was ready to be commenced as soon as the programs were authorized by Congress.

The Department of Agriculture spokesmen appearing before the House committee stated that the Department had developed a new comprehensive program, of which the flood-control program would be a part. Such comprehensive program was to include Production and Marketing Administration activities, Rural Electrification Administration activities, department-wide research, and so forth. In other words, it is completely tied in with all those administrations, so it is a matter of take all or take none.

Apparently, the House committee members believed that such procedure would not give needed emphasis to the flood-control program. It is my understanding that the chairman of the House subcommittee actually wrote a letter to the Secretary, requesting the Department to make available to the committee some kind of a report on this flood-control program. But nothing happened. Due to the urgency of other legislation, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill finally passed the House and came over to the Senate, minus any provisions for this type of work.

When the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee undertook hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill, inquiry was made as to whether Agriculture Department spokesmen had discussed in any way this Missouri Basin flood-control program. It is my understanding that the Agriculture Department witnesses failed to give any satisfactory explanation of the disposition which the Department was making of this flood-control report, which some of us would so desperately like to have.

Thinking that there was possibly some misunderstanding somewhere, and because I had personally been instrumental in causing this survey to be made, I called the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture on April 8, and he very graciously came to the Senate and had a visit with me on that date. I emphasized to him our great concern over the repeated flood threat in our area and the necessity of the report being submitted to the Congress, so that, if the report were approved and the Senate felt the provisions should be made, the authorization to proceed with the program could be made; finally, that if the authorization were made an appropriation must be provided and that it all had to be worked out in the Eighty-first Congress. I asked if the Department intended to reveal to the Congress the report of their survey of last year. The Secretary told me on April 8, the day he came to the Senate to confer with me, that the program was complete and that it would be placed in the hands of the Senate subcommittee within a few days. In fact, that was late in the week, and he told me it would be in the hands of Members of Congress the next Tuesday following the day on which he came to the Senate. Valuable time has elapsed relative to the authorization and relative to the appropriation, yet the report has not been delivered to Members of Congress.

My office and the offices of my colleagues in the Senate and in the House representing the Missouri Basin are receiving hundreds of letters from individual farmers, from farm organizations, from soil conservation district supervisors, and from State agencies, inquiring as to what has happened to this flood-control report. Our offices, in contacting the Department of Agriculture, are given no direct and clear-cut reply as to the Department's intent. We are told indirectly that any flood-control program that would materialize would have to be included in a new comprehensive program, which the Department is developing. That will tie in together all the agencies, and, as I said before, it is a matter of taking them all or not getting any.

I am not in any sense critical, at this time at least, of any new, comprehensive program which the Department might develop. I have not even seen it, so how could I be critical of it. Nor have I had such a program explained to me.

But I question the wisdom of trying to bury an all-important program to be applied on the land, such as the flood-control program, within some new vehicle which the Congress has not yet seen, at a time when the appropriation hearings are about complete and when they are certainly drawing to a close. I feel very sure that the Congress would find it difficult to come to a complete understanding of a new and involved program requiring billions of dollars in appropriations, when, at this late hour, we have been given no clear-cut information as to the contents of this new, comprehensive program.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With reference to what the Senator is discussing at the moment, I did not know he had written to the Secretary of Agriculture. I have just sent for my file. Some weeks ago I also wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture for a copy of the report, which I was reliably informed had been filed by the Department about January 3. This morning I received a two-page single-spaced typewritten letter discussing the philosophy of saving the soil, which was interesting and constructive, but not one mention was made of the report which was on file, no answer given as to when Congress or the public could have a look at the report. I immediately wrote back, calling attention to my letter of several weeks ago, and saying that I was interested in the discussion of flood-control philosophy, but would he please refer to my letter and tell me what happened to the report. I have had the same experience of failing to receive an answer, or even of getting a look at the letter, which the Senator from Nebraska has had, and I therefore join in his criticism with reference to the matter and in his representations of the urgency of the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the Senator from Iowa for his observation, but I call his attention emphatically to the fact that his experience is the experience of quite a few Members of the Senate, who have done as he did. I did not intend to mention it, but this year, in one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations on which I was sitting as a member, governors of the interested States were present, testifying that the flood-control program was needed. In the course of the hearings, I inquired of the governors whether they had received the report. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that the three governors who were present said they had received it before January 1, and that they had copies of it in their hands. When I asked if I might have the report, they replied that it had been given them in confidence. From that time until now, I not only have not seen the report myself, but other Senators have also had a similar experience. The distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota has told me of a similar experience. I think the Senator from Iowa and I both have the idea that others who are interested have had a similar experience.

I should like to say also that the answer to the letters is about the same. They tell us how necessary it is to have flood control, in order to prevent people from being drowned, in order to protect the land from soil erosion, and make a great number of observations about the necessity of the program. But in each and every case they apparently decline the invitation to send the report to us. It is very necessary. The money has to be ap-

propriated. If we could get the report, the Congress might see fit to adopt the program. It is a program prepared by technicians of the services as to the kind of flood-control measures which should be taken. We are denied the report. The only thing we get back indirectly is the statement that there is a new comprehensive program which will be presented, running into billions of dollars, of which we are to take all or nothing.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator from Nebraska have any observations to make as to why the report is so essentially confidential at this stage of the game?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit, I should like to make the comment that I cannot see why it is confidential at this stage of the game, inasmuch as 10 governors have received the report. I cannot see why, if they received it, Members of the Congress cannot receive it. I want to be fair to the Secretary. We have asked him time and time again for the report. I have a feeling now that the reason we have not had the report, the reason it is not being publicized, and the reason we do not have it up for consideration is that the time will lapse when appropriations can be made, and it will then be in order to bring forward this new comprehensive plan, which, as I say, is to be integrated into one great program, as to which we shall have the choice either of taking it in its entirety or not getting anything at all. It is my opinion, in view of the fact that Congress once authorized this in the Eightieth Congress, that if the report were here, the Congress would go ahead with the first authorization and would make additional appropriations to carry out the flood-control work by the agencies that have been set up to do it. I call them the technical agencies. The plan would call for modest appropriations, but a very fine technical job would be done, and it would not be involved as an integral part of a great comprehensive program. The Senator knows what I am talking about, so far as results to be obtained from that kind of set-up are concerned.

Moreover, I regard the action of the Eightieth Congress, in voting this appropriation, as at least an implied directive to the Department of Agriculture to appear before the House and Senate and give us a report on the flood-control survey.

The need is so great for flood protection and control of erosion on the lands to which the flood-control program would be applied that the Department of Agriculture quite properly gave high priority to the surveys authorized by Congress and the preparation of the report to which I refer. Let me repeat that I am reliably informed this report has been ready for many weeks and is on the desk of the Secretary of Agriculture. For reasons known only to the Secretary it has not been handed on to Congress.

If the individual projects which are recommended by the Department as a result of this survey are found unsatisfactory by the Congress, it follows that no appropriation would be made. If that be the judgment of the Congress, of course I would not complain. But it appears we are being denied any report whatsoever on a program which the Eightieth Congress specifically authorized.

Only recently have I learned that the Missouri Basin is not the only area as to which there exists an apparent deadlock between the Congress and officials of the Department of Agriculture on the subject of flood-control programing for the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service.

Some persons intimately concerned with the national problem of soil conservation and flood control have even expressed the fear that the Department of Agriculture, by its temporizing with the Missouri Basin flood-control program, is giving evidence of an intent to reduce or abandon its interest in flood-control activities in other major watersheds throughout the country, as they have been carried on up to this time.

It is difficult to reach any other conclusion than that the Department has taken the position that Congress shall either buy a comprehensive plan for Agriculture Department participation in resources development, or get no plan at all, even after the Eightieth Congress authorized a plan.

I am most hesitant to say that this is the policy of the Department of Agriculture. But the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture to deliver the Missouri Basin flood-control report which Congress specifically authorized gravely concerns all of us who are intimately associated with the problem.

In full recognition of the seriousness and urgency of this matter it is my opinion that the Senate Appropriations Committee should, before completing work on the current agricultural appropriation bill, make demand upon the Secretary of Agriculture, either to produce the Agricultural Department's Flood Control Survey Report for the Missouri Basin, or furnish adequate explanation for its nondelivery to Congress.

As I have said, the subcommittee is about to write up the bill. It may do it today or tomorrow.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have now the letter which I received this morning from the Secretary, and, in verification of the suspicion which the Senator from Nebraska voiced a moment ago, that the report will not be released until some more complicated plan has been prepared, I should like to read the third paragraph of the letter in reply to my inquiry with reference to the plan. The Secretary says:

> As authorized by Congress in flood-control legislation I have had the Department's Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service make a survey for the purpose of determining watershed-treatment measures needed for water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in the interest of flood control in the Missouri River Basin.

I am quite sure that is the investigation and the subsequent report to which the Senator has been referring. But the next sentence of the letter is the important one, and it verifies the Senator's suspicion, in my judgment:

> The survey findings are now being incorporated into a plan for an over-all agricultural program for the basin which not only will strengthen and assure the success of the flood-control phase, but will, in addition, assure the full and sound development of the basin's agricultural land and water resources.

I believe that is complete confirmation of the speculation just voiced by the Senator from Nebraska that the report will not be released until some other comprehensive plan is proposed, of which this is only one, and we shall have to take it without explanation or not get it at all.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. That letter is more timely than are the letters which I have received. It shows conclusively, however, that it is not the intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to release the report in which we are all interested, which was authorized by the Eightieth Congress. It conclusively shows that the study is to be held back until this great, comprehensive plan comes out. But the matter about which I am worried is that the Eightieth Congress did authorize the appropriation. There was no objection. It was recommended by the Appropriations Committee without debate, and passed the Senate. There was no quibbling or argument with reference to it. It is not only the policy of the Missouri River Basin representatives, but the policy of the entire Congress. Congress authorized the survey. The President asked for $5,000,000 in his message in January, to carry out the findings of the survey made by delegated authority under the Secretary of Agriculture. Why is not the report here? Why cannot the membership of the Senate have it? Why can we not see the report if the 10 governors in the Missouri River Basin can see it? Why should it be delayed? Why should not those of us who are interested have the report here in order that we may submit to the Appropriations Committee further evidence that more appropriations should be made before the committee reports the bill, which might be tomorrow, so that the money which the President asked for in January might be included in the bill? I cannot see any reason why we should not have the report.

So, Mr. President, to support the Senate Appropriations Committee in this regard, and also the Members of the Senate, I propose that the Senate go on record as supporting a demand upon the Secretary of Agriculture either to produce the flood-control survey report for the Missouri River Basin, or else furnish adequate explanation for its nondelivery to Congress.

Therefore I am submitting a resolution, Mr. President, which reads as follows:

Senate Resolution 114

Whereas the Congress in 1947 appropriated the sum of $500,000 to the Department of

Agriculture for the making of a complete survey of the Missouri River Basin with a view to ascertaining the areas in which flood-control projects should be undertaken; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture was urged to submit to the Eighty-first Congress a full report of such survey; and

Whereas such survey was made and in December 1948 a preliminary report thereof submitted to, and tentatively approved by, the governors of the Missouri Basin States; and

Whereas the President's budget contained an item of $5,000,000 with which the flood-control projects could be undertaken upon approval by the Congress of the report of such survey; and

Whereas, although numerous requests have been made to officials of the Department of Agriculture to expedite the submission of such report, and assurances have been received that such report would be forthcoming, such report has not been received by the Congress; and

Whereas present conditions in the Missouri Valley necessitate immediate consideration of the subject matter of such report: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to transmit forthwith to the Senate a full report of the survey of flood-control needs in the Missouri Valley Basin made by the Department under authority of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948.

Mr. President, I send the resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed and lie on the table. My reason for taking this action at this time is that I feel that if all the Members of the Senate know the situation, the Secretary will send the report to the Senate. I hope he will. If he does not, I expect to call up the resolution, and I think the Senate will give approval of it, so that we may receive the report for study and consideration. It seems to me it makes no difference as to the plans. We have a right to the report and to study it for the information contained in it.

I hope the Secretary will forthwith send the report to the Senate. If he does not, I beg of the membership of the Senate to read the observations which I have made and to examine the law and the authorization, and then if the resolution comes up for consideration I hope the Members of the Senate will see to it that the authorization is carried out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution (S. Res. 114) will be printed and lie on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a very few minutes to place myself on record against the pending amendment, known as the Lodge amendment. I am satisfied that it will be unnecessary to make any further argument against the amendment in order to advance the cause of its defeat, because I am certain that the amendment will be soundly defeated when the roll call is taken. However, I speak for the record, because I am perfectly aware of the fact that one with my record on civil-rights legislation is going to be called upon from time to time to explain his votes, both his vote against the so-called nonsegregation amendment to the housing bill of a few days ago, and his vote this afternoon in opposition to the Lodge amendment.

I wish to say at the outset that it is always a great source of regret to me whenever I find myself of an opinion different from that of my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It is a great source of regret for many reasons, among them being the fact that I am sure the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Oregon are working toward a common goal, trying to build up in this country a great Republican Party, devoted to sound principles of progressive republicanism. The Senator from Massachusetts and I certainly seek the same goal, so far as concerns accomplishing for the downtrodden of America full enjoyment of their civil rights. My difference with the Senator from Massachusetts today is not a difference over the ultimate goal, but it is a difference over the legislative steps which should be taken in accomplishing that goal.

I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Massachusetts in respect to his amendment because I do not think the amendment will aid the great civil-rights fight which must be made in this country. It will not aid it, in the first place, because we are confronted, in my opinion, with the practical parliamentary situation in the Congress, just as we were in the case of the housing bill, of not being able to pass a Federal aid-to-education bill with the Lodge amendment in it even though we could agree that in this type of legislation such an amendment should be encompassed. I say that, Mr. President, because the votes simply are not available to pass the bill with the amendment in it.

Immediately someone might very properly say, it seems to me, in reply to the comment which I have just made, "Does this mean that the junior Senator from Oregon is willing to compromise a matter of principle in order to advance a Federal-aid-to-education bill, which some of us think ought to have a civil-rights provision in it?" If that were my position, then anything I could say in support of what would then be a vote of expediency would not be worthy the consideration of any intellectually honest person. I wish to make perfectly clear that my opposition to the Lodge amendment is not based upon the fact that in my judgment the bill could not be passed with the amendment in it. I merely have pointed out that the Lodge amendment is one of the legislative facts which is going to have a great deal to do, I think, with the passage or nonpassage of Federal-aid-to-education legislation.

I am opposed to the Lodge amendment, not because its incorporation in the bill would probably, in my honest judgment, mean the impossibility of passing any Federal-aid-to-education legislation at all, but I am opposed to it because it does not belong in a Federal-aid-to-education bill. The amendment itself is inconsistent with what I think one of the fundamental policies of the Federal-aid-to-education bill is and should be. In my judgment the amendment seeks, at the very time we pass the legislation, to deny our assertion that as a Congress we do not propose to interfere with the educational policies of the States.

Mr. President, I think we have to meet that issue head-on. We have to determine here and now whether or not we believe in a Federal-aid-to-education bill which makes perfectly clear that the Federal Government should not be empowered to interfere with the State educational policies and practices.

I know how difficult it is to follow one premise in this argument to its ultimate conclusion without at the same time being charged with an inconsistency as far as one's stand on civil-rights issues as a whole is concerned. But speaking as a lawyer, I say that the primary purpose of this address is to lay down a legal proposition on which I am going to stand in respect to civil-rights legislation in connection with Federal aid to education.

Until the contrary is held by the Supreme Court of the United States I take the position here this afternoon that under existing American law, the right to determine educational policy within the borders of a State, with respect to State schools, vests in the State, and not in the Congress of the United States. Irrespective of the subject matter of the pending amendment, I say the result of the Lodge amendment is to violate what I believe to be well-established policy in this country, namely, that the power is vested in the States to determine State educational policies.

Mr. President, I am not arguing that the Congress of the United States does not have the power to lay down conditions even in respect to Federal aid to education if it cares to do so. But I am saying that if the Congress of the United States, in respect to this subject matter of education, wishes to lay down conditions in regard to the matter of segregation, then it needs to recognize also that it has the same power to determine other educational policies of the States, including the salaries of teachers, curricula, schedules, and other educational policies.

My point is that there is a great issue involved in Federal aid-to-education legislation about which millions of American people have great doubt, an issue which those of us who have been supporting Federal aid to education for years constantly have had to meet. That issue is what? The charge has constantly been made that a Federal-aid-to-education bill will be just the beginning, will be just a nose-under-the-tent act on the part of the Congress for the gradual taking over of State educational policies.

Mr. President, I think the Lodge amendment supports that fear. I think the Lodge amendment supplies the opponents of the bill with an argument which justifies their fear. Laudable as

the ideal is of eventually having in this country nonsegregation in the public schools, we cannot, in my opinion, lay it down as a Federal condition in a Federal-aid-to-education bill. If we lay the Lodge amendment down as a condition, then it would be just as sound to proceed to lay down other conditions and other policies which the States would have to follow in their schools. It would result in the taking over of the educational system of this country by the Federal Government.

Oh, it may be said that it becomes a matter of degree, and I admit it. But I believe that at the very time we pass this bill, we must make certain that we have not a single clause or section in it which will give any support to those people in this country who say that what is being attempted—and that the Lodge amendment is only the beginning—is for the Federal Government gradually, step by step, to take over the educational system of the country and give us truly a regimented educational system under which, in my opinion, freedom cannot long exist.

Mr. President, I want to discuss this legal proposition from another angle for a moment. I want to point out that there is quite a difference between the Congress of the United States, as the legislative branch of our Government, recognizing a need in this country for better education, for the raising of minimum standards of education to a level where we can say that at least the future citizens of our country are receiving that minimum instruction which makes it possible for them to develop into enlightened citizens and adopting a policy of telling the States how to run their schools. I say there is quite a difference between the use of Federal funds for the purpose of helping the States raise their educational standards and the exercise of a Federal right over a subject matter for which the Federal Government has a direct legal responsibility, such as the regulation of interstate commerce.

Let me say it in a little different way, because in my judgment the legal distinction is not a legalism, but the legal distinction I seek to draw here this afternoon is exceedingly basic to an understanding of our form of government. There are certain legal duties, powers, and rights of the Federal Government which we as a Congress cannot justify escaping or failing to carry out.

Thus, under the interstate commerce clause we find, and it is verified by a legion of United States Supreme Court decisions, that there is the right, the power, the duty, and the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States to take those steps which are necessary to see to it that interstate commerce is carried on in this country in accordance with the legal meaning of the commerce clause of the Constitution. Thus, when we pass legislation based upon congressional power under the commerce clause we have adequate basis for including antidiscrimination conditions in it. It is the duty of the Congress of the United States to keep the channels of interstate commerce free from discrimination based upon race, color, or creed. That is why I say that a fair-employment-practice act as a matter of a legal proposition stands in a class entirely different from a Federal-aid-to-education bill, or from a public-housing bill based upon a Federal-aid principle. That is why I say that I think it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to proceed to pass a fair-employment-practice act and meet one of the facets of the civil-rights issue head on. That duty, in my judgment, is an affirmative duty, a positive duty, a duty which we have not yet assumed, but should assume, and which rests upon us if we are to carry out what I consider to be our obligation under the interstate commerce clause of the Federal Constitution. In such a case we are moving from a clear delegated authority to regulate interstate commerce.

Federal aid to education does not stand in that legal category at all. There is no obligation in the sense of a legal mandate to pass a Federal-aid-to-education bill. We have the power to do it, but the point I want to stress is we are not under any legal obligation to do it. I contend that we are under a legal obligation to see to it that interstate commerce in this country is conducted in a manner which is free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed.

So, Mr. President, the power we are exercising here this afternoon in respect to a Federal-aid-to-education bill is a power which it is our privilege to exercise, it is a power which it is our right to exercise, but it is quite a different thing from a compelling legal duty to exercise it. Therefore, we have to look, in the exercise of our power under legislation such as this to the corresponding rights and privileges of the States. We have also to look to the corresponding legal duties of the States.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court has not held yet that the States do not have the right under the Constitution of the United States to adopt a policy of segregation in their public schools. As I read the cases they have thus far hinged on the question of providing equal educational opportunity. One of the motivating arguments behind the Federal-aid-to-education bill which is pending, has been the desire on the part of those of us who are sponsors of it to try to help the States to give equal educational opportunities to all children within the States. We know, and the record is perfectly clear, that some of the greatest disparities, as far as opportunities are concerned for the children of this country, are to be found in the Southern States. Thus in Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, and other States, the very clear data have been advanced during the course of this debate which show the need of improved educational opportunities for colored children in particular. We as individual Senators may think it is unwise public policy, on the part of the Southern States, to follow a course of segregation in the administration of their schools. I happen to share that view. But after all, I come from an entirely different environmental background, from an environment of an entirely different cultural mores than my colleagues in the Senate from the Southern States. I should think not only once, but twice, and dozens of times, before taking the position on the floor of the Senate that in connection with a Federal-aid-to-education bill I should seek to impose upon the Southern States a nonsegregation policy in connection with the operation of their schools. If I were from the South I think I would advocate such a reform. At the same time I recognize that it is generally admitted by an overwhelming majority of the people of the country that the determination of such questions ought to vest within a State itself. I cannot out of one corner of my mouth say to the people of the country, "I am for Federal aid to education, and I assure you that I will do what I can to guarantee to you that the Federal Government will not interfere with the educational policy of the States by affixing to the grant of funds conditions contrary to the educational policy of the State," and out of the other corner of my mouth vote for the Lodge amendment.

As I said once before on the floor of the Senate, as I analyze my background I suppose the greatest contributing factor in my social views on the whole racial problem is that as a boy, from the first grade through the eighth, I went to a school in Madison, Wis., known as the Greenbush School. It was a school which served the children of the slum area of Madison. Many of my playmates and associates for those 8 years were boys from the Negro quarter, the Italian quarter, the Polish quarter, and the Jewish quarter—the melting pot of Madison. We did not have a large slum area, but we had a very large grade school, filled with what were referred to in those days as "foreigners." Because of the small economic resources of my parents, it was my happy lot to have to go to school in that locality. I think that probably explains more than anything else my social outlook on all these questions of social relations.

Thus, Mr. President, it is not surprising that I find it difficult to accept the policy of the Southern States in regard to segregation. But I hope that I am objective enough to recognize the importance of the Congress of the United States not attempting to step into the Southern States and say to them, This is the way you are going to operate your schools if you get any Federal aid money. One of the first things you have to do is to pass a law abolishing segregation in your public schools. That would have to be done in all the Southern States. If that is not an interference with the educational policies of the Southern States, then I do not know what an interference would be.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further legal point, before someone else makes it. It will be recalled that a year ago I led the fight—as I shall again, in case it is again raised on the floor of the Senate—against the Senate affirming or ratifying a compact which was offered by 16 Southern States asking for congressional ratification of the pact so that those Southern States could proceed with what was known as the regional school proposal for higher education in the Southern States.

Someone may ask, How consistent is the Senator from Oregon? He now argues against the Lodge amendment in the Federal-aid-to-education bill on the theory that it would interfere with State policy with regard to education in the Southern States; yet a year ago he argued against the ratification of the interstate compact on higher education as presented by the representatives of 16 Southern States. My answer is that there is no inconsistency whatsoever if one will follow through the legal theory on which the Senator from Oregon rests his case. They are not comparable situations at all. In the interstate compact case the Senate was asked to exercise a power specifically delegated to it under the Constitution in respect to interstate compacts. However no power is granted to us under the Constitution to control or regulate State school policies.

This Federal-aid-to-education bill does not rest upon any claim that we have the right to determine State school policies as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal funds. I am not saying that if we should pass the Lodge amendment we would do anything that would be subject to a reversal by the United States Supreme Court. I am not saying that the power does not vest in us to pass the Lodge amendment and have it subsequently sustained by the highest court of the land. But that is quite a different thing from exercising a duty under the interstate compact clause of the United States Constitution as was involved last year in connection with the interstate compact proposal relative to schools. When we are asked to ratify an interstate compact we must look to the interstate compact section of the Constitution and determine two questions. First, is this the type of compact which the Constitution requires the Congress to ratify? I shall not repeat my argument of last year at any length, other than to point out that I am satisfied now, as I was then, that the interstate compact offered by the 16 Southern States was not the type of interstate compact that the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, is required—and I underline the word "required"—to ratify.

So when the interstate compact was before us we had to decide this question, "Is this the type of compact which requires ratification by the Congress of the United States?" Of course the answer to that question was clearly "No"; and the answer was "No" because of the second question which we must consider in such a situation. The second question is: What Federal jurisdiction is in any way encroached upon by the proposed compact? It will be recalled that during the course of the debate not a single southern Senator could point out a single Federal power which was encroached upon by the proposed compact. Until they could show wherein that southern compact in some way transgressed a delegated Federal power under the Constitution of the United States, they were clearly out of court, so to speak, so far as the Congress was concerned. They failed to advance any sound argument showing that as a matter of constitutional duty under the interstate compact clause we would have to approve the compact before it could be put into effect by the States.

However, that is not this case at all. On that occasion I said, and I repeat it now, that whenever in the Senate of the United States I am asked to join in the exercise of a congressional constitutional duty and obligation, thereby setting up a Federal public policy in respect to the exercise of that duty or obligation, I shall never vote to exercise that duty, which thereby will establish a Federal policy in respect to the subject matter of the bill or other proposed legislation—or, in that particular instance, the compact which was before us—without insisting upon my views as to civil rights. So, Mr. President, at the time of that interstate compact fight, I said to my friends from the South: "If you want the proposed compact approved, you will have to show me that the compact itself impinges upon or infringes in some way or takes away at least to some extent some power now delegated to the Federal Government; and before I shall ever vote to relinquish any such existing Federal power"—and, of course, I am talking about Federal jurisdiction, Mr. President, and about delegated legal power vested in the Congress of the United States under the Constitution—"I shall insist upon laying down certain conditions which the States will have to meet before they are allowed to take over the Federal power that we relinquish." So I said: "If it is the position of the gentleman from the South that this compact require congressional approval it now becomes my duty to say that if we are to give Federal approval to the setting up of regional schools, we must attach to that approval certain conditions of public policy, one of them being nonsegregation."

But, Mr. President, I say there is no comparison between that case and a case in which the Congress is called upon, under its appropriating powers, to appropriate money for the aid of schools in the States. One case involved a clear constitutional mandate placed upon us to see to it that no delegated Federal authority is taken away from us without the consent of the Congress. That was the interstate compact case. On the other hand, the case now before us involves only the right of the Congress to appropriate money for the educational needs of the States, by way of a Federal-aid bill, in order to help the States raise their educational standards to the minimum which we think is necessary if we are to maintain good citizenship in this country.

Mr. President, I shall make one other point, and then I shall be through. I wish to say that yesterday I also voted against the amendment for the Lodge formula. I did not speak about it at the time, because I thought the Senator from Ohio. [Mr. TAFT] did such a masterful job in supporting the formula which we voted out of committee, that nothing further needed to be said. However, I should like to have the RECORD show that I associate myself with the major arguments which the Senator from Ohio advanced yesterday in support of our formula. I wish to make perfectly clear that I do not argue that it is a perfect formula, but I think the Lodge amendment on which we voted yesterday and the Lodge amendment which is before us today are two amendments which, if adopted, would have the effect of thwarting the fulfillment of the great need of hundreds and hundreds of schools in the United States for adequate funds which would enable them to educate the young citizens of our country to the point of giving them an enlightened understanding of what our democratic form of government is all about.

Mr. President, I do not wish to overemphasize this point, but I do not make an overstatement when I say here, this afternoon, that so far as preserving freedom in the United States is concerned, I seriously question whether any other piece of legislation which will come before the Eighty-first Congress is of greater importance than this Federal-aid-to-education bill. I think it is of utmost importance, Mr. President, that we proceed to pass this bill without adopting amendments of the type the Senator from Massachusetts is proposing. I think it to be of the utmost importance that we pass this bill promptly, and without such amendments, so that the funds to be provided under the bill can soon begin to flow into the States, in order to improve the educational standards throughout the United States. Likewise, I think it most important that we guarantee to the States that they shall have complete control of educational policy and administrative policy in respect to their schools.

Mr. President, in my judgment we cannot properly adopt an amendment which violates what I thought was to be our guarantee to the States, namely, that under this Federal-aid-to-education bill the Federal Government does not propose to dictate to the States as to how they shall run their schools.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindly and courteous remarks made about me personally by the junior Senator from Oregon, and I very heartily reciprocate them.

I agree with what he says about the importance of developing a forward-looking republicanism as a part of our two-party system. It has been a satisfaction to me to work with him in that respect in the past, and I look forward to doing so in the future. The pending question seems to be one on which we disagree; but I am happy to think that there have been many issues, and I am sure there will be many others, on which we see eye to eye.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe that in principle the Senator from Oregon and I are in disagreement in this particular case. It is more a question of where he would place the emphasis and where I would place the emphasis.

He has spoken very correctly about some of the principles involved in this bill. One principle which he has discussed, and which certainly has been mentioned a great deal during this debate, is the principle of letting the States alone in this matter, once we give them the money, and thereafter not interfering with the way they use it. I say that

principle has been honored more in theory than in practice, however, because on page 9 of the bill a perfectly overt and categorical requirement is placed upon the States as follows:

(f) In States where separate public schools are maintained for minority races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds to public schools maintained for minority races.

That is a requirement that is imposed as a condition, and is placed in the bill as it now stands. If that is not an interference with the educational processes of the States, then neither is the amendment which I advocate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Or perhaps I can save time by making a very brief statement at this point, instead of asking a question, if there is no objection to my doing so. All the section does is state the existing American law. That is what the United States Supreme Court holds. But I should like to have the Senator produce the United States Supreme Court decision which says that the States are not privileged to set up separate schools for whites and blacks.

Mr. LODGE. I am not a lawyer, and I am not going to undertake to match my wits against those of the Senator from Oregon in a legal argument. All I can do is read English. On page 8, beginning with line 9, section 7 reads:

In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act a State—

It then proceeds:

through its legislature, shall * * * (b) provide—

And so forth. It seems to me that is a directive on the part of the Federal Government insofar as States are concerned. The Senator may say it does not apply to the educational program, that it is a sociological directive. Perhaps it is. If it is a sociological directive, then so is the amendment which I offered.

This is in essence a question of who goes to school and who does not go to school. It has nothing whatever to do with the educational curriculum. The curriculum deals with what is taught. If we were here to offer an amendment saying they should teach American history or they should teach biology, that would be an interference with the curriculums. But the question of who goes and who does not is a far broader question, one that involves the question of citizenship; at least, so it seems to me. That is one of the principles at stake here.

Another principle is the principle of what we do with the Federal dollar. I have never undertaken to pass judgment on what the States do with their own money. That is an entirely separate question. But we are responsible for the way in which the Federal dollar is spent, and it seems to me it is utterly repugnant to all the traditions of the United States for the Federal dollar to be spent to sanction and enhance segregation. When I say that, I am not looking at any particular section of the country; let me make that clear. There is segregation in a great many States. The Southern States have no monopoly on that, as I well know. It seems to me inescapable that if we are going to use the Federal dollar, we must use it in an absolutely fair way as between Americans.

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont, earlier in the afternoon, made two remarks about the proposal which I offered. His first was that he did not like some of the people who were in favor of it. I think that is the way he put it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think I expressed any dislike. I may have expressed the opinion that some of them might be misguided; but certainly I expressed no dislike for them.

Mr. LODGE. There may be people who are not nice, who are on both sides of this question, for all I know. I do not know how we are going to run all through the United States of America to look inside everybody's skull to see who is in favor of the bill and who is not. I have only heard from one organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I do not know how any other organizations stand on the matter. It seems to me that after all we should judge the proposition on its merits and vote it up or down on its merits, regardless of who may be in favor of it or who may be against it.

Then, the able Senator from Vermont and the distinguished senior Senator from Utah both made the argument that the adoption of the amendment would kill the aid-to-education bill. They gave practically no consideration whatever to the whole argument I had made, that segregation in the schools was wrong. They gave most of their attention to the argument that the adoption of the amendment would kill the bill. They did not merely make it as a flat assertion. They pointed to the vote in October 1943, on the Langer amendment, and then they pointed to the vote a month or so ago on the Bricker amendment to the housing bill, as precedents to prove their point. That would be a very serious charge, if it could be sustained. But I think I can show that it is nothing more than an assertion, and that it certainly cannot be proved. The Langer amendment—and I have looked it up since the statement was made by the Senator from Utah—was not an antisegregation amendment at all. It was an equalization amendment, which is an entirely different thing. So I think we can simply dismiss that because the two cases are not parallel.

Insofar as the segregation amendment to the housing bill is concerned, let me recall that it was said at that time that if the Senate adopted a provision prohibiting segregation in public housing that such a provision would kill the bill. I have just looked up the vote on the housing bill (S. 1070). I find there were 57 Senators voting yea, 13 voting nay, with 26 not voting. If it is assumed that all 24 Senators from the 12 States usually called Southern States would have voted against the bill, plus the 13 Senators who actually did vote against the bill, which included two Senators from the Southern States, then the vote would have been 35 yeas, 35 nays, taking the most pessimistic possible view of the situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator really think that would be true, if the final vote had followed the adoption of the Bricker amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I do not see how it could be different. There are just so many Senators from States who feel strongly on this subject.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator think the adoption of the Bricker amendment would have completely changed the course and type of action on the part of the Senate subsequent thereto?

Mr. LODGE. I think it would. I think it might have resulted in a filibuster, and I think the adoption of my amendment might result in a filibuster. But that is a very different thing from defeating a bill. I said this morning I thought the adoption of my amendment might result in a filibuster, and I think, if we are going to undertake to go into this subject and talk boldly and bravely about civil rights in national conventions and in political campaigns, and when we are having general discussions on the floor of the Senate, and then when it comes up specifically to say, "Oh, we must not run into a filibuster," I think we are going to make ourselves look quite ridiculous. I know that is not what the Senator from Oregon wants. I know he never runs away from an issue; he in fact likes to meet an issue.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator I was not thinking about the filibuster. I restate my question: Does not the Senator think that in all probability there might have been a great difference in the vote, referring to the final vote, if we had come to a vote on the measure with the Bricker amendment in it?

Mr. LODGE. No. I think if the Bricker amendment had been put in the housing bill, we would have had the 13 Senators who voted against the housing bill in the first place, which included two Southern Senators, and then 22 more, and that is the most that can possibly be figured.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know how the Senator from Massachusetts figures the vote of the Senator from Oregon, but I can assure him that if the Bricker amendment had been added to the bill, I should have voted against it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that all the votes against the civil-rights program were not cast by the 22 southern Senators? If he will look at the RECORD, he will find that there were a good many from the West and the North; I think a few from the East; and that they also voted against bills designed to implement the civil-rights program. If the Senator adds them to the 35, which he has already accumulated, I am sure he would have a majority against any bill carrying the Bricker amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not want to bring up the question, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, of the significance of the vote on the Bricker amendment and the amendments which followed, but I think it should be realized that in addition to the 13 Senators who voted against the measure on final passage, and in addition to the southern Senators and probably 25 or possibly as many as 30 Senators who would have voted against it, there was a considerable number of Senators who, on the amendment to strike out titles II and IV, voted to eliminate those titles. Therefore this group, presumably, was opposed to virtually all the housing measure with the possible exception of title I.

Mr. LODGE. I voted for the Bricker amendment, and I was in favor of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not speaking of the particular Bricker amendment, but of the amendments later offered by the Senator to strike out titles II and IV.

Mr. LODGE. I think there were very few Senators who had that viewpoint.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have sent for the RECORD, and I should like to reserve the right to have printed in the RECORD a statement on this point. I think there were possibly 28 Senators who voted to eliminate titles II and IV. I may be mistaken, but I think that is correct. That measures the opposition to the housing bill more accurately than did the final vote on the measure itself when the results were pretty well known.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I gather that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is in favor of Federal aid to education, but wishes qualifying amendments, and particularly his segregation amendment, to be agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I think Federal aid to education is a very important thing to be done, and I am in favor of it; but I should like to see some proposition with reference to it which is not as ill-digested, half-baked, and full of injustice as is the pending bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts. If it is the issue of segregation or the amendment which is bothering him, would it not be more desirable, since we have housing legislation, health legislation, and education legislation on the part of the Federal Government, that the Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Minnesota offer an amendment, standing on its own merits, standing out boldly in the face of the very practical parliamentary situation, to the effect that we jointly propose that Federal funds to be expended for health, housing, and education be applied in those States which abide by certain basic civil rights? Would not that seem to be much more desirable than to attach an amendment to legislation that is of a different substance from that which the Senator is proposing?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that it would be a very desirable thing to have that thought enacted into law; but when the Senator from Minnesota has been here as long as I have, he will realize, I think, that the way to get legislation enacted is to attach an amendment to some bill that will go through anyway. Even though the Senator is a member of the majority party, which is in control, he will find it is extremely difficult and arduous to get a bill out of committee, get it placed on the calendar, and get an opportunity to take it up. While it is all very well to introduce bills and make an announcement to that effect, to write a letter to some friend saying such a bill has been introduced, the way to get legislation on the statute books is to amend some bill that will become law anyway. That is my experience, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know whether the Senator was present during my remarks, but I am wondering why the Senator did not amend the appropriations bill. Why did he not attach an amendment to that bill?

Mr. LODGE. There is a practical reason why. We cannot attach legislation to an appropriation bill. It is against the rules of the Senate. There is a practical prohibition to that effect.

We can sit here and speculate until we turn blue in the face as to what would have happened to the housing bill if the Bricker amendment had been adopted. My conclusion is that the most pessimistic estimate would be that the vote would have resulted in 46 yeas to 35 nays.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to admonish the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators that after this interruption the Chair will be compelled to enforce the rule that a Senator may yield only for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I shall not talk very much longer. I have been trying to answer the points which have been made by the able Senators who are opposed to my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true, in reference to the comments of the junior Senator from Massachusetts respecting legislation attached to an appropriation bill, that on a two-thirds vote such a bill can be so amended?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that in order to break a filibuster, which the Senator has readily admitted would be precipitated by the Bricker amendment to the housing bill, it would require a two-thirds constitutional majority, and not simply a two-thirds vote?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows very well that is true, because he and I took exactly the same view in opposing the new cloture rule. If the Senator was present this morning he will recall that I said if there was to be a filibuster, let it come, and let us break it. If we cannot break it because the rule is defective, let us find out whether it is defective, because until that is ascertained we shall never get a better rule.

I say to my good friend from Minnesota and to my good friend from Illinois that there is no future in running away from a filibuster. We might just as well face the fact that it is one of the issues before us, and we must come to grips with it sometime, and the sooner we do so, the better.

I give that as a word of advice to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was wondering whether the Senator would agree that, since both of us are desirous of winning the fight against filibustering, and both of us are in favor of civil-rights legislation, we should accept the opportunity of putting such legislation on the statute books.

Mr. LODGE. Paraphrasing the words of Robert Ingersoll, the place to favor civil rights is here and the time to favor civil rights is now. I paraphrase his statement on when and where to be happy insofar as this question is concerned. There is another saying—"Prune when the knife is sharp." The time to do these things is when there is an opportunity to do them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator know that even though the knife be sharp, if a grapevine is pruned at the wrong time——

Mr. LODGE. I shall not argue with the Senator from Vermont about pruning grapevines.

Mr. AIKEN. I am more familiar with apple trees.

Mr. LODGE. I was not thinking about apple trees. I was simply trying to make the point to my friend from Minnesota that it is a long time between drinks, so far as the civil-rights issue is concerned. We take up a civil-rights bill and it goes along for week after week. Then the North Atlantic Pact or the Marshall plan comes in, and questions of civil rights disappear. Then when there is a chance, we shy away from trying to fight a filibuster.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. The Presiding Officer insists that the Senator put what he has to say in the form of a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was only reminding the Senator of the rules.

Mr. LODGE. The Chair reminds me to remind the Senator to observe the rule.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to make a prefatory statement with reference to the child-health bill which was debated a few days ago. There was not a vote against it. In fact, there were not many Senators on the floor. Would it not have been a splendid opportunity, since it was a measure which provided Federal funds for all children, to have attached such an amendment to that bill?

Mr. LODGE. Did the Senator read the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly did.

Mr. LODGE. Then the Senator must have overlooked the language on page 6, line 21, which provides:

> Such examinations and service shall be made available to children, on a just and equitable basis, without regard to race, creed, color, or nationality, or the location or character of the school in which the examination is made.

Surely the Senator from Minnesota would not want me to duplicate that language in the bill, if it is there already.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator of the mind that the bill from which he quoted, S. 246——

Mr. LODGE. I was quoting from the child health bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator also quoted from S. 246.

Mr. LODGE. No; I was quoting from the child health bill. The Senator asked me whether I did not think we should have amended the child health bill so as to make it apply to children, and I just read this quotation, which was in S. 1411, to show why I did not think it was necessary to put it in.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the portion the Senator read does not have a word to say about segregation, that it prescribes equal and just treatment, prescribes equality?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not S. 246 assume just and equal treatment, not only assume it, but state it in direct language?

Mr. LODGE. Why does it not say so, if that is what it means? I do not think it does. The Senator from Minnesota is very clever, and he can think up all sorts of ingenious questions and arguments, but he still cannot convince me, nor do I think he can convince the American people, that S. 246 as it now stands eliminates segregation in education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Surely the junior Senator from Massachusetts does not intend to say that I am saying that S. 246 eliminates segregation. That was what his amendment was trying to do.

Mr. LODGE. That is exactly why I do not know what the Senator is trying to get at.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota is attempting to show that on page 9 of S. 246, in subsection (f), it is provided that in order to qualify for aid a State must, "in States where separate public schools are maintained for minority races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds to public schools."

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly the language that is contained in the health services bill.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Except that the latter bill goes on and says without regard to race, color, or creed.

Mr. LODGE. That is a big difference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This bill is to be administered without regard to race, color, or creed. If the Senator wants that language put into this bill, I shall be the first to move for the insertion of the language. But that is different from segregation. That is the elimination of discrimination. We are not talking about that. The Senator's amendment is on the matter of segregation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts yielded for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I am opposed to discrimination and to segregation. I think I have made that clear.

Mr. President, I shall be through in a moment. The Senator from Utah spoke about appealing to first principles. I contend that the amendment which I have offered appeals to first principles. It appeals to the very first principles which gave birth to this Government, the principle of the dignity of the individual man, the principle of the value of human personality, the principle that all men are created equal. It seems to me those are first principles, and that we would have to look very far to find anything that had a higher priority.

The statement has been made that if the amendment were put into the law it would be resisted. That is what has been said—I think I am quoting—that it will be resisted. Must we give up the struggle for civil rights wherever or whenever a civil-rights proposal is resisted? If that is to be an argument against civil rights, we certainly are never going to make very much progress in the struggle for civil rights.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator see any reason why southern Senators should filibuster against the bill if it were amended as he has moved? Would it not be better for the States merely to turn down the aid and be done with it?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know enough about conditions to answer that question. What I have said was that the worst that could happen would be a filibuster. Perhaps there would not be one. Perhaps Senators would conclude that in a great many places it would be worth while for the people to modify their practices in order to get the money, and perhaps there would be some who would conclude they would rather not. Those are matters for speculation as to the future.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator must have been in the South, in fact, I know he has been, and does he not realize that today there is not one Southern State that would take one cent of money if the antisegregation amendment were added to the bill? They would turn it down. So why should we filibuster against the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps I am wrong; perhaps there would not be a filibuster. I said that would be the worst that could happen.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that under the previous Lodge amendment the State of Missisippi would have been reduced to about $4,581,000 for all aid, white and colored alike?

Mr. LODGE. No; the State of Mississippi would have received four times as much as it put in.

Mr. LONG. Under the previous Lodge amendment would not the State of Mississippi have received around $4,581,000?

Mr. LODGE. It would be four and a half million dollars, as I recall the statistics, just speaking from memory, and it would put in about $1,200,000. So she would get back on a 4-to-1 ratio, which is pretty good.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator mind referring to the record and see what the State of Mississippi would have received under the previous Lodge amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I cannot put my finger on it just now, and I am quoting from memory. The State of Mississippi would have received less under the amendment which I proposed than it would have received under the bill, but at the same time the amount it would have received under the amendment I proposed would have been about four times as much as it put in.

Mr. LONG. Referring to the table, would not the State of Mississippi, without either of the Lodge amendments, have received about $16,980,000?

Mr. LODGE. Under the bill?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator is reading from the table, I accept the figure, but I do not care to argue my amendment of yesterday. I know when I am beaten. I was beaten on that amendment. I still think it meritorious, but I have been in public life long enough to know that when one is beaten he is beaten, and should forget about it and go on to something else. So I do not want to rehash all that. I am talking about civil rights.

Mr. LONG. Would not subsection (f) of section 7 (1) of the bill require that any minority race should receive its share of any aid under Federal aid to education?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but I think it is a poor rule to have two sets of teachers and two overheads.

Mr. LONG. Following subsection (f) of section 7 (1), would it not be necessary that the State of Mississippi spend about $8,500,000 of this Federal aid in educating colored children, whereas under the previous Lodge amendment the whole State of Mississippi, for white and colored alike, would receive a total of only $4,581,000, or only one-half as much as Negro education alone would receive under S. 246?

Mr. LODGE. No. I think the effect of the amendment I am now arguing would be obviously to reduce the expense

because it would not be necessary to have two sets of buildings and two sets of teachers.

Mr. LONG. Under the previous Lodge amendment the whole State of Mississippi would have gotten only one-half as much as S. 246 would require the State of Mississippi to spend on Negroes alone, and under the pending amendment the State would turn down Federal aid and the Negro would not get any assistance.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator cannot expect me to agree to that, in the first place, because it is not true, and in the second place, the Senator cannot get me to agree to it because I am not going to rehash the whole argument we had on Friday and Monday. I think the amendment I submitted was very meritorious, but I was unsuccessful in persuading a substantial number of Senators that I was right. I think as time goes by a great many Senators who voted against the amendment will see that I was right. I have a right to hold that view. But I am not going to burden the Senate with a rehash of that discussion.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator feel that the Southern States would accept aid if an antisegregation amendment were made a part of the law?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has been trying all day to get me to say, or to infer, that I am aiming this amendment at Southern States. He cannot get me to do that, because plainly it is not so. I have been in the South too much ever to think there is any monopoly of intolerance or segregation in the South. I think it is a national problem, one which exists everywhere. Man's inhumanity to man is something we find in all parts of the country, and the Senator from Louisiana, able as he is, is not going to trip me into taking the kind of a position he apparently wants me to take, because I do not entertain the view he suggests. The Senator's guess as to what the Southern States would do, and particularly what his own State would do, if the amendment were enacted into law, is probably a better guess than mine would be.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Speaking of man's inhumanity to man, does the Senator know that the State of Louisiana last year increased the average Negro school teacher's salary by $1,263, while increasing the average white school teacher's salary by only $500?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Louisiana tells me that is true I certainly shall believe it.

Mr. LONG. I assure the Senator from Massachusetts it is so.

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to hear that Louisiana is making headway.

Mr. President, I think that concludes the statement I want to make in rebuttal of the arguments which have been made. The proposal is one which is in accord with the most fundamental American traditions. It is in the interests of the economical and efficient operation of the law. If enacted the amendment will not kill the bill, nor will it cut the heart out of it, nor do anything deleterious to it. The fact of the matter is that we are presented here with a proposal which is very ill-digested and ill-considered. Education is wonderful. We are all in favor of it. There is no line of demarcation between all the eloquent speeches which have been made here this afternoon on the necessity of education and the views which I hold. Knowledge is power. The more people are educated the more productive they become, the better citizens they are.

It is a great draw-back to our national defense, which concerns every young man in this country, if there are certain groups of young men who cannot read and write. There is no use in trying to change this discussion from an argument on civil rights, which is what it is, into an argument on the merits of education, because we are all in favor of education, and we all think it is a good thing. But certainly, Mr. President, it ought to be possible to draw up a bill dealing with education which does not take a narrow pedantic view of the problem, but which sees it as a great sociological question, a great problem of citizenship.

The question of the delivery of education to the individual citizen is not merely a question of pedagogy; it is a question of statesmanship, just as the delivery of medical care is not simply a question for the doctors to decide, but is a question for the community as a whole to settle. There is a difference between the conduct of the school curriculum and the practice of medicine on the one hand, and the delivery of education and the delivery of medical care on the other, if I may make that comparison. Certainly to go ahead and propose an education bill with apparently almost complete indifference to the matter of civil rights, is to my mind a very dangerous and a very poor way to proceed. I hope for that reason that the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I assume the Senate is ready to vote. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Brewster	Hill	Magnuson
Bricker	Hoey	Martin
Byrd	Holland	Maybank
Cain	Humphrey	Miller
Capehart	Hunt	Millikin
Chapman	Ives	Morse
Chavez	Jenner	Mundt
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Conor
Eastland	Kem	O'Mahoney
Ecton	Kerr	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Reed
Ferguson	Knowland	Robertson
Flanders	Langer	Russell
Frear	Lodge	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Long	Schoeppel
George	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Gillette	McClellan	Sparkman
Green	McFarland	Stennis
Gurney	McGrath	Taylor
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Withers
Thomas, Utah	Watkins	Young
Thye	Wherry	
Tydings	Williams	

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is necessarily absent. If he were present and voting, I understand he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—16

Baldwin	Ives	Mundt
Bricker	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Schoeppel
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Ecton	Lodge	
Ferguson	Martin	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Holland	Myers
Brewster	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Donnell	Kerr	Russell
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Flanders	McCarran	Taylor
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
George	McGrath	Thye
Gillette	McKellar	Tydings
Green	McMahon	Vandenberg
Gurney	Maybank	Watkins
Hayden	Miller	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Withers
Hill	Morse	Young
Hoey	Murray	

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Lucas	Taft
Butler	McCarthy	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Graham	Malone	Wiley

So Mr. LODGE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and myself, I offer the amendment which is at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "(a)"; and beginning with the comma in line 10, it is proposed to strike out down through the word "greater" in line 13.

On page 4, beginning with the semicolon in line 25, it is proposed to strike out over through "(A)" in line 4, page 5.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield, to permit an inquiry of the acting majority leader with respect to the possibility of obtaining unanimous consent in regard to a time for a final vote upon the pending measure?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland requests unanimous consent that he may yield for that purpose. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I simply wish to make a preliminary suggestion as to the possibility of obtaining such unanimous consent. My colleague and I have an invitation to appear before the legislature of our State. I have heard other Senators express themselves as being desirous of being away from the Senate tomorrow.

I understand that there are a number of other amendments to be proposed to this bill, and that there are a number of Senators who wish to address themselves to this measure.

Of course I would not wish to interfere with or delay the presentation of their views. I simply have been wondering whether it might be possible, for the convenience of all Senators, to obtain unanimous consent with respect to the time for a final vote on this measure—for instance, on the day after tomorrow, at any time the leadership may choose—rather than to plan to vote on the bill tomorrow. I have that thought in mind, in view of the numerous addresses which I understand are contemplated.

My colleague reminds me that probably our own engagement would carry over to Thursday; but I would not wish to ask for more than 1 day's delay in this matter, unless that much delay would be desired by other Senators.

So I wonder whether the acting majority leader cares to express himself in regard to the possibilities of obtaining such unanimous consent, for the convenience of the Members of the Senate generally.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, for myself, I would have no objection to entering into an agreement to have the Senate vote at a definite time on Thursday. If a majority of the Senators wish to have the vote on this measure postponed until Thursday, it will be satisfactory to me to have that done. I understand that in addition to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has an amendment which may take several hours to dispose of, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has an amendment which I understand may also take some time to dispose of.

In view of those amendments, and in view of the desire of a number of Senators to address themselves generally to the pending bill, I have some doubt as to whether we can conclude our action on the bill by tomorrow afternoon. So I would be quite willing to enter into an agreement to fix a time on Thursday for the final vote on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me under the same conditions?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire whether the acting majority leader feels that a vote will be taken tonight on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. MYERS. It is extremely difficult to determine whether we can reach a vote tonight on that amendment, inasmuch as it is obvious that it will not be possible for us to conclude action on the bill tonight. I do not desire to keep the Senate in session later than 5:30 o'clock this afternoon, under the circumstances.

Therefore, Mr. President, in an effort to reach agreement in this connection, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the pending bill and on all amendments pending at that time, at 3 p. m. on Thursday of this week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska reserve the right to object?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have already informed the distinguished acting majority leader that at this time I shall have to object to his unanimous consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

(At this point Mr. TYDINGS yielded to Mr. MAGNUSON, who presented certain matters to be printed in the RECORD, which appear elsewhere under the appropriate headings.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to admonish the Senator from Maryland that if he yields for various requests, the Chair will be compelled to enforce the rule that he cannot do so without losing the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I must say to the Senator from Missouri that I can yield only for a question. I should like to accommodate the Senator, but I do not desire to yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before a recess is taken, there will be opportunity for Senators to have insertions made in the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall not say that I shall speak for only a short time and then speak for a long time. In that respect I wish to make an exception to the preliminary remarks usually made at the commencement of addresses in the Senate. If I am not interrupted, I shall not speak for more than 15 or 20 minutes. I do not desire to debate this amendment, except to explain it briefly for those who may not have had an opportunity to read it and who may not be familiar with it.

The effect of the amendment is briefly as follows: It would strike from the bill the provision for the payment of $5 a pupil a year, which is one of the alternative ways proposed for fixing the appropriation for each State. As a result of adopting the amendment, Federal aid to education would be extended only to States which are below the average in their financial support of education. That, briefly, is the substance of the amendment. It would eliminate approximately 24 or 25 of the States from receiving aid under this bill, but the bill as thus amended would help approximately 24 or 25 of the States which are below the average in respect to the amount of money they contribute per pupil for educational purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should prefer to continue a little longer without interruption. However, I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the Senator's amendment, would $5 be reduced from all appropriations for this purpose, or

would the amendment permit the appropriations for the schools needing such aid to be in the amounts set forth in the bill, and would the $5 reduction be made only as to the other States?

Mr. TYDINGS. The $5 would be deducted from the appropriations for all States. So the net result—without defining it in detail because I do not wish to delay the Senate long enough to do that—would be to have the difference between subsection (A) and subsection (B) of section 4 remain in effect, and to strike out altogether the provision for the $5 payment.

The result of such action would be that the 24 States which are below the average for the entire country in respect to their contributions per pupil for educational purposes would receive all the money to be appropriated under this bill, and the 24 States which are, above the average and which do not need the money would not receive a single dollar of it.

Mr. President, if there is any justification for Federal aid to education, certainly it is to be predicated upon the assumption there is need for Federal aid. My own State would go out of the picture under the amendment I have offered. We do not need a dollar of Federal money in Maryland for our educational system. We are perfectly able, willing, and anxious to pay the whole bill ourselves, and we are willing and anxious to help the States which because of their economic and commercial and industrial situation cannot levy the taxes perhaps to make the happy average which we want to prevail over the whole country. So what my amendment does is simply to aid those States which are below the line, and stop right there. It will save taking nearly $100,000,000 out of the Treasury. There is not a bit of sense in the world in having a Federal appropriation go to States which are already away above the average appropriation basis for education. It is simply a sheer waste of money; there is no justification for it.

Furthermore, the bill in its present form carries with it the danger of Federal control of education eventually, because it helps all the States, regardless of need; and when all the States are helped regardless of need, we enter the whole field of education in every State in the union; whereas, if we take the States that have smaller than the average contribution for education per pupil and confine our effort to those alone, we do a worthy thing without laying the heavy hand of the Federal Government on the educational system of the Nation.

The other day, in this very body, following an effort to amend an appropriation bill, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to reduce the appropriations by 5 percent, because Senators did not want an unbalanced budget; they did not want a deficit when the work of this session was over. In what better way can we save $100,000,000 than by taking from the bill that amount intended for States that do not want it and do not need it, and for whom it is a sheer waste of money to make the contribution? I am told by my friends, many of whom favor this amendment, that if the appropriation is taken away from some States, it will result in losing the votes of those States for the bill. I do not believe that that argument is sound, for most of the States that would not get an appropriation under my amendment are States that would contribute more than they would get back anyway. So all we would be doing would be to take $5 out of one pocket per pupil and put it in another pocket per pupil. It would be hocus pocus. Any good opponent on the stump could show it was hocus pocus, if a Senator undertook to say he did it to protect the appropriation for his own State. It would not amount to that. It could be demonstrated a hundred times over.

Inasmuch as the sole justification of Federal aid to education is to aid what might be called—and I say this without any thought of aspersing the States—the backward States, so far as appropriations for education are concerned, why do we not confine the bill to its announced purpose, and stop right then and there? Mark my word, I care not how much restraint is placed in the bill, I care not how vehemently the Congress says the Federal Government is never going to take over the educational systems in the States; once an appropriation of this kind in aid of all the States for general educational purposes is made, the next Congress will put a little more pressure on; the succeeding one, a little more; and in 5, 10, 15, or 20 years there will be a Federal bureaucracy in Washington running the educational systems of the United States of America. Make no mistake about it. It is as certain as tomorrow morning's sunrise.

I do not like the term "States' rights." It connotes a false meaning. I like the term "State responsibility." There are certain things which are the responsibilities of the States. One of them, where the line of demarcation stops at the District of Columbia, is education. Into that field, under our form of government, under our Constitution, under our traditions, under our customs, to enter the Federal Government has no right. Education is an intimate, family, local, and State responsibility. I do not want the States to give up this responsibility, and I do not want to see the Federal Government assume it.

Already the Government is headed toward a deficit. The other day we passed several bills necessary for the national defense, involving a radar screen for North America, and a guided-missile range. These items will cost $75,000,000 or $80,000,000 or $100,000,000 apiece, to be superimposed eventually on our defense costs. Welfare legislation is gradually mounting and mounting, and we are likely to increase the deficit more than we need increase it when we add to all the necessary things, perhaps, appropriations which the States do not want, and which they are told practically they must take whether they want them or not.

I ask my colleagues who are interested in economy if they will not support this amendment. It will not hurt any State in the Union. The States that will not get Federal money under the amendment do not need Federal money. Forsooth, then, why should we give them Federal money to perform a State function, when they themselves say they do not need it, and when all the reports and all the statistics show abundantly the States that will not get the money are already above the average in their educational appropriations? I want those States that are below the average to have the help carried by the bill, if it is to be provided at all; and I am hoping I can get myself in such a position that I can support the bill. I am not one who looks with favor on even a mild encroachment by the Federal Government in the field of State responsibility for the educational systems of the Nation as propounded by each of the separate States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator have readily available, for the information of the Senate, the names of States which will not benefit from Federal funds, in the event his amendment is adopted?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has the committee report on his desk. If he will turn to the last page and strike a line, I think, just above the State of Florida, the States from Florida on down will, if my amendment is adopted, get the money. Those States are Florida, Iowa, New Hampshire, Minnesota, Maine, Idaho, Vermont, North Dakota, Utah, South Dakota, Virginia, Texas, Arizona, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Tennessee, West Virginia, Georgia, New Mexico, Kentucky, North Carolina, Alabama, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Mississippi.

The States that are above the position of Florida in the chart will not get a single dollar of this money. This is an equalization plan. This is what many States do all over the country. In the case of a rural county whose tax revenues are small and whose area is large, they appropriate extra money to allow the educational system in sparsely settled and comparatively economically poor counties to get some additional help; and that is what we have done here.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have a chart showing what amount the States would pay into the fund, similar to the chart on income submitted with the bill? I mean the States that are not benefited. This amendment would reduce the bill considerably.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I can say to the Senator as a round figure, as an approximate figure, if he will reduce by about 30 percent the figures in his table that he read the other day, he will get a rough idea and approximation of what each State will pay under my amendment.

Here is a place where we can save approximately $100,000,000, without defeating a single aim of the bill. We will help the poorer States—and I say that with

no desire to asperse them—to raise their educational levels. That is why the bill is before us.

Mr. President, I shall not take more time to dwell on the subject, unless some Senator has a question to ask. We are about to do something this afternoon which has far-reaching implications that will carry down through the years. I hope Senators will meditate well. I say to those who believe in States' rights, or, as I prefer to say, State responsibility, they should not play hot and cold with this great problem. There is nothing more sacred in the field of States' rights and States' responsibilities than is the educational systems of the States.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is the Senator aware of the fact, in connection with the proposal he advances, that the State of Maryland, for example, is not only financially able to take care of its obligations, but, through its chief executive, has in writing stated that it does not desire Federal aid?

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for bringing that to my attention. The Governor of my State wrote to the chairman of the House committee which was hearing this matter, saying that Maryland did not want any money. We are perfectly willing that other States should have it. Why bleed the Federal Treasury when the Nation is confronted with a $250,000,000,000 debt, and why force us to take money today. Why squander it? If we appropriate the entire sum, let us give it to the States which need it most, so that we can end present unfortunate conditions and bring them up more quickly to the national level we desire them to attain?

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is the Senator not also aware of the compilation which has been made of the outstanding surpluses and balances of the various States of the Union, indicating in connection with general funds, postwar funds, or other State reserves, that there is approximately $3,200,000,000 in surpluses to the credit of the various States, and particularly showing that the States to which the Senator has referred as being able to carry their own school load would be able, from their surpluses, to meet their obligations if desired?

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank my colleague for his very helpful reference to what I consider to be prime data in the consideration of this bill. He has shown that State treasurers, by their own reports, have surpluses in the neighborhood of $3,000,000,000 available for purposes of this kind. Luckily, the purposes of this bill are best applied to those States which have not large surpluses which are available for education. If many of the States are paying bonuses to veterans, if they have these reserves, acquired pretty generally during the war, why should we make a huge and unnecessary expenditure when we can accomplish the purposes of the bill by confining the expenditure to those States which need Federal help in order to raise the standard of their educational systems? Shall we insist on spending $100,000,000 against the wishes of the governors of the States, in the face of large State surpluses, to assist States which are well above the average? What advantage would it serve to the Nation, to the cause of education, or to the educational systems in the individual States if we should do so?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have just been reading the debate on this issue which took place in March 1948, when the same question was being considered. It appears from the debate that even the well-to-do States have school districts with substandard educational facilities. The State of Maryland may have, in most of its cities and towns, educational standards above the average, but there may be districts which, because of their poor economic condition, need some Federal assistance. According to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has made a study of the problem, many of the States do not have equalization funds so that the funds are divided among various counties according to need. The conclusion I reach from the colloquy and debate of last year is that even the State of New York, as stated by the junior Senator from that State, has many school districts which need some Federal assistance to carry on their programs and to bring the amount up to $55 per pupil.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to take up the Senator's statements as he made them, and I think I can show him that he is not hitting the target, if he will bear with me a moment. Then I shall again yield to him.

In the first place, the State of Maryland has what is called an equalization fund. It is an appropriation from the State treasury to assist those counties which do not have sufficient revenue to bring them up to what we might call a good Maryland average. There will always be counties in every State in the Union, where there is the county system of education, which will have a little more than some other counties. But the equalization system in my State raises what might be called the poor-revenue counties up to a point where they pretty well blend in with the general educational level of the State.

The second point is that there is nothing in the bill which would give the money we are appropriating to the poor counties, even if we were to adopt that suggestion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator. Is not my statement correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think so. There will have to be a requirement that——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland yielded only for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator think the bill provides that there must be a minimum of $55 spent on each school child, in the event the State accepts aid under this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I do not. Certain generalities are stated; but even if the argument of the Senator from Tennessee and the argument of the Senator from Utah are correct, it proves what I had hoped it would not be necessary for me to prove over again, that it is an entering wedge into the field of determining how the money is to be spent and how the educational systems are to operate in the States. So, unless we give the money with no strings attached to it, we are beginning a measure of control as to how the money shall be spent and where it shall be spent in the States. That may be worthy, for the time being. But that will be only the beginning of regulations. After it has been in operation a little while we will not recognize our own bill. Even if there are communities in any rich State that are not financially able to bring their educational system up to the desired level, it is the local responsibility of the States to do it, and it is not our duty to go forth with a shotgun and compel them to do it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the distinguished Senator know of any State in the Union which, under its own constitutional authority, does not have the power to make readjustments to bring about an equalization within its own borders?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is abundantly correct. We are trying, primarily on a State level, to find out the States which, because of smaller revenues, have not the financial ability to create such an educational system, on the whole, as we think they should have. In the case of those States a good argument can be made for Federal aid, but if a State has a large surplus, and chooses to let Buncumbe County or Jones County or Wilson County have a lower-than-average educational system, that is the responsibility of the people who live in the State, and not the responsibility of the Senator from Maryland or the eminent Senator from Colorado in this body.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does it not follow that when we give generalized aid all over the United States, we are subsidizing States for not doing their own duty and readjusting their own affairs so that they can equalize their own educational systems?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. In my judgment, one of the reasons why we have a swollen bureaucracy today is that we have taken over State responsibility here in the Capital of the Nation. There are many things which the Federal Government is doing which should have been done by the States, in my judgment, or by the cities or the towns or the counties, in many instances.

Everybody complains about the swollen bureaucracy. The word is almost spelled with 65 letters, if we judge by the emphasis on its utterance, rather than the number of letters which are really in it.

My point is that swollen bureaucracies are nothing more than a lot of small things put together, like drops of water in a bucket, and the reason why we have a swollen government is because, as is exemplified by the pending bill, we have been doing unnecessary things, to widen the scope of the Federal Government in the field of local dominion, when there is really no need for it in a great many cases.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I regard it as a privilege to aline myself with the sentiments of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and to have the opportunity to vote for his amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I were in doubt before the eminent Senator from Colorado joined with me, I have no doubt now about the righteousness of my cause, so high is my regard for his intellectual capacity.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Inasmuch as there is a general desire on the part of the Members of the Senate to have a minimum of Federal interference with the States in the handling of the education-aid fund, does not the Senator feel that if only a few States receive the benefits under the program, which would be the result of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland——

Mr. TYDINGS. Twenty-three or twenty-four, I think the number is.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There might be an inclination on the part of the representatives of those States which do not receive funds not to be so careful about imposing regulations on the States?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; that does not worry me at all. I think it would work just the contrary.

I am about to surrender the floor, but I wish to make three or four observations before I do so. Some of the things I shall say I have said once or twice before, but I believe that as a peroration, if I might call it that, it might be wise to restate them.

What is the United States of America? It is a Government of 48 separate nations. This country of ours is 33 times the size of Great Britain in geographical area, it is 16 times as large as France, it is 14 times the size of Germany. When we pass laws in the United States we pass laws for a federation of 48 States. In fact, we pass laws for most of a continent. The whole genius of our Government has been to give to the people of the local communities the widest measure of local responsibility and self-assertion that is commensurate with the national welfare, not indispensable to the national welfare. That is why we are great. That is why we have liberty. It is because we have kept liberty decentralized, and liberty can live only in an atmosphere of decentralization. The more we centralize, small though each effort may be, the more we inevitably whittle and whittle and whittle at the trunk of the tree of liberty.

We have here just one more opportuity, either to preserve it, or to whittle it a little more. I am speaking in no small geographical, acquisitive sense when I say this, because my State will not get a dollar of the money if my amendment shall be agreed to, and I am glad of that, for the strength of our country should lie in the strong States helping the small States, and not insisting on a part of the gravy while they are raising the flag of patriotism and claiming they are doing it for bleeding and suffering humanity.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that as we stand here, faced as we probably are, with a large deficit, with certainly very little prospect for a payment on the national debt, we will save $100,000,000 in appropriations which the States which are well off do not want.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. How would the Senator change his amendment so that I could vote for it? I do not believe the State of South Dakota needs money to help it in carrying on its school program, and I intend to vote against the bill. I do not want to vote for the Senator's amendment if my State would be a recipient under the terms of the amendment. I am convinced that quite a number of States in the schedule just above the State of Florida may be in the same category, and the Senator might go down eight or ten more States. If that were done, I should be perfectly willing and happy to vote for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I cannot change my amendment, because I am establishing a principle. The principle is that the 24 States which are above the average get nothing, the 24 States which are below the average get something. I would say to the Senator that I am sure his State can do as much for itself as we can do for it here in Washington. If I were the Governor of South Dakota and that were the situation, and the State had not been visited by a devastating flood or some other unforeseen calamity, I would refuse to take the Federal money. When we get one or two Governors who will do that, we may one of these days get a new candidate for President of the United States whom the people would like to follow.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not correct that in the situation in which we find ourselves we cannot remake a bill on the Senate floor, and so have to take the alternatives as we find them? I think on the list two or three or four States which would receive aid should not receive it. I should like to see them excluded. It seems to me that is not a practicable procedure, and therefore we are driven to the choice of alternatives presented by the amendment or by the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. And at the same time retain a valid reason why we can go as far as the amendment permits us to go.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And in a wholesome direction, as I see it, which can be corrected as we learn more as time goes on.

Mr. TYDINGS. I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he had information, to the effect that some of the States, including my own State, which are now included in the bill, did not want the $5 per child.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not sent around any questionnaire; but they would only be getting their own $5 back, because we have to get the money from the 24 States, turn it into the Treasury, and then send it back to them again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does not the difference lie in the fact that we are getting it from those who pay income taxes in varying degrees, on the theory of taxing those best able to pay, and putting that money into education?

Mr. TYDINGS. But we are not using income-tax money alone for this purpose. We are using the perfume and liquor-tax money, the tire-tax money, the gasoline-tax money, all the excise-tax money, and the sooner we take these selective sales taxes off the consumers of the United States of America, the better it will be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator uses the term "national average." Does the Senator feel that the national cost average per child should remain static in one place, where it is now?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have taken only the yardstick which the committee itself provides in the bill. What I have stricken out is the alternative. The alternative was put in to give $5 a pupil to those States which, under the philosophy of the bill, would receive nothing, and I simply propose to take that out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see that the State of Washington and the State of Maryland are very high in the list.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would not the addition of $5 in the State of Maryland or in the State of Washington add to the average and make for better school facilities?

Mr. TYDINGS. We have a surplus of $30,000,000 in our State. If we want to improve our school facilities we will do it ourselves. We are not asking for this money. The same can be said about the State of Washington. The State of Washington can take care of itself. There are $3,000,000,000 of general surplus in the treasuries of the States of the Union, and here the Government of the United States, facing, as it is, a deficit, is forcing the States of the Union to take $100,000,000 which they really do not need.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not agree with the Senator's use of the word "forcing."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in the distinguished Senator's amendment, but I cannot for the life of

me see why he stops with the State of Florida when the $5 allotment per child runs down as far on the list as the State of Vermont. I am trying to find the formula. I cannot quite understand it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the bill the first five States coming down the list, including Florida, would not receive quite the equivalent of $5. They are in the range where they would receive either $1.65 or $2.65. But after the fifth State on the list, if the Senator will figure it out, he will find that we then get into the $5 category. But for the purpose of my argument, they would be the beneficiaries of my amendment as I have offered it. So I have named them as such beneficiaries. Let me say to the Senator—and it will clear the matter up in his mind, because it was something which confused me until I had it cleared up in my own mind, that this is what the bill provides. Let us turn to the bottom of page 3 of the bill. The bill provides that the money shall be distributed among the States in the following manner:

(A) Multiply the number of children from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, in each State—

By $50. That is one process.

(B) Multiply the average of the annual income payments for each State—

By 1 percent and take 1 percent of it. Now we come to the next paragraph:

(C) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, the amount of the Federal allotment for any State shall be the amount, if any, by which the amount calculated under paragraph (A) exceeds the amount calculated under paragraph (B)—

That left out about 24 States. So in order to bring them in there was inserted in paragraph (C) this language—

or $5 multiplied by the number of children in such State.

Otherwise the 24 States would not have gotten any money at all under paragraph (A) and paragraph (B), because if we subtract paragraph (A) from (B) there would not be a dollar left. That is the reason the language I just read was put into the bill—so as to bring these States on the gravy train.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Apropos of the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], does not the Senator from Maryland feel that there is less likelihood of the beginning of what might develop into a permanent system of Federal control if there is not an over-all allocation of Federal funds to schools rather than an allocation limited to a certain number?

Mr. TYDINGS. In my judgment the junior Senator from Maryland could not have asked a more profound question. Certainly if we have a Federal education system that covers every State in the Union we will embark on a Federal education system per se. But if we have a Federal-aid-to-education system which embraces only those States that perhaps need the assistance, then we are in the realm of financial assistance, rather than educational programs per se. I think that is one of the virtues of the amendment I have offered.

As I have made the statement that I would not speak long, unless interrogated, and unless the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who is on his feet, wishes to ask me a question, I will now say that I hope Senators will seize this last chance to keep $100,000,000 in the Treasury of the United State, almost $1 for every man, woman, and child in America, which there is not the slightest need for spending, and which does not go to the educational deficiencies which are sought to be corrected by the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I apologize to the Senator for being obliged to ask the question. Perhaps I was interrupted at the time and did not hear everything the Senator said. But I still do not understand his answer made to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as to why he stops on the list at the State of Florida. I have been making calculations, and it seems to me that under the terms of the Senator's amendment he should stop before the State of Florida is reached.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will explain that. If the Senator will take the bill and turn to page 3 he will find there are two yardsticks provided.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The first is to multiply the number of school children between 5 and 17 years of age by $50. The other is to take 1 percent of the annual income of a State. Now subtract the sum of the second proposition from the sum of the first proposition, and that is how much the State will receive. When the subtraction is made it will be found that some States would receive a larger amount than the amount which would be arrived at by multiplying the number of children by $50. Therefore, if we were to subtract the larger amount from the smaller amount we would have nothing; we would have naught minus. So in order to put those States back into the bill, or to use the expression of the man on the street, to get them on the gravy train, so there would be enough deceptive votes to put the measure through and strike down a great principle, this provision was put into the bill:

Or $5, multiplied by the number of children in such State from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, as determined under paragraph (A), whichever is greater.

That brought in about 24 or 25 or 26 States which otherwise would not have been brought in under the formula. I am, by my amendment, deleting that $5 proposition, and permitting the money to go only to the States where the formula shows help is needed, where there are great numbers of children, and where the incomes of the States are small. That is the formula. Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator has. I gather from what the Senator has just said that under the calculations made by him up to the State of Florida on the list the income of the State is greater than the number of children.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. Even in the first five States beginning with Florida, the income of the States, while not greater than the number of children, when we subtract one from the other, is a little less than $5 per child, and that is the reason why the amount would be $1.65 or $2.65 or $3.25 for the first five States. After that the amount of the grant would be more than $5 per child.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What would the bill cost under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. My amendment, as nearly as it can be calculated, will reduce the cost of the bill in an amount ranging from $82,000,000 to $100,000,000 in grants.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I hope the Senate will continue discussion of the amendment. I wish to ask the Senator if it would not be better to figure the actual income per school child? That would make the amendment a very simple one, and make the bill more simple. I ask the Senator to examine the last page of the report of the committee. Let us take the income per school child for the State of Arizona. Then in the States following there is a very big drop in the income per school child.

Mr. TYDINGS. What page is the Senator referring to?

Mr. GURNEY. The last page of the report.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. GURNEY. There is a drop in income between Arizona and Oklahoma of approximately $600. If we had an amendment which would give aid to the States where the income is below $4,000, that would be a fine way, in my opinion, to reach the States where evidently there is not enough revenue to take care of an adequate school system.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there is a great deal of merit in the Senator's suggestion——

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to see a bill like that passed. I would vote for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there is a great deal of merit in the Senator's suggestion; but we are up against a practical difficulty. We cannot rewrite the bill on the floor of the Senate, as would be necessitated if the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Dakota were adopted. In the desire to be perfect we would lose 90 percent of our objective. We would probably lose the whole thing. The Senator from Maryland has tried to take the yardsticks which the committee deemed advisable. I myself believe that the yardstick of the Senator from South Dakota is more advisable but so long as the committee held hearings and proceeded on the basis of the yardsticks set forth in the bill, I retained the same yardsticks in applying the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall try to be as brief as possible. It so happens that I am in direct conflict with the position taken by the able Senator from Maryland. In the first place, I do not

like the idea of calling this program a "gravy train." If it were a "gravy train," so far as I am concerned, and so far as the State of New York is concerned, I might be in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

It so happens that under the bill as it now stands, with the $5 minimum provision, New York State would get about $12,000,000; and in order to get that $12,000,000, in order to obtain the amount which the $5 minimum provision would yield, New York State would have to make an extra contribution of about $16,000,000, above and beyond what would be required of New York under the proposed amendment.

In other words, the State of New York would lose somewhere in the neighborhood of from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000 by reason of the $5 minimum provision. So if it were a "gravy train," if that were all there were to it—and that seems to be the main argument of the Senator from Maryland—I might be with him; but I am not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does not the very argument which the Senator is making, comparing the cost and benefits in the case of the State of New York, show that to some degree he is approaching the question from the standpoint of the "gravy train" philosophy?

Mr. IVES. The argument which the Senator from New York is about to make will indicate that he is approaching the problem strictly from an educational standpoint. There is no "gravy train" involved. However, as long as the Senator from Maryland emphasizes the idea of a "gravy train," if that is what people like to call it, I point out that undoubtedly the State of New York and every other State, including Maryland, can find use for the moneys derived from the $5 minimum provision. I congratulate the States which feel that they do not need this money. Those States are indeed in a most fortunate and happy condition.

So far as the State of New York is concerned—and I dare say we are not exactly alone in this matter—we have discovered that we have just about reached our limit from the standpoint of taxation. At the last session of the legislature the State was unable, under the conditions as they existed, to tax sufficiently to meet the requirements of the State budget which was before the legislature. As a result, as I understand it, a short-time loan had to be agreed upon to meet the situation. That is the fiscal condition of the State of New York. I do not think we are unique in our situation.

We can use whatever money we receive by reason of this provision. We can use it very profitably and very effectively from an educational standpoint.

But that is not the reason why I favor the bill as it stands. As I have indicated, the taxpayers of New York would actually lose several million dollars by reason of the $5 minimum requirement. The reason I am for the $5 minimum is that from an educational standpoint—and this is where I definitely and distinctly differ with the Senator from Maryland—it is most necessary that every State in the Union, without exception, be a party to the entire program.

We have heard a great deal of discussion today on the floor of the Senate about the various provisions in the bill, and in the various amendments which were before us, which would perhaps cause the Federal Government to intrude more and more into the State educational systems, until eventually the Federal Government might get complete control of education in the States. I grant that there is that danger in the bill. It cannot be denied. But, Mr. President, let me point out now that the greatest safeguard against that danger, the greatest force to offset it, is the participation of every single State in the whole program. I know that all of us will participate from the standpoint of making the contributions through the Federal taxes we pay. That goes without saying. That is done by reason of the taxing process. But that does not inform our States, or the educational agencies in our States, as to the conduct of the administration of the educational aid program which may be carried on under Federal supervision or Federal direction.

There is no question that in the bill there are definite provisions requiring Federal supervision, requiring that certain specifications be met and certain directives be carried out by the States if they are to benefit from the bill. Yet, if only a small number of States—19, I believe—were to derive such benefits, to that lesser extent there would not be the watchdog capacity on the part of the Nation as a whole to see that there was no Federal intrusion within the States in their educational programs. There are 29 States which would not be included if the $5 minimum provision were eliminated. If we eliminate those States from this program, we remove from it many of the States in the Union which have some of the best educational departments. That is not saying in any way that the other States do not have excellent educational departments; but if we eliminate from the program 29 States which have excellent educational departments, we take away 29 States which could contribute very materially toward the carrying out of the intent and purpose of the bill.

If we should decide to take a course which makes this program a program of charity—and that is all it would amount to under the amendment now before us—if we should deprive it of the use of one of the chief functions of education—and that is what virtually would be done if we were to go along with the proposed amendment—the outcome might be that which we definitely do not want.

I oppose this amendment not because of any "gravy train" angle, not because under it New York State would be deprived of any financial benefit, dubious as that benefit would be. I do not oppose it for any financial reason.

I do not oppose it on the ground that I do not agree with the able Senator from Maryland when he says that we could save about $100,000,000 by his amendment. Technically, we could do so. However, I raise the point that savings could be effected far more satisfactorily by percentage cuts in all appropriation bills. Under this bill every State could get along with 5 percent less or even 10 percent less. That has absolutely nothing to do with the basic question before us. The safeguarding of education in our States from Federal control far transcends in importance the $100,000,000, or whatever the amount of the suggested saving might be. That is what is at stake in this debate.

In closing, let me say that if this amendment is adopted, if the bill is passed without the $5 minimum provision, if 29 of our great States cannot effectively participate in this program, if they can have nothing whatever to do in checking what is going on, or in influencing it, then eventually the entire program will prove not only to have been futile, but to have been most damaging to our entire educational structure.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. IVES. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, who was first on his feet.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has stated that under the amendment of the Senator from Maryland there would be a benefit to the State of New York, even though the Senator from New York would call it an indirect benefit, or whatever the Senator may choose to call it.

Mr. IVES. It would be a most dubious financial benefit, because we in New York would pay more than we would receive.

Mr. WHERRY. But does the Senator from New York mean that it would be an indirect benefit to safeguard the educational systems of the country? What is the benefit to which the Senator refers?

Mr. IVES. In referring to the indirect benefit, I was referring to the $12,000,000 which presumably we in New York would receive, after contributing approximately the extra $16,000,000. That is about what it would amount to. However, that would not be very good business. The able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] will tell the Senate that, I am sure.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I was trying to ascertain. The Senator from New York said in the course of his remarks that if the Tydings amendment is adopted, there will be an indirect benefit to New York. Can the Senator tell me what that indirect benefit would be?

Mr. IVES. I did not make such a statement, so far as I recall; or if I did, I did not intend to do so.

I will say that if there is to be any indirect benefit or any benefit of any kind to New York under the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, it would merely be that the taxpayers of the State of New York would be relieved of approximately $16,000,000 in taxes, if that is what the Senator from Nebraska has in mind.

Of course, I do not consider this to be merely a matter of dollars and cents.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator from New York. I

thought he said that there would be an indirect benefit to his State, under the Tydings amendment.

Mr. IVES. My State would receive an indirect benefit, to the extent that its taxpayers would profit in the amount of the difference between $12,000,000 and $16,000,000, a difference of about $4,000,000. Of course, such a benefit would be a dubious one financially and would not exist educationally.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My State is in the same position as that of the State of New York, under this amendment, for it would require my State to pay more than it would receive.

I understand that the purpose of the bill is to raise the educational standards for all children in the United States, regardless of where they may live.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State of Massachusetts, like the State of New York, needs many advantages which it does not now have, for its educational system. It needs better books, let us say, and better standards of instruction, perhaps more pay for its teachers, and so forth.

Under our system of taxation, with the Federal Government assuming the tax sources it now has assumed, it is difficult for either New York or Massachusetts to find additional sources of taxes.

Mr. IVES. I have explained the New York situation in that respect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. So it is my understanding that the Senator from New York takes the position that every State should benefit from this bill to the extent of being able to raise its educational standards and make possible greater allocations of funds for educational purposes than would be possible under the Tydings amendment, if it were adopted. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. That is correct, as I understand the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, from the point of view of education, the people of New York need certain things which at the present time they are not able to obtain. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. Yes; we cannot afford to get them now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator from New York look with favor on an amendment to increase the $5 limit per pupil to $10 or $15 or $20 or $25? In such case, he then would be able to do a great deal more for the pupils in his State—and, also, for the pupils in other States, such as Massachusetts and Maryland.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think the Senator from Maryland overlooks a very fundamental point in respect to the principle of aid to education, although I think that point is recognized and covered in all State educational systems. I refer to the fact that the taxpayers of every school district pay local and State taxes for their educational system, and every school district benefits to a certain extent from State aid, where such systems of aid are in existence. That is fundamental in education.

I tried to explain the reason for that. It is the only way by which the whole educational structure in one State, in many States, or in the entire country, can be made to work harmoniously and unitedly toward a given aid, which is the safeguarding and continual improvement of education itself.

In the case of the pending bill, the improvement would be severalfold; for instance, there would be an improvement in the over-all educational structure and in the quality of education within the States, and at the same time Federal intrusion and Federal control would be prevented.

I can see very definitely a crying need for some minimum benefit for all in respect to this matter. Of course, a $1 minimum might be better; instead of increasing the amount, I might be willing to decrease it. In such event, the net cost to the people of my State would be less. I would not favor a provision for a $10 or $15 minimum or anything of that sort, in this kind of proposal with the formula it provides.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the Federal Government had not preempted so broadly the fields of taxation in the States, including New York, there would be available, would there not, through the taxing powers of the States, more money for education?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in answer to that question I would point out that that is one of the chief difficulties with which New York is confronted. There has been so much overlapping in the matter of income taxes, estate and inheritance taxes, stock transfer taxes, and taxes of other types as to which there are duplications, that my State's sources of revenue are practically dried up at the present time.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would the Senator from New York say that, if the State of New York had the power to extend its tax structure so as to collect more money in taxes, it would spend that money for educational purposes?

Mr. IVES. The State of New York definitely would do so; there is no question about it.

Mr. BALDWIN. And would the Senator from New York agree that every other State of the 29 States mentioned, which are not below the minimum, would be in the same position?

Mr. IVES. I assume that at least a substantial number of them would be. I think the Senator from Maryland pointed out a number of States which temporarily have surpluses; but I would remind him that in a period of diminishing income, surpluses are apt to disappear.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then is it the Senator's point that the effect of giving some of this money to the States which apparently are not below the prescribed educational standard would be merely to transfer the benefits of the taxing power which the Federal Government now exercises, so that the funds raised by the exercise of that taxing power would be given in part to them and in part to the States which cannot now provide adequately for themselves in the educational field?

Mr. IVES. To the extent that the States themselves would derive a return from that process, that would be the result.

In the State of New York we would not get back one dollar for each dollar we would pay. So I cannot conscientiously say that that would be exactly the case so far as New York is concerned.

As I indicated, I believe we would receive approximately $12,000,000, which we could very profitably use in New York in our educational structure. Of course, we would prefer to have a system by which we would get back the $16,000,000 we would contribute, instead of only the $12,000,000, which the $5 minimum would provide. However, that is not possible under the terms of this bill. I am not quarreling with the bill on that account, because I take the position that transcending everything else in importance is the matter of education itself and the maintenance of a free and independent educational system in all the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF POLISH BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have a short statement which I desire to make on another subject, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to have the Executive Calendar called. Thereafter I intend to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. President, Americans of Polish descent and Poles in the free countries throughout the world observe publicly today the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of the signing of the Polish Bill of Rights, the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. It was on May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution, that signatures were affixed to a document giving Poland's common man the freedoms inherent in democracy. This deliverance and emancipation succeeded without revolution or disorder.

To all that has been said on previous occasions in praise of the Polish Constitution of May 3, I want to add today a special point which better than anything else might explain why that charter drafted so long ago in a distant country continues to appeal to all Americans and really deserves our sympathetic interest.

Poland is symbolized to us by the well-known names of two of her greatest heroes, who also belong to American history: Pulaski that Kosciuszko. And it so happened that each perfectly represented one of the factors which contributed to make the Polish reform movement a great success.

As far as Kosciuszko is concerned, it is obvious that nobody was better qualified to popularize in his country the ideas

of the American and French revolutions which he knew so well out of his personal experience and which were introduced in a well-adapted form into the basic articles of Poland's new constitution.

But such an adaptation would have hardly been possible, if there had not been in Poland herself a four-century-old tradition of parliamentary government, of the respect of human rights, and of liberty under law, completely different from the absolutist pattern in the neighbor countries.

It was in defense of that tradition that Pulaski had started a first independence war against Russian interference, 23 years before the Constitution, which he did not live to see, because, defeated at home, he came to America and died that our country might rise and live.

This is one more reason why we owe to Pulaski such a tremendous debt of gratitude. In addition to his military and even financial contribution to the foundation of the United States, he through his example encouraged his own country to remain faithful to the principles which a little later were embodied almost simultaneously in both the American and Polish constitutions.

Many millions of Americans of Polish descent have shown that this heritage of Pulaski's spirit can be a real asset in the development of our American way of life. It seemed fitting to recall it on Poland's national holiday, which at present cannot be duly celebrated at home.

Poland today is a tragic nation, for, having fought gallantly on the field of battle, it is today under the domination of Soviet Russia and her puppets. It is therefore our serious obligation to promote the survival of Polish culture, Christian, western and democratic, just like our own, on our free soil.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in order that I may fill a speaking engagement, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from the session of the Senate tomorrow until 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, consent is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be Federal Works Administrator, vice Philip B. Fleming.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William D. Murray, of Montana, to be United States district judge for the district of Montana, vice Robert L. Brown, deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be War Assets Administrator.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, one of the Senators on the minority side requested that we allow this nomination to go over. I therefore make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request, the nomination will go over.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip J. Finnegan to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Earl Cooper to be United States attorney for division No. 3 of the district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dennis E. Sullivan to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott M. Matheson to be United States attorney for the district of Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Vernon P. Burns to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul C. Herring, to be United States marshal for division No. 3 of the district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Wein, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 4, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Adams, George Talmage, Jr., AO27932.
Adams, Ranald Trevor, Jr., AO28002.
Allen, Lew, Jr., AO28029.
Atkinson, Anderson Watkins, AO28018.
Baisley, William Denton, AO28215.
*Bajcura, Orestes Methodius, AO50540.
Barricklow, John Alan, AO28134.
Bartholf, John Copeland, AO28581.
Bauchman, Walter Donald, AO28483.
Baugh, Hale, AO28141.
Baxter, William Dee, AO56731.
Bellis, Benjamin Neil, AO27989.
Bennett, John Linden, AO28051.
Berge, Truman Kent, Jr., AO28157.
*Berry, Waldron, AO28604.
Birdsall, Alan Homer, AO28395.
Blazina, Thomas David, AO27995.
Bodie, Jack Lowman, AO28412.
*Bowers, Grayson Hunter, Jr., AO28420.
Bradburn, David Denison, AO28000.
Brechwald, Edward Joseph, AO28106.
Brosius, Charles William, AO28648.
Brothers, William Wesley, Jr., AO28090.
*Bruce, James Eugene, AO28173.
Buckingham, Charles Edward, AO28614.
Buckley, Robert Clarence, AO28066.
Burgess, Richard Benton, AO28181.
Burke, Robert Oscar, AO28489.
*Burnside, Walter, Jr., AO28293.
Butler, Jerome Frederick, AO28658.
Buzhardt, Joseph Fred, Jr., AO28390.
Cahill, Laurence James, Jr., AO27969.
Cameron, Burton Gordon, AO28574.
Carbine, James Thomas, Jr., AO28462.
*Carnright, Richard Glenn, AO28510.
Castle, Johnny Rudd, AO28465.
Chapman, Kenneth Richard, AO28104.
Chatfield, James David Lloyd, AO28739.
Christensen, Everett Eugene, AO28020.
*Clapp, William LaFayette, Jr., AO28632.
Clemenson, Robert Carey, AO28205.
Clements, Philip Lee, Jr., AO28408.
Cochran, Alexander Turner, AO28705.
Cole, Frank Ellsworth, AO28016.
*Colladay, Martin Grimes, AO28033.
Creveling, Louis Gregory, AO27912.
Daye, Thomas Maldwyn, AO28746.
Deatrick, Eugene Peyton, Jr., AO28138.
*Denniston, Clyde Roscoe, Jr., AO28414.
Dobbs, Robert Lee, AO28517.
Donahue, John Francis, AO28620.
Doolittle, John Prescott, AO28290.
Dorman, George Stanton, AO28320.
Dosh, Robert Nathaniel, Jr., AO28180.
Doyle, Frank Adair, AO28366.
Dresser, Richard Lloyd, AO28144.
Dunlap, Lloyd Leslie, Jr., AO28175.
Eichenberg, Robert John, AO28603.
Evans, William John, AO28070.
Eyman, Robert Lee, AO28031.
Feibelman, Max Milton, AO28598.
*Feldman, Martin Bruce, AO28213.
Felices, Salvador Enrique, AO28163.
Flavin, Michael John, AO56724.
Fox, Harold Paul, Jr., AO28634.
French, James Raymond, AO56729.
Freshwater, Robert Earl, AO56725.
Fryberger, Philip Henry, AO28113.
Furuholmen, James Bjarne, AO28567
Galt, Richard Russell, AO28243.
Gay, Hobart Raymond, Jr., AO28610.

Gee, Thomas Gibbs, AO28084.
Gordon, Lawrence Norman, AO28550.
Gordon, Mose William, Jr., AO28647.
Gorman, Robert Thomas, AO28093.
*Green, Jesse Edwards, AO28472.
*Grier, Samuel, 3d, AO28479.
Griffin, William Aiken, AO28315.
Hackney, Donald Ingram, AO28150.
Hafer, Frederick LeRoy, AO28027.
*Hagan, Frank Stevens, AO28274.
Hairston, Guy Edward, Jr., AO28401.
Hamilton, Francis Frazee, AO28282.
Harper, Gilbert Stewart, Jr., AO27947.
Harris, Edgar Starr, Jr., AO28694.
Harton, William Martin, Jr., AO283912.
Hauenstein, Charles Judd, AO28089.
Heiberg, Harrison Howell Dodge, Jr., AO28124.
Hicks, Arlie Hugh, Jr., AO56732.
Hildebrandt, James Edwin, AO28063.
Hilovsky, Steve Edward, AO28443.
Hirsch, George Walter, Jr., AO28179.
Hopkins, Herbert Ziegler, Jr, AO28110.
Hopkins, Philip Bird, Jr., AO28692.
Horton, Clarence Frost, Jr., AO28621.
Hudspeth, Roy Ritter, AO28572.
Hughes, James Donald, AO28561.
Hunt, Senour, AO28303.
Hurley, James Patrick, AO28324.
Hutto, Merl Galbreath, AO28403.
Ingram, John Carl, AO27948.
Jackson, John Wallace, AO28741.
Jenkins, William Henry, AO28260.
Jernigan, Ernest Deloy, Jr., AO28067.
Jones, Gerald Marshall, AO28319.
Kellogg, Richard Allan, AO28400.
*Kimball, Jack Quentin, AO28382.
Knight, Harry Russell, AO28046.
Korn, Alden Davis, AO28518.
*Lamp, Richard Earl, AO28342.
*Langstaff, Thomas Corbett, AO28447.
Larson, Cecil Carlyle, AO28564.
Lawson, Gene Kenyon, AO28699.
Lembeck, Edward Adams, 2d, AO28485.
Lengnick, Roger Horace, AO27953.
Lester, Frank Gibson, AO28115.
Lobdell, Harrison, Jr., AO28092.
Logan, Lewis Benjamin Castle, AO28034.
Longarini, Edmond Charles, AO28405.
Lowry, Robert Mason, Jr., AO28355.
*Lundholm, Donald Alfred, AO28229.
Lusk, Joe Fenton, AO28128.
*Lyman, Walter Alfred, AO28035.
McBride, Benjamin Ransom, AO28375.
McCoy, Andrew Alexander, Jr., AO28536.
*McKay, William Irving, AO28659.
McKinney, Joseph Tomlinson, AO27937.
McMillan, Cornelius, Jr., AO28639.
*McPhee, Harry John, Jr., AO28474.
MacWilliams, Malcolm Means, AO28270.
Martin, John Alexander, AO28700.
Mason, William Henderson, AO28703.
Melo, Eugene Emil, AO28676.
*Memminger, Charles Gustavus, AO28663.
Messmore, Donald Morgan, Jr., AO28549.
Miller, James Robert, AO28595.
Minnich, E. Scott, AO28535.
Minor, John Max, AO28334.
Molchan, John Eugene, AO28241.
Moore, Arthur Raymond, Jr., AO28587.
Munkres, John Neil, AO28613.
Murphy, Robert Denslow, AO56727.
Naleid, Jerome Fredrick, AO27998.
Nelson, George Joseph, AO28637.
Nemetz, Albert Michael, AO28331.
Newell, Richard Gordon, AO28617.
*Newman, David Arnold, AO28330.
Norris, Paul Maxfield, AO28718.
Norwood, Billie Jack, AO56726.
Pasons, Charles Henry, 2d, AO28737.
Paschall, James Ernest, AO28385.
Pitts, John Emmett, Jr., AO28310.
Plank, David Heber, AO28343.
Poe, Bryce, 2d. AO28253.
Posvar, Wesley Wentz, AO27893.
Potter, Campbell McLeod, AO56730.
Poytress, Earl Francis, AO27900.
Prebbanow, James Campbell, AO38532.
Prevost, Ernest Willet, AO28723.
*Reed, Marvin Chapman, AO28657.
Reed, William Preston, AO28500.
Richards, Marion Rich, AO28398.
Riedel, John Alfred, Jr., AO28287.
Roddenberry, Harry H., Jr., AO28378.
Roney, William Rogers, AO28690.
*Rountree, Fred Brinson, AO28655.
Ruggiero, Charles, Jr., AO28629.
Safford, Philip Riviere, AO28424.
Schmidt, Julius Henry, Jr., AO50539.
*Schmitt, John Jacob, Jr., AO28566.
Shaw, Reginald Oras, AO28279.
Shawe, Hamilton Bruce, Jr., AO28264.
Sherman, Milton, AO28054.
Skladzien, Thaddeus Stephen, AO28532.
Sliney, George Michael, AO28437.
Smith, Clyde Barton, AO38531.
Smith, Sam Hugh, AO28167.
Stees, Hubert Sheldon, Jr., AO28733.
Stephenson, Robert Hogan, AO28195.
Stewart, Donald Warner, Jr., AO28080.
Stewart, Robert Benfred, AO27934.
Strain, Bailey Toland, AO27929.
*Stringer, Elbert Madison, AO28370.
Studer, William Francis, AO27994.
Tallman, Kenneth Lee, AO28006.
Temple, William Alan, AO27917.
Thomas, James Edwin, AO28461.
*Trexler, David Howerter, AO56728.
Tribolet, Robert Webb, AO28298.
*Turner, Richard Hugh, AO28431.
*Umlauf, John Louis, AO28353.
*Upland, Robert Theodore, AO28151.
VanSickle, Earl Rosenquist, AO28740.
*Waggener, Robert Rodney, AO28226.
*Walker, Robert Lawrence, AO28722.
Walsh, Robert Arthur, AO28526.
Walterhouse, Richard George, AO28230.
Wayne, Robert Earl, AO28271.
*Weber, Marvin Octavius, Jr., AO28533.
Welch, Stanford Alden, AO27993.
Wells, Emory Robert, AO28235.
Wheat, Allen Albert, AO27956.
White, Richard Taylor, AO28351.
Whitfield, Raymond Palmer, Jr., AO28545.
*Wiedman, Charles Orion, AO28575.
Wilcox, Arthur Burt, Jr., AO28487.
*Williams, Harold, Jr., AO28109.
*Williams, Henry Kirk 3d, AO28069.
Williams, Marshall McDairmid 3d, AO28670.
Wilson, Donald, Jr., AO28314.
Wilson, Robert Seedorf, AO28519.
Withers, William Price, Jr., AO28451.
Wright, Robert Kenneth, AO28048.
Wright, William Marion, AO28537.
Yancey, William Burbridge, Jr., AO28588.
Yeoman, Wayne Allen, AO27961.
Zeh, Theodore, George, Jr., AO28363.
Zuppan, Lawrence Louis, Jr., AO50541.

NOTE.—These officers will complete the required 3 years' service for promotion during the month of June. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Philip J. Finnegan to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph Earl Cooper to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Dennis E. Sullivan to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire.

Scott M. Matheson to be United States attorney for the district of Utah.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Vernon P. Burns to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama.

Paul C. Herring to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

John J. Wein to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, Eternal God, for all Thy bountiful blessings, and pray that we may use them for the advancement of that which is right and just among our fellow men. May we surrender self for the common weal, and thus follow the guidance of our better impulses.

In both success and failure, implant within us self-restraint, the quietness of thought and the courage of our great Teacher. Help us to live out our Master's definition of a good life: do unto others what you would have them do unto you. Do Thou increase our strength in all those virtues that make us better men and women, and we shall praise Thee in all our works. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1741) entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. HART asked and was given permpermission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an address delivered by the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Shram.

Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Concord (N. C.) Tribune containing some remarks by James A. Farley in an address before the Kiwanis Club, of Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Saturday evening, April 30, 1949, entitled "Are We Outsmarted?"

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include in one an article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Rapid City Journal on his bill dealing with tidelands and Federal aid to education.

Mr. McDONOUGH and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning the congressional New York-West Point tour, May 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Bulwinkle	Gilmer	Short
Byrne, N. Y.	Hobbs	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	O'Konski	Taylor
Coudert	Plumley	Thomas, N. J.
Cox	Powell	Walsh
Crawford	Redden	Withrow
Crosser	Sadowski	Wolcott
Dawson	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	
DeGraffenried	Shafer	
D'Ewart		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT LONG-RANGE PROVING GROUND FOR GUIDED MISSILES

Mr. BROOKS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes.

ARTICLES OF WAR

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 201, Rept. No. 495), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a uniform code of military justice. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2032, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, April 29, there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 12 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the newspapers that the backers of the original Lesinski labor bill have come to a more realistic appreciation of the situation. They are now prepared, so I understand from the press, to accept more of the Taft-Hartley bill. There is no longer any talk of crippling amendments or outright repeal. That, apparently, is out. Perhaps we now can complete amending the Wood amendment and secure for that a passage by a substantial vote.

Mr. Chairman, a debate which will live in the records of this great deliberative body is drawing to a close. For the most part it has been earnest, intelligent, and on a high plane. It is generally recognized that all of us, regardless of our opinions, are actuated by the single desire of bringing through cooperation and peace in the field of labor and management, more jobs, more production, lower prices, and more prosperity.

We may differ in our viewpoint on certain proposals. This is wholesome; it is wise; it is consistent with American democracy. We debate; we amend, and out of our discussions and decisions, come a sounder judgment than if the legislation had been the handiwork of one or two individuals.

This was the spirit which many of us had wanted to prevail in the consideration of this vital legislation.

We all knew there was a problem here; a problem which will never be permanently solved until it is resolved on the basis of fairness and justice to labor, to management, and to the great masses of our people—those who are obliged to pay the bills.

That there was a serious problem in the labor-management field is indicated because it has been a leading topic in Congress for many years. The Wagner bill was passed because of deficiencies in our labor-management relations and later other bills were enacted down through the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill in 1947. These all showed a public demand for legislation.

Let us not forget the Taft-Hartley bill became law not as a partisan measure but over the veto of President Truman, through the votes of a majority of both Republicans and Democrats in both branches of Congress. The credit for the legislation was shared by both major political parties. These overwhelming votes could not have been obtained unless there was a strong popular sentiment.

At the time of the passage of the legislation it was definitely stated the proposed bill was not the last word. That it might need amending was expressed and the so-called watchdog committee was named to bring in recommendations, as a result of their observations.

That committee did make some recommendations; other Members in the House and Senate had suggestions of their own. Many of us had hoped there would be a genuine judicial study of the subject and out of the committee would come a bill which could win bipartisan support. We had no pride in either authorship or in seeking party credit. We wanted only fair consideration. Unfortunately, this we did not get. The so-called Lesinski bill was reported out of committee without permitting any effort at amendments. And now even the leadership of this House admits that that was a serious mistake. That admission is indicated by the amendments which are to be proposed. How much better it would have been for the committee to do the job. This action of the committee presented a real dilemma for us who wanted to consider the measure in accordance with merit and facts. We knew it was difficult to rewrite the Lesinski bill on the floor. The whole subject is highly technical and, as a vehicle with which to operate, the Lesinski bill was grossly inadequate. We feared only confusion and legislation by hysteria and chance might result. It might create a situation where in all probability a majority would conclude to recommit the bill and send it back to the committee for further consideration.

This brings me to a subject that has been mentioned several times—a meeting in room 18. As a newspaper publisher, I know some columnists and commentators like to exaggerate and make an unusual story based on few facts.

Now for the facts. Room 18 is a room very generously assigned to me by Speaker RAYBURN for minority party use. I might say my two regular rooms were not sufficient to meet our needs. Room 18 is located on the first floor,

flush up against the rooms of my good friend, the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, and directly opposite the barber shop. Certainly if we were seeking privacy that is the last place we would hold a meeting.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that there is a door leading from room 18 into one of my suites. The door is closed, of course, and I can assure my friend that there was no eavesdropping.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Having known my good friend from Massachusetts for many years, I know he would not do that if he could have heard. I have confidence in his integrity. I might add it is generally known to newspaper and radio men and women that this room is used as a Republican meeting place. It was not a smoke-filled hotel room, nor were any present outside of Members of Congress.

So much for room 18. We did have a meeting in room 18 and the subject of the meeting was the revision of the Taft-Hartley bill. To this meeting were summoned by me as chairman of the Republican policy committee our full membership of 26 and in addition every Republican member of the labor committee, bringing the attendance to about 35. This meeting was generally known to every alert newspaper man and woman. We have had many similar meetings, and will again when the occasion arises.

For several hours we debated the issue. We concluded it would not be feasible to offer 20 or 25 amendments to the Lesinski bill and we decided to try to get them, as far as possible, into a single amendment.

We looked over the first Wood amendment. It made more easily possible the amendments the policy committee had in mind. We debated for one afternoon every item in the Wood amendment and found much we could not agree upon. We decided to seek changes.

The policy committee gave to SAMUEL McCONNELL, the ranking Republican on the Labor Committee, their version of the amendments that were needed and asked him to work out the phraseology.

I am free to admit this committee sought advice and assistance from both Republicans and Democrats in Congress, and we had very helpful suggestions from our associates in another branch of the Congress. We wanted all the congressional wisdom possible in our difficult task.

We believed—and we still believe—that our procedure was representative government working at its very best—debating the issue, receiving suggestions for changes and then the finished product from the decision of many minds.

May I say here this real democratic way of doing our legislative work is characteristic of the Republican procedure. We have our own gatherings in the policy committee, where we shape up our ideas, and then we submit the findings to a meeting of every one of the Republicans in a conference.

We had such a conference on the labor measure—this time in an equally secret place—the House chamber. We submitted our amendments and talked them over at length and secured general approval, and so they became to all general purposes a Republican policy.

May I say here, we in the Republican Party do not have a binding clause in our conference. We leave it to the judgment of the individual member as to his responsibility to the party. There is no coercion and no threats of reprisal.

I believe it is the better way and is one reason why we are generally in agreement.

My colleagues, I have talked longer than I intended. I have gone into more detail because I want you to know the truth. I shall not talk about the details of the Wood amendment to the Lesinski bill, the Rayburn-McCormack bill, or the Lesinski bill itself. These facts have been discussed and will be discussed much better by others.

One word more and I shall conclude. We face a serious situation not only in America but in every nation in the world. We face the possibility of a new war and we face the catastrophe of an economic depression. Either would be ruinous. We must avert both. We must keep this country sound, and we must avoid bitter internal dissension if we are to come through unscathed.

In such a situation it is childish to talk about granting or denying to a Democrat patronage in accordance to their vote on the request of the executive department. That is the road to totalitarianism. It is the road to the end of representative government. It is the collapse of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and when it comes, labor, management, and everybody loses. God forbid that such a condition shall ever come here in America.

It is small-potato talk to rail at Republicans and Democrats voting on the same side when they think alike on certain legislation. Should a Democrat vote against his convictions simply because he finds himself walking down the aisle with a Republican instead of a Democrat? That, of course, is sheer nonsense. What good is representative government if we do not express our own convictions. And may I say right here, it is time we established real tolerance and understanding between the sections of our common country as well as between races and religions. In war and in every great crisis like the present, northerners and southerners have stood side by side. We never let the party label prevent cooperation for the welfare of the country. We are one common people in this country; we shall all go up together or we shall go down together. Let us vote on great issues as Americans and not as petty partisans, as trusted representatives of the people and not as any one man or few men demand.

I want to help bring cooperation, understanding, and peace between labor and management. It is absolutely essential if we are to avoid a depression. It is absolutely necessary if we are to fulfill our obligations to the world. I believe the Wood amendment, as amended, and with amendments to come, will give us the best start and for that reason I am urging its adoption. I would not say it is the perfect answer, but it does make progress. I believe personally labor and management should sit down together and study the situation and reach an understanding. That should not be impossible where there is mutual respect for the other. And both groups have so much to gain by ending class hostilities. And they might find it very easy to reach a decision. Because they have not gotten together, Congress must act.

This better understanding must be reached. Two great and powerful minorities fighting each other sow the seeds of destruction. Soviet Russia can never conquer America through force of arms. It can only prevail when we are divided. This must not be allowed to come.

The one great urge of the American people at the present is for peace and jobs. They are tired of war and they want our efforts to be used to bring a real and lasting peace. There is plenty of chance for everybody in this big world of ours. And the people want peace in the industrial world to the end they can improve their position in life and give to their children more of the opportunities and comforts of life.

I sincerely believe the Wood amendment, as amended, is a contribution to that end. I hope the substitute will be rejected, several other amendments to the Wood bill be adopted, and then the Wood amendment be added to the Lesinski bill.

Such a bill will strengthen the union—the Union of the American States and the union of the American people in this march to progress, prosperity, and peace at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the Wood amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers a substitute which the Clerk will report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Chair please tell the House what is the situation regarding amendments on the Clerk's desk? I have an amendment which was placed on the Clerk's desk last week, which I was hoping to discuss today. Will those amendments be called up after this substitute, or at what time?

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment can be called up until some Member rises and offers the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order that this amendment is not in order for the simple reason that the Wood amendment is not an amendment. It is a substitute for the bill before the House. A substitute for a substitute is not in order. It is one step too far removed under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Wood amendment is an original amendment providing that certain language be stricken out and certain other language inserted. The point of order is overruled.

The Clerk will report the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMS as a substitute for the Wood amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'National Labor Relations Act of 1949.'

"TITLE I—REPEAL OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AND REENACTMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1935

"REPEAL OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

"SEC. 101. The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law Numbered 101, Eightieth Congress) is hereby repealed.

"REENACTMENT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

"SEC. 102. The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 449), as it existed prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby reenacted.

"MEMBERSHIP OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"SEC. 103. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) The National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter called the Board) is hereby continued as an agency of the United States. The Board shall consist of five members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The terms of office of the Members of the Board in office on the date of enactment of the National Labor Relations Act of 1949 shall expire as provided by law at the time of their appointment. Members appointed after such date of enactment shall be appointed for terms of five years each, excepting that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"'(b) The Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers which it may itself exercise. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board, and three members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum of the Board, except that two members shall constitute a quorum of any group designated pursuant to the first sentence hereof. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.'

"SEC. 104. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4. (a) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $17,500 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board shall appoint such employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties. Any arbitrators appointed by the Board under section 9 (d) may be appointed in the manner authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) at per diem rates to be determined by the Board but not exceeding $100, and shall be entitled to traveling expenses as authorized by section 5 of such act (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons so employed. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Board, appear for and represent the Board in any case in court. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Board to appoint individuals for the purpose of conciliation or mediation (or for statistical work), where such service may be obtained from the Department of Labor.'

"(b) Section 4 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by striking out subsection (b) thereof and by relettering the succeeding subsection '(b).'

"BAR TO CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 105. Notwithstanding the provisions of the act of February 25, 1871 (16 Stat. 432), neither the Board nor any court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to entertain, process, make, impose, or enforce any petition, complaint, order, liability, or punishment under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to the date of enactment of this act, unless such petition, complaint, order, liability, or punishment could be entertained, processed, made, imposed, or enforced under the National Labor Relations Act with respect to a like act or omission occurring after the date of enactment of this act. No complaint shall hereafter be issued by the National Labor Relations Board based upon any unfair labor practice occurring prior to August 22, 1947, unless charges with respect thereto were pending before the Board on January 1, 1949.

"UNJUSTIFIABLE SECONDARY BOYCOTTS AND JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

"SEC. 106. (a) Section 1 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by inserting after the third paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"'Experience has further demonstrated that certain unjustifiable conflicts between or among labor organizations lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife which substantially burden or obstruct commerce, and that failure of employers to maintain a neutral position aggravates and prolongs these conflicts. The public interest requires abatement of such industrial strife through just, peaceable, and final settlement.'

"(b) Section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by striking out paragraph (11) thereof and by adding two new paragraphs (11) and (12), to read as follows:

"'(11) The term "secondary boycott" means a concerted refusal in the course of employment by employees of one employer to produce, manufacture, transport, distribute, or otherwise work on articles, materials, goods, or commodities because they have been or are to be manufactured, produced, or distributed by another employer.

"'(12) The term "jurisdictional dispute" means a dispute between two or more labor organizations (not established, maintained, or assisted by any employer action defined in this act as an unfair labor practice) concerning the assignment or prospective assignment of a particular work task by an employer.'

"(c) Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by inserting after the figure '8' at the beginning thereof the letter '(a)' and adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (6) to read as follows:

"'(6) To refuse to assign a particular work task in accordance with an award under section 9 (d) of this act.'

"(d) Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization—

"'(1) to cause or attempt to cause employees to engage in a secondary boycott, or a concerted work stoppage, to compel an employer to bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if—

"'(a) another labor organization is the certified representative of such employees within the meaning of section 9 of this act; or

"'(b) the employer is required by an order of the Board to bargain with another labor organization; or

"'(c) the employer is currently recognizing another labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any employer action defined in this act as an unfair labor practice) and has executed a collective-bargaining agreement with such other labor organization, and a question concerning representation may not appropriately be raised under section 9 of this act;

"'(2) to cause or attempt to cause employees to engage in a secondary boycott, or a concerted work stoppage, in furtherance of a jurisdictional dispute if such labor organization is seeking to compel an employer to assign a particular work task contrary to an award made under section 9 (d) of this act.'

"(e) Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by inserting between subsections (c) and (d) thereof a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

"'(d) Whenever a jurisdictional dispute results in or threatens to result in a concerted work stoppage, or a secondary boycott, affecting commerce, the Board may hear and determine, or appoint an arbitrator to hear and determine, the dispute, and issue an award, first affording the labor organizations involved in the dispute a reasonable opportunity to settle their controversy between or among themselves. In determining the dispute, the Board or the arbitrator, as the case may be, may consider any prior Board certification under which any such labor organization claims the right to represent employees who are or may be hired or assigned to perform the work tasks in dispute, any union charters or intersnion agreements purporting to define areas of jurisdiction between or among the contending labor organizations, the decisions of any agency established by unions to consider such disputes, the past work history of the organizations involved in the dispute, and the policies of this act. If an arbitrator is appointed to hear and determine a dispute, he shall proceed in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe; and his award determining the dispute shall have the same effect as an award of the Board. In any proceeding under this section, the employer whose assignment or prospective assignment of a particular work task is in controversy shall have an opportunity to be heard in any hearing conducted by the Board, or an arbitrator, as the case may be. If at any stage of the proceeding it shall appear to the Board that the dispute is in fact one concerning representation, it shall treat the case as one instituted under section 9 (c) of this act and proceed accordingly.'

"(f) Subsection (d) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is relettered '(e)' and, as relettered, is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Whenever an order of the Board made pursuant to section 10 (c) is based in whole or in part upon facts certified following an investigation pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, or upon an award made in proceedings under subsection (d) of this section, and there is a petition for the enforcement or review of such order, such certification and the record of such investigation, or such award and the record of the proceedings under subsection (d) of this section, as the case may be, shall be included in the transcript of the entire record required to be filed under subsections 10 (e) or 10 (f), and thereupon the decree of the court enforcing,

modifying, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board shall be made and entered upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript.'

"FREEDOM FROM RESTRICTED STATE LAWS

"SEC. 107. The proviso of section 8 (a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, or in any State law, shall preclude an employer engaged in commerce, or whose activities affect commerce, from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any employer action defined in this act as an unfair labor practice) to require as a condition of employment membership therein, or from paying to such labor organization, pursuant to a collective-bargaining agreement, membership obligations or sums equivalent thereto by deduction from wages or salaries, if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9 (a), in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made.'

"NOTICE OF TERMINATION OR MODIFICATION OF COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING CONTRACTS

"SEC. 108. Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(c) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to terminate or modify a collective-bargaining contract covering employees in and industry affecting commerce, unless the party desiring such termination or modification notifies the United States Conciliation Service of the proposed termination or modification at least 30 days prior to the expiration date of the contract, or 30 days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification, whichever is earlier.'

"BARGAINING BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 109. Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, as amended by subsection (d) of section 106 of this title, is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (b) thereof a new paragraph (3), to read as follows:

"'(3) to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a): Provided, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require a labor organization to bargain separately with respect to any particular unit or units, or to agree to any particular procedures or conditions with respect to collective bargaining so long as such labor organization is bargaining in good faith.'

"FREE SPEECH

"SEC. 110. Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection (d), to read as follows:

"'(d) The Board shall not base any finding of unfair labor practice under any provision of this act upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all the relevant circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefit.'

"FILING OF ORGANIZATIONAL AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND EMPLOYERS

"SEC. 111. Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by adding at the end thereof three new subsections (e), (f), and (g), to read as follows:

"'(e) The Board shall not certify any labor organization as bargaining representative under this section nor issue any complaint under section 10 of this act based upon a charge filed by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10 of this act unless such labor organization and any national or international labor organization of which such labor organization is an affiliate or constituent unit (A) shall have filed with the Secretary of Labor copies of its constitution and bylaws and a report, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, showing—

"'(1) the name of such labor organization and the address of its principal place of business;

"'(2) the names, titles, and compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and of any of its other officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the preceding year exceeded $5,000, and the amount of the compensation and allowances paid to each such officer or agent during such year;

"'(3) the manner in which the officers and agents referred to in clause (2) were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected;

"'(4) the initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay on becoming members of such labor organization;

"'(5) the regular dues or fees which members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing of such labor organization;

"'(6) a detailed statement of, or reference to, provisions of its constitution and bylaws showing the procedure followed with respect to, (a) qualification for or restrictions on membership, (b) election of officers and stewards, (c) calling of regular and special meetings, (d) levying of assessments, (e) imposition of fines, (f) authorization for bargaining demands, (g) ratification of contract terms, (h) authorization for strikes, (i) authorization for disbursement of union funds, (j) audit of union financial transactions, (k) participation in insurance or other benefit plans, and (l) expulsion of members and the grounds therefor:

and (B) can show that it has—

"'(1) filed with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, a report showing all of (a) its receipts of any kind and the sources of such receipts, (b) its total assets and liabilities as of the end of its last fiscal year, (c) the disbursements made by it during such fiscal year, including the purposes for which made; and

"'(2) furnished to all of the members of such labor organization copies of the financial report required by paragraph (1) hereof to be filed with the Secretary of Labor.

"'(f) It shall be the obligation of all labor organizations to file annually with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, reports bringing up to date the information required to be supplied in the initial filing by subsection (f) (A) of this section, and to file with the Secretary of Labor and furnish to its members annually within 120 days after the end of their respective fiscal years or such other reasonable period of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor financial reports in the form and manner prescribed in subsection (f) (B). No labor organization shall be eligible for certification under this section as the representative of any employees, no petition under section 9 (e) (1) shall be entertained, and no complaint shall issue under section 10 with respect to a charge filed by a labor organization unless it can show that it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit has complied with its obligation under this subsection.

"'(g) The Board shall not issue any complaint based upon a charge filed by an employer under subsection (b) of section 10 of this act unless such employer and any national or international employer organization of which such employer is an affiliate or is a member shall have prior thereto filed with the Secretary of Labor information such as is required to be filed by labor organizations by the provisions of paragraphs (A) (2), (A) (3), and (B) (1) of subsection (e) of this section and shall have filed reports bringing up to date the information thus required to be filed in the manner provided in subsection (f) of this section.'

"AFFIDAVITS BY LABOR ORGANIZATION OFFICERS AND EMPLOYERS

"SEC. 112. Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (h), to read as follows:

"'(h) The Board shall not certify any labor organization as bargaining representative under this section nor issue any complaint under section 10 of this act based upon a charge filed by—

"'(i) a labor organization unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by each officer of such labor organization and the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit; or

"'(ii) an employer, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by such employer (including each owner, partner, receiver or trustee, or, if a corporation, each officer thereof), and each officer thereof, and the officers of any national or international employer organization of which such employer is a member or affiliate—

stating that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of, or supports, any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 35A of the Criminal Code shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits. For the purpose of this subsection, the term "officer" is defined as including any person who performs any policy-making, governing or executive function in, or is a member of any policy-forming, governing, or executive body of an employer or labor organization or any national or international employer or labor organization, of which such employer or labor organization, as the case may be, is an affiliate or constituent unit.'

"TITLE II—MEDIATION AND ARBITRATION

"THE UNITED STATES CONCILIATION SERVICE

"SEC. 201. (a) The United States Conciliation Service is hereby reestablished in the Department of Labor; and the functions transferred to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service by section 202 (d) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, are hereby restored to the Secretary of Labor. The Service shall be under the direction of a Director of Conciliation (hereinafter called the 'Director'), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"(b) The personnel, records, property, and unobligated balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service are hereby transferred to the Department of Labor. Such transfer shall not affect any proceedings pending before the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service or any rule or regulation heretofore made by it or by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

"(c) The United States Conciliation Service shall be administered under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Labor. General policies and standards for the operation of the Service shall be formulated and promulgated by the Director of Conciliation, with the approval of the Secretary af Labor.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to appoint such clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the execution of the functions of the Service, and shall fix their compensation

in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and may, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such conciliators, mediators, and arbitrators as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Service.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE SERVICE

"SEC. 202. (a) The United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the 'Service') shall assist labor and management in settling disputes through the processes of free collective bargaining. The Director shall have authority to proffer the facilities of the Service in any labor dispute in any industry affecting commerce either upon his own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute whenever, in his judgment, the facilities of the Service will assist the parties in settling the dispute.

"(b) Upon request of the parties to the dispute, the Service shall cooperate in formulating an agreement for the arbitration of the dispute, in selecting an arbitrator or arbitrators, and in making such other arrangements and in taking such other action as may be necessary.

"(c) The Service shall furnish to employer, employees, and other public and private agencies, information concerning the practicability and desirability of establishing suitable agencies and methods to aid in the settlement of labor disputes by mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and other peaceful means, and to promote and encourage the uses and procedures of sound collective bargaining. The Director is authorized to establish suitable procedures for cooperation with State and local mediation agencies and to enter into agreements with such State and local mediation agencies relating to the mediation of labor disputes whose effects are predominantly local in character.

"(d) Through conferences and such other methods as it deems appropriate, the Service shall seek to improve relations between employers and the representatives of their employees for the purpose of avoiding labor disputes and preventing such disputes as might occur from developing into stoppages of operations which might affect commerce or develop consequences injurious to the general welfare.

"CONDUCT OF CONCILIATION OFFICERS

"SEC. 203. The Director and the Service shall be impartial. They shall respect the confidence of the parties to any dispute. Commissioners of Conciliation shall not engage in arbitration while serving as Commissioners and they shall not participate in cases in which they have a pecuniary or personal interest.

"DUTIES OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 204. In order to prevent or minimize labor disputes affecting the free flow of commerce or threatening consequences injurious to the general welfare, it shall be the duty of employers and employees, and their representatives to—

"(a) exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain collective-bargaining agreements for definite periods of time, concerning (1) rates of pay, hours, and terms and conditions of work; (2) adequate notice of desire to terminate or change such agreements; (3) abstention from strikes, lockouts, or other acts of economic coercion in violation of such agreements; and (4) procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes involving the interpretation or application of such agreements;

"(b) participate fully and promptly in such meetings as may be undertaken by the Service for the purpose of aiding in a settlement of any dispute to which they are parties.

"INTERPRETATION OF EXISTING AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 205. It is the public policy of the United States that any collective-bargaining agreement in an industry affecting commerce shall provide procedures by which either party to such agreement may refer disputes growing out of the interpretation or application of the agreement to final and binding arbitration. The Service is authorized and directed to assist employers and labor organizations in—

"(a) developing such procedures;

"(b) applying such procedures to individual cases, including assistance in framing the issues in dispute and the terms and conditions under which the arbitration proceedings shall be conducted, including methods for the selection of the arbitrator or arbitrators; and

"(c) selecting an arbitrator or arbitrators, including making available to the parties a roster of names from which the parties may choose one or more arbitrators and, if the parties so desire, designating one or more arbitrators.

"LABOR-MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES

"SEC. 206. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall appoint such labor-management advisory committees as he deems necessary or appropriate in the administration of this title. The membership of each such committee shall consist of equal numbers of labor and management representatives, and one or more public members. The Secretary shall designate a public member as chairman. Members of such advisory committees shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation, and per diem in lieu of subsistence at a rate of $25 a day, as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons so serving. Such committees shall have authority to adopt, amend, or rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary to the performance of their functions.

"(b) Such advisory committees shall advise the Secretary on questions of policy and administration affecting the work of the Service and shall perform such other functions to help in achieving the purposes of this title as the Secretary may request.

"TITLE III—NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 301. Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position, and shall contain the recommendations of the board for the settlement of the dispute. The President shall file a copy of such report with the United States Conciliation Service and shall make its contents available to the public.

"SEC. 302. (a) A board of inquiry shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings, either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(b) Members of a board of inquiry shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(c) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. 19, title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of said board.

"SEC. 303. (a) Upon receiving a report from a board of inquiry the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof, and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out—

"(i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and

"(ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

"(b) In any case, the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' shall not be applicable.

"(c) The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 346 and 347).

"SEC. 304. (a) Whenever a district court has issued an order under section 303 enjoining acts or practices which imperil or threaten to imperil the national health or safety, it shall be the duty of the parties to the labor dispute giving rise to such order to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, with the assistance of the United States Conciliation Service. Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any proposal of settlement made by the Service.

"(b) Upon the issuance of such order, the President shall reconvene the board of inquiry which has previously reported with respect to the dispute. At the end of a 75-day period (unless the dispute has been settled by that time), the board of inquiry shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement, and shall include a statement by each party of its position and the recommendations of the board for the settlement of the dispute.

"SEC. 305. Upon a settlement being reached, or upon the elapse of 5 days from the date of the report of the board to the President, whichever happens sooner, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged. When such a motion is granted, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, including the findings and recommendations of the board of inquiry, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"APPLICATION OF ANTI-INJUNCTION STATUTES

"SEC. 401. The act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes' (Norris-La Guardia Act), approved March 24, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115), and sections 6 and 20 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes' (Clayton Act) approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 17, and title 29, sec. 52), are continued in full

force and effect in accordance with the provisions of such acts; except that the provisions of such act and such sections shall not be construed to be applicable with respect to section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act or with respect to action by the Government under and pursuant to title III of this act.

"POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 402. Section 610 of title 18 of the United States Code (Public Law 772, 80th Cong., 2d sess.), is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 610. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation who consents to any contribution by the corporation in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 403. When used in this act—

"(1) The term 'industry affecting commerce' means any industry or activity in commerce or in which a labor dispute would burden or obstruct commerce or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(2) The terms 'commerce,' 'affecting commerce,' 'labor dispute,' 'employer,' 'employee,' 'labor organization,' and 'person' shall have the same meaning as when used in the National Labor Relations Act as reenacted by title I of this act.

"SAVING PROVISION

"SEC. 404. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent; nor shall the quitting of labor by an employee or employees in good faith because of abnormally dangerous conditions for work at the place of employment of such employee or employees be deemed a strike under this act.

"EXEMPTION OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

"SEC. 405. The provisions of titles I, II, and III of this act shall not apply to any carriers, companies, employees, or any matter subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended, or to any representative as defined in section 1, Sixth, of said act while acting in a representative capacity for individuals employed by any person subject to said act.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 406. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"TITLE V—TEMPORARY LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION

"SEC. 501. There is hereby created a Temporary Labor Relations Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission'), to be composed of (1) 5 Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the ate; (2) 5 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and (3) 10 members, 5 representing management and 5 representing labor, to be appointed by the President of the United States. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not impair its powers to exercise its functions and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of original appointments. Members of the Commission appointed by the President shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, together with their necessary travel and other expenses, or a per diem allowance in lieu thereof. Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

"SEC. 502. (a) The Commission shall make a thorough study and investigation into the underlying causes of disputes between labor and management, including union and employer policies and practices, economic and other factors, methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process, Government policies, present and proposed legislation affecting such disputes, and the measures by which such disputes may be minimized or eliminated in order to safeguard the public interest, including, particularly, voluntary and cooperative measures between labor and management which can be promoted or facilitated by the Federal Government. In making such study and investigation the Commission shall place particular emphasis upon the special and unique problem of Nation-wide strikes in essential industries affecting the public interest with a view to recommending a method to prevent or settle such strikes without endangering our general democratic freedoms.

"(b) The Commission shall also study and investigate the desirability of further legislation concerning the health and safety of employees engaged in industries that are essentially hazardous, with a view to the prevention of accidents and the improvement of health and sanitary conditions connected with such industries.

"(c) The Commission shall also study and investigate the feasibility of the establishment of a uniform voluntary system of welfare funds for the benefit of ill, disabled, or aged employees and their families, with a view to the enactment of legislation to assist in the promotion and encouragement of such a program.

"(d) The Commission shall confer and consult with responsible leaders of both organized labor and industry and shall seek, as far as compatible with their own judgment, to recommend legislation that will eliminate all reasonable objections of either labor or industry.

"SEC. 503. (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions. The Commission may make such expenditures as may be necessary for performing its functions.

"(b) The Commission may, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of other agencies or departments of the Government, and may cooperate with and utilize the services of other public and private agencies.

"SEC. 504. (a) On or before December 15, 1949, the Commission shall submit to the President, for transmission by him to the Congress, a preliminary report, together with such recommendations for legislation and such other recommendations as the Commission deems appropriate; and shall submit such further reports and recommendations from time to time to the President, for transmission by him to the Congress, as the Commission deems appropriate.

"(b) Upon the submission of its final report to the President, which shall be on or before December 15, 1950, the Commission shall cease to exist and its records and property shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

"SEC. 505. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title.

Mr. KELLEY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk concluded reading the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. The substitute bill I have introduced is simply the Lesinski bill with seven changes.

The first change in effect adopts the Taft-Hartley provisions for dealing with a national emergency.

The second change adopts in effect the Wood bill provision requiring labor organization officers and employers to sign anti-Communist affidavits.

The third change guarantees free speech to employers.

The fourth change requires labor organizations to bargain in good faith.

The fifth change requires labor and employee organizations to file organizational and financial statements.

The sixth change creates a temporary labor relations commission to study and make recommendations concerning labor relations.

The seventh change makes it entirely clear that railroad employers, employees, and their representatives, as well as subject matter to the Railway Labor Act are exempt from titles I, II, and III of this bill.

Personally, I am not wedded to all the provisions of this measure. There are a number of changes which I would make if I were writing a labor-management bill to suit my own taste. But a bill that would suit my taste would not pass this House of Representatives.

I mention this because I realize that this bill will not meet with the complete approval of anyone here today. I believe that each of us here today is faced with a compromise. I believe that each of us here must weigh the good and the bad and then determine whether the good outweighs the bad.

Legislating would be a simple job indeed if we could vote our sincere convictions on each individual provision

without taking into consideration the ultimate goal and the over-all strategy involved.

Let us face facts. Those of us interested in repealing the Taft-Hartley Act and enacting the Lesinski bill know, or should know, that if the Lesinski bill is voted on without any amendments, it will be defeated. It becomes our duty then, if we are genuinely interested in repealing Taft-Hartley, to amend the Lesinski bill in such a way that it will pass this body.

From talking with some of the members of my committee, from talking with a number of southern liberals, from talking with key members of the House from all sections of the country, I am convinced that there are at least two amendments to the Lesinski bill which are necessary if a sufficient number of votes are to be gained to repeal Taft-Hartley. There are many Members in Congress who would like to vote for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act who feel and feel very deeply that a new labor law should include first, a strong provision dealing with a national emergency and second, a requirement for union and company officers to sign non-Communist affidavits.

Let us examine the substitute bill which I have introduced and see how it deals with a national emergency. On pages 23, 24, 25, and 26 of the substitute print, you will note that the national emergency provision of the proposed substitute is exactly the same as the Taft-Hartley provision dealing with national emergencies with two exceptions: First, the emergency boards of inquiry are required to make recommendations for settlement of the dispute which the President is directed to make public; and, second, the statement of and secret ballot on the employer's last offer of settlement are omitted. As under the Taft-Hartley Act injunctions against a strike or a lock-out may be obtained by the Attorney General for a period of not more than 80 days.

Now let us look at pages 15, 16, and 17 of the substitute print. This is the section requiring a non-Communist affidavit. This provision is exactly the same as the Wood bill with three exceptions:

First. Investigations or proceedings may be undertaken by the Board so long as no certification is made in a representation case and no complaint issued in an unfair labor practice case where the required affidavits have not been filed.

Second. Affidavits are required of employers, including owners, partners, receivers, trustees, and any officers of employers, or of any national or international employer organization, of which the employer is a member or affiliate.

Third. The term officer is broadened to include any person performing a policy making, governing or executive function or who is a member of any policy forming, governing or executive body of an employer or labor organization or of any national or international employer or labor organization as the case may be.

Section 110 of the substitute print on page 11 protects the freedom of speech of both employers and employees. The amendment provides that the National Labor Relations Board shall not base any finding of an unfair labor practice upon any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, if such statement contains under all of the relevant circumstances no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefit. Under these provisions the statement, if relevant, may be admitted in evidence for what it is worth, and the statement may constitute an unfair labor practice, but only if other relevant circumstances show that the statement actually represents a threat of force or reprisal or an offer of benefit.

Section 109 of the committee print on page 11 is a new section which would make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a). It is recognized that the provision will be applied only infrequently since unions exist for the primary purpose of collective bar- recognized that under modern economic gaining on behalf of employees. It is also conditions the procedures, scope and subject to collective bargaining are constantly changing and developing. Accordingly, it is provided that the provision contained in section 109 shall not be construed to require a labor organization to bargain separately with respect to any particular unit or units, or to agree to any particular procedures or conditions with respect to collective bargaining. Thus, the section safeguards industry-wide and area agreements such as those which have been reached through collective bargaining in many industries. It also leaves to the parties the development of procedures and conditions of collective bargaining, as seems best to them, for example, in accordance with their constitution or charter or bylaws. Situations of the type presented *In re American Radio Association* (82 N. L. R. B. No. 151, Apr. 19, 1949) and *In re National Maritime Union* (82 N. L. R. B. No. 152, April 19, 1949) are not intended to be unfair labor practices under the bill.

Section 111 of the substitute print on page 12 contains provisions similar to those contained in the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to the filing of organizational and financial data by labor organizations. In addition, certain organizational and financial data must be filed by employers bringing charges of unfair labor practices against a labor organization. It is provided that the Board is not to certify a labor organization as bargaining representative nor issue any complaint of unfair labor practice based on a charge filed by a union or by an employer unless the union or the employer, as the case may be, has filed with the Secretary of Labor the required organizational and financial information.

Section 405 of the committee print on page 29 makes it clear that those subject to the Railway Labor Act do not come under the provisions of title I, II, and III of this bill.

Title V of the committee print on page 30 creates a Temporary Labor Relations Commission composed of 20 members—5 representing management and 5 representing labor to be appointed by the President, 5 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, and 5 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate. The Commission is to make a thorough study and investigation into the underlying causes of disputes between labor and management.

In summing up let me say, ladies and gentlemen, that the substitute which I have introduced is the Lesinski bill with seven amendments.

First. The Taft-Hartley provisions for a national emergency.

Second. An anti-Communist affidavit.

Third. Free speech.

Fourth. Labor organizations required to bargain in good faith.

Fifth. Labor organizations to file organizational and financial statements.

Sixth. Creating a Temporary Labor Relations Commission.

Seventh. And a clarifying amendment.

I urge the Members of this body who are genuinely interested in the trade-union movement and who are interested in discarding the restrictive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to join together on this compromise measure.

This substitute protects the American public from the whims of a labor gangster and at the same time protects and encourages the right to bargain collectively. I urge its adoption without crippling amendments.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know from where this substitute came, but I am no party to it. I did not see it until this morning. I did not know it was being prepared. I am opposed to it, since I have heard it read. It contains certain provisions that are most objectionable. They were most objectionable in the Taft-Hartley Act, they certainly are objectionable in this bill as well as in the Wood bill. I refer particularly to the injunction provision and the anti-Communist oath provision.

I am not going to deal specifically with these provisions because they have been covered in the past, but the anti-Communist oath I think is very unjust, because it assumes that certain groups of people in this country are Communists when they ask them to sign an anti-Communist oath. And that applies to management as well. That provision is contained in this bill.

I notice that title V has been inserted. Title V reads, word for word, with a resolution that was introduced before the Committee on Education and Labor, Resolution 24, in which I have pride of authorship. It sets it forth in this bill, a commission to study the problems of management and labor, inviting management and labor to sit around the table with Members of the House and Members of the Senate to write a labor code. I repeat that is the only way we will ever get fair and decent labor legislation. We cannot do it in a committee; we cannot do it in the House in Committee of the Whole. The problem is too intricate, too technical. Labor-management problems deal entirely with human relations, and we just cannot do it without having all the members concerned sit around a conference table and work it out. However, I feel very complimented that it has been accepted. But

it is in the wrong place. You cannot expect a commission to sit down in an atmosphere of resentment such as this bill will create, and hope to meet with success. You start out by antagonizing large labor groups by asking them to sign anti-Communist affidavits, and you do the same thing with management. In this bill you provide for the injunction, which all labor resents. In that atmosphere you are going to ask this commission to sit down and try to devise a labor code. You therefore very largely nullify the whole purpose of title V. That should have been done some time ago; it is not too late to do it now. I had proposed to offer it as an amendment to the original Lesinski bill; I think that is where it should be, because we should start with, let us say, zero, on labor bills in order to have a commission like this function thoroughly and properly; and it is the only method by which you can ever expect to achieve peaceful relationship between management and labor. I might call your attention to the fact that it was done in the Railway Labor Act; management and labor asked the Congress to pass that bill. This is the same idea.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Is it not true, however, that the gentleman from South Carolina, when we had the full committee meeting, asked that we be permitted to read the bill in committee and make these same amendments in committee? And he was denied that privilege by the chairman.

Mr. KELLEY. I do not remember, but I will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Did we not want the bill read then?

Mr. KELLEY. I will agree.

Mr. KEARNS. Many of us had amendments that we indicated we wanted to offer in committee but we were denied that privilege because you would not permit us to read the bill.

Mr. KELLEY. All right; that is true, but that is water over the dam; what are you going to do about it? We have arrived at a point where we must do something.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a further fact that section 107 of this proposed substitute also wipes out State laws?

Mr. KELLEY. I am against the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but it will wipe out State laws as they now exist.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what the basic question is before us, the Wood bill or the amended Lesinski bill?

Mr. KELLEY. I do not know; that remains to be seen.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is not the case because in the event that the Sims substitute is adopted, then the choice will be between the Sims substitute and the original Lesinski bill. I believe the honest labor vote is to vote "No" on the substitute and "No" on Wood bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe the Wood bill will be passed in this House, and every Member knows that in a choice between the Lesinski bill and the Wood bill, the Wood bill will be passed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is your responsibility: To make a decision between two similiar bills which lead to the same result; to keep American labor under the main provisions of Taft-Hartley. I pledged to repeal Taft-Hartley and I shall vote against any bill, Sims or Wood, both of which reinstate the spirit and guts of Taft-Hartley. Anything else would be a surrender, and surrender under the present conditions is betrayal.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate, that the proper way to proceed in writing a bill is to do it by way of commission and not by the Congress' sitting here and trying to do a patchwork job. That is all it can ever be if it is done in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that we have not heard more from management in trying to prepare a labor bill. If management thinks it is going to escape being subject to Federal regulation in some fashion, it is foolish. The camel has its nose under the tent, or will have if this passes, because now they are asking management to sign an anti-Communist oath and there is quite a bit of talk that instead of the injunction procedure, we should give the President the authority to seize plants, operate them by the Federal Government, and the profits to go to the United States Treasury. Do you think management is going to like that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, as an employer I do not like that and management will wake up someday and regret that it has not put up a fight to see that a proper labor code is written by the Congress of the United States, not one that is gathered together from everybody's peeves or policies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this measure. I am opposed to the Wood amendment also, on the theory or basis that it is the incorrect way to do a job and that it will be a job that will be unsatisfactory. There will be no satisfaction for labor or management in the kind of a bill we try to write on the floor of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think that I express the sentiments of probably a majority of the members of this Committee regardless of which side they may be on in reference to the issue before us in commending the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS] for the able and articulate manner in which he set forth the provisions of the administration substitute, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] for the forthright manner in which he expressed his opposition to the substitute.

I am not going to direct my remarks in the time available to me to the question of where the substitute was written. Whether it was written in room 619 or for that matter room F-18 is, in my opinion, not particularly material in this debate.

What is important in the case of the Sims substitute as well as the Wood amendment is not where or how they were written but what provisions they would enact into law. How does the Sims substitute differ from the Wood amendment? On that point I wish to say at the outset that I am opposed to the Sims substitute and I believe that strong support for that opposition will be obtained from those members of the committee who witnessed the confusion which reigned on the floor of this House a few moments ago. We saw Members on this side rush down to the desk on my left and Members on that side rush to the desk on my right so that they could obtain for the first time copies of a substitute bill which contains seven major changes in the bill before the committee. Prior to this very moment no one on either side has been able to learn what those changes were to be. To cap the climax we have heard two members of the Committee on Labor, who heretofore have been together in representing the administration viewpoint, violently disagree as to what the Sims substitute does and whether the administration followers should support it. For these reasons alone I think the members of the committee should reach the conclusion that the Sims substitute is not a proper vehicle to use for the purpose of writing a fair, honest piece of labor-management relations legislation.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS] has adequately pointed out the seven changes in the Lesinski bill which his substitute would make. His amendment has a non-Communist affidavit provision, a provision for the use of injunctions in national emergency strikes, a provision recognizing the right of free speech for employers, a provision requiring unions to make financial reports to their members, and a provision that both unions and management should bargain in good faith. I think the gentleman is to be congratulated for recognizing that in these seven instances the bill originally supported by the administration was wholly inadequate and

that therefore, the provisions of the existing law, at least in principle, should be written into the new law that the Committee is to adopt.

But I think that those of us who are studying this legislation should also bear in mind those provisions of existing law and of the Wood bill which are not contained in either the Lesinski bill or in the Sims substitute to the Lesinski bill. In other words, I should like to point out those principles, covered by provisions in existing law in which we would have to start out from scratch if we were to use the Sims substitute as the basis for our deliberations.

There are no regulations whatever of the abuses of the closed shops or the closed union. In fact, the Sims substitute contains that provision of the Lesinski bill which invalidates State laws limiting closed-shop contracts.

There is no provision against political contributions by unions while corporations are prohibited from making political contributions, unions are free to contribute any amount they like without regard to the opinions their individual members may have in a particular political contest.

There is no provision requiring that union members must sign a check-off agreement before union dues and assessments can be deducted from their pay checks by employers.

There is no provision against unions levying excessive initiation fees where they hold the power of economic life or death over those applying for membership.

There is no provision protecting the rights of union members in the welfare funds to which they contribute.

There are no restrictions on featherbedding; none on mass picketing.

There is no provision in this bill prohibiting strikes by Federal employees, and I wonder whether we realize how serious an omission this could prove to be in the future.

None of the valuable and workable procedural changes which the present law made to the Wagner Act are contained in the Sims substitute.

There is no provision that both employers and unions should be responsible for their contracts.

The point I wish to make is this: The House must now make a choice—we must select either the Wood amendment or the Sims substitute as a basis from which to write an adequate piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIXON. It is true that the Sims substitute provides a better basis from which to start than did the Lesinski bill because it has these additional seven provisions which have been pointed out. But in the very limited time I have had, I have pointed out 10 very fundamental issues on which this House should make a decision, and on which we have no provisions at all in the Sims substitute from which to start. For that reason I say that if this committee honestly wants to write good labor legislation, it has no choice but to vote down the Sims substitute and proceed to amend, strike out, or adopt the provisions of the Wood substitute which are before the House and which have been the subject of study during the past several days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for several days and been tremendously interested in the remarks that have been made for and against the Lesinski bill, the Wood amendment, and the various other amendments that have been offered. I think it has been an enlightening debate.

I quite agree with my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that we live in a dangerous world. Crosscurrents are running throughout its length and its breadth. Many people in many sections of the earth feel that in the situations under which they must exist they are being done a grave injustice. I quite agree with them. Frankly, I do not know what kind of a world we are living in, and I do not think anybody else on the face of this earth does. Nobody can look into the mind of a dictator, no instrument has been factoried yet that would pierce his heart. So I agree that we are living in a dangerous time.

I do not want the people of the United States or any section of them, class, creed, or color, to think the Congress of the United States would do them a continuing injustice. Millions of good men and women throughout the length and breadth of this land have felt ever since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act that they have been done a serious injustice.

We had a campaign last fall, and I shall try to steer clear of politics in my remarks. One side said the Taft-Hartley Act was unfair and unjust. The other side, when they spoke of it, defended it. It seems that we have been divided on the justice and the fairness of the Taft-Hartley Act up until today, when even the leader of the minority party, that was the majority party in the Eightieth Congress, said that he is for amendments, far-reaching amendments, to the Taft-Hartley Act. Yet he is for the Wood amendment, and most of those who have spoken against the committee bill have used the Wood amendment as their standard; and I say to you there is no difference whatever between the philosophy behind the Taft-Hartley Act and that behind the Wood amendment.

From the conversation we have heard since the beginning of the reading of the Sims substitute, it appears that we may find ourselves in a situation where it is both ends against the middle. I trust out of the good judgment of the Members of this House that they will not be swept off their feet by the arguments of either end, but that the great middle, thinking membership of this House will decide that the Sims substitute is the proper approach to passing legislation the vast majority of the people will feel is fair.

So I endorse wholly and fully the provisions of the Sims substitute, and I trust that the House in its wisdom will use it as a standard and march forward to wiping from the statute books some things that I feel now, as I felt when I voted against the Taft-Hartley Act, were unfair, believing that it made good men and women throughout the length and breadth of this land feel that we had not been fair to them. Some people living in almost totally agricultural districts, like I do, feel, in all probability, that their constituents are not tremendously interested in the condition of labor. They could never be more mistaken in their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that our distinguished Speaker may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, the intelligent man in Texas or North Carolina or Wisconsin or Minnesota, or wherever he may be, knows that there cannot be one sector of the American people that is not reasonably prosperous and he remain reasonably prosperous. It is in the interests of the cotton farmer on the black lands of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas that labor be employed at good wages, that they may have a buying power to buy the things that they produce. It is just as much in the interests of the man who toils in the shop or in the factory. He knows that unless those thirty-odd million people out on the farms of the country sell the product of their toil at a price sufficient to give them a buying power, his job and his prosperity is insecure. Let us not legislate here to punish somebody. Legislation should never be passed to punish anyone. Legislation should be passed to bring about justice and fair play and equal opportunity between all classes in all sections of our country. Millions of people are demanding the repeal or the revision of the Taft-Hartley Act. I stand with them. In my opinion, the Sims substitute is the best answer to their plea that I know of. Let us be just, let us be fair, let us not move in an atmosphere of passion or of prejudice because somebody voted against us or because somebody voted for us. Let us move in such a way that the great House of Representatives will maintain its high standing as the representative body of the American people. Let us not have one sector of the millions of Americans known as labor, and their wives and their families, believe that we, for one moment, would press down upon their brow a crown of thorns.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment. Mr. Chairman, our Speaker, for whom I have the highest regard personally and in whom I have great confidence, has just enunciated some very fine and laudable principles. I find myself in agreement with him up to the point of his conclusion, in

which he calls upon this body to adopt the Sims substitute.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I expect when the eagles begin to fly around it is time for the sparrows to seek cover, but I have some very strong convictions about this matter. I doubt if there is a man in this House who has listened to any more labor hearings or given any more time to it than I have. Certainly I do not believe there is anyone in the House who has been reared in an environment where he has had better opportunity to get the view of both sides.

It is a rather peculiar situation that we should come into this House and debate a bill for approximately 5 days and then have a new labor committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has taken everything that one could throw at him. He has put up a good fight. Then somebody snatches the rug out from under him.

Now, we return a little bit to the facts. First, there was an attempt to gag us. Next, they attempted to frighten us. Third, they now attempt to bait us. I am sure this House does not gag very easily. I am definitely sure there is a great majority in this House who do not frighten very easily. I am thoroughly confident that a majority of this House will not be baited by the dish offered because it is not palatable.

For the last 2 or 3 days there have been many amendments appearing in the press and over the radio. Now I cannot explain except by name the amendments that are supposed to be in the bill that is now offered as a substitute. You know, there is one thing in naming an amendment and another in finding out what is in it. Are you gentlemen to be called upon in this short space of time to digest what has been served to you? If you were to adopt the Sims substitute and all of the amendments that have been proposed and apparently agreed upon and carried around in Members' pockets were added, I say to you, gentlemen, in all frankness, I am inclined to think it would take a wheelbarrow to move it over to the Senate.

Now, we proceeded with the Wood substitute and the House has been, and will, in my opinion, continue to work its will on that piece of legislation. Talk about fairness. I yield to no man in my desire to be fair to my fellow man. Not to any one group, no. I pray God that he will give me the wisdom and vision to be fair to labor and fair to management and fair to that great group of people who belong to neither but who have faith in the Congress of the United States that they will be considered in the passing of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from North Carolina may be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with the Wagner Labor Relations Act. I say to you that I do not recall a piece of legislation passed by the United States Congress that has brought about more confusion. It is seldom that I find myself—I do not know that I ever do—find myself in agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]; certainly, not for the same reason, even though we might vote alike occasionally. But I must say that the gentleman from New York is consistent; he proceeds on the theory that there is a class war on in this country; I do not proceed on that theory. He proceeds, secondly, on the theory that confusion will weaken the adversary; and, thirdly, the thing that he thought would accomplish that more quickly and probably more adequately than anything else was the reinstatement of the National Labor Relations Act, and he offered such an amendment. The gentleman has the right to do that; he has the right to his opinions, and I want to say right here there is not a Member, whether on the right or on the left, with whom I have shown any impatience concerning their conscientious convictions. To every man I certainly would accord the privilege of being absolutely sincere and standing by his convictions, and I believe the American people do the same thing. The responsibility, nevertheless, rests upon us to pass this bill, to pass legislation. If amendments be necessary to the Taft-Hartley Act, and I subscribe to the theory that they are, then let us work them out; but, in the name of high heavens, not the Sims bill, for at one stroke of the pen by referring to statute number and page number of the United States statute law it reenacts about 4,500 words of statutory law that is not printed in the Sims substitute, and the Members are called upon to vote upon approximately 4,500 words of Federal law that does not appear in the language read by the Clerk as the Sims substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we vote down the Sims substitute and that we continue to use the Wood bill as a basis for writing this law. Let the House continue to work its will in an orderly legislative manner and perfect it in a manner that will be acceptable. I do not believe you can take the National Labor Relations Act and jumble it up with the Sims substitute and come out with an answer that will be satisfactory to anyone. That is my honest opinion, because I have been through the hearings on the National Labor Relations Board. It would be most interesting and enlightening if some of you were to take up the hearings on the National Labor Relations Act and read them.

So, as my best judgment, I think we should continue to consider the Wood bill and vote down the Sims proposed substitute bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PERKINS to the Sims substitute: Page 23, line 1, section 301, strike out all of title III of the Sims substitute, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

"SEC. 301. Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work, or if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

"EMERGENCY BOARDS

"SEC. 302. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an emergency board.

"(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 25 days after the issuance of the proclamation, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Secretary of Labor shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) After a Presidential proclamation has been issued under section 301, and until 5 days have elapsed after the report has been made by the board appointed under this section, the parties to the dispute shall continue or resume work and operations under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect immediately prior to the beginning of the dispute unless a change therein is agreed to by the parties.

"POWERS OF EMERGENCY BOARDS

"SEC. 303. (a) A separate emergency board shall be appointed pursuant to section 302 for each dispute and shall be composed of such number of persons as the President may deem appropriate, none of whom shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organizations of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute. The provisions of section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by this act (relating to the investigatory powers of the National Labor Relations Board) shall be applicable with respect to any board appointed under this section, and its members and agents, and with respect to the exercise of their functions, in the same manner that such provisions are applicable with respect to the National Labor Relations Board. Any board appointed under this section may prescribe or adopt such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to govern its functions. Members of emergency boards shall receive compensation, at rates determined by the President, when actually employed, and travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons so employed. When a Loard appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply strikes all of section 3 of the Sims substitute as it now reads and inserts the exact verbatim language of the original Lesinski bill concerning national emergencies that the Committee on Education and Labor studied and reported.

Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act contained provisions regarding the use of the injunction in so-called national emergency strikes which has recently

aroused the angry opposition of all organized labor. It has restored "government by injunction," it has placed Government at the bargaining table and practically always on the side of the employer.

The Lesinski bill recognizes that national emergencies may arise out of certain types of actual or threatened work stoppages and that in such cases the public interest must be protected; but it avoids the use of the injunction process of unhappy experience. When the President declares that a national emergency exists, he may appoint a board of inquiry to investigate and make findings and recommendations which will serve to focus the interest of the parties and the public on a fair and reasonable solution.

It declares that it is public policy after a Presidential proclamation has been issued and until 5 days after the report submitted by the board of inquiry for the parties to the dispute to continue or to resume work under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect immediately prior to the beginning of the dispute unless the change therein is agreed to by the parties.

This encouragement of the parties to continue to negotiate is just as effective and much fairer in a national policy of promoting collective bargaining than the overhanging threat of the issue of an injunction. Railway labor has been agreeable to maintaining the status quo under such conditions, in an industry which more vitally affects the public interest than almost any other industry for more than a generation. All other American labor is equally agreeable to being bound by such a statement of public policy.

Now it is proposed in this new amendment to the Lesinski bill to go back to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is true that under this new amendment the board of inquiry may make recommendations and there is no longer the ridiculous vote on the employers' last offer; but essentially the procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act are retained.

There is no record that the use of the injunction as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act has either solved industrial relations problems or provided a guaranty against work stoppages. In a number of cases a strike ensued after the entire waiting period was consumed. The effect of the injunction in the maritime cases was to delay the strike and then to delay the settlement by bringing the issues raised by the injunction to the fore. This was also true in the coal miners' strike.

Of all the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act the overhanging injunction is the most objectionable. But the restoration of "government by injunction" is a step backward which cannot be tolerated.

The provision in the original Lesinski bill shortened the waiting period to 25 days but it requires that the status quo be maintained during this period and the board of inquiry make actual recommendations for settlement. This makes altogether unnecessary any resort to the injunctive process. If and when, however, a national emergency were to confront the country, the Attorney General has already testified that the President has inherent powers in his high office to protect the national safety and secure it.

I move the substitution of sections 301, 302 (a), (b), and (c), and 303 of the Lesinski bill, H. R. 2032; Report No. 317 for title III of the Lesinski substitute, including sections 301, 302 (a), (b), and (c), 303 (a), (b), and (c), 304 (a) and (b), and 305.

We studied the original Lesinski bill in committee. We gave much time to the question of injunctions. Sometimes 12 and 15 hours a day we devoted to the study of the administration bill.

I cannot here this afternoon sacrifice the principle involved and go along with the Sims substitute. I personally campaigned for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law last fall, and I would not be loyal to my constituents if I accepted one of the most vicious provisions of the Taft-Hartley law—the injunction. This I cannot accept.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I cannot yield.

I am for the original Lesinski bill as reported out of committee. I sponsored a resolution calling for a two-package approach to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, because I thought this dilemma would be forthcoming. My resolution was voted down before the full committee, and then it was that we considered the one-package approach and reported the Lesinski bill out of committee with recommendations that same should pass.

There is another provision in this substitute to which I wish to voice my objection, and that is the non-Communist-affidavit requirement. This is just as un-American as anything possibly could be. To me a Communist is a person who is disloyal to our form of Government. In the Taft-Hartley law the affidavit requirement was only applicable to unions and their officials. This was unfair on its face, because this brought about the assumption that labor was communistic. Not only was this an un-American requirement, but this played right in the hands of the Communists. Communists do not mind to take such an oath. The leaders who sponsored the Taft-Hartley law recognized that this was a discriminatory provision against labor, so they came back with the idea that the oath requirement should also apply to employers or management. This provision has not only been carried over into the Wood amendment, but to the Sims substitute. Under our laws in America we are all presumed innocent until proven guilty, and it is an insult to both labor and management to cast any reflection that any American group of people are suspected of being tainted with communism. In my judgment this is what this provision does.

My amendment should be adopted. There is no necessity for the injunction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here these 5 days of debate and listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments pro and con. There may have been a time in my youth that I thought a man who differed with me just wanted to be wrong and refuse to see the right but I have lived long enough to know better. I do not question any one's sincerity in this House. Labor relations is one of the most difficult fields of legislation with which we deal in Congress. That is so because it involves human relationships and human beings; it involves regulation by law of some of the activities of employers and employees in the public interest and for the general good; it involves not dollars and cents alone, not investments alone, not factories alone but also the labor of human beings. If workers are to have jobs there must be factories, farms, and shops where they can work. In turn factories, farms, and shops cannot operate without the services of people. No one can be required to invest his money in a factory against his will and he will not do so unless he can feel that he has a just and fair opportunity to make a profit on his investment and no one can be compelled by law to work for a private employer against his will so long as there is a Bill of Rights left in this country. Hence, legal compulsion of any kind directed at either management or labor must be avoided to the greatest extent possible and compulsion employed only when in fairness, honesty and common sense it can be accepted in good faith by the parties concerned, both the employer and the employee. On any other basis it is unjust, oppressive, and impossible of fair enforcement.

I voted against the Hartley bill and later against the Taft-Hartley bill when they were considered in this House in the Eightieth Congress. I consider the Wood substitute to embody the Taft-Hartley law and in some respects it is even worse. I cannot support it and, in my judgment, it cannot be made into a good bill by any amount of amendment. The whole spirit of it is wrong for it assumes that labor unions and the people who compose them are different from other people and must be singled out for special regulations and controls that are offensive to every sense of justice and right. It can no more be converted into a good labor-relations law by amendments on the floor than could the heart and soul of a man be changed by a surgical operation. I sincerely believe, as many of my colleagues do and as millions of Americans do, that the Wagner Act offers the correct approach to sound labor legislation. It recognizes that working people are human beings with rights and wills of their own and that they have a sense of justice and of right and of obligations even as other Americans do and that they do not constitute a separate class but are themselves part of the great American public which makes up our common country. In my judgment, the Wagner Act needs amendment in light of past experiences in its use and application. But we should take it as a working basis and seek to improve it wherever experience and sound judgment indicate a need. But under the parliamentary situation with which we are now confronted, the only practical means of being able to do that is to adopt

the substitute for the Wood bill offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS].

I do not favor everything in the Sims substitute and I would like to see other provisions in it that are not there but it does offer a working basis for a sound labor law. It was obviously an attempt at a compromise among those who believe in the philosophy of the Wagner Act, but who find themselves in disagreement as to details. It became perfectly evident during consideration of the Lesinski bill last week that the strategy of its opponents would be to destroy it by the adoption of the Wood substitute. By that strategy the Members of this House would have no opportunity to even consider the Lesinski bill for amendment, and, personally, I feel that it does need amending. Therefore, we should adopt the Sims substitute.

In that manner we, of the majority, will at least keep control of the bill and in that manner enable the membership to consider a bill embodying the philosophy of the Wagner Act. As I view it, that is an obligation that we on this side of the aisle owe the membership and the American people.

In the last Congress the Republicans kept control of their bill. They put it up for a vote. That was not the responsibility of the Democrats. It was their responsibility and because they met that responsibility, the American people last November had a clear-cut issue submitted to them as between the Taft-Hartley Act and its repeal. They spoke. And, today, we Democrats have the responsibility of keeping faith with the membership and with the American people.

As I have said, I am not in full agreement with the Sims substitute. Perhaps no one in this House is, but it does offer a working basis, it does embody the approach of the Wagner Act and it does incorporate many good features. In the first place it incorporates the Kelley resolution, which provides for the formation of a commission consisting of five Members of the House, five Members of the Senate, five members representing management and five members representing labor with the authority and the duty to sit down together, study the problems of management and labor, seek means of providing peaceful adjustments of labor disputes and of settling strikes should they occur and report their findings and recommendations for such amendment to the law as may be needed to the President and to the Congress. In my judgment, this is the best way to get a fair, just, and workable labor-relations law. The President has three times recommended to the Congress that such a Commission be created. I offered an amendment in the Eightieth Congress which sought to provide such a Commission. Nearly 25 years ago, to be exact in 1926, railroad management and railroad labor representatives sat down together and after weeks of study submitted their recommendations to the Congress and as a result the Railway Labor Act was passed. I am sure it is not perfect but at any rate I have heard of no agitation for its repeal. No doubt, since both employers and employees had been consulted and given a chance to participate in the making of that law they have a peculiar interest in making it work and have no doubt in good faith sought to make it work.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is to be commended for introducing his resolution. It has already been favorably considered, as I understand it, by the Committee on Education and Labor and, as I have said, it is incorporated in the Sims substitute.

Now, let us consider the question of the loyalty affidavit. It is far better than the one contained in the Wood bill. It embodies an oath of allegiance to the United States and a disavowal of any obligations to any foreign government. In addition it affirms that the maker is not a Communist nor a member of any organization advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Unlike the Taft-Hartley Act, it would require the employer and a responsible official of a corporation as well as the employees and a responsible official of a labor union to make such an affidavit. Is it wrong for officials of organized labor or for an official of a corporation to take an oath of loyalty to this country? You and I take an oath as Members of Congress. Every employee of the United States takes a loyalty oath before he or she can get a dime of pay. What is wrong with that? But some have suggested that it is an insult to labor in that it assumes, so it is said, that union officials are disloyal. I disagree. It no more assumes that the labor leader or the corporation official is disloyal than does the requirement for the oath of office assume that a Member of Congress would fail to bear faith and allegiance to the United States Government unless he took an oath.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to point out that a member of this committee offered this amendment. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] asked for additional time and an objection was made. What is the situation now? Are objections going to be made only against those who are in favor of it?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues. I know you are anxious to get a vote and I will be as brief as I can.

Mr. SHAFER. That is the only reason I objected.

Mr. COMBS. I know that. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for whom I have the highest regard for his consideration in withdrawing the objection.

It is my hope that I can offer some further observations on this Sims substitute that you may find of interest.

Now, let us consider the injunction provision contained in the Sims substitute. There is a lot of misunderstanding about it that is quite understandable in view of the short time the Members have had to acquaint themselves with the substitute bill. I know something about injunctions, their use, and their abuse; I know how susceptible they are to abuse in labor disputes, even when granted by judges of the best intentions, and I, for one, believe in the dignity and fairness of the courts of our country.

One of the reasons, among many, which caused me to oppose the Taft-Hartley bill was the injunction feature it contained, particularly those embodied in sections 8 and 10. It is those provisions that have been so construed and applied as to prevent peaceful picketing, interfere with the organizational work of the unions and in short to harass and oppress labor unions. But these provisions of the Taft-Hartley law and the Woods bill are not embodied in the Sims substitute. The injunction feature of the Sims substitute deals purely with a national emergency threatening the health and safety of the Nation. It can only be invoked by the Attorney General of the United States under direction of the President after investigation and the determination by the President of a national emergency. Such an injunction can exist for not longer than 80 days and during that time a special board would make investigations and findings and set forth the contentions of both parties to the dispute. These would be made public and thus the labor union, as well as the employer, would be assured that the American people could be given the facts. Also it contains a feature not in the Taft-Hartley or the Wood bill, a provision that this special fact-finding board would submit recommendations for settlement of the dispute. This would enable the American people to know what it is all about and to pass an intelligent judgment. Now if we should have a Nation-crippling strike that would affect the peace and security of our Nation and there is not some provision in the law that offers a chance for the President to deal with it then the legislation which the American people will demand at such a time would make the injunction provision of the Sims substitute look as harmless as a Sunday-school lesson by comparison.

I see no substantial harm that could come to either employer or employee in such a situation by application of this injunction feature, which is subject to review by the highest Court in the land, the Supreme Court. The worst trouble with it is, and I do not think an injunction is the final answer nor the most effective means of dealing with the question of a Nation-crippling strike, we must seek better means of preventing such

strikes and more effective means of dealing with them when they occur. The people of this country must not be subjected to constant fear and apprehension that any group or organization will exercise a power to endanger the health and safety of all the people of our country. At least the existence of this emergency injunction power will have a psychological and beneficial effect in preventing and dealing with Nation-crippling strikes. It would give opportunity for the public to get the true facts and in any case, by its inclusion in the Sims amendment of it shall be adopted and the Taft-Hartley Act repealed, if there is a Nation-crippling strike it cannot be said that the President would have had better means of dealing with it had the Taft-Hartley Act not been repealed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. On the question of injunction, the Sims bill reaffirms the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which prohibits an injunction, except in section 10 of the Taft-Hartley Act, so that it retains the right to issue injunctions in cases of unfair labor practices, prior to the adjudication of the merits of the case, and the Board may sue out an injunction.

Mr. COMBS. I do not so construe it.

Now, one other thing about the injunction feature. Not all injunctions are bad—I want to call attention to the fact that the Wagner Act itself provides for injunctions in certain situations.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COMBS. No, I am sorry, I cannot yield now. Let me say this in conclusion. Republican leadership, according to this morning's paper, is now in favor of certain amendments to the Wood bill. They have made the Wood bill their very own. The news account says that Republican leaders favor changing the Wood bill so a union acting under a union shop contract can get a man fired by expelling him from the union if he embezzles union funds or discloses union secrets. Thus our Republican friends come out of the Jimson weeds for the first time and publicly admit that under the Taft-Hartley law and under the Wood substitute the right of a union to determine its own membership or even to throw a member out for embezzlement of union funds is denied. They publicly admit that under the Taft-Hartley law and the Wood substitute that a union must retain in its membership the miserable fink, or labor spy, so long as he offers to pay his dues. This is but one example of how the Taft-Hartley law and its counterpart, the Wood bill, invades the right of union people to control their own unions which they have built through the years. To the union people and working people everywhere the Wagner Act is a sort of symbol as well as a repository of their rights, it is a symbol and a charter of their right to organize, to bargain collectively, and to preserve their union institutions. Let us adopt the Sims substitute which will result in restoring a considerable part of the Wagner Act by reference alone as is done in the Lesinski bill. It is not wholly satisfactory to any of us but it offers a working basis for something that is fair and just. I hope you will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky. This amendment proposes to substitute for title III of the Sims amendment title III of the Thomas-Lesinski bill as reported out of the committee.

When I appeared on this floor in general debate 1 week ago today I made it clear that I was offering on behalf of the Committee on Education and Labor the committee's and the Democratic Party's objection to the inclusion of injunctions in labor legislation. I stated, if I recall, that I wanted no part of injunctions, mandatory or discriminatory. I still am of that opinion. My State of West Virginia has suffered more from the abuses of mandatory injunctions than any other State in this Union. Without having spoken to a single one of my colleagues from West Virginia I can assure you now that not a single one of the West Virginia delegation in the lower House of Congress is in favor of any kind of labor legislation that contains an injunction provision. Our State of West Virginia has learned its lesson through blood, and tears, and suffering. My State of West Virginia wants no part of any injunction procedure in any labor legislation, and I speak for the vast majority of the people of my State.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will not yield; I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to this situation if you please: The Republican Party is on the spot over the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. As good, self-respecting Democrats do you propose to take them off of the spot? Pass either the Wood substitute or even this present Sims substitute and you take responsibility and free the Republicans from it; they are on the spot; let us keep them on the spot.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WE NEED LABOR-MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is right for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to want no part of injunctions. Where does the unemployment come from? From West Virginia? Not long ago the coal strike down there threw 55,000 railroad workers out of their jobs. Deprived them of their pay checks for something like 10 days. Was that of benefit to the railroad workers?

All anyone needs to do in order to realize that we need labor legislation is to take a look at current strikes. Look at one of the more recent strikes, that at the Bendix plant in South Bend. Forty-seven employees were charged with a slow-down. Instead of arbitrating and settling the matter, the whole union went out; and 35,000 workers in Michigan, in Detroit, are out of their jobs. Was that an act tending to aid employees or was it not? It was an arbitrary act on the part of 47 and their union which harmed more than 35,000 other union employees who were not involved in the dispute. Now General Motors, Ford, and Hudson have moved their dies out of Bendix and it has lost much of its business and its 7,000 employees may lose their jobs permanently.

COMPROMISE LABOR LEGISLATION MAY LOSE AS WELL AS WIN VOTES

During the debate on the issue now before the House, it has been stated repeatedly that the November election was a mandate or order to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to reenact the provisions of the Wagner Act under the name of the Lesinski bill.

It is quite true that during the campaign the President called for the defeat of Congressmen who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, the reelection of Congressmen who voted against it and of others who would support his demand for its repeal. However, that was not the sole issue in the campaign and his opponent took no definite stand, made no aggressive campaign on that issue.

Time and again, we have been told during the present debate that those who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act were no longer in Congress, and quite clearly it has been intimated, not by way of threat, but by way of giving information, that those who continued to support the essential provisions of the Taft-Hartley legislation would not, after the next election, longer represent their constituents because they would be defeated. For me those arguments are not very persuasive; certainly they are not terrifying—they inspire no fear of defeat in my mind.

According to a check made by my office on roll call No. 85, of the Eightieth Congress, which carries the vote on the President's veto, 331 Members of the House voted to override the veto of the Taft-Hartley Act, while 83 Members voted to sustain that veto. Of the 331 who voted to override the veto, 224 were reelected and are here today as Members of the Eighty-first Congress.

Four, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, who voted to override the veto, were reelected and are now Members of the Senate.

Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. DOLLIVER, and Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina, who were paired in favor of overriding the veto, are Members of the present House.

Mr. Gifford, who was paired, and Mr. Drury, Mr. Owens, Mr. Robsion, Mr. Springer, and Mr. Zimmerman, who voted to override, died.

To the 224 who voted to override, we should add three names, those of Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. DOLLIVER, and Mr. MCMILLAN, which gives us a total of 227 Members of the Eighty-first Congress who were in favor of overriding the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley Act.

And to the 227 should be added the names of the four—Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas—elected to the Senate who voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act, which gives us a total of 231 Members of the House who voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act, who are now sitting in the present Congress.

Yes, strange as it may seem, some of the 227 now seem to accept the President's statement that the Congress received a mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

Are the 227 Members of the Eighty-first Congress who voted to override the President's veto now convinced that, as stated by the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] during the debate that they did not know the contents of the bill which their votes made the law of the land, or have they since learned that the bill was not sound legislation, or are they fearful of retaliation by the President or by those who claim to control the labor vote?

If they have learned that the act is not sound, I have failed to hear any of them state their reasons during the debate.

The following is a statement prepared by my office which gives the names of those who voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act when the President's veto came down to the House and who were reelected to the Eighty-first Congress:

TAFT-HARTLEY VOTE TO OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

On roll call No. 85 on June 20, 1947, which was the vote on the President's veto, 331 Members voted to override, and of the 331, 224 were reelected. Their names are as follows, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

Abernethy; Albert; Allen, Calif.; Allen, Ill.; Allen, La.; Anderson, H. Carl; Anderson, Calif.; Andresen, August H.; Andrews, Ala.; Arends; Auchincloss; Barden; Barrett; Bates, Mass.; Battle; Beall; Beckwith; Blackney; Bland; Boggs, Del.; Boggs, La.; Bolton; Bonner; Boykin; Bramblett; Brehm; Brooks; Brown, Ga.; Brown, Ohio; Bryson; Bulwinkle; Burke; Burleson; Byrnes, Wis.; Camp; Canfield; Case, N. J.; Case, S. Dak.; Chelf; Chiperfield; Church; Clevenger; Cole, Kans.; Cole, N. Y.; Colmer; Cooley; Cooper; Corbett; Cotton; Coudert; Cox; Crawford; Cunningham; Curtis; Dague; Davis, Ga.; Davis, Tenn.; Davis, Wis.; Deane; D'Ewart; Dondero; Doughton; Durham; Eaton; Ellsworth; Elston; Engel, Mich.; Engle, Calif.; Evins; Fallon; Fellows; Fenton; Fernandez; Fisher; Fulton; Gamble; Gary; Gathings; Gavin; Gillette; Goodwin; Gore; Gossett; Graham; Grant; Gregory; Gwinn, N. Y.; Hagen; Hale; Hall, Edwin Arthur; Hall, Leonard W.; Halleck; Hand; Hardy; Harris; Harrison; Hays; Hébert; Herter; Hesselton; Hill; Hinshaw; Hobbs; Hoeven; Hoffman; Holmes; Hope; Horan; Howell; Jackson, Calif.; Jenison; Jenkins, Ohio; Jennings; Jensen; Johnson, Calif.; Jones, Ala.; Jones, N. C.; Judd; Kean; Kearney; Kearns; Keating; Keefe; Kerr; Kilburn; Kilday; Kunkel; Larcade; Latham; LeCompte; LeFevre; Lodge; Lucas; Lyle; McConnell; McDonough; McGregor; McMillen, Ill.; Macy; Mahon; Martin, Iowa; Mason; Merrow; Meyer; Michener; Miller, Md.; Miller, Nebr.; Mills; Monroney; Morton; Murray, Tenn.; Murray, Wis.; Nixon; Norblad; Norrell; O'Hara; O'Konski; Pace; Passman; Patterson; Peterson; Phillips, Calif.; Pickett; Plumley; Poage; Poulson; Preston; Priest; Rains; Rankin; Redden; Reed, Ill.; Reed, N. Y.; Rees; Rich; Richards; Riehlman; Rivers; Rogers, Fla.; Rogers, Mass.; Sadlak; St. George; Sanborn; Sasscer; Scott, Hardie; Scott, Hugh D., Jr.; Scrivner; Shafer; Short; Sikes; Simpson, Ill.; Simpson, Pa.; Smathers; Smith, Kans.; Smith, Va.; Smith, Wis.; Stanley; Stefan; Stigler; Stockman; Taber; Talle; Taylor; Teague; Thomas, N. J.; Towe; Trimble; Vinson; Vorys; Vursell; Wadsworth; Weichel; Wheeler; Whitten; Whittington; Wigglesworth; Williams; Wilson, Ind.; Wilson, Tex.; Wolcott; Wolverton; Wood; Woodruff; Worley.

Two hundred and twenty-four Members reelected.

One hundred and seven Members did not return, but the 107 includes Mrs. Smith and Messrs. Mundt, Chapman, and Johnson, Texas, who were elected to the Senate; Messrs. Drury, Va., Owens, Robsion, Springer, Zimmerman, and Gifford, who died; and Messrs. Almond, Johnson, Ind., and Jones, Ohio, who resigned. So, from the 107 should be subtracted the 13 who were either elected to the Senate, died, or resigned.

In addition to the above the following were paired for and against:

For: Van Zandt, Gifford, Dolliver, McMillan, S. C.

Against: Kefauver, Kelley.

Many a Member of Congress who voted to override the President's veto is here again. Beyond question, a majority of those advocates of the Taft-Hartley Act who did not hesitate to announce their position when up for election last fall are here again. On the theory that the President received a mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, those Members of Congress who voted to override his veto, on the same theory, received a mandate of equal force from their constituents to vote against that repeal.

The question then arises: Am I, having received a mandate from—a majority of the votes of—my people, to disregard their wishes and go along with the President? Am I to desert my constituents who overwhelmingly supported me and go along with the President who did not receive a majority of the popular vote in November? If I am thinking about reelection, should I seek the favor of individuals who did not and cannot, because they are not residents of my district, vote for or against me?

If I am thinking solely of political results and of self-interest, then most assuredly I should not follow the political strategy of the political master minds who seek to obtain my support of legislation designed only to procure votes at the next election, and disregard the mandate issued to me personally last November.

Let us not be deceived or fooled into betraying our constituents by voting for legislation which we know they do not want, simply because some top-notch, so-called leader either thinks or pretends to think that we can win a national election by a compromise on fundamental legislation. The folks back home—at least those in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and I assume, elsewhere—are not going to be fooled into believing that legislation which does not protect the individual worker and the public as a whole is good labor legislation.

While we know that in the enactment of all legislation there must be compromise, it is also true that in the history of every legislative proposal there comes a time when principle cannot, from a political standpoint, be successfully abandoned, when compromise may become a source of weakness instead of strength.

We have our Chamberlains in labor legislation as well as in world affairs. At Munich, Chamberlain, with his umbrella, compromised and appeased a Hitler. The ultimate result was disastrous. Some of those who, 2 years ago, courageously voted to override the President's veto, are now talking compromise and appeasement. To avoid war, Chamberlain sacrificed principle. The morning papers tell us that the administration is coming up with a compromise proposal, apparently drafted to appease labor leaders whom the President had overpromised in return for political support. Those who made possible the principles contained in the Taft-Hartley Act are now about to placate and appease certain labor leaders who have political weight. It is possible that the umbrellas carried by these compromisers in this present contest may turn aside the raindrops of displeasure now showered upon us by the labor lobby and the labor political leaders, but they will never save us from the hailstones of righteous wrath of the voters who were tired and disgusted with the misinterpretation and maladministration which forced us to a repudiation of the basically unfair provisions of the Wagner Act.

I, for one, do not propose to go along with or to vote for compromise legislation which does not protect nonunion as well as union employees against coercion from any source. I do not propose to go along and vote for legislation which gives us the principle of the closed shop, even though it be called union security or the union hiring hall—legislation which compels the American citizen to pay tribute to some nongovernmental organization in order to exercise his right to work. I do not propose to go along with legislation which makes no attempt to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

So, may I say to those in charge of this legislation, you may, if you will, in order to obtain the support of this, that, or the other man, adopt amendments which will emasculate the essential provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, but if you do, I feel under no obligation whatever to support it. I am interested primarily in obtaining sound labor-management legislation—not, at the moment, in following a course which some political strategist thinks will win an election which is to be held in 1950 or 1952.

Ultimately, those in the House and in the Senate who are willing to sacrifice principle and sound legislation in an effort to placate and appease the advocates of special privilege, be it advanced either by the supporters of free enterprise or those who speak for organized labor, will discover that the people—a majority of them—cannot in the end be fooled.

Now, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] may bluster all he wishes, but you are not going to frighten anybody on the Republican side with threats as to what you expect or intend to do, come next election. The New Deal

and the unions did their very best last year, may I say, but 227 of us are back here and it may be we will be back again.

LESINSKI-WOOD-SIMS COMBINATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire first to confine my remarks to the Wood bill, and later I shall speak of the Sims substitute. If I may be permitted my little paraphrase, let me say that a thorn by any other name would stick just as much. The Wood bill is a sharp barb with which some would lacerate labor. Let us identify it properly. It is a reaffirmation of the principles and purposes of the Taft-Hartley Act. To consider it as a substitute for or an amendment to the Lesinski bill is taking a completely divergent road upon which we had set our feet when we started consideration of the Lesinski bill. I say that essentially the Wood bill is not germane to the discussion of the Lesinski bill despite the appearances of language and subject matter. The two bills are only parallel in the respect that they can never meet.

Let the distinguished Members of this Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, face the issue squarely. Will this Chamber, the representatives of the people, mistake the temper of the country again as it did in the Eightieth Congress? Will it remain, as did the Eightieth Congress, smugly indifferent to the majority will of its citizenry? And is it prepared to take the personal consequence in the national elections in 1950?

There are those who say that the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law was only one of the issues in the Presidential election that returned the Democratic President to office. It was not one among many. It was one of the major issues of the campaign. It was one of the major planks in the Democratic platform. That platform is law for me. Whatever obscurities and double interpretations surrounded other issues, this one was clear. The Taft-Hartley law was repudiated by the majority. Now the Wood bill offers this unpalatable dish again in almost the same form, but the disguise is a most transparent one. It will fool nobody.

It is almost amusing to watch those who tumble all over themselves in being first to cry the virtues of free enterprise embrace a bill that would destroy one of the fundamentals of a free society—collective bargaining. It is equally as amusing to watch these logicians rail against Government interference and yet place the whole weight of their power behind a bill that would make it mandatory for the Government to regulate, control, and bind one of the most vital segments of our society—labor.

True, none is so blind as he who will not see. What are the Taft-Hartley law and the Wood bill but the expression of an attitude that the laboring man is a commodity to be procured at the lowest price? What security is there for the worker in individual bargaining? The strength of the worker, which in essence is the strength of the country, lies in collective free bargaining. When, except in times of war, have there been more jobs than workers? What is this talk about equalization between the powers of labor and management? Where does the need for protection actually and factually lie? Is it the worker who has reaped the harvest of inflation, or is his the struggle to meet the cost of living? In times of depression where is the largest number of victims found? Among the ranks of labor or management? Where does the buying power of the Nation come from? Can the wheels of industry keep running with the worker subjected to low wages, hired and fired at will? Cannot you see the direst relationship between a secure and free labor movement with the health of our economy? A worker gripped with fear of the future with a shrinking pay envelope does not buy. Only free collective bargaining can bring him the assurance and the pay which inures to the benefit of both labor and management. I say that organized labor is not merely to be tolerated, but to be welcomed. Every time you hack away at the freedom of such bargaining you hack away at the freedom of all society.

There is no need for me to go into an analysis of either the Lesinski or the Wood bill. You have heard these analyses again and again during the course of this debate. But I am impelled by conscience and logic to emphasize and reemphasize the general principles upon which we as a representative body must proceed.

At no time during the life of the Wagner Act do I recall the victimization of management. Nor do I recall the economy of our country so weakened that we could not prepare to meet the demands of a world war. Rather, I recall more vividly the economic woes that preceded the Wagner Labor Act and before that the chaos and economic dismay in the days of the yellow-dog contract prior to the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia and Clayton Acts.

There is not one economist who will say that we are not stronger and wealthier because of labor's gains.

As to the Sims bill, I would call it ersatz. It just sugar-coats the Taft-Hartley Act, but it is still quite unpalatable. It is an attempt at the eleventh hour to pull the brand from the burning bush. It is an attempt to write a labor bill on the floor of the House. Labor is not a commodity like ships and shoes and sealing wax. It involves human relationships and gives rise to diverse emotions and passions that usually attend discussions of any labor bill on the floor of the House. Even the Democratic members of the Labor Committee were not consulted on the Sims proposal. They heard its provisions for the first time a few moments ago. Our distinguished Speaker is for it as a compromise. I am anxious to follow the Speaker, but cannot in good conscience, and in consideration of the interests of my good people back home, follow him in this instance. The Sims bill still retains many of the obnoxious provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, particularly the provisions for injunctions. If there are any heavy burdens cast upon labor, the most frightening is the injunction. Under the Sims proposal, the injunction is retained not only in the case of national emergency, but in many other instances; instances that would give rise to the infamous yellow dog contracts of the buccaneer days.

I am against the Sims bill, the Wood bill, and I am for the Lesinski bill, period. I shall assume fullest responsibility for that choice.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Sims substitute makes it obvious more than ever before in this debate that we have gone a long, long way from the last election and the promises of the last election. This debate was started by the administration leadership in an atmosphere of surrender, and it now continues its course of surrender with this Sims substitute. I tell you that if the atmosphere of the election campaign had been translated into this House, that if there had been no talk of amendments to the Wagner Act last week, that if this Sims substitute had not been offered as evidence of abject surrender to the forces of Taft-Hartley here, that if a militant uncompromising fight had been made, the Wood bill would be defeated.

I want to direct my remarks to those who campaigned for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. No one can expect a Member of Congress who was elected on a platform of repealing the Taft-Hartley Act to keep that promise and at the same time accept either the Sims substitute or the Wood substitute. No matter how you try to quibble, no matter how you try to trim, the Sims substitute places in the original Thomas-Lesinski bill the very heart, the brains, and spirit of the Taft-Hartley law. I predicted last week that this was going to happen. I said last Wednesday, last Thursday, and again last Friday that surrender was the policy of the administration leadership on the issue of Taft-Hartley, despite the clear demand of the American workers for outright repeal.

First, there was talk of these amendments, there were rumors. I recited an article that appeared in the New York Times which defined these amendments almost word for word. No one would either confirm nor deny nor reply to my repeated charges and challenges. At long last we finally find them in the Sims substitute.

Oh, I know the arguments that are going to be advanced in support of this betrayal of election promises; but in my experience I have never failed to find that when people want to go back on promises they can find excuses and they can find arguments. The argument will be made here that this is a compromise. Tell that to the millions of American workers who will be facing the gun of unemployment, tell that to those who constitute a labor market which is becoming cheaper as a result of unemployment, tell them that it was a compromise when they are forced to battle for their very existence under the tyranny of the Taft-Hartley law which you have rein-

carnated and reestablished in the Sims substitute.

Yes, we are told that this is a choice between the Wood bill and the Sims substitute. Superficially that is so; fundamentally the choice is the Sims substitute as an amendment to the Thomas-Lesinski bill, and you cannot get away from it.

We are also told that certain so-called leaders of labor want this Sims substitute. If they do, then they are misleading labor. I challenge them to go before their locals and read to the rank and file the provisions of the Sims substitute. They will face the charge of sell-out, and the charge will be sustained by the facts.

There is no real difference between the Sims proposal and the Wood bill. Both revive all the viciousness of Taft-Hartley. That is what the issue here is in substance; that is what it is in reality, so that in voting for the Sims substitute you are voting for a mere statement of repeal but you are also voting for the reinstatement of the Taft-Hartley law. It is not necessary for me to describe to you people who have studied labor problems the significance of these amendments contained in the substitute. They constitute Taft-Hartley all over again. The gentleman from North Carolina said I was preying on confusion. I think the RECORD shows otherwise. I think that the position I have taken here and that I advocated last Friday when I called for outright repeal of Taft-Hartley and reinstatement of the Wagner Act, was the only clear-cut position which cleared the atmosphere of any confusion. He states that I press the class struggle. I have not put the class struggle into existence. As long as man can exploit his fellowman and exploit his labor, there is a struggle, and all we seek in a democracy is equality in bargaining. We seek genuine, collective bargaining in the light of that struggle. You cannot talk of equality under the law unless it is implemented with economic security. Anatole France once said:

> The law in all of its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, beg on the streets and steal their bread from shop windows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So, Mr. Chairman, I say that the proper course for those who want to keep both the spirit and the letter of their promise to the people to vote for outright repeal, that the honest course in the interest of labor is to vote "no" on the Sims substitute and "no" on the Wood substitute, and if we are defeated let the responsibility rest on those who seek to reincarnate the Taft-Hartley law and on those who have advocated surrender. Let us go back to the people. I have always had an abiding faith in the intelligence of the American people. They have spoken once in the election. They will speak again in this struggle for freedom and security. I propose to support labor not only here, but I propose to support labor on the picket line, too, to bring about that equality which is so necessary in a democracy such as ours and to bring justice to the men and women who toil for a living.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Perkins amendment close in 5 minutes, the 5 minutes to be given to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I wish to first state for the benefit of the RECORD that when our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Texas, Judge COMBS, had the floor, I did not intend to object to his unanimous-consent request to continue for five additional minutes. I did want to point out that a member of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the author of this amendment, had previously received an objection from this other side of the House when he wanted his time extended, and I did not think it was fair to cut off the time of a proponent and then to allow extra time to an opponent; that is all. I think if we are going to allow extra time to speakers, it should be allowed to both sides.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with that, and I trust we can have equal treatment on both sides and on all subjects.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. He has always been fair.

I rise in support of the Perkins amendment, because the Perkins amendment would remove from the Sims substitute the most objectionable feature, objectionable as far as labor and those of us who represent laboring districts are concerned. If the Perkins amendment is not agreed to, then I must take my place along with those of us from urban centers who represent trade-union people, and vote against the Sims substitute.

As a matter of practical politics, I should like at this time to congratulate the leadershp on the Republican side on maneuvering my side into the place where the onus of being the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act has been removed but the philosophy of the Taft-Hartley Act has been retained. If the Sims substitute passes this House, we can look forward to the Eighty-second Congress being a Congress dominated by our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. Gentlemen, you are in, because at least 50 men on this side will not be here in the Eighty-second Congress if the Sims substitute is adopted. In fact, I can see the campaign slogan now of the northern Democrats—defeat the Lesinski Act instead of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Sims substitute, while it does not include all the things the Taft-Hartley Act included, does include the major item to which labor objects—the injunction provision.

We come here as men to write legislation for laboring people. We of the urban centers of the North do not write the agricultural acts. We take the advice of you gentlemen from the agricultural districts. We come before you today and ask that agricultural Representatives do not write labor legislation. If the Sims substitute is not defeated, then you are putting around the workers in our urban centers the same chains the Taft-Hartley Act put around them in the Eightieth Congress. There is no difference between the two except in the matter of words. The philosophy is the same.

If you say that the only choice is between the Wood amendment and the Sims substitute, you are wrong. There is a third choice, and that choice is the choice of whether we are going to vote as our voters sent us here to vote, according to our conscience, or whether we are going to adopt what is called a compromise but is not a compromise. Neither the Sims substitute nor the Wood amendment is a compromise; they are the Taft-Hartley Act.

Therefore I feel that if we vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, which will take away the sting of the injunctive provision, we will have taken the first step toward making a fundamental difference between the worst Taft-Hartley philosophy and the Sims substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to the Sims substitute.

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 109, noes 197.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS and Mr. SIMS.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported there were—ayes 132, noes 238.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Sims substitute and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed one-half an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: Strike out all of line 2, page 23, and all following through page 26 and insert the following:

"301. The United States Conciliation Service shall immediately certify to the President all notices, under section 8 (c) of title I of this act, whereby it is proposed to terminate or modify any collective-bargaining agreements covering a substantial portion of any industry. If the President believes a resultant work stoppage therein is likely and would if it occurred imperil national health and safety he shall immediately appoint and convene an emergency board composed of such persons and to be compensated as he directs.

"302. Such Board shall immediately hold public hearings, affording all interested parties full opportunity to be heard. It shall

have available such facilities and assistance as the President shall direct, and shall investigate, hear evidence, make findings and recommendations, and report the same to the President as follows:

"(a) The normal amount of production or services in that portion of the industry covered and, separately the normal amount of production or services in that portion of the industry not covered by such agreement.

"(b) The minimum amount of production or service covered by such agreement which will be necessary to avoid endangering the national health and safety (as distinguished from public convenience), taking into consideration the amount of the finished product available at the time of the hearing.

"(c) The positions of the respective parties to the agreement or dispute.

"(d) Such recommendations as the Board deems just for a settlement of the dispute, together with its written reasons therefor.

"The report and recommendations shall be returned to the President, made public, and a copy thereof filed with the United States Conciliation Service at least 5 days before the final notice to terminate such agreement expires.

"The President shall affirm, modify, or reverse such findings, but to the extent he affirms the same he shall immediately issue his proclamation directing the parties to continue operation of sufficient facilities (without designating which facilities) as is found necessary to avoid imperiling the national health and safety, as distinguished from public convenience.

"Unless the parties otherwise agree such operations as are continued shall be under the terms and conditions of the existing collective-bargaining agreement; and the price of the product or service shall not be increased during such emergency except in cases where the President finds that due to a rise or fall in the current costs of living and general price structure as compared with those existing when such agreement was entered into, that great hardships will result, he may direct that the wage scale and price of such product or service be accordingly modified, but only pending full agreement of the parties, and he may in any event, pending agreement of the parties, direct the adoption of any safety measures he finds necessary.

"The President shall also include in his proclamation such directions as he deems necessary for the allocation of such reduced product or service, but only pending full agreement of the parties.

"Such proclamation shall be enforceable in any Federal district court having jurisdiction of any party violating the same, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity and for other purposes.'

"The Board, the President, and such court or courts shall retain continuing jurisdiction to review and modify and may when circumstances warrant, and shall when the parties agree, dissolve both the proclamation and any enforcing court decree."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane for the simple reason that it goes far beyond the scope of the legislation and involves price fixing which is not provided for in the bill before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACOBS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that this amendment would fix prices during an emergency if there were a fluctuation in the cost of living or price structure, it is no different from the existing provision which fixes prices as they existed in the collective-bargaining agreement. It is only an escape in case there is a violent fluctuation in the cost of living or in the price structure, but the general purpose of the amendment is to reduce the area of the strike so that we will not be led into permanent price fixing.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire of the gentleman, does the amendment go into price fixing so far as products are concerned?

Mr. JACOBS. It goes into the fixing of prices so far as products are concerned in that area where a strike is forbidden, because the production would then be limited on account of the cutting back of the area of the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Indiana has offered an amendment, which has been reported, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] makes a point of order against it on the ground that it is not germane. The Chair has examined the amendment, and has submitted a question to the gentleman from Indiana which he has answered very frankly.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment providing for fixing prices for products is beyond the scope of the pending bill, and is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JACOBS. Would it be proper to offer an amended substitute with that portion stricken at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer another amendment, and if the question is raised the Chair would pass on it. The gentleman is recognized to offer another amendment.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: Strike out all of line 2 on page 23 and all the following through page 26, and insert the following:

"301. The United States Conciliation Service shall immediately certify to the President all notices, under section 8 (c) of title 1 of this act, whereby it is proposed to terminate or modify any collective-bargaining agreements covering a substantial portion of any industry. If the President believes a resultant work stoppage therein is likely and would, if it occurred, imperil national health and safety he shall immediately appoint and convene an Emergency Board composed of such persons and to be compensated as he directs.

"302. Such Board shall immediately hold public hearings, affording all interested parties full opportunity to be heard. It shall have available such facilities and assistance as the President shall direct, and shall investigate, hear evidence, and make findings and recommendations and report the same to the President as follows:

"(a) The normal amount of production or services in that portion of the industry covered and, separately the normal amount of production or services in that portion of the industry not covered, by such agreement.

"(b) The minimum amount of production or service covered by such agreement which will be necessary to avoid endangering the national health and safety (as distinguished from the public convenience), taking into consideration the amount of the finished product available at the time of the hearing.

"(c) The positions of the respective parties to the agreement or dispute.

"(d) Such recommendations as the Board deems just for a settlement of the dispute, together with its written reasons therefor.

"The report and recommendations shall be returned to the President, made public and a copy thereof filed with the United States Conciliation Service at least 5 days before the final notice to terminate such agreement expires.

"The President shall affirm, modify, or reverse such findings, but to the extent he affirms the same he shall immediately issue his proclamation directing the parties to continue operation of sufficient facilities (without designating which facilities) as is found necessary to avoid imperiling the national health and safety, as distinguished from public convenience.

"Unless the parties otherwise agree such operations as are continued shall be under the terms and conditions of the existing collective-bargaining agreement; and the price of the product or service shall not be increased during such emergency, except in cases where the President finds that due to a rise or fall in the current costs of living and general price structure as compared with those existing when such agreement was entered into, that great hardships will result, he may direct that the wage scale be modified, but only pending full agreement of the parties, and he may in any event, pending agreement of the parties, direct the adoption of any safety measures he finds necessary.

"The President shall also include in his proclamation such directions as he deems necessary for the allocation of such reduced product or service, but only pending full agreement of the parties.

"Such proclamation shall be enforceable in any Federal district court having jurisdiction of any party violating the same, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity and for other purposes.'

"The Board, the President and such court or courts shall retain continuing jurisdiction to review and modify and may when circumstances warrant, and shall when the parties agree, dissolve both the proclamation and any enforcing court decree."

Mr. JACOBS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, because it is exactly the same as the previous amendment except that the words pertaining to price fixing have been stricken out.

Mr. RANKIN. I object, Mr. Chairman. Let us hear the reading of this amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, for the reason that it injects new matter into the bill in two or three different places. In the first place, this is not a public-health bill. The President is given power under this amendment to exercise under certain conditions involving the public health, which is not involved in the measure before the House. Again, it provides for the distribution of the material and for the price-fixing of the material that is to be produced. From every parliamentary standpoint, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Indiana has offered an amendment, which has been reported. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

In response to the argument offered by the gentleman from Mississippi that it is sought to inject something new in the pending provision, of course if an amendment did not seek to make some change in a pending provision there would be no purpose in offering the amendment.

The Chair has examined the amendment with considerable care. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment deals with specific powers of the President of the United States in relation to labor disputes. In response to the argument offered by the gentleman from Mississippi that the proposed amendment affects public health, the Chair invites attention to the fact that the Sims substitute relates to public health and safety.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] is germane, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the Chair to recognize all Members who were standing at the time of the adoption of the motion, including those who had amendments to the pending substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to ask the indulgence of the Committee to make a statement on that point. The Chair invites attention to the fact that debate on the Sims substitute and all amendments thereto has been limited to 30 minutes. The Clerk has listed the names of 19 Members standing at the time. The Chair assumes that all 19 Members were seeking recognition. The fact is that several amendments to the Sims substitute are on the Clerk's desk. The Chair cannot know, of course, whether all of those listed desire recognition on amendments which are to be offered or whether they want to move to strike out the last word in order to obtain recognition to speak. The Chair will call the names of those Members listed and, if any of those called do not desire recognition, the Chair would appreciate being so advised.

The Chair will recognize the Members on the list.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, a minute and a half is a very short time to discuss a matter which is so fraught with significance. The amendment I have offered is offered in perfectly good faith, with reference to a problem which faces the Nation, which will eventually have to be solved by an approach different from what we have ever taken before. Heretofore we have enjoined an entire strike. We have done that for a certain length of time. We recognize that we have no right to force men to work permanently unless we fix their wages. But the strike is enjoined for 80 days. What are we going to do when the 80 days are up? Eventually we are going to fix wages, and ultimately we will fix prices. Ultimately, then, we will have a controlled economy. The purpose of my amendment is to survey the production of an industry where the dispute arises and determine what amount of production is necessary in order to safeguard the public health and safety. The President then issues a proclamation directing the parties to keep in production sufficient facilities to produce what is necessary to safeguard the public health and safety. In the balance of the field the strike is free to proceed. If either of the parties violates the proclamation of the President the courts may take such steps as are proper to enforce the proclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYLE: On page 10, lines 3 and 7, strike out all of line 3, and that part of line 7 which reads "or in any State law."

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer reserves for the States the power to legislate against what they believe to be injurious practices in their internal commercial and business affairs. It is questionable whether a single member of this House would find such a proposal repugnant or in conflict with his philosophy of American government.

There appears to be an unfortunate attitude in the Chamber today, causing good men to turn their backs upon constructive ideas through fear of assisting in the passage of certain legislation. Whatever your position may be on the Sims amendment, on the Lesinski bill, or the Woods substitute, you cannot rightfully escape the responsibility of sound ideas offered with the intention of perfecting legislation under consideration.

Our American philosophy of government recognizes the sovereignty of our 48 State legislatures within their proper fields. The present bill does violence to that sovereignty, without the adoption of this or a similar amendment protecting the power of the State to legislate within the field of labor relations. I am confident that a majority of this House does not subscribe to this provision of the bill. It is not within our province, nor is it our privilege or obligation to sterilize the State legislatures in this field. Recently the Supreme Court, in the case of *Lincoln Federal Labor Union, et al,* v. *Northwestern Iron & Metal Co.,* said:

This Court, beginning at least as early as 1934, when the Nebbia case was decided, has steadily rejected the due process philosophy enunciated in the Adair-Coppage line of cases. In doing so it has consciously returned closer and closer to the earlier constitutional principle that States have power to legislate against what are found to be injurious practices in their internal commercial and business affairs, so long as their laws do not run afoul of some specific Federal constitutional prohibition, or of some valid Federal law. See *Nebbia* v. *United States,* supra, at 523–524, and *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish,* supra, at 392–395, and cases cited. Under this constitutional doctrine the due process clause is no longer to be so broadly construed that the Congress and State legislatures are put in a straitjacket when they attempt to suppress business and industrial conditions which they regard as offensive to the public welfare.

The amendment I now offer is consistent with the philosophy expressed by the Court. I am disturbed, however, not because of any lack of soundness in the proposal I advocate, but because I fear that those who are opposed to the bill as a whole will turn their backs upon the validity of the proposal, hoping that it will defeat the entire measure. No man in this House, I sincerely hope, would deliberately do away with the soundness and integrity of the State legislatures, yet if you refuse to adopt this amendment, you have, in effect, contributed materially to such a circumstance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WORLEY moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hate to resort to this parliamentary device in order to secure time to speak on this bill. However, I believe the seriousness of the legislation we are considering fully justifies such action.

I believe that the rank and file of the American people feel that there is some middle ground which will not allow labor to be exploited nor which will give labor

a license to ride roughshod over management. I am trying my very best, and I believe all of us are, to be as fair as we can; but today there seems to be two distinct extremes. I can no more follow the gentleman from Michigan in his original Lesinski bill than I can at this time subscribe to the so-called Wood bill. It seems to me that the fair approach to this would be—and it is admittedly a compromise between the two extreme views—is the Sims substitute, with additional amendments. I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] will, if adopted, be an additional basis for both factions to work on. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we can agree on a bill which will be fair, completely fair to both management and to labor, and at the same time protect the welfare of the general public.

I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LYLE) there were—ayes 63, noes 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURKE: On page 15, line 21, after line 20, strike out all of lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 on page 15, all of page 16 and lines 1 through 8, inclusive, on page 17.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out of the Sims substitute the provision calling for the filing of the anti-Communist affidavit. I do not believe I need to go into the reasons too deep and certainly I cannot in the time allotted me.

Although I quite agree with my colleague from Texas [Mr. COOMBS] on the subject that we in the House of Representatives and public employees have filed such an affidavit, certainly when we stood in the well of the House and took our oath of office we in effect did the same thing. I quite agree with that. But this provision requires people in private enterprise, both employee and employer, to sign a loyalty oath in order to conduct their regular calling in life. To me that is the wrong approach to the subject and I do not think it cures the situation that we propose to remedy. I would much prefer a more positive approach to this subject by requiring that members or officers of corporations, unions, and what not shall not be permitted to be such officers if they are members of subversive organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Sims bill as a substitute for the original Lesinski bill. I am doing this because I believe that the original Lesinski bill if it comes to a vote will be defeated by the Wood bill which bears a strong resemblance to the Taft-Hartley bill.

Rather than burden labor for the next years with this legislation, I shall support the amended Lesinski or Sims bill, as the best compromise that can be had from this House. I do this with reluctance but with the firm conviction that it is the only course open to us and that it is for the best interests of labor.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY to pending Sims substitute: Page 16, line 24, after the word "method", strike out the remainder of line 24, line 25, on page 16, and lines 1 through 8, inclusive, on page 17 and insert the following:

"The Board shall not require the filing of any such affidavit as to any union or employer which by its constitution, charter, or articles of partnership or association has the effect of prohibiting any officers thereof from being a member of any of the organizations above specified if such prohibition is being enforced in good faith. Any such affidavit shall, for the purpose of this subsection, be conclusive upon the Board as to the statements contained therein. The provisions of section 35A of the Criminal Code shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the pending legislation in general debate 1 week ago today I stated and I quote:

There is no place in these United States for a second-class citizenship such as is set up under the Taft-Hartley law.

I was, of course, referring directly to the anti-Communist affidavit that is required in the Taft-Hartley Act of all union groups as a prerequisite for using the facilities of the Labor Relations Board in labor-management disputes.

The proposed Wood bill and the Sims substitute just offered serve only to enlarge the scope of this discrimination. They merely add the employers to the list of citizens whose loyalty is under suspicion. Two wrongs never made anything right. Such discrimination as is contained in all three of the proposals is unfair and has no proper place in the scope of labor-management relations.

While the amendment I have just proposed does not remove the onus of assumption of guilt from all of the individuals covered under this provision, it does serve to protect a large part of both labor and management who have given evidence of their loyalty by having set up within their constitution and bylaws proper safeguards against disloyalty and subversive activities.

Many of these groups anticipated even the action of the Congress 2 years ago by having set up several years prior to the Taft-Hartley law their own safeguards within their membership against the activities which are sought to be corrected by both the Wood proposal and the Sims substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Florida: On page 11 between lines 22 and 23 insert a new subsection (4), as follows:

"(4) (A) To refuse to grant membership to persons, having the qualifications generally required, upon the same terms and conditions generally required; or

"(B) To penalize a member or a subordinate body for criticizing or demanding an explanation of the conduct of its officers or agents; or

"(C) In any event to penalize a member or a subordinate body without written charges; adequate notice thereof with copy of such charge attached; and a hearing before a tribunal composed of disinterested persons with opportunity to produce favorable witnesses and cross-examine adverse witnesses."

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced two amendments to this bill, one of which is set out in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A2570, and the other which we have heard read just now.

This latter one gets at the chief evil that sometimes arises out of the closed-shop situation. There are good things about a closed shop and there are bad things about a closed shop. This particular provision is primarily designed to see to it that no man is refused the opportunity to join a union. It says that you can have a closed shop, but you cannot refuse to let a man join a union if he is qualified.

Point (B) makes it an improper labor practice for a union to penalize a member or subordinate body for criticizing or demanding an explanation of the conduct of its officers or agents.

Point (C) makes it an unfair labor practice in any event to penalize a member or a subordinate body without written charges upon adequate notice.

The main objectives of the provison of this amendment are to get at some problems which have arisen in the labor movement in the past. I think they are each salutary and each is a thing which you have thought about before, and I hope you see fit to approve this particular amendment.

The other amendment I shall offer is set out on page A2570 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is designed to give a tax incentive for the establishment of profit-sharing plans. Personally, as I have said before on the floor of this House, I feel that something like that perhaps may make unnecessary all the rules and regulations we have established in the past and are establishing here today. What we need is more harmony, more cooperation, more pro-

ductivity. An amendment of the kind I am suggesting here I think would bring that about.

I am speaking now on both my amendments, since because of the limitation of time I shall have only one opportunity to take the floor. I do hope you will see fit to act favorably on both the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Florida to the Sims substitute: On page 10, after line 2, insert the following:

"PROFIT SHARING AS INDUCEMENT TO BETTER LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

"SEC. 109. (a) Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(bb) Amounts paid by corporations to employees as a share of profits—

"'(1) In general: If a corporation, prior to the beginning of any taxable year, adopts a plan legally obligating itself to pay to its employees a percentage of its profits for such year, 150 percent of the amount of the profits paid for such year under such plan to any employee shall be deductible under this subsection for the taxable year in which paid, and no part of such amount payable to such employee shall be deductible for any taxable year under any other subsection of this section.

"'(2) Special rules: The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply—

"'(A) only if every employee who is employed by the taxpayer for more than 150 days during the taxable year for which the plan is adopted is entitled to share in the profits for such year; and

"'(B) only if the amounts payable under the plan do not discriminate in favor of employees who are officers, shareholders, persons whose principal duties consist in supervising the work of other employees, or highly compensated employees; and

"'(C) only to amounts paid to an employee before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of the taxable year of the corporation for which such amounts are paid, and only to so much of such amounts paid as does not exceed 25 percent of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued during such taxable year to such employee. In the case of a corporation on the accrual basis, amounts paid after the close of the taxable year of the accrual of such amounts and before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such year shall, for the purposes of paragraph (1), be considered as paid in the year of accrual.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948."

And renumber the remaining titles and sections of the bill accordingly.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, in order to save the time of the Committee, since this amendment relates to profit sharing, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the Sims amendment: On page 24, after line 15, strike out sections 303, 304, and 305, running from page 24, line 16, to page 26, line 22, and substitute the following:

"SEC. 303. Whenever the President, having acted pursuant to this section 302 and to section 301, finds after investigation and proclaims that a labor dispute has resulted in, or imminently threatens to result in the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in an industry essential to the national health or security of sufficient magnitude to imperil or imminently threaten to imperil the national health or security, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to preserve and protect the national health or security, the President is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto, and by order to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or facility, the subject of such labor dispute, and to use and to operate such plant, mine, or facility in the interests of the United States: *Provided, however,* That (1) such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of the United States and while operated in its interests, shall be operated only to the minimum extent which seems to the President necessary to protect the national health or security of the United States, or of a material part of the territory or population thereof; and (2) the wages and other terms of employment in the plant, mine, or facility so taken, during the period of Government possession and operation shall be as prescribed by the President pursuant to the applicable provisions of law, and to the findings of a board appointed for the purpose by the President, which wages and other terms of employment shall be not less than those prevailing for similar work in the area of such plant, mine, or facility by private business; and (3) such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 30 days after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or facility, that the possession and operation, thereof, by the United States, or in its interest, is no longer necessary to insure the minimum operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the national health or security; and (4) the President may by order confer authority upon any Government department or officer to take possession of, to operate, or to exercise any other of the powers herein granted to the President with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility; and (5) fair and just compensation shall be paid to the employer for the period of such possession and operation by the United States, or in its interests, as follows:

"(A) The President shall determine the amount of the compensation to be paid as rental for the use of such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of or operated by the United States, or in its interests, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder.

"(B) If the employer is unwilling to accept as a fair and just compensation for the use of the property taken hereunder by the United States and as full and complete compensation therefor, the amount so determined by the President, the employer shall be paid 50 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided by section 24 (20) and 145 of the judicial code (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 41 and 250), for an additional amount which when added to the amount so paid shall be equal to the total sum which the employer considers to be fair and just compensation for the use of the property so taken by the United States."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is the national seizure amendment, which appeared in the RECORD at page 5283. I do not think I need to take the time of the Committee to go into the details of the amendment. Its five major points are as follows:

First, the property is not to be operated on a strikebreaking basis, but it is to be operated by the Government only to the minimum extent required to preserve or protect the public health or security. Second, the employees—those who choose to remain on the job—are to be paid not less than prevailing wages in the area, and a special board is to consider the wage scales during Government control. Third, the Government is to pay only just compensation for the value of its use of the seized property, and is not to operate for the account of the employer as if it were a going concern. Fourth, the property is to be restored to its owner when normal labor relations have been restored. Fifth, the President is given authority, not direction, and may act through an officer or department.

The point is that the disquiet which people have had, and which was the public fear played upon during the last Congress to get support for a law like the Taft-Hartley law, was the fear of national paralysis due to a strike or labor conflict.

The debates on the question of the use of the injunction in national emergencies have clearly shown that labor regards injunctions which seek to make men work against their wills as opposed to the rights of freemen and as involuntary servitude. If the Nation is to have the residual power to protect itself against a paralyzing condition as a result of a great labor conflict, this amendment shows the way in which it can have it.

It is likely that this is the last opportunity which will be had to so revise the Sims substitute as to attract those who are friends of labor and who are genuinely anxious to truly repeal the Taft-Hartley law and at the same time genuinely anxious to protect and defend the public interest.

The President is said to have power under the Constitution to protect the country in the event of national emergencies, but we all should recognize, first, that no one knows who will be in the Presidency at some future time; and second, that the President is unlikely to want to alarm the whole country that a labor dispute may result in national paralysis in a particular State or particular part of the country, by declaring that he must exercise his constitutional powers to keep public order. Furthermore, there are no provisions in the law which tell the President what to do in such an event and how to do it; how to protect labor, or how to protect the employer.

As bearing on this subject it is interesting to consider the testimony of Hon. William H. Davis, Chairman of the War

Labor Board during most of the war, who in his testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the other body, said in his prepared statement dated February 7, 1949:

The history of the Taft-Hartley law illustrates and confirms what I have just said. There have been six cases in which the President has declared a national emergency under the Taft-Hartley law. In two of them, the meat-packing case and the telephone case, no injunction was sought. In the coal dispute of March 1948 involving the miners' welfare fund, an injunction was issued on April 3. The strike, however, continued until April 12, when it was announced that a new neutral trustee had been appointed and that he and Mr. Lewis had approved a plan under which the welfare fund might be activated. Thereupon the miners went back to work. In the three remaining cases injunctions were issued, but the disputes were not settled in the 80-day period, and in each case the injunction was discharged at the end of that period, leaving the workers free to strike. In the atomic-energy case, under the tremendous pressure of the national interest in the atomic-energy program, the parties continued their negotiations without a strike and, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, finally negotiated an agreement. In the west-coast maritime case the injunction was discharged at the end of the 80-day period, and the strike was called and continued for over 3 months. In the east-coast maritime case the 80-day period also expired without settlement, and the longshoremen were on strike for several weeks.

* * * * *

Since the Taft-Hartley law does not extend protection by injunction beyond the cooling-off period, the real question that arises on comparison of the Taft-Hartley Act with the proposal now under consideration by this committee is merely the question whether the injunction is a good or necessary means of preventing a strike during the cooling-off period.

I think all the evidence is to the contrary. In no case in which an injunction issued under the Taft-Hartley law has there been settlement of the controversy during any cooling-off period. On the other hand, the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, which are the pattern for the substitute now proposed, have never failed in any significant case to secure the cooling-off period of 60 days. I think the reason is that an injunction compelling a man to work even temporarily for a private employer—and that is the practical effect of the Taft-Hartley injunctions—meets with bitter and profound resentment among freemen. If in any case the cooling-off period of the proposed substitute should be violated, the country would be confronted only by the same kind of revived national emergency that confronts us when under the Taft-Hartley Act the 80-day period expires without settlement of the dispute. Thus, the injunctions devised to support the cooling-off period is an irritant during that period and is not available if the emergency persists after that period.

I believe that this amendment is necessary and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 72, noes 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES: On page 16, line 20, of the Sims amendment, after the word "party" insert the words "or with any Fascist organization."

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one that every Member of this House who is opposed to totalitarianism and subversive organizations can sincerely support. It would correct one of the many unjust provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and a provision which is also in the Wood and Sims substitutes.

If a labor-management bill is to contain a clause for non-Communist affidavits, then it is only reasonable to have included therein a provision for non-Fascist oaths.

I do not have the time to fully discuss the merits of this amendment, but if we are going to be honest with ourselves and with management and labor, then we will adopt this amendment. The change that the Wood bill and the Sims substitute makes in this section of the Taft-Hartley Act pertaining to non-Communist affidavits is a subterfuge. No intelligent person will be fooled by the sheer nonsense that you can make this section fair simply by compelling management as well as labor to sign non-Communist oaths. Let both groups sign non-Communist and non-Fascist affidavits if this section is to be a part of the labor-management law. Let us show our attitude toward both brands of totalitarianism.

I regret I do not have time to discuss the potential Fascist danger, but I ask that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RHODES) there were—ayes 161, noes 102.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'SULLIVAN to the Sims amendment: Strike out that part of section 112 on page 16 beginning with line 5, paragraph 1, and ending with the word "method" appearing on line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Every officer, manager, or agent of every labor union, and every officer, manager, or agent of any employer of labor whether employing union or nonunion labor, shall, on July 4, 1949, and yearly thereafter take the following affirmation orally and also in writing, before some person authorized under the laws of the United States of America to administer an affirmation, and shall forthwith transmit the properly executed written oath by registered mail to the United States Secretary of Labor at the then seat of government:

" 'UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

" 'State of ------, ss:

" 'I hereby solemnly affirm that I absolutely, entirely, and forever renounce and adjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I may heretofore have been an affiliate, employee, agent, subject, or citizen; that I will always support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the Government of the United States of America by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods; that I am not now and will never become a member of, or support any such organization, in the future; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservations or purposes of evasion whatsoever, and do so, fully mindful of all of the pains and penalties of perjury; and I fully know and understand that the making of a false affirmation will subject me to prosecution, not only for perjury but also under other applicable laws of the United States of America relating to subversive and other illegal, kindred activities.

" 'In acknowledgment whereof I have hereunto affixed my signature this ____ day of ------, 19__.

" 'Subscribed, etc.' "

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that a rousing "No" will be the answer to my proposed amendment, and I hate to detain you from the kill, but I feel that I must cause you this temporary embarrassment by speaking to you 1½ minutes at this time.

From listening to the reading of the proposed amendment you can readily understand that there is substituted for the anti-Communist affidavit an affirmation of allegiance to the United States Constitution and laws. I believe that it is wrong to so advertise communism as is done in the Sims amendment, and give foreign agents of Russia and other people the impression that they have not only infiltrated the ranks of labor leaders but now the ranks of business leaders.

It is indeed a shame to give out this impression. I regard it as a great disservice to our country to do so and hope you may see fit to correct this wrong impression by adopting my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KLEIN) there were—ayes 102, noes 171.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Page 24, line 15, after the words "duties of such board.", strike out all of sections 303 and 304.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I have introduced this amendment to strike from the so-called compromise labor bill, H. R. 2032, the court injunction provision as applied to labor disputes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two things we have outlawed in this country: One, the blacklist, and the other, the court injunction in labor disputes. Well do I remember as a boy when the great ARU railway strikes swept over the country, that many railroad men, trained by years of service, were blacklisted. They left their homes and sought employment all over the United States, only to return to their homes without any employment and without any means of support. We have outlawed blacklists in this country, but now we must outlaw these court injunctions that arrest progress and stop

the advancement in this country. I very well remember the difficulties that attended the advancement of labor. We were all very much interested a few years ago before the First World War in the movement in France on the part of the railroad men to strike for better working conditions and better pay. They had military conscription in France. The Government simply called the railroad men to the colors and told them to run the railroads, and that was the end of the strike and the movement for advanced wages and improved labor conditions. Compare labor and business conditions in France with the labor and living conditions in this country today, and decide if we want the courts here to arrest progress as the Army did in France.

Mr. Chairman, by our wise and constructive policies in dealing with labor, this country has made great progress in our generation. We have demonstrated our superiority in labor production, in finance, and in military prowess. Today, our Nation stands preeminent among world powers. People from all over the world are clamoring for admittance to this country that they may come in and enjoy the fruits of the toil. of American labor, and the blessings of good government, that the wise policies our Nation have vouchsafed to us and our children.

We must not arrest progress by giving power to any judge to force the members of organized labor to work against their will. Many of us remember the drastic treatment of organized labor by the courts in the famous or infamous Danbury Hatters' case, when the courts awarded damages to the manufacturers against the union, whose members were dispossessed of their homes and made destitute by court proceedings in collecting the damages awarded their former employers.

Members of the Committee, I ask your support of this amendment to strike from the bill the provision that gives the courts the power to issue injunctions in labor disputes and force the laborers to work against their will.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE of Idaho) there were—ayes 103, noes 181.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALE. How much time is left on the Sims amendment? I thought debate was limited to a half hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee did limit it, but this is like a football game, the time counts while the ball is in play.

Mr. HALE. I want to know how much time is left.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair invites attention to the fact that much time has been required in reading the amendments. Some of them have been quite long. There have been a number of parliamentary inquiries and several points of order. That time does not count. The motion was that debate be limited to a certain time, and debate means when debate is in progress.

Mr. HALE. I would still like to know how much time remains for debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Twelve Members are entitled to a minute and a half each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken heretofore in this debate, and time does not now permit me to elaborate at length on something which I think is very important. I wish to emphasize this thinking for your consideration for the balance of your voting. But there are two fundamental principles of action facing us as Congressmen, to choose between this day. I will say to you frankly I think we ought to choose the bill which imposes the least legal regulations in the field of labor-management. Only by imposing the least possible body of law in the field of labor-management can we have free collective bargaining to which I have heard no objection in this debate. Since we believe in free collective bargaining, then your vote and my vote must be in favor of the bill which imposes the least amount of law on labor and management in the field of labor-management relationships. The American home is the most intimate relationship which exists in America. It is the most importan relationship existing in America. The next most intimate relationship is in the field of labor-management. You cannot successfully handle the field of labor-management by legalistic restrictions and penalties.

Free collective bargaining is an absolute requisite if we are to have increased understanding and cooperation between labor and management. This relationship of labor and management is one of copartnership interests. And only by strengthening processes whereby there can be the utmost free collective discussion and going forth together, can there be enduring and stronger bonds of cooperation under our capitalistic system of free enterprise.

The Democratic national platform in Philadelphia, was written in favor of repealing the Taft-Hartley law which was enacted by the Eightieth Congress. Upon this platform which included that specific provision, President Harry Truman of the United States, vigorously campaigned from border to border of our great Nation and spoke out emphatically for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. One of the greatest compliments President Truman has received, in my judgment, is that which is contained in Look magazine for May 10, 1949, wherein Republican Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, from Ohio, under his own signature spoke of President Truman and said in part as follows:

> But he is a man of his word and he means to keep his promises

The Taft-Hartley bill as enacted by the Eightieth Congress surrounded the area of labor-management relationships with new and untried legalism, prohibitions, restraints and restrictions which were, and still are, contrary to the best interests of mutuality in collective bargaining. Therefore, believing as I do, that this field of economic relationships as between employer and employee is next in importance to that of the relationships of the human family, and their individual homes, I must declare that I feel that the least law that can be injected into this strategic human relationship of employer and employee, the better.

As the Wood amendment and the Sims substitute now stand before us, the Wood amendment to the administration bill is much more wrapped up with substantially the same penalties, prohibitions, restrictions and legal terminology as is contained in the Taft-Hartley bill. This no one has denied. No one on this floor in these days of debate, has defended the Taft-Hartley bill as was written by the Eightieth Congress. Republican leadership frankly admits that there must be substantial amendments to the Taft-Hartley bill as written by the Eightieth Congress.

When the voters of our Nation chose between Harry Truman and Governor Dewey on the issue of labor-management legislation, knowing that Democratic national platform specifically provided for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill, enacted in the Eightieth Congress, it amounted to a mandate to the Eighty-first Congress, regardless of party, that the Taft-Hartley bill should be repealed and in its place and stead substantially the sort of legislation which President Truman should ask on labor-management should be enacted. This is as I see it.

The fact is, the joint Congress watchdog committee created by the Eightieth Congress admitted in its final report on the functioning of the Taft-Hartley bill in its report of December 31 that material changes were needed, the main ones being substantially as follows:

> (1) That certified election no longer be required as prerequisite to a union shop; (2) that management representatives, as well as labor's, be required to file non-Communist affidavits; (3) that the NLRB's jurisdiction be narrowed to exclude most small business; (4) that a vote of employees on the employer's last offer not be necessary before a strike can be called; (5) that unions and employees who strike to obtain working conditions made illegal by the act be deprived of protection given by the act; (6) that unions be required to reimburse workers denied access to their jobs by coercive picketing.

Few people realize that the basic labor laws which have been enacted by Congress such as the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act are allowable as Federal legislation only because of article I, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution which says:

> Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

And, Mr. Chairman, probably no other clause of our Constitution has been the subject of more strenuous litigation and literally hundreds of cases involving such

clauses have been tried and determined by the United States Supreme Court. Consequently, Congress has been defined as "intercourse for the purpose of trade." Interstate commerce now includes pipe lining of fuel, telephone and telegraph, insurance, and endless other subjects not readily conceived of by our forefathers who drafted article I, section 8, clause 3.

And when the voters of America, who thought enough of their great Nation and their duties of citizenship, to go to the polls and vote at the last Presidential election, and did so, they manifestly voted that not only the text of the Taft-Hartley bill should be repealed as advocated by President Truman, but they expected that the political philosophies of the Taft-Hartley bill should likewise be repealed. So today, unless the Wood law is so changed that it would never be recognized as embodying the spirit or the text of the original Taft-Hartley law, the American people have not had their way.

Surely no Member of this important body is so naive as to not recognize that there is continuous and strenuous challenge back and forth on an economic basis, as between labor and management. Surely the facts of the case belittle any claim to the contrary. Management naturally is in business from the monetary profit and gain motives. And that is what we expect them to make and have. That is the motive which makes the American way of life have the greatest attractiveness, as compared with the communistic philosophy we have no use for. So I do not criticize big business for wanting big profits. In a like manner labor, in order to have adequate purchasing power to buy the products of the shops and factories of American management, must have adequate wages and income. Else, Mr. Speaker, neither management nor labor in America will continue to raise their standard of living nor increase the production of American business. Therefore, labor is dependent on management and management is dependent on labor. There is 100 percent mutual interdependency between America's big business and America's individual workingman. But that individual workingman cannot longer survive economically, in this era of mass production and mass bargaining, unless he has the opportunity of free collective bargaining. Big business knows this and recognizes it. It is only human enough to not voluntarily give in to organized labor more than it reasonably has to by reason of collective bargaining or by legislation. If it is done by legislation it is but temporary in my judgment.

Nor can it be soundly argued it is necessary to pass penalizing statutes against labor in order to protect the public interest throughout our Nation, because, in many States, all types of economic security contracts are prohibited and there are ample laws in all the States against violence and force and duress. The fact that in any instance the State law is not enforced on occasion is no justification for the enactment of the Federal law to supersede the State law. That is bad in my judgment. It is imperative that citizens at the local and State levels assume and discharge, with dispatch, their own responsibilities for the enacting; for the observances; for the enforcement of State statutes. This applies to labor-management, as well as to any other subject.

So, the final and ultimate test of any legal enactment in the field of labor-management is whether it encourages and strengthens cooperation and collective bargaining between free democratic labor unions and free democratic management, so as to reach the desired goal of a growing, stable, expanding, and productive economy. In this very debate, on the minority side, has been admission and agreement that strong, healthy labor unions free to collectively bargain, are an effective economic counterinfluence to some of the evils and destructive influences of monopolistic, industrial, and financial aggregations operating in violation of our antitrust laws. These facts of monopoly trends and excessive corporate profits have been so frequently related during this debate that I will not again repeat them.

May I say, that it is most surprising to me that you distinguished members on the Republican side of this House, who so habitually plead against having the finger of Government in the field of private business and private enterprise, nevertheless, equally or even more emphatically, urge the extension and continuance of the finger of Federal Government controls and power, in the intimate field of human relationships as related to labor and management. This, to me, is inconsistent.

And if you on the Republican side of this House feel that I, a registered Democrat, am too emphatic in my position that the Sims substitute is the soundest bill before us this day, then I call your attention to the fact that one the foremost Republican United States Senators, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, during the debate in the United States Senate during the Eightieth Congress, said of the economic struggle as between labor and management as follows, as to Taft-Hartley bill:

> As I see it, these two great economic forces, management and labor, have girded themselves for battle. We have an economic war ahead of us. We are to have a test of economic strength.
>
> One of the reasons why I oppose this bill is that, in my judgment, an attempt is being made so to change the law that it will not carry out the principles of equality in collective bargaining for which I have pleaded in this session of Congress. One of the objections I shall make is that I believe that the bill will not result in a fair equalizing of the rights of labor and management. Management under this bill will be given such an advantage over labor that it can prevent effective collective bargaining by unions. I am such a firm believer in government by law rather than by man that I do not want to see legislation enacted which in many cases will force a test of defiance of law because enforcement of it would result in great injustices. When a large body of people believe that a law is unjust, they are going to exert the basic, fundamental right which exists in a free society to oppose the administration of such a law.

And as we come to vote, I again emphasize for your consideration, that I believe the soundest principle of legislation to apply in the field of labor-management is, that there shall be the least amount of law entering in that field, consistent with the exercise of the police power of the State when necessary and for the preservation of law and order. There is no other way whereby the American way of life can be strengthened more, than that labor-management relationship shall be enabled to bargain more freely and collectively, rather than to have unnecessary and multitudinous legalistic provisions and prohibitions specifying their daily conduct; when they full well would do it better without such legal dictation, control, and legal compulsion.

In closing, I think I quote the distinguished minority leader of this House fairly accurately, when I refresh your memories, that within the last few hours he stated substantially, that he believed labor and management could sit down together and come to an understanding and that he recognized that they were two great powerful forces opposing each other. I believe the same. Therefore, I believe that it is important that there be the least statutory regulation enforced, as between labor and management, and not a maximum, as is the status of the Taft-Hartley—or rather the Wood bill as it is now called. But it is still the Taft-Hartley bill in essence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the Chairman has mentioned that the debate is being carried along as in a football game. There is another similarity to a football game, it seems to me, in our present situation. We have all seen occasions when the team with the ball, no matter what it does, seems to be unable to get it forward toward the goal and the team goes backward. The majority seems to be in that fix. I hope it will soon be fourth down and the other side get the ball. Whatever they want to say about us here in the Eighty-first Congress, they certainly can see that we are willing to work. We are busy perfecting three bills, when we cannot possibly pass but one. Personally, I would be just as well satisfied if we did not pass any, unless we improve the situation.

It is regrettable that legislation as important to national welfare as labor-management relations should be considered in an atmosphere of exaggeration, of make-believe, particularly when to this ficticious approach there is added the tension and recrimination that inevitably results from the opening of old sores. The outcome is almost certain to be unsatisfactory to everybody.

That the extensive and skillful debates of the last week were largely distorted by the background of make-believe is obvious, if one dispassionately reviews the RECORD.

Even at this late hour, we are still subjected to the hoarse cries of repeal Taft-Hartley, because it stands for slave labor and union-busting. We are continually reminded that there is a mandate from the voters to take such action. That it should be taken at once to redress the great wrongs done organized labor by the labor-baiting Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. It is upon this combination of fabrications that

the present debate rests. It makes the whole show sadly inopportune.

Any fair-minded, impartial observer will recognize the truth of these charges. Despite all the breast-beating and oratory, no one has yet pointed out any slave sections in the 1947 act. No one has named any union that has been busted, or individual enslaved.

Likewise, it is a matter of common knowledge that there has been a substantial decrease in picket line rough stuff, goon tactics, racketeering, irresponsible work stoppages and Communists working into positions of power in the labor field. A sound approach would be to allow the Taft-Hartley law to operate long enough to reasonably determine its merits and defects. If impatience forbids this restraint, we should then consider the various changes recommended one by one.

The mandate theory is equally fallacious. It is true that outright repeal was called for in the Democratic platform and its candidate was elected by a small margin. However, the same election returned a majority to this body who had voted to override the Presidential veto of the very same law.

Many of us were reelected from marginal districts after campaigns in which credit was claimed for that very thing. The question of mandate could be made to read both ways, if there had been a mandate. The past election was too close, and the issues too numerous, to show any even if the all-out smear to which the law was subjected had left its import clear to many.

When this body voted 275 to 37 last Friday against the Marcantonio amendment, there was an overwhelming admission that only a handful of Members really desire outright repeal. That exploded both the mandate idea, and the sanctity of campaign promises, as well.

Since a large majority was unwilling to accept outright repeal, and even some of the calamity howlers do not wish to do away with the injunction features, why make ourselves ridiculous by passing a patchwork measure that pleases no one and does not even indicate a policy. I think it would be far better if we recommitted the bill to the committee for the consideration it so clearly never got there, before being reported out and brought to this floor.

Let us stop pretending that we must hurriedly release anybody from slavery or shield any union, not Communist controlled, from destruction. Let us be realistic about mandate and campaign promises. Let us do nothing that we cannot perform in a workmanlike manner.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be allotted to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, with great interest and with great patience, I have followed this debate. Strange and unfortunate things have happened since this debate started. Ill-considered statements have been made in an effort to influence the deliberations of this House. One such statement is attributed to one of our colleagues—the statement to the effect that economic war might be declared on the South. Another such statement attributed to the President—to the effect that patronage would be withheld if he were displeased by votes which are to be here taken. Southern delegations have been scorned on the one hand and subjected to pressure on the other.

I am a southerner and I am proud of it. I am an unterrified southerner, and I am not frightened by threats of retaliation nor by any of the ill-considered statements which have been made. I have been a Member of this House for a good many years and I think I know a little something about the character and the courage of Members of Congress. Seldom, if ever, here in this ancient Hall have I met a political coward. I also know the Members of the House who come from the South and I think I can safely say that most of them are free and unfettered and that among them you will not find a single political coward. Not even the President of this great Republic can black-jack them into a violation of their consciences. Any Member of this House who is influenced by threats of retaliation or who will let his conscienced be coerced by the hope of political patronage is unworthy to represent any of the great districts of this country. Let us put aside such foolish things and deal with each other as men and as Members of the legislative branch of the greatest Government on earth.

Some other rather ridiculous statements have also been made concerning the situation in which we find ourselves. We are told that when the President advocated and urged a repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and when he embraced the platform of the Democratic Party, which likewise promised a repeal of that act, that neither the President nor the platform meant what they said, that actually they only meant to repeal the name of the act but not to substantially change the provisions of the act. Both the Democratic platform and the President called for a repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and not just the name, Taft-Hartley. Certainly there is nothing offensive about the name Taft and there is nothing obnoxious about the name of Hartley, but there are definitely some provisions of that law that are objectionable to the public, offensive to labor, and incompatible to the spirit of a free people.

It seems to me when all the evidence is weighed and when all the pertinent facts and circumstances are considered, that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed, that the Wood substitute should be defeated, and that the committee bill should be enacted. This, I believe, is not only in the interest of labor but is likewise in the interest of industry and is definitely in the interest of the general welfare.

I shall vote for some amendments to the committee bill and I hope that it may be amended. In casting my vote I shall be influenced only by my conscience and by no other considerations.

Not one of us would deprive labor of its inherent right to strike—not one of us would deprive labor of the privileges of collective bargaining and not one of us should be willing to impair the right nor to mitigate the power of the effective exercise of either the right to strike or to engage in fair collective bargaining.

I am not afraid of the laboring men of this Nation. Neither am I afraid of the labor organizations of America. The laboring men of America are devoted to the institutions of their Republic and to the blessings of freedom which they here enjoy and they realize that the most powerful force in America is now and ever shall be the terrific and dynamic force of outraged public opinion. Therefore the laboring men of America know that they cannot long abuse the powers which their organizations may wield in the life of this Nation. If a vindictive spirit prompted the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, if it was, in fact, a punitive measure, maybe it has accomplished its purpose and has achieved the necessary reformation; so let us reason together in solving the problems now presented. But above all let us not insult the spirit that prompted the writing of the labor plank in the Democratic platform.

Since neither the Lesinski bill nor the Wood bill are entirely satisfactory, it occurs to me that we should be able to find a middle ground upon which to reach an agreement. It seems to me that the Sims amendment provides the vehicle and offers us something in the nature of a compromise. It may not go far enough for some and it may go too far for others. Those who feel that it goes too far should reappraise and revalue the amendments which have been attached to the committee bill. Certainly, the friends of labor should not be afraid to trust the President of the United States. In the first place, the President has not asked for the power and apparently, he does not want the power and if he has not asked for it and does not want it, there is certainly no reason to believe that he would abuse the power or exercise it unreasonably or in a manner incompatible with the security and welfare of the Nation. Although he has not asked for the power of injunction and apparently does not want it, we know that if the health, security, and welfare of the Nation were in danger and the situation indicated that he should have the power, herein proposed, he would step forth and ask for it and it would be granted. So why should we be so disturbed over the thought that the President of the United States might be given a power which he may never use and certainly never abuse.

Actually, we have made a tempest in a teapot over the communistic affidavit provision. We are now in a rather ridiculous position with regard to that provision. There should be no objection to the free-speech amendment or to the other amendments which are incorporated in the Sims substitute. In the campaign of last year, if the President emphasized one issue and if he made his position clear on that one issue, it was certainly in favor of a repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. Now, we are face to face with making the great decision. The Speaker of this House, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and our majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and the chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor, yes; the entire organization on the

Democratic side is supporting the Sims amendment. It is in keeping with our platform pledge and it should be adopted. If we fail to adopt the Sims substitute, all of us now know that we will end up with the Wood bill which does not keep faith with the pledge of our party and we will actually have in effect the Taft-Hartley bill. We may witness industrial strife and unrest and maybe, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, the issue may finally be decided in the picket lines which may encircle the Nation in the days ahead. Under the Sims substitute, we may find a spirit of conciliation and cooperation and industrial peace.

Yes, I am in favor of organized labor just as I am in favor of organized agriculture. The prosperity of agriculture depends upon the prosperity of labor and the prosperity of labor depends upon a prosperous agriculture. Let us keep faith with our party and let us keep faith with our farmers and with the laboring men and women of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friends on the Democratic side that have been reasonable, that I have always supported the position of labor and I tell you that the only opportunity you are going to have to salvage any legislation that will be beneficial to labor is by the adoption of the Sims substitute. If we do not do that what we will have is the Taft-Hartley bill, and labor cannot live under that for another year and a half. I think we would be acting unwisely if we did not take this opportunity, where there is a possible chance of consolidating our forces on this one issue. I do not know whether we can carry this amendment, but if we cannot carry this amendment on the majority side, we will have the Taft-Hartley bill unadulterated as it is today. Do not be misled. The labor leaders are not naive when it comes to legislation. They know what has been going on here. They are not going to be deceived as to who is carrying the ball and what is what. They know.

I appeal to you at this time to support the Sims substitute, in order to salvage even a splinter of benefit to labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for a minute and a half.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the so-called Wood bill. It is the Taft-Hartley bill with a sugar coating. It is composed of 68 pages of complicated phrases and words that will mean practically slavery to organized labor. It is dangerous to labor, management, and the country in general. It violates every sound principle of a constructive labor-management relations statute. It has been rewritten several times by antilabor experts and contains all the objectionable features of the old Taft-Hartley Act. In many instances it strengthens some sections to make it more of a direct blow to organized labor. It puts the executive branch of our Government in the role of a strikebreaker, and it makes the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board a labor czar. He would have complete power to obtain injunctions without investigation, hearings, or charges filed by an employer. This office filled by a labor-hating individual could practically destroy every labor union in our country.

The other features of the bill are just as bad with some slight window trimming. I hope this bill is voted down and that H. R. 2032 is passed without amendments. Organized labor is about to find out whether its efforts in the November elections are to be rewarded. A vote for the Wood bill or the administration substitute—Sims bill—is a vote for the present Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is nearly as much confusion on this floor as some people try to tell us. The very first vote that comes up here is one that we have to keep our eyes on. In that vote the Thomas-Lesinski bill does not enter the picture. I am one of those who is for the Thomas-Lesinski bill; I am hopeful that at some stage of the proceedings I shall have a chance to vote for it. But the first vote that comes on this floor is going to be a vote between the Taft-Hartley law, now called the Wood-Halleck bill, and the Sims bill. The Taft-Hartley law has been scrubbed behind the ears and had a new suit of clothes put on it; that is all the difference there is between the Wood-Halleck bill and the Taft-Hartley law.

The Sims bill does take care of some of the worst objections which working people have had to the Taft-Hartley law. I wish, personally, it went further; there are some parts of it I do not like. But when you reach the next vote which will confront us please note it is between the Sims substitute and the Wood-Halleck bill. All of us who are interested in the welfare of the people of the United States, the welfare of workers and manufacturers, should be voting for the Sims amendment. I hope that the Sims substitute amendment will carry when debate on it stops and the issue is put clearly and straight, which is, I repeat: Shall the Sims amendment be substituted for the Wood amendment?

Mr. Chairman, I also desire to call the attention of the House to the true situation regarding strikes under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley law. So much misinformation has been uttered on this subject that I believe a few simple, statistical facts are in order.

We know now that the Taft-Hartley Act was written by some high-priced behind-the-scenes lobbyists, one of whom was paid for his services by the Republican National Committee. We know that these bill drafters were identified with large, antilabor employer groups and associations, and that their motive in drafting and pushing such legislation was to weaken and disorganize the efforts of labor to improve their living conditions.

But we also know that many of the Members of Congress who voted for that bad law did so in the sincere but misguided hope that it would lessen strikes and labor unrest; that it would promote labor peace.

Most of those sincere Members of Congress, that is, those who came back this year, will vote for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wagner Act improvements provided in the administration bill. They will do so because they were deluded 2 years ago. They were fooled not only as to the motives of those pressing the legislation; they were fooled as to the facts.

For the fact is that there have been more strikes under Taft-Hartley, on a monthly basis, than there were during the first 5 years of the Wagner Act. You will all remember, I am sure, the publicity about labor conflict, when many employers actually disobeyed the Wagner Act and provoked strikes until the Supreme Court upheld its constitutionality 2 or 3 years later.

The newspapers in those days were full of headlines about strikes and labor lawsuits. Yet, when you dig down into the actual statistics of then and now, you come up with an entirely different picture.

Compared with the prewar Wagner Act era, 1935–39, the Taft-Hartley era—July 1947 through last December—has witnessed 8 percent more strikes per month, 50 percent more workers involved, and 80 percent more man-days lost through strikes.

The man-days lost during 1948, last year, amounted to 34,000,000. This was greater than for any prewar year on record.

Now it may be that some of our colleagues were led into error, in those Taft-Hartley votes 2 years ago, by the fact that there was a record number of strikes in 1946. But most of us knew then, and the later strike figures show, that those strikes were almost inevitably a part of postwar readjustment. There was a similar flurry of strikes in 1919, which ended quickly when the economic machine got to moving in peacetime pursuits. So it would have been this time, if the Taft-Hartley Act had not been enacted, over President Truman's veto, to disrupt labor-management relationships.

The Department of Labor's accepted strike statistics show the pattern very clearly, when they are analyzed on a month-to-month basis.

In 18 months after the passage of the Taft-Hartley law—July 1947 through December 1948—259 strikes began, on the average, each month. This level is below the abnormal war and immediate postwar period but is above the 1935–39 average of 239 strikes per month. In other words, the number of stoppages oc-

curring each month since June 1947 has been 8 percent higher than during the 5-year prewar period under the National Labor Relations Act.

On the basis of number of workers involved, the Taft-Hartley period since June 1947 has witnessed, each month, an average of 46,000 more workers on strike than during the more peaceful 1935–39 period, or an increase of 50 percent.

Idleness occasioned by labor-management disputes in the 18 months ending with December 1948 was 80 percent greater than during 1935–39. In round figures, approximately 2,530,000 days of strike idleness were recorded each month since June 1947, as against a prewar monthly average of but 1,410,000 man-days.

Here are the monthly averages:

	Stoppages	Monthly averages	
		Workers	Man-days
1. 1935–39	239	94,000	1,410,000
2. War period, December 1941 to August 1945	334	153,000	829,000
3. Postwar period, September 1945 to June 1947	401	351,000	7,570,000
4. Taft-Hartley period, July 1947 to December 1948	259	140,000	2,530,000

And here is a comparison between the year 1948 and the first 5 years of the Wagner Act:

	1948	1935–39 average
1. Number of stoppages	3,300	2,862
2. Workers involved	1,950,000	1,125,000
3. Number of workers involved in strikes as percent of total employed	5.6	4.4
4. Man-days idle	34,000,000	16,900,000
5. Percent of estimated working time lost in relation to total time worked	0.4	0.3

The facts speak for themselves—there have been more strikes under Taft-Hartley than under the early years of the Wagner Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

I STAND FOR A FAIR DEAL FOR LABOR AND MANAGEMENT UNDER THE LESINSKI LABOR BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, because I realize and recognize the unfairness of the use of injunctions in labor disputes, I have always advocated its elimination. Consequently, I voted to eliminate the injunction clauses from the present bill in the hope that this bill would be fairer and bring about real understanding between capital and labor and between employer and employee. Naturally, I am for the Lesinski bill because I consider it a fair bill. However, in view of the conditions which confront us today, and realizing that after all, legislation in the last analysis is a compromise, I shall vote and urge that we vote for the Sims substitute in the hope that we will then be able to eliminate the Wood monstrosity that is pending, which to my mind, is more objectionable than the Taft-Hartley Act. And in this connection, I am in favor of the Sims amendment notwithstanding the fact that it contains many provisions which I am opposed to. I shall vote for this amendment for the sole purpose of securing some action on this bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I hope that the gentleman, for whom I have a deep and real respect and affection will realize, that by voting for the Sims substitute you are reenacting Taft-Hartley.

Mr. SABATH. No, that is the last thing I propose to do. By voting for the Sims substitute we will at least have some semblance of a fair labor bill. I state again so that there be no misunderstanding, I am opposed to the reenactment of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Chairman, I have always maintained that we should give men a living wage so that they can decently provide for their families and also provide decent working conditions, and I am satisfied that they will not quit their employment. But when laboring men observe in the news and press the tremendous profits their employers are making and the luxuries they are enjoying, they feel that they are entitled to decent treatment and, not being able to obtain it through appeals to their employers, unfortunately, at times, they have been obliged to give up their employment in the hope that their appeals would receive consideration. In years gone by, the employer instead of agreeing to negotiate with labor, would obtain from an overly-friendly corporation judge, on the merest technicality and often without a hearing, an injunction under which a union would be enjoined and its members and officials held in contempt of court and, of course, without a trial by jury, were frequently sentenced to terms of imprisonment. After many years, this outrageous abuse and unfairness was abolished by Congress and, notwithstanding the abolishment of the injunction, labor for many years continued to produce until today our industrial production is from 100 to 150 percent higher, with fewer strikes and, as I have stressed, this higher production having been attained without the use of the injunction.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to the fact that the Congress has received a mandate from the American people to return to the principles of free collective bargaining by repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. This infamous piece of legislation was conceived in hatred and born in anger, fathered by the National Association of Manufacturers, mothered by the Republican Eightieth Congress and nursed by Wall Street and its pawns.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of the statements made against the Lesinski bill by the reactionary Republicans, controlled and dictated to by the National Association of Manufacturers representing the largest and richest industries and aided, unfortunately, by some reactionary Tory Democrats, the vast majority of the American people are satisfied that the Lesinski bill is a fair bill that will beyond doubt bring about more friendly relations between labor and management. It is a bill which will bring about healthier and more peaceful conditions and will insure better understanding and, I repeat, is generally approved by all fair-minded citizens.

It is to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, that companies and corporations which have accumulated the highest profits in their history, which have enabled them to expand their plants with these tremendous profits and thereby increasing their production from 100 to 200 percent, are those behind the opposition to the Lesinski bill.

At this point, I desire to insert as part of my remarks an article appearing in the April issue of the National Farmers Union which directs attention and bears out the profits made by big business in 1948. It is as follows:

BIG BUSINESS 1948 PROFITS ARE BONANZA

The profit report from big business for 1948 is just in, and the grab was even better than most people expected.

We get our information from a March issue of the Wall Street Journal.

A front-page story said: "For business generally it turns out the year 1948 was the most profitable ever. A Wall Street Journal study of the annual reports of 376 important companies in two dozen industries shows these firms had profits of nearly five and a quarter billion dollars last year, more than 23 percent above 1947.

PILED HIGH

The Journal goes on to say "that 1947 earnings were 47.8 percent greater than those of 1946, and that 1946 profits topped 1945 about 34 percent."

* * * * * *

The graph showing the profit taken by groups of industries is sufficient unto itself, but here are a few reports from individual firms that you will be interested in:

National Dairy Products jumped its profit from $23,159,391 in 1947 to $25,358,546 in 1948, or, putting it another way, 1948 profits were $4.03 a common share, compared with $3.68 in 1947.

General Foods hiked its profits from $18,300,000 in 1947 to a fat $24,600,000 in 1948.

The DuPont company did even better. Its 1948 net profits were $157,445,622, compared to $120,009,760 in 1947.

The huge General Motors Corp. skyrocketed profits from $287,991,373 in 1947 to the astronomical figure of $440,447,724 in 1948.

General Electrict didn't do bad either. Net profits in 1948 were $123,835,316, or $30,000,000 more than in 1947.

The railroads were doing all right, too. For instance, the New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad increased net profits 87.75 percent. The 1947 figure was $8,178,733, and 1948 profits equalled well over $15,000,000.

Here are some final profit figures taken at random:

Inland Steel Co.:	
1947	$29,888,558
1948	38,606,698
Standard Oil of California:	
1947	107,268,575
1948	161,491,932
Texas Oil Co.:	
1947	106,312,617
1948	165,980,989
Ohio Oil Co.:	
1947	29,161,496
1948	49,383,158
Sears Roebuck:	
1947	107,739,892
1948	137,206,016
Montgomery Ward:	
1947	59,050,066
1948	68,232,076
Republic Steel:	
1947	31,018,418
1948	46,438,382

The proposed legislation is all-important in that rules and regulations must be formulated in an equitable and just manner between labor and capital in view of the public interest. Hence the importance of enacting H. R. 2032, commonly known as the Lesinski bill, which does just that and amends the Wagner Act. This amendment to the Wagner Act calls for "fair and rational changes" in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which contained no provisions making action on the part of a union unfair labor practice.

The Wagner Act only concerned itself with the question of collective bargaining because corporations interfered with the rights of workers to bargain collectively by use of labor spies, yellow-dog contracts, and other unfair devices.

The Wagner Act did not attempt to deal with speed-ups, arbitrary discharges, favoritism in hiring, unhealthy working conditions, and unsafe premises. It did not deal with kick-backs, sweatshop wages, unfair promotions, or any of the other management "unfair labor practices."

The provisions in the Lesinski bill relative to unfair labor practices, as set forth in section 8 (b) (1), make it illegal to declare a strike or a secondary boycott to force an employer to deal with one union where another union has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board; also, where the National Labor Relations Board has certified another union or where there is an existing union as a bargaining agent.

In this section also are covered cases where one union, through use of a strike or boycott, tries to require an employer to deal with it, contrary to the ruling of the National Labor Relations Board. Thus, it is made possible under this section for a company union controlled by the employer, or let us say a weak and designing union not interested in the welfare of the labor man, to deal with the employer and accept wages much below those fixed in the industry.

Therefore, unions are forced under this section to depend upon the fairness and integrity of the National Labor Relations Board and also upon the judicial decisions to make steadfast the wage levels and the bargaining position of the employer with whom the union has entered into agreements.

While section 8 (b) (1) represents a decided basic change in the Wagner Act of 1935, it should be noted that union labor is considerably worried, and justly so, about the possible misinterpretations which might result in the course of events with reference to this section.

Just as uncertainty prevails with regard to this section, the enforcement provisions relative to secondary boycott serve to point out the unjustified use of the secondary boycott. The Wagner Act provided for only National Labor Relations Board proceedings against unfair labor practices of employers, while the Taft-Hartley secondary boycotts by unions are met with immediate and mandatory injunctions, action for damages suffered by any party, loss of employee status, and improper labor proceedings. The Lesinski bill adjusts the differences and requires that both the employer and union shall come under the same provisions and under the same prohibitions.

There is dealt with in the Lesinski bill another unfair union labor practice which prohibits unions from participating in a jurisdictional strike or boycott forcing an employer to assign a particular work task in opposition to a ruling by the National Labor Relations Board. Under section 9, which is new, the National Labor Relations Board is required to hear and determine such jurisdictional disputes following provisions set forth in the act. And if the Board appoints an arbitrator, his decision is as effective as that of the Board itself.

Under the Lesinski bill, the union member may be protected in his rights and prosper as an American citizen. Under it also the employer is protected in his rights and is able to prosper. Both parties deal with each other at arms length and cannot be heard to complain. It is reasonable to expect that a weak union with no control over its members can bring about substandard living wages and unhealthy working conditions, thus making for poor output and low production as well as an unhealthy and dissatisfied laboring man and employer.

Instead of leaving these matters to chance, the Lesinski bill proposes that the Government acting for the people shall sit as an umpire with the right to make final decision and returns to the Department of Labor its jurisdiction over labor matters. Fair and just action on the part of the National Labor Relations Board will result in removing conflict from the field of labor relations, harmful not only to labor and industry, but constituting a distinct threat to the public weal.

I commend labor for the stand it has taken in conceding the right of Government to step in and deal with a secondary boycott or strike, which is a fundamental right of labor whereby an employer is compelled to bargain with labor.

We find labor submitting to imposed conditions such as entering into and executing contracts, service of notice of termination or modification of contracts, prohibition of strikes in violation of contracts, arranging means and methods of adjustments of these agreements, and taking part and cooperating in the hearings before the United States Conciliation Service, which helps the disputants in establishing procedures of settlement as well as making arbitrators available. Added to these mechanics are the advisory labor management committees to the Secretary of Labor which add their assistance further in the hopes of adjusting settlements.

We come to another question dealt with in this legislation, namely, that of national emergency disputes. Since the Wagner Act does not provide for settlement of these disputes, the Lesinski bill applies the provisions of the Railway Labor Act which has worked so well since 1926. Therein we have a voluntary 30-day cooling off period, after Presidential proclamation, that an emergency exists. Then comes the selection of an emergency board, armed wtih sufficient power to attempt adjustment, but in the event of failure in effecting a settlement to report to the President with its recommendation, 25 days after the President's proclamation.

Another important section which is written into the Lesinski bill is that which gives full force and legal effect to all union security contracts arrived at by free and voluntary action. Section 8 (3) of the Wagner Act is supplemented by the Lesinski bill in this manner. Union security provisions are made valid only in unfriendly labor States where they are valid, while the Taft-Hartley law did away with the closed shop making the union shop legal only after an election was held. The unions could only seek discharge of employees upon failure to pay dues under the Taft-Hartley bill. State laws are more restrictive than the Taft-Hartley law are permitted. This amendment under the Lesinski bill, therefore, is protective of interstate competition to weaken unions.

Another salutary and effective provision of the Lesinski bill makes changes in the structure of the power of the National Labor Relations Board by withdrawing from it, concern over minor details, thereby speeding up its action and decisions. Its work is delegated to a panel of three members. This makes for a speedy discharge of the business at hand.

A brief statement of the defects in the present Taft-Hartley law which are corrected by the Lesinski bill are set forth:

First. The employer charging that he is the victim of an unlawful strike is heard immediately and ahead of the pending complaints filed by the union against the employer. These must wait for the long-drawn-out and complicated processes under the present Taft-Hartley law.

Second. Union members striking during the life of the agreement or before the time limit of 60 days are discharged promptly and without right to be restored to their jobs. But the employer discharging a worker is charged only with an unfair labor practice.

Third. An unfair labor practice charge by the employer empowers the Board to seek a mandatory injunction against the union, but no such remedy exists on behalf of the union.

Fourth. A suit for damage lies against the union for damages arising out of sympathetic strikes or boycotts, but the union does not have a similar cause of action.

Fifth. The employer during a strike for a new agreement may hire nonunion workers who are permitted to vote in the event of a petition being filed before the National Labor Relations Board for a certificate of election. But the strikers are not permitted to vote in this instance.

Sixth. In every complaint made by the employer, he may give his own interpretation of the agreement. The union in cases where complaints are made by individuals cannot give its interpretation upon the various clauses of the contract.

Seventh. The employer is not required to file a financial statement when he appeals to the Board. The union, on

the other hand, is forced to file a financial report.

Eighth. The union officers must swear as to their political beliefs before they can apply to the Board, while the employer need not do so and still is permitted the use of the Board procedure.

Ninth. Union cases are subjected to delays during the period when registration and affidavits are required, and when financial reports are due. The employers' cases are heard expeditiously.

Tenth. The unions are prevented from opposing sweatshop labor within their industry, if they refuse to handle nonunion goods. The employer on the other hand is permitted by law to destroy and violate union standards in his contract with the union by use of sweatshop goods and sweatshop employees.

Mr. Chairman, the unfairness of the Taft-Hartley Act which estops a member of a union from contributing a dollar to his organization for the purpose of disseminating truthful information to its members, which information is invariably not given them by the capitalistic press or by columnists and commentators, the latter whose time is paid for by the largest and most powerful corporations, is most unjust to labor. But it is perfectly permissible under the Taft-Hartley Act for the large corporation stockholders and members of their families, although restricted to political donations of $5,000, to indirectly contribute $25,000, $50,000, and more, to political campaigns, saying nothing of the activity of the National Association of Manufacturers, representing many industrialists, who raise millions of dollars to spread their propaganda of half truths and false information in their fight against labor.

The plea that individual workers need protection from so-called big unionism is ridiculous and is tantamount to placing a flock of defenseless sheep under the protection of a pack of wolves. Does it not strike you as peculiar that the very groups which enslaved the individual worker before the rise of unionism are the same groups which have recently taken such a so-called benevolent attitude toward them—at least in their public statements? Of course, they are the same people who in the past resisted the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts. It is a fact that during the life of the Wagner Act, passed by a Democratic Congress, labor as well as industry have prospered as never before. Yet, under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, the protection that has been accorded all unions, and especially to the small, weak unions that are struggling for existence, have been removed.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I wish to say that the contributions of the American laboring man, his physical efforts and ingenuity have served to develop our country to the world power it is today. The part that labor has played and will continue to play in the future development of the Nation's resources and requirements demand that every fair and just consideration be given this largest segment of our population. In the immortal words of William Jennings Bryan, which I heard him utter and which I repeat:

> Thou shalt not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns—you shalt not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to several of the provisions of the Sims' amendment. The reason for my opposition is that they do nothing that is not done by the Lesinski bill. I have stated before that I feel that the provisions in the Lesinski bill covering boycotts, jurisdictional disputes and national welfare, and emergencies in the Lesinski bill are adequate and workable. This has been my position and nothing has been said or offered here to convince me that my position is unsound. Therefore as a member of the subcommittee I feel that although there might be some provisions which I personally would not object to in Mr. Sims' amendment, I cannot consistently support it. However, it is in my opinion certainly preferable to the Wood amendment which of course is as you well know the opposition's bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], chairman of the subcommittee, and the members who have put up a loyal fight for labor legislation. I realize, however, that all legislation is a compromise, and I am going to ask my committee to stand by loyally and pass the Sims amendment. There is nothing else left to do. Unless you vote for the Sims amendment you are going to get the Wood bill, which is worse than the Taft-Hartley Act. So I again say, let us stand shoulder to shoulder with labor and win.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, let us pause for a moment and see what the legislative situation is at the present time as we are about to vote. The Wood amendment is pending to the committee bill. To that is pending the Sims substitute.

There being no perfecting amendments before the Committee at this time to the Wood amendment, the vote now is between the Sims substitute and the Wood amendment. The Sims substitute will be voted upon first.

It seems to me that those Members who are opposed to either the Sims substitute or the Wood amendment ought to vote for the Sims amendment in preference to the Wood amendment. On the other hand, it seems to me that those Members on both sides who believe that the Taft-Hartley Act is too drastic and that the Wood amendment is too drastic should also vote for the Sims amendment. The Sims amendment incorporates in it certain proposals with which I am not altogether in agreement, but I will go along with them, because they represent a real honest approach to the establishment of a peaceful relationship in the industrial field between management and labor.

I join with the Speaker in urging the adoption of the Sims amendment. When we go back into the House the Sims amendment will be the first matter of consideration in the House. I therefore hope the Sims amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that that motion has just been voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. The previous motion was withdrawn by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is dilatory. Is the gentleman going to press his motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the Chair should ask if the gentleman is opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Louisiana opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman favors the Sims compromise.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Louisiana does not qualify.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, despite the confusion that has reigned here today, the issues are still easy to see and are still clearly drawn. Two philosophies clash in this House today, the same philosophies that have been clashing down through the years. The conflict is as old as the Republican Party, as old as the Democratic Party, as old as Alexander Hamilton, and as old as Thomas Jefferson. On one side we have the Democratic philosophy, equal rights for all, special privileges for none, government of all the people, by all the people, in the interest of all the people. On the other side the Republican philosophy of a government of all the people by a privileged class in the interest of that class and that philosophy is seeking today to bind labor and deliver it helpless into the hands of the National Association of Manufacturers and the 300 richest families in the United States.

The Democratic Party has the only record of liberalism in the United States today. The Republican philosophy was tried out from 1920 to 1932 and failed utterly. The Democratic philosophy was given direction of the country when it was on the brink of disaster in 1932. Almost 10,000 banks had failed in the United States during the previous 12-year period, our farmers were bankrupt, our financial structure a national ruin, our great life-insurance companies tottering, our labor jobless and in rags, without money, without credit, and without hope. Today after more than 16 years of Democratic rule our farmers are receiving the best prices in peacetime history for their food and fiber. Labor is employed at good wages, our bank deposits are guaranteed, there is more money in savings accounts than ever before, more people own their homes than ever before. There are more boys and girls in colleges and universities than ever before. Our factories and mines, in fact all our industries, are producing at capacity. There are more radios, washing machines, refrigerators, and bathtubs in American homes than ever before.

We have a minimum wage, production credit, Federal land banks, the Security and Exchange Act, assistance for our aged, social security, soil-conservation program, and REA. It is all Democratic legislation, the result of Democratic philosophy. So you see, my colleagues on the right-hand side of this House, we have everything for which to be proud. The people of the United States have entrusted to the Democratic Members of this Congress the task of repealing the Taft-Hartley law and the Aiken farm bill. Are we going to prove true to that trust or are we going to demonstrate that we are not worthy of the confidence the voters placed in us when they sent us to Washington to represent them in this Congress? Everybody knew what the Truman program was when they cast their ballots last November. He proclaimed it from one end of this Nation to the other. No Member of this House can plead ignorance. The Democratic Party was pledged to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and I hope and trust that the Members of this House will prove true to that pledge.

The mail that has flooded my desk for weeks regarding the labor law carried a lesson before it was opened. The letters coming from the laboring men and their wives, praying for the repeal of the Republican law that bound them, came for the most part written on cheap stationery, usually just a sheet torn from a 5-cent pencil tablet, but the pro-Taft-Hartley literature was printed or lithographed on paper so slick that a fly would have broken his neck had he alighted on it. We must choose today whether we will remain true to the faith of our fathers. Whether we will remain true to the teachings of the Democratic Party or whether we will be deceived by the welter of propaganda and fail to do what we know we ought to do, repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

The only reason the Taft-Hartley law has not absolutely destroyed organized labor is that so far it has never been enforced. If it ever is enforced in all its ramifications, it will utterly destroy every labor organization in the land.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made many times by responsible leaders of organized labor that the Taft-Hartley Act tends to destroy the right of labor to organize or to engage in free collective bargaining. When that statement is made some supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act always sit back smugly and say, "Well, why not be specific?"

I shall be specific in these remarks. I cite a case that happened recently in the State of Ohio. It is a case which illustrates the many ways in which employers take advantage of the Taft-Hartley Act—not as is so frequently claimed in the columns of the press or even in speeches in this House, but to destroy honest, free, legitimate labor unions.

Cases like this one fortify my strong belief that if we are to make progress toward a strong, democratic industrial society in America, the Taft-Hartley Act must be immediately repealed, and the Lesinski bill passed by the Congress.

For we cannot build a strong, democratic industrial society in which the basic law governing labor-management relations is a law loaded, in its every detail, to give all the advantages to the employer. Such a law injures the morale of working men and women. It produces bitterness and dismay. It can, over the long run, weaken the wholesome support for our democratic society which all of us wish to support and strengthen.

Recently, in the city of Columbus, Ohio, a union of the CIO—the Playthings, Jewelry, and Novelty Workers Union, a labor organization with a fine record of Americanism—undertook to organize the workers at the Fred D. Pfening Co., a fabricating company with about 35 eligible workingmen.

This legitimate effort to win the adherence of the workers to a bona fide union, in order to engage in collective bargaining negotiations over wages and working conditions, was met by the company with a continuous series of propaganda actions which seem to me to go far beyond the meaning of free speech.

On February 7, for instance, according to an affidavit signed by the chairman of the union, the company distributed a mimeographed letter to all its employees.

This company letter concluded with this paragraph:

> We just can't take the punishment of fighting to get business to keep employing you and fight with a union at the same time. Without a union, we think we can make it; with a union, we don't believe we can. We have to sell it before we can make it. With the threat of a union, there isn't much reason for us to beat our brains trying.

Note the threat, throughout this letter, to throw the workers out of their jobs if they vote for a union to represent them, as millions of other American workers are similarly represented in their dealings with corporation managements.

The chairman of the union, in his sworn affidavit, stated that the employer would have no dealings with any union or any supporter of any union. He predicted that after the election there would be a lot of new faces around the plant. Throughout the conversation between the head of the union and the head of the firm, there was the implication that men who supported the union would lose their jobs. The employer even cited the names of the first two men who would be dismissed if the union won the election.

On February 23, the day of the National Labor Relations Board election, the management distributed two notices to all the employees. One hinted broadly that there would soon be reductions in the working force; the other announced that the plant would be closed that afternoon, but that employees were invited to a meeting which the company said, "we believe will be to your interest to attend." Needless to say, employees of the company believed it would be wise for them to attend that management-sponsored meeting.

At the meeting, Mr. Fred Pfening, the head of the company, gave the men this advice as reported in the affidavit:

> I am not going to tell you how to vote, but I hope that you will vote 100 percent against the CIO.

And he threatened that if the company found out who had started the CIO in the plant, the man would be promptly fired.

He charged that the CIO was dominated by Communists, although it is clear from the record that the overwhelming mass of CIO members and their responsible leaders are good Americans who abhor, and who have taken successful steps against, Communist infiltration; and he referred, as the affidavit pointed out, to the amount of unemployment in Columbus—obviously to indicate by inference once again that supporters of the union would lose their jobs if the union won the election.

This "strategy of terror" had its effect, of course, upon the men who worked in that company. Although two-thirds of them had voluntarily signed union application cards, a small majority voted against the union in the election.

There is no question that this constant stream of threats against the union and the jobs of the men was directly responsible for the defeat of the union.

It seems clear to me, also, that the decent boundaries of free speech were far exceeded in this case. This was not a presentation of viewpoint by an employer—to which he is certainly entitled. No; under the cloak of free speech was contained a whole series of threats and promises—a deliberate use of fear psychology and fabrications to discourage unionism. This is no more free speech than was the case to which the Supreme Court Justice referred when he said that free speech does not permit a man to scream "fire" in a crowded movie house.

This type of open antiunionism, with its threats, its intimidations, and its promise of discrimination, is a direct result of the Taft-Hartley Act. I recall that some sponsors of the Taft-Hartley law sought, 2 years ago, to justify this legislative proposal on the basis that unions were completely in the ascendancy. But, as Dr. William Leiserson, distinguished former member of the National Labor Relations Board, pointed out recently, there are millions of workers still unorganized, and there are great numbers of workers in unions whose bargaining power is still very weak.

They are people who are hurt, and hurt badly, by the one-sided Taft-Hartley Act. And I fear that as time goes on, if this law is not repealed, the bargaining strength of even the most powerful unions will be seriously impaired. That will not be good for labor, for management, for the public, or for the general welfare of this great Nation.

The case I have mentioned is a specific instance of the harm that follows from the one-sided protection which the Taft-Hartley Act gives to employers, and the bias and hostility which it manifests for every type of union activity.

The Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed, and the Lesinski bill as amended enacted into law in order that we may move back to the path of fair and friendly labor-management relations—in which Government sets the basic rules and allows the two parties at the collective-bargaining table to work together, on an equitable basis, for the welfare of all. I support the Sims substitute in preference to the Wood amendment. I vigorously oppose the Wood amendment, which is much akin to the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act, Mr. Chairman, represents the first shameful, ugly step toward fascism taken in the Congress of the United States. Attacks upon labor unions and farmers and consumer cooperation were the first steps toward fascism in Italy, Germany, and Spain.

I, Otto Berk, first being duly sworn, attest that I live at 812 Sullivant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, and that,

I am the duly elected chairman of the organizing committee of the employees of the Fred D. Pfening Co., 1075 West Fifth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, and that

The following is to the best of my recollection a true account of the attempts made by Fred D. Pfening, Sr., my employer, to intimidate and coerce me to vote against the Playthings, Jewelry, and Novelty Workers International Union, CIO, in the collective-bargaining election held by the National Labor Relations Board on February 23, 1949.

On or about February 7, 1949, I received a mimeographed letter signed "The Management of Your Company," which is attached hereto and marked "A."

This letter concludes with the following paragraph:

"We just can't take the punishment of fighting to get business to keep employing you and fight with a union at the same time. Without a union we think we can make it; with a union we don't believe we can. We have to sell it before we can make it. With the threat of a union there isn't much reason for us to beat our brains out trying.

"THE MANAGEMENT OF YOUR COMPANY."

I was first approached in person by Mr. Fred D. Pfening, Sr., on or about Friday, February 18, 1949. Mr. Pfening, Sr., asked what I knew about the union and who had signed membership cards. I answered, "I am a member."

Mr. Pfening, Sr., then told me that he would have no dealings with any union or anyone supporting a union. He said that after the election was over there would be a lot of new faces around the plant.

His entire conversation indicated to me that those of us participating in union affairs would be fired.

He showed me a slip of paper with two names—Leroy Stevens, of the sheet-metal department, and Roy Harris, of the welding department. Mr. Pfening, Sr., said that these would be the first men fired and if the others wanted to hold their jobs they had better get wise. He said there would not be any work around there (the plant) for any union man.

He said that no man would ever get to bargain with him, now or at any other time, and he added, "I don't give a damn who the man is."

The following night I received a telephone call at my home from Mr. Pfening, Sr. Mr. Pfening, Sr., again urged me to drop out of the union and told me that if I did he would "take care of me." He again asked me who were the other employees who had signed membership cards in the union and I again refused to tell him.

At exactly 11:57 a. m., February 23, 1949, 3 minutes before we normally cease work for lunch, the superintendent of the company, Mr. J. W. Brazelton, handed two mimeographed papers to each employee as he was working. These mimeographed sheets are attached hereto and marked "B."

The statements told us that there would be no work of any kind in the shop that afternoon and that we should ring out at 12 noon. This was the first time that we had been laid off for an afternoon, in my recollection. In my opinion, the language used in these notices was designed to scare me into voting against the union in the election that afternoon.

One of the mimeographed papers invited us to attend a meeting in the shop at 1 p. m. that day—which was 2 hours before election was scheduled to begin—and I attended that meeting.

All of the employees who attended were addressed by Mr. Fred D. Pfening, Sr. Mr. Pfening, Sr., spoke for quite some time and the following is, to the best of my recollection, what he had to say. Mr. Pfening, Sr., told us, "I am not going to tell you how to vote, but I hope you will vote 100 percent against the CIO." He also stated, "If the union wins the election, you will never sit across the table from me to negotiate anything." He asked us who started the union in the plant. Nobody answered. Then he asked if the CIO approached the men in the plant, or did the employees approach the CIO. Nobody answered. Then Mr. Pfening, Sr., said, "If I find out who started the union, I will get rid of him."

He showed us some newspaper clippings about unemployment in Columbus, and he said that if the CIO won the election, he wasn't going to risk his health by keeping the company going. He showed us some other clippings about the strike at the American Zinc Oxide Co. and he said that the CIO was dominated by Communists.

Just before the meeting ended, he said again, "I am not going to tell you how to vote, but I know you will vote for me 100 percent."

Many times, as I met Mr. Pfening, Sr., in the plant in the weeks before the election, he would say to me, "Be careful of the company you are keeping." I asked him what company, and he answered, "The Communists."

The day after the election the plant resumed work on its normal schedule, and we have not lost any time since then, which proves to me that the statement that the plant was going to close down was designed to also scare us into voting against the union.

After the election was over and the union had notified the company that it was protesting the election, I was approached by James H. Nabors, roadman of the Pfening Co., at my home. This conversation took place on or about March 19, 1949.

He told me that Mr. Pfening, Sr., couldn't come to me himself, but that if I would drop out of the union "old man Pfening knew that it would collapse." He told me that if I went to Mr. Pfening, Sr., and told him that I had pulled out, he knew that "I could have anything I want for my asking."

At the same time he said, "as for that guy Harris (referring to Leroy Harris, vice president of the organizing committee), when I catch Harris off the company property, I am going to beat hell out of him."

I have been employed by the Fred D. Pfening Co. for the past 4½ years as chief lay-out man.

OTTO M. BERK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4th day of April 1949, in the State of Ohio, county of Franklin, city of Columbus.

[SEAL] GERALDINE O'BRIEN,
Notary Public.

My commission expires December 5, 1950.

EXHIBIT A

THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO EVERY STORY

A CIO union called, of all things, playthings, jewelers, and novelty workers is making a desperate attempt to unionize our plant employees. Certainly we are not jewelers; surely we make no toys unless they think they can make playthings out of our employees, we can see no point * * * and no union, by whatever name, can help you. Union organizers make a lot of extravagant promises—they are skilled salesmen in their line—they are sharpshooters with plausible arguments—they go to a union school just to learn how to fool a group of men into signing cards * * * in our shop they got cards signed under the pretense that it would merely admit the signers to a union meeting. * * * Too late these men found they had actually signed in favor of a union organization. * * * Some of our men were smart enough to catch onto this trick and rightfully refused to have anything further to do with the union stooges. * * *

It takes more than metal and labor to make a business. It takes more than paying a man $20 per month to be president of a shop union, to make him big and smart enough to tell the owners how to run their business * * * if he was that smart, he would be worth more than $20 and, if so, he would be in business for himself.

If you read the papers and listen to the radio (something besides sports and the funnies) you know that business is sliding fast; that unemployment has increased by 2,000,000 since December and worsening. The people with money are so scared they are selling their securities. The stock market on last Saturday fell $2,000,000,000—all because these people are afraid of the future. Well, we're afraid, too.

Business is down, our business is down, employment is down, and frankly, we are worried about the whole thing. * * * Are you worried, too?

We just can't take the punishment of fighting to get business to keep employing you and fight with a union at the same time. Without a union we think we can make it; with a union we don't believe we can. We have to sell it before we can make it. With the threat of a union there isn't much reason for us to beat our brains out trying.

THE MANAGEMENT OF YOUR COMPANY.
FEBRUARY 7, 1949.

EXHIBIT B

Due to several conditions beyond our control, there will be no work of any kind in our shop this afternoon. Please ring out at 12

noon. We suggest that you have your lunch as usual. You are invited to attend a meeting in the shop at 1 p. m. which we believe will be to your interest to attend. The law forbids us to hold a meeting of employees during working hours. * * *

The election will be held at 3 p. m. under the supervision of a United States labor examiner. Only one man is in the election booth at a time; your ballot is secret. No one will know how you vote unless you tell it yourself. We urge that each of our registered employees cast his vote.

A list of employees entitled to vote today has been furnished to the election official. Each name will be checked as he votes. We want every eligible man to vote. Don't run out. Vote as you think—but vote.

JANUARY 31, 1949.

J. W. BRAZELTON, *Superintendent:*

Rust and corrosion: For some time we have been replacing panels and doors which rusted out after being installed in bakeries, particularly in proof boxes. Fermentation rooms and bread coolers, carrying a lower temperature and humidity, have not been affected so much as proof boxes. All replacements have been made free of charge. This has become so expensive we are compelled to stop production until the cause is found.

Cause: From tests in the shop and surveys in the field, we find zinc-coated steel sheets have insufficient zinc to protect the steel surface; that the glue used has too much water in it, together with a dew point, the steel begins to rust quickly after installation. Panels brought back from bakeries can be seen in the factory to sustain this conclusion.

Remedy: Before the war we bought steel from Armco, which carried much more zinc coating and a bonderizing coat. None of these sheets show rust, although some have been in service for over 12 years. We are trying to again purchase this sheet for panels and doors (for proof boxes at least). We also have to develop or find an adhesive containing no water.

We thought we had the rusting problem solved by the use of Tropolite on the glue side of the steel. However, this, too, is rusting. It will cost us thousands of dollars to replace all these defective panels and doors.

Time: It may take some time to get a supply of good steel and develop an adhesive. It is certain we cannot take further risk. To continue could bankrupt the company.

Curtailed operations: This being the case, it is unfortunate that we must necessarily cut down our working force. We have two bread coolers to build now and a limited number of paneled fermentation rooms—in which we can use the old method—and therefore keep a certain number of men continuously employed.

Reducing number of employees: You will immediately consider the jobs and men whom we can keep at work on a 45-hour weekly basis. Their employment will be steady and we trust they will appreciate our efforts to maintain their usual weekly pay check. If there are any men who believe they can get better jobs elsewhere and wish to leave voluntarily, they should be given the first choice of voluntarily quitting. However, it must be our privilege to choose those we wish to retain. * * * It may take 1 to 3 months to get a new supply and type of steel * * * at that time we will reconsider reemploying those who have left our employment at this time.

THE FRED D. PFENING CO.

Effective immediately.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to state that I am for the Lesinski bill and at the same time to answer the request of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that those seeking repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act point to the specific provisions of the act which are wrong. In answering this request, I confine my remarks, of necessity, to a few salient provisions of the act. I do so, not because of the lack of glaring defects throughout the entire structure of this now notorious piece of legislation, but rather because of the limitations on the time allotted me on the floor.

At the outset I wish to emphasize the basic difference in philosophies underlying enactment of the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Prior to August 22, 1947, the keystone of our national labor policy was the recognition that only through collective bargaining could the imbalance between the bargaining positions of the individual wage earner and the American industry be corrected, to enable labor to obtain its fair share of the products of our economy. Such a policy recognized the necessity of keeping mass purchasing power in pace with productive capacity, an equilibrium which is essential to the health of a free economy. Thus collective bargaining was not only protected under the Wagner Act; it was also encouraged. But with one major qualification. Government intervention in the collective-bargaining process was restricted to the minimum.

The Taft-Hartley Act was founded upon the false premise that the wage earners of this country had become too powerful in the collective-bargaining process. At a time when industry was reporting its highest profits on record it was ordained that the ability of the worker to share in decisions affecting wages, hours, and conditions of work had to be curbed. Rather than merely providing the broad principles by which collective bargaining could be carried out, the act limited the economic weapons essential to the life and growth of trade-unions, undermined their security, encouraged resort to legalistic attitudes at the expense of the effectiveness of collective bargaining, and provided arbitrary and inequitable procedures for Federal Government intervention into the very process of collective bargaining.

Section 8 (a) (3) of the Taft-Hartley Act bans the closed shop, requires special elections among employees under section 9 (e) before a union security clause may be inserted in a contract, and provides that an employee working under a union-security clause may be fired only for nonpayment of dues. This proscription of the closed shop and the restrictions on union security in general were based upon the false assumption that union bosses had become so powerful on the labor scene that the workers would gladly be freed from the bondage of union membership. The results of the union-shop elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board present a devastating refutation of this assumption. At a tremendous expense to the American taxpayers in the conduct of the polls, hundreds of thousands of workers have indicated an overwhelming desire to be governed by union membership as a condition of employment. In the face of this evidence, even the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act have recognized the invalidity of their original assumption and have endorsed a proposal to rescind the union-shop-election provisions.

The indiscriminate banning of the closed shop fails to recognize the importance of union control over employment based upon the dignity and skill of a craft. It fails to recognize the peculiar nature of certain industries, such as the building trades and maritime industries, which have found the closed shop essential to the effective recruitment of labor forces. The general restrictions on union security ignore the proven fact that secure unions are responsible unions. The numerous contracts providing some form of the closed shop, negotiated in the face of the Taft-Hartley prohibitions, are ample evidence that this blind legislation has forced a resort to the bootleg practices of the ill-conceived prohibition legislation.

The flat restrictions on union security in section 8 (a) (3) must go and with it the union-shop elections of section 9 (e).

Sections 10 (j) and 10 (l) introduce a drastic change in the enforcement of Federal legislation dealing with collective bargaining. The Wagner Act empowered the National Labor Relations Board to enforce its orders by injunctions after a complete adjudication of the merits of the case by the Board. Sections 10 (j) and 10 (l) of the Taft-Hartley Act, however, empower the Federal body to seek summary injunctive restraints prior to any Board adjudication. In specific cases of alleged union illegal conduct, the general counsel must seek such injunctive restraints.

The injunction powers have been evoked in 39 instances—twice against employers and 37 times against unions. The cases to date have introduced serious confusion on the labor scene by virtue of the dual adjudication in the court's early prejudgment of the issues and the Board's subsequent ruling. The summary procedures followed have restricted unions in their resort to legitimate economic activities. The provisions have vested Government officials with far-reaching discriminatory power that is repugnant to our democratic institutions. Healthy bargaining relationships do not exist in an atmosphere in which the threat of injunctions hangs over the head of the parties. Sections 10 (j) and 10 (l) have no place in a Federal legislative pattern which seeks to foster stable relationships in the labor-management field.

Section 301 facilitates resort by union or employer to Federal courts in breach of contract actions. Section 303 creates civil remedies by which an employer may sue a union for damages incurred from specified illegal conduct of unions. These sections are based on the premise that collective-bargaining contracts may be policed by court actions and that responsible action in labor relations can be enforced by judicial reprimand. This reasoning ignores completely the realities of relations in the labor-manage-

ment field. A collective-bargaining contract is a document which regulates the daily undertakings of the signatory parties. Groups who must live together in close contact do not settle their differences by lawsuits. Nevertheless, these provisions encourage resort to court action. They invite thinking in terms of legal rights; not thinking in terms of compromise and adjustment of differences. The philosophy of these sections runs counter to the very theme of sound labor relations. They must fall by the wayside if we are to achieve the desired goal of stability on the industrial front.

Section 8 (b) (4) (A) provides a blanket prohibition of secondary boycotts. In effect, it deprives trade-unions of the vital economic weapons basic to the growth of unionism—a growth that is essential if the balance between labor and increasingly centralized management is to be maintained. The blanket ban has made union members strikebreakers, who are forced to contribute to their own destruction. It has deprived certain unions of the only economic sanction available to them in light of the nature of the industry in which they work. Tied to the injunction mandate, section 8 (b) (4) (A) has created a pattern of inequitable restriction. The provision must be erased from the statute books if we are to enjoy industrial peace in this Nation.

The Taft-Hartley Act pays lip service to the preservation of the right to strike, but its provisions cut deep into this basic prerogative. The indiscriminate banning of all secondary boycott activity has seriously restricted the legitimate concerted activities of unions. Moreover, section 8 (d) provides for a loss of employee status should a worker strike before the expiration of a 60-day cooling-off period, regardless of the conduct of the employer which may have provoked the work stoppage. In section 9 (c) (3) the all-important right to vote in a representation election is taken away from the worker who strikes to attain legitimate economic benefits. These sections render meaningless the sanctimonious professions of the Taft-Hartley Act that the right to strike is preserved. The death knell must be sounded over these antilabor provisions.

The Taft-Hartley Act has introduced a number of impractical procedural devices which have only plagued the industrial-relations scene and must be eliminated. Not only the union-shop-election provision of section 9 (e) but also the employer's last-offer vote in the emergency-strike provision of section 209 (b) has proved impractical and prohibitively expensive to administer. Section 3 (d) introduces the concept of separation of functions—creating the position of an independent general counsel entrusted with far-reaching administrative authority and policy-making discretion. Vast powers have been given to a virtual labor czar. Indeed, the House Committee on Executive Expenditures, at the time when the gentleman from Michigan was its chairman, felt impelled to ask for a modification of the general counsel's sweeping assertion as to the limitless jurisdiction of the NLRB under the Taft-Hartley Act. The creation of the independent general counselship has resulted in dual policy making at the expense of orderly administration. In such a situation, intra-agency frictions were inevitable. They have come to light with the resulting deterioration of effective administration of our national labor policy.

It avails us little to talk about a piecemeal revision of the Taft-Hartley Act. Its entire framework was based upon a philosophy of antiunionism which is blind to the major role of collective bargaining in a free society facing the worldwide challenge of statism.

It is interesting to note that in the wild orgy which was the legislative program of the Eightieth Congress, the party which raved against bureaucratic, Federal interference with private rights fathered a bill which extended Government control far beyond anything previously known in the labor field, except in wartime. But the workers of the Nation were not fooled. They gave their clear answer to the antilabor sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act by overwhelmingly supporting unionism in thousands of union-shop elections. Nor was the electorate of the Nation blind to the issues. In the gratifying manner in which they kept our great President in the White House they endorsed his often-repeated pledge to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that this enumeration of some of the evils of the Taft-Hartley law will bring about a change of attitude on the part of those who would continue this act on the books and convert them to the belief that labor legislation must be written with the viewpoint of being fair to all parties concerned, which, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many other unbiased Members of Congress, is exactly what the Lesinski bill does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of saving time, I demand tellers now.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SIMS and Mr. WOOD.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 183, noes 211.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Wood amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:40 o'clock.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] amend his request and ask that debate end at 6 o'clock?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes. I will agree to that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Wood amendment and all amendments thereto close at 6 o'clock, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request means that debate will end at 6 o'clock, it does not mean an hour and a half afterward?

Mr. KELLEY. It means exactly 6 o'clock.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it possible to find out how many amendments there are to the Wood bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot anticipate that. Many Members have not sent their amendments to the desk. But there are now 11 amendments on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] revise his request so as to provide 5 minutes on this side immediately preceding the 5 minutes allotted to the committee to close debate?

Mr. KELLEY. That is agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Wood amendment and all amendments thereto close not later than 6 o'clock, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the majority members of the committee, and the 5 minutes preceding that to be reserved for the minority members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LODGE to the Wood substitute: Page 15, line 24, and page 17, line 11, after the word "methods" in each such place insert the following: "or (4) the disclosure by the employee of confidential information of the labor organization, or (5) conviction of the employee of a felony, or (6) the employee's having engaged in conduct subjecting the labor organization to civil damages or criminal penalties."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered deals with the so-called union-shop provisions of the Wood substitute. As you all know, under the Taft-Hartley Act an employer is permitted to enter into a union-shop agreement with a labor organization, which requires that 30 days after an individual is employed he must become a member of the union and remain a member thereafter. In the Taft-Hartley Act, however, there are certain exceptions made to this requirement of the union-shop agreement. First, an employee who has been hired can still keep his job if the union will not take him in as a member, and if that employee has tendered to the union the regular initiation fee and dues.

Likewise, if after the employee has joined the union he is expelled from the union for some reason other than his failure to pay his dues, the union cannot compel the employer to discharge that individual. Thus, under the Taft-Hartley Act, nonpayment of dues is the sole ground on which a union may expel

a member and still require the employer to discharge him. The Wood substitute adds two additional grounds.

Under the Wood substitute, if an employee has been expelled from the union because he is a member of the Communist Party, or a member of some other subversive organization, the union having a union-shop agreement with the employer can compel the employer to discharge that individual. Similarly, if the union has expelled an individual for engaging in an unauthorized or wildcat strike, the union could compel the employer to discharge that individual under the Wood substitute.

The amendment which I have offered proposes that we add three additional grounds. I think it would be reasonable to provide, as does my amendment, that if an employee is expelled from the union because he has been found guilty of disclosing confidential union information to the employer, the union be permitted to require his discharge by the employer. Unions claim that under the Taft-Hartley Act they cannot expel an employer spy from the union and compel the employer to discharge that individual. I think their criticism in this regard has a great deal of merit, and so my amendment adds this additional ground.

If an employee has been convicted of embezzling union funds or has been convicted of some other crime which is a felony, it seems reasonable to me to permit the union having a union-shop agreement with an employer to compel the employer under that agreement to discharge the individual who has been so convicted, and so my amendment adds this ground as an additional ground of expulsion.

Finally, if an individual has been expelled from the union for doing something that has subjected the union to civil damages or criminal liability, I believe the union having a union-shop agreement with an employer should have the right to compel the employer to discharge that individual. So my amendment adds this as an additional ground for expulsion.

Summarizing, the three additional grounds that I propose be added to the union-shop provisions of the Wood substitute are as follows:

First. Disclosing confidential union information.

Second. Conviction of a felony.

Third. Engaging in conduct subjecting the union to civil damages or criminal penalties.

I think my amendment is reasonable, and I urge that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, for many days we have been discussing this bill so vital not only to labor and management, but to the country as a whole. Actually there can be no labor-management dispute that resolves itself into a work stoppage that does not affect the public interest. We have now reached the point in this debate on the momentous question before us when we must determine whether we shall repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and keep it repealed as provided in the pending bill, H. R. 2032, or repeal the bill and reenact it under the Wood amendment, now being discussed and debate on which will end at 6 o'clock this evening.

I desire to state that I am definitely against the Wood amendment. It does nothing for labor except to draw tighter around the necks of the workers of my district, the Twenty-third Congressional District in Bronx County, N. Y., the noose that was prepared for them by the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress. Perhaps I am too parochial. The antilabor noose that was uncoiled by the Eightieth Congress encompassed all workers the country over, not only those in my district.

Today we are confronted with the stark reality that we, as Democrats, must do everything within our power to repeal and keep repealed the Taft-Hartley law. We who are Democrats see a strange combination working against us to defeat the will of the people who elected us. We see the alinement of big business with the communistic labor element working in cahoots to bring about the defeat of the American workingman.

The Republicans do not want the Thomas-Lesinski bill. The Communists of the country do not want the Thomas-Lesinski bill. The Republicans are opposed to the administration bill because they believe that the NAM represents the American thought on the problem of labor relations and the NAM is opposed now, as in the past, and probably always will be opposed to equitable treatment of labor.

Strangely enough, in the effort to defeat the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law is the communistic element of labor in New York. They are advocating opposition of every amendment, good, bad, or indifferent—they want the Taft-Hartley bill repealed and the Wagner bill reinstated without an amendment, the dotting of an "i," or the crossing of a "t." They know that the bill cannot be passed without a compromise. They oppose any bill, or any amendment thereto, that would remedy defects in the Wagner Act which are recognized by the national leaders of labor. They do not want to aid labor—they only want to add to chaos. They would like to see the Taft-Hartley Act retained so that they might make political capital out of labor's bill of rights.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot state too definitely that I am for the Lesinski bill. At the same time I must say that I have never taken the position, and I hope never will, that my thought is final and beyond me there is no appeal. I am not Stalin—I am just an American, from an American community in New York City called the Bronx, and from a neighborhood that I affectionately call Mott Haven. I grew up in that neighborhood. I went to school there. My children attended the same school. I love that neighborhood and the people who are in it. I firmly believe that the laboring people of my district are in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the restoration of the Wagner Act with corrective amendments not opposed by labor, and I shall gladly vote accordingly. They do not always agree with the votes that I have cast in Congress, but they are a broad-minded people who realize that there are two sides to every page.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I sincerely trust that the people of my district, with whom I have lived for over 50 years, will believe, that we cannot decently live if we are to have, as the law of the land, the Taft-Hartley law and the Wood amendment thereto. The Wood amendment is the Taft-Hartley law repealed and reenacted. I cannot stomach such hypocrisy.

I cannot close without a tribute to the distinguished Speaker, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, who have fought so valiantly and courageously to fulfill the commitments of the Democratic platform. If we win, the plaudits of the workers of the country will be theirs. If we lose, the workers of the country will know that under the courageous leadership of our Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, and the indefatigable zeal of JOHN MCCORMACK, we fought the good fight. But if, in this hour of trouble, we who are the friends of labor lose, we will never cease our struggle for a fair deal and a square deal to labor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCAS: On page 51, line 12, after the word "labor" strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "equal representation insofar as practicable shall be accorded all labor organizations, whether or not such organizations are national or international in their scope."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I think I have presented for the first time in the last few days an amendment which is not controversial. Everyone with whom I have discussed it has praised the amendment. The simple reason they have praised it is because it provides for equal representation without any compulsion on the part of the appointing officer, equal representation for independent unions on the national labor-management panel which is appointed by the President for the purpose of advising him on the avoidance of industrial controversy.

There is in this country a large body of independent unions which are not affiliated with either the CIO or the AFL. They have in the past been overlooked—I would not say purposely, but they have been overlooked—in the appointment of advisory councils and such committees as are called upon to advise the President on labor matters. I think it wise that we say to the President, who appoints the officers in this case that independent unions shall receive consideration. We do not say that he shall appoint them, but we merely say that insofar as practicable these independent unions shall receive recognition on such boards. I

believe, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that it is wise that we express these precatory words in this legislation advising the President that we hope that he will look toward the independent unions for some advice in avoiding labor controversy.

I hope the membership will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORTON: On page 15, line 24, after the word "method" strike out the remainder of the page, and lines 1 and 2 on page 16, and insert the following: *"And provided further,* That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from notifying a labor organization (not established, maintained or assisted by any action defined in section 9 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice) of opportunities for employment with such employer, or giving such labor organizations a reasonable opportunity to refer qualified applicants for such employment."

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, in the Wood amendment an attempt was made to permit the hiring hall in other words, to permit the closed shop to work in practice where it was wanted by both employer and employee. Some of us felt that it did not go far enough in that respect and that it only permitted an employer to inform a union of employment opportunities.

My amendment merely reasserts that permission and then states: "And that the union may be given a reasonable amount of time for the fulfillment of those opportunities."

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Will not this amendment, if adopted, take care of the ITU situation with which the gentleman and I are familiar?

Mr. MORTON. My answer is that it will; and it will also take care of the maritime situation in which many of us are interested.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORTON: On page 63, strike out lines 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, this strikes out the language:

If such representative is the same local labor organization which is a party to such collective-bargaining contract.

On Friday last I offered a similar amendment but failed to include in the amendment to strike the language as it occurs in both sections of the bill. On Friday last this committee adopted my amendment, but through my own fault I did not include the language on page 63 as well as the language on page 18. The committee has already expressed its will. This amendment is in the nature of a clarifying amendment. I hope it is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LODGE to the substitute: On page 20, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The Board shall not base any findings of unfair labor practice upon, or set aside or refuse to hold any election upon the basis of, any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral (1) if such statement, considered in the light of all the relevant circumstances, contains no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefits, or (2) if the statement, considered in the light of all the relevant circumstances, is such as would justify a district judge in refusing to submit it to a jury, or in setting aside a verdict based thereon against the person making it, were the same issues involved in a trial of such person in a district court of the United States."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, under the law and also under the revised Wood bill an employer is allowed, not only complete freedom of speech—excepting threats or coercion—but in addition no statements of an employer can be introduced as evidence in any unfair labor practices case under any circumstances. There is no doubt complete justification for the provision that employers should be allowed freedom of speech. On the other hand, the provision which does not allow the courts or the administrative bodies to take into consideration the employer's comments along with all the other facts in the case goes further than any provision of law has ever gone in the past and most lawyers, regardless of their position on labor legislation agree that the restriction is too broad.

The amendment which I have proposed would still allow the employer freedom of speech but would allow the Board to take into consideration his remarks, together with his other conduct in determining whether or not an unfair labor practice had been committed. The speech alone, however, without other conduct could not constitute an unfair labor practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 114, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING:

On page 9, line 8, after the word "controlling" add *"Provided,* That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of any member thereof solely on the ground of such membership."

On page 58, line 6, after the word "controlling" add *"Provided,* That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of any member thereof solely on the ground of such membership."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, attention has been called to the fact that in the administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the inclusion of the paragraph to which this amendment is directed has led to an interpretation of it which I feel was never intended when the law was passed.

In that statute it was sought to define what was meant by the word "agent" and when a corporation or labor organization might become responsible for the acts of one of its agents. It was stipulated that actual authority or subsequent ratification would not necessarily be controlling in determining this question.

This wording has apparently led to the making of some rulings which, in my judgment, do an injustice to labor unions. It has been objected to strenuously by the representatives of organized labor. I believe they are right in the position they have taken. This amendment is offered in an effort to remedy that situation.

It expressly provides that no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of any member thereof solely on the ground of such membership. In other words, very properly, in order to make a labor organization responsible, if my amendment is adopted, it will be necessary to show the same state of facts which are usually required to establish liability for the acts of an agent.

It will be necessary to satisfy the regular common-law rules of agency in order to create such responsibility.

This is only just and fair. I hope it may have strong support.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Assuming this amendment is adopted, then under what conditions can a labor organization be held liable?

Mr. KEATING. If they actually, either by formal action or by informal action, authorized or subsequently ratified the action of the individual.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The meaning of the gentleman's amendment then is that Mr. A cannot be held liable simply because he is a member of the union and on that only.

Mr. KEATING. That is right. That is exactly what it says. It says, *"Provided,* That no labor organization shall be held liable for the acts of any member thereof solely on the ground of such membership." We should protect labor unions against the possibility that, by court or Board interpretation, they will be charged with responsibility for the acts of a member simply and solely because he is a member, even though he may be operating absolutely on his own and without any authority from or subsequent ratification by the union.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. As I tried to tell you on Friday of last week I voted against the Taft-Hartley bill because I thought it was going to delay and unfairly hinder union organization. I voted

against it for another reason, and that is that it was evident upon its face that the labor unions were discriminated against, and the provision which the gentleman from New York seeks to amend is one of the provisions in the bill that I objected to at the time I voted against it.

I will tell you this—when the Taft-Hartley bill was passed you changed the law of agency as far as the unions were concerned but you left the law of agency as it was as far as the employer was concerned, and that is what the gentleman from New York is trying to correct.

Now, you did another thing. You made the unions suable in the Federal courts under conditions where no other person could be sued. Not only did you do that. It has always been a rule of law that where there is a conflict of laws, a conflict between the laws passed by the Congress and the laws passed by the States, the Federal law was the supreme law of the land. You reversed that ancient rule in the Taft-Hartley law. These are some of the provisions unfair on their face to the workingman. They are retained in the Wood bill. Hence, I shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 2032, repeals the Taft-Hartley law and reenacts the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. I am going to support this bill.

Under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 organized labor made great progress. The Wagner Act recognized that the average worker could not individually protect himself from the standpoint of wages, hours, and other conditions of employment when he attempted to deal with large employers by himself. The Wagner Act enabled employees to join together and deal collectively with their employers through the unions of their own choosing. The Wagner Act recognized the fact that working men and women of America are human beings, and not property rights of their employers. Prior to this, workers were afraid to join weak and ineffective unions, because such membership meant being placed on a blacklist, and it subjected the worker to the possibility of losing his job and being denied the right to find work in affiliated industries.

Prior to the Wagner Act it was the practice of many employers to impose so-called yellow-dog contracts. Workers were given jobs under the express condition that they would not join a labor union. Workers signed these yellow-dog contracts because they needed jobs for the support of themselves and their families. After the Wagner Act was passed the workers were freed from these fears and joined unions by the thousands. Many fair-minded employers cooperated in working out principles of collective bargaining. Of course, there were some employers who fought the unions and the Wagner Act.

In 1946 the Republicans won the congressional elections, and they immediately set out to pass the Taft-Hartley bill. The Taft-Hartley bill was vicious and far-reaching. It contained over 20 antilabor provisions. These were provisions which gave inequitable advantages to employers to destroy rights which labor had gained after a struggle of 50 years. The Taft-Hartley bill was driven through the Congress by hatred and hysteria. The Taft-Hartley Act severely restricted free collective bargaining and crippled workers in the exercise of their rights. It increased vastly the number of cases coming before the Labor Board, and it has unfairly discriminated against labor organizations. A multitude of provisions were placed in the act which enabled employers to use injunctions in the courts to delay or prevent the use of the only economic power labor had—that is, the right to strike. The procedures and regulations were so complicated that it was almost impossible for labor to comply. And then, too, the technical requirements and delay periods oftentimes nullified the power of the strike.

It was indeed fortunate for labor that the Republicans did not win in 1948, for then the full meaning of the Taft-Hartley Act would have been heaped upon labor. Much of the Taft-Hartley viciousness was held in abeyance by the Democratic administration. It was fortunate that the people of the United States awoke to the crushing threat of the Taft-Hartley Act. Because of the threat of Taft-Hartley and the fear that it aroused in the hearts of labor, union organizations were forced to fight for their lives and, as a result many of those Congressmen who had voted for Taft-Hartley in the Eightieth Congress were defeated. Membership in labor unions increased. Many workingmen who were only lukewarm to organized unions became alarmed and joined in the fight against Taft-Hartley. They realized that not only the Wagner Act, or National Labor Relations Act of 1935, was at stake, but also that the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, which had been passed to outlaw the writ of injunction in labor disputes, was in jeopardy.

With the injunctive process provided in the Taft-Hartley Act, it placed the Government in the field of compulsory arbitration. Both management and labor rebelled against this. It was clear that compulsory arbitration placed a club in the hands of the Government whereby the Government could swing it in either direction, depending upon the political philosophy of those in charge of the Government bureau. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress and their antilabor friends tried to impose this strait-jacket on the millions of American working men and women.

As we all know, President Truman vetoed the Taft-Hartley Act, but the Eightieth Congress passed it over his veto. I was one of those Members of the Eightieth Congress who voted against the Taft-Hartley bill, and later I voted to uphold the President's veto. The passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, of course, created great bitterness, hatred, and strained relations between labor and management. The President, in his veto message, made it clear that the Taft-Hartley Act would inject the Government into private economy on an unprecedented scale, and that it would conflict with important principles of our democratic society; that it would cause more, not fewer, strikes; that it would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic peace and progress; that it would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy; that it contained seeds of discord which would plague the Nation for years to come; that it would go far toward destroying our national unity; that by raising barriers between labor and management and by injection of political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action.

President Truman was correct in his analysis. Where Federal legislation should have developed cooperation, the Taft-Hartley Act disrupted sound collective bargaining; where Federal legislation should have encouraged industrial peace, the Taft-Hartley Act created industrial unrest; where Federal legislation should have reduced Government intervention, the Taft-Hartley Act injected the Government into labor disputes to the advantage of management and to the disadvantage of labor and the Nation. Where Federal legislation should have encouraged free collective bargaining, the Taft-Hartley Act restricted it.

These were the results of the Taft-Hartley Act, a bill which was passed in an atmosphere of anger and confusion.

A pledge was made in the Democratic Party platform last year to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. I believe that every Democratic Member of this Congress is bound by this pledge, and is obligated to vote for H. R. 2032, in order to keep faith with the American people who voted for us. The Taft-Hartley Act actually died on election day, November 2, 1948. On January 5, 1949, President Truman declared in his message on the state of the Union as follows:

> If we want to keep our economy running in high gear, we must be sure that every group has the incentive to make its full contribution to the national welfare. At present, the working men and women of the Nation are unfairly discriminated against by a statute that abridges their rights, curtails their constructive efforts, and hampers our system of free collective bargaining. That statute is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, sometimes called the Taft-Hartley Act.
>
> That act should be repealed.
>
> The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for setting up machinery for preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.
>
> The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within the Department should be placed in it.

H. R. 2032 is the Democratic administration bill that has been presented to carry out the President's proposals. The Taft-Hartley supporters are trying to defeat the administration bill by substituting the Wood bill. On Thursday I said that I looked upon the Wood bill as the old Taft-Hartley bill with a southern accent, but I found that I was wrong. The Wood bill is a Republican Massachusetts-Indiana bill. Its true sponsors are Republican Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I quoted from the newspaper Labor which is published by the 15 standard railroad labor organizations and is their official Washington weekly newspapers. In that article they referred to the story carried in the magazine Newsweek on the origin of the Wood bill:

According to Newsweek, "the Wood bill was hatched at a highly secret 3-hour meeting in room F-18 at the Capitol. * * * Actually, there were two Wood bills. The first one bearing the Georgian's name was so much more drastic than Taft-Hartley that the Republican leaders decided they couldn't put it over," Newsweek pointed out.

"So they prepared a new one, ostensibly milder. Before doing so," Newsweek said, "MARTIN and HALLECK obtained a pledge of support from Southern Democratic leaders and conferred with Senators TAFT, of Ohio, and IVES, of New York, on features to be incorporated in the new substitute.

"At the secret meeting in room F-18," the magazine explained, "members of the GOP policy committee and the party's members on the House Labor Committee, unanimously agreed to go along with the MARTIN-HALLECK strategy.

"Core of the strategy," the magazine stressed, "was this: The new Wood bill would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act on paper, but in reality would retain many of the key Taft-Hartley provisions."

Also, Congressman SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Representative of Pennsylvania, "passed the word along to COX, of Georgia, SMITH, of Virginia, and BARDEN, of North Carolina, who in turn lined up their southern Democrats."

"The secret was so well guarded," the magazine declared, "that WOOD himself, who had not been in Washington for 2 weeks, had never seen his new bill, and had little idea of what was in it."

"By getting WOOD to front for them," the magazine added, "Republicans succeeded in dividing censure" with southern Democrats.

"Old-timers on Capitol Hill, when they finally heard of the scheme, were shocked. They said that never in the Capital's history had any such cold-blooded conspiracy been hatched by reactionaries of the two major parties nor in such a subterranean manner."

Up to this time neither the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] nor the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has answered this article. If they are the authors and sponsors of the Wood bill, why do not the Republicans take full credit for it? Maybe they realize what the antilabor tag of Taft-Hartley did to the Republican Party. Is not that the real reason that the Republicans do not want the Wood bill to be known as the Martin-Halleck bill?

The cat is out of the bag, and the people will not be fooled. I shall vote against the Wood bill, and I know that every friend of labor shall do likewise.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, by virtue of his independent authority, the general counsel has been invading the field heretofore treated by the State governments. Under the law, it is the policy of the general counsel to penetrate State authority and to broaden the scope of the Federal Government. The general counsel now has twice as large a staff to carry out the Taft-Hartley law, as compared to the staff that was previously given to the National Labor Relations Board under the Wagner Act. Now that the Taft-Hartley law is weighted in favor of management, they have been given twice the number of employees to carry out the antilabor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in order to break the back of the trade-union movement. This Wood bill is no different than the Taft-Hartley in this respect. Under the Wagner Act, there was a great reluctance on the part of the Federal Government to inject itself into labor-management disputes unless these disputes affected a vital national interest.

If we are to be honest with ourselves, if we want to be honest with the people, if we want to be honest and keep our pledge to the Democratic platform, every true Democrat should vote against the Wood substitute. The Democratic platform specifically called for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the Wood bill certainly does not do this. Let us remember that under the Wood substitute the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board will be able to file a suit for injunction in Federal courts merely on the filing of charges alleging that a union has committed an unfair labor practice. An injunction can be obtained merely on the allegation. No investigation is required. It is not necessary to submit facts and evidence to prove the allegation. It is only necessary for someone to allege, and immediately the general counsel can get an injunction. How can anyone vote to put shackles upon labor without due process, without investigation, without any evidence, but just on a simple allegation?

The Wood bill, just as the Taft-Hartley, takes the Government out of its proper position of neutrality and puts it on the side of management in the industrial field. Instead of building and promoting harmony and understanding, it will create suspicion, distrust, and discord. It is punitive and repressive legislation directed at labor. We should endeavor to insure the individual worker, through collective bargaining, protection against punitive and repressive action.

Our course is clear. We must vote down the Wood substitute and pass H. R. 2032, the administration bill.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment like the other amendments that have been offered to the Wood bill, pretends to soften it, whereas it has little or no effect upon it. The present Wood bill states the same rules in regard to agency that that the Taft-Hartley bill stated. The qualification that mere membership in the union will not be accepted as sufficient to establish responsibilty is a wholly inadequate limitation. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, if you were to bring action against management, you had to establish a relationship of agency. Under the Wood bill, as in the Taft-Hartley, the word "agent" is used parenthetically, not in the ordinary legal sense, when applied to labor unions and members, the Wood bill, like the Taft-Hartley, says it does not make any difference whether the action was approved of beforehand or whether it is subsequently ratified by the union. In other words, it is the action they are here concerned about, not the question of responsibility.

I do not like to attribute motives to the actions of any Members of the House. It appears to be the custom here to preface your remarks by saying you make no such judgment against them. However, there was a good practice in medieval times. When, in Christian charity, men could not pass judgment upon the motives of their fellow men, they coined the term "culpable ignorance" to fix responsibility. I think it might be well for Members of this House to give some consideration to culpable ignorance when they examine their political consciences.

I repeat that the amendment just offered is like those offered earlier in debate. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] offered the first amendment. He extended the time during which a member of a labor union might retain voting rights under strike conditions after he had been replaced in his job, from 90 days, the provision of the Wood bill, to 6 months. This was offered as a liberalizing amendment—yet the provision is wrong in principle—any man who is a part of an economic dispute, which is legally recognized by the National Labor Relations Board—should have a right to vote in the election which is called to settle that dispute, no matter how much time elapses after he is replaced, if he was an employee in good standing at the time the strike was called. The amendment is unsound practically as well. From the gentleman's own statements made in support of his amendment, we find, so he says, that usually 30 days elapse before the original hearing is held after the petition for election is filed. Then, he says, usually 90 days pass before the election is ordered. Often, he says, the time is longer. Then after the election is ordered, it takes at least another 30 days before the election is held. Thus by his own count, it appears that 6 months is just long enough to disqualify most prospective voters.

In similar vein the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has offered a liberalizing amendment. He strikes out the language which would limit secondary boycotts, all other conditions of the law being met, to labor groups which are members of the same local as that involved in the original strike. The only recourse the struck plant then has is to farm out its work to a plant which is worked by members of another union or some other local union. Or as I read the amended act, to a plant which has not agreed with its employees to allow the secondary boycott under the conditions described in the bill. It is possible also to transfer work to

other units of the employers own company, if he has other units in other parts of the country. Then the Bentsen amendment was offered to protect labor in injunction proceedings. The amendment requires an investigation, so thorough, as we can judge by the language that follows in the same amendment, that it is not even necessary to discover where the unfair practice occurred, for the amendment states that the petition may be filed in a district court where the unfair practice in question has occurred, or is alleged to have occurred. If there were any danger that the actions of the general counsel were going to be conducted without written records of any kind, this amendment might be in order; if they were going to be carried out by smoke signals, or through mental telepathy. The amendment adds nothing significant in the way of legal protection to labor.

Let me say finally that the committee deserves commendation for its presentation of this bill. The Lesinski bill as presented here did deal with what is the proper object of this legislation, namely, labor-management relations. The bill was offered for amendment.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] early this afternoon spoke consolingly to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. He made reference to a rug-pulling operation. I am satisfied if the gentleman from North Carolina would submit to examination we would find lint under his fingernails.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD]: On page 15, line 3, after "agreement" insert the following: *"Provided further,* That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement which is valid under State law with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice) to require as a condition of employment membership therein, if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9 (a), in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made."

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] to the Sims amendment because it proposed to permit States to ban closed shops. By the same token, the States that want to legalize the closed shop should be permitted to do so. The policy of the Wood amendment is that closed shops are not lawful. I realize that there are valid objections to the closed shop. The general principle of the closed shop does not appeal to me. However, I feel that it would be a proper concession to States' rights to permit closed-shop arrangements if sentiment supports such a policy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman's amendment that if the closed shop is to be made legal in a State it requires affirmative, positive legislation action by the State?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Where the States do act affirmatively to permit the closed shop, which in certain limited instances are justified and proper, I feel they should be permitted to do so.

It seems to me that one objection to the Lesinski bill is that local situations where there might be abuses of the closed shop cannot be corrected by the States. That is in the face of a recent Supreme Court decision, recognizing the States' authority to ban closed shops. Now, if the Wood bill is designed to correct this weakness in the Lesinski bill, it should at the same time grant to the States the power to permit closed shops if the anti-closed-shop policy is not acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 45, after the period in line 16, insert "the provisions of section 8 (a) 3 and section 8 (b) 2 of the National Labor Relations Act as reenacted and amended by this title shall not make an unfair labor practice the performance of any obligation under a collective-bargaining agreement entered into prior to the date of enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 if the performance of such obligation would not have constituted an unfair labor practice under section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act prior to the effective date of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, unless such agreement was renewed or extended subsequent to such effective date."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, when the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was enacted, a provision was inserted which is known as section 102, which validated any existing closed-shop agreements. Some of them, I am informed, were extended for as much as 5 years, or at least more than 1 or 2 years. The parties had entered into those agreements, and it was felt at that time that no interference should be caused by the Congress concerning the existing contracts. When the bill before us, the Wood bill, was drawn up, that section was omitted. It does not seem to me that it was intended to invalidate any existing legal, binding closed-shop contract. The purpose of this amendment is to restore to the Wood substitute the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 insofar as they validated these agreements. This is one of the things most strenuously objected to by labor organizations in the Wood bill. I believe their position on it is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the adoption of your amendment will help in newspaper plants and printing shops where they have historically had closed-shop contracts?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, under the unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate, debate was to close at 6 o'clock, with 5 minutes to be reserved to this side and 5 minutes to the other side. The clock is approaching that time, and I want to be sure that we will not be foreclosed.

The CHAIRMAN. Even after debate is over, amendments may still be offered and be voted upon.

Mr. HALLECK. But, Mr. Chairman, will we have 5 minutes' time on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The list shows 5 minutes for each side of the committee. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Amendment of that part of section 9 at page 29 beginning with subsection (h) on line 19, all of the balance of page 29 and ending with the word "method" on line 15 on page 30 thereof.

To strike out from the Wood amendment to the Lesinski bill that part of section 9 at page 29 beginning with subsection (h) on line 19, all of the balance of page 29 and ending with the word "method" on page 30 thereof, and to insert in its place and stead the following:

"Every officer, manager, or agent of every labor union, and every officer, manager, or agent of any employer of labor, whether employing union or nonunion labor, shall, on July 4, 1949, and yearly thereafter, take the following affirmation orally and also in writing, before some person authorized under the laws of the United States of America to administer an affirmation, and shall forthwith transmit the properly executed written oath by registered mail to the United States Secretary of Labor at the then seat of government:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

"State of ------, ss:

"I hereby solemnly affirm that I absolutely, entirely, and forever renounce and adjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I may have heretofore been an affiliate, employee, agent, subject, or citizen; that I will always support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the Government of the United States of America by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods; that I am not now and will never become a member of, or support any such organization, in the future; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservations or purposes of evasion whatsoever, and do so, fully mindful of all of the pains and penalties of perjury; and I fully know and understand that the making of a false affirmation will subject me to prosecution, not only for perjury, but also under other applicable laws

of the United States of America relating to subversive and other illegal kindred activities.

"In acknowledgment whereof I have hereunto affixed my signature this ____ day of ------, 19---.

"----------"

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in substance the same amendment which I offered to the Sims amendment, and I feel that it should be passed in order to protect the leaders of labor and management from being besmirched by the insinuations inadvertently contained in the language of the Wood bill which I seek to have stricken out. This oath of allegiance is copied in part from the United States naturalization law.

Just why it should be necessary to give communism such publicity and unearned and unwarranted recognition is beyond my powers to understand. To require these affidavits amounts to a pointing of the finger of suspicion at the leaders of labor and management.

If my amendment is adopted it would not be offensive for the leaders of labor and management to make an affirmation of allegiance to the United States of America and its laws.

Boy Scouts take pledges. Peoples of various religions renew their baptismal vows, and many other pledges are taken.

Why not require on the Fourth of July a renewal of the oath of allegiance to our country by these leaders of labor and capital? Let us be for something—not against the foulest political creed known to the world to date.

A negative approach is not good. No Democrat would say, "I am not a Republican." He would say, "I am a Democrat."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] is entitled to recognition for 5 minutes, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time granted to me to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, we are rapidly approaching a vote on the substitute bill pending before us.

Just let me point out that that substitute has had careful consideration. It has been a good vehicle through which the House could work its will. Amendments have been adopted to it. It has stood the test of a substitute proposed by administration leaders that was offered to take its place and was retained by the House. Other amendments striking out any provision of that bill might have been made.

On that bill the House of Representatives has had complete freedom of action to write labor-management legislation. Now we have gone through it, considered it, amended it, and we are up to the point where we must determine whether we shall proceed with the action that has been thus far carried along so well, in what I believe is one of the finest debates I have ever witnessed on the floor, or whether we shall just take a bill that had no consideration in the committee, and has had no consideration on the floor of the House.

Substantial improvements have been made in existing law, namely, the Taft-Hartley law. Let no one tell you that they are not substantial.

Let me recount them to you. They are the result of honest attempts to meet legitimate criticism that has been made by organized labor and others.

First of all, elections for a union shop were eliminated so that union-shop contracts can be made by voluntary agreement between an employer and a union without election by employees.

The prohibitions on the closed shop were clarified so as to make clear that the union hiring hall will be an available channel for securing applicants for employment.

The secondary-boycott provisions were substantially liberalized to permit unions to strike against work that is farmed out.

Provision for the reopening of contracts was recognized.

Economic strikers were specifically given the right to vote in representation elections.

Unions were given substantially greater latitude in the time for filing their financial statements.

Non-Communist affidavits were made applicable to employers as well as employees, to meet the criticism that the existing law was one-sided in this regard.

The ballot, at the end of a national-emergency injunction was done away with, to meet the criticism that this ballot sought to undermine the union's authority as a representative of the employees.

As we have gone along with the consideration of the bill in the House, what else has happened?

Other liberalizing amendments of a substantial nature were adopted. The Ford amendment extending from 90 days to 6 months the time within which economic strikers remain eligible to vote in representation elections now has been agreed to. This amendment will prevent any possibility of union busting by employers.

The Morton amendment was agreed to, permitting secondary strikes against farmed-out work even where the same local union is not involved in the primary strike.

The Bentsen amendment was agreed to, prohibiting applications for injunction before there has been complete investigation, issuance of a complaint, and a finding of irreparable injury—these injunctions to be obtainable only by the Government itself and not by any private employer. This amendment meets all of the criticism here on the floor and elsewhere about the injunction provision of the Wood bill.

The Lodge amendment was agreed to, recognizing the right of unions to secure the discharge of members who violate union loyalties by disclosing secret union information, members who may have embezzled union funds, or subjected the union to damages or penalties.

Another Morton amendment was then agreed to, further liberalizing the union-shop provisions.

Then the Lodge amendment, correcting the effects of the evidence rule in the free-speech provisions of existing law was agreed to. This was a matter to which my friend from Indiana has so often referred. That is taken care of.

Next came the Keating amendment clarifying the agency rule of existing law, under which it has been charged that unions would be held liable for the unauthorized acts of members of the union just because they were members of the union. This criticism was met.

The Hays amendment, offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, extended the States' rights principle so that States may not only invalidate union shop agreements, but they may likewise by affirmative legislative action validate closed-shop agreements that would otherwise be prohibited under the Federal law.

Then another Keating amendment was agreed to in order to meet the objection raised by many Members that the provision in the Taft-Hartley law, the grandfather clause, protecting existing closed-shop arrangements had been wiped out in this substitute.

I have here a letter addressed to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] by a most important labor organization up there in his area in the State of Maryland. He asked them to point out the things they did not like in the revised Wood substitute. They did that, and I wish to say to you that a majority of those objections have been met.

The measure on which you are about to vote is a measure that has been written by the House itself as a result of the best debate with the best attendance I have ever witnessed in the House of Representatives. It is a measure that ought to be supported by you Members whether you are Democrats or Republicans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Sims substitute is out. We were told that we had a choice between the Sims substitute and the Wood amendment, but the choice now is between the Lesinski bill and the Taft-Hartley Act and all it contains, all the objectionable features that are carried over into the Wood bill. Before you vote for the Wood bill ask yourself whether you are going to accept those parts of the Taft-Hartley Act that are carried over into it, especially the provision for injunctions and

the anti-Communist oath which is so objectionable to many people. Here is the opportunity to vote the Wood bill up or down. This is the choice; this is the test as to whether or not campaign promises and platform pledges are to be upheld by the Democratic Members of the House. I do not, of course, expect the Republicans to go along with that, but I certainly expect the Democrats to go along with it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the issue in 1950 in Ohio is going to be the Taft-Hartley law. We Democrats would rather fight it out, calling it the Taft-Hartley law than calling it the Wood-Halleck bill, because nobody in Ohio knows Mr. WOOD or Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the fundamental principle involved in this discussion of labor-management legislation is whether or not labor should be treated as a commodity, to be purchased in the competitive market, at a price to be determined solely by the law of supply and demand.

Two years ago, we were asked to believe that the way to American security and abundance, to peace and progress, was along the path of reaction in punitive moves directed against all forms of labor security.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was admittedly presented for the purpose of changing the whole range of national labor policy that had been built up in the previous 16 years and reduce in every aspect the privileges and rights of labor. Its avowed objective was, in effect, to abolish industry-wide collective bargaining.

I submit that any attempt to weaken or destroy the working people's right to bargain collectively on an industry-wide basis is directly opposed to the socially progressive movement, in solid labor-management relations, that has been steadily advancing for over a century of our American democratic life.

The advantages of industry-wide bargaining manifestly outweigh the pretended disadvantages. Industry-wide collective bargaining is a natural, inevitable, and healthy step forward toward maturity in industrial relations. It is an alternative to competitive anarchy and Government regulation. It is a logical development in a progressive trend from excessive individualism to group responsibility, and proper social control.

Mr. Chairman, collective bargaining has become an integral part of America's industrial structure. Most authorities agree that free collective bargaining is by far the most democratic and wholesome way of bringing about needed adjustments. It is the right way for labor and management to settle their differences and share their responsibility; it is the American way.

From the very beginning of the American labor movement, the things which unions asked for—the bread-and-butter contracts which they sought—were denounced in many corners. Then, after each gain had been won, historians and people generally looked back and agreed that labor's so-called demands were justified and necessary—because they represented the very things that gave meaning and purpose to our democracy. This fact was clear enough in retrospect and I should think it would be clear today.

Now much is being said about the need for more democratic procedures within the ranks of organized labor. I would like to point out to you that the rank and file of union members are much closer to union affairs than are the electors of most cities. I would like to remind you that union members have a much more direct interest and, indeed, a more direct voice in the way their unions are run than the average citizens in the affairs of their city.

Democracy in unions is not perfect, of course, but it compares very favorably with its counterpart in other kinds of civic activity.

Only in this country and in Canada can you find so very few in the labor movement who are tainted by some ism which threatens the safety of the kind of democracy we have known. Ninety-eight percent of the American trade-unionists are not Socialist or Communist or Fascist.

The Communists, in particular, have made desperate efforts to secure a foothold in the American labor movement. Up to date they have failed utterly because the hand of American labor is against them, and will continue to be against them.

Please do not imagine I am arguing that the labor union is always right and that the employers are always wrong. I would not insult your intelligence by pressing such an argument.

There are 15,000,000 trade-unionists in the United States. With the members of their families and close relatives, they undoubtedly represent at least a fifth, and possibly a fourth, of our population. Of course, there are many shortsighted, selfish, even dishonest, men among them. If that were not true, then the labor movement of America would constitute the greatest miracle witnessed by human beings since our Lord left his sepulcher on the third day and gave His disciples concrete evidence of His divinity.

The labor movement in this country is as American as the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial. Of course, it is constantly fighting to improve the condition of its members, and it will continue to do so. It is led by honorable men whose records in private and public life will bear comparison with the records of the leaders of any other group in American life. I am not apprehensive concerning the future of the American labor movement. It is not a revolutionary movement; I feel it should be regarded as an evolutionary movement, constantly progressing; the efforts being made to hold it back are practically and economically unwise.

I wish to say to the employers of labor: "Extend the hand of fellowship to your workers. Recognize their right to organize unions which suit their needs. Do not be shocked when differences develop. Devise machinery to handle those differences, with a minimum of governmental or other outside interference."

If you do that in good faith, you will find that American trade unionists will meet you at least half way. That is all you have a right to expect, and that is all the trade-union movement should concede.

I think there is a trinity in economics, as there is in religion. The trinity in economics is made up of agriculture, labor, business. They are so closely affiliated that if one is injured, the others are bound to suffer.

Impoverish the farmer, and the industrial worker will find himself without a job, and the businessman will look in vain for a market for his wares. Treat business unfairly, and labor and farmer will discover the door of opportunity is closing. Deny a just wage to the worker, and business and agriculture cannot escape the disastrous consequences.

The task of this Congress is to place our management upon a sound and workable foundation. Up until 2 years ago, the consistent policy of this Government has been based upon the promotion and encouragement of free collective bargaining; our objective should be to restrict the accepted practice of collective bargaining and provide protective provisions for its healthy operation. Where there are admitted and demonstrated weaknesses, we must remedy and strengthen them. At the same time, we must beware of the creation of voluminous and complicated rules which can only result in transferring the conduct of industrial relations, from the parties vitally concerned, to a specially trained group of legal experts, which I submit would be a most disastrous development.

At a time when this Nation and the world is entering a fateful hour of history, let us act without passion and emotion; let us judiciously avoid any threat to our national economy and security by excitement toward industrial strife. Let us reestablish the faith and confidence of both management and labor, in our Government, by inspiring them to reach a commonly advantageous understanding through the peaceful processes of industry-wide collective bargaining.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that despite the trimmings that have been added here and recited by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that the issue today in this House is the same as it was two years ago when the Taft-Hartley law was enacted? By voting for the Wood substitute you are today voting to reenact the Taft Hartley Act.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say one or two things in the closing minutes of this debate. This has been a hard, crucial type of battle for all of us, and it has been difficult to keep our balance. I wish to congratulate the opposition as led by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] for the fine way in which he has handled the debate on this bill. I shall not say a word about the voting; I am sure everyone here knows what the issues are and will vote as he or she deems right.

Mr. KELLEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. All the time has expired on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] as amended.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KELLEY and Mr. WOOD.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 210, noes 196.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 191, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For the benefit of the House, the vote is on the adoption of the Wood amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. The vote is now on the Wood amendment that was adopted in the Committee of the Whole. If the Wood amendment is defeated, then the vote would come on the committee bill, the Lesinski bill, without amendment?

The SPEAKER. The next vote would be on the engrossment and third reading of the Lesinski bill.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 203, answered "present" 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—217

Abbitt	Gwinn	Nixon
Abernethy	Hagen	Norblad
Allen, Calif.	Hale	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Hall,	O'Hara, Minn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Edwin Arthur	Pace
Anderson, Calif.	Hall, Leonard W.	Passman
Andresen, August H.	Halleck	Peterson
Andrews	Hand	Pfeiffer, William L.
Arends	Harden	Phillips, Calif.
Auchincloss	Hardy	Pickett
Barden	Hare	Plumley
Barrett, Wyo.	Harris	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Harrison	Potter
Battle	Harvey	Poulson
Beall	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Bentsen	Hébert	Rankin
Blackney	Herlong	Redden
Bland	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Md.	Hill	Rees
Bolton, Ohio	Hinshaw	Regan
Bonner	Hoeven	Rich
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Bramblett	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Brooks	Holmes	Rivers
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Bryson	Jackson, Calif.	Sadlak
Burton	James	St. George
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Sanborn
Camp	Jenkins	Scott, Hardie
Carlyle	Jennings	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Case, S. Dak.	Jensen	Scrivner
Chatham	Johnson	Scudder
Chiperfield	Jonas	Shafer
Church	Judd	Short
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Keating	Smith, Va.
Coudert	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Cox	Kerr	Stanley
Crawford	Kilburn	Stefan
Cunningham	Kilday	Stockman
Curtis	Kunkel	Taber
Dague	Larcade	Tackett
Davis, Ga.	Latham	Talle
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Taylor
Davis, Wis.	LeFevre	Teague
D'Ewart	Lichtenwalter	Towe
Dolliver	Lodge	Van Zandt
Dondero	Lovre	Velde
Doughton	Lucas	Vinson
Durham	McConnell	Vorys
Eaton	McCulloch	Vursell
Ellsworth	McDonough	Wadsworth
Elston	McGregor	Weichel
Evins	McMillan, S. C.	Werdel
Fallon	McMillen, Ill.	Wheeler
Fellows	Macy	Whitten
Fenton	Mahon	Whittington
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Ford	Martin, Mass.	Williams
Gamble	Mason	Willis
Gary	Merrow	Wilson, Ind.
Gathings	Meyer	Wilson, Tex.
Gavin	Michener	Winstead
Gillette	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Gossett	Morton	Wood
Graham	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Grant	Murray, Wis.	
Gregory	Nelson	
	Nicholson	

NAYS—203

Addonizio	Bolling	Case, N. J.
Albert	Bosone	Cavalcante
Allen, La.	Breen	Celler
Angell	Brehm	Chelf
Aspinall	Buchanan	Chesney
Bailey	Buckley, Ill.	Christopher
Baring	Buckley, N. Y.	Chudoff
Barrett, Pa.	Burdick	Clemente
Bates, Ky.	Burke	Combs
Beckworth	Burleson	Cooper
Bennett, Fla.	Burnside	Corbett
Bennett, Mich.	Byrne, N. Y.	Crook
Biemiller	Canfield	Crosser
Bishop	Cannon	Davenport
Blatnik	Carnahan	Davies, N. Y.
Boggs, La.	Carroll	Dawson
Deane	Kennedy	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Delaney	Keogh	Philbin
Denton	King	Phillips, Tenn.
Dingell	Kirwan	Polk
Dollinger	Klein	Powell
Donohue	Kruse	Price
Douglas	Lane	Priest
Doyle	Lanham	Quinn
Eberharter	Lemke	Rabaut
Elliott	Lesinski	Rains
Engel, Mich.	Lind	Ramsay
Engle, Calif.	Linehan	Rhodes
Feighan	Lyle	Ribicoff
Fernandez	Lynch	Rodino
Flood	McCarthy	Rooney
Fogarty	McCormack	Sabath
Forand	McGrath	Sadowski
Frazier	McGuire	Sasscer
Fugate	McKinnon	Secrest
Fulton	McSweeney	Sheppard
Furcolo	Mack, Ill.	Sikes
Garmatz	Mack, Wash.	Sims
Golden	Madden	Smathers
Gordon	Magee	Spence
Gore	Mansfield	Staggers
Gorski, Ill.	Marcantonio	Steed
Gorski, N. Y.	Marsalis	Stigler
Granahan	Marshall	Sullivan
Granger	Miles	Sutton
Green	Miller, Calif.	Tauriello
Gross	Mills	Thomas, Tex.
Hart	Mitchell	Thompson
Havenner	Monroney	Thornberry
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Tollefson
Hedrick	Morris	Trimble
Heffernan	Morrison	Underwood
Heller	Moulder	Wagner
Holifield	Multer	Walter
Howell	Murdock	Welch, Calif.
Huber	Murphy	Welch, Mo.
Hull	Noland	White, Calif.
Irving	Norton	White, Idaho
Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien, Ill.	Wickersham
Jacobs	O'Hara, Ill.	Wier
Javits	O'Konski	Wilson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.	O'Neill	Withrow
Jones, Mo.	O'Sullivan	Woodhouse
Jones, N. C.	O'Toole	Worley
Karst	Patman	Yates
Karsten	Patten	Young
Kee	Patterson	Zablocki
Kelley	Perkins	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cooley

NOT VOTING—10

Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Walsh
Clevenger	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitaker
DeGraffenried	Smith, Ohio	
Gilmer	Thomas, N. J.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Gilmer against.
Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mr. Cooley against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Walsh with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BULWINKLE. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. TACKETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. If this bill uses language which is no longer in keeping with our laws, I raise the point of order that it is incorrectly drawn. On page 53, line 13, this bill uses the language, "to review by the appropriate circuit court of

appeals." I make the point of order that there is no longer any circuit court of appeals.

The SPEAKER. There might be 203 Members take the same position that the gentleman from New York does, but that does not alter the situation.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. The Chair thinks it would not be practicable to wait for that this evening.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSAY, Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from a newspaper.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain statistical data.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Charles Collingwood on patronage.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on Sunday, April 3, 1949.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] as to the program for the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. After the disposition of the labor bill tomorrow, the next order of business will be the bill H. R. 165, relating to the American River Basin.

I may say no rule has yet been reported on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

I understand that quite a number of Members are going to New York on Friday, and it is my hope to adjourn over from Thursday to Monday. For Wednesday and Thursday I have scheduled the bill H. R. 165, relating to the American River Basin, H. R. 2989, a bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, H. R. 4080, the military justice uniform code bill—I have placed this on the program after consulting the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services—and H. R. 2023, a bill providing for a decennial census of housing. We will try to dispose of all of these bills, if possible, or as many as we can. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I cannot put the tobacco-tax bill on the program for this week.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 2 hours on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the labor bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the Motion Picture Industry Council.

Mr. SASSCER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous material, and further to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include information concerning the program for rural reconstruction in China. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will take seven and one-half pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $562, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the United States Naval Institute proceedings. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will take two and one-half pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $187.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I was served with a subpena issued by the Federal grand jury sitting in New York City, demanding that I appear before this body on Wednesday, May 4, in regard to an alleged violation of section 88, title 18, United States Code. This violation of the United States criminal law deals with conspiracies. I have been informed that the jury is interested in hearing my testimony concerning facts that I obtained while employed as an FBI agent by the Department of Justice, from 1942 through 1945. Further than that, the grand jury wants some information about Russian espionage activities which took place in the San Francisco Bay area, where I was assigned from 1943 to 1945.

Prior to this subpena being served upon me last week I had been requested by the Criminal Division of the office of the Attorney General to appear before the New York grand jury in order to verify or deny certain statements in the press regarding Russian espionage activities. At that time, due to the fact that the Labor Committee, of which I am a member, was holding important hearings almost daily, I declined the request to appear. At the same time I declined this request I stated to the Attorney General's office that I would be glad to cooperate with the Federal grand jury and that I would make every effort to appear before it at the first opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of the House are more familiar than I with the procedure of grand juries and other courts in subpenaing Members of Congress while it is in session. It appears at this time that the debate and discussion and vote on labor legislation here will continue during the time I am called to appear before the grand jury; therefore I shall use my prerogative as a Member of Congress and refuse to answer this subpena. For the record, however, I want to say that I shall make every attempt to meet with the grand jury in New York City and give it any information I may have concerning the matters they are now investigating.

I have made tentative arrangements to appear before the New York grand jury on Friday of this week, provided that the appearance does not interfere with my duties here. As a member of the Un-

American Activities Committee, but not speaking for the committee as a whole, I wish to say that I will refuse to reveal any information obtained as a member of that committee until authorized to do so by the committee as a whole. I shall, however, cooperate with the grand jury and give them any information I may have gained as an investigator for the FBI until the latter part of 1945.

It appears to me that inasmuch as the information which is desired by the grand jury was secured by numerous FBI agents working all over the country, and since my information only represents a very minor part of the total investigation, the grand jury should first of all exhaust all the present means of obtaining evidence concerning this espionage activity from the Department of Justice's own files.

The matter which is being investigated by the New York grand jury and the Un-American Activities Committee at this time is, in my opinion, one of the most serious espionage cases ever developed in the United States history. It involves the attempt by the Russian Government, working through American Communists and agents in this country, to secure the secret of the atomic bomb—the most powerful weapon of war the world has ever known. Whether we like it or not and whether we can successfully prosecute the guilty or not, we do know that there are a number of Russian espionage agents who have been and still are operating in this country. It may be that our laws are not sufficiently strong to enable us to bring to justice these dangerous criminals. I feel that since they have not been brought to justice during the past 6 years we should make some effort to revise our criminal laws on sedition, espionage, treason, and conspiracy to commit these crimes, but we cannot revise these laws without a thorough study by congressional committees to ascertain the real reason prosecution is not possible.

There has been some comment that the 3-year statute of limitations is not sufficient for the crimes of peacetime espionage and sedition. There also has been some comment concerning the advisability of allowing evidence by wiretapping to be introduced in court in these criminal cases which involve national security. In my opinion, the Un American Activities Committee was set up by Congress for this very purpose, that is, to study these unprosecuted violations in order to obtain sufficient information to determine what laws are needed to combat them. Of course, I also believe that the Un-American Activities Committee should publicize the past activity of these Russian espionage agents so that the public can become fully aware of the great danger they bear to our national security.

THE WOOD AMENDMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Wood amendment, as adopted by the House, be printed in the RECORD of today's proceedings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949."

(b) Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and above all recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

It is the purpose and policy of this Act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to define and proscribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare, and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce.

TITLE I

REPEAL OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AND REENACTMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT WITH CERTAIN AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby repealed. The National Labor Relations Act, as it existed prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND POLICIES

"SECTION 1. The denial by some employers of the right of employees to organize and the refusal by some employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest, which have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by (a) impairing the efficiency, safety, or operation of the instrumentalities of commerce; (b) occurring in the current of commerce; (c) materially affecting, restraining, or controlling the flow of raw materials or manufactured or processed goods from or into the channels of commerce, or the prices of such materials or goods in commerce; or (d) causing diminution of employment and wages in such volume as substantially to impair or disrupt the market for goods flowing from or into the channels of commerce.

"The inequality of bargaining power between employees who do not possess full freedom of association or actual liberty of contract, and employers who are organized in the corporate or other forms of ownership association substantially burdens and affects the flow of commerce, and tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions, by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners in industry and by preventing the stabilization of competitive wage rates and working conditions within and between industries.

"Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

"Experience has further demonstrated that certain practices by some labor organizations, their officers, and members have the intent or the necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce by preventing the free flow of goods in such commerce through strikes and other forms of industrial unrest or through concerted activities which impair the interest of the public in the free flow of such commerce. The elimination of such practices is a necessary condition to the assurance of the rights herein guaranteed.

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. When used in this act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

"(2) The term 'employer' includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporations, or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

"(3) The term 'employee' shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute or because of any unfair labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse, or any individual having the status of an independent contractor, or any individual employed as a supervisor, or any individual employed by an employer subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or by any other person who is not an employer as herein defined.

"(4) The term 'representatives' includes any individual or labor organization.

"(5) The term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, or dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"(6) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State

or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

"(7) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(8) The term 'unfair labor practice' means any unfair labor practice listed in section 8.

"(9) The term 'labor dispute' includes any controversy concerning terms, tenure or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee.

"(10) The term 'National Labor Relations Board' means the National Labor Labor Relations Board provided for in section 3 of this act.

"(11) The term 'supervisor' means any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay-off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibly to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment.

"(12) The term 'professional employee' means—

"(a) any employee engaged in work (i) predominantly intellectual and varied in character as opposed to routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work; (ii) involving the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance; (iii) of such a character that the output produced or the result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time; (iv) requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning or a hospital, as distinguished from a general academic education or from an apprenticeship or from training in the performance of routine mental, manual, or physical processes; or

"(b) any employee, who (i) has completed the courses of specialized intellectual instruction and study described in clause (iv) of paragraph (a), and (ii) is performing related work under the supervision of a professional person to qualify himself to become a professional employee as defined in paragraph (a).

"(13) In determining whether any person is acting as an 'agent' of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling: *Provided*, That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of any member thereof solely on the ground of such membership.

"NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"SEC. 3. (a) The National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter called the 'Board'), consisting of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949, the terms of office of the members of the Board in office on the date of the enactment of such act shall expire as provided by law at the time of their appointment. Their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, excepting that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) The Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers which it may itself exercise. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board, and three members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum of the Board, except that two members shall constitute a quorum of any group designated pursuant to the first sentence hereof. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

"(d) There shall be a general counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949, the term of office of the general counsel in office on the date of the enactment of such act shall expire as provided by law at the time of his appointment. The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law.

"SEC. 4. (a) Each member of the Board and the general counsel of the Board shall receive a salary of $12,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties. The Board may not employ any attorneys for the purpose of reviewing transcripts of hearings or preparing drafts of opinions except that any attorney employed for assignment as a legal assistant to any Board member may for such Board member review such transcripts and prepare such drafts. No trial examiner's report shall be reviewed, either before or after its publication, by any person other than a member of the Board or his legal assistant, and no trial examiner shall advise or consult with the Board with respect to exceptions taken to his findings, rulings, or recommendations. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Board, appear for and represent the Board in any case in court. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Board to appoint individuals for the purpose of conciliation or mediation, or for economic analysis.

"(b) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"SEC. 5. The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. A member who participates in such an inquiry shall not be disqualified from subsequently participating in a decision of the Board in the same case.

"SEC. 6. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 8 (a) (3).

"UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

"(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7;

"(2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it: *Provided*, That subject to rules and regulations made and published by the Board pursuant to section 6, an employer shall not be prohibited from permitting employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of time or pay;

"(3) by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization: *Provided*, That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice) to require as a condition of employment membership therein on or after the thirtieth day following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of such agreement, whichever is the later, (i) if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9 (a), in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made and has complied with all the requirements imposed by sections 9 (f), (g), and (h); and (ii) if, in case an election has been held under section 9 (e) (1) within 1 year preceding the effective date of such agreement, the Board shall not have certified that at least a majority of the employees eligible to vote in such election have voted to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make such an agreement: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement which is valid under State law with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by

any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice) to require as a condition of employment membership therein, if such labor organization is the representative of the employees as provided in section 9 (a), in the appropriate collective-bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made: *Provided further,* That no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, or (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than (1) the employee's failure to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (2) the employee's participation in, or encouragement of other employees to engage in, a strike or concerted activity in violation of the collective-bargaining agreement between such labor organization and the employer, or (3) the employee's membership or affiliation with the Communist Party or his support thereof, or his membership in, affiliation with, or support of any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overtarow of the United States Government by force or any illegal or unconstitutional methods or (4) the disclosure by the employee of confidential information of the labor organization, or (5) conviction of the employee of a felony or (6) the employee's having engaged in conduct subjecting the labor organization to civil damages or criminal penalties: *And provided further,* That nothing in this act, or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from notifying a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice) of opportunities for employment with such employer, or giving such labor organizations a reasonable opportunity to refer qualified applicants for such employment;

"(4) to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this act;

"(5) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees, subject to the provisions of section 9 (a).

"(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organizaion or its agents—

"(1) to restrain or coerce (A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquistion or retention of membership therein; or (B) an employer in the selection of his representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances;

"(2) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of subsection (a) (3) or to discriminate against an employee with respect to whom membership in such organization has been denied or terminated on some ground other than (1) the employee's failure to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership, or (2) the employee's participation in, or encouragement of other employees to engage in, a strike or concerted activity in violation of the collective-bargaining agreement between such labor organization and the employer, or (3) the employee's membership or affiliation with the Communist Party or his support thereof, or his membership in, affiliation with, or support of any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or any illegal or unconstitutional methods or (4) the disclosure by the employee of confidential information of the labor organization, or (5) conviction of the employee of a felony, or (6) the employee's having engaged in conduct subjecting the labor organization to civil damages or criminal penalties;

"(3) to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, provided it is the representative of his employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a);

"(4) to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is: (A) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person; unless such strike or concerted refusal is authorized by a clause or stipulation in a collective-bargaining contract permitting employees covered by such contract to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose employees, who would normally perform such work, are engaged in a lawful strike approved or ratified by their representative whom such employer is required to recognize under this act; (B) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (C) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9; (D) forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class, unless such employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under this act;

"(5) to require of employees covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a) (3) the payment, as a condition precedent to becoming a member of such organization, of a fee in an amount which the Board finds excessive or discriminatory under all the circumstances. In making such a finding, the Board shall consider, among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organizations in the particular industry, and the wages currently paid to the employees affected;

"(6) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed or not to be performed; and

"(c) The Board shall not base any findings of unfair labor practice upon, or set aside or refuse to hold any election upon the basis of, any statement of views or arguments, either written or oral, (1) if such statement, considered in the light of all the relevant circumstances, contains no threat, express or implied, of reprisal or force, or offer, express or implied, of benefits, or (2) if the statement, considered in the light of all the relevant circumstances, is such as would justify a district judge in refusing to submit it to a jury, or in setting aside a verdict based thereon against the person making it, were the same issues involved in a trial of such person in a district court of the United States.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession: *Provided,* That where there is in effect a collective-bargaining contract covering employees in an industry affecting commerce, the duty to bargain collectively shall also mean that no party to such contract shall terminate or modify such contract, unless the party desiring such termination or modification—

"(1) serves a written notice upon the other party to the contract of the proposed termination or modification 60 days prior to the expiration date thereof, or in the event such contract contains no expiration date, or such contract contains reopening provisions for purposes of modification, 60 days prior to the time it is proposed to make such termination or modification;

"(2) offers to meet and confer with the other party for the purpose of negotiating a new contract or a contract containing the proposed modifications;

"(3) notifies the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service within 30 days after such notice of the existence of a dispute, and simultaneously therewith notifies any State or Territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or Territory where the dispute occurred, provided no agreement has been reached by that time; and

"(4) continues in full force and effect, without resorting to strike or lock-out, all the terms and conditions of the existing contract for a period of 60 days after such notice is given:

"The duties imposed upon employers, employees, and labor organizations by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall become inapplicable upon an intervening certification of the Board, under which the labor organization or individual, which is a party to the contract, has been superseded as or ceased to be the representative of the employees subject to the provisions of section 9 (a), and the duties so imposed shall not be construed as requiring either party to discuss or agree to any modification of the terms and conditions contained in a contract for a fixed period, if such modification is to become effective before such terms and conditions can be reopened under the provisions of the contract.

"REPRESENTATIVES AND ELECTIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) Representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment: *Provided,* That any individual employee or a group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer and to have such grievances adjusted, without the

intervention of the bargaining representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining contract or agreement then in effect: *Provided further*, That the bargaining representative has been given opportunity to be present at such adjustment.

"(b) The Board shall decide in each case whether, in order to assure to employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this act, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof: *Provided*, That the Board shall not (1) decide that any unit is appropriate for such purposes if such unit includes both professional employees and employees who are not professional employees unless a majority of such professional employees vote for inclusion in such unit; or (2) decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purposes on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination, unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation or (3) decide that any unit is appropriate for such purposes if it includes, together with other employees, any individual employed as a guard to enforce against employees and other persons rules to protect property of the employer or to protect the safety of persons on the employer's premises; but no labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

"(c) (1) Whenever a petition shall have been filed, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Board—

"(A) by an employee or group of employees or any individual or labor organization acting in their behalf alleging that a substantial number of employees (i) wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their employer declines to recognize their representative as the representative defined in section 9 (a), or (ii) assert that the individual or labor organization, which has been certified or as being currently recognized by their employer as the bargaining representative, is no longer a representative as defined in section 9 (a); or

"(B) by an employer, alleging that one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim to be recognized as the representative defined in section 9 (a);

the Board shall investigate such petition and if it has reasonable cause to believe that a question of representation affecting commerce exists shall provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice. Such hearing may be conducted by an officer or employee of the regional office, who shall not make any recommendations with respect thereto. If the Board finds upon the record of such hearing that such a question of representation exists, it shall direct an election by secret ballot and shall certify the results thereof.

"(2) In determining whether or not a question of representation affecting commerce exists, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of the identity of the persons filing the petition or the kind of relief sought and in no case shall the Board deny a labor organization a place on the ballot by reason of an order with respect to such labor organization or its predecessor not issued in conformity with section 10 (c).

"(3) No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held. An employee on strike shall be eligible to vote (A) if he is entitled to reinstatement, or (B) even though he is not entitled to reinstatement, if his place has not been validly filled by a permanent replacement for 6 months or more preceding the date of the election. In any election where none of the choices on the ballot receives a majority, a run-off shall be conducted, the ballot providing for a selection between the two choices receiving the largest and second largest number of valid votes cast in the election.

"(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the waiving of hearings by stipulation for the purpose of a consent election in conformity with regulations and rules of decision of the Board.

"(5) In determining whether a unit is appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b) the extent to which the employees have organized shall not be controlling.

"(d) Whenever an order of the Board made pursuant to section 10 (c) is based in whole or in part upon facts certified following an investigation pursuant to subsection (c) of this section and there is a petition for the enforcement or review of such order, such certification and the record of such investigation shall be included in the transcript of the entire record required to be filed under section 10 (e) or 10 (f), and thereupon the decree of the court enforcing, modifying, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board shall be made and entered upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript.

"(e) (1) Upon the filing with the Board by 30 percent or more of the employees in an appropriate collective-bargaining unit of whom a labor organization is the representative as provided in section 9 (a), of a petition alleging that they desire to rescind the authority of such labor organization to make an agreement with the employer of such employees requiring membership in such labor organization as a condition of employment in such unit, the Board shall take a secret ballot of the employees in such unit shall certify the results thereof to such labor organization and to the employer.

"(2) No election shall be conducted pursuant to this subsection in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held.

"(f) No investigation shall be made by the board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, unless such labor organization and any national or international labor organization of which such labor organization is an affiliate or constituent unit (A) shall have prior thereto filed with the Secretary of Labor copies of its constitution and bylaws and a report, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, showing—

"(1) the name of such labor organization and the address of its principal place of business;

"(2) the names, titles, and compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and of any of its other officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the preceding year exceeded $5,000, and the amount of the compensation and allowances paid to each such officer or agent during such year;

"(3) the manner in which the officers and agents referred to in clause (2) were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected;

"(4) the initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay on becoming members of such labor organization;

"(5) the regular dues or fees which members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing of such labor organization;

"(6) a detailed statement of, or reference to provisions of its constitution and bylaws showing the procedure followed with respect to, (a) qualification for or restrictions on membership, (b) election of officers and stewards, (c) calling of regular and special meetings, (d) levying of assessments, (e) imposition of fines, (f) authorization for bargaining demands, (g) ratification of contract terms, (h) authorization for strikes, (i) authorization for disbursement of union funds, (j) audit of union financial transactions, (k) participation in insurance or other benefit plans, and (l) expulsion of members and the grounds therefor;

and (B) can show that prior thereto it has—

"(1) filed with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, a report showing all of (a) its receipts of any kind and the sources of such receipts, (b) its total assets and liabilities as of the end of its last fiscal year, (c) the disbursements made by it during such fiscal year, including the purposes for which made, which report shall be filed within 125 days of the end of such fiscal year; and

"(2) furnished to all of the members of such labor organization copies of the financial report required by paragraph (1) hereof to be filed with the Secretary of Labor.

"(g) It shall be the obligation of all labor organizations to file annually with the Secretary of Labor, in such form as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, reports bringing up to date the information required to be supplied in the initial filing by subsection (f) (A) of this section, and to file with the Secretary of Labor, and furnish to its members annually financial reports in the form and manner prescribed in subsection (f) (B). No labor organization shall be eligible for certification under this section as the representative of any employees, and no complaint shall issue under section 10 with respect to a charge filed by a labor organization unless it can show that it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit has complied with its obligation under this subsection.

"(h) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees under subsection (c) of this section raised by, and no complaint shall be issued under subsection (b) of section 10, pursuant to a charge made by—

"(i) a labor organization unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by each officer of such labor organization and the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit; or

"(ii) an employer, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by such employer, if a natural person or persons, or each officer of such employer—

stating that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of, or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 35A of the Criminal Code shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits.

"PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 10. (a) The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in sec. 8) affecting commerce. This power shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry (other than mining, manufacturing,

communications, and transportation except where predominantly local in character) even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce, unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

"(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect, and containing a notice of hearing before the Board or a member thereof, or before a designated agent or agency, at a place therein fixed, not less than 5 days after the serving of said complaint: *Provided,* That no complaint shall issue based upon any unfair labor practice occurring more than 6 months prior to the filing of the charge with the Board and the service of a copy thereof upon the person against whom such charge is made, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the armed forces, in which event the 6-month period shall be computed from the day of his discharge. Any such complaint may be amended by the member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or the Board in its discretion at any time prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to the original or amended complaint and to appear in person or otherwise and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint. In the discretion of the member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or the Board, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the said proceeding and to present testimony. Any such proceeding shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure for the district courts of the United States, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 723–B, 723–C).

"(c) The testimony taken by such member, agent, or agency or the Board shall be reduced to writing and filed with the Board. Thereafter, in its discretion, the Board upon notice may take further testimony or hear argument. If upon the preponderance of the testimony taken the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act: *Provided,* That where an order directs reinstatement of an employee, back pay may be required of the employer or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination suffered by him: *And provided further,* That in determining whether a complaint shall issue alleging a violation of section 8 (a) (1) or section 8 (a) (2), and in deciding such cases, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of whether or not the labor organization affected is affiliated with a labor organization national or international in scope. Such order may further require such person to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If upon the preponderance of the testimony taken the Board shall not be of the opinion that the person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint. No order of the Board shall require the reinstatement of any individual as an employee who has been suspended or discharged, or the payment to him of any back pay, if such individual was suspended or discharged for cause. In case the evidence is presented before a member of the Board, or before an examiner or examiners thereof, such member, or such examiner or examiners, as the case may be, shall issue and cause to be served on the parties to the proceeding a proposed report, together with a recommended order, which shall be filed with the Board, and if no exceptions are filed within 20 days after service thereof upon such parties, or within such further period as the Board may authorize, such recommended order shall become the order of the Board and become effective as therein prescribed.

"(d) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the Board may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(e) The Board shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia), or if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application may be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia), within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair labor practice in question occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceedings, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board. No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board, its members, agent, or agency, and to be made a part of the transcript. The Board may modify its findings as to the facts; or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals if application was made to the district court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 348 and 347).

"(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Board granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, including the pleading and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered, and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Board under subsection (e), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Board such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board; the findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall in like manner be conclusive.

"(g) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (e) or (f) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Board's order.

"(h) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Board, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 29, secs. 101–115).

"(i) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously, and if possible within 10 days after they have been docketed.

"(j) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice under this act, an investigation has been conducted and a complaint has been issued thereon by the general counsel, if irreparable injury to the charging party is unavoidable and it is in the public interest, the general counsel may petition any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any district where the unfair labor practice in question has occurred, is alleged to have occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Board with respect to such matter. Upon the filing of any such petition the district court shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further,* That no temporary restraining order shall be issued without notice unless a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party will be unavoidable and such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and will become void at the expiration of such period. Upon

filing of any such petition the courts shall cause notice thereof to be served upon any person involved in the charge and such person, including the charging party, shall be given an opportunity to appear by counsel and present any relevant testimony: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this subsection, district courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of any employer or a labor organization (1) in the district in which such employer or labor organization, as the case may be, maintains its principal office, or (2) in any district in which (in the case of an employer) the employer transacts business, or (in the came of a labor organization) in which the labor organization's authorized officers or agents are engaged in promoting or protecting the interests of employee members, and in the case of a labor organization the service of legal process upon such an authorized officer or agent shall constitute service upon the labor organization and make such organization a party to the suit.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 11. For the purpose of all hearings and investigations, which, in the opinion of the Board, are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by section 9 and section 10—

"(1) The Board, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. The Board, or any member thereof, shall upon application of any party to such proceedings, forthwith issue to such party subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such proceeding or investigation requested in such application. Within 5 days after the service of a subpena on any person requiring the production of any evidence in his possession or under his control, such person may petition the Board to revoke, and the Board shall revoke, such subpena if in its opinion the evidence whose production is required does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if in its opinion such subpena does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence whose production is required. Any member of the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Board shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

"(3) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(4) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Board, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(5) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(6) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

"SEC. 12. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Board or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 13. Nothing in this act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.

"SEC. 14. (a) Nothing herein shall prohibit any individual employed as a supervisor from becoming or remaining a member of a labor organization, but no employer subject to this act shall be compelled to deem individuals defined herein as supervisors as employees for the purpose of any law, either national or local, relating to collective bargaining.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

"SEC. 15. Wherever the application of the provisions of section 272 of chapter 10 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (U. S. C., title 11, sec. 672), conflicts with the application of the provisions of this act, this act shall prevail: *Provided,* That in any situation where the provisions of this act cannot be validly enforced, the provisions of such other acts shall remain in full force and effect.

"SEC. 16. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 17. This act may be cited as the 'National Labor Relations Act.'"

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. No proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board shall abate, and no order or certification of the Board in effect on the date of the enactment of this act shall be invalidated, by reason of any of the provisions of this act or of the amendments made by this act, but such proceeding shall be continued, and such orders and certifications continue in effect, as if this act had not been enacted; and no provision of this act shall prevent the Board from entertaining, processing, making, or enforcing any petition, charge, complaint, or order with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this act; except that the Board shall not, in any of the above cases, entertain, process, make, or enforce any petition, charge, complaint, or order with respect to any act or omission occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this act unless such petition, charge, complaint, or order could be entertained, processed, made, or enforced by the Board with respect to a like act or omission occurring after the date of the enactment of this act. The provisions of section 8 (a) (3) and section 8 (b) (2) of the National Labor Relations Act, as reenacted and amended by this title, shall not make an unfair labor practice the performance of any obligation under a collective-bargaining agreement entered into prior to the date of enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, if the performance of such obligation would not have constituted an unfair labor practice under section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act prior to the effective date of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, unless such agreement was renewed or extended subsequent to such effective date.

TITLE II—CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES IN INDUSTRIES AFFECTING COMMERCE; NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

SEC. 201. It is the policy of the United States that—

(a) sound and stable industrial peace and the advancement of the general welfare, health, and safety of the Nation and of the best interests of employers and employees can most satisfactorily be secured by the settlement of issues between employers and employees through the processes of conference and collective bargaining between employers and the representatives of their employees;

(b) the settlement of issues between employers and employees through collective bargaining may be advanced by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration to aid and encourage employers and the representatives of their employees to reach and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, and to make all reasonable efforts to settle their differences by mutual agreement reached through conferences and collective bargaining or by such methods as may be provided for in any applicable agreement for the settlement of disputes; and

(c) certain controversies which arise between parties to collective-bargaining agreements may be avoided or minimized by making available full and adequate governmental facilities for furnishing assistance to employers and the representatives of their employees in formulating for inclusion within such agreements provision for adequate notice of any proposed changes in the terms of such agreements, for the final adjustment of grievances or questions regarding the application or interpretation of such agreements, and other provisions designed to

prevent the subsequent arising of such controversies.

SEC. 202. (a) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 101 of this act, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is hereby continued as an independent agency of the United States. The Service shall be under the direction of a Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"), appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but section 101 of this act shall not have the effect of vacating or abolishing the office of Director in office on the date of the enactment of this act. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. The Director shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(b) The Director is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to appoint such clerical and other personnel as may be necessary for the execution of the functions of the Service, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and may, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such conciliators and mediators as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Service. The Director is authorized to make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as he deems necessary. Such expenditures shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Director or by any employee designated by him for that purpose.

(c) The principal office of the Service shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Director may establish regional offices convenient to localities in which labor controversies are likely to arise. The Director may by order, subject to revocation at any time, delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him by this act of any regional director, or other officer or employee of the Service. The Director may establish suitable procedures for cooperation with State and local mediation agencies. The Director shall make an annual report in writing to Congress at the end of the fiscal year.

(d) All mediation and conciliation functions vested, prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the Secretary of Labor or the United States Conciliation Service under section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913 (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 51), and all functions vested, prior to the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in the United States Conciliation Service under any other law shall continue as functions of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The Director and the Service shall not be subject in any way to the jurisdiction or authority of the Secretary of Labor or any official or division of the Department of Labor.

FUNCTIONS OF THE SERVICE

SEC. 203. (a) It shall be the duty of the Service, in order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, to assist parties to labor disputes in industries affecting commerce to settle such disputes through conciliation and mediation.

(b) The Service may proffer its services in any labor dispute in any industry affecting commerce, either upon its own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to the dispute, whenever in its judgment such dispute threatens to cause a substantial interruption of commerce. The Director and the Service are directed to avoid attempting to mediate disputes which would have only a minor effect on interstate commerce if State or other conciliation services are available to the parties. Whenever the Service does proffer its services in any dispute, it shall be the duty of the Service promptly to put itself in communication with the parties and to use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement.

(c) If the Director is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation within a reasonable time, he shall seek to induce the parties voluntarily to seek other means of settling the dispute without resort to strike, lock-out, or other coercion. The failure or refusal of either party to agree to any procedure suggested by the Director shall not be deemed a violation of any duty or obligation imposed by this act.

(d) Final adjustment by a method agreed upon by the parties is hereby declared to be the desirable method for settlement of grievance disputes arising over the application or interpretation of an existing collective-bargaining agreement. The Service is directed to make its conciliation and mediation services available in the settlement of such grievance disputes only as a last resort and in exceptional cases.

SEC. 204. (a) In order to prevent or minimize interruptions of the free flow of commerce growing out of labor disputes, employers and employees and their representatives, in any industry affecting commerce, shall—

(1) exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, including provision for adequate notice of any proposed change in the terms of such agreements;

(2) whenever a dispute arises over the terms or application of a collective-bargaining agreement and a conference is requested by a party or prospective party thereto, arrange promptly for such a conference to be held and endeavor in such conference to settle such dispute expeditiously; and

(3) in case such dispute is not settled by conference, participate fully and promptly in such meetings as may be undertaken by the Service under this act for the purpose of aiding in a settlement of the dispute.

SEC. 205. (a) There shall be a National Labor-Management Panel which shall be composed of 12 members appointed by the President, 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of management and 6 of whom shall be selected from among persons outstanding in the field of labor, equal representation insofar as practicable shall be accorded all labor organizations whether or not such organizations are national or international in scope. Each member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, four at the end of the first year, four at the end of the second year, and four at the end of the third year after the date of appointment. Notwithstanding section 101 of this act, the terms of office of the members in office on the date of the enactment of this act shall expire as provided by law at the time of their appointment. Members of the panel, when serving on business of the panel, shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

(b) It shall be the duty of the panel, at the request of the Director, to advise in the avoidance of industrial controversies and the manner in which mediation and voluntary adjustment shall be administered, particularly with reference to controversies affecting the general welfare of the country.

NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

SEC. 206. (a) Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, will, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the national health or safety, he may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof, and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out—

(i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and

(ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lock-out, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

(b) In any case, the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall not be applicable.

(c) The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 346 and 347).

SEC. 207. (a) Whenever a district court has issued an order under section 206 enjoining acts or practices which imperil or threaten to imperil the national health or safety, it shall be the duty of the parties to the labor dispute giving rise to such order to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, with the assistance of the service created by this act. Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any proposal of settlement made by the service.

(b) Upon the issuance of such an order, the President shall appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues involved in the dispute and to make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the disputes, including each party's statement of its position but shall not contain any recommendations. The President shall file a copy of such report with the service and shall make its contents available to the public.

(c) At the end of an 80-day period after the issuance of any order by a district court (unless the dispute has been settled by that time), the board of inquiry shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement, and shall include a statement by each party of its position and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. The President shall make such report available to the public.

SEC. 208. Upon the expiration of such 80-day period or upon a settlement being reached, whichever happens sooner, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction, which motion shall then be granted and the injunction discharged. When such motion is granted, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, including the findings of the board of inquiry, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action.

SEC. 209. (a) A board of inquiry shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

(b) Members of a board of inquiry shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

(c) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. 19, title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

COMPILATION OF COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS, ETC.

SEC. 210. (a) For the guidance and information of interested representatives of employers, employees, and the general public, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor shall maintain a file of copies of all available collective-bargaining agreements and other available agreements and actions thereunder settling or adjusting labor disputes. Such file shall be open to inspection under appropriate conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, except that no specific information submitted in confidence shall be disclosed.

(b) The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor is authorized to furnish upon request of the Service, or employers, employees, or their representatives, all available data and factual information which may aid in the settlement of any labor dispute, except that no specific information submitted in confidence shall be disclosed.

EXEMPTION OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

SEC. 211. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any matter which is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time.

TITLE III

SUITS BY AND AGAINST LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this act, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties.

(b) Any labor organization which represents employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this act and any employer whose activities affect commerce as defined in this act shall be bound by the acts of its agents. Any such labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity and in behalf of the employees whom it represents in the courts of the United States. Any money judgment against a labor organization in a district court of the United States shall be enforceable only against the organization as an entity and against its assets, and shall not be enforceable against any individual member or his assets.

(c) For the purposes of actions and proceedings by or against labor organizations in the district courts of the United States, district courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of a labor organization (1) in the district in which such organization maintains its principal office, or (2) in any district in which its duly authorized officers or agents are engaged in representing or acting for employee members.

(d) The service of summons, subpena, or other legal process of any court of the United States upon an officer or agent of a labor organization, in his capacity as such, shall constitute service upon the labor organization.

(e) For the purposes of this section, in determining whether any person is acting as an "agent" of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling: *Provided*, That no labor organization shall be held responsible for the acts of any member thereof solely on the ground of such membership.

RESTRICTIONS ON PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 302. (a) It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of his employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any representative of any employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce to receive or accept or to agree to receive or accept, from the employer of such employees any money or other thing of value.

(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable (1) with respect to any money or other thing of value payable by an employer to any representative who is an employee or former employee of such employer, as compensation for, or by reason of, his services as an employee of such employer; (2) with respect to the payment or delivery of any money or other thing of value in satisfaction of a judgment of any court or a decision or award of an arbitrator or impartial chairman or in compromise, adjustment, settlement, or release of any claim, complaint, grievance, or dispute in the absence of fraud or duress; (3) with respect to the sale or purchase of an article or commodity at the prevailing market price in the regular course of business; (4) with respect to money deducted from the wages of employees in payment of membership dues in a labor organization: *Provided*, That the employer has received from each employee, on whose account such deductions are made, a written assignment which by its terms is not effective beyond whichever of the following dates first occurs (1) 1 year from the date of its execution or (ii) the termination date of the applicable collective bargaining agreement; or (5) with respect to money or other thing of value paid to a trust fund established by such representative, for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents): *Provided*, That (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or unemployment benefits or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; (B) the detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer, and employees and employers are equally represented in the administration of such fund, together with such neutral persons as the representatives of the employers and the representatives of the employees may agree upon and in the event the employer and employee groups deadlock on the administration of such fund and there are no neutral persons empowered to break such deadlock, such agreement provides that the two groups shall agree on an impartial umpire to decide such dispute, or in event of their failure to agree within a reasonable length of time, an impartial umpire to decide such dispute shall, on petition of either group, be appointed by the district court of the United States for the district where the trust fund has its principal office, and shall also contain provisions for an annual audit of the trust fund, a statement of the results of which shall be available for inspection by interested persons at the principal office of the trust fund and at such other places as may be designated in such written agreement; and (C) such payments as are intended to be used for the purpose of providing pensions or annuities for employees are made to a separate trust which provides that the funds held therein cannot be used for any purpose other than paying such pensions or annuities.

(d) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(e) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories and possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing law against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain violations of this section, without regard to the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of such act of October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 17, and title 29, sec. 52), and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

(f) Compliance with the restrictions contained in subsection (c) (5) (B) upon contributions to trust funds, otherwise lawful, shall not be applicable to contributions to such trust funds established by collective agreement prior to January 1, 1946, nor shall subsection (c) (5) (A) be construed as prohibiting contributions to such trust funds if prior to January 1, 1947, such funds contained provisions for pooled vacation benefits.

BOYCOTTS AND OTHER UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be unlawful, for the purposes of this section only, in an industry or activity affecting commerce, for any labor organization to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities, or to perform any services, where an object thereof is—

(1) forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person, unless such strike or concerted refusal is authorized by a clause or stipulation in a collective-bargaining contract permitting employees covered by such contract to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose employees, who would normally perform such work, are engaged in a lawful strike approved or ratified by their representative whom such employer is required to recognize under this act;

(2) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization

has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act;

(3) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act;

(4) forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class unless such employer is failing to conform to an order of certification of the National Labor Relations Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) may sue therefore in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 hereof without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of the suit.

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 304. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251; Supp. V, title 50, App., sec. 1509), is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which presidential and vice presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

STRIKES BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

SEC. 305. It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, to participate in any strike. Any individual employed by the United States or by any such agency who strikes shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil-service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for reemployment for 3 years by the United States or any such agency.

TITLE IV

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 401. When used in this act—

(1) The term "industry affecting commerce" means any industry or activity in commerce or in which a labor dispute would burden or obstruct commerce or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(2) The term "strike" includes any strike or other concerted stoppage of work by employees (including a stoppage by reason of the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) and any concerted slow-down or other concerted interruption of operations by employees.

(3) The terms "commerce," "labor disputes," "employer," "employee," "labor organization," "representative," "person," and "supervisor" shall have the same meaning as when used in the National Labor Relations Act as amended by this act.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 402. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent; nor shall the quitting of labor by an employee or employees in good faith because of abnormally dangerous conditions for work at the place of employment of such employee or employees be deemed a strike under this act.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 403. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill pending in the other body and a companion measure which he today introduced.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Brooklyn Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today is May 3, Polish Constitution Day. To all Poles, this day has the same meaning as our American Fourth of July. To bring out the full significance of this occasion, I shall outline briefly the background and history of the Polish Constitution; also, I shall describe its tremendous and far-reaching effects upon the whole Polish race during the next 156 years.

As you all know, the Polish Constitution was signed on May 3, 1791. It was the product of the best minds of the generation. Polish thinkers and statesmen studied the works and teachings of Western philosophers, such as Locke and Rousseau, and incorporated many of their ideas into a document which was heralded as one of the foremost political achievements of the age. The new constitution was a compromise between the progressive trends of the world and the need to reckon with existing conditions in Poland, which were not good. The nobility, which at that time was the ruling class, would not accept more radical reforms. The economic situation in Poland was critical. The country was also threatened by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The May 3 constitution tried to reorganize Poland in the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which was adopted 2 years earlier. It abolished certain weaknesses which had been paralyzing the state. Like the Constitution of the United States, the Polish Constitution provided for three separate and equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. The crown was made hereditary, but its powers were restricted. The King was deprived of the decisive voice, which was given to the Diet, or as they called it in Poland, the Sejm. The Diet was to consist of two chambers: the Chamber of Deputies and the Chamber of Senators, with the King at its head as presiding authority. The judicial authority was to be vested in the courts of law.

The Polish Constitution also proclaimed the principle of religious toleration and guaranteed government protection to all religions. Other provisions were made for the rule by the majority of citizens; also for secret ballot at public elections. Under this constitution, each man was insured freedom of thought.

Social reform was also outlined. At that time, the Poles were divided into three classes: the nobility, the bourgeoisie, and the peasants. The constitution confirmed the liberties, which heretofore the nobility had enjoyed. They were guaranteed personal security and security of property, although they were to be subject to taxation. The bourgeoisie or the middle class gained certain rights which up to this time were the exclusive privilege of the nobility. The bourgeoisie were granted the right to acquire and possess land. They were granted the right to receive commissions as officers, to hold office in the civil service, and even to acquire the rank of nobility. As far as the peasant was concerned, the constitution did not introduce any far-reaching reforms. However, it provided for an agreement between the master and the peasant and extended full protection of the law to the peasant. This act of the constitution was supplemented 4 years later by Kosciusko's famous proclamation giving full civil rights to the peasants. Another important provision of the May 3 constitution recognized the sovereignty of the nation, which was to derive its power from the will of the people. This document also made all citizens obligated to their motherland, obligated to defend her at all times. Poland was no longer to be a government of a few, but a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

This was the substance of the constitution which was approved on May 3, 1791,

by the Polish Diet and Stanislaw August Poniatowski, Poland's last king. It was accepted with joy by all Poles who regarded it as a symbol of democracy and liberty. To the whole nation, this document became a signpost pointing the road to freedom and equality. This document became a guide for the future. Progressive thinkers throughout Europe hailed it as a significant step in establishing a modern political system. This is what the great English statesman and orator, Edmund Burke, has to say of the May 3 constitution:

> We have seen anarchy and servitude removed; a throne strengthened for the protection of the people * * * not one man incurred loss or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order, everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder * * * not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery, no outrage, no system of slander; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled. The whole was affected with a policy, a discretion * * * such as have never been known before on any occasion; but such glorious conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men. Happy people, if they know how to proceed as they have begun.

Such was the glorious tribute of Edmund Burke to one of the first nations in Europe to accept a democratic constitution. The happy people to whom he referred would have proceeded as they began if it were not for the tragic events that followed. The recognition of equality of all men, the proclamation of religious liberty, the new freedoms promised in the constitution were more than Catherine the Great of Russia could stand. Prussia and Austria, too, saw that Poland was being strengthened by the spirit of political revival and wanted to live. None of these neighbors liked the idea of Poland's political progress, so they attacked her with full force on all sides. The negligence of past generations left Poland weak and she could not find in herself enough strength to defend her independence. In 1795 Poland fell.

In spite of the fact that Poland was partitioned, the May 3 constitution kindled a new light in the Polish people, a light of spirit and hope. Out of their deep sorrow, an intensified love of their native country was born. The constitution brought moral victory for millions of Poles who became infused with a new patriotism and love of liberty. The next century and a quarter witnessed their heroic efforts to realize the ideals of freedom, equality, independence and social justice set forth in the constitution.

Yes, for 127 years, to be exact, the Polish people thought, planned and plotted for their national independence. No power could stop their determination. To each Pole, national independence became inseparably linked with democracy and progress. A democratic Poland, a people's Poland, governed by the people and for the people, a Poland of free and equal men, the home of social justice and a creative member of the great family of free nations—these were the aims and ideals of the whole Polish nation.

Their patriotism manifested itself in literature and song. Most of Poland's poetry of the period was an expression of grief, but also of hope and faith in the future. The greatest of poets was Adam Mickiewicz, whose works aroused such fire in men that they were ready to give their lives for freedom. It was Mickiewicz who wrote:

> Whenever there is a struggle for freedom, there is a struggle for Poland.

Polish songs, too, were songs of freedom, hymns of faith. The villagers sang plaintive ballads, relating the sad story of a peasant or blacksmith or cobbler moved by the love of his country to lead an unsuccessful insurrection against the enemy. Every song, every ballad ended on the hopeful note that Poland would not perish: that Poland would live again.

The struggle for independence never ceased. The Poles tried to free themselves many times. In 1793, Kosciusko led the Polish armies against the Russians, but was captured. Then there were the insurrections against Russian rule in 1830 and 1863. The Poles also started an uprising against Prussia and Austria in 1846 and 1848. They led the revolutionary movement against czarism in 1905. Even though all of these uprisings were unsuccessful and many Poles lost their lives, the cause of freedom was never lost. The May 3 constitution served as a beacon of political freedom and democratic government. It was worth every sacrifice.

Along with the physical struggle for independence, the May 3 constitution inspired the development of modern political thought. The landed aristocracy was losing its power and importance and the peasants were coming into their own. The "new Poland" was to be a democratic nation, the home of working people. Leaders and great men of the period worked out a program for the development of industry and trade, for better and more general education, for a struggle against ignorance and conservatism. They believed in cultural progress; they believed in the power of science and education. Also, they advocated freedom of conscience and social reform.

All of this work was being done underground. Polish patriots lived in constant fear of death, imprisonment, or exile. Many a Pole was sentenced to Siberia for his political activities, but no threat or punishment was great enough to stop his work or dim his hope that someday Poland would be free. In fact, with each generation, the flame of patriotism burned brighter for in almost each family there was a tale of deep tragedy that arose from life in bondage.

When, at last, Poland was restored as a republic in 1918, the thoughts and dreams of the idealistic Poles for 127 years were realized. The new government was set up, with a few technical changes, along the lines of the constitution of May 3, 1791. So, you see, that the authors of this constitution were centuries ahead of their time. Their ideas fitted in with the twentieth century pattern of life and political thought. Their ideas were universal and timely. The May 3 constitution embodied the highest principles of humanity, which never change. Also, this document grew out of Poland's own national tradition, which made it dear to the heart of every citizen.

The next 21 years bore witness to the excellence of that document. Poland flourished as an independent nation. Her people enjoyed democratic living, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, a voice in the government. Business, industry, and commerce grew and brought prosperity. Education became widespread. Yes, in 21 years, Poland made remarkable strides in progress. However, the happy, glowing picture of a free and independent Poland was blotted out by World War II.

First, Germany invaded Poland and enslaved its people. Then, the Russians took over and made a mockery of freedom and all the principles set forth in the May 3 constitution.

During this war, the Poles did not sit back, but inspired by the high ideals of freedom and love of liberty, which have grown inherent in them, fought bravely on all battlefronts of the world—in Africa, England, France, and Italy. They fought at Narvik, on the Maginot Line, and at Monte Cassino. They fought with heroic determination to vanquish the common enemy. Millions gave their lives that other people in the world might be free.

Now that the war is over, the Polish people do not see a free and independent homeland for themselves. They are not without hope, however. They are Poles, cheerful, hopeful, idealistic, as their forefathers have been—imbued with patriotism and a love for freedom. They are mindful of the spirit of their constitution of May 3, which says, and I quote:

> Valuing above life and personal happiness the political existence, external independence, and internal freedom of the nation, we have resolved upon the present constitution.

So, you see, the principles of this great document have become a part of the character of these brave Poles. They value freedom above their own life. Though they are scattered all over the world, they are working for the day when Poland will arise again. You may be sure that in the Polish underground, today, courageous and progressive ideas are maturing again—ideas which are the fruit of the thoughts and struggles of generations of Polish fighters for freedom, equality, and justice. Poland is again marching toward a better future along the road blazed by Kosciuszko, Mickiewicz, and the gallant men who were inspired by the humanitarian principles of the Polish Constitution of May 3.

In closing, I would like to cite the words written 100 years ago by Adam Mickiewicz, the greatest of Polish poets. These words apply to Poland again today. I quote:

> Like smoldering lava
> Our nation is cold on the surface, stiff and brittle;
> Yet the centuries have cooled but little
> The fires within her.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today again marks the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, one of the outstanding milestones in the evolution of democracy in Europe.

This remarkable document gives first place to the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state. The humanitarian and tolerant philosophy of government evident throughout its pages would lead one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source. We find in this Polish Constitution, adopted almost contemporaneously with our own, rule by majority, secret ballot at public elections, and the following inspiring language relating to religion:

> We assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the Republic.

Yet, at that time, even as now, the light of liberalism coming from Poland was recognized as a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Prussia. And now today Poland is again the victim of her neighbors.

Not entirely of her immediate neighbors, however. Our own country is not blameless, for the present situation of Poland and its enslaved people also has been brought about as a direct result of the series of secret agreements signed at Tehran and Yalta. None of these agreements has ever been fully made public. None of them has been embodied in a treaty ratified by the United States Senate. We can, at least, therefore, let the sturdy, courageous people of Poland know that when these secret commitments were made they did not bespeak the will of the American people. We can let them know that our Government's legislators do not approve of the acts of the terrorist regime now dominating the puppet government of Poland. Thus, we can take a stand on the side of the Polish people in their present struggle with enemy forces occupying their country.

With this in mind, today let us honor here in the House of Representatives what is the Fourth of July for Poland. Today Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries will celebrate a Polish national holiday and will endeavor to establish spiritual contact with the only country where no such celebrations will be allowed, namely, "liberated" Poland. Let us join in that endeavor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend and colleague from Connecticut in paying tribute to the Polish people on Polish Constitution Day. The armed forces of Poland fought gallantly side by side with American, British, and French troops during the recent war. They fought at Norvik. They fought at Tobruk. They fought on the Maginot line. They fought in the skies over Britain. They formed some 20 percent of those forces at a time when Winston Churchill declared that never before in all the history of man had so many people owed so much to so few. Three thousand six hundred of those brave men lie buried on the slopes of Monte Cassino. I hope very much when the displaced persons legislation reaches the floor of this body that the amendment providing for the admission of 18,000 of these brave men and their families will be adopted by the House. This is the least we can do in partial atonement for the wrong we committed at Yalta.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I know the gentleman from Connecticut, who has been so earnest is proposing this amendment before the Committee on the Judiciary, and in furthering it, will be happy to know that it is incorporated in the bill reported favorably by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judicary and is now before the full committee. There, where extensive debate has taken place, and varying viewpoints have been presented, there has never been heard any dissent to the inclusion of these 18,000 brave men, as eligible persons under the pending measure.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I would like to express my appreciation to my distinguished friend from New York for his remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is a Polish national holiday. It will be fittingly observed by millions of Americans of Polish ancestry and by millions of citizens of other nations who are of Polish origin. It will be observed by Poles everywhere—except in Poland. The Communist masters who are in control of the destinies of Poland will see that there is no celebration there.

But while there can be no celebration today in Poland, no parades and no public exercises to commemorate this anniversary of the adoption of a constitution designed to make a free people self-governing, there will be a different kind of observance. It will be in the form of a quiet but determined rededication in the minds and hearts of millions of freedom-loving Poles. They will rededicate themselves to the ideals and the principles of free men and women, for whom there will be no real peace until the yoke of their conquerors is once again thrown off.

The secret agreements of Yalta and Tehran which sold Poland down the river are a black page in the history of world displomacy. With no consultation with the legal, constitutional representatives of Poland, these agreements deprived Poland of nearly one-half of its territory and foisted upon these powerless and stricken people a government hand-picked by the Kremlin. The worst of this tragedy is we as a nation shared in the betrayal. It is a chapter in our foreign relations which brings no prestige to our country.

And what is the situation in Poland today? This great freedom-loving nation is living under the reign of a terroristic, police state. It has been robbed of its industry and ruined economically. Religious persecution has been increasing. Many of her people are homeless and destitute.

This is the tragic plight of a people who on May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the adoption of the American Constitution, wrote into their organic law that—

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation.

This doctrine of free government still lives in the aspirations of the people of Poland. With each passing year of domination by a foreign aggressor, the flame that burns in the hearts of Poles neither diminishes nor dies. No, it brightens and intensifies. And it will eventually be triumphant because it is just and right.

This day which is a sacred anniversary to all Poles should also be a day of rededication for all Americans, all Americans who are burdened with the humiliation of Yalta and Tehran. It is a time for us to remember the immortal truth that lasting peace can be built only upon the solid foundation of justice to all nations, and that the efforts of this great nation must always be directed to the end that justice shall prevail.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHESNEY] is recognized for 2 hours.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day of commemoration, May 3, 1949, of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, the issue of Poland's present status can be easily stated in a few words, "Behind the iron curtain" or "Is this the new Europe?" The title would apply to Poland in each instance.

Let us dust off the pages of World War II—they should still be fresh in our minds. Certainly the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact are good reminders. Thus Poland, the first country to resist the armed onslaught of the Reich, and the principal sufferer of the war, has come to be regarded by a few as the price of victory. Such a position cannot be possibly accepted by the Poles as final, though for the time, unfortunate as the conditions exist, the unjust and imposed settlement of Poland must be painfully tolerated.

For that reason alone the Polish question deserves the closest scrutiny and the constant attention of the public opinion of the world.

The present struggle of Polish people for independence actually begins with the days of Kosciuszko's insurrection, and since that day the Poles have always resisted force and fought to suppress violence in international relations. As in the past, no less than today, their struggle was inspired by a deep faith in the ultimate victory of democracy.

What is happening today in Poland is an all-round attempt to turn this nation into an outpost and parcel of the East. The very structure of the Polish nation and the essence of its spiritual life are to be refashioned and remolded on the Eastern pattern. A nation with a great past, reared for centuries in culture, is now forced to take its cue from the new Marxist culture. Its fundamental concepts about life, freedom, its own mission and that of the world are now fundamentally changed and adapted to an alien and entirely different model.

There are many ill-informed people who regard these far-reaching changes in the nature of a social revolution. But we in the United States know that a social revolution can be made only from below, as a result of the pressure of native social forces. The present developments in Poland are all imposed from above, and their only purpose is to adapt Poland to the tasks set for her by the occupying power. The future plans of the world will not be drawn by Russia but by the western powers. In the United States, and elsewhere, we are trying to establish a new world order based on right and justice. We have our muddling but nevertheless the efforts are toward humanitarianism and tolerance.

Lest we forget the contribution of Poland's part in the last war—after the downfall of the Polish Government by the conquering madman Nazi Hitler—Poland continued to fight outside her own frontiers, on the land, on the sea, and in the air, and at the same time stood firm in her resistance to the invader inside the country. But the world did not seem to appreciate the Polish defeat at its true value, and continued to consider it as a result of Poland's weakness, and tactical mistakes. In face of this unfavorable opinion, it was considered imperative to establish anew the position of Poland as an allied power, based on existing facts and new developments. With the assistance of the Allies, the Polish Air Force, Army, and Navy became an integral part of the fight for freedom.

The Poles are ready to fight at any front. The country of Norway will never forget the Podhale Brigade in the invasion of Narvik, and the successful attack of Ankenes.

France still praises the bravery of the First Division of Grenadiers in Lorraine, the Second Division at the Belfort Gap.

On British soil threatened with invasion, the Poles under the great leadership of General Sikorski aided the British in the evacuation at Dunkirk. The Kosciuszko Fighter Squadron, during the Battle of Britain, destroyed 126 enemy aircraft, with 19 probable and 7 damaged. Polish pilots serving with British squadrons added to this score 77 aircraft destroyed, 16 probable, and 28 damaged.

It is still remembered how the Carpathian Brigade fought at the besieged Tobruk-El Gazala. How can the Allies forget the Second Army of Poles at the Battle of Monte Casino? Or in the capture of the Port of Ancona?

In the campaigns of Italy the forces of General Anders, truly a great soldier of Poland, took 20,000 prisoners, seized about 400 guns, 50 tanks, and over 2,000 machine guns. Their losses were over 2,400 killed and 9,000 wounded. They displayed not only courage, fighting spirit, and stubbornness, but also an offensive spirit, initiative, and courage.

From Normandy to Arnheim, the heroic Poles fought on the side of the Allies. The Polish soldier responded beyond the call of duty.

In the course of the second war the Polish Nation did everything that was humanly possible, and more, to do its share for the common Allied victory, which represented to her the sacred cause of freedom.

When we recall the outstanding bravery of the Poles during the war that ended, and compare their present political plight, we wonder whether the Polish Nation has suffered in vain.

The reason why so many Poles prefer the bitter road of exile to a return home is their refusal to acquiesce to the Soviet totalitarian system which is now in force in Poland.

It would be a mistake, and instant imprisonment to return.

The Russia of today is a new civilization—a civilization unique in the world. Poland belongs to the west—to Christendom.

Poland was partitioned three times before 1939, and each partition was regarded as a crime by the civilized world. But the difference between her and Russia is far greater now than it was in the eighteenth century—the century of the three partitions. The crime today would be incomparably greater than it was then, because the victims would be incorporated in a state which is more alien by comparison with their own than it was then. The consequence in terms of change, displacement, of readapation, of human suffering, would be much greater, the more so, because the means of coercion at the disposal of a modern state are much more formidable than those at the disposal of the eighteenth century state.

Reasons of ethnology and of racial doctrine in the affairs of nations are not reasons of justice or humanity—least of all are they reasons of genuine brotherhood.

It is hoped that the countries which had given refuge to the thousands of displaced Poles, have acted not only in mercy, but in justice, serving the interest of world peace.

Freedom-loving people throughout the world pray that justice and righteousness will overcome the evil of totalitarian rule and give the true Polish nation a rightful place in the world of democracy.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHESNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world today all Poles, all persons of Polish extraction, yes and all freedom-loving people pause to celebrate the Polish Fourth of July. One hundred and fifty-eight years ago today the Polish constitution was adopted, a very definite step toward the recognition of the basic right of all people to a free and democratic way of life.

The history of the Polish people is a glorious one—it is a record of valor unsurpassed, of courage without fear, of honor without blemish. And so it is fitting today that we recall Poland's magnificent heritage, ever present through the years, that we recall that spirit of Poland which never yielded its devotion to an ideal, its consciousness of manhood.

It has been said that the true measure of a people's greatness is in its fidelity to its native ideals. If this be true, then the Polish people are without peer, for the record they have achieved in resisting the forces of oppression and tyranny in the face of almost insurmountable odds stands as a splendid, shining example to people of all races and all creeds.

Through the centuries Poland has had her great leaders—her Pulaski, her Sobieski, and her Kosciusko—men of extraordinary capabilities, character, and courage. Yet all of the great men of Poland, no matter how varied their spheres of influence or how different their fields of endeavor, have inherited several things in common which gave them their reason for being—their love of God and their religion, their love of country, and their burning desire for its eventual liberation.

The heroic stand of Poland in 1939 in the face of aggression by superior force was an example of courage unparalleled in history. When Poland offered the first resistance to the overwhelming strength of Hitler and his Nazi war machines, she inspired the freedom-loving nations of the world and brought home to them the first realization of the Axis threat to civilization. By thus engaging Hitler in the early days of the war, Poland prevented a surprise attack on France and England, who were unprepared. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

Poland's contribution to the success of the Allied Nations during World War II and the fight of her people to preserve western civilization as they had on several previous occasions make it incumbent upon each one of us to keep faith with the Polish people now at a time when her long-cherished freedom is once again in chains.

Civilization is based upon a reign of peace and justice, and for this reason America has been ennobled by the spiritual contributions of her citizens of Polish descent. By being true to their culture and their creed, Americans of Polish ancestry cannot help being true to their country. Their love of Poland and their desire to make it free only enhance their love of America.

We must continue our efforts to restore Poland to its prewar glory. We are morally obligated to render all assistance possible to Poland in her underground struggle to break the chains of Russian communism by which she is now surrounded and which threaten to engulf all of Europe. We must keep faith with our promises of the Atlantic Charter, and it is our sacred duty to most solemnly pledge ourselves to the memory of Poland's gallant heroes, that we will not rest until the promises of freedom and independence given to the Polish Nation during our last world-wide struggle while

she was fighting and bleeding—are redeemed.

If we of the United Nations go forward in the spirit of the brave men and women of Poland who were the first to stand up against Hitler, and who are now resisting by every possible means the communistic domination of Russia and her satellite nations, including the puppet government now in power in Poland, it is my conviction that we can build a world where intolerance and aggression are only bitter memories of the past and where the ideals of liberty and justice are adhered to by all the nations of the world.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a real privilege and with pride that I am permitted to stand before this microphone in this House of Representatives, to freely and under no restrictions, address the Members on the occasion of the one hundredth and fifty-eighth anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, adopted in 1791, by the Congress of the Republic of Poland, which was the most liberal, most democratic of its day. Upon rereading it today, one is profoundly moved at its wisdom and magnanimity which assured rights and freedom to the people of Poland. May I quote at this time a part of that constitution?

> Every person, upon coming to this republic from whatsoever parts of the world or one returning to this, the country of his origin, as soon as his foot touches the Polish soil, he is entirely free to indulge in whatsoever enterprise he wishes to enter, in the manner and place of his own choice; that person is free to enter into contract for purchase of property, for work, for rent in whatever manner and for whatever time he himself agrees upon; he is at liberty to settle in the city or in the village; he is free to live in Poland or to return to whatever country he himself chooses after his commitments in Poland which he voluntarily embraced, are duly performed and completed.

This constitution of May 3 abolished restrictions upon the freedom of the individual and gave the Polish Nation a democratic form of government. However, due to the aggressiveness of its neighbors, the Polish Nation was allowed but a short time in which to enjoy the blessings of its democratic rule. The three powerful neighbors of Poland—Russia, Germany, and Austria—were dissatisfied with the reforms introduced in Poland by this constitution. They connived among themselves, and partitioning Poland, put an end to the freedom and democracy of the Polish Nation. It was not until much later, that, thanks to the efforts of one of our Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, it regained its freedom and independence.

It is impossible today to recall the constitution of May 3, without comparing the events of the eighteenth century with what has taken place in Poland.

After years of unfortunate appeasement of Germany, during the dark days of September 1939, it was the Polish nation which first took up arms against the evil forces of violence and aggression. The events of war developed in such a way, that many of us subconsciously forget the part that Poland played in World War II. We forget the ideals and the principles which Poland rose to defend, and which are being fought for today by almost the entire world. We forget that the chief slogan at the outbreak of war was the struggle for individual freedom, the defense of the weaker against the stronger, the struggle for justice above evil.

In the opening days of World War II, President Roosevelt called Poland an inspiration to all nations because Poland alone dared defy the Germans in their ruthless challenge of those freedoms and democratic liberties championed by Poland.

It was but a short-lived appellation. Poland, that inspiration to all nations, was most ignominiously sold down the Soviet river and today it is languishing in the throes of Russian forced slavery.

Today Poland's sons, scattered through the various parts of the globe, dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by Soviet secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

At this point, I again reiterate the remarks I made last year on the occasion of Poland's Constitution Day, that in today's Poland—Poland which emerged from Tehran and Yalta's Conferences—freedom is nonexisting. American press and our own officers in the diplomatic service therein testify to the fact. As long as this status quo will be permitted to persist, as long as the United States and Great Britain will not justly repair the harm done Poland and the other countries similarly mistreated in Tehran and Yalta secret dealings—until then there will be no peace in the true sense of the word.

Lasting peace, God's peace, must, of necessity, rest upon a solid foundation of justice. Heretofore we were trying to build peace upon the crumbling foundation of the gravest kind of injustice.

Strictest justice demands that the United States and England redeem Poland from that onerous yoke of Soviet domination which they thrust upon Poland at a time when it was politically impotent to resist it.

Poland must be free, since without a free Poland, there will be no true peace.

SPEECH MADE BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK AT THE POLISH NATIONAL DAY CELEBRATION IN BALTIMORE, MD., ON MAY 1, 1949

Mr. Chairman, honorable guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we are gathered here in such numbers to celebrate the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of the Constitution of the 3d of May, celebrated by the Polish people as their national day.

I am grateful to the Maryland executives of the Polish-American Congress and especially to their chairman, Mr. Jarosinski, for his kind invitation to take part in your manifestation.

I consider it a great honor and privilege to join you on this great day the significance of which is so close to our hearts.

The presence of so many outstanding Americans at this Polish national day celebration indicates not only that the Americans of Polish origin, loyal citizens of their adopted country, have kept in their hearts and memories the traditions of the country of their fathers but also shows that many other Americans are not indifferent to the fate of the Polish people and its ideas which have always constituted the basis of the freedom and independent, existence of the Polish nation.

Immediately the question arises, why in spite of the so many heroic deeds, victorious wars, banners covered with glory and unparalleled sacrifices which have made Polish history for over a thousand years, our ancestors have chosen the anniversary of the Constitution of the 3d of May as National Day of Poland.

Why this act, in spite of the fact that in the meantime more than 150 years have elapsed, makes the Polish national day celebration always so significant.

The enactment of the Constitution of 1791 was a victory of democratic common sense and not a victory of military force.

It was a victory over selfishness consisting of a concession of the privileged classes for the benefit of oppressed masses of the people. This victory was achieved without a bloody revolution—after years of decadence, bondage, and oppression. It was prepared by a long and enduring struggle and by the work of great thinkers, preachers, leaders, and educators of the nation.

The revolutionary and democratic currents in western Europe, affecting Poland by giving her a progressive and for those days a democratic political system, introducing social reforms, placing the peasants and the townsfolk under the protection of the law, and the granting of religious freedom—prove the close contact of Poland with western culture and civilization.

It is true that the peasants—the most numerous class of the nation—did not obtain at once what Skarga, Staszyc, and Kollataj demanded for them. The Polaniec act and recognition of the peasants as the citizens who feed and defend the country was accomplished by Kosciuszko later, but the ideas granting equal civil rights to all Poles were for the first time embodied in the constitution of the 3d of May. The force of the foreign oppressors prevented from putting into effect the ideas of this constitution and plunged the country into a long period of oppression. But these ideas remained in Polish hearts and Polish men both within the country and abroad, sustaining the vision of an independent Poland as a true mother, equally just to all her children.

The participation of Poles in all the liberation movements in the different countries of Europe, and here in America connected with the efforts of Pulaski and Kosciuszko who fought "for your freedom and ours," originated in the progressive and democratic ideas of the constitution of 3d of May, in the faith for a new world—based upon the principles of freedom, social justice, and democracy.

The spirit of the nation, always alive, drew from the ideological principles of the May constitution strength necessary for the struggle as well as the will for endurance, and sustained Paderewski, when he convinced President Wilson of the necessity of upholding after the First World War, reconstitution of a free and independent Poland. Undoubtedly, the longing for freedom, social justice, and democracy deeply ingrained in souls of the masses of the Polish people helped it to survive the bondage, to retain its language and its culture, sustain its active struggle against the oppressors and to create an outstanding record of fighting for independence in Poland as well as elsewhere

for 150 years and especially in the recent war against Hitler's aggression.

Those great ideals inspired us also after the Second World War to endure the fight against communism in Poland for 2½ years and to show to the free people of the world that the will of the Polish people had been suppressed and that this nation so deeply loving freedom and democracy lost them again because of the Soviet aggression and the rape of Poland committed by the agents of the Kremlin.

Our participation in your celebration is so dear to our hearts not only because the aims of independence and democracy are again so significant today, especially in Poland where they were displaced by oppression, terror, and Communist dictatorship, but also because in Poland of today the celebration of the 3d of May is forbidden.

My colleagues of the Polish Peasant Party present here—vice chairman Stanislaw Banczyk and secretary general Stanislaw Wojcik fought during the war against the Germans in the underground and after the war against the bloody Communist dictatorship, who risking their lives succeeded in getting away from the Communist hell only several weeks ago are indeed happy to be able to celebrate with you this day, the celebration of which is now forbidden in Poland.

Still in May 1946 and 1947 the embassies of the Warsaw Communist regime abroad invited guests for the celebration of the Polish National Day, while in Poland, for example in Cracow, the security police and Soviet forces fired at the university students leaving the St. Mary's church after the mass. This took place on the same square on which Tadeusz Kosciuszko took his oath.

I witnessed how in Poznan the national flags displayed by the people were torn off, how small school children leaving the church in Wloclawek were beaten and imprisoned. The standard bearer of the Polish Peasant Party in Katowico had his head broken by the butt ends of the rifles of the security police, the standard was shattered and the image of the Blessed Virgin embroidered on this standard was treaded under foot.

This year in Poland even a celebration for 4 days was announced but not for the purpose of celebrating the 3d of May but for collecting funds for so-called educational and cultural purposes.

This new kind of celebration begins on the 1st of May with Communist manifestations.

Under the threat of arrests, loss of jobs and living quarters, the starved workers will be driven on the streets and, according to instructions, will be forced to carry posters offensive to the Western World.

And for 4 days "compulsory-voluntary" collections of funds will be taken out the remainder of the starvation wages for the purposes of poisoning later with Communist leaflets the spirit of Polish culture and science, to corrupt the soul of the Polish youth.

The Communist press and books that flood Poland instruct to love Stalin humbly, to love and respect the Red Army, and to build monuments for its glorification, to believe in the only truth of Leninism-Stalinism, to hate, betray, and assist in the extermination of all those who still do not believe in the people's democracy and had retained in their hearts the sentiment of patriotism.

I saw in the Polish Communist newspapers cartoons of General Marshall in German uniform with Nazi medals. I saw there the Statue of Liberty covered with Nazi swastikas. Elsewere President Truman, Bevin, and Schuman were pictured as warmongers aiming at the conquest of the whole world. Justice Medina, of New York, was pictured with Hitler and Goering standing behind him with Goebels at a microphone. In another cartoon President Truman had on a leash two worms bearing the initials of CIO and AFL ready to bore through the whole world. There was one cartoon of President Truman who, having set the American rat trap, wants to entice the Persian and Indian rats with the slice of bacon on which it was written, "Help for the undeveloped countries."

The so-called Communist cultural and educational press has in view the indoctrination of the recruits to be ready to sacrifice their lives for the new order in the fight for the realization of the aims of true Leninism-Stalinism.

Its poems call the "brothers" from Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sofia, Athens, and Paris for the final reckoning with rotten American capitalism and its Socialist agents in western Europe. The present educational activities in Poland consist of Communist propaganda concerned with the kolchoz-system, according to which the Russian farmer has practically no work to do, since he has at his disposal all of the newest scientific methods and implements. Supposedly all of these were first invented and constructed in Russia only to be stolen later by the agents of the West and saboteurs for their own use.

We have to admit that the Poles are very intelligent pupils. Once when at a certain mass meeting the Communist propagandist praised the Soviet paradise for the workers and peasants and contrasted it with the famine and misery in the west, one of the worker participants in the meeting made the following motion: "I propose that all those dissatisfied with conditions in Poland be sent to the west and thus be punished. Let those approving of present conditions be sent to Russia and thus be rewarded." The reaction to this motion was spontaneous and the applause was terrific, but no one volunteered to go to the Soviet paradise, and the worker who made the motion was put in jail. There are many amusing stories on the subject of the Soviet paradise dealing with many different spheres of Soviet life, but now one finds that there is every day less amusing comments and more and more sad faces and bitter tears.

Everyone can see and feel how the vises of the Communist dictatorship tighten, how every day it is more difficult to live and to breathe freely because of the quickening tempo of the sovietization of the country and the exploitation of the Polish economy for the purposes of the Soviet economic system and the military preparedness of the Red army.

What does this quickening tempo of the sovietization mean? I shall mention here briefly only a few of the methods used: The liquidation of the independent Polish Peasant Party, the so-called fusion of the Socialists and Communists, the liquidation of all independent newspapers which appeared until recently in spite of the censorship and the want of the necessary quantity of newsprint, the liquidation of all the remnants of the independent cooperative movement, the quickened tempo of the liquidation of the remnants of private enterprise, the introduction of the Soviet slave-labor system for the workers, the beginning of the collectivization of agriculture, the increased number of arrests and the compiling on the Kremlin orders of lists of people of up to 1,200,000 who are to be done away with in the event of a crisis, the placing at the head of the regime and the army well-known and experienced international Communist agents, and speeding up of the Communist indoctrination of the youth, and instead of hitherto disguised struggle with the church, an open fight against it.

As one who was called traitor because I dared, at a time when public opinion of the western world considered the Soviet Russia as an ally, loving peace and democracy, to return to Poland and fight there communism for the independence of the Polish nation and for democracy, as one who without circumspection and without entertaining any illusions told Stalin frankly that I have never been a Communist in my life and will never become one; as one who together with his collaborators watched on the spot the violence and terror of Soviet aggression and of communism having together with my friends here escaped a certain death and perhaps even the "self-accusation" so well known in Communist trials, I together with my friends here consider it our greatest duty to tell of the injustice done to Poland, one of the most faithful allies, at a time when my countrymen are forced to remain silent.

I think it is our duty to warn the free peoples in the west, those who still do not believe, or who still do not want to see the Communist danger for the whole world.

In my book recently published in America and Great Britain under the titles of "The Rape of Poland" and "The Pattern of Soviet Aggression," I tried to inform public opinion of the world as to the terrible truth about Poland. Perhaps you will say that I repeat myself, that you know all this. But I maintain that it is absolutely necessary to experience and to see it because what is happening under the Communist regime is actually more terrible than one can describe.

It is difficult to understand and imagine it from a distance. It is difficult to see even for a stranger visiting in Poland.

The first impression of a stranger would be a spring in full bloom, the sun shining, people working, when questioned they either avoid an answer or reply that everything is all right. In the Communist press there is plenty of statistical data about the success of production plans, enthusiastic testimonial letters signed by people, public squares are filled with manifestating crowds, books and newspapers shout about the emancipation of man, about the happiness of the worker and peasant, about the right of free enterprise, about religious freedom, about the equality of all people, and about the longing for peace. Only the exploiters, black marketeers, profiteers, rich peasants, and saboteurs are being condemned.

It is proclaimed that the Communist government is a government of the workers. But ask the worker what he thinks about it. His right to life depends upon his work and the norm of his work imposed from above. The State provides work and gives him right to have his home.

His wages depend upon a fixed minimum of work done. When recently the Polish miners in Silesia were unable to reach the prescribed norms of production, their wives were ordered to come and collect their wages. They were told that if the wages were insufficient the fault was with their husbands. A strike is considered as sabotage against the State because the latter owns the industry. The trade unions are ruled by the Communists and their duty is to assist management rather than assist the worker in gaining a living wage, because a government of the workers it is said is incapable of doing injustice to anyone.

If the worker does not submit, he will be left without employment, without living quarters, even without a starvation wage, he is not accepted for employment elsewhere, he will have to die on the street from starvation or be obedient to the Communists, attend their manifestations and applaud enthusiastically suppressing his bitter tears.

The peasant, if he has not already been deprived of his land—and sometimes he is deprived of it in the course of ten minutes—has the duty to pay his taxes in produce and these are often higher than the total yield of his land. If there is anything left it is preempted by the Communist controlled cooperatives of so-called peasant self-help at fixed prices which are but fractions of the market prices. In addition he has to

pay a sum to the savings fund which is at the disposal of the Communists. When the peasant is doing well, he is condemned as a rich kulak, village exploiter, and therefore must be liquidated because Lenin teaches that an independent peasantry threatens the Communist system with the revival of capitalism. That is why the peasants must be liquidated, must be forced into the system of kolkhoses and reduced to the status of serfs to the state.

When a small-business man opens a private shop he receives his merchandise from the public store at fixed prices and fixed margin of profit. While the state-owned shops sell better merchandise at better prices and with a higher margin of profit to the state-owned shops.

If one were able to pay the tax fixed arbitrarily, one would have to face a special commission which has the unlimited authority to confiscate all of one's merchandise and send the owner to a forced-labor camp without trial. A craftsman has to wait until he is alloted raw materials and he has to deliver his products to the cooperative where the Communists will pay for it whatever price they chose.

A high-school student has to live in town and the Communists decide whether he can obtain lodgings and at the examination he has to show his "political maturity" and confess whether he loves the "liberator of mankind," Stalin.

A citizen looks for consolation in God, is a believing Christian and he is forced to attend manifestations against his pastor, or bishop, to accuse him falsely, that he is a traitor, that he supports the bandits from the underground, "corrupts the youth, misappropriates public funds" and that he is a saboteur of the new order.

If such a worker, peasant, craftsman, clerk, teacher, businessman or professor has stood all this, and his spirit has not broken down after becoming a modern slave completely dependent economically, then there comes the political terror.

A man has not broken down, he has lost his temper, he has said something rash, the security police picks him up in the night and he disappears. Sometimes he disappears without trace, or his body is found floating in the river, thrown in the field, or in the forest. Sometimes he stays in prison for months without trial. After that they release him and place him under the close observation of spies. Sometimes in the prison cell he is sentenced secretly for several years where later beaten and tortured, he is starved in an overcrowded prison cell. And sometimes a secret sentence, a pistol shot in the back of his head and only by accident a dog may dig out his corpse it was not buried deep enough in the ground.

If it is necessary a political trial will be staged, always before a military court, rendering sentences according to the orders of the NKVD. First of all they will try to break him down. Then they make him appear at a public trial and accuse himself—he is made to disgrace his good name, to accuse falsely his friends, to deny all that he has believed in throughout his life. Then he is given a sentence and will never be free again so that he cannot disclose how they did force him to accuse himself and to denounce his friends.

In this way by means of slave labor, complete economic dependence on the state, poisoning of the soul of the nation, 1,000,000 armed men of the Communist Party, of the security police, of the NKVD, of the so-called Polish Army led by Soviet officers in Polish uniforms and of the Soviet Army stationed in Poland, govern 24,000,000 Poles of anti-Communist views, known for their love of freedom and of the independence of their country.

Five families are forced to live in two rooms while at the same time to show off there are being built palaces, government buildings, party quarters, Communist press buildings, prisons; highways and railways from the east to the west for Soviet military purposes. In addition an unheard-of splendor and luxurious living of those who govern allegedly in the name of the proletariat. The difference in the living standards between the ruling class and the rest of the people is so enormous that you cannot find a similar disparity in any capitalist society of the west.

Such are the conditions in Poland, in Rumania, in Hungary, and in Bulgaria. And in spite of the so-called Tito rebellion the same conditions exist in Yugoslavia. Conditions are similar also in Czechoslovakia, in Lithuania, and Estonia, in Latvia, and, because of the longer period of Communist government in Russia, the conditions there are even worse. The same is to be expected in China, as it would take place in any country in which the Communists succeed in seizing the power.

We therefore warn you, because we know from experience that the ultimate aim of communism is the domination of the whole world. Perhaps you will still disregard what we say today. Perhaps you will distrust us thinking that we speak with the bitterness of political exiles. Perhaps you will say that we want to provoke a war. My answer is—we speak with the voice of those who have witnessed their own nation being put into the irons of oppression and feel with it the brutal injustice of this act. We give warning with the voice of those who having experienced the misfortune and injustice of their own people would like most sincerely only one thing that a misfortune similar to ours be not the lot of other nations.

We do not want either war or human suffering but we are deeply convinced that those who deprived our nations of their freedom, those merely in defense of their dictatorship and not in the defense of any ideology—murder and imprison their countrymen not letting them to live in peace even in poverty, that those keeping in every country their agents ready to betray their own peoples and to murder them with the hands of their own brothers, those are the ones who do not want peace. They want only to gain time for the solution of the secrets gained through espionage and in order to produce the weapons of mass murder.

After having established a dictatorship over 350,000,000 people of Russia and of the countries behind the iron curtain, today they aim to consolidate their power over 400,000,000 of Chinese so that tomorrow they be ready to threaten India and Japan in the east and the rest of Europe in the west.

I do not say this to frighten you but to assist you to face the truth and to appraise the actual state of affairs calmly. I say this so that we entertain no illusions that the world can enjoy peace divided into halves of free men and of slaves, that the two halves one—democratic, strong, powerful, a part of which is the United States, the strongest world power today, but the half always running the risk of diversionary action and burdened by costly armaments, a nonaggressive half wanting peace at any price; and alongside a second aggressive half of bloody and perverse dictatorship not counting the price of human lives and not concerned with human dignity—those two halves cannot live peacefully the one alongside the other. The period of appeasement has passed. The Marshall plan inspired new life and new hope in western Europe. The Atlantic Pact united the countries of western urope for the purposes of common defense against armed aggression. The Communist wave is receding and the Communist attempts to seize the power in Italy and France have failed. These are positive achievements. I believe that the time of easy conquest of one country after another by the Communists has passed. The question, Who is next? will not be repeated as a reflection of helplessness on the part of the free countries.

I think that today already no one entertains the illusions that at this moment only Berlin and lifting of the blockade is the real issue. I think that if another appeasement came to pass and the nations behind the iron curtain were forgotten and left to their fate, besides the guilty conscience of the western democracies, it would not bring to disturbed humanity a lasting peace. That is why the systematic enlightenment of the public opinion of the free nations of the world is necessary. That is why the expansion of alliances is needed in order not to tempt the Kremlin to attack the still weak spots.

On this Polish National Day I wish to your statesmen and leaders that their wisdom and endurance, backed by your power, could bring about the realization of the four freedoms which were born on American soil—bring about the application of the provisions of the Atlantic Charter and of the Charter of Human Rights in international life and among all people of the world.

I wish also that the promises of our great allies concerning the Polish nation were put into effect—the promises of free, strong, and independent Poland. The hopes for such a Poland sustained the fighting spirit of the Poles who fought during the last war in the Polish underground as well as side by side with the other allies, together with the soldiers of the United States and the British Empire. After the last victorious war the Poles are again in bondage. But nobody can kill the spirit of the nation that preserved its ideas of freedom and democracy embodied in the constitution of May 3, 1791, during one and a half centuries of bondage.

We Poles believe that finally justice, freedom, and democracy are bound to win in the whole world and so also in Poland.

We believe that the democracies will win because they have the will to win and are in a position to be victorious in the whole world, assuring lasting peace and happiness to humanity.

(Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by the chairman of the Polish Peasant Party, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, at the Polish National Day celebration in Baltimore, Md., on May 1.)

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of the Polish Constitution, I wish to share with my colleagues the deep feeling, considerations and convictions that move me to a sincere desire of true sympathy and justice for the enslaved peoples of Poland. This desire, Mr. Speaker, is not based on sentiment and emotion, but on factual historic background demanding such justice. Let us go back in memory and recall the history of Poland. Before our eyes unfurls the story of a brave and peace-loving nation which, thrust into the center of Europe, throughout the thousand years of its existence and development, brought to the world and to civilization the sublime ideals of the human soul. The history of Poland, which at one time stretched from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, is singular in the objectives it has always pursued. In the panorama of Poland's history one does not see aggressive wars; there is no persecution of

the neighboring peoples, there is no pillage, destruction, denationalization or slavery. There is seen only the paternal embracing under the protecting roof of other races, nationalities and creeds, and giving them shelter at a time when other nations of Europe expelled them from their boundaries.

In ancient Poland we see human genius, genius of research. We see Copernicus, the great astronomer, who "stopped the sun and moved the earth." We see an endeavor in studies, with the University of Cracow, the second oldest university in Europe, and the historical Commission on Education, leading the way. We see a nation which led all nations at that time as an exponent of democratic principles, where individualism, the dignity of man, and the intangible laws of personal property have been raised to heights unsurpassed even in today's concept of democracy. This was Poland.

But it would be impossible for one to understand the history of Poland, or even the essential character of the Polish nation, unless one realizes the Poles are fundamentally a nation of parliaments. For this circumstance explains the fact that the most important moments of Polish history are concerned with the problems on parliamentarism, and that the Polish nation as such raised to the forefront of its tradition and history not battles or revolutions, but the date of a fundamental reform of parliament and the system; that of the constitution of May 3, 1791. Therefore, it is to this event that my remarks are devoted.

The parliamentary system is a deep-rooted and age-old tradition in Poland. As early as the seventh century, the one common principle to be found in all the Slavonic peoples was a social system in which the supreme authority was the general assembly of all the members of the tribe. Even more important is the fact that already in the ninth and tenth centuries the principle of unanimity, and not the will of the majority, was obligatory. On these democratic principles the Slavonic nations were built, but among them it is particularly characteristic of the Poles, that they were the only nation that remained faithful to the parliamentary tradition throughout all their independent existence. The unbroken continuity of the parliamentary system in prepartitioned Poland, and the fact that on the European Continent only in Poland did the existence of, and government by, parliament know no brake, is one of the distinctive phenomena of European history, which attracted the attention and study of historians, thinkers, and political reformers of the entire world.

If one turns back the pages of history to the Middle Ages, one learns that the will of the reigning Polish princes was subordinated to the decisions arrived at during the gatherings of the leading advising nobles.

In the fourteenth century, when the various local princes again united in a homogeneous Polish Kingdom, these gatherings developed into state council. This was liberalized, giving the gentry representation and a right to share in the council's decisions, with the result that in 1462 Polish history records the first meeting of the General Sejm, representing the gentry of the Polish Kingdom. And that happened over three centuries before our great Nation was born. The fundamental law establishing the principles of Polish parliamentarism, and transforming a traditional practice into an obligatory law, was passed later in 1505 and with it the constitutional "Nihil Novi," announcing that from that day forward the King could not establish anything new without the joint agreement of the senate and the regional deputies. The conception of the Polish Parliament as the General Sejm of those long-ago times embodied three factors: The elected King; the senate, which included the highest officials; and the Sejm, consisting of deputies elected by the gentry at provincial assemblies. This progressive development is a phenomenon which by its modernity was centuries ahead of the principles Europe generally put into force only in the nineteenth century. And the constitutional "Nihil Novi" remained the basic law which, without regard to the changes evoked by later practice, in reality established the principles of Polish parliamentary system down to the passing of the May 3 constitution.

But this system was not without faults. In the first place the delegates of urban areas dropped out early from the labors of the Polish Parliament with the result that the interests of the landed gentry become predominant. And the future was to see many an occasion when the gentry were to forget that their nation was not made of knights and nobles alone. The other great weakness of this system proved to be the outstanding principles of unanimity adopted from the very beginnings at Polish assemblies and Sejms. And although its weaknesses became apparent with the passing of time, the regard and respect for each citizen's word was inherent in the political mind of the Poles and so sacred to them that it was not abandoned until too late. In its later form of "Liberum Veto," which became a settled practice from 1652 on, a single deputy had the power to thwart the work of the Parliament by bringing in question the legality of any later decisions. This principle, more than anything else, ruined not only the principles of parliamentary government as such, but indeed the entire state apparatus of Poland.

But grim and foreboding clouds enveloped the future of Poland after the first partition. While France bathed in the blood of her children killing each other for the rights denied them, something happened which astounded the whole world; without bloodshed and revolution, but with joy and unanimous agreement of her sons, Poland gave birth to her political masterpice, the first written democratic constitution in Europe.

The greatness of the May 3, 1791, constitution consisted of the fact that it freely and openly eliminated the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system.

Based on the principle that "All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people," this great document assured the nation a dual-chamber functioning of Parliament, with the real and final decision belonging to the lower chamber, the Sejm. It further abolished the "Liberum veto," and ensured a program of social reforms, equalizing to a great extent the privileges of the burghers and the nobility, giving the peasants equality under the law, and reaffirming religious toleration, which was a fundamental element in Polish history. The 1791 constitution laid down the essential direction, and succeeding generations, in accordance with the steadily developing spirit of the age, not by way of social revolution, but by evolutionary reforms, tended to follow the line. And, in consequence, in 1918 the Polish State, newly restored under President Wilson's famous thirteenth point, at once took the line of parliamentary government in its broadest sense.

Today, after 158 years, the people of Poland once again pause to draw inspiration and new courage from this truly great and unselfish testament left them by their forefathers, for it is inspiration and courage they need today. Not unlike the time when the constitution of May 3 was signed, Poland's future is again enveloped by dark clouds—red clouds—and while suffering from the terrible devastation of a brutal war, her children live in pressing physical want, and even in more unbearable spiritual want of freedom. Only the inspiration of their historical past, of their ageless sacrifices for the principles in which they have always believed, can give them courage to face the future with the hope of withstanding the advances of a system that knows little of the dignity of a human being, and of restoring their nation to its former state.

In our great and free country, a moment of reflection on the history and the democratic constitution of Poland can help to give us the understanding and the strength needed to ascertain the plight of our traditional ally who has been deprived of her independence and national sovereignty following a victorious war. If we are truly sincere in our desire to see justice and freedom granted to those desirous of it, then our objectives will not and cannot be achieved until the wrong in Poland is rectified. It is urgent that we give sympathetic understanding and effort to aid our ally from the yoke of oppression and minority rule. In our attempt to attain peace and harmony among the nations and peoples of the world, let us be ever mindful and cognizant of the country of parliamentary tradition and its historic constitution of May 3, 1791.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, the Polish people throughout the world will celebrate Polish Constitution Day. A most memorable day to all.

Just about 2 years after the adoption of our American Constitution the Polish Diet proclaimed the Magna Carta of Poland and today, 158 years later, we here in America are extremely proud of those who gave to Europe its birth of democracy.

Today, people of all nationalities in free countries wonder when they will be able to rejoice in knowing that Poland is once again free. That the crunching yoke of Russian communism has been torn from those enslaved people. Yes; they wonder, too, when these people will again enjoy religious freedom and the right of free speech. When they can raise their heads to their God above in praise and thanksgiving from a people who would not give up, even under the Nazi and Russian persecution.

It was not but a short time after the adoption of the Polish Constitution when its jealous, suspicious, overbearing neighbors cast the finger of death at this new child of democracy. They feared, lest the love of liberty might find a spot among their people. Poland was ordered to be partitioned. Resist—yes, they did; but courage and faith could not withstand the thrust of the bloodthirsty hordes.

Taken from them was their new-born liberty. The right to live as each one's equal. All given to them, of all classes, without bloodshed, persecution, or the fear of being doomed to exile. Gone, alas, was their future that had been likened to the brightness of the Star of Bethlehem.

The western world has been shocked at the manner in which fundamental human freedoms have been gradually eliminated in the eastern and southeastern European nations. In the closing days of World War II the Soviet armies entered these countries posing as the great liberators from Nazi tyranny. They were welcomed because the people of these lands thought there could be nothing so oppressive or stifling of human freedoms than the Nazi hordes. Then too, they all looked to the great and humanitarian promises of the Atlantic Charter—once again they would be free men and free women. Now almost 4 years after the end of hostilities we see what a sad and inhuman delusion has been visited upon these unsuspectiong people.

To all thinking men it is clear now that the Soviet armies were not fighting primarily to eliminate the hordes of Hitler but in reality they were fighting to establish the ideology of communism as the way of life to be followed by all men the world over. These same Soviet armies were the means of establishing rump governments in the countries men of good will thought they were liberating from tyranny. It is an undisputed fact that the evil system of communism now dominates Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia only because the advance agents of the Comintern were backed solidly in their lust for total power by the Soviet armies. Is it not peculiar that communism has failed to take power in those European countries which were fortunate to escape liberation by the Soviet armies?

The greatest pages in the book of world heroism has been written by those stalwarts of the democratic way of life who remained in these satellite countries to fight totalitarianism every inch of the way in the noble effort to stem the tide and salvage basic human liberties for their fellow countrymen. They looked to the western world to hold true to the promises of the Atlantic Charter, they expected us to stand solidly by their side as they fought for the liberties of their people. Even when it became apparent that moral persuasion could not compete with the military stranglehold the Soviets had upon their country they continued the struggle. As one political party after another was put upon the rack of Soviet falsehoods and trumped-up charges they might have given up the fight, had they been faint of heart, but still they continued the struggle. Some of the leaders were put to death by the usual Soviet method of trial by jurists specially trained by the Comintern while still others disappeared in the still of the night, never to be heard of again by their loved ones. Despite these unbelieveable circumstances they continue the fight against red tyrants.

In the western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy there are today thousands of people who have escaped from the red tyranny. Some are the families of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in fighting for the dignity of man in their homelands, while still others represent the shattered remains of truly democratic political parties, those fortunates who escaped the dragnets which were put out after the Communists took over total power. Then there are those whose greatest crime was to believe in democracy as western civilization knows it who have managed to flee from their homelands, and have thrown themselves upon the mercy of our occupying armies.

May it be our prayer today, that soon Poland will enjoy the freedom that 158 years ago they thought was theirs.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROOK].

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the one hundred and fifty-eighth aniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—the first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation to recognize the fundamental principles of esteemed democracy.

I congratulate the Polish people for having pioneered and cradled the cause of liberty and justice, not only for their great country, but in many parts of Europe and the United States of America. Under the guidance of their torch of freedom the illustrious sons of Poland marched forth in defense of a cause that was just, even to crossing the troubled waters of the Atlantic in frail boats in defense of our own country during the discouraging days of the American Revolution. Yes, they cherished a great ideal; they fought hard, and many died young that we today may be privileged the greatest blessings on earth.

The United States of America, sometimes called the melting pot of the world, has been enriched with the contributions made by our immigrants that came from the cradle of European democracy. Wherever the Polish people have taken domicile in the United States, their citizenry has proved second to none. They have taken an active part in education, religion, law, civic, social, and governmental affairs. Their loyalty and patriotism have been unexcelled. They have carried Old Glory in both war and peace and they stand ever ready to protect our priceless heritage regardless of the sacrifice connected therewith.

So today we celebrate their day of days, and to those millions of Americans of Polish descent, we celebrate with them. And may that great Polish nation ever be protected that its constitution may stand as a beacon light to guide a troubled Europe down the avenues to understanding, reenforced brotherhood of man, and a just and lasting peace for the world.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHESNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, today on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution I wish to single out for especial tribute a great Polish patriot and soldier who contributed in such full measure to the democratic establishment of our own country. I refer to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, that distinguished Polish gentleman, patriot, military genius, who joined the forces of our own colonies in their fight for independence.

There is in the Fifth District of Tennessee a thriving city which proudly bears the name of this Revolutionary War hero. Pulaski, Tenn., situated in Giles County, in the great State of Tennessee, proudly keeps alive the memory of that patriot who helped so much toward making our own Constitution possible.

When we consider the heroism of this man, his devotion to the cause of freedom and liberty, his genius on the field of battle—and how he joined the forces of freedom on this continent many thousands of miles removed from his home, the land of his distinguished birth, and how his courage and valor were an inspiration to the patriots of our Nation in their hour of need—I think we can all receive inspiration.

It is my sincere hope that somehow this country which this patriot helped to establish in the principles of freedom and democracy and constitutional government may repay the debt of gratitude we owe in such great measure. It is my sincere hope that the shroud of communistic darkness which has enveloped the valiant people of Poland may be lifted—and through the efforts and encouragement of our own great democracy—and the Polish people who so early joined this Nation in the fight for constitutional freedom may be restored to their traditional dignity and liberty.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHESNEY. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, as busy as we are in the House today I cannot let the occasion pass without making sincere reference to the fact that this is the anniversary of Polish independence. It is a time when we can recall the glories of the past of this great Polish nation and its gallant noble people. It is a time to note the bitter struggles, sacrifices, and contributions which Poland has made in the name of human liberty, in the name of Christianity, and in the name of suffering humanity.

Let me therefore once again join my voice to those which have been raised today in tribute to Poland and her unexcelled sons and daughters. Let me laud her achievements. Let me praise her valor and her indomitable spirit which forged a great legacy of freedom.

She is now in chains and shackles even though the blood of her noble sons has drenched the sacred soil of Poland and other nations in defense of liberty against unspeakable tyranny. Yes, Poland has heroically served the cause of freedom and she must not be abandoned by those of us with whom she fought as allies. Our cause was her cause. Our cause is her cause and we can never sacrifice her noble people to permanent slavery behind the iron curtain.

Let us never forget what Poland has suffered and advanced to make liberty a vital living reality. Let every true American stand with Poland in her hour of sorrow and oppression and do everything we can as a people and a nation to insure her early liberation.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I observe that during the month of May the Polish Constitution was written, and I observe also that during this month of May in the year 1949 we pay tribute to the memory of that brave people and that event in the history of liberty. Certainly in the month of May, the month of spring, and the month of rebirth in the law of nature we hope and pray that there is reborn in Poland that liberty for which they have always been leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to the brave people of an ancient and great nation and to pay as well my tribute to this day of commemoration honoring Poland's Constitution Day, May 3. This could very well be described as Poland's Fourth of July, and let me assure you I am proud, indeed, of this opportunity of raising my voice so that it may be heard in this great public forum for democracy and liberty—the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

And it is proper, Mr. Speaker, that the celebration of Poland's Constitution Day be held during the month of May in this year of our Lord 1949, and it was fitting and proper as well that the constitution of Poland in the year 1791 was recognized and promulgated during the month of May, because May is recognized the whole world over as the month of spring. This is the month in which there is reborn under the law of nature all the vigor and all of the hope and all of the dreams and all of the ambitions of things that are new, of things that are to come, of hope and of vision and of certainty for happiness and a new life in the future. We say today then to our friends and brave allies of Poland that in May should be reborn in the hearts and the breasts of all who love liberty, and that means all Poles, whether they be Poles in America or Poles in Poland itself, or in whatever country their search for liberty may have scattered them throughout the world. Certainly in our great country of America the hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Polish ancestry join with their friends, their relatives, and their neighbors in the motherland behind that iron curtain superimposed upon a great and religious people by Communist atheists. Everything must be done to assure these great and freedom-loving and God-fearing peoples that they are not forgotten. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that communism is the enemy of Christianity, and Poland is one of the historic Christian nations not only of Europe but of the world. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that the Communist enemy wishes to destroy the freedom and the liberty of God-fearing America as well as to destroy the same beloved qualities in our faithful ally and friend, Poland.

We must mark well the precept that as long as there is any people, as long as there is any nation, suffering the chains of slavery, economic, political, or religious, or of any other kind, just so long as that slavery exists in the world, then no country and no people any place else in the world are entirely free. The casualty lists of World War I and even more so the casualty lists of World War II for the armed forces of the United States carry thousands of Polish names, and thus prove that Poland's contribution to America has won her, by the blood of her children here, the right to our interest and our concern and our aid. The sons of Poland, in their own uniform and in the uniform of the leading Allied nations, fought on every battlefield with the Allied nations of the far-flung scene that was the horrible World War so lately concluded. In the air, and on the sea, and under the sea, Polish aircraft and Polish ships fought the good fight shoulder to shoulder with their freedom-loving brothers of the Allied western Christian democracies; so we are not throwing crumbs to a beggar, we are merely recognizing in all Christian decency the right of equal peoples to equal liberty, to equal justice, and to equal freedom under Almighty God.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on the third of May, 1791, the Congress of the Republic of Poland adopted a new constitution which was the most liberal and democratic of its day. We are profoundly moved by its breadth and wisdom, which defined specifically the liberties and the freedom of the Polish people.

With the noble ideals of freedom as a battle cry, the Polish nation went forth in that unequal match of power with the enemy in September of 1939. In the opening days of the most recent world conflict, President Roosevelt called Poland an "inspiration to all nations," because Poland alone dared defy the Germans in their ruthless challenge of those freedoms and democratic liberties championed by Poland.

The heroic Polish people fought the invader, from the beginning of the war, not only in their own country, but on every battle front until the enemy surrendered. Poland was one of the fighting Allies, bearing more than her share of the war's burdens, and her sacrifices were not surpassed by any nation.

Poland fought with the Allies with the same objective as expressed in the celebrated charter, the "Four Freedoms," but today Poland is not free. She lies prostrate, suffering from the oppression of an imperialistic tyrant. She is denied the right to have a government which represents the will of her own people.

After her magnificent sacrifices and heroic efforts, Poland deserves better justice from the allies to whom she gave such courageous assistance. From the desecrated ashes of Nazi conflagration, Poland rises a weakened and impoverished republic, seemingly deserted by her allies and scourged by her enemies. She is a victim in war and a victim in peace—a tragedy indeed.

However, the fires of liberty for Poland still flame in the hearts of Poland's people. This spirit is as intense now, in the minds and hearts of all Poles, as it was on May 3, 1791.

Today, Poland is striving mightily to keep body and soul together that she may gain strength to build a new nation out of the ruin left by war. Today, more than ever, she needs our aid, physically and spiritually. God grant that we will repay a debt of gratitude we owe to the indomitable people of Poland. Until Poland and the other small liberty-loving nations are free, there will be no just foundation for true peace in this troubled world.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the independence day of Poland, a great nation because the spirit and courage of the Polish people throughout history has shown the way toward worthy steadfast principles which many other nations have been pleased to follow. A nation becomes great because, in spite of its disadvantages, both in manpower and in natural resources, it is able to rise above the elements and take its place among the worthy nations of the world because of the contributions it makes to the progress and welfare of the world. This Poland has been able to do. I mention only a few of the great men of Polish nationality who stand forth as the emblem of a nation dedicated to principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. Not long ago, in our midst, there came Jan Paderewski, with whom I had the pleasure of collaborating in the passage of the resolution demanding the independence of Poland.

Gifted in the fine art of music, looked up to as a leader in this field which means so much to the cultural development of all peoples in the world, his name became a signpost in the march of artistry in music and gentleness of expression. Millions throughout the world were thrilled as they sat throughout his concerts and felt the throb of gifted and nimble fingers which gave forth expression. Millions throughout the world were age as well. Not only did he give example to the world in the art of music, but also did he become a leader in the art of government. He came into power in Poland at a time when chaos and disunity reigned, and, by the use of kind but firm

methods, combined with a high sense of appreciation and understanding of the many difficult problems, he brought order and unity to his native land. Here indeed is an illustration of unusual success and extraordinary accomplishment made by one both an artist and a statesman.

We may go back into the beginning of our own national existence and refer to the aid and assistance which was given the patriots of 1776 by great Polish military geniuses, who brought to the struggling and discouraged men of Washington's army an awakened zeal and forthright courage for their continued struggle to obtain independence. We are indebted to General Casimir Pulaski, whose incomparable efforts in time of need joined with them and gave signal assistance to their then wavering cause. The American people have never forgotten General Pulaski, who together with another countryman, Thaddeus Kosciusko, are remembered by every schoolboy and schoolgirl in America who read in their history books the unusual honor and praise that must be given to these two men of indomitable courage and love of freedom.

It was my privilege and pleasure, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, to play a small but important part in creating a free and independent Polish Republic after World War I. At that time, the people of Poland were struggling for understanding and sympathy from the nations of the world. This great people had the well-earned admiration and plaudits of a world citizenry for their exceptional military accomplishments in beating back the attack of the Nazi hordes upon their sacred territory. They refused to bargain with the Nazi aggressor, and with honor they went down fighting against great odds. For this, the American people and their allies were grateful and saw to it that Poland was not divided up as spoils of war.

In World War II, the Polish people repeated their gallant stand again, before the Nazi bestiality, and held firm, giving time to the allies to collect their forces and provide and build up other obstacles to the German advance. It is well-known that though their territories were overrun with their enemies and Quislings, the underground system of the Polish people was active in the cause of the allies of World War II, and kept alive the spark of human freedom which was ever burning in the hearts of every true and loyal Polish patriot.

Today, however, Poland finds herself in the throes of great economic suffering and political subservience. Her people are surrounded by other enemies. Her leaders beckon to the call of alien doctrines. They listen not to the voice of Poland as enunciated by the history of a free people, struggling for independence and deliverance from its oppressors.

The United States of America numbers among its citizens hundreds of thousands of industrious and honorable citizens of Polish descent throughout the various communities. Active in every field of endeavor, they have brought to American life the fine human characteristics which the native Pole possesses; always struggling under great odds, they have fought alongside other Americans for a religious and political freedom embodied in the Constitution and Bill of Rights of the United States. Time does not permit me to set forth the names of the many citizens of Polish extraction who have helped to keep alive the noble traditions of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

On this May 3, 1949, it is my fervent hope, and I know the hope of all Americans, that the time is not far off when the yoke of the oppressor shall be lifted from the Polish people in order that they may take their place among the people of other nations and be invested again with their natural rights which our Creator has ordained for all the peoples of the world.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 158 years ago this 3d of May, Poland gave to the world an imperishable document. The constitution of May 3, 1791, adopted by the Parliament of Poland holds place of highest rank in the political literature of the ages. It has been a heartening inspiration to free men in every country and to men everywhere struggling to attain for themselves and all humankind the full measure of political equality.

On this one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of the adoption of that constitution the sun is shining here in Washington, the trees about the Capitol are green with the springtime hues of hope, and in the flowers of white and pink and red that we passed in coming from our offices to this Chamber was Nature's message of optimism. I cannot but feel that this pleasant day upon which this anniversary has fallen is an augury of the future that lies ahead for Poland.

Poland and her people, giving so much to all the world, so much, so bitterly, and so undeservedly has suffered. Surely for a country of such quality and a people of such character ahead the day of light and sunshine must be breaking. In the darkest hours of the night men and women held fast their faith that "Poland is immortal." That faith they will never abandon. Again, and soon, it is the hope and prayer of everyone in this Congress, Poland will be a truly free and independent nation in which, in the words of the constitution of May 3, 1791, "all power in civil society is derived from the people."

To the people of Poland on this anniversary day may there beam from this historic Chamber what is in our hearts and minds: your sufferings and your sacrifices we will not forget, always as a good and close friend you can count upon us.

I could not close without mention of the circumstance that this year of 1949 is being widely observed by the people of the United States as "Chopin Year," proclaimed in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of the great composer who drew his rich musical treasuries from the folklore and folk motives and melodies of centuries of Polish people, reflecting their joys and sorrows and their longings.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my greetings to the people of Poland on this, the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. In former years these great liberty-loving people celebrated this occasion as a national holiday, the same as we Americans do our Fourth of July, but today they are deprived of this privilege, and, instead of a day of happiness, it is a day of sorrow, for only a few short years ago they stood out as a bulwark against the nation which threatened to be the world's greatest tyrant. They were the first to be attacked. The world will forever remember the heroic defense of Warsaw. When the Nazis invaded Poland from the west, the Russians invaded Poland from the east. They were surrounded by two powerful enemies, and when it appeared that the defense of their country was hopeless, these brave soldiers did not surrender but retreated to the territory of friendly allies and carried on the battle. They never wavered and never lost hope, until the enemies of freedom were destroyed and the cause of the Allied countries was victorious. But that victory cast a dark shadow over Poland because Russia, one of its former enemies and a collaborator of Hitler, emerged as a dominant European power and now dominates their country. Many of those brave soldiers who fought so gallantly all through the war cannot now return to their homeland and join their families but are scattered all over the world, waiting for developments, not knowing where or what country their future home will be in, for to return to Poland they would then be sent to Siberia or their lives would be in danger.

I hope that the people of Poland will soon regain their freedom and complete independence, which they have fought so dearly for in past centuries and which they dearly love and cherish.

May their future be as bright as their history is glorious, for these champions of freedom and democracy will never stop fighting until they free themselves of the shackles which their tyrant enemy has placed upon them.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1401. An act relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 227. An act for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.;

S. 635. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and

before United States commissioners, and for other purposes; and

S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 2, 1949:

H. R. 4152. An act to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Bitter Root irrigation district, the Shasta View irrigation district, the Okanogan irrigation district, the Willwood irrigation district, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, and Kittitas reclamation district, to authorize their execution, and for other purposes.

On May 3, 1949:

H. R. 1401. An act relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 4, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

583. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of The Virgin Islands Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 170), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 201. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4080, a bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice; without amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 326. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; with an amendment (Rept. No. 496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3151. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of aureomycin, chloramphenicol, and bacitracin, or any derivative thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3559. A bill to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4471. A bill to regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHATHAM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMATHERS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 937. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 4481. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to withhold certain wildlife-restoration project payments in the case of any State which unreasonably discriminates against nonresident hunters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4482. A bill to provide for flight experience for certain students in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 4483. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 4484. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4485. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1948 (Public Law 897), entitled the "Agricultural Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 4486. A bill to repeal the tax on certain toilet preparations and certain war tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 4487. A bill to encourage construction of rental housing at or in areas adjacent to military and naval installations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4488. A bill to provide for further contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4489. A bill to repeal the Federal automotive excise taxes, so called, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 4490. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the opening of the suspension bridge at Wheeling, W. Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4491. A bill to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4492. A bill to establish for individuals who served in the armed forces during World War II a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of tuberculosis existing within 3 years after discharge from such forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 4493. A bill directing that special consideration be given to excess agricultural commodities produced in the United States when entering into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4494. A bill providing for an amendment to the Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4495. A bill to provide additional benefits for certain postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4496. A bill providing for an amendment to the Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 4497. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4498. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of April 15, 1938, to expedite the carriage of mail by granting additional authority to the Postmaster General to award contracts for the transportation of mail by aircraft upon star routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 4499. A bill to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4500. A bill to provide a civil government for American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4501. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for those civilian employees engaged in hazardous occupations in any branch of the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4502. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 4503. A bill to amend 32 U. S. C. 76, 10 U. S. C. 371a, and 34 U. S. C. 853g–1, defining officers and employees of the United States or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4504. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, to provide additional grades for mail handlers, messengers, and watchmen at post offices of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4505. A bill to vest title to certain lands in the Pueblo of Laguna of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4506. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4507. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4508. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the settling in New England of the first French-Canadian immigrants; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 4509. A bill to amend the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 452), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4510. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school facilities in Klamath County, Oreg., to be available to all Indian and non-Indian children without discrimination; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between Pasco and Kennewick, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEE:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Trade Organization, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Joint Memorial 20, requesting Federal funds to aid in establishing the proposed cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4511. A bill for the relief of Constantine David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 4512. A bill for the relief of Rashid Mia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 4513. A bill for the relief of Anthony N. Zahareas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 4514. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sook Chong Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4515. A bill authorizing Jerome J. Wisniewski, an employee of the Department of the Army, to accept the decorations tendered him by the Governments of France and Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

751. By Mr. PATTEN: House Joint Memorial No. 1 of the Legislature of Arizona, relating to the propagation of fish; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

752. By Mr. WHITE of California: Petition of 38 citizens of Turlock, Calif., submitted by Mr. L. W. Boies, druggist, protesting the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods and requesting its repeal as quickly as possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

753. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. L. Larson, president, Trinity Hospital, Ashland, Wis., expressing emphatic opposition to compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

754. Also, petition of Harold S. Foster, Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Fort Worth, Tex., expressing opposition to H. R. 3190, the Lesinski minimum-wage bill, and stating that the bill H. R. 4272, the Lucas bill, is less objectionable; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

755. Also, petition of Charles B. Allen, Dallas Branch Railway Mail Association, Dallas, Tex., relative to action depriving clerks of the air-mail service in Dallas of their seniority rights, and protesting such action; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

756. Also, petition of Emmet Arthur Hinkelman, Chicago, Ill., urging the establishment of Federal scholarships to help train additional psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric social workers in order to combat mental illness; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

757. Also, petition of William J. Smith, United States Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the case of William J. Smith, petitioner, ASN 16051074, against the Adjutant General, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

758. Also, petition of Edward F. Alcock and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

759. Also, petition of Mrs. Nettie R. Austin and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, at this high altar of the Nation's service maintain in us the fidelity of those to whom much has been given and from whom much will be required. Give us honesty in dealing with our besetting sins, humility in confessing them, and resolution in overcoming them. Even as the din of words assails our ears from a turbulent world, grant us an inner calm undisturbed by any outer commotion. Endue us with Thy enabling grace that we may never betray for expediency's sake the high solemnities of duty which are the very breath of our integrity. Give us courage to seek the truth honestly and then to follow humbly the kindly light that leads us on. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 3, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 227. An act for the relief of Stone & Copper Coal Co., Inc.;

S. 635. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 850. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso Benderach.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ives	Neely
Baldwin	Jenner	O'Conor
Brewster	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Byrd	Kefauver	Reed
Cain	Kem	Robertson
Capehart	Kerr	Russell
Chapman	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Chavez	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ecton	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarran	Stennis
Flanders	McCarthy	Taft
Frear	McClellan	Taylor
George	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McKellar	Thye
Gurney	McMahon	Tydings
Hayden	Martin	Wherry
Hendrickson	Maybank	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Miller	Williams
Hill	Millikin	Withers
Hoey	Morse	Young
Holland	Mundt	
Hunt	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which is holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

STANDARD SCHEDULE OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a standard schedule of rates of basic compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government; to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of basic compensation of individual employees; to repeal the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate beginning tomorrow through the 12th of May.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize Senators who wish to present routine matters without debate or speeches.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas during the last generation the enormous expenses of Federal governmental activities has created a condition of confusion and overlapping in the divisions of the administrative authority which has placed upon the President of these United States an ever-increasing burden and has resulted in increased costs, and

"Whereas, pursuant to Public Law 162, enacted by the Eightieth Congress, there was created a commission known as the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which public law was on July 7, 1947, approved by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, and

"Whereas, pursuant to said Public Law 162, there was appointed a bipartisan group of representative and distinguished citizens of our country who had had experience in governmental affairs, which group made an exhaustive and unbiased examination into the administration of the agencies of the Federal Government, and

"Whereas the said Commission has filed a detailed report of its findings and its conclusions therefrom together with its recommendations covering the matter, and

"Whereas it appears to your memorialists that the said findings, conclusions, and recommendations constitute a cohesive and efficient program which will be of great benefit to the peoples of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, petitioned and requested by your memorialists to give due consideration to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to the end that the said recommendations may be adopted by the Congress of these United States and the President of the United States be directed thereby to effectuate the provisions of such recommendations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this joint memorial to the President and clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY LABOR LAW—RESOLUTION OF SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) BOARD OF ALDERMEN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of Springfield, Mass., favoring the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there has been enacted by the Eightieth Congress of the United States a labor bill known as the Taft-Hartley law; and

Whereas since the passage of this law, labor organizations have been oppressed and collective bargaining has been made more difficult to promote the advancement of the American labor movement; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law creates an inferior class of citizens, an inferior category and a debased position politically for the men and women who toil by hand or brain for their daily subsistence; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act, in its entirety, is an insult to the working people of the United States, a brand upon their integrity and decency, and a handicap to all fair-minded employers; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act invades the constitutional guaranties of free speech, free press, and freedom of contract; and

Whereas one of the main issues in the last Presidential campaign was the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and such issue was supported by an overwhelming majority vote for candidates to political office who were on record for the immediate repeal of this vicious and obnoxious law; and

Whereas the Eighty-first Congress has conducted hearings on a substitute labor bill known as the Thomas bill and such hearings have resulted in needless repetitious testimony, consequently delaying action on the repeal of this law; and

Whereas thousands of collective-bargaining contracts presently expiring and will expire in the very near future, and labor organizations and employers cannot negotiate with any degree of confidence as to the provisions that may be contained in a new labor bill, thus creating an air of uncertainty and endangering harmonious labor relations between labor and management which may result in unavoidable work stoppage; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States of America have, by their vote last November, delivered a mandate to the new Congress for immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of aldermen of the city of Springfield assert its disapproval of the Taft-Hartley law; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of aldermen of the city of Springfield go on record for the immediate and unqualified repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and that the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, the majority leaders of the House and the Senate, the Members of Congress from the western Massachusetts area, and the United States Senators from Massachusetts State, be so notified as soon as possible after the passage of this resolution, so that they may act accordingly, by having the city clerk send them an attested copy of this resolution.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY—JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Vermont, dealing with the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and to commend Ambassador Austin in his efforts toward the accomplishment of said policy.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution to reaffirm the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and to commend Ambassador Austin in his efforts toward the accomplishment of said property

Whereas peace with justice and the defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms require international cooperation through more effective use of the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Legislature of the State of Vermont in general assembly reaffirm the policy of the United States to maintain international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in the common interest, and that the President of the United States be advised of the sense of this general assembly that the United States Government, by constitutional process, should particularly pursue the following objectives within the United Nations Charter:

(1) Voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving Pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members.

(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affecting its national security.

(4) Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

(5) Maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as provided by the Charter, and to obtain agreement among member nations upon universal regulation and reduction of armaments under adequate and dependable guaranty against violation.

(6) That a duly certified copy of this resolution be presented to Ambassador Warren R. Austin of the United Nations as a greeting from his native State; thereby conveying to him its commendation for, and its appreciation of, his accomplishments toward universal peace among all nations.

(7) The secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the members of the Vermont delegation in Congress.

HAROLD J. ARTHUR,
President of the Senate.
J. HAROLD STACEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved March 17, 1949.
ERNEST W. GIBSON,
Governor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 353. A bill to protect scenic values along and tributary to Aspen Basin Road, and contiguous scenic area, within the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 324);

S. 812. A bill to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 325);

H. R. 1029. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Howard C. Heckenlively; without amendment (Rept. No. 326);

H. R. 1030. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Howe; without amendment (Rept. No. 327);

H. R. 1109. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Phena M. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 328); and

H. R. 1281. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Leslie Paul Schroeder; without amendment (Rept. No. 329).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 20. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 330).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 4, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 227. An act for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.;

S. 635. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 850. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1759. A bill to amend section 312 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for the retention of certain officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1760. A bill to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734, 7 U. S. C. 429); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1761. A bill for the relief of Anita Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LONG (by request) introduced Senate bill 1762, to establish a standard schedule of rates of basic compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government; to provide an equitable system of fixing and adjusting the rates of basic compensation of individual employees; to repeal the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1763. A bill providing for the use of Yakima Tribal funds with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior and the Yakima Tribal and General Councils of the Yakima Tribe, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1764. A bill for the relief of George K. Haviland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1765. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals" (Public Law 830, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 1766, providing for the disposition of 50 percent of the grazing receipts from certain public lands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1767. A bill to facilitate the cashing of salary checks of railway postal clerks in New York City; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1768. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require civil aircraft of the United States operated in overseas air commerce or in foreign air commerce to be equipped with radio installations and to carry qualified radio operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution making an appropriation to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

STANDARD SCHEDULE OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a standard schedule of rates of basic compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government, and so forth. It is my understanding that this bill more or less represents the administration's point of view on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to the Vice President by the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, dated May 4, 1949, explanatory of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1762) to establish a standard schedule of rates of basic compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government; to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of basic compensation of individual employees; to repeal the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The letter presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1949.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
The Vice President,
United States Senate.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT BARKLEY: We transmit herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend and supersede all of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except section 9 of that act as amended, which requires the establishment and use of efficiency ratings. We intend to propose a separate measure dealing with the problem of appraising the performance of employees.

The problem of appraising employee performance—whether such appraisals are expressed as "efficiency ratings" or otherwise—is and should be service-wide and is and should be closely interlocked with efficient and productive management in all departments and agencies, whether under the Classification Act or not. Thus, a legislative measure of broader agency and position coverage is more appropriate than a proposed classification act and pay bill.

The Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is the principal Federal statute governing rates of pay for Federal white-collar workers, outside the postal service and the Foreign Service under the State Department. As of July 1, 1948, the salaries of about 860,330 employees in the Federal Government and in the District of Columbia municipal government were fixed under its provisions. About 82 percent of these are in the field service and about 18 percent in the departmental service. Because of the fact that certain existing exemptions are not continued by the bill, we estimate that about 25,000 additional positions will be covered.

These 885,000 employees are located in nearly every department and agency, in the District of Columbia, each of the 48 States, Territories, and possessions, and in foreign countries. The work which they do covers a wide variety of occupations and activities—professional, scientific, technical, administrative, supervisory, clerical, maintenance, and protective. All levels of difficulty and responsibility are represented, from that of a routine clerical worker to that of a bureau head or the head of a regional or other office in the field service.

Originally enacted on March 4, 1923, effective July 1, 1924, the Classification Act has been amended or directly supplemented by the provisions of 11 other acts of Congress and indirectly amended, supplemented, or referred to, by the provisions of many other statutes, including organic and appropriation acts.

Because of the repeated amendment of various parts of the basic act and the supplemental effect of later law, it is highly desirable from an operating and a legal standpoint to bring together the provisions of existing law and to eliminate those provisions which are obsolete or which have been completely executed.

More important than this is the desirability of reviewing and improving the policies underlying the provisions of the Classification Act and the procedures required by existing law, with a view to bringing such policies closer to the needs of the Government as now constituted and simplifying and coordinating such procedures.

The proposed bill seeks to accomplish those objectives.

We recommend the proposed bill for consideration and enactment by the Congress. We have been advised that this proposal is in accordance with the President's financial and administrative program.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

DISPOSITION OF GRAZING RECEIPTS FROM CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the disposition of 50 percent of the grazing receipts from certain public lands, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1766) providing for the disposition of 50 percent of the grazing receipts from certain public lands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

During the past several years we have heard a great deal of discussion about the condition of the grass-type lands in our western national forests. Out of these discussions and arguments have come the following indisputable facts:

1. About 50 percent of the national forest lands in the 11 Western States do not carry livestock; yet much of this acreage needs to be reseeded to grass.

2. During the past 25 years the Forest Service has cut in half the number of livestock permitted to graze on our western forests; yet the grass crop is not improving because of other important factors such as rodents, unequal distribution due to lack of drift fences, flash floods, the coming of thickets of underbrush and other causes.

3. The Federal Government, as proprietor, places all annual receipts from this property in the Treasury and does not have a long-range financial plan for discharging any of the automatic financial responsibilities of ownership of this real property other than fire protection and the payment of taxes.

4. Several million acres of western national forest acreage need to be reseeded to grass. The experimental work has been done. From now on it is primarily a case of furnishing the financial tools with which to do the job.

5. Much of this acreage will not again produce grass unless a crop is first sown by artificial methods.

6. As a result of long-time experiments, we now find thousands of acres of western range land, both private and public, have been reseeded. I have seen some tracts that were reseeded as long as 10 years ago. Erosion has been retarded, stream flow regulated, and the per-acre production of wildlife and of meat substantially increased.

7. The sagebrush can and should be removed on the bench lands below the timber line. One hundred years ago, when Captain Fremont crossed my State, the sage plant was so unusual that he made a note of its presence in his diary whenever he encountered it. Today the sagebrush covers 25 percent of Oregon and is rapidly choking out the grass. The same can be said of the other 10 Western States.

8. Public ownership of property achieves no purpose when the public sets a bad instead of a good example of husbandry.

9. Congress has spent millions providing a soil-conservation instruction program designed to teach better methods to the owners of our Nation's farms and ranches. The time has arrived when the Government, as the owner of 1 acre out of 2 in the 11 Western States, should commence to practice what it preaches.

Nothing will be gained if we in the Congress and those on the outside continue to argue back and forth as to the basic cause of this set of facts that I have summarized. As we argue, the soil, without a good grass-root structure to hold it in place, is washing out to sea. My purpose in introducing legislation on this subject, is to urge the Congress to get on with the job of rehabilitating this land without delay.

Let us look at this problem in terms of food production. Beefsteak always costs too much in the opinion of the housewife. It is obvious that we automatically drive the price higher as we cut the volume of production. Prof. E. R. Jackman, of Oregon State College, one of our western experts on range grasses and problems, writing in the January 1949 issue of the Country Gentleman, reports that we are losing 200,000,000 pounds of meat a year from the American dinner table because of the unsatisfactory condition of our western national forest lands that are adaptable to grazing.

At the present rate of reduction in production, says Professor Jackman, there will be no grazing on the national forests at the end of 25 years; and that will mean the loss of an additional 200,000,000 pounds, or a total of 400,000,000 pounds of meat a year. My bill will expedite Professor Jackman's suggestions as to the corrective measures that should be undertaken.

The bill I am introducing today is designed to provide automatically, so far as the Congress can, funds for a 10-year period with which to start the rehabilitation of this vast acreage. Ten years from now, or sooner if it desires, the Congress can again review this subject. Aggressive action today so that there will be more natural resources tomorrow for all is preferable to continued argument over the division of less and less.

I can think of no better way to guarantee the appropriation of funds for this necessary reseeding work than to earmark for this purpose 50 percent of the annual receipts from national forest grazing permits in the 11 western States. The following table, supplied at my request by the Forest Service, shows the grazing receipts received from each

of the 11 Western States during the past fiscal year:

Grazing receipts from national forests, Western States, fiscal year of 1948

Arizona	$313,570.25
California	236,363.01
Colorado	484,299.44
Idaho	345,549.01
Montana	284,467.82
Nevada	133,922.50
New Mexico	166,291.59
Oregon	193,431.21
Utah	323,471.56
Washington	48,385.01
Wyoming	272,484.35
Total	2,802,235.75

I am recommending that for the next 10 years we guarantee, so far as we can, that at least this modest sum shall be plowed back into these properties which produced them. Certainly that seems fair. A landlord who takes everything and puts little or nothing back cannot be expected to be popular out in the wide open spaces any more than he would be here in Washington renting to a Member of this body.

Bear in mind that the tenant of these lands is discouraged from making improvements on them at his own expense. If the Congress should supply additional funds through other legislation, the goal will be reached much sooner. The time has arrived when the obligation of the public, as a property owner, must be fixed, because all wealth and all taxes come through the application of capital and labor to the natural resources.

To those who urge further reduction in livestock numbers, I say that although the number has been cut in half and the size of the national forest pasture increased by several million acres, we still face this problem of saving the surface in order to save all. The predominant crop of the West is grass and the universal industry is that of raising livestock for your table and mine. The demand from any quarter that the scope of this essential business be reduced lodges trouble at your door and mine. We cannot afford a further reduction at this time in the source of our food and fibre. Furthermore, the doctrine of scarcity has never been popular in this country. The way to attack this problem, I believe, is to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before.

I wish to close by placing emphasis upon the provisions in the bill which authorize the Government to cooperate with public and private land owners in a reseeding program. Range reseeding machinery is very expensive because it is not mass produced and because of the hazards of the terrain. Once the job is done, an owner has no further immediate use for it. Consequently, the average western rancher cannot afford to make the capital investment necessary to rehabilitate and otherwise conserve his grass acreage. By permitting the Forest Service, as provided in my bill, to do the entire job in a selected area, under contract with the owner of the private land and upon payment of the actual cost, we thereby foster the job of conservation at no increased cost to the public purse. Stockmen and wildlife groups in my State have asked us to provide a cooperative reseeding plan embracing all owners where the national forest lands are intermingled with State, county, and private property. My bill presents such a plan, which I hope will prove to be acceptable.

The text of the bill is as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., that 50 percent of the gross grazing receipts during each fiscal year within the period beginning July 1, 1949, and ending June 30, 1959, from national-forest lands located within each of the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture during the succeeding fiscal year, together with any funds appropriated for such purpose, (1) for the purpose of making and maintaining range improvements, including development of water resources, fencing, rodent control, and reseeding of forage plants, on any national-forest lands within such State, and (2) for the purchase and maintenance of the equipment necessary therefor.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into agreements with owners of lands, whether public or private, suitable for forage and lying adjacent to such national-forest lands providing for (1) reseeding of such adjacent lands by the Secretary, (2) payment of the actual cost of such reseeding by the owners, (3) advance deposit of the estimated cost of such reseeding, and (4) cooperative management by the owners of such adjacent lands during a period not exceeding 5 years following such reseeding in such manner as will best conserve the forage resources of such adjacent lands.

"SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO ESTIMATES OF COST OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, relating to reports of estimates of probable cost of proposed legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) All bills and joint resolutions reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. FERGUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

"That section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) All bills and joint resolutions reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution, over the first 5-year period of its operation, or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years'."

The responsibility of Congress for revenue and appropriations' legislation carries with it an obligation to establish a positive fiscal policy. This was recognized in the provision, by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, for the legislative budget. The legislative budget would require Congress each year to state its expectations with regard to receipts and expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year, and to state its recognition of a prospective deficit if such appears forthcoming.

Important as the legislative budget is, however, it is only a part of any program for establishing a sound fiscal policy in Congress.

We must bear in mind that appropriations are merely the implementation of authorizing legislation. It is true that authorizations do not technically constitute a commitment for future or implementing appropriations. But as a practical matter they invariably do. It follows that the root of any efforts at economy in the operation of the Federal Government is a critical examination of the enabling legislation.

Such scrutiny is not always possible, however, for the simple reason that a statement of ultimate cost and effect on future appropriations is not available. The proposed amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act would permit an evaluation of those factors. It would require that any legislation reported to Congress carry with it a statement of its estimated cost for the first 5 years of its operation, or for its life if less than 5 years. Estimates would be prepared by the Bureau of the Budget.

It should be remarked that a notable feature of the Legislative Reorganization Act was the compulsory submission of printed reports on all legislation reaching the floor of Congress. This was designed to permit Congress to know in detail the terms and significance of the proposed legislation.

The fiscal consequences of any legislation can be no less important to complete that picture, so that Members of Congress may evaluate a bill in all its features. The present amendment is designed to complete that picture.

And the full picture is of paramount importance if Congress is to provide and assure anything but the rocks of loose fiscal policy upon which, as has been remarked in the past, many ships of state have foundered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3838) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, in Washington, D. C., April 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETAINING AND IMPROVING THE AMERICAN SYSTEM OF MEDICAL CARE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. LONG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "How To Retain and Improve the American System of Medical Care," delivered by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, before the California Medical Association, in San Francisco, Calif., on Friday, April 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH FROM WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject, the North Atlantic Pact, delivered by him over Station WMAL, Washington, D. C., Friday, April 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH FROM SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The North Atlantic Pact," delivered by him from Station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator WHERRY on the occasion of a testimonial dinner given to Senator MARTIN at Washington, Pa., on April 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF HON. HUGH SCOTT AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from remarks made by Hon. HUGH SCOTT, chairman of the Republican National Committee, at a testimonial dinner given to Senator MARTIN at Washington, Pa., on April 30, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

CAN CONGRESS CURE TRANSPORTATION ILLS?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Can Congress Cure Transportation Ills?" delivered by him at a luncheon session of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in Washington, D. C., on May 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION OF 1791—MESSAGE BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a message entitled "The Polish Constitution of 1791," sent by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey to a commemorative meeting held under the auspices of Fairleigh Dickinson College, at Rutherford, N. J., on May 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FREEDOM OF SCIENCE—ITS OPPORTUNITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES—ARTICLE BY HARRY AUBREY TOULMIN, JR.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Freedom of Science—Its Opportunities and Responsibilities," written by Harry Aubrey Toulmin, Jr., of Dayton, Ohio, and published in the Chemical and Engineering News, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND SOCIAL CUSTOMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civil Rights and Social Customs," from the Christian Science Monitor for May 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM PROBLEM IN THE SPOTLIGHT—ARTICLE BY JOSEPHINE RIPLEY

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Farm Problem in the Spotlight," written by Josephine Ripley and published in the Christian Science Monitor for May 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum-foundation-education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. Those who favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes strongly to endorse and support the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for himself and other Senators. I trust that most Senators have had an opportunity to read and consider what was said about the pending amendment by the senior Senator from Maryland during yesterday's session of the Senate.

With reference to the pending amendment, the Senator from Maryland pointed out yesterday with keen clarity and force that in his view the intention of the Senate is to provide Federal aid for those States which are presently unable, because of economic and resource inadequacy, to maintain a reasonable and good standard of education. The Senator from Maryland believes—and certainly I agree—that most Senators are willing to appropriate Federal moneys for use by those States which lack adequate educational budgets because of conditions and circumstances beyond their control. If the pending amendment is adopted, it will result in helping only those States which are clearly and obviously in need of Federal assistance.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator feel that we have absolute proof, demonstrated beyond any doubt, that all those States have made their maximum effort so far as taxing themselves is concerned?

Mr. CAIN. I shall endeavor during the course of the remainder of this brief statement to present my point of view on that subject. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it is a most important question.

If the pending amendment prevails, approximately half of the 48 States of the Union will receive Federal grants, and the other States will contribute portions of their Federal tax income for the benefit of States whose present-day level of substandard education should and must be improved and brought up to standard. If our real intention is to help only those States which need Federal help—and I personally hope it is nothing more—we should make certain that we help no State which is presently able to maintain a high standard of education.

The junior Senator from Washington represents a State which happens to be endowed with great resources and possessed of educational standards and attainments of a high quality. Admittedly my State and every other State could utilize any Federal educational funds which might be available; but Washington State and many other States can today, and for some time to come, maintain high standards of education without Federal aid. Is it not most reasonable to recommend Federal aid to education for the State of Washington when that State actually requires it, and not before? I can recommend no such aid at this time. Therefore the junior Senator from Washington simply cannot support a bill which would provide Federal funds where they are not imperatively required. However, I shall happily vote for the bill if the pending amendment is adopted.

It happens to be a simple and completely distressing fact that our Government, of which the Senate is a part, is spending money faster than we can take it from the American taxpayer. We are taking much of what he now earns, and we shall very soon take much more if our appetite for Federal spending is not accommodated in a reasonable way to what comes in by way of revenue.

We all know that existing services, fixed charges, and necessary expenses are very high, and most of them are not subject to material reductions without imperiling the general welfare and national security. In the face of this reality, I know it to be short-sighted, fallacious, and potentially dangerous to authorize and appropriate a single dollar for any service anywhere which could get along with what it now has, through a full utilization of its own resources.

If the pending amendment is adopted and the bill becomes law, I think most Americans will approve the purpose and the cost of the Federal-aid-to-education program. Certainly the junior Senator from Washington would publicly defend and fight for its public acceptance.

Should the pending amendment fail of adoption and the bill then pass, I feel very deeply that the average thinking American would have reason to believe that we had given substance to the fear of future Federal interference in the field of education, that we had needlessly and extravagantly consumed tax dollars, and that we had failed to recognize an opportunity legitimately and wisely to economize; also that we had failed once more to challenge, stimulate, and encourage the self-reliance and ambition of every State in the Union to be just as self-supporting, self-respecting, and self-sufficient as is humanly possible from available resources.

On the terms outlined, the junior Senator from Washington hopes that the amendment will prevail, so that he may freely vote for final passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I was very much interested a couple of days ago in the illustration given by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] comparing the financial ability of the Federal Government with that of the various States. I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the situation, from an indebtedness standpoint, of the three levels of government.

As we know, the Federal Government now has a public debt of about $252,000,000,000. On January 1, 1948, the States owed a little under $3,000,000,000. The counties of the United States owed about $1,500,000,000. The cities owed a little more than $8,000,000,000; the townships $178,000,000; the special districts, which include the poor districts and organizations of that type, owed a little under $3,000,000,000. The school districts—and this represents money expended in building—owed $1,355,000,000.

To my mind that shows that the Federal Government is not in as good condition as are the States and local governments throughout the Nation. There are exceptions to that statement, of course. Some States are in better financial condition than others, and some units of local government are in better condition than others, but that is the over-all picture.

We are confronted with the problem of revenues for the Federal Government. The President of the United States has asked us to increase revenues for the next fiscal year. From the best estimate we can make, it now seems that there will be a falling off in revenues because of a falling off of business in the United States.

I wish to state some examples: So far this year the output of industry is down 5 percent; machinery, 9 percent; lumber, 21 percent; shoes, 19 percent; textiles, 11 percent; coal, 18 percent; sales of manufacturers, 10 percent; loading of freight cars, 20 percent; construction of new dwellings, 38 percent; sales of department stores, 14 percent; prices at wholesale, 7 percent; farm prices are off 15 percent; grains, 39 percent; meat, 25 percent; scrap steel, 49 percent; lead, 30 percent; exports, 27 percent; imports, 21 percent; and commercial loans of banks, 7 percent. Those percentage figures are in terms of the peak during the war. They show the trend. Mr. President, if this trend continues throughout the year, the loss of Federal revenues will be more than $5,000,000,000. That will mean deficit financing during peacetime. So now we have a danger signal, and I believe the Congress should heed it.

I should like to discuss for a moment the control of the higher echelon of government over the lower when grants in aid are made. First, I wish to read one or two sentences from the Municipal Finance Officers Association's report on this subject:

> Where there is duplication of service by several levels of government, the duplication or overlapping has come down from the top. State and National Governments have entered into activities originally started by local governments. Seldom have local governments instituted new programs which duplicated services already performed at a higher level.

Mr. President, if we undertake that sort of service, it will mean duplication of effort, and the duplication will come from the top.

I wish to read another sentence from the same report:

> Supervision, planning, and financing account for much Federal and State activity, while the actual performance of services which affect the everyday life of the citizen is carried out by the various types of local government.

Mr. President, the real education of the children of America will come from the local level, and it should come from that level. The question of control is being considered and debated in connection with the subject. I know the authors of the bill believe that no control will come from the Federal level, but the various progressive techniques utilized by the higher levels of Government in extending their control over local functions are very interesting.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does not the able Senator from Pennsylvania believe that if the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Maryland were to be adopted, there would be far more danger of Federal control than there would be without the adoption of that amendment? Of course, by that amendment, at least $5 a child a year would be no longer guaranteed. Under those circumstances, would not there be far greater danger of Federal intrusion and Federal control in respect to education within the States? In other words, by the adoption of the Tydings amendment, would not that danger be increased and intensified?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am usually in agreement with the distinguished junior Senator from New York, but on the proposition he has suggested I am not in agreement. I believe that under the Tydings amendment, because of the fact that only a few of the States—approximately half of them—would qualify under it, there would not be the Federal control which I fear in connection with Federal aid to education.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Continuing with the thought I have just advanced, let me inquire whether the able Senator from Pennsylvania believes that the active participation in the program by every State in the Union—and when I refer to "active participation" I mean that every State would not only be on the giving end, which it would be in any case, but would be also on the receiving end as well—does not the able Senator from Pennsylvania believe that the active participation of every State in this matter, by which every State can keep an eye on the Federal Government as concerns its plans, its programs, and its purposes, would be an increasing and far more effective safeguard than almost any other protection which we could devise?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, again I say that, although usually I am in accord with the very sound and progressive thinking of the able Senator from New York, yet from my point of view, if only a part of the States receive the proposed aid, there will be less likelihood of Federal interference.

I wish to give an example in that connection. Some years ago the Federal Government began to aid the States in the matter of road building. When that program began there was very little Federal interference. But as of today it is impossible for a State to build a road to which the Federal Government makes a contribution until the engineering features and the location of the road are approved by bureaucrafts in Washington.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not take issue in any way with the able Senator from Pennsylvania on the statement he has just made, but I should like to ask him if he does not think it would be much more difficult for a minority of the States—in the present case 19—to resist Federal intrusion and Federal control in their educational systems than would be the case if the program were participated in by every State of the Union. In that connection I should like to point out the fact that some of the best educational systems in the United States—I do not say all of them, but I say some of them—are to be found in States which would not be able to participate under the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am not in agreement with the able Senator from New York. I believe that when only a part of the States receive aid, probably the other States, which would not receive it, would see to it that the Federal Government did not control the policies and plans in connection with the educational system of the United States.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Pennsylvania is now on the very point which I am trying to emphasize, namely, that unless all the States are to participate, those outside the program, which could not participate, would not be in a position to know what was going on directly under Federal pressures, under attempted Federal domination in this field, and therefore they would not be in position to exert the opposition which would be vital in helping to defeat efforts along the lines I have indicated.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I believe that in the Congress of the United States, the representatives of the States that would not participate in the program would be more ardent than ever in seeing to it that the Federal Government did not dominate the policies

of the public-school system of America. Such domination is what I fear. If it were not for that, I should not be apprehensive of this bill at all. But, taking the record of the Federal Government and of government at the State level it appears that when they make contributions to local activities they gradually increase their control, until in most cases they finally control completely. In my own State of Pennsylvania, for example, beginning about 30 years ago, the State made a rather liberal contribution to the schools. The contribution has increased until now it constitutes about half the total cost; and the State must approve the curriculum, it must approve the types of building, and must approve other factors in the educational program; so that it now has practically complete control.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MARTIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York apologizes to the Senator from Pennsylvania for consuming so much of the Senator's time in asking questions, but the Senator from New York feels that the questions are rather pertinent. The Senator from New York realizes the high quality of education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Its standard is second to none in the United States. Therefore, the Senator from New York desires to point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania that without the $5 minimum, by which Pennsylvania would also participate fully in the program, the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would not be in a position to know what might be going on under the Federal-aid program as completely as would be the case if it were a party to it and itself received some benefits, by which at all times and under all conditions it would be acquainted with the Federal pressures and procedures.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's statement, I may say I think the various States that will participate in the program, if their school systems were being directed from the Federal level, would inform some of the Senators and some of the Representatives from the States that are not participating, and there would probably then be a congressional investigation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but if he does not mind, I should like to ask one or two questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield. I think a very good way to elucidate this matter is by asking questions back and forth. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Pennsylvania is familiar, is he not, with the practices which were indulged in for a number of years by industries in the southern part of the country, of advertising in magazines and newspapers urging industries to leave Northern States and go into the South, where the taxes are so much lower? The Senator has seen such advertisements; has he not?

Mr. MARTIN. Very frequently, and Pennsylvania has suffered from such advertisements.

Mr. LODGE. So has Massachusetts, and so have a great many other States. Does the Senator see anything in the pending bill that reflects the maximum effort that a State must make in order to raise as much money as possible, or that requires it to make a maximum effort, insofar as raising as much money as possible is concerned? Does the Senator see anything in the bill that does that?

Mr. MARTIN. No. I do not see anything in the bill that requires it, but I think if the amendment is adopted and the bill providing Federal aid to education is passed, there will then be a very careful study made by the Congress to avoid any inequalities which might arise. I enjoyed very greatly the discussion by the Senator from Massachusetts of the potential richness of several of the States of the Union. It is a study which I think every Senator should preserve and pursue carefully, because there is no question that, decade after decade, the industrial conditions and the economic conditions of the various States have changed. It will be necessary to make a continuous study, if the program is to be carried into effect equitably.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask one more question?

Mr. MARTIN. Very gladly.

Mr. LODGE. Would it not only be a matter of justice to the country as a whole, but also very much in the interests of the school children, if States were required to make their maximum efforts?

Mr. MARTIN. In answer to the very distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I may say I am not in favor of compulsion in our country.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to arouse among the people a feeling that they themselves should assume the responsibility for and the direction of their local activities. In my own State, for example—and I apologize for the personal reference—while I was Governor of Pennsylvania, by reason of my military experience I found that so many who were called under the selective-service law were defective physically, that the State appropriated about $6,000,000, as I recall the figure, in order that every school child might have a physical examination, a report of which would be given to the parents. There was nothing compulsory about it, but we urged, by newspaper editorials and by speeches, that the parents take the suggestions, so that the defects might be cured.

As I have said, I am not very much for compulsion. I am very much for arousing the interest of the general public of America in educational matters, because I am a great believer in having as fine educational facilities as can possibly be provided. I have made the statement in Pennsylvania many times that every school child in Pennsylvania, regardless of his place of residence, creed, or color, should have equal opportunities for basic education. I still believe in that.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say one further thing?

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am not suggesting that there be any compulsion. I am simply suggesting that if States are to receive Federal money, they should be required to make a maximum effort at self-help. That is all I am suggesting. It is an astounding thing to me that the idea they should not make the maximum effort is so strongly upheld by Senators in charge of the bill, particularly by my friend the Senator from Ohio, who apparently says there is great virtue in having the States not make the maximum effort.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Senator at all. The bill does require them to make every major effort. The bill does exactly what the Senator is asking. I do not understand what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Ohio talked for a good long time the other day, saying we should not require the States to impose the maximum amount of taxes, in order to raise the maximum amount of money and thereby deal ruthlessly with the lobbies that might influence the State legislatures. He has said it was none of our business, and he said it in a very dramatic and in a very forceful way.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator entirely misunderstood what I said. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. LODGE. I recall that the Senator did so say, and that he said that all we cared about was the percentage of their income devoted to education. He said it was none of our business how they raised their money, or what taxes they imposed. I am sure I can find the quotations to that effect.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The bill makes it perfectly clear that the State is given a year or two to catch up, but it cannot get one cent of Federal aid unless it taxes its citizens and devotes to the cause of primary and secondary education 2 percent of the income of the people of the State.

Mr. LODGE. That is the income, not the taxes. That is the whole point I am talking about. Other States say to Ohio, "Our taxes are lower than yours, therefore leave Ohio and come south." I say they ought to be required to impose taxes. That is the whole point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The bill makes it perfectly clear that the States must spend on primary and secondary education 2 percent of the income of the people. Where can they get it except from taxes? They can get it only from taxes. There is no other place they can get it. That means therefore that they must levy taxes equivalent to 2 percent of the income of the people. I said the other day I do not care, it does not interest us, whether

they get the money from sales taxes or real-estate taxes, or where they get it. But they must levy that amount of taxes. It is not proposed that we should undertake to say they have got to levy this tax and that tax and some other tax. Not only must they, in order to get one cent of Federal aid, levy taxes to produce 2 percent of the income of the people for education, but their Federal aid will be docked, I think immediately, if they do not levy 2¼ percent of the total income of the people, and within 3 years, levy 2½ percent of the income of their people, far beyond the national average today, which is 1.88 percent of the income of the States.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think it is all right for a State to say that it is poor, insofar as education is concerned, and then spend the money for roads and for other things? If the State is poor, is it not poor all the way, and if it is rich, is it not rich all the way?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is true. I do not know just what the argument is about, from that point of view, however.

Mr. LODGE. The point is that there are many States that do not impose anything like the taxes imposed in Ohio, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania; and it would be to the interest of the school children if they did, proportionately speaking.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think the taxes levied for other purposes can be related to this particular bill. We might add a provision that taxes for all State purposes must amount to 6 percent of the income of the citizens of the State; but I think that would be an unwise provision. So far as educaticnal aid is concerned, I think the State must levy on its citizens sufficient taxes so that they will spend on education more than the national average. If the Senator from Massachusetts thinks the percentage should be higher, he can argue it. I think the percentage is a reasonable amount. There are some States, such as Alabama, which will have to levy more taxes for education. They may be levying 8 percent for roads and for other purposes. But we are concerned that they bring their taxes for education up to a point at which they are spending 2 percent of the income of their citizens, which is more than the average throughout the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have been very glad to yield——

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I apologize to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. These are questions which should be discussed. What is worrying me more than is anything else is the possibility of Federal control over our schools. I feel that the education of the children of America should be at the local level. I made quite a study of the question 2 or 3 years ago, and I wish to read a paragraph from an address which I made to a group of persons, showing the technique of control:

> The various progressive techniques utilized by the higher levels of government in extending their control over local functions is interesting. First is the offer of free advice and information. Then comes the offer to coordinate and to cooperate in administration. Later is a step involving inspection of projects. Additional control may be had by the fixing of standards. It may end up by the ultimate power of appointment and removal of local officers concerned with the project and the issuance of general regulations binding upon the locality. All of this naturally follows monetary grants-in-aid or the furnishing of free labor or expert advice. When local officials are pushed aside, free government as we know it is gone.

Mr. President, what worries me is the centralization of control. Where centralization of control has been established in the world it has meant the loss of individual liberty. That was the case in Germany and in Italy, and we are approaching it here. That is what worries me more than anything else in connection with the proposal.

I wish to read from a minority report made in 1943 by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and former Senator Ball, of Minnesota:

> We do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the National Government. Our schools are one of the remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain.

Mr. President, I feel that these are most eloquent words, and they should have the consideration of every American who believes in our system of government.

I have had an opportunity, Mr. President, to observe what grants to the States have meant. I referred a moment ago, in answer to a question of the distinguished Senator from New York, how the Federal Department of Public Roads had encroached upon the independence of the road departments of the States and how grants are rapidly increasing. The Federal Government not only tends to take over control, but there is also involved the prospect of an additional financial burden being imposed upon the United States. For example, starting in 1944, aid programs amounted to approximately $579,000,000. For 1949 it is estimated the amount will be $1,798,290,000. That is not only an additional financial burden, but as it grows larger the Federal Government takes over control.

So, Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will give very careful consideration before we start on a program of aid to education. It creates not only an additional financial burden, which the Federal Government is not able to assume until we have some determination as to our revenues, but, what is worst of all, it will start control by the Federal Government over our local school systems, which have been one of the great bulwarks of American freedom and independence and which have made us the greatest nation in all history. We must not destroy any of those ideals.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Maryland, of which I desire to express my approval. I do so for several reasons. The so-called Federal-aid-to education bill is one which undoubtedly brings before us many considerations. But there is an objective at which the pending amendment is aimed and which I think can very well be considered apart from the general purpose of the bill. I feel that general support should be given to the policy of the Federal Government to give aid to those States which are in need of it. I submit, Mr. President, that under the bill there is the possibility that many serious results may ensue. For example, I feel that the aid which will be forced upon those States which do not desire it is unwanted, in many instances it is unneeded, and in other respects it may be undesirable.

In connection with the fact that it is unwanted, I feel that it is pertinent to comment upon a communication which was addressed to the Congress by the Governor of Maryland while this proposal was under consideration heretofore.

After being asked to express his views about the proposal for Federal aid to education, the Governor of Maryland, who happens to be the chairman of the Governors' Conference, a position occupied in the past by such distinguished men as the present senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who has just addressed the Senate, replied and answered categorically the questions which were propounded to him in connection with the pending bill. In answer to the query whether the aid was desired, and whether Maryland was in a position to finance its educational program without Federal assistance, he declared:

> We have plenty of reserve financial strength and can do more for public education without additional Federal assistance.

I submit, Mr. President, in view of that statement, which is made on behalf of the people of a sovereign State by its chief executive, it certainly seems foolhardy to force upon that State—and I am confident the same situation exists with regard to other American Commonwealths—aid which they say is not needed.

In his reply to the Congress the Governor continued, and I quote from his own statement:

> It is simply that Federal aid should be given only to the poorer States and for the purpose of providing a desirable and attainable minimum program of education.

Certainly we endorse that statement, we subscribe to it, and, indeed, it appears that the draftsmen of the bill undertook to do just that, because in the report of the committee, on the very first page, this wording is used:

> The bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing—

What?—

> a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools.

Then on page 9 of the report, in the analysis of the bill as amended, I think it is significant to note that the committee distinguishes between or among

the States, just as the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Maryland distinguishes, because in this statement the following is to be noted:

The purpose of the act is to assist the States in equalizing educational opportunity through Federal allotments—

Mr. President, note the distinction the committee itself makes—

of not less than $5 per child of school age to any State—

That is one group—

and sufficient additional amounts to those States which, after making reasonable effort to provide support for schools, are still unable to produce an amount necessary to guarantee a minimum educational program.

So, in that sentence there is clearly made the distinction that two groups of States exist, one, those States which, after making reasonable effort to provide support for the schools, are still unable to produce an amount necessary to guarantee a minimum educational program, and the other group consists of those States which are now meeting every requirement that the committee seeks to impose under the bill. But to those States, which fall in the second class, and which, therefore, are those States which have demonstrated their ability to provide support for schools, what is given? An additional amount of $5 per child of school age.

I have not yet heard any explanation, convincing explanation, at least, why in the fixation of that amount—$5 is named. It is an arbitrary amount. The fixation of that amount, I submit, indicates that it is not one which is absolutely needed, because if any other formula were adopted, which was based upon the need of the State, it would not come out exactly $5 in every case.

Mr. President, I think that where we have a group of States as to which, under the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, the line is clearly drawn, we should stop at that point when evidence has already been advanced that the States are able to finance their own educational programs.

In connection with that, Mr. President, I have before me a list of all the States of the Union, showing the aggregate balances in their State general, highway, and postwar reserve funds, as of the last year for which these figures are available, the fiscal year 1947. It shows that in every State in the Union, of course more in some than in others, sizable surpluses exist. The sum total of the surpluses of all the States is $3,221,977,000.

Of course, anyone who has familiarized himself with the fiscal affairs of the States realizes that there must be reserve funds, there must be surplus funds, there must be working funds, because the total funds should not or could not be used, but the figures that a number of the States have amounts still available to them which could be used, just as the Governor of my State says Maryland funds can be used for this purpose.

In that connection, I noted just this morning the message of the Governor of my State to the general assembly this year, in which, in stating the condition of the State, and also its program for the future, he says that "the progress in public education during the past 2 years has been almost phenomenal." He used that word. If the progress in the State has been phenomenal, if the State has a sizable surplus—and I merely use this as typical of the situation which exists with regard to other States, undoubtedly, not making my State separate and distinct from the others—if there is a sufficient surplus to use, and if the State expresses its desire to handle its own funds rather than have unnecessary Federal interference, I submit Maryland should be allowed to do that.

Mr. President, that brings me to one further point, as to whether or not there will be Federal interference with State educational programs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he starts on another point?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the opinion of my colleague from Maryland, is there anything in the bill which requires a State to accept the aid?

Mr. O'CONOR. There is not. On the contrary, there is a provision as to what the State must do in order to qualify under the act. So, if I understand what is behind the Senator's question, I think undoubtedly there would, of course, be a positive act on the part of the State, and obviously a State could refrain from accepting. But I think that where the citizens of each and every State are required to meet the over-all bill, of course it would be possibly expecting too much, for a State which had made its contribution, as in the case of Maryland or Massachusetts, to refrain from taking action through its Governor or otherwise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Maryland referred very pleasantly to several of us on this side of the aisle. He, too, was chairman of the Governors' Conference, not once, but several terms, and as a governor, and as a good governor, I think he will agree with me that the fact that some States may now have reserves does not necessarily mean that those reserves are growing and increasing. They were accumulated during the war years, when the State could not perform its regular functions, and they might very soon run out.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct, and I think the situation now may be an unusual one, because certainly we all know that through the accumulation of postwar reserves, or other tax money which could not be utilized, particularly in regard to road construction and the like, there is now and has been in recent days a greater amount in State surpluses than would ordinarily be the case.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One of the great difficulties arises because of the problems faced by local governments. For instance, when I was a member of the board of aldermen of Newton, 39 cents of every dollar, as I remember, went to the schools. There is resistance to appropriating more money for purely educational purposes, indeed, not only resistance, but inability in many cases to put a greater portion of the money a community receives from its limited sources of taxation into purely educational matters. Is that not so?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think it is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So, as I see it, if we are going to consider the general educational standards throughout the country, and bring them to a higher level, it is a perfectly proper problem for the Federal Government to consider.

Mr. O'CONOR. I will say in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it is eminently proper that a minimum standard be fixed, as is undertaken in the bill, and for us to aim unitedly at the objective of having all the States reach that minimum, because obviously the condition of affairs in a State in any part of the country, as it affects the educational qualifications of its citizens, does unquestionably have an effect upon the citizenry as a whole of the United States of America. That is why I think we are justified and why I think it is entirely proper for the citizens of Maryland to make their contribution toward the elevation of educational standards in every part of the country where the State or local governments are unable to meet the minimum requirements. But I question the right of the Federal Government to come into a State which has met and is continuing to meet its minimum requirements, and undertake to say to the State, "You must still do other things even after you have reached the minimum requirements."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Maryland speaks of a minimum standard. I do not understand that in the matter of education there exists any fundamental minimum standard which would apply throughout the country. There are certain standards which can be raised so as to provide better education. Is that not true?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is undoubtedly true. I was merely adopting the language used in the bill and in the report, because the whole effort is based upon the attempt to reach, as the committee styles it, a minimum foundation educational program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I appreciate that the Senator from Maryland is entirely altruistic in his argument. Some statistics were presented yesterday which indicate that the pay of school teachers throughout the Nation as a whole is too low. In view of that fact, might it not be well to leave to each State the question of deciding whether it wants to accept Federal aid or does not want to accept Federal aid, rather than for Congress to decide for certain States that they do not need aid?

Mr. O'CONOR. There is a great deal to be said for that point of view.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Generally, I do not have to get into the debate, because some other Senator always says what I want to say, and the questions I have in mind are usually answered. But

there has been one idea which has persisted in the arguments made in behalf of the pending amendment, which is wholly wrong, entirely fallacious, absolutely untrue. Those are rather strong words. There is not one single element of force in the bill. No State need take anything under the bill. As the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] stated yesterday, if the governor of a given State were to say to the Federal Government, "No, we do not need the money which would come to us under the bill," and turn it back, he would immediately become a potential candidate for President of the United States. Now there we find a golden opportunity for some State, and a golden opportunity for some governor. But please do not let it be assumed that any State is forced to take any money. The underlying idea of the bill is to unify the objectives, to overcome illiteracy, and raise the educational standards for the whole Nation, so that the citizens of all States will have some educational equality when they meet one another.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very grateful to the Senator from Utah. I am delighted that he has given us the benefit of his views. I attempted, in answer to one of the questions propounded to me, to say that there is no force being exercised by the bill. I am confident that is the case. But I cannot avoid repeating the statement, that human nature being what it is, and public officials being subjected to what they are subjected, when the citizens of each and every State are required, through taxation, to meet the over-all educational program of the country, then I think it is too much to expect the governor of a State, or the legislative body of a State, to turn its back upon money which is available to it. Certainly there are instances too numerous to need mentioning of States which have criticized the Federal Government, and of citizens of States which have criticized the Federal Government for making certain appropriations, and yet when they see Federal money within reach they have descended upon Washington and made requests for their share. Therefore, as I said before, I do not think there is anything surprising in the fact that the other levels of government find it impossible to resist accepting Federal allocations.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. WITHERS. The State of North Carolina could meet and more than meet its educational needs if it applied to educational purposes the Federal tax on cigarettes produced in the State of North Carolina. What would the Senator say respecting the justness of taking out of the State, by application of the Federal tax, money which the State itself could use for purposes of education?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think that is something which is a little bit foreign to the question we are discussing. Of course, the State of North Carolina, it is true, does produce that particular commodity in great quantities. But the citizens of the entire country do their part in paying the taxes on that commodity.

Mr. WITHERS. They do. They buy the cigarettes and smoke them, and pay the Federal tax. What is the principal industry of the Senator's State?

Mr. O'CONOR. We have a number of manufacturing industries.

Mr. WITHERS. Are the goods produced by those manufacturing industries sold within the Senator's State?

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes; and outside also.

Mr. WITHERS. They are sold within the State and outside the State. When they are sold, the producer pays the State a tax on them.

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes.

Mr. WITHERS. And then the goods go into the several States, and each person who purchases those goods helps to pay the tax which had previously been paid in the Senator's State. Is that not true?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is true.

Mr. WITHERS. Then why would it not be as fair for the Federal Government to levy a tax on the articles and goods produced in the Senator's State as on the goods, that is cigarettes, produced in North Carolina?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is not what is attempted here. The thing we are arguing against is the needless expenditure of the money provided by the bill.

Mr. WITHERS. I am coming to that point. I wish to ask the Senator this question: If the Federal Government laid a heavy tax on the articles produced in the Senator's State, just as the Federal Government lays a heavy tax on the cigarettes produced in North Carolina, then the Senator's State would not be permitted to lay as heavy a State tax on the articles produced in the Senator's State as are now laid by the State?

Mr. O'CONOR. No; not in that particular case.

Mr. WITHERS. So the favorable financial condition of the Senator's State is due to the manner of Federal taxation which we now have, there being a special Federal tax on the products of some States, and no special Federal tax on the products of the Senator's State. Is that not true? And does not that result in the unbalancing of the whole national economy?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think there is very much that can be said in support of the Senator's contention. I think there is great inequality in the imposition of the cigarette tax. Do no misunderstand me. I do not brush over it as though it were entirely correct, but I do not think it is particularly pertinent to the question we are discussing.

Mr. WITHERS. If all the taxes were equitably levied by the Federal Government, then would not all the States be more able to raise their State taxes and not be obliged to call upon the Federal Government for assistance?

Mr. O'CONOR. I think undoubtedly they would.

Mr. WITHERS. Take my State. The Federal Government taxes the chief commodities of my State, which makes it one of the greatest contributors of taxes to the Federal Government, and yet my State is marked down as one of the poorer States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that in the Senator's State and in my State the necessities of life are heavily taxed. [Laughter.]

Mr. WITHERS. That is correct. But because of the fact that the Federal Government receives that tax, and the State does not receive it, we are obliged to come here and petition the Federal Government to equalize the burden that falls upon us. In other words, the articles manufactured in the Senator's State are not subject to Federal taxation. The articles manufactured in the Senator's State are sold to people all over the United States. Whereas in some other States a heavy Federal tax is placed on commodities produced in those States. That is something which tends to unbalance the whole national economy.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is undoubtedly correct. Of course, the Senator understands full well that in the argument now being made there is no disposition on our part to deprive the group of States to which the Senator refers of the amounts which presently are shown to be needed by them.

Mr. WITHERS. I was using the Senator's State as an example. It is permitted to operate with a greater income than that enjoyed by some other States, whose articles are taxed for Federal purposes, which States would otherwise be able to meet their obligations. It all tends to show that a great deal of the wealth of certain States has been built up because of our system of taxation.

Mr. O'CONOR. I think that is true.

Mr. WITHERS. If that be true, why should they not be permitted to participate, without calling the other States poor States, but recognizing a national obligation? The inequalities might be leveled by some change in the system of taxation, so that the income of one State would not overshadow that of another State. The Senator's State, for example, uses raw materials from other States in producing its manufactured articles.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is true. The Senator must understand that in stating our position we state our willingness to do just what the Senator has in mind. I do not like the reference to poorer and richer States. I think a much more suitable expression could be invented. Nevertheless, that description has been used in the report.

Mr. WITHERS. The States are all interdependent, are they not?

Mr. O'CONOR. They are.

Mr. WITHERS. No State could prosper unless it traded with the other States.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is unquestionably true.

Mr. WITHERS. The Senator's State needs the raw products of the States which are called poor States. It needs to trade with those States and sell them manufactured articles. In selling those manufactured articles, all the taxes are included.

Mr. O'CONOR. I agree entirely. I believe that the imposition of trade barriers or the balkanizing of the States would be one of the worst things that could

happen, because the States are all interdependent.

Mr. WITHERS. The entire economy has been unbalanced to the extent that some States are apparently prosperous and others apparently not so prosperous, except for their potential wealth, which they have not been permitted to capitalize to the full extent.

Mr. O'CONOR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland one question. In the Senator's opinion, according to the report, should any State not elect to accept the money offered what would happen to the money? Would it be divided among the other States?

Mr. O'CONOR. No.

Mr. FREAR. Would it simply be unexpended?

Mr. O'CONOR. It would not be expended, in my opinion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the Senator does not feel that in the State of Maryland there are some districts in the poorer sections of the State which do not have a proper minimum educational standard. I know that in most States education is financed by local taxation in the districts, and also by a State tax. The result is that many of the more prosperous communities have school facilities and educational advantages which are very much superior to those in poorer communities. Does not that situation prevail in Maryland?

Mr. O'CONOR. It does. I will say in answer to the able Senator from Tennessee that that fact was recognized in our State many years ago when the equalization fund was established to take care of that very situation. The distinguished Senator well knows, because of his wealth of experience, that in some sections of the State there are greater opportunities than in others. There is more wealth, and there is a better condition of affairs generally, all of which is reflected in the educational system.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I invite the Senator's attention to the report of local superintendents of schools for 1947 and 1948, which states that whereas in New York, for example, $234 per pupil was spent on the average; in some sections of New York the expenditure was as low as $71 or $84. In the case of New Jersey the average expenditure was $232 per pupil; yet expenditures in certain districts were as low as $80. Does not the Senator feel that the $5 per student assistance could be used to bring up the educational facilities and opportunities in poorer sections in New York, New Jersey, and even in Maryland, where a very small amount is being spent on each pupil?

Mr. O'CONOR. I will say in answer to the Senator from Tennessee that undoubtedly the condition which he describes does exist in the State of Maryland. I have no doubt that it exists in virtually every State of the Union. However, I believe that the proper handling of that question and the solution of it ought to remain in the hands of the various States, rather than to have the Federal Government impose its will upon them and impose regulations which are unnecessary, and which should not be made.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator will agree, will he not, that there is no State which could not use some part of this money to good advantage in raising the educational standards in poorer sections?

Mr. O'CONOR. I would rather say that I know of no State which would not use it. I am sure that the school authorities of every State would welcome it. But again I say that I think we are confronted with another problem, one which is even more important than that. That problem is this: With a given amount of funds to expend, and with the present condition of our fiscal affairs, I do not believe that we ought to send money into a State where it is not needed. I will not use the words "force upon." We ought not to put into effect a system which would result in States being given money which they do not require, and which they can very well raise through their own methods.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In connection with the matter of forcing States to accept benefits, as I recall, the educational associations of every State in the Union have endorsed the principle of this bill and have endorsed the plan for participation in the program by all the States. Is not that true?

Mr. O'CONOR. They have. I am very glad the Senator asked that question. In connection with the amendment proposed by my colleague, the spokesman for our Parent-Teachers' Association, than which there is no group of our citizenry more interested in education in our State, and no group which has so consistently advanced the cause of education in the public-school system of our State, have endorsed the principle of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. President, without further delaying the Senate on this question, let me say that I feel that all the desirable purposes of this legislation can be achieved without at the same time bringing into effect conditions and regulations which ought not to be forced upon the State. At this important time in the Nation's history, in view of the condition of our Treasury, I do not believe that large amounts of money should be sent into the States unrequested, unneeded, and, as I said before, with undesirable conditions attached to the grants. I therefore trust that the pending amendment will prevail.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think there has been sufficient argument upon this amendment. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Baldwin	Hill	Morse
Brewster	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	Pepper
Capehart	Jenner	Reed
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lodge	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McClellan	Thye
Fulbright	McFarland	Tydings
George	McGrath	Vandenberg
Gillette	McKellar	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Martin	Young
Hendrickson	Maybank	

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], for himself, and for the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr.

O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is temporarily absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—17

Bricker	Kem	Reed
Byrd	McCarthy	Robertson
Cain	McClellan	Schoeppel
Capehart	Martin	Tydings
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Frear	O'Conor	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Baldwin	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Chapman	Holland	Murray
Chavez	Hunt	Neely
Connally	Ives	Pepper
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kefauver	Sparkman
Ferguson	Kerr	Stennis
Flanders	Kilgore	Taft
Fulbright	Langer	Taylor
George	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	Long	Thye
Green	McFarland	Vandenberg
Gurney	McGrath	Watkins
Hayden	McKellar	Withers
Hendrickson	McMahon	Young

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McCarran	Tobey
Donnell	Malone	Wagner
Downey	Miller	Wherry
Graham	Mundt	Wiley
Humphrey	Myers	
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	

So the amendment, offered by Mr. TYDINGS for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. CAIN, was rejected.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague and I may be excused today and tomorrow from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, by reason of our going to Florida to appear before our State legislature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words regarding the pending measure. First, I should like to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, some data which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say, because I believe that the Senate will pass the pending measure, as it did in the last session. I think there has been a very commendable spirit of bipartisanship and a very farsighted and unselfish attitude exhibited by the membership of the Senate, as a whole, with respect to this subject. There are some who are fearful that the Congress of the United States could not legislate in this rather delicate field, could not give aid without imposing control upon our public elementary and secondary school systems in this country. The Senate committee, when the matter was considered in the last session, and the Senate itself, when it enacted the legislation, and the Congress refuted any such accusation.

The measure, as it is now designed and as I feel it will be passed by the Senate, makes it very clear that the Congress, while it gives aid to education to public elementary and secondary schools in America, leaves the curriculum, the employment and selection of teachers to the States. In other words, it leaves the operation of our public schools where it ought to be and where it always must be—in the hands of the local authorities of the country.

I think it is very salutary that we leave to the States the matter of the distribution of the funds they shall receive, so that the final disposition of the funds rests, not in the Congress, which is more remote from the people, but in the governments of the several States. So long as there is local control in this field, we may be assured that the free character of elementary secondary education in this Nation shall always be preserved.

The bill is very simple in principle, Mr. President. It simply recognizes that there is a disparity in this Nation between the distribution of children of school age and the distribution of the wealth of the Nation. The bill provides nothing more than an equalization fund, in substance, which the Congress of the United States makes available to the several States to make up for that maldistribution, to bring about a more proper distribution between the wealth of the country in supporting the public schools and the distribution of the children of the Nation. It will mean a great deal to many parts of the Nation. My own State will profit only to the extent of $5 per pupil. I am glad that we have in the past few years been raising our appropriations for our public schools in Florida until we are in a category in which we shall receive only $5 per pupil in Federal aid under this bill. Florida will get only $2,365,000 a year as its share.

Mr. President, this bill is a proper thing for the Congress to pass. It is in the right direction. Congress has imposed restraints upon its own power; and I hope those who shall come after us will not try to break down the general understanding which prevails when the measure is enacted and which prevailed when a similar measure was enacted at the last session, that it is an aid program; that we shall not hereafter, when we have accustomed the States to receiving Federal help without Federal control, breach our obligation and violate the implied agreement which now prevails and attempt to carry with Federal aid, Federal control. That would mean that a number of the States will feel disposed to decline to accept the funds contributed by taxpayers.

So, Mr. President, I think this bill is a great step forward in providing for elementary and secondary education in America. It will equalize the opportunities of the boy or girl having the misfortune to be born in a poor State or in a poor section of a State by having the Congress of the United States come to his or her aid and assistance, giving an opportunity for an education in the public-school system which should be open to every American boy and girl.

Mr. President, I am not ashamed of it, but in my great native State of Alabama, like many other members of this body, when I started to school, I walked 3 miles over a muddy road to a 1-teacher country school and sat on a rough-hewn bench. Those were the facilities available in that day. We have progressed far beyond that point. Yet, even today, the poorer States—and many of them are in the South—although they give a larger percentage of their wealth toward the education of their boys and girls than is given by the wealthier States, are still not able to give American boys and girls the secondary educational opportunities which should be open to them.

So, Mr. President, this is a great measure. The Senate has shown magnificent statesmanship, wisdom, and vision in the manner in which it has approached the subject, and, I believe, in the spirit in which the bill will be passed.

EXHIBIT 1

DATA PRESENTED BY SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER, DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL

EXPENDITURES ON EDUCATION

1. Spending for education of all kinds has been far outstripped by our expenditures on foreign aid and defense. For foreign aid our expenditures in 1948 and 1949 were $7,200,000,000, for defense $12,300,000,000, for education $5,500,000,000.

2. The proportion of our national income spent on education in our elementary and secondary schools was 3.3 percent in 1933–34,

2.8 percent in 1939–40 and only 1.8 percent in 1947–48.

3. Expenditures in 1946–47 for elementary and secondary schools per school child, was $46 in Mississippi and $165 in New Jersey, or 3.7 times as much. Eight States spent less than one-half as much per child as New New York and New Jersey.

4. The quality of education depends upon many factors, including the number and the quality of teachers. Since better teachers migrate to States paying better salaries, and since current expenditures for such salaries constitute a substantial part of total expenditures, current expenditures, per child, are the most significant factor to be considered. It may be assumed, therefore, that education furnished to our school children in States, for example, expending less than $60 per child, in 1946–47, was far inferior to States spending as much as $120.

5. The financial ability of States, per child, varies from $2,065 for Mississippi to $9,758 in New York, or 4.7 times. The financial ability of the 10 poorest States was less than one-half of the 10 richest States. The average for the country as a whole was $5,932, and for Florida $5,205 in 1946–47.

6. The ratio of expenditures for public schools to the income average for the 12 poorest States was 2.17 percent, in comparison with 1.6 percent in the six wealthiest States.

7. If the six poorest States had to increase their expenditures per child to the average for the six richest States in 1946–47, they would have had to expend, respectively, 7.2 percent (Mississippi), 5.8 percent (South Carolina), 5.6 percent (Arkansas), 5.4 percent (Alabama), 4.8 percent (Kentucky and North Carolina) of the State income. In other words, the poorest States are spending relatively more of their income on public-school education and getting poorer results, and if they had to reach the level of the richest States they would have to expend much more of their income than the richer States.

8. The superintendent of instruction in Florida says we will need for the next 2 years $12,000,000 more than the State is now spending ($42,000,000). For 1949–50 he states Florida will need $46,000,000 as a minimum, and 1950–51, $50,000,000, as a result of increased school enrollments, increased number of qualified teachers, and increased costs. Three years ago State expenditures for schools was $19,000,000. The present $42,000,000 does not include $2,000,000 received from the Federal Government and $12,000,000 from the counties. The state budget commission has cut the $96,000,000 requested by the State superintendent to $84,000,000, primarily because of the financial difficulties in which the State finds itself. In 1947–48 Florida was the thirty-ninth State in order of expenditure per pupil. The average for the country as a whole was $147.07 per child, and in Florida $106.69. Nine other Southern States spent less per child enrolled than Florida. In 1946–47 Florida expended $87.80 per child enrolled.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

1. In 1947–48 Florida paid an average salary in the elementary and high schools of $2,682. This was the highest in the South and Florida was eighteenth in the Nation. Florida moved up substantially from the position it occupied in 1945–46 ($1,661).

2. The national average for 1948–49 is estimated to be $2,750, against $2,500 in 1947–48.

3. Since the problem in our public schools is primarily related to the elementary schools and not our schools, an examination of teachers' salaries partly explains the situation. In 1948–49 grade-school teachers in 27 States are receiving salaries of $500 per year or more below the average for high-school teachers.

4. As a result of the substantial increase in teachers' salaries in Florida, press reports indicate that Florida was able to induce well-trained teachers to come in from other States. In fact, over 1,000 teachers were drawn from the State of Georgia. This has since been stopped.

SUPPLY OF TEACHERS

1. According to the State department of education, Florida will need 1,760 new teachers in the next 2 years. The State now has 16,955 public-school teachers. In the past 2 years 1,900 teachers have been added. The ratio of pupils per teacher has only decreased in that period from 29 pupils per teacher to 28.

2. In 1948, 20,000 teachers were granted certificates all over the country, whereas 175,000 were needed in the fall of 1948. Of the 20,000, only 12,000 had completed a 4-year program. These figures apply only to elementary schools.

3. Over 100,000 teachers have emergency and substandard certificates. At least 85,000 of these need to be replaced in our elementary schools.

4. Our high-school shortages are not as serious.

5. Florida will need at least 2,000 new teachers per year for the next few years.

TEACHER TRAINING

1. In 1948, 175 teacher colleges reported almost an 8-percent drop in the number of new students entering their schools. Seventy percent of these colleges reported they could take care of 160 more students each, or a total of 25,000 for the country.

2. Although it is estimated that we will need a million more elementary-school teachers in the 10 years, a survey shows that only 200,000 will be made available by our teacher-training colleges.

3. Of all the students in teacher colleges, only 30 percent of them intend to enter teaching in our elementary schools. The remainder intend to teach in high school or college.

4. Although enrollments in teacher-training colleges are up over 1941, many of the students do not intend to teach at all. They entered only because liberal-arts colleges were overcrowded and could not accommodate them.

5. In Florida 622 teachers were trained, of which 124 were for the public schools and 441 for high schools. The shortage was 1,453, about one-half of the shortage being made up by drawing teachers from other States and the rest by inadequately trained teachers.

6. The ratio of teachers with college degrees to all teachers in Florida has increased substantially.

SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

1. The census reports that between now and 1955 the population will increase from 146,221,000 to 155,745,000, or an increase of about 8.1 percent.

2. It estimates that by 1960, school enrollments will be up by 40 percent. Enrollments in 1947 were 24,500,000 to over 34,500,000 by 1958. The population for the first eight grades will rise to 26,500,000, or an increase of 8,000,000. The school population for high schools is expected to rise to 8,000,000, or an increase of 2,000,000.

3. These increases will require an increase of 40 percent in school facilities.

4. It is expected that Florida's enrollments will increase 40,000 during the current fiscal year to a total of some 471,000.

5. Generally speaking, Florida has shown a greater increase in its public-school population than most States in the Union. The only two States in the East and the South showing an increase since 1940 were Florida and Maryland. The national drop between 1940 and 1946 was 2.7 percent. Only the States of California, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and Michigan showed increases greater than Florida.

6. In 1949–50, Florida school enrollments are expected to reach 500,000, a rise of 44,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if there is one field of Government activity in which the Federal Government exercises power and authority of which the States and the localities, the cities and towns, are extremely jealous, it is the field of public education. From time immemorial that has been considered a local problem, to be met locally. So I think history would record that our educational systems started, not from the State capital or the Federal capital, but from the little township and the little district school.

In the long years of public education in this land the power and authority of the Federal Government in the matter of taxation has been tremendously expanded, and we now have reached the point where the Federal Government has practically preempted all the fields of taxation which were formerly open to the States, or to the cities and towns within the States.

The purpose of the amendment the junior Senator from Connecticut proposes to offer is to utilize the taxing power of the Federal Government, which is all-inclusive and all-powerful, to the use of the States, and the cities and towns within the States, for educational purposes. The effect of the adoption of the amendment would be to remove entirely from the bill, I think, any possibility of Federal control. I know that the bill contains provision stating that no Federal control will go with the financial aid extended, but it has always seemed questionable to the junior Senator from Connecticut whether or not Congress could make an appropriation of money, and turn it over to States or to cities and towns, without any control whatsoever. It seemed to me that inevitably with every appropriation must go the imposition of conditions and regulations which spell control.

It seems to me that inevitably, with a Federal appropriation for education, there are bound to arise questions of standardization, questions of proper use of the money, questions of the proper type of school buildings, and eventually, a thing which the States, cities and towns fear very much, provisions concerning the kind of textbooks to be used, and the kind of an educational program which must be carried on in order to entitle a State to Federal money.

If that is the case, we will gradually build up a situation in which the Federal Government will be dictating to the States and the cities and the towns the educational program which some Federal authority may deem necessary. In doing that, Mr. President, we will be seriously interfering with the control which the local boards of education, the State boards and commissioners of education, have exercised on the local and State levels in this all-important field.

It seems desirable, therefore, to put into the bill every practicable provision to guarantee that with this Federal money, with this exercise of the Federal taxing power to the extent that the money collected goes into the States, there is no possibility of directives and

programs and regulations coming from the Federal Government, and reaching into every State and every city and town and school district, as to what is to be taught in the schools.

Therefore, Mr. President, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Connecticut simply provides that the collector of internal revenue in each one of the States shall set apart the amount to which the State would be entitled under the terms and provisions of the bill, as a credit to the State, that a like credit be set up on the books of the Treasury in Washington as the amount of money which the State would be credited against the collection of internal revenue within the State, and that each year that amount be determined in accordance with the terms of the bill, so that the money collected in the State from all sources of Federal taxes would be left in the State, and would be turned over by the collector of internal revenue, at the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, directly to the State treasury.

In that way, Mr. President, the money would never come into the Federal Treasury. The most there would be in the way of a record in Washington would be a record of the amount of tax money held in the State for educational purposes, for which the State would be credited.

Mr. President, this would mean that the money which the Federal taxing authority collects would be left in the State, and would be paid directly into the State treasury. In effect it would mean that the Federal taxing authority, which has so completely preempted the tax sources of the States and the cities and towns, would be used to collect money for local educational purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, under all the other programs we collect the money into the Federal Treasury, then, no matter what the authorization bill may be, we have to appropriate the money out of the Treasury for a particular purpose. That means the item has to go into an appropriation bill, be considered by the House Committee on Appropriations and by the House, and then by the Senate committee and the Senate, and the bill must be signed by the President. Is it the purpose of the Senator's amendment, or would it follow if the Senator's amendment were agreed to, that there would be no appropriation by the Congress, that the fund would automatically go from the office of the United States Collector of Internal Revenue in a particular State into the treasury of the State for the purposes set forth in the bill?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is exactly what would happen.

Mr. HILL. In other words, there would be no appropriation by Congress?

Mr. BALDWIN. There would be no appropriation by Congress for this Federal educational program, aside from the other functions provided for, that is, there would be no appropriation of the funds provided for in the bill which would go into the State as an equalization fund, so to speak. The other provisions of the bill would be as is.

Mr. HILL. Take the State of Connecticut, for instance. The State of Connecticut would have a certain allotment out of the funds authorized in the bill. The money would be collected in the State of Connecticut by the United States Collector of Internal Revenue.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Then, instead of that money going into the Federal Treasury, as Federal funds generally do, so far as I know, to be appropriated by Congress in specific appropriation bills, a different procedure would be followed under the Senator's amendment. The funds would go directly from the office of the United States Collector of Internal Revenue to the State treasurer, or whoever may be the State officer for the receipt of State funds. Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct. This does not mean that the State of Connecticut would pay any less, in the over-all amount, in the way of Federal taxes.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that. The Senator's amendment would not affect the taxes raised in the Senator's State.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Suppose a particular State did not see fit to avail itself of the funds. Then what would happen?

Mr. BALDWIN. The State would have a credit on the books of the Treasury for the amount which was available in the Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue in the particular State. It would be up to the State to say whether it would use it or not.

My further answer to the question would be that I cannot conceive that a State would refuse to accept the money under those circumstances, because under the amendment the State would be in a position of saying, "This is our money. It is collected from our citizens. The only Federal connection with it is that the Federal taxing power has been used to raise it. But it is left here in the State, and is not sent back to the Federal Treasury." So, really it is a use of the Federal taxing power applied to the citizens of the States to raise money for their local school needs.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator, because I believe the States will use the funds allotted to them, and I think they have need for such funds. But I think we ought to know exactly what the modus operandi would be, what the procedure would be with respect to the funds. In other words, if a State did not use the particular funds allotted to it, then is it the Senator's thought that the funds would go into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. BALDWIN. They would go into the Federal Treasury. But there are other provisions of the bill which would then be operative. A State could accept the funds provided under the terms of the bill, but if it did not do so, if it did not want to avail itself of the particular credit for educational purposes, and failed to accept the provisions of the bill, then of course the money would go into the Federal Treasury, and the State would not have any grant for school purposes whatsoever.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is so able that I am sure he has considered thoroughly the effect of the amendment in bypassing Congress, so far as appropriations are concerned. Congress passes all kinds of appropriation bills. But an authorization bill in and of itself does not take one single penny out of the Federal Treasury. All it does is to authorize the Appropriations Committees of the Congress to report appropriation bills to carry out the authorization. As the Senator knows, with respect to all other authorizations, as I have said, it is necessary to come back to Congress. Congress then and there sits in judgment on the appropriations. In many instances, as the Senator from Connecticut knows, an appropriation does not always square up to the authorization.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator from Connecticut thanks the Senator from Alabama for that contribution. He is aware of that particular situation. The Senator from Connecticut concedes, that what he proposes is a departure, insofar as he has been able to find, from anything that has been done heretofore. However, the experience of the junior Senator from Connecticut as Governor of a State, as I am sure it is the experience of every other Senator who has been a Governor, is this: When new needs arise the States find themselves in great difficulty to find available a field of taxation from which they can obtain money. If they step into the field of gasoline taxes, the Federal Government is there. If they step into the field of income taxes, the Federal Government is there. If they step into the field of luxury taxes, the Federal Government is there. Wherever the State tax collector proposes to go he will find a Government tax collector ahead of him with a bucket larger than the State tax collector has.

So we have reached a point, as it seems to the Senator from Connecticut, of tremendous importance to the country. The point is this: At what stage is the Federal Government going to stop reaching out to collect tax moneys? Is it going to continue, as it has over the past 100 years, and particularly since the adoption of the income-tax amendment, to proceed until it completely preempts both in detail and in amount, every field in which it is possible to collect a tax? If it continues along that line, and the amount collected in taxes continues to increase, there will soon come a time when the cities and the towns and the States themselves will find it utterly impossible to raise money to meet their needs.

Typical of that, Mr. President, is the situation that occurred in my own State in 1947. Following the war we were faced with the need of improving our educational program. It was a program of which we could justifiably be proud at the time; but everyone in Connecticut had a keen desire to improve it. So the

State looked around to find some new field into which it could reach out and gather more taxes. For the first time in the history of the State of Connecticut we adopted a sales tax, with rather general exceptions on the necessities of life. Only in that way were we able to raise adequate money, to be turned back to the cities and towns, to support a needed educational program.

Under this particular bill Connecticut, as I recall, will come under the $5 provision, because the standard in Connecticut is above the standard set in this particular bill. But Connecticut can use the money provided for in the bill.

I might say the reason why the junior Senator from Connecticut voted against the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was that he felt that since the Federal tax gatherer takes this money out of the State, if it is collected for schools elsewhere, we might in justice and fairness ask for something for our own schools, because we are rapidly being deprived of fields into which we can reach out and collect taxes to meet our own requirements.

My amendment works a marked departure. The junior Senator from Connecticut readily admits that. But what it does in effect is to use the Federal taxing power to the extent of the ratio set up in the bill for providing funds due each State and to that extent the State is exercising the Federal taxing power for its own benefit. Since the Federal Government is the creature of the States in the first instance, it seems to me perfectly proper and logical in the development of our Federal system that the Federal taxing power be used in this particular way.

Mr. President, this is the one way of guaranteeing to the States and to the cities and towns within the States that there will not be Federal control of education. This is one way of saying to the cities and States, "Congress and the Federal Government recognize that this is a State and a local responsibility. We recognize that it is an obligation which has to be discharged in a particular way; in a way consistent with the geography and with the ability of the particular State. It is a way in which the State can go forward with what it believes is the kind of an educational program best suited and best designed to meet the needs of its people." In that way it guarantees the local control of education, which we all hold so precious and dear, for education began as a matter of local and State concern, and should continue as a matter of local and State concern. The adoption of the amendment will guarantee that, and to the junior Senator from Connecticut that is a vitally important factor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator's amendment affect in any way the equalization features of the pending bill?

Mr. BALDWIN. My amendment would not affect in any way the equalization provisions. In other words, each State would receive what it was determined it was entitled to receive under the formulas set up in the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator's amendment would not effect, would it, the same result the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would have effected, in simply saying that the tax money shall go back to the States in proportion to the number of children they had in their schools?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am sorry, but I do not believe I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The other day the Senator from Massachusetts offered an amendment to the effect that the tax moneys collected would in effect go back to the States for their schools in the same proportion as the amount of tax money collected in a State bore to the entire tax collection. In other words, it had no equalization feature in it. It would not put more money in the poorer States proportionately.

Mr. BALDWIN. My amendment would not change the amount which would be available under the bill to any State, nor would it change the amount of over-all taxes any State now has to pay, or after the adoption of the bill would have to pay to the Federal Treasury, excepting the amount contributed for the particular educational grant for each particular State.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand a provision of the amendment. The Secretary of the Treasury, under the Senator's amendment, is directed to set up a credit to each State out of the proceeds of internal revenue collections from sources within that State. Suppose those resources were not sufficient to meet the allocation for education.

I think of the Territory of Puerto Rico, for example, where I am sure the collections would not be sufficient. In Puerto Rico the internal-revenue collections, under the organic act, remain in Puerto Rico. What would happen if the tax collections were not adequate? Would the State be cut off from aid under the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. BALDWIN. I intended that the amendment should cover that particular situation. In other words, to the extent that taxes collected in the individual State or Territory were inadequate to meet the amount which the particular State or Territory was entitled to, to that extent there would have to be a balance coming from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite see what is accomplished by the Senator's amendment, except a bookkeeping transaction with respect to these funds. It would not in any way affect the distribution.

Mr. BALDWIN. From my examination of the figures I do not understand that there is any State in which that situation would arise. It seems to me that the Federal Territories are in an entirely different classification. They are, in effect, parts of the Federal domain. I do not know that that description exactly fits them, but the treatment of the Territories of the United States has always been on an entirely different basis from the treatment of the States. Perhaps the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut does not adequately cover that situation, but it does cover the situation so far as the States are concerned.

The State and local governments have long made education one of their prime tasks and purposes. They have been very jealous in the performance of that task and the meeting of that duty. This amendment would mean that the Federal taxing power would be used, but the money would never go out to the particular State. It would be left there; and consequently, being State money, it would be used at the discretion of the State government and the local governments for educational purposes.

Mr. TAFT. I still do not see how the amendment would change in any way the provisions of the bill. The money still must be spent under the State plan. I do not understand that any change whatever would be made, under any conceivable circumstances, except in the case to which I referred, in which the total internal-revenue collections in a State might not equal its allocation of funds under the act. The Senator says he does not think that would happen in any State. Otherwise I do not see what difference would be brought about by the amendment. The money which the States finally receive will be subject to the general terms of the act with respect to its expenditure. I do not quite understand what would be accomplished by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. The money which would be collected from the citizens of the States would never get into the Federal Treasury. It would continue to be State money at all times. It would be turned over by the collector of internal revenue to the State treasury. If this amendment were adopted, that would always be so. The only effect the bill would have would be that of determining the amount to which the State would be entitled under the formula of the bill. Consequently it would mean that the States would be dealing with their own money and using the Federal taxing power to that extent to raise money for their own particular purposes. No appropriation by Congress would be necessary so long as this act remained on the books. The Congress could not withhold an appropriation because some Federal officer felt that the uses to which the money was being put were not within what the Federal authority thought should be done with the particular money. It seems to the Senator from Connecticut that this amendment would take away all vestige of Federal control. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a question. If we turn to page 8 of the bill we find the heading "State acceptance provisions." On page 9, in

line 3, subdivision (e) we find the following language:

(e) provide that the State educational authority shall make such reports in such form and containing such information concerning the administration of this act as the Commissioner may reasonably require and give him upon request access to the records on which such reports are based.

I share the feeling of the Senator from Connecticut about encroachment on the part of the Federal Government. I ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if he does not think the language of the bill contains sufficient provisos and provisions under which the Federal Government could exercise some type and degree of control over the educational facilities in each State?

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that that is true under the terms of the bill. But under the terms of my amendment, if a credit were set up on the books of the Treasury for the State of Kansas in the amount determined under the formula of the bill, and the money collected in the State of Kansas as Federal taxes were turned over to the State in the amount determined under the formula of the bill, then it would make no difference whether the Federal Commissioner of Education liked the way the State educational authorities dotted their "i's" or crossed their "t's." His report would be purely advisory.

It seems to me that under the terms of the bill there is grave question whether the Federal Commissioner of Education could say, "Do not give the amount this month or this quarter, because the State of Kansas has sent in a report which, instead of being 10 pages long, is only 3 pages long, and does not contain the information we want." The question would come back to the Congress. The issue would then be, "Is the State of Kansas abusing this particular Federal taxing power in its use of the money collected under it, to the extent that we ought to change the law?" The question would not be whether the Commissioner of Education in Washington thought the State of Kansas was abusing the Federal taxing power. We would go back to the very fundamentals involved in the entire question.

My answer to the Senator from Kansas is that under the terms of the bill as it now stands there would be a possibility of considerable power and authority in the Commissioner. My amendment would obviate that particular difficulty.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I associate myself with the Senator in his amendment. That is one of the reasons why I asked the question. I am further authorized to say that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], a former Governor of that State, feels as I do.

I think this is a most commendable amendment. On a number of occasions in our respective States, as chief executives of those States, we have seen the innocuous beginnings of Federal control and authority within the States. We have seen such power and authority elaborated upon until finally we were confronted with blueprints in the various States, under which it was impossible to jar loose any funds unless the State officials got "right" with those in authority. I commend the Senator for offering this amendment. I hope it will be supported by a sufficient number of Senators to insure its adoption.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator from Kansas most heartily. He is very generous in his remarks.

Let me say further to the Senator from Kansas and to the Senate that as we go back over the history of the administration of the public-works program in the 1930's, we find the development of control in the use of Federal moneys. That situation might very possibly furnish a pattern for what could very readily happen under the pending bill. In the early days of the depression there was created the Civil Works Administration. Before that I believe there was the FERA. In the early days Federal money was turned over to the State governments, and the State governments themselves directed and handled the administration of the funds and carried on the public-works program. I will admit that in some ways that was not altogether desirable, because there are public works which extend across State lines. However, that was not an insuperable difficulty, because as the Senator from Kansas well knows, having once been the governor of a great State, there are such things as interstate compacts, under which difficulties of that kind have been ironed out very successfully among a group of States which had a common problem which was not a problem of all the other States. But in the administration of the Federal works agencies gradually Federal control and Federal authority stepped in, and the State and local authorities were moved out. The result was that we had a great colossus of Government, with enormous expenditures for overhead, with numberless details of administration, and many miles of red tape.

In this particular case, if the money is turned over to the State government, and if the Governor of the State and the general assembly of the State and the commissioner of education and the other educational authorities of the State are charged with the responsibility of handling it, the persons who handle it will be close to home, where they can be reached, just as any mother or father can walk into the office of the local superintendent of schools or into the office of the principal of a grade school and make a complaint. Thus, the money will be left in the State, and there will be State control and local control, and a continuation of the happy development—at least, it has been happy in the State of Connecticut—of the State educational authorities and the local educational authorities, settling educational problems inside the schoolhouses.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Would not such an arrangement eliminate the very misgivings the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] voiced a moment ago when he said that he hoped when this measure goes into effect there will not be a disposition on the part of future Congresses to enlarge the activities of the Federal Government to a point where the State and local units will lose control? In other words, does not the Senator agree that his amendment will prevent that very development?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has stated the point most forcefully. The amendment will do exactly that; that is its purpose. The amendment guarantees, more than any other provision of the bill could possibly guarantee, that so long as we have a Federal education program, education shall forever be a State and local concern.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that that is the wish of the great majority of the people of the United States. The amendment will guarantee that never will there be direction from Washington as to what we should teach or how we should teach it. In order to come under the provisions of the bill, we shall be required to maintain certain educational standards, to maintain a certain reasonable level of education; but beyond that, under the amendment the problem will be ours to deal with as we in the individual States think best to deal with it.

Furthermore, under the amendment those who will administer the educational program will be the persons whom we know as members of our school boards, as fathers and mothers of children in our public schools—persons living in our own States. They will be persons to whom we can go to obtain a hearing, without having to fly 10 or 12 hours in an airplane or travel 2 or 3 days and nights in a railroad car. They will be the folks right back home. It seems to me that is inherently necessary in our educational system.

Mr. President, if our educational system is intended to teach the youth of the land to think, if its prime purpose is to increase and heighten the level of intelligence, local control is what we need to have. Education in America has never been propaganda. In the United States, education has always meant the teaching of the truth as we know it from the facts, the encouragement and stimulation of young minds to discover new horizons and new ways of doing things. That is what education ever must be. Education in part is a rehearsal of what we know to be facts, as determined in the past, plus an encouragement and stimulation of our thinking and our mental activity so as to raise the level of intelligence of all our people. Thus, education is markedly different from propaganda as we have seen it in other parts of the world. We must keep the educational program in the United States on that basis.

Because of the inability of the States and towns to levy sufficient taxes to provide the necessary funds for that purpose an inability which arises because the Federal Government of necessity has preempted practically every field of taxation, to the exclusion of the States and the cities, in this instance we wish to use the Federal taxing authority to raise money for local education. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 1, after "Sec. 3", it is proposed to insert "(a)."

On page 3, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to establish on the books of the Treasury an account for each of the States, and to credit to the account of each State for each fiscal year an amount of the proceeds of internal-revenue collections from sources within such State ascertained by the Secretary to be equal to the amounts to be paid to such State from funds appropriated under subsection (a) for such fiscal year. All amounts paid to a State from such funds shall be charged to the account established for such State under this subsection.

On page 7, beginning with the word "The", in line 2, it is proposed to strike out all through the word "and" in line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine for each fiscal year the amounts to be paid under this act to each State that has qualified under section 7 of this act, and shall, through."

On page 7, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out the word "certified" and insert in lieu thereof the word "determined."

On page 8, in lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Treasury."

On page 8, in line 24, it is proposed to strike out the word "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 9, in lines 8 and 11, it is proposed to strike out the word "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 11, in lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Treasury."

On page 11, in line 23, it is proposed to strike out the word "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 12, in lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Treasury."

On page 12, in lines 15 and 19, it is proposed to strike out the word "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

On page 13, in lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "Commissioner" and "Commissioner's" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary" and "Secretary's."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the Senator from Connecticut apply to several portions of the bill. Does the Senator wish to have all of his proposals considered en bloc, as one amendment?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, Mr. President; that is my purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have every sympathy with the purposes stated by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but I think the method proposed by his amendment is no better than the method proposed by the bill.

His amendment certainly violates every principle of Federal finance. It is based on the supposition that in some way a State has some property right to the taxes collected from sources within its boundaries. If, for one moment, we admit such a principle, the entire Federal financial system will crash, because a State has no such interest. The place where tax moneys are collected has no relationship even to whether people living in that State pay the taxes. For instance, hundreds or thousands of people live in Connecticut and pay income taxes to the collector of taxes in Connecticut, but earn all their income in the State of New York. None of that money comes from Connecticut. There is no reason why Connecticut should be credited with that particular tax money, for it is not earned in Connecticut. Likewise, many corporations of tremendous size have their principal offices located in Connecticut, and other corporations have their principle offices located in New York. Certain other tremendously large corporations have their principal offices located in other States. Each of those corporations pays its income taxes at the place where its principal office is located, although in many cases the money on which those taxes are paid is earned in all the States of the Union. The fact that the money is collected in the State where the principal office of the corporation is located has no relationship whatever to the right of that particular State to those particular funds. Certainly we cannot for a moment recognize the right of a State to the tax funds collected in it, simply because that is the place where the taxes happen to be paid.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a small table showing the distinction in this case, for the States of North Carolina and Missouri.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1948

	Missouri	North Carolina
Individual income taxes	$525,000,000	$228,000,000
Corporate income taxes	320,000,000	187,000,000
Total	845,000,000	415,000,000
Pay-roll taxes	78,000,000	34,000,000
Miscellaneous	190,000,000	788,000,000
Total	1,113,000,000	1,137,000,000

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the other day I referred to the State of North Carolina. In this connection, I might point out that North Carolina pays $228,000,000 in individual income taxes, $187,000,000 in corporation income taxes, $34,000,000 in pay-roll taxes, and $788,000,000 in excise taxes, but that money has no relationship at all to the State of North Carolina. Those taxes are paid entirely by people throughout the United States who buy the cigarettes on which the taxes are imposed. But it happens that the excise taxes of $788,000,000 for North Carolina, more than all the other internal-revenue taxes collected in the State of North Carolina—in fact, nearly twice as much as all the other taxes collected in the State of North Carolina—are from sources within the State.

The amendment recognizes some proprietary interest of the State in the money collected within the State. That simply is contrary to fact. The internal-revenue taxes collected by the United States are collected, not from citizens of the States; they are collected from citizens of the United States. They are collected from them because they are citizens of the United States. Where they earn the money, or whether the taxes are collected within the State, makes not the slightest difference. So the whole theory of the amendment, it seems to me, is based on an absolutely unsound fiscal principle.

The effect of the amendment may or may not be desirable. Personally, I do not think we should allocate the money in the way the amendment proposes. It is Federal money, as I have indicated; it is not State money. It is not the money of the citizens of the States. It has no relation whatever to the State, except that it happens to be collected by the Federal internal-revenue collector stationed within the State. The suggestion is that, because of the assumption that the State has some proprietary interest in the money collected, it shall go to the State without any strings whatever, and therefore without any possible control. I say the assumption is wrong. If the Senator wishes to remove Federal control, then the bill should be amended simply to provide that once the money is paid to the State, there shall be no check, no audit, or any other control imposed upon the State.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator from Connecticut recognizes the force of the Senator's argument, but the Senator from Connecticut would like to ask this question: The Senator from Ohio has said that the money collected as Federal taxes is collected from citizens of the United States, and he points out that hundreds of thousands—he overestimates the figure, I may add——

Mr. TAFT. No; I said "hundreds or thousands."

Mr. BALDWIN. "Hundreds or thousands?"

Mr. TAFT. I raised the ante, but not to "hundreds of thousands."

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish it were otherwise, but unfortunately it is not so. The Senator says that hundreds or thousands of citizens of Connecticut make their money in New York or in other parts of the United States. Indeed they do. But I should like to ask the Senator

from Ohio this question. If one of those citizens lives in Hartford, or in Stratford, or in Milford, or Greenwich, as many of them do, and he dies, has the State of Connecticut any right to levy an inheritance tax upon money which he has earned in New York?

Mr. TAFT. No, it has no right to levy any such tax on the money. The State may levy an inheritance tax on property owned by him. It can always levy an inheritance tax on property, no matter where it is. An individual may own property in New York or Texas, and still the State of Connecticut can levy an inheritance tax on it, if it is personal property, on the theory that he is a resident of the State of Connecticut. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. My point is this: If he makes money in other States, saves it, and dies a resident of Connecticut, leaving the money there, it may be money he made from Texas oil wells, it may be money he made from California gold mines, nevertheless it is in the State of Connecticut, and when he dies, even though it may be money that he earned as a citizen of the United States it is nevertheless in the State of Connecticut, and the State of Connecticut can levy an inheritance tax upon it, can it not?

Mr. TAFT. So can other States, where it is also located, in many cases.

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly. The point of my question is that there is no great virtue in saying that it is money he has earned as a citizen of the United States. It is money he has earned as a citizen of the State of Connecticut. I freely admit that under our Federal system no State can withhold, nor could it claim that it should withhold, in its own State treasury, the amount of money collected from its own citizens. It cannot do that. But it seems to me the amendment does no violence to the principle the Senator from Ohio advances. The State is not claiming any particular or peculiar proprietary interest in Federal taxes. Since the Federal Government taxes the citizens of my State, in all ways, the amendment simply provides that a certain amount of the money collected in taxes from citizens of my State shall be left in the State. The purpose is to avoid the necessity of money going into the Federal Treasury, then being subject to Federal appropriation, then being subject to all sorts of regulations and controls imposed by Federal authority, and the possibility that not the Congress shall say it shall be withheld, but that some Federal officer in Washington shall say it shall be withheld. The amendment guarantees that the money, without Federal controls, without the expense of Federal regulation in any way, or Federal bookkeeping in any way, shall be used for educational purposes in the State.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the money derived from Federal taxes is either Federal money or it is State money, and my contention is that beyond question it is Federal money. If it is Federal money it must be paid into the United States Treasury. I do not think there could be any sound argument to the contrary. I think it would probably be completely unconstitutional not to pay it into the Federal Treasury. Certainly it would be the very worst of fiscal practices if it were not so collected. It is Federal money. That is the point I have been trying to make. It is not State money. Under no known theory can that money be in any way said to be the property of the State merely because it happens to be collected by internal revenue collectors in the State.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. How, then, does the Senator square his argument with the revolving funds in such organizations as TVA, when the money is not paid into the Federal Treasury but stays at the point where it is collected, never coming into the Federal Treasury? A great rumpus has been made in connection with TVA.

Mr. TAFT. TVA is a wholly owned Federal corporation, and the money is Federal money. It belongs to the Federal Government as much as anything in the Treasury belongs to the Federal Government. The TVA is not a third party. It is just a branch of the Federal Government. We happen to say we will obtain the money through that branch of the Government instead of through the Treasury.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On that theory, could it not be handled by a State, as a branch of the Government?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think a State is a branch of the Federal Government. It is an entirely independent sovereignty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That used to be the case.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the subject of TVA?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TAFT. If it is merely for a question about TVA, the Senator does not need to worry about TVA.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask the Senator from Ohio whether he believes it is within the power of Congress to declare what the nature of the money it collects through its own taxing authority is? Is it not within the power of the Congress to say, "This shall be left in the States, and this shall be taken into the Federal Treasury?" It has done that in other circumstances.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly, not on the basis that it happens to be collected from sources within the State. I say it has no relation to the State whatever, so far as I can see. I should be glad to support, and I think there should be worked out, some plan for a separation of revenue between the State and Federal Government. But, in my opinion, it should not be by the arbitrary allocation to a State of money simply because it is collected in the State. That has no relation to the question whether the State ought to have it back or not.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. HICKENLOOPER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. The proposed amendment has intrigued me very greatly. It sounds to me like a Vermont amendment, as well as a Connecticut amendment, as well as a Kansas amendment, as well as a Wyoming amendment. I must admit to being a little puzzled, and I should like to ask one or two questions of the Senator from Ohio; one of which relates to a constitutional matter. In the first place, is it true that under the terms of the proposed amendment the funds are recognized in any way as being State funds? Are they not paid into the Treasury of the United States, where a credit is established, but not from funds which are earmarked from the State? They would seem to me to come from the taxation of citizens of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. TAFT. I understood the Senator from Connecticut to state very clearly that this money never went into the Treasury of the United States, and therefore the Treasury had no control over it when it went out to the States. That certainly was the statement of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not get that from his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment credits to the account of each State, I suppose, the taxes collected from it by the Treasury. The Senator, however, apparently thinks that appropriations are unnecessary.

Mr. FLANDERS. That was the next point I was about to raise.

Mr. TAFT. The States can draw on the money without appropriation. That is the only theory on which it can be done, so far as I can see.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is really the next question I raise, as to whether there is something unconstitutional in getting money back into the hands of the State without appropriation. It seems to me that is the catch point in the matter.

Mr. TAFT. If all we are doing is establishing a special fund for each State, then it seems to me we are simply creating a great deal of bookkeeping. What is the result? The money never belonged to the States. If that is not the theory, and if we are simply establishing a special fund which has to be appropriated, I do not see any reason for all the bookkeeping. We might as well appropriate out of the General Treasury.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The unemployment-compensation tax is collected from the citizens and industries of the States. The money is considered State money, and yet it is the Federal taxing authority which collects it. The fund is established as a State fund. It is drawn upon by the unemployment compensation division in each State, the officials of which

are, in effect, State officials. The Federal Government exercises the authority of controlling the amount spent for administration, and there is always a battle over it between the States and the Federal Government. The Federal Government always seems disposed to reduce appropriations for the administration of that particular fund. It is essentially a State fund. It seems to me that if we can do it in that case, we can do it in this case.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct in part. The tax is a 3-percent tax, and 2.7 percent is returned to the States. The tax is levied for the States and paid to the States for that particular purpose. Three-tenths of 1 percent is a Federal levy. That is the Federal share of the tax. It goes into the Treasury and is reappropriated to the States for administration. I think the Senator's formula would be closer to that of the rest of the unemployment tax which is levied by the Federal Government and immediately credited to the States, on the theory, which is certainly much sounder than this one—that the people work in the State, their salaries are paid in the State, and the money is allocated to the State, if the State chooses to take it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. To what greater extent is that the money of the people of the particular States? There is a vast number of industries in every State, some of which do an interstate business of one kind or another. The money received for products in distant States is money which has been in general circulation among and between the States and the citizens of the States. It is drained into the pay roll of the particular individuals. It seems to me the Senator from Ohio is setting up a fiction as to what is Federal money and what is State money. In American terms, money is money. It does not make much difference where it is collected. If it is found in a State, the State can tax it, as it does in many instances. In interstate commerce the Federal Government taxes it. It was necessary for the Federal Government, in order to levy income taxes, to adopt a special amendment to the Constitution for that particular purpose. From the beginning, the money of individual citizens of a State has a bigger earmark on it as being the money of that citizen as a citizen of the State than it does as being a citizen of the United States. So it seems to me that it is a fiction——

Mr. TAFT. No; it is not a fiction. In the first place, the 2.7 percent which goes to the States is levied on persons who are working in the particular State and who may become unemployed in the particular State. It is directly related to the State. It is not like saying that income taxes, corporation income taxes, or excise taxes are in any way related to the State. The Senator does not suggest levying any special tax in a particular State and turning the money back to the State. The Senator says that all taxes which happen to be collected in a State shall be allocated to the State——

Mr. BALDWIN. Pardon me for interrupting, but I did not say that. The effect of the amendment is that in this particular instance the money is used for the benefit of the particular State to the extent that the formula in the bill provides that the State shall have a certain amount of money for educational purposes.

Mr. TAFT. The money which is credited to the account of each State may include personal income taxes, corporation taxes, cigarette taxes, such as are collected in North Carolina, for instance, which certainly are not in any way related to the State. We set it all up as if it were the property of the State. Under the unemployment-compensation law a special tax is levied for a particular purpose in behalf of the States. The tax is levied on the money actually earned for work done in the State.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the point is to leave the money in the States, I suggest the simple way to do it is to vote against the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Furthermore, I do not think we should relax all control. I do not think the purpose is as stated by the Senator from Connecticut, in effect, to take off all Federal control so that the State can spend the money as if it were its own money. I think it would be a very unwise disposition of money collected by a Federal tax.

It seems to me we have done the best we could in the bill. I do not see how there can be a better protection against interference by the Federal Government with the States than that which we have in the bill. It provides that there shall be no intereference. It provides for a State plan. I think the Federal Government has an obligation to see that the money is spent for education. It has an obligation to see that each school receives a minimum amount. I think there should be that obligation. I think we should have a right to cut off the money if that particular obligation is not performed. It is a mechanical obligation. It can be determined without any discretion on the part of Federal officers. Therefore the State is free from Federal control.

In section 8, page 12, it will be seen that if the State educational authority is dissatisfied with any action taken by the Commissioner of Education, it can take an appeal, have a trial, and then, if dissatisfied, take the whole question to a United States court. The Federal Government can in no way interfere with the disposition of the money, except as expressly provided. If the Commissioner goes one step beyond that, the courts of the United States can reverse his abuse of discretion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator has pointed out, and quite properly, because it is in the bill, that a State, if it be dissatisfied with what is done, can appeal to the Federal Commissioner of Education. I ask the Senator from Ohio if a sovereign State of the United States should appeal to the Federal Commissioner of Education, who is not an elected official in any way, shape, or manner? He is an appointee. In dealing with a matter which has fundamentally been at all times within the province of the State, and one which from the very beginning has been developed and carried along for all these years by the State, until the Federal Government reached in and preempted every field of taxation, I am wondering if the Senator from Ohio does not believe, with me, that if a State should appeal, the appeal should be made to the Congress rather than to the Federal Commissioner of Education.

Mr. TAFT. My answer is "No," and I will cite the Senator the case which involved this very principle.

Under Governor Davey in Ohio, when Harry Hopkins was the head of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the State of Ohio became involved in a controversy with the Administrator. He cut off from the old-age pension fund about $2,000,000, and took that amount away from the State of Ohio because he said the State of Ohio was not administering the funds as he thought they should be administered. I think he alleged there was undue politics in the administration of the fund. It was cut off. The matter was settled after a while, and payments were resumed. I introduced a bill in Congress to get back the $2,000,000 for the State of Ohio on the theory that the discretion of the Administrator had been abused, that there was no reason why the people of Ohio should suffer by reason of some mismanagement by the Governor, if there was any such mismanagement. Did we get the bill through? No; we did not. The head of the Relief Administration, who had refused the money, came to Congress and opposed the bill, and the bill was defeated and to date Ohio never has recovered that $2,000,000. That is why in every State-aid bill with which I have had anything to do I have inserted a provision for an appeal by the State, first from the decision of the Commissioner, because that is where it starts, then to the United States courts. So it is not necessary to come to Congress, where the matter is determined by political considerations. An appeal is taken to court, and the court can decide whether the State is right and whether the discretion of the Commissioner has been abused.

I think the method of appeal is the wisest provision. It is the one that is most likely to give a State a fair deal in getting money to which it is entitled. The very fact that the court will have a say exercises restraint on the Federal official who might want to interfere with State administration, because if he does

interfere and is slapped down, it is quite a deterrent. It is a reflection on the manner in which the administrator has conducted his office. So I believe the right of appeal gives us all we want in restraining arbitrary action on the part of any Federal official.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, while I recognize the reasons which move the Senator from Connecticut to offer his amendment, yet I believe that the approval of the amendment by the Senate would merely serve to aggravate a condition which we are trying to get away from, and which we ought to get away from, and which I am sure the Senator from Connecticut and no other Senator wants to perpetuate. I refer to the matter of hidden expenditures of Government, which cost the taxpayers money of which they are not fully conscious for the reason that the expenditures do not appear in appropriation bills.

Mr. President, during the last year and a half a commission has been at work on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. It is the Commission popularly known as the Hoover Commission. That Commission has found that the taxpayers have been paying enormous sums in the way of expenditures of Government of which they were not aware, for the simple reason that the items never appeared in the appropriation bills of the Congress.

One of the most glaring examples was the case of the direct subsidies for milk and meat which were used during the war to keep down the prices of those commodities. The money for that purpose was acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation merely by giving notes to the United States Treasury for such sums as were necessary to carry out the authorization of the Congress. When the time came for the notes to be paid, instead of appropriating for the purpose, Congress merely authorized the cancellation of the Treasury notes. In that one item alone the taxpayers spent about $2,000,000,000 of which they were not aware because that $2,000,000,000 of expense never appeared in an appropriation bill and never was appropriated by the Congress.

I agree with those who say we should make our citizens conscious of the fact that the things we get cost money; that the citizens of the United States do not get something for nothing; that what they get costs something. Federal aid to education will cost something. According to the bill, it will cost between $260,000,000 and $300,000,000 annually. I think the citizens of the country should know that Federal aid to education is costing them money; that somebody has to pay for it; and the way to make them clearly conscious of the fact is to have the appropriations included in appropriation bills which go through Congress from year to year, so that they may be fully aware of the fact that what they are getting is not free; that it is not a gift of the Federal Government, or a gift of the States.

For that reason, Mr. President, I think the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut would probably defeat the purpose for which it was intended, and I say that we need to get away from hiding the expenditures of Government, and need to bring them out into the open, where they can be read by everyone.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator knows that under the bill now pending not the entire cost of education of any State is provided for.

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely true.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, the State and the local governments are going to have to make up the difference.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am sure the Senator is aware of what a Vermont town meeting is like.

Mr. AIKEN. Very much so.

Mr. BALDWIN. As the Senator from Connecticut is aware of what a Connecticut town meeting is like.

Mr. AIKEN. No doubt.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator recall that in the consideration of the school budget, there is a question as to how much the town gets from the State, and that is always an item in the minds of the people?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then the next figure is what they have to raise on the local level.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. BALDWIN. And the less they get from the State the more they have to raise on the local level. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator feel that on that basis they are going to see to it that the money which comes from the State or the Federal Government is honestly and effectively spent, because on the honesty and effectiveness with which it is spent depends entirely the amount of money the State and the town have to provide?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that under the bill the money which would be expended by the States would be well expended, because they would use it in exactly the same manner in which they would expend their own money, money which they raised through State taxes; they would be very careful how they spent it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator believe, then, that one of the best ways to bring this matter under close scrutiny of the local people is never to let the money get into the Federal Treasury, but to keep it back in the States?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. BALDWIN. Where the people would have direct and personal supervision over it?

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator to a point, but this is where the agreement stops. I believe that money collected by Federal tax collectors should appear as Federal tax collections, and that payments should appear as expenditures in an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment, as has already been stated, is in such keeping with the purpose of the bill that the Senator from Utah felt that if there were any possible way of accepting the amendment, without having it interfere with the rules of the Federal Government in the administration of its funds, he would like to be able to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question on that point. What rules are there which might be imposed on a State relative to Federal aid within the provisions of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. None, except that the money will be used for exactly the purposes for which the Federal Government appropriates it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I was not able to hear the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that the Senator from Utah said rules would be imposed. I asked the Senator what rules would be imposed, and he said rules relative to the payment of the funds to the different States according to the formula. Is that correct, I ask the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, we are talking about two different things. I am talking about the rules with regard to collection of taxes. That is what I spoke of.

Mr. WHERRY. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator had correctly heard my first sentence, he would have realized that there could not have been any conflict, because my first sentence was that the objectives and the purposes of the Senator from Connecticut in offering his amendment were so in keeping with the spirit and the theory of the bill, and wholly in harmony with the authors of the bill, that I thought, of course, it would be fine to be able to accept the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Utah is now saying that the theory is to divorce the Federal Government entirely from the control of the States and leave the control in the States. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course.

Mr. WHERRY. And that is what is attempted to be done by the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is done by the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. If the bill should be passed and the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut not adopted, then what rules would be applied under the provisions of the act with respect to the State authorities? What would the Federal Government do to enforce the provisions of the act if the amendment of

the Senator from Connecticut were not adopted?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The rules provided for in the bill would be applied. But the rules have nothing to do with the administration of the money in the sense the Senator from Nebraska means it.

Mr. WHERRY. Nothing?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Nothing at all. The only condition imposed upon the various States in order for them to receive the funds allotted to them is, of course, that they must use the funds entirely in harmony with the purposes of the bill, those purposes being to bring equal education to the boys and girls of the Nation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take a Southern State where there are Negro schools and white schools. Will the administrator or an appointee from Washington check up to see that the money is spent in accordance with the rules which would apply to the Negro schools and the white schools of the State, to see that both schools are receiving what they are entitled to receive within the provisions of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The schools of the State will receive the same amount of money for the Negro boy as it would for the white boy. It will be the duty of the Federal Government, of course, to see that no discrimination is practiced so far as the distribution of the money is concerned. Under the bill, all that has to be done is the submission of a report by a State official that $55 has been spent, or is being spent, by the State for each Negro boy and each Negro girl, and $55 for each white boy and each white girl.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that as far as examination will go relative to the Federal expenditures? Will there only be a certification from the State authorities that the money has been spent in that way?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The State has absolute control of the administration of the funds.

Mr. WHERRY. Then there will be no investigation by any representative of the Federal Government who will check on the amounts disbursed to see whether they have been spent in the local schools according to the provisions of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The State is required to submit an audit, of course. That means exactly what it says. The State is required to submit an audit. If there is any reason for assuming that a State auditor would perjure himself, I imagine the Federal Government would do something about it.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is any reason to believe that the money is not being distributed equally in the States, it would require more than an audit, it would require more than the submission of a statement; it would require an investigation to be made of the situation, would it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not think it would. The Senator is talking to a man who has had 20 years of experience in dealing with Federal funds, a man who has never been investigated once in the 20 years, a man who has never had his word disputed once in the 20 years, a man who has been through this whole matter. He thinks, of course, in the terms of his own experience, and he can be excused for doing so. Since the Federal Government has been making expenditures of Federal funds to the States for various purposes throughout the years, why should it be assumed that only in connection with this particular bill some wrong will occur? It seems to be completely absurd to consider that the money will be disbursed wrongfully. Expressions of fear are heard respecting Federal control in this particular matter. A Senator from one State says that Federal control will result from the bill. Yet, when we look at the institutions of his State, we find they have been receiving money from the Federal Government year after year; they have been receiving money for other purposes than for education.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has raised the very point which makes me apprehensive. It has been my experience with bureaus in Washington that when Federal appropriations have been made to States, the bureaus take over, and there is Federal control. That is the thing of which I am apprehensive. I am not more apprehensive of the particular bureau that will have charge of this matter than of any other bureau. But we have had experience with bureaus that have had charge of the distribution of money appropriated for the use of States in the building of roads, for which the States match the amount appropriated by the Government. We have had the experience under the law we wrote dealing with veterans that finally the agency which has control of the funds is the authority which interprets the law and imposes its interpretation of the law upon the recipients.

Mr. President, I am not an authority on schools, but I have taken great interest in schools. I highly respect the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has had much experience in the educational field. I know that no Member of the Senate has had more experience in the field of education than has the Senator from Utah. The experience the Senator from Utah has had in that field no doubt furnishes the background for the statement he has made that he has no apprehension that there will be any Federal control over education, as a result of the Federal grants to the States. My own experience, however, leads me to exactly the opposite belief. There is one thing I would not like to see, that is, Federal control of education in the United States. I would not want to see the Federal Government even get its toe in the door to begin to get control over the school system of the country.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Nebraska does not have any stronger convictions along that line than does the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad the Senator made that statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Nebraska knows that Federal land-grant money has gone to State educational institutions for nearly a century. The Senator knows that Federal money is being paid to veterans all over the country. The Senator knows that Federal money is being paid under the Public Health Service to practically every medical school in the country. The Senator knows that Federal money is being paid for vocational education. The Senator knows that Federal money is being paid for school lunches. Never has the charge been made that anyone in the Federal Government has tried to interfere with the administration of any of those institutions. Never has the charge been made that the Federal Government has tried to interfere in the distribution of school lunches. Since any such thing is outside our experience, and has been outside our experience for many, many years, why should such a question be raised in connection with this particular bill? In the case of building roads the Federal Government lays down standards. It is lucky for all of us that the Federal Government has laid down such standards. There is a great highway in the United States called the Lincoln Highway. What would have happened to that road had not the Federal Government laid down standards in connection with the building of it? The Senator cannot compare roads and children. It simply does not work.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with much of what the Senator has said.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course the Senator does.

Mr. WHERRY. Yet the Senator from Utah knows as well as I do that when the Federal Government lays down standards, whether it is in connection with the building of roads, or the appropriation of money for veterans, or for education, we always find that someone in a bureau which has control imposes his interpretation of a statute on the recipients.

So I go back to the question I originally asked the Senator, and I again address it to him because of his long experience in this field. Is there anything within the bill that provides that a Federal investigator shall go into a State and make a searching investigation as to what is being done with the money, and find whether equal educational opportunities are being afforded? If Congress appropriates $300,000,000 for educational purposes, and no control over the distribution of the money is provided, I say that is a lax way for Congress to operate. If control is to be exercised, provision for control should be placed in the bill. Such control should be written out in the bill itself. So I ask the distinguished Senator: Does the bill contain provisions for the establishment of rules which would provide that some agent of the Federal Government may check up the school systems of the various States to see how the money is being spent, and exercise authority and control over the State agency which gets the money?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The answer to that is definitely no. This is the reason. I read section 2 of the bill:

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or to prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instructions, nor shall any provision of this act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any damage in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this act.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me preface the question by a brief statement. When the distinguished Senator from Utah started to speak he filled my heart with hope by saying that he thought the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was so in keeping with the spirit of the bill that he was disposed to accept it. Then there was interposed a question by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the distinguished Senator from Utah never had an opportunity to pursue the thought further. I have been dangling here in the hope that he might have that opportunity. Would the Senator like the opportunity to go a little further?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I realize that we have never had much opportunity in all the years we have been discussing this bill, because most of the opposition has been developed around imaginary experiences in regard to Federal money used for education in the various States. I stated that this amendment is so in keeping with the spirit of the bill and the local control features of the bill that I would like to see it made acceptable, if possible. But we run into snags. I used the word "rules." I was referring to the rules which would be upset by this amendment, rules having to do with the manner in which taxes are collected and distributed, and the manner in which taxes are accounted for by the Federal Government. Therefore the reports coming back from officers of Government are such as this:

The earmarking of tax collections violates modern tax theory because it crystallizes the action of government. With this precedent established there might be further earmarking until the Federal budgeting authorities would be unable to provide adequately for the general functions of the Federal Government.

I do not use that as an argument. I cite it as a reason given by Government officials why the amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Our broad experience in the field of Federal grants has been in connection with such things as highways, reclamation, river development, and other programs which deal with material things. Here we are entering a field which deals with persons. It deals with the minds of men and of children. It deals with a field which I am sure my friend from Utah will agree is a field in which the local government itself—the city, the town, the village, the school district, or the State—has long been peculiarly interested. Under the circumstances, I wonder if the Senator does not feel that in this particular field we are perhaps justified in departing from long-established custom and practice in placing in the bill every possible guaranty that the control of education shall remain at the State and local level. That is the purpose of this particular amendment.

I know it is a departure from what we have done before, but it is a departure which, it seems to me, has been forced upon the States and towns through no fault of their own. They have not the wherewithal in the way of tax collections or the wherewithal in the way of fields of new or increased taxation, because the Federal Government, in its great programs of every kind, has preempted those fields. It seems to me that in this particular instance, since we are dealing with a thing which is so fundamentally American, so fundamentally individual, and so fundamentally personal, namely, men's minds, we are perhaps justified in making a departure from regular accounting practices and government rules of financing. It seems to me that we would be justified in giving back to the States, the cities, and the towns a certain share of Federal taxes, as provided by the bill, so that they can carry on a function which they began in the first instance, and which, up to now, they have developed and would like further to develop, but have been unable to do so because the Federal Government necessarily has preempted the fields of taxation which they could enter, and has made it impossible. Does not the Senator feel that in those circumstances we would be justified in making this bookkeeping departure?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. All that the Senator argues justifies the bill. The Federal Government has preempted the taxing power, especially in the case of some of the local districts, and the States themselves have occupied a part of the field.

The only difference between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Utah is the technical question which is presented to us by Government authorities who handle taxes. They say that the amendment is bad for the reasons which they give. The reasons which I cite are not mine. They are the reasons of the Government.

Because of the experiences which we have had with legislation, I would not be loath to consider less seriously any of the reasons given. The Senator from Utah had something to do with the passage of the first Science Foundation bill. He had something to do with its passage the second time, and the third time. When Congress passed the bill it was vetoed by a President who was in favor of its purposes and who recommended and wanted the Science Foundation. It was vetoed on the advice of the Budget Bureau, let us say, or some other bureau which advised him in relation to it.

The Senator from Utah loves this bill very much. The one thing he wants to avoid is some kind of technicality which might cause the President of the United States to think twice before signing the bill, despite the fact that the President has recommended the bill and has campaigned all over the country in favor of it. That is what gives me concern, and prevents me from immediately answering the question by saying, "Let us take a chance."

I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that if I had anything to do with the administration of the funds in a State, I would not have any trouble with the accounting problem the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am sure the Senator from Utah would not.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not share the fears of some Senators about having 48 different sets of books set up. As one of the sponsors of the bill, I do not choose to discuss the constitutional questions which the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut seem to believe to be involved. I would waive that point, because anyone who has worked in a department store knows how money can be handled in various funds without being lost.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then, as I understand the objection to the amendment, it is based upon the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. In other words, the amendment is objected to because of certain technical accounting problems it would present; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. However, it seems to me that in this matter, instead of being chiefly concerned with the technical accounting aspects of the amendment, we should lay the chief emphasis upon the fact that this amendment presents an opportunity to demonstrate on the Federal level that we trust the States and recognize their long record in dealing successfully with education, and that we wish to have no part of the educational problem handled under Federal control. Thus, under the amendment, regardless of whether the money is Federal money earned by citizens of the United States or is State money earned by citizens of the States, we would say that the money is to be turned over to the State departments of education, and thereafter is to be handled by the people of the States, who will determine how it shall be used. After all, Mr. President, we must remember that if the money were not spent

honestly or intelligently, the bill then would require the people in the States to make up the difference for their educational programs. I have never seen a Connecticut Yankee who did not make sure that the money which came to him from Hartford was fairly and wisely spent. He would make sure that it was well spent, because he would know that if it was not, he would have to make up the difference.

It seems to me that, in that respect, this amendment will provide one of the best guarantees we could possibly have, and will encourage interest on the local level, and will keep public education, which is so precious to us and which has seen its greatest fruition in America—for it is the basis of our victories in every war in which we have been engaged and the basis of our solution of every problem in our history—controlled at home, where it should be controlled. That is the purpose of my amendment, and I appreciate the support and interest and sympathy of the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is arguing again for the spirit of the bill, and I accept his argument on that basis. But as one of the sponsors of the bill, I shall have to ask the Senate to reject the amendment. Certainly if it were offered in the House of Representatives, it would be ruled out on the point of lacking germaneness.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Baldwin	Hunt	Mundt
Brewster	Ives	Murray
Bricker	Jenner	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Taylor
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McGrath	Tydings
Gillette	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hayden	Magnuson	Wiley
Hendrickson	Martin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Withers
Hill	Miller	Young

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, before voting on the amendment that is now the pending question before the Senate, the junior Senator from Connecticut would like to make a brief recapitulation. As has been previously pointed out in the debate, one of the difficulties many people find with Federal aid to education is the possibility of Federal control that might go with it. That fear is founded upon the fact that from the beginning, education has been considered a local problem and has been met on the local and State levels.

The effect of this amendment, Mr. President, would be simply this: It would make it possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to credit upon the books of the Federal Government the amount of money which, under the formula of the bill, each State is entitled to receive. That amount of money collected in the internal revenue office in the State would be left in the State and, each year, turned over to the State treasury. In that way the money would never come into the Federal Treasury, would not be subject to its control, and if there were any abuse in the administration and the use of the money, appeal could be made directly to the Congress as to the effectiveness and the desirability of action taken by the State, or the necessity for requiring any change. That would avoid the possibility of any Federal agent or officer who is an appointed officer and merely a part of the executive department having authority to say, "You must do this, or I shall not certify that you are entitled to the money. You must do that, or you will not be living up to your obligations." There would be a direct relationship between the State and Federal Governments as separate and distinct political sovereignties, and the money collected from the citizens of the States would be used for local educational purposes.

The further purpose behind it, which impels the necessity of this kind of a proposal, is this: The Federal Government has preempted practically every field of taxation formerly open to the States, to the cities, and to the towns. It has not only preempted those fields of taxation, but it has greatly extended the amount of taxes collected in them, so that it is extremely difficult for individual States and local governments to raise money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from Connecticut apply that principle to all Federal-aid money, or does he distinguish between Federal aid to schools and other forms of Federal aid?

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator from Connecticut thinks there is a very marked distinction between this type of a Federal grant and any other type of Federal grant.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is that because the distinguished Senator from Connecticut feels that ultimately it will lead to Federal control of education in the States?

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to the Senator from Connecticut that the method proposed by the amendment of dealing with it is one of the best guaranties we can put into the bill that there shall not be Federal control.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the Senator does fear Federal control, does he not?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think there is a great possibility of it; yes. I do not say it is immediate, but there is a possibility of its extension.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I share the fears of the distinguished Senator that there is a possibility of its extension, and therefore I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the distinguished Senator from Virginia will vote for my amendment he can feel much greater reassurance in that connection.

Mr. President, I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there any example anywhere in the governmental procedure of such a plan as this having been used?

Mr. BALDWIN. The nearest thing to it is the collection of unemployment-compensation money, which is built up in the form of State funds and expended in the States at the direction of the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which is holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER], who are absent by leave of the Senate on official business in Florida, would vote "nay" if present.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY],

the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—30

Baldwin	Gurney	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Cain	Hunt	Reed
Capehart	Ives	Schoeppel
Chapman	Jenner	Tydings
Cordon	Kem	Wherry
Eastland	Lodge	Wiley
Ecton	McCarthy	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Young

NAYS—49

Aiken	Kefauver	Neely
Brewster	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Robertson
Donnell	Knowland	Russell
Douglas	Langer	Saltonstall
Ellender	Long	Smith, Maine
Flanders	McCarran	Sparkman
Frear	McClellan	Stennis
Fulbright	McFarland	Taft
George	McGrath	Taylor
Gillette	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Magnuson	Thye
Hoey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	Miller	Withers
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Green	Pepper
Butler	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Humphrey	Tobey
Connally	Lucas	Wagner
Downey	Malone	Watkins
Graham	Myers	

So Mr. BALDWIN's amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 99)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to submit in behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and myself, minority views on the National Labor Relations Act of 1949, to which is appended comment by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I desire in connection therewith to make a brief statement.

If the amendments which are proposed in the minority views are adopted, we shall have a new bill which still embodies the best features of the Taft-Hartley law. It will contain all the basic principles of equality between employers and employees and the prohibition of unfair labor practices on the part of both. It will impose responsibility on unions equal to the power which they have—and will retain under this bill—including the obligation to bargain collectively, to be liable in court for damages resulting from breach of contract, secondary boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes. It will retain all of the important protection given to individual employees against arbitrary union power. The list of the important features retained is attached hereto, totaling 22.

On the other hand, wherever the labor unions have presented a reasonable criticism of the act, I have favored its prompt correction. In many cases I have felt that the original provision was just, but since others have differed, I have been willing to accede to their judgment if it did not seem to change any fundamental principle. In a bill of this length, some mistakes were made, and in some cases the Board or the courts have construed the language in a way which was not intended. Altogether, 29 changes have been made, the list of which also is attached hereto.

I do not regard the bill which results as a perfect bill, and certainly, as we have more experience with it, some further amendments may be required, but if the Senate will adopt our recommendations I am satisfied that it will be absolutely fair between management and labor and will contain all the best features of the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the list of important features of the Taft-Hartley Act retained if the minority amendments are adopted, and a list of the proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be filed and printed, and the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

LIST OF IMPORTANT FEATURES RETAINED

If the committee bill is amended as suggested in the minority report, the following basic provisions of the Taft-Hartley law will be continued in effect with modification in some cases as set out below:

1. Unions as well as employers will be forbidden to engage in unfair labor practices and be subject to the procedures of the Board to prevent such practices. While we have removed the so-called mandatory injunction provisions, we retain the Board's right to seek temporary injunctions against unfair labor practices by both employers and employees.

2. Unions as well as employers are required to bargain collectively.

3. Unions as well as employers remain responsible on their contracts, and are liable to suit as if they were corporations in the Federal courts. They are also liable for damages caused by secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes.

4. The unfair labor practice of secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike is continued, although one type of secondary boycott is permitted against work transferred from a struck plant.

5. It remains an unfair labor practice for a union or an employer to coerce employees in such a way as to interfere with their right of organization or their right to work. This prohibits mass picketing.

6. The guaranty of the right of free speech has been retained with a slight modification.

7. The closed-shop prohibition is retained, although we permit employers to give the union a reasonable time in which to submit names to fill employment vacancies. The authorization of union-shop contracts is continued without requiring any vote. Unions may require the discharge of union members only for nonpayment of dues, engaging in wild-cat strikes in breach of contract, or Communist membership.

8. The power of the States to regulate compulsory unionism within their boundaries is preserved.

9. Unions are held responsible for the acts of their agents as if they were corporations, but not for the acts of individual members as such.

10. We have continued the exclusion of foremen from coverage.

11. Labor organizations as well as corporations are prohibited from making contributions to political candidates, but the word "expenditures" is removed from the act. We feel that expenditures of any importance are in fact contributions.

12. The prohibition of strikes by Government employees is continued.

13. The independent mediation service is continued and not placed in the Department of Labor.

14. While extensive changes are made in the procedure dealing with national paralysis strikes, the power of the President to secure an injunction for 60 days is retained.

15. The non-Communist affidavit requirement has been retained and extended to employers.

16. The requirement that unions make a financial report to the Secretary of Labor and to their members is retained.

17. The requirement for a 60 days' notice of proposed termination or modification of collective-bargaining contracts so that strikes may not be called without notice to the employer and the mediation service is retained.

18. The ban on check-off of employees' dues without their written consent remains in the act, though modified to make it unnecessary to obtain new consents every year.

19. The Board's right to prevent excessive discriminatory initiation fees in union-shop situations is continued.

20. The protection of welfare funds is continued, but placed under the direct supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

21. While we do not retain the independent counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, we have retained many of the procedural reforms made in the Taft-Hartley law, including: (a) an enlarged Board operating in panels to expedite case handling; (b) the abolition of the review section; (c)

the emphasis on proper rules of evidence; (d) the greater power of review by the courts; (e) reforms in election procedures permitting employer petitions, petitions for decertification, the limiting of elections to one per year and the permitting of a vote for "no union" in a run-off election.

22. We have retained the requirements that equal treatment be accorded to independent unions, that professional employees be given an opportunity to separate representation, that greater consideration be given craft employees, and we have also continued the abolition of the extent-of-organization theory.

LIST OF PROPOSED CHANGES FROM THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

1. The term "employer" is redefined, omitting the exemption of Federal Reserve banks and charitable hospitals (sec. 2 (2)).

2. The definition of "supervisor" is revised so that no one may be exempted as a foreman unless he is actually a foreman. The words "assign" and "responsibility to direct" are eliminated (sec. 2 (11)).

3. We redefine "agency" to make it perfectly clear that a labor organization is only responsible for the acts of its authorized agents to the extent of other business concerns and is not responsible for the acts of any member of the union solely on the ground of membership (sec. 2 (13)).

4. The Board membership is increased from five to seven and made bipartisan (sec. 3 (a)).

5. The independent General Council provision is eliminated so that the Board will be governed hereafter by the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, except that we have retained certain of the procedural reforms made in the Taft-Hartley law (sec. 3 (d)).

6. The Board is permitted to cede jurisdiction to State boards, even though the State law is not entirely consistent with the Federal law. Section 10 (a) as amended by section 6 (b).

7. The responsibility of unions for the restraint of employees is eliminated, but the legality of coercion of employees in their right to work is reasserted. Section 7 and section 8 (b) (1).

8. While the prohibition of the closed shop is retained, it is provided that an employer may notify a labor organization of any vacancy and give it a reasonable opportunity to refer qualified applicants for such employment. Section 8 (a) (3).

9. The vote to authorize the union shop is eliminated, although a vote to deauthorize a union shop is retained. Unions may require the discharge of men expelled from the union because they are Communists or engage in strike in violation of the contract. Sections 8 (a) (3); 8 (b) (2); 9 (2) (1).

10. While the general prohibition of secondary boycotts is retained, one form of secondary boycott is authorized, namely, a case where a strike occurs in one plant and the work which would have been done in that plant is transferred to another plant. Employees are not required to do work thus transferred. Section 8 (b) (4) (A).

11. The limited restriction on featherbedding is eliminated. Section 8 (b) (6).

12. The prohibition against free speech is continued, but modified by eliminating the prohibition against the use of statements as evidence. On the other hand, the prohibition is extended to cover election cases. Section 8 (c).

13. The clause providing for 60 days' notice and a waiting period is retained but corrected so that a strike is not illegal in case the contract is reopened in accordance with its terms. Also the penalty against employees engaging in a strike before the 60-day period is repealed. Section 8 (d).

14. The provision requiring a separate union for plant guards is eliminated. Section 9 (b) (3).

15. The hearing officer at the regional office is permitted to make recommendations. Section 9 (c) (1).

16. Employees on strike will be eligible to vote, even if they are not entitled to reinstatement. Section 9 (c) (3).

17. The Board is authorized to conduct elections prior to hearing. Section 9 (c) (4).

18. While unions are required to file reports, the form of the report is greatly simplified. Section 9 (f).

19. The Communist oath is continued, but applied also to employers and their officers and extended to include a form of fascism. Section 9 (h).

20. The statute of limitations on the filing of charges is increased from 6 months to 1 year. Section 10 (b).

21. The provision which prohibits the Board from reinstating an individual if he was suspended or discharged for cause is eliminated. Section 10 (c).

22. The provision which permits a trial examiner's report to take effect without action by the Board is eliminated. Section 10 (c).

23. We repeal section 10 (l) which makes it mandatory for the Board to seek temporary injunctions in certain cases and giving complete priority to such action. Section 10 (j) is retained, however, so that the Board has the power to seek temporary injunctions in such cases. Section 10 (j) and (l).

24. In jurisdictional strikes, the Board is authorized to appoint an arbitrator to decide the question of jurisdiction if it does not desire to pass on such an action itself. Section 10 (k).

25. While the provision regulating welfare funds is retained, it is no longer required that there be joint control if the employer does not desire it. Criminal liability is removed if the Secretary of Labor approves the terms of the welfare fund. Other amendments meet objections in the operation of the law. Section 302 (a) now section 18 of our amendments.

26. Check-off limitations are modified to permit authorization to continue from year to year unless rejected. Section 302 section 18 of our amendments.

27. While the prohibition of labor-union contributions to political candidates is continued, the prohibition of expenditures is eliminated. Section 304.

28. In national emergency strikes, the existing provision is modified in various respects. The President may call on the employer and employees to continue work before appointing a Board of Inquiry. The Board of Inquiry may make definite recommendations. If the strike or lock-out continues, the President may either submit the whole matter to Congress for special legislation, or he may apply to the court to authorize an injunction for 60 days or seizure, or both. Sections 206 to 210 modified by sections 301 to 307 of our amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not join in the minority views on the type of legislation needed to correct the Thomas bill, S. 249, which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has just submitted. It will be recalled that the Thomas bill was reported by the Democratic members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare early in March, without the slightest opportunity to be granted for the presentation and consideration of amendments.

While I agree with many of the recommendations in the minority views, nevertheless in my judgment the minority report perpetuates some of the serious substantive and procedural defects of the Taft-Hartley law. At a later date I shall offer specific amendments which I hope will avoid what I consider to be some fatal weaknesses in the reports both of the majority and of the minority. But for a very few minutes this afternoon I wish to make some comments upon the problem which I think confronts the Senate in view of the action taken in the House of Representatives in the whole matter of labor legislation.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I speak from a very heavy heart today, but I hope with a head that is clearer than my heart is light. At the very outset of these remarks I wish to pay my compliments to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for what I know has been a very sincere effort on his part to try to bring together the conflicting views and differences of opinion among Republicans on the committee in the form of a minority report on which all of us could unite. I wish to repeat, there are many phases of the minority report with which I find myself in agreement, and I shall discuss those points of agreement in a series of speeches which I shall present at later times on the floor of the Senate as I present from day to day my proposed amendments on labor legislation.

However, I wish to make clear that I think the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed. The Taft report repeals it in name only because the recommendations of the minority report retain too many of the objectionable provisions and procedures of the Taft-Hartley law. We need to repeal the Taft-Hartley law outright and then add a few fair amendments to the Thomas bill in order to give us a just labor law.

Mr. President, in view of what has happened in the House of Representatives, I think the Senate should proceed now to dig in with a determination to lift this whole matter of labor legislation out of the field of politics into the realm of statesmanship. If we are to have statesmanlike labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress, which the country so sorely needs, then that must be accomplished in the Senate.

Because some persist, apparently with a determination, in misunderstanding the position of the junior Senator from Oregon, let me for the RECORD today make a few brief suggestions as to what I think needs to be done. But let me quickly review what I think the problem is, and what the causes for the predicament in which we find ourselves are.

It seems as though it were only yesterday, but in fact it has been weeks ago, that I pleaded on the floor of the Senate in an exchange with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] that we not follow the procedural course of action in the handling of labor legislation that was proposed by the Administration forces at the beginning of this session of Congress. I was bold enough to suggest then, by way of prophecy, that the votes did not exist in the Eighty-first Congress for the passage of the Administration bill. I was bold enough to suggest then that the votes did not exist in the Senate for the passage of the Administration bill. They did not exist in the Senate then, they do not exist in the Senate today.

I pleaded at that time for a bipartisan approach to this problem of labor legis-

lation, and for full hearings, but the determination of the Democrats in the Senate at that time was to steamroller through the Senate, if they could, the Administration bill, without even subjecting it to adequate hearings.

The RECORD is clear as to the results of that procedural controversy. The Democrats fixed an arbitrary February 10 deadline for the closing of the hearings. After hearings began, they recognized that they could not possibly, even under steamroller tactics, hear all the witnesses they knew would have to be heard by February 10, so on February 8 they agreed to an extension of the hearings until February 23.

I wish to say that it was at that point that hope was born again that in this session of Congress we could make a bipartisan approach to the labor legislation problem. I thought that by that extension there was an indication on the part of men on both sides of the aisle primarily responsible for the drafting of labor legislation, because they were members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to come forward at long last with some unity of action in the form of a bipartisan bill. But those hopes did not last very long, because immediately upon the conclusion of our hearings on February 23 it was decided to postpone for one week any consideration of the legislation in executive session of the committee. At the meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the week following we were confronted with a motion—and I think it is important to get the history of this matter straight in the RECORD today—to report the Administration bill to the floor of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the junior Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], all and each had some specific suggestions to make by way of modification of the Administration bill, in the hope that we might reach relatively common ground and understanding as to what the labor legislation should be.

It is important to keep clearly in mind that the Republicans on the committee were not in agreement then any more than it is evident we are in agreement today, as is evidenced by the fact that we cannot all agree to sign the minority views. But we were trying to reach agreement, we were men acting in good faith then, as we are today, trying to find what the common denominator of agreement may be which will permit us to take this issue out of the field of partisan politics.

Mr. President, we were not even allowed—believe it or not—in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to offer our amendments. We were not even allowed to receive any consideration for our amendments. That treatment was accorded us in spite of the fact that on the floor of the Senate on a previous occasion we had been assured by a Democratic spokesman on labor legislation that any Member of the Senate—not only a member of the committee, but any Member of the Senate—would be given an opportunity, in executive session of the committee, to present amendments, to be heard on the amendments, and to have the amendments thoroughly and carefully considered.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant to make a report such as this, but we must keep the facts straight. I want to say that on that day, when the Democratic Members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare would not even open up their minds to the degree that would permit us to receive some consideration for our amendments they thereby guaranteed and gave assurance that the bill would have to be written on the floor of the Senate. I deplored it then. I deplore it now. I deplore it because I think the procedure that was adopted in handling the legislation in the Senate committee gave opportunity to division elements and antilabor forces in the Congress and in the country to bring about what I think is the sorry mess which confronts labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress as of today.

I am sorry about it because of what I know will be misunderstandings, because of what I know will be the political repercussions and consequences of the action which has been taken in the House of Representatives.

I am not going to argue the Wood bill in any detail today. I am not of the opinion that my views of the Wood bill will carry very much weight in the Congress. But there is no doubt about the fact that the Wood bill was the product of a coalition participated in by many Republicans.

I want to say to my Republican brethren today that I think the coalition which produced the Wood bill was an unfortunate Republican mistake. Whether we like it or not, American organized labor is now in politics to stay for some time. Believe me, it is going to be in politics with renewed energy and determination in the elections of 1950 and 1952. Once again I say on the floor of the Senate, I hope Republicans will not be misguided by any illusion or delusion that the opposition will be just from the labor leaders. The opposition against my party, Mr. President, is going to be from the rank and file of workers by the millions, because the rank and file of American workers could not possibly accept many of the provisions of the Wood bill.

All I can say, for whatever my experience in the field of labor may be worth, the Republicans in the Senate of the United States, in my judgment, now have the challenge and the duty of trying to save our party as far as labor support is concerned from the serious blunder and mistake which, I think, was made as the result of the coalition which produced the Wood bill.

There are a great many features of the Taft minority views which, in my judgment, point the way, provisions which, I think, are sound provisions. The differences I have with the Taft minority views today I shall set out in detail as the days go by in respect to specific amendments which I shall present.

Mr. President, for whatever it may be worth, I want to say to the members of the Republican Party that we do not have a ghost of a chance of obtaining labor support in 1950 and 1952 unless we make clear to American labor that we have no intention of returning to government by injunction. Labor is scared of it. It should be. Labor is determined to fight us on the injunction issue. I hope that careful consideration will be given to the first amendment which I shall offer, within the week, I hope, in respect to emergency disputes. It is an amendment which does not include an injunction provision. It should not include in it an injunction provision on the merits of that issue if we want a workable and successful procedure for handling emergency disputes.

I would not have my party—and let me make this perfectly clear today—I would not have my party in connection with labor legislation come forward with a single amendment of expediency in order to secure a single labor vote. I would only have my party come forward with amendments to the Thomas bill which I think are necessary to give us a bill that will be fair to labor and to management and to the public. I do not think the Thomas bill in its present form is fair to labor nor do I think it is fair to management or to the public. It needs some amendments in order to make it a just piece of legislation. We can make it fair and just without making the mistake of using as a first club in the field of labor legislation the injunctive process. I am convinced that the injunctive weapon as a first club in connection with labor issues will not work, is not sound, will not promote the public welfare.

I want to say—because I know the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio will have differences with me in respect to some details as the oncoming debate starts on labor legislation—I want to say to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] that I think our party and our country owe him a great debt of gratitude for the valiant service he has rendered in conference during the present session of Congress with Republican members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, along with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and with myself, as we have sat down trying to narrow the area of disagreement between us and broaden the area of agreement on specific amendments. I think that although disagreements will exist as we discuss specific amendments, it will be found that on a great many amendments we will be shoulder to shoulder in our endeavor to try to perfect the Thomas bill.

One more word respecting the use of injunctions in labor disputes. I want to say to my Republican brethren that in the labor halls of America, I think the one argument that has hurt us most is the argument that the Republican Party is seeking, through labor legislation, to get labor back to rule by injunction. I want to say that I do not think the injunctive approach will work, because most of the issues that confront us in emergency disputes are not issues that can be settled by an injunctive process. They can only be settled by agreement. We need to face the reality that labor so

fears the injunction that we cannot expect free collective bargaining processes to go on in the face of the injunction. If there was any one thing that stood out above all else in the excellent hearings which we finally had, it was the deep-seated opposition of American labor to the injunctive process. Throughout the hearings the question was raised as to whether or not, under the Taft-Hartley law, the injunction has produced any beneficial effects at all. According to my study of the disputes which have arisen under the Taft-Hartley law it has not. According to my sights, all the injunction under the Taft-Hartley law has done has been to make already bitter resentments more bitter. Injunctions have been issued at the expense of industrial peace in this country.

One major point at which I leave the minority report today is on the issue of the injunction. What are some of the other issues we must consider in framing a good labor law? I believe that we must agree upon some amendments, as between the Thomas bill and the Taft-Hartley law, in respect to secondary boycotts. I think we must make it perfectly clear, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has done in his minority report, that there are certain procedures under the Taft-Hartley law which, in the interest of labor, should be continued. I refer to such procedures as the filing of financial reports. How can anyone object to the financial report system? We may need to simplify it but we should not discard it.

As a party we Republicans ought to recognize—the minority report today does recognize it, but the Wood bill does not—the importance of bringing to an end the giving of such all-powerful authority to one man as is held at the present time by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. If I had to name the second thing that is causing the most bitter resentment toward the Republican Party on the part of organized labor in this country today, it is the fact that the Taft-Hartley law gives to the general counsel of the Board such arbitrary power. One only has to read the record of our hearings or listen to the general counsel in testimony to recognize how dangerous it is to give such power to one man.

In the interest of good government the Republican Party ought to come forward in the Eighty-first Congress with a bill which makes it perfectly clear that we are not going to clothe any human being with the arbitrary power with which the Taft-Hartley law clothed the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. The Wood bill does not check the power of the general counsel.

There are many amendments which I wish to consider in greater detail at a later date, but I wished to make these few remarks today, first, to make clear that I do not find myself in opposition to the objectives of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New York, but differ with them only with respect to certain basic and fundamental procedures of the Taft-Hartley law which I think must be changed in order to have a fair labor bill. Therefore I strongly favor outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law in fact as well as in name. My amendments are aimed at improving the Thomas bill, not in trying to patch up the Taft-Hartley law.

Secondly, once again I issue what I know to be a very important warning so far as my party is concerned. If it lets the record on labor legislation of the coalition in the House stand, it will receive the determined opposition of labor in 1950 and 1952. I cannot say in all honesty that labor will be wrong and unjustified if it organizes in political opposition to those principles of the Wood bill which certainly should not be in any labor legislation if the Republican Party proposes to be fair to labor.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate very long, but I wish to say a few words about the bill, in general, not addressing myself to any particular amendment. I want to put into the RECORD a few facts about the situation in Arkansas itself, which I think will, as well as the situation in any other State, justify the formula provided by the bill.

A great deal is said in the Senate and in other forums about the various defects in our society. It seems to me that the fundamental defect, out of which a great many of others arise, is the lack of adequate educational opportunity for our children. If our country is not to be ruled by irrational whims and blind prejudice, our citizens must have some understanding of the social and political principles and institutions which are their most sacred heritage.

We are all familiar with the statistics which show that the American people spend more money for alcoholic beverages, tobacco, toilet preparations, and beauty and barber-shop services than they do for the education of their children. I do not need to labor the point that teachers, generally speaking, receive less reward for their services than do doctors, lawyers, carpenters, plumbers, truck drivers, factory workers, and any other comparable trades and professions.

We have been in a kind of stalemate. We have needed support for public education from the country as a whole, but because of the lack of adequate and proper education of the people we have been unable to obtain the required governmental support. It is a vicious circle which in some manner must be broken, or, through ignorance and indifference, we shall risk the loss of our self-governing democratic system.

Mr. President, others have stated the national principle involved in the policy of Federal aid to education. Particularly, day before yesterday, the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Utah outlined those principles in a very clear way. I do not propose to reiterate them today. I shall not labor the point, except to say that many other problems which are undeniably national in scope are attributable to our deficiencies in the field of public education. For example, I believe that a good educational system will contribute tremendously to the solution of the problem of health. I might mention others, such as old-age pensions and some of the other social difficulties. I think educational deficiency is fundamental to the whole field of problems. However, inasmuch as the State of Arkansas is one of the prime beneficiaries under the bill, I think it appropriate to ask, what is that State doing to discharge its own obligations toward public education? I think that is one of the principal questions, one of the principal points that justify the formula which the committee has adopted in the bill.

If it is found that Arkansas is not fulfilling its obligations, then I do not think we should be asking for Federal assistance. If, however, we are making a fair effort, and that effort is not sufficient to assure a relatively adequate system, it is to the national benefit that our effort should be supplemented by Federal assistance.

It is a fact that the areas of greatest wealth in this country do not coincide with the areas where the greatest number of children live. In Arkansas we have the children, but we do not have the wealth. I might digress, but I shall not at this time, to explain many of the reasons why we do not have the wealth. I may say Arkansas has great natural resources, but, due to causes going back for a hundred years, control of that wealth is not exercised by the State and its benefit does not accrue to the people of Arkansas as it should. I realize that the problem will have to be attacked from other approaches. So, while there is a good explanation, and a reasonable one, why Arkansas does not have the taxable wealth, I shall not take the time of the Senate further at this time to discuss that phase of the matter. Regardless of the reason for the condition, the fact is nevertheless that we do have in our State at present children in numbers disproportionate to the State's taxable wealth.

Practically all children in the age group of 5 to 17 years, inclusive, should be in school; consequently there is an obligation to support a school program for this group, and this is the best measure of the potential educational load in any State. According to figures of the Bureau of the Census, the proportion of school-age children to total population ranges from a low of 16.6 percent, in New Jersey, to a high of 28.3 percent, in New Mexico. Arkansas ranks eighth, with a proportion of 26.1 percent, a figure very near the top. Thus the potential educational load in Arkansas is approximately 57 percent greater than it is in New Jersey or New York, and approximately 23 percent greater than the median for all the States.

As I have indicated, however, Arkansas does not have the wealth to support this burden, in comparison with other States where the burden is less.

Perhaps it would be sufficient to say that the average per capita wealth of Arkansas, in 1947, was $710, as compared with eight States which had a corresponding figure of over $1,600. But even this does not tell the whole story. The true comparison should be made on the basis of income per child of school age. In New York, the income per child between the ages of 5 to 17, inclusive, is nearly four times that of Arkansas. The income per child of school age is over $8,000 in five States, but it is only $2,404 in Arkansas.

The people of Arkansas have not viewed these facts and sat back with an attitude of hopeless futility. On the contrary, they have taken decisive and positive steps to improve their educational system. With limited financial resources and a wealth of childen it was imperative to provide a more economical school administrative structure. Because of this need and the desire to provide educational opportunities from grade 1 to grade 12 for every child, the people of Arkansas, in the last general election, adopted an initiated act to dissolve all school districts in the State which enumerated less than 350 children and annex this territory to larger school districts. This act will reduce the number of school districts in Arkansas from over 1,500 to approximately 400 on its effective date, June 1.

While this will provide more economical administration in terms of cost per child in school, it will actually cost more money, because one of its main purposes is to provide high school educational opportunity for all children now without a high school to attend. Getting these children to school will increase transportation costs by approximately $750,000. The additional teachers needed will require an additional $1,500,000.

Thus, without considering expenditures necessary to provide rooms for the students, and without considering increased operational and maintenance costs, it is evident that school funds must be increased by $2,250,000 annually, merely to provide an extension of the present inadequate school program to the additional students. In addition to this immediate increase at the high-school level, there is an increased load at the elementary and primary level resulting from the increased birth rate of recent years.

In addition to this school reorganization act, the people of Arkansas adopted a constitutional amendment authorizing every school district, by a majority vote, to levy a property tax in such an amount as they deem necessary for support of their schools. Under this amendment, it is expected that local school district taxes will increase 40 percent within the next 2 years.

In the recent session of the Arkansas Legislature, which adjourned in March, State aid to local school districts was increased to $25,000,000, a $4,000,000 increase above the 1947–48 level. Another measure was enacted to increase local school district revenues by approximately $2,800,000.

These additional burdens were not delayed acts of desperation. In the past 15 years, State aid to local school districts has been increased from approximately $2,000,000 to approximately $21,000,000 in 1947–48.

This is a tenfold increase in 15 years. I think that there are few, if any, records in any other State of the Union which excel that record, and there are very few which equal it.

Local school-district revenues have been increased from $8,000,000 to $10,400,000. During this same period of time high-school enrollments increased by 33,000, with 4,000 more graduating from high school than 15 years ago. In 1947–48 there were 105,000 more children being transported to school at State expense. This service cost $2,875,000 more in 1947–48 than 15 years ago. The average school term had been increased from 142 days to 169 days. Teachers' salaries had been increased from an average of $489 to $1,548, which is still a pitifully small salary, as compared with other professions, as I mentioned in the beginning of my remarks.

While these facts indicate that Arkansas has made significant improvements, they are more significant in pointing up the inadequacy of the present program. Just to provide the present limited program for a 9-month school term for all children of the State would require an additional $7,000,000 annually for current operating expenses. Even with its limited financial resources, Arkansas perhaps can raise this increase in total tax revenues to provide the $7,000,000. But such a program is woefully inadequate. It would mean only 50 cents per day per child in average daily attendance.

Just to provide the 50 cents per day per child in average daily attendance for the children now in school, and only for an average of 169 days, the people of Arkansas allocated 2.3 percent of their 1947 income to school-tax revenues.

I wish to bring that to the attention of the Members of the Senate because the figure presented sometime ago was 2.01, which was in the preceding year. We have already raised it to 2.3 percent.

Only 16 States paid a higher percentage of their income for public school purposes, yet only 3 States had less income per child.

The abundance of children and the scarcity of economic wealth in Arkansas manifest themselves in other ways. Arkansas in 1947 to 1948 ranked thirty-eighth among the 43 States which made reports on the value of their school property per child in average daily attendance. Yet Arkansas ranks twentieth in school indebtedness per child, and it is the only State of the 43 reporting where the school indebtedness per child in average daily attendance was greater than the current expenditures per child in 1947 to 1948.

If we are to consider school teachers as uniform objects, important only in the sense of the number employed, there might still be adequate reason for Federal aid to education. This is true, because it is a fact that there simply are not enough teachers of any qualifications. But this is not the only factor, because, more than anything else, the teacher makes the school. This means that poor teachers make poor schools and poor students, and that good teachers help to make good schools and good students.

From the fiscal year 1937 to 1939 to the fiscal year 1947 to 1948, the average annual salary of all teachers, principals and superintendents in Arkansas was increased from $571 to $1,548, but Arkansas continued to rank forty-seventh among the 48 States, even though the percentage gain was the highest of all the States. In 1937 to 1938 the range in average annual salaries for all States was from $479 to $2,322. In 1947 to 1948, the lowest average was $1,293 and the highest was $3,450. On a percentage basis the gap has narrowed, but on a dollar basis it has widened.

Of more significance to the educational welfare of the children than this average salary of $1,548 in Arkansas, is the fact that 54.9 percent of all teachers in 1947 to 1948 received less than $1,500. Low salaries make necessary low requirements for teaching certificates. In Arkansas any person 18 years of age or over can secure a teaching certificate for elementary grades with only 12 semester hours of college work. Prior to 1947 no college work was required. To get a high-school certificate requires only 2 years of college work. In 1947 to 1948, 10.5 percent of all teachers in Arkansas had no college training; 25.9 percent had less than 2 years of college work; 16.2 percent had 2 years, but less than 4; and only 41.7 percent had a bachelor's degree; and only 5.7 percent had a master's degree or higher.

Arkansas, as do all other States, attempts to safeguard the welfare and rights of its citizens by setting up educational requirements for professional work, including teaching. But in no other profession do the requirements fall so low as in teaching, especially in the elementary schools. Yet what is more important than the profession which is responsible for directing the mental and social development of boys and girls during the ages known to be particularly important for the development of attitudes, the formation of habits, and the acquisition of skills for learning and living.

The toleration of these low standards, existing throughout the Nation, has an important, and perhaps controlling influence upon our national existence and progress. In no other field is there so much room for improvement, and so much necessity for immediate action.

As the most fortunate and the most powerful Nation in the world, we are rightfully expected to exercise a wise leadership in these difficult and trying times. We have shown leadership in the war and in the development of the physical sciences and technology, but the task now confronting us is to reestablish peace and harmony among the peoples of the world.

Today, we are fighting a war of ideas with the Communists. It is evident that this situation will continue as long as we can forsee. It is a long-term proposition for which we must prepare for many years to come. To understand and to give leadership in this war of ideas, we must have an intelligent and informed citizenry as well as wise leaders. If we are to unite and lead the western world

in its struggle against the domination of Communist totalitarians, I believe that we should provide an opportunity for every American boy and girl to obtain a reasonably good education.

I think this bill will make it possible for the States to provide a reasonably good opportunity for every boy and girl in the United States to have a fair start toward the acquisition of the education and skills which they need today to meet the problems of our modern world. I think the formula in the bill which has been so thoroughly discussed is an excellent one. While I am sure it will not prove to be perfect, in the long run it will be extremely easy to adjust any of the maldistributions which may arise, as was pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] a few days ago in attempting to lay aside this formula altogether.

I am greatly gratified by the action of the Senate on the amendments up to this point. It would indicate that the Senate will repeat its action of last year, pass the bill, and send it to the House of Representatives within a very few days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated. I offer the amendment on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, after line 23, it is proposed to add the following new paragraph:

(4) shall require that each teacher in each public elementary or public secondary school within the State be paid at a rate of not less than $2,850 per school year.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the amendment would simply establish a minimum wage for all teachers in the States receiving Federal aid. I feel very strongly that the very heart of any educational system obviously is the teacher. We cannot hope to get a sufficient number of high-grade teachers if we pay the salaries presently being paid in some of the States.

A very cursory survey which I have made, with the assistance of a number of educational institutions, indicates that in many States teachers are receiving, not a minimum, but an average of less than $1,000 a year. We know that a man working with a shovel and a hoe can make that much, and if we continue to pay our teachers salaries of that grade I think the money we will spend attempting to improve the educational standards of the Nation will simply be wasted.

In Wisconsin, for example, if the bill shall be enacted, the State will pay out, roughly $3,000,000 more than it will receive in Federal aid. I think that is all right if by the spending of the $3,000,000 a year we can be sure that the desired result is being accomplished and the educational standards of the Nation are actually being raised. However, I fear that will not result, I fear the money will be completely wasted, unless we provide some assurance that teachers can make the teaching profession a career, make it their life work, and they certainly cannot do that at the salaries being paid currently in many States.

Mr. President, the amendment should require no lengthy argument. I believe it speaks for itself, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Before a quorum is called, because a great number of Senators thought there would be no vote this evening, I think it is likely there would be difficulty in getting a quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should be glad to wait and have a vote tomorrow, if the Senator prefers. I should like to have the yeas and nays.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator is going to ask for the yeas and nays, we would have to be fair to all Senators and give them a chance to be present. I have no objection to trying to get a quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that the Senator has stated that many Senators felt that there would be no further vote tonight, I suggest that it is getting late, and I presume there is an intention to take a recess soon anyway, and I have no objection to waiting and having the vote on the amendment tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I advised all Senators who inquired that I thought the Senate would be in session until half-past 5 or 6 o'clock, and that we would have a vote on another amendment. Every Senator who consulted me I advised to the effect that there would be a vote on another amendment. So far as my knowledge is concerned, I do not know of any Senator who has left under the impression that there would not be a vote on an amendment this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I started for the Senate from the hearings on the North Atlantic Treaty, and met a Senator who had a friend with him who said to me, "No votes today. It is all over." I merely submit that for what it is worth. It was only one Senator.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if the Senate is about to take a recess.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I have said, I advised every Senator who consulted with me that the Senate would remain in session until half-past 5 or 6 o'clock, and would very likely have a vote on an amendment, or perhaps more than one amendment. For that matter, I think I told practically all Senators who inquired that a vote would be taken on one amendment even at 6 o'clock, if necessary, and that the Senate might remain in session a little beyond 6 o'clock. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee, what his wishes are.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. My desire, of course, would be to attempt to get a vote tonight, but at the same time, in fairness to all Senators, I think we should be sure that there is a quorum present. I do not care to embarrass any Senator, and I do not want to embarrass the leaders.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Millikin
Baldwin	Hunt	Mundt
Bridges	Ives	Murray
Byrd	Jenner	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Taylor
Ellender	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McGrath	Tydings
George	McKellar	Vandenberg
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hayden	Magnuson	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	Withers
Hill	Maybank	Young

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made after each quorum call:

The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been granted permission to be absent from the sessions of the Senate while the Committee on Foreign Relations was conducting hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think it will require only a word or two to show that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin is entirely out of harmony with the theory of the bill, completely out of harmony with the fundamental purposes of the bill, and wholly out of harmony with the wording of the bill. The second section of the bill lays down the principle that the Federal Government shall make no prescriptions in regard to anything which specifically refers to persons in schools. I read the entire section:

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or to prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe

requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instructions, nor shall any provision of this act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any change in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this act.

Mr. President, if the amendment were adopted it would be in complete conflict with the theory of the bill. Therefore I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division cannot be had on a request for the yeas and nays.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] on behalf of himself and other Senators [putting the question].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the acting majority leader whether he intends to have the Senate continue in session this evening. I have an amendment to offer if he does.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is the intention to hold an executive session, and then take a recess. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] desired to offer an amendment.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

Mr. DONNELL. The amendment which I sent to the desk a day or so ago, and which I desire to offer in due course, will require considerable time for discussion, in my judgment. I wondered whether it was the purpose of the acting majority leader to proceed further this evening. I am perfectly willing to continue if he desires to do so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is not the intention to proceed with any further amendments this afternoon. However, I had understood that the Senator from Connecticut desired to offer an amendment, and that the Senator from Missouri also had an amendment to offer. The Senator from Connecticut spoke to me earlier in the day and expressed the hope that as soon as the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was disposed of, he might be recognized to offer his amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. That is quite satisfactory to me. However, I do not want a third reading of the bill to take place without an opportunity for me to offer my amendment.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that he offer his amendment at this time.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is perfectly agreeable to me to go forward with the amendment. I will say to the acting majority leader that it will require considerable time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may offer his amendment and have it pending.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the period following the word "State" and to insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following: "*Provided, however,* That the funds expended to provide school-bus transportation shall be available to all school children, on a just and equitable basis, without regard to race, creed, or color, or nationality, or the location or character of the school which the child attends."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is not the intention to proceed with the consideration of this amendment tonight. One or two Senators have expressed a desire to speak briefly or to place something in the RECORD. I therefore yield the floor in order that they may be recognized for that purpose. Then I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in grappling with our daily problems, we are apt to forget that great and truly historic events sometimes take place before our eyes. One of these events, a truly unique one, is the resurrection of the Jewish state after an interval of two millenia. Today, May 4, marks the first anniversary of the establishment of that state according to the ancient Hebraic calendar.

A state is that form of community which has been shaped by mankind to give expression to the needs and desires of organized society. A state is neither necessarily good nor necessarily bad. It is an instrument, not an end in itself. If the people of the state seek the common good, if the statesmen and politicians, the active workers of the state, are faithful to their mission, then that state can become a tremendous force for freedom, for welfare, and for progress.

Not all peoples have been inspired by these ideals, and not all states have been a force for good. But even where peoples err, and where the governing powers commit grave mistakes, we still believe in the right of every people to govern itself, to have a state of its own, to exercise the right of self-determination. For, in the long run, the remedy against governmental abuse lies in the hands of the people themselves.

It is indeed a tragedy that the Jewish people has been denied that right of self-determination for many centuries. The price for this was an endless saga of martyrdom and suffering. Now that this state is a reality, we rejoice to greet and welcome it; we should assert its right to retain its independence; and we should defend it against every attempt to rob it of that independence.

We have reason to believe that Israel will develop into a great instrument for good and that it will seek always to bring human liberty, higher standards of living, and enlightened concepts of social welfare to all its citizens. We are entitled to believe that this will be the constant purpose of this new state and of all its nationals. The same passionate searching for truth and justice which characterized the Jewish prophets of old will, I sincerely hope, be once more the paramount characteristic of the new state of Israel.

Not only the people of Israel but the peoples of the neighboring countries and the world at large stand badly in need of such an example. The cause of freedom, the cause of justice, the cause of a decent attitude toward our fellow human beings, are undergoing a difficult struggle all over the world against the forces of greed and selfishness. The Middle East, that part of the world in the midst of which Israel is to live, presents a particularly unattractive picture. Its social, economic, and hygienic standards are pathetically low; its political framework is archaic; modern conceptions of liberty and self-government are either unknown or perverted. More than anything else, that part of the world, in its own interest, needs to be awakened to the great opportunities which freedom, decency in social relations, and modern economic methods can bring in their wake.

I am able to understand the resentment which many Arabic-speaking peoples of the Middle East hold toward Israel. Conflicts between nationalities based on geographic and political rivalry are a frequent phenomenon in history. But wherever it has been possible to overcome those conflicts and rivalries and wherever peoples have learned to live in peace with one another on the basis of mutual respect and tolerance, the result has been of lasting benefit to all. I hope, therefore, that the day will come when not only the world at large but also the immediate neighbors of Israel—those who will be able to profit most from its example—will be united with the new state by bonds of mutual friendship and respect.

The ideal of many farseeing men and women of our age does not remain focused on the ultimate existence of a large number of mutually independent sovereign states. To many the ideal of self-determination and the right of every people to organize a state of its own choosing is only part of the peaceful and just organization of humanity. The ultimate aim of many is that all these states should freely surrender some

of the privileges that go by the name of sovereignty and voluntarily unite in a great and peaceful federation of mankind.

Though this happens to be a very modern conception, it is also a very ancient one. None other than the ancient prophets of Israel preached the gospel of a united humanity in which there should be no more war and in which one universal order should assure life and freedom to all. In greeting the state of Israel on its first anniversary I am confident that this new state, faithful to these ancient traditions, will be in the forefront among those who will fight for international peace, cooperation, and a better world order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today marks the official celebration of the first anniversary of Israel's statehood. This newest addition to the family of nations is the fruition of decades of zealous, unceasing labor on the part of hundreds of thousands of Jewish men and women the world over.

Many of the most effective workers for establishment of this Jewish homeland are American citizens who gave everything they had in energy and money to further this cause. Like other Jewish men and women throughout the world they refused to give up their goal even when attaining it sometimes seemed impossible.

Some of the strongest champions of the Jewish homeland did not live to see establishment of the new state. Many died in the Nazi gas chambers.

So today, as throughout the United States and the world Jewish people and all of us observe the first aniversary of Israel as a state, our thoughts turn to those men and women who sacrificed so much on the way.

Already this young state has accomplished great things. We can confidently expect even more in the future from a nation which represents so vast an effort and so many sacrifices on the part of so many people.

We look to Israel for continued progressive developments in the Middle East. We look to Israel for constructive work toward preservation of peace.

Such accomplishments will constitute rich rewards for the work done in the past 50 years to make possible this fine, new nation.

MOTHER'S DAY—TRIBUTE TO MISS ANNA JARVIS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on Mother's Day, which is observed each year on the second Sunday in May, there will be a special service in the city of Philadelphia to which I should like to refer briefly.

It will be held in tribute to the memory of a gentle and kindly woman who found inspiration in her love for her own mother to suggest the observance of Mother's Day, which has become a permanent and beautiful part of American life.

Miss Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day, passed away since we last observed the day with which her name will always be associated in praise and gratitude. Her death occurred on November 24, 1948, in her eighty-fourth year. Next Sunday at her grave in West Laurel Hill Cemetery there will be a distinguished assembly to pay tribute to Miss Jarvis and to unveil a bronze plaque bearing her likeness. The service will be attended by the Gold Star Mothers, Army and Navy War Mothers, American War Mothers, Women's Army Corps Mothers and other organizations. They will be joined by official representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia.

Forty-two years have passed since Miss Anna Jarvis invited several of her friends to spend the second Sunday of May with her to commemorate the anniversary of her mother's death. From that occasion there has developed in every civilized land a day of reverent appreciation of the gentlest and loveliest—yet the most powerful—influence for all that is good in the world.

It is worthy of note also that in 1914, at the request of Miss Jarvis, the Congress of the United States by joint resolution gave recognition to the second Sunday of May as Mother's Day. Pursuant to that resolution the day was proclaimed by President Woodrow Wilson in those troubled days of 1914 when the dark clouds of war were gathering over Europe.

The world is indebted to Miss Anna Jarvis and it is most fitting that tribute be paid to her memory on the day that represents the realization of her dream.

No one can ever hope to repay the debt we owe our mothers for the blessings their love, their prayers, and their teachings have brought to us and the world.

As we pause to pay honor and homage to mother in our homes and in our places of worship next Sunday, let us recall the impressive words of Abraham Lincoln:

All that I am or hope to be I owe to my angel mother.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be War Assets Administrator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I favor the confirmation of this nomination. As the Senate knows, on two previous days, requests have been made to have the nomination passed over, and on those occasions it has been passed over. I now ask that the nomination be passed over again, but I do so in the hope and belief that at the next executive session the nomination will be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be Federal Works Administrator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do so simply in order to have the RECORD show that I am present at the time when this nomination is being considered. I now withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William D. Murray to be United States district judge for the district of Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Capus M. Waynick, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nicaragua.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Edward Mount Webster, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1949. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR

Jess Larson to be Federal Works Administrator.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William D. Murray to be United States district judge for the district of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we would be still and know that Thou art God. Above all differences of opinion, in partisan situations, O bring us all to the common sanctuary where a common need links all in a common fraternity.

Be Thou the strength behind our weakness, the wisdom behind our ignorance, and the vision behind our shadows. By Thy grace help us to present our bodies a living sacrifice, not conformed to this world, but by the renewing of our minds we may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God. Mercifully calm our spirits and rest our hearts, that we may bring forth the fruits of brotherhood. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 2032) to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes, which was demanded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Bland	McSweeney	Thomas, N. J.
Clevenger	Murphy	Walsh
DeGraffenried	Short	Wood
Gilmer	Smith, Ohio	
Hobbs	Tackett	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 416 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the engrossed copy be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the bill H. R. 2032 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WELCH of California. I am unalterably opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WELCH of California moves to recommit the bill H. R. 2032 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order at this time to offer an amendment to the motion to recommit? I raise that question because in paragraph 788 of the House Manual it is stated:

An amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order.

I have just looked up the citation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and it appears that in 1912, on the 16th of August, a motion to recommit was made and then the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Moon, offered an amendment to the motion to recommit. In stating what it did he said:

It is a motion to strike out all of what is known as the Born amendment and insert in lieu thereof part of it as a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I make this parliamentary inquiry for the purpose of finding out whether it would be in order at this time to offer an amendment to the motion offered by the gentleman from California proposing that the Wood amendment be stricken out and that the original provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, for example, be substituted therefor.

The SPEAKER. Paragraph 2714, appearing on page 361, volume 8, Cannon's Precedents, states:

It is not in order to propose in connection with a motion to recommit instructions to amend an amendment which has been adopted by the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 209, answered "present" 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—212

Addonizio	Bennett, Mich.	Buckley, N. Y.
Albert	Biemiller	Burdick
Allen, La.	Bishop	Burke
Angell	Blatnik	Burleson
Aspinall	Boggs, La.	Burnside
Bailey	Bolling	Byrne, N. Y.
Baring	Bolton, Md.	Canfield
Barrett, Pa.	Bosone	Cannon
Bates, Ky.	Breen	Carnahan
Beckworth	Buchanan	Carroll
Bennett, Fla.	Buckley, Ill.	Case, N. J.
Cavalcante	Huber	O'Sullivan
Celler	Hull	O'Toole
Chelf	Irving	Patman
Chesney	Jackson, Wash.	Patten
Christopher	Jacobs	Perkins
Chudoff	Javits	Peterson
Clemente	Jones, Ala.	Pfeifer,
Combs	Jones, Mo.	Joseph L.
Cooley	Jones, N. C.	Philbin
Cooper	Karst	Phillips, Tenn.
Crook	Karsten	Polk
Crosser	Kee	Powell
Cunningham	Kelley	Price
Davenport	Kennedy	Priest
Davies, N. Y.	Keogh	Quinn
Dawson	King	Rabaut
Deane	Kirwan	Rains
Delaney	Klein	Ramsay
Denton	Kruse	Rhodes
Dingell	Lane	Ribicoff
Dollinger	Lanham	Rodino
Donohue	Lemke	Rooney
Douglas	Lesinski	Sabath
Doyle	Lind	Sadowski
Eberharter	Linehan	Sasscer
Elliott	Lyle	Secrest
Engel, Mich.	Lynch	Sheppard
Engle, Calif.	McCarthy	Sikes
Evins	McCormack	Sims
Fallon	McGrath	Smathers
Feighan	McGuire	Spence
Fernandez	McKinnon	Staggers
Flood	McSweeney	Steed
Fogarty	Mack, Ill.	Stigler
Forand	Madden	Sullivan
Frazier	Magee	Sutton
Fugate	Mansfield	Tackett
Furcolo	Marcantonio	Tauriello
Garmatz	Marsalis	Thomas, Tex.
Golden	Marshall	Thompson
Gordon	Miles	Thornberry
Gore	Miller, Calif.	Tollefson
Gorski, Ill.	Mills	Trimble
Gorski, N. Y.	Mitchell	Underwood
Granahan	Monroney	Wagner
Granger	Morgan	Walter
Green	Morris	Welch, Calif.
Gross	Morrison	Welch, Mo.
Hardy	Moulder	Whitaker
Harris	Multer	White, Calif.
Hart	Murdock	White, Idaho
Havenner	Murphy	Wickersham
Hays, Ark.	Noland	Wier
Hays, Ohio	Norrell	Wilson, Okla.
Hedrick	Norton	Withrow
Heffernan	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodhouse
Heller	O'Brien, Mich.	Worley
Herlong	O'Hara, Ill.	Yates
Holifield	O'Konski	Young
Howell	O'Neill	Zablocki

NAYS—209

Abbitt	Colmer	Halleck
Abernethy	Cotton	Hand
Allen, Calif.	Coudert	Harden
Allen, Ill.	Cox	Hare
Andersen,	Crawford	Harrison
H. Carl	Curtis	Harvey
Anderson, Calif.	Dague	Hébert
Andresen,	Davis, Ga.	Herter
August H.	Davis, Tenn.	Heselton
Andrews	Davis, Wis.	Hill
Arends	D'Ewart	Hinshaw
Auchincloss	Dolliver	Hoeven
Barden	Dondero	Hoffman, Ill.
Barrett, Wyo.	Doughton	Hoffman, Mich.
Bates, Mass.	Durham	Holmes
Battle	Eaton	Hope
Beall	Ellsworth	Horan
Bentsen	Elston	Jackson, Calif.
Blackney	Fellows	James
Bland	Fenton	Jenison
Boggs, Del.	Fisher	Jenkins
Bolton, Ohio	Ford	Jennings
Bonner	Fulton	Jensen
Boykin	Gamble	Johnson
Bramblett	Gary	Jonas
Brooks	Gathings	Judd
Brown, Ga.	Gavin	Kean
Brown, Ohio	Gillette	Kearney
Bryson	Goodwin	Kearns
Bulwinkle	Gossett	Keating
Burton	Graham	Keefe
Byrnes, Wis.	Grant	Kerr
Camp	Gregory	Kilburn
Carlyle	Gwinn	Kilday
Case, S. Dak.	Hagen	Kunkel
Chatham	Hale	Larcade
Chiperfield	Hall,	Latham
Church	Edwin Arthur	LeCompte
Cole, Kans.	Hall,	LeFevre
Cole, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Lichtenwalter

Lodge	Phillips, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Lovre	Pickett	Smith, Wis.
Lucas	Plumley	Stanley
McConnell	Poage	Stefan
McCulloch	Potter	Stockman
McDonough	Poulson	Taber
McGregor	Preston	Talle
McMillan, S. C.	Rankin	Taylor
McMillen, Ill.	Redden	Teague
Macy	Reed, Ill.	Towe
Mahon	Reed, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Martin, Iowa	Rees	Velde
Martin, Mass.	Regan	Vinson
Mason	Rich	Vorys
Merrow	Richards	Vursell
Meyer	Riehlman	Wadsworth
Michener	Rivers	Weichel
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Fla.	Werdel
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.	Wheeler
Morton	Sadlak	Whitten
Murray, Tenn.	St. George	Whittington
Murray, Wis.	Sanborn	Wigglesworth
Nelson	Scott, Hardie	Williams
Nicholson	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Willis
Nixon	Scrivner	Wilson, Ind.
Norblad	Scudder	Wilson, Tex.
O'Hara, Minn.	Shafer	Winstead
Pace	Short	Wolcott
Passman	Simpson, Ill.	Wolverton
Patterson	Simpson, Pa.	Wood
Pfeiffer, William L.	Smith, Kans.	Woodruff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Brehm

NOT VOTING—9

Clevenger	Gilmer	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	Hobbs	Thomas, N. J.
DeGraffenried	Mack, Wash.	Walsh

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Hobbs against.

Mr. Mack of Washington for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Clevenger against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CLEVENGER. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote on the motion to recommit and to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, the decision made by the majority membership of this House to recommit the Lesinski bill to the Committee on Education and Labor comes as a victory to many of us who have hoped since the start of this debate that a labor-management bill, more favorable to both labor and management than either the Taft-Hartley Act or the Wood bill, would eventually be enacted.

I want to thank personally those Members who voted to recommit the bill to the committee. It took real courage for some of those who had voted for the original Wood substitute to support the motion to recommit. Yet I am confident that their votes were prompted by their own real sense of right and wrong and their earnest desire to be fair about these matters.

We, who come from labor, recognize that the struggle of humanity for advancement is a constant continuing struggle that is the price we have to pay for improvements of our social order. It took long struggles against the vested interests to enact pure food and drug laws, improve housing conditions, stop monopolies, act against unfair trade monopolies, and assure for the average man a more full and equal opportunity for his future. Those and many other improvements in man's lot in the struggle for advancement have only been gained after long and bitter struggles.

I am confident that when the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, meets again to deal with the problems of labor-management legislation its members will benefit some from the debates and actions taken here and will be able to report again to the House some bill that will be passed. It is necessary because the Taft-Hartley Act is so patently unfair that even the Republicans have admitted it should be changed.

As a word of advice to those in management, I wish to say that it is my sincere opinion that the inequalities and unfairness of many of the Taft-Hartley Act's provisions, if left on the statute books, will react most unfavorably in the long run to industry and business. The confusion will be such that both industry and the general public will suffer.

Many of those who have voted here to continue in effect the Taft-Hartley Act or to enact the equally unfair Wood bill come from farming communities where the people have all too little understanding of the real and basic problems of either labor or management in the complex industrial economic life in the other parts of this country. Despite their lack of knowledge of those problems and any apathy they may feel against really learning something of those problems, I think it will be sufficient to remind those reactionary Republicans, who have acted against a fair deal for both labor and management on this floor yesterday, that unless the important economic position of labor is maintained on a high level of prosperity, the farmer will have less and less opportunity to sell his produce.

I fear that some of those who come from agricultural communities may have voted in an extremely short-sighted manner because they did not realize the importance of maintaining a high level of wages so the working people of this country can buy the things the farmer has to sell. In other words, I cannot help but feel they cut off their own noses to spite their faces and I do feel that when their constituents find out what they have actually done, they will interpret those votes as being against their own well-being.

We have heard the former Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], whose leadership of the Eightieth Congress was so roundly repudiated by the good people of this United States last November, make a stirring speech in favor of continuation of the democratic system in this country. He even hailed the slim margin of defeat of the Sims bill as a victory for those he felt believed in American democracy. Nothing could be further from the actual truth because the pressure groups' work had actually paid off again in opposition to the will of the people as expressed last November.

It seems to me that those remarks about democracy should be taken with a grain of salt because we certainly had no evidence that the Republicans intended to let their own party members vote their honest convictions.

Yesterday when the Sims amendment was up for a vote the Republican leaders formed a barricade of their own bodies in the path of the line voting yea for that bill. Recalcitrant Republicans who sought to enter that line were cautioned and advised against voting for the Sims amendment. Many turned away and did not go through the line's barricade which would have taken a flying wedge to penetrate.

Now, I ask, was that democracy in action?

Of course, behind the reluctance of many to break through that line was some fear of reprisals from the Republican leadership. I hope the good people who elected those men, too timid to exert their own honest right to vote as their consciences dictated, will realize what type of people they have elected to represent them and will choose stronger men in the next election.

There can be little doubt in my mind but that the Republicans, by their actions on the floor of this House on this important bill, have again committed an act which will cost them more and more votes from people who no longer can be kidded and cajoled into following the old Republican theory that prosperity can reach them most safely only after funneling through the hands of a few financial barons at the top, leaving for the common people only the small share those at the top feel that they have to give in order to keep peace. People are not that stupid any more.

I have waited with bated breath here on the floor of this House to hear one of the reactionaries say the swan song, "It's too bad we ever taught the common people to read and write." That would be the ultimate in reactionarism.

We have even heard the veiled threat of the gentleman and orator from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] that those of us who voted the people's mandate would not be returned, implying that we were to be the dead ducks in the weed patch. Nothing can be further from the truth because we only have to look at his own close primary last year to know the way the thinking of people is changing. I will say that once the people get the true picture of any real problem they can tell the short brush from the timber, and they do not have to crawl under any barn to find out from some politician.

The distinguished orator from Missouri dealt at great length with the problem of featherbedding. Frankly, I have no real respect for any employer who would

be so spineless as to enter into a contract with labor to permit featherbedding. Yet I did not hear my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] condemn such spineless creatures because too many of them are Republicans who condone it, complain against it and take no action other than make lush contributions to the Republican Party.

While we are dealing with featherbedding as an issue, is not that practice as a labor-management problem comparable, in a way, to the Member of Congress who takes weeks away from his official post of duty to make "educational" speeches throughout the country for sizable fees arranged for by a professional and private lecture-booking agency?

Then, too, I was amused at the confused reasoning of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that sit-down strikes were still at issue. No one in labor has considered for years that the sit-down strike is a legitimate weapon to use in the economic warfare between labor and management. Yet how does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] reason that the failure of this Congress to pass fair and impartial labor-management legislation, after the people had voted in favor of it, to be anything other than a sit-down strike on the part of Congress?

So that you may get a clearer picture of the coalition of status quo statesmen that was worked out behind the Wood bill, I wish to call your attention to the column written by Scripps-Howard Columnist Peter Edson which appeared in the Washington Daily News yesterday. It reads:

WHO WROTE THE WOOD BILL?

(By Peter Edson)

The mystery of who wrote the so-called Wood bill as a substitute for the Taft-Hartley labor law is pretty thick. But it isn't really so mysterious as has been let on.

Representative JOHN S. WOOD, Democrat, of Georgia, whose name is on the bill, is largely responsible for whatever confusion exists about its origin. His first answer to the question, "Who wrote the Wood bill?" is: "It was not written by the Department of Labor."

When the question is repeated, he gives a second answer of: "The bill was written in my office with the help of a few Republicans on the House Committee on Education and Labor."

When asked, "Who?" he replies with a nasty, "What business is it of yours?" and walks away.

The answer to that one is simple. Who wrote the Wood bill may not be the personal business of any reporter. But it most certainly is public business who writes these tricky pieces of legislation. And in the public interest, every reporter has the right to ask any question he chooses with the expectation that he'll get a civil answer.

Representative WOOD'S reluctance to come clean on this one may be due to several factors. One is he wants all the credit for himself. Another is he doesn't want it known how the bill was written, what deals it represents, or who supplied the brains.

William Ingles, organizer and front for the Committee to Save the Taft-Hartley Law, says he didn't write the Wood bill but he knows how it was written. Ingles says Representative WOOD'S unwillingness to discuss the subject seals the mouths of those who had anything to do with writing it.

Gerald D. Morgan, who got $7,500 from the Republican National Committee for helping write the Taft-Hartley bill, says he had no hand in writing the Wood bill and knows nothing about it.

Gerard D. Reilly, former NLRB counsel now retained as labor lawyer for a number of employers, says he had no hand in writing the Wood bill. Reilly gives much credit for putting it over to North Carolina Democrat GRAHAM A. BARDEN, in the House Labor Committee. Union labor lawyers here in Washington have charged openly, however, that some of the language in the Wood bill is unmistakably Reilly's.

Reilly had considerable to do with writing the Taft-Hartley Act. His influence on the Taft-Hartley law "watchdog" committee's December report on the workings of the law is also discernible. And the real key to the Wood bill is to be found in this report.

Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., Pennsylvania, ranking Republican on the House Labor Committee, offers what at least has the merit of being the frankest explanation of how the Wood bill came about. MCCONNELL says it didn't take any brains to write the Wood bill, and there is no mystery about it.

"I could have written the Wood bill myself," says MCCONNELL, "and I'm no lawyer." He adds that the original bill was simply the Taft-Hartley law with the watchdog committee GOP majority's recommended amendments. So writing the Wood bill required only scissors and paste, not genius.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am convinced that the Committee on Education and Labor and this House of Representatives will pass a labor-management bill before adjournment to wipe out the unfair and unjust provisions of the present Taft-Hartley Act.

ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this body is very much pleased, in fact, very happy at the fact that our beloved colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE, who has not been able to attend the sessions of the House for quite a while on account of illness, is sufficiently far along on the road to complete recovery that he has returned this morning to assume his duties as a Member of the House. I am also sure, Mr. Speaker, that not only the people of his own district and the people of North Carolina, but the people of the entire country, all of whom he has served so faithfully and so long, all rejoice in the fact that he has been able to come back and assume his duties and responsibilities again in this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a radio address and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to Polish constitution day.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the first anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel. I know that many Members feel as I do, that they would like to extend their good wishes and congratulations to this new state, this great democracy in the Middle East. I have, therefore, obtained unanimous consent that today, after the close of all legislative business, I may address the House for 2 hours on that subject. If any Member wishes to speak at that time or to extend his remarks, I will be very happy to yield to him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Post.

Mr. BURKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Reverend John M. Corridan.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the question of world peace and how we are going to attain that peace is uppermost in the minds of all people. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted at the annual town meeting of Rowley, Mass., in my district, bearing on that subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INFORMATION FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE REGARDING DENIAL OF VISAS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 196) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested to transmit to the House of Representatives the following information, namely, the facts upon which the Department of State made its decision to refuse visas to Pierre Cot, former Minister of Aviation of France and now member of Chamber of Deputies of the Republic of France, and to Konni Zilliacus, now a member of the House of Commons of Great Britain.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee and a communication from the Secretary of State in reference to this resolution be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE RESOLUTION 196

The Committee on Foreign Affairs to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 196) to obtain information from the Secretary of State regarding denial of visas, having considered the same, reports adversely thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution do not pass.

The recommendation of the committee is based on a communication received from the Department of State, the text of which is included in this report for the information of the House:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 3, 1949.

The Honorable JOHN KEE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR JUDGE KEE: Reference is made to your recent request for comments of the Department on House Resolution 196, a resolution of inquiry introduced by Mr. MARCANTONIO.

The Department of State made its decision to refuse visas to Pierre Cot, former Minister of Aviation and now a member of the Chamber of Deputies of the Republic of France, and to Konni Zilliacus, now a member of the House of Commons of Great Britain, based upon investigative material obtained by the Department and provided to the Department by other agencies of the Government. Section 161 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 22) authorizes the head of each department to prescribe regulations for the custody, use, and preservation of departmental records and papers. The investigative agencies of the Government have advised the Department of State that their investigative reports, which were made available to the Department, may not be disclosed without specific prior approval by them.

Furthermore, disclosure of the information would jeopardize the conduct of foreign relations of the United States in respect to further confidential negotiations with other governments. Consequently, it is believed that the transmission of such information to the House of Representatives would be incompatible with the public interest.

Because of the urgency of this matter it has not been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, to which copies are being sent.

Sincerely yours,

For the Secretary of State:

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain articles written by Harry Christman.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Hon. George V. Cavanaugh, city judge of the city of Mishawaka, Ind., on the subject of Those Intrepid Little Heroes of the Air.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several articles.

Mr. MOULDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Neil Scott, of 400 Manhattan Avenue, New York, on Communism in Harlem.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include certain extracts.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in today's Times-Herald.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN RIVER BASIN

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 166, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 165) to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield one-half of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 165, a bill to extend and reauthorize the Central Valley project of California, to include the Folsom Dam and Reservoir and supplemental works as a part of that project. The original authorization was passed in 1944, and was for construction as a flood-control project. Subsequently, it was agreed that the project should be enlarged and built as a multiple-purpose project for flood control, irrigation, power, and other beneficial uses. The Federal and State authorities appear to be in general agreement as to the necessity for enlargement of the original project.

While there are perhaps controversial provisions in the bill, under the open rule proposed they can be fully discussed and amendments considered.

I reserve the balance of my time and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands, I am happy to come here today to explain this legislation and to support it. In view of the fact that we have only 1 hour under the rule for general debate on the bill, I felt I should make a brief statement on the rule, rather than on the bill itself. That is the reason for my appearing at this particular time.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] has explained the purpose of the rule. It is an open rule. It provides for 1 hour general debate, as is the ordinary provision. I trust that the rule will be unanimously adopted. I know of no objection to this bill. I was glad when I came before the Rules Committee to say that it was reported out unanimously and was one of the parts of the total developments of the great Central Valley in California which we are putting together through the years. It is a great task. Rome was not built in a day. That great work cannot be done in a day. It is comparable to some of the

other great river basins of the West requiring piecemeal effort but taking a long time to bring to full completion and fruition.

I was happy to understand that there is considerable agreement on the part of the Rules Committee regarding this rule before the House at this time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. As I understand it, the issue before the House now is whether any great project involving one of our great rivers in the United States shall be a multiple-purpose project or whether it shall be a single-purpose project, it being felt by us who have studied the matter that if it is a multiple-purpose project the Federal investment is more secure. Is that not true?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is correct. I am sure it is the sense of those of us who come from the West that the great rivers of the West ought to be developed in multiple-purpose projects. There are so many of those purposes which ought to be considered. We started out, of course, in the early days with flood control and navigation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In order that the House may understand this project, it originally was authorized under the report of and by the Committee on Flood Control and it was designed as a multiple-purpose project, but with no present power plant, which the committee planned to authorize later. But that is not as far as this bill goes. As I understand it, this bill goes further. While it was originally authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944, it contemplated that the proceeds of any power that might be later developed would go into the Federal Treasury, but this bill, instead of providing that the proceeds of the power shall be paid into the Federal Treasury, provides that the proceeds of the production of power shall be used for the development of land for cultivation. Am I correct about that?

Mr. MURDOCK. There is a portion of that that is used as a subsidy or a help to the irrigators. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, that is the difference between this bill and the act as it was originally passed as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and subsequently modified by the Chief of Engineers, as recommended, with proceeds of power to be used in developing reclamation as shown by H. R. 1210 now pending before the Committee on Public Works. So that the House may understand just what it is doing, instead of the proceeds from power being paid into the Federal Treasury as originally contemplated, the proceeds of the power will be used in developing land, until it has been developed. Is that not true?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is substantially correct.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Following that thought, I ask the gentleman from Mississippi not to lose sight of this fact: that under the proposal for a strictly flood-control dam, it is all outlay and no income.

Under the proposal for a multiple-purpose dam in which part of these funds are used to encourage irrigation and the other purposes, and there are many more besides irrigation, most of this money will be returned to the Federal Treasury, and a greater portion than though the purpose were entirely flood control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With regard to that, it is true that whenever power is developed at a flood-control project where multiple purposes are authorized, but with all deference to the gentleman from California—and I favor reclamation—the purpose of making a multiple-purpose project out of flood control is that the proceeds of the power that may be developed may be turned in to the Federal Treasury so as to make that project self-liquidating.

It is rather unusual that this project was first referred to the Committee on Flood Control, now the Committee on Public Works, and now for a modification was referred to another committee; and it is rather unusual, I may say to the gentleman, that in a multiple-purpose project it is first provided that the proceeds from power shall be used for the development of the lands which should be reclaimed as other lands rather than for the liquidation of the cost of the projects providing primarily for flood control. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I recognize that the gentleman has made a correct statement, and I say to the gentleman that on that committee we have always been very sympathetic to him in the matter of flood control. Here is a situation where we need a broader authorization; and we know that he, knowing this thing—I know there has been a little jurisdictional difficulty over the bill—but the gentleman, knowing the situation, will appreciate the objectives we seek.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the gentleman's permission, I may say to my colleague that we are as much interested in flood control in California as we are in any other State, and it was because of our interest in the people of California that the committee voted for the project and at the request of the people of California and the people of that area, who have submitted to the Public Works Committee no request for a hearing on H. R. 1210, now pending before the Public Works Committee.

In respect to this jurisdictional question, there was some jurisdictional question in the beginning between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, at the time the Committee on Flood Control took up this project, and we had in mind the public interest when we adopted it. We thought the funds should not be diverted from making the project self-liquidating to some other purpose. In the matter of jurisdiction, if this project was originated by the Committee on Flood Control it should be changed or enlarged by that committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for bringing this matter before us so plainly. Out in the West the question of flood control is not quite the same as it is in the balance of the country, for there we have so many needs for water which must be considered, but with us the use of water for irrigation is primary. There is no attempt on the part of anybody to deny that fact; in fact, we want to emphasize it every opportunity we get, so I appreciate the broad-minded attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi in this jurisdictional matter.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I know the gentleman from Arizona has been a champion of conservation and reclamation, but I have also with Mr. WOODRUFF, of Michigan, and others been deeply interested in these projects. Our interests lay in preventing the terrific erosion that takes place along these rivers, handling the land in such way that it would be a continuing program. Does the gentleman not believe that further appropriations for flood control and irrigation programs should carry with them a proposition for reforestation in the immediate territory either under the Weeks Act or to do something to keep down silting so that in 50 or 100 years these great projects will not be obsolete?

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Ohio. That is a very basic consideration. We must do our utmost to stop or minimize the terrific erosion which results in the silting up of the reservoirs. It is a wise investment to reforest or reseed the watershed to protect the great and vital investments. They should be made to last 1,000 years as in China.

I have a few additional things to bring to your attention before my time expires. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that the great Central Valley in California is made up of two river basins, that of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, and the valley extends about 600 miles, from north to south. It is already a great agricultural empire and can be made much greater and more productive. It is the greatest garden spot of the Pacific Southwest. It is a challenge to the engineers to take surplus water from the northern half of that valley where two-thirds of the water flows and transport a portion of it to the southern part where two-thirds of the productive land lies. It is a great problem for the engineers and they are trying hard to accomplish the undertaking. In this bill we have the united effort of the Army engineers and the Reclamation engineers to solve this great problem.

Out West where we have occasion to do great things in a big way, we have equal respect and confidence in the Corps of Army Engineers and in the engineers in the Bureau of Reclamation. We are glad to call on both for the services which each group can best render and are glad indeed that our laws are so written that we may have the services of both groups. We are glad indeed that the President as the over-all Chief recognizes the great effectiveness of these builders and encourages them to work on those projects where their services will be most desirable and most needed. In this case of the development on the American River we have a good example of cooperation in which the Army engineers build the Folsom Dam and the Bureau of Reclamation operates the project for the benefit of irrigation and many other public benefits accruing from it.

As the sponsors of the bill will no doubt bring out later, this bill has been especially favored by the President. Twice he has called attention to the need of this development, and to my mind his interest in this particular project is a good illustration of his interest in such developments throughout the great West—a matter for which we westerners are indeed grateful. We have had a few Presidents—too few—who understood the West and appreciated its great possibilities and threw the influence of their powerful office in support of western development. President Truman ranks high among such Presidents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes. If its purpose is carried out, it will make the American River Basin and Folsom Dam an integral part of the great Central Valley project.

It is to be built by the United States Army engineers at an estimated cost of $51,800,000. It will be self-liquidating. The reservoir behind the dam will have a capacity of 1,000,000 acre-feet of water, and from it will be developed 120,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power. This project will help to relieve the critical shortage of both water and power which exists from one end of the State of California to the other.

The President of the United States sent a special message to Congress and also a letter to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee urging immediate consideration of this legislation. It has been approved by the Governor of the State of California and the Department of the Interior. The bill was carefully considered by the Public Lands Committee, and large delegations from California, representing various interests, appeared and testified at hearings on this project and bill. No opposition to the bill developed, and it was reported unanimously by the committee with a favorable recommendation.

The national reclamation program was born at the turn of the century under the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt. Since that time there have been four other Presidents in the White House—Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman—who, like Theodore Roosevelt, have given consideration and outstanding assistance to the problems of the western section of the United States.

Reclamation is no longer limited to the simple reclamation of land. Out of it has grown one of the most vital products necessary to our Nation's security and economy, the generation of hydroelectric power.

The Central Valley project was inaugurated in 1933 by an act of the California State Legislature. Subsequently the adversaries of the Central Valley project were instrumental in bringing about a referendum in an attempt to defeat the act. I was one of a group of Representatives, headed by the late Senator Hiram W. Johnson, of California, who took the Central Valley project of California to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt who gave it his wholehearted support. As I have previously pointed out, the Central Valley comprises a vast empire, equal to the combined area of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and one-half the State of New Jersey. It is traversed by two great navigable rivers flowing into San Francisco Bay. It is estimated between eleven and fifteen million acre-feet of fresh water annually run out of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers into the Bay of San Francisco, an arm of the Pacific Ocean. One of the primary objects of the project has been to save from salt water infiltration over 1,000,000 acres of the most fertile land in the world. Before the Federal Government undertook this project more than 50,000 acres already had been destroyed.

To carry out this project it was necessary to build two large dams, the Shasta Dam and the Friant Dam. The Friant Dam at the southerly end of the valley is not a multiple dam and does not develop hydroelectric power. The Shasta Dam, however, is capable of developing 450,000 kilowatts of hydroelectricity. This great dam with its power development is an integral part of the entire project, designed as a soil conservation measure and also of tremendous importance from the standpoint of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, oil and electric energy are two of the greatest assets in our national economy and national defense. Every barrel of oil taken from the ground and used is gone forever.

I have learned from the best possible source of information the astounding fact that if the full hydroelectric potentialities of the United States west of the Mississippi River were utilized the amount of power thereby produced would be the equivalent of the amount of electric power that could be obtained by burning 600,000,000 barrels of oil per year.

The American Petroleum Institute has estimated that the oil reserves from known petroleum deposits in the United States at the end of 1947 were 21,488,000,000 barrels. Production of oil for the year 1947 was 1,989,000,000 barrels. From this rate of production and use of oil we can readily see our known oil reserves will last for approximately 10 years. In 1948 production was stepped up from 1,999,000,000 barrels to 2,016,000,000 barrels, or an approximate 8-percent increase in production. The legislation presently pending before the committee pertains strictly to the State of California. California is not a coal-producing State and must therefore depend entirely upon oil or electricity.

On December 31, 1947, California's known oil reserves were 3,295,000,000 barrels. In 1948 California produced 340,039,000 barrels of petroleum. Thus it will be seen that California's known oil reserves will be exhausted in approximately 10 years. Despite this alarming fact, California uses more petroleum for the generation of steam than any other State in the Nation. In the year 1947 our State burned in the generation of electricity 15,999,693 barrels.

California's population in 1940 was 6,907,387. On July 1, 1948, it was estimated by the Bureau of the Census to be 10,031,000, or an increase of between 45 and 46 percent, which is the greatest shift of population in the history of this country. In the face of this enormous growth in population, which has brought with it increased demands for both water and power from one end of the State to the other, we are told that the Federal Government should not loan its credit to relieve a condition over which the people of California have no control.

Hydroelectric power is almost inexhaustible. Every reclamation project developing hydroelectric power conserves just that much of our oil reserves for future use and extends the life of those reserves.

Mr. Speaker, it should be understood that money appropriated for reclamation projects does not constitute a Government subsidy. It is an investment in the future of America, every dollar of which must and will be repaid over a period of time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the statement that has been made by the gentleman who believes that the bill originally should have been referred and considered by his committee, namely the Committee on Flood Control, I believe the bill found itself in the right hands and has been acted upon very judiciously. A real and very good recommendation has been made to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am more or less familiar with the section of the country which this bill affects, having visited it for many years and spending from 2 to 4 months time out there after the Congress had adjourned.

I realize there is a shortage of power there, but more important is the shortage of water in that particular section. The people of the United States realize and recognize the advantages that exist in

the great State of California, and many people have moved there from Mississippi and other States where they find it more convenient and agreeable to live and bring up their families.

I appreciate that this proposed project will cost around $50,000,000; in fact, I am satisfied it will cost much more before the high-salaried engineers will get through with the construction of the project. But, I believe, nevertheless, that by reason of the benefits that will be derived by those that will acquire the irrigated and reclaimed lands, that eventually our country as a whole will be benefited. I know that in years gone by, before the Democratic Party came into power, and especially under the Hoover administration, and even before that administration came into being, many of those people who were on those irrigation and reclamation projects were unable to make their payments. To safeguard their interests we deferred and extended the payments and in some instances reduced them and even waived the interest. I believe that action was taken for a good cause in the interest of the people who helped to develop the territory. Had it not been for the irrigation projects and the reclamation projects and also the soil conservation program that we started about 15 years ago, the farmers today could not produce as much as they are producing. We must help to bring about greater and still greater production of our farm products so that we not only can provide for our own citizenry but also that we will be able to help to supply those who are less fortunate than we.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I just want to announce to the House that the gentleman who has the floor was at one time a landowner in the Central Valley, and if he had retained his ownership of the land on Mildred Island, down in the delta of the San Joaquin River, he would have been benefited by this bill, because one of the purposes of this bill is to prevent the encroachment of salt water from San Francisco Bay. The very land that the gentleman once owned was menaced not only by floods but also by salt water, and I want to compliment the gentleman for giving us assistance on this bill.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I held the property for about 25 years. It was the richest soil in our country. It was peak land. In some years I was successful in farming it and made money, but then unfavorable conditions developed. The Republican Party came into power. Prices of farm products went down to a new low and I leased my land. About 8 years ago I sold it for practically nothing. The area of the land was not large—only about 1,200 acres. I am pleased to say that the people that have acquired it are making a splendid living and some money. I do not regret disposing of it.

But, the reason I took the floor is that I wanted to pass on to you information about that locality. I know the conditions that exist there and I know that this project will safeguard the interests of thousands upon thousands of people in that section.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. You know, I was interested when the gentleman said that he was unable to get anything out of the property when the Republicans were in power, and then a little later on he said that after 12 years of Democratic rule he gave it away.

Mr. SABATH. Yes, I did, because of conditions that arose at that time due to the infiltration of salt water into the San Joaquin and the Long Rivers, and other tributaries making it almost impossible to put in a crop to good advantage. The salt-water seepage practically ruined every crop that was planted. For that reason, I disposed of it notwithstanding the fact I thought there was a great future for it when some day some effort would be made by the State of California or the Federal Government to eliminate the salt-water infiltration. This bill will bring this about. Therefore, I feel it should receive favorable consideration. I congratulate the gentleman from California and others who have worked for these many weeks and months to bring about the passage of this legislation. I think these gentlemen are doing a great service for their districts, their State, and the country.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman still own that land in California?

Mr. SABATH. No, as I stated I disposed of it about 8 years ago. Ex-President Hoover, I think, acquired several thousand acres adjoining my land.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Whether Ex-President Hoover owns land or not, he never took any money from the Federal Government for running the Government.

Mr. SABATH. He had money and he bought that land. He had confidence that the land eventually would become valuable and bought it as an investment. I have nothing against him because of that. But I could discuss at length some of his activities. However, since he is an ex-President, I am not going to go further into the matter.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The people in this country think that Herbert Hoover is one of the biggest men that ever served it.

Mr. SABATH. I wish the gentleman would read the record of Herbert Hoover from the time he started his business career in China, and his connections with the Farben cartels in Germany. If the gentleman did read the record he might agree with me. Let the truth come out. I have served here for many years, and served under him, and disagreed with him a great many times when I believed he was wrong. I am sorry the gentleman brought up this question, and I am not going to say anything further at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is there anybody who is against this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know of anybody who is actively against it.

Mr. Speaker, this is the culmination of efforts started many years ago. But the particular effort I am thinking about was the one in the Seventy-eighth Congress when the flood-control bill was up. I appeared as a witness before the committee, of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was and still is chairman, to recommend a flood-control bill on the American River to safeguard the property and lives of the people of the city of Sacramento, primarily. The project was not placed in the bill because of the fact that there was not on file a report by the Chief of Engineers recommending the project. The bill went to the other body where Senator DOWNEY and I appeared as witnesses and recommended that the American River flood-control project, which the Chief of Engineers had then recommended be placed in the bill. It was placed in the bill. A report was filed and the House concurred in that action. In the course of studies made by the Chief of Engineers under a directive, which was issued by President Roosevelt, providing that in the case of a stream where possibilities other than flood control existed, the question of ultimate development of that stream was thoroughly studied and looked into by the United States engineers.

The American River, as some of you know, is a very historic river—along the banks of this river gold was discovered in California on January 24, 1849. But, in addition to that, and much more important, the American River has one of the finest flows and one of the largest flows in the entire group of streams in California which makes its water a perpetual resource. The flow fits the need of irrigation and power development as nearly as it is possible for a stream to do. As a result of these studies that the Chief of Engineers made, and concurrently I might add, the Department of Interior were also making similar studies, it was recommended that a multiple-purpose dam be built in which 1,000,000 acre-feet of water could be impounded. Three hundred and fifty thousand feet of that is in the nature of a catch basin, so as to have a place to catch the flood-waters which might be disastrous to cities and lands below the dam. The other purposes for which the structure, as well as the auxiliary structures were to be used, were for irrigation and hydroelectric development. Those are the features of the dam that will pay back money to the American taxpayer. As I say, the flow of this stream is probably the best flow of any stream in the entire Sierra Nevadas.

What do we propose to do with this project? It is to be integrated into the Central Valley water project by this plan. Some of you have heard me say many times before that that project is the most fantastic water conservation project in the entire world. You take water out of

the Sacramento watershed, which has too much water, and where you have had flood problems and inundations since 1893, carry it over 100 miles south to put it in the San Joaquin River. The reason for placing the water in the San Joaquin River is that at the Friant Dam, which is one of the dams in this great Central Valley water project, water is diverted southward by the Friant-Kern Canal from that stream to two more watersheds, the Kern River watershed and the Kings River watershed. So what you are doing in substance is to spread this water—which is the inexhaustible resource of the State of California—water which never stops coming, which will last for all eternity, and you spread that water over these watersheds in which there is a shortage of water for irrigation. In our State, as all of you know, from April until December we have an arid, dry climate. Scarcely no rain falls at all. The result is that by irrigation you change the agriculture of an area from the raising of grain, and perhaps feed for cattle, to a highly intensive, specialized form of agriculture; 75 kinds of crops are raised in this great valley. The reason we are able to do that is that the irrigation feature of this dam and the other dams brings water to the land during the hot summer months where, ordinarily, without this water, they would not be able to raise anything. In my congressional district there are 25 major specialized crops, fruits, grapes, all vegetables, walnuts, almonds, and many other such things.

I wish the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] were present to hear what I have to say, because what he touched on this morning is one of the problems which this bill might create.

I intend to vote for this bill. I think there is no doubt but what the waters from this and other streams, draining into the Central Valley of California, will ultimately be integrated into the Central Valley project. But there is this curious situation, and we must face these practical situations: The money that goes into this dam does not come from the money appropriated for the Department of the Interior although, under this bill, that Department will operate it. Also, the authorization for a million last year and three and one-half million this year came from the flood-control bill of 1944, of which the Public Works Committee has jurisdiction. Because of the fact that the Army engineers have control of navigation and rivers and harbors, they get their appropriation recommendations from Civil Functions Appropriations Subcommittee. It draws the bills to appropriate money for flood-control projects and also for rivers and harbors. So after we had the Folsom Dam authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act we went before the civil-functions subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress and asked for money. When we arrived at the Senate hearing, by that time the nature of the dam had been changed in the report so to enlarge it from 355,000 acre-feet, the amount necessary for flood control, to 1,000,000 acre-feet, the size required for the multiple purposes, which this enlarged dam will serve. We were met with this objection by the subcommittee: That they did not think, as this bill provides, that a dam built by the engineers should be turned over to another agency of Government, and if that was proposed why should the Civil Functions Subcommittee place such an item in its bill. Subcommittee members also mentioned the fact that if this was going to become a dam in which the Bureau of Reclamation was to operate it, then the money should come out of the Subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations.

The Governor of California was the one, if you could name anyone, whom I think was largely responsible for the fact that the purpose of this dam was changed. With that change I am in entire harmony, and I think I had something to do with it, behind the scenes. But the Governor of California got the Reclamation Bureau and the engineers together and they agreed, under his leadership it may be said, that we should enlarge the dam from a flood-control dam of 355,000 acre-feet to 1,000,000 acre-feet. So when he wrote a letter commenting on this bill, he made this significant comment:

> Under these circumstances, I am not in a position to say whether reauthorization to the Reclamation Bureau should be made at this time in the manner proposed by H. R. 165. I say this because I do not know how the Appropriations Committees would view our request for an appropriation in the Army bill if the State of California should urge an immediate reauthorization to the Department of the Interior.
>
> I voice this concern because last year there was serious discussion in the Senate Appropriations Committee as to whether an appropriation should be made in the Army bill while your bill similar to H. R. 165 was then pending.
>
> You and other friends of Folsom Dam in Congress are much better able to appraise the effect of such an argument than am I. But there is one thing we cannot afford, and that is to become involved in legislative procedure that could result in no appropriation this year in either the War Department or the Interior bills.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I wish to make this statement: I am as much interested in the development of our natural resources as the average Member of Congress. As is indicated, there was a bill introduced last year, which was referred to the Public Lands Committee, with respect to the enlargement of this project. There was also a bill introduced and referred to the Committee on Public Works. I was not chairman of the committee then. Hearings were conducted by the Committee on Public Works during the Eightieth Congress without any protest.

A similar bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Public Works in the Eighty-first Congress. Inasmuch as it had been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and inasmuch as the pending bills, H. R. 165 and H. R. 310, were pending before the Public Lands Committee, I did not raise the question of jurisdiction. I do want to say that my understanding is that the Chief of Engineers when he went into it felt that there should be an enlargement of the capacity of this dam and that that enlargement should be made by Congress, but I submit for the consideration of the House that when one committee has authorized a project and when the project as it is provided by this bill is to be constructed by the agency of that committee, it would have been better for this enlargement to have been authorized by the same committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California five additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Those are some of the matters I was just discussing when the gentleman walked in. We met that same situation when we first went to the Senate. I do not know whether the gentleman remembers this bill, but I testified before his Committee on Flood Control in favor of the original bill authorizing 355,000 acre-feet. The gentleman from Mississippi was kind enough after I tried to get the project into the bill on the floor of the House to tell me that if the Senate put the Folsom project in, which it did, pursuant to the testimony of various witnesses and Senator DOWNEY, and myself that he would as committee chairman help get the conferees to accept it, which they did.

When we went to the Senate committee to seek appropriations for Folsom Dam in 1947 it raised the point that if the dam was built by the Engineers, they should operate it, and they mentioned the point again this year when I was over there advocating that we get money for the Folsom Dam. It came about in this way: I think we ought to be perfectly frank about these things, and I am heartily in favor of this type of bill, but we do have to consider what might happen before appropriation committees. Among others I went to the Budget Bureau and talked about this project very extensively. That Bureau is the one who recommended it to the President, and the President wrote to me, and I think to other Members from California, and told us that he thought that under all the circumstances the only thing to do was to allow the Engineers to build the project, which was originally only a 350,000 acre-foot project, and build it to a million acre-foot dam, and then because it had conservation features turn it over to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation. As far as I know that had never happened before in any project that I have ever heard of. I do not know whether that has any weight one way or the other, but it never has happened. So we have that situation confronting us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know of any other circumstance where a project has been started as flood control and it has resolved itself into one primarily of irrigation and reclamation?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think there are some, but I cannot name a specific one.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is from a Western State, the biggest State of the Union with respect to this kind of problem. The Central Valley project of California in my opinion is the biggest thing on earth today. I think it will cost nothing less than $5,000,000,000 before it is completed. In every way I could I have been supporting the project. I see no reason on earth why a project once it becomes overwhelmingly irrigation and reclamation should be under the control of the Army engineers.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is a matter of opinion. I do not see any reason for it either. I believe there are cases where the Army engineers have hydroelectric development and flood control together. That combination constitutes a multiple-purpose project. In this project in addition to irrigation, hydroelectric development, and flood control, there is salinity control, there are recreation features, wildlife features, and others. There is nobody that I know of in central California, nobody who has studied the problem but what admits that to get the maximum out of what I call the perpetual resources of our State, the waters, that there should be integration of the projects and effort. The question is when it should start. The war intervened and stopped our early efforts. We are convinced that the bill we have before us, as the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], senior member of the California delegation, has said, will put back the irrigation features, the hydro features, and other features of that kind which will produce untold wealth by the crops that it will bring in from arid lands and in every way it is a tremendous potential in the way of development, both agricultural and industrial development.

The chairman of the Rules Committee mentioned the land he owns out there on Mildred Island which was encroached upon by water from the San Francisco Bay. This controls that problem. At one time there were 450,000 acres of highly cultivated land which were threatened by the encroachment of salt water. This project will take care of that situation.

I am frankly mentioning some of these things here today because I do not care much who builds this or even who operates it, but I want to be sure it is built and I want to be sure it is operated so that it will spread the benefits as far as possible. We started with the Army engineers, but apparently when they get through building they are going to go ahead under Presidential recommendation and turn it over to the Bureau of Reclamation. I want to be sure that this does not even temporarily stop the flow of appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I am for all the features of this project and have been ever since I came to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCSWEENEY].

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] for this opportunity to speak not on the rule but on another matter that has come to my attention this morning. I know the President of the United States does not need my defense. However, David Lawrence came out with a statement this morning that Mr. Truman is flirting with impeachment.

I happen to be a teacher of history and, in my opinion we in America just missed one of the tragic things that could have been a smirch upon our annals throughout all time had we impeached President Johnson at the time he followed Mr. Lincoln as President. We missed it by only one vote. I find from the pages of history that the people were excited about this impeachment process by just such persons as are exciting this movement today, saying that Mr. Truman is violating the Federal statutes and, also, as Mr. Lawrence says here, flirting with impeachment because he made a statement at a press conference with regard to certain patronage.

There is no one in politics who believes more than I do that we should try to encourage a two-party system. I had the honor to serve in Italy during the past war at the time of an election, at which time there were 13 recognized parties over there. I can realize what a detriment that was to the political thinking of the people who were trying to do something for their country. So I am very much in favor of trying to maintain a two-party system, with a party now and then growing up on some extraneous matter that may be current at the time of election. But I do not think Mr. Lawrence has the right to make a statement like this when the President is merely trying to recognize those people who are cooperating and helping.

We realize that during this last campaign as never before in our history was our party, the Democratic Party, so badly split. In other words, in my humble mind, and I am only stating my own sentiments, any man who votes with or joins another party no longer belongs to the original party. Our Republican friends realize that when men joined the Bull Moose Party in the old days they were members of the Bull Moose Party at that time and they were not recognized for the same considerations as were the men who remained in the old Republican Party. On the other hand, may I say on behalf of the President that he has in no way in the selection of his members for committees and in other things shown in any manner animosity to those people who went out and fought against him. He comes now to a matter that is very close to his heart, and may I say very close to my heart, the question of proper labor-relation laws. He merely says that he wants to know who his friends are and how they stand on things he went out and fought for and on which many of us feel he was elected. No candidate for the Presidency in the history of our country has ever made a more courageous, a more singlehanded, and a more sportsmanlike fight than was made by Mr. Truman. No victory was ever more deserved. So I say that David Lawrence is merely trying to inspire in the minds and hearts of the American people a wrong sentiment and a wrong attitude, which we in America must continuously guard against and deeply resent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 165) to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 165, with Mr. EBERHARTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, somewhat generally, the purpose of this bill is to extend and reauthorize the Central Valley project in California to include the Folsom Dam and Reservoir and supplemental works as a part of that project.

The Folsom Dam was authorized for construction as a flood control project by the Army Engineers in 1944. The plans called for 355,000 acre-feet storage capacity.

After the project was authorized and prior to any appropriation for construction it was agreed that the project should be enlarged and built as a multiple-purpose project for flood control, irrigation, power, and other beneficial uses. The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the State water authorities all agreed finally that the initial plans for a reservoir of 355,000 acre-feet capacity should be enlarged to provide a reservoir of 1,000,000 acre-feet capacity which would not only provide more adequate storage for flood control but also provide the minimum storage required for irrigation, hydroelectric power, and other uses consistent with the conservation of water resources in the Central Valley area.

In other words, we have a situation in which we have a bill to authorize a project for flood control exclusively for 355,000 acre-feet, with everybody agreeing that it should be 1,000,000 acre-feet. The initial authorization of the project for 355,000 acre-feet did not include any authorization for the construction of any power or irrigation facilities.

The President of the United States recognized the incongruity of that situation in a special message to Congress on January 12, 1948, and I will quote from it in part:

> The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and the State of California are agreed

that the initial plans, for a reservoir of 355,000 acre-feet capacity, should be revised to provide a reservoir of 1,000,000 acre-feet. This will not only provide more adequate storage for flood control but will also provide adequate storage at the Folsom Dam site for irrigation, hydroelectric-power production, and other uses consistent with the conservation of water resources in the Central Valley area. The Corps of Engineers is completing construction plans for the dam on this revised basis and work can be started promptly.

In other words, and to interpolate, the Army engineers were sitting there with an agreed project of 1,000,000 acre-feet and only an authorization for 355,000 acre-feet. The purpose of this bill is to expand that authorization and put them in a position to proceed. One million dollars has already been appropriated for initial work on this project. Some $2,500,000 was voted into the recent civil-functions bill passed by this House. As a consequence, it is extremely necessary that this authorization be expanded so that the Army engineers can proceed to construct the project in accordance with the plan, which are agreed by everybody to be correct, and, in addition, that authorization be given for the power and irrigation facilities so that if we get a 1,000,000-acre-foot dam we shall not have a project with a great deal of water behind it and no facilities either to generate power from that project or to distribute the water throughout California.

I think it would be of interest to the committee to know something about this project, its general location, and its relationship to other aspects of the Central Valley project. Most of you, I believe, are familiar with the general features of the Central Valley project. I will refer to map here. The Central Valley project in California comprises the two big rivers in California—the Sacramento River, running generally in a southerly direction, with its confluence in San Francisco Bay, and the San Joaquin River, running northerly, with its confluence in San Francisco Bay. The Central Valley is approximately 600 miles in length and 120 miles in width.

The Central Valley project is based upon a fundamental geographic fact in our State—that there is an excess or surplus of water in the Sacramento River and in the northern part of the State and a lack of sufficient water in the southern part of the State. In short, the San Joaquin Valley is drying up. The farmers in the San Joaquin Valley are having to reach further and further into the ground to get water from their pumps. On the other hand, northern California, with the Sacramento River, has adequate water if that water is conserved and properly distributed. So the basic concept of the Central Valley project is to transfer the surplus water from the Sacramento Valley to the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley and then divert the water which comes from the San Joaquin and flows north in the San Joaquin River southerly by the Friant-Kern Canal.

We have the Shasta Dam, which is the key unit in the north, conserving water in the north and holding it. The Sacramento River itself is used as a canal or conduit to bring the water down to what is called Mendota, where we have the pumping plant, when pumping it into the Delta-Mendota canal and sending it down to the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley.

As a correlating unit, the Friant Dam is built to catch the waters of the San Joaquin River and to send those south in the San Joaquin Valley.

To summarize, the excess water from the Sacramento Valley takes the place of the water in the north San Joaquin which is shifted by the Friant Dam and Canal to the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley. It is an integrated system of transferring water. The Folsom Reservoir, which is proposed in this legislation and which, as I say, has been previously authorized as a flood-control project, is located very close to Sacramento, about 20 miles. This dam will corral the waters of the American River and will distribute those into this system.

The American River is one of the last two remaining large sources of water which can be caught and put into this Central Valley project. It is, therefore, doubly important that we build this project on a 1,000,000-acre-foot basis in order to use the water which ordinarily would be caught in the flood-control dam and then sent on down the river.

This measure also says that this project when built will be integrated in its operation with the entire Central Valley project of California, all this canal system, the Shasta Dam, the dam at Keswick, which is in effect a part of Shasta, and the one at Friant. That is very important, because, as a result of integration, benefits can be secured from this project which cannot be secured without this integration. What I am saying, in effect, is that 2 and 2 makes 5. In other words, if you take the benefits of separate operation of these projects and add them together, they will reach one figure, but when you integrate the operation you get more benefits than that. Let me illustrate what I mean: One of the functions of Shasta Dam is the control of salinity in the bay area. Salt waters come up from the sea and intrude themselves on that land. It is necessary to keep something like 4,000,000 acre-feet of water pouring out of those rivers in order to force those salt waters back. We use the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River for that purpose. But if we use the two dams, and happen to be short at Shasta, we can use the water which is at Folsom in the event it happens to be abundant at that time. In other words, by integration we get additional benefits because there is more flexibility in the project.

The same thing is true with reference to irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to have you explain how you get any irrigation from salt water.

Mr. ENGLE of California. You cannot get any irrigation from salt water. That is why we have to have this project. We use both of these rivers to force the salt water back so that those lands will not become infected with salt, and therefore become unusable.

As I was saying, the same kind of benefits are derived from integration so far as irrigation is concerned. If Folsom has adequate water and Shasta happens to be short, more water can be used from Folsom to meet the demands of the Delta-Mendota Canal and the San Joaquin Valley and the short water in Shasta is conserved. On the other hand, if Folsom happens to be short and Shasta long on water, then the reverse would be true. So, as a matter of integration for irrigation, that is also correct.

The reason this project was initially authorized as a flood-control project solely was because of the possibility that we might have a flood in the Sacramento and American Rivers at the same time, in which event they would flood out the State capital of California, Sacramento. That happened, I believe, once, in 1911, and it was feared that it would happen again. But with the integration of these projects, and, incidentally, this dam at Folsom will not only be built by the Army engineers, but the flood-control features will be operated under criteria laid down by the Chief of Engineers, as I was saying, with the integration of these projects the same kind of benefits can be had with reference to flood control. Probably the most significant one is power. Folsom Dam will have a power plant which will produce something like 12,000 kilowatts of electricity. Shasta Dam, of course, has a power plant and so does Keswick and Friant. The existence of an additional power plant on the same line has a tendency to firm up Shasta power, and vice versa the Folsom power will have a tendency to firm up Shasta power. You cannot sell power which is not firm. In other words, you have to have an assured supply. It has to be a supply which is not subject to either short water or the transmission facilities going out.

If water is short at Shasta, and there is sufficient water at Folsom, the Folsom plant can be operated more continuously and thus it has a tendency to firm up Shasta power. So, also, Shasta power has a tendency by such integration to firm up Folsom power and that of Friant Dam. In summary, then, the integration of these projects as a part of the Central Valley project gives additional benefits in salinity control, in irrigation and flood control, and in power, which would otherwise not exist if those projects were operated separately.

That is substantially what the bill does. The bill authorizes the extension of this authorization from 355,000 acre-feet to 1,000,000 acre-feet. It authorizes irrigation facilities, power facilities, and authorizes the integration and operation of this project as an integral part of the Central Valley project.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does this bill contemplate power plants?

Mr. ENGLE of California. Yes; indeed it does. There is a power plant contemplated at Folsom reservoir.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I doubt the presence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I will not make the point of order.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for withdrawing his point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] was concerned not over the question as to whether there would be hydroelectric-power installations in connection with this bill, but whether there was anything that might possibly relate to the construction of steam plants. There is nothing of that kind in the bill, is there?

Mr. ENGLE of California. There is not. There is authorization for a study of steam-plant capacity which might in the future be necessary, but there is no present authorization for any steam-plant capacity in this measure.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand there is nothing in the bill that could be construed as being at present an authorization for the construction of a steam plant?

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is correct. There is no authorization in this bill for the construction of steam-plant capacity. The bill does say that the Bureau shall study the possibility of the need of steam-plant construction. I refer the gentleman to page 3, line 7, of the bill, and this is a committee amendment, incidentally, "including studies of such supplemental works and equipment as may be required to maintain a firm supply of electric energy."

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman explain one word that has never up to this day found itself in my vocabulary and I have never seen it in the press, to my knowledge. It appears at the end of line 17, on page 2: "and necessary hydroelectric afterbay power plants." What does that word "afterbay" mean?

Mr. ENGLE of California. The word "afterbay" refers to the small dams below the main dam, which has the purpose of firming up the flow of the river. For instance, at Keswick we have the afterbay of Shasta. The water comes out of Shasta after going through the power plants. Then, by building another small dam, they use that water twice for power purposes, because of the fall. That is a very common thing. Keswick Dam is just south of Shasta Dam and was built as an integral part of that program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not speaking critically, because I shall support this legislation, but I want to understand the terminology that is in the bill, and that word "afterbay" I had never seen before.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is correct. They have a big dam, and when the water comes out they catch it again and put another power plant on it. In this particular bill they have three power plants lined up below that dam as an aid to the total amount of power that you can get out of the project. In short, it gives you the maximum amount of power that you can get out of a project, which, of course, is what we want.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I was just going to mention the support of this measure. The Army engineers appeared before our committee and testified in support of this legislation. The Bureau of Reclamation is for it. Every State agency is for it. The Governor of California has sent a letter in support of the principles of this legislation, which you will find on the last page of the transcript of the committee hearings. In addition to that, we had a further message from the President of the United States, which appears in the committee report on page 4. Those of us in California appreciate the fact that the President of the United States has seen fit to give particular attention not only to the whole program of reclamation but directs attention to specific projects. On two occasions with reference to this particular legislation he has called the attention of the Congress to the matter and asked for favorable action. He reiterated a request which he made in January of 1948 in a special letter to the chairman of our committee in February of this year, and called to the attention of the committee chairman the fact that his administration and the administration program was in favor of the reclamation policies which he has advocated in the last year. California is grateful to the President.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I note that in section 3, on page 6, there is a general authorization of appropriation to carry out the purposes of this legislation. How much is this project estimated to cost?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I refer the gentleman's attention to page 3 of the report, in the first paragraph. The cost of the dam and reservoir has been estimated by the Corps of Engineers on the basis of October 1948 at $51,800,000, and the cost of the supplemental works as of October 1948; that is, the power plant and irrigation facilities have been estimated at $59,200,000.

Mr. KEEFE. That is $111,000,000.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Approximately $111,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. That is what it is going to cost.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is correct, except that the major part of it is reimbursable.

I also wish to point out that this bill has as its coauthors the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER; the gentleman from California, Mr. JOHNSON; the gentleman from California, Mr. ANDERSON; and the gentleman from California, Mr. WELCH. In other words, I am not the sole proprietor of this legislation at all; it has been authorized by my colleague on this side of the aisle as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman tell me if these towns and cities in the valley have to pay a half or something of the amount the Federal Government puts in this project?

Mr. ENGLE of California. They have to pay for it all except what is written into the project as nonreimbursable, and that is about $18,000,000, which is contributed to flood control.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So, if this project goes through, the cities and towns in this bill will have to pay what the Government guarantees?

Mr. ENGLE of California. They will have to pay the money advanced except for the nonreimbursable items which I have mentioned; and it will be paid in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to one of the coauthors of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from California, 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the proposed Folsom Dam is an integral part of the Central Valley project, as has been brought out here. The particular interest that I have in this bill is the fact that it provides for studies that I hope will eventually materialize in the bringing of water from the Central Valley into the East Bay section of the San Francisco Bay area and down through the Santa Clara Valley.

In the original bill, the first bill introduced on this subject, an authorization for construction of such canals and facilities was included. It was later stricken out and a provision for study put in. While I much preferred the original language in the spirit of compromise I wholeheartedly support this bill.

Water in California can at once be the worst enemy and the best friend of man; as a matter of fact, it is indispensable, and the control of the waters of California is important. That is what we seek to do here. Irrigation and power have been fully discussed. Let me point out some of the other features that have been mentioned. One is salinity control. If no money were ever recovered from the building of the Central Valley project and hundreds of millions of dollars that have been poured into the Central Valley project other than the returns that have come from salinity control, the result would be worth while for it has meant the saving of the rich lands of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River delta and would be economically justified. Salinity encroachment had gone dangerously far toward destroying some of the richest lands in California.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman should add right there in the interest of proper accounting that it has also proved very valuable to industry in the area because when the saline waters get in the boilers it makes them scale up.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right and that is one of the features of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also calls for a fish and wildlife development, which may seem insignificant. But I point out to you that the control of water in the rivers and the additional control and protection of a spawning ground for the Chinook salmon is important to the people of the west coast because the maintenance of a commercial fishing industry supplies the tables of the people of the west coast with a type of food that is irreplaceable. The high protein value of fish food is an indispensable item in the diets of people.

I see my colleague from Oregon looking at me when I spoke of salmon in the Sacramento River, but I may point out that salmon fishing in the Sacramento River is one of the oldest on the west coast and that salmon spawned in the Central Valley system are taken by trolling as far north as Eureka and as far south as Monterey along the coast of California. When I refer to the trolling method, I am speaking not as a recreational fish, I am speaking of fish as a food supply. It also provides a fine recreational facility, one not to be discounted.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. The gentleman is not making any contention that the California Sacramento River salmon are better than the salmon taken from the Columbia River in Oregon, I assume?

Mr. MILLER of California. I would not say that, but I will say for the gentleman's information that we in California export to the canneries, in his section, about a million pounds of salmon a year that are used to bring up the coloring of the salmon in the north. The Chinook salmon taken in the Sacramento River are used to blend with the fish of the Columbia River to bring up the color tone of them.

Mr. NORBLAD. That is certainly news to me.

Mr. MILLER of California. I will be glad to discuss that with the gentleman at any time he wants me to go further into the matter. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that for 4 years I was head of the California Division of Fish and Game and I think I know something about the fishery resources of the west coast.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that one of the most rapidly growing sections in the United States is the East Bay section of the San Francisco Bay area. Water is essential for its development, and I call attention to the fact that we need the new source of water to come with the construction of this dam. I do not have to tell you of the necessity for conservation, as you know it too well.

I remember 2 years ago having the privilege of visiting Jerusalem in the company of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. It was on this trip that we discussed a great many of the conservation problems, and I like to think that perhaps some of the data that he got at that time was responsible for the support he has given us in California and our Central Valley project. He has visited it, he knows it, and, with the enthusiasm that usually characterizes the gentleman, he has become one of its sponsors in this House. It was during that trip that we saw what happens when you lose your natural resources, when you lose the land. The hill upon which Bethlehem is located has the remnants of the stone wall contours on it that indicated it was once cultivated arable land. A little monk who acted as our guide told us that the meaning of Bethlehem was green hill or a green place, and that once it was green with growing things. It is a rocky, barren hill today. But the land was gone and what is left is sterile. That is what can happen to us in the West if we do not conserve our resources and if we do not master the water.

I would be derelict if I did not say that President Truman, who is familiar with the problems of the West, and familiar particularly with the problems in the Central Valley, has been very helpful to us in this connection, and on more than one occasion I personally have gone down to discuss it with him and have found that he has a fine knowledge of our water power and other conservation needs. He knows them inimitably and well.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, this project vitally affects the farmers and the irrigationists in my district. I think we get most of the benefits from it, and my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. ENGLE and Mr. MILLER] and others, have done most of the work on it. I want to take my hat off to those gentlemen for the fine job they have done.

I merely want to say to the members of the committee that there is no difference of opinion, no disagreement of any kind on this matter within the California delegation so far as I am able to find out. On this bill we are 100 percent in accord, and we will sincerely appreciate the support of the other members of the committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the bill has been explained in detail, and I invite particular attention to the report which sets forth the justification thereof.

We have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill has the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Lands and as will appear from the debate here today the Members from California are urging the passage.

The President of the United States on January 12, 1948, sent a message transmitting his recommendation that Congress expand the present authorization for the construction of Folsom Dam. He stated, among other things:

> The Folsom Dam and Reservoir is a key unit in any plan for the full development of the water resources of the Central Valley. There is an urgent need for this structure.

He also said:

> The power plant at Folsom must be integrated with the hydroelectric power plants at Shasta and Keswick * * * and with the Delta-Mendota pumping plant of the Central Valley project—all of which must be operated as a unit. * * * The transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation would assure that Folsom Dam and its important related developments would be operated in coordination with other Federal conservation structures in the Central Valley to yield the greatest possible benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Central Valley project, California, authorized by section 2 of the act of Congress of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 850), is hereby reauthorized to include the American River development as hereinafter described, and the whole is declared to be for the purpose of the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands; the controls of floods; the development of electric power; furnishing municipal and industrial water supplies; the control of salinity; fish and wildlife development; and recreation, and other purposes.

SEC. 2. The American River development shall consist of: Folsom Dam and Reservoir, having a storage capacity of approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet, to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers at such point below the confluence of the north fork and the south fork of the American River near the city of Folsom, Calif., as the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers after consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation and other appropriate State, Federal, and local agencies may find most advisable; and the following features for the development and use of water, to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior through the Commissioner of Reclamation: A hydroelectric power plant with a generating capacity of approximately 90,000 kilowatts, and necessary afterbay and such supplemental works and equipment as may be required to maintain a firm supply of electrical energy, necessary electric transmission lines to power load center; a storage dam with a capacity of approximately 40,000 acre-feet to be located on Sly Park Creek, a tributary of the north fork of Consumnas River, with necessary appurtenant works, including a diversion dam on Camp Creek, tunnel, conduit, and canals for the delivery of water to lands in El Dorado County, and incidental works appurtenant thereto. The Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, is hereby authorized and directed to conduct the necessary investigations, surveys, and studies for the purpose of developing plans for disposing of the water and electric power which would be made available by the project, and render reports thereon which would set forth the works required for such disposition, together with findings as to their engineering and financial feasibility,

including a study of the water resources and requirements of the entire American River watershed and the areas serviceable therefrom, and of a diversion canal at the highest feasible level extending southerly from Folsom Reservoir as will permit the maximum beneficial use of the water for irrigation of the lands lying under said canal in El Dorado and Sacramento Counties; a diversion canal at the highest feasible level for the purpose of securing the maximum beneficial use of the water in Placer County extending northerly from such reservoir to a point in the vicinity of Roseville, Calif., and a conduit or conduits with necessary pumping plants and supplemental works extending from the most feasible diversion point on the Central Valley project, California, to serve lands and municipalities in Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Benito Counties.

Said studies and the reports thereon shall be submitted to the proper State authorities under the procedure provided for in the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Public Law 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess).

Folsom Dam and Reservoir, upon completion of construction by the Corps of Engineers, to the extent where water from said reservoir is ready to be turned either into the power plant or conduits, shall be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior together with the other features of the American River development herein authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, all in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). After the transfer as provided herein, the dam shall be operated for flood control in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Army as provided for in section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Public Law 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.).

SEC. 3. In locating and designing the works authorized for construction by section 2 of this act the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation shall give due consideration to the report set forth in Bulletin No. 26 of the Division of Water Resources of the Department of Public Works of the State of California, and shall consult the local interests to be affected by the construction and operation of said works, through public hearings or in such other manner as in their discretion may be found best suited to a maximum expression of the views of such local interests.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to cause the operation of said works to be coordinated and integrated with the operation of existing and future features of the Central Valley project in such manner as will effectuate the fullest and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Central Valley project of California for the widest possible public benefit.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "and the whole" and insert "which development."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "ninety thousand" and insert "one hundred and twenty thousand."

Page 2, line 17, after the word "necessary", insert "hydroelectric."

Page 2, line 17, after the word "afterbay", insert "power plants."

Page 2, line 18, strike out beginning with the word "such" down to and including the word "energy" on line 20.

Page 3, line 3, after the word "hereby", insert "further."

Page 3, line 7, after "project", insert "including studies of such supplemental works and equipment as may be required to maintain a firm supply of electric energy."

Page 3, line 14, after the word "and", insert "particularly."

Page 4, line 3, insert "Nothing contained in this act shall be construed by implication or otherwise as an allocation of water and in the studies for the purposes of developing plans for disposal of water as herein authorized the Secretary of the Interior shall make recommendations for the use of water in accord with State water laws, including but not limited to such laws giving priority to the counties and areas of origin for present and future needs."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I may say that this amendment, which bore the name of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], was reported unanimously by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON: On page 3, line 21, after the word "point" insert the words "on the Bear River"; and in line 22, strike out "Roseville" and insert "Sheridan."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to make it in conformity with the whole project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EBERHARTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 165) to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 166, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT LONG-RANGE PROVING GROUND FOR GUIDED MISSILES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 10, after the word "missiles", insert "authorized by this Act,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

OVERTON BROOKS,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
W. STERLING COLE,
JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN,
CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 2 of the House bill authorized the Secretary of the Air Force, in discharging the authority to establish the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, to make surveys and to acquire lands and rights or other interests pertaining thereto. It provided that, in any case in which lands of the United States in connection with which grazing permits or licenses have been issued are used for the purpose of establishing the proving ground, the payments to which the holders of such permits are entitled under the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C. Supp. 315q), could be made without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes which prohibits advance payments. The effect of the Senate amendment to section 2 was to extend the exemption from the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes so that in any case involving the making of surveys or the acquisition of lands and rights or other interests pertaining

thereto advance payments could be made. The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 2: The Senate amendment requires that in any case in which the Secretary of the Air Force desires to acquire any lands or rights or other interests pertaining thereto for the purpose of establishing the joint long-range proving ground he shall come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives before acquiring such lands, rights, or other interests. The Senate amendment is applicable with respect not only to the acquisition of lands or rights or other interests pertaining thereto located within the United States but also to the acquisition of any lands or rights or other interests pertaining thereto through any type of agreement or treaty with any foreign nation. The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 3: The Senate amendment substitutes a single section, section 4, for sections 4 and 5 of the House bill. Section 4 of the House bill authorized the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to contribute to the support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles to the extent that any one of them might deem necessary or advisable. That section also specifically authorized the other services to furnish their respective contributions of support in the form of allocation of funds available to them for such purposes as well as by other means. The Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary of Defense to determine, as he may deem appropriate, the extent to which contributions of support shall be made by one service to another in connection with the establishment and operation of the proving ground. Moreover, the amendment eliminates the authority contained in section 4 of the House bill to contribute monetary support and specifically limits the authority for support to the loan, assignment, or transfer of personnel, supplies, equipment, and services with or without reimbursement. In this manner the types of support which are permissible are limited to assistance in kind and no service may furnish monetary support. The purpose of this limitation is to prevent the enlargement of appropriations which may be made for these purposes over and above the sums specifically intended by the Congress through the interservice transfer of additional sums of money.

Section 5 of the House bill authorized the Secretary of Defense in his discretion to transfer all or any part of the authority granted by this act from the Secretary of the Air Force to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy, and to subsequently retransfer such authority or any part thereof to the Secretary of the Air Force or to the Secretary of either of the other two services. This section further authorized the Secretary of Defense, in connection with any such transfer or retransfer, to transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment or support of the joint long-range proving ground. The effect of the Senate amendment, insofar as section 5 of the House bill is concerned, is merely to clarify the language of the House bill by setting forth more clearly the intent of the Congress to permit transfers and retransfers between any and all of the services at any time in the future.

The conference agreement adopts the substance of the Senate amendment.

OVERTON BROOKS,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
W. STERLING COLE,
JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the managers on the part of the House. It merely restates in words, perhaps a little more clear and succinct, the provisions of the original bill which passed the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think it might be important for the gentleman to point out that the conference report differs from the provisions of the House bill in that before any acquisition under the authority of the bill is made by any of the services, the services will come into agreement with the committees of the Senate and House, both with respect to the terms of the particular acquisition and the terms of any agreement which might be incidental to, but necessary in, the acquisition.

Mr. BROOKS. I would say to the gentleman that that arrangement is substantially in accordance with the agreement made with the Committee on Armed Services of the House prior to the passage of the bill in the House. Is that not true?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is correct. There is this further point, if the gentleman will permit, that the bill, as now recommended, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to delegate the operational jurisdiction of this activity to one of the three existing departments, but only with respect to this particular guided-missile range, and not to other guided-missile ranges now being operated by the services.

Mr. BROOKS. That is the amendment which the House conferees urged should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain material.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in a third instance and include therein a speech by Hon. John W. Gibson, Assistant Secretary of Labor. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost $187.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 185, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 87]

Andresen, August H.	Heffernan	Regan
Breen	Herter	Ribicoff
Buckley, N. Y.	Hobbs	Rich
Bulwinkle	Hoffman, Ill.	Scott, Hardie
Burke	Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Irving	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Steed
DeGraffenried	Jennings	Stigler
Dingell	Kearney	Stockman
Ellsworth	Lind	Sutton
Fallon	Lodge	Thomas, N. J.
Fellows	Lucas	Towe
Fisher	McMillen, Ill.	Walsh
Fogarty	Mason	Welch, Mo.
Furcolo	Morton	Whitaker
Garmatz	Murphy	White, Calif.
Gilmer	Murray, Wis.	White, Idaho
Gossett	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson, Ind.
Hart	Pace	Withrow
Hedrick	Potter	Wood
	Ramsay	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who has consented to take charge of the time on the minority side, during the discussion on the rule, and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, there is now before the House for its consideration House Resolution 185, which makes in order the bill (H. R. 2989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation. As you well remember, we purchased these islands from Denmark. They became a part of this country, but the islands were not established under any government instrumentality. In order for the people of the Virgin Islands to transact business, and to do the things that a normal citizenry ordinarily do, there was set up in 1934 the Virgin Islands Company. When that expired, it was reincorporated and the authority for that expires on

June 30, 1949. This bill calls for the incorporation of a new entity to be known as the Virgin Islands Corporation, which encompasses practically everything that was in the former Virgin Islands Company, besides adding a few more powers. I want to especially call to your attention that under this bill the corporation not only reports to the Department of the Interior, but must also report to the President of the United States. We ask your favorable consideration for this matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time on the rule to discuss briefly some of the provisions of the bill that you will presently be considering. The rule makes in order the consideration of a bill which will set up a permanent organization known as the Virgin Islands Corporation. I think the Members of the House will be interested in some history of the Virgin Islands. They are about 1,400 miles southeast of New York. We bought the islands from Denmark in 1917 for $25,000,000. There are about 50 islands. Of those 50 islands only 3 of them have any population. There are about 25,000 people in the Virgin Islands.

You will remember we bought those islands from Denmark in 1917, before the First World War. We needed them because of certain conditions in the world. We thought Germany was about to get those islands. Since that time they have been sort of a burden on the American people. I think we have an obligation to help take care of some of those people. How to do it?

There are three main islands, St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John. They make up the main islands. The Virgin Islands Company was incorporated in 1934. We formed that company in 1934 to try to help rehabilitate the islands. Has it been done? Over a period of years the WPA was in the Virgin Islands making some loans and they tried to raise tomatoes. Mr. Tugwell was in the islands and set up an economy for the Virgin Islands which they cannot possibly continue.

How many people in the Virgin Islands are working at the present time? Of all types, about 7.000. Those who are self-employed, as well as those who are working for somebody else. The biggest business in the Virgin Islands today is employment by the Government. I visited the islands a little over a year ago with a committee from the other body. We made a very careful investigation of conditions in the Virgin Islands. You know, we are in the rum business. I am sorry the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who is so interested, is not present just now. One thousand two hundred and fifty-two people are employed by the Federal Government. Only about 800 are employed in private employment. The rest, 5,000, work for themselves in some type of business. As I said, the biggest business is that of Government. We subsidized their government. The United States taxpayers have been carrying this load. We pay for their deficits.

St. Thomas is the largest island in the Virgin Islands group. There are about 12,000 people on that island. The city council, consisting of seven members, meets every day in the week. It is a year-around job for them. They are in a little town of less than 12,000 people. That is their livelihood. Such a situation is unthinkable in this country.

I was going to tell you about the island of Tortola. It is owned by Great Britain and lies just a few miles from St. Thomas. It is about the same size and has about the same number of people, 12,000. It has the same amount of rainfall, the same topography. It is almost exactly comparable. It is run by the English. On that island, however, they have about 500 farms. They could do the same thing on St. Thomas or on St. Croix, but they will not work. There is only a little group of people on St. Thomas who will work, that is the French group. They do not want any help from anyone, they will work. Over on the island of Tortola, run by the English, instead of 1,282 in the employ of the government they run that island with about 50 people. The Governor said: "I have the right to employ 52 people, but I am getting along with 50." They are the ones who supply St. Thomas and St. Croix with a great deal of meat and food. You see little boats going across this strip of water between the islands. It is not unusual to see the end of a cow sticking over the end of a boat; they are taking fresh meat to the island: a cow, a hog, some fruit, or something like that. The island of Tortola is run by the English with 52; we employ 1,282. What a difference.

Our financial and business management, as far as these two islands are concerned, has not been good. Then, there is an unwillingness on the part of the people of the Virgin Islands to work. Let me tell you this, you cannot go down in St. Thomas and find any Virgin Islanders working in the hotels. Who do they have? They are English people from Tortola or from Puerto Rico. Some Puerto Ricans have gone over to the Virgin Islands. They are not afraid to work; they want no help from the Government. These Puerto Ricans farm and make a good living. The Virgin Islanders do not want them on the island. Remember, however, that 90 percent of the population of the Virgin Islands is colored, and since 1914 when we took them over they have expected this country to take care of them.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Are the English colored also?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The English are colored also; yes. The people who work over in Tortola are mostly colored.

The Virgin Islands Company has gone into the raising of sugarcane and the making of rum. The Government I believe also owns a hotel, the Bluebeard's Castle Hotel. The raising of sugarcane is not a profitable investment; it is high-cost production. They have lost money on it every year they have tried to run it because of the poor methods being used by the Government and the type of workers they have raising the sugarcane. During the WPA days they raised a large crop of tomatoes and canned them and tried to ship them to New York, but they spoiled and they quit the tomato business.

What does this bill propose to do? The Virgin Islands Company ordinarily employs the year around, about 600 people; during the peak season they have 600 more for 3, 4, or 5 months. In the rum factory they have approximately 35 people employed. Most of the molasses for making the rum is brought over from Puerto Rico; they ship the molasses across the water to turn it into rum. Some said it was not very good rum, but during the war days there was great demand for rum because grain was being used for other purposes. Now, with the war over, rum has been running out of their ears. Dealers use tie-in sales to sell this stuff.

So, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues want to keep the folks back home in the rum business as partners they can do so under this bill, because the Government is in the rum-making business. I suppose one solution might be to force each congressional district to take a certain amount of rum, and they could apportion it out on that basis.

The bill proposes to set up a borrowing capacity of $9,000,000. Mr. Speaker, for the 25,000 people in the islands, that is $371 for every man, woman, and child; but if you take it on the basis of the number of people employed, the 1,200 people working the Virgin Islands, it means over $7,000 for each one of them. What are we thinking about? If you will read the bill carefully you will find there are two purposes to the bill. One section of it is to encourage private industry to come in and build hotels and create other business.

Another section sets this Government corporation up in business to do everything that private business is encouraged to do. It can buy property, it can go into almost any business it wants to. It is a socialist paradise. The other section of the bill states that we want to encourage private industry to come in. How are you going to encourage private industry when you set up the Government in competition across the street? It is ridiculous.

Let us look at the schools for a moment. I visited those schools. They had the first compulsory education system in this hemisphere. They are well educated. There are more Virgin Islands people in this country than there are in the Virgin Islands. The average age of the individual residing in the Virgin Islands today is about 51 years. The city of New York, as I understand it, has more Virgin Islanders living in it than there are Virgin Islanders in the Virgin Islands.

As I stated, I visited a school and it had about 150 pupils. We sponsor a school-lunch program, and it is interesting to find out that they had 165 pounds of potatoes for 150 youngsters. All the vegetables, all the meat, all the butter, and everything served in the school-lunch program came from where? From the United States. Yet they could raise

every item in the Virgin Islands if they wanted to, at the job. The fish came from Maine or the west coast, but all kinds of fish can be had if someone had enough ambition to fish.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. If this bill is enacted into law, will not anyone who attempts to go into private business down there be obliged, in fact compelled, to do the bidding of the Government and to borrow money from the Federal Government to get into business or stay in business, and if they attempt to set up a private industry of their own, they will have so much Government competition and so much Government control we will have exactly no private industry in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, it is impossible for private industry to go in there and engage in the same things that the Government proposes to engage in. That is what is proposed in this bill.

Let us take another look at this thing. This is not all the money we have spent. The Seventy-eighth Congress passed Public Law 510, which made $10,000,000 available to the Virgin Islands for a period of 6 or 8 years. Four million dollars had already been appropriated and most of it spent. The Seventy-eighth Congress did that. I looked over some of the things that have been done under Public Law 510. Here is an example:

There are two cities, Christiansted and Frederiksted, on the Island of St. Croix. There were 1,744 houses in these two towns. Under the WPA, or the Federal Works Agency, they decided to build some sewers in those two towns. They thought they ought to build some sewers for these houses; so they built 3½ miles of sewer for 1,744 houses. How many houses do you think they connected up? Just 83, and of the 83, 52 were government houses. In other words, Mr. Speaker, our Government is inclined to establish an economy in the Virgin Islands which the people of those islands cannot support. You could give a million people in China and in other parts of the world an automobile and they could not run it because they could not buy the gasoline for it. Here in two towns were 1,744 houses, and $1,500,000 was used in the project, 83 houses hooked up, 52 of which were government houses. I just do not believe that a people can long remain self-respecting when they are being supported by funds from another government. The Government should encourage local capital and industry by making some loans instead of merely providing work-relief projects. Since 1934 it has been a work-relief project. That is all I think it will ever be as long as this Government is the boss. Yes, encourage private industry. You cannot do it when you send the Government into competition with the very people that you are trying to help. Somehow the island people must change what can be changed. They must make up their minds to work, and nothing will be of much avail unless the island people themselves, with their own money and their own energy, attempt new industries. The standard of living established by this Government cannot be supported by their economy. It is nice to have streets and parks and sewers and roads and automobiles, but, my colleagues, if you cannot support them and you cannot afford them, then they are not of much avail.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, our good friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has repeated almost word for word the argument and the speech which he delivered before us on June 18, 1948. At that time the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress brought before us this bill. I think the sponsor was our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. At that time, despite the objections of the gentleman from Nebraska, the bill passed by a vote of 132 to 9.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman from New York said it was the same bill. It is not the same bill. This is a different bill entirely and includes some amendments which were not in the other bill.

Mr. POWELL. It is not a different bill "entirely," I beg to differ with the gentleman. It includes some amendments, but these amendments do not in any way alter the general character of the bill. The gentleman from Nebraska, as he did in 1948, has given us every reason to support this bill because he has brought out clearly that until this bill becomes law the people of the Virgin Islands will be on relief, in other words, until this bill becomes law we will be pouring money down the drain with absolutely no hope of any return. With this bill we set up a corporation which will loan, from a revolving fund, moneys to put the Virgin Islanders on their feet as a self-sustaining population.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question: Is the gentleman from Nebraska in favor of the millions of dollars that the United States Government is spending in Nebraska now to transmit power and light to the hitherto dark regions of Nebraska? Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We have no dark regions in Nebraska.

Mr. POWELL. Until the United States Government came into Nebraska and put up public power lines you had dark regions.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the people of Nebraska are paying back every dollar and with interest that the Federal Government has put into Nebraska for power lines.

Mr. POWELL. What difference is there between the purpose of this bill and United States power in Nebraska?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the people of Nebraska will work, but the people of the Virgin Islands will not work.

Mr. POWELL. There you are stating something that is a supposition not based on any facts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is charity and a relief project.

Mr. POWELL. This bill is not charity at all. That is where the gentleman is making a fundamental mistake. Has the gentleman any other suggestion to offer than this bill then?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I think I have. If we are going to have a relief program, we can do it much cheaper and easier than on the basis of $8,000 per person on relief. There are only about 1,500 people supposed to be on relief. We can take care of them much cheaper by some other method, because they are not going to work, and, I am sure if we permit private capital to go in instead of this socialistic dream, then private industry would go in and develop the islands. They will not do so if the Government is to be their chief opposition. There are three or four small hotels being built. They will close up if the Government comes in in competition with them, because they cannot borrow money at the same rate, and they will not go into business. There is a lot of opportunity in the Virgin Islands for private business to go in and go to work, and I believe they will if the Government will stay out. This bill gives the Government the right to go in and buy property and do everything under the sun. How in the world do we expect private enterprise to live under those conditions?

Mr. POWELL. But the gentleman does not object to the Government's going into Nebraska in opposition to the private utilities companies there and setting up public power.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We have no private power in Nebraska, it is all public power.

Mr. POWELL. Before the Government went in, what did you have?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is all public power now.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, I know it, because the Government is in there, but prior to the Government's going in there it was private power, was it not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Partly so, yes. But please remember these REA districts are organized under State law; borrow money from the RFC and then it is all paid back with interest. That is not socialistic.

Mr. POWELL. If that is the argument the gentleman uses, it is entirely specious. He evidently does not know that this is a democracy.

The gentleman used the term "socialistic dream." Is public power in Nebraska a socialist dream? Is the gentleman against it?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not know what that has to do with this bill. We are setting up a corporation here with $9,000,000 to try to reestablish the economy of the islands.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They have tried since 1934 to do it, and they have not done it. Since 1934 they have not reestablished or rehabilitated anyone in the islands.

Mr. POWELL. Since 1934 we have not had a corporation to do this job; we

had a company receiving only $900,000 in 4 years, and they do employ, even now, 500 to 1,000 people a year.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; since 1934 this Company was set up to rehabilitate the people and make them self-supporting. It has not been done.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman prefers to keep people on relief rather than give them a chance to create their own self-sustaining economy?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They have had since 1934 to make a recovery and they have not done so. Public Law 510, passed in 1944, has made $10,000,000 available to them.

Mr. POWELL. That is because they have been on relief. This will take them off relief.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] who sponsored this bill in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I point out that some 30 years ago the power of the United States went into the Virgin Islands, Danish territory, and acquired that territory without the consent of the good people who constitute the citizenry of the Virgin Islands. We acquired them under the slogan of national defense. I make no complaint against that. These good people in the Virgin Islands have been under the American flag 30 years. They are citizens of the United States. No man can stand on this floor and say that the Virgin Islanders are lazy, that they will not work, that they are not thrifty, that they are not intelligent, that they do not have the same emotions and desire to make progress that the people of the United States have, and sustain that statement by the facts. I defy any man to prove such a statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will read carefully the investigating committee report made by the Senate and House, of which committee the gentleman now speaking was a member, he will find in that report that the Virgin Islanders do not work.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I did not make any such report as a Member of this House. I am not responsible for what other Members say. I have studied seriously the problems of the Virgin Islands for fully 30 years. I have made many trips there. I know the islands. I know their industries and I know their people. I know the detailed operations of this Company since 1934. I am familiar with the balance sheet and the operating statements and factory operations and farm lands and so forth, with reference to this Company, and all that goes along with it. It is time for the Congress to do one of two things—either to liquidate this Company and get out of its operation and leave the people to seek their own way out from here on, or put this Company on a business basis and stop fooling with it. Let Congress make its decision.

So far as I am concerned, I am going to support this bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, there is not one word in the committee report that even implies that Virgin Islanders are lazy. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] any further requests for time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2989, with Mr. JACKSON of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, the strength of this bill, in my opinion, lies in section 9 on page 13, which provides for the appointment of a board of directors to operate this Corporation. I would like to read that provision for the information of the Committee. It is as follows:

> The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of seven members, including the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the president of the Corporation, the President of the United States representative or his nominee, and four others who shall be appointed by the President of the United States.
>
> The board shall select its chairman. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the term of the members first appointed shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment in number as nearly equal as possible each year. Qualifications of board members shall include demonstrated ability, attachment to the public interest, impartiality, and diversified experience among its members. The board shall include members who are not full-time employees of the United States, the government of the Virgin Islands or its municipalities. The board shall be responsible for over-all policy making and general supervision. The board shall meet at least quarterly, at least one of which meetings each year shall be held in the Virgin Islands. The board of directors shall act only by a majority vote of those present at a meeting attended by a quorum, and such quorum shall consist of four directors.

In another provision of the bill it is provided that the appointment shall be made without regard to political connections or affiliations. So that this board, when appointed, ought to consist of seven outstanding businessmen of the United States, appointed by the President.

I have not had the privilege of visiting the Virgin Islands. I do not know what my opinion may have been had I been allowed that privilege. I can see how good men might differ, however. Many men seem to have gone there and come back with an opinion somewhat different from others. But I do not recall having heard anyone who has visited those islands make the adverse remarks about them that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has made. Of course, I do not challenge his sincerity about it. That is his observation and appraisal of what he saw there. On the other hand, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] who went along at the same time, comes back with a different appraisal of the situation.

I do recall when this bill was being considered by the committee, that the only adverse testimony or statement made by anyone for the record was made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and the overwhelming, and I might say the unanimous testimony, except for Dr. MILLER's statement, was on behalf of and in support of this legislation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] put it as I see it, and so has the gentleman from Michigan, that it is a question of letting the people of the Virgin Islands sink into economic oblivion, or I might say economic destruction, or doing something about it in a manner that does not dole out the money of the people of the United States. One of the great mistakes we have made in this country, in days gone by, was following too much the dole system. But even that is necessary occasionally. I assume the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] would remember perhaps, in years past, when it was very beneficial in his home State, where he says all the people work. I have no doubt but that they do; but we are offering to raise the people of the Virgin Islands to a different economic status than the dole would allow them to enjoy.

This Corporation provides for a revolving fund of $9,000,000—not as a gift, if you please; not as a contribution, and not to take money from the people of one section and give it to another, but for the purpose of establishing a fund whereby seven businessmen, appointed by the President, may conduct the Corporation in a businesslike way, and make proper and profitable investments and loans, in keeping with good business judgment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman say that the purpose of this organization you are attempting to set up now is anything different than the Virgin Islands Company that has been in operation since 1934?

Mr. REDDEN. I have not read the original Virgin Islands Company bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The original Company was set up to rehabilitate the islands. We have poured a great deal of money into those islands. After 16 years, would the gentleman say they have been rehabilitated? If not, how will this

bill help do it any more than has been done in the past 16 years?

Mr. REDDEN. It may be possible that we took over a liability down there as well as an asset. If so, we owe a duty to the people of those islands, if we took them over without their consent and over their protest, to see that their economy is improved as we are trying to improve the economy of all other citizens of this country.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. One further question. The bill permits the Corporation to borrow from the United States Treasury. Is there any guarantee that that money will be paid back?

Mr. REDDEN. Yes, sir; I think there is. The assets of this Corporation would certainly be liable for its debts.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDDEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the chairman of the committee to have this fact in mind? I want to deal with facts, now—cold-blooded facts. And I am not going to pull any punches. We have got a question to decide here, and the quicker this Congress decides it the better it will be for the people of the United States, to say nothing of the Virgin Islands.

The Public Works Administration went down there in 1934—and this is the direct answer to the statement just made by the gentleman from Nebraska—bought a group of sugar plantations and two sugar mills, and the rum factory. That was one part of the capital structure. The Government of the United States incorporated the Virgin Islands Company, a Government-owned corporation, and gave it a grant from the Treasury of some $900,000, set the company up in business, and it leased the properties purchased by Public Works. Since 1934 it has operated and given great employment to the people who have produced there. It is a case where you have not poured in millions of dollars in the form of relief since then.

But this is the thing I want to nail down: That was not a capital structure to build the Virgin Islands economically. Any man who understands capital structures knows that you cannot buy a bunch of farms, a couple of processing plants, set up a little company to operate it and call that a capital structure for the purpose of rehabilitating the economy of a country. No such thing was contemplated; it was primarily an employment program to keep the people from starving to death.

What is the difference between that approach and this approach? It is as wide as the world, almost. Here you propose to go in and provide a capital structure sufficiently strong to do this thing of inducing the people to come in and invest their funds, establishing handicrafts, improving the productivity of the soil through proper soil conservation, impounding water to be used during the dry season to step up production of sugarcane so that the mill that is there in operation may run profitably. It provides five of the nine million total so that the company may lend it to people on good security, secured by collateral, because there is no other lending agency down there except a bank which is iron-clad and makes no loan unless you put up five or six hundred percent collateral. Now, what do we want to do? Do we want to single them out and put them on a profitable basis?

Mr. REDDEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDDEN. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] knows his problem factually and he can back up what I am going to say: That the difference between the Virgin Islands Company of the past and what this bill will do is that we set up the Virgin Islands Company in 1934 but gave them no money; we merely gave them relief. The amount of money we gave them in relief did not amount to even $900,000. What this bill in effect does is to set up a little RFC to lend to private corporations, private business, lend them money to get on their feet. That is what this bill does in contrast to what we did not do with the other proposition.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REDDEN. Almost two-thirds of my time is gone and I have used the most of it in yielding to others; I regret, but I cannot yield further. I suggest that the gentleman get time in his own right.

Let me say that the purpose of this legislation is not to create a charitable institution or corporation but to charter an organization to be conducted on a business-like basis by, as I have said, seven men appointed by the President of the United States, which group will make loans that in their judgment are secure, and to charge interest not exceeding 6 percent, as the bill provides; to offer inducements to get corporations to come to the Virgin Islands, to give publicity to the tourist attractions of the islands, the climate, and so forth; and to do whatever is necessary in keeping with the spirit of this bill to build up the economy of those people down there who have no other way on this earth to improve their standard of living.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask what this corporation is going to do with the money we allow them to set up this Corporation; what do they intend to do with it?

Mr. REDDEN. There are many things this bill provides. Of course the power is limited under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me answer the gentleman specifically. If you are familiar with large aggregations of machinery and buildings in one lump sum, you can comprehend very easily that at least $100,000 of this money will be used to put a sugar mill in a first state of repair. You can comprehend that probably $50,000 will be used for contouring all of the lands owned by the Company, buying bulldozers, terracing machines, and tractors with which to do that work, because there is no one equipped to do that work down there.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Do we do these things for the several of the 48 States?

Mr. REDDEN. We have done this and a lot more, sir, and have found it absolutely necessary, at the instruction and with the permission of the Congress of the United States.

The gentleman asked what they are authorized to do. Beginning on page 2 he will find the following enumerations:

(a) To examine, investigate, and conduct research and experimentation in the marketing, distributing, advertising, and exporting of products or resources of the Virgin Islands, and to make known the results of such activities.

(b) To encourage and promote the investment of private capital in industrial, agricultural, commercial, or related enterprises, undertakings, or activities in the Virgin Islands. Insofar as may be possible without jeopardizing the maximum development of the industrial, agricultural, commercial, and related resources of the Virgin Islands for the public good, the Corporation shall formulate its policies so as to encourage and promote the investment of capital owned by residents of the Virgin Islands.

(c) To engage inland-use planning to the end that the most economic and socially beneficial use may be made of the soil of the Virgin Islands, and to encourage and assist private persons and organizations to act in accordance with the results of such planning.

(d) To encourage and engage in the business of providing, whenever adequate facilities are not otherwise available, transportation for persons and property to and from the Virgin Islands, and from place to place in the Virgin Islands.

(e) To encourage, promote, and develop, and to assist in the encouragement, promotion, and development of tourist trade in the Virgin Islands.

(f) To encourage the establishment and development of small farms and small farm communities in the Virgin Islands, and, for that purpose, to construct, equip, improve, administer, operate, and supervise such small farms or communities and to give other assistance to them.

(g) To make loans to any person for the establishment, maintenance, operation, construction, reconstruction, repair, improvement, or enlargement of any industrial, commercial, agricultural, or related enterprise.

Those are some of the things. I regret time will not permit me to give an analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman from New York if we are passing the same kind of bill for the Canal Zone, for Alaska or any other Territory that we may have under the supervision of this country?

Mr. LEFEVRE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Or for any other State except the Virgin Islands?

Mr. LEFEVRE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON. In Alaska we have a little bit different situation. Ninety-nine percent of all the land still in the Territory of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government. Most of the operations up there are under lease, including mining operations and that sort of thing. They have an immense wealth up there. For instance, we have mined in gold alone more than $600,000,000 in Alaska.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that one of the geniuses of our democracy is its adaptability, the fact we are flexible enough to take care of a situation in the manner in which it needs to be taken care of, like this one. I think the committee has done a splendid job and I would like to express myself as being in favor of this legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened to everything that has been said. I am seeking information at this time. Do I understand that what is proposed here is to establish a corporate body by act of Congress to engage in the functions set forth in this bill, to be financed out of a revolving fund of $9,000,000?

Those islands are under the control of a political organization in the Virgin Islands dominated by a governor appointed by the President with power to legislate, is that not true?

What I would like to ask the gentleman is this: What is the relationship, if any, between the government of the Virgin Islands and the powers of the councils of St. John and St. Thomas, and this Corporation, and the powers, if any, of those councils and the governor of the islands to interfere in any way or to change or to limit or to extend what you proposed to do in this bill for the benefit of the Virgin Islands? I have heard no one discuss that phase of the activity at all, and before I vote on it I would like to be enlightened.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that there are two municipal councils in the Virgin Islands which constitute the local government: The municipal council of St. Thomas and the municipal council of St. Croix. In each of those areas they have the collection of local revenues and disbursements; in other words, the budgets. Whatever the deficits are in those two budgets for those two municipalties, it has been the historic custom, and is this very year, for the governor of the Virgin Islands to come to the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have been providing the necessary funds to make up those deficits from year to year. Now, that is the policy we have followed.

Mr. KEEFE. I am thoroughly familiar with that, and I have passed on those, but what I would like to have explained is where is there anything in this set-up that is going to stop that practice?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will come to that now. What powers do the two municipal councils have over the Virgin Islands Corporation under this bill? None. They have no power to interfere with its operation. They have no power to make appropriations to the Virgin Islands Corporation. They have no power to withhold funds or to interfere with its operation, except that this bill provides that the governor of the Virgin Islands, appointed by the President of the United States, confirmed by the Senate. may act as one of the directors of the Corporation. The proposal was submitted that the governor of the Virgin Islands should be the president of the Corporation. I protested against that and told them I would not support any such proposition, and I think other members of the committee indicated the same, because I did not want that political influence to interfere with a business operation, which business operation should come forth under this bill.

Now, assume, for instance, that this Corporation is established. Let me reemphasize that of this $9,000,000 structure we are setting up here, $5,000,000, or over 50 percent, is to represent lending power on a collateralized basis, if you please. If there are no loans applied for by people who may want to borrow money from the lending agency, then the $5,000,000 will not be called for. So, this matter is entirely in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations of this House and the other body constituting the Congress of the United States, and before this Corporation can even get these funds its representatives must come before the Committee on Appropriations and justify the expenditure it proposes to make constituting a part of the $9,000,000 structure or that portion which represents, we will say, $4,000,000, even to repair a mill.

Now, have I answered the gentleman's question?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has not, only in part, and he has gotten entirely away from the thing that I am trying to develop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, bring me back to it.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I will bring the gentleman back to it. The gentleman has been talking about the people of the Virgin Islands and the desire——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I beg to differ with the gentleman. I have been discussing the capital structure of the corporation.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that. The gentleman is talking about this capital structure to provide services and facilities to ultimately develop these people into being self-supporting. Now, that is a function of government. I want to know what, if any, power the existing government, headed by a Governor and operated by a council or councils, may have to legislate in the Virgin Islands that may in any way interfere with the development of these land-use programs or the acquisition of that land or the development of railroads or the development of power. Do not these people who have self-government themselves in the Virgin Islands have any right to say to this corporation that you propose to set up, "You shall not" or "you shall do this"? It would be a funny government encouraging self-government if you set up a supercorporation on top of their local government that can obstruct or do away with anything the local government might determine. I am raising this question merely to get the facts before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is all right; it is perfectly in order. It is a funny Government of the United States of America which says to Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, "Your legislation by your local people is subject to review by the Congress of the United States and the President." Why, we can upset the local legislative acts of the island of Puerto Rico, where they elect their own Governor, and we can upset any council order they may want to put through down in the Virgin Islands. Who can upset it? The President of the United States and the Congress of the United States. They are dependent upon us. They cannot go out and destroy this company. As I said before, and I am just repeating what I said, only in different words, the two municipal councils of the Virgin Islands cannot run this company. They cannot interfere with its operation because we have power in the Congress and the White House to stop those interferences. They cannot do anything about that.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that thoroughly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then what is the gentleman's question? I may be dumb, I admit it, but I am trying to find out what the gentleman is asking about.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE].

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will yield, let me give a positive example that will illustrate what I am trying to get at. When you established the Los Alamos atomic energy plant and established Oak Ridge you moved into Oak Ridge, a community of over 30,000 people, and you moved thousands of people into Los Alamos, and there you provided for a municipal government operated entirely by the Atomic Energy Commission; no mayor, no council, no ability of self-government on the part of the people at all, in either of those places, or at Hanford. Finally those people, who were living as Americans, rose up and demanded some rights of self-government. What did we do? Just a few weeks ago there was set up at Oak Ridge a municipal government giving to those people some rights as citizens. Now in the same manner, down here in the Virgin Islands, you have a local government. You want to train these people for self-government. What does this legislation do in that direction? That is what I want to find out.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his speech. I think he is making a fine speech.

Mr. KEEFE. I am seeking information. I am sure the gentleman will have sufficient time to finish his speech.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from New York, if I may, because they have taken up so much of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state that the gentleman from Michigan has already yielded him 10 minutes. Does the gentleman from Florida yield an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON. May I state this in regard to their right to govern themselves, a question that has been asked in part by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. We have another bill providing for a resident commissioner, which is an endeavor to assist the people of the Virgin Islands. Getting back to the bill before us, we definitely tried to keep out politics. On page 7 the committee wrote an amendment into the bill as follows:

> In the appointment of officials and the selection of employees for said Corporation, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I compliment the gentleman on the splendid address that he is making here this afternoon.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed the course of the Virgin Islands Company with real interest since I have been a Member of Congress. In my judgment, the course taken by the Federal Government in 1934, by investing $3,000,000 in land, a sugar mill, and a distillery to be operated by the Virgin Islands Company, was the only logical course to take. It was contemplated that such an arrangement would provide employment for the inhabitants of the Islands at small cost to the United States, and that has proved to be the case. The Congress was not asked for a cent of direct appropriation to the Company until 1947, yet as of that date, the loss in operations totaled only $60,000 for the entire period of the Company's life. Meantime the Company continued to stave off the necessity for a relief program by the United States. That was the alternative which the administration faced in 1934, and unless the Company is kept going today, and its activities broadened as would be provided by H. R. 2989, that is still the alternative today. I do not need to emphasize how repugnant that alternative is, and how at variance it would be with our American principles.

But I would like to make clear just what would happen if the present Company is not given a charter by the Congress by June 30 of this year. The officials of the Company will be under a statutory duty to liquidate it promptly. The immediate effect will be that the employees of the Company will be out of work. The permanent employees total from 600 to 700 persons. And an additional 400 to 500 are employed for the grinding season of February to June. Many of these employees are persons who would not be employed by private industry for reasons of age or inefficiency. The sugar mill operated by the Company is the only one on the Island of St. Croix, and is the only market for the cane produced by approximately 550 small, independent farmers. As of the last census in 1940, the number of employed persons in St. Croix was 3,429. Total population and number of employment opportunities have changed little since then, so that the Virgin Islands Company has been the direct income source for about half the employed population of the Island. Besides the various activities in which the Company engages, in addition to the sugar and rum operations, provide considerable indirect employment. It has also provided all kinds of assistance to small farmers in plowing their land and furnishing cane seed. Its equipment may be rented by anyone. It maintains a herd of cattle; operates a rock crusher, and the crushed stone is used in local road construction. It runs a mail, cargo, and passenger schooner between St. Croix and St. Thomas. And it operates a rural electric plant which supplies current to the rural areas of St. Croix.

There is very little private industry on St. Croix at the present time and what there is could not begin to absorb the persons who would lose their jobs if the company were dissolved. The municipality of St. Croix is not in a position to carry these persons on relief rolls. The municipality has been unable to raise sufficient revenue from local sources to provide necessary governmental services on anything more than a minimum basis. In 1946 the Public Administration Service, of Chicago, was selected by the chairman of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to make a study of the fiscal affairs of the municipality of St. Croix. It reported that—

> The governmental services provided by the municipality of St. Croix are not extravagant; for the most part they are barely adequate to meet the minimum requirements of the population. * * * The economic base of St. Croix is so limited that, unless there is unexpected and substantial improvement in the local economy, it can provide the funds required by the municipality only if all public revenues raised locally and at least a substantial portion of those originating from local activities are applied to the operation of the local government.

Local revenues are derived chiefly from the income tax and a real property tax. In the Virgin Islands as a whole, 84 percent of the families have an income of less than $500 a year and less than 1 percent have an income of $5,000 a year or more. During 1946, the median family income in St. Croix was only $339. It is clear that revenues derived from income taxes cannot be very substantial. As a consequence of the limited revenues available, only about two out of every three persons in the islands in need of public assistance receives it, and the average grant per person for all types of public assistance in June 1948 was only $4.05 per month. It is quite obvious that the municipality of St. Croix is totally incapable, at this time, of assuming the enormous additional financial burden of supporting, or even contributing to the support of, the employees of the Virgin Islands Company and their families, should the Company now be dissolved.

The alternative to incorporating the Company is a tremendous appropriation annually to the municipality of St. Croix for purposes of an extensive relief program. The people of the Virgin Islands are citizens of the United States, and we have an obligation to them. However, as a matter of practical business, it seems far more sensible to enact the bill incorporating the Company and setting up a revolving fund for the purpose of financing the Company's operations, than it does to take the alternative of making large appropriations for relief. In the latter instance, money will be spent without any return to the United States. If the new corporation is established and does its job properly, the funds granted to the Corporation will be returned with interest and will in the meantime have gone to encourage the establishment of new industries, and thus have provided increased returns to the local treasury and widened employment opportunities.

The present Company has demonstrated what can be done even with practically no funds and little authority. We can expect much more from the Company reorganized and recapitalized as H. R. 2989 would provide. The operations of the new Corporation will be under close congressional supervision under the terms of the bill. I think it is time that the Congress really made an effort to solve the economic problems of the islands, and assisted them to become a genuine asset to the economy of the United States as a whole.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEFEVRE. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if this does not set up the United States Government in business.

Mr. LEFEVRE. That is not the purpose of it. The purpose of it is to keep the economy going and not have all the people in the Virgin Islands on relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE] has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is it in order to move that the Committee adjourn?

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order in Committee.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is it in order to move that the Committee rise?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will yield for that purpose, such a motion would be in order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not yield for that purpose, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have not heard the gentleman from Massachusetts ask the gentleman from Nebraska to yield and therefore suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that a point of order based on no quorum is a privileged matter and is in order at any time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we are nearly finished and that this will be the continuing order of business tomorrow, I move that the Committe do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. RABAUT and KEEFE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 2 hours.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day in history for the long-suffering Jewish people of the world; it is a great day in history for democracy; it is a great day for people who believe in freedom and democracy for all the peoples of the world.

This is the first anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel. It would be pointless for me at this stage to go into the long and painful history of the fight for a free and independent Israel. For 2,000 years, as history records it, the Jewish people have been chased from pillar to post. They became a homeless, wandering people, always hoping that they might return at some time to their homeland in Palestine where they could establish a haven for the peoples of the world regardless of religion, where all people could be free and safe and practice the religion that they themselves want to practice, where they could worship their God in their own way without fear of violence from enemies wherever they might be.

On May 14, 1948, after 2,000 years of blood, sweat, and tears, there was established in the Middle East an infant state. Looking ahead now, anyone who knows the history of these people will realize that in that portion of the world, in that part of the world which is the last outpost of an outworn feudalism, is the beginning of the greatest democracy which that Middle East has ever known or ever will know, similar to the beginning of our own great country, this great democracy which is now without question the greatest democracy in the world. We now have a little satellite, if you please, a small state, a small country, which we know eventually will develop, possibly with a good deal of hardship and a good deal of suffering, into the same kind of a democracy, a place for freedom-loving people, as we have here in the United States.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WEIZMANN

Mr. Speaker, I have today sent a telegram to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the first president of Israel, who is now in New York City. I should like to take the time of the House to read it:

Hon. CHAIM WEIZMANN,
President, Republic of Israel, Care of Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, Fiftieth Street and Park Avenue, New York City:

The whole world hails you as the first president of the youngest and oldest democracy in the family of nations. This is an hour of triumph for all men of good will. The triumph does not belong to the Jewish world alone, but to all men who believe in human freedom, justice, and dignity. I deeply regret that I cannot be with you tonight. My thoughts and my hopes are with you and with Israel. As an American, I am proud of the American contribution to the independence of Israel; and as a Jew I am proud of the Jewish contribution to America and to the world.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has always been a tower of strength to oppressed peoples; indeed, to all people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no one who loves freedom as much as a man who has had to do without it. Wherever there is a nation chained to a conqueror, even though its ruler may be benevolent and the yoke mild, there is a time for rejoicing when the yoke is removed and the foreign rule thrown out. In Israel there has been born a new republic which, in the long history of wandering and displacement of its people, can find no parallel. For 20 centuries the Jews have wandered, scattered, often friendless and oppressed, never without courage, always a nation, never a state.

Today the Republic has existed a full year. In that incredibly short time the Israelis have repulsed their invaders, pacified their own territories, made peace with hostile neighbors, and have come before the Congress of Nations seeking admittance as an established, peaceful, and prosperous people. The scattered nation is united.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are of Irish descent have always had a special sympathy for the aspirations of the Jews. There is a clear parallel in the history of the two nations, in their conquests and dispersals. It gives me special pleasure today to hail the Republic of the Israelis.

Mr. KLEIN. For myself, and for all of my faith, I thank the gentleman for his words. They will be long treasured.

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling on the President to set aside a day each year to be known as Israel Independence Day. Although May 14 is the actual date, according to our calendar, of the establishment of Israel, in the Hebrew calendar, which has 13 months instead of 12, we commemorate the event this year on May 4.

Each year it will come out on a different date. Whatever date the Hebrew calendar states, that would be the particular day set aside by the Republic of Israel to celebrate the anniversary of its birth. In my resolution I call on the President to set aside a particular day, whenever it may be each year, as Israel Independence Day, to permit Members to extend their remarks here on the floor, or people anywhere in the country to observe the anniversary of the birth of a new republic, a new democracy in the world, which the world needs so badly.

I want to read a short statement from a speech made by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, who is the chairman of the American Zionist Council, an outstanding rabbi in this country and an outstanding statesman. I will insert the entire speech in the RECORD at the completion of my remarks:

But the Israeli spent their first year not merely in defensive fighting for survival. They set up the machinery of the new state, the complete apparatus of self-government. They held their first general election for a constituent assembly. They published to the world the draft of the constitution of the new state, a model of the most advanced democratic conception of government, grounded in the exalted spiritual teachings of justice, brotherhood, and equality of the ancient prophets of Israel. The dignity of man and his inalienable rights are proclaimed. No discrimination whatever between Jew and non-Jew in Israel, between races, creeds, and the sexes is tolerated in law. The Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States and the exalted doctrines of human freedom of our Declaration of Independence are in essence faithfully reflected in the constitution of the State of Israel.

GOING HOME

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take too much time because I know there are many Members who want to speak on

this great occasion. I want to point out, however, that in the past year this small state was set up in the main for the homeless peoples throughout the world, particularly the homeless Jews who had no place to live. I do not have to remind you that 6,000,000 Jews were slaughtered by Hitler and his minions in Nazi Germany, nor of the hundreds of thousands of Jews who were displaced, who had no homes, who had been in concentration camps, many of whom had suffered untold misery, had even seen their entire families wiped out before their eyes. It was they who finally found a place of refuge in Israel. Over 214,000 homeless Jews have been admitted to the state of Israel in the past year. Every day of the week 1,000 homeless Jews are being admitted to that little state.

One more point, Mr. Speaker. Everything that we could possibly do in this country has been done. We were, as you know, the first country to extend diplomatic recognition to Israel. Within minutes after the proclamation of the establishment of the state of Israel, President Truman, through the State Department, afforded de facto recognition of that Government. We were the first; other nations followed. Subsequently, after all of the painful delays—painful, I say, because the countries of the world were waiting for the Government, the liberal Government, if you will, of Great Britain, to lead the way, which they should have, as the mandatory power in Palestine—the parade of recognition began. As time goes by, I suppose we will forget all those painful thoughts about that once great power; but, unfortunately, it is painful for me to have to state that even now it is the opposition of the British Government and their representatives in the United Nations which has caused a situation which should never exist in regard to the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations. Who on earth deserves it more? The Arab countries have been admitted to the United Nations.

They were the ones that fought against Israel, in direct and outright contravention of the rules and regulations and orders of the United Nations; yet they are members in good standing, as this little country is not. On March 4, 1949, the Security Council of the United Nations voted to accept Israel into membership. When it came before the United Nations, a great nation, this so-called great democracy, Great Britain, abstained from voting, and many, many of the smaller countries that usually follow it voted against admittance. Therefore the state of Israel was not admitted. We hope that that may be remedied very shortly. I believe it will be. That is the final step.

I regret the lateness of the hour. Many of our colleagues want to express their thoughts on this memorable occasion, and I shall yield to them in a moment. First, however, let me read a paragraph from a statement made by Dr. Weizmann, President of the state of Israel, today:

> The events of the passing year have been great and impressive, but no less vast are the tasks which await us in the immediate future. May the first year of Israel's independence radiate its inspiration upon all the coming years of freedom that are to be Israel's destiny in future years.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, as I noted earlier, I am inserting the text of the radio address by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American Zionist Council:

RADIO ADDRESS ON FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL—DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL, ABC NETWORK, MAY 2, 1949

The Jews of the world will celebrate this coming Wednesday, May 4, the first anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel. In this they will be joined, I am sure, by non-Jewish friends everywhere who, throughout the long struggle to reestablish the Jewish state and the Jewish nation in its ancestral home, gave it their sympathetic understanding and loyal support.

The proclamation of the establishment of the state of Israel last May was for the Jewish people an historic act of incomparable grandeur, the majestic climax of a profound millennial drama. The hope of the centuries was finally realized. The faith which sustained them through the long, weary centuries was proudly vindicated. The people that had so often been consigned to death had risen from its immemorial crucifixion and had returned to sovereign national life. Quite naturally there was great rejoicing in their hearts. And when, within a few short minutes after the proclamation of the establishment of the state, the Government of the United States granted that state de facto recognition, an act which was to be the forerunner of similar acts of recognition on the part of more than 50 states since, the hearts of American Jews were filled with pride and gratitude at this historic and decisive act of support on the part of their beloved country. The oldest and strongest republic on earth had reached out a helping hand to the youngest republic.

The year which has elapsed since that memorable day, while never wanting in the sustaining hopefulness of the great political achievement, was not without its hard struggle and fighting for the new state of Israel, and not without other severe and taxing problems. Palestine was almost immediately invaded by the armies of the neighboring Arab states. Desperate fighting ensued. The United Nations was powerless to restrain the invaders, who had resolved by violence to alter the decision of the international body reached in November of 1947 to solve the Palestine problem by the setting up of two independent states there, one Jewish and one Arab. The successive truces ordered by the Security Council of the United Nations did not halt the fighting. It was on the battlefield that the final decision had to be reached, and it was reached. The fighting Jewish forces, though poorly equipped and hampered in every way by the mandatory regime from organizing and equipping themselves in anticipation of the inevitable military struggle which was to ensue, nevertheless fought with a valor and a skill and a resoluteness which decisively discomfited and defeated the invading armies. So that today, on the eve of the first anniversary, an armistice has been established between Israel and all of the neighboring Arab states with the exception of Syria, where a cease-fire order is in effect. Final peace negotiations are at this very moment being carried on at the peace conference in Lausanne, Switzerland, between the representatives of the Government of Israel and the neighboring Arab states. The old adage has again been proven: Freedom is never given. It is always won, and the price is often very high. The Israeli paid a very high price in war casualties for the privilege of becoming free.

But the Israeli spent their first year not merely in defensive fighting for survival. They set up the machinery of the new state, the complete apparatus of self-government. They held their first general election for a constituent assembly. They published to the world the draft of the constitution of the new state, a model of the most advanced democratic conception of government, grounded in the exalted spiritual teachings of justice, brotherhood, and equality of the ancient prophets of Israel. The dignity of man and his unalienable rights are proclaimed. No discrimination whatsoever between Jew and non-Jew in Israel, between races, creeds, and the sexes is tolerated in law. The Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States and the exalted doctrines of human freedom of our Declaration of Independence are in essence faithfully reflected in the Constitution of the state of Israel.

Second only to the historic political achievement of the past year has been the amazing social achievement in terms of the rescuing of tens of thousands of homeless refugees and of bringing them into the country and giving them a new life and a new hope. Since last May nearly 200,000 Jews have come into Israel—the war-ravaged, the camp-wearied, the men, women, and children who had walked the broken highways of hopeless wandering across the face of Europe. They finally found sanctuary among their own people in their own land. They are pouring into the country at this very moment at the rate of a thousand a day. I know of no comparable saga in all the history of the migration of peoples that so many would so desperately seek the shelter of so little a country in so short a time. Israel is rapidly emptying the DP camps of Europe and solving a problem which all the powerful nations of the world with their vast empty territories could not solve.

This most welcome large-scale Jewish immigration into Israel has, however, imposed most severe economic burdens upon the young state. The cost involved in the transportation, reception, housing, and resettlement of these immigrants runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. The young republic is exerting itself to the utmost to meet this situation. The Israeli are heavily taxing themselves and are submitting to severe austerity measures to meet the situation. Jews throughout the world have been assisting generously to help care for the new immigrants, but much greater assistance is needed and everyone hopes prayerfully that it will be forthcoming. Of all the problems which confront the new state on its first anniversary, none is as severe and as urgent as this problem of immigration.

There are other problems with which the new state is confronted. It has not yet been admitted into the United Nations although the Security Council on March 4 approved Israel's application for membership in the United Nations. We hope that this admission will take place in the near future.

When I first addressed the Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on May 8, 1947, and presented the Zionist case in behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, I said: "The Jewish people belong in the society of nations. Surely, the Jewish people are no less deserving than other peoples whose national freedom and independence have been established and whose representatives are now seated here. The Jewish people were your allies in the war and joined their sacrifices to yours to achieve a common victory. The representatives of the Jewish people of Palestine should sit in your midst—the representatives of a people and a land which gave to mankind spiritual and ethical values, inspiring human personalities and sacred texts which are your treasured possessions. We hope that those people, now rebuilding again its national life in its ancient homeland, will be welcomed before long by you to this noble fellowship of the United Nations."

Now that Israel has achieved its independence and its sovereignty has been acknowledged by nearly all the countries of the world, it is only fitting and proper that its admission into the United Nations should no longer be delayed.

The status of Jerusalem still remains to be finally determined. The state of Israel is in favor of guarantees to safeguard the holy places of Jerusalem which are sacred to the three great religions of mankind. The President of the state of Israel, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, speaking the other day for the state of Israel, pledged: "To insure full security for religious institutions in the exercise of their functions, to grant the supervision of the holy places by those who hold them sacred and to encourage and accept the fullest international safeguards and controls for their immunity and protection."

The problem of the Arab refugees who left their homes in Israel during the period of the war is a serious social problem which has given great concern to the state of Israel as well as to the Arab peoples and to the members of the United Nations. The state of Israel has indicated time and again its readiness to cooperate in any practical scheme for the permanent solution of this problem. The suggestion for the resettlement of most of these refugees in neighboring Arab countries through a voluntary scheme of population transfer has been gaining favor in responsible circles. "There was a time," wrote Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, "when perhaps the best solution would have been for these people to return to Israel. However, now with the great influx of Jewish immigration from Cyprus and central Europe, the Arabs probably will be better off if the funds already in hand are used to resettle them in some of the Arab countries where there are vacant lands that need people to work them."

The gravity and urgency of the problem is not being overlooked by the leaders in the state of Israel, who have always advocated the policy of close cooperation with all the peoples of the Near East for mutual benefit.

And so, we salute the state of Israel on the occasion of its first anniversary of existence. Although it is beset with many grave problems, it will, we are confident, solve them by the exercise of the same skill, determination, devotion, and sacrifice which enabled it to come through the war dangers of the past year and sustained it during the many discouraging years of struggle which preceded establishment of the state.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on this first anniversary of the rebirth of the state of Israel, what else is there to do or to say but to join in the festive and congratulatory period set aside by the House for this occasion?

For those of us who rejoice in the reestablishment of the historic state there is in fact more which we can do. We can and must give evidence of our good will by practical, tangible, and constant assistance to the new Republic in order to bolster and make permanent the one real democracy of the Near East. We must strengthen the ties between our respective peoples by loans and grants and practical pressing relief made necessary by the influx of countless and stateless people who are returning to the land of their forefathers, the promised land. They return home to escape the horrible memories—the concentration camps, the massacres. They return in response to God's promise, which to them is a command and means respite from persecution, means peace and contentment. The hegira of Jews returning to the holy land has been of such great proportions as to excite wonderment and compassion, not only for the impoverished immigrant, but for the Israeli Government, faced with the solution of the gigantic problem of resettlement never contemplated and which quite properly should be shared in its solution by the friendly nations of the world. We should consider it a privilege to participate in the resettlement and rehabilitation of the reborn land of the Jew, for in so doing we will be taking an active part in the fulfillment of God's promise to his people. Sentimentally and in fact we will give testimony of the everlasting and imperishable word of God on this anniversary day which Moses and the prophets of old predicted, but only we, undeserving as we are, were privileged to witness. In this era of skepticism I am strengthened in my Christian belief to meet the challenge of the unfaithful, for to me it is proof of God's existence and of His everlasting love of mankind. It is the word made a reality. Shalom.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice on this first anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel. In this time of cold war and confusion, it is inspiring to us all to look at this country, new in the family of nations, yet thousands of years old in historical and religious tradition. It is a monument to an age-old hope, an age-old courage, rising afresh from the ashes of a persecuted people.

The devoted and tenacious spirit of the Jewish people has held them together through centuries of persecution, and the faith that has enabled them to survive has led to the foundation of a new state in the land of their ancient glory. Today, from what I can learn from people who have come back from Israel, they are creating anew, in that felicitous phrase of the Scriptures, "a land of milk and honey."

And they are also creating, in a land red with the blood of ancient wrongs, a new democracy, ready and able to take its place among the leaders of modern civilization. Hating dictatorship, hating false theories of race supremacy, the people of Israel are building a land of freedom and tolerance. Their example will spread over the Near East and out toward the rest of the world.

The Government of Israel deserves congratulation for extending a welcome to the homeless Jewish people of Europe who are finding new hope and life there. They are being welcomed in Israel at the rate of approximately a thousand a day. I hope that the United Nations and our Government will extend all possible help to this nation in its heroic effort to rehabilitate the thousands who barely escaped with their lives from vicious persecution.

I think that the Government of Israel, based upon the social teachings of the prophets of old, will take its place as one of the great bright lights in the history of the growth of human progress on our planet.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our calendar indicates that on the 14th of May 1948 the state of Israel proclaimed its independent existence. In accordance with the Hebrew calendar, which the State of Israel uses, that day was the fifth day of Iyor of the year 5708, and today is the anniversary of that great proclamation in accordance with the Hebrew calendar. Therefore, all civilization today should rejoice, not so much because a political entity came into being again but because there was reaffirmed the great principles of all monotheistic religions. It is in the Old Testament, the Torah, as the Jews call it, that you find time and time again repeated the concepts of true democracy and the true principles by which all civilized democracies may flourish. It is really a great day of rejoicing for all civilization. As I said before on the floor of the House, there in the Middle East, in the Holy Land, we now see shining brightly a beacon of freedom and liberty teaching by practice what we preach in principle.

The following is an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times:

BIRTHDAY IN ISRAEL

On the Hebrew calendar today marks the first anniversary of the proclamation of the existence of the young state of Israel. For that newest of all nations this has been a year of impressive achievement. Free elections have been held. A stable and representative Government has been established. Agreements have been reached with several neighboring Arab states, and on other similar agreements there has been progress. In relation to the capacity of this little land itself, a remarkable flow of immigration has been absorbed successfully. Economic plans are soundly made and well advanced. The future is bright with hope. It is small wonder that the day will be marked by appropriate celebrations.

On this day we should like to urge again the admission of Israel to the family of the United Nations. That question has now been referred to the Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly. It is kept there, apparently, chiefly because of a lack of agreement on a single point: Jerusalem. The original partition plan of November 1947, proposed that that city and its environs (including Bethlehem) be established as a separate entity under the international authority of the UN itself. Israel now aspires to have as part of its own territory not the old city of Jerusalem, containing the religious shrines, but the new city that has grown up outside the walls in recent years. Apparently the Arabs would readily agree to this, provided that they themselves retain sovereignty over the old city. The hitch in the General Assembly arises from the fact that some member nations are unwilling to vote for Israel's admission to the UN until there is an explicit recognition of the proposal in the original partition plan for the establishment of the whole Jerusalem area under international control.

Undoubtedly there is a problem here to be solved. But the existence of this problem does not constitute an adequate reason for denying Israel membership in the United Nations. Sufficient proof of this fact is that none of the Arab states—Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, or Yemen—has been denied membership for the reason that they likewise question the proposal for putting Jerusalem under international control. The admission of Israel would, therefore and in fact, place that country on an equal status

in approaching a solution of the problem. On the record, this admission is well earned and richly deserved. We congratulate the young state on an impressive first year and hope for its prompt and generous recognition by the UN.

Israel, we salute you. All freedom-loving peoples everywhere salute you. Eternal peace and happiness is our wish for you and yours and all mankind.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the tragic story involving the history of Palestine and the Jewish people. We are familiar with the historical conquest of that little country and of that great people. During all these centuries, no matter where the Jew has made his home, he has held in his heart the desire and hope that ultimately there might be created a free nation in Palestine.

According to the Jewish calendar, the reality of an independent State of Israel occurred 1 year ago today, and it is a marked pleasure to extend my congratulations on the first anniversary to the Jewish people and the patriotic directors of the Jewish nation.

The establishment of the state of Israel was a significant development following long years of constant effort and suspense. It evidenced the turning point in the struggle of an oppressed people and recognition of their just rights and claims.

In 1 year of existence Israel has given ample proof she is ever ready to make a substantial contribution to the progress and reconstruction of the Middle East. Our confidence that the Palestine policy would be dedicated to the promotion of justice and democracy in the world has been fully borne out.

Israel has clearly demonstrated she deserved an opportunity to prove her ability to stand amcng the nations of the world as a free and sovereign state.

As an American, I was proud, and publicly endorsed, last year, the decisive action of our President in recognizing the state of Israel almost immediately upon her proclamation of independence. But more remains to be done than formal recognition of the existence of the state of Israel. Having taken the lead in proffering this recognition, the United States should pursue every effort to assist in the consummation of plans for the fulfillment of the destiny of this state.

Let us by all means be consistent. To do that, this Government is morally bound to actively urge and fully cooperate in having Israel admitted as a member of the United Nations. In this way, we can give full evidence of our readiness and willingness to aid a sovereign people in their acknowledged purpose of achieving a rightful place among the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the state of Israel has reached the end of its first year as an independent and free nation. Perhaps no nation in history has suffered so much or fought so courageously for the right to take its proper place among the democracies of the world. Israel's steadfast belief in the principles of democracy, its willingness to sacrifice life and property for its ideals, finally earned for it the recognition of the United States and other nations.

Those same ideals, which have made it possible for her to survive this past year of aggression and untold hardship, will lead Israel to realize her aims—a strong nation, built upon precepts of democracy, equality, and justice. Israel has won the admiration and respect of all the freedom-loving peoples of the world, who look to her to help win and preserve the peace.

On this day, May 4, the first anniversary of the declaration of Israel's independence, we salute the new state with pride and prayer in our hearts.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom in one's legislative career that he is privileged to witness the creation of an independent sovereign state. Therefore, we who are proud this year to be Members of the Congress of the United States should and will, I am sure, be pleased to join with our many and distinguished colleagues in noting the first anniversary of the new and independent state of Israel.

Coming into existence as it did, at a time when most of the world was hungry for peace, it will stand in that most important part of the world as a great symbol of peace. Rich in cultural and historic background; a place set apart to which men of all creeds can turn and there visualize the realization of a hope, of an ambition, and of an objective that has lived through the centuries—through centuries of adversity but ultimate triumph.

We hail the new state as a member of the family of peace-loving, civilized nations, and we wish for it a future as rich as its historic past has been.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, it was on November 29, 1947, that the United Nations passed a resolution to establish a Jewish state in the British Mandate of Palestine. While this was a world-wide recognition of the 2,000-year struggle of the Jewish people to regain their homeland, it was not until May 14, 1948, that the Jewish state was proclaimed and the British mandate came to an end.

And on that memorable day—May 14, 1948—began the struggle of the world's newest democracy against the ravages of invasion and war. In a baptism of fire, as it were, the Republic of Israel has stood the test. Today the people of Israel are preparing for their first anniversary. They have every reason to be proud of their accomplishments. The world, and especially the United States, looks forward to a strengthening of democratic ties in the Middle East. The cultural achievements Jews have made in every country where they have settled in the past will now find fruition in the Middle East.

We, in the United States, are proud that we have helped play a role in the establishment of Israel. We know how much the Jews of eastern and central Europe yearned for Palestine. We know what the rise of Hitlerism did to their numbers and to their hope. With the rise of Hitlerism, Palestine became a real land of promise. The opening of her gates would have been a real weapon in the war against nazism and fascism. But we know this was not done until 3 years after that most terrible of all wars. In the meantime, 6,000,000 Jews of Europe lost their lives.

In 1948, more than 100,000 Jews came to Israel. This was a number equal to that President Truman unsuccessfully tried to get the British to permit into Palestine in 1945. In 1949, the Israeli Government hopes to welcome 250,000 Jews into Israel. I am proud that the United States Government is doing what it can to help these people pick up the threads of their lives.

Jews have contributed much to the culture of the world. There is little question that Hitler fought them because to him they represented the culture associated with democracy. They were individualists; they were champions of civil rights. They stood in the way of autocracy. In his fiendish effort to kill democracy in Germany, he also killed that country's progress in art, music, science, and literature. We should always be thankful that some of the scientists he chased from Germany came to this country and were instrumental in developing the atomic bomb. What if they had been forced to work for the Nazi machine?

Who is not familiar with the names of Wassermann and Ehrlich in medicine; Fritz Haber in chemistry; Disraeli and Blum in politics; Mendelssohn and Rubenstein in music? They are just a few Jews who have contributed to the welfare of the human race.

And in the United States to mention a few: Did not a Jewish friend of George Washington go into poverty because he gave all his money to the cause of our freedom? Judah P. Benjamin was in the Confederate cabinet. Samuel Gompers, who founded the American Federation of Labor, and Sidney Hillman are but two who fought valiantly to advance the cause of American labor. Irving Berlin and George Gershwin gave us memorable music. And what of the philanthropists? There are only a handful of really wealthy Jews in the United States, but they stand among our greatest philanthropists. To mention only a few, there are the Rosenwalds, Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Strauses, and the Guggenheims. Julius Rosenwald alone helped establish more than 5,000 Negro schools in the United States.

With the example of what Jews in other lands have accomplished, I feel certain that one of the great cultural and democratic centers of the world of tomorrow will be Israel. Its first anniversary is a cause for rejoicing throughout the democratic world.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

WORLD JEWRY AND ISRAEL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, what has come to be the state of Israel is not beyond imagination, because it was imagi-

nation and vision that shaped it, but its significance and impact to and on the world that is and the world that will be demand the most careful of examinations.

We have reason to be proud. Over 50 nations have granted recognition to Israel. The dramatic recognition by the United States almost simultaneous with the proclamation of independence was the signal for other countries to follow suit. And I admit it was a bit more than ironic to watch the nations tumble forward to recognition because bullets had given a more unanswerable argument than all the logic and all the equities and moralities could produce before. I believe that to be the saddest commentary on our times. Indeed, the recognitions came in so fast and furiously that the Israelis considered putting up a sign, "No recognitions received after 12." In fact, Eleazer Kaplan, Israeli Secretary of Treasury, told me that he had issued strict orders to his staff not to awaken him under any circumstances if a new recognition comes in. Such is the bandwagon fever of our day. It is not a pretty thought that scurries across the mind of how much bloodshed and heartache and sacrifice could have been avoided had each nation acted on the merits of logic and conscience in the first place.

However, that page of history is turned, turned it is true by the valor and sword and shield of the Israelis, but turned behind us, nonetheless. The pace, henceforth, must be a forward one.

That it will be is testified to by the action of the Security Council in its affirmatively acknowledging that Israel is acceptable to it for membership in the United Nations. Russia and the United States met in agreement on the admission of Israel; a small but significant bridgehead was thus secured between the East and West, a portent, God willing, that other areas of agreement can yet be reached. China, too, nodded in assent, China as deeply aware of its ancient culture as is Israel. The Scandinavian viewpoint was expressed by Norway's affirmative vote as Cuba and Argentina represented our neighbors to the south. Canada, independently and maturely, gave voice to the conscience of the British Empire, in casting its favoring vote. Britain, under the sulky, obstinate, myopic domination of Bevin, refrained. That abstention did not add to the stature of Britain one whit. It merely confirmed the picture of a Britain behaving like a spoiled, peevish, and pettish child who had lost the center of the stage and now says, "I won't play."

As I said before, we have reason to be proud; we have, however, no reason to be smug. There is still much planting to be done before the harvest. The gathering of the fruit is not yet. For Israel with her small territory, limited populations and her dearth of natural resources, faces the greatest challenge ever placed on any nation. Israel is the first national baby with an international birth certificate. It is the first nation that the UN has sired. Israel will be asked to make none of the mistakes of other nations and to outdo their virtues. As her destiny is shaped so is the fate of world Jewry fashioned. It has been the pattern, you must admit, a curiously misshapen pattern, illogical and unfair, that the sins of one Jew are visited on all other Jews. Let there be one criminal of Jewish faith and he is evidence of the criminality of all Jews. Let there be one traitor of Jewish faith and he is evidence of the disloyalty of all Jews. The Jews have never been permitted their scoundrels as have other peoples.

The same inequitable challenge faces Israel. Her errors are prone to be twisted in all kinds of fanciful interpretations. She will not be permitted her frailties. The challenge is that she cannot just be. No, she must be better. Whether she seeks the pedestal or not, it has been thrust upon her. I do not say that is fair or just: I simply say that that is so.

Fortunately for Israel and fortunately for us, Israel is aware of that grave responsibility to herself and to world Jewry. She knows she cannot live in a hostile world, that she cannot isolate herself from the fortunes of the entire Middle East. She knows that if her own standards are to be high she must cooperate to revive an illiterate, disease-ridden, poverty-stricken, slumbering Middle East. She cannot be safe and secure without the safety and security of her neighbors. She has her own point IV in her international program, to extend to her neighbors, her know-how, her democratic vitality, and her social conscience, keeping aware, at the same time, that good fences make good neighbors.

It is in that direction that the Rhodes peace talks must proceed, not as victors brandishing the sword, but as ploughmen, together seeking from the earth the fruits of a just and dignified and honorable peace. I quote from the second book of Kings, "Let not him that buckleth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off."

But no less a responsibility does world Jewry owe to Israel, not in any sense of a political allegiance, but in terms of a cultural, spiritual and historical bond. Israel has given to the individual Jew—and I must emphasize the individual Jew—a more secure foothold in the country of his choice. Israeli victories on the battlefield have heightened the stature of Jews everywhere. We are now looked upon as sons of David and the Prophets, as descendants of the Maccabees rather than mere pants pressers and dealers in junk and old clothes. Israel has shattered the legend of the Wandering Jew, forever homeless. As the Irish and Greek and French and Norwegian Americans rejoice in the achievement of these countries so can the the Jew, openly and without apology, rejoice in the achievements of Israel. World Jewry awaits the day when Israel, taking her seat in the family of nations, participates in the discussions of the day, casts her vote with the rest of humanity, is articulate before the bar of the world, no longer in the corridors and backrooms pleading for the fate of the Jewish people, no longer a spectator sitting by while others decide her fate, but as a partner and a collaborator in the making of history. She is no longer a mere onlooker while others interfere in her affairs. She can now interfere, herself, in the affairs of other nations.

I really believe that the individual Jew in the United States walks a little straighter, his head a little higher when Israel is mentioned. I have seen this happen every time the conversation has turned to Israel. Seeing this, I know that Jewry in the United States, the greatest in numbers and in strength in the world today, as Jews, will give what help is asked of them. They will help, I know, to bring the immigrants into Israel, now arriving at the rate of 35,000 a month; they will help to integrate them into the culture, to provide homes and trades for them, to restore to them the sense of their own integrity, as human beings in a society that makes them welcome. Today, Jews from Europe, from the Orient, from North Africa are pouring into Israel, turning with Messianic fervor to Israel, the promised land, as did the ancient Jews fleeing the Egyptian tyranny, fulfilling the prophecy of the Book as they go into Zion singing. These are the people going home again.

Israel already has contributed richly to world Jewry. Seek the answer within your own heart. Now, world Jewry must be aware of its duties and responsibilities to Israel.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, Israel is a friend of America and America is a friend of this newborn nation. The world always rejoices at the birth of something. When a living organism comes into being it seems to add more to the luster of the world. So nations today should rejoice because a year ago a new nation took its place upon the face of the earth. The Jewish people have been, as my own race has been, persecuted on through the centuries, have finally realized their hopes and their ambitions. Israel is today a nation. It has now the right to make its own laws; it has the right to govern its own people. Its government has taken the concept of laws that we as Americans take, they are based upon justice to all people. The rulers of Israel have worked for the common good of the people, and in this 1 year every act of its legislative body, every deed of its executive branch of the government, has been constantly for the common good of the people. It is a democracy in character; it is a democracy in its actions. And it rightfully takes its place among the democracies of the world. It must now take its place in the United Nations.

So today the rest of the nations of the world in union with the Members of Congress of the United States join in expressing to its elected officers and to its peoples a fond and a genuine and a sincere good will so that Israel will continue on and on, as America has concontinued on, and take its rightful place as a leader among the nations of the world.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman for Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the great patriotism of the

American Jew and the exciting contributions that this great religion has made to the people of America. Well do I remember the words of the great English poet who said:

Breathes there a man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land?

This great body of people have never been able to say for generations that this is my home, my native land, and I am glad that the nations of the world have given the great religion of Judaism this opportunity to say, "This is my native land."

However, Mr. Speaker, throughout the world as they have been forced to wander, I think one of the greatest tributes we can pay to the Jewish people is the fact that in times of great stress, during all their trials and tribulations, they always had the highest regard for their women. We have seen great races and we have seen great nations come and go, and those great races and those great nations have fallen by the wayside because they made their women subservient and made their women bear the greater portion of the burden. But, when these people were making their trek into Siberia and were driven from their homes, their women rode upon the ass, when there was one available, and the men took the greater portion of the burden.

I am glad that these great people are finding a home and that they may go on and perpetuate themselves and make their contribution to a better world that I feel lies ahead for all mankind.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a radio address which I referred to by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the state of Israel, and consequently the fifth day of Iyyar according to the Jewish calendar will live forever in the history of the Jewish people and their long struggle for a homeland, as well as in the minds of all freedom-loving people.

As one who from the very inception joined and cooperated with the handful of honest and sincere men whose dream it was to bring about the realization of a Jewish homeland, I am happy, indeed, to be able to participate today in paying tribute to the state of Israel. In those days when the Zionist dream was being formed, we never in our fondest dreams expected that during our lifetime our efforts would materialize into ultimate statehood, and, further, that in 1948 our dream would become a realization.

On this first anniversary of the statehood of Israel, surely everyone must feel extremely joyful in the great attainment and accomplishments of the people who fought so valiantly under adverse conditions to bring about the recognition of the state of Israel. The trials and tribulations of our people in their Messianic quest for a permanent homeland in Palestine has finally materialized. Before our very eyes those of our people who lived in darkness and despair in the concentration camps have seen and are enjoying the light of freedom in Israel. The land of Israel has been won by bravery and sacrifices that have hitherto never been equaled.

I fervently hope and pray that the future of the new state will bring an end to the nomadic wanderings which have hitherto been forced upon our people, to the end that the new state of Israel will contribute greatly toward the enhancement of peace, liberty, love, justice, and freedom of worship, and that she may set examples of unity, harmony, brotherhood, and cooperation among the freedom-loving, progressive democracies of the world.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the people of Israel on their first anniversary of independence. I have watched with intense interest their gallant fight for a homeland. I admired their brave soldiers in the struggle against great odds, their indomitable courage won over what appeared insurmountable obstacles. I wish them peace and prosperity and hope that their nation will prosper and that they will take their place as one of the great and enlightened democracies in the family of nations.

A MESSAGE OF GREETING ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL, MAY 4, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago at this time all of us greatly rejoiced at the news of the establishment of the state of Israel. It was the fulfillment of an age-old dream and hope of the martyred Jewish people, a dream whose realization in our own day is nothing short of a modern miracle at its best. This miracle did not come of itself. It required much suffering, many sacrifices, a long struggle, and the ardent support of liberty-loving and right-thinking people everywhere.

I am very proud that the American people have throughout their history felt a warm bond of friendship and sympathy with the hopes and aspirations of downtrodden peoples to achieve their freedom and independence. This bond of friendship has also been extended in the last few decades to the Jewish people in their effort to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Now, it will likewise be extended to the state of Israel and its brave people.

Israel is today a harbinger of peace and progress. On this first anniversary of its existence as an independent state and a homeland for persecuted Jews, I congratulate its people and its able leaders and wish them long years of genuine peace and prosperity.

THE BIRTH OF A NATION—ISRAEL

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, according to the Hebrew calendar today, May 4 marks the first anniversary of the birth of the new state of Israel. Jews the world over are celebrating this memorable, historic day in the long history of the Jewish people. Many liberty-loving Christians have sent messages of congratulation to Mr. Chaim Weizmann, Israel's President. One hundred members of the British Parliament have cabled felicitations to David Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel. I join with my colleagues in Congress in expressing the hope that the state of Israel may flourish and become again, as in the past, a beacon light to the rest of the world.

The establishment of the independent state of Israel is an event nothing short of the miraculous. Few events in history can compare with this unique achievement. Only an inspired group could accomplish this objective.

Six million Jews were slaughtered by Hitler's heinous and devilish devices. Perhaps it was this frightful sacrifice of human life that inspired the Jews everywhere and especially in Palestine to accept the challenge of history and fight for independence. With what courage this war of independence was fought has already been written into history. The 600,000 Jews in Palestine were surrounded by millions of hostile Arabs, who in turn were in no small degree encouraged by Great Britain to resist the formation of an independent Jewish state. But the shooting war is over. Most of the nations of the world have officially recognized the State of Israel.

As an American I am proud of the role that my country played in assisting Israel in its war of independence. Congress after Congress approved the idea of those who sought to establish a homeland and an independent state in Israel. President after President, from Woodrow Wilson down to Truman, gave a helping hand. Now our country through its official representatives should use its influence in securing Israel's admission into the United Nations.

As an American citizen I am proud also that so many American Jews and a great number of non-Jews supported the Zionists that strove for three decades to establish the state of Israel. We in America are happy that the constitution and Government of Israel are grounded in democratic principles. Israel's constitution reveals the true democratic spirit of our times and may yet serve as a model for other nations that have not yet achieved democracy.

This independence day was celebrated in Israel with serious and solemn ceremony. I close with the statement of this celebration as reported in the New York Times:

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, May 3.—All Israel was festive tonight on the eve of the first birthday of the state.

Although the state of Israel was proclaimed May 14 last year, the anniversary is being observed according to the corresponding date in the Hebrew calendar which, this year, falls on May 4.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, in a broadcast, reviewed the state's development through trying periods. He reminded his people that the realization of their dream could not be fulfilled unless immigration were developed to the utmost. He mentioned barren wastes of the Southern Negeb where thousands could eventually be accommodated, and Israel's maritime service, which, he said, could bring in those who wished to come from the four quarters of the earth.

"We are not thinking of peace in only passive terms, in terms of mutual nonaggression," Mr. Ben-Gurion said. "We are thinking of an active peace policy, of mutual help and cooperation for the benefit of the entire Middle East. We are thinking in terms of a policy aimed at economic development and

social progress of this entire area designed to raise the standard of living of the population and to increase the independence of its people. By helping to promote the stability, progress and independence of the Middle East we are making an important contribution to the strengthening of world peace."

RECALLS MINORITY RIGHTS

Mr. Ben-Gurion also reminded all Israelis that, despite the nationalistic trend, they must never forget that among them were Moslems and Christians who must have every right and privilege accorded to all.

"As a free people whose political orientation is universal, to defend its independence and sovereignty, we shall loyally support to the full extent of our humble capacity every measure which strengthens world peace, promotes understanding between nations, assures the rights of man and the equality of nations and which strengthens the authority, effectiveness, and international character of the United Nations organization," Mr. Ben-Gurion said.

The holiday was officially inaugurated when the Knesset (Assembly) interrupted a debate on the government program to bring down the cost of living and Speaker Joseph Sprinzak read a holiday message from President Chaim Weizmann who is delayed in the United States. As Mr. Sprinzak paid tribute to the fallen in the past year Knesset members stood in silence with bowed heads.

The decorated streets teemed with singing and dancing revelers tonight. Festive services were held in the synagogues. The Ram's Horn, which, normally, is heard only on solemn high holidays, was sounded as a sign of redemption.

Foreign Minister Moshe Sharet gave dinner for the diplomatic corps at a seaside resort near Tel Aviv. Tomorrow's program includes military parades in all towns and villages. The Prime Minister and Mrs. Ben-Gurion will entertain 1,500 guests at a garden party.

LONDON, May 3.—One hundred Laborite members of Parliament sent birthday greetings today to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion on the first anniversary of the independence of the state of Israel.

The message conveyed "warm greetings to the labor movement of Israel," and added:

"We welcome the success of the working class parties in your recent elections. We watch with interest the measures of economic planning which you are taking to deal with problems similar to our own."

The Laborites said they looked forward to a revival of friendly relations between Britain and Israel and hoped that Mr. Ben-Gurion's efforts would bring prosperity and social justice to your own people and to the whole Middle East.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today upon Israel's first anniversary of liberty and freedom I wish to add my humble congratulations to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, first President of the new state, and to all of its citizenry. The prayers and hopes of the Jewish people throughout the centuries were at long last realized 1 year ago today, and in hailing the first anniversary we cannot help but pause and reflect in wonderment the remarkable achievements of this youthful state. Particularly when one considers the magnificent strides of this new state in immigration.

I have been pleased to read that homeless refugees are arriving in Israel at the rate of 1,000 a day and that this year 250,000 will reach that country. This remarkable achievement is most impressive. May this land of Israel be an inspiration and example to our consideration of the unfortunate displaced persons of the war-torn world.

The sooner that we can empty the displaced persons camps of Europe, so that homeless peoples of all countries and of all faiths once again establish themselves as decent citizens, the better it will be for the world's ills. I am hopeful that our own Congress will pass a displaced persons bill which will remove the inequity of the present legislation and which will open up the chances of liberty.

May this first year of progress be an inspiration to a never-ending successful and peaceful future.

May the star of freedom shine bright and forever on the new state of Israel.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by Julian Swing, and reported by Quentin Reynolds in Collier's of April 30, 1949, that Israel is "the only bulwark of democracy in the whole Middle East, and it is our kind of democracy."

In an inaugural address which, like Lincoln's Address at Gettysburg will grow upon the minds of men, President Truman drew the blueprint of the world ahead. In this new world visioned by President Truman international relationship will be based upon mutual helpfulness in the development by each country of its own resources for the advancement of the welfare and contentment of its own people and the enrichment of a common world through equitable interchanges in commerce.

I wish to call attention on this happy occasion, when we, with all the democracies of the world are celebrating the first anniversary of the new state of Israel, to the similarity in thought to the inaugural words of President Truman with those of Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion of Israel.

Broadcasting from Tel Aviv, the Prime Minister of Israel said:

> We are thinking of an active peace policy, of mutual help and cooperation for the benefit of the entire Middle East. We are thinking in terms of a policy aimed at economic development and social progress of this entire area designated to raise the standard of living of the population and to increase the independence of its people by helping to promote the stability, progress, and independence of the Middle East we are making an important contribution to the strengthening of world peace.

To me it is most heartening that among the nations of the world is now the young, radiant state of Israel, so successfully completing her first year of tremendous achievement, and that she stands, as shown by what she has done and outlined by the words of her Prime Minister, a bulwark of democracy and our kind of democracy.

Every pure heart everywhere in all the world must be filled with joy that at last for the Jew has come a homeland and that the first year of the new nation has ended in a blaze of glory. With my happiness, however, is a leveling sense of sorrow. The state of Israel was the dream of Rabbi Stephen A. Wise as it was that of countless thousands. The brilliant mind, the great heart of understanding, of Rabbi Wise constituted an irresistible driving force in America for this realization of the dream of his people for centuries. He lived to see the founding of the state of Israel and to watch through those anxious weeks and months when the new ship of state passed the perilous reefs. But a few weeks before this day of anniversary happiness the great soul of a great leader of his people, beloved by Christians and Jews alike, ascended to the higher realm. I have the faith that in the glory of the state of Israel, ever standing a bulwark of democracy and coworker with our United States of America for the advancement of the dignity, the welfare, and the happiness of all men, the spirit of Rabbi Wise will live on, and by good works be reflected through the ages.

The Jews in America, themselves, are a minority group. Bitterly knowing from their own experience the brutal treatment too often in some countries and the cruel discriminations too often in other countries given to minority groups, the Jews have never once failed to rally with all their force in numbers and in resources when challenge was hurled at any segment of our population because of difference in race or color, of station or of religion. In the new state of Israel they are the predominating majority group. What is their attitude on the question of the rights of minority groups when in the answer is no concern as to their own welfare? Exactly, Mr. Speaker, as it always has been—another powerful proof of the bond of understanding and of purpose which unites the democracy of Israel with the democracy of the United States.

In no part of the stirring anniversary broadcast of Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion was I more profoundly moved than by his ringing assertion that the Moslems and Christians in Israel must and will be given every right and privilege accorded to all.

All that I have said would be an idle gesture if I did not make a positive assertion of my position personally and as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress on a matter currently of the greatest importance to the state of Israel. I refer to the admission of Israel to the family of the United Nations. None of the Arab states has been refused admission because of the existence of the problem which is presumed to be the cause of the delay in the case of Israel. There can be no good excuse for further delay. The state of Israel has proved herself by her works. No state in history has made a better record during the first year of national existence. Every day that passes until Israel is admitted into full membership in the United Nations is a day deeply to be regretted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating the first anniversary of the establishment of the independence of Israel. The event celebrated today in Israel is celebrated, too, throughout the world wherever men thirst after liberty and justice; for the ability of the Jews of Palestine and the Jewish survivors of the Nazi halocaust in Europe to create and organize a state in the face of determined and armed opposition by the neighboring Arab states is one of the greatest triumphs of courage and justice the world has ever known. Here indeed sheer necessity and great valor by a people have triumphed over

seemingly insurmountable obstacles. It must always be remembered that 700,000 Jews in Israel were opposed by over 36,000,000 Arabs.

The historic role of the United Nations in bringing about the independence of Israel must especially be given great weight. Despite obstacles presented by the Arab states and the resentful attitude of the mandatory power, Great Britain, which was for a long time of deep concern to the whole world, the United Nations came through to its greatest triumph in the partition resolution of November 29, 1947, which was the ultimate basis for the establishment of the new state of Israel. Subsequently through the outstanding work of the UN mediator, the lamented Count Folke Bernadotte, and his successor Dr. Ralph Bunche and in the exercise of almost superhuman patience, an armistice was at last brought to the Holy Land.

The whole world is now encouraged by the expressed disposition of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the new President of Israel, speaking for the new State, that Israel seeks improved conditions of health and education and a higher standard of living for the whole Near East, recognizing that she is now part of a region and that her well-being is bound up with the well-being of that whole region. The Government of Israel is also to be commended for its enlighted statements regarding its full intention to cooperate to see that the holy places—holy to the three faith—Christian, Jewish, and Moslem—in Palestine come under international safeguards for care and access.

All peoples whether Jews or not who have resisted great oppression will realize the stake for them in bringing about the success of Israel, and in this spirit Americans who have traditionally helped new democracies seeking their way to freedom can lend their strength and resources in aid of this success. For the Jewish people in Israel it is an opportunity not only to afford a safe haven for the martyred Jews of Europe, but to show that they know how to build a country and how to do justice to themselves and their neighbors. All hail to the new state of Israel and its people, and may the blessings of liberty be theirs.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a particular pleasure that I address myself on this occasion to commemorate this first anniversary of the Israeli nation. I say the pleasure I feel is particular because of the fact that nearly 4 years ago I had the honor, while a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, of introducing the Flood resolution calling for the recognition by the United States of a free and independent democratic nation in Palestine, which has come to pass. The Flood resolution passed this House with an overwhelming vote on the eve of Christmas, that most important of Christian religious festivals. And there was great significance in that coincidence because I have never considered the Zionist cause in their eagerness for their establishment of this new democracy as entirely a Jewish problem. The cause of freedom for a race and for a people is at all times a cause to be sponsored and proposed and fought for by Christians. And, indeed, the United States of America properly was to the fore in bringing to the attention of the nations and the peoples of the world the righteousness of the Jewish peoples to the establishment of a free and independent sovereign nation in their ancient and traditional homeland of Palestine.

Here on the North African coast, along the shores of the sparkling Mediterranean, in the birthplace of three of the great religions of the world, there now exists "a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." That quotation from the Gettysburg Address of our beloved President, Abraham Lincoln, whose abhorrence of slavery and dedication of his life to the belief in freedom, will forever be an example to the lovers of equality and of justice everywhere for all times.

Mr. Speaker, I am mindful of the great contributions made by generations of American citizens of the Jewish ancestry and faith, acts of statesmanship, and deeds of valor excelled by none of the innumerable races and peoples whose blood and traditions and actions have welded this great melting pot into the leading Nation of the world, the United States of America.

And let us not forget that once again we have an example of hands across the sea—for the hand of Israeli and the hand of America will clasp in an eternal bond of understanding and friendship across the great Atlantic Ocean and across the blue Mediterranean. America will always be a friend at that crossroads of the world—turbulent and seething birthplace of man in the near Middle East.

The star of Israel now shines brightly in the firmament alongside her sister nations. Steeped in the tradition of democracy and the equality of man, the western Christian world will find a brave and courageous and indomitable spirit which will be excelled by no other star in that firmament.

Belief in an ideal, faith in a true cause, and the courageous dedication to its successful culmination is the history of many brave peoples, but none have been found more completely and without reservation than the Jews dedication to such a course.

As a shining example that freedom and liberty will never be conquered; as a heartening symbol to mark the way to all peoples and all nations suffering today the bonds of slavery, the new Jewish state, in the first year of its life, is a God-given example.

As a member of the American Christian Zionist Committee, it has been my privilege to serve with outstanding American Christians working in close cooperation with our Jewish brothers of the Zionist cause.

I do not feel that our work is done as Christians now that the state of Israeli has reached its first birthday.

I am sure that down through the long avenue of years that lie ahead great and good will be the deeds of the history of this Nation.

And I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty to aid and assist in every way consistent with the relations between sovereign powers the new Israeli Government. This state must creep before it can walk, and must walk before it can run. The genius and industry of organization exhibited by this nation and its leaders will, I am sure, accelerate the growth and development of this Nation. But I would like to feel that my country, always the friend and helper of little peoples and little states, is standing by watching proudly over the new democratic government and welcoming her again on her birthday to the council tables of the great.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment that the new state of Israel today celebrates its first birthday. We join in that celebration because by the establishment of this new dynamic and democratic state we see evidence of the extension of the democratic ideals which we in this country cherish so firmly.

The accomplishments of the Jewish people in Palestine in the short space of 1 year have been magnificent. Here is only a brief list of those accomplishments of a small but heroic group of men and women who fought for their independence in a struggle which bears striking resemblance to that which confronted our early colonists:

First. Against the greatest of odds, Israel won military victory on the battlefield. Six hundred thousand Jews, surrounded by some thirty million hostile Arabs, who had the material encouragement of Great Britain, succeeded in resisting the Arab armies.

Second. During this first year of its independence this little state settled approximately 200,000 immigrants within its borders. Most of these immigrants were rescued from displaced persons' camps. This was a gigantic undertaking in the face of a shortage of shipping facilities, shortage of housing, and shortage of many of the essential things of life.

Third. During the year the state of Israel drafted a constitution, established a judicial system maintained by magistrate courts, set up a civil service, and established a temporary government.

Fourth. In spite of the serious problems of reconstruction, the Israeli elected by democratic processes a constituent assembly, organized various departments of the government, and now are in the midst of creating a permanent government under a constitution approved by the elected representatives. It is significant to note, too, that the right to vote has been extended to any adult resident—Jew, Christian, Moslem—who declares his intention of becoming an Israeli citizen, and that the voting franchise is granted without distinction of race, color, or sex. In the first election more than 84 percent of those eligible to vote exercised their privilege.

Fifth. The State of Israel received the official recognition of most of the nations of the world. It has made application for membership in the United Nations, and that application will shortly be acted upon by the General Assembly of the United Nations, favorably, it is hoped.

Sixth. The Government of Israel has been able to attract into that country large sums of new capital for the building of new factories and the devolpment

of its natural resources. The latest enterpriser to investigate the investment of capital in Israel is the Ford Motor Co.

Seventh. The State of Israel has made preparation for absorbing the Jews who still remain in the camps of Europe, thus proving that Israel is in fact a real haven for homeless Jews.

Those who nurtured this dream for years can feel justly proud. By their courage and faith they have made their dream come true.

On the occasion of its first birthday, freedom-loving people the world over wish the new State of Israel well as it makes its contribution as a free people among other free peoples to the democratic ideals toward which we are striving.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, many Members have indicated to me that they desire to address the House on this subject, but have unavoidably been detained. I therefore ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject, their remarks to appear at this point in the permanent RECORD when it is prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as the traditional ram's horn sounds out today, May 4, in Israel, the first anniversary of the republic's independence, there is small wonder that the Jewish citizens of the new state have every reason to rejoice.

The first year of Israel's history has been one of notable achievement. Politically, a stable, democratic government has been established, and Israel is well on the way toward the conclusion of a final peace with its neighbors. Economically Israel's plans of development are well advanced and are rapidly progressing. Immigration on a large scale is being successfully absorbed.

The establishment of the Jewish state on May 14, 1948, marked the culmination of a long, difficult and memorable struggle by the Zionists to secure independent security from persecution and ostracism and to establish their own national homeland. Not only Jews but also many Christians from all over the world have sent messages of congratulations to Chaim Weizmann, the President of Israel. One hundred members of the British Parliament have sent a message of greeting to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion expressing the wish that his efforts would "bring prosperity and social justice to your own people and to the whole Middle East."

On this festive occasion I would like to join with the countless well-wishers of Israel in extending to this courageous and liberty-loving people my sincerest felicitations and hopes for continued success and prosperity in the many years to come. The people of the United States have every reason to be proud of the support which they gave the Zionists in helping them to establish their homeland. The Zionists themselves are to be highly praised for their perseverance in what for such a long time appeared to be a hopeless cause. In regard to both material assistance and diplomatic support at the international council tables of the world the United States has been in the forefront of those working for the cause of an independent Israel.

Yesterday in Tel-Aviv Prime Minister Ben-Gurion declared that the aims of his country are "mutual help and cooperation for the benefit of the entire Middle East." He declared that by helping to promote the progress of the Middle East Israel was "making an important contribution to the strengthening of world peace." In view of this high and noble ideal it is most fitting that Israel be made a member of the United Nations. Up to the present time certain political difficulties have stood in the way of Israel's admission to the United Nations, but these difficulties upon examination do not prove to be important enough to justify her exclusion. I hope on this first anniversary of Israel's independence that she will remain steadfast in her ideals and will soon be included among the other peace loving states of the United Nations.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain correspondence.

BOARD OF VISITORS—UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MAY 3, 1949.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As I find that I will be unable to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, N. Y., on May 6 and 7, I wish to appoint Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma, to attend in my stead.

Thanking you and with kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Yours very sincerely,
S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

BOARD OF VISITORS—COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MAY 3, 1949.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I find that due to the pressure of congressional work as well as the work before my committee, I will not be able to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy to be held on May 13 and 14, 1949, in New London, Conn. I am informed that pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939 (53 Stat. 1044) whenever a member or an ex officio member is unable to attend the annual meeting another member may be appointed in his stead. I wish to appoint Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, to attend this meeting in my place.

Thanking you and with kindest personal regards, I am

Your very sincerely,
S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for tomorrow, to attend a medical conference in Canada.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1741. An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 850. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

584. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a civil government for American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

585. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning a provision contained in Public Law 269, approved July 30, 1947 (the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

586. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend and supersede the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

587. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill which, if enacted, would require a classification of the public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

588. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

589. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of Carmen Lopez or Carmen Lopez De Tovar or Carmen Lopez De Herrera, file No. A-6394355 (formerly A-6382050) CR 21535, be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

590. A letter from the Chairman, United States Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting the Fifth Semiannual Report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission, for the period ending December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3881. A bill to provide for the use of the State course of study in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs upon petition therefor; with amendments (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. S. 270. An act to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to Trenton Dam and to name the body of water arising behind such dam Swanson Lake; without amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands: S. 392. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett; without amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 716. An act authorizing the Secretary of the interior to sell the land of George Peters under existing regulations; without amendment (Rept. No. 508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3616. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird; with amendments (Rept. No. 509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3886. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns; with amendments (Rept. No. 510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 196. Resolution to obtain information from the Secretary of State regarding denial of visas (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 4516. A bill to amend section 312 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for the retention of certain officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4517. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4518. A bill to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4519. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Mississippi River flood-control project at and in the vicinity of Aitkin, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 4520. A bill to establish one or more national cemeteries in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4521. A bill to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4522. A bill to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4523. A bill to liberalize the requirement for payment of pension in certain cases to veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4524. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4525. A bill to amend sections 555 and 556 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4526. A bill to exempt performances for the benefit of crippled children from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 237. A joint resolution to recognize Israel Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give due consideration to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to the end that the said recommendations may be adopted by the Congress of these United States and the President of the United States be directed thereby to effectuate the provisions of such recommendations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Tennessee Valley Administration having made outstanding strides, and being in favor of such low rates; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 4527. A bill for the relief of Mariana de Rojas, nee Mariana Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4528. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis J. Marx; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 4529. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4530. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna L. De Angelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4531. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth De Courcy and minor children; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4532. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ta Fu Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4533. A bill for the relief of Matthew Henson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4534. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susie Hundley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

760. By Mr. BREEN: Resolution adopted by the City Commission of Dayton, Ohio, urging favorable consideration of H. R. 4167, a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

761. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of E. E. Kelley and 74 other residents of Norwood and Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging repeal of the 20 percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

762. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Columbian Civic Club, of Newark, N. J., appealing for the support of Italy's moral claim for the trusteeship of her former colonies and for her admission to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

763. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of D. W. Wildman, druggist, and other citizens of Sully, Iowa, urging repeal of the 20 percent excise tax on all toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

764. By Mr. NORBLAD: Memorial of the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning that the Congress of the United States give due consideration to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to the end that the said recommendations may be adopted by the Congress of these United States and the President of the United States be directed thereby to effectuate the provisions of such recommendations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

765. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edward T. Welch, secretary, the Society of Medical Jurisprudence, New York, N. Y., stating their opposition to Federal compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

766. Also, petition of S. F. Matthews and others, Homestead Townsend Club No. 1, Homestead, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

767. Also, petition of Willis Sherrill and others, Sixth Congressional District Townsend Conference of Townsend Clubs, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

768. Also, petition of M. W. Clark and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

769. Also, petition of Mrs. S. L. Kinsey and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

770. Also, petition of Eddie Diaz and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

771. Also, petition of L. A. Tinnes and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

772. Also, petition of I. C. Ellis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.